PMO-RALG

KISHAPU DC CWIQ
Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services in Kishapu DC

JANUARY 2007

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was commissioned by the Prime Minister's Office – Regional Administration and Local Governance (PMO-RALG) and implemented by EDI (Economic Development Initiatives). It is part of an effort to conduct CWIQ surveys in 34 districts across Tanzania. The project Director is Joachim De Weerdt. Field work operations are being co-coordinated by Respichius Mitti and Francis Moyo. Field supervision was in the hands of Matovu Davies, Wilson Kabito, Henry Kilapilo, Henry Lugakingira, Josephine Lugomora, George Musikula, and Neema Mwampeta. The listing team was formed by Felix Kapinga and Benjamin Kamukulu. Interviewers were Dativa Balige, Geofrey Bakari, Rukia Charles, Abbanova Gabba, George Gabriel, Jamary Idrissa, Felix James, Batista John, Gloria Joseph, Placidia Josephat, Justina Katoke, Makarius Kiyonga, Sampson Mutalemwa, Faustine Misinde, 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 John Ibembe, Baruani Mshale, Teddy Neema, Anitha Philbert, and Jodi Schilz under the supervision of Manuel Barron. Assistance from Charles Citinka and Howard Clegg from PMO-RALG is acknowledged.

DEFINITIONS

General

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

Education

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

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

Health

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

Employment

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

Welfare

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

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

3 EDUCATION……. 17
3.1 Overview Education Indicators……. 17
3.1.1 Literacy……. 17
3.1.2 Primary School Access Enrolment and Satisfaction……. 17
3.1.3 Secondary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction……. 19
3.2 Dissatisfaction……. 21
3.3 Non-Attendance……. 22
3.4 Enrolment and Drop Out Rates……. 23
3.5 Literacy……. 24

4 HEALTH……. 27
4.1 Health Indicators……. 27
4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction……. 29
4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting……. 30
4.4 Type of Illness……. 30
4.5 Health Provider……. 31
4.6 Child Deliveries……. 31
4.7 Child Nutrition……. 33

5 EMPLOYMENT……. 37
5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population……. 37
5.1.1 Work Status……. 37
5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads……. 39
5.1.3 Youth Employment……. 39
5.2 Working Population……. 39
5.3 Underemployment Population……. 41
5.4 Unemployed Inactive Population……. 44
5.5 Household Tasks……. 45
5.6 Child labour……. 47

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES.. 49
6.1 Economic Situation……. 49
6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community…. 49

6.1.2 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Household……..... 51
6.2 Self- reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs……..... 53
6.2.1 Food Needs……..... 53
6.2.2 Paying School Fees……..... 54
6.2.3 Paying House Rent……..... 55
6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills……..... 56
6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare……..... 56
6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status……..... 57
6.3.1 Assets Ownership……..... 57
6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation ……..... 58
6.4 Agriculture……..... 58
6.4.1 Agriculture Inputs……..... 58
6.4.2 Landholding……..... 60
6.4.3 Cattle Ownership……..... 61
6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community……..... 61
6.6 Household Income Contribution……..... 64
6.7 Other House Items……..... 64

7 HOUESHOLD AMENITIES……..... 67
7.1 Housing Materials and Typing OF Housing Unit……..... 67
7.2 Water and Sanitation……..... 70
7.3 Type of Fuel……..... 71
7.4 Distance to Facilities……..... 72
7.5 Anti -Malaria Measures……..... 76

8 GOVERNANCE……..... 77
8.1 attendance at Meeting……..... 77
8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders……..... 78
8.3 Public Spending……..... 79

CHANGES BETWEEN 2004 AND 2006..... 81
Table 9.1 Household Characteristics..... 82
Table 9.2 Education..... 82
Table 9.3 Health..... 82
Table 9.4 Household Assets and Perception of Welfare..... 84

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Variables used to predict consumption expenditure..... 2
Table 1.2 Predicted vs. actual poverty rate in Shinyanga Region, and 2000/01……..... 3
Table 1.3 Cluster location……..……. 3
Table 1.4 Socio-economic group…….....…….... 4
Table 1.5 Socio-economic group and gender of households head ……..... 4
Table 1.6 Socio-economic group and main economic activity……...……... 5
Table 2 1 Percent distribution of total population by gender and age…….....… 7
Table 2.2 Dependency ratio ……..….....…..... 8
Table 2.3 Percent distribution of households by number of household members……..... 8
Table 2.4 Percent distribution of total population by relation to head of household……..... 9
Table 2.5 Percent distribution of the total population age 12 and above by marital status…. 10
Table 2.6 Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by socio-economic group..... 10
Table 2.7 Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by highest level of education..... 11
Table 2.8 Percent distribution of heads of households by marital status……..... 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 …..... 13
Table 2.11 Percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost their mother and /or father..... 14
Table 2.12 Percent distribution of children less than 18 year's old living without mother and/or father..... 15
Table 3.1 Education indicators……..... 19
Table 3.2 Percent of students currently enrolled in school by reasons for dissatisfaction…. 20
Table 3.3 Percent of children 7-9 years who ever attended school by reasons not currently attending..... 21
Table 3.4 Primary School enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender..... 22
Table 3.5 Secondary school enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender…..... 23
Table 3.6 Adult literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15 and above)……..... 24
Table 3.7 Youth literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15-24)……..... 25
Table 4.1 Health Indicators……...……. 27
Table 4.2 Percent of persons who consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and were not satisfied, and the reasons for dissatisfaction..... 28
Table 4.3 Percent of persons who did not consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and the reasons for not consulting..... 29
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..... 30
Table 4.5 Percent distribution of health consultation in past 4 weeks by type of health provider consulted……..... 31
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..... 32
Table 4.7 Percent distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by place of birth..... 33
Table 4.8 Percent distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisted in delivery of the child..... 33
Table 4.9 Nutrition status indicators and program participating rates……..... 34
Table 4.10 Percent distribution of children vaccination by type of vaccination received….. 35
Table 4.11 Percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information……..... 36
Table 5.1 Percent distribution of the population by working status (age 15 and above)..... 37

Table 5.2 Principal labour force indicators (persons age 15 and above)…….... 38
Table 5.3 Percent distribution of the population by work status (age 15 -24)…….... 38
Table 5.4 Percent distribution of the working population by type of payment in main job 39
Table 5.5 Percent distribution of the working population by employer……. 40
Table 5.6 Percent distribution of the working population by activity……..... 41
Table 5.7 Percent distribution of the working population by employer, sex and activity….. 42
Table 5.8 Percent distribution of the working population by employer, sex and employment status..... 42
Table 5.9 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by employment status….. 43
Table 5.10 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by employer…..... 43
Table 5.11 Percent distribution of the underemployed population by activity……..... 44
Table 5.12 Percent distribution of the unemployed population by reason……..…..... 45
Table 5.13 Percent distribution of the economically inactive population by reason…….. 45
Table 5.14 Activities normally undertaken in the households (age 15 and over)……..... 46
Table 5.15 Activities normally undertaken in the households (age 5 to 14)……... 46
Table 5.16 Child labour (age 5 to 14)……..... 47
Table 6.1 Percent of household by the percent of the economic situation of the community compared to the year the survey..... 50
Table 6.2 Percent distribution of households by the percent of the economic situation of the household to the year before the survey..... 51
Table 6.3 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey..... 51
Table 6.4 Percent distribution of households but the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey……..... 53
Table 6.5 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey…….... 54
Table 6.6 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying utility bills during the year before the survey……..... 55
Table 6.7 Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for health care during the year before the survey…….... 56
Table 6.8 Percent of households owning certain assets……..... 57
Table 6.9 Percent distribution of households by occupancy status……...…. 58
Table 6.10 Percent distribution of household by type of occupancy documentation…...… 59
Table 6.11 Percent of household using agricultural inputs and the percent using certain inputs..... 60
Table 6.12 Percent distribution of households using agricultural inputs by the main source of the inputs……..... 61
Table 6.13 Percent distribution of households by the area of land owned by the household 62
Table 6.14 Percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned by the household..... 62
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..... 63
Table 6.16 Percent distribution of households by principal contributor to household income..... 64
Table 6.17 Percent of households owning selected household items……..... 65
Table 7.1 Percent distribution of households by material used for roof of the house……. 67
Table 7.2 Percent distribution of households by materials used for walls of the house..... 68
Table 7.3 Percent distribution of households by material used for floors of the house…….. 68
Table 7.4 Percent distribution of households by type of housing unit……..... 69
Table 7.5 Percent distribution of households by main source of drinking water……..... 70
Table 7.6 Percent distribution of households by main type of toilet……..… 71
Table 7.7 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for cooking…….. 72
Table 7.8 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting……..... 73

Table 7.9 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest drinking water supply and health facility..... 73
Table 7.10 Percent distribution of households by time (in minutes) to reach the nearest primary and secondary school……..... 74
Table 7.11 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest food market and public transportation…..... 75
Table 7.12 Percent distribution of households taking anti-malaria measures and percent taking specific measures……..... 76
Table 8.1 Percent distribution of attendance of meetings (any household members within past 12 months) 77
Table 8.2 Distribution of leaders' satisfaction ratings and reasons for dissatisfaction……..... 78
Table 8.3 Percent distribution of households who received financial information in the past 12 months……..... 79
Table 8.4 Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction…….. 80
Table 9.1 Household Characteristics..... 81
Table 9.2 Education..... 82
Table 9.3 Health..... 83
Table 9.4 Household Assets and Perception of Welfare..... 84

Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

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

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

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

** 1.96 standard deviations*

	2004	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Net Enrolment Rate							
Primary School	72.0	78.4	6.4	3.3	*	-0.2	13.0
Secondary School	4.4	9.8	5.4	2.2	**	0.3	8.9
Rate of Dissatisfaction with School	53.3	59.1	5.8	6.6		-5.7	20.7
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Books/Supplies	68.5	47.8	-20.7	8.0		-4.9	27.3
Poor Teaching	15.8	25.1	9.3	4.4	***	14.7	32.1
Lack of Teachers	54.6	67.8	13.2	8.1	***	22.4	54.8
d Condition of Facilities	40.3	50.1	9.8	8.1	***	12.4	44.9
Overcrowding	11.4	15.5	4.1	3.8	**	1.8	17.1
Health Facility Consulted							
Private hospital	14.0	13.7	-0.3	3.5		-6.1	7.8
Government hospital	68.3	41.8	-26.5	5.4	***	-31.8	-10.1
Traditional healer	8.2	9.8	1.6	2.9		-4.2	7.6
Pharmacy	8.2	27.8	19.6	3.9	***	12.4	28.0
Rate of Dissatisfaction with Health Facilities	30.3	28.2	-2.1	4.4		-11.1	6.6
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Long wait	31.1	40.7	9.6	7.3		-3.1	26.1
of trained professionals	19.6	14.9	-4.7	7.1		-18.4	9.9
Cost	38.6	33.7	-4.9	9.3		-23.8	13.6
No drugs available	24.9	19.1	-5.8	7.5		-19.5	10.7
Unsuccessful treatment	23.0	16.9	-6.1	6.8		-23.2	4.0
Water and Sanitation							
Piped water	3.8	3.1	-0.7	3.1		-6.9	5.4
Protected well	18.2	15.5	-2.7	6.6		-15.9	10.5
No toilet	7.3	16.9	9.6	2.8	***	3.9	15.2
Flush toilet	5.7	1.4	-4.3	1.4		-2.1	3.4
Covered pit latrine	61.2	79.2	18.0	7.0	**	4.0	32.0
Uncovered pit latrine	25.7	2.5	-23.2	5.5	***	-34.1	-12.3

	2004	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Child Delivery							
Hospital or Maternity W	80.1	68.0	-12.1	4.1	***	-37.1	-20.5
Delivery Assistance							
Doctor/Nurse/Midwife	81.6	71.2	-10.4	6.1	*	-22.7	1.9
TBA	16.5	8.0	-8.5	5.2	*	-19.5	1.3
Self-assistance	1.8	21.0	19.2	2.8	***	13.3	24.5
Child Nutrition							
Stunted	27.7	18.5	-9.2	3.6	**	-15.2	-0.9
Severely Stunted	8.3	7.8	-0.5	2.5		-8.4	1.8
Wasted	6.0	1.4	-4.6	1.9	***	-9.9	-2.5
Severely Wasted	1.9	0.2	-3.2	1.0	***	-5.1	-1.2

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Kishapu District CWIQ

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

This survey was the second of its kind to be administered in Kishapu DC, located in Shinyanga region, the first one having been administered in 2004. Chapter 9 of this report analyses changes between the two surveys.

Although beyond the purpose of this report, the results of Kishapu CWIQ could also be set against those of other CWIQ surveys that have are being implemented at the time of writing in other districts in Tanzania: Bahi DC, Bariadi DC, Bukoba DC, Bukombe DC, Bunda DC, Dodoma MC, Hanang DC, Karagwe DC, Kasulu DC, Kibondo DC, Kigoma DC, Kilosa DC, 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.

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure in Shinyanga Region

Basic Variables	***Household Assets***
Household size	Ownership of a radio
Level of education of the household head	Ownership of a bicycle
Main source of income	Ownership of an iron
Problems satisfying food needs	Ownership of motor vehicles
Number of meals per day	Ownership of watches
Activity of the household head	Ownership of a bed or matress
	Ownership of a sewing machine
Household Amenities	Main material in the roof
Type of toilet	Main material in the walls
Fuel used for cooking	Main material in the floor
Village level variables	
Distance to market	
Distance to public transport	
Distance to hospital	

Source: HBS 2000/2001 for Shinyanga Region

1.2 Sampling

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

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

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

1.3 Constructed variables to disaggregate tables

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

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

Predicted	Observed		
	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Non-Poor	57.6	15.4	73.0
Poor	9.5	17.5	27.0
Total	67.1	32.9	100.0

Source: HBS 2000/01 for Shinyanga Region

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

Table 1.3: Cluster Location

	Median Time (in minutes) to:			Poverty Rate	Estimated Number of Households
	District Capital	All-Weather Road	Public Transport		
Cluster Location					
Remote	30	120	300	18.9	10,770
Accessible	20	29	180	22.7	30,255

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

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

Once the consumption level of a 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 Kishapu 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 9.5 percent of the cases, and vice versa in 15.4 percent of the households. This gives an overall percentage of correct predictions of 75.1 percent.

When the model is applied to the CWIQ 2006 data for Kishapu DC, the resulting share of households living in poverty is 22 percent, with a 95 percent confidence interval ranging from 16 to 27 percent. However, it must be kept in mind that the aim of the model is not estimating poverty rates, but determining the characteristics of the poor population. Hence, the accuracy of the model does not hinge on the closeness between the estimated and actual poverty rate; but on the percentage of correct predictions as indicated in Table 1.2.

Expenditure surveys, such as the 2000/2001 Household Budget Survey, are much better suited for informing on poverty rates. However, such large scale surveys have insufficient number of

[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	Percentage Living in Accessible Clusters
Socio-Economic Group			
Employees	7.6	83.7	16.3
Self-Employed Agriculture	21.7	73.0	27.0
Self-Employed Other	0.0	67.6	32.4
Other	46.1	83.4	16.6

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

	Male	Female	Total
Socio-economic Group			
Employees	92.7	7.3	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	86.3	13.7	100.0
Self-Employed Other	78.3	21.7	100.0
Other	78.0	22.0	100.0
Total	85.4	14.6	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

1.3.2 Cluster Location

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

Table 1.3 shows that the poverty rates differ substantially by cluster location: households in accessible villages are slightly more likely to be poor than households in accessible villages. Whereas the poverty rate in accessible villages is 23 percent, the rate in remote villages is 19 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 unemployed, inactive, unpaid, or a household worker, at a rate of 46 percent. In turn, poverty is lowest for households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities, at a rate of 0 percent. In addition, households from the latter group are the most likely to be located in accessible villages, at 32 percent, whereas the employees and the 'other' socio-

economic group are the most likely to be located in remote villages, at 84 and 83 percent, respectively.

The gender composition of the socio-economic group is shown in Table 1.5. 85 percent of households are headed by a male. The share of female-headed households is lowest for the employees at 7 percent and highest for the self-employed in non-agricultural activities and the 'other' group at 22 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 79 percent of the household heads is dedicated. Employees are mostly dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction, with a share of 91 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities are mostly dedicated to services (77 percent). More than half of the 'other' category is mainly concentrated in agriculture (54 percent) with the rest almost evenly split between services and household duties (25 and 22 percent, respectively).

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

	Agriculture	Mining ManufacturingEnergy Construction	Private and Public Services	Household Duties	Other	Total
Socio-economic Group						
Employees	9.5	90.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	87.6	0.7	7.0	4.6	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Other	19.5	0.0	76.6	3.9	0.0	100.0
Other	53.7	0.0	24.8	21.6	0.0	100.0
Total	78.6	4.2	11.9	5.3	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1 Introduction

2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1Introduction

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

2.2 Main Population Characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the percent distribution of the population by cluster location and poverty status, by gender and age. Overall, the district's population is young. For instance, 6 percent of the population is 60 years old or over, whereas 49 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 45 percent is between 15 and 59 years old.

Analysis of data by poverty status and cluster location revealed that households in accessible villages and non-poor are more likely to be in the 15-59 cohort, whereas households in remote villages and poor households show a greater share in the 0-14 cohort.

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

The mean dependency ratio is 1.1, meaning that on average one adult has to take care of more than 1 person. The breakdown by cluster location shows that at the age of 15-64, households in accessible villages have higher dependency ratio than households in remote villages at 2.9 and 2.7 respectively. The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher dependency rate than non-poor households, at 1.4 and 1.0 respectively.

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.2 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 1.4 for households with 7 or more members. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'other' group has the highest dependency ratio (1.2), whereas the 'employee' has lowest dependency ratio (0.8).

The breakdown by gender of the household head did not show strong difference in dependency ratio.

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 6 individuals. Households with 1 or 2 individuals only represent 8 percent of all households in the district. The figure for

Table 2.1: Percent distribution of total population by gender and age

	Male				Female				Total			
	0-14	15-59	60+	Total	0-14	15-59	60+	Total	0-14	15-59	60+	Total
Total	24.5	22.6	2.8	49.9	24.4	22.9	2.9	50.1	48.9	45.4	5.7	100.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	23.6	23.3	2.3	49.2	24.7	23.7	2.4	50.8	48.3	47.0	4.7	100.0
Remote	25.3	21.9	3.4	50.5	24.1	22.0	3.3	49.5	49.4	43.9	6.7	100.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	27.0	18.6	2.3	47.9	28.1	21.2	2.8	52.1	55.1	39.8	5.1	100.0
Non-poor	23.3	24.4	3.1	50.8	22.7	23.6	2.9	49.2	46.0	48.0	6.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

Table 2.2: Dependency ratio

	0-4 years	5-14 years	0-14 years	15-64 years	65+ years	Total	Dependency ratio
Total	1.0	1.9	2.9	2.8	0.2	6.0	1.1
Cluster Location							
Accessible	1.0	1.9	2.9	2.9	0.2	6.0	1.1
Remote	1.1	1.9	2.9	2.7	0.3	6.0	1.2
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.6	3.2	4.8	3.6	0.3	8.7	1.4
Non-poor	0.9	1.5	2.4	2.6	0.2	5.2	1.0
Household size							
1-2	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.5	0.3	1.9	0.2
3-4	0.6	0.7	1.3	2.0	0.2	3.6	0.8
5-6	1.1	1.5	2.6	2.8	0.2	5.5	1.0
7+	1.5	3.4	4.9	3.7	0.3	8.9	1.4
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	1.0	1.5	2.6	3.4	0.1	6.1	0.8
Self-employed - agriculture	1.0	1.9	3.0	2.8	0.2	6.0	1.1
Self-employed - other	0.8	1.2	2.0	2.3	0.2	4.5	0.9
Other	1.2	2.0	3.2	3.0	0.6	6.8	1.2
Gender of Household Head							
Male	1.1	1.9	3.0	2.9	0.2	6.2	1.1
Female	0.6	1.6	2.2	2.2	0.4	4.8	1.2

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	8.4	26.5	27.0	38.1	100.0	6.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	9.0	28.3	22.1	40.7	100.0	6.0
Remote	7.9	24.8	31.7	35.6	100.0	6.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	3.1	15.8	81.1	100.0	8.7
Non-poor	10.8	33.0	30.1	26.2	100.0	5.2
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	15.2	21.0	21.6	42.3	100.0	6.1
Self-employed - agric	7.5	26.2	28.1	38.2	100.0	6.0
Self-employed - other	17.3	45.3	25.3	12.1	100.0	4.5
Other	8.3	16.9	18.0	56.8	100.0	6.8
Gender of Household Head						
Male	6.7	25.1	27.5	40.7	100.0	6.2
Female	18.9	34.6	23.9	22.7	100.0	4.8

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

households with 7 or more members is 38 percent which is the highest share.

The breakdown by cluster location revealed no wide difference. The difference by poverty status is more pronounced, with poor households reporting a mean household size of 8.7 members, and non-poor households reporting 5.2 members on average.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the 'other' category has the highest mean household size, at 6.8, while the 'self-employed other' socio-economic group has the lowest at 4.5 members.

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Parents	Other relative	Not related	Total
Total	16.7	13.9	50.7	0.8	16.9	1.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	16.7	13.8	53.4	0.7	14.6	0.7	100.0
Remote	16.8	14.0	48.0	0.9	19.1	1.3	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	11.6	9.8	52.4	1.4	23.2	1.6	100.0
Non-poor	19.1	15.8	49.8	0.5	14.0	0.8	100.0
Age							
0- 9	0.0	0.0	76.0	0.0	23.3	0.7	100.0
10-19	0.0	0.9	74.8	0.0	23.6	0.7	100.0
20-29	10.3	31.5	37.7	0.0	16.3	4.2	100.0
30-39	39.5	43.3	11.1	0.0	5.7	0.3	100.0
40-49	58.0	37.5	3.5	0.0	1.1	0.0	100.0
50-59	66.7	27.7	0.7	2.8	2.1	0.0	100.0
60 and above	61.7	19.1	0.0	11.4	5.8	1.9	100.0
Gender							
Male	28.7	0.2	53.4	0.3	16.9	0.5	100.0
Female	4.9	27.6	47.9	1.2	16.8	1.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female-headed households: the former have 6.2 members in average, whereas the latter have only 4.8 members.

