PMO-RALG

TEMEKE MC CWIQ
Survey on Poverty, Welfare and Services in Temeke MC

FEBRUARY 2007

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

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was commissioned by the Prime Minister's Office – Regional Administration and Local Governance (PMO-RALG) and implemented by EDI (Economic Development Initiatives). It is part of an effort to conduct CWIQ surveys in 34 districts across Tanzania. The project Director is Joachim De Weerdt. Field work operations are being co-coordinated by Respichius Mitti and Francis Moyo. Field supervision was in the hands of Matovu Davies, Wilson Kabito, Henry Kilapilo, Henry Lugakingira, Josephine Lugomora, George Musikula, and Neema Mwampeta. The listing team was formed by Felix Kapinga and Benjamin Kamukulu. Interviewers were Dativa Balige, Geofrey Bakari, Rukia Charles, Abbanova Gabba, George Gabriel, Jamary Idrissa, Felix James, Batista John, Gloria Joseph, Placidia Josephat, Justina Katoke, Makarius Kiyonga, Sampson Mutalemwa, Faustine Misinde, Jessica Nkonjerwa, Kamugisha Robert, Resti Simon, Pius Sosthenes, Aissa Soud, Adella Theobald, and Honoratha Wycliffe. The data processing software was written by Jim Otto and Neil Chalmers. The data entry team consisted of Mary Stella Andrew and Alieth Mutungi, and was supervised by Thaddeus Rweyemamu. Formatting the final document layout was in the hands of Amina Suedi. The data analysis and report writing were undertaken by Anitha Philbert and Manuel Barron. Assistance from Charles Citinka and Howard Clegg from PMO-RALG is acknowledged.

DEFINITIONS

General

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

Education

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

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

Health

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

Employment

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

Welfare

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Household characteristics						
Dependency ratio	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.5
Head is male	83.6	2.2	85.5	81.7	79.4	84.0
Head is female	16.4	2.2	14.5	18.3	20.6	16.0
Head is monagamous	63.8	3.2	58.2	69.2	76.8	62.3
Head is polygamous	3.2	1.0	2.8	3.6	2.3	3.3
Head is not married	33.0	3.2	39.0	27.2	20.9	34.4
Household welfare						
Household economic situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	45.1	2.8	37.6	52.5	60.0	43.4
Better now	19.5	2.8	25.4	13.8	4.8	21.2
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago						
Worse now	41.3	4.4	37.0	45.5	54.3	39.8
Better now	35.4	4.2	31.2	39.5	30.0	36.0
Difficulty satisfying household needs						
Food	22.0	2.9	21.4	22.5	57.0	18.0
School fees	4.5	1.2	5.0	4.0	13.3	3.5
House rent	8.8	1.7	8.3	9.2	2.1	9.5
Utility bills	9.2	1.7	13.2	5.3	16.2	8.4
Health care	16.8	2.5	12.6	21.0	37.5	14.5
Agriculture						
Land owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	0.6	0.5	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.7
More now	0.9	0.6	0.0	1.8	4.5	0.5
Cattle owned compared to one year ago						
Less now	0.6	0.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.7
More now	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.8	0.0	0.5
Use of agricultural inputs						
Yes	9.8	2.1	5.8	13.8	15.3	9.2
Fertilizers	41.7	7.4	62.4	33.2	23.3	45.1
Improved seedlings	62.9	7.3	58.5	64.7	83.2	59.1
Fingerlings	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Hooks and nets	12.9	10.5	0.0	18.2	20.9	11.4
Insecticides	42.1	7.8	63.1	33.4	48.5	40.9
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Household infrastructure						
Secure housing tenure	41.0	2.7	44.0	37.9	48.4	40.1
Access to water	97.7	1.1	99.9	95.6	98.2	97.7
Safe water source	68.9	4.4	70.6	67.3	72.9	68.4
Safe sanitation	27.7	3.8	36.2	19.4	5.6	30.2
Improved waste disposal	74.3	4.2	76.5	72.1	63.2	75.5
Non-wood fuel used for cooking	7.4	1.4	10.6	4.3	0.0	8.2
Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment						
Fixed line phone	1.3	0.5	1.2	1.5	0.0	1.5
Mobile phone	65.6	3.6	69.9	61.3	35.2	68.9
Radio set	75.9	2.6	80.4	71.6	67.9	76.8
Television set	37.0	4.5	45.7	28.5	9.4	40.1

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Employment						
Employer in the main job						
Civil service	4.1	0.9	5.1	3.3	0.0	4.8
Other public serve	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.4
Parastatal	0.6	0.3	0.8	0.3	0.9	0.5
NGO	0.7	0.3	0.8	0.6	0.0	0.8
Private sector formal	13.0	1.9	19.4	7.2	4.3	14.4
Private sector informal	33.0	2.0	29.2	36.4	33.8	32.9
Household	44.1	1.8	39.6	48.2	57.9	41.9
Activity in the main job						
Agriculture	3.3	1.5	1.9	4.5	10.0	2.2
Mining/quarrying	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Manufacturing	1.7	0.5	3.1	0.4	1.5	1.7
Services	4.8	0.9	6.0	3.7	1.2	5.4
Employment Status in last 7 days						
Unemployed (age 15-24)	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
Male	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.3
Female	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Unemployed (age 15 and above))	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2
Male	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	1.0	0.1
Female	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.3
Underemployed (age 15 and above)	18.2	1.5	20.0	16.5	10.9	19.4
Male	24.3	1.8	26.7	21.9	15.7	25.5
Female	12.1	1.9	12.7	11.6	7.1	13.0
Education						
Adult literacy rate						
Total	90.1	2.0	95.4	85.3	74.0	92.8
Male	96.3	1.0	98.9	93.7	82.9	98.3
Female	83.8	3.4	91.5	77.5	66.7	87.0
Youth literacy rate (age 15-24)						
Total	93.9	1.3	97.3	90.7	93.3	94.0
Male	98.7	1.0	100.0	97.3	96.8	99.2
Female	89.6	2.1	94.5	85.5	87.6	89.9
Primary school						
Access to School	88.2	4.1	94.5	83.5	77.4	91.3
Primary Gross Enrollment	112.9	3.2	115.1	111.3	136.3	106.3
Male	113.1	5.5	114.7	111.8	132.8	108.0
Female	112.7	5.5	115.5	110.8	139.9	104.1
Primary Net Enrollment	93.1	1.9	96.8	90.4	99.6	91.3
Male	94.7	1.6	99.1	91.0	99.2	93.5
Female	91.2	3.2	93.6	89.6	100.0	88.5
Satisfaction	52.6	4.5	43.7	59.5	46.9	54.7
Primary completion rate	22.3	2.8	25.8	19.7	13.2	24.9

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Secondary school						
Access to School	53.9	5.4	72.4	38.6	59.8	52.4
Secondary Gross Enrollment	39.6	6.1	42.8	36.9	12.5	46.6
Male	38.6	6.4	43.5	34.1	13.8	47.1
Female	40.7	8.2	42.0	39.8	9.9	46.1
Secondary Net Enrollment	29.5	4.5	34.7	25.2	9.2	34.8
Male	29.9	4.9	35.9	24.3	13.8	35.4
Female	29.1	5.9	33.0	26.2	0.0	34.1
Satisfaction	60.3	6.1	51.4	68.9	71.8	59.5
Secondary completion rate	3.3	1.5	5.5	1.5	0.0	4.2
Medical services						
Health access	73.2	2.7	79.1	68.4	65.2	74.8
Need	17.1	1.2	18.9	15.8	16.5	17.3
Use	19.8	1.3	21.6	18.4	17.0	20.4
Satisfaction	63.9	5.7	52.6	74.6	62.9	64.1
Consulted traditional healer	0.9	0.6	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.0
Pre-natal care	96.7	2.6	97.9	95.9	100.0	96.2
Anti-malaria measures used	93.7	1.9	92.4	95.0	89.1	94.2
Person has physical/mental challenge	0.5	0.2	0.5	0.5	1.6	0.3
Child welfare and health						
Orphanhood (children under 18)						
Both parents dead	1.6	0.5	2.1	1.2	2.1	1.4
Father only	6.8	1.3	4.4	8.5	16.1	4.5
Mother only	3.3	0.8	3.9	2.9	3.5	3.3
Fostering (children under 18)						
Both parents absent	13.7	1.9	11.0	15.5	26.7	10.4
Father only absent	15.1	2.5	15.9	14.6	20.7	13.8
Mother only absent	8.6	1.6	10.5	7.3	7.3	9.0
Children under 5						
Delivery by health professionals	95.4	1.6	95.3	95.4	90.2	96.2
Measles immunization	77.8	2.5	78.8	77.3	67.9	79.4
Fully vaccinated	66.4	3.3	72.9	63.0	63.3	66.9
Not vaccinated	11.1	3.8	3.3	15.2	31.7	7.8
Stunted	14.4	3.8	12.9	15.1	8.0	15.3
Wasted	2.4	1.4	2.2	2.6	0.0	2.8
Underweight	8.9	2.9	8.5	9.1	10.7	8.6

** 1.96 standard deviations*

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Temeke MC CWIQ

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

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

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

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

Although beyond the purpose of this report, the results of Temeke MC CWIQ could also be set against those of other CWIQ surveys that have been or 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, Meatu DC, Kahama DC, Mpwapwa, Mbulu DC, Morogoro DC, Muheza DC, Musoma DC, Ngara DC, Ngorongoro DC, Njombe DC, Rufiji DC, Shinyanga MC, Singida DC, Songea DC, Sumbawanga DC, Dodoma MC and Tanga MC. Other African countries that have implemented nationally representative CWIQ surveys include Malawi, Ghana and Nigeria.

1.2 Sampling

The Temeke MC CWIQ was sampled to be representative at district level. Data from the 2002 Census was used to put together a list of all mitaa[1] in the district. In the first stage of the sampling process, 30 mitaa were chosen with probabilities proportional to their population size. In a second stage a section was chosen within each selected mtaa[2] through simple random sampling. In the selected section (also referred to as cluster or enumeration area in this report), all households were listed and 15 households were randomly selected. In total 450 households in 30 clusters were visited. All households were given statistical weights reflecting the number of households that they represent.

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

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

1.3 Constructed variables to disaggregate tables

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

---

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

[2] Singular of 'mitaa'

1.3.1 Poverty Status

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

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

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

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

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure in Dar es Salaam 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	Ownership of an iron
Main source of income	Ownership of a watch or clock
Main acticity of the household head	Ownership of a motor vehicle
	Ownership of a matress or bed
Household Amenities	Main material on the roof
People per room	Main material on the walls
Problems satisfying food needs	Land ownership
Type of toilet	Main material on the floor
Mtaa Level Variables	
% of households with a bank account	

Source: HBS 2000/2001 for Dar es Salaam Region

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[3].

The Temeke 2007 CWIQ uses poverty predictors to classify households as poor or non-poor, i.e. to determine whether a household's monthly consumption per adult equivalent unit is below or above the Basic Needs Poverty Line. This binary approach generates two types of mistakes associated with the prediction:

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

One way of determining the accuracy of the poverty predictors is to see how many mistakes of each type the model makes. To do this the poverty predictor model is applied to the actual consumption expenditure data. Results of this exercise are presented in Table 1.2. The model wrongly predicts a non-poor household to be poor in just 1 percent of the cases, but at the same time it predicts a poor household to be non-poor in 7 percent of the cases. This means that the model is strongly biased towards underestimating poverty, and thus cannot be used. Effectively, when applied to the 2007 data for Temeke MC, this method results in only 3 percent of poor households, while the poverty rate for Dar es Salaam region with the 2000/2001 HBS is 10 percent.

Table 1.2 : Predicted and Observed Poverty Rates, Dar es Salaam Region, 2000/01

Predicted	Observed		
	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Non-Poor	89.4	6.9	96.3
Poor	1.3	2.4	3.7
Total	90.7	9.4	100.0

Source: HBS 2000/01 for Dar es Salaam Region

For this reason the method was changed slightly to get the poverty variable, in the following way. First, the model was used to predict household income. Then, households were ranked according to their predicted income. Finally, the 10 percent with the lowest income were classified as poor (the poverty rate for Dar es Salaam region obtained with the HBS is 10 percent).

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 Temeke CWIQ, on the other hand, is sufficiently large to allow detailed district-level analysis.

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.

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

Table 1.3: Cluster Location

	Median Time (in minutes) to: District Capital	All-Weather Road	Public Transport	Poverty Rate	Estimated Number of Households
Cluster Location					
Remote	15	15	90	14.5	100,395
Accessible	15	10	50	5.9	106,755

Source: CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

	Poverty Rate	Percentage Living in	
		Remote Clusters	Accessible Clusters
Socio-Economic Group			
Employees	2.5	54.4	45.6
Self-Employed Agriculture	36.7	14.1	85.9
Self-Employed Other	10.8	53.1	46.9
Other	31.1	40.5	59.5

Source: CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC DC

Table 1.3 shows that the poverty rates differ substantially by cluster location: households in remote clusters are more likely to be poor than households in accessible clusters. Whereas the poverty rate in accessible clusters is 6 percent, the rate in remote clusters is 15 percent.

1.3.3 Socio-economic Group

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

Table 1.4 shows that the poverty rate is highest for households whose main income earner is self-employed in agriculture or belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group, at rates of 37 and 31 percent, respectively. On the contrary, poverty is lowest for households where the main income earner is an employee or self-employed in non-agricultural activities, with 3 and 11 percent of the households of each group being classified as poor, respectively. In addition, households from the latter groups are the most likely to be located in remote clusters, at rates of 54 and 53 percent, respectively, whereas the self-employed in agriculture report the highest shares of households located in accessible clusters, at 86 percent.

The gender of the household head by socio-economic group is shown in Table 1.5. 86 percent of households are headed by a male. The share of female-headed households is highest for the 'other' socio-economic group at 55 percent, and in second place for the self-employed in agriculture, at 25 percent. It is lowest for the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, at 16 and 14 percent, respectively.

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 services, to which 65 percent of the household heads are dedicated. Employees are mostly dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction, with a share of 88 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities are mostly dedicated to services (96 percent). The 'other' category is mainly concentrated in services and mining,

manufacturing, energy, and construction (63 and 29 percent, respectively).

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

	Male	Female	Total
Socio-economic Group			
Employees	84.2	15.8	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	75.1	24.9	100.0
Self-Employed Other	85.8	14.2	100.0
Other	45.3	54.7	100.0
Total	83.6	16.4	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

	Agriculture	Mining Manufacturing Energy Construction	Private and Public Services	Household Duties	Other	Total
Socio-economic Group						
Employees	2.8	88.2	7.1	1.9	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Agric	94.6	0.0	3.1	2.3	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Other	1.2	0.3	96.4	2.1	0.1	100.0
Other	0.0	8.0	28.9	63.2	0.0	100.0
Total	5.3	26.2	64.9	3.6	0.1	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1 Introduction

2 POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Introduction

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

2.2 Main Population Characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the percent distribution of the population by cluster location and poverty status, by gender and age. Overall, the district's population is young. For instance, 4 percent of the population is 60 years old or over, whereas 36 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 61 percent is between 15 and 59 years old. The breakdown by cluster location and poverty status reveals that households in accessible clusters and non-poor households report higher shares in the 15-59 cohorts than their respective counterparts.

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

The mean dependency ratio is 0.6, meaning that on average one adult has to take care of 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 1.0 and 0.5 respectively.

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.1 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 0.8 and 0.7 for households with 5 or 6 members and 7 or more members respectively. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'self-employed agriculture' group has the highest dependency ratio (1.1), whereas the 'employee' group has the lowest dependency ratio at 0.5.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that the dependency ratio in female-headed households is slightly higher than in male-headed households, at 0.6 and 0.7, respectively.

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 4.0 individuals. Households with 7 or more individuals only represent 15 percent of all households in the district. The figure for households with 3 or 4 members is 38

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	18.5	30.2	2.1	50.9	17.0	30.6	1.5	49.1	35.5	60.9	3.6	100.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	17.4	33.6	2.0	53.0	14.6	31.3	1.0	47.0	32.0	64.9	3.0	100.0
Remote	19.4	27.5	2.2	49.1	18.9	30.0	1.9	50.9	38.4	57.6	4.1	100.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	22.4	21.3	4.3	48.1	20.8	25.5	5.6	51.9	43.1	46.9	10.0	100.0
Non-poor	17.8	32.0	1.7	51.4	16.3	31.6	0.7	48.6	34.1	63.6	2.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

Table 2.2: Dependency ratio

	0-4 years	5-14 years	0-14 years	15-64 years	65+ years	Total	Dependency ratio
Total	0.5	1.0	1.4	2.5	0.1	4.0	0.6
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.3	0.9	1.2	2.4	0.1	3.6	0.5
Remote	0.6	1.1	1.7	2.6	0.1	4.4	0.7
Poverty Status							
Poor	0.6	2.2	2.8	3.2	0.5	6.6	1.0
Non-poor	0.4	0.8	1.3	2.4	0.0	3.7	0.5
Household size							
1-2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.1	1.4	0.1
3-4	0.6	0.7	1.3	2.2	0.0	3.5	0.6
5-6	0.7	1.6	2.2	3.1	0.1	5.4	0.8
7+	0.7	2.7	3.4	4.8	0.2	8.3	0.7
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	0.5	1.1	1.6	3.0	0.0	4.5	0.5
Self-employed - agric	0.4	1.3	1.7	2.1	0.6	4.4	1.1
Self-employed - other	0.4	0.9	1.4	2.4	0.1	3.8	0.6
Other	0.4	0.5	0.9	1.8	0.4	3.1	0.7
Gender of Household Head							
Male	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.7	0.1	4.2	0.6
Female	0.2	0.9	1.1	1.8	0.1	3.1	0.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

	1-2 persons	3-4 persons	5-6 persons	7+ persons	Total	household size
Total	27.7	37.7	19.6	15.0	100.0	4.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	33.7	34.1	20.4	11.9	100.0	3.6
Remote	21.8	41.2	18.8	18.1	100.0	4.4
Poverty Status						
Poor	8.0	7.8	29.9	54.2	100.0	6.6
Non-poor	29.9	41.0	18.4	10.6	100.0	3.7
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	16.3	39.2	27.5	17.0	100.0	4.5
Self-employed - agric	24.3	38.8	13.3	23.6	100.0	4.4
Self-employed - other	31.9	38.0	16.0	14.0	100.0	3.8
Other	49.8	17.5	25.9	6.9	100.0	3.1
Gender of Household Head						
Male	25.0	36.5	21.4	17.0	100.0	4.2
Female	41.6	43.5	10.2	4.7	100.0	3.1

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

percent.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote clusters tend to be larger than households in accessible clusters, with means of 4.4 and 3.6 members, respectively. The difference by poverty status is more pronounced, with poor households reporting a mean household size of 6.6 members, and non-poor households reporting 3.7 members on average.

