PMO-RALG

MEATU DC CWIQ
Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services in Meatu DC

FEBRUARY 2007

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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 further 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

LIST OF TABLES

Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Household characteristics						
Dependency ratio	1.2	0.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.1
Head is male	82.2	1.8	79.1	85.6	78.4	83.9
Head is female	17.8	1.8	20.9	14.4	21.6	16.1
Head is monagamous	48.7	2.0	51.3	45.8	40.6	52.4
Head is polygamous	30.4	2.4	23.8	37.8	35.1	28.2
Head is not married	20.9	1.8	24.9	16.4	24.3	19.4
Household welfare						
Household economic situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	38.3	2.8	33.7	43.5	42.1	36.6
Better now	36.0	2.4	38.1	33.6	29.6	38.9
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	9.8	2.3	12.7	6.5	8.0	10.6
Better now	40.8	4.5	32.4	50.4	50.4	36.5
Difficulty satisfying household needs						
Food	56.0	3.3	45.9	67.6	77.7	46.2
School fees	3.4	0.8	5.6	0.9	4.3	3.0
House rent	1.2	0.6	2.3	0.0	0.0	1.8
Utility bills	1.1	0.8	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.6
Health care	33.7	3.2	25.7	42.7	41.3	30.2
Agriculture						
Land owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	2.8	0.9	3.4	2.1	0.9	3.7
More now	4.4	0.9	3.4	5.7	3.2	5.0
Cattle owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	25.2	2.9	19.5	31.8	18.6	28.2
More now	7.2	1.3	8.9	5.2	10.6	5.6
Use of agricultural inputs						
Yes	72.7	3.5	66.4	79.8	73.4	72.3
Fertilizers	37.3	4.8	46.8	28.3	33.1	39.3
Improved seedlings	79.3	4.2	72.8	85.3	78.8	79.5
Fingerlings	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hooks and nets	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Insecticides	70.6	5.0	62.8	77.9	78.8	66.8
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Household infrastructure						
Secure housing tenure	6.0	2.3	11.2	0.0	0.0	8.7
Access to water	77.4	3.5	85.2	68.4	72.7	79.5
Safe water source	48.9	8.3	38.0	61.4	49.2	48.8
Safe sanitation	2.6	1.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	3.8
Improved waste disposal	26.5	5.2	19.5	34.4	27.2	26.1
Non-wood fuel used for cooking	0.9	0.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	1.3
Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment						
Fixed line phone	0.7	0.6	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.1
Mobile phone	11.8	3.1	20.6	1.7	2.7	15.9
Radio set	46.9	3.0	53.5	39.4	25.1	56.9
Television set	3.3	1.9	6.2	0.0	0.0	4.8

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Employment						
Employer in the main job						
Civil service	1.4	0.6	2.4	0.5	0.0	2.3
Other public serve	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Parastatal	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
NGO	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.3
Private sector formal	1.1	0.5	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.7
Private sector informal	33.0	1.2	32.3	33.7	30.3	34.7
Household	58.9	1.5	57.0	60.8	63.4	56.0
Activity in the main job						
Agriculture	78.9	2.7	70.6	87.0	83.7	75.8
Mining/quarrying	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.1
Manufacturing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Services	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.6
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	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Male	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1
Underemployed (age 15 and above)	26.3	1.6	28.8	23.8	25.2	26.9
Male	33.2	2.1	36.0	30.6	28.8	36.1
Female	19.7	2.1	22.2	17.2	21.8	18.4
Education						
Adult literacy rate						
Total	61.9	2.5	70.2	53.6	56.0	65.7
Male	73.9	2.5	82.9	64.8	69.7	76.4
Female	50.6	3.1	58.2	42.7	43.0	55.3
Youth literacy rate (age 15-24)						
Total	84.7	2.2	91.2	78.3	83.1	85.9
Male	91.5	2.2	95.9	86.7	89.4	93.4
Female	78.0	3.0	86.1	70.5	75.6	79.6
Primary school						
Access to School	61.6	5.0	68.5	53.8	53.9	67.4
Primary Gross Enrollment	109.1	3.0	108.0	110.4	105.1	112.2
Male	113.0	3.6	109.1	117.7	107.5	117.4
Female	105.7	4.2	107.0	104.3	102.9	107.8
Primary Net Enrollment	83.6	1.9	84.3	82.9	76.7	88.9
Male	82.8	2.5	81.9	83.8	75.2	88.7
Female	84.3	2.2	86.4	82.1	78.0	89.1
Satisfaction	34.6	3.3	34.4	34.8	37.7	32.4
Primary completion rate	15.7	2.0	17.3	13.9	14.8	16.3

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Secondary school						
Access to School	17.1	5.1	30.5	2.2	6.2	26.4
Secondary Gross Enrollment	14.6	3.5	24.6	3.5	8.2	20.1
Male	16.3	4.0	25.4	5.3	10.3	22.1
Female	12.9	3.6	23.7	1.8	5.8	18.3
Secondary Net Enrollment	11.1	2.9	19.5	1.7	5.5	15.9
Male	11.1	2.9	18.0	2.7	6.7	15.3
Female	11.1	3.3	21.1	0.8	4.1	16.4
Satisfaction	22.0	5.6	24.7	0.0	3.3	28.4
Secondary completion rate	0.7	0.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.2
Medical services						
Health access	32.9	6.3	55.8	10.1	22.8	39.6
Need	20.4	1.3	23.8	17.1	17.3	22.5
Use	24.4	1.2	27.2	21.6	21.3	26.4
Satisfaction	62.2	2.9	59.1	66.1	64.9	60.8
Consulted traditional healer	13.0	2.1	11.2	15.4	16.8	11.0
Pre-natal care	96.6	2.0	100.0	94.4	94.2	98.5
Anti-malaria measures used	66.5	3.3	77.0	54.5	48.7	74.6
Person has physical/mental challenge	0.4	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.5
Child welfare and health						
Orphanhood (children under 18)						
Both parents dead	1.3	0.3	1.7	0.8	1.2	1.3
Father only	7.2	1.3	4.8	9.7	9.6	5.4
Mother only	2.4	0.8	3.1	1.7	3.0	1.9
Fostering (children under 18)						
Both parents absent	13.2	1.3	16.5	9.9	11.3	14.6
Father only absent	13.2	1.3	13.2	13.1	16.6	10.7
Mother only absent	2.2	0.5	2.9	1.4	2.4	2.0
Children under 5						
Delivery by health professionals	40.2	5.2	60.7	22.0	25.9	49.7
Measles immunization	65.0	3.8	79.2	52.4	56.3	70.8
Fully vaccinated	22.8	4.4	36.3	10.8	16.5	27.0
Not vaccinated	9.6	2.1	3.2	15.3	10.9	8.7
Stunted	17.6	2.4	10.6	23.8	21.4	15.1
Wasted	1.4	0.5	0.9	1.8	1.5	1.3
Underweight	9.8	1.6	7.0	12.3	13.4	7.5

*1.96 standard deviations

	2004	2007	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Net Enrolment Rate							
Primary School	81.0	83.6	2.6	3.2		-3.7	9.0
Secondary School	3.6	11.1	7.5	3.4	**	1.2	14.7
Rate of Dissatisfaction with School	65.4	65.1	-0.3	6.9		-13.8	13.9
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Books/Supplies	53.1	43.5	-9.6	9.5		-28.5	9.4
Poor Teaching	3.0	22.3	19.3	3.7	***	12.0	26.7
Lack of Teachers	52.0	63.2	11.2	7.5		-3.9	26.3
d Condition of Facilities	30.6	48.9	18.3	7.6	**	3.0	33.4
Overcrowding	10.8	9.3	-1.5	4.6		-10.8	7.6
Health Facility Consulted							
Private hospital	8.1	7.4	-0.7	2.6		-5.3	5.2
Government hospital	67.5	53.8	-13.7	5.2	**	-24.1	-3.2
Traditional healer	7.9	13.0	5.1	2.6	*	0.0	10.3
Pharmacy	3.3	23.2	19.9	2.3	***	15.6	24.8
Rate of Dissatisfaction with Health Facilities	30.2	37.8	7.6	5.1		-2.4	18.0
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Long wait	28.9	51.7	22.8	7.3	***	9.2	38.6
of trained professionals	50.8	18.7	-32.1	6.3	***	-42.6	-17.5
Cost	43.6	19.3	-24.3	5.9	***	-35.4	-11.6
No drugs available	45.4	16.3	-29.1	6.5	***	-39.8	-13.8
Unsuccessful treatment	34.3	16.7	-17.6	8.2	**	-37.0	-4.3
Water and Sanitation							
Piped water	0.3	4.7	4.4	2.3	*	-0.2	9.1
Protected well	43.3	45.8	2.5	11.5		-20.6	25.6
No toilet	1.5	19.3	17.8	3.2	***	11.4	24.2
Flush toilet	0.2	2.1	1.9	1.4		-0.8	4.7
Covered pit latrine	88.8	77.2	-11.6	4.4	***	-20.5	-3.0
Uncovered pit latrine	9.5	0.9	-8.6	2.6	***	-13.6	-3.4

	2004	2007	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Child Delivery							
Hospital or Maternity W	68.3	32.5	-35.8	7.6	***	-51.2	-20.8
Delivery Assistance							
Doctor/Nurse/Midwife	54.9	37.0	-17.9	6.9	**	-31.7	-4.2
TBA	32.6	9.2	-23.4	3.7	***	-30.8	-16.0
Self-assistance	12.5	53.2	40.7	6.1	***	28.5	53.0
Child Nutrition							
Stunted	35.1	17.6	-17.5	3.7	***	-23.7	-9.1
Severely Stunted	13.7	5.9	-7.8	2.4	***	-12.7	-2.9
Wasted	6.4	1.4	-5.0	1.4	***	-6.8	-1.3
Severely Wasted	1.5	0.6	-0.9	0.7		-2.3	0.5

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Meatu District CWIQ

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

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

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

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

Although beyond the purpose of this report, the results of Meatu CWIQ could also be set against those of other CWIQ surveys that have are being implemented at the time of writing in other districts in Tanzania: Bariadi DC, Bukoba DC, Bukombe DC, Bunda DC, Chamwino DC, Hanang DC, Karagwe DC, Kasulu DC, Kibondo DC, Kigoma DC, Kilosa DC, Kishapu DC, Korogwe DC, Kyela DC, Ludewa DC, Makete DC, Maswa DC, Kahama DC, Mbulu DC, Morogoro DC, Mpwapwa DC, Muheza DC, Musoma DC, Ngara DC, Ngorongoro DC, Njombe DC, Rufiji DC, Shinyanga MC, Singida DC, Songea DC, Sumbawanga DC, Tanga MC, Temeke MC. Other African countries that have implemented nationally representative CWIQ surveys include Malawi, Ghana and Nigeria.

1.2 Sampling

The Meatu 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.

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure in Shinyanga Region

Basic Variables	*Household Assets*
Age of the household head	Ownership of a radio
Household size	Ownership of a bicycle
Level of education of the household head	Ownerhip of an iron
Main source of income	Ownership of a watch or clock
Main activity of the household head	Ownership of a motor vehicle
	Ownership of a sewing machine
Household Amenities	Ownership of a bed or matress
Meat consumption	Main material on the roof
Problems satisfying food needs	Main material on the walls
Type of toilet	Main material on the floor
Meals per day	Land ownership
Fuel used for cooking	
	Village Level Variables
	Distance to food market
	Distance to public transportation
	Distance to hospital

Source: HBS 2000/2001 for Shinyanga Region

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

Predicted	Observed		
	Non-Poor	**Poor**	**Total**
Non-Poor	59.5	14.7	74.2
Poor	7.9	17.8	25.8
Total	67.5	32.5	100.0

Source: HBS 2000/01 for Shinyanga Region

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.

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 six-year gap is far from ideal, but the data itself is reliable and is the most recent source of information available. Work was then done to investigate the specific characteristics of Shinyanga Region

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	60	90	240	41.0	18,615
Accessible	15	15	120	23.0	21,465

Source: CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

(where Meatu DC is located) 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 needs[1].

The Meatu 2007 CWIQ uses poverty predictors to classify households as poor or non-poor, i.e. to determine whether a

[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*'.

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 of Shinyanga Region. Results of this exercise are presented in Table 1.2. The model wrongly predicts a non-poor household to be poor in 7.9 percent of the cases, and vice versa in 14.7 percent of the households. This gives an overall percentage of correct predictions of 77.4 percent.

When the model is applied to the CWIQ 2007 data for Meatu DC, the share of households living in poverty is 31 percent, with a 95 percent confidence interval ranging from 25 to 37 percent. This is highly consistent with the estimate obtained from the 2000/2001 HBS: 35, with the 95 percent confidence interval from 30 to 41 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 observations to inform on district-level trends. The Meatu CWIQ, on the other hand, is sufficiently large to allow detailed district-level analysis. The accuracy with

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

| | Poverty Rate | Percentage Living in | |
		Remote Clusters	Accessible Clusters
Socio-Economic Group			
Employees	3.2	83.2	16.8
Self-Employed Agriculture	33.8	47.3	52.7
Self-Employed Other	10.5	82.5	17.5
Other	47.6	71.3	28.7

Source: CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

	Male	Female	Total
Socio-economic Group			
Employees	84.8	15.2	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	82.4	17.6	100.0
Self-Employed Other	85.6	14.4	100.0
Other	73.7	26.3	100.0
Total	82.2	17.8	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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 remote villages are 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 41 percent. In turn, the median time to the district capital, all-weather roads and to public transportation is between 2 and 6 times

longer in remote villages than in accessible villages.

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 in the 'other' category or is self-employed in agriculture, at rates of 48 and 34 percent, respectively. In turn, poverty is lowest for households where the main income earner is an employee, at 3 percent. In addition, the employees together with the self-employed in non-agricultural activities are the most likely to be located in remote villages, at 83 percent, whereas the self-employed in agriculture report the highest shares of households located in accessible villages, at 53 percent.

The gender composition of the socio-economic group is shown in Table 1.5. Almost 4 out of 5 households are headed by a male. The share of female-headed households is highest for the 'other' socio-economic group at 26 percent, with the shares for the remaining categories ranging from 14 to 18 percent.

Table 1.6 shows the breakdown of socio-economic groups by main activity of the household heads. As expected, the main economic activity in the district is agriculture, to which 80 percent of the household heads is dedicated. Employees are mostly dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction, with a share of 80 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities are mostly dedicated to services (88 percent). Finally, agriculture is the main activity for the household heads in the 'other'

category (74 percent), followed by services (23 percent).

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	17.0	80.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	92.5	0.1	5.0	2.3	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Other	6.0	2.6	88.0	3.4	0.0	100.0
Other	74.0	0.0	22.7	3.2	0.0	100.0
Total	80.0	4.8	12.8	2.3	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1 Introduction

2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Introduction

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

2.2 Main Population Characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the percent distribution of the population by cluster location and poverty status by gender and age. Overall the district's population is young. For instance 5 percent of the population is 60 years old or over, whereas 50 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 45 percent is between 15 and 59 years old. There are no strong differences by cluster location and poverty status.

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

age takes care of.

The mean dependency ratio is 1.2, meaning that on average one adult has to take care of more than 1 person. The breakdown by cluster location does not show strong differences. However, the breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher dependency rate than non-poor households at 1.3 and 1.1respectively.The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.3 for households with 1 or 2 members to 1.3 for households with 7 or more members. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'self-employed agriculture' group has the highest dependency ratio (1.2), whereas the self-employed in non-agricultural activities and the employees have the lowest ratio (0.9 for each group).

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong correlation with the dependency ratio.

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 6.1 individuals. Households with at most two individuals only represent 10 percent of all households in the district. The figure for households with 7 or more members is 41 percent.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages tend to be larger than households in accessible villages, with means of 6.6 and 5.7

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	24.6	22.0	2.3	48.9	25.7	23.1	2.3	51.1	50.3	45.0	4.7	100.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	24.8	22.4	2.1	49.3	25.0	23.4	2.3	50.7	49.8	45.8	4.4	100.0
Remote	24.4	21.6	2.6	48.6	26.4	22.7	2.4	51.4	50.8	44.3	4.9	100.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	26.6	21.1	2.1	49.8	25.8	21.8	2.6	50.2	52.4	42.9	4.7	100.0
Non-poor	23.3	22.6	2.5	48.4	25.6	23.9	2.2	51.6	48.9	46.4	4.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

Table 2.2: Dependency ratio

	0-4 years	5-14 years	0-14 years	15-64 years	65+ years	Total	Dependency ratio
Total	1.1	2.0	3.1	2.8	0.2	6.1	1.2
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.9	1.9	2.9	2.7	0.2	5.7	1.1
Remote	1.2	2.1	3.4	3.0	0.3	6.6	1.2
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.4	2.8	4.1	3.5	0.3	7.9	1.3
Non-poor	0.9	1.7	2.6	2.5	0.2	5.3	1.1
Household size							
1-2	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.3	0.2	1.7	0.3
3-4	0.6	0.7	1.3	2.0	0.3	3.5	0.8
5-6	1.0	1.9	2.9	2.5	0.1	5.5	1.2
7+	1.6	3.2	4.8	3.9	0.2	8.9	1.3
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.8	1.4	2.2	2.5	0.1	4.8	0.9
Self-employed - agric	1.1	2.1	3.2	2.8	0.2	6.3	1.2
Self-employed - other	0.7	1.8	2.4	2.6	0.1	5.1	0.9
Other	0.9	2.3	3.2	3.3	0.4	6.9	1.1
Gender of Household Head							
Male	1.1	2.1	3.2	3.0	0.2	6.4	1.2
Female	0.7	1.7	2.5	2.2	0.3	5.0	1.2

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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	10.4	17.8	30.7	41.1	100.0	6.1
Cluster Location						
Accessible	13.3	17.3	34.3	35.1	100.0	5.7
Remote	7.1	18.5	26.5	47.9	100.0	6.6
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	3.9	22.6	73.5	100.0	7.9
Non-poor	15.2	24.0	34.4	26.4	100.0	5.3
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	24.4	27.9	26.0	21.7	100.0	4.8
Self-employed - agric	8.9	17.0	31.4	42.6	100.0	6.3
Self-employed - other	22.3	23.3	29.4	25.1	100.0	5.1
Other	3.4	13.2	26.9	56.5	100.0	6.9
Gender of Household Head						
Male	7.2	18.1	30.1	44.5	100.0	6.4
Female	25.0	16.5	33.3	25.3	100.0	5.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

members, respectively. The difference by poverty status is more pronounced, with poor households reporting a mean household size of 7.9 members, and non-poor households reporting 5.3 members on average.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the 'other' category has the highest mean household size at 6.9, while the 'employee' socio-economic group has the lowest at 4.8 members.

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female headed households, the former have 6.4 members in average, whereas the latter have only 5.0 members.

2.3 Main Household Characteristics

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

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Parents	Other relative	Not related	Total
Total	16.3	13.3	51.2	1.1	17.2	1.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	17.4	13.3	50.7	1.1	16.2	1.3	100.0
Remote	15.1	13.2	51.6	1.0	18.3	0.6	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	12.7	10.3	54.5	1.1	21.0	0.5	100.0
Non-poor	18.7	15.2	49.0	1.1	14.7	1.3	100.0
Age							
0- 9	0.0	0.0	78.9	0.0	20.8	0.3	100.0
10-19	0.0	1.8	70.9	0.0	25.4	1.9	100.0
20-29	14.1	33.3	29.7	0.0	21.0	1.8	100.0
30-39	48.0	43.1	7.0	0.0	0.8	1.0	100.0
40-49	57.2	33.9	4.4	0.6	3.9	0.0	100.0
50-59	59.5	30.4	0.5	7.7	1.3	0.6	100.0
60 and above	65.8	13.5	0.0	15.8	4.9	0.0	100.0
Gender							
Male	27.3	0.3	55.0	0.2	16.9	0.2	100.0
Female	5.7	25.7	47.5	1.9	17.6	1.7	100.0

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

When analysing by age-groups, it is clear that the category 'other relatives' is mostly comprised by children under 19 years old. This highlights the importance of the analysis of fostering and orphan status. After the age of 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 27 and 6 percent, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be spouses to the household head than males, at rates of 26 and less than 1 percent, respectively.

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, 32 percent is married and monogamous, and 18 percent is married and polygamous. Despite virtually nobody in the district has been 'officially' divorced, 4 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated. Informal unions constitute 1 percent of the population and 5 percent is widowed.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages are more likely to have never been married than households in remote villages who in turn report a higher share in a polygamous marriage than the former. However, the breakdown by poverty status shows that members of poor households are more likely to have never been married, whereas members of non-poor households are more likely to be in a monogamous marriage.

The age breakdown shows that the 'polygamous-married' category peaks for the 50-59 groups, at 44 percent. For the population after 20 years old, married-monogamous is the most common category. 'Separated' and 'widowed' show higher shares for the older cohorts. 'Never married' also shows correlation with age, decreasing rapidly as the population gets older.

Around 45 percent of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is only 34 percent. While 10 percent of women are widowed and 6 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, 19 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, with 77 percent in other activities. No strong differences are observed between accessible and remote

2 Village, population and household characteristics

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	39.0	32.0	18.4	1.0	0.0	4.1	5.5	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	42.1	31.9	14.8	1.2	0.0	4.7	5.3	100.0
Remote	35.9	32.2	22.2	0.7	0.0	3.4	5.7	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	44.5	24.5	17.8	1.4	0.0	4.8	7.0	100.0
Non-poor	35.5	37.0	18.7	0.7	0.0	3.6	4.5	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	88.9	8.4	1.7	0.6	0.0	0.3	0.0	100.0
20-24	42.6	42.0	8.9	1.2	0.0	4.0	1.4	100.0
25-29	14.8	51.9	21.8	2.6	0.0	7.0	1.8	100.0
30-39	4.2	56.0	29.5	1.5	0.0	6.2	2.6	100.0
40-49	1.6	44.6	39.1	0.7	0.0	6.5	7.6	100.0
50-59	0.0	38.1	43.5	0.0	0.0	3.8	14.6	100.0
60 and above	0.0	31.1	23.9	1.5	0.0	8.8	34.7	100.0
Gender								
Male	44.7	33.4	18.4	1.0	0.0	1.8	0.8	100.0
Female	33.8	30.8	18.5	0.9	0.0	6.2	9.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

clusters. The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher share in the 'other' category than non-poor households.