2.3 Main Household Characteristics

Table 2.4 shows the percent distribution of total population by relationship to the head of household. In general children of the household head account for the highest percentage of the population at 51 percent. Analysis of the data by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages report a higher share of 'child', whereas households in remote villages report a higher share of 'other relatives'. In addition, the analysis by poverty status shows that the shares of 'child' and 'other relative' are higher in poor households, whereas non-poor households report higher shares of 'head' and 'spouse'.

When analysing by age-groups, it is clear that the category 'other relatives' is mostly comprised by children under 19 years old. This highlights the importance of the analysis of fostering and orphan status. After the age of 29, 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 29 and 5 percent, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be spouses to the household head than males.

Table 2.5 shows the percent distribution of the population age 12 and above by marital status. Overall, 39 percent of the population has never been married. In addition, 36 percent is married and monogamous, and 14 percent is married and polygamous. While 6 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated, the percentage of informal unions is 1 and 6 percent of the population is separated. Only 4 percent of the total population reported to be widowed.

Further analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages have greater shares of being not married or in a monogamous marriage than remote households. Breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have greater share of not being married whereas non-poor households are more likely to be in a monogamous marriage.

The age breakdown shows that the 'polygamous-married' category peaks for the 40-49 age-group, at 32 percent. For the population after 24 years old, married-monogamous is the most common category but decreases at the age of 60 and above. 'Separated' and 'widowed' show higher shares for the older cohorts. 'Never married' also shows correlation with age,

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	39.3	35.9	13.8	1.0	0.1	6.3	3.7	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	41.5	36.2	11.9	1.5	0.2	5.9	2.9	100.0
Remote	37.2	35.6	15.7	0.4	0.0	6.6	4.4	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	46.4	31.2	9.6	0.4	0.0	7.7	4.7	100.0
Non-poor	36.3	37.8	15.6	1.2	0.1	5.7	3.2	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	92.6	5.8	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.8	0.0	100.0
20-24	54.9	34.0	3.6	1.1	0.0	6.4	0.0	100.0
25-29	14.5	61.1	12.0	3.9	0.0	7.6	0.9	100.0
30-39	4.8	58.6	21.9	0.9	0.4	12.2	1.1	100.0
40-49	0.4	58.2	32.0	1.0	0.0	7.1	1.2	100.0
50-59	0.3	47.0	31.8	1.6	0.0	11.2	8.0	100.0
60 and above	0.0	45.6	18.3	0.5	0.0	8.2	27.5	100.0
Gender								
Male	46.4	36.2	13.8	1.0	0.0	1.5	1.0	100.0
Female	32.3	35.5	13.9	0.9	0.2	11.0	6.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	1.0	19.8	2.1	77.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	1.3	19.0	2.3	77.4	100.0
Remote	0.8	20.6	2.0	76.6	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.2	15.5	0.3	84.0	100.0
Non-poor	1.4	21.8	3.0	73.8	100.0
Age					
5- 9	0.0	0.2	0.0	99.8	100.0
10-14	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
15-19	0.0	0.6	0.0	99.4	100.0
20-29	2.5	17.6	4.3	75.7	100.0
30-39	0.8	39.3	4.1	55.8	100.0
40-49	4.6	55.3	4.8	35.3	100.0
50-59	2.6	61.3	3.3	32.8	100.0
60 and above	0.4	48.7	5.3	45.6	100.0
Gender					
Male	1.9	32.6	3.1	62.4	100.0
Female	0.2	7.2	1.1	91.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

decreasing rapidly as the population gets older. Virtually no one between 12 and 14 years old was married.

Around 46 percent of the men has never been married, but for women the figure is only 32 percent. While 6 percent of women are widowed and 11 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, 20 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, with 77 percent in other activities.

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

	None	Nursery school	Some primary	Completed primary	Some secondary	Completed secondary	Post secondary	Total
Total	35.4	1.2	31.1	28.8	2.2	0.1	1.3	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	30.4	1.5	31.8	32.0	2.6	0.0	1.7	100.0
Remote	40.1	1.0	30.4	25.7	1.8	0.1	0.9	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	40.2	1.3	35.4	21.6	1.0	0.0	0.7	100.0
Non-poor	33.2	1.2	29.1	32.0	2.7	0.1	1.6	100.0
Age								
5- 9	75.6	5.0	19.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	6.7	1.3	89.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	5.8	0.0	31.9	55.3	6.7	0.0	0.3	100.0
20-29	15.4	0.0	16.1	60.9	4.4	0.1	2.9	100.0
30-39	25.8	0.0	14.0	57.9	0.8	0.4	0.9	100.0
40-49	36.8	0.0	10.2	44.4	3.4	0.0	5.3	100.0
50-59	58.8	0.0	21.3	11.2	5.5	0.0	3.1	100.0
60 and above	83.9	0.0	11.8	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.9	100.0
Gender								
Male	30.6	0.9	33.0	30.6	2.8	0.2	2.0	100.0
Female	40.0	1.6	29.2	27.0	1.6	0.0	0.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

	Never married	Married monogamous	Married polygamous	Informal, loose union	Divorced Separated Widowed	Total
Total	0.3	57.2	24.4	1.3	16.8	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	0.7	58.7	21.2	2.3	17.2	100.0
Remote	0.0	55.8	27.4	0.4	16.5	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	61.3	21.2	1.0	16.5	100.0
Non-poor	0.4	56.1	25.2	1.4	16.9	100.0
Age						
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	0.0	72.6	12.2	10.1	5.1	100.0
30-39	0.9	65.4	20.7	0.7	12.3	100.0
40-49	0.0	59.5	29.5	0.0	11.0	100.0
50-59	0.4	48.5	29.2	1.4	20.4	100.0
60 and above	0.0	46.4	22.2	0.8	30.5	100.0
Gender						
Male	0.3	67.0	28.2	1.2	3.3	100.0
Female	0.5	0.0	1.8	1.8	95.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

Households in accessible villages reported higher shares of 'employee', 'self-employed other' and the 'other' socio-economic categories. In contrast households in remote villages are more likely to be self employed in agriculture. The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households have higher share in 'self-employed agriculture' category whereas poor households reported greater share in 'other' category.

The analysis of the age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of employees peaks at 5 percent for the 40-49 cohort. The shares of self-employed agriculture tend to increase with age and peaks for the 50-59 cohort at 61 percent after which it decreases. On the contrary,

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	3.4	83.0	6.3	7.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	4.8	81.3	7.3	6.6	100.0
Remote	2.1	84.6	5.3	8.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	1.2	83.2	0.0	15.6	100.0
Non-poor	4.1	82.9	8.0	5.0	100.0
Age					
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	2.2	87.4	10.3	0.0	100.0
30-39	2.0	88.2	8.0	1.9	100.0
40-49	6.4	84.5	5.9	3.1	100.0
50-59	3.9	81.5	3.9	10.6	100.0
60 and above	1.5	74.1	5.2	19.1	100.0
Gender					
Male	3.7	83.8	5.8	6.7	100.0
Female	1.7	77.9	9.3	11.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

the category 'other' tends to decrease with age, showing a sharp decrease between the 15-19 and 20-29 cohorts, from 99 to 76 percent, then decreases steadily until 33 percent for the 50-59 cohort and then rises to 45 percent for the 60 and above cohort.

The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be self-employed (whether in agriculture or non-agricultural activities) than females. In turn, females are more likely to be in the 'other' category, with a share of 91 percent against 62 percent for the males.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. Roughly 35 percent of the population has no education, 31 percent has some primary, and 29 percent has complete primary. Only 1 percent has post secondary education.

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 some primary, complete primary and some secondary. The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher share of population with no education or with just some primary than non-poor households. In turn the latter report higher shares with complete primary, some secondary and post secondary.

The age breakdown shows that 76 percent of the children aged between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 92 percent of the children between 10 and 14 have some or complete primary. Rates of no education are lowest for the population in the 15-19 cohort (6 percent) and higher for the older groups. Finally, in the groups between 15 and 39 years old, the most common category is complete primary, the 40-49 cohort reported highest share of post secondary education at 5 percent.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males at 40 and 31 percent respectively. Across all levels of education, females exhibit lower percentages than males.

2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 57 percent of the household heads is married and monogamous, 17 divorced, separated or widowed, 24 percent married and polygamous, and 1 percent lives in an informal union.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible villages report higher shares of 'married monogamous' and 'loose informal union' than remote clusters. In turn, the latter report a higher share in 'married polygamous'.

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	36.1	16.8	40.1	3.4	0.0	3.7	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	27.6	19.0	46.1	2.9	0.0	4.4	100.0
Remote	44.0	14.7	34.5	3.7	0.0	3.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	43.6	22.0	29.9	1.0	0.0	3.5	100.0
Non-poor	34.0	15.3	43.0	4.0	0.0	3.7	100.0
Age							
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	8.4	28.4	61.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	100.0
30-39	18.3	14.9	62.7	1.7	0.0	2.4	100.0
40-49	19.4	8.5	58.8	5.8	0.0	7.4	100.0
50-59	47.6	27.3	14.6	7.3	0.0	3.3	100.0
60 and above	78.8	16.8	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	100.0
Gender							
Male	30.1	18.7	43.8	3.5	0.0	4.0	100.0
Female	71.0	5.6	18.8	2.7	0.0	1.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

The breakdown by age-group shows that the 'married-monogamous' category decreases with age, as 'married-polygamous' and 'divorced, separated or widowed' increase. Virtually all household heads between 15 and 19 years old were not married at the time of survey.

Most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (96 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 3 percent. Most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (67 and 28 percent, respectively).

Table 2.9 shows the percent distribution of household heads by socio-economic group. It is worth remembering that the socio-economic group of the household is determined by the type of employment of the main income earner of the household, who not always the household head. As expected, the great majority of the district's household heads belongs to the self-employed in agriculture, with a share of 83 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities represent 6 percent of the household heads, the 'other' category (unemployed, inactive, unpaid and household workers) represents 7 percent, and the employees are a further 3 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 85 and 81 percent, respectively.

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

The breakdown by age of the household head shows interesting insights. Except for the 15-19 cohorts, 'self-employed agriculture' is the most important category in the remaining age-groups. The 'self-employed other' is lower for the 50-59 and 60+ cohorts.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households are more likely to be self-employed in agriculture than male-headed households, at 84 and 78 percent respectively. In addition, female-headed households account for greater shares in 'self-employed other' and in the 'other' socio-economic categories.

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, around 36 percent of the household heads has no education, 17 percent has some primary, 40 percent has complete primary and 4 percent has post secondary education.

Table 2.11 - Orphan status of children under 18 years old

	Children who lost mother only	Children who lost father only	Children who lost both father & mother
Total	1.8	3.0	1.4
Cluster Location			
Accessible	2.1	2.8	1.5
Remote	1.4	3.2	1.3
Poverty Status			
Poor	0.7	3.3	2.4
Non-poor	2.3	2.8	0.9
Age			
0-4	0.6	1.6	0.0
5-9	1.8	3.0	1.2
10-14	2.4	3.4	2.1
15-17	3.2	5.7	4.0
Gender			
Male	1.7	2.7	1.7
Female	1.8	3.2	1.1

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages report greater share of not being educated at 44 percent whereas the share for accessible villages is 28.In contrast, households in accessible villages report higher shares in some primary, complete primary and post secondary as compared to households in remote villages.

Poverty status is strongly correlated with the education of the household heads. This should be no surprise, since education of the household head is one of the poverty predictors used to define poverty status. However, the difference is still important: household heads from poor households are more likely to have no education than heads from non-poor households, whereas the latter are more likely to have complete primary or post secondary studies than the former.

The age breakdown shows that 79 percent of household heads aged 60 or over has no education, and only 3 percent has complete primary. While 40-49 cohort exhibit the highest share of complete primary at 63 percent, the share for 15-19 cohort is virtually null. The percentage of households with post secondary education tends to increase with age.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education than males, with rates of 71 and 30 percent, respectively. Males report a higher share with some primary and complete primary than females. Furthermore, 4 percent of the male household heads have post secondary education against 2 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, 1 percent of children under 18 lost both parents, 2 percent lost only their mother and 3 percent lost only their father. Breakdown of the data by cluster location and poverty status reveals that, children are more likely to lose their fathers than mothers or both parents.

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 16 percent of the children between 10 and 17 years lost at least one parent and 9 of the children in that age-groups lost their father. Further analysis of the data by gender revealed no strong differences.

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

Children from remote clusters are more likely to live in non-nuclear households than children from accessible clusters, at 31 and 27 percent, respectively. A similar difference is observed between poor and non-poor households, with poor households showing a higher share of children in non-nuclear households than non-poor households. Furthermore, 32 percent of children from poor households live in non-nuclear households, while the share for non- poor households is 27 percent. Children from poor households are more likely to live with their mothers only whereas children from non-poor households are more likely to live with their fathers only.

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

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

Table 2.12 - Foster status of children under 18 years old

	Children living with mother only	Children living with father only	Children living with no parents	Children living in non-nuclear households
Total	11.7	4.0	13.0	28.8
Cluster Location				
Accessible	9.9	5.5	11.3	26.7
Remote	13.5	2.6	14.7	30.8
Poverty Status				
Poor	16.1	2.3	13.4	31.8
Non-poor	9.3	5.0	12.8	27.1
Age				
0-4	13.9	1.3	8.2	23.3
5-9	10.5	4.4	14.2	29.1
10-14	10.7	5.5	15.9	32.1
15-17	11.4	7.2	16.3	34.9
Gender				
Male	12.0	4.4	12.4	28.7
Female	11.4	3.7	13.7	28.8

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

2 Village, population and household characteristics

3 EDUCATION

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

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

3.1 Overview of the Education indicators

3.1.1 Literacy

Table 3.1 shows the main education indicators for the district. Literacy is defined as the ability to read and write in any language, as reported by the respondent. Individuals who are able to read but cannot write are considered illiterate. The adult literacy rate[1] is 62 percent. Literacy rates differ between accessible and remote villages at 69 and 55 percent respectively. Likewise, the literacy rate among non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 65 and 54 percent respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that literacy rates are higher among households where the main income earner is an employee (93 percent) than in the remaining categories.

The gender breakdown shows an important literacy rate gap between men and women. The literacy rate among men is 20 percentage points higher than that of women at 72 percent and 52 percent respectively.

The breakdown by orphan status shows that literacy rates are higher among orphaned children than non-orphaned children at 94 and 86 percent respectively. On the other hand, the literacy rate among non-fostered children is 8 percentage points higher than that of fostered children at 88 and 76 percent respectively.

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

3.1.2 Primary School Access

Primary school access rate is defined as the proportion of primary school-age children (7 to 13 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school. Overall, 61 percent of primary school-age children live within 30 minutes of a primary school. Primary school access is higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters, at 72 and 50 percent respectively.

64 percent of the children aged 7 to 13 living in non-poor households lives within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 55 percent of those living in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that 98 percent of children living in households belonging to the 'employee' category live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 58 percent of the children living in households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category.

Orphaned children have a higher access rate to primary schools than non-orphaned children, at 68 and 60 percent respectively. On the other hand, 61 percent of non-fostered children has access to primary schools, whereas the rate for fostered children is 56 percent. Finally, gender does not show strong correlation to primary school access.

Enrolment

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

Primary school GER informs on the ratio of all individuals in primary school to the population of individuals of primary school-age (7 to 13 years) in the district.

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

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

The primary school GER was 102 percent at the time of the survey. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 102 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The NER further shows that 78 percent of all primary school-age children were attending school.

While the GER for households located in accessible clusters is 107 percent, the share for households located in remote clusters is 98 percent. Likewise, NER for households located in accessible clusters is higher than that of households in remote clusters at 84 and 73 percent respectively. Furthermore, while GER for non-poor households is 104 percent, the share for poor households is 98 percent. Likewise, NER for non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 83 and 70 percent respectively.

GER is highest among people living in households belonging to the 'employee' and 'self-employed agriculture' categories at 103 and NER is highest among households belonging to the 'employee' category at 85 percent. On the other hand, GER is lowest among households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed other' and 'other' categories at 98 and NER is lowest among households belonging to the 'self-employed other' at 73 percent.

Furthermore, while GER for females is 104 percent, the share for males is 100 percent. Likewise, NER for females is higher than that of males at 83 and 74 percent respectively.

The breakdown by orphan status shows that GER for orphaned children is higher than that of non-orphaned children at 142 and 99 percent respectively. Likewise, orphaned children have a higher NER than non-orphaned at 87 and 78 percent respectively. On the other hand, non-fostered children have a higher GER than fostered children at 100 and 93 percent respectively. In contrast, foster status does not show strong correlation with NER. It is worth remembering the small sample size in the orphaned and fostered category (see chapter 2), as well as that foster and orphan status is strongly correlated with age: orphaned and fostered children have higher mean ages than non-orphaned and non-fostered children.

Satisfaction

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

40 percent of all primary school pupils were satisfied with school. 42 percent of pupils living in accessible clusters are satisfied with school compared to 37 percent of pupils living in remote clusters. Likewise, while 42 percent of pupils living in poor households reported to be satisfied with school, the share for pupils living in non-poor households is 38 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 primary school at 62 percent, while the share for pupils living in households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' and 'other' categories is 39 percent.

Furthermore, 47 percent of orphaned children reported to be satisfied with primary school compared to 39 percent of non-orphaned children. Likewise, 52 percent of fostered children reported to be satisfied with primary school compared to 38 percent of non-fostered children.

Table 3.1: Education indicators

		Primary				Secondary			
	Adult Literacy rate	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction
Total	62.0	60.8	102.1	78.4	39.6	6.8	10.6	9.0	48.5
Cluster Location									
Accessible	69.2	72.0	106.8	83.9	41.6	10.5	11.7	9.6	56.4
Remote	54.9	50.1	97.7	73.2	37.4	2.4	9.3	8.2	36.4
Poverty Status									
Poor	54.4	55.0	98.4	69.8	41.9	0.0	7.7	7.7	70.2
Non-poor	64.8	64.1	104.3	83.4	38.3	10.6	12.2	9.7	40.8
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	92.9	97.9	102.9	85.1	61.7	5.6	42.5	32.2	39.6
Self-employed - agriculture	60.5	59.3	102.8	78.8	38.8	7.6	9.4	8.4	49.8
Self-employed - other	72.4	71.2	97.6	72.5	40.8	8.3	11.7	11.7	42.7
Other	55.6	57.6	97.6	75.3	39.3	0.0	2.5	0.0	100.0
Gender									
Male	71.7	60.3	100.0	73.7	40.7	6.0	10.9	8.9	44.6
Female	52.4	61.2	104.2	83.0	38.5	7.9	10.2	9.1	53.6
Orphan status									
Orphaned	94.4	68.0	141.9	86.5	46.8	13.6	11.6	11.6	38.2
Not-orphaned	86.1	60.3	99.1	78.3	39.3	5.9	9.3	9.0	40.3
Foster status									
Fostered	76.0	55.7	92.9	76.6	51.5	9.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not-fostered	88.3	61.2	100.2	78.2	38.4	5.4	10.3	9.9	38.7

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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.

Finally, males have a slightly higher satisfaction rate than females at 41 and 39 percent respectively.

3.1.3 Secondary School Access

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

Only 7 percent of all pupils in secondary school live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school. While 11 percent of pupils living in accessible villages has access to secondary school, the share for pupils living in remote villages is 2 percent. Similarly, 11 percent of pupils with access to secondary school, whereas the share for pupils living in poor households is virtually null.

The socio-economic status of the household seems to be correlated with the rate of access to secondary school. Pupils living in households belonging to the 'self-employed other' and 'self-employed agriculture' categories have the highest rate of access to secondary school at 8 percent, followed by those who belong to the 'employee' category (6 percent), whereas the share for the 'other' category is virtually null.

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	59.1	47.8	25.1	67.8	5.9	15.5	50.1	1.2	0.1
Cluster Location									
Accessible	55.7	44.1	33.8	56.7	9.4	20.3	50.3	2.0	0.2
Remote	62.8	51.3	16.6	78.4	2.5	11.0	50.0	0.5	0.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	58.2	59.3	11.2	65.0	2.2	15.5	52.0	0.7	0.0
Non-poor	59.6	41.7	32.3	69.2	7.8	15.5	49.1	1.5	0.1
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	45.2	25.3	12.6	45.9	0.0	41.1	37.7	12.9	2.3
Self-employed - agriculture	60.3	47.2	24.0	70.5	6.6	16.0	51.0	0.6	0.0
Self-employed - other	54.0	35.4	51.5	33.5	0.0	0.0	31.4	6.3	0.0
Other	57.7	75.3	29.2	66.5	4.1	6.0	57.0	0.0	0.0
Gender									
Male	58.6	46.3	25.6	68.5	4.8	12.6	47.6	2.4	0.0
Female	59.6	49.1	24.5	67.1	6.9	18.3	52.5	0.2	0.2
Type of school									
Primary	60.4	50.1	26.8	68.3	6.3	15.4	50.0	0.1	0.0
Government	60.9	50.1	26.8	68.4	6.4	15.5	50.1	0.0	0.0
Private	22.2	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	51.5	26.0	1.7	75.0	0.0	5.2	36.3	21.4	1.7
Government	53.2	26.7	0.0	72.6	0.0	6.6	32.2	20.8	0.0
Private	61.2	28.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	61.5	28.0	0.0
Other	20.3	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Other	48.9	31.4	17.7	53.9	4.1	25.8	63.9	1.4	0.0
Government	50.9	34.6	17.9	54.0	4.5	28.4	65.6	1.6	0.0
Private	13.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	48.7	0.0	18.8	44.2	0.0	0.0	55.8	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

While 8 percent of females live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for males is 6 percent. On the other hand, the access rate for non-orphaned children is 6 percent, lower than that for orphaned children, at 14 percent. In contrast, while 9 percent of fostered children live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for non-fostered children is 5 percent.