Regarding socio-economic groups, the employees have the highest mean household size, at 4.5, while the 'other' socio-economic group has the lowest at 3.1 members.

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female headed households: the former have 4.2 members in average, whereas the latter have only 3.1 members.

2.3 Main Household Characteristics

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

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

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

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Parents	Other relative	Not related	Total
Total	24.8	17.5	41.8	0.6	15.0	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	27.5	17.8	40.8	0.1	13.2	0.6	100.0
Remote	22.6	17.2	42.7	0.9	16.5	0.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	15.2	12.1	38.1	1.6	32.6	0.4	100.0
Non-poor	26.7	18.5	42.6	0.4	11.5	0.3	100.0
Age							
0- 9	0.0	0.0	81.2	0.0	18.8	0.0	100.0
10-19	0.9	3.0	68.6	0.0	26.6	0.9	100.0
20-29	23.8	31.7	28.0	0.0	16.2	0.3	100.0
30-39	52.2	39.1	4.9	0.0	3.9	0.0	100.0
40-49	66.2	30.0	1.4	0.3	1.4	0.8	100.0
50-59	78.5	18.9	0.0	2.3	0.3	0.0	100.0
60 and above	66.6	13.7	0.0	12.9	6.9	0.0	100.0
Gender							
Male	40.7	0.5	43.4	0.2	14.9	0.3	100.0
Female	8.3	35.0	40.2	1.0	15.0	0.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

	Never married	Married monog	Married polyg	Informal, loose union	Divorced	Separated	Widowed	Total
Total	42.8	44.7	2.2	2.6	0.4	4.8	2.6	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	46.3	43.0	2.1	2.8	0.1	4.3	1.5	100.0
Remote	39.7	46.1	2.4	2.4	0.6	5.2	3.6	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	51.1	35.3	1.0	0.0	0.3	4.7	7.5	100.0
Non-poor	41.3	46.4	2.5	3.0	0.4	4.8	1.7	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	90.9	6.3	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.5	0.3	100.0
20-24	65.8	28.0	0.0	3.9	0.3	1.6	0.3	100.0
25-29	37.0	52.5	1.8	4.6	0.0	4.0	0.2	100.0
30-39	13.0	70.2	3.0	4.0	0.5	9.0	0.3	100.0
40-49	2.0	76.5	5.9	1.8	1.8	7.1	4.8	100.0
50-59	4.0	67.6	9.1	0.8	0.0	7.8	10.6	100.0
60 and above	2.6	63.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	7.8	24.2	100.0
Gender								
Male	47.0	44.2	2.2	2.5	0.2	2.8	1.0	100.0
Female	38.4	45.2	2.3	2.6	0.6	6.8	4.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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 41 and 8 percent, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be spouses to the household head than males, at rates of 35 and 1 percent, respectively.

Table 2.5 shows the percent distribution of the population age 12 and above by marital status. Overall, 43 percent of the population has never been married. In addition, 45 percent is married and monogamous, and 2 percent is married and polygamous. Despite virtually nobody in the district being 'officially' divorced, 5 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated. Informal unions and widowed population constitute 3 percent each.

The breakdown by cluster location and poverty status shows that households in accessible clusters and poor households are more likely to have never been married than their respective counterparts. In turn, households in remote clusters and the non-poor are more likely to be in a monogamous marriage.

The age breakdown shows that the 'polygamous-married' category peaks at the 50-59 groups, at 9 percent. For the population after 25 years old, married-monogamous is the most common category. 'Separated' and 'widowed' show higher shares for the older cohorts. 'Never married' also shows correlation with age, decreasing rapidly as the population gets older. Around 47 percent of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is only 38 percent.

Table 2.6 shows the percent distribution of the population age 5 and above by socio-economic group. Overall, 28 percent of the population is self-employed in non-agricultural, with 61 percent in other activities. The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible clusters report a higher share in the 'employee' category, whereas households in remote cluster report a higher share in the 'other' socio-economic group. Similar observations are evident when analysing by poverty status with non-poor households resembling households in accessible clusters.

The analysis of the age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of employees peaks at 30 percent for the 50-59 cohorts. The share for self-employed other is higher for the population in the 30-39 age-group, at 51 percent. The share of self-employed in agriculture tends to

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	10.3	1.3	28.0	60.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	13.2	0.5	29.7	56.6	100.0
Remote	7.8	2.0	26.5	63.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	1.4	2.8	22.3	73.5	100.0
Non-poor	12.1	1.0	29.1	57.8	100.0
Age					
5- 9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
10-14	0.0	0.0	0.9	99.1	100.0
15-19	0.4	0.0	12.4	87.2	100.0
20-29	8.5	0.0	36.5	55.0	100.0
30-39	18.4	1.6	51.2	28.8	100.0
40-49	33.1	1.8	47.4	17.6	100.0
50-59	29.9	5.3	46.2	18.5	100.0
60 and above	9.8	14.3	42.6	33.2	100.0
Gender					
Male	14.3	1.6	34.7	49.4	100.0
Female	6.0	1.0	20.8	72.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	11.7	2.7	24.3	36.6	13.6	0.7	10.5	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	7.9	2.0	23.7	36.0	16.1	1.1	13.3	100.0
Remote	14.9	3.3	24.8	37.2	11.5	0.3	8.0	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	23.0	3.8	36.2	28.4	7.0	0.0	1.6	100.0
Non-poor	9.4	2.5	21.9	38.3	14.9	0.8	12.2	100.0
Age								
5- 9	40.0	18.2	41.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	0.0	0.9	86.2	10.3	2.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	2.1	0.0	17.3	49.7	29.0	0.0	1.8	100.0
20-29	7.3	0.0	6.6	50.7	24.5	1.8	9.1	100.0
30-39	4.8	0.0	5.4	57.7	13.6	1.0	17.6	100.0
40-49	6.6	0.0	6.0	50.0	10.4	0.5	26.6	100.0
50-59	16.9	0.0	14.8	31.1	4.3	0.0	32.9	100.0
60 and above	42.3	0.0	23.3	9.8	3.1	0.3	21.3	100.0
Gender								
Male	8.9	2.2	26.2	34.3	14.3	0.5	13.7	100.0
Female	14.7	3.3	22.3	39.1	12.9	0.8	7.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

increase with age, peaking at 14 percent for the 60+ cohort. On the contrary, the category 'other' tends to decrease with age, showing a sharp decrease between 15-19 and 20-29, from 87 to 55 percent, then decreases steadily until 19 percent for the 50-59 cohort.

The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be self-employed in non-agricultural activities than women. In turn, females are more likely to be in the 'other' category, with a share of 72 percent against 49 percent for the males.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. Roughly 12 percent of the population has no education, 24 percent has some primary, 37 percent has completed primary, 14 percent has some secondary and 11 percent has post secondary education.

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

The age breakdown shows that 40 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 96 percent of the children 10-14 have some or complete primary. Rates of no education are lowest for the population in the 10-14 cohorts and higher for the older groups. In the groups between 20 and 49 years old, the most common is completed primary.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males: 15 against 9 percent, but at the same time similar shares some and completed secondary. The share of females reporting completed primary is higher than that of males (39 and 34 percent, respectively).

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	15.2	63.8	3.2	3.7	14.1	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	22.4	58.2	2.8	3.7	12.8	100.0
Remote	8.1	69.2	3.6	3.6	15.4	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	4.2	76.8	2.3	0.0	16.7	100.0
Non-poor	16.4	62.3	3.3	4.1	13.9	100.0
Age						
15-19	53.5	46.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	42.0	47.1	0.0	6.0	4.9	100.0
30-39	13.7	64.3	1.1	5.5	15.4	100.0
40-49	2.5	74.4	4.9	2.7	15.6	100.0
50-59	4.8	63.1	11.7	0.0	20.4	100.0
60 and above	3.9	75.2	2.4	0.0	18.4	100.0
Gender						
Male	11.9	75.8	3.8	3.8	4.7	100.0
Female	32.2	2.7	0.0	3.2	61.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	29.1	3.8	63.7	3.4	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	34.5	1.2	62.3	2.0	100.0
Remote	23.6	6.3	65.2	4.9	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	7.3	13.8	68.3	10.6	100.0
Non-poor	31.5	2.7	63.2	2.6	100.0
Age					
15-19	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	15.1	0.0	81.4	3.5	100.0
30-39	31.0	1.6	66.1	1.3	100.0
40-49	41.3	2.8	53.1	2.9	100.0
50-59	42.7	6.4	46.1	4.8	100.0
60 and above	7.4	18.6	63.5	10.6	100.0
Gender					
Male	29.3	3.4	65.5	1.9	100.0
Female	27.9	5.7	54.9	11.4	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 64 percent of the household heads is married and monogamous, 14 divorced, separated or widowed, 15 percent has never been married, 3 percent married and polygamous, and a further 4 percent lives in an informal union.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote clusters report higher shares of married monogamous household heads than accessible clusters. In turn, the latter are more likely to have never been married than the former. Similarly, poor households are more likely to be in a monogamous marriage, whereas non-poor households are more likely to have never been married.

The breakdown by age-group shows that the ‘married-monogamous’ and ‘divorced, separated or widowed’ categories

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	5.4	8.2	49.3	10.5	0.4	26.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	2.1	5.8	48.4	12.6	0.9	30.2	100.0
Remote	8.7	10.5	50.1	8.5	0.0	22.2	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	36.6	24.3	32.6	0.0	0.0	6.5	100.0
Non-poor	1.9	6.4	51.2	11.7	0.5	28.3	100.0
Age							
15-19	0.0	0.0	53.5	46.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	5.8	7.9	66.2	9.0	1.2	9.9	100.0
30-39	1.1	2.9	56.7	13.9	0.3	25.2	100.0
40-49	0.9	5.0	46.2	13.4	0.3	34.2	100.0
50-59	8.0	12.0	36.3	4.3	0.0	39.5	100.0
60 and above	27.0	29.8	12.0	1.4	0.5	29.3	100.0
Gender							
Male	2.4	8.9	50.0	11.3	0.5	27.0	100.0
Female	20.8	4.6	45.9	6.9	0.0	21.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

increases with age as 'never married' decreases. The trend is less clear for 'married polygamous' and 'loose informal union'.

Most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (62 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 5 percent. Most male household heads are married monogamous (76 percent against 3 percent of females).
Table 2.9 shows the percent distribution of household heads by socio-economic group. It is worth remembering that the socio-economic group of the household is determined by the type of employment of the main income earner of the household, who not always the household head. As expected, the great majority of the municipal's household heads belongs to the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, with a share of 64 percent. The self-employed in agriculture only 4 percent of the household heads, the employees represent 29 percent, the 'other' category (unemployed, inactive and household workers) is a further 3 percent.

The analysis by cluster location shows that the share of employee's household heads in accessible clusters is higher than in remote clusters, with shares of 35 and 24 percent, respectively. Heads of poor households belong to the 'self-employed other' group more frequently than non-poor households. On the other hand, the heads of non-poor households belong to the 'employee' group more often than the heads of poor households.

The breakdown by age of the household head shows interesting insights. For all age-groups, 'self-employed other' is the most important category, representing at least 4 out of 5 household heads in each age-group. The 'employee' category peaks at 43 percent for the 50-59 age-groups. The 'self-employed agriculture' tends to increase with age. The 'other' category gains importance in the 60+ age-group, with a share 11 percent, as it includes the economically inactive population.

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

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, around 26 percent of the household heads has any education after primary. 46 percent of the household heads has completed primary, 8 percent some primary and only 5 percent of the household heads have no formal education.

Table 2.11 - Orphan status of children under 18 years old

	Children who lost mother only	Children who lost father only	Children who lost both father & mother
Total	3.3	6.8	1.6
Cluster Location			
Accessible	3.9	4.4	2.1
Remote	2.9	8.5	1.2
Poverty Status			
Poor	3.5	16.1	2.1
Non-poor	3.3	4.5	1.4
Age			
0-4	0.5	2.6	0.0
5-9	0.7	5.1	0.7
10-14	5.1	10.7	2.9
15-17	10.0	10.3	3.7
Gender			
Male	4.2	5.4	1.5
Female	2.4	8.3	1.6

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

The age breakdown shows that 27 percent of household heads aged 60 or over has no education, and a further 30 percent just some primary. Completed primary represents 66 percent for the 20-29 age-group; but only 36 percent in the 50-59, and 12 percent of the 60+ cohort. In the latter groups, 'some primary' gains importance. The share of post secondary tends to increase with age peaking at 40 percent for the 50-59 cohorts.

The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education than males, with rates of 21 and 2 percent, respectively. Males report a higher share with some secondary and post secondary than females.

2.5 Orphan and Foster Status

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

Cluster location and poverty status are not strongly correlated with orphan status of the children. 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 24 percent of the children between 15 and 17 years lost at least one parent, and 10 of the children in that age-group lost their father only. 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 37 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

55 percent of children from poor households live in non-nuclear households, while the share for poor households is 33 percent. There appears to be no strong correlation between cluster location and foster status.

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	15.1	8.6	13.7	37.4
Cluster Location				
Accessible	15.9	10.5	11.0	37.5
Remote	14.6	7.3	15.5	37.4
Poverty Status				
Poor	20.7	7.3	26.7	54.7
Non-poor	13.8	9.0	10.4	33.2
Age				
0-4	16.7	1.4	3.1	21.1
5-9	18.3	10.0	10.1	38.5
10-14	12.6	11.1	19.6	43.3
15-17	10.9	13.9	28.4	53.2
Gender				
Male	17.8	8.5	10.9	37.2
Female	12.2	8.8	16.7	37.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

2 Population and household characteristics

3 EDUCATION

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

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

3.1 Overview of the Education indicators

3.1.1 Literacy

Table 3.1 shows the main education indicators for the district. Literacy is defined as the ability to read and write in any language, as reported by the respondent. Individuals who are able to read but cannot write are considered illiterate. The adult literacy rate[1] is 90 percent. The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible clusters report a higher literacy rate than remote clusters, at 95 and 85 percent, respectively.

In turn, the breakdown by poverty status shows that the rate is higher among non-poor households, at 93 percent, compared to poor households, at 74 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the literacy rate is highest among the employees (96 percent) and lowest among the self-employed in agriculture and the 'other' category (73 and 76 percent, respectively).

The gender breakdown shows an important literacy rate gap between men and women. The literacy rate among men is 12 percentage points higher than that of women at 96 percent and 84 percent respectively.

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

There are no strong differences in literacy by orphan status, but fostered children report a lower literacy rate than non-fostered, at 99 and 91 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, 88 percent of primary school-age children have access to primary school. Access is higher for accessible clusters and non-poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the highest rate is shown by the employees, while the lowest is shown by the 'other' socio-economic group.

The gender breakdown shows that males report a higher access rate than females, at rates of 91 and 85 percent. There are no strong differences by orphan status, but fostered children report a lower access rate than non-fostered children, with rates of 90 and 71 percent, respectively.

Enrolment

The two main measures of enrolment, the Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) and the Net Enrolment Rate (NER) are analysed in this section. The 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. The primary school GER informs on the ratio of all individuals in primary school to the population of individuals of primary school-age (7 to 13 years) in the district.

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

3 Education

Table 3.1: Education indicators

		Primary				Secondary			
	Adult Literacy rate	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction
Total	90.1	88.2	112.9	93.1	52.6	32.3	39.6	29.5	60.3
Cluster Location									
Accessible	95.4	94.5	115.1	96.8	43.7	55.7	42.8	34.7	51.4
Remote	85.3	83.5	111.3	90.4	59.5	13.0	36.9	25.2	68.9
Poverty Status									
Poor	74.0	77.4	136.3	99.6	46.9	21.7	12.5	9.2	71.8
Non-poor	92.8	91.3	106.3	91.3	54.7	35.1	46.6	34.8	59.5
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	96.1	92.8	106.4	93.6	45.4	48.7	63.7	45.3	69.6
Self-employed - agriculture	72.9	80.4	108.0	94.2	73.0	0.0	69.0	51.1	46.8
Self-employed - other	88.5	88.4	116.7	92.5	54.9	25.3	24.0	19.0	48.0
Other	75.9	23.8	125.2	100.0	36.0	6.1	22.4	22.4	43.2
Gender									
Male	96.3	90.9	113.1	94.7	53.3	33.0	38.6	29.9	57.2
Female	83.8	85.0	112.7	91.2	51.7	31.6	40.7	29.1	63.8
Orphan status									
Orphaned	97.0	89.3	124.8	96.5	42.6	39.9	21.9	21.9	72.8
Not-orphaned	97.1	88.0	111.0	92.5	54.6	29.7	39.2	35.7	54.2
Foster status									
Fostered	90.9	71.2	100.2	79.1	69.9	18.8	4.5	4.5	100.0
Not-fostered	99.2	89.5	113.6	93.3	52.0	33.9	48.2	44.5	56.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

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 113 percent at the time of the survey. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 113 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The NER further shows that 93 percent of all primary school-age children were attending school.

The GER does not differ by cluster location, but the NER is higher in accessible clusters. Surprisingly, the breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report higher GER and NER than non-poor households.

The GER is highest for the 'other' socio-economic category at 125 respectively. On the other hand, the GER is lowest among the employees and the self-employed in agriculture at 106 and 108 percent, respectively. The highest NER is also shown by the 'other' socio-economic

group at 100 percent, while the remaining groups report rates of 93 or 94 percent.

The breakdown by gender shows no strong differences in either enrolment rate.

The breakdown by orphan status shows that the GER for orphaned children is higher than that of non-orphaned children at 125 and 111 percent respectively, with no strong differences in NER. The breakdown by foster status shows that fostered children have a lower GER than non-fostered children at 100 and 114 percent, respectively. Likewise, fostered children have a lower NER than non-fostered children at 79 and 93 percent respectively. It is worth remembering the small sample size in the orphaned and fostered category (see chapter 2), as well as that foster and orphan status is strongly correlated with age: orphaned and fostered children have higher mean ages than non-orphaned and non-fostered children.