The analysis of the age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of employees peaks at 4 percent for the 40-49 cohort. The share for self-employed other is higher for the population in the 30-39 age-group, at around 9 percent. The share of self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age, peaking at 60 percent for the 50-59 cohort. On the contrary, the category 'other' tends to decrease with age, showing a sharp decrease between 20-29 and 30-39, from 75 to 45 percent, decrease to 34 percent for the 40-49 cohort then increases to 42 percent for the 60+ 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 90 percent against 63 percent for the males.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. Roughly 34 percent of the population has no education, 32 percent has some primary, and 27 percent has completed primary.

The remaining levels have shares of at most 3 percent each.

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 completed primary. 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 completed primary and some secondary.

The age breakdown shows that 67 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 91 percent of the children 10-14 have some or complete primary. Rates of no education are lowest for the population in the 15-19 cohorts (6 percent) and higher for the older groups. In the groups between 15 and 39 years old, the most common is completed primary.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males: 38 against 2 percent, but at the same time similar shares with completed primary and some primary.

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	1.3	19.0	2.6	77.1	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	2.4	16.8	3.8	77.0	100.0
Remote	0.3	21.2	1.3	77.2	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.4	17.6	1.4	80.7	100.0
Non-poor	2.0	19.9	3.4	74.7	100.0
Age					
5- 9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
10-14	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
15-19	0.0	0.9	0.0	99.1	100.0
20-29	3.1	18.3	4.0	74.6	100.0
30-39	3.3	42.8	9.1	44.8	100.0
40-49	4.0	57.0	4.9	34.1	100.0
50-59	1.5	59.6	2.8	36.1	100.0
60 and above	0.9	52.7	4.9	41.5	100.0
Gender					
Male	2.0	31.1	3.6	63.3	100.0
Female	0.7	7.7	1.6	89.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

	None	Nursery school	Some primary	Completed primary	Some secondary	Completed secondary	Post secondary	Total
Total	33.7	2.4	32.1	27.4	3.1	0.1	1.1	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	28.5	2.8	31.7	29.4	5.4	0.2	1.8	100.0
Remote	38.9	2.0	32.5	25.4	0.7	0.0	0.4	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	38.4	1.6	34.5	23.9	1.5	0.0	0.1	100.0
Non-poor	30.5	2.9	30.5	29.9	4.2	0.2	1.8	100.0
Age								
5- 9	66.9	10.4	22.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	7.4	1.0	88.9	2.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	6.2	0.0	34.9	49.9	9.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	16.9	0.0	8.4	64.6	7.2	0.6	2.3	100.0
30-39	25.9	0.0	16.2	55.3	1.9	0.0	0.6	100.0
40-49	47.3	0.0	10.4	33.9	5.2	0.3	2.9	100.0
50-59	68.2	0.0	14.8	11.1	0.0	0.0	5.9	100.0
60 and above	75.0	0.0	17.5	3.8	0.0	0.0	3.7	100.0
Gender								
Male	29.1	2.2	33.8	29.2	3.9	0.2	1.6	100.0
Female	38.0	2.6	30.6	25.7	2.4	0.0	0.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 49 percent of the household heads is married and monogamous, 17 divorced, separated or widowed, 30 percent married and polygamous, 3 percent has never been married and a further 1 percent lives in an informal union.

11

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	2.5	48.7	30.4	1.3	17.1	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	4.0	51.3	23.8	1.6	19.2	100.0
Remote	0.7	45.8	37.8	0.9	14.8	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	40.6	35.1	2.3	21.9	100.0
Non-poor	3.6	52.6	28.0	0.8	15.0	100.0
Age						
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	9.4	60.8	16.4	6.3	7.1	100.0
30-39	3.6	57.1	27.3	1.0	11.0	100.0
40-49	1.5	50.7	31.9	0.4	15.4	100.0
50-59	0.0	36.6	45.6	0.0	17.8	100.0
60 and above	0.0	34.4	29.9	1.1	34.7	100.0
Gender						
Male	1.7	59.2	36.4	0.8	2.0	100.0
Female	6.2	0.6	2.7	3.6	86.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible villages report a higher share of married monogamous household heads, whereas remote villages report a higher share of 'married polygamous'. Regarding poverty status, heads of poor households are more likely to be single (never married, divorced, separated or widowed), while heads of non-poor households are more likely to be in a monogamous marriage. The breakdown by age-group shows that the 'married-monogamous' category tends to decrease with age, as 'married-polygamous' and 'divorced, separated or widowed' increase.

Most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (87 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 2 percent. Most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (59 and 36 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 is not always the household head. As expected, the great majority of the district's household heads belong to the 'self-employed agriculture', with a share of 80 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities represent 8 percent of the household heads, the 'other' category (unemployed, inactive and household workers) represents 7 percent, and the employees are a further 5 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 90 and 80 percent, respectively. In accessible villages, household heads are more likely to be in the 'self-employed other' group than heads of households in remote villages, with shares of 11 and 5 percent respectively.

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

The breakdown by age of the household head shows interesting insights. For all age-groups, 'self-employed agriculture' is the most important category, representing at least 4 out of 5 household heads in each age-group. The 'employee' category peaks at 15 percent for the 20-29 age-groups. The 'self-employed other' is lower for the 50-59 and 60+ cohorts. The 'other' category gains importance in the 60+ age-group, with a share of 14 percent as it includes the economically inactive population.

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	5.0	80.1	8.0	6.8	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	8.2	71.8	12.4	7.6	100.0
Remote	1.5	89.7	3.0	5.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.5	86.5	2.7	10.3	100.0
Non-poor	7.1	77.2	10.5	5.2	100.0
Age					
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	14.9	74.1	10.9	0.0	100.0
30-39	6.0	77.4	14.7	1.9	100.0
40-49	4.8	80.2	4.7	10.3	100.0
50-59	1.0	89.3	3.3	6.5	100.0
60 and above	1.4	81.3	3.4	13.9	100.0
Gender					
Male	5.2	80.3	8.4	6.1	100.0
Female	4.3	79.2	6.5	10.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

Table 2.10: Percent distribution of heads of household by highest level of education

	None	Some primary	Completed primary	Some secondary	Completed secondary	Post secondary	Total
Total	34.9	16.8	40.7	3.3	0.1	4.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	26.4	14.8	47.9	5.0	0.2	5.6	100.0
Remote	44.5	19.2	32.5	1.5	0.0	2.4	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	51.0	17.0	29.7	1.8	0.0	0.5	100.0
Non-poor	27.3	16.8	45.9	4.1	0.2	5.8	100.0
Age							
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	13.7	7.7	64.0	6.1	0.0	8.6	100.0
30-39	12.3	17.8	65.6	2.9	0.0	1.3	100.0
40-49	36.6	13.3	38.5	7.0	0.5	4.1	100.0
50-59	58.8	17.5	18.6	0.0	0.0	5.1	100.0
60 and above	64.0	24.5	5.8	0.0	0.0	5.6	100.0
Gender							
Male	29.6	18.7	42.9	4.1	0.2	4.5	100.0
Female	58.9	8.0	30.8	0.0	0.0	2.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong correlation with the socio-economic groups.

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, around only 4 percent of the household heads has any education after primary. 35 percent of the household heads has no education, 17 percent some primary and 41 percent has completed primary.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that household heads from remote villages are more likely to have no education than household heads from accessible villages. In turn the latter report a higher share of completed primary than the former at 48 and 33 percent respectively. Poverty status is strongly correlated with the education of the household heads. This should be no surprise, since education of the household head is one of the poverty predictors used to define poverty status. However, the difference is still important: household heads from poor households are more

Table 2.11 - Orphan status of children under 18 years old

	Children who lost mother only	Children who lost father only	Children who lost both father & mother
Total	2.4	7.2	1.3
Cluster Location			
Accessible	3.1	4.8	1.7
Remote	1.7	9.7	0.8
Poverty Status			
Poor	3.0	9.6	1.2
Non-poor	1.9	5.5	1.3
Age			
0-4	1.3	3.4	0.0
5-9	2.6	6.9	0.5
10-14	2.4	10.1	2.3
15-17	4.5	10.9	3.9
Gender			
Male	3.3	6.9	1.2
Female	1.5	7.5	1.3

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

likely to have no education than household heads from non-poor households, whereas the latter are more likely to have completed primary or post secondary studies than the former.

The age breakdown shows that 64 percent of household heads aged 60 or over has no education, and a further 25 percent has just some primary. Completed primary represents almost 66 percent for the 20-29 age group, but only 19 percent in the 50-59 cohort, and 6 percent for the 60+ cohort.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education than males, with rates of 59 and 30 percent, respectively. Males report a higher share with some primary than females. Furthermore, 43 percent of the male household heads has completed primary, against 31 percent of females.

2.5 Orphan and Foster Status

Table 2.11 shows the percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost at least one parent. Overall, about 1 percent of children under 18 lost both parents, 2 percent lost only their mother and 7 percent lost only their father. This amounts to 9 percent of all children under 18 who lost at least one parent at the time of the survey.

The breakdown by cluster location and poverty status revealed no strong correlation with the orphan status of children under 18 years old. 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 15 percent of the children between 15 and 17 years lost at least one parent, and 13 percent of the children in that age-group lost their father. There does not seem to be a gender trend in orphan status.

The percent distribution of children under 18 years old by foster status is shown in Table 2.12. A child is defined as living in a nuclear household when both parents live in the household and as living in a non-nuclear household when at least one parent is absent from the household. Note that this makes it a variable defined at the level of the child, rather than the household (a household may be nuclear with respect to one child, but not with respect to another). The table shows that 29 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

Children from accessible clusters are more likely to live in non-nuclear households than children from remote clusters at 33 and 24 percent, respectively. Further breakdown by poverty status shows that 17 percent of children from poor households lives with their mother only while the share for children from non-poor households is 11 percent.

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

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

Table 2.12 - 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	13.2	2.2	13.2	28.5
Cluster Location				
Accessible	13.2	2.9	16.5	32.6
Remote	13.1	1.4	9.9	24.4
Poverty Status				
Poor	16.6	2.4	11.3	30.3
Non-poor	10.6	2.0	14.6	27.2
Age				
0-4	10.5	0.4	4.5	15.4
5-9	12.5	2.2	13.4	28.2
10-14	15.1	3.5	17.2	35.8
15-17	17.0	3.4	24.9	45.2
Gender				
Male	12.0	2.6	12.3	26.9
Female	14.3	1.7	14.1	30.1

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

2 Village, population and household characteristics

3 EDUCATION

This chapter examines selected education indicators in Meatu 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 is 62 percent. Literacy rates differ between accessible and remote villages at 70 and 54 percent respectively. Likewise, the literacy rate among non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 66 and 56 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 (98 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 23 percentage points higher than that of women at 74 percent and 51 percent respectively.

The literacy rate among non-orphaned children is higher than that of orphaned children. Likewise, the literacy rate among non-fostered children is 5 percentage points higher than that of fostered children at 93 and 88 percent respectively.

3.1.2 Primary School

Access

Primary school access rate is defined as the proportion of primary school-age children (7 to 13 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school. Overall, 62 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 69 and 54 percent respectively.

67 percent of the children aged 7 to 13 living in non-poor households lives within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 54 percent of those living in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that 95 percent of children living in households belonging to the 'employee' category live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school compared to 57 percent of the children living in households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category.

Further breakdown by orphan status revealed no remarkable differences between orphaned children and non-orphaned children in relation to access rate to primary schools. 83 percent of fostered children reports access to primary schools, whereas the rate for non-fostered children is 59 percent. Finally, while 65 percent of males reports access to primary schools, the share for females is 59.

Enrolment

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

3 Education

Table 3.1: Education indicators

	Adult Literacy rate	Primary				Secondary			
		access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction
Total	61.9	61.6	109.1	83.6	34.6	7.2	14.6	11.1	22.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	70.2	68.5	108.0	84.3	34.4	13.4	24.6	19.5	24.7
Remote	53.6	53.8	110.4	82.9	34.8	0.3	3.5	1.7	0.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	56.0	53.9	105.1	76.7	37.7	4.3	8.2	5.5	3.3
Non-poor	65.9	67.4	112.2	88.9	32.4	9.8	20.2	15.9	28.4
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	97.8	94.5	99.7	86.0	23.9	34.6	63.9	54.8	10.4
Self-employed - agriculture	58.2	57.3	109.3	83.6	33.3	4.8	9.1	6.6	21.9
Self-employed - other	77.6	88.7	111.1	90.4	34.0	19.5	37.2	27.3	46.1
Other	65.9	65.3	110.9	77.1	52.5	3.8	16.6	12.2	13.7
Gender									
Male	73.9	65.0	113.0	82.8	33.3	8.2	16.3	11.1	32.2
Female	50.6	58.6	105.7	84.3	35.8	6.2	12.9	11.1	8.4
Orphan status									
Orphaned	88.1	63.0	111.8	83.7	48.5	5.9	14.6	14.6	11.4
Not-orphaned	91.8	60.9	108.3	83.6	32.5	8.2	9.6	9.6	21.6
Foster status									
Fostered	88.2	83.1	110.0	85.5	23.5	0.0	13.6	13.6	14.3
Not-fostered	93.2	58.9	108.1	83.3	36.1	9.2	8.6	8.6	22.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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.

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 109 percent at the time of the survey. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 109 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The NER further shows that 84 percent of all primary school-age children were attending school.

Cluster location does not show strong correlation with GER and NER. On the other hand, while GER for non-poor households is 112 percent, the share for poor households is 105 percent. Likewise, NER for non-poor households is higher than that of poor households at 89 and 77 percent respectively.

GER and NER are highest among people living in households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category at 111 and 90 percent respectively. On the other hand, GER is lowest among households where the main income earner is an employee with a rate of 100 percent and NER is lowest among households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category at 77 percent respectively.

Furthermore, while GER for males is 113 percent, the share for females is 106 percent. On the other hand, gender does not show strong correlation with NER.

The breakdown by orphan status shows that GER for orphaned children is higher than that of non-orphaned children at 112 and 108 percent respectively. However, orphan status does not show strong correlation with NER. On the other hand, fostered children have a higher GER than non-fostered children at 110 and 108 percent respectively. Likewise, fostered children have a higher NER than non-fostered children at 86 and 83 percent respectively. It is worth remembering the small sample size in the orphaned and fostered category (see chapter 2), as well as those foster and orphan statuses are strongly correlated with age: orphaned and fostered children have higher mean ages than non-orphaned and non-fostered children.

Satisfaction

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

35 percent of all primary school pupils reported being satisfied with school. Cluster location does not show strong correlation with primary satisfaction rates. On the other hand, while 38 percent of pupils living in poor households reported to be satisfied with school, the share for pupils living in non-poor households is 32 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that households belonging to the 'other' category reported the highest rate of satisfaction with their primary schools at 53 percent, while the share for pupils living in households belonging to the 'employee' category is 24 percent.

Furthermore, 49 percent of orphaned children reported to be satisfied with primary school compared to 33 percent of non-orphaned children. On the other hand, 36 percent of fostered children reported to be satisfied with primary school compared to 24 percent of non-fostered children. There appears to be no strong correlation between gender and satisfaction with primary school.

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 13 percent of pupils living in accessible villages live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for pupils living in remote villages is virtually null. Similarly, 10 percent of pupils living in non-poor households live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, whereas the share for pupils living in poor households is 4 percent.

The socio-economic status of the household seems to be strongly correlated with the rate of access to secondary school. While pupils living in households belonging to the 'employee' category have the highest rate of access to secondary school at 35 percent, followed by those who belong to the 'self-employed other' category (20 percent), the share for the 'self-employed agriculture' category is 5 percent and the share for the 'other' category is 4 percent.

The breakdown by gender and orphan status shows no strong correlation with access to secondary school. However, while 9 percent of non-fostered children live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school, the share for fostered children is virtually null.

Table 3.2: Percentage of students currently enrolled in school by 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	65.1	43.5	22.3	63.2	5.6	9.2	48.9	3.0	1.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	65.0	50.8	15.6	68.6	5.9	9.8	37.4	5.1	0.7
Remote	65.2	34.5	30.8	56.6	5.2	8.3	63.2	0.4	1.4
Poverty Status									
Poor	62.8	37.4	23.9	58.1	2.9	5.6	56.2	1.7	1.6
Non-poor	66.6	47.4	21.4	66.4	7.2	11.4	44.4	3.8	0.6
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	79.2	71.4	13.0	64.3	0.0	9.2	56.0	21.4	5.9
Self-employed - agric	66.3	41.8	25.2	62.0	6.3	9.5	46.3	1.0	0.8
Self-employed - other	59.7	32.0	1.5	79.8	1.5	8.9	56.3	6.2	0.0
Other	50.0	49.7	20.3	58.4	7.2	5.8	64.5	5.7	0.0
Gender									
Male	66.5	40.7	20.8	65.4	3.9	4.9	48.1	2.5	0.6
Female	63.8	46.4	23.9	61.1	7.2	13.4	49.6	3.5	1.4
Type of school									
Primary	65.4	42.6	23.9	61.9	6.3	9.3	50.1	0.5	0.9
Government	65.3	42.8	24.0	62.1	6.3	9.3	50.3	0.1	0.9
Private	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Secondary	78.0	54.1	11.0	71.6	1.4	2.4	27.8	25.3	2.6
Government	80.6	57.4	13.2	83.0	1.6	2.9	31.8	21.0	3.2
Private	62.7	46.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	53.2	0.0
Other	69.4	34.7	0.0	21.1	0.0	0.0	10.9	44.1	0.0
Other	48.2	41.6	14.4	72.5	0.0	18.1	62.3	8.8	0.0
Government	50.9	44.8	16.4	75.0	0.0	20.6	68.3	3.8	0.0
Private	28.8	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Other	39.2	0.0	0.0	56.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.3	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

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 15 percent and NER was 11 percent. The secondary school GER for households located in accessible clusters is 21 percentage points higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 25 and 4 percent respectively. Likewise, Secondary school NER is higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters at 20 and 2 percent respectively. Furthermore, both secondary

GER and NER are higher in non-poor households than in poor households, with a difference of 12 and 10 percentage points respectively.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'employee' is the category with highest GER and NER at 64 and 55 percent respectively, whereas households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category have the lowest GER and NER at 9 and 7 percent respectively. Furthermore, while GER and NER for orphans is 15 percent, the share for non-orphans is 10 percent. Likewise, while the GER and NER for fostered children is 14 percent, the share for non-fostered children is 9 percent.

Finally, NER and GER rates among boys and girls children do not show strong differences.

Satisfaction

22 percent of the population enrolled in secondary school reported being satisfied with school. 78 percent of this population reports to be dissatisfied with the secondary schools they attend. This satisfaction rate is lower than in primary schools (35 percent). While the satisfaction rate of pupils living in accessible clusters is 25 percent, the rate for pupils living in remote clusters is virtually null. Likewise, 28 percent of pupils living in non-poor households reported satisfaction with their school whereas; the share for those living in poor households is 3 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that 46 percent of pupils living in households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category reported being satisfied with secondary school, while the share for those living in households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' categories is 10 percent.

32 percent of male pupils reported satisfaction with their school, whereas the share for females is 8 percent. Among the individuals enrolled in secondary schools, non-orphaned children reported satisfaction with their schools more often than orphaned children at 22 and 11 percent respectively. Likewise, 22 percent of non-fostered children report being satisfied with their secondary schools, whereas the share for fostered children is 14 percent.

3.2 Dissatisfaction

One of the aims of the survey is to inform on perceptions of quality of services received among individuals for whom these are provided. To obtain this information, primary and secondary school students who were not satisfied with 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 complaints regarding overcrowding and bad condition of facilities. The results are shown in Table 3.2.

Overall, 65 percent of the students who were enrolled in either primary or secondary school reported dissatisfaction with school. 63 percent of students reported lack of teachers as the cause of their dissatisfaction. In addition, 49 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to bad condition of facilities whereas, 44 percent reported lack of books and supplies. While 22 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools due to poor teaching, 9 percent reported lack of space and 6 percent reported teachers' absence.

Cluster location does not show correlation with dissatisfaction rates. However, the dissatisfaction rate for people living in non-poor households is higher than that of people living in poor households at 67 and 63 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 66 and 58 percent respectively. Likewise, while 69 percent of people living in accessible clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers, the share for those living in remote clusters is 57 percent. It is also observed that 51 percent of people living in accessible clusters reported dissatisfaction due to lack of books and supplies compared to 35 percent of people living in remote clusters. In turn the latter reported dissatisfaction due to facilities in bad condition at 63 percent against 37 percent of the former.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that the dissatisfaction rate among households belonging to the 'employee' category is the highest (79 percent). At the same time, the 'other' category reported the lowest dissatisfaction rate (50 percent). It is also observed that 80 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category and 64 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers whereas, the share for households belonging to the 'other' category is 58 percent.

Gender breakdown shows that the females reported a dissatisfaction rate due to lack of books and supplies at 5 percentage points higher than males at 46 and 41 percent respectively. In turn, 65 percent of males reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers compared to 61 percent of females.

Those attending primary school reported to be most dissatisfied due to lack of teachers (62 percent) followed by bad

condition of facilities (50 percent) while those attending secondary schools reported dissatisfaction due to lack of teachers (72 percent) followed by lack of books and supplies (54 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 18 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who were not attending school. Around 40 percent of the non-attending population did not attend because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level. 31 percent reported that they were awaiting admission and 22 percent said they had failed standard four, seven or form four exams. 13 percent of respondents reported that they were not attending school because of work. While 10 percent were not attending due to marriage, 6 percent were not attending school because school was useless / uninteresting.

The breakdown by cluster location and poverty status shows that, while 47 percent of children living in households located in remote clusters reported not attending school because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level, the share for those living in households located in accessible clusters is 33 percent. On the other hand, 35 percent of children living in non-poor households were not attending school because were awaiting admission compared to 27 percent of those living in poor households.

Furthermore, 22 percent of children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category reported not attending school compared to 15 percent of those from households belonging to the 'employee' category. Further breakdown of the data shows that 41 percent of children from households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category reported not attending school because they had failed exams, whereas the share for those from households belonging to the 'employee' category is virtually null.