Enrolment

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

The GER and NER at secondary school are very low compared to primary school level. Overall, GER was 11 percent and NER was 9 percent. The secondary school GER for households located in accessible clusters is 3 percentage points higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 12 and 9 percent respectively. Likewise, secondary school NER is higher in accessible clusters than remote clusters at 10 and 8 percent respectively. In addition, secondary school GER is higher among non-poor households, but there are no strong differences in NER by poverty status.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the employees report the highest GER and NER at 43 and 32 percent respectively, whereas the

'other' category has the lowest GER at 3 percent. Likewise, NER for households belonging to the 'other' category is virtually null. Furthermore, the GER and NER rates among orphaned children are higher than among non-orphaned children at 12 and 9 percent respectively. On the other hand, while the GER and NER for non-fostered children is 10 percent, the share for fostered children is virtually null. Finally, the gender breakdown shows no strong differences in GER and NER.

Satisfaction

49 percent of the population enrolled in secondary school is satisfied with school. 51 percent of this population reports to be dissatisfied with the secondary schools they attend. This satisfaction rate is higher than in primary schools (40 percent). The satisfaction rate is higher among people living in accessible clusters than among people living in remote clusters, at 56 and 36 percent respectively. Likewise, while 70 percent of pupils living in poor households was satisfied with their school, the share for those living in non-poor households is 41 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that virtually all pupils living in households belonging to the 'other' category are satisfied with secondary school, while the share for those living in households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category is 40 percent.

54 percent of female pupils were satisfied with their school compared to 45 percent of males. Among the individuals enrolled in secondary schools, non-orphaned children were more satisfied with their schools than orphaned children. 40 percent of non-orphaned children are satisfied with their schools, whereas the share for orphaned children is 38 percent. Likewise, 39 percent of non-fostered children reports to be satisfied with their secondary schools whereas, the share for fostered children is virtually null.

3.2 Dissatisfaction

One of the aims of the survey is to inform on perceptions of quality of services received among individuals for whom these are provided. To obtain this information, primary and secondary school students who were not satisfied with school at the time of the survey were asked to provide reasons for their dissatisfaction. Complaints regarding lack of books and other resources were allocated into the 'books/supplies' category, while those relating to quality of teaching and teacher shortages were grouped into the 'Teaching' category. The 'facilities' category incorporates

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

			Reasons not currently attending									
	Percent not attending	Completed school	Distance	Cost	Work	Illness	Pregnancy	Got married	Useless/ uninteresting	Failed exam	Awaits admission	Dismissed
Total	23.6	22.3	0.0	12.7	16.6	3.5	0.5	5.8	10.8	24.8	31.6	0.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	25.5	19.0	0.0	15.1	14.5	0.9	0.0	3.7	7.1	27.8	33.0	0.0
Remote	21.4	26.7	0.0	9.5	19.3	7.1	1.2	8.5	15.7	20.9	29.8	0.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	21.0	17.1	0.0	14.1	23.3	5.3	0.0	2.1	13.1	28.0	24.6	0.0
Non-poor	24.9	24.6	0.0	12.0	13.5	2.7	0.8	7.4	9.7	23.4	34.8	0.0
Socio-economic Group												
Employee	27.8	37.7	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	91.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	22.7	20.7	0.0	14.6	14.4	4.4	0.7	6.4	9.5	25.6	27.8	0.0
Self-employed - other	20.3	36.4	0.0	0.0	29.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.7	51.7	0.0
Other	32.5	22.5	0.0	4.1	35.9	0.0	0.0	2.1	29.0	32.6	26.9	0.0
Gender												
Male	27.0	21.0	0.0	12.3	19.9	5.4	0.0	0.0	14.8	22.5	26.4	0.0
Female	20.0	24.0	0.0	13.2	11.8	1.0	1.3	13.9	5.2	28.1	38.9	0.0
Age												
7-13	2.6	11.2	0.0	18.5	6.5	19.1	0.0	0.0	12.7	8.6	18.8	0.0
14-19	53.4	23.0	0.0	12.3	17.2	2.5	0.6	6.2	10.6	25.9	32.5	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

complaints regarding overcrowding and bad condition of facilities. The results are shown in Table 3.2.

Overall, 59 percent of the students who were enrolled in either primary or secondary school reported dissatisfaction with school. 68 percent of students reported lack of teachers as the cause of their dissatisfaction. In addition, 50 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to bad condition of facilities whereas, 48 percent reported lack of books and supplies. While 25 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to poor teaching, 16 percent reported lack of space and 6 percent reported teachers' absence.

The dissatisfaction rate for people living in remote villages is 7 percentage points higher than that of those living in accessible villages, at 63 and 56 percent respectively. Likewise, dissatisfaction rate for people living in non-poor households is higher than that of people living in poor households at 60 and 58 percent respectively. Further breakdown of the data shows that the dissatisfaction rate due to lack of teachers among non-poor households is higher than that among poor households at 69 and 65 percent respectively. Likewise, while 78 percent of people living in remote clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers, the share for those living in accessible clusters is 57 percent. It is also observed that 51 percent of people living in remote clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of books and supplies compared to 44 percent of people living in accessible clusters.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that the dissatisfaction rate among households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is the highest (60 percent). At the same time the 'employee' category reported the lowest dissatisfaction rate (45 percent). It is also observed that 71 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category and 67 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers compared to 34 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category.

The gender breakdown does not show strong correlation with dissatisfaction rates. However, further break down of the data shows that 53 percent of females reported dissatisfaction due to bad condition of facilities compared to 48 percent of males.

Those attending primary school reported to be most dissatisfied due to lack of teachers (68 percent) followed by lack of books and supplies (50 percent) while those attending secondary schools reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers (75 percent) followed by bad condition of facilities (36 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 24 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who were not attending school. Around 32 percent of the non-attending population did not attend because they were awaiting admission. 25 percent

Table 3.4: Primary school enrollment and drop out rates by gender

	Net enrollment rates			Drop out rates		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Total	73.7	83.0	78.4	2.7	0.7	1.7
7	26.2	42.8	35.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	62.3	79.4	70.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	91.3	93.1	92.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	82.9	95.6	88.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
11	88.7	100.0	95.4	3.9	0.0	1.6
12	96.1	90.0	93.5	3.9	0.0	2.2
13	80.9	91.8	87.5	13.6	3.6	7.5

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

Table 3.5: Secondary school enrollment and drop out rates by gender

	Net enrollment rates			Drop out rates		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Total	8.9	9.1	9.0	26.2	27.2	26.7
14	0.0	5.0	2.3	7.1	11.0	8.9
15	6.3	2.9	4.5	39.0	37.2	38.0
16	13.8	12.0	13.0	40.8	51.2	45.6
17	13.3	16.4	14.9	40.0	25.6	32.5
18	12.9	20.2	15.0	22.7	18.2	21.4
19	8.9	5.1	7.3	17.9	10.4	14.8

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

reported they had failed standard four, seven or form four exams and 22 percent said they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level. 17 percent of respondents reported that they were not attending school due to work. While 13 percent were not attending due to cost, 11 percent reported not attending because school was useless or uninteresting.

26 percent of children from households located in accessible clusters does not attend school compared to 21 percent of children from households located in remote clusters. On the other hand, while 25 percent of children form non-poor households does not attend school, the share for children from poor households is 21 percent. Further breakdown of the data shows that while 28 percent of children living in households located in accessible clusters were not attending school because they had failed standard four, seven or form four exams, the share for those living in households located in remote clusters is 21 percent. Similarly, 28 percent of children living in poor households were not attending school because they had failed standard four, seven or form four exams compared to 23 percent of those living in non-poor households.

Furthermore, 33 percent of children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category does not attend school compared to 20 percent of those from households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category. Further breakdown of the data shows that 91 percent of children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category was not attending because they were awaiting admission, whereas the share for those from households belonging to the 'other' category is 27 percent.

27 percent of males does not attend school compared to 20 percent of females. However, further breakdown of the data shows that while 39 percent of girls were not attending because they were awaiting admission, the share for boys is 26 percent. It is also observed that while 14 percent of females were not attending school due to marriage, the share for males was virtually null.

Almost all primary school-aged children attend school, as their non-attendance rate is 3 percent. On the other hand, the share for secondary school-age children is 53 percent. 23 percent of secondary school-aged individuals not attending secondary school reported having completed school. While 19 percent of primary school-aged children not attending school reported illness, the share for secondary school-aged children is 3 percent. On the other hand, 33 percent of secondary school-aged children were not attending school because they were awaiting admission compared to 19 percent of primary school-aged children.

3.2 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	71.7	52.4	62.0
15-19 years	84.6	87.0	85.7
20-29 years	73.7	70.0	71.7
30-39 years	75.6	54.8	63.6
40-49 years	85.9	30.7	61.1
50-59 years	53.2	14.9	36.6
60+ years	30.0	4.8	17.3
Accessible	82.5	56.2	69.2
15-19 years	92.9	85.5	89.4
20-29 years	79.6	73.1	76.0
30-39 years	85.9	52.3	66.8
40-49 years	96.9	46.1	75.2
50-59 years	65.1	13.6	41.7
60+ years	45.6	7.3	25.9
Remote	61.2	48.7	54.9
15-19 years	75.1	89.3	80.9
20-29 years	68.0	66.9	67.4
30-39 years	66.2	57.0	60.8
40-49 years	75.1	18.1	48.3
50-59 years	40.4	16.5	30.6
60+ years	20.1	3.0	11.6

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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. Disaggregation of the data shows that at the time of the survey, the primary school drop-out rate was only 2 percent. Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

Overall, 78 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), 83 percent of girls and 74 percent of boys were enrolled. The required age at which children should start standard one is 7 years. However, data on primary school enrolment show that at the time of the survey 35 percent of all seven year olds were enrolled. Children are most likely to be in school by the age of 11, where the NER is about 95 percent.

Secondary School

Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by age. Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those at primary level. Only 9 percent of secondary school-aged children was enrolled compared to 78 percent in primary school. For a person following a normal school curriculum, i.e. started standard one at age 7, he/she is expected to start form one at age 14. The table shows that the biggest difference in enrolment rates is observed between age 16 and 15 and between age 18 and 19. Furthermore, 15 percent of 17 and 18 year olds reported to be enrolled at the time of the survey. It is also noticeable that the while 5 percent of girls were enrolled in secondary school at the age of 14, the share for boys is virtually null.

Secondary school drop-out rates among secondary school-age individuals (14 to 19 years) are higher compared to those of primary school. 27 percent of children of secondary school-age had dropped out in the year prior to the survey. In general, the highest drop-out rate is observed among 16 year olds (at 46 percent). The highest drop-out rate among males and females is at the age of 16.

3.5Literacy

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. Questions that helped determine adult literacy were only asked for individuals aged 15 or older.

Adult Literacy

Overall, 62 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district are literate. The difference in literacy rates among males and females is about 20 percentage points at 72 and 52 percent respectively. Individuals aged between 15 and 19 have the highest literacy rate (86 percent) while 17 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write. There are remarkable gender differences in literacy. Furthermore, the gap is larger for the older cohorts.

The literacy rate in accessible villages is 14 percentage points higher than in remote villages. The literacy rate for the 15-19 age-groups in accessible villages is 89 percent, whereas for remote villages the rate is 81 percent. Furthermore, in accessible villages the literacy rate of men

is 27 percentage points higher than that of women. In remote villages, the difference decreases to 12 percentage points. On the contrary, while the literacy rate of women in accessible villages is about 7 percentage points higher than that of women in remote villages, the difference in literacy rates between men in accessible and remote villages is 22 percentage points. Finally, there is a remarkable difference in literacy rates among men and women above 60 years in both cluster locations. In both cases, the literacy rates of men over 60 years are above 17 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 83 percent, but the gender difference is important. While the literacy rate for men is 83 percent, the rate for women is lower, at 82 percent.

Analysis by age-groups shows that 15 to 17 year olds have the highest literacy rate at 89 percent. Youth of 15 to 17 years have the highest literacy rate in accessible villages at 93 percent, while in remote villages the literacy rate is highest among the youth of 15 to 17 years at 84 percent. However, youth literacy rate in accessible villages is higher than that of youth in remote villages at 87 and 78 percent respectively.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	83.3	81.5	82.5
15-17 years	86.0	92.2	89.1
18-20 years	81.2	79.3	80.5
21-22 years	90.7	75.8	82.7
23-24 years	72.2	62.4	66.7
Accessible	89.6	83.4	86.6
15-17 years	95.8	91.0	93.1
18-20 years	90.0	77.4	85.4
21-22 years	88.2	80.5	84.2
23-24 years	68.7	69.6	69.1
Remote	76.2	79.3	77.7
15-17 years	75.9	94.1	84.0
18-20 years	70.8	81.3	74.9
21-22 years	94.0	71.0	80.9
23-24 years	76.1	57.4	64.7

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is population aged 15-24

3 Education

4 HEALTH

This chapter examines health indicators for the population in Kishapu 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	36.4	19.7	23.9	71.8
Cluster Location				
Accessible	50.7	19.9	25.1	75.3
Remote	22.8	19.6	22.7	68.2
Poverty Status				
Poor	29.5	16.2	21.8	57.9
Non-poor	39.6	21.3	24.8	77.4
Socio-economic group				
Employee	66.1	10.7	21.3	71.6
Self-employed - agriculture	34.5	20.0	23.8	72.2
Self-employed - other	53.2	27.4	30.9	87.1
Other	33.5	16.7	22.2	55.4
Gender				
Male	35.4	18.4	22.9	72.4
Female	37.4	21.0	24.9	71.3
Age				
0-4	35.7	27.2	61.7	67.5
5-9	35.0	12.7	11.3	75.5
10-14	31.8	11.5	9.8	79.5
15-19	40.8	10.2	8.7	75.8
20-29	39.9	17.6	18.1	82.8
30-39	35.2	25.4	22.6	67.4
40-49	38.3	23.8	21.1	74.6
50-59	28.1	18.4	18.4	100.0
60+	38.9	31.9	24.9	73.7

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	28.2	22.9	40.7	14.9	33.7	19.1	16.9	0.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	24.7	29.7	35.8	14.2	37.7	16.9	15.6	0.0
Remote	31.8	17.3	44.7	15.4	30.4	20.9	17.9	0.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	42.1	23.2	38.8	14.1	43.4	15.6	13.1	0.0
Non-poor	22.6	22.7	42.1	15.4	26.4	21.7	19.8	0.0
Socio-economic group								
Employee	28.4	0.0	57.8	20.7	21.5	20.7	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	27.8	27.4	38.7	15.6	32.7	19.3	19.4	0.0
Self-employed - other	12.9	0.0	62.8	21.3	0.0	0.0	15.9	0.0
Other	44.6	3.8	44.7	7.2	50.6	21.5	4.7	0.0
Gender								
Male	27.6	21.0	51.7	11.5	30.1	17.8	6.8	0.0
Female	28.7	24.5	31.0	17.8	36.8	20.3	25.8	0.0
Type of provider								
Public hospital	37.0	26.3	67.4	20.2	7.1	19.8	12.4	0.0
Private hospital	40.1	34.5	2.8	4.5	80.7	7.6	8.1	0.0
Religous hospital	39.2	0.0	0.0	9.9	90.1	9.9	25.9	0.0
Village health worker	48.4	27.8	100.0	0.0	0.0	27.8	0.0	0.0
Private Doctor/Dentist	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pharmacist	11.3	7.2	0.0	15.8	62.9	46.7	26.9	0.0
Trad. Healer	13.4	0.0	0.0	10.1	21.7	0.0	81.3	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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, 36 percent of the households have access to medical services. Conversely, 64 percent of the households in the district do not have access to medical services.

As would be expected, household in accessible villages have higher access to medical services than households in remote villages. Both show similar proportions of need and use, but households in accessible villages report higher satisfaction rates (75 percent) than households in remote villages (68 percent).

Non-poor households have higher access rates than poor households, with shares of 40 and 30 percent, respectively. Non-poor households report higher shares of need, use and satisfaction with medical services than their counterparts.

Regarding socio-economic status, the 'employees' show the highest access rate, at 66 percent. The 'other' category shows the lowest access rate at 34 percent. Employees showed the lowest rate of need at 11 percent, whereas households self-employed in non-agricultural activities showed the highest rate at 27 percent. Households where the main income earner was in the 'other' category showed the lowest satisfaction rate, at 55 percent.

There are no gender differences in access. However, females report slightly higher need and use rates than males and both report similar satisfaction.

Access and need do not vary widely by age-groups, but the rate of use does. It starts at 62 percent for children under 5, reduces to around 9 percent for the population aged between 5 and 19, and then starts going up again to 25 percent for the 60+ cohort. The rate of satisfaction tends to increase with age. Virtually all households between the age of 50 and 59 were satisfied with medical services at the time of survey.

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, 28 percent of users of healthcare facilities is dissatisfied, mostly because of long waits (41 percent), the cost (34 percent) and facilities being not clean (23 percent). Lack of success in the treatment was reported by 17 percent of the users. It should be noticed that this does not imply that treatments were successful in 83 percent of the cases, but that in 83 percent of the cases the result of the treatment was not a cause for dissatisfaction.

The analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages are more commonly dissatisfied by the cost of the treatment (38 percent, against 30 percent for households in remote villages), whereas households in remote villages report long waits more often (45 percent, against 36 percent of the households in accessible villages).

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher rate of dissatisfaction than non-poor households, at 42 and 23 percent respectively. Poor households are more frequently dissatisfied by the cost of the treatment than non-poor households at 43 and 26 percent respectively. In turn the latter are relatively more frequently dissatisfied by unsuccessful treatment and drugs not available than the former.

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	76.1	96.2	1.7	1.3	0.1	1.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	74.9	97.3	0.8	0.6	0.0	1.3
Remote	77.3	95.1	2.4	1.9	0.1	0.7
Poverty Status						
Poor	78.2	98.2	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.7
Non-poor	75.2	95.2	2.2	1.7	0.0	1.1
Socio-economic group						
Employee	78.7	99.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
Self-employed - agriculture	76.2	96.2	1.6	1.3	0.1	1.1
Self-employed - other	69.1	97.2	1.0	1.8	0.0	0.0
Other	77.8	93.9	3.6	1.7	0.0	1.2
Gender						
Male	77.1	96.3	0.9	1.7	0.2	1.0
Female	75.1	96.0	2.4	0.8	0.0	1.0
Type of sickness/injury						
Fever/malaria	4.1	0.0	53.2	32.3	0.0	25.3
Diarrhea/abdominal pains	6.9	0.0	90.1	0.0	0.0	9.9
Pain in back, limbs or joints	22.0	6.5	40.1	46.3	0.0	11.8
Coughing/breathing difficulty	22.7	0.0	58.0	39.6	0.0	10.3
Skin problems	22.6	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ear, nose, throat	10.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eye	42.9	0.0	49.2	34.8	0.0	16.0
Dental	9.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Accident	23.7	0.0	29.7	45.5	0.0	24.8
Other	20.1	16.1	13.8	39.7	30.3	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

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

	Sick or injured	Fever or malaria	Diarrhea/ abdominal pain	Pain in back, limbs or joints	Coughing/ breathing difficulty	Skin problem	Ear, nose, throat,	Eye	Dental	Accident	Other
Total	19.7	42.6	22.2	15.7	17.3	2.5	3.0	3.9	1.5	2.2	4.9
Male Total	18.4	50.4	20.2	14.6	13.7	0.8	2.4	4.6	0.8	3.9	5.1
0-4	25.1	66.2	30.7	3.7	13.9	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.2	3.6
5-9	14.0	55.3	19.1	3.4	6.0	6.5	3.4	9.4	0.0	9.7	6.7
10-14	11.8	29.3	18.0	16.4	20.4	0.0	15.4	3.6	3.7	4.3	11.3
15-29	12.2	46.6	23.2	11.3	14.9	0.0	3.2	2.8	2.9	6.4	2.0
30-49	21.2	54.7	20.4	18.8	3.9	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	4.1	6.0
50-64	27.1	38.1	3.4	30.7	33.5	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	4.1
65+	37.6	31.9	8.0	37.1	16.2	0.0	0.0	10.2	0.0	0.0	3.7
Female Total	21.0	35.8	24.0	16.5	20.4	4.0	3.5	3.2	2.1	0.6	4.8
0-4	29.3	43.1	31.1	1.4	24.9	4.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
5-9	11.5	60.1	6.8	0.0	24.9	2.8	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3
10-14	11.2	39.0	15.4	14.9	11.8	17.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	3.8
15-29	16.9	34.9	31.0	8.4	13.5	2.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	1.5	13.8
30-49	27.9	27.8	26.9	27.9	24.6	3.0	2.3	0.0	5.7	0.0	2.8
50-64	24.3	25.0	20.2	40.9	13.3	0.0	0.0	2.6	9.1	5.4	0.0
65+	43.7	21.9	10.9	39.6	16.8	2.8	0.0	26.7	0.0	0.0	3.8

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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.

Households self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the lowest dissatisfaction rate at 13 percent. The 'other' socio-economic group report cost of medicine more often, with long wait as the second most cited reason for dissatisfaction.

Dissatisfaction does not vary by gender, but the reasons do so. Males point out the long waits more often than females. In turn the females report cost, lack of medicine, hygiene problems in health facilities and unsuccessful treatment more often than males.

Regarding health provider, the main cause of dissatisfaction in public hospitals is the long wait, whereas in private and religious hospitals, as well as in pharmacists, is the cost of healthcare. Furthermore, village health worker shows the highest rate of dissatisfaction at 48 percent.

4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting

The distribution of the population who did not consult a health provider in the four weeks preceding the survey is shown Table 4.3. The table shows that overall, 76 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (96 percent of the cases). However, 4 percent of the people who did not consult a health provider had other reasons, mainly the cost of healthcare.

Neither cluster location nor poverty status seems to be correlated with the reasons for not consulting. Nevertheless, the division by socio-economic shows such differences. For the employees, virtually all the people who did not consult health facilities had no need to do so, whereas in 'other' the share was 94 percent. The main reason was cost (for 4 percent of the households in 'other').

The gender breakdown shows no remarkable differences. However, the split-up by type of illness shows that for most infirmities except accidents and other, the main cause for not consulting a health practitioner is cost followed by distance. It is worth noticing the relatively low percentage of people not receiving attention (4 percent) for fever/malaria.