Satisfaction

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

Around half (53 percent) of all primary school pupils were satisfied with school. 44 percent of pupils living in accessible clusters are satisfied with school compared to 60 percent of pupils living in remote clusters. Likewise, while virtually all pupils living in poor households reported to be satisfied with school, the share for pupils living in non-poor households is 91 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households belonging to the 'other' category have the lowest rate of

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

		Reasons for dissatisfaction							
	Percent dissatisfied	Books/ supplies	Poor Teaching	Lack of teachers	Teachers absent	Lack of space	Facilties in bad condition	High fees	Other
Total	42.8	69.0	22.8	28.9	6.8	19.4	33.4	21.4	1.4
Cluster Location									
Accessible	51.8	62.0	33.0	28.8	12.3	31.6	24.0	30.3	2.5
Remote	35.2	77.7	10.2	28.9	0.0	4.2	45.1	10.3	0.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	48.5	85.0	12.6	32.5	12.1	6.6	37.3	8.3	0.0
Non-poor	41.4	64.3	25.8	27.8	5.2	23.1	32.3	25.2	1.8
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	41.0	68.9	33.2	39.6	8.6	36.2	43.4	19.6	2.3
Self-employed - agric	32.2	72.7	0.0	12.9	0.0	12.9	12.9	35.7	0.0
Self-employed - other	44.3	68.1	18.1	23.4	6.4	9.9	26.1	22.2	0.9
Other	64.5	87.9	15.2	23.5	0.0	3.8	88.6	7.6	0.0
Gender									
Male	44.0	64.3	22.6	27.1	4.7	20.1	33.0	24.1	1.5
Female	41.3	75.1	23.0	31.2	9.4	18.3	33.9	17.8	1.2
Type of school									
Primary	47.4	75.4	21.8	28.8	6.6	20.4	31.1	12.5	1.9
Government	48.1	76.7	22.7	29.9	6.8	21.0	32.4	9.2	1.9
Private	33.7	40.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	39.7	60.4	27.5	40.7	10.0	12.9	47.2	41.1	0.0
Government	41.1	68.5	42.5	65.2	5.3	6.5	64.7	18.8	0.0
Private	40.2	41.8	6.2	21.0	15.9	2.9	28.0	61.9	0.0
Other	33.6	91.4	39.7	9.0	9.0	73.3	42.6	60.3	0.0
Other	27.4	37.4	22.4	10.7	3.2	21.9	27.7	52.7	0.0
Government	20.4	32.9	48.9	16.4	10.2	23.8	13.4	57.6	0.0
Private	24.1	47.3	19.6	15.2	0.0	26.1	50.8	34.0	0.0
Other	53.9	30.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.2	15.2	69.4	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

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

		Reasons not currently attending										
	Percent not attending	Completed school	Distance	Cost	Work	Illness	Pregnancy	Got married	Useless/ uninteresting	Failed exam	Awaits admission	Dismissed
Total	22.1	24.7	0.2	29.1	29.5	0.0	0.0	8.4	5.4	33.1	20.8	0.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	21.9	9.7	0.0	32.5	43.8	0.0	0.0	6.6	6.2	40.1	26.3	0.0
Remote	22.2	36.5	0.4	26.4	18.3	0.0	0.0	9.9	4.8	27.6	16.4	0.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	21.3	21.8	0.0	29.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.5	33.8	11.2	0.0
Non-poor	22.3	25.4	0.3	29.1	32.5	0.0	0.0	10.7	3.8	32.9	23.4	0.0
Socio-economic Group												
Employee	19.8	28.8	0.0	25.0	27.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	16.9	34.9	0.0
Self-employed - agric	8.4	0.0	0.0	88.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	88.4	11.6	0.0
Self-employed - other	24.1	24.7	0.4	28.5	31.5	0.0	0.0	8.4	8.5	38.9	13.7	0.0
Other	33.1	0.0	0.0	44.5	27.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.5	27.8	0.0
Gender												
Male	20.0	25.4	0.0	32.5	27.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	33.2	24.8	0.0
Female	24.5	24.0	0.5	25.8	31.0	0.0	0.0	16.5	4.4	33.1	17.0	0.0
Age												
7-13	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.4	46.4	30.2	0.0
14-19	48.6	25.5	0.2	30.1	30.5	0.0	0.0	8.7	4.8	32.6	20.5	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

satisfaction with primary school at 36 percent, while the figure for pupils living in households belonging to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is highest, at 73 percent.

The gender breakdown shows no strong differences. In addition, orphaned and non-orphaned children report similar satisfaction rates. However, fostered children report lower rates than non-fostered children, at 79 and 93 percent, respectively.

3.1.3 Secondary School Access

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

Only 32 percent of all pupils in secondary school have access to secondary school. While the rate is 56 percent for accessible clusters, the rate for remote clusters is 13 percent. Similarly, while 35 percent of pupils living in non-poor households have access to secondary school, the share for pupils living in poor households is less than 22 percent.

The socio-economic status of the household seems to be strongly correlated with the rate of access to secondary school. While pupils from the 'self-employed agriculture' category have the lowest rate of access to secondary school at 0 percent, the employees have the highest rate at 49 percent.

There are no strong differences in the access rate to secondary school by gender, but orphan children report a higher rate of access. In contrast, non-fostered children report a higher access rate than fostered children, at 34 and 19 percent, respectively.

Enrolment

As previously explained, the 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, the GER was 40 percent and NER was 30 percent. Accessible clusters and non-poor households report higher enrolment rates than their counterparts.

The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the self-employed in agriculture report the highest GER and NER at 69 and 51 percent, respectively whereas the 'self-employed other' and the 'other' categories report the lowest rates, at 24 and 22 percent for the GER and 19 and 22 percent for the NER, respectively.

There are no differences by gender, but orphan and foster status show important differences. Non-orphaned children report higher NER and GER (39 and 36 percent) than orphaned children (22 and 22 percent). In turn, non-fostered children report higher GER and NER (at 48 and 45 percent) than fostered children (at 5 and 5 percent).

Satisfaction

60 percent of the population enrolled in secondary school is satisfied with school. The satisfaction rate is higher than in primary schools (53 percent). The satisfaction rate is higher for remote clusters and poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the employees report the highest satisfaction rate at 70 percent, while the remaining groups show rates between 43 and 48 percent.
The secondary school satisfaction rate is higher among females, at 64 percent, than among females, at 57 percent. In turn, orphaned and fostered children report higher satisfaction rates than their counterparts.

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, 43 percent of the students who were enrolled in either primary or secondary school reported dissatisfaction with school. 69 percent of students reported lack of books or supplies as the reason for dissatisfaction, followed by 33 percent reporting dissatisfaction due to facilities in bad condition and 29 percent reporting lack of teachers. Lack of space and poor teaching were cited by 23 and 19 percent of the dissatisfied students, respectively.

The dissatisfaction rate for accessible clusters is 17 percentage points higher than that of accessible clusters, at 52 and 35 percent respectively. Accessible clusters show higher proportions of dissatisfied students reporting poor teaching, lack of space, and high fees; and lower shares reporting lack of books or supplies and facilities in bad condition than remote clusters. Similar differences are observed with the breakdown by poverty status, with non-poor households resembling accessible clusters.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that the dissatisfaction rate among the 'other' category is the highest (65 percent). At the same time the self-employed in agriculture reported the lowest dissatisfaction rate (32 percent).

The gender breakdown shows no strong differences in the overall dissatisfaction rate. However, further breakdown of the data shows that females are more likely to report lack of books or supplies and less likely to report dissatisfaction due to high fees than males.

Primary school reported a dissatisfaction rate of 47 percent, while secondary school report a dissatisfaction rate of 40 percent. For those attending primary school, the most common complaint was lack of books or supplies, followed by facilities in bad condition and lack of teachers. For secondary school the most common complains were similar to primary school, but the third place was occupied by lack of teachers and high fees.

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	94.7	91.2	93.1	0.0	2.2	1.0
7	79.0	81.3	79.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	98.6	100.0	99.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
9	97.0	100.0	98.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
10	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11	98.2	100.0	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
12	100.0	82.9	92.2	0.0	6.5	3.0
13	95.5	70.0	84.7	0.0	11.0	4.6

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	29.9	29.1	29.5	15.7	16.4	16.0
14	29.7	29.3	29.5	16.6	22.4	19.3
15	25.6	38.9	30.7	20.2	28.3	23.3
16	39.9	37.6	38.7	26.7	22.0	24.2
17	59.4	40.3	49.1	14.7	7.9	11.0
18	34.2	6.5	21.1	16.9	14.5	15.8
19	2.7	28.1	12.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

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 22 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who were not attending school. Around 30 percent were not attending due to work, 29 due to cost. 25 percent of the non-attending population did not attend because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level. 21 percent reported that they were awaiting admission and 33 percent said they had failed standard four, seven or form four exams. 8 percent were not attending school because they got married and 5 percent reported that they were not attending school because they found it useless or uninteresting.

There are no strong differences in the shares of children not attending by cluster location or poverty status. However, remote clusters report higher shares of 'completed school', and lower shares of 'cost', 'work' 'failed exams', and 'awaiting admission' than accessible clusters. The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report higher non-attendance rates due to work, marriage and awaiting admission than poor households, who in turn report a higher share not attending because they found school useless or uninteresting.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' category shows the highest share of school-age children not attending school, at 33 percent. They are followed by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 24 percent and the employees at 20 percent. The self-employed in agriculture report the lowest share not attending, at 8 percent.

The gender breakdown shows that girls are less likely to be attending school than boys, with non-attendance rates of 25 and 20 percent, respectively. Males report a higher share not attending due to cost or awaiting admission than girls, who in turn report a higher share not attending due to marriage.

Almost all primary school-aged children attend school, as their non-attendance rate

is 1 percent. On the other hand, the share for secondary school-age children is 49 percent. Most of the primary school-aged children that were not attending school reported having failed the exams (46 percent), being awaiting admission (30 percent) and finding it useless or uninteresting (23 percent). In turn, the main reasons for non-attendance cited by secondary school-age children were work (31 percent), cost (30 percent), and having completed school (26 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, the 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. The primary school drop-out rate was 1 percent, with only the 12 and 13 year olds showing positive drop-out rates (3 and 5 percent, respectively). Therefore, only enrolment rates will be analysed.

Overall, 93 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), 95 percent of boys and 91 percent of girls 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 only 80 percent of all seven year olds were enrolled. Children are most likely to be in school by the age of 10, with a rate of 100 percent.

Secondary School

Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by age. Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those at primary level. Only 30 percent of secondary school-aged children were enrolled, compared to 93 percent in primary school. For a person following a normal school curriculum, i.e. starting standard one at age 7, he/she is expected to start form one at age 14. The table shows that the biggest gender difference in enrolment rates is observed at the age of 18, with 34 percent of males and 7 percent of females being enrolled.

Secondary school drop-out rates among secondary school-age individuals (14 to 19 years) are remarkably higher than those of primary school. 16 percent of children of secondary school-age had dropped out in the year prior to the survey. For males, the highest drop-out rate is observed among 16 year olds (at 24 percent), and for females among the 15 year olds at 28 percent.

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.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	96.3	83.8	90.1
15-19 years	98.9	94.9	97.1
20-29 years	96.9	86.4	90.6
30-39 years	96.9	87.8	92.1
40-49 years	98.9	82.7	92.6
50-59 years	93.6	52.0	83.1
60+ years	81.5	26.3	58.4
Accessible	98.9	91.5	95.4
15-19 years	100.0	94.2	97.4
20-29 years	98.4	93.5	95.6
30-39 years	100.0	93.4	96.6
40-49 years	97.7	84.1	92.7
50-59 years	99.2	86.3	96.9
60+ years	95.3	60.2	83.5
Remote	93.7	77.5	85.3
15-19 years	97.9	95.6	96.8
20-29 years	95.3	80.2	86.0
30-39 years	93.4	82.5	87.5
40-49 years	100.0	81.6	92.5
50-59 years	88.8	38.1	73.1
60+ years	71.1	11.7	43.2

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is population age 15+

Furthermore, questions that helped determine adult literacy was only asked for individuals aged 15 or older.

Adult Literacy

Overall, 90 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district are literate. The difference in literacy rates among males and females is about 12 percentage points at 96 percent for males and 84 percent for females. The literacy rate is negatively correlated with age. While individuals aged between 15 and 19 have the highest literacy rate (97 percent) only 58 percent of those who are above 60 years know how to read and write. There are remarkable gender differences in literacy. Furthermore, the gap is larger for the older cohorts. In the oldest cohort, the rate for males is 82 percent, and for females 26 percent, resulting in a gap of 56 percentage points.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible clusters report a higher literacy rates for males and females than remote clusters. The literacy rate for accessible clusters is 95 percent, while for remote clusters it is 10 percentage points lower, at 85 percent. The breakdown by age-group shows that the differences are wider in the older cohorts, whereas there are no strong differences in the 15-19 cohort. In addition, in accessible clusters the literacy rate of men is 7 percentage points higher than that of women. In remote clusters, the difference is larger, of 16 percentage points. While the literacy rate of women in accessible clusters is about 14 percentage points higher than that of women in remote clusters, the difference in literacy rates between men in accessible and remote clusters is just 5 percentage points. Finally, there is a significant difference in literacy rates among men and women above 60 years in both types of clusters.

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 94 percent, but the gender difference is important. While the literacy rate for men is 99 percent, the rate for women is 9 percentage points lower, at 90 percent.

Analysis by age-groups shows that the 15-17 and the 21-22 age-groups report the highest literacy rates at 97 percent. The youth literacy rate in accessible clusters is higher than that of youth in remote clusters at 97 and 91 percent, respectively. In addition, the literacy rate for males in accessible clusters is 100 percent, while in remote clusters is 97 percent. The rates for females are lowering, at 95 percent for accessible and 86 percent for remote clusters.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	98.7	89.6	93.9
15-17 years	98.0	95.6	96.9
18-20 years	100.0	85.1	92.0
21-22 years	100.0	95.7	97.3
23-24 years	96.8	81.9	89.9
Accessible	100.0	94.5	97.3
15-17 years	100.0	90.5	95.5
18-20 years	100.0	100.0	100.0
21-22 years	100.0	96.7	98.0
23-24 years	100.0	85.5	94.6
Remote	97.3	85.5	90.7
15-17 years	96.1	100.0	98.1
18-20 years	100.0	75.4	86.1
21-22 years	100.0	94.0	95.9
23-24 years	92.1	79.4	85.1

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is population aged 15-24

4 HEALTH

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

4.1. Health Indicators

Throughout this report, a household is said to have access to medical services if it is located within 30 minutes 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 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, 73 percent of the population have access to medical services, 17 percent reported having needed them, and 20 percent reported having used medical services. Finally, 64 percent of those who used medical services reported being satisfied with them.

As would be expected, households in accessible clusters have higher access to medical services than households in remote clusters. Both show similar proportions of need and use, but remote clusters show a higher satisfaction rate. The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households have a higher rate of access, but similar rates of need, use and satisfaction than poor households.

Regarding socio-economic status, the employees show the highest rate of access at 84 percent, while the rates for the remaining groups fluctuate between 64 and 68 percent. The ‘other’ socio-economic group reports the highest rates of need and use. Finally, the self-employed in agriculture report the highest satisfaction rate.

The gender breakdown shows no difference in access, need or use, but females report a lower satisfaction rate than males, at 58 and 71 percent, respectively.

Access does not vary widely by age-groups, but the rate of need and use do. Both rates are higher for the younger and older cohorts, being lower for the middle cohorts. The rate of satisfaction does not follow a particular trend.

4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction

Table 4.2 shows the percentage of population who consulted a health provider in the 4 weeks preceding the survey and were not satisfied. Overall, 36 percent of users of healthcare facilities were dissatisfied, mostly because of long waits (52 percent), cost (36 percent), and unavailability of drugs (33 percent). Other causes for dissatisfaction were treatment unsuccessful (16 percent), unavailability of trained professionals (14 percent) and facilities not clean (11 percent).

The analysis by cluster location shows that accessible clusters report a higher dissatisfaction rate than remote clusters. Furthermore, the latter report a higher share of dissatisfaction due to facilities not clean, no trained professionals and unsuccessful treatment, whereas the

Table 4.1 - Health Indicators

	Medical Services			
	Access	Need	Use	Satisfaction
Total	73.2	17.1	19.8	63.9
Cluster Location				
Accessible	79.1	18.9	21.6	52.6
Remote	68.4	15.8	18.4	74.6
Poverty Status				
Poor	65.2	16.5	17.0	62.9
Non-poor	74.8	17.3	20.4	64.1
Socio-economic group				
Employee	84.1	17.5	19.9	63.9
Self-employed - agriculture	64.1	15.7	19.7	77.7
Self-employed - other	68.2	16.4	19.5	62.8
Other	67.7	32.1	26.9	66.7
Gender				
Male	74.7	16.4	18.5	70.8
Female	71.7	17.9	21.2	57.7
Age				
0-4	70.4	21.9	49.2	70.9
5-9	70.9	18.2	16.7	51.3
10-14	72.9	12.8	11.5	68.0
15-19	78.5	10.3	11.9	83.4
20-29	71.7	13.9	14.1	53.4
30-39	77.1	18.9	19.0	66.5
40-49	80.2	16.1	15.9	54.9
50-59	56.4	9.0	9.0	100.0
60+	63.6	29.9	27.3	62.9

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

former report higher shares of users dissatisfied by long waits and unavailability of drugs.

The breakdown by poverty status shows no strong differences in the dissatisfaction rate. However, further breakdown of the data shows that poor households report higher shares dissatisfied by facilities not clean, cost and treatment unsuccessful; while non-poor households report higher shares dissatisfied by long waits and unavailability of drugs.

There are no strong differences in the dissatisfaction rate by poverty status. However, poor households report 'facilities not clean' less frequently, and unavailability of drugs more often than non-poor households.

The self-employed in agriculture are the socio-economic group with the lowest dissatisfaction rate (22 percent). At the same time, they report the highest share of users dissatisfied due to unsuccessful treatments.

The dissatisfaction rate is higher among females, at 42 percent, than among males, at 29 percent. Females report higher shares of users dissatisfied due to long waits, cost, and unavailability of drugs than males, while the latter report a higher share dissatisfied due to unsuccessful treatment than the former.

Regarding health provider, public hospitals report the highest dissatisfaction rate (48 percent), followed by private traditional healers (40 percent) and private and religious hospitals (28 and 29 percent, respectively). The main cause for

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

		Reasons for dissatisfaction						
	Percent dissatisfied	Facilities not clean	Long wait	No trained professionals	Cost	No drugs available	Treatment unsuccessful	Other
Total	36.1	10.8	51.6	13.7	36.2	33.0	15.6	0.7
Cluster Location								
Accessible	47.4	9.4	53.0	12.0	34.8	34.9	10.9	1.1
Remote	25.4	13.1	48.9	16.5	38.5	29.8	23.8	0.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	37.1	23.5	39.5	17.5	57.6	23.4	31.8	0.0
Non-poor	35.9	8.6	53.6	13.0	32.5	34.7	12.8	0.9
Socio-economic group								
Employee	36.1	7.4	38.4	16.7	42.9	16.3	19.3	2.2
Self-employed - agriculture	22.3	0.0	8.6	8.6	38.4	0.0	53.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	37.2	13.3	59.7	11.3	33.9	43.1	11.2	0.0
Other	33.3	5.1	63.6	29.8	9.4	37.3	32.1	0.0
Gender								
Male	29.2	11.3	40.2	14.1	40.5	26.8	22.5	0.0
Female	42.3	10.4	58.7	13.4	33.4	36.9	11.2	1.2
Type of provider								
Public hospital	47.9	12.2	71.6	12.5	19.3	44.7	11.4	1.1
Private hospital	27.9	11.1	10.6	16.6	77.1	10.9	15.3	0.0
Religous hospital	29.2	0.0	12.7	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Village health worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Private Doctor/Dentist	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pharmacist	14.9	0.0	0.0	20.3	57.0	0.0	55.4	0.0
Trad. Healer	40.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.7	0.0	48.3	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

dissatisfaction in public hospitals is cost, followed by unavailability of drugs. In private and religious hospitals, the most common complaint was cost. The main causes for dissatisfaction with pharmacists are cost and unsuccessful treatment. These are also the main causes for dissatisfaction with traditional healers.