The gender breakdown shows that boys reported a higher rate of not attending to school because they had completed standard seven, O-lever or A-level, than girls at 44 and 36 percent respectively. It is also observed that while 20 percent of

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

	Percent not attending	Completed school	Distance	Cost	Work	Illness	Pregnancy	Got married	Useless/ uninteresting	Failed exam	Awaits admission	Dismissed
									Reasons not currently attending			
Total	18.2	39.7	0.0	5.2	12.8	2.3	0.9	10.0	5.5	22.4	30.7	0.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	17.0	32.7	0.0	7.7	11.8	4.5	1.7	6.0	2.9	26.3	36.7	0.0
Remote	19.7	46.7	0.0	2.6	13.9	0.0	0.0	14.0	8.2	18.5	24.8	0.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	20.3	39.5	0.0	4.8	15.7	2.8	0.0	7.1	7.1	26.0	26.5	0.0
Non-poor	16.6	40.3	0.0	5.5	9.5	1.8	1.6	12.6	3.2	19.6	34.8	0.0
Socio-economic Group												
Employee	15.1	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.9	0.0
Self-employed - agric	18.1	41.9	0.0	5.8	14.3	2.9	1.1	10.8	7.0	22.1	27.8	0.0
Self-employed - other	16.2	40.4	0.0	0.0	15.5	0.0	0.0	19.8	0.0	9.7	46.7	0.0
Other	22.4	36.2	0.0	5.6	5.7	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	40.5	29.2	0.0
Gender												
Male	18.2	43.8	0.0	8.9	7.5	1.9	0.0	0.0	3.8	24.6	37.9	0.0
Female	18.3	35.8	0.0	1.6	17.9	2.6	1.7	19.5	7.2	20.4	23.9	0.0
Age												
7-13	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.0	0.0
14-19	45.3	40.8	0.0	5.3	13.2	2.3	0.9	10.3	5.7	23.1	30.4	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

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

	Net enrollment rates			Drop out rates		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Total	82.8	84.3	83.6	0.3	0.6	0.5
7	40.8	50.2	45.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	75.6	88.9	81.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	94.8	93.9	94.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	97.9	83.3	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11	96.3	97.3	96.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
12	97.2	92.2	94.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
13	94.2	87.5	90.6	2.8	5.9	4.5

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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	11.1	11.1	11.1	21.0	18.9	20.0
14	3.3	6.3	5.0	8.2	7.1	7.5
15	0.0	9.6	4.7	19.8	21.3	20.5
16	9.6	25.7	17.0	11.8	25.4	18.0
17	15.3	4.6	10.2	47.4	31.8	39.9
18	20.5	11.0	16.6	29.0	17.6	24.4
19	22.8	9.4	15.4	5.5	13.4	9.9

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

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 less than 1 percent. On the other hand, the share for secondary school-age children is 45 percent. 41 percent of secondary school-aged individuals not attending secondary school reported having completed school. While 42 percent of primary school-aged children not attending school reported that were awaiting admission, the share for secondary school-aged children is 30 percent.

3.4 Enrolment and Drop-out Rates

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

Primary School

Table 3.4 shows primary school net enrolment and drop-out rates. The drop-out rates at primary level are generally very low. Disaggregation of the data shows that at the time of the survey, the primary school drop-out rate was less than 1 percent. Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

Overall, 84 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), 84 percent of girls and 83 percent of boys were enrolled. The required age at which children should start standard one is 7 years. However, data on primary school enrolment show that at the time of the survey 46 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 97 percent.

Secondary School

Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by gender. Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	73.9	50.6	61.9
15-19 years	94.4	83.6	89.3
20-29 years	82.2	66.3	73.4
30-39 years	74.7	45.0	58.4
40-49 years	64.9	31.0	49.0
50-59 years	43.7	11.9	28.6
60+ years	39.7	2.1	20.8
Accessible	82.9	58.2	70.2
15-19 years	97.8	89.5	94.1
20-29 years	82.8	79.8	81.1
30-39 years	87.8	49.6	66.7
40-49 years	74.7	46.8	62.5
50-59 years	39.0	17.8	27.1
60+ years	69.4	4.2	34.9
Remote	64.8	42.7	53.6
15-19 years	90.0	77.5	83.8
20-29 years	81.8	55.3	67.5
30-39 years	57.2	38.7	47.1
40-49 years	54.5	18.0	36.1
50-59 years	46.9	4.2	30.0
60+ years	16.0	0.0	8.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is population age 15+

at primary level. Only 11 percent of secondary school-aged children was enrolled compared to 84 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. Furthermore, 17 percent of 16 year olds reported to be enrolled at the time of the survey. It is also noticeable that the rate of girls enrolled in secondary school at the age of 16 is 16 percentage points higher than that of boys at 26 and 10 percent respectively.

Secondary school drop-out rates among secondary school-age individuals (14 to 19 years) are higher compared to those of primary school. 20 percent of children of secondary school-age had dropped out in the year prior to the survey.. The highest drop-out rates for both genders are observed at the age of 17 at 47 percent for males and 32 females.

3.5 Literacy

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

Adult Literacy

Overall, 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 23 percentage points at 74 and 51 percent respectively. Individuals aged between 15 and 19 have the highest literacy rate (89 percent) while 21 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write.

The literacy rate in accessible villages is 16 percentage points higher than in remote villages. The literacy rate for the 15-19 age-groups in accessible villages is 94 percent, whereas for remote villages the rate is 84 percent. Furthermore, in accessible villages the literacy rate of men is 25 percentage points higher than that of women. In remote villages, the difference decreases to 22 percentage points. On the contrary, while the literacy rate of women in accessible villages is about 15 percentage points higher than that of women in remote villages, the difference in literacy rates between men in accessible and remote villages is 18 percentage points. Finally, there is a significant difference in literacy rates among men and women above 60 years in both cluster locations. While the literacy rate of men over 60 years in accessible clusters is 69 percent, the share for women is 4 percent. Likewise, while the literacy rate of men over 60 years in remote clusters is 16 percent, the share for women is virtually null.

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 85 percent, but the gender difference is important. While the literacy rate for men is 92 percent, the rate for women is 14 percentage points lower, at 78 percent.

Analysis by age-groups shows that 15 to 17 year olds have the highest literacy rate at 91 percent. In accessible villages, youth aged between 15 to 17 years have the highest literacy rate at 93 percent.

Likewise, in remote villages the literacy rate is highest among the youth of 15 to 17 years at 89 percent. However, youth literacy rate in accessible villages is higher than that of youth in remote villages at 91 and 78 percent respectively.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	91.5	78.0	84.7
15-17 years	93.9	88.4	91.3
18-20 years	94.5	70.6	83.0
21-22 years	87.3	68.4	75.4
23-24 years	74.3	77.1	75.8
Accessible	95.9	86.1	91.2
15-17 years	97.4	87.8	92.9
18-20 years	98.9	80.1	90.3
21-22 years	100.0	87.0	89.9
23-24 years	76.5	100.0	86.9
Remote	86.7	70.5	78.3
15-17 years	89.2	89.2	89.2
18-20 years	89.6	62.1	75.6
21-22 years	84.0	55.3	68.0
23-24 years	72.1	66.0	68.3

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is population aged 15-24

3 Education

4 HEALTH

This chapter examines health indicators for the population in Meatu 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 facility use is defined as the proportion of

Table 4.1 - Health Indicators

	Medical Services			
	Access	Need	Use	Satisfaction
Total	32.9	20.4	24.4	62.2
Cluster Location				
Accessible	55.8	23.8	27.2	59.1
Remote	10.1	17.1	21.6	66.1
Poverty Status				
Poor	22.8	17.3	21.3	64.9
Non-poor	39.7	22.4	26.3	61.0
Socio-economic group				
Employee	57.0	25.7	27.5	58.4
Self-employed - agriculture	28.6	20.5	24.6	63.3
Self-employed - other	64.8	23.8	27.7	67.2
Other	37.6	13.9	17.6	41.9
Gender				
Male	32.8	17.2	21.1	63.8
Female	32.9	23.5	27.5	61.0
Age				
0-4	32.3	29.8	57.8	57.7
5-9	32.4	14.4	14.6	75.5
10-14	32.4	12.6	12.3	74.1
15-19	34.2	11.6	12.0	74.9
20-29	32.6	18.0	17.8	73.1
30-39	33.2	24.6	22.3	58.5
40-49	34.6	25.6	23.0	57.7
50-59	35.0	38.7	38.7	39.3
60+	32.7	30.4	24.9	48.5

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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.

	Percent dissatisfied	Facilities not clean	Long wait	No trained professionals	Cost	No drugs available	Treatment unsuccessful	Other
				Reasons for dissatisfaction				
Total	37.8	16.2	51.7	18.7	19.3	16.3	16.7	0.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	40.9	17.8	46.1	22.4	18.3	21.4	19.8	0.0
Remote	33.9	13.8	60.2	13.2	20.8	8.6	12.1	0.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	35.1	17.5	59.7	18.4	12.0	12.5	19.3	0.0
Non-poor	39.0	15.7	48.4	19.1	22.6	18.4	15.0	0.0
Socio-economic group								
Employee	41.6	41.8	53.6	50.0	16.9	13.9	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	36.7	14.2	51.5	17.9	18.9	15.5	16.7	0.0
Self-employed - other	32.8	25.2	55.6	7.1	16.9	8.9	27.5	0.0
Other	58.1	12.9	50.0	17.6	25.7	31.2	18.1	0.0
Gender								
Male	36.2	13.1	60.3	18.5	15.0	19.0	14.7	0.0
Female	39.0	18.3	45.9	18.9	22.2	14.5	18.1	0.0
Type of provider								
Public hospital	52.0	17.2	67.8	21.8	6.1	21.5	8.8	0.0
Private hospital	32.9	33.4	0.0	6.5	85.9	6.7	13.5	0.0
Religous hospital	40.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Village health worker	71.3	50.0	100.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private Doctor/Dentist	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pharmacist	12.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	74.1	0.0	25.9	0.0
Trad. Healer	27.9	5.9	0.0	14.6	32.7	0.0	73.2	0.0
Other	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

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, 33 percent of the population has access to medical services, 20 percent reported having needed them, and 24 percent reported having used medical services. Finally, 62 percent of those who used medical services reported being satisfied with them.

As would be expected, analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages report a higher access rate to medical services than households in remote villages, at 56 and 10 percent, respectively. Furthermore, households in accessible villages report higher shares of need and use than their counterpart. Interestingly, the small proportion of households in remote villages accessing medical services report a higher satisfaction rate at 66 percent compared to 59 percent of households in accessible villages.

Breakdown by poverty status shows similar results with non-poor households resembling accessible villages. Similarly, poor households report a higher satisfaction rate than non-poor households with shares of 65 and 61 percent respectively.

Regarding socio-economic status, households self employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest rates of access (65 percent), use (28 percent) and satisfaction (67 percent), while the 'other' socio-economic group (households where the main income earner is unpaid, unemployed, inactive, or a household worker) reports the lowest shares in need (14 percent), use (18

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

	Percent not consulting	Reasons for not consulting				
		No need	Cost	Distance	No confidence	Other
Total	75.6	97.6	0.9	1.0	0.1	0.6
Cluster Location						
Accessible	72.8	98.2	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.8
Remote	78.4	97.1	1.1	1.7	0.0	0.5
Poverty Status						
Poor	78.7	98.1	0.8	0.9	0.0	0.4
Non-poor	73.7	97.2	1.0	1.1	0.1	0.8
Socio-economic group						
Employee	72.5	96.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9
Self-employed - agriculture	75.4	97.6	0.9	1.1	0.1	0.6
Self-employed - other	72.3	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	82.4	97.4	1.5	1.9	0.0	0.0
Gender						
Male	78.9	98.1	0.5	0.8	0.1	0.6
Female	72.5	97.1	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.7
Type of sickness/injury						
Fever/malaria	4.2	11.6	35.3	30.3	0.0	29.4
Diarrhea/abdominal pains	3.9	0.0	40.2	45.9	0.0	26.0
Pain in back, limbs or joints	16.0	0.0	51.5	35.2	6.8	17.4
Coughing/breathing difficulty	5.8	0.0	43.3	0.0	0.0	56.7
Skin problems	3.1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ear, nose, throat	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eye	22.6	0.0	100.0	28.1	0.0	0.0
Dental	18.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Accident	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

percent) and satisfaction (42 percent). The employees report the highest need rate for medical services at 26 percent. Finally, the self employed in agriculture report the lowest access rate to medical services at 29 percent.

The gender breakdown shows no remarkable differences in the rate of access and satisfaction between males and females. However, females report higher rates of need and use with shares of 24 and 28 percent, respectively compared to that of males at 17 and 21 percent respectively.

The split by age reveals that, access does not vary widely by age-groups, but the rate of need does. It starts at 30 percent for children under 5, reduces to 12 percent for the population aged between 15 and 19, and then starts increasing again, peaking at 39 percent for the 50-59 group. The rate of use follows a similar trend: it starts at a fairly high rate (58 percent) decreasing with age but then increases for the older cohorts. Irrespective of their lowest rate of use and need for medical services, the 15-19 cohort reports the second highest satisfaction rate at 75 percent.

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. Roughly, 1 in 3 users of healthcare facilities is dissatisfied, mostly because of long wait (52 percent), cost of medical services and lack of trained professionals (19 percent, each), unsuccessful treatments (17 percent), unavailability of drugs and facilities not being clean (16 percent, each).

The analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages report a higher dissatisfaction rate than those in remote villages, at 41 and 34 percent respectively. While the former reports

4 Health

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

	Sick or injured	Fever or malaria	Diarrhea/ abdominal pain	Pain in back, limbs or joints	Coughing/ breathing difficulty	Skin problem	Ear, nose, throat,	Eye	Dental	Accident	Other
Total	20.4	46.5	18.5	17.6	23.1	3.6	1.8	3.1	1.1	1.3	4.9
Male Total	17.2	48.5	15.4	14.4	24.3	4.4	1.1	4.9	0.0	2.0	5.5
0-4	32.0	56.7	19.0	4.0	29.8	8.6	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.8	1.8
5-9	12.1	38.3	16.5	4.5	34.0	0.0	1.5	12.2	0.0	0.0	5.5
10-14	10.5	30.7	12.9	6.3	27.3	5.4	0.0	6.4	0.0	0.0	29.1
15-29	10.3	49.1	11.8	14.8	21.4	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	6.8	8.2
30-49	18.8	59.7	12.2	26.4	18.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.1	1.5
50-64	19.0	41.6	7.2	49.6	7.1	0.0	15.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	26.2	16.6	22.4	34.5	10.8	16.6	0.0	19.7	0.0	0.0	5.3
Female Total	23.5	45.0	20.7	19.9	22.2	3.1	2.4	1.8	1.8	0.9	4.5
0-4	27.4	61.6	19.2	1.0	22.0	5.2	4.8	3.6	0.0	0.0	3.0
5-9	16.8	52.1	10.5	4.2	26.3	5.0	1.5	0.0	1.8	0.0	4.8
10-14	14.2	46.8	24.5	4.4	20.9	1.8	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	13.1
15-29	20.5	48.2	20.1	11.4	25.2	4.2	1.6	2.4	1.3	2.8	4.0
30-49	32.0	29.9	28.1	42.6	19.3	1.8	3.4	0.0	3.1	1.3	3.3
50-64	33.3	51.3	20.1	30.0	16.5	0.0	2.1	5.0	8.1	0.0	0.0
65+	46.7	22.3	12.6	57.9	23.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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.

higher shares in 'facilities not clean', 'no trained professionals', 'no drugs available' and 'treatment unsuccessful', the latter reports a higher share in 'long wait'. Both report almost similar shares of cost as a reason for dissatisfaction.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report a higher dissatisfaction rate than poor households, with shares of 39 and 35 percent, respectively. The former reports higher shares in cost for medical service and no drugs available, while the latter reports higher shares in long wait, with similar shares for the remaining reasons.

Among different socio-economic groups, the highest dissatisfaction rate was reported by the 'other' category (59 percent) mainly due to long wait (50 percent), cost of medical services (26 percent) and no drugs available (32 percent). Employees report the second highest dissatisfaction rate at 42 percent with main reasons being no trained professionals (50 percent) and facilities not clean (42 percent). On the other hand, the 'self-employed other' socio-economic group reports the lowest dissatisfaction rate, at 33 percent with long wait (56 percent) and treatment unsuccessful (28 percent) as the main reasons for

dissatisfaction.Dissatisfaction rates and the reasons for dissatisfaction does not vary widely by gender except that females point out 'facilities not clean' and 'cost' of medical services more often than males, while the latter report a higher share in long wait than the former.

Regarding health provider, users of medical services were mainly dissatisfied with village health workers (71 percent) due to long wait (100 percent), facilities not clean and lack of trained professionals (50 percent, each). The second dissatisfaction rate goes to public hospitals (52 percent) due to long wait (69 percent) and unavailability of trained professionals and drugs (22 percent, each). The main cause for dissatisfaction with religious and private hospitals is cost for medical services (at 100 and 86 percent, respectively). The rate of dissatisfaction with traditional healers is 28 percent mainly due to treatment unsuccessful (73 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 (98 percent of the cases).

Analysis by cluster location and poverty status is not correlated with the reasons for not consulting, 'no need' accounts for 97 to 99 percent of the cases not consulting. Nevertheless, the division by socio-economic group shows that the self employed in non-agricultural activities report the lowest rate not consulting (at 72 percent) while the 'other' category reports the highest rate (at 82 percent).

Although males report a higher percent than females not consulting (79 and 73 percent, respectively), there are no sharp differences in the reasons for not consulting between males and females.

The split-up by type of illness shows that, in case of eye related problems, 23 percent did not consult due to cost (100 percent), dental (18 percent not consulting) due to distance (100 percent) and pain in back , limbs or joints (16 percent) due to cost (52 percent) and distance (35 percent). Although the remaining infirmities have low percent not consulting, the main reasons reported for not consulting a health practitioner are cost and distance.

4.4 Type of Illness

Table 4.4 shows the percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 20 percent of the population was sick or injured. Fever or malaria is the most common sickness, affecting 47 percent of the population. Breathing difficulties come in second affecting 23 percent, followed by diarrhoea/abdominal pain and pain in back, limbs or joints in third and fourth places, affecting around 19 and 18 percent, respectively. Other diseases affected minor shares of the ill population (less than 5 percent).

The gender breakdown reveals that females report a higher share of sick or injured population than males (24 and 17 percent, respectively). While the former reports to be affected more by 'diarrhoea/abdominal pain' and 'pain in back, limbs or joints', the latter, is more affected by 'fever or malaria'.

The age breakdown shows age related trend whereby, at lower ages the share of ill population decreases with increasing age and increases again at higher ages. While the share of ill population affected by malaria is highest for children under five years for both males and females, for adults it is highest for persons between 30 and 49 year among males and between50 and 64 years among females. In both sexes, 'pain in back, limbs or joints' affect households aged 30 years and above more frequently than those aged 29 years and below. Breathing difficulties seems to affect almost equally all age groups among females, while among males, those at least 50 years are less likely to be affected.

4.5 Healthcare Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 54 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 23 percent to a pharmacist or chemist, 13 percent to traditional healers and 7 percent in a private hospital.

The breakdown by village location shows that, unexpectedly households in accessible villages consult public hospitals more often than households in remote villages (60 and 46 percent, respectively), while the latter report a higher share consulting pharmacists/chemists than the former at 27 and 20 percent respectively..

Analysis by poverty status shows that non-poor households make their consultations in public hospitals more often than poor households, with shares of 56 and 50 percent, respectively. In turn, members of poor households tend to consult traditional healers more often than non-poor households, at rates of 17 and 11 percent, respectively. Interestingly, the rate of poor and non-poor households consulting pharmacists or chemists and private hospitals is almost similar.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that the employees and self-employed in agriculture report consulting public hospitals more often than the rest socio-economic groups. Furthermore the employees report highest shares consulting private hospitals and village health workers, The 'self-employed agriculture' and 'self-employed other' categories report highest shares consulting a pharmacist or chemist (at 24 percent each) while the 'other' socio-economic category reports the highest share

31

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	53.8	7.4	0.4	0.8	0.0	23.2	13.0	1.3	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	59.9	6.2	0.4	1.0	0.0	20.4	11.2	0.8	100.0
Remote	46.2	8.9	0.4	0.5	0.0	26.7	15.4	1.9	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	51.3	5.5	0.0	1.4	0.0	22.3	16.8	2.6	100.0
Non-poor	55.5	8.5	0.6	0.4	0.0	23.6	10.7	0.6	100.0
Socio-economic group									
Employee	56.7	19.6	0.0	6.3	0.0	17.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	54.8	5.9	0.4	0.6	0.0	24.0	12.8	1.6	100.0
Self-employed - other	46.8	13.4	1.2	0.0	0.0	24.0	14.6	0.0	100.0
Other	47.0	12.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.6	24.6	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is population who consulted a health provider

consulting traditional healers (at 25 percent).

4.6 Child Deliveries

Table 4.6 shows the percentage of women aged 12 to 49 who had a live birth in the year preceding the survey. Overall, 15 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 6 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate increases to 32 percent (20-24 years group), then peaks at 37 percent for the 25-29 cohort and finally drops to around 8 percent for the 40+ age group. In addition, 97 percent of pregnant women received prenatal care.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that the birth rate in remote villages is higher than in accessible villages, at rates of 19 and 12 percent, respectively. Both have their highest birth rates in the 25-29 years age group, with shares of 39 percent for the females in remote villages and 35 percent for females in accessible villages. It is worth noticing that for the age-group 15-19 years, 10 percent of females in remote villages gave birth compared to around 2 percent in accessible villages. Moreover, more women received prenatal care in accessible villages (100 percent) than in remote villages (94 percent).

Although the breakdown by poverty status does not show remarkable differences in the overall birth rate between poor and non-poor, the age specific birth rates show wide variations between the two. The highest birth rate observed among poor females in the preceding year was around 40 percent for the 20-24 cohort, while in non-poor households the highest share is 38 percent in the 25-29 cohort. Females from poor households report higher birth rates at older ages than those from non-poor households. For the 40+ cohort, 16 percent of females from poor households gave birth while from the share for females from non-poor households is virtually null. Regarding prenatal care, 99 percent of pregnant women in non-poor households received the care compared to 94 percent in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the highest birth rates correspond to the 'self-employed-agriculture' category with a rate of 16 percent followed by the 'other' at a rate of 12 percent, whereas the employees and self employed in non-agricultural activities report the lowest shares, of around 9 percent each. Interestingly, 34 percent of female employees reported birth in the 20-24 age group whereas for the rest age-groups the share is virtually null. With the above exception, all other socio-economic groups reported highest birth rates for females between 25 and 29 years with shares of 79 percent for the 'other' category, 38 percent for 'self-employed agriculture' and 27 percent for the 'self employed-other' category. Virtually all pregnant women (100 percent) in all socio-economic groups, except the 'self-employed other' (96 percent) received prenatal care.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years

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	5.9	31.5	36.9	19.7	7.8	15.2	96.6
Cluster Location								
Accessible	0.0	1.5	23.2	35.0	15.1	11.3	11.9	100.0
Remote	0.0	10.4	37.7	38.5	26.1	5.0	18.7	94.4
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	3.8	39.8	33.9	31.2	16.3	17.0	94.2
Non-poor	0.0	6.5	27.0	37.6	12.9	0.0	13.9	98.5
Socio-economic group								
Employee	0.0	0.0	33.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.5	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	6.5	30.1	38.3	24.0	8.6	16.4	96.1
Self-employed - other	0.0	0.0	23.6	27.0	4.3	0.0	9.4	100.0
Other	0.0	7.0	53.4	78.5	0.0	6.7	12.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is females aged 12 or older.