4.4 Type of Illness

Table 4.4 shows the percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks

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	41.8	13.7	4.8	1.8	0.3	27.8	9.8	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	40.6	16.0	4.9	1.4	0.3	27.8	9.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	43.0	11.3	4.6	2.3	0.3	27.8	10.6	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	44.5	16.3	6.0	1.7	0.0	18.4	13.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	40.7	12.7	4.3	1.9	0.4	31.6	8.5	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic group									
Employee	54.8	29.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	42.0	13.2	5.0	1.6	0.4	27.8	10.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	40.7	18.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.5	6.3	0.0	100.0
Other	35.2	9.0	6.1	6.4	0.0	29.8	13.5	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is population who consulted a health provider

preceding the survey. Overall, fever or malaria is the most common sickness, affecting almost 43 percent of the total population. In turn, diarrhoea or abdominal pain and difficulties in breathing or coughing come in second and third place, with 22 and 17 percent of the population respectively. Limbs, joints or back pains affected 16 percent of the ill population, whereas other illnesses affected minor shares of the ill population.

The gender breakdown reveals that there is no strong difference between females and males, but males report a higher share of ill population affected by fever or malaria than females at 50 and 36 percent respectively. The age breakdown shows that the share of sick/injured population is higher for children under 5, decreases for the 5-14 cohorts, and then starts increasing again for the 15-64 cohorts, peaking at for the population aged 65 and over (38 percent for males, and 44 percent for females in that group). The share of ill population affected by malaria tends to come down with age but other problems emerge. Limb, joint and back pains are more pronounced in the older cohorts.

4.5 Health Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 42 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 28 percent to a pharmacist or chemist, 14 percent in a private hospital, and 10 percent to traditional healers. Religious hospitals were consulted just in 5 percent of the cases.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong correlation with health provider, but households in accessible villages seem to go more often to private hospitals than households in remote villages, and the latter to traditional healers.

Non-poor households make their consultations to the pharmacist or chemist more often than poor households, with shares of 32 and 18 percent, respectively. In turn, members of poor households tend to consult traditional healer more often than females.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that employees go to public and private hospitals more often than the rest, while the rest of socio-economic groups go to chemists and traditional healer 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, 14 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 7 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 34 percent for the 25-29 group, and then goes down, ending at 10 percent for the group aged 40 to 49. In addition, virtually all pregnant women received prenatal care.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong difference in the share of women who had a live birth in the year preceding the survey between remote and accessible

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	7.0	33.2	33.5	13.9	10.4	14.2	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	0.0	4.4	23.8	31.2	18.5	9.6	13.1	100.0
Remote	0.0	10.7	41.4	36.1	9.9	11.1	15.3	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	5.0	37.7	54.6	14.3	27.1	16.2	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	8.1	32.1	26.2	13.7	4.2	13.3	100.0
Socio-economic group								
Employee	0.0	0.0	0.0	38.7	0.0	0.0	6.4	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	6.2	35.1	28.4	14.1	11.9	13.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	11.1	38.9	37.7	16.0	0.0	19.2	100.0
Other	0.0	14.8	26.6	84.2	13.7	0.0	17.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is females aged 12 or older.

villages. Households in remote villages show higher rates for women between 20 and 29 years old, whereas households in accessible villages show a higher rate for the 30-39 cohort.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that 55 percent of women from poor households in the 25-29 cohort had a live birth in the year preceding the survey, the share for non-poor is 26 percent. Furthermore, in poor households, 38 percent of the women between 20 and 24 years old had a child in the 12 months preceding the survey, while the share for non-poor households is 32 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the highest rates correspond to the self-employed in non-agricultural activities and the 'other' categories, with shares of 19 and 18 percent respectively. Overall the employee shows the lowest share of just 6 percent. The 'other' category reports the highest share in the 25-29 cohort at 84 percent, but the share in 40+ cohort is virtually null. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities show highest rate at 39 percent for women between 20 and 24 years old, followed by the self-employed in agriculture at 35 percent.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. Roughly, 66 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place in a hospital or a dispensary, about 29 percent at home. The ordering remains across cluster location, poverty status, and socio-economic group of the household head.

While households in accessible villages had a higher share of births in hospitals, households in remote villages had a higher share of births in dispensaries and at home.

The breakdown by poverty status shows slight differences, whereas non-poor had a higher share of deliveries in hospital (with shares of 44 and 28 percent, respectively), poor households had a higher share of deliveries at home (38 and 25 percent, respectively).

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that hospitals are the most common place for deliveries, with shares of above 50 percent for all except the 'self-employed other' category (35 percent). Home and dispensaries rank the second and third place. While home represents 31 percent of deliveries for the self-employed in agriculture, the share for the self-employed in non-agricultural activities is 4 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, 7 of 10 deliveries were attended by a health professional, mostly nurses and midwives (72 percent of births). Traditional birth assistants (TBA) and trained TBA accounted for 7 and 1 percent, whereas doctors attended 3 percent of the deliveries in the district.

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	39.0	2.1	26.9	0.0	29.4	2.5	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	47.6	1.6	23.9	0.0	25.0	1.9	100.0
Remote	31.3	2.6	29.6	0.0	33.3	3.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	28.4	0.9	28.4	0.0	38.3	4.0	100.0
Non-poor	44.2	2.7	26.2	0.0	25.1	1.8	100.0
Socio-economic group							
Employee	67.6	0.0	5.2	0.0	27.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	35.3	1.5	29.5	0.0	30.6	3.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	58.0	10.4	27.3	0.0	4.3	0.0	100.0
Other	52.0	3.9	10.8	0.0	33.2	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

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

	Doctor Nurse	Midwife	Trained T.B.A.	T.B.A.	Other Self	Don't know	Total	Delivery by health prof.
Total	2.7	68.5	0.8	6.6	20.7	0.6	100.0	72.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	4.0	71.3	0.0	9.6	14.7	0.4	100.0	75.4
Remote	1.6	66.0	1.5	4.0	26.1	0.8	100.0	69.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	2.4	61.2	0.7	5.5	30.2	0.0	100.0	64.3
Non-poor	2.9	72.1	0.8	7.2	16.2	0.9	100.0	75.8
Socio-economic group								
Employee	0.0	86.9	0.0	0.0	13.1	0.0	100.0	86.9
Self-employed - agriculture	1.8	67.0	0.9	6.7	22.8	0.7	100.0	69.8
Self-employed - other	4.9	90.9	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	100.0	95.7
Other	11.3	63.5	0.0	12.2	13.1	0.0	100.0	74.8

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

The analysis by cluster location shows that TBA were more common in accessible villages (10 vs. 4 percent), whereas other forms of deliveries were more common in remote villages (26 against 15 percent).

As expected, non-poor households show a higher share of deliveries attended by a professional, 75 percent, against 64 for the poor. In turn, poor households report a higher share of unattended deliveries (30 and 16 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest share of deliveries attended by professionals: 96 percent, against 70, 75 and 87 of 'self-employed in agriculture' the 'other' and 'employee' categories. In turn, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the lowest share with other forms of deliveries at 4 percent.

4.7 Child Nutrition

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

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

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

Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates

	Nutritional status indicators		Program participation		
	Stunted	Wasted	Nutrition	Weigh-in	Vaccinated
Total	18.5	1.4	43.6	97.2	86.5
Cluster Location					
Accessible	19.5	1.2	45.1	96.7	84.6
Remote	17.5	1.6	42.2	97.7	88.3
Poverty Status					
Poor	22.0	1.5	42.8	94.8	86.1
Non-poor	16.8	1.3	43.9	98.4	86.8
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	5.5	5.5	69.2	100.0	82.7
Self-employed - agriculture	18.8	1.4	43.0	96.6	85.7
Self-employed - other	19.0	0.0	63.8	100.0	92.7
Other	20.5	0.0	27.2	100.0	93.2
Gender and age in completed years					
Male	19.6	1.9	43.8	97.6	91.1
0	12.1	5.4	38.6	98.1	96.5
1	33.2	0.0	47.7	98.5	93.5
2	15.1	2.2	51.8	96.0	88.0
3	21.1	1.7	47.7	95.8	90.8
4	10.7	0.0	31.5	100.0	84.0
Female	17.3	0.9	43.3	96.8	81.8
0	9.8	2.2	40.2	94.1	85.2
1	24.5	1.5	47.3	97.8	89.2
2	15.1	0.0	43.1	96.1	87.4
3	23.0	0.0	33.6	96.1	70.6
4	11.6	0.0	50.6	100.0	72.2
Orphan status					
Orphaned	23.0	0.0	45.9	93.9	69.9
Not-orphaned	18.0	1.4	44.0	97.2	87.0
Foster status					
Fostered	19.8	0.0	33.0	100.0	77.4
Not-fostered	17.8	1.5	44.1	97.0	87.1

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

measurements of the well nourished population. The reference population used, as recommended by the World Health Organisation (WHO), is that of the United States National Centre for Health Statistics (NCHS).

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

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

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	66.9	93.3	93.5	89.3	83.4	53.6	92.8	89.4	83.4	46.7
Cluster Location										
Accessible	69.3	93.8	93.1	88.8	83.2	61.0	92.6	88.8	83.3	45.3
Remote	64.7	92.9	93.9	89.8	83.6	46.8	93.1	89.9	83.6	48.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	63.8	91.5	92.3	86.7	80.1	48.6	92.3	87.2	80.1	37.8
Non-poor	68.4	94.2	94.1	90.7	85.1	56.0	93.1	90.5	85.1	51.2
Socio-economic group										
Employed	76.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.2	63.3	100.0	100.0	87.2	59.1
Self-employed - agric	64.8	92.8	92.7	88.0	81.5	52.1	91.8	88.0	81.5	44.7
Self-employed - other	78.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	98.5	81.0	100.0	100.0	98.5	60.4
Other	76.2	91.6	95.3	92.2	92.2	48.3	95.3	92.2	92.2	53.4
Gender and age in completed years										
Male	68.5	94.2	94.5	90.7	85.3	50.9	93.7	90.7	85.3	48.1
0	14.6	89.3	90.9	77.8	65.3	43.9	87.0	77.8	63.4	7.0
1	71.1	98.5	98.5	96.0	89.6	42.3	98.5	96.0	91.5	51.0
2	81.8	89.8	89.5	89.5	89.5	48.1	89.5	89.5	89.5	58.8
3	91.6	93.8	95.8	95.8	91.6	59.7	95.8	95.8	91.6	64.1
4	93.8	100.0	97.5	95.0	93.8	63.7	97.5	95.0	93.8	67.5
Female	65.2	92.4	92.4	88.0	81.5	56.3	91.9	88.1	81.5	45.4
0	19.4	81.1	82.0	73.0	58.4	53.2	82.0	74.6	58.4	11.9
1	68.5	94.3	95.4	89.2	80.0	46.1	93.4	89.2	80.0	32.5
2	85.7	96.1	96.1	96.1	94.6	64.3	96.1	94.6	94.6	63.6
3	75.8	92.5	92.5	88.8	85.3	55.0	92.5	88.8	85.3	70.5
4	88.0	100.0	97.7	96.2	96.2	67.0	97.7	96.2	96.2	64.4

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

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

Overall, 1 percent of all the children are wasted, and 19 percent are stunted. About 44 percent of the children participate in nutrition programs.

Cluster location status is not strongly correlated with nutrition. In turn poor households have a higher rate of stunted children than non-poor households at 22 and 17 percent respectively.

Regarding socio-economic status, households in the employee category show the highest rate for wasted children, at 6 percent, whereas households from the category 'other' show the highest rate of stunted children, at 21 percent. Children from households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities show the lowest rate of wasted at 0 percent.

The gender breakdown shows no difference in rates of wasted children, but the rate of stunted boys is higher than that of stunted girls. In addition, the age breakdown shows no clear trend, with higher rates of stunting than wasting for all age groups.

The breakdown by orphan status shows important differences between orphans and non-orphans. A child is considered orphan if he/she is under 18 years old and has lost at least one parent. Orphaned children show a higher rate of stunting than non-orphans, as well as lower participation in weigh-ins and lower rates of vaccinations.

A child is considered fostered when at least one of his/her parents does not leave at home. The split-up by foster status

reveals similar trends: foster children are more likely to be stunted than non-fostered children. In turn, non-fostered children report higher rates of participation in weigh-ins and vaccination programmes.

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received. Overall, 67 percent of children under 5 have vaccination against measles, 93 against BCG, and roughly between 54 and 93 percent received vaccinations against DPT and OPV. Finally, 47 percent of the children in the district receive vitamin A supplements.

There are no strong differences by cluster location or poverty status, except with OPV0 where households in accessible villages and non-poor households reported higher shares than their respective counterparts. The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that vaccination rates in most cases tend to be higher for children from the 'employee' and 'self-employed in non-agricultural activities', and tend to be lower for children from the 'self-employed agriculture' category.

The gender breakdown shows that boys have slightly a higher vaccination rate against measles than girls and higher or similar shares with girls for the rest of vaccines. The age breakdown shows that the share of children consuming vitamin A and shares of all vaccines tend to increase with age. Virtually all 4 years old children were vaccinated with BCG at the time of survey.

Table 4.11 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information. Overall, the information for 95 percent of the vaccinated children was supported by a vaccination card.

There is no difference by cluster location or poverty status. The main difference by socio-economic group is that all vaccinated children from the 'employee' and 'self-employed other' categories had vaccination cards, whereas in the 'other' and 'self-employed-agriculture' categories the share was around 95 percent.

Further more, virtually all boys aged 3 and girls aged 2 had vaccination cards at the time of survey. Children between 0 and 11 months had vaccination cards in 89 and 85 percent of the cases, for females and males, respectively.

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

	Health Card	Other	Total
Total	95.1	4.9	100.0
Cluster Location			
Accessible	95.5	4.5	100.0
Remote	94.7	5.3	100.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	95.9	4.1	100.0
Non-poor	94.7	5.3	100.0
Socio-economic group			
Employed	100.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	94.6	5.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	100.0	0.0	100.0
Other	94.6	5.4	100.0
Gender and age in completed years			
Male	94.9	5.1	100.0
0	85.1	14.9	100.0
1	97.4	2.6	100.0
2	97.4	2.6	100.0
3	100.0	0.0	100.0
4	95.0	5.0	100.0
Female	95.2	4.8	100.0
0	88.8	11.2	100.0
1	95.9	4.1	100.0
2	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	96.0	4.0	100.0
4	96.2	3.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

5 EMPLOYMENT

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

5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population

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

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

5.1.1 Work Status

Table 5.1 shows that 74 percent of the adult population is employed and 21 percent underemployed. Unemployment is virtually 0 percent and the inactivity rate is 5 percent. There are no remarkable

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	74.3	21.2	95.4	0.0	4.6	4.6	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	76.2	19.8	96.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	100.0
Remote	72.4	22.5	94.9	0.0	5.1	5.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	72.2	21.1	93.3	0.0	6.7	6.7	100.0
Non-poor	75.0	21.2	96.2	0.0	3.8	3.8	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	66.5	28.4	94.9	0.0	5.1	5.1	100.0
15-29	78.2	17.4	95.6	0.0	4.4	4.4	100.0
30-49	53.9	43.4	97.3	0.0	2.7	2.7	100.0
50-64	67.0	30.0	97.0	0.0	3.0	3.0	100.0
65+	58.9	17.0	75.9	0.0	24.1	24.1	100.0
Female	82.0	14.0	96.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	100.0
15-29	88.4	9.3	97.8	0.0	2.2	2.2	100.0
30-49	76.8	21.7	98.5	0.0	1.5	1.5	100.0
50-64	82.2	14.9	97.1	0.0	2.9	2.9	100.0
65+	73.8	0.0	73.8	0.0	26.2	26.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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.

differences by cluster location and poverty status. For both genders, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 30 and 49. Around 43 percent of the males in this group are underemployed, whereas the share for

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	95.4	0.0	22.2	95.4	0.0	37.7
Cluster Location						
Accessible	96.0	0.0	20.6	97.3	0.0	37.3
Remote	94.9	0.0	23.7	93.6	0.0	38.1
Poverty Status						
Poor	93.3	0.0	22.7	91.2	0.0	40.6
Non-poor	96.2	0.0	22.0	96.5	0.0	36.9
Gender and age						
Male	94.9	0.0	30.0	95.2	0.0	40.0
15-29	95.6	0.0	18.2	100.0	0.0	53.2
30-49	97.3	0.0	44.6	97.6	0.0	45.0
50-64	97.0	0.0	30.9	96.9	0.0	31.2
65+	75.9	0.0	22.4	76.6	0.0	21.7
Female	96.0	0.0	14.6	96.6	0.0	24.5
15-29	97.8	0.0	9.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
30-49	98.5	0.0	22.1	100.0	0.0	50.7
50-64	97.1	0.0	15.4	100.0	0.0	16.5
65+	73.8	0.0	0.0	88.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	86.4	9.4	95.8	0.0	95.8	4.2	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	89.3	5.9	95.1	0.0	95.1	4.9	100.0
Remote	83.0	13.4	96.5	0.0	96.5	3.5	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	86.0	10.3	96.3	0.0	96.3	3.7	100.0
Non-poor	86.5	9.0	95.5	0.0	95.5	4.5	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	81.8	12.8	94.6	0.0	94.6	5.4	100.0
15-16	88.4	4.1	92.5	0.0	92.5	7.5	100.0
17-19	86.6	9.8	96.5	0.0	96.5	3.5	100.0
20-21	72.7	19.5	92.2	0.0	92.2	7.8	100.0
22-23	68.8	27.6	96.4	0.0	96.4	3.6	100.0
Female	91.3	5.7	97.0	0.0	97.0	3.0	100.0
15-16	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
17-19	85.8	7.7	93.4	0.0	93.4	6.6	100.0
20-21	93.2	0.0	93.2	0.0	93.2	6.8	100.0
22-23	85.6	13.8	99.4	0.0	99.4	0.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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 5.4 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employment status

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	1.7	33.4	3.4	61.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	2.0	31.8	3.8	62.4	100.0
Remote	1.3	35.0	3.1	60.6	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.3	30.4	0.0	69.2	100.0
Non-poor	2.2	34.5	4.7	58.6	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	3.0	55.2	5.0	36.8	100.0
15-29	2.1	15.5	3.0	79.3	100.0
30-49	4.3	84.0	5.7	6.0	100.0
50-64	3.1	91.4	5.5	0.0	100.0
65+	1.7	77.1	13.2	7.9	100.0
Female	0.3	12.1	1.9	85.6	100.0
15-29	0.5	3.6	1.4	94.5	100.0
30-49	0.2	13.5	3.3	83.0	100.0
50-64	0.5	28.7	0.0	70.8	100.0
65+	0.0	32.8	0.0	67.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

females is 22 percent

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

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 slightly higher in remote villages than accessible villages for the total population and no remarkable differences were observed for household heads. The analysis of the data by poverty status revealed no important difference.

The gender breakdown shows that in the general population males are more likely to be underemployed than females, with rates of 30 and 15 percent, respectively. A similar difference is observed for the household heads.

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

5.1.3 Youth Employment

Table 5.3 shows the distribution of the youth (ages 15 to 24) by work status. The activity rate of this group is similar to the overall population, at around 95 percent. However, underemployment is lower: 9 percent of workers is underemployed, as opposed to 22 percent of workers for the whole adult population. The youth from remote villages has higher underemployment than their counterparts. The breakdown by poverty status shows similar differences with poor households resembling the remote households.

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

5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by households in the ‘other ‘activities (inactive, unemployed, unpaid workers,

Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer

	State/NGO/ Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	0.9	37.5	61.6	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	0.9	36.5	62.6	100.0
Remote	0.9	38.5	60.6	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.3	30.4	69.2	100.0
Non-poor	1.1	40.1	58.7	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	1.5	61.6	36.8	100.0
15-29	0.5	20.6	79.0	100.0
30-49	3.0	91.0	6.0	100.0
50-64	1.6	97.3	1.1	100.0
65+	0.0	92.1	7.9	100.0
Female	0.3	14.0	85.7	100.0
15-29	0.5	5.0	94.5	100.0
30-49	0.2	16.8	83.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	29.2	70.8	100.0
65+	0.0	30.5	69.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

domestic workers) at 62 percent and self-employed in agriculture at 33 percent, 3 percent is self-employed in non-agricultural activities and employees only account for 2 percent of the working population.

The population self-employed in agriculture is higher in remote villages, whereas the 'other' group is bigger in accessible villages. Non-poor households report a lower share in the 'other' category and higher shares in other activities than poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that a higher share of males is self-employed in agriculture, 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 30-49 cohort (4 percent), the self-employed in agriculture for 50-64 cohort (91 percent), the 'self-employed other' for 65+ cohort (13 percent) and 'other' for 15-29 females (95 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 38 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to over 99 percent of the working population.

The breakdown by cluster location did not yield strong differences. In turn, 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 79 percent of them work in the household. The share of females working in the private sector increases gradually with age, but is always lower than the respective shares of males. At the same time, the share of females working for the household decreases with age.

Table 5.6 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by main activity. The categories are agriculture; mining, manufacturing, energy and construction; services (transport, trade, private and public services); domestic duties; and other. Overall, agriculture and domestic duties together account for 95 percent of the working population. 88 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, and 7 percent in domestic duties.

The split-up by remoteness of the village and poverty status of the household shows

Table 5.6 - Percentage distribution of the working population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	Pub & priv services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	88.4	0.6	3.2	6.9	0.9	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	86.1	1.3	3.4	8.5	0.8	100.0
Remote	90.7	0.0	3.1	5.3	0.9	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	92.7	0.0	0.3	7.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	86.8	0.9	4.3	6.8	1.2	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	87.3	1.3	4.6	5.4	1.5	100.0
15-29	84.2	0.8	2.7	11.6	0.7	100.0
30-49	90.0	1.7	6.4	0.0	1.9	100.0
50-64	92.1	2.0	3.4	1.1	1.4	100.0
65+	81.2	0.0	9.8	3.9	5.1	100.0
Female	89.5	0.0	1.9	8.3	0.3	100.0
15-29	87.1	0.0	1.3	10.9	0.7	100.0
30-49	94.4	0.0	3.2	2.4	0.0	100.0
50-64	97.5	0.0	0.5	2.0	0.0	100.0
65+	61.1	0.0	0.0	38.9	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

that accessible villages and non-poor households report lower shares working in agriculture than their respective counterparts.