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, 80 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (98 percent of the cases).
Neither cluster location nor poverty status seems to be correlated with the percentage not consulting or with the reasons for not doing so. However, the breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' category reported the lowest share not consulting (73 percent) but at the same time they reported the highest shares not consulting because of cost (12 percent) and lack of confidence (5 percent).

There are no remarkable gender differences in the shares not consulting nor in the reasons for not consulting. The split-up by type of illness shows that for most infirmities the main cause for not consulting a health practitioner is cost, followed by 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, 17 percent of the population was sick or injured. Fever or malaria is the most common sickness, affecting 61 percent of the ill population. Diarrhoea or abdominal pain, and coughing or breathing difficulties come in second place, affecting 14 percent of the ill population.

The gender breakdown shows no substantial differences in the shares of sick

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	80.2	98.3	0.6	0.0	0.6	0.6
Cluster Location						
Accessible	78.4	97.5	0.5	0.0	1.0	1.0
Remote	81.6	98.8	0.7	0.0	0.2	0.2
Poverty Status						
Poor	83.0	96.0	1.4	0.0	0.8	1.8
Non-poor	79.6	98.7	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.3
Socio-economic group						
Employee	80.1	98.7	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.8
Self-employed - agriculture	80.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	80.5	98.5	0.6	0.0	0.4	0.5
Other	73.1	83.0	11.8	0.0	5.2	0.0
Gender						
Male	81.5	98.4	0.3	0.0	0.8	0.6
Female	78.8	98.1	1.0	0.0	0.3	0.5
Type of sickness/injury						
Fever/malaria	3.4	18.2	73.6	0.0	0.0	8.2
Diarrhea/abdominal pains	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Pain in back, limbs or joints	20.4	9.2	85.1	0.0	0.0	5.7
Coughing/breathing difficulty	7.8	79.9	11.9	0.0	0.0	8.2
Skin problems	23.4	40.7	59.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ear, nose, throat	6.6	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eye	29.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Dental	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Accident	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	9.7	0.0	70.0	0.0	0.0	30.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

or injured population. Males report a higher share affected by fever or malaria, but there are no marked differences in the remaining diseases.

The age breakdown shows that for males the share of sick/injured population is higher for the oldest cohort (65+), at 56 percent, while the remaining age-groups report shares between 11 and 20 percent. In the case of females, the share of ill population follows a similar trend, reaching 76 percent of the population in the 65+ cohort. The remaining cohorts report shares ranging from 11 to 26 percent.

4.5 Health Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 52 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 28 percent to in private hospitals, 17 percent to pharmacists or chemists, 2 percent in religious hospitals and 1 percent to traditional healers.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that poor households and households in remote clusters report higher shares consulting public hospitals and lower shares consulting private hospitals than their respective counterparts. In addition, poor households report a higher rate of visits to pharmacists or chemist than non-poor households.

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	17.1	61.4	13.7	7.7	13.9	4.0	2.0	1.3	1.8	1.7	9.0
Male Total	16.4	64.2	15.1	7.8	11.8	2.3	0.2	0.8	1.3	2.3	6.9
0-4	17.5	98.5	11.9	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5-9	19.7	44.7	26.2	0.0	18.1	3.7	0.0	3.7	0.0	4.5	9.5
10-14	14.7	59.1	14.6	14.6	23.3	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
15-29	11.3	60.0	7.6	2.1	12.1	0.0	0.0	0.7	6.8	0.0	11.4
30-49	16.9	71.7	21.6	6.4	8.3	3.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.0
50-64	15.6	83.1	9.7	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.8
65+	56.1	36.9	0.0	44.8	17.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.9
Female Total	17.9	58.8	12.4	7.6	16.0	5.6	3.7	1.8	2.3	1.2	10.9
0-4	25.6	66.3	11.2	0.0	11.1	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	7.2
5-9	16.2	67.5	4.7	0.0	16.6	14.6	0.0	0.0	7.2	0.0	0.0
10-14	10.7	69.4	6.8	2.3	14.8	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.6
15-29	13.6	57.7	10.7	6.7	16.1	10.7	5.1	0.0	5.6	0.0	8.6
30-49	20.2	47.2	17.8	2.7	25.8	0.0	7.5	0.0	0.0	2.8	23.0
50-64	17.1	78.9	0.0	44.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	76.3	57.9	21.2	42.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.1	0.0	0.0	8.1

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

2. Base is population sick.

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	51.6	28.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	17.4	0.9	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	46.6	35.3	1.1	0.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	56.4	21.4	2.6	0.0	0.0	17.8	1.7	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	60.0	16.0	1.3	0.0	0.0	22.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	50.3	30.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	16.5	1.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic group									
Employee	41.0	37.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	21.0	0.6	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	92.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	54.1	26.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	16.0	1.2	0.0	100.0
Other	61.9	13.0	5.2	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is population who consulted a health provider

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in agriculture report the highest rate of visits to a public hospital (93 percent) followed by the 'other' socio-economic group (62 percent). The self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the third highest rate (54 percent) and the employees the lowest rate of visits to a public hospital (41 percent). The reverse ordering is observed in the case of public hospitals, with the employees reporting the highest rate (37 percent) and the self-employed in agriculture the lowest (0 percent). Finally, the employees and the 'other' socio-economic group report the highest rates of visits to pharmacists or chemists at 21 and 20 percent, respectively.

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	4.9	13.1	17.0	4.5	3.4	8.1	96.7
Cluster Location								
Accessible	0.0	0.0	14.7	15.4	2.1	7.9	7.2	97.9
Remote	0.0	8.9	11.7	18.4	6.7	0.0	8.8	95.9
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	2.2	7.2	0.0	16.6	11.4	7.6	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	5.3	13.6	19.1	2.0	1.6	8.2	96.2
Socio-economic group								
Employee	0.0	3.7	6.0	9.0	1.4	2.9	4.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.4	0.0	0.0	1.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	6.2	17.0	22.6	7.0	4.2	11.2	95.9
Other	0.0	0.0	22.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	85.9	0.8	8.9	0.0	3.1	1.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	92.8	2.4	1.8	0.0	3.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	82.2	0.0	12.7	0.0	3.2	1.9	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	61.6	0.0	28.6	0.0	9.8	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	89.7	1.0	5.8	0.0	2.1	1.4	100.0
Socio-economic group							
Employee	97.4	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	76.3	0.0	6.3	0.0	17.3	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	82.4	1.3	11.0	0.0	3.4	2.0	100.0
Other	53.1	0.0	46.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

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, 8 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 5 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 17 percent for the 25-29 group. In addition, 97 percent of pregnant women received prenatal care.

There are no remarkable differences in the shares of women having given birth in the year preceding the survey by cluster location or poverty status. However, remote clusters report a higher share in the 15-19 cohort than accessible cluster, where the share of pregnant women in the 40+ age-group is higher. In turn, the share of pregnant women in non-poor households is higher in the 20-24 and 25-29 cohorts, and lower in the 30-39 and 40+ age-groups than in poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the highest rate corresponds to the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, at 11 percent, while the remaining groups report rates ranging from 2 to 4 percent. The highest shares are observed for the 'other' socio-economic group in the 20-24 cohort, ant eh self-employed in non-agricultural activities in the 25-29 cohort, both at 23 percent.

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	10.4	85.0	0.0	1.2	3.4	0.0	100.0	95.4
Cluster Location								
Accessible	11.2	84.1	0.0	0.0	4.7	0.0	100.0	95.3
Remote	10.0	85.4	0.0	1.8	2.7	0.0	100.0	95.4
Poverty Status								
Poor	9.9	80.2	0.0	3.9	6.0	0.0	100.0	90.2
Non-poor	10.5	85.7	0.0	0.8	3.0	0.0	100.0	96.2
Socio-economic group								
Employee	10.9	85.6	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	100.0	96.5
Self-employed - agriculture	0.0	82.7	0.0	17.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	82.7
Self-employed - other	9.5	85.7	0.0	1.1	3.7	0.0	100.0	95.2
Other	34.6	65.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. Around 86 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place in a hospital, 9 percent at a dispensary, and 3 percent at home.

Women from accessible clusters reported births in hospitals more often than women from accessible clusters, at rates of 93 and 82 percent, respectively. In turn, the latter reported higher rates of births at dispensaries than the former, at rates of 13 and 2 percent. Poor households report a higher rate of deliveries at home and dispensaries than non-poor households. In turn, the latter reported a higher share of deliveries in hospitals than the former, at rates of 90 and 62 percent, respectively.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that the most common place for deliveries for most groups were hospitals. The employees report the highest share in hospitals, at 97 percent, followed by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 82 percent. The self-employed in agriculture come third, whereas the 'other' socio-economic group reports the lowest share of births in a hospital. However, the remaining 47 percent of deliveries for the latter group took place in a dispensary, whereas up to 17 percent of births of the self-employed in agriculture took place at home.

Table 4.8 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisted in the delivery of the child. Overall, 95 percent of the deliveries were attended by a health professional, mostly by midwives (85 percent of births). Doctors or nurses attended 10 percent of the deliveries in the district. Around 1 percent of the deliveries were attended by traditional birth assistants (TBAs), and a further 3 percent of the deliveries did not receive assistance.
There are no strong differences by cluster location, but poor households report a lower share of deliveries attended by midwives than non-poor households, at rates of 80 and 86 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that the 'other' category reports the highest share of deliveries attended by professionals: 100 percent, followed by the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at96 and 95 percent, with the self-employed in agriculture reporting the lowest share at 83 percent. The 'other' socio-economic group shows the highest share of births attended by doctors or nurses, at 35 percent, while the self-employed in agriculture report the lowest, at 0 percent. In turn, the latter report the highest share attended by TBAs, at 17 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 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

Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates

	Nutritional status indicators		Program participation		
	Stunted	Wasted	Nutrition	Weigh-in	Vaccinated
Total	14.4	2.4	62.5	97.9	87.9
Cluster Location					
Accessible	12.9	2.2	61.2	100.0	96.7
Remote	15.1	2.6	63.2	96.8	83.1
Poverty Status					
Poor	8.0	0.0	67.0	100.0	68.3
Non-poor	15.3	2.8	61.8	97.6	91.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	21.9	1.3	65.8	100.0	88.4
Self-employed - agriculture	0.0	0.0	47.3	100.0	60.8
Self-employed - other	11.7	3.3	62.6	96.7	89.2
Other	0.0	0.0	44.2	100.0	83.1
Gender and age in completed years					
Male	12.6	1.8	57.3	96.7	84.3
0	0.0	0.0	37.1	92.9	84.2
1	34.3	0.0	47.3	100.0	100.0
2	2.9	5.4	76.2	95.6	81.1
3	18.6	0.0	68.4	100.0	82.5
4	0.0	0.0	72.1	100.0	66.5
Female	15.6	3.0	67.0	99.0	90.9
0	20.5	0.0	57.3	94.6	91.4
1	10.1	0.0	82.1	100.0	98.3
2	7.0	3.1	61.7	100.0	88.7
3	25.6	0.0	70.0	100.0	84.9
4	16.7	17.8	61.4	100.0	92.5
Orphan status					
Orphaned	0.0	0.0	83.4	100.0	77.3
Not-orphaned	13.9	2.5	62.6	97.8	88.1
Foster status					
Fostered	58.0	0.0	36.5	100.0	100.0
Not-fostered	13.3	2.5	62.6	97.9	87.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

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

	Measles	BCG	DPT1	DPT2	DPT3	OPV0	OPV1	OPV2	OPV3	Vitamin A
Total	77.8	93.5	93.4	92.4	87.8	92.2	93.4	92.0	87.1	70.8
Cluster Location										
Accessible	78.8	94.1	94.1	92.5	88.6	96.1	94.1	92.5	88.6	77.8
Remote	77.3	93.2	93.0	92.3	87.3	90.2	93.0	91.7	86.2	67.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	67.9	95.7	88.3	87.2	80.3	94.7	88.3	84.3	77.3	70.3
Non-poor	79.4	93.2	94.2	93.2	88.9	91.9	94.2	93.2	88.6	70.8
Socio-economic group										
Employed	82.6	98.5	95.6	95.6	91.9	96.3	95.6	95.6	91.9	77.5
Self-employed - agric	93.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.7	62.8
Self-employed - other	75.7	90.5	91.7	90.1	86.4	89.5	91.7	89.4	85.2	68.4
Other	59.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	69.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	69.9	59.4
Gender and age in completed years										
Male	70.1	90.3	88.4	86.8	80.5	90.1	88.4	86.8	80.5	65.8
0	10.3	82.9	66.3	61.2	41.6	87.9	66.3	61.2	41.6	10.3
1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	76.1
2	91.8	94.4	95.6	95.6	94.5	89.9	95.6	95.6	94.5	91.8
3	100.0	93.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	89.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
4	100.0	80.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Female	84.4	96.2	97.7	97.1	94.0	94.1	97.7	96.3	92.6	75.0
0	48.2	85.1	87.2	84.0	76.4	79.6	87.2	84.0	76.4	28.9
1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.0	100.0	96.5	96.5	86.8
2	86.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.8	77.1
3	96.5	94.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	92.9
4	86.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	86.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	86.7	86.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

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, around 63 percent of the children participate in nutrition programs, 98 percent in weigh-in programs and 88 percent had received some vaccination. In contrast, 14 percent are stunted and 2 percent are wasted.

There are no strong differences in the stunting and wasting rates by cluster location, but non-poor households report a higher stunting rate than non-poor households. In turn, poor households report a higher rate of participation in nutrition programs. Regarding socio-economic status, the employees report the highest stunting rate at 22 percent, followed by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities at 12 percent. The remaining groups report virtually null stunting rates. In contrast, the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest rates of participation in nutrition and vaccination programs, while there are no strong differences in the shares participating in weigh-in programs.

There are no strong gender differences in the rates of wasting and stunting, but girls report higher participation rates in nutrition and vaccination programs. The age breakdown shows that the stunting rate peaks at 34 percent for boys aged 1, and at 26 percent for 3 year old girls; whereas the wasting rate peaks at 5 percent for 2 year old boys and 18 percent for 4 year old girls.

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 rates of stunting and wasting are higher among non-orphaned children, with orphaned children reporting virtually null rates. Regarding program participation, orphaned children are less likely to participate in vaccination programs and more likely to participate in nutrition programs than non-orphaned children.

In turn, the breakdown by foster status shows that fostered children report a higher rate of stunting than non-fostered children. Fostered children report lower rates of participation in nutrition programs and higher in vaccination programs than non-fostered children.

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received. Overall, 78 percent of children under 5 have vaccination against measles, 94 against BCG, and roughly between 87 and 93 percent received vaccinations against DPT and OPV. Finally, 71 percent of the children in the district receive vitamin A supplements.

There are no major differences in the vaccination rates by cluster location, but accessible clusters report a higher share of children receiving vitamin A than remote clusters, at 78 and 67 percent, respectively.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households tend to report lower vaccination rates than non-poor households, but there is no difference in vitamin A supplements.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in agriculture tend to report the highest shares, generally followed by the ‘other’ socio-economic group (households where the main income earner is unemployed, inactive, unpaid or a household worker).

The gender breakdown shows that girls tend to report higher vaccination rates than boys. In turn, the age breakdown shows that the share of children consuming vitamin A tends to increase with age. The share of vaccinated children tends to increase with age.

Table 4.11 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by source of information. Overall, the information for 96 percent of the vaccinated children was supported by a vaccination card.

There are no differences in the share of vaccinated children with vaccination cards by cluster location, but the breakdown by poverty status shows that the share is higher in non-poor households, at 97 percent, against 91 percent of poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows no substantial differences. However, the gender breakdown shows that boys are more likely to present other sources of information than girls, with rates of 8 and 1 percent, respectively.

Finally, the age breakdown shows that children under the age of one report lower shares of health card than the remaining age-groups, with 26 percent of boys and 8 percent of girls in that age-group presenting other sources of information.

5 EMPLOYMENT

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

5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population

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

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

5.1.1 Work Status

Table 5.1 shows that 79 percent of the adult population is employed and 18 percent underemployed. Unemployment is virtually 0 percent and the inactivity rate is 3 percent. There are no clear

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

	Working			Not working			
	Employed	Under emp.	Total	Unemploy.	Inactive	Total	Total
Total	79.1	17.6	96.8	0.2	3.0	3.2	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	77.4	19.5	96.9	0.3	2.8	3.1	100.0
Remote	80.7	16.0	96.7	0.2	3.1	3.3	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	83.7	10.3	93.9	0.4	5.6	6.1	100.0
Non-poor	78.4	18.9	97.3	0.2	2.5	2.7	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	72.8	23.5	96.3	0.2	3.5	3.7	100.0
15-29	81.3	14.6	95.9	0.3	3.8	4.1	100.0
30-49	68.6	30.8	99.4	0.0	0.6	0.6	100.0
50-64	62.4	31.8	94.2	0.9	4.8	5.8	100.0
65+	47.6	24.4	72.0	0.0	28.0	28.0	100.0
Female	85.5	11.8	97.3	0.2	2.4	2.7	100.0
15-29	86.1	10.6	96.7	0.0	3.3	3.3	100.0
30-49	84.6	14.5	99.0	0.6	0.3	1.0	100.0
50-64	86.9	13.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	83.9	0.0	83.9	0.0	16.1	16.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

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

	Total population			Heads of household		
	Active population	Unemployment rate	Underemployment rate	Active population	Unemployment rate	Underemployment rate
Total	97.0	0.2	18.2	98.2	0.4	31.4
Cluster Location						
Accessible	97.2	0.3	20.0	98.2	0.6	33.6
Remote	96.9	0.2	16.5	98.1	0.2	29.2
Poverty Status						
Poor	94.4	0.4	10.9	91.7	1.7	22.1
Non-poor	97.5	0.2	19.4	98.9	0.3	32.3
Gender and age						
Male	96.5	0.2	24.3	97.8	0.3	33.4
15-29	96.2	0.3	15.2	100.0	0.6	34.9
30-49	99.4	0.0	31.0	99.7	0.0	32.9
50-64	95.2	1.0	33.4	95.1	1.0	32.9
65+	72.0	0.0	33.9	77.2	0.0	36.6
Female	97.6	0.2	12.1	100.0	0.9	21.2
15-29	96.7	0.0	10.9	100.0	0.0	34.2
30-49	99.7	0.6	14.5	100.0	1.7	18.8
50-64	100.0	0.0	13.1	100.0	0.0	18.0
65+	83.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

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

	Active population				Active		
	Employed	Under emp.	Working	Unemployed	Total	Inactive	Total
Total	86.4	8.5	94.9	0.1	95.0	5.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	85.5	8.9	94.4	0.0	94.4	5.6	100.0
Remote	87.3	8.1	95.4	0.2	95.6	4.4	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	92.7	3.2	95.9	0.0	95.9	4.1	100.0
Non-poor	85.4	9.4	94.7	0.1	94.9	5.1	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	86.1	8.7	94.8	0.2	95.0	5.0	100.0
15-16	90.1	6.3	96.4	0.0	96.4	3.6	100.0
17-19	88.7	2.7	91.3	0.0	91.3	8.7	100.0
20-21	90.0	0.0	90.0	1.8	91.7	8.3	100.0
22-23	78.4	21.2	99.6	0.0	99.6	0.4	100.0
Female	86.7	8.3	95.0	0.0	95.0	5.0	100.0
15-16	92.5	0.0	92.5	0.0	92.5	7.5	100.0
17-19	90.7	0.0	90.7	0.0	90.7	9.3	100.0
20-21	86.0	14.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
22-23	80.4	15.3	95.7	0.0	95.7	4.3	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

differences by cluster location. In turn, poor households show a higher employment rate, whereas non-poor households show a higher

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	14.2	1.8	39.2	44.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	17.6	0.7	40.9	40.7	100.0
Remote	11.2	2.8	37.6	48.3	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	1.9	4.8	35.3	58.0	100.0
Non-poor	16.3	1.4	39.8	42.6	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	20.3	2.3	49.8	27.5	100.0
15-29	6.7	0.0	34.3	59.0	100.0
30-49	33.4	2.4	61.7	2.5	100.0
50-64	27.6	10.3	61.8	0.3	100.0
65+	17.7	4.2	70.8	7.2	100.0
Female	8.2	1.3	28.6	61.8	100.0
15-29	5.3	0.0	24.4	70.3	100.0
30-49	12.1	1.0	38.0	48.9	100.0
50-64	14.2	5.9	12.1	67.9	100.0
65+	0.0	26.6	18.3	55.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

underemployment rate. The underemployment rate for males peaks at 32 percent for the 50-64 cohort, whereas in the case of females the rate peaks at 15 percent for the 30-49 cohort.