Table 4.7: Percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by place of birth

	Hospital	Health centre	Dispensary	Health post	At home	Other	Total
Total	17.7	3.5	11.4	0.0	65.5	2.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	26.8	5.4	17.6	0.0	47.3	2.9	100.0
Remote	9.6	1.8	5.8	0.0	81.7	1.2	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	12.9	3.2	6.5	0.0	75.1	2.3	100.0
Non-poor	20.9	3.7	14.6	0.0	59.0	1.8	100.0
Socio-economic group							
Employee	53.6	19.7	3.8	0.0	19.8	3.1	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	12.3	3.1	11.5	0.0	70.9	2.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	51.9	0.0	15.3	0.0	32.8	0.0	100.0
Other	44.1	0.0	10.9	0.0	45.1	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

preceding the survey. Roughly, 66 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place at a home, 18 percent at a hospital, 11 percent at a dispensary, 4 percent at a health care and 2 percent in 'other' locations.

There are sharp differences in distribution of births according to cluster location. Women from accessible villages reported births in hospitals and dispensaries at 27 and 18 percent respectively, while the shares for women from remote villages are10 and 6 percent respectively. In turn, the latter reported a higher rate of births at home than the former, at rates of 81 and 47 percent respectively. Similar differences are observed by poverty status, with non-poor households resembling accessible villages.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that hospitals are the most common place for deliveries for the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, with shares of 54 and 52 percent, respectively. It is worth noticing that an equal proportion of deliveries for the employees took place at a home and a health centre (20 percent). For the self-employed in agriculture, the most common place for child deliveries was home, with a share of 71 percent of the deliveries. Regarding the 'other' socio-economic category, the share of deliveries at a hospital and at a home was almost similar.

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.

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	1.5	35.5	3.4	5.8	53.2	0.6	100.0	40.3
Cluster Location								
Accessible	2.9	55.1	3.1	6.3	32.0	0.7	100.0	61.0
Remote	0.3	18.0	3.6	5.3	72.2	0.6	100.0	21.9
Poverty Status								
Poor	1.3	21.3	3.1	4.8	68.2	1.3	100.0	25.6
Non-poor	1.6	45.0	3.6	6.4	43.2	0.2	100.0	50.2
Socio-economic group								
Employee	0.0	77.1	0.0	16.0	6.9	0.0	100.0	77.1
Self-employed - agriculture	1.8	29.7	3.9	4.3	59.6	0.7	100.0	35.4
Self-employed - other	0.0	79.4	0.0	12.4	8.1	0.0	100.0	79.4
Other	0.0	54.9	0.0	16.2	28.9	0.0	100.0	54.9

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

Overall, 40 percent of the deliveries were attended by a health professional, mostly by midwives (36 percent) and Traditional Birth Assistants (TBAs) (6 percent). A further 53 percent were unassisted deliveries. Doctors or nurses attended around 2 percent of the deliveries in the district.

The analysis by cluster location shows that 61 percent of the deliveries in accessible villages were attended by a health professional compared to 22 percent of deliveries in remote villages. Accessible villages report a higher share of deliveries attended by midwives (55 percent) than remote villages (18 percent). In turn, the latter report a higher proportion of unassisted deliveries than the former, with shares of 72 and 32 percent respectively.

The analysis by poverty status shows that non-poor households report a higher share of births attended by midwives than poor households, whereas the latter report a higher share of unassisted deliveries than the former.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the 'self-employed other' category report the highest share of deliveries attended by health professionals (at 79 percent) followed closely by employees (77 percent). The 'other' category and the self-employed in agriculture comes third and fourth, with rates of 55 and 35 percent, respectively. For most of the socio economic groups, midwives attended deliveries are the most common followed by a fairly high proportion of unassisted deliveries. The

employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, report the highest shares of births attended by midwives, with rates of 77 and 79 percent, respectively. The self-employed in agriculture reported the highest share of unassisted child deliveries, at 60 percent while the employees report the lowest share at 7 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 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

Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates

	Nutritional status indicators		Program participation		
	Stunted	Wasted	Nutrition	Weigh-in	Vaccinated
Total	17.6	1.4	52.1	95.5	89.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	10.6	0.9	53.2	99.3	95.8
Remote	23.8	1.8	51.1	92.2	83.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	21.4	1.5	54.5	94.0	87.2
Non-poor	15.2	1.3	50.6	96.8	90.5
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	14.1	0.0	58.9	100.0	96.1
Self-employed - agriculture	18.5	1.0	51.9	94.8	87.5
Self-employed - other	3.9	4.4	57.0	100.0	97.5
Other	18.7	5.3	45.4	100.0	100.0
Gender and age in completed years					
Male	18.8	2.0	53.4	94.6	89.1
0	18.0	4.2	49.7	92.8	89.7
1	31.5	0.0	52.1	92.7	85.9
2	6.9	0.0	56.1	98.9	98.9
3	18.1	3.4	56.6	95.2	89.0
4	20.4	2.3	54.3	94.4	78.5
Female	16.3	0.7	50.7	96.5	88.9
0	2.1	0.0	52.8	96.0	88.1
1	24.3	0.0	44.4	98.2	95.1
2	23.4	2.4	56.1	98.6	90.1
3	19.6	1.0	54.0	94.0	85.1
4	5.7	0.0	45.3	95.0	84.5
Orphan status					
Orphaned	32.0	0.0	40.2	100.0	67.0
Not-orphaned	16.8	1.4	52.6	95.3	90.0
Foster status					
Fostered	10.0	0.0	28.0	81.2	72.4
Not-fostered	17.8	1.4	52.9	95.9	89.9

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

malnutrition; it is indicative of long term inadequacy of nutrient intake, and is commonly associated with poor economic conditions and chronic or repeated infections.

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

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

Overall, about one half of the children (52 percent) participate in nutrition programs,

4 Health

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	65.0	91.2	91.3	87.6	83.7	37.1	92.0	88.0	83.4	49.5
Cluster Location										
Accessible	79.2	96.6	96.9	94.0	91.5	56.3	96.9	94.0	91.5	60.0
Remote	52.4	86.3	86.2	81.9	76.7	20.1	87.7	82.6	76.2	40.3
Poverty Status										
Poor	56.3	89.6	90.0	84.2	78.8	27.7	90.7	84.6	78.2	44.3
Non-poor	71.0	92.5	92.4	90.1	87.1	43.5	93.2	90.5	87.1	53.2
Socio-economic group										
Employed	91.8	100.0	100.0	91.8	91.8	65.7	100.0	91.8	91.8	57.6
Self-employed - agric	62.6	90.0	90.4	86.7	82.5	33.9	91.3	87.2	82.2	47.8
Self-employed - other	77.1	100.0	95.7	95.7	95.7	64.8	95.7	95.7	95.7	58.4
Other	73.2	94.6	94.6	90.8	84.6	42.2	94.6	90.8	84.6	63.1
Gender and age in completed years										
Male	63.7	90.7	90.1	86.3	82.5	35.6	91.1	86.8	82.5	50.4
0	12.6	87.1	83.4	71.0	58.4	32.1	87.0	72.8	58.4	14.1
1	80.1	90.7	90.7	90.7	90.7	39.8	90.7	90.7	90.7	59.1
2	87.9	93.4	93.4	93.4	91.8	42.1	93.4	93.4	91.8	63.3
3	81.1	88.6	91.0	91.0	91.0	24.5	91.0	91.0	91.0	66.3
4	85.6	97.2	97.2	94.5	94.5	43.1	97.2	94.5	94.5	71.5
Female	66.4	91.7	92.5	89.0	84.9	38.8	93.0	89.3	84.4	48.6
0	16.4	92.8	81.6	74.5	65.4	35.0	84.3	76.2	65.4	13.3
1	78.5	92.7	96.5	92.4	90.3	46.1	96.5	92.4	90.3	42.8
2	77.6	98.6	98.6	94.9	94.9	46.9	98.6	94.9	94.9	52.7
3	82.4	88.1	93.9	91.7	89.6	25.1	93.9	91.7	87.2	68.6
4	74.7	84.5	90.2	90.2	81.7	40.1	90.2	90.2	81.7	68.5

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

96 percent participate in weigh-in programs, and 89 percent in vaccination programs. In contrast, around 1 percent is wasted and 18 percent is stunted.

Analysis by cluster location shows that children from households in remote villages have higher shares of wasting than those from accessible villages, with shares of 24 and 11 percent, respectively. While there are no remarkable differences in rates of wasted children and participation in nutrition programs, children from accessible villages report higher participation rates in weigh-in and vaccination programs than their counterparts.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher stunting rate than children from non-poor households (21 and 15 percent respectively), with no wide differences in the stunting rate and participation in all the three programs.

Regarding socio-economic status, the 'other' group and self-employed in agriculture report the highest rates of stunted children, at 19 percent. Employees report a null rate of wasting, while all other social economic groups report rates of between 1 and 5 with the highest reported by the 'other' category (5 percent). The latter group also shows the lowest share of children participating in nutrition program (45 percent). The self employed in agriculture reported the lowest shares of children participating in weigh-in and vaccination programs (95 and 88 percent) while the remaining categories report rates of around 100 percent.

The gender breakdown does not show wide variation between boys and girls in nutritional status indicators and program participation. The split by age indicate that rate of participation in all the three programs increases with age and peaks at age of 2 years for boys and at age of one year for girls followed by a decline, no

clear trend was observed with nutritional status.

A child is considered orphan if he/she is under 18 years old and has lost at least one parent. In turn, a child is considered fostered when at least one of his/her parents does not leave at home. The breakdown by orphan status shows that the rate of stunting is higher among orphaned than non-orphaned children at 32 and 17 percent respectively. Regarding program participation, orphaned children are less likely to participate in nutrition and vaccination programs than non-orphaned children.

In turn, the breakdown by foster status shows that non-fostered children report a higher rate of stunting (18 percent) than non-fostered children (10 percent). Unexpectedly, fostered children report lower rate of participation in all three health programs.

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received. Overall, 65 percent of children under 5 years have been vaccinated against measles, 91 against BCG and roughly between 83 and 92 percent received vaccination against DPT and OPV (except for OPV0, at 37 percent). Finally, 50 percent of the children in the district received vitamin A supplements.

Analysis by cluster location shows wide differences in the shares of vaccinated children between those from households in accessible and remote villages, whereby the former reports higher shares in all types of vaccination and vitamin A supplements than their counterparts.

Non-poor households report higher shares of children vaccinated in almost all types of vaccination except for BCG, DPT1 and OPV1 where the share is almost equal between poor and non-poor households.

The socio-economic breakdown shows that, the 'self-employed agriculture' category reports remarkably low percentages of vaccination received by type, while employees and self employed in non agricultural activities tend to report the highest rates of vaccination received.

The gender breakdown does not show wide differences between the rate of boys and girls receiving vaccinations and vitamin A supplements. The age breakdown shows interesting insights. Among boys, there is a clear trend for all types of vaccination, whereby the percentage of children vaccinated increases with age to maximum rate at age of 4 years. The trend less clear among girls but, for most vaccination types with the exception of measles, BCG, OPV0 and vitamin A supplements, the rate increases from zero years and peaks at age of 2 years.

Table 4.11 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information. Overall, the information for 94 percent of the vaccinated children was supported by a vaccination card.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that vaccination among children from households in accessible villages tends to be more supported by vaccination cards than in remote villages. In turn, the breakdown by poverty status does not show wide differences in the percentage of vaccinations supported by cards between poor and non-poor households. Similarly

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

	Health Card	Other	Total
Total	93.8	6.2	100.0
Cluster Location			
Accessible	95.6	4.4	100.0
Remote	92.1	7.9	100.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	92.1	7.9	100.0
Non-poor	94.9	5.1	100.0
Socio-economic group			
Employed	91.8	8.2	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	93.7	6.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	95.7	4.3	100.0
Other	96.1	3.9	100.0
Gender and age in completed years			
Male	94.3	5.7	100.0
0	80.7	19.3	100.0
1	100.0	0.0	100.0
2	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	100.0	0.0	100.0
4	97.2	2.8	100.0
Female	93.3	6.7	100.0
0	83.4	16.6	100.0
1	94.1	5.9	100.0
2	96.2	3.8	100.0
3	95.7	4.3	100.0
4	97.0	3.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

there are no wide differences in shares of vaccination supported by vaccination cards among various socio-economic groups.

Finally, the age breakdown shows that children under the age of 1 year report lower shares of health card than children aged 1 and above years.

5 Employment

This chapter examines employment indicators for the population of Meatu 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 71 percent of the adult population is employed and 25 percent underemployed. Unemployment is virtually 0 percent and the inactivity rate is 3 percent. Households from remote villages are more likely to be employed than households from accessible villages at 75 and 68 percent respectively. The

Table 5.1 - Percentage distribution of the population by work status (age 15 and above)

	Working			Not working			Total
	Employed	Under emp.	Total	Unemploy.	Inactive	Total	Total
Total	71.3	25.4	96.7	0.0	3.2	3.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	67.9	27.5	95.4	0.1	4.6	4.6	100.0
Remote	74.8	23.3	98.1	0.0	1.9	1.9	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	72.9	24.6	97.5	0.0	2.5	2.5	100.0
Non-poor	70.3	26.0	96.3	0.1	3.6	3.7	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	64.1	31.9	96.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	100.0
15-29	71.2	24.6	95.8	0.0	4.2	4.2	100.0
30-49	52.7	46.6	99.4	0.0	0.6	0.6	100.0
50-64	71.2	25.9	97.1	0.0	2.9	2.9	100.0
65+	64.2	15.0	79.1	0.0	20.9	20.9	100.0
Female	78.3	19.2	97.5	0.1	2.4	2.5	100.0
15-29	83.3	14.3	97.6	0.0	2.4	2.4	100.0
30-49	69.7	29.7	99.4	0.2	0.4	0.6	100.0
50-64	87.5	12.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	76.2	6.2	82.4	0.0	17.6	17.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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.

5 Employment

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	96.8	0.0	26.3	96.4	0.1	38.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	95.4	0.1	28.8	96.2	0.3	44.9
Remote	98.1	0.0	23.8	96.6	0.0	30.2
Poverty Status						
Poor	97.5	0.0	25.2	95.5	0.0	31.2
Non-poor	96.4	0.1	27.0	96.8	0.2	41.2
Gender and age						
Male	96.0	0.0	33.2	97.0	0.0	40.2
15-29	95.8	0.0	25.7	95.5	0.0	38.5
30-49	99.4	0.0	46.9	99.7	0.0	48.9
50-64	97.1	0.0	26.6	97.0	0.0	25.1
65+	79.1	0.0	18.9	85.0	0.0	18.5
Female	97.6	0.1	19.7	93.5	0.8	27.6
15-29	97.6	0.0	14.7	100.0	0.0	27.6
30-49	99.6	0.2	29.8	97.8	1.5	38.6
50-64	100.0	0.0	12.5	100.0	0.0	16.4
65+	82.4	0.0	7.6	77.5	0.0	9.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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	80.9	16.2	97.1	0.0	97.1	2.9	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	79.8	15.2	95.0	0.0	95.0	5.0	100.0
Remote	81.9	17.3	99.2	0.0	99.2	0.8	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	79.4	19.8	99.1	0.0	99.1	0.9	100.0
Non-poor	82.0	13.5	95.4	0.0	95.4	4.6	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	76.4	20.6	97.0	0.0	97.0	3.0	100.0
15-16	94.8	5.2	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
17-19	76.3	21.2	97.5	0.0	97.5	2.5	100.0
20-21	73.5	21.9	95.4	0.0	95.4	4.6	100.0
22-23	43.0	48.4	91.4	0.0	91.4	8.6	100.0
Female	85.3	11.9	97.2	0.0	97.2	2.8	100.0
15-16	90.8	6.9	97.7	0.0	97.7	2.3	100.0
17-19	90.5	8.2	98.7	0.0	98.7	1.3	100.0
20-21	77.5	15.8	93.3	0.0	93.3	6.7	100.0
22-23	77.0	20.4	97.4	0.0	97.4	2.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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.

breakdown by poverty status shows no strong correlation with work status. For both genders, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 30 and 49.

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	2.3	32.5	4.2	61.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	4.2	29.1	6.4	60.3	100.0
Remote	0.5	35.8	2.1	61.6	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.6	31.4	2.4	65.5	100.0
Non-poor	3.4	33.2	5.4	58.1	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	3.5	53.1	5.8	37.6	100.0
15-29	2.2	19.0	2.0	76.7	100.0
30-49	5.9	78.3	11.6	4.1	100.0
50-64	0.9	94.8	4.4	0.0	100.0
65+	3.1	89.7	2.6	4.6	100.0
Female	1.2	13.2	2.7	82.9	100.0
15-29	1.0	1.8	2.1	95.0	100.0
30-49	1.5	21.5	3.2	73.8	100.0
50-64	1.4	23.8	4.1	70.7	100.0
65+	0.0	34.7	1.9	63.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

Around 47 percent of the males in this group are underemployed, whereas the share for females is 30 percent.

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

5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads

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

The gender breakdown shows that in the general population males are more likely to be underemployed than females, with rates of 33 and 20 percent, respectively. A similar difference is observed for the household heads.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that underemployment rates tend to decrease with age of the household head and individuals in the total population. Table 5.2

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 97 percent. However, underemployment is lower: 16 percent of workers is underemployed, as opposed to 26 percent of workers for the whole adult population. The analysis by cluster location and poverty status revealed no strong correlation with work status.

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

5.2 Working population

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

41

5 Employment

Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer

	State/NGO/ Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	1.9	37.2	60.9	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	3.3	36.5	60.3	100.0
Remote	0.6	37.9	61.5	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.4	34.1	65.5	100.0
Non-poor	2.9	39.2	57.9	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	3.0	59.4	37.6	100.0
15-29	1.9	21.4	76.7	100.0
30-49	5.0	90.8	4.1	100.0
50-64	0.9	99.1	0.0	100.0
65+	3.1	92.4	4.6	100.0
Female	0.9	16.3	82.8	100.0
15-29	1.1	4.3	94.6	100.0
30-49	0.7	25.5	73.8	100.0
50-64	1.4	27.9	70.7	100.0
65+	0.0	36.5	63.5	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

Table 5.6 - Percentage distribution of the working population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	Pub & priv services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	87.4	0.6	4.1	6.1	1.8	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	80.4	0.6	6.9	8.8	3.3	100.0
Remote	94.3	0.5	1.3	3.4	0.4	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	93.1	0.3	1.5	4.2	0.9	100.0
Non-poor	83.8	0.8	5.7	7.3	2.4	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	87.5	1.2	5.7	3.3	2.4	100.0
15-29	88.7	0.5	3.1	6.6	1.1	100.0
30-49	83.4	2.0	10.3	0.0	4.3	100.0
50-64	94.8	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.9	100.0
65+	91.6	2.6	3.1	2.7	0.0	100.0
Female	87.3	0.0	2.6	8.8	1.3	100.0
15-29	86.7	0.0	2.3	10.1	0.9	100.0
30-49	93.3	0.0	3.2	1.2	2.3	100.0
50-64	78.9	0.0	2.7	18.3	0.0	100.0
65+	66.9	0.0	1.9	31.3	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

domestic workers) at 61 percent and the 'self-employed in agriculture' at 33 percent. 4 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 than in accessible villages at 36 and 29 percent respectively. Poor households report a higher share of self-employed workers in other activities than non-poor households at 66 and 58 percent respectively.

The gender breakdown shows that males report higher shares self-employed in

Table 5.7 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, sex and activity

	Employee		Self-employed Agriculture		Self-employed Other		Other		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	9.1	7.4	90.1	82.9	90.9	89.5	0.0	0.0	87.5	87.3
Mining & non-primary	6.7	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
Services	74.8	81.3	5.2	9.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	5.7	2.6
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	8.7	9.9	0.0	100.0	3.3	8.8
Other	9.4	11.3	3.2	5.4	0.5	0.4	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.3

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

	Government		Private		Household		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	0.0	0.0	69.4	100.0	89.5	87.9	87.5	87.3
Mining & non-primary	4.3	0.0	30.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
Services	95.7	81.5	0.0	0.0	3.7	2.1	5.7	2.6
Domestic duties	0.0	18.5	0.0	0.0	3.3	8.7	3.3	8.8
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	1.3	2.4	1.3

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

agriculture and in non-agricultural activities, while females report a higher share in 'other' activities. The cut down by age-groups shows that the share of employees peaks for males in the 30-49 cohort (6 percent), the self-employed in agriculture for 50-64 at 95 percent, the 'self-employed other' for 30-49 males (12 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 37 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 98 percent of the working population.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong correlation with the working population by employer. 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 77 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 93 percent of the working population. 87 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, and 6 percent in domestic duties.

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

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are agriculture and household duties, accounting for 96 percent of the working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less concentrated, with 9 percent in other activities.

43

The breakdown by age-groups shows that, for both genders, younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to other duties. The share of women in 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 and female labour force is in agriculture. Domestic duties have the second highest share for females at 9 percent while for males, services rank the second most activity at 6 percent. Each of the remaining activities occupies less than 5 percent of the labour force for each gender.

For both genders, virtually all households in the 'other' category work in domestic duties. The employees work mostly in services, with shares of 75 percent for males and 81 percent for females.
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 (86 percent of males, 88 percent of females), but domestic duties also reports important shares (3 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. Overall, 46 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed in agriculture, 7 percent self-employed in other activities, 43 percent is in 'other' activities and 4 percent is formed by employees.