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are agriculture and domestic duties, accounting for 98 percent of the working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less concentrated, with 7 percent in other activities.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that, for both genders, younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. In turn, the share of females dedicated to agriculture is lower for the youngest and the oldest cohorts, where the shares dedicated to domestic duties are higher.

Table 5.7 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, gender and activity. Overall, around 87 percent of the male labour force is in agriculture, whereas the share for females is 89 percent. Domestic duties have the second highest shares for both genders: 6 percent for males and 9 percent for females. Each of the remaining activities occupies less than 10 percent of the labour force for each gender, but with the shares for males higher than those for females.

For both genders, virtually all the female employees work in services, whereas the share for male employees who work in service is 52 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities work also mostly in services, with shares of 55 percent for males and 78 percent for females. In the 'other' category, the main activities for both genders are 'agriculture' and 'domestic duties'.
Table 5.7

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer, gender, and activity is shown in Table 5.8. The working population employed by the government is mostly dedicated to services. The labour force working for private employers (whether formal or informal) is concentrated in agriculture. Among the individuals who were employed by the household, the main activity was agriculture (85 percent of males, 90 percent of females), but domestic duties also reports important shares (13 percent of males, 9 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.

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	12.9	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	86.6	89.7	87.0	88.9
Mining & non-primary	28.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
Services	52.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	55.0	78.0	0.0	0.1	4.5	1.9
Domestic duties	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	6.8	13.4	10.2	5.7	8.9
Other	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.9	15.3	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.3

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	14.8	0.0	90.3	85.6	85.4	90.3	87.0	89.4
Mining & non-primary	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0
Services	85.2	100.0	4.1	10.9	1.4	0.3	4.5	2.0
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.8	1.1	12.9	9.4	5.6	8.3
Other	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.4	0.3	0.0	1.6	0.3

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

Overall, 55 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed in agriculture, 6 percent self-employed in other activities, 37 percent is in the 'other' activities and 3 percent is formed by employees. Even though self-employed in agriculture are 33 percent of the working population, they represent 55 percent of the underemployed.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that there were no strong differences. Further breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report a higher share self-employed in agriculture, while poor households report a higher share in 'other' activities.

The gender breakdown shows that in the underemployed population, females are more likely than males to be in 'other' activities. In turn, males are more likely to be self-employed in agriculture than females at 75 and 15 percent respectively.

For males, the employees peak at 8 percent in the 65+ cohort, whereas the share for female employees in this cohort is virtually null. The 'self-employed other' group shows a higher share in the 65+ cohort, and the 'other' group shows positive rates only in the 15-29 age-group. In the case of females, the shares for self-employed in agriculture tend to increase with age until the 50-64 cohort, and the share in 'other' activities is higher in the 15-29 at 90 percent.
Table 5.9

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at 61 percent and in second place for the household at 37 percent. The State, NGOs, and other types of employer only account for 2 percent of the underemployed population.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible villages report a slightly higher percentage of underemployed population working for a private employer than remote villages.

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

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed males are strongly concentrated in private employers at 81 percent. In turn, underemployed females report higher share working for the

household than males at 77 and 17 percent respectively

.

The age breakdown shows that underemployed males report positive shares working for the household only in the 15-29 cohort. Underemployed females report the highest share working for the household in the youngest cohort (15-29) and the lowest share in the oldest cohort (65+).

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. Overall, 92 percent of the

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	2.8	55.1	5.5	36.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	2.5	56.4	4.8	36.3	100.0
Remote	3.0	54.0	6.0	37.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	1.5	50.3	0.0	48.3	100.0
Non-poor	3.3	56.9	7.5	32.3	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	3.6	74.9	4.7	16.7	100.0
15-29	0.0	40.7	4.9	54.4	100.0
30-49	4.3	88.5	2.5	4.6	100.0
50-64	6.5	89.4	4.1	0.0	100.0
65+	7.7	61.0	31.4	0.0	100.0
Female	1.0	15.3	7.1	76.6	100.0
15-29	0.0	8.4	1.3	90.4	100.0
30-49	1.1	16.3	11.0	71.5	100.0
50-64	3.1	27.2	0.0	69.6	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	2.1	61.3	36.7	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	1.5	62.2	36.3	100.0
Remote	2.6	60.4	37.0	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	1.5	50.3	48.3	100.0
Non-poor	2.3	65.4	32.3	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	2.8	80.5	16.7	100.0
15-29	0.0	45.6	54.4	100.0
30-49	3.6	91.7	4.6	100.0
50-64	5.3	94.7	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.7	22.8	76.6	100.0
15-29	0.0	9.6	90.4	100.0
30-49	1.1	27.3	71.5	100.0
50-64	0.0	30.4	69.6	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

Table 5.11- Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	private services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	91.7	0.2	5.9	0.6	1.5	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	92.1	0.5	5.0	1.2	1.2	100.0
Remote	91.4	0.0	6.8	0.0	1.8	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	98.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	89.1	0.3	7.6	0.8	2.1	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	91.6	0.4	5.3	0.4	2.3	100.0
15-29	93.6	0.0	2.5	1.6	2.3	100.0
30-49	93.2	0.6	5.0	0.0	1.2	100.0
50-64	91.8	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	61.0	0.0	16.1	0.0	23.0	100.0
Female	91.9	0.0	7.2	0.9	0.0	100.0
15-29	98.7	0.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	87.9	0.0	10.7	1.5	0.0	100.0
50-64	96.9	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

underemployed workers are dedicated to agriculture, and 6 percent to services, with the remaining activities reporting shares between 1 and 2 percent.
Accessible villages and poor households report higher shares in agriculture and lower shares in services than their respective counterparts.

The gender breakdown shows no strong differences. The age breakdown shows that the share of underemployed males dedicated to agriculture tends to decrease with age, while the share in services tends to increase. In turn, the share of underemployed females dedicated to agriculture tends to increase with age. Males in the oldest cohorts are more likely to be in the 'other' category at 23 percent, whereas the share for females in this case is virtually null.

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, infirmity is the main cause for inactivity (38 percent), followed by being a student (31 percent) and being too old (30 percent).

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

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

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

5.5 Household Tasks

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

The breakdown by cluster location reveals no strong differences. Further breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report higher shares of population fetching water and cleaning

Table 5.12 - Percentage distribution of the unemployed population by reason

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

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	31.4	0.6	29.6	0.0	38.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	40.0	1.3	20.8	0.0	37.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	36.2	0.0	38.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	0.0	17.5	0.0	42.1	0.0	40.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	0.0	40.3	0.9	21.6	0.0	37.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	0.0	0.0	39.1	0.0	27.7	0.0	33.2	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	20.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	79.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.3	0.0	24.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	22.1	1.2	31.9	0.0	44.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	94.8	5.2	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	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	58.4	0.0	41.6	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is inactive population aged 15+

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

	Fetching water	Fetching firewood	Cleaning toilet	Cooking	Care of children	Care or elderly/sick
Total	62.9	55.2	57.0	52.8	81.7	97.3
Cluster Location						
Accessible	64.6	54.9	59.5	53.8	81.1	97.7
Remote	61.2	55.5	54.6	51.8	82.2	96.9
Poverty Status						
Poor	60.7	54.9	45.7	52.2	83.6	96.3
Non-poor	63.7	55.4	61.3	53.0	80.9	97.6
Gender and age						
Male	42.8	28.9	43.0	12.1	75.6	97.4
15-29	65.2	43.2	53.4	22.6	67.9	99.0
30-49	36.1	24.4	40.8	4.7	83.4	97.9
50-64	13.3	9.8	29.6	3.6	82.1	100.0
65+	1.6	4.8	18.6	3.2	70.4	81.1
Female	82.8	81.2	70.8	93.0	87.7	97.2
15-29	97.4	89.3	71.5	97.3	86.5	99.7
30-49	86.5	86.1	77.7	96.8	91.5	98.2
50-64	62.2	74.0	73.0	93.0	90.8	98.2
65+	18.1	27.0	32.8	53.8	71.1	78.4

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

	Fetching water	Fetching firewood	Cleaning toilet	Cooking	Care of children	Care or elderly/sick
Total	56.6	33.0	34.7	30.5	71.9	88.1
Cluster Location						
Accessible	55.3	29.2	32.7	31.3	70.9	88.4
Remote	58.0	36.6	36.7	29.8	72.9	87.9
Poverty Status						
Poor	57.1	38.7	27.1	30.2	77.1	83.8
Non-poor	56.4	29.6	39.2	30.7	68.9	90.6
Gender and age						
Male	45.7	18.9	32.7	9.3	66.4	87.8
5-9	25.5	6.1	17.3	4.6	63.8	79.3
10-14	62.9	29.9	45.9	13.4	68.7	95.1
Female	67.5	46.9	36.7	51.6	77.4	88.4
5-9	41.9	16.2	15.2	15.3	77.1	81.2
10-14	88.8	72.5	54.6	81.9	77.6	94.4
Orphan status						
Orphaned	60.1	43.4	38.6	40.8	52.6	89.1
Not-orphaned	56.5	32.4	35.0	29.7	73.3	88.2
Foster status						
Fostered	60.9	32.9	32.3	32.3	61.7	94.0
Not-fostered	56.0	32.6	34.5	29.8	73.4	87.4

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

toilets than poor households.

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 71 and 89 percent. The shares for males range from 12 to 76 percent, except for taking care of the sick and elderly (97 percent).

The analysis of age-groups shows that for males the shares decrease with age in all activities. In the case of females the shares tend to decrease with age as well but with

sharp decrease in the oldest cohort for all activities.

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 elderly, sick and children. Analysis by cluster location did not yield remarkable differences. Children from poor households report higher shares in fetching firewood and taking care of children whereas children from non-poor households report higher shares in cleaning toilets and taking care of elderly and the sick.

The gender breakdown shows that girls report 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 than their counterparts. In addition, fostered children report higher shares in fetching water and taking care of the elderly or sick, whereas non-fostered children report a higher share in taking care of children.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that 55 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activity is mostly household duties at 66 percent. Children from accessible villages report a higher share working in household duties, whereas children form remote villages report a higher share in agriculture activities. The particular activity does not show evident correlation with poverty status.

The gender breakdown shows that girls are more likely to work in household duties than boys. However, the main difference is given by the age breakdown. Roughly one third of children in the 5-9 cohort were part of the working population, whereas virtually all the children in the 10-14 cohort were working at the time of the survey.

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 74 and 54 percent, respectively. Similarly, fostered children are more likely to be working than non-fostered children, at rates of 60 and 54 percent, respectively. Orphaned children are more likely to work in agriculture than non-orphaned children, who in turn report a higher share in the household category.

Table 5.16 - Child labour (age 5 to 14)

		Main activity			Employer	
	Working	Agriculture	Household	Other	Private	Household
Total	55.1	34.0	66.0	0.0	0.1	99.9
Cluster Location						
Accessible	56.3	31.5	68.5	0.0	0.2	99.8
Remote	54.0	36.5	63.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	58.0	34.8	65.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	53.5	33.6	66.4	0.0	0.2	99.8
Gender and age						
Male	55.1	41.4	58.6	0.0	0.2	99.8
5-9	36.2	22.6	77.4	0.0	0.5	99.5
10-14	99.0	57.4	42.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	55.1	26.6	73.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-9	35.8	8.0	92.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	98.5	41.8	58.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Orphan status						
Orphaned	74.2	39.4	60.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Not-orphaned	53.9	33.8	66.2	0.0	0.1	99.9
Foster status						
Fostered	59.9	29.0	71.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Not-fostered	53.8	34.0	66.0	0.0	0.1	99.9

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

5 Employment

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES

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

6.1 Economic Situation

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

6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community

Table 6.1 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey. Results show that 36 percent of all households in the district reported a positive change in the economic situation of their community, and 25 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. Even though the 37 percent of the respondents reported the community's economic condition to have deteriorated, only 9 percent reported the situation to be much worse.

Cluster location and poverty status of the household show some correlation with the perceived economic changes. 41 percent of the households in remote clusters reports deterioration in their community's economic situation compared to 32 percent of those living in accessible clusters. Likewise, while 46 percent of poor households reports deterioration in their community's economic situation, the share for non-poor households is 34 percent.
6.1

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported worsening conditions in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households with one or two members at 41 and 26 percent respectively. Furthermore, there is a difference of 6 percentage points between households owning six or more hectares of land and those owning no land who reported deteriorating conditions in their community's economic situation at 37 and 31 percent respectively. Likewise, the percentage of households owning both large and small livestock who reported worsening conditions in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households owning large livestock at 39 and 31 percent respectively.

While 48 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported deterioration in their community's economic situation, the share for households whose main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category is 22 percent. In contrast, while 47 percent of the households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category reported an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is 35 percent.

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

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	8.7	27.7	25.2	35.3	0.4	2.6	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	6.6	25.1	23.4	41.0	0.5	3.3	100.0
Remote	10.7	30.0	26.9	30.0	0.4	2.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	13.2	33.4	19.1	31.6	0.9	1.8	100.0
Non-poor	7.5	26.1	26.9	36.4	0.3	2.8	100.0
Household size							
1-2	0.0	26.2	22.6	46.9	0.9	3.4	100.0
3-4	5.4	26.3	29.2	35.2	0.7	3.2	100.0
5-6	11.6	26.1	19.5	38.3	0.0	4.5	100.0
7+	11.0	30.0	27.1	30.7	0.5	0.7	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	4.6	25.5	30.2	35.6	1.4	2.8	100.0
< 1 ha	0.0	59.4	4.3	36.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	8.3	26.9	17.8	42.1	0.0	4.9	100.0
2-3.99 ha	12.8	29.2	23.2	33.1	0.0	1.7	100.0
4-5.99 ha	6.6	28.7	27.6	34.2	1.2	1.7	100.0
6+ ha	10.7	26.2	25.3	34.9	0.0	2.9	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	9.8	26.2	21.2	39.2	0.4	3.2	100.0
Small only	2.7	30.6	29.0	36.6	0.0	1.1	100.0
Large only	12.3	19.1	37.2	25.1	2.6	3.7	100.0
Both	8.9	30.4	27.0	31.3	0.2	2.2	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	21.5	24.8	44.8	2.2	6.7	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	9.2	27.7	25.3	34.7	0.2	2.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	24.0	33.8	42.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	15.0	32.7	17.2	32.5	2.6	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	9.3	29.5	24.1	33.7	0.4	3.1	100.0
Female	5.6	17.0	32.0	44.8	0.5	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.2	22.8	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	10.0	28.6	23.6	34.5	0.3	3.1	100.0
Polygamous	9.1	28.5	25.5	32.6	0.8	3.6	100.0
Loose union	0.0	52.4	14.4	33.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	4.9	21.8	31.9	41.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	11.3	26.5	22.3	37.2	0.5	2.1	100.0
Primary	8.2	29.0	26.9	32.8	0.3	2.8	100.0
Secondary +	0.0	22.8	27.0	45.9	1.1	3.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

Furthermore, 52 percent of households where the household head has a loose union reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their communities, whereas the share for households where the household head is single is virtually null. In contrast, virtually all households where the head is single reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation. It is also observed that the percentage of households where the head has no formal education and reported worsening conditions in their community's economic situation is 15 percentage points higher than that of households where the head has secondary education or more. Finally, while 46 percent of female-headed households reported improvement in their

Table 6.2: Percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation of the household compared to the year before the survey

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	11.9	31.4	29.6	26.5	0.5	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	10.3	30.9	27.7	30.6	0.5	0.0	100.0
Remote	13.5	32.0	31.3	22.7	0.5	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	22.1	28.6	28.9	20.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	9.1	32.2	29.8	28.2	0.6	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	8.8	34.8	31.2	24.3	0.9	0.0	100.0
3-4	10.5	31.6	32.1	25.1	0.7	0.0	100.0
5-6	13.4	29.0	31.6	25.2	0.9	0.0	100.0
7+	12.6	32.3	26.1	29.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	12.7	24.4	34.7	26.9	1.4	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	27.5	22.2	25.5	24.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	18.4	29.4	46.2	6.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	19.5	33.7	33.1	13.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	5.5	42.6	25.8	26.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	9.7	30.7	24.8	34.2	0.5	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	16.5	30.1	32.8	20.3	0.4	0.0	100.0
Small only	6.2	34.5	23.8	33.8	1.7	0.0	100.0
Large only	8.9	27.2	43.7	20.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	8.4	33.1	24.2	34.0	0.2	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	5.2	38.0	54.6	2.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	12.6	32.2	31.1	23.6	0.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	24.8	14.1	61.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	20.6	40.6	22.2	16.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	11.9	31.3	28.2	28.1	0.5	0.0	100.0
Female	11.9	32.3	37.8	17.5	0.5	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	0.0	0.0	0.0	77.2	22.8	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	12.6	29.1	28.6	28.9	0.7	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	12.3	36.6	24.0	27.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	36.2	44.2	19.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	10.4	32.1	40.3	17.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	12.4	36.2	30.3	20.4	0.6	0.0	100.0
Primary	13.1	30.1	29.1	27.3	0.3	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	0.0	17.8	29.7	51.4	1.1	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

community's economic situation, the share for male-headed households is 34 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 6.3: 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	13.4	28.5	43.9	14.2	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	17.2	30.0	39.0	13.7	100.0
Remote	9.8	27.1	48.5	14.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	2.6	14.8	55.2	27.4	100.0
Non-poor	16.4	32.3	40.8	10.6	100.0
Household size					
1-2	22.4	20.0	39.2	18.3	100.0
3-4	17.2	29.3	43.8	9.6	100.0
5-6	13.5	29.7	42.8	14.0	100.0
7+	8.7	28.9	45.8	16.6	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	15.2	24.2	44.3	16.2	100.0
< 1 ha	15.2	12.8	63.9	8.1	100.0
1-1.99 ha	6.4	27.5	48.6	17.5	100.0
2-3.99 ha	14.0	19.3	47.0	19.6	100.0
4-5.99 ha	9.8	27.6	48.8	13.8	100.0
6+ ha	14.9	34.5	39.0	11.6	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	9.9	21.3	50.9	18.0	100.0
Small only	12.6	28.4	45.7	13.3	100.0
Large only	3.2	32.4	38.3	26.1	100.0
Both	21.3	38.3	34.1	6.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	31.8	51.1	11.9	5.2	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	12.1	27.4	45.5	14.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	33.0	23.7	34.6	8.7	100.0
Other	2.6	34.3	48.3	14.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	13.6	30.1	42.7	13.5	100.0
Female	12.2	18.9	50.6	18.3	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	11.6	29.3	43.1	15.9	100.0
Polygamous	18.3	29.1	43.3	9.2	100.0
Loose union	19.6	13.6	52.4	14.4	100.0
Widow/div/sep	10.0	26.5	47.6	15.9	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	11.4	33.6	40.4	14.7	100.0
Primary	12.5	24.6	47.6	15.3	100.0
Secondary +	30.6	34.3	32.0	3.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

before the survey. Only 27 percent of the households reported an improvement in their economic conditions, while 30 percent reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

46 percent of households located in remote clusters reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households compared to 41 percent of households located in accessible clusters. Likewise, poor households expressed negative views on the change in their economic condition more frequently than non-poor households, with a difference of 10 percentage points at 51 and 41 percent respectively.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households is higher than that of households with one or two members at 29 and 25 percent respectively. Likewise, while 35 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households, the share for households owning no land is 28 percent. Disaggregation of the data further shows that 47 percent of households owning no livestock express negative views on their households' economic conditions compared to 36 percent of households owning large livestock.

The percentage of households belonging to the 'other' category who reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households is higher than that of households whose main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category at 62 and 5 percent respectively. Likewise, while 49 percent of households where the head is polygamous reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households, the share for households where the head is single is virtually null. In contrast, virtually all households where the head is single reported improving conditions in their households' economic situation.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that 29 percent of male-headed households reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households compared to 18 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 52 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more reported an improvement in their households economic situation compared to 21 percent of households where the head no formal education.

Table 6.4: Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	97.1	0.9	1.7	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	96.7	1.1	1.7	0.6	100.0
Remote	97.4	0.8	1.8	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	97.1	0.0	2.9	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	97.0	1.2	1.4	0.4	100.0
Household size					
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	95.6	2.4	2.0	0.0	100.0
7+	95.4	0.7	3.1	0.7	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	96.8	0.0	3.2	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	95.5	2.8	1.6	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	96.2	0.5	3.3	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	96.2	0.9	2.2	0.7	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	98.1	0.6	1.3	0.0	100.0
Small only	96.6	0.6	2.8	0.0	100.0
Large only	96.9	0.0	3.1	0.0	100.0
Both	95.8	1.7	1.6	0.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	83.3	6.6	10.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	97.4	0.8	1.4	0.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	96.2	0.0	3.8	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	96.8	1.1	1.8	0.3	100.0
Female	98.6	0.0	1.4	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	96.0	1.3	2.2	0.5	100.0
Polygamous	98.1	0.8	1.1	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	98.8	0.0	1.2	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	98.0	0.8	1.2	0.0	100.0
Primary	97.8	0.4	1.4	0.5	100.0
Secondary +	86.2	5.9	7.9	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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, 42 percent of the district's households never/seldom

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	98.4	0.9	0.7	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	97.6	1.0	1.4	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	97.9	1.1	0.9	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	92.6	3.7	3.7	0.0	100.0
3-4	97.0	2.2	0.8	0.0	100.0
5-6	99.2	0.0	0.8	0.0	100.0
7+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	91.3	4.8	3.9	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	97.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	100.0
Small only	98.6	1.4	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	94.6	5.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	98.5	0.6	0.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.2	2.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	98.1	1.0	0.9	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	97.5	1.2	1.3	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	99.1	0.0	0.9	0.0	100.0
Primary	98.4	1.2	0.4	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	94.4	2.7	3.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

experienced food shortages, while the remaining population experienced food shortages frequently (often/always).

While 47 percent of households in accessible clusters never / seldom experienced food shortages, the share for households in remote clusters is 37 percent. Likewise, 48 percent of non-poor households never / seldom experienced food shortages compared to 18 percent of poor households.