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

5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads

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

The gender breakdown shows that in the general population males are more likely to be underemployed than females, with rates of 21 and 11 percent, respectively. A similar difference is observed for the household heads.

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

5.1.3 Youth Employment

Table 5.3 shows the distribution of the youth (ages 15 to 24) by work status. The activity rate of this group is similar to the overall population. However, underemployment is lower: 9 percent of workers is underemployed, as opposed to 18 percent of workers for the whole adult population.

The breakdown by cluster location and poverty status shows no strong correlation with the distribution of the population by work status. The gender breakdown shows that the underemployment rate among the male youth is higher than that for the female youth. It can be seen that underemployment is remarkably higher in the 22-23 group.

5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by self-employed in non-agricultural activities or

Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer

	State/NGO/ Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	6.9	48.8	44.3	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	8.9	50.9	40.2	100.0
Remote	5.2	46.9	47.9	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.9	42.0	57.2	100.0
Non-poor	7.9	49.9	42.2	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	9.6	63.0	27.3	100.0
15-29	1.5	40.0	58.4	100.0
30-49	16.6	80.9	2.5	100.0
50-64	18.3	81.4	0.3	100.0
65+	0.0	92.8	7.2	100.0
Female	4.2	34.6	61.2	100.0
15-29	2.8	27.6	69.6	100.0
30-49	5.2	46.6	48.2	100.0
50-64	14.2	17.9	67.9	100.0
65+	0.0	44.9	55.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	3.8	6.8	34.0	42.0	13.3	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	2.5	8.5	32.6	38.9	17.5	100.0
Remote	5.0	5.3	35.4	44.7	9.6	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	9.2	6.3	16.7	52.5	15.2	100.0
Non-poor	2.9	6.9	36.9	40.3	13.0	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	3.4	12.6	38.8	25.4	19.9	100.0
15-29	0.6	8.7	25.3	53.8	11.6	100.0
30-49	3.2	16.3	49.3	2.5	28.7	100.0
50-64	12.2	17.1	48.5	2.7	19.5	100.0
65+	11.5	0.0	58.2	1.5	28.8	100.0
Female	4.2	1.1	29.4	58.5	6.8	100.0
15-29	1.7	0.8	21.6	69.4	6.6	100.0
30-49	3.6	1.9	43.6	43.4	7.6	100.0
50-64	21.0	0.0	23.7	48.7	6.6	100.0
65+	34.7	0.0	1.9	63.4	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

in other activities (inactive, unemployed, unpaid workers, domestic workers) at 39 and 45 percent respectively. The employees account for 15 percent of the working population and a further 2 percent is self-employed in agriculture. Households in accessible clusters report a higher share of employees, whereas the 'other' group is bigger in remote clusters. A similar trend is observed when analysing by poverty status with non-poor households resembling accessible clusters.

The gender breakdown shows that a higher share of males is self-employed in non-agricultural activities, while females report a higher share in 'other' activities. The cut down by age-groups shows that the share of employees peaks for males in the 30-49 cohort (33 percent), the self-

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	2.9	0.0	4.5	4.5	1.6	4.7	0.0	0.0	3.4	4.2
Mining & non-primary	11.9	11.1	19.0	0.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.6	1.1
Services	57.2	72.1	48.7	72.8	6.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	38.8	29.4
Domestic duties	0.0	2.7	1.4	4.7	89.6	91.9	0.0	100.0	25.4	58.5
Other	28.0	14.0	26.4	17.4	1.6	0.7	0.0	0.0	19.9	6.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

	Government		Private		Household		Person/HH	Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Male	Female
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	6.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	3.1	4.4	0.0	3.4	4.2
Mining & non-primary	8.0	3.3	22.0	0.0	12.5	1.1	0.0	12.6	1.1
Services	65.8	88.4	24.4	90.1	37.5	26.9	0.0	38.8	29.4
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	27.8	60.9	0.0	25.4	58.5
Other	20.2	8.4	45.4	9.9	19.1	6.7	0.0	19.9	6.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

employed in agriculture for 50-64 cohort (10 percent), the 'self-employed other' for the 65+ males (71 percent) and 'other' for 15-29 females (70 percent).

The percentage distribution of the working population by employer is analysed in Table 5.5. The table shows that the private sector (formal or informal) employs 49 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 93 percent of the working population.

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

Males report a higher share working for a private employer, while females report a higher share working for the household. Most males work for a private employer, except in the 15-29 cohorts, where 58 percent of them work in the household. The share of females working in the private sector tends to increase 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, domestic duties, public and private services together account for 75 percent of the working population. 34 percent of the population is engaged in services, and 42 percent in domestic duties.

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

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are services and household duties, accounting for 88 percent of the working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less

Table 5.9 Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	17.1	3.5	65.8	13.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	22.9	0.5	65.9	10.7	100.0
Remote	10.9	6.8	65.7	16.6	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	7.1	13.8	61.5	17.6	100.0
Non-poor	18.0	2.6	66.2	13.1	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	18.6	4.5	72.9	4.0	100.0
15-29	9.8	0.0	76.0	14.2	100.0
30-49	25.1	2.7	72.2	0.0	100.0
50-64	12.2	15.4	72.4	0.0	100.0
65+	24.8	12.5	62.7	0.0	100.0
Female	14.1	1.5	51.7	32.6	100.0
15-29	16.3	0.0	55.0	28.7	100.0
30-49	13.5	3.4	48.1	35.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	51.1	48.9	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

Table 5.10 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer

	State/NGO/Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	11.9	75.2	13.0	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	17.6	71.7	10.7	100.0
Remote	5.7	78.9	15.4	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	0.0	82.4	17.6	100.0
Non-poor	13.0	74.5	12.5	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	12.3	83.7	4.0	100.0
15-29	2.5	83.3	14.2	100.0
30-49	18.6	81.4	0.0	100.0
50-64	12.2	87.8	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	11.1	58.0	30.9	100.0
15-29	16.3	55.0	28.7	100.0
30-49	6.7	62.1	31.2	100.0
50-64	0.0	51.1	48.9	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

concentrated, with 36 percent in other activities.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that, for both genders, younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. For both genders the share dedicated to agriculture tends to increase with age. In all age-groups, males report higher shares in mining, manufacturing, energy and construction as well as services than females.
Table 5.6

Table 5.7 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by

Table 5.11 Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	private services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	4.9	9.5	51.1	12.7	21.8	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	2.1	13.5	49.7	10.4	24.4	100.0
Remote	7.9	5.1	52.7	15.2	19.1	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	13.8	17.7	26.6	17.6	24.4	100.0
Non-poor	4.0	8.7	53.4	12.3	21.6	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	5.7	13.9	47.2	3.8	29.4	100.0
15-29	0.0	11.9	47.9	13.6	26.6	100.0
30-49	5.1	15.5	46.1	0.0	33.3	100.0
50-64	15.4	15.3	45.8	0.0	23.5	100.0
65+	12.5	0.0	63.8	0.0	23.7	100.0
Female	3.1	0.6	59.0	30.7	6.7	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	64.9	27.8	7.3	100.0
30-49	6.9	1.3	53.4	31.5	6.9	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	51.1	48.9	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

employment status, gender and activity. Overall, around 59 percent of the female labour force is in domestic duties, whereas the share for males is 26 percent. Services have the second highest shares for female at 29 percent, and 39 percent for males. While, respectively19 and 13 percent of males are dedicated to domestic duties and mining, manufacturing, energy and construction, the shares for females are 7 and 1 percent.

For both genders, virtually all the employees work in services. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities work also mostly in services, with shares of 51 percent for males and 76 percent for females. In the 'other' group the population is concentrated in domestic duties at 91 percent for males and 92 percent females.

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 also concentrated in services and mining, manufacturing, energy and construction. Among the individuals who were employed by the household, the main activity was domestic duties (88 percent of males, 85 percent of females.

5.3 Underemployed Population

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status is shown in Table 5.9. Overall, 66 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed in non-agricultural activities, 14 percent is in 'other' activities, 4 percent is self-employed in agriculture and 17 percent is formed by employees.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that the underemployed population in accessible clusters is composed by a higher share of employees than the underemployed population from remote clusters. 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 share of employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, 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 non-agricultural activities than females.

For males, the employees peak at 25 percent for the 30-39 cohorts. The share self-employed in non-agricultural activities tends to decrease with age. The 'self-employed agriculture' group show higher shares in older cohorts, and the 'other' group shows positive rates only in the 15-29 age-group. In the case of females, the share in the 'other' group tends to increase with age until the 50-64 cohort, and the shares in 'employee' category decreases with age.

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at 76 percent and in second place for the household and the State/NGOs and other types of employer at 13 and 12 percent respectively.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that accessible clusters report a higher percentage of underemployed population working for state/NGOs or other types of employers than remote clusters, and the latter report higher shares working for the household and a private employer than the former. Similarly, non-poor households report a higher share of underemployed population working for the state/NGOs or other types of employers, while poor households report higher shares in the remaining types of employers.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed males are concentrated in private employers at 84 percent. In turn, underemployed females are split between private employers and household, with shares of 58 and 31 percent respectively.

The age breakdown shows that underemployed males report a positive share working for the household only in the 15-29 cohorts. In males, the shares working for private employers tend to increase with age. Virtually all underemployed males in the 65+ cohort were working for a private employer at the time of the survey. In case of females, the share working for the household employer tends to increase with age.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. Overall, 51 percent of the underemployed workers are dedicated to services, 22 percent to other activities, 13 percent to domestic duties, 10 percent to mining, manufacturing, energy and construction and 5 percent to agriculture.

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	91.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	86.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.8	100.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	89.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.9	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	83.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.3	100.0
15-29	66.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.2	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
50-64	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
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 Temeke MC

1. Base is unemployed population aged 15+

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

	No work available	Seasonal inactivity	Student	HH/Family duties	Age: too old	Age: too young	Infirmity	Retired	Other	Total
Total	2.0	0.0	48.4	0.0	6.0	0.0	32.4	11.1	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	65.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	26.4	0.0	100.0
Remote	3.5	0.0	35.9	0.0	10.4	0.0	50.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	0.0	17.8	0.0	9.4	0.0	60.3	12.4	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	2.9	0.0	61.1	0.0	4.6	0.0	20.8	10.6	0.0	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	3.3	0.0	37.8	0.0	9.7	0.0	31.5	17.8	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	79.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	51.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	48.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.4	0.0	65.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	0.0	66.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	92.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	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	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is inactive population aged 15+

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong correlation with the distribution of underemployed population by work status. Non-poor households report a higher share in public and private services, whereas poor households report higher shares in the remaining activities.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed females have higher shares dedicated to services and domestic duties than underemployed males, who have a higher share in other activities. The age breakdown shows that the share of underemployed males dedicated to services increases with age, while the share in other activities decreases. In addition, the share of underemployed females dedicated to services and domestic duties increases 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 a student is the main cause for inactivity (48 percent), followed by infirmity (32 percent), retirement (11 percent) and being too old (6 percent).

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

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

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

Infirmity is also concentrated in the oldest cohort for females, but is relatively more widespread among males.

5.5 Household Tasks

Table 5.14 shows the activities normally undertaken in the household by its members. First the population aged 15 and above is analysed. The most common activities for the population aged 15 and above are taking care of the sick, elderly, and children. All the activities are undertaken by more than 50 percent of the members except fetching firewood at 5 percent.

Accessible clusters report a higher share

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	69.8	5.1	65.6	61.6	69.9	96.1
Cluster Location						
Accessible	70.5	1.4	68.1	62.5	68.3	95.4
Remote	69.3	8.4	63.3	60.8	71.4	96.8
Poverty Status						
Poor	68.4	15.5	69.4	64.1	85.6	93.5
Non-poor	70.1	3.3	65.0	61.2	67.3	96.6
Gender and age						
Male	48.0	3.4	38.7	27.6	61.0	94.6
15-29	77.5	3.4	54.3	36.4	48.5	94.6
30-49	25.9	2.7	28.0	22.0	68.6	95.0
50-64	23.7	5.2	22.6	19.2	82.2	97.2
65+	5.7	5.2	16.6	9.7	58.2	81.3
Female	91.8	6.8	92.7	95.8	79.0	97.6
15-29	96.8	6.2	95.3	96.7	75.9	97.7
30-49	90.2	5.2	92.3	96.3	84.8	99.1
50-64	77.3	14.5	80.1	94.9	80.8	100.0
65+	42.5	22.9	70.8	75.9	62.1	73.9

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

	Fetching water	Fetching firewood	Cleaning toilet	Cooking	Care of children	Care or elderly/sick
Total	78.1	7.4	38.6	30.3	49.8	87.9
Cluster Location						
Accessible	79.9	2.2	38.2	31.0	38.8	85.2
Remote	76.9	11.2	38.9	29.9	57.8	89.9
Poverty Status						
Poor	82.7	24.3	41.3	30.9	57.9	88.0
Non-poor	76.7	2.3	37.8	30.2	47.3	87.9
Gender and age						
Male	72.6	5.7	31.1	14.3	44.4	86.2
5-9	60.4	6.5	14.1	5.8	40.3	78.8
10-14	83.0	4.9	45.5	21.6	48.0	92.4
Female	84.6	9.5	47.5	49.2	56.1	89.9
5-9	72.5	6.3	15.6	7.8	53.5	77.9
10-14	94.3	12.0	72.7	82.0	58.2	99.4
Orphan status						
Orphaned	88.0	12.2	57.0	53.2	54.0	97.2
Not-orphaned	76.8	6.7	35.8	26.8	49.2	86.4
Foster status						
Fostered	84.3	3.4	41.8	16.0	57.4	79.4
Not-fostered	76.2	6.9	36.3	28.6	50.2	87.5

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

Table 5.16 - Child labour (age 5 to 14)

		Main activity			Employer	
	Working	Agriculture	Household	Other	Private	d
Total	57.3	1.0	97.9	1.1	0.4	99.6
Cluster Location						
Accessible	57.4	2.5	97.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	57.2	0.0	98.1	1.9	0.7	99.3
Poverty Status						
Poor	71.1	0.0	96.8	3.2	0.9	99.1
Non-poor	53.8	1.3	98.2	0.4	0.2	99.8
Gender and age						
Male	58.0	1.9	96.7	1.4	0.8	99.2
5-9	42.1	0.0	98.8	1.2	0.9	99.1
10-14	89.3	3.7	94.6	1.7	0.7	99.3
Female	56.4	0.0	99.2	0.8	0.0	100.0
5-9	35.9	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	99.5	0.0	98.6	1.4	0.0	100.0
Orphan status						
Orphaned	85.4	4.7	95.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Not-orphaned	54.5	0.4	98.3	1.3	0.5	99.5
Foster status						
Fostered	75.0	0.0	96.4	3.6	3.6	96.4
Not-fostered	53.9	1.2	97.7	1.1	0.2	99.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

of population cleaning toilet than remote clusters. Other activities are not strongly correlated with cluster location. The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report higher shares of population fetching firewood, cleaning toilets and taking care of children than non-poor households.

The most important differences are shown in the gender and age-breakdown. Females report remarkably higher shares in all the activities, with rates fluctuating between 79 and 96 percent except for fetching firewood (7 percent). The shares for males range from 28 to 61 percent, except for taking care of the sick and elderly (95 percent) and fetching firewood at (3 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 and sick. Children from remote clusters report a higher share taking care of the children than children from accessible clusters at 58 and 39 percent respectively. Children from poor households report higher rates in most activities than children from non-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 youngest children, for all household tasks.

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

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that 57 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activity is mostly household duties at 98 percent. The share of working children is higher in poor households. 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 other activities

(services, mining, manufacturing, or construction). 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. Virtually all the children were working for a household employer 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 85 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.

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES

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

6.1 Economic Situation

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

6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community

Table 6.1 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey. Results show that 22 percent of all households in the district reported a positive change in the economic situation of their community. 33 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation and 31 percent reported the community economic condition to have deteriorated.

The breakdown by cluster location reveals that, while 33 percent of households from remote clusters reported deterioration of the community economic condition, the share for households in accessible clusters is 18 percent. Further breakdown by poverty status shows that 23 percent of non-poor households reported positive change in the economic situation of their community compared to 7 percent of poor households.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported worsening of their community's economic situation is higher than that of households with one or two members at 42 and 24 percent respectively. Furthermore, there is a difference of 38 percentage points between households owning six or more hectares of land and those owning no land who reported deterioration in their community's economic situation at 65 and 27 percent respectively. While 75 percent of households owning both small and large livestock reported worsening conditions in their community's economic situation, the share for households owning large livestock only is 20 percent. 24 percent of households whose main income earner is employee reported positive change in their community's economic situation, the share for households whose main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' category is only 2 percent. In addition, 26 percent of households where the household head has a loose union reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their communities compared to 14 percent of households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated.