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

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report a higher

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	4.3	45.8	7.3	42.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	6.4	44.9	10.8	37.9	100.0
Remote	1.9	46.9	3.2	48.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	0.0	43.8	2.9	53.3	100.0
Non-poor	6.9	47.0	10.0	36.1	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	6.8	60.5	8.7	24.0	100.0
15-29	7.8	31.2	0.0	61.0	100.0
30-49	7.1	74.9	14.1	3.8	100.0
50-64	3.3	86.1	10.6	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	86.1	13.9	0.0	100.0
Female	0.4	22.5	5.1	71.9	100.0
15-29	0.0	4.7	8.1	87.2	100.0
30-49	0.8	30.5	4.0	64.7	100.0
50-64	0.0	41.8	0.0	58.2	100.0
65+	0.0	48.3	0.0	51.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

Table 5.10 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population
by employer

	State/NGO/Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	3.8	53.7	42.5	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	5.3	56.8	37.9	100.0
Remote	1.9	50.1	48.0	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	46.7	53.3	100.0
Non-poor	6.0	57.9	36.1	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	5.9	70.1	24.0	100.0
15-29	6.4	32.5	61.0	100.0
30-49	6.3	89.9	3.8	100.0
50-64	3.3	96.7	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.4	27.6	71.9	100.0
15-29	0.0	12.8	87.2	100.0
30-49	0.8	34.5	64.7	100.0
50-64	0.0	41.8	58.2	100.0
65+	0.0	48.3	51.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

Table 5.11 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population
by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	private services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	87.0	0.6	7.4	0.6	4.4	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	80.4	0.5	10.8	1.1	7.2	100.0
Remote	94.8	0.7	3.2	0.0	1.2	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	97.1	0.0	0.8	0.0	2.2	100.0
Non-poor	81.0	1.0	11.3	0.9	5.8	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	84.0	1.0	10.5	0.5	4.0	100.0
15-29	89.4	0.0	7.8	1.3	1.5	100.0
30-49	79.8	1.1	13.3	0.0	5.8	100.0
50-64	86.1	0.0	8.9	0.0	5.0	100.0
65+	86.1	13.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	91.7	0.0	2.4	0.8	5.1	100.0
15-29	88.5	0.0	3.2	2.2	6.2	100.0
30-49	92.5	0.0	2.3	0.0	5.2	100.0
50-64	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

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.

For males, the employees peak at 8 percent in the 15-29 cohort. The shares of self-employed in agriculture tend to increase with age. 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 share self-employed in agriculture tends to increase with age, and the share in 'other' activities

5 Employment

Table 5.12 Percentage distribution of the unemployed population by reason

	No work available	Seasonal inactivity	Student	HH/Family duties	Age: too old	Age: too young	Infirmity	Retired	Other	Total
Total	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
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	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
30-49	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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	29.8	0.0	34.6	0.0	30.9	0.0	4.7	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	41.6	0.0	29.4	0.0	22.5	0.0	6.5	100.0
Remote	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.6	0.0	52.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	0.0	9.3	0.0	54.0	0.0	21.7	0.0	15.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	0.0	39.1	0.0	25.7	0.0	35.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	0.0	0.0	24.3	0.0	26.4	0.0	41.5	0.0	7.9	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	57.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.9	0.0	18.7	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	47.5	0.0	52.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.1	0.0	47.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	37.9	0.0	46.6	0.0	15.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	87.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	91.3	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

is highest in the 15-29 cohorts (87 percent) and lowest in the 65+ cohort (52 percent).

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at 54 percent and in second place for the household at 43 percent. The State, NGOs, and other types of employer only account for 4 percent of the underemployed population.The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible villages report a higher percentage of underemployed population working for a private employer than remote villages, and the latter report a higher share working for the household.

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	56.8	50.5	55.3	53.6	83.3	97.8
Cluster Location						
Accessible	61.0	47.5	59.8	56.3	82.9	97.1
Remote	52.4	53.6	50.8	50.9	83.7	98.5
Poverty Status						
Poor	53.7	51.3	48.0	50.0	85.7	97.4
Non-poor	58.6	50.0	60.1	55.9	81.7	98.1
Gender and age						
Male	25.4	16.5	40.4	11.0	76.9	97.3
15-29	42.3	23.7	55.1	19.9	70.5	97.4
30-49	12.3	11.9	33.3	3.8	85.2	99.6
50-64	6.2	6.6	17.0	0.0	78.7	98.5
65+	8.5	7.8	15.0	4.5	75.3	83.4
Female	86.7	83.0	69.6	94.5	89.4	98.3
15-29	98.4	88.9	75.9	98.8	86.9	99.7
30-49	91.9	89.6	73.6	96.5	93.6	99.6
50-64	51.8	61.6	57.2	88.7	93.2	97.3
65+	26.9	37.1	20.8	61.0	79.1	82.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed males are concentrated in private employers at 70 percent. In turn, underemployed females report a higher share working for households at 72 percent against 24 percent of males.

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). For both genders the share working for a private employer tends to increase with age, whereas the shares working for households tend to decrease with age.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. Overall, 87 percent of the underemployed workers are dedicated to agriculture, and 7 percent to services, with the remaining activities reporting shares between 1 and 4 percent.

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

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed females have a higher share dedicated to agriculture than underemployed males, who have a higher share in services. The age breakdown shows that the share of underemployed males working in services decreases with age, while the share dedicated to agriculture tends to increases with age. In turn, the share of underemployed females dedicated to agriculture increases constantly with age.

5.4 Unemployed and Inactive Population

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

Table 5.13 shows the main causes of economic inactivity. Overall, being too old

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	50.5	34.1	34.0	34.5	69.1	84.4
Cluster Location						
Accessible	57.2	35.6	41.8	40.5	69.1	86.9
Remote	43.6	32.5	25.9	28.4	69.2	81.7
Poverty Status						
Poor	44.8	34.1	28.7	31.5	69.5	80.7
Non-poor	54.8	34.1	38.1	36.9	68.8	87.2
Gender and age						
Male	33.0	17.0	26.8	11.7	68.4	80.4
5-9	18.1	7.3	6.7	1.0	67.7	68.8
10-14	48.4	27.1	47.6	22.8	69.2	92.3
Female	65.5	48.8	40.2	54.2	69.7	87.8
5-9	37.4	18.7	20.5	15.8	66.2	77.7
10-14	87.0	71.8	55.3	83.6	72.5	95.5
Orphan status						
Orphaned	43.3	28.2	34.2	32.2	62.5	86.2
Not-orphaned	51.7	34.9	34.0	34.8	69.8	84.0
Foster status						
Fostered	58.7	38.3	39.2	44.4	59.6	91.7
Non- Fostered	50.1	33.5	33.2	33.5	70.3	83.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

is the main cause for inactivity (35 percent), followed by infirmity (31 percent) and being too old (30 percent).

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

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 was reported by a higher share of the inactive population in poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that females report being a student or being too old more frequently than males, who in turn report infirmity more often. For both genders, being a student and being too old are concentrated in specific age-groups: the youngest (15-29) and the oldest (65+) cohorts. Infirmity is also concentrated in the older cohorts for males, but in females the share tends to decrease with age.

5.5 Household Tasks

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

Remote villages report a higher share of population fetching firewood than accessible villages. In turn, the latter report higher shares cleaning the toilet and cooking than the former.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report higher shares of population cleaning toilets and cooking, while poor households report a higher share in taking care of children.

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 69 and 95 percent. The shares for males range from 17 to 77 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 show sharp decreases in the oldest cohort.

5.6 Child Labour

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

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

The breakdown by orphan status shows that non-orphaned children are more likely to undertake most of the activities, except for cleaning the toilet and taking care of the elderly and sick. Similarly, fostered children are more likely to undertake most of the household tasks under analysis than non-fostered children.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that 57 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activities are mostly household duties and agriculture activities at 60 and 40 percent respectively. The particular activity does not show evident correlation with cluster location or poverty status.

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

The breakdown by orphan and foster status shows stark differences. Orphaned children are more likely to be working than non-orphaned children, at rates of 75 and 54 percent, respectively. Similarly, fostered children are more likely to be working than non-fostered children, at rates of 75 and 54 percent, respectively. Orphaned children are more likely to work in agriculture than non-orphaned children, who in turn report a higher share working for the household.

Table 5.16 - Child labour (age 5 to 14)

		Main activity			Employer	
	Working	Agriculture	Household	Other	Private	Household
Total	56.5	39.6	60.4	0.0	0.1	99.9
Cluster Location						
Accessible	58.3	34.2	65.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	54.7	45.2	54.8	0.0	0.2	99.8
Poverty Status						
Poor	58.7	41.5	58.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	54.9	38.1	61.9	0.0	0.2	99.8
Gender and age						
Male	52.6	42.1	57.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-9	36.0	27.1	72.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	98.0	57.3	42.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	60.2	37.4	62.6	0.0	0.2	99.8
5-9	39.5	18.8	81.2	0.0	0.5	99.5
10-14	99.8	51.5	48.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Orphan status						
Orphaned	74.6	49.8	50.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Not-orphaned	54.1	38.0	62.0	0.0	0.1	99.9
Foster status						
Fostered	74.6	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non- Fostered	53.6	39.1	60.9	0.0	0.1	99.9

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

5 Employment

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES

This chapter presents the perceptions on welfare status and changes in Meatu 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 47 percent of all households in the district reported a positive change in the economic situation of their community. 28 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. Even though 23 percent of the respondents reported the community's economic condition to have deteriorated; only 2 percent reported the situation to be much worse.

Cluster location of the household shows some correlation with the perceived economic change. 15 percent of the households in accessible clusters report their community's economic situation to be deteriorating compared to 32 percent of those living in remote clusters. Further breakdown by poverty status revealed no strong correlation with the perceived economic change.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households with one or two members at 49 and 43 percent respectively. Furthermore, 55 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation compared to 44 percent of households owning no land. Likewise, the percentage of households owning small livestock who reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation is higher than that of households owning no livestock at 61 and 40 percent respectively.

While 52 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category reported an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for households whose main income earner belongs to the 'employee' and 'other' categories is about 29 percent each. In contrast, while 38 percent of the households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category reported deterioration in their community's economic situation, the share for households belonging to the 'other' and 'self-employed other' categories is about 18 percent each.

Furthermore, 48 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 16 percent. In contrast, 53 percent of households

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

where the head is single or polygamous reported improving conditions in their community's economic situation, whereas the share for households where the head has a loose union is virtually null. It is also observed that the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported worsening conditions in their community's economic situation is 16 percentage points higher

than that of households where the head has no formal education at 37 and 21 percent respectively. Lastly, while 48 percent of male-headed households reported an improvement in their community's economic situation, the share for female-headed households is 44 percent.

6.1.2 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Household

Table 6.2 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of their economic situation compared to the year before the survey. Only 36 percent of the households reported an improvement in their economic conditions, while 26 percent reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

44 percent of households located in remote clusters reported worsening conditions in the economic situation of their households compared to 34 percent of households located in accessible clusters. Likewise, 42 percent of poor households reported worsening economic conditions of their households' situation compared to 37 percent of non-poor households.

The percentage of households with one or two members who reported deterioration in the economic conditions of their households is higher than that of households with seven or more members at 42 and 37 percent respectively. On the other hand, 46 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported improving conditions in the economic situation of their households compared to 36 percent of households owning no land. Disaggregation of the data further shows that 47 percent of households owning large livestock reported improving economic conditions in their households' economic situation compared to 30 percent of households owning no livestock.

The percentage of households belonging to the 'employee' category who reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households is higher than that of households whose main income earner belongs to the 'other' category at 56 and 22 percent respectively. Similarly, while 68 percent of households

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	2.3	20.5	27.8	47.0	0.2	2.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	3.3	11.8	32.0	48.5	0.4	4.0	100.0
Remote	1.2	30.5	23.1	45.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.6	18.9	28.3	48.5	0.0	2.7	100.0
Non-poor	2.7	21.3	27.7	46.1	0.3	1.9	100.0
Household size							
1-2	4.0	28.4	17.2	42.7	0.0	7.7	100.0
3-4	3.6	26.2	27.9	40.3	0.0	2.0	100.0
5-6	1.0	17.7	28.6	50.3	0.7	1.7	100.0
7+	2.3	18.2	29.9	48.5	0.0	1.1	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	3.0	21.6	27.7	43.9	0.0	3.8	100.0
< 1 ha	2.9	0.0	28.6	43.3	0.0	25.2	100.0
1-1.99 ha	0.0	14.8	26.1	54.6	4.5	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	2.7	23.1	31.4	42.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	0.0	29.8	35.4	34.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	2.7	18.2	24.0	54.8	0.0	0.3	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	2.5	24.1	29.8	39.7	0.4	3.5	100.0
Small only	0.0	14.6	22.5	60.9	0.0	2.0	100.0
Large only	3.1	18.8	25.4	52.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	2.8	16.6	27.0	53.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	37.7	33.3	29.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	2.6	20.2	26.5	49.3	0.0	1.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	2.5	14.9	21.0	52.1	0.0	9.5	100.0
Other	0.0	18.2	47.3	26.7	3.2	4.7	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	2.7	20.5	28.3	47.6	0.3	0.7	100.0
Female	0.6	20.8	25.8	44.0	0.0	8.8	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	8.1	8.0	22.6	53.0	0.0	8.1	100.0
Monogamous	2.9	20.5	29.5	45.5	0.4	1.2	100.0
Polygamous	2.3	19.7	24.6	53.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	48.3	51.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	0.0	21.8	27.7	42.5	0.0	8.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	0.3	20.9	25.7	48.6	0.0	4.5	100.0
Primary	3.5	18.6	29.2	48.1	0.0	0.6	100.0
Secondary +	2.7	33.5	27.4	30.9	2.8	2.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	9.0	29.3	25.7	35.2	0.8	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	12.0	21.8	28.2	36.8	1.3	0.0	100.0
Remote	5.5	38.0	22.9	33.4	0.2	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	8.9	33.2	28.3	28.6	1.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	9.0	27.6	24.5	38.0	0.7	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	23.7	17.8	24.9	33.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	10.2	31.6	25.0	33.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	6.6	31.1	26.0	36.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	6.5	30.0	25.9	35.6	2.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	10.2	27.0	27.0	35.5	0.3	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	42.3	20.0	16.4	21.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	16.3	14.8	38.9	27.8	2.2	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	8.5	31.1	26.2	34.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	9.0	37.3	35.2	18.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	3.6	30.7	20.2	43.8	1.7	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	11.2	29.7	29.7	28.8	0.6	0.0	100.0
Small only	9.4	26.8	18.5	45.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	3.1	28.6	21.9	46.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	5.8	30.0	21.9	40.3	1.9	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	8.3	11.2	24.3	54.2	2.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	7.8	31.6	24.7	35.1	0.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	15.6	20.6	27.9	36.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	15.9	26.3	36.0	21.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	6.7	30.4	24.6	37.2	1.0	0.0	100.0
Female	19.3	24.3	30.6	25.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	0.0	8.1	24.0	67.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	8.5	28.5	23.9	38.0	1.2	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	5.0	33.5	23.8	37.0	0.7	0.0	100.0
Loose union	8.5	48.3	26.4	16.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	18.7	26.2	34.3	20.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	12.9	30.8	29.2	26.8	0.3	0.0	100.0
Primary	7.1	28.8	23.9	39.1	1.0	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	5.5	26.5	22.9	43.7	1.4	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

where the head is single reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households, the share for households where the head has a loose union is 17 percent. In contrast, 57 percent of households where the head has a loose union reported worsening conditions in their households' economic situation.

38 percent of male-headed households reported improving conditions in their households' economic situation compared to 26 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 45 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more reported an improvement in their households economic situation compared to 27

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

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	16.2	27.7	40.6	15.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	20.9	33.2	27.6	18.3	100.0
Remote	10.9	21.5	55.4	12.2	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	2.5	19.8	58.8	18.8	100.0
Non-poor	22.5	31.4	32.1	14.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	26.9	32.5	26.8	13.8	100.0
3-4	18.1	29.7	34.8	17.3	100.0
5-6	13.6	29.7	41.3	15.4	100.0
7+	14.7	24.2	46.0	15.1	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	17.3	34.6	35.5	12.6	100.0
< 1 ha	0.0	14.6	38.8	46.5	100.0
1-1.99 ha	8.4	22.3	34.9	34.4	100.0
2-3.99 ha	12.6	18.2	54.2	14.9	100.0
4-5.99 ha	15.1	16.9	57.4	10.6	100.0
6+ ha	20.1	32.0	34.0	14.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	10.9	28.5	42.5	18.0	100.0
Small only	21.0	13.9	51.9	13.2	100.0
Large only	18.5	38.3	26.6	16.6	100.0
Both	24.1	29.6	35.2	11.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	35.0	27.0	31.0	6.9	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	13.8	28.1	42.8	15.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	30.4	26.5	29.2	13.8	100.0
Other	13.8	25.6	34.5	26.2	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	17.1	28.6	40.4	13.8	100.0
Female	12.0	23.7	41.3	23.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	67.8	18.5	13.7	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	19.3	24.9	39.8	16.1	100.0
Polygamous	11.9	37.2	41.8	9.1	100.0
Loose union	0.0	15.5	26.4	58.1	100.0
Widow/div/sep	9.1	21.2	45.7	23.9	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	9.0	28.2	44.7	18.2	100.0
Primary	18.8	26.7	39.6	14.9	100.0
Secondary +	30.0	33.9	28.9	7.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

percent of households where the head no formal education

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, 44 percent of the district's households never/seldom experienced food shortages while the remaining population experienced food shortages frequently (often/always).

While 54 percent of households in accessible clusters never/seldom experienced food shortages, the share for households in remote clusters is 33 percent. Likewise, 54 percent of non-poor households never/seldom experienced food shortages compared to 23 percent of poor households.

20 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land never experienced problems satisfying food needs, the share for households with less than 1 hectare of land is virtually null. Furthermore, while 27 percent of households with one or two members never experienced food shortages, the share for households with seven or more members is 15 percent. There is also some correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. While 24 percent of households owning both small and large livestock never experienced food shortages, the share for households owning no livestock is 11 percent.

The socio-economic group of the household also shows some correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. 35 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group never experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to 14 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' and 'self-employed agriculture' categories. Furthermore, 68 percent of households where the head is single had never experienced food shortages, whereas the share for households where the head has a loose union is virtually null.

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	94.9	1.7	2.7	0.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	91.7	2.7	4.3	1.3	100.0
Remote	98.5	0.6	0.9	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	95.3	0.3	4.0	0.3	100.0
Non-poor	94.6	2.3	2.2	0.8	100.0
Household size					
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	98.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	94.5	1.9	3.6	0.0	100.0
7+	92.3	2.1	4.0	1.6	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	95.3	1.2	2.7	0.7	100.0
< 1 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	87.6	7.6	4.8	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	96.6	2.1	1.3	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	92.2	2.0	4.4	1.3	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	96.6	0.9	1.9	0.6	100.0
Small only	94.4	1.1	4.5	0.0	100.0
Large only	90.7	4.2	0.0	5.1	100.0
Both	92.7	2.9	4.3	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	83.0	9.8	3.2	4.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	96.2	0.9	2.8	0.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	95.2	3.2	1.6	0.0	100.0
Other	88.2	3.4	3.0	5.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	94.4	2.1	2.7	0.8	100.0
Female	96.9	0.0	3.1	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	93.0	3.0	2.7	1.4	100.0
Polygamous	96.9	0.9	2.2	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	95.4	0.0	4.6	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	98.8	0.0	1.2	0.0	100.0
Primary	95.2	0.6	3.3	0.8	100.0
Secondary +	74.4	17.7	5.3	2.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that male-headed households reported having food shortages less frequently than female-headed households, as 46 percent of male-headed households never / seldom experienced food shortages compared to 36 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, while 30 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 9 percent.

6.2.2 Paying School Fees

Table 6.4 shows the percentage distribution of households by the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey. At the time of the survey, 95 percent of the households in the

**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	97.0	1.8	0.8	0.4	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	94.4	3.3	1.5	0.8	100.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	95.6	2.6	1.1	0.6	100.0
Household size					
1-2	92.5	5.3	0.0	2.2	100.0
3-4	96.4	1.3	1.1	1.1	100.0
5-6	95.3	2.8	1.9	0.0	100.0
7+	99.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	89.8	6.1	2.7	1.5	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	95.2	3.3	1.2	0.4	100.0
Small only	96.8	0.0	1.3	1.9	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	83.1	4.5	12.4	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	98.6	1.2	0.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	89.3	5.4	0.0	5.4	100.0
Other	98.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	97.3	1.5	0.7	0.5	100.0
Female	95.8	3.1	1.1	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	95.9	2.0	1.2	0.9	100.0
Polygamous	98.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	97.0	1.9	1.2	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	99.3	0.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	96.3	2.3	0.6	0.8	100.0
Secondary +	91.8	2.7	5.5	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

district reported that they never had problems paying school fees and only 4 percent of the households reported that they often/always had problems paying school fees. It is worth noting that children in primary state schools do not pay fees. While children in secondary state schools do pay fees, the secondary school enrolment rates are very low (for more details, see chapter 3).

99 percent of households located in remote clusters never experienced problems paying school fees compared to 92 percent of households located in accessible clusters. On the other hand, poverty status does not show correlation with the ability to pay school fees.

Furthermore, smaller households find problems paying school fees less frequently than larger households.

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always
Total	97.9	1.0	0.9	0.2
Cluster Location				
Accessible	96.1	1.9	1.6	0.4
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	97.0	1.4	1.3	0.3
Household size				
1-2	97.8	2.2	0.0	0.0
3-4	98.1	0.7	1.1	0.0
5-6	96.7	1.2	1.4	0.7
7+	98.8	0.6	0.6	0.0
Area of land owned by the household				
None	94.9	2.8	1.5	0.8
< 1 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1-1.99 ha	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0
2-3.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4-5.99 ha	98.4	0.0	1.6	0.0
6+ ha	99.3	0.0	0.7	0.0
Type of livestock owned by the household				
None	97.1	1.3	1.2	0.4
Small only	97.9	2.1	0.0	0.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Both	99.1	0.0	0.9	0.0
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	88.8	7.2	4.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	99.3	0.4	0.3	0.0
Self-employed - other	90.5	4.2	5.4	0.0
Other	96.6	0.0	0.0	3.4
Gender of the head of household				
Male	98.4	0.8	0.6	0.3
Female	95.7	2.0	2.3	0.0
Marital status of the head of household				
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Monogamous	98.2	1.3	0.0	0.5
Polygamous	97.7	0.8	1.5	0.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Widow/div/sep	96.9	0.8	2.4	0.0
Education level of the head of household				
None	98.4	0.4	1.2	0.0
Primary	98.6	0.6	0.8	0.0
Secondary +	90.4	6.5	0.0	3.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

Virtually all households with one or two members never had problems with paying school fees compared to 92 percent of households with seven or more members.