50 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land never / seldom experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to 39 percent of households owning no land. In addition, while 22 percent of households with one or two members never experienced food shortages, the share for households with seven or more members is 9 percent. There is also some correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. While 69 percent of households owning no livestock frequently experienced food shortages, the share for households owning both large and small livestock is 40 percent.

The socio-economic group of the household also shows some correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. 63 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group frequently experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to 17 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee. Furthermore, virtually all households where the head is single had never experienced food shortages compared to 10 percent of households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that male-headed households reported having food shortages less frequently than female-headed households as 44 percent of male-headed households never / seldom experienced food shortages compared to 31 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, while 31 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more never experienced food shortages, the share for households where the head has no education is 11 percent.

6.2.2 Paying School Fees

Table 6.4 shows the percentage distribution of households by the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey. At the time of the survey, 97 percent of the households in the district reported that they never had problems paying school fees and only 2 percent of the households reported that they often/always had problems paying school fees. It is worth noting that children in primary state schools do not pay fees. While children in secondary state schools do pay fees, the secondary school

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	97.0	1.5	1.4	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	96.2	1.6	2.3	0.0	100.0
Remote	97.9	1.5	0.6	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	98.0	0.7	1.3	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	96.8	1.8	1.4	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	96.3	3.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	96.4	2.0	1.5	0.0	100.0
7+	95.6	1.8	2.6	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	95.1	2.7	2.2	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	96.8	3.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	97.9	0.0	2.1	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	96.2	2.3	1.6	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	97.5	1.7	0.9	0.0	100.0
Small only	99.4	0.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	94.7	2.2	3.1	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	89.9	10.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	98.4	0.4	1.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	83.6	14.0	2.4	0.0	100.0
Other	96.7	0.0	3.3	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	96.7	1.6	1.6	0.0	100.0
Female	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	96.6	1.4	2.0	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	96.6	2.4	1.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	99.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	98.2	0.9	0.9	0.0	100.0
Primary	96.5	1.6	1.9	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

enrolment rates are very low (for more details, see chapter 3).

It is also observed that 10 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group and 8 percent of the household heads with secondary education or more reported having frequent problems paying school fees. Other selected household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, land ownership, livestock ownership, gender and marital status do not show strong correlation with 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

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	29.6	39.2	27.3	3.9	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	37.2	38.6	23.4	0.9	100.0
Remote	22.4	39.8	31.0	6.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	19.8	37.0	33.4	9.8	100.0
Non-poor	32.3	39.8	25.6	2.3	100.0
Household size					
1-2	38.5	36.9	19.7	5.0	100.0
3-4	33.4	40.2	24.4	2.0	100.0
5-6	25.1	40.3	28.5	6.1	100.0
7+	28.2	38.3	30.1	3.5	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	34.4	34.0	22.8	8.8	100.0
< 1 ha	28.5	31.3	40.2	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	21.1	42.5	34.0	2.4	100.0
2-3.99 ha	22.8	32.5	35.0	9.7	100.0
4-5.99 ha	20.9	54.0	23.7	1.3	100.0
6+ ha	34.3	37.8	26.3	1.6	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	26.9	37.1	29.9	6.2	100.0
Small only	28.6	44.7	23.9	2.8	100.0
Large only	32.7	25.5	36.0	5.9	100.0
Both	33.3	43.1	22.9	0.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	74.1	21.6	4.3	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	26.5	40.4	29.6	3.5	100.0
Self-employed - other	50.5	32.7	11.1	5.6	100.0
Other	25.8	39.4	25.2	9.5	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	30.1	40.2	26.5	3.2	100.0
Female	26.8	33.2	31.9	8.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	29.9	40.4	25.5	4.2	100.0
Polygamous	30.0	38.9	29.5	1.6	100.0
Loose union	34.0	50.0	16.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	26.0	35.7	31.3	7.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	25.9	42.5	27.4	4.2	100.0
Primary	29.4	39.4	27.0	4.3	100.0
Secondary +	50.3	20.5	29.2	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

survey. Overall, 98 percent of the households in the district reported that they never had problems paying house rent although a small percentage (5 percent) of households owning no land and those belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group reported seldom having problems paying house rent. Other selected household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty level, household size, livestock ownership, gender, marital status and education level do not show correlation with the ability to pay house rent.

6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills

Table 6.6 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying utility bills during the year before the survey. 97 percent households in the district faced no problems paying utility bills although a small percentage (14 percent) of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category and 10 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group reported seldom having problems paying utility bills. Other selected household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, land ownership, livestock ownership, gender, marital status and level of education do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay utility bills.

6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare

Table 6.7 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for healthcare during the year before the survey. 69 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 37 percent of households located in accessible clusters never experienced problems paying for healthcare compared to 22 percent of households located in remote clusters. Likewise, while 32 percent of non-poor households never experienced problems paying for healthcare, the share for poor households 20 percent.

39 percent of households with one or two members never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 28 percent of households with seven or more members. On the other hand, while 32 percent of households owning no land frequently had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households owning six or more hectares of land is 28 percent.

Furthermore, 33 percent of households owning both small and large livestock never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 27 percent of those owning no livestock. Similarly, while 74 percent

Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets

			Livestock				Motor-		Wheel
	Home	Land	Small	Large	Both	Vehicle	cycle	Bicycle	barrow
Total	85.2	81.3	13.7	7.1	31.9	0.5	1.0	67.1	15.7
Cluster Location									
Accessible	82.9	83.7	12.1	6.5	33.9	0.5	0.7	69.0	14.0
Remote	87.4	79.0	15.2	7.7	30.0	0.6	1.3	65.4	17.4
Poverty Status									
Poor	89.8	90.1	23.2	5.0	25.6	0.0	0.0	57.0	9.6
Non-poor	83.9	78.8	11.1	7.7	33.6	0.7	1.3	69.9	17.4
Household size									
1-2	64.3	71.8	4.4	7.8	16.6	0.9	0.0	44.7	4.0
3-4	73.6	67.3	10.1	3.2	21.9	0.0	0.3	52.6	10.1
5-6	89.3	83.5	12.5	9.4	29.0	1.2	1.7	69.8	19.0
7+	95.0	91.5	19.1	8.1	44.3	0.4	1.3	80.3	20.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	37.4	59.2	39.3	0.0	33.3	6.6	4.4	84.7	21.5
Self-employed - agric	87.0	82.1	12.6	6.7	31.6	0.0	0.5	65.4	14.3
Self-employed - other	77.0	61.3	12.4	3.0	36.7	5.0	7.3	75.7	24.9
Other	93.8	100.0	15.3	19.3	31.1	0.0	0.0	71.1	21.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	85.3	81.8	14.6	7.1	33.6	0.5	1.2	72.9	17.8
Female	84.5	77.9	8.1	7.0	22.1	0.5	0.0	33.4	3.6

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

of households belonging to the 'employee' category never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is 26 percent.

Virtually all households where the household head is single never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 26 percent of households where the household head is widowed, divorced or separated. On the other hand, 40 percent of female-headed households frequently had problems paying for healthcare compared to 30 percent of male-headed households. While 50 percent of household heads with secondary education or more never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for household heads with no formal education is 26 percent.

6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status

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

6.3.1 Asset Ownership

Table 6.8 shows the percent distribution of households owning a selected group of assets. Overall, 85 percent of the households in the district owns their dwellings while 81 percent owns some land. 32 percent of all households owns both small and large livestock while only 14 percent of all households owns small livestock. While 67 percent of the households owns a bicycle, the share for households owning a motorcycle is 1 percent.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. While 87 percent of households located in remote clusters owns their dwellings, the share for households located in accessible clusters is 83 percent. Likewise, 90 percent of poor households owns their dwellings compared to 84 percent of non-poor households.

Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status

	Own	Rent	Free	Other	Total
Total	85.2	8.6	5.6	0.6	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	82.9	10.4	6.2	0.6	100.0
Remote	87.4	6.9	5.0	0.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	89.8	2.2	6.8	1.3	100.0
Non-poor	83.9	10.4	5.2	0.5	100.0
Household size					
1-2	64.3	24.1	9.9	1.8	100.0
3-4	73.6	16.9	7.6	1.9	100.0
5-6	89.3	5.3	5.4	0.0	100.0
7+	95.0	1.7	3.3	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	37.4	51.8	10.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	87.0	7.0	5.4	0.6	100.0
Self-employed - other	77.0	12.8	7.8	2.4	100.0
Other	93.8	2.4	3.7	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	85.3	8.8	5.5	0.4	100.0
Female	84.5	7.7	5.9	1.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

Disaggregation of the data shows that 95 percent of households with seven or more members own their dwellings compared to 64 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 94 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category owns their dwellings, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is 37 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that gender does not show strong correlation with dwelling ownership. In contrast, 73 percent of male-headed households owns a bicycle compared to 33 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 80 percent of households with seven or more members owns a bicycle compared to 45 percent of households with one or two members. Similarly, while 85 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee owns a bicycle, the share for households where the head belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' socio-economic group is 65 percent.

Furthermore, while 70 percent of non-poor households owns a bicycle, the share for poor households is 57 percent. Likewise, 69 percent of households located in accessible clusters owns a bicycle compared to 65 percent of households located in remote clusters.

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. 2 percent of the households possess formal occupancy documentation, which includes a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 91 percent of households in this district have no documentation at all.

6.4 Agriculture

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

6.4.1 Agricultural Inputs

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

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

	Title deed	Renting contract	Payment receipt	Other document	No document	Total	Secure tenure
Total	0.2	0.9	0.5	7.1	91.4	100.0	1.5
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.4	1.5	0.9	5.8	91.4	100.0	2.8
Remote	0.0	0.3	0.0	8.3	91.5	100.0	0.3
Poverty Status							
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	94.7	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	0.2	1.1	0.6	7.6	90.5	100.0	1.9
Household size							
1-2	0.0	0.9	0.0	11.6	87.5	100.0	0.9
3-4	0.0	1.6	0.3	6.0	92.1	100.0	1.9
5-6	0.0	1.1	0.6	5.9	92.4	100.0	1.7
7+	0.5	0.2	0.6	7.6	91.1	100.0	1.3
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	8.8	13.1	0.0	78.1	100.0	21.9
Self-employed - agriculture	0.2	0.7	0.0	6.8	92.3	100.0	0.9
Self-employed - other	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.4	81.6	100.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	96.7	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	0.2	1.0	0.5	6.6	91.6	100.0	1.8
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.6	90.4	100.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

76 percent of all farmers applies agricultural inputs to their farms and the majority (65 percent) of those who use farm inputs use improved seedlings. Further breakdown of the data shows that 80 percent of households in remote clusters applies agricultural inputs compared to 72 percent of households in accessible clusters. Furthermore, while 77 percent of non-poor households uses agricultural inputs, the share for poor households is 75 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that as the number of household members increases, the usage of agricultural inputs also tends to increase as 81 percent of households with seven or more members uses agricultural inputs compared to 53 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 80 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category uses agricultural inputs, the share for households belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group is 50 percent. Likewise, use of agricultural inputs in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households. While 79 percent of male-headed households uses agricultural inputs the share for female-headed households is 62 percent.

Most households that use agricultural inputs purchase them at an open market (42 percent) and in second place get them from cooperatives (34 percent). While 23 percent of the households obtains their inputs by preparing them themselves, 1 percent reports government and none reports donor agencies as their main source.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that the percentage of households located in accessible clusters who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 43 and 41 percent respectively. Likewise, 27 percent of households located in accessible clusters obtains agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves compared to 18 percent of households located in remote clusters. While 48 percent of non-poor households purchases agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for poor households is 19 percent. On the other hand, 33 percent of poor households obtains agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves compared to 20 percent of non-poor households.

In addition, while 59 percent of households with one or two members purchases agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for households with seven or more members is 37 percent. In

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	76.2	49.5	65.1	0.0	0.0	58.3	0.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	72.4	54.5	60.3	0.0	0.0	48.2	0.0
Remote	79.9	45.2	69.2	0.0	0.0	66.9	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	74.7	54.8	45.9	0.0	0.0	53.7	0.0
Non-poor	76.7	48.1	70.3	0.0	0.0	59.5	0.0
Household size							
1-2	52.9	22.5	91.6	0.0	0.0	61.3	0.0
3-4	74.6	58.0	62.8	0.0	0.0	52.1	0.0
5-6	79.1	50.8	65.1	0.0	0.0	59.2	0.0
7+	80.5	47.0	62.7	0.0	0.0	61.2	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	50.0	36.4	77.8	0.0	0.0	69.4	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	79.9	49.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	59.6	0.0
Self-employed - other	62.8	50.0	67.5	0.0	0.0	53.2	0.0
Other	58.0	62.9	32.9	0.0	0.0	38.7	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	78.6	49.7	66.1	0.0	0.0	60.1	0.0
Female	62.4	47.8	57.5	0.0	0.0	45.1	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

contrast, the percentage of households with seven or more members who obtain agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves is 13 percentage points higher than that of households with one or two members, at 21 and 8 percent respectively.

81 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 14 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group. In turn, about 42 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category obtain agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves. Finally, while 42 percent of male-headed households purchases agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for female-headed households is 38 percent. In contrast, 31 percent of female-headed households obtains agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves compared to 21 percent of male-headed households.

6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around 29 percent of households own less than two acres of land (including 19 percent of landless households). 13 percent owns between two and four acres and the majority (59 percent) own four or more acres.

Landless households are more common in remote clusters and households owning large portions of land are more common in accessible clusters. Likewise, the percentage of landless households among non-poor households is higher than that of poor households, at 21 and 10 percent respectively.

Regarding household size, while 28 percent of households with one or two members are landless, the share for households with seven or more members is 9 percent. In contrast, larger households seem to own larger landholdings more frequently than households with less members.

While households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category reported the highest share of landless households (41 percent), the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is virtually null. In turn, 84 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to

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	41.8	1.4	0.0	34.3	22.5	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	43.1	1.3	0.0	28.3	27.4	100.0
Remote	40.7	1.5	0.0	39.5	18.3	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	18.8	2.2	0.0	45.8	33.3	100.0
Non-poor	48.0	1.1	0.0	31.2	19.6	100.0
Household size						
1-2	58.8	0.0	0.0	32.9	8.4	100.0
3-4	49.8	1.2	0.0	21.6	27.3	100.0
5-6	38.1	2.1	0.0	36.7	23.2	100.0
7+	36.8	1.2	0.0	41.0	21.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	80.9	0.0	0.0	14.7	4.4	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	41.7	1.6	0.0	35.3	21.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	55.9	0.0	0.0	17.2	26.9	100.0
Other	14.0	0.0	0.0	43.6	42.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	42.4	1.6	0.0	34.7	21.3	100.0
Female	37.5	0.0	0.0	31.2	31.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

1. Base is households using agricultural inputs

the 'other' category owns four or more acres of land. Finally, male-headed households tend to have larger landholdings (4 or more acres) compared to female-headed households at 60 and 48 percent respectively.

6.4.2 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. Overall, 61 percent of the households own no cattle at all. While 21 percent owns between 2 and 10 heads of cattle, 11 percent owns between 11 and 20 heads of cattle. Households in remote clusters are more likely to own no cattle compared to households in accessible clusters at, 62 and 60 percent respectively. Likewise, the percentage of poor households owning no cattle is higher than that of non-poor households at 70 and 59 percent respectively. 76 percent of households with one or two members owns no cattle, compared to 48 percent of households with seven or more members. Likewise, 67 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category owns no cattle compared to 50 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category. Finally, while 71 percent of female-headed households owns no cattle, the share for male-headed households is 60 percent.

6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community

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

40 percent of the households reported that the security situation was improving, 49 percent said it was the same while 11 percent reported it was deteriorating. The percentage of households located in remote clusters who reported the current crime and security situation as improving is higher than that of households located in accessible clusters at 43 and 35 percent respectively. In contrast, poverty status does not show strong correlation with perception of crime and security situation in the community.

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	18.7	2.3	7.9	12.8	15.7	42.6	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	16.3	2.7	8.9	12.0	16.8	43.3	100.0
Remote	21.0	2.0	6.9	13.5	14.6	42.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	9.9	3.1	7.3	14.6	21.1	43.9	100.0
Non-poor	21.2	2.1	8.0	12.2	14.2	42.2	100.0
Household size							
1-2	28.2	2.7	19.6	15.9	13.8	19.8	100.0
3-4	32.7	0.7	7.4	10.0	16.1	33.0	100.0
5-6	16.5	2.8	8.6	16.8	16.2	39.1	100.0
7+	8.5	3.1	5.1	11.1	15.4	56.8	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	40.8	4.4	6.5	4.4	15.9	28.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	17.9	2.3	8.5	13.6	14.6	43.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	38.7	5.2	4.5	8.2	15.9	27.5	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	5.0	11.5	27.5	56.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	18.2	2.5	7.8	11.6	14.4	45.5	100.0
Female	22.1	1.2	8.6	19.7	23.1	25.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	61.2	1.0	21.3	10.6	4.6	1.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	60.0	0.4	24.6	10.4	4.2	0.4	100.0
Remote	62.3	1.6	18.2	10.8	5.1	2.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	70.4	0.6	17.1	9.3	2.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	58.7	1.1	22.5	11.0	5.2	1.7	100.0
Household size							
1-2	75.6	5.0	15.4	1.8	2.3	0.0	100.0
3-4	74.9	0.0	14.5	6.1	1.6	2.8	100.0
5-6	61.6	1.6	24.3	9.5	3.0	0.0	100.0
7+	48.2	0.4	25.1	16.4	8.4	1.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	66.7	0.0	18.4	14.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	62.1	1.2	20.0	10.5	5.1	1.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	60.3	0.0	32.1	3.5	4.1	0.0	100.0
Other	49.6	0.0	28.4	15.9	2.0	4.1	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	59.5	0.7	22.9	10.4	5.0	1.5	100.0
Female	70.9	2.9	11.7	11.9	2.6	0.0	100.0

While 43 percent of households with one or two members reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households with seven or more members is 39 percent. On the other hand, 17 percent of households owning no land reported the current crime and security situation as deteriorating compared to 10 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land. While 44 percent of households owning both small and large livestock reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households owning large livestock is 30 percent.

While 16 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the

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

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	2.4	8.7	48.7	29.5	9.7	1.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	2.5	9.1	52.4	24.4	10.7	0.9	100.0
Remote	2.4	8.3	45.3	34.3	8.7	1.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.0	11.1	48.8	29.0	10.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	2.8	8.0	48.7	29.6	9.6	1.2	100.0
Household size							
1-2	0.0	13.5	43.5	33.5	9.4	0.0	100.0
3-4	3.7	6.9	48.5	32.9	6.6	1.4	100.0
5-6	3.7	7.3	48.2	27.0	11.6	2.2	100.0
7+	1.2	9.9	50.4	27.9	10.5	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	0.0	16.6	48.6	24.2	10.7	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	0.0	6.4	24.7	37.5	31.3	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	3.6	4.0	38.2	44.0	7.8	2.4	100.0
2-3.99 ha	0.0	10.1	53.3	28.7	6.2	1.7	100.0
4-5.99 ha	5.2	6.2	40.4	36.1	12.1	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	3.1	6.7	53.8	26.4	8.6	1.4	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	1.5	9.8	49.4	28.1	10.3	0.8	100.0
Small only	6.1	9.8	47.5	27.4	8.1	1.1	100.0
Large only	0.0	3.7	64.0	23.7	6.0	2.6	100.0
Both	2.8	7.7	44.8	33.6	10.4	0.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	16.1	43.7	27.5	12.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	2.6	9.5	47.6	29.8	9.3	1.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	4.5	4.1	37.3	41.1	12.9	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	73.4	16.4	10.3	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	2.8	8.7	50.7	27.7	9.1	0.9	100.0
Female	0.0	8.5	37.2	39.4	13.5	1.3	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	0.0	77.2	0.0	0.0	22.8	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	2.7	9.4	51.8	27.4	8.1	0.6	100.0
Polygamous	1.8	6.2	49.2	30.2	11.7	1.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	19.6	66.0	0.0	0.0	14.4	100.0
Widow/div/sep	2.5	7.7	37.4	38.4	12.8	1.1	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	3.2	10.2	47.9	28.9	8.9	0.9	100.0
Primary	2.3	6.6	49.6	31.6	8.9	1.1	100.0
Secondary +	0.0	17.9	46.1	15.2	20.8	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

'employee' category reported deterioration in the current crime and security situation, the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is virtually null. In turn, 73 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported same conditions in the current crime and security situation.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that 53 percent of female-headed households reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 37 percent of male-headed households.

While 77 percent of households where the household head is single reported deterioration in the current crime and

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

	Principal contributor of income				
	Head	Spouse	Child	Other	Total
Total	86.6	4.7	5.9	2.8	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	88.5	4.8	4.8	1.9	100.0
Remote	84.9	4.6	6.9	3.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	75.6	8.9	12.9	2.6	100.0
Non-poor	89.7	3.5	3.9	2.8	100.0
Household size					
1-2	90.2	7.4	0.0	2.5	100.0
3-4	89.4	3.6	4.4	2.7	100.0
5-6	87.5	5.0	5.4	2.1	100.0
7+	83.4	4.7	8.6	3.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	94.8	0.0	5.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	93.1	1.9	2.5	2.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	89.7	5.0	5.4	0.0	100.0
Other	6.6	38.0	44.8	10.6	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	89.6	5.2	3.6	1.6	100.0
Female	69.4	1.8	19.0	9.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

security situation, the share for households where the head is polygamous is 8 percent. In turn, 66 percent of households where the head has a loose union reported same conditions in the current crime and security situation.

Finally, the breakdown by level of education of the household head shows that the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported deterioration in the current crime and security situation is 5 percentage points higher than that of household heads with no formal education at 18 and 13 percent respectively.

6.6 Household Income Contributions

Table 6.16 shows the percent distribution of households by main contributor to household income. The survey includes information on household income contributions by listing all the income contributors in the households and then identifying the household member who contributes the largest portion. For the majority (87 percent) of households the head is the main contributor.