It is also observed that the percentage of households where the head has no education and reported deterioration in their community's economic conditions is 17 percentage points higher than that of households where the head has secondary education or more, at 50 and 33 percent respectively. Finally, while 23 percent of male-headed households report positive change in the economic conditions of their communities, the share for female-headed households is 1 percent.

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

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	11.9	19.1	33.1	19.7	1.7	14.5	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	8.8	9.9	34.2	26.7	2.3	18.1	100.0
Remote	15.0	28.2	32.0	12.8	1.1	10.9	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	24.7	27.1	35.6	7.0	0.0	5.5	100.0
Non-poor	10.5	18.2	32.8	21.1	1.9	15.5	100.0
Household size							
1-2	6.5	16.4	42.4	21.9	2.1	10.8	100.0
3-4	14.6	15.7	30.5	20.3	2.5	16.4	100.0
5-6	14.7	21.3	24.4	17.8	1.1	20.8	100.0
7+	11.7	29.8	33.8	16.4	0.0	8.4	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	10.3	16.8	35.1	22.0	1.9	13.9	100.0
< 1 ha	10.2	24.5	56.5	5.4	0.0	3.4	100.0
1-1.99 ha	16.5	21.6	24.3	8.7	1.2	27.8	100.0
2-3.99 ha	24.6	18.1	25.8	9.2	2.1	20.1	100.0
4-5.99 ha	9.6	40.2	10.6	16.2	0.0	23.5	100.0
6+ ha	19.8	44.6	15.1	15.0	0.0	5.5	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	11.4	18.9	33.8	19.3	1.8	14.8	100.0
Small only	10.0	20.0	18.7	35.5	0.0	15.8	100.0
Large only	19.9	0.0	0.0	80.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	42.9	32.0	21.2	4.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	12.7	17.9	27.1	25.4	0.9	16.1	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	6.2	37.7	33.4	2.3	0.0	20.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	11.5	18.3	36.0	18.4	2.3	13.6	100.0
Other	19.9	23.6	30.0	14.9	0.0	11.6	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	12.2	19.2	32.1	21.8	1.2	13.4	100.0
Female	10.2	18.6	38.0	9.2	4.1	19.9	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	9.4	13.5	42.2	21.4	4.8	8.7	100.0
Monogamous	11.5	21.8	31.0	20.5	0.9	14.2	100.0
Polygamous	35.3	15.9	15.3	24.9	0.0	8.6	100.0
Loose union	15.4	0.0	31.0	25.5	0.0	28.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	10.1	18.7	37.2	11.4	2.9	19.8	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	2.6	47.2	37.2	6.7	0.0	6.4	100.0
Primary	13.4	14.7	35.6	19.2	2.3	14.8	100.0
Secondary +	11.0	21.9	28.6	22.3	1.0	15.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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. 20 percent of the households reported an improvement in their economic conditions, while 34 percent reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

While 55 percent of those living in remote clusters reported deterioration of the

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

	Much Worse	Worse	Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	18.9	26.2	35.4	17.6	2.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	17.5	20.0	37.1	21.5	3.8	0.0	100.0
Remote	20.3	32.3	33.7	13.7	0.1	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	35.9	24.1	35.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	17.0	26.4	35.4	19.0	2.2	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	22.4	23.1	37.6	15.7	1.1	0.0	100.0
3-4	18.1	28.0	37.1	14.4	2.4	0.0	100.0
5-6	19.5	28.5	28.3	22.6	1.1	0.0	100.0
7+	13.9	24.0	36.1	22.4	3.6	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	17.7	24.7	37.8	18.1	1.8	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	14.9	37.9	34.4	12.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	37.6	25.4	27.1	9.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	30.8	24.8	17.0	19.5	7.8	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	11.7	37.4	43.3	7.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	11.6	42.4	24.7	21.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	19.0	26.4	35.6	17.0	2.1	0.0	100.0
Small only	10.1	33.4	35.8	20.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	0.0	0.0	80.1	19.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	33.2	8.3	14.5	44.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	12.4	18.5	38.0	27.3	3.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	18.1	45.6	12.5	23.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	20.8	29.3	35.0	13.5	1.4	0.0	100.0
Other	39.3	11.3	44.9	4.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	18.4	26.7	34.0	18.7	2.3	0.0	100.0
Female	21.7	23.7	42.6	12.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	19.5	26.8	37.9	15.5	0.3	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	17.4	26.2	34.4	19.0	3.0	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	27.1	18.8	21.9	32.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	21.7	43.6	30.3	4.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	22.6	22.4	41.6	13.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	27.9	33.1	28.5	10.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	21.1	29.0	37.6	11.5	0.8	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	14.3	20.7	32.9	28.0	4.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

households' economic situation, the share for accessible clusters was 38 percent. Similarly, 60 percent of poor households reported deterioration of the households' economic situation compared to 43 percent of non-poor households.

The percentage of households with seven or more members who reported an improvement in the economic conditions of their households is higher than that of households with one or two members at 26 and 17 percent respectively. Furthermore, while 19 percent of households owning no land report much worse economic conditions of their households, the share for households owning six or more hectares of land is 33 percent. Disaggregating the data further shows that, while 43 percent of households

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	49.6	28.5	19.1	2.8	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	52.7	26.0	18.4	3.0	100.0
Remote	46.5	31.0	19.8	2.7	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	13.9	29.0	46.7	10.4	100.0
Non-poor	53.5	28.4	16.0	2.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	46.2	27.1	23.0	3.7	100.0
3-4	58.4	23.5	15.0	3.2	100.0
5-6	43.5	35.4	18.7	2.4	100.0
7+	41.5	34.7	22.8	1.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	50.8	26.1	19.8	3.3	100.0
< 1 ha	46.3	24.7	29.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	42.8	40.1	11.4	5.7	100.0
2-3.99 ha	26.1	50.1	23.8	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	69.9	24.3	5.8	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	60.5	30.5	9.1	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	48.0	29.0	20.0	3.0	100.0
Small only	88.1	10.0	1.9	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	66.8	33.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	66.6	24.7	8.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	42.4	33.8	23.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	44.3	30.2	22.2	3.3	100.0
Other	9.9	23.7	44.3	22.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	52.1	27.9	17.8	2.2	100.0
Female	36.5	31.6	25.9	6.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	47.3	28.4	19.1	5.3	100.0
Monogamous	50.9	30.5	17.0	1.7	100.0
Polygamous	63.8	15.9	20.3	0.0	100.0
Loose union	60.8	22.9	12.1	4.2	100.0
Widow/div/sep	39.9	23.9	30.3	5.9	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	24.0	17.7	47.8	10.5	100.0
Primary	44.7	29.6	24.1	1.6	100.0
Secondary +	60.8	28.3	7.2	3.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

owning small livestock and those owning no livestock express negative views on their households' economic conditions the share for households owning large livestock only is virtually null.

The percentage of households in the employee category who reported an improvement in their households' economic conditions is higher than that of households whose main income earner is in the 'other' category at 31 and 5 percent respectively. Furthermore, while 66 percent of households where the head has a loose union reported deterioration in their household's economic conditions, the share for 'monogamous' households is 43 percent. 43 percent of female-headed households reported observing no changes in their economic conditions compared to 34 percent of male-headed households. Finally, the percentage of households reporting much worse economic conditions is higher for households where the head has no education than households where the head has secondary education or more at 28 and 14 percent respectively.

6.2 Self-reported Difficulties in Satisfying Household Needs

This section analyses the difficulties households faced in satisfying household needs during the year prior to the survey. These household needs are such as food, school fees, house rent, utility bills and healthcare. For each household, the respondent was asked to say whether they never, seldom, often or always experienced 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, 79 percent of the district's households never/seldom experienced food shortages while the remaining population experienced food shortages frequently (often/always). While 53 percent of households in accessible clusters had never experienced food shortages, the share for households in remote clusters is 47 percent. Furthermore, 54 percent of non-poor households never experienced food shortages compared to 14 percent of poor households.

70 percent of households owning four to six hectares of land never experienced problems satisfying food needs compared to 51 percent of landless households. Furthermore, while 73 percent of households with one or two members never/seldom experienced food shortages, the share for households with five or six members is 82 percent. There is also some correlation between livestock ownership

and difficulties in satisfying food needs. While 33 percent of households owning both small and large livestock seldom experienced food shortages, the share for households owning large livestock only is virtually null.

The socio-economic group of the household also shows some correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. While 66 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group reported frequent problems satisfying food needs, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is only 9 percent. Furthermore, 64 percent of households where the head is 'polygamous' had never experienced food shortages compared to 40 percent of households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households reported having food shortages more frequently than male-headed households as 26 percent of female-headed households experienced frequent food shortages compared to 20 percent of male-headed households. Likewise, while 59 percent of households where the head has no education experienced food shortages frequently, the share for households where the head has secondary education or more is 11 percent.

6.2.2 Paying School Fees

Table 6.4 shows the percentage distribution of households by the difficulty in paying school fees during the year before the survey. At the time of the survey, 96 percent of the households in the district reported that they never/seldom 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).

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong correlation with the ability to pay school fees. However, poor households report having problems in paying school fees more often than non-poor households. In addition, smaller households find problems paying school fees less frequently than larger households. While 99 percent of households with one or two members never had problems paying school fees, the share for households with seven or more members is 74 percent.

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	89.9	5.6	4.1	0.4	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	92.2	2.8	4.8	0.2	100.0
Remote	87.7	8.3	3.4	0.6	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	84.1	2.6	11.8	1.5	100.0
Non-poor	90.6	5.9	3.2	0.3	100.0
Household size					
1-2	99.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	94.1	3.4	2.5	0.0	100.0
5-6	81.0	9.8	8.0	1.3	100.0
7+	74.3	14.0	10.6	1.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	91.6	4.0	3.9	0.4	100.0
< 1 ha	96.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	77.9	17.0	3.7	1.5	100.0
2-3.99 ha	82.2	7.9	9.9	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	94.8	0.0	5.2	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	76.3	23.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	89.9	5.4	4.3	0.4	100.0
Small only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	75.9	24.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	85.0	11.0	4.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	86.0	9.9	4.1	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	91.9	3.1	4.4	0.6	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	91.1	4.8	3.7	0.4	100.0
Female	83.9	9.6	6.2	0.4	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	96.8	0.7	2.5	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	89.8	4.8	4.8	0.5	100.0
Polygamous	86.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	87.8	12.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	84.7	10.4	4.5	0.4	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	91.4	0.0	8.6	0.0	100.0
Primary	93.5	2.3	3.5	0.7	100.0
Secondary +	84.2	11.4	4.4	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	78.7	12.5	8.0	0.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	74.3	17.4	7.3	1.0	100.0
Remote	83.0	7.7	8.8	0.4	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	89.8	8.1	0.0	2.1	100.0
Non-poor	77.5	13.0	8.9	0.6	100.0
Household size					
1-2	72.2	15.6	12.2	0.0	100.0
3-4	72.9	14.0	11.7	1.3	100.0
5-6	87.4	10.2	1.3	1.1	100.0
7+	93.8	6.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	76.3	14.2	8.7	0.7	100.0
< 1 ha	89.8	10.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	94.2	3.7	2.1	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	80.7	8.6	8.6	2.1	100.0
4-5.99 ha	93.6	6.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	88.6	1.5	9.9	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	77.8	13.1	8.4	0.8	100.0
Small only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	94.7	5.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	84.2	12.4	3.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	94.2	5.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	74.5	13.3	11.0	1.1	100.0
Other	92.5	7.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	80.3	10.9	7.9	0.9	100.0
Female	70.5	20.9	8.6	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	69.0	20.2	10.8	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	82.6	9.7	6.5	1.1	100.0
Polygamous	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	48.8	14.7	36.5	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	74.5	19.2	6.3	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	76.9	14.2	8.1	0.7	100.0
Secondary +	78.3	11.8	9.1	0.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

Furthermore, 4 percent of households with no land often experienced problems paying school fees, whereas the share for households owning six or more hectares of land is virtually null. Similarly, while 5 percent of households with no livestock reported experiencing problems paying school fees frequently, the share for households owning large livestock and those owning both small and large livestock is virtually null.

Disaggregating the data further shows that virtually all (100 percent) households whose main income earner is in the 'other' category never had problems paying school fees compared to 85 percent of 'employees' households.

The percentage of female-headed households who reported often experiencing problems paying school fees is twice as high that of male-headed households at 10 and 5 percent respectively. Likewise, while 97 percent of households where the head is single never had problems paying school fees, the share for households where the head is widowed, divorced or separated is 85 percent. Finally, households where the household head has no education had problems paying school fees more often than households where the head has primary education.

6.2.3 Paying House Rent

Table 6.5 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey. 79 percent of households in the district reported that they never had problems paying house rent. 83 percent of households in remote clusters reported never having problems paying house rent compared to 74 percent of households from accessible clusters. Similarly, 90 percent of poor households reported never having problems paying house rent against 76 percent of non-poor households.

It is noticeable that while 11 percent of households where the head is single had problems paying house rent more often, the share for 'polygamous' households is virtually null. Similarly, 11 percent of households whose main income earner is self-employed in non-agriculture activities and 9 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more reported that they often had problems paying house rent. It is also observed that 14 percent of households owning no land and 13 percent of households owning no livestock reported that they seldom had problems with paying house rent. Other household characteristics such as household size and gender do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay house rent.

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	76.2	14.6	8.2	1.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	67.4	19.4	12.4	0.8	100.0
Remote	84.9	9.8	4.1	1.2	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	66.7	17.2	16.2	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	77.3	14.3	7.3	1.1	100.0
Household size					
1-2	80.7	12.3	6.8	0.2	100.0
3-4	76.3	15.8	6.9	1.1	100.0
5-6	73.3	16.5	7.4	2.7	100.0
7+	71.5	13.4	15.1	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	76.0	15.5	7.4	1.0	100.0
< 1 ha	66.8	10.2	17.6	5.4	100.0
1-1.99 ha	79.7	16.1	3.0	1.2	100.0
2-3.99 ha	74.1	5.1	20.8	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	74.7	20.1	5.2	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	86.4	10.6	3.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	76.2	14.9	8.0	1.0	100.0
Small only	79.5	16.1	2.5	1.9	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	66.8	0.0	33.2	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	81.5	8.2	10.3	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	81.9	14.1	4.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	72.3	18.3	7.8	1.6	100.0
Other	97.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	75.8	15.3	7.7	1.2	100.0
Female	78.5	10.8	10.7	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	71.7	19.5	8.8	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	75.0	15.8	7.6	1.6	100.0
Polygamous	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	81.1	14.7	4.2	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	79.7	7.1	13.2	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	81.1	11.0	7.9	0.0	100.0
Primary	75.1	16.8	7.5	0.5	100.0
Secondary +	77.2	11.7	9.3	1.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills

Table 6.6 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying utility bills during the year before the survey. The outcome on household's ability to pay utility bills is almost similar to those of paying house rent. 76 percent of households in the district never face problems paying utility bills. 85 percent of households in remote clusters reported never having problems paying utility bills compared to 67 percent of households from accessible clusters. Similarly, 77 percent of non-poor households reported never having problems paying utility bills against 67 percent of poor households.

It is observed that 13 percent of households where the household head is

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	56.1	27.1	13.3	3.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	63.5	23.9	9.9	2.7	100.0
Remote	48.7	30.3	16.7	4.3	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	10.9	51.6	26.4	11.1	100.0
Non-poor	61.1	24.4	11.9	2.6	100.0
Household size					
1-2	56.4	26.4	12.2	5.0	100.0
3-4	64.0	20.4	13.2	2.4	100.0
5-6	50.8	28.3	16.4	4.4	100.0
7+	42.3	43.8	11.6	2.3	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	59.0	24.2	13.5	3.3	100.0
< 1 ha	35.9	19.2	30.0	14.9	100.0
1-1.99 ha	46.5	47.8	0.0	5.7	100.0
2-3.99 ha	36.4	41.5	18.1	4.1	100.0
4-5.99 ha	69.6	24.6	5.8	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	45.6	44.1	10.3	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	55.3	27.6	13.4	3.6	100.0
Small only	72.0	16.1	10.0	1.9	100.0
Large only	19.9	80.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	81.6	4.0	14.5	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	74.9	14.0	9.9	1.2	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	46.8	31.4	11.6	10.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	50.2	32.7	13.7	3.4	100.0
Other	16.1	30.3	36.5	17.1	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	58.5	27.2	10.9	3.4	100.0
Female	43.8	26.7	25.5	3.9	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	61.2	23.3	11.3	4.2	100.0
Monogamous	56.1	28.8	11.6	3.5	100.0
Polygamous	80.7	19.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	53.7	27.7	18.7	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	45.3	25.5	24.7	4.6	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	12.5	52.7	27.8	7.1	100.0
Primary	54.6	29.6	12.9	2.9	100.0
Secondary +	64.6	19.6	11.9	3.9	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

widowed, divorced or separated and 10 percent of the employees claim having problems paying utility bills often. Likewise, 9 percent of households where the household head has secondary education or more and 21 percent of households owning two to four hectares of land reported often having problems paying utility bills. 33 percent of households owning both small and large livestock reported often having problems paying utility bills, whereas the share for households owning large livestock only is virtually null. Other selected household characteristics such as household size and gender do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay utility bills.

6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare

Table 6.7 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for healthcare during the year before the survey. 83 percent of the households reported that they never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare in the year prior to the survey. Desegregation of the data further shows that while 88 percent of households located in accessible clusters never/seldom experienced problems paying for healthcare; the share for households located in remote clusters is 79 percent. Poverty status of the household does not show strong correlation with the ability to pay for healthcare.

44 percent of households owning seven or more members reported seldom having problems paying for healthcare compares to 26 percent of households with one or two members. While 15 percent of households owning less than 1 hectare of land always experienced problems paying for healthcare, the share for households owning four or more hectares of land is virtually null.

Furthermore, 82 percent of households owning both small and large livestock never had problems paying for health care compared to 20 percent of those owning only large livestock. Similarly, while three quarters (75 percent) of households whose main income earner is an employee never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is 16 percent. Likewise 81 percent of households where the household head is polygamous never had problems paying for healthcare compared to 45 percent of households where the household head is widowed, divorced or separated.

59 percent of male-headed households never had problems paying for healthcare, while the share for female-headed households is 44 percent. On the other hand, 35 percent of household heads with no education often/always had problems paying for healthcare compared to 16

percent of household heads with secondary education or more.

6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status

This section discusses ownership of selected assets and household occupancy status. 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, 38 percent of the district's households own their dwellings while 21 percent owns some land. While 15 percent of all households owns a bicycle, the share for households owning wheelbarrows is 8 percent, 5 percent own vehicles and a further 1 percent own a motorcycle. Livestock ownership account for less than 10 percent of all households in the district.