Virtually all households owning 1 hectare of land never experienced problems paying school fees compared to 95 percent of landless households and 92 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land. Likewise, 97 percent of households owning no livestock never had problems with paying school fees, whereas the share for households owning both small and large livestock is 93 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that 96 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category never had

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	33.3	33.0	28.9	4.8	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	42.2	32.1	21.8	4.0	100.0
Remote	23.2	34.1	37.0	5.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	27.2	31.5	39.4	2.0	100.0
Non-poor	36.2	33.6	24.2	6.1	100.0
Household size					
1-2	46.6	21.3	19.3	12.8	100.0
3-4	27.6	31.9	35.0	5.6	100.0
5-6	36.9	37.9	19.8	5.5	100.0
7+	29.8	32.9	35.5	1.9	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	37.9	33.0	25.0	4.2	100.0
< 1 ha	15.8	45.0	33.7	5.5	100.0
1-1.99 ha	23.3	27.6	37.6	11.5	100.0
2-3.99 ha	29.5	38.9	26.8	4.8	100.0
4-5.99 ha	23.9	25.8	41.7	8.6	100.0
6+ ha	37.6	32.7	26.7	2.9	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	30.0	31.9	32.4	5.7	100.0
Small only	41.0	34.3	19.5	5.1	100.0
Large only	38.7	29.9	23.8	7.6	100.0
Both	35.1	35.6	27.4	1.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	67.4	20.0	12.6	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	29.8	32.9	32.6	4.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	40.5	37.9	13.4	8.2	100.0
Other	40.3	38.6	15.7	5.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	34.0	32.7	29.2	4.1	100.0
Female	30.1	34.8	27.3	7.7	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	67.8	26.6	5.6	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	31.3	33.1	31.3	4.3	100.0
Polygamous	35.4	34.3	27.4	2.9	100.0
Loose union	33.4	0.0	58.1	8.5	100.0
Widow/div/sep	30.2	34.1	25.9	9.9	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	29.7	32.8	30.6	7.0	100.0
Primary	32.8	34.2	29.2	3.7	100.0
Secondary +	53.6	25.1	18.6	2.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

problems with paying school fees compared to 83 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee.

Furthermore, virtually all households where the head has a loose union and those where the head is single never had problems paying school fees, compared to 93 percent of households where the head is monogamous. Lastly, nearly all (99 percent) households where the household head has no education ever experienced problems paying school fees compared to 74 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more. Finally, gender does not show strong correlation with the ability to pay school fees.

Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets

	Home	Land	Livestock			Vehicle	Motor-cycle	Bicycle	Wheel barrow
			Small	Large	Both				
Total	80.8	70.9	12.3	7.2	26.5	0.8	1.9	60.8	17.1
Cluster Location									
Accessible	72.2	62.0	10.5	9.3	21.4	1.4	3.3	55.7	21.4
Remote	90.6	81.1	14.4	4.8	32.3	0.0	0.3	66.5	12.2
Poverty Status									
Poor	89.7	79.4	12.0	4.1	29.1	0.0	1.0	45.4	10.9
Non-poor	76.6	66.9	12.5	8.7	25.2	1.1	2.3	67.7	20.0
Household size									
1-2	56.3	54.5	6.3	6.6	4.2	0.0	0.0	42.9	6.6
3-4	68.7	59.4	7.4	3.8	20.8	0.0	0.0	55.0	8.8
5-6	78.5	62.1	19.1	6.0	17.4	0.4	1.2	59.3	12.1
7+	93.8	86.6	10.9	9.7	41.5	1.5	3.8	68.8	27.1
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	40.9	34.7	21.8	0.0	13.4	5.1	5.1	80.2	30.8
Self-employed - agriculture	84.5	75.0	12.0	6.9	28.4	0.3	0.5	60.0	15.3
Self-employed - other	60.4	44.5	15.1	8.5	9.3	3.3	8.1	62.8	27.8
Other	89.9	80.4	6.3	14.1	34.9	0.0	9.4	52.8	15.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	82.4	73.0	13.5	7.8	27.6	0.8	2.3	67.3	19.8
Female	73.0	61.3	7.0	4.6	21.7	0.7	0.0	30.8	4.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

6.2.3 Paying House Rent

Table 6.5 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey. 97 percent households in the district reported that they never had problems paying house rent.

Virtually all households located in remote clusters never had problems paying house rent, whereas the share for households located in accessible clusters was 94 percent. Likewise, virtually all poor households never had problems paying house rent compared to 96 percent of non-poor households.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that virtually all households with seven or more members never had problems paying house rent compared to 93 percent of households with one or two members. Likewise, virtually all households owning one or more hectares of land never had problems paying house rent compared to 90 percent of households owning no land at all.

Furthermore, virtually all households owning large livestock and those owning both small and large livestock never had problems paying house rent compared to 95 percent of households owning no livestock. Likewise, 99 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category never had problems paying house rent compared to 83 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category. Similarly, virtually all households where the head has a loose union and those where the head is single never had problems paying house rent, whereas the share for households where the head is monogamous is 96 percent.

While 99 percent of households where the head has no formal education never had problems paying house rent, the share for households where the head has secondary education or more is 92 percent. Finally, gender does not show strong correlation with the ability to pay house rent.

6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills

Table 6.6 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying utility bills during the year before the survey. 98 percent households in the district never had problems paying utility bills.

Virtually all households located in remote clusters never had problems paying utility bills, whereas the share for households located in accessible clusters is 96 percent. Likewise, virtually all poor households never had problems paying utility bills

Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status

	Own	Rent	Free	Other	Total
Total	80.8	8.9	10.1	0.2	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	72.2	16.7	11.1	0.0	100.0
Remote	90.6	0.0	9.0	0.4	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	89.7	1.0	8.7	0.6	100.0
Non-poor	76.6	12.5	10.8	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	56.3	27.4	16.3	0.0	100.0
3-4	68.7	18.3	11.9	1.1	100.0
5-6	78.5	7.2	14.3	0.0	100.0
7+	93.8	1.4	4.7	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	40.9	45.5	13.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	84.5	4.0	11.2	0.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	60.4	36.7	2.9	0.0	100.0
Other	89.9	6.7	3.4	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	82.4	7.8	9.8	0.0	100.0
Female	73.0	14.1	11.8	1.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

compared to 97 percent of non-poor households.

Furthermore, virtually all households owning 1hectare of land never had problems paying utility bills compared to 95 percent of households owning no land. On the other hand, virtually all households owning large animals never had problems paying utility bills compared to 97 percent of households owning no livestock. Likewise, 99 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' never had problems paying utility bills compared to 89 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category.

Disaggregation of data further shows that virtually all households where the head is single and those where the head has a loose union never had problems paying utility bills compared to 97 percent of households where the head is widowed/divorced or separated. 98 percent of households where the head has no formal education never had problems paying utility bills compared to 90 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more. Finally, gender and household size does not show strong correlation with the ability to pay utility bills.

6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare

Table 6.7 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for healthcare during the year before the survey. 66 percent of the households reported that they never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare in the year prior to the survey. Disaggregation of the data further shows that 42 percent of households located in accessible clusters never experienced problems paying for healthcare compared to 23 percent of households located in remote clusters. Likewise, while 36 percent of non-poor households never experienced problems paying for healthcare, the share for poor households 27 percent.

47 percent of households with one or two members never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 30 percent of households with seven or more members. On the other hand, while 38 percent of households owning no land and those owning six or more hectares of land never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households owning 1 hectare of land is 16 percent.

Furthermore, 41 percent of households owning small livestock never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 30 percent of those owning no livestock. Similarly, while 67 percent of households belonging to the 'employee' category never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' socio-economic group is 30

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

	Title deed	Renting contract	Payment receipt	Other document	No document	Total	Secure tenure
Total	1.9	1.7	2.4	7.0	87.0	100.0	6.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	3.6	3.1	4.5	9.1	79.6	100.0	11.2
Remote	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	95.5	100.0	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	95.8	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	2.8	2.4	3.5	8.3	83.0	100.0	8.7
Household size							
1-2	0.0	8.6	11.6	6.3	73.5	100.0	20.2
3-4	1.5	0.0	1.3	9.2	88.0	100.0	2.8
5-6	2.6	2.0	3.2	7.6	84.6	100.0	7.8
7+	2.1	0.3	0.0	5.7	91.9	100.0	2.4
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	15.9	10.6	9.6	6.3	57.5	100.0	36.1
Self-employed - agriculture	0.4	0.6	1.6	5.8	91.7	100.0	2.6
Self-employed - other	9.9	8.2	8.2	13.9	59.7	100.0	26.3
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	86.7	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	1.9	1.2	1.4	7.1	88.5	100.0	4.4
Female	2.2	3.9	7.3	6.5	80.1	100.0	13.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

	% of hhs using	Fertilizer	Improved seedling	Fingerlings	Hooks and nets	Insecticides	Other
Total	72.7	37.3	79.3	0.0	0.0	70.6	0.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	66.4	46.8	72.8	0.0	0.0	62.8	0.0
Remote	79.8	28.3	85.3	0.0	0.0	77.9	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	73.4	33.1	78.8	0.0	0.0	78.8	0.0
Non-poor	72.2	39.4	79.4	0.0	0.0	66.6	0.0
Household size							
1-2	58.1	44.2	78.4	0.0	0.0	40.5	0.0
3-4	70.3	24.9	85.6	0.0	0.0	77.1	0.0
5-6	73.2	36.7	73.2	0.0	0.0	62.6	0.0
7+	77.0	41.4	81.2	0.0	0.0	79.4	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	59.4	34.9	96.5	0.0	0.0	77.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	76.7	33.9	82.5	0.0	0.0	72.4	0.0
Self-employed - other	40.6	76.8	40.1	0.0	0.0	33.9	0.0
Other	72.3	55.7	54.0	0.0	0.0	68.7	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	74.0	37.6	81.9	0.0	0.0	73.5	0.0
Female	66.5	36.0	65.9	0.0	0.0	55.6	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

percent.

68 percent of households where the household head is single never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 30 percent of households where the household head is widowed/divorced or separated.. While 54 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 30 percent. Finally, gender does not show strong correlation with the ability to pay for healthcare services.

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, 81 percent of the district's households own their dwellings while 71 percent owns some land. 27 percent of all households own both small and large livestock while 12 percent of all households own small livestock. While 61 percent of all households own a bicycle, the share for households owning a motorcycle is 2 percent.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. 91 percent of households located in remote clusters own their dwellings compared to 72 percent of households located in accessible clusters. Likewise, while 90 percent of poor households own their dwellings, the share for non-poor households is 77 percent.

Disaggregation of the data shows that 94 percent of households with seven or more members own their dwellings compared to 56 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 90 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category owns their dwellings, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is 41 percent.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that 82 percent of male-headed households owns their dwellings compared to 73 percent of female-headed households. In contrast, 67 percent of male-headed households owns a bicycle compared to 31 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 69 percent of households with seven or more members owns a bicycle compared to 43 percent of households with one or two members. Similarly, while 80 percent of households where the main income earner is an employee owns a bicycle, the share for households where the head belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group is 53 percent.

Furthermore, while 68 percent of non-poor households owns a bicycle, the share for poor households is 45 percent. Likewise, 67 percent of households located in remote clusters owns a bicycle compared to 56 percent of households located in accessible 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. Only 6 percent of the households possess formal occupancy documentation, which include a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 87 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.

73 percent of all farmers apply agricultural inputs to their farms and the majority (79 percent) of those who use farm inputs use improved seedlings. Further breakdown of the data shows that 80 percent of households in remote clusters apply agricultural inputs compared to 66 percent of households in accessible clusters. Furthermore, poverty status does not show strong correlation with use of agricultural inputs. Disaggregation of the data further shows that as the number of household members increases, the usage of agricultural inputs also tends to increase as 77 percent of households with seven or more members use agricultural inputs compared to 58 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 77 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 'self-employed other' socio-economic group is 41 percent. Likewise, use of agricultural inputs in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households. While 74 percent of male-headed households uses agricultural inputs, the share for female-headed households is 67 percent.

Most households that use agricultural inputs get them from cooperatives (44 percent) and in second place purchase them at an open market (35 percent). While 16 percent of the households obtains their inputs by preparing them themselves, 4 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 38 and 33 percent respectively. In turn, 48 percent of households located in remote clusters gets agricultural inputs from cooperatives compared to 40 percent of households located in accessible clusters. While 38 percent of non-poor households purchases

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	35.4	4.2	0.0	44.0	16.4	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	38.4	0.5	0.0	40.4	20.7	100.0
Remote	32.5	7.8	0.0	47.5	12.2	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	29.6	7.6	0.0	48.7	14.2	100.0
Non-poor	37.8	2.7	0.0	42.0	17.4	100.0
Household size						
1-2	66.5	0.0	0.0	15.6	17.9	100.0
3-4	36.4	5.0	0.0	45.0	13.5	100.0
5-6	28.9	3.2	0.0	44.0	23.9	100.0
7+	33.6	5.5	0.0	49.0	11.8	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	36.2	0.0	0.0	63.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	36.9	5.0	0.0	43.7	14.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	21.0	0.0	0.0	25.9	53.1	100.0
Other	25.1	0.0	0.0	48.1	26.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	34.4	4.6	0.0	46.3	14.7	100.0
Female	40.6	2.2	0.0	32.2	25.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

1. Base is households using agricultural inputs

agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for poor households is 30 percent. On the other hand, 49 percent of poor households gets agricultural inputs from cooperatives compared to 42 percent of non-poor households.

In addition, while 67 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 34 percent. In contrast, the percentage of households with seven or more members who gets agricultural inputs from cooperatives is 33 percentage points higher than that of households with one or two members, at 49 and 16 percent respectively.

37 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 21 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' socio-economic group. In contrast, 64 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category gets agricultural inputs from cooperatives compared to 26 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' category. Lastly, while 41 percent of female-headed households purchases agricultural inputs at an open market, the share for male-headed households is 34

percent. In contrast, 46 percent of male-headed households gets agricultural inputs from cooperatives compared to 32 percent of female-headed households.

6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around 38 percent of households own less than two acres of land (including 29 percent of landless households). 15 percent owns between two and four acres and 47 percent own four or more acres.

Landless households are more common in accessible clusters and households owning large portions of land are more common in remote clusters. On the other hand, the percentage of landless households among non-poor households is higher than that of households, at 33 and 21 percent respectively.

Regarding household size, larger households seem to own larger landholdings more frequently than households with less members as 67 percent of households with seven or more members owns 4 or more acres of land compared to 30 percent of households with one or two members.

While households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category

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	29.1	3.7	4.8	14.9	12.4	35.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	38.0	4.9	5.7	9.2	8.4	33.8	100.0
Remote	18.9	2.2	3.8	21.3	17.0	36.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	20.6	5.6	5.0	21.6	11.4	35.8	100.0
Non-poor	33.1	2.8	4.7	11.8	12.9	34.6	100.0
Household size							
1-2	45.5	9.0	10.2	5.1	14.1	16.1	100.0
3-4	40.6	4.1	5.7	16.9	10.7	22.0	100.0
5-6	37.9	2.1	3.2	20.8	12.5	23.5	100.0
7+	13.4	3.3	4.3	12.0	12.7	54.3	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	65.3	0.0	7.2	4.5	0.0	23.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	25.0	3.1	4.7	15.8	14.4	37.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	55.5	7.8	0.0	11.2	5.4	20.2	100.0
Other	19.6	8.5	10.0	15.7	7.0	39.2	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	27.0	3.0	4.9	14.7	11.7	38.8	100.0
Female	38.7	6.7	4.3	15.9	16.0	18.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

reported the highest share of landless households (65 percent), the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category is 20 percent. In contrast, while 46 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category own four or more acres of land, the share for employees is 23 percent. Finally, male-headed households have larger landholdings (4 or more acres) compared to female-headed households at 51 and 34 percent respectively.

6.4.3 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. Overall, 66 percent of the households own no cattle at all. While 19 percent owns between 2 and 10 heads of cattle, 7 percent owns between 11 and 20 heads of cattle. Households in accessible clusters are more likely to own no cattle compared to households in remote clusters at, 69 and 63 percent respectively. On the other hand, poverty status does not show strong correlation with cattle ownership.

Furthermore, 89 percent of households with one or two members own no cattle, compared to 49 percent of households with seven or more members. Likewise, 87 percent of households belonging to the

compared to 51 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category. Finally, while 74 percent of female-headed households own no cattle, the share for male-headed households is 65 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

41 percent of households reported it was improving, 48 percent said it was the same while 10 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 50 and 33 percent respectively. Likewise, 51 percent of poor households reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 36 percent of non-poor households.

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

	None	1	2-10	11-20	21-50	50+	Total
Total	66.3	0.4	18.6	7.4	5.4	1.9	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	69.3	0.0	17.1	5.6	6.2	1.8	100.0
Remote	62.8	0.8	20.3	9.4	4.6	2.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	66.9	0.5	19.4	9.0	4.2	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	66.2	0.3	18.0	6.7	6.0	2.8	100.0
Household size							
1-2	89.2	0.0	6.3	2.8	0.0	1.6	100.0
3-4	75.3	0.0	14.5	3.0	4.3	2.9	100.0
5-6	76.6	0.7	16.8	3.2	2.7	0.0	100.0
7+	48.7	0.4	24.8	13.6	9.3	3.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	86.6	0.0	0.0	5.1	8.4	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	64.7	0.5	19.5	8.1	5.1	2.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	82.2	0.0	8.5	2.8	3.3	3.2	100.0
Other	50.9	0.0	33.2	6.4	9.4	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	64.6	0.2	18.7	8.1	5.9	2.3	100.0
Female	73.7	0.9	18.0	4.1	3.3	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

'employee' category own no cattle

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

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	0.7	9.1	48.4	33.7	7.1	1.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	1.3	11.4	53.7	29.9	2.6	1.2	100.0
Remote	0.0	6.5	42.4	38.1	12.3	0.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.3	6.7	41.0	41.7	8.7	0.6	100.0
Non-poor	0.4	10.2	51.7	30.2	6.4	1.1	100.0
Household size							
1-2	0.0	7.7	68.7	18.4	3.3	1.9	100.0
3-4	0.0	15.6	42.9	33.4	5.6	2.5	100.0
5-6	1.0	8.0	47.7	32.7	10.3	0.4	100.0
7+	1.0	7.4	46.3	38.4	6.3	0.5	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	1.4	10.2	49.0	32.3	6.3	0.7	100.0
< 1 ha	0.0	2.9	52.3	27.8	11.1	5.9	100.0
1-1.99 ha	0.0	21.4	56.7	21.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	2.0	3.8	43.6	41.9	7.3	1.5	100.0
4-5.99 ha	0.0	8.4	42.6	39.3	7.1	2.5	100.0
6+ ha	0.0	9.6	50.5	31.7	8.2	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	0.8	9.3	50.5	31.7	6.2	1.6	100.0
Small only	0.0	3.3	45.2	43.1	8.5	0.0	100.0
Large only	4.0	20.6	40.1	29.8	5.4	0.0	100.0
Both	0.0	8.3	48.0	34.6	8.7	0.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.0	20.7	34.7	26.5	13.5	4.5	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	0.9	7.8	48.5	34.2	8.0	0.7	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	14.9	51.8	30.8	0.0	2.5	100.0
Other	0.0	9.4	54.2	36.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	0.5	9.7	46.4	35.2	7.4	0.8	100.0
Female	1.6	6.3	57.7	27.0	5.6	1.8	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	0.0	8.1	66.7	17.0	0.0	8.1	100.0
Monogamous	0.0	9.8	45.8	34.9	9.5	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	0.0	9.9	47.4	35.8	5.7	1.4	100.0
Loose union	32.8	16.7	24.1	0.0	0.0	26.4	100.0
Widow/div/sep	1.7	5.3	56.8	31.8	4.4	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	0.8	8.9	48.1	34.7	7.1	0.3	100.0
Primary	0.7	9.0	50.7	31.6	6.9	1.1	100.0
Secondary +	0.0	10.3	32.8	45.2	9.0	2.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

While 44 percent of households with seven or more members reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households with one or two members is 21 percent. Likewise, 40 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 38 percent of households owning no land.

While 51 percent of households owning small livestock reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households owning large livestock is 35 percent.

While 41 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category reported an improvement in the current crime and

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Other	Total
	Principal contributor of income	
Total	86.0	7.3	4.3	2.4	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	89.6	6.3	2.6	1.4	100.0
Remote	81.9	8.3	6.2	3.6	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	75.7	14.1	7.7	2.5	100.0
Non-poor	90.7	4.2	2.8	2.4	100.0
Household size					
1-2	91.0	4.5	0.0	4.5	100.0
3-4	89.1	3.3	3.2	4.4	100.0
5-6	91.1	5.7	2.2	1.0	100.0
7+	79.6	10.9	7.4	2.1	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	90.4	4.4	4.0	1.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	100.0
Other	9.7	55.3	15.8	19.2	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	87.7	8.0	2.9	1.4	100.0
Female	78.2	3.8	10.6	7.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

security situation, the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed other' category is 31 percent. In turn, 54 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported same conditions in the current crime and security situation. On the other hand, 42 percent of male-headed households reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 33 percent of female-headed households.

While 50 percent of households where the household head has a loose union reported deterioration in the current crime and security situation, the share for households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated is 7 percent. In turn, 57 percent of households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated reported same conditions in the current crime and security situation. Lastly, the percentage of households where the head has secondary education or more and reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation is 12 percentage points higher than that of household heads with no formal education at 54 and 42 percent respectively.

6.6 Household Income Contributions

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

90 percent of households located in accessible clusters reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 82 percent of households located in remote clusters. Likewise, while 91 percent of non-poor households reported the household head as the main income contributor, the share for poor households is 76 percent.

91 percent of households with one or two members reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 80 percent of households with seven or more members.

Furthermore, virtually all households belonging to the 'employee' category and 98 percent of households belonging to the

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	23.3	1.1	5.1	5.5	79.4	42.5	46.9	3.3	0.7	11.8
Cluster Location										
Accessible	33.0	2.0	9.6	10.2	88.1	50.7	53.5	6.2	1.4	20.6
Remote	12.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	69.3	33.1	39.4	0.0	0.0	1.7
Poverty Status										
Poor	7.8	0.0	0.0	1.1	64.6	30.6	25.1	0.0	0.0	2.7
Non-poor	30.5	1.5	7.5	7.5	86.0	47.8	56.7	4.8	1.1	15.9
Household size										
1-2	14.0	0.0	1.9	6.6	75.0	36.9	45.1	3.9	0.0	16.3
3-4	15.9	0.7	2.0	3.0	72.3	39.3	37.9	2.2	0.0	11.9
5-6	23.3	1.5	5.4	5.0	80.2	40.3	41.7	2.2	1.1	11.1
7+	28.9	1.1	7.1	6.6	82.9	46.9	55.2	4.5	1.0	11.1
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	68.6	11.9	9.2	29.4	100.0	78.7	86.9	21.9	0.0	71.6
Self-employed - agric	16.4	0.4	1.7	1.7	76.5	38.8	42.8	0.9	0.3	5.4
Self-employed - other	64.3	1.6	32.8	21.8	89.8	66.0	75.8	17.2	6.6	37.7
Other	23.1	0.0	10.2	12.2	85.8	31.3	31.3	1.9	0.0	11.4
Gender of the head of household										
Male	25.5	1.0	6.1	5.5	81.5	44.2	52.1	3.1	0.7	12.3
Female	13.3	1.5	0.7	5.0	69.7	34.9	23.2	4.5	0.7	9.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

'self-employed other' category reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 10 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category. In contrast, 55 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category reported the spouse as the main income contributor.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that 88 percent of male-headed households reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 78 percent of female-headed households. In contrast, 11 percent of female-headed households reported the child as the main income contributor compared to 3 percent of male-headed households.