89 percent of households located in accessible clusters reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 85 percent of households located in remote clusters. Likewise, while 90 percent of non-poor households reported the household head as the main income contributor, the share for poor households is 76 percent.

90 percent of households with one or two members reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 83 percent of households with seven or more members.

Furthermore, 95 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 7 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category. The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that 90 percent of male-headed households reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 69 percent of female-headed households. In contrast, 19 percent of female-headed households reported a child of the household head as the main income contributor compared to 4 percent of male-headed households.

6.7 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. 87 percent of households

owns at least one mattress or bed, 49 percent owns a radio, 40 percent owns a watch or clock and 19 percent owns an electric iron. Although none of the households owns a fixed line phone, 10 percent owns a mobile phone. Households in accessible clusters and non-poor households tend to have higher rates of ownership in almost every selected item.

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

Table 6.17: Percentage of households owning selected household items

	Electric iron	Refrigerator	Sewing machine	Modern stove	Mattress or bed	Watch or clock	Radio	Televison	Fixed line phone	Mobile phone
Total	19.2	0.8	4.3	3.1	86.5	39.6	49.4	2.0	0.2	10.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	25.4	1.2	6.1	3.1	93.1	42.6	56.3	2.7	0.5	14.2
Remote	13.4	0.3	2.6	3.0	80.3	36.8	42.9	1.2	0.0	6.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.8	67.8	38.3	19.7	0.0	0.0	3.4
Non-poor	23.1	1.0	5.4	3.7	91.7	40.0	57.7	2.5	0.3	11.8
Household size										
1-2	12.0	2.7	9.6	3.6	77.4	33.7	48.3	4.4	0.9	12.5
3-4	18.0	0.0	4.2	2.8	87.3	27.7	46.6	0.6	0.3	6.2
5-6	16.5	0.8	2.8	2.8	86.5	40.2	49.6	2.9	0.3	12.3
7+	23.6	0.8	4.2	3.4	88.1	48.8	51.6	1.7	0.0	10.5
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	55.8	21.8	19.6	26.1	95.7	72.9	79.3	32.8	6.6	51.9
Self-employed - agric	16.2	0.0	2.5	2.3	86.4	37.8	47.5	0.5	0.0	6.6
Self-employed - other	47.7	0.0	24.6	4.7	100.0	62.9	78.2	6.2	0.0	29.6
Other	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.9	25.0	33.1	0.0	0.0	12.8
Gender of the head of household										
Male	21.0	0.8	4.6	3.5	87.1	41.0	52.3	2.2	0.2	10.7
Female	9.0	0.5	2.4	0.5	83.4	31.3	32.5	0.5	0.5	5.7

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

7 HOUSEHOLD AMENITIES

This chapter analyses the main amenities of the households in Kishapu 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, 84 percent of households have thatch as their main roof material and 15 percent have iron sheets.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages are more likely to use thatch than households in accessible villages at 89 and 79 percent respectively. In turn, households in accessible villages tend to use iron sheets more often. Similarly, 99 percent of poor households uses thatch as their main roof material compared to 80 percent of non-poor households. On the other hand, while 19 percent of non-poor households uses iron sheets, the share for poor households is only 1 percent.

The breakdown by household size shows that there are no strong differences in material used for the roof of the house. The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' category has the highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 92 percent), and that employees are the group that uses thatch less at 11 percent. Employees have the highest use of iron sheets (at 60 percent).

The breakdown by gender of the household head reveals no strong correlation with material used for roof of the house.

Table 7.2 shows the distribution of households by type of material used in the walls. Overall, 97 percent of houses are

Table 7.1: Percent distribution of households by material used for roof of the house

	Mud	Thatch	Wood	Iron Sheets	Cement/ concrete	Roofing tiles	Asbestos	Other	Total
Total	0.0	83.7	0.0	15.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	0.0	78.7	0.0	19.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	88.5	0.0	11.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	0.0	98.8	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	79.6	0.0	19.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	0.0	81.4	0.0	15.9	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	0.0	85.1	0.0	14.1	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.0	82.1	0.0	16.8	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	0.0	84.5	0.0	14.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	0.0	11.2	0.0	60.3	0.0	28.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	86.3	0.0	13.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	80.0	0.0	17.6	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	91.7	0.0	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	0.0	83.9	0.0	14.9	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	82.8	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	97.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	96.7	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	97.3	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	96.2	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size								
1-2	93.8	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	98.4	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	94.7	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	98.3	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	57.5	0.0	0.0	42.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	98.9	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	90.2	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household								
Male	96.9	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	97.3	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	93.4	0.0	0.2	6.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	93.3	0.0	0.3	6.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	93.6	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	99.3	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	91.8	0.0	0.2	8.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	93.8	0.0	0.9	5.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	92.9	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	92.3	0.0	0.3	7.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	94.6	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	41.6	0.0	4.4	54.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	95.3	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	90.2	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	93.5	0.0	0.1	6.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	92.9	0.0	0.5	6.6	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

built with mud or mud bricks compared to 3 percent of houses built with cement or sandcrete.

The analysis reveals no strong differences in cluster location, and gender of household head with materials used for walls of the house.

The analysis by poverty status shows that all (100 percent) poor households use mud or mud bricks compared to 96 percent of

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

	Single room	Flat	Two or more rooms	Whole building	Other	Total
Total	0.8	0.0	3.5	58.7	37.0	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	1.0	0.0	5.2	57.5	36.3	100.0
Remote	0.6	0.0	1.9	59.7	37.7	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.0	66.0	100.0
Non-poor	1.0	0.0	4.5	65.5	29.0	100.0
Household size						
1-2	3.9	0.0	14.0	73.1	9.0	100.0
3-4	1.7	0.0	5.5	81.6	11.1	100.0
5-6	0.0	0.0	1.9	65.0	33.1	100.0
7+	0.0	0.0	1.0	35.0	64.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	4.4	0.0	37.5	31.4	26.8	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.6	0.0	1.7	61.9	35.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	2.4	0.0	12.8	55.2	29.5	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	37.2	62.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	0.9	0.0	3.0	59.0	37.1	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	6.6	56.7	36.8	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

non-poor households. Conversely, 4 percent of non-poor households uses cement for their walls compared to virtually null of the poor households. Similarly, 98 percent of households with 3 to 4 members and more than 7 members uses mud or mud bricks as main material in the walls of the house compared to 94 percent of households with up to 2 members.

Virtually all (100 percent) households in the 'other' category report living in houses made of mud or mud bricks compared to 58 percent of households in the 'employee' category, who report the highest share for houses made of cement (43 percent).

The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 93 percent of households is made of mud or dirt, and 6 percent of concrete or cement.

There is no strong correlation between cluster location, household size or gender with material used for the floor. However, 99 percent of poor households uses mud or dirt compared to 92 percent of non-poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group reveals that virtually all (100 percent) households in the 'other' category have mud or dirt floors compared to 42 percent of employees. Conversely, 54 percent of the employees uses concrete or cement for flooring.

Table 7.4 shows the percentage distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 59 percent of households occupy the whole building where they live.

The breakdown by cluster location and gender shows no strong correlation with type of housing unit occupied.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that 34 percent of poor households occupies a whole building compared to 66 percent in non-poor households. The breakdown by household size shows that 82 percent households with 3 to 4 members occupy the whole building where they live compared to 35 percent households with more than 7 members. The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that those self-employed in agricultural activities have the highest share of occupying a whole building 62 percent and the employees have the lowest share at (31 percent). However, employees also have the highest share of households occupying single rooms.

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	2.9	0.2	14.1	1.3	8.4	0.8	71.9	0.3	0.0	100.0	18.4
Cluster Location											
Accessible	5.3	0.4	22.1	1.6	9.1	1.1	60.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	29.0
Remote	0.6	0.0	6.6	1.1	7.6	0.6	82.8	0.6	0.0	100.0	8.4
Poverty Status											
Poor	1.5	0.0	11.9	1.1	8.2	0.0	77.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	14.5
Non-poor	3.3	0.2	14.8	1.4	8.4	1.0	70.5	0.4	0.0	100.0	19.5
Household size											
1-2	2.7	0.0	16.9	3.4	7.6	4.8	64.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	23.0
3-4	2.2	0.0	18.8	0.7	8.0	0.0	70.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	21.7
5-6	3.2	0.0	10.9	1.4	6.9	0.6	75.9	1.2	0.0	100.0	15.5
7+	3.2	0.5	12.6	1.3	9.8	0.7	72.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	17.1
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	34.6	0.0	15.5	0.0	0.0	4.3	45.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	50.1
Self-employed - agric	0.8	0.2	14.0	1.6	9.8	0.6	72.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	16.5
Self-employed - other	13.8	0.0	20.9	0.0	0.0	2.4	58.0	5.0	0.0	100.0	34.7
Other	2.4	0.0	8.9	0.0	3.2	0.0	85.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	11.3
Gender of the head of household											
Male	3.1	0.2	12.8	1.6	8.8	0.9	72.2	0.4	0.0	100.0	17.5
Female	1.7	0.0	21.8	0.0	6.0	0.0	70.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	23.6

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

7.2 Water Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 18 percent of households have a safe source of water. About 72 percent of all households gets drinking water from a river, lake or pond. Safe sources of drinking water are pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and protected wells.

The analysis by cluster location shows that 29 percent of households in accessible villages have a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share of households in remote villages is 8 percent. On the other hand, 83 percent of households in remote villages gets drinking water from a river, lake or pond, compared to 61 percent of accessible villages. The breakdown by poverty status of the household shows that 15 percent of poor households have access to safe, water compared to 20 percent of non-poor households.

The breakdown by household size reveals that households with up to 2 members and with 3 or 4 members have the highest access rate to safe sources of drinking water (23 and 24 percent, respectively). In turn, households with 5 to 6 members report the lowest rate, at 16 percent. Households with 5 to 6 members have highest access to water from river, lake and pond, at 76 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that 'employee', is the category with the highest rate of access to safe sources of drinking water (50 percent), followed by the 'self-employed other' category (35 percent), while 'other' is the category with the lowest access to safe water (11 percent). On the other hand, 73 percent of the households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category gets drinking water from a river, lake or pond.

The breakdown by gender of the household head reveals that female households have a higher access rate to safe sources of drinking water than male-headed households, at 24 and 18 percent respectively.

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Overall, 81 percent of households have safe sanitation, with up to 79 percent households using a covered pit latrine.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong correlation with type of toilet. However, non-poor households have a higher level o f safe sanitation (at 85

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	16.9	0.1	1.4	0.0	79.2	2.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	80.7
Cluster Location										
Accessible	16.4	0.2	2.2	0.0	78.5	2.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	80.9
Remote	17.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	79.9	2.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	80.5
Poverty Status										
Poor	29.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	66.4
Non-poor	13.5	0.1	1.7	0.0	82.7	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	84.6
Household size										
1-2	45.7	0.0	2.7	0.0	49.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	51.7
3-4	17.6	0.0	0.9	0.0	80.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	81.5
5-6	17.8	0.3	2.0	0.0	76.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	79.2
7+	9.4	0.0	1.0	0.0	86.6	3.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	87.5
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	4.3	2.2	26.3	0.0	67.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	95.7
Self-employed - agric	17.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	79.7	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	79.7
Self-employed - other	24.4	0.0	7.4	0.0	68.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	75.6
Other	11.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	88.6
Gender of the head of household										
Male	15.8	0.1	1.5	0.0	80.3	2.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	81.9
Female	23.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	73.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	73.5

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

percent) than poor households (at 66 percent).

The breakdown by household size shows households with 7 or more members have the highest rate of safe sanitation (88 percent) compared to households with up to 2 members at 52 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the employees have the highest rate of safe sanitation, at 96 percent while the 'self-employed other' category has the lowest rate of safe sanitation at 76 percent. The 'other' socio-economic category reports a higher share of households using covered pit latrines, at 89 percent than those in the employee category (at 67 percent).

Analysis by gender of the household head shows that male-headed households have higher access to safe sanitation than female-headed households, at 82 percent and 74 percent respectively. Male-headed households also have a higher share of covered pit-latrines (80 percent) than female-headed households (73 percent).

7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 95 percent of households use firewood compared to 42 percent of households that use charcoal. The use of firewood and charcoal is not correlated with cluster location. The breakdown by poverty status reveals that virtually all (100 percent) poor households use firewood compared with 94 percent of non-poor households.

Analysis of household size reveals that households with 7 or more members use firewood more often than households with up to 2 members, at 99 and 76 percent, respectively. Households with 5 to 6 members and those with 3 to 4 members report shares of 97 and 95 percent respectively. Conversely, households with up to 2 members have the highest rates of use of charcoal at 23 percent compared to households with more than 7 members, at 1 percent.

The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' category has the highest use of firewood (100 percent) and the 'self-employed other' together with the 'employee' category have the lowest use of firewood (67 percent each). The 'self-employed other' category report the highest rate of uses for charcoal at 30 percent.

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	95.3	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.5
Cluster Location										
Accessible	94.6	4.3	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1.1
Remote	95.9	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	94.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.7
Household size										
1-2	75.9	23.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.9
3-4	94.8	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.9
5-6	97.2	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.3
7+	98.5	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.4
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	67.2	21.8	0.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	11.0
Self-employed - agric	98.2	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	67.3	30.3	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2.4
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	96.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.5
Female	90.9	8.6	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.5

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows reveals that male-headed households have the highest rate of use of firewood (96 percent) and the lowest rate for charcoal (3 percent).

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lighting. Overall, 96 percent of the households in the district uses kerosene or paraffin and 3 percent uses firewood. Gas, batteries and candles are virtually not used for lighting in the district.

The analysis of cluster location and gender of the household head show no strong correlation with fuel used for lighting. Non-poor households have the highest rate of use of kerosene or paraffin (97 percent). On the other hand, about 1 percent of non-poor households uses firewood compared to 9 percent of poor households.

The breakdown by household size reveals that 98 percent of households with 3 to 4 members use kerosene/paraffin compared to 91 percent of households with up to 2 members. On the other hand, 4 percent of households with up to 2 members uses firewood compared to 2 percent of households with 3 to 4 and 5 to 6 members.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'self-employed – agriculture' and 'self-employed – other' have the highest rate of use of kerosene and paraffin at 98 percent compared to 67 percent in the 'employee' category. In turn, 33 percent of households belonging to the 'Employee' category uses electricity, while the share for the self-employed in agriculture and the 'other' is virtually null. However, 9 percent in the 'other' category uses firewood for lighting.

Finally, there is no strong correlation between gender of household head and type of fuel used for lightning.

7.4 Distances to Facilities

Table 7.9 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest drinking water supply and health facility. Although each table gives more detailed information, the analysis of this section will be focused on the 30 minute threshold that was used to define access to a facility. It must be kept in mind that distance to public transportation is one of the variables used to define a cluster as accessible or remote, so it must come as no surprise that distance to public

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

	Kerosene/ paraffin	Gas	Mains electricity	Solar panels/ generator	Battery	Candles	Firewood	Other	Total
Total	96.0	0.0	1.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	96.3	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	100.0
Remote	95.7	0.0	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	91.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	97.4	0.0	1.6	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	91.2	0.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	100.0
3-4	97.5	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	100.0
5-6	96.6	0.0	1.1	0.7	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	100.0
7+	95.7	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	67.2	0.0	32.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	97.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.6	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	91.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	96.0	0.0	1.4	0.2	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	100.0
Female	96.4	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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

	Drinking water supply					Health facility				
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	Total
Total	31.8	27.8	18.3	22.1	100.0	14.9	22.7	27.0	35.4	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	41.5	25.0	18.1	15.4	100.0	22.2	30.1	32.0	15.7	100.0
Remote	22.7	30.5	18.4	28.4	100.0	7.9	15.8	22.3	54.1	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	20.3	28.7	18.9	32.1	100.0	8.0	21.2	26.7	44.1	100.0
Non-poor	35.0	27.6	18.1	19.3	100.0	16.8	23.1	27.1	33.0	100.0
Household size										
1-2	46.1	31.2	14.6	8.2	100.0	23.3	30.3	21.4	25.0	100.0
3-4	36.4	25.1	18.7	19.8	100.0	15.2	21.6	25.1	38.0	100.0
5-6	31.7	31.9	15.8	20.6	100.0	13.9	21.9	27.7	36.6	100.0
7+	25.6	26.0	20.6	27.8	100.0	13.5	22.4	29.1	35.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	57.2	29.8	13.1	0.0	100.0	21.8	46.7	22.0	9.5	100.0
Self-employed - agric	30.9	27.7	18.0	23.4	100.0	14.6	21.3	27.8	36.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	41.1	28.2	18.5	12.2	100.0	23.2	30.4	31.5	14.9	100.0
Other	23.0	27.7	23.6	25.7	100.0	7.7	21.3	16.8	54.1	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	31.2	27.2	18.6	23.0	100.0	14.3	23.8	26.6	35.3	100.0
Female	35.4	31.2	16.4	17.0	100.0	17.9	16.4	29.6	36.1	100.0

transportation and cluster location are strongly correlated. However, the rest of the variables, despite not being used to define cluster location, also show strong correlations.

Overall, 60 percent of households are located under 30 minutes of a drinking water supply. In addition, 38 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes of a health facility.

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	36.7	29.3	23.7	10.2	100.0	4.2	8.9	13.9	73.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	46.0	32.3	19.1	2.5	100.0	7.0	13.6	18.6	60.8	100.0
Remote	27.9	26.4	28.1	17.6	100.0	1.4	4.5	9.4	84.6	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	21.6	33.7	33.1	11.6	100.0	2.0	5.5	9.7	82.8	100.0
Non-poor	40.9	28.1	21.2	9.9	100.0	4.8	9.9	15.0	70.3	100.0
Household size										
1-2	62.9	22.7	5.7	8.7	100.0	5.8	12.0	15.9	66.4	100.0
3-4	32.5	31.0	24.9	11.6	100.0	4.6	9.6	13.6	72.2	100.0
5-6	38.3	29.8	19.8	12.1	100.0	2.4	10.6	12.8	74.1	100.0
7+	32.8	29.2	29.7	8.3	100.0	4.7	6.6	14.4	74.3	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	72.5	21.0	2.2	4.3	100.0	10.9	27.3	8.3	53.5	100.0
Self-employed - agric	35.4	30.3	23.6	10.7	100.0	4.2	8.2	13.5	74.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	47.9	26.1	21.5	4.5	100.0	2.4	19.2	25.6	52.8	100.0
Other	25.4	24.4	37.3	12.8	100.0	2.0	0.0	10.8	87.2	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	34.9	29.7	24.4	11.0	100.0	4.3	9.8	13.9	72.0	100.0
Female	47.6	26.7	19.8	5.9	100.0	3.5	3.8	13.7	78.9	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

The breakdown by cluster location shows that 67 percent households in accessible villages has access to a drinking water source and 52 percent to a health facility, whereas the shares for households in remote villages are 53 and 24 percent. Similar differences are observed by poverty status, with non-poor households reporting higher access rates than poor households.

Analysis of household size reveals that households with 7 or more members have the lowest rate of access to drinking water supplies and to health facilities at 52 and 36 percent respectively. On the contrary, households with up to 2 members have the highest access to drinking water supplies and health facilities.

Households where the main income earner is an employee have the highest rate of access to drinking water (87 percent) and access to health facilities (69 percent), whereas households where the main income earner is in the 'other' category have the lowest access to drinking health facilities at 29 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong difference in access rate to drinking water supplies, but female-headed households show a lower access rate than male-headed households.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 66 percent of households are located within 30 minutes of a primary school; however only 34 percent of households live within 30 minutes of a secondary school. Access to school was also analysed in chapter 3 but with a different focus. In chapter 3, access to school was analysed at child level, i.e. the access rate of each child. In this section the focus is the distance of the house to the nearest school.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 54 percent of households in remote villages have access to primary school, against 78 percent in accessible villages. For secondary school, the rate for accessible villages is 21 percent against only 6 percent for those in remote villages. On the other hand, the breakdown by poverty status of the household reveals that non-poor households have higher access to both primary and secondary school education at 69 and 15 percent respectively. The access rate of poor households to secondary education is only 8 percent.

Analysis by household size reveals that households with up to 2 members have the highest rate of access to both primary and secondary education at 86 percent and 18 percent respectively. On the other hand, households with 7 or more members have the lowest access to primary and secondary education.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the 'employee' category have the highest rate of access to primary school, at 94 percent, while those in the 'other' category have the lowest access, at 50 percent. The employees have the highest access rate to secondary schools at 38 percent while only 2 percent of the 'other' category has the lowest access to secondary school.

Households headed by females have higher access rates to primary school than male-headed households, at 74 percent, against 65 percent for males. Male households have higher access to secondary education at 16 percent against 7 percent of female households.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation. Overall, 41 percent of households has access to a food market, and 72 percent to public transportation.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 55 percent of households in accessible villages live within 30 minutes of a food market and, against 28 percent of households in remote villages. The shares for public transportation are 90 percent for accessible and 42 percent for remote villages. Non-poor households have higher rates of access to food markets, with a rate of 43 percent, against 34 of poor households. Similarly, while 67 percent of non-poor households have access to public transportation, the share for poor households is 58 percent.

The analysis by household size shows that households with up to 2 members have higher rates of access to food markets as well as public transportation at 44 and 78 percent respectively.

Analysis by socio-economic group reveals that those self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest rate of access to food markets and public transportation, with rates of 52 percent and 90 percent respectively. Households in the 'other' category have the lowest access to food markets, at 29 percent.