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. 47 percent of households located in remote clusters own their dwellings compared to 28 percent of households located in accessible clusters. Similarly, 81 percent of poor households own their dwellings against 33 percent of non-poor households. Desegregation of the data shows that 90 percent of households with seven or more members own their dwellings compared to 18 percent of households with one or two members. Furthermore, while 84 percent of households whose main income earner belongs to the 'self-employed agriculture' socio-economic group own their dwellings, the share for households whose main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities is 33 percent. Disaggregation of the data further shows that while 39 percent of male-headed households own their dwellings, the share for female-headed households is 29 percent. It is also observed that 17 percent of male-headed households own a bicycle compared to only 4 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 29 percent

Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets

			Livestock				Motor-		Wheel
	Home	Land	Small	Large	Both	Vehicle	cycle	Bicycle	barrow
Total	37.5	20.6	2.6	0.3	1.6	4.6	1.2	15.2	7.5
Cluster Location									
Accessible	28.1	9.8	3.2	0.1	1.3	5.7	0.2	14.5	4.5
Remote	46.7	31.2	2.0	0.5	1.9	3.4	2.2	15.8	10.5
Poverty Status									
Poor	80.7	39.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5	2.0
Non-poor	32.6	18.4	2.9	0.4	1.8	5.1	1.4	15.3	8.1
Household size									
1-2	18.9	14.8	2.5	1.2	2.0	1.0	0.0	8.1	2.5
3-4	20.1	16.7	1.4	0.0	0.2	2.1	0.2	11.9	5.8
5-6	56.7	24.2	2.1	0.0	2.3	7.0	1.2	21.1	8.2
7+	90.3	36.4	6.5	0.0	3.6	14.2	6.1	28.7	20.1
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	38.5	17.8	4.6	0.2	2.4	7.4	2.5	17.7	10.0
Self-employed - agriculture	84.0	88.4	0.0	0.0	6.2	1.5	0.0	38.3	9.9
Self-employed - other	33.1	17.0	2.0	0.4	1.1	3.7	0.8	12.8	6.2
Other	57.9	35.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.7	8.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	39.2	22.6	3.1	0.1	1.7	5.4	1.1	17.4	8.0
Female	28.6	10.5	0.0	1.6	1.4	0.4	2.0	4.0	5.2

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status

	Own	Rent	Free	Other	Total
Total	37.5	52.9	9.5	0.2	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	28.1	62.4	9.1	0.3	100.0
Remote	46.7	43.4	9.9	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	80.7	11.7	7.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	32.6	57.5	9.7	0.2	100.0
Household size					
1-2	18.9	68.5	12.6	0.0	100.0
3-4	20.1	67.5	12.5	0.0	100.0
5-6	56.7	36.7	5.8	0.9	100.0
7+	90.3	8.5	1.2	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	38.5	53.7	7.3	0.6	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	84.0	8.1	7.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	33.1	56.2	10.7	0.0	100.0
Other	57.9	33.1	9.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	39.2	51.4	9.2	0.2	100.0
Female	28.6	60.4	10.9	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

of households with seven or more members own a bicycle compared to only 8 percent of households with one or two members.

6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation

The percent distribution of households by type of occupancy documentation is shown in Table 6.10. 39 percent of residents in the district do not have any documentation to verify their occupancy status. 41 percent of the households possess formal occupancy documentation, which include a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt and a further 20 percent posses other forms of documents.
The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote villages report higher shares of households with title deed and a lower share with renting contracts than accessible villages. Similarly, poor households report a higher share of households with title deed and lower shares with renting contracts and no documentation than non-poor households.

The share of households with title deed increases with household size, whereas the share with no documentation decreases.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that the 'other' category has the lowest share of households with title deed and the highest share with other documents.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong differences.

6.4 Agriculture

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

6.4.1 Agricultural Inputs

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

Only 10 percent of all farmers applies agricultural inputs to their farms almost two thirds (63 percent) of those who use farm inputs uses improved seedling. The percentage of households located in remote clusters using agricultural inputs is higher than that of households located in

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	18.2	19.8	3.0	20.3	38.7	100.0	41.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	15.0	27.8	1.2	21.1	34.8	100.0	44.0
Remote	21.3	12.0	4.7	19.5	42.6	100.0	37.9
Poverty Status							
Poor	36.7	2.1	9.5	17.8	33.8	100.0	48.4
Non-poor	16.1	21.8	2.2	20.6	39.3	100.0	40.1
Household size							
1-2	6.0	31.3	2.5	20.1	40.1	100.0	39.8
3-4	9.3	21.7	2.4	16.0	50.6	100.0	33.4
5-6	20.2	14.8	3.3	27.8	33.9	100.0	38.3
7+	60.0	0.6	4.7	21.8	12.8	100.0	65.4
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	22.1	22.5	3.9	18.3	33.2	100.0	48.5
Self-employed - agriculture	31.3	0.0	5.1	21.0	42.6	100.0	36.4
Self-employed - other	16.4	20.5	1.9	20.1	41.0	100.0	38.9
Other	2.6	5.6	12.2	40.7	38.9	100.0	20.5
Gender of the head of household							
Male	19.2	19.2	3.0	21.1	37.4	100.0	41.5
Female	12.7	23.2	2.6	16.3	45.3	100.0	38.4

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	9.8	41.7	62.9	0.0	12.9	42.1	0.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	5.8	62.4	58.5	0.0	0.0	63.1	0.0
Remote	13.8	33.2	64.7	0.0	18.2	33.4	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	15.3	23.3	83.2	0.0	20.9	48.5	0.0
Non-poor	9.2	45.1	59.1	0.0	11.4	40.9	0.0
Household size							
1-2	7.2	55.7	49.8	0.0	13.0	51.9	0.0
3-4	9.1	34.4	61.3	0.0	12.3	43.4	0.0
5-6	9.4	73.2	74.4	0.0	3.3	59.4	0.0
7+	17.0	17.7	66.9	0.0	20.4	20.2	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	8.1	58.9	41.3	0.0	0.0	63.6	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	55.3	21.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	35.2	0.0
Self-employed - other	8.0	44.1	56.0	0.0	24.6	36.9	0.0
Other	6.9	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	10.4	37.7	64.9	0.0	14.6	36.1	0.0
Female	7.0	71.9	48.3	0.0	0.0	87.2	0.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

accessible clusters, at 14 and 6 percent respectively. Similarly, poor households report a higher share using agricultural inputs than non-poor households.

Disaggregating the data further shows that as the number of household members increases, the usage of agricultural inputs also increases. Furthermore, while 55

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	95.0	0.6	2.6	0.6	1.1	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	98.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	100.0
Remote	93.6	0.9	3.7	0.9	0.9	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	94.0	0.7	3.1	0.7	1.3	100.0
Household size						
1-2	80.8	3.1	13.0	3.1	0.0	100.0
3-4	98.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	100.0
5-6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	98.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	97.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	91.3	1.2	5.0	1.2	1.2	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	95.7	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.3	100.0
Female	89.3	5.4	0.0	5.4	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

1. Base is households using agricultural inputs

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	79.4	2.6	4.2	6.9	2.6	4.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	90.2	1.0	1.6	3.6	1.7	1.9	100.0
Remote	68.8	4.1	6.6	10.3	3.6	6.6	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	60.2	7.4	4.4	14.5	6.0	7.4	100.0
Non-poor	81.6	2.0	4.1	6.1	2.3	3.9	100.0
Household size							
1-2	85.2	2.6	2.5	5.5	0.9	3.3	100.0
3-4	83.3	0.9	5.4	5.7	2.7	2.0	100.0
5-6	75.8	6.7	4.2	5.1	2.6	5.6	100.0
7+	63.6	1.2	4.1	15.3	5.8	9.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	82.2	0.9	5.3	4.3	3.3	4.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	11.6	10.1	5.7	44.7	10.0	17.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	83.0	2.8	3.4	5.3	1.8	3.8	100.0
Other	65.0	4.5	6.9	19.1	4.6	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	77.4	2.3	4.8	7.8	3.2	4.5	100.0
Female	89.5	3.9	0.8	2.6	0.0	3.2	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture uses agricultural inputs, the share for households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group is 7 percent.

In addition, the rate use of improved seedlings in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households at 65 and 48 percent respectively.

Most households that use agricultural inputs obtain them by purchasing them at an open market (95 percent, 3 percent obtain them from donor agencies and 1 percent prepares them.

The data also shows that the percentage of households located in accessible clusters and the poor households who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is higher than that of their respective counterparts. Likewise the percentage of households with five or six members who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is 19 percentage points higher than that of households with one or two members, at 100 and 81 percent respectively.

96 percent of male-headed households purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 89 percent o female-headed households. On the other hand, while 5 percent of female-headed households obtain agricultural inputs from cooperatives, the share for male-headed households is virtually null. There appears to be no strong correlation between socio-economic groups and the distribution of households using agricultural inputs by the main source of inputs.

6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around 86 percent of households own less than two acres of land (including 79 percent of landless households). 7 percent own between two and four acres and a further 7 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.

Regarding household size, while 85 percent of households with one or two members are landless, the share for households with seven or more members is 64 percent. In contrast, larger households seem to own larger landholdings more frequently than households with less members.

While households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities reported the highest share of landless households (83 percent), households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group reported the lowest share at 12 percent. Finally, female-headed households are more likely to be landless than male-headed households at 89 and 77 percent respectively.

6.4.3 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. The majority (98 percent) of

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	98.0	0.1	1.8	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	98.5	0.1	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	97.6	0.0	2.3	0.2	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	97.8	0.1	2.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	96.9	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	99.8	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	97.7	0.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	96.4	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	97.4	0.2	2.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	93.8	0.0	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	98.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	98.3	0.1	1.6	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	97.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	20.4	20.8	21.9	30.8	4.6	1.5	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	18.0	19.0	29.4	26.5	4.6	2.5	100.0
Remote	22.8	22.6	14.4	35.0	4.5	0.6	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	25.7	28.7	13.0	24.4	5.5	2.7	100.0
Non-poor	19.8	19.9	22.9	31.5	4.5	1.4	100.0
Household size							
1-2	14.5	25.5	22.6	30.2	3.2	3.9	100.0
3-4	26.7	13.7	21.7	32.1	5.5	0.4	100.0
5-6	16.3	27.3	23.1	28.2	5.1	0.0	100.0
7+	21.1	21.6	19.4	31.9	4.2	1.8	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	20.6	20.2	21.6	30.9	4.8	1.9	100.0
< 1 ha	37.4	28.4	12.6	21.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	33.2	20.6	18.5	19.9	7.7	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	12.3	14.8	37.0	31.8	4.1	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	11.7	33.1	24.4	24.6	6.1	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	13.8	29.4	9.0	47.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	21.0	20.6	22.0	30.4	4.5	1.6	100.0
Small only	12.0	35.5	13.9	28.5	10.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	5.3	13.6	33.2	44.9	3.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	22.9	18.8	20.4	30.4	6.1	1.5	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	18.6	14.1	30.5	30.6	6.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	18.9	23.1	22.2	30.1	4.0	1.7	100.0
Other	31.0	4.3	18.7	46.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	20.9	19.6	23.4	30.2	5.0	0.9	100.0
Female	18.1	27.0	14.2	33.8	2.5	4.4	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	16.7	30.6	25.8	16.9	4.8	5.2	100.0
Monogamous	21.9	18.3	23.1	30.9	5.2	0.7	100.0
Polygamous	36.2	18.8	16.9	21.2	6.9	0.0	100.0
Loose union	7.1	23.9	16.8	47.9	4.3	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	17.5	21.5	14.7	43.0	1.1	2.2	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	26.3	24.3	22.0	27.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	17.8	21.8	22.7	30.2	5.4	2.0	100.0
Secondary +	23.6	18.8	20.6	32.1	3.9	1.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

households owns no cattle at all, and only 2 percent owns between 2 and 10 heads of cattle. All the selected household characteristics such as cluster location, poverty status, household size, socio-economic groups and gender of the household head do not show strong correlation with cattle ownership.

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.

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

	Principal contributor of income				
	Head	Spouse	Child	Other	Total
Total	91.7	2.7	1.7	3.9	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	91.1	3.3	1.3	4.3	100.0
Remote	92.4	2.1	2.1	3.5	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	71.1	8.0	5.9	14.9	100.0
Non-poor	94.1	2.1	1.2	2.6	100.0
Household size					
1-2	92.9	0.6	0.0	6.5	100.0
3-4	92.9	2.1	1.5	3.5	100.0
5-6	92.5	3.0	3.1	1.3	100.0
7+	85.6	7.7	3.6	3.2	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	93.6	2.9	0.6	2.8	100.0
Self-employed - agric	83.6	0.0	0.0	16.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	93.8	1.6	2.4	2.2	100.0
Other	46.9	23.1	0.0	29.9	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	93.2	3.1	1.9	1.9	100.0
Female	84.2	0.8	0.9	14.1	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

36 percent the households reported it was improving, 22 percent said it was the same while 41 percent reported it was deteriorating. The percentage of households located in remote clusters who reported the current crime and security situation as worsening is higher than that of households located in accessible clusters at 46 and 37 percent respectively.

While 22 percent of households with one or two members reported same conditions in the current crime and security situation, the share for households with seven or more members is 9 percent. In addition, 48 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported the current crime and security situation as improving compared to 36 percent of landless households. While 48 percent of households owning small livestock reported deterioration in the current crime and security situation, the share for households owning large livestock is virtually null.

Furthermore, 23 percent of male-headed households reported observing no changes in the current crime and security situation compared to the year before the survey against 14 percent of female-headed households. Similarly, while 52 percent of households where the household head has a loose union reported an improvement in the current crime and security situation, the share for households where the head is single is 22 percent. On the other hand, while 31 percent of households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category reported a much worse crime and security situation, the share of households where the main income earner is self-employed both in agriculture and non-agricultural activities is 19 percent each. Finally, the percentage of households where the head has no education and reported deterioration of the current crime and security situation is higher than that of household heads with primary education, at 50 and 40 percent respectively.

6.6 Household Income Contributions

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

great majority (92 percent) of households the head is the main contributor.

94 percent of non-poor households reported the household head as the main income contributor compared to 71 percent of poor households. Cluster location is not strongly correlated to household income contributions.

While 8 percent of households with seven or more members reported spouses as the main income contributor, the share for households with one or two members is 1 percent. Furthermore, 94 percent of households belonging to the 'self-employed other' and the 'employee' categories reported the head as the main income contributor compared to 45 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that 93 percent of male-headed households reported the head as the main income contributor compared to 84 percent of female-headed households.

6.7 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. 99 percent of households own at least one mattress or bed, 76 percent own a radio, 70 percent own a watch or clock, 66 percent own mobile phones, 49 percent own an electric iron, 38 percent own a modern stove, 37 percent own television, 25 percent owns refrigerators and 12 percent own sewing machines. Non-poor households and households in accessible clusters have higher rates of ownership in almost every selected item than their respective counterparts.

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

Table 6.17: Percentage of households owning selected household items

	Electric iron	Refrigerator	Sewing machine	Modern stove	Mattress or bed	Watch or clock	Radio	Televison	Fixed line phone	Mobile phone
Total	49.0	24.9	11.8	38.0	99.1	70.0	75.9	37.0	1.3	65.6
Cluster Location										
Accessible	57.7	30.1	11.3	52.0	99.1	80.1	80.4	45.7	1.2	69.9
Remote	40.4	19.7	12.3	24.2	99.2	60.1	71.6	28.5	1.5	61.3
Poverty Status										
Poor	31.1	6.9	4.2	52.2	97.7	52.3	67.9	9.4	0.0	35.2
Non-poor	51.0	26.9	12.6	36.4	99.3	72.0	76.8	40.1	1.5	68.9
Household size										
1-2	31.2	12.1	4.9	24.9	98.9	62.6	65.1	27.1	1.9	51.1
3-4	44.0	17.6	10.7	41.4	98.6	67.0	76.7	31.7	0.5	68.3
5-6	68.4	44.0	13.0	47.8	100.0	81.2	77.5	51.0	1.4	76.1
7+	68.8	41.6	25.7	40.8	100.0	76.9	92.0	50.7	2.3	71.5
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	68.1	42.5	15.3	43.3	100.0	87.5	86.5	56.5	1.3	83.3
Self-employed - agric	45.1	11.8	7.7	11.5	93.8	42.0	79.6	11.8	0.0	15.4
Self-employed - other	41.1	18.6	11.1	38.0	99.3	65.5	72.9	31.1	1.5	63.5
Other	36.2	5.5	0.0	22.0	95.5	37.1	38.9	9.9	0.0	10.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	51.0	25.0	13.6	37.0	99.4	71.9	81.9	38.9	1.6	69.5
Female	38.4	24.4	2.8	42.8	97.6	60.6	45.6	27.7	0.0	45.3

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

7 HOUSEHOLD AMENITIES

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

7.1 Housing Materials and Type of Housing Unit

Table 7.1 shows the distribution of households according to the main material used in the roof of the house. Overall, 96 percent of households have iron sheets as their main roof material and 3 percent have thatch.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households tend to use iron sheets more often than poor households at 97 and 86 percent respectively. The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in agriculture is the category with lowest share of households using iron sheets for the roof (at 53 percent), and the remaining socio-economic categories report the shares between 93 and 98 percent. In turn the self-employed agriculture category has the highest use rate of thatch (47 percent) than the remaining categories. Other selected household characteristics such as cluster location, household size and gender of the household head do not show strong correlation with the type of materials used for roofing.

Table 7.2 shows the distribution of households by type of material used in the walls. Overall, 96 percent of houses are built with cement or sandcrete. Burnt bricks occupy the second place, with a share of 4 percent.

The analysis of cluster location reveals that households in accessible clusters have a higher share of cement or sandcrete than households in remote clusters. The rates are 98 and 93 percent, respectively. Likewise, non-poor households use

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	2.6	0.0	96.0	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	0.0	0.0	0.0	98.0	0.3	0.7	1.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	5.2	0.0	94.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	0.0	13.6	0.0	86.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	1.4	0.0	97.0	0.2	0.9	0.5	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	0.0	2.1	0.0	96.4	0.0	0.9	0.5	0.0	100.0
3-4	0.0	2.2	0.0	96.6	0.0	0.2	0.9	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.0	3.4	0.0	93.6	0.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	0.0	3.6	0.0	96.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	0.0	0.0	0.0	98.0	0.6	0.3	1.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	0.0	47.0	0.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	1.0	0.0	97.7	0.0	1.1	0.2	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	6.9	0.0	93.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	0.0	2.3	0.0	96.1	0.2	0.9	0.5	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	4.0	0.0	95.5	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

	Mud/ mud bricks	Stone	Burnt bricks	Cement/ sandcrete	Wood/ bamboo	Iron sheets	Cardboard	Total
Total	4.3	0.0	0.0	95.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	1.7	0.0	0.0	98.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	6.9	0.0	0.0	93.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	14.8	0.0	0.0	85.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	3.1	0.0	0.0	96.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size								
1-2	5.4	0.0	0.0	94.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	4.0	0.0	0.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	3.7	0.0	0.0	96.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	4.0	0.0	0.0	96.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	47.0	0.0	0.0	53.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	3.4	0.0	0.0	96.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	11.3	0.0	0.0	88.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household								
Male	3.8	0.0	0.0	96.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	6.7	0.0	0.0	93.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

	Mud/ earth	Wood/ plank	Tiles	Concrete/ cement	Grass	Other	Total
Total	8.9	0.0	1.4	89.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	3.9	0.0	2.2	93.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	13.7	0.0	0.5	85.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	28.5	0.0	1.7	69.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	6.7	0.0	1.3	92.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	10.8	0.0	0.0	89.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	6.9	0.0	2.3	90.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	8.3	0.0	0.4	91.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	10.9	0.0	2.7	86.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	1.1	0.0	3.0	95.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	48.5	0.0	0.0	51.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	9.1	0.0	0.8	90.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	26.9	0.0	0.0	73.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	8.0	0.0	1.5	90.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	13.3	0.0	0.5	86.2	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

cement or sand Crete more often than poor households (97 and 85 percent, respectively).