6.7 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. 79 percent of households own at least one mattress or bed, 47 percent owns a radio, 43 percent owns a watch or clock and 23 percent owns an electric iron. Although less than 1 percent of the households own a fixed line phone, 12 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, 'employees' and 'self-employed in non-agricultural activities' show higher rates of ownership in most of the selected household items than the remaining socio-economic groups.

7 Household Amenities

This chapter analyses the main amenities of the households in Meatu 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, 60 percent of households have thatch as their main roof material and 40 percent have iron sheets.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no correlation with material used for roof of the house. On the other hand, poor households use thatch more than non-poor households as their main roof material, at 85 and 48 percent respectively. In turn the latter report a higher share of using iron sheets for roofing than the former at 52 and 15 percent respectively.

The breakdown by household size shows that 64 percent of households with 7 or more members uses thatch compared to 50 percent of households with up to 2 members. In turn, households with up to 2 members are more likely to use iron sheets for their roofs, at 50 percent than households with 7 or more members, at 36 percent. The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' category has the highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 76 percent), and that employees are the group that uses thatch the least at 4 percent. On the other hand, 96 percent of households in the employee category use iron sheets for roofs compared to 24 percent of those in the 'other' category.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households report use of thatch more frequently than male-headed households.

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	60.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	0.0	58.8	0.0	41.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	61.3	0.0	38.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	0.0	85.1	0.0	14.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	48.4	0.0	51.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	0.0	49.7	0.0	50.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	0.0	54.5	0.0	45.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.0	61.0	0.0	39.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	0.0	64.2	0.0	35.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	0.0	4.3	0.0	95.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	66.5	0.0	33.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	16.2	0.0	83.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	75.6	0.0	24.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	0.0	58.4	0.0	41.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	67.3	0.0	32.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

7 Household amenities

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

	Mud/ mud bricks	Stone	Burnt bricks	Cement/ sandcrete	Wood/ bamboo	Iron sheets	Cardboard	Total
Total	95.4	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	91.3	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	93.2	0.0	0.0	6.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size								
1-2	90.3	0.0	0.0	9.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	95.1	0.0	0.0	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	96.7	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	95.8	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	71.0	0.0	0.0	29.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	99.3	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	69.2	0.0	0.0	30.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	98.1	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household								
Male	96.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	92.4	0.0	0.0	7.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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	91.2	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	83.5	0.0	0.0	16.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	87.2	0.0	0.0	12.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	80.9	0.0	0.0	19.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	91.8	0.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	91.2	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	93.6	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	48.1	0.0	0.0	51.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	98.6	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	38.7	0.0	0.0	61.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	98.1	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	91.3	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	90.5	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

In turn the latter report a higher share of using iron sheets than the former 42 and 33 percent respectively.

Table 7.2 shows the distribution of households by type of material used in the walls. Overall, 95 percent of houses are built with mud or mud bricks compared to 5 percent of houses built with cement or sand Crete.

The analysis of cluster location reveals that virtually all households (100 percent) in remote villages have mud or mud bricks

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

	Single room	Flat	Two or more rooms	Whole building	Other	Total
Total	3.6	0.0	2.7	60.8	33.0	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	6.8	0.0	5.0	61.8	26.4	100.0
Remote	0.0	0.0	0.0	59.5	40.5	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.5	47.5	100.0
Non-poor	5.3	0.0	3.9	64.4	26.4	100.0
Household size						
1-2	20.4	0.0	4.7	67.2	7.7	100.0
3-4	7.0	0.0	7.7	71.4	13.8	100.0
5-6	0.7	0.0	2.2	77.0	20.1	100.0
7+	0.0	0.0	0.3	42.3	57.3	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	12.6	0.0	22.0	55.1	10.3	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.5	0.0	0.7	64.3	34.5	100.0
Self-employed - other	28.8	0.0	10.7	40.6	19.8	100.0
Other	3.4	0.0	1.9	46.8	47.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	3.6	0.0	2.7	58.0	35.7	100.0
Female	3.6	0.0	2.4	73.6	20.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

compared to 91 percent of households in accessible villages. On the other hand, 9 percent of households in accessible villages reports use of cement, while the share for households in remote villages is virtually null.

The analysis by poverty status reveals that virtually all (100 percent) poor households report use of mud or mud bricks compared to 93 percent of non-poor households. Similarly, 97 percent of households with 5 to 6 members use mud or mud bricks as main material in the walls of the house compared to 90 percent of households with up to 2 members. On the other hand, 10 percent of households with up to 2 members reports use of cement for the walls.

Households self-employed in agriculture report the highest share living in houses made of mud or mud bricks at 99 percent. In contrast, the employees report the lowest share at 71 percent. While 31 percent of those self-employed in non-agricultural activities uses cement the share those self-employed in agriculture is virtually null.

The gender breakdown shows that households headed by males use mud or mud bricks more often than female-headed households, at rates of 96 and 92 percent respectively.

The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 91 percent of households is made of mud or dirt, and 9 percent of concrete or cement.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that virtually all households (100 percent) in remote villages report having houses with mud or earth floor, the share for households in accessible villages is 83 percent. In turn, households in accessible villages report a higher share of houses with a concrete floor than households in remote villages. The analysis by poverty status shows that virtually all (100 percent) poor households have mud or dirt floor compared to 87 percent of non-poor households. On the other hand, 13 percent of non-poor households use concrete or cement as material for the floor while the share for poor households is virtually null.

The breakdown by household size shows that 94 percent of households with 7 or more members have mud or dirt floor compared to 81 percent of households with up to 2 members. However, households with up to members report the highest share for concrete/cement, at 19 percent, and the lowest share is observed in the households with 7 or more members at 7 percent. The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that those self-employed in agriculture

report the highest share of mud or dirt at 99 percent whereas those self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the lowest share at 39 percent. Conversely, households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest share of concrete or cement at 61 percent, while the lowest is the self-employed in agriculture, at 1 percent.

The gender breakdown shows no strong correlation with material used for the floor.

Table 7.4 shows the percentage distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 61 percent of households occupy the whole building where they live whereas 33 percent occupy 'other' forms of housing units.

The breakdown shows by cluster locations shows that households from remote villages are more likely to use 'other' forms of housing units than households from accessible villages at 41 and 26 percent respectively. Non-poor households occupy whole buildings more than poor households, at 64 and 53 percent respectively. In turn the latter report a higher share using other housing units

than the former at 48 and 26 percent respectively.

The breakdown by household size shows that 77 percent of households with 5 to 6 members occupy the whole building where they live compared to households with 7 or more members, at 42 percent. The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows households self-employed in agriculture report the highest share of occupying the whole building at 64 percent whereas those self employed in non-agricultural activities report the lowest share at 41 percent. Female-headed households occupy whole buildings more frequently than male-headed households, at 74 and 58 percent respectively.

7.2 Water and Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 49 percent of households have access to a safe source of water. About 46 percent of all households get drinking water from boreholes/hand pumps and 43 percent of households obtain water from river, lake or pond. Safe sources of drinking water are treated pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and protected wells.

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	3.1	1.6	45.8	0.0	3.4	0.0	42.7	3.1	0.3	100.0	48.9
Cluster Location											
Accessible	5.8	1.0	32.2	0.0	4.6	0.0	50.1	5.9	0.5	100.0	38.0
Remote	0.0	2.3	61.4	0.0	2.1	0.0	34.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	61.4
Poverty Status											
Poor	1.9	2.7	47.3	0.0	4.9	0.0	43.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	49.2
Non-poor	3.7	1.1	45.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	42.5	4.6	0.4	100.0	48.7
Household size											
1-2	0.0	0.0	44.4	0.0	10.2	0.0	37.4	8.0	0.0	100.0	44.4
3-4	4.2	2.5	44.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	40.8	6.2	0.0	100.0	48.4
5-6	4.4	2.3	42.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	47.5	1.7	0.0	100.0	47.3
7+	2.4	1.1	49.1	0.0	4.0	0.0	41.2	1.6	0.6	100.0	51.5
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	0.0	0.0	52.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.2	17.8	0.0	100.0	52.0
Self-employed - agric	3.1	1.9	48.9	0.0	3.9	0.0	42.1	0.2	0.0	100.0	52.0
Self-employed - other	2.9	0.0	28.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	39.5	26.2	3.2	100.0	31.1
Other	6.2	1.5	25.7	0.0	4.8	0.0	61.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	31.9
Gender of the head of household											
Male	3.2	1.5	46.7	0.0	3.2	0.0	42.6	2.5	0.3	100.0	49.9
Female	2.7	1.9	42.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	42.8	6.2	0.0	100.0	44.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

The analysis of cluster location shows that 61 percent of households in remote villages have a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share of households in accessible villages is 38 percent. On the other hand, 61 percent of households in remote villages gets drinking water from boreholes/hand pumps compared to 32 percent of accessible villages. Poverty status of the household reveals that there is no strong correlation with main source of drinking water.

The breakdown by household size does reveal that households with 7 or more members report the highest access rate to safe sources of drinking water at 52 percent, followed by households with 3 to 4 members (at 48 percent), and the lowest being households with up to 2 members, at 44 percent. Households with 7 or members have highest access to water from bore holes and hand pumps, at 49 percent whereas households with 5 to 6 six members report the highest access rate to safe water from the river, lake or pond.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that 'employees' and 'self-employed agriculture' are the categories with the highest rate of access to safe sources of drinking water (52 percent each), followed by the 'other'

category (32 percent), while 'self-employed other' is the category with the lowest access rate to safe water (31 percent). On the other hand, 52 percent of the households where the main income earner belongs to the 'employee' category get drinking water from boreholes/hand pumps while the share for households in the 'other' category is 23 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head reveals that male-headed households report a higher access rate to safe sources of water than female-headed households, at 50 and 45 percent respectively. A similar difference is observed on the use of boreholes/hand pumps..

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Overall, 79 percent of households have safe sanitation, whereas up to 77 percent use a covered pit latrine.

The cluster location breakdown shows that 86 percent of households in accessible villages have safe sanitation, while the share for households in remote is 72 percent. Similarly, 86 percent of non-poor households have safe sanitation compared to 65 percent of poor households.

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	19.3	0.0	2.1	0.0	77.2	0.9	0.5	0.0	100.0	79.3
Cluster Location										
Accessible	12.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	81.9	1.0	0.9	0.0	100.0	85.9
Remote	27.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	71.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	71.8
Poverty Status										
Poor	33.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	65.3
Non-poor	12.7	0.0	3.1	0.0	82.8	0.7	0.7	0.0	100.0	85.9
Household size										
1-2	25.6	0.0	1.9	0.0	71.4	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	73.4
3-4	20.7	0.0	2.6	0.0	76.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	79.3
5-6	18.5	0.0	1.1	0.0	77.9	1.8	0.7	0.0	100.0	79.0
7+	17.6	0.0	2.7	0.0	78.4	0.6	0.6	0.0	100.0	81.1
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	0.0	0.0	14.6	0.0	82.7	0.0	2.6	0.0	100.0	97.4
Self-employed - agric	22.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	76.4	1.2	0.3	0.0	100.0	76.5
Self-employed - other	2.5	0.0	15.6	0.0	80.3	0.0	1.6	0.0	100.0	95.8
Other	21.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	79.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	79.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	18.2	0.0	1.7	0.0	78.8	0.8	0.6	0.0	100.0	80.5
Female	24.4	0.0	4.1	0.0	69.9	1.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	74.1

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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

	Firewood	Charcoal	Kerosene/oil	Gas	Electricity	Crop residue/ sawdust	Animal waste	Other	Total	Non-wood fuel for cooking
Total	89.4	9.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.2	100.0	0.9
Cluster Location										
Accessible	81.4	16.6	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	100.0	1.6
Remote	98.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	98.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	85.2	12.9	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	100.0	1.3
Household size										
1-2	75.6	14.1	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	100.0	8.3
3-4	84.5	15.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
5-6	90.5	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
7+	94.2	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	30.3	60.7	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	100.0	5.1
Self-employed - agric	97.8	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	41.2	51.3	7.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	7.5
Other	91.5	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	89.4	9.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.2	100.0	0.8
Female	89.8	9.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1.1

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

The breakdown by household size shows that households with 7 or more members have the highest access rate to safe sanitation (81 percent) compared to households with up to 2 members at 73 percent. However, the use of uncovered pit latrines decreases with a corresponding increase in number of household members, with the opposite being observed in the case of 'no toilets/bush'.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that employees report the highest rate of safe sanitation, at 97 percent while the 'self-employed agriculture' category reports the lowest rate of safe sanitation at 77 percent. Those employees use covered pit latrines more often than those in the 'self-employed-agriculture' category at 83 and 76 percent respectively.

Analysis by gender shows that male-headed households report a higher access rate to safe sanitation than female-headed households, at 81 percent and 74 percent respectively. In addition male-headed households report a higher access rate using covered pit latrines than female-headed households at 79 and 70 percent respectively.

7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 89 percent of households use firewood compared to 9 percent of households that use charcoal.

Analysis by poverty status shows that 99 percent of remote households use firewood for cooking against 81 percent of the accessible households. Conversely, 17 percent of accessible households uses charcoal whereas the share for remote households is virtually null. Poor households use firewood more often than non-poor households, at 99 and 85 percent respectively. The use of charcoal in non-poor households is 13 percent against 1 percent in poor households.

Analysis of household size reveals that use of firewood increases as households numbers increase while the uses of charcoal decreases as households numbers increases.

The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the 'self-employed agriculture' category reports the highest rate of using firewood at 98 percent and the lowest use of charcoal, at 2 percent. The 'employee'

category reports the lowest use of firewood at 56 percent and the highest rate use for charcoal at 61 percent.

There appears to be no strong correlation between gender and type of fuel used for cooking.

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lighting. Overall, 91 percent of the households in the district uses kerosene or paraffin and 4 percent uses electricity. Gas, batteries and candles are virtually not used for lighting in the district.

The analysis of cluster location shows that about 94 percent of households in remote villages uses kerosene/paraffin compared with 88 percent of households in accessible villages. 7 percent of households in accessible villages uses electricity, while the share for remote clusters is virtually null. Similarly, 6 percent of non-poor households uses electricity while the share for non-poor households is virtually null.

The breakdown by household size reveals that 92 percent of households with 5 to 6 members and 7 or more members use kerosene/paraffin compared to 79 percent of households with up to 2 members. On the other hand, 8 percent of households with up to 2 members use electricity compared to 3 percent of households with 5 to 6 members.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that households self-employed in agriculture report the highest rate of use of kerosene and paraffin at 95 percent and households in the 'employee' category report the lowest use rate at 70 percent. In turn, 32 percent of households in the 'employee' category uses firewood compared to1 percent of the households self-employed in agriculture.

Finally, male-headed households report use of kerosene/paraffin more frequently than female-headed households, at 92 and 85 percent respectively. On the other hand, 10 percent of female-headed households use firewood compared to 3 percent of male-headed households.

7.4 Distances to Facilities

Table 7.9 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest drinking water supply and health facility. Although each table gives more detailed information, the analysis of this section will be focused on the 30 minute threshold that was used to define access to a facility. It must be kept in mind that distance to

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

	Kerosene/ paraffin	Gas	Mains electricity	Solar panels/ generator	Battery	Candles	Firewood	Other	Total
Total	90.8	0.0	3.9	0.3	0.0	0.5	4.4	0.2	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	87.7	0.0	7.3	0.5	0.0	0.9	3.3	0.4	100.0
Remote	94.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	92.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	89.9	0.0	5.7	0.4	0.0	0.7	3.1	0.3	100.0
Household size									
1-2	79.4	0.0	7.8	0.0	0.0	4.4	6.2	2.2	100.0
3-4	89.1	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	0.0	100.0
5-6	92.8	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	0.0	100.0
7+	92.9	0.0	3.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	62.3	0.0	32.6	0.0	0.0	5.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	94.5	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	69.9	0.0	19.1	3.2	0.0	2.5	2.5	2.9	100.0
Other	92.7	0.0	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	92.1	0.0	3.5	0.3	0.0	0.6	3.2	0.3	100.0
Female	84.6	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.8	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

7 Household amenities

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	44.5	32.8	16.3	6.3	100.0	15.6	18.5	23.3	42.6	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	54.2	31.1	12.9	1.8	100.0	28.3	27.6	26.2	17.9	100.0
Remote	33.5	34.8	20.2	11.4	100.0	1.1	8.1	20.0	70.8	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	33.5	39.3	19.2	8.0	100.0	9.8	12.1	26.0	52.0	100.0
Non-poor	49.7	30.0	14.8	5.5	100.0	18.3	21.4	22.2	38.1	100.0
Household size										
1-2	61.6	21.6	11.4	5.5	100.0	32.2	11.7	22.4	33.7	100.0
3-4	55.0	32.3	9.3	3.3	100.0	11.1	19.5	23.2	46.2	100.0
5-6	44.2	32.7	16.7	6.4	100.0	17.6	24.3	18.8	39.3	100.0
7+	35.9	36.0	20.3	7.7	100.0	11.9	15.4	27.0	45.7	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	64.6	20.1	15.3	0.0	100.0	43.7	10.6	22.1	23.5	100.0
Self-employed - agric	41.7	32.6	18.4	7.3	100.0	11.1	17.6	24.4	46.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	67.6	28.2	4.2	0.0	100.0	47.8	25.8	14.7	11.7	100.0
Other	36.1	50.1	7.6	6.3	100.0	10.0	25.7	21.5	42.7	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	43.2	32.5	18.1	6.3	100.0	13.7	18.8	24.0	43.5	100.0
Female	50.9	34.4	8.2	6.6	100.0	24.3	17.1	20.2	38.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

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	34.6	28.1	22.5	14.9	100.0	5.1	12.5	22.0	60.5	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	49.5	23.4	16.3	10.9	100.0	8.7	20.6	30.5	40.2	100.0
Remote	17.5	33.5	29.6	19.4	100.0	0.9	3.2	12.2	83.7	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	26.2	26.8	27.0	20.0	100.0	2.6	4.6	15.0	77.8	100.0
Non-poor	38.5	28.8	20.5	12.3	100.0	6.2	16.1	25.2	52.5	100.0
Household size										
1-2	56.8	8.7	22.4	12.1	100.0	9.9	16.7	31.5	41.9	100.0
3-4	38.5	27.9	20.8	12.8	100.0	4.2	10.0	24.5	61.2	100.0
5-6	29.7	31.9	23.2	15.2	100.0	2.5	14.6	26.3	56.6	100.0
7+	30.8	30.3	22.7	16.2	100.0	6.1	10.9	15.2	67.8	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	82.4	11.0	6.6	0.0	100.0	13.4	20.1	40.7	25.8	100.0
Self-employed - agric	29.6	28.5	25.5	16.4	100.0	4.4	11.2	18.1	66.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	65.9	22.7	6.1	5.2	100.0	6.4	22.5	43.9	27.3	100.0
Other	20.6	42.5	17.8	19.2	100.0	5.3	10.0	27.4	57.3	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	33.2	29.8	22.4	14.7	100.0	5.2	12.1	21.3	61.4	100.0
Female	41.0	20.1	23.1	15.8	100.0	4.3	14.1	25.1	56.5	100.0

public transportation is one of the variables used to define a cluster as accessible or remote, so it must come as no surprise that distance to public transportation and cluster location are strongly correlated. However, the rest of the variables, despite not being used to define cluster location, also show strong correlations.

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	22.2	13.5	17.0	47.3	100.0	37.6	19.6	17.7	25.1	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	40.2	17.8	16.0	26.0	100.0	62.4	19.7	10.9	7.0	100.0
Remote	1.7	8.6	18.1	71.7	100.0	9.4	19.4	25.4	45.8	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	14.1	8.9	14.6	62.4	100.0	23.9	20.7	22.1	33.4	100.0
Non-poor	26.0	15.6	18.1	40.3	100.0	44.0	19.1	15.4	21.4	100.0
Household size										
1-2	37.3	10.2	13.3	39.2	100.0	49.7	15.2	16.2	18.9	100.0
3-4	18.1	15.7	15.1	51.2	100.0	41.3	17.7	16.0	24.9	100.0
5-6	24.7	14.1	16.6	44.7	100.0	41.2	15.6	18.5	24.7	100.0
7+	18.3	12.9	19.0	49.7	100.0	30.3	24.5	18.1	27.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	48.1	8.7	19.7	23.5	100.0	77.2	9.2	6.8	6.8	100.0
Self-employed - agric	15.3	14.1	17.3	53.3	100.0	30.8	21.5	19.3	28.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	62.3	14.0	10.2	13.4	100.0	75.8	12.7	6.2	5.2	100.0
Other	37.3	8.8	18.8	35.0	100.0	43.7	13.3	19.6	23.5	100.0
Gender of head of household										
Male	20.2	13.8	19.0	46.9	100.0	37.7	19.3	18.4	24.6	100.0
Female	31.3	12.0	7.6	49.1	100.0	37.4	20.8	14.3	27.6	100.0

Overall, 79 percent of households are located under 30 minutes of a drinking water supply. In addition, 35 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes of a health facility.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that 85 percent of households in accessible villages have access to a drinking water source and 56 percent to a health facility, whereas the shares for households in remote villages are 69 and 9 percent respectively. Non-poor households report a higher access rate to drinking water supply than poor households, at 80 and 73 percent respectively. Similar observations are made for access to health facilities.

Analysis of household size reveals that households with 3 to 4 members report the highest access rate to drinking water supply, at 87 percent. On the other hand, households with up to 2 members report the highest access rate to health facilities, at 44 percent. Households with 7 or more members report the lowest access rate to both drinking water supply and health facilities, at 72 and 27 percent respectively.