Finally, male-headed households have a

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	21.7	19.3	21.0	38.0	100.0	44.7	20.4	16.2	18.7	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	27.1	27.4	16.4	29.1	100.0	62.2	27.7	8.4	1.7	100.0
Remote	16.7	11.5	25.3	46.4	100.0	28.0	13.5	23.7	34.8	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	14.4	19.2	28.9	37.5	100.0	34.4	24.0	21.2	20.4	100.0
Non-poor	23.8	19.3	18.8	38.2	100.0	47.5	19.4	14.9	18.2	100.0
Household size										
1-2	28.9	15.4	12.9	42.8	100.0	59.8	18.5	3.5	18.2	100.0
3-4	19.3	18.7	22.5	39.5	100.0	46.4	21.9	15.7	16.1	100.0
5-6	25.3	16.7	19.8	38.2	100.0	41.1	16.4	16.7	25.8	100.0
7+	19.3	22.3	22.6	35.8	100.0	42.6	22.6	19.1	15.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	25.1	20.4	13.3	41.2	100.0	53.8	21.0	14.6	10.6	100.0
Self-employed - agric	21.8	19.3	20.5	38.5	100.0	42.5	20.9	17.1	19.6	100.0
Self-employed - other	29.6	22.0	29.4	19.0	100.0	77.2	13.0	9.8	0.0	100.0
Other	12.8	16.4	23.1	47.7	100.0	37.2	21.1	13.3	28.4	100.0
Gender of head of household										
Male	21.1	20.7	20.6	37.6	100.0	41.7	21.3	17.7	19.3	100.0
Female	25.3	11.1	22.9	40.8	100.0	62.0	15.1	7.5	15.4	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

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	75.3	32.5	11.9	6.7	1.1	51.3	1.1	13.6	2.3	0.5	0.9
Cluster Location											
Accessible	79.2	27.4	15.2	8.1	1.4	57.4	1.6	10.9	2.0	0.0	1.3
Remote	71.5	37.9	8.4	5.3	0.8	44.9	0.5	16.5	2.5	1.0	0.5
Poverty Status											
Poor	61.3	30.6	6.9	0.8	0.0	46.3	0.0	19.3	3.4	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	79.1	32.9	13.0	8.0	1.4	52.4	1.3	12.4	2.0	0.6	1.1
Household size											
1-2	67.2	48.2	7.6	6.7	0.0	30.9	0.0	18.7	0.0	0.0	3.4
3-4	78.5	30.2	10.3	9.6	1.4	51.9	0.9	15.2	1.8	0.0	0.0
5-6	76.8	34.3	17.5	8.2	2.7	49.1	1.2	10.1	2.3	0.0	1.2
7+	73.7	29.8	9.8	3.4	0.0	56.6	1.3	14.1	3.0	1.3	0.9
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	100.0	19.5	27.1	5.4	2.2	68.3	5.4	28.3	0.0	0.0	4.4
Self-employed - agric	74.0	34.4	10.3	7.9	0.3	48.8	0.7	13.8	2.1	0.6	0.9
Self-employed - other	100.0	27.0	23.5	0.0	9.5	60.4	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	57.2	23.7	5.7	0.0	0.0	59.9	4.6	4.6	10.7	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household											
Male	75.2	31.9	12.1	6.5	1.3	53.7	1.2	13.7	2.0	0.6	1.1
Female	75.5	36.1	10.8	8.2	0.0	37.2	0.0	13.3	4.1	0.0	0.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

higher access rate to food markets than female-headed households, at 42 and 36 percent. In turn, the latter report a higher rate of access to public transportation than the former, at 63 and 77 percent, respectively

7.5 Anti-Malaria Measures

The percentage of households taking anti-malaria measures and the specific measures they take are shown in Table 7.12. Overall, 75 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken measures are the use of insecticide treated nets (51 percent of households) and bed nets (33 percent).

The analysis by cluster location shows that 79 percent of households in accessible villages takes measures against malaria, compared to 72 percent of households in remote villages. On the other hand, while 57 percent of households in accessible villages uses insecticide treated nets, the share for households in remote villages is 44 percent.

In addition, 79 percent of non-poor households take measures against malaria compared to 61 percent of poor households. The most commonly taken measures are insecticide treated nets, at 52 and 46 percent for non-poor and poor households, respectively.

The share of households taking measures is highest for households with 3 to 4 members, at 79 percent, while the lowest is for households with up to 2 members, at 67 percent. The most commonly taken share measures are the use of insecticide treated nets, more likely to be used by households with more than 7 members, at 57 percent, and less likely to be used by households with up to 2 members, at 31 percent.

The analysis of socio-economic status shows that virtually all (100 percent) the employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities take measures against malaria compared to 57 percent in the 'other' category.

Finally, there is no strong correlation between gender of the household head and share of households taking measures against malaria. However, male-headed households use insecticide treated nets more frequently than female-headed households at 54 and 37 percent respectively.

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 the [...] level in the past 12 months'. This question was repeated 4 times with the dots being replaced by kitongoji, village, ward and district. The results show that 87 percent of households had at least one member attending at least one kitongoji meeting in the past 12 months. Attendance at village meetings was slightly higher at 90 percent. However, ward and district level meetings did not attain attendance of the majority of households at 19 and 1 percent respectively.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible villages report a higher attendance rate at ward meetings, with no strong differences at the other levels. Looking at the breakdown of the results by poverty status, it can be seen that attendance at kitongoji meetings is slightly lower than attendance at village meetings for both the poor and non-poor households. Only around 20 percent of each group attended ward meetings and under 2 percent attended a district meeting. Analysis of the results by socio-economic group shows that attendance at village meetings was slightly higher than attendance at kitongoji meetings in all groups with the 'other' socio-economic category, a small group of households where the main income earner is neither an employee nor self-employed, having the highest attendance rate at both types of meeting. Attendance rates drop considerably at the ward level showing only 25 percent of employees, 20 percent of both self-employed agriculture and self-employed other and only 14 percent of the 'other' socio-economic group attending these meetings. Less than four percent of self-employed agriculture, self-employed other and the other socio-economic group attended a district meeting. The employees show the highest attendance rate at district meetings, at 20 percent, while the remaining groups report rates of 3 percent or less.

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	86.8	90.1	19.4	1.4
Cluster Location				
Accessible	85.1	90.2	22.1	1.6
Remote	88.3	90.0	16.9	1.3
Poverty Status				
Poor	84.2	88.5	20.8	0.0
Non-poor	87.5	90.6	19.1	1.8
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	73.7	80.3	24.6	20.4
Self-employed - agriculture	87.2	90.0	19.7	0.4
Self-employed - other	82.8	91.9	19.7	2.4
Other	91.5	94.5	13.6	3.3
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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	90.0	81.2	67.2	53.9	62.5
Not Satisfied	8.4	16.3	15.8	13.1	35.0
Don't Know	1.6	2.5	17.0	33.0	2.5
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location					
Accessible	91.1	84.0	71.7	56.8	67.5
Remote	89.0	78.6	63.1	51.2	57.8
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status					
Poor	89.2	76.4	68.8	41.1	61.9
Non-poor	90.3	82.6	66.8	57.5	62.7
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group					
Employee	84.7	78.1	61.8	60.6	50.0
Self-employed - agriculture	91.4	81.2	67.3	53.2	63.6
Self-employed - other	85.8	80.8	68.5	67.7	56.1
Other	80.4	83.8	68.4	47.1	61.5
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)					
Political differences	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Embezzlement/corruption	21.1	22.9	17.4	1.5	10.7
They do not listen to people	28.4	38.7	17.5	1.9	22.7
Favouritism	21.6	21.0	7.0	0.6	7.9
Lazy/inexperienced	6.1	19.6	7.6	0.0	15.4
Personal Reasons	2.1	3.0	3.2	0.5	0.0
I see no results	35.8	28.5	15.6	12.4	38.7
They never visit us	0.0	11.1	50.3	87.2	60.1
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu 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?'

8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders

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

The results displayed in Table 8.2 show that except at the level of district councillor, the rate of satisfaction increases as the level of government decreases. Therefore lower government positions show higher satisfaction rates. The level of dissatisfaction is lowest at the kitongoji level and highest for the district councillor. The number of people responding 'I don't know' increases as the level of government increases, again except at the level of the district councillor of the satisfaction rate for the district councillor was 63 percent, higher than that of the district leaders. However, the dissatisfaction level of the district councillor was also the highest at 35 percent.

When looking at cluster location and poverty level the table shows that accessible villages rate their satisfaction with their leaders slightly higher more villages and that at almost every level of government non-poor households report a higher satisfaction rate than that of poor

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	10.8	20.7	3.0	0.2
Cluster Location				
Accessible	12.5	23.0	4.2	0.4
Remote	9.1	18.5	1.8	0.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	8.9	22.6	1.7	0.0
Non-poor	11.3	20.2	3.3	0.2
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	5.2	20.4	5.2	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	11.6	20.1	2.7	0.2
Self-employed - other	10.9	30.1	8.9	0.0
Other	3.7	20.0	0.0	0.0
Source				
Letter	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Notice board	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Meeting	94.9	96.3	74.7	100.0
Rumours/hear-say	5.1	3.7	25.3	0.0
Radio/newspapers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

households. Present again in both divisions is the trend of the satisfaction increasing as the level of government decreases, except at the level of district councillor. All of the socio-economic groups show the same trend as above, rating their satisfaction higher at lower levels of government.

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

The reasons for dissatisfaction vary across the different levels of government. At the lower levels of government, kitongoji and village, the most common complaints were of embezzlement or corruption, favouritism, no visible results and failure to listen. Ward leaders received the same types of complaints as kitongoji and village leaders except favouritism was not as prominent. The most common reason for dissatisfaction with ward, district leaders and district councillors is their failure to pay visits, followed by the complaint that no results of their work can be seen.

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 20 percent. Information on kitongoji, ward and district finances reaches 11, 3 and less than 1 percent of the households, respectively. Overall households in accessible villages report receiving more financial information than households in remote villages. Breaking the numbers down by poverty status shows that less information about district and ward finances reaches both poor and non-poor households than information about village and kitongoji finances.

Information on village finances reaches all four socio-economic groups whereas only the self-employed agriculture and self-

employed other groups received information on kitongoji finances. Low shares of respondents claimed knowledge of ward and district finances. The results in Table 8.3 show that at all levels of government the most important method of acquiring information was attendance of meetings. Low percentages of respondents reported receiving information about kitongoji and village finances by rumour or hearsay whereas one quarter replied hearing about ward finances in this manner.

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 that satisfaction with spending is higher for lower levels of government. Dissatisfaction at the kitongoji, village and ward levels fluctuate between 20 and 25 percent. Dissatisfaction was the lowest at the district level at 8 percent. However, the share of respondents reporting 'I don't know' increases as the level of government increases and was highest, 58 percent, at the district level.

In line with the previous results, there was a decrease in the satisfaction rates as the level of government increased for accessible and remote clusters, as well as for poor and non-poor households. The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in agriculture display the highest satisfaction rates at the kitongoji and village levels but that the self-employed in non-agricultural activities showed the highest satisfaction at the ward and district levels.

When respondents questioned why they were not satisfied, or why they did not know whether they were satisfied, the most common response at all government levels was that they did not receive any information. In addition to that, respondents also claimed no visible results and embezzlement or corruption.

Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction

	Kitongoji Spending	Village Spending	Ward Spending	District Spending
Total				
Satisfied	60.7	55.8	39.5	34.4
Not Satisfied	19.7	24.9	24.0	7.7
Don' Know	19.5	19.4	36.6	58.0
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location				
Accessible	61.3	58.2	41.8	35.4
Remote	60.2	53.4	37.2	33.4
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status				
Poor	58.9	55.1	34.5	26.8
Non-poor	61.3	55.9	40.8	36.5
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group				
Employee	42.4	53.3	32.9	42.9
Self-employed - agriculture	62.7	57.1	39.8	33.2
Self-employed - other	49.7	48.8	57.0	53.1
Other	56.5	47.4	23.4	27.3
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)				
I see no results	18.2	26.2	21.8	12.4
Embezzlement/corruption	19.3	33.8	26.2	2.6
Favouritism	0.0	1.7	0.8	0.5
This is what I hear	0.7	1.6	4.8	0.0
They give no information	57.8	59.0	65.9	80.9
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2006 Kishapu DC

9 Changes between 2004 and 2006

This chapter will use the results of the 2004 Kishapu DC CWIQ to analyse changes in a selected set of indicators between the two surveys. Both the sampling methodology and the structure of the questionnaires allow comparisons between the surveys. 't' tests were performed to ensure statistical significance of the changes that take into account the clustered nature of the dataset. The null hypothesis in all cases was equality of means, so rejection of the null implies that the means are statistically different. These tests rely on two assumptions: normality of the distribution of each variable in the population and equality of variance in both samples. Violation of the first assumption does not pose serious problems in practice. Regarding the second assumption, one may be willing to assume equal variance between the two samples if it is considered that both are representative of the same population in two relatively close points in time.

Being estimates, the changes should not be read as points, but from the corresponding confidence intervals. For instance, Table 9.3 shows that the rate of use of health services increased by 6 percentage points, and that the 95 percent confidence interval of the change runs from 0.4 to 7.8 percentage points. This should be read: 'rate of use of health services increased between 0.4 and 7.8 percentage points, at the 95 percent of confidence'. If the confidence interval includes zero, it is said that the change is not significant. For the sake of space, the tables only show the 95 percent confidence intervals. However, some researchers or policy makers may prefer 90 or 99 percent confidence intervals. Although they are not presented in the tables, stars indicate the significance level of each change. *, **, and *** represent significance at the 90, 95 and 99 percent of confidence. The text only discusses changes at the 95 percent of confidence.

Some caveats must be pointed out. In first place, the sample is not a panel, i.e. the households interviewed in 2004 were not re-interviewed interviewed in 2006. Therefore, only the overall changes can be analysed, not the evolution for individual households. For instance, as shown in Table 9.4, the share of population owning only small livestock did not change significantly between the two surveys. It must be kept in mind that this result does not mean that the households that owned small livestock in 2004 are the same ones that own small livestock in 2006, or that there is no commerce of small livestock.

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

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

Section one presents changes in household

Table 9.1: Household Characteristics

	2004	2006	Change			
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval
Household Size						
1-2	12	8	-3.9	2.22		-8.1 0.8
3-4	22	27	4.9	3.06		-1.1 11.1
5-6	27	27	-0.3	3.31		-7.2 6.0
7+	39	38	-0.6	3.87		-8.5 6.9
Mean Household Size	6.1	6.0	-0.1	0.29		0.60 -0.74
Female-headed Households	16	15	-1.4	2.57		-6.9 3.4

Source: Kishapu CWIQ for 2004 and 2006

Table 9.2: Education

	2004	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Literacy	63	62	-1	4.12		-9.0	7.4
Primary School							
Net Enrolment Rate	72	78	6	3.28	*	-0.2	13.0
Satisfaction	44	40	-5	6.74		-19.8	7.2
Secondary School							
Net Enrolment Rate	4	10	5	2.16	**	0.3	8.9
Satisfaction	62	49	-14	14.66		-48.5	11.4
Dissatisfaction Rate	53	59	6	6.58		-5.7	20.7
Reasons for dissatisfaction							
Books/Supplies	69	48	-21	8.04		-4.9	27.3
Poor Teaching	16	25	9	4.35	***	14.7	32.1
Lack of Teachers	55	68	13	8.09	***	22.4	54.8
Bad Condition of Facilities	40	50	10	8.12	***	12.4	44.9
Overcrowding	11	16	4	3.82	**	1.8	17.1

Source: Kishapu CWIQ for 2004 and 2006

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

9.1 Household characteristics

The mean household size has remained fairly stable at around 6 members per household, as would be expected from two surveys with a relatively short time gap. Furthermore, the percent distribution of households by number of members did not change significantly either. Finally, the share of households headed by females has not changed at the 95 percent of confidence.

9.2 Education

The literacy rate did not change between the surveys. The net enrolment rate did not change for primary school, but increased for secondary school, by around 5 percentage points. The rate of satisfaction with school did not change between the surveys, either for primary or secondary school.

Some of the reasons for dissatisfaction show interesting changes. The shares of dissatisfied students pointing out poor teaching, lack of teachers, bad condition of the facilities and overcrowding are significantly higher in the 2006 survey.

9.3 Health

The rates of need and use increased between 2004 and 2006, but the rate of satisfaction remained constant. None of the reasons for dissatisfaction included in the survey show significant changes. In both surveys, the main reason for dissatisfaction is ‘long wait’, followed by the cost of the treatment.

The share of people who did not consult a health provider reduced significantly between the surveys. The shares reporting no need of a healthcare provider or the cost of the treatment did not change, but the share reporting distance reduced by between 1 and 4 percentage points, at the 95 percent of confidence.

Government hospitals are the facility with the highest rate of use in both surveys, but the share of patients reporting having visited a government hospital decreased sharply in 2006, from 68 to 42 percent. In contrast, the share of patients visiting pharmacies increased by between 12 and 28 percentage points.

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

Table 9.3: Health

	2004	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Medical Services							
Need	16	20	4	1.79	**	0.6	7.7
Use	18	24	6	1.87	**	0.4	7.8
Satisfaction	70	72	2	4.43		-6.6	11.1
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Long wait	31	41	10	7.30		-3.1	26.1
Shortage of trained professionals	20	15	-5	7.05		-18.4	9.9
Cost	39	34	-5	9.32		-23.8	13.6
No drugs available	25	19	-6	7.53		-19.5	10.7
Unsuccessful treatment	23	17	-6	6.77		-23.2	4.0
Percentage not Consulting	80	76	-4	1.87	**	-7.8	-0.4
Reasons for not consulting							
No need	93	96	3	1.40	*	-0.1	5.5
Cost	4	2	-3	1.43	*	-5.5	0.2
Distance	4	1	-2	0.82	***	-4.0	-0.7
Facility Used							
Private hospital	14	14	0	3.47		-6.1	7.8
Government hospital	68	42	-27	5.43	***	-31.8	-10.1
Traditional healer	8	10	2	2.95		-4.2	7.6
Pharmacy	8	28	20	3.89	***	12.4	28.0
Women who Had Live-Births							
15-19	6	7	1	2.62		-3.6	6.9
20-24	32	33	1	7.19		-12.0	16.7
25-29	29	33	5	6.80		-7.8	19.5
30-39	16	14	-2	5.19		-16.8	4.0
40+	1	10	9	3.11	***	3.5	15.9
Prenatal care	99	100	2	0.01		0.0	0.0
Facilities Used in Child Deliveries							
Hospital or maternity ward	80	68	-12	4.13	***	-37.1	-20.5
Delivery Assistance							
Doctor/Nurse/Midwife	82	71	-10	6.14	*	-22.7	1.9
TBA	17	8	-9	5.18	*	-19.5	1.3
Other/Self	2	21	19	2.79	***	13.3	24.5
Child Nutrition							
Stunted (-2SD)	28	19	-9	3.57	**	-15.2	-0.9
Severely Stunted (-3SD)	8	8	-1	2.53		-8.4	1.8
Wasted (-2SD)	6	1	-5	1.85	***	-9.9	-2.5
Severely Wasted (-3SD)	2	0	-3	0.98	***	-5.1	-1.2

Source: Kishapu CWIQ for 2004 and 2006

The share of women giving birth in hospitals or maternity wards has decreased significantly at the 95 percent of confidence.

The last panel of the table shows child nutrition indicators, previously defined in section 4. The rates of stunting, wasting, and severe wasting have decreased at the 95 percent of confidence, whereas the rate of severe stunting has remained statistically unchanged between both surveys.

Table 9.4: Household Assets and Perception of Welfare

	2004	2006	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Landholding							
Less	16	2	-14	3.00	***	-19.2	-7.2
Same	58	92	34	4.91	***	24.5	44.2
More	5	6	0	1.70		-3.3	3.5
Difficulty satisfying food needs							
Never	11	13	3	2.52		-6.0	11.0
Seldom	38	29	-10	4.37	**	-18.2	-0.8
Sometimes	51	44	-7	5.07		-17.2	3.1
Always	0	14	14	2.09	***	9.9	18.2
Livestock							
No livestock	61	47	-13	4.49	***	-22.2	-4.3
Small only	9	14	5	2.11		-1.8	6.6
Large only	11	7	-4	2.08		-5.6	2.7
Small and large	20	32	12	4.45	***	3.4	21.2
Landholding (in acres)							
Mean	5	7	2.3	0.96	**	0.4	4.2
0	22	19	-4	6.42		-15.4	10.3
0-0.99	2	2	1	1.06		-1.2	3.0
1-1.99	13	8	-5	3.22		-10.9	2.0
2-3.99	25	13	-12	2.44	***	-15.5	-5.7
4-5.99	15	16	1	3.01		-4.4	7.6
6+	24	43	19	5.61	***	3.9	26.4
Source of water							
piped water	4	3	-1	3.07		-6.9	5.4
protected well	18	16	-3	6.61		-15.9	10.5
unprotected well	76	81	5	5.09		54.6	-11.7
Type of toilet							
None	7	17	10	2.84	***	3.9	15.2
Flush toilet	6	1	-4	1.39		-2.1	3.4
Covered pit latrine	61	79	18	6.99	**	4.0	32.0
Uncovered pit latrine	26	2	-23	5.46	***	-34.1	-12.3
Economic Situation Has Deteriorated							
Community	81	36	-45	4.28	***	-53.5	-36.4
Household	74	43	-31	4.38	***	-39.7	-22.2

Source: Kishapu CWIQ for 2004 and 2006

9.4 Household Assets and Perceptions of Welfare

Table 9.4 analyses changes in household assets and on welfare perceptions. The share of households owning less land than the year preceding the survey is lower in the 2006 survey. The change was compensated by the increase in the share of households for which land ownership did not change.

There is a significant reduction in the share of households owning between 2 and 3.99 acres of land, whereas the share of households owning 6 or more acres increased. As a result, the mean landholding increased from 5 acres in 2004 to 7 acres in 2006.

Regarding livestock ownership, the share of households owning no livestock decreased, whereas the share of households owning both small and large livestock increased significantly.

The share of households that had frequent difficulties satisfying food needs increased between 10 and 18 percentage points, but the share of households that reported having had such difficulties 'seldom' reduced between 1 and 18 percentage points.

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water remained statistically unchanged, with both surveys reporting similar shares of households getting water from pipes, protected wells, and unprotected wells, the latter including rivers, lakes and ponds.

Surprisingly, the share of households with no toilet shows a significant increase, as well as the share of households using covered pit latrines. On the other hand, the share of household using uncovered pit latrines decreased by between 12 and 34 percentage points.

Finally, the last panel of the table shows the changes in the households' perceptions on the economic situation of the household and the community. The share of households that reported deterioration in the economic situation of the community decreased significantly, by between 36 and 54 percentage points. Similarly, the share of households reporting deterioration in the economic situation of the household decreased by between 22 and 40 percentage points.