Households where the main income earner self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest rate of access to both drinking water (96 percent) and health facilities (74 percent). The 'self-employed agriculture' category reports the lowest access to both drinking water and to a health facility, at 74 and 29 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households report higher access rate for both safe drinking water supply and health facilities, at 85 and 41 percent respectively, whereas the shares for male-headed households are 76 and 33 percent respectively.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 63 percent of households are located within 30 minutes of a primary school; however only 18 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 51 percent of households in remote villages have access to primary school, against 73 percent in accessible villages. For secondary school, the rate for accessible villages is 29 percent against 4 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 67 and 22 percent respectively. The access by poor households to secondary education is 7 percent.

Analysis by household size reveals that households with up to 2 members and with 3 to 4 members report the highest rate of access to primary school, at 66 percent. On the other hand, households with up to 2 members report the highest access rate to secondary school at 27 percent whereas households with 3 to 4 members report the lowest access rate at 14 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the 'employee' category report the highest rate of access to both primary school and secondary school, at 93 and 34 percent respectively. Households in the 'other' category report the lowest access rate to secondary schools at 15 percent.

There is no substantial correlation between gender of household head and access to primary and secondary school.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation. Overall, 36 percent of households have access to a food market, and 58 percent to public transportation.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 58 percent of households in accessible villages live within 30 minutes of a food market and, against 10 of households in remote villages. The shares for public transportation are 82 percent for accessible and 29 percent for remote villages. Non-poor households report a higher rate of access to food markets, with a share of 42 percent, against 23 percent of poor households. Similarly, while 63 percent of non-poor households reports having access to public transportation, the share for poor households is 45 percent.

The analysis by household size shows that households with up to 2 members report higher rates of access to both food markets and public transportation, at 48 and 65 percent respectively. In contrast households with 7 or more members report the lowest rates of access to both food markets and public transportation, at 31 and 55 percent respectively.

Analysis by socio-economic group reveals that those self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest rates of access to food markets and public transportation, at 76 and 89 percent respectively, whereas households self-employed in agriculture report lowest access rates for both food market and public transportation, at 29 and 53 percent respectively. Finally, female-headed households report a higher access rate to food markets than male-headed households at 43 and 34 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, 67 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken measures are insecticide treated nets (56 percent) and bed nets (33 percent).

The analysis of cluster location shows that accessible villages are more likely to take measures against malaria than the remote villages, at 77 and 55 percent. However, remote households report maintenance of good sanitation more often than accessible households, at 17 and 12 percent respectively. In addition, 75 percent of non-poor households take measures against malaria compared to 49 percent of poor households.

69 percent of households with 5 to 6 members take measures against malaria compared to 57 percent of households with up to 2 members. 67 percent of households with up to 2 members report use of insecticide treated nets compared to 48 percent of households with 3 to 4 members. The analysis of socio-economic status shows that virtually all (100 percent) households in the 'employee' category take measures against malaria compared to 61 percent of households in the 'other' category. Similarly, employees report maintenance of good sanitation more often than the rest socio-economic categories..

Finally, 69 percent of households headed by males take measures against malaria compared to 54 percent of households headed by females. There appears to be no strong correlation between gender of the household head and measures taken against malaria.

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	66.5	33.3	10.3	3.5	1.3	56.3	0.9	14.2	2.3	0.0	4.5
Cluster Location											
Accessible	77.0	26.5	14.2	4.4	2.1	66.1	1.0	12.4	2.4	0.0	6.2
Remote	54.5	44.2	4.0	2.1	0.0	40.4	0.8	17.1	2.1	0.0	1.8
Poverty Status											
Poor	48.7	37.4	4.5	0.0	0.0	45.2	0.0	16.8	1.3	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	74.9	32.1	12.0	4.6	1.7	59.6	1.2	13.4	2.6	0.0	5.8
Household size											
1-2	57.2	32.9	3.9	5.4	0.0	67.1	0.0	13.8	0.0	0.0	0.0
3-4	66.4	45.2	15.2	1.1	0.0	48.4	1.1	16.2	0.0	0.0	1.1
5-6	69.0	27.8	12.4	5.5	1.6	56.6	2.3	15.0	4.0	0.0	8.1
7+	67.0	32.5	7.9	2.6	1.9	57.1	0.0	12.7	2.5	0.0	4.1
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	100.0	25.6	9.2	6.6	10.3	74.4	5.2	42.5	0.0	0.0	16.0
Self-employed - agric	63.2	36.6	11.5	4.0	0.4	50.4	0.7	11.2	2.3	0.0	2.5
Self-employed - other	83.2	13.3	8.4	0.0	2.0	86.7	0.0	15.7	0.0	0.0	11.7
Other	60.9	35.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.2	0.0	13.1	8.9	0.0	3.2
Gender of the head of household											
Male	69.2	31.7	11.0	3.9	1.5	56.9	0.9	14.7	1.9	0.0	4.8
Female	54.2	42.9	6.2	1.4	0.0	52.5	1.4	10.7	4.4	0.0	2.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

7 Household amenities

8 GOVERNANCE

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

8.1 Attendance at Meetings

Table 8.1 summarises responses to the following question "Did you or anyone in your household attend a meeting at […] level in the past 12 months". This question was repeated 4 times with the dots replaced by kitongoji, village, ward and district. Generally, the trend in meeting attendance is decreasing as government levels increase, with a sharp decline just after the first two lower levels. Results show that 84 and 79 percent of households had at least one member attending at least one kitongoji and village meeting respectively in the past 12 months. The attendance sharply declines to 16 percent at ward and further lower to 2 percent at district level meetings.

Data as presented in table 8.1 show that the attendance in meeting was proportionally higher among households in the accessible cluster at all government levels. Households from accessible villages report a higher meeting attendance rate at ward level than households from remote villages at 20 and 10 percent respectively.

The breakdown of the data by poverty status, shows that there is no considerable differences in meeting attendance rate for all government levels. Analysis of the results by socio-economic groups indicates that the shares of households in the 'self-employed agriculture' and the 'self-employed other' groups at district level meetings are virtually null. On the other hand, the 'self-employed agriculture' and 'other' groups report the majority of meeting attendance at both kitongoji and village level meetings. Generally, ward and district level meetings, are characterised by lower attendance rates by all groups than kitongoji and village levels.

8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders

The main respondent was asked whether he or she considered the leaders at

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	83.9	79.3	15.6	1.7
Cluster Location				
Accessible	86.4	83.8	20.3	2.5
Remote	81.1	74.2	10.2	0.7
Poverty Status				
Poor	86.0	82.0	15.4	0.0
Non-poor	83.2	78.3	15.7	2.4
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	71.6	73.0	23.3	26.8
Self-employed - agriculture	86.1	81.1	15.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	74.7	63.7	15.8	0.0
Other	78.0	81.1	16.2	4.7
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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	90.2	80.2	71.5	64.4	74.6
Not Satisfied	8.1	17.3	14.9	7.0	22.9
Don't Know	1.6	2.5	13.6	28.6	2.5
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location					
Accessible	92.1	83.4	76.0	67.9	77.8
Remote	88.1	76.5	66.3	60.3	70.9
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status					
Poor	91.8	80.1	68.0	60.1	73.1
Non-poor	89.7	80.2	73.0	66.2	75.5
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group					
Employee	88.5	71.6	78.1	91.4	90.6
Self-employed - agriculture	90.4	81.7	71.3	63.8	72.3
Self-employed - other	86.9	76.8	79.9	68.8	87.2
Other	93.9	72.5	58.3	46.2	74.4
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)					
Political differences	0.0	1.4	0.5	0.0	0.0
Embezzlement/corruption	21.5	29.4	17.3	0.6	19.4
They do not listen to people	35.0	33.0	12.1	1.9	27.9
Favouritism	16.7	12.6	7.6	1.1	3.8
Lazy/inexperienced	9.5	20.2	5.1	0.0	9.3
Personal Reasons	3.5	4.3	1.5	0.9	0.4
I see no results	24.3	34.2	14.2	9.6	47.4
They never visit us	7.7	15.0	61.2	85.3	51.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450	449

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu 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?'

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

The results are displayed in Table 8.2. Similar to meeting attendance rates, satisfaction with leaders seems to decrease as government levels goes up. It is shown that, while the satisfaction rate is 90 percent and 80 percent at kitongoji and village levels, the proportion of respondents saying that they are satisfied with ward and district leaders is 72 percent

and 64 percent respectively. However, the proportion of respondents specifically reported dissatisfaction with leaders at the district levels of government is low at 7 percent and larger proportions of respondents about 29 percent answered ' I don't know'. Results further show that, 23 percent of the people were not satisfied by the district councillor. However, majority of people 75 percent are satisfied with the work of their district councillor with 3 percent answered 'I don't know'.

While retaining the general trend of increasing satisfaction with declining levels of government leadership, disaggregating data by accessibility shows a slight difference in satisfaction with leaders among respondents in accessible and remote clusters. It is shown that people in the accessible clusters report

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	8.2	16.1	4.1	0.2
Cluster Location				
Accessible	9.8	21.0	4.7	0.4
Remote	6.4	10.5	3.5	0.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	5.8	7.9	3.9	0.0
Non-poor	9.3	19.9	4.2	0.3
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	17.6	26.5	18.7	4.0
Self-employed - agriculture	6.5	13.9	3.1	0.0
Self-employed - other	18.8	28.8	2.8	0.0
Other	9.2	19.4	6.8	0.0
Source				
Letter	5.3	0.0	6.3	0.0
Notice board	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0
Meeting	90.9	92.9	79.1	0.0
Rumours/hear-say	3.8	7.1	6.6	0.0
Radio/newspapers	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

higher satisfaction rates by their leaders at all levels than those from remote clusters. Further disaggregating of results by the poverty status revealed that non-poor households reported more satisfaction with their ward and district leaders more frequently than non-poor households.

Disaggregating the ratings by socio-economic group shows higher shares of satisfaction by all socio-economic groups, except the 'other' category which reported the lowest satisfaction rate with ward leaders at 46 percent. On the other hand, the 'employee' socio-economic group, reports the highest satisfaction rate with district councillor.

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

The reasons for dissatisfaction are very different across the different levels of government. It can be seen that failure of leaders to pay visits to their respective communities is the most important reasons for dissatisfaction for ward and district leaders as well as for the district councillor. For lower government levels, important reasons for dissatisfaction include 'leaders not listening to people ',' any results' and embezzlement. Political difference is not an important reason for dissatisfaction on leadership at all levels of government as well as the district councillor.

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 finances seems scanty reach only a few households at all levels. It is clearly shown in table 8.3 that information on ward and district finances reach only 4 and less 1 percent respectively. It can further be noted that information on finances reachs slightly more households in accessible clusters in the past twelve months than households in remote clusters across all

Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction

	Kitongoji Spending	Village Spending	Ward Spending	District Spending
Total				
Satisfied	58.5	44.9	37.4	34.3
Not Satisfied	20.0	33.3	26.8	9.0
Don' Know	21.5	21.8	35.9	56.7
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location				
Accessible	62.2	50.3	39.9	34.7
Remote	54.3	38.7	34.5	33.8
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status				
Poor	55.2	41.9	29.6	26.0
Non-poor	60.2	46.4	41.0	38.2
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group				
Employee	40.2	48.5	63.7	60.0
Self-employed - agriculture	57.3	43.5	34.1	32.7
Self-employed - other	70.8	50.9	49.5	36.0
Other	71.1	51.8	42.6	31.6
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)				
I see no results	14.3	24.5	16.9	7.7
Embezzlement/corruption	23.4	43.3	29.3	3.7
Favouritism	0.6	1.5	0.8	0.4
This is what I hear	1.1	6.7	8.5	0.9
They give no information	58.8	54.3	71.8	87.1
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Meatu DC

local government levels. Disaggregating households by poverty status exposed that information on finances reached non-poor households more frequently than poor households during the last 12 months.

Distribution of households received financial information by socio-economic groups show that, the 'employee' and the 'self-employed other' categories had relatively higher access to information on finances than the remaining socio-economic categories. It is further shown that, with exception of the 'employee' category, the remaining socio-economic categories had no access to information on district finances for the past 12 months. Relatively wide coverage is observed on village finances for the 'self-employed other' category at 29 percent.

The data as presented in table 8.3 clearly show that attendance in meetings were the chief source of information in all local government levels except for the district finances, for the latter, radio was the main source of information. Information received through rumours or hear-say

seems to be the second best source of information.

Respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with spending at different levels of government and were requested to respond either 'yes', 'no' or 'don't know'. Table 8.4 shows the results. Satisfaction with spending is slightly declining as levels of government go up. While satisfaction with public spending is 59 and 45 percent at kitongoji and village levels respectively, for ward and district level the shares are 37 and 34 percent respectively. This does not, however, mean that respondents specifically report dissatisfaction with spending for higher levels of government, rather the share of respondents reporting 'I don't know' increased up to 57 percent at district level.

The satisfaction by cluster location and poverty status shows that respondents in the accessible clusters reported being satisfied with public spending at all government levels more often than remote clusters. Similarly, the non-poor households report being satisfied with the public spending more frequently than poor

households. However, breakdown of the data by socio-economic groups showed that the 'employee' reported relatively high satisfaction rates in government spending particularly for the ward and district spending than the rest socio-economic groups. The highest rate of satisfaction was reported by the 'other' and the 'self-employed other' categories for the kitongoji spending at 71 percent each.

Further probing on why respondents were not satisfied, or why they did not know whether they were satisfied, the most common response across all government levels was that they did not receive any information. The second most important response was that associated with embezzlement/corruption in the public spending and seeing no results was the third most reason.

8 Governance

9 Changes between 2004 and 2007

This chapter will use the results of the 2004 Meatu 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 rate of need of healthcare increased by 9 percent, and that the confidence interval of the change runs from 5.6 to 12.3 percent. This should be read: 'rate of need of healthcare increased by between 5.6 and 12.3 percent, at the 95 percent of confidence'. If the confidence interval includes zero, it is said that the change is non-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 2007. 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 2007.

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 characteristics. In section two, the evolution of education indicators is analysed. Changes in health are reported

Table 9.1: Household Characteristics

	2004	2007	Change				
			Estimate	**SE**	**Signif.**	**95% Confidence Interval**	
Household Size							
1-2	9	10	1.9	3.18		-4.4	8.3
3-4	18	18	0.0	2.66		-5.3	5.3
5-6	26	31	4.6	3.19		-1.8	11.0
7+	48	41	-6.4	5.20		-17.0	3.8
Mean Household Size	6.7	6.1	-0.6	0.34		-1.23	0.14
Female-headed Households	26	18	-8.0	6.42		-21.4	4.3

Source: Meatu DC CWIQ for 2004 and 2007

Table 9.2: Education

	2004	2007	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Literacy	60	62	2	3.85		-5.4	10.0
Primary School							
Net Enrolment Rate	81	84	3	3.16		-3.7	9.0
Satisfaction	35	35	0	7.11		-14.7	13.8
Secondary School							
Net Enrolment Rate	4	11	8	3.38	**	1.2	14.7
Satisfaction	47	22	-25	10.37	**	-47.7	-4.9
Dissatisfaction Rate	65	65	0	6.92		-13.8	13.9
Reasons for dissatisfaction							
Books/Supplies	53	44	-10	9.47		-28.5	9.4
Poor Teaching	3	22	19	3.69	***	12.0	26.7
Lack of Teachers	52	63	11	7.53		-3.9	26.3
Bad Condition of Facilities	31	49	18	7.59	**	3.0	33.4
Overcrowding	11	9	-2	4.59		-10.8	7.6

Source: Meatu DC CWIQ for 2004 and 2007

in section three. The last section presents an analysis of changes in household assets and perceptions of welfare.

9.1 Household characteristics

The percent distribution of households by number of members presents no significant changes between the two surveys. This means that the observed differences are due to sampling errors, not to actual differences. The mean household size has also remained statistically unvaried, as well as the share of female-headed households.

9.2 Education

The literacy rate did not change between the surveys. The net enrolment rate and the satisfaction rate for primary school remained stable. In turn, while the net enrolment rate for secondary school increased, the satisfaction rate decreased significantly. It must be pointed out that the net enrolment rate for secondary school still lags far behind that for primary school.

Despite the overall share of dissatisfied students did not change between 2004 and 2007, some changes are appreciated in the reasons for dissatisfaction. The shares of students reporting dissatisfaction due to poor teaching and bad condition of the facilities increased drastically between the surveys.

9.3 Health

The rates of need and use increased between 2004 and 2007, while the rate satisfaction remained constant. The reasons for dissatisfaction varied markedly. While the share of dissatisfied users of healthcare that reported long waits increased, the shares reporting shortage of trained professionals, cost, no drugs available, and unsuccessful treatment decreased.

The share of people who did not consult a healthcare provider is 6 percentage points lower in 2007 than in 2004. There are no changes in the reasons for not consulting.

The distribution of consultations by type of health facility shows interesting variations. The share of patients who used a hospital decreased significantly, while the share consulting pharmacies increased.

The distribution of women giving birth shows significant increases in the 20-24, 25-29 and 40+ cohorts. The share of women receiving pre-natal care did not change between the surveys. The share of women giving birth in hospitals or maternity guards has decreased at the 95 percent of confidence, by between 21 and 51 percent. The distribution of births by person who assisted the delivery shows

Table 9.3: Health

	2004	2007	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Medical Services							
Need	12	20	9	1.69	***	5.6	12.3
Use	19	24	6	1.72	**	0.6	7.5
Satisfaction	70	62	-8	5.10		-18.0	2.4
Reasons for Dissatisfaction							
Long wait	29	52	23	7.34	***	9.2	38.6
Shortage of trained professionals	51	19	-32	6.26	***	-42.6	-17.5
Cost	44	19	-24	5.94	***	-35.4	-11.6
No drugs available	45	16	-29	6.49	***	-39.8	-13.8
Unsuccessful treatment	34	17	-18	8.17	**	-37.0	-4.3
Percentage not Consulting	81	76	-6	1.72	**	-7.5	-0.6
Reasons for not consulting							
No need	98	98	0	0.56		-1.3	0.9
Cost	1	1	0	0.36		-1.0	0.5
Distance	1	1	0	0.44		-1.1	0.7
Facility Used							
Private hospital	8	7	-1	2.61		-5.3	5.2
Government hospital	68	54	-14	5.21	**	-24.1	-3.2
Traditional healer	8	13	5	2.57	*	0.0	10.3
Pharmacy	3	23	20	2.32	***	15.6	24.8
Women who Had Live-Births							
15-19	6	6	0	3.13		-6.4	6.2
20-24	14	32	17	6.18	***	5.7	30.4
25-29	21	37	16	6.45	**	2.9	28.8
30-39	22	20	-2	3.94		-10.6	5.1
40+	2	8	6	2.93	**	0.0	11.8
Prenatal care	97	97	-1	0.02		-5.6	4.3
Facilities Used in Child Deliveries							
Hospital or maternity ward	68	33	-36	7.61	***	-51.2	-20.8
Delivery Assistance							
Doctor/Nurse/Midwife	55	37	-18	6.88	**	-31.7	-4.2
TBA	33	9	-23	3.71	***	-30.8	-16.0
Other/Self	13	53	41	6.11	***	28.5	53.0
Child Nutrition							
Stunted (-2SD)	35	18	-18	3.66	***	-23.7	-9.1
Severely Stunted (-3SD)	14	6	-8	2.43	***	-12.7	-2.9
Wasted (-2SD)	6	1	-5	1.39	***	-6.8	-1.3
Severely Wasted (-3SD)	2	1	-1	0.71		-2.3	0.5

Source: Meatu DC CWIQ for 2004 and 2007

that the shares of births attended by health professionals and TBAs (traditional birth assistants) decreased, while the share of child deliveries without assistance increased drastically, between 29 and 53 percent.

The last panel of the table shows child nutrition indicators, previously defined in section 4. The rates of stunting and wasting show important decreases. Furthermore, the rate of severe stunting has also decreased significantly. The exception is the rate of severe wasting, which has remained unaltered.

Table 9.4: Household Assets and Perception of Welfare

	2004	2007	Change				
			Estimate	SE	Signif.	95% Confidence Interval	
Landholding							
No holding	23	29	6	6.41		-6.8	18.8
Less	14	3	-12	3.12	***	-18.1	-5.6
Same	58	93	35	4.03	***	27.4	43.5
More	5	4	0	1.65		-3.8	2.8
Difficulty satisfying food needs							
Never	3	16	13	2.48	***	7.9	17.8
Seldom	27	28	1	4.58		-8.3	10.0
Sometimes	69	41	-28	5.87	***	-39.7	-16.2
Always	1	15	14	1.86	***	10.5	18.0
Livestock							
No livestock	62	54	-8	5.31		-18.0	3.3
Small only	10	12	3	2.44		-2.2	7.5
Large only	7	7	0	2.30		-4.5	4.7
Small and large	22	27	5	3.96		-3.3	12.5
Landholding (in acres)							
Mean	6.9	6.6	-0.3	1.07		-2.4	1.9
0	25	29	4	6.41		-6.8	18.8
0-0.99	3	4	1	1.36		-1.8	3.7
1-1.99	11	5	-6	1.65	***	-8.8	-2.2
2-3.99	17	15	-3	3.07		-7.5	4.8
4-5.99	15	12	-3	3.01		-7.9	4.1
6+	33	35	2	4.77		-7.8	11.3
Source of water							
piped water	0	5	4	2.32	*	-0.2	9.1
protected well	43	46	3	11.55		-20.6	25.6
unprotected well	56	3	-53	8.32	***	-69.6	-36.3
Type of toilet							
None	2	19	18	3.20	***	11.4	24.2
Flush toilet	0	2	2	1.35		-0.8	4.7
Covered pit latrine	89	77	-12	4.36	***	-20.5	-3.0
Uncovered pit latrine	10	1	-9	2.55	***	-13.6	-3.4
Economic Situation Has Deteriorated							
Community	69	23	-46	4.33	***	-54.9	-37.6
Household	66	38	-27	3.76	***	-35.0	-19.9

Source: Meatu DC CWIQ for 2004 and 2007

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 the same extension of land as the year preceding each of the surveys has increased, while the share reporting a decrease in landowning has reduced. The distribution of households by landholding shows that the share of households owning between 1 and 2 acres of land has decreased significantly. There were no changes in the percentage distribution of ownership of any type of livestock.

The distribution of households by difficulties satisfying food needs shows contrasting results. Both the share of households that report never having difficulties and always having difficulties increased significantly, while the share

that reported having difficulties 'sometimes' decreased.

The share of households getting water from unprotected wells decreased significantly by between 36 and 70 percent. The share of households with no toilet is higher in the 2007 survey, while the share of households reporting pit latrines has is lower both for covered and uncovered latrines.

Finally, the share of people reporting deterioration in the economic situation of the community has decreased in 2007 in comparison to the 2004 survey, as well as the share reporting deterioration of the economic situation of the household.