Virtually all households in the employee category were living in houses made of cement or sandcrete by the time of the survey, whereas the share for the self-employed in agriculture is 53 percent. In turn the latter report the highest share of houses built of mud or mud bricks than the remaining socio-economic categories at 47 percent. Gender of the household head and household size are not strongly correlated

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

	Single room	Flat	Two or more rooms	Whole building	Other	Total
Total	43.6	0.3	20.6	35.1	0.4	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	47.9	0.5	24.5	27.1	0.0	100.0
Remote	39.3	0.0	16.9	43.0	0.8	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	13.5	0.0	23.0	59.3	4.2	100.0
Non-poor	46.9	0.3	20.4	32.4	0.0	100.0
Household size						
1-2	71.9	0.3	15.3	12.5	0.0	100.0
3-4	55.2	0.5	23.1	21.3	0.0	100.0
5-6	12.8	0.0	29.6	57.5	0.0	100.0
7+	2.3	0.0	12.7	82.1	2.8	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	24.4	0.9	28.0	46.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	4.0	0.0	14.2	81.8	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	54.5	0.0	18.2	26.6	0.7	100.0
Other	45.8	0.0	11.7	42.6	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	40.9	0.3	20.7	37.6	0.5	100.0
Female	57.0	0.0	20.5	22.5	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

with the material used for walls of the house.

The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 90 percent of households is made of concrete or cement and 9 percent of mud or earth.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible clusters, with a rate of 94 percent, have more houses with concrete floor than households in remote clusters, with a rate of 86 percent. In contrast, 14 percent of houses in remote clusters have mud or earth floor while the share for houses in accessible clusters is 4 percent.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households have a higher share of houses with cement or concrete (92 percent, against 70 percent of the poor households). Up to 29 percent of poor households have mud or earth floor, whereas the share for non-poor is only 7 percent.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that those self-employed in agriculture have the lowest share of concrete or cement than the remaining socio-economic groups. In addition, while 49 of households self employed in agriculture and 27 percent of households in the 'other' category have houses with mud or dirt floors, the share for the employees is only 1 percent. Finally, households headed by females have a higher share of mud or dirt floor than male-headed households at 13 and 8 percent respectively.

Table 7.4 shows the percent distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 44 percent of households occupy a single room where they live, 35 percent occupy the whole building, and 21 percent occupy two or more rooms.

Households from remote clusters are more likely to occupy the whole building than households from accessible clusters. In turn the latter are more likely to occupy a single room than the former at 48 and 39 percent respectively. The breakdown by poverty status shows similar results with poor households resembling remote clusters.

The breakdown by household size shows that small households are more likely to occupy single rooms, at 79 percent of households with up to 2 members occupies single rooms compared to 2 percent of households with 7 or more members. While 82 percent of households with 7 or more members occupy the whole

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	48.8	16.9	16.3	3.8	3.7	0.0	1.9	6.6	2.1	100.0	68.9
Cluster Location											
Accessible	47.5	19.3	22.0	1.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	5.7	3.8	100.0	70.6
Remote	50.2	14.4	10.7	6.4	6.7	0.0	3.7	7.6	0.3	100.0	67.3
Poverty Status											
Poor	51.4	8.5	17.1	4.4	9.5	0.0	4.1	4.9	0.0	100.0	72.9
Non-poor	48.6	17.8	16.2	3.7	3.0	0.0	1.6	6.8	2.3	100.0	68.4
Household size											
1-2	45.3	16.4	14.6	3.7	1.7	0.0	2.8	9.3	6.2	100.0	63.5
3-4	51.1	23.4	12.7	2.2	4.3	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.9	100.0	66.0
5-6	52.3	8.5	20.3	5.7	3.8	0.0	4.7	4.7	0.0	100.0	78.3
7+	45.2	12.1	23.3	5.4	5.6	0.0	1.2	7.2	0.0	100.0	73.9
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	50.5	12.6	22.3	3.8	0.8	0.0	0.0	7.4	2.6	100.0	76.7
Self-employed - agric	30.7	3.1	17.9	8.5	25.0	0.0	14.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	57.1
Self-employed - other	49.8	19.0	13.8	3.0	3.9	0.0	1.7	6.8	2.0	100.0	66.6
Other	36.9	29.0	9.5	12.2	0.0	0.0	6.9	5.5	0.0	100.0	58.6
Gender of the head of household											
Male	49.2	17.7	15.1	3.5	3.1	0.0	2.0	7.0	2.5	100.0	67.8
Female	47.0	12.5	22.3	4.9	6.7	0.0	1.5	5.1	0.0	100.0	74.3

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

building where they live, the share for households with up to 2 members is 13 percent.

The analysis of socio-economic groups shows that the 'self-employed other' category has the lowest share of households occupying the whole building at 27 percent, and the highest share occupying a single room at 55 percent. Finally, female-headed households are less likely than male-headed households to occupy the whole building.

7.2 Water and Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 69 percent of households have a safe source of water, whereas 17 percent of them get it from an untreated pipe borne. Safe sources of drinking water are treated pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and protected wells.
The analysis of cluster location shows that 22 percent of households in accessible clusters obtain drinking water from hand pumps, whereas the share of households in remote clusters is 11 percent. The breakdown by poverty status of the household shows that, while 73 percent of poor households use safe sources of water the share for non-poor households is 68 percent.

Further breakdown by household size shows that the rate of access to safe source of drinking water tends to increase with increasing household size, as 64 percent of household with up to two members use safe sources of water compared to 74 percent of households with 7 or more members. The split-up by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households have a higher access rate to safe source of drinking water than male-headed households at 74 and 68 percent respectively. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household reveals that the 'employee' is the category with the highest rate of access to safe sources of drinking water at 77 percent and the 'self-employed agriculture' category reports the lowest share at 57 percent.

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. Overall 93 percent of households have safe sanitation, whereas up to 67 percent use a covered pit latrine.

The cluster breakdown shows that 99 percent of households in accessible clusters have safe sanitation, while in households in remote clusters the share is

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	1.1	0.9	25.2	0.0	66.8	4.4	1.7	0.0	100.0	92.8
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.5	35.0	0.0	63.2	0.5	0.9	0.0	100.0	98.6
Remote	2.2	1.2	15.6	0.0	70.3	8.1	2.6	0.0	100.0	87.1
Poverty Status										
Poor	1.2	0.0	2.9	0.0	89.0	4.1	2.7	0.0	100.0	91.9
Non-poor	1.1	1.0	27.7	0.0	64.3	4.4	1.6	0.0	100.0	92.9
Household size										
1-2	1.8	0.6	14.7	0.0	77.1	4.9	0.9	0.0	100.0	92.4
3-4	1.3	0.5	31.6	0.0	60.4	5.4	0.7	0.0	100.0	92.6
5-6	0.6	0.5	28.1	0.0	69.9	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	98.5
7+	0.0	2.8	24.2	0.0	59.8	5.2	8.0	0.0	100.0	86.8
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	0.0	3.0	39.4	0.0	49.5	4.0	4.1	0.0	100.0	91.9
Self-employed - agric	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0	76.4	12.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	87.5
Self-employed - other	1.4	0.0	20.9	0.0	73.6	3.4	0.8	0.0	100.0	94.4
Other	6.9	0.0	1.4	0.0	75.4	16.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	76.9
Gender of the head of household										
Male	1.1	0.9	23.5	0.0	69.2	3.6	1.7	0.0	100.0	93.6
Female	1.3	0.6	33.6	0.0	54.6	8.3	1.6	0.0	100.0	88.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

87 percent. The analysis by poverty status shows that 89 percent of poor households have covered pit latrines compared to 64 percent of non-poor households. In turn, the latter report a higher share with flush toilets than the former at 28 and 3 percent respectively. Households with 7 or more members have the lowest percentage of safe sanitation, at 87 percent. The rates for other groups fluctuate between 92 and 99 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that the 'self-employed other' category has the highest rate of safe sanitation at 94 percent, and the 'other' category has the lowest rate at 77 percent. While 39 percent of the employees have flush toilets, the share for households in the 'other' category is 1 percent.

The analysis by gender of the household heads reveals that male-headed households are more likely to have safe sanitation than female-headed households. Furthermore, female-headed households are more likely to have flush toilets than male-headed households, with rates of 34 and 24 percent, respectively. In addition, the percentage of male-headed households that has covered pit latrines is higher than that of female-headed households at 69 and 55 percent respectively.

7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 83 percent of households use charcoal. 87 percent of households in accessible clusters uses charcoal compared to 80 percent of households in remote clusters. The breakdown by poverty status reveals similar differences with poor households resembling the remote clusters.

The breakdown by household size shows that the rate of using charcoal tends to increase with increasing household size, as 66 percent of households with up to 2 members uses charcoal against 93 percent of households with 5 to 6 members. In contrast, 19 percent of households with up to 2 members use kerosene or oil for cooking, whereas the share for households with 7 or more members is virtually null.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that, while 91 percent of employees uses charcoal for cooking, the share of employees using firewood is virtually null. The 'self-employed agriculture' and the 'other' categories report higher rates of using firewood for cooking and lower shares for charcoal than the other two categories.

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	8.1	83.4	7.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	100.0	7.4
Cluster Location										
Accessible	1.2	87.0	10.2	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.3	100.0	10.6
Remote	14.9	80.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	100.0	4.3
Poverty Status										
Poor	29.3	66.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	5.7	85.3	8.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.7	100.0	8.2
Household size										
1-2	10.4	66.2	19.4	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	3.9	100.0	19.6
3-4	6.8	88.7	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	4.5
5-6	5.9	92.9	0.9	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1.2
7+	9.9	89.6	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.4
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	0.0	90.8	7.6	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	100.0	7.8
Self-employed - agric	54.9	45.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	7.4	83.5	7.9	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	100.0	8.0
Other	38.1	61.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	6.5	84.6	7.9	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.8	100.0	8.1
Female	16.1	77.6	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	100.0	3.8

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	47.9	0.0	50.2	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.5	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	35.2	0.0	62.1	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.2	100.0
Remote	60.3	0.0	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.8	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	81.7	0.0	14.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	100.0
Non-poor	44.1	0.0	54.3	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.1	100.0
Household size									
1-2	50.5	0.0	45.3	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	1.8	100.0
3-4	50.1	0.0	49.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	41.5	0.0	54.9	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	46.0	0.0	54.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	27.8	0.0	69.8	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	88.3	0.0	11.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	52.4	0.0	46.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.8	100.0
Other	89.6	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	47.2	0.0	52.1	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.1	100.0
Female	51.4	0.0	40.8	0.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	2.6	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for lightning. Overall, 50 percent of the households in the district use electricity and 48 percent use kerosene or paraffin. Gas, solar panels, batteries, and firewood are virtually not used for lighting in the district.

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	92.8	4.9	1.7	0.6	100.0	45.2	29.1	21.5	4.2	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	99.2	0.6	0.0	0.1	100.0	53.6	26.0	19.7	0.7	100.0
Remote	86.5	9.1	3.3	1.0	100.0	37.0	32.1	23.2	7.7	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	91.1	7.1	1.8	0.0	100.0	35.5	27.4	30.4	6.6	100.0
Non-poor	93.0	4.7	1.7	0.6	100.0	46.3	29.3	20.5	4.0	100.0
Household size										
1-2	97.3	1.2	0.7	0.9	100.0	50.4	30.0	16.6	3.0	100.0
3-4	90.5	7.6	1.2	0.7	100.0	40.0	28.8	24.3	6.9	100.0
5-6	90.2	7.3	2.2	0.3	100.0	48.9	28.1	20.9	2.2	100.0
7+	93.9	2.0	4.1	0.0	100.0	44.0	29.4	24.2	2.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	96.4	1.4	1.1	1.1	100.0	54.7	27.2	15.6	2.5	100.0
Self-employed - agric	83.6	16.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	31.6	30.5	35.6	2.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	91.4	6.1	2.1	0.4	100.0	42.1	29.8	22.8	5.4	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	39.2	30.6	30.3	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	92.8	5.0	1.8	0.4	100.0	44.9	31.4	19.8	3.9	100.0
Female	92.9	4.4	1.1	1.6	100.0	47.1	17.3	29.8	5.8	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

The analysis of cluster location shows that households in accessible clusters report a higher share using electricity than households in remote clusters, who in turn report a higher share using kerosene or paraffin. The split-up by poverty status reveals similar results with poor households resembling remote clusters. The breakdown by household size reveals that larger households report use of electricity more often than smaller households. In turn, the latter report use of kerosene or paraffin for lighting more frequently than the former.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees and self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the highest rates of use of electricity, at 70 and 46 percent, respectively. On the other hand, the 'other' category has the highest rate of use of kerosene or paraffin, at 90 percent. Finally, male-headed households are more likely to use electricity and less likely to use kerosene/paraffin than female-headed households.

7.4 Distances to Facilities

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

Overall, 98 percent of households are located under 30 minutes of a drinking water supply. In addition, 74 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes of a health facility.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that virtually all (100 percent) households in accessible clusters have access to a drinking water source and 90 percent to a health facility, whereas the shares for households in remote clusters are 96 and 69 percent respectively. Similar differences are observed by poverty status, with non-poor households having higher access rates than poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that the smallest households (up to 2 members) have the highest rates of access to both sources of drinking water and to

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	57.5	29.1	12.1	1.3	100.0	16.1	34.4	31.3	18.3	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	62.4	29.1	8.3	0.2	100.0	24.0	38.8	33.0	4.2	100.0
Remote	52.7	29.0	15.9	2.4	100.0	8.3	30.1	29.5	32.1	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	57.1	22.0	20.9	0.0	100.0	14.2	27.5	32.4	25.8	100.0
Non-poor	57.6	29.9	11.1	1.4	100.0	16.3	35.2	31.1	17.4	100.0
Household size										
1-2	60.0	26.2	13.4	0.3	100.0	16.0	38.2	34.9	10.9	100.0
3-4	55.0	30.2	13.4	1.4	100.0	12.2	33.5	31.9	22.4	100.0
5-6	60.4	26.6	10.9	2.1	100.0	17.6	36.9	30.3	15.2	100.0
7+	55.3	34.7	8.2	1.8	100.0	23.9	26.4	24.2	25.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	57.9	33.3	7.6	1.1	100.0	28.2	34.6	25.8	11.4	100.0
Self-employed - agric	11.2	70.1	18.7	0.0	100.0	2.3	22.8	31.9	43.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	60.4	24.4	13.7	1.5	100.0	11.5	35.4	33.2	19.9	100.0
Other	50.8	35.4	13.7	0.0	100.0	13.7	27.7	40.8	17.8	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	56.8	29.3	12.5	1.3	100.0	14.3	35.2	31.1	19.4	100.0
Female	60.8	27.9	10.2	1.1	100.0	25.0	30.2	32.1	12.7	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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	57.3	31.9	9.6	1.2	100.0	65.8	28.1	6.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	61.3	30.0	8.3	0.3	100.0	72.2	24.2	3.5	0.0	100.0
Remote	53.3	33.7	10.9	2.1	100.0	59.6	32.0	8.5	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	64.0	20.2	14.0	1.8	100.0	67.1	24.3	8.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	56.5	33.2	9.1	1.2	100.0	65.7	28.6	5.7	0.0	100.0
Household size										
1-2	73.5	15.5	10.6	0.3	100.0	75.4	20.5	4.1	0.0	100.0
3-4	51.6	37.7	8.6	2.1	100.0	60.0	32.6	7.4	0.0	100.0
5-6	52.5	35.5	12.0	0.0	100.0	66.3	26.5	7.2	0.0	100.0
7+	47.9	42.5	7.2	2.4	100.0	62.3	33.1	4.6	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	59.1	35.2	5.2	0.5	100.0	74.5	23.1	2.4	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	49.2	46.2	2.3	2.3	100.0	65.0	26.4	8.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	56.3	29.7	12.4	1.6	100.0	62.0	30.1	7.9	0.0	100.0
Other	68.5	27.4	4.0	0.0	100.0	64.5	35.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of head of household										
Male	55.3	34.0	9.6	1.1	100.0	63.6	29.6	6.8	0.0	100.0
Female	67.2	20.9	9.9	2.0	100.0	77.0	20.6	2.3	0.0	100.0

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

health facilities. Households with 7 or more members report the lowest rate of access to a safe source of drinking water at 96 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic categories shows that virtually all households in the 'other' category have access to drinking water; while the remaining categories report shares above 95 percent each. The 'employee' category has the highest rate of access to a health facility at 82 percent, whereas households self-employed in agriculture have the

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	93.7	20.4	11.0	2.5	7.8	74.0	2.2	12.4	0.1	0.0	22.8
Cluster Location											
Accessible	92.4	16.9	12.4	3.8	14.2	76.4	3.3	10.8	0.0	0.0	34.2
Remote	95.0	23.8	9.6	1.2	1.7	71.6	1.1	13.9	0.1	0.0	12.0
Poverty Status											
Poor	89.1	28.2	11.7	0.0	3.1	61.9	0.0	10.6	0.7	0.0	7.3
Non-poor	94.2	19.6	10.9	2.8	8.3	75.3	2.4	12.6	0.0	0.0	24.5
Household size											
1-2	88.0	24.8	11.2	0.6	5.7	59.9	0.0	9.4	0.0	0.0	20.9
3-4	94.6	19.6	9.1	2.4	5.0	77.8	4.5	12.9	0.0	0.0	18.0
5-6	96.6	19.1	15.4	2.9	15.7	78.1	2.3	13.8	0.0	0.0	27.9
7+	98.2	17.1	9.6	5.3	8.0	82.9	0.0	14.4	0.4	0.0	31.3
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	98.9	17.0	14.7	3.8	9.9	81.9	2.4	12.3	0.0	0.0	39.4
Self-employed - agric	88.2	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	67.9	0.0	14.2	0.0	0.0	11.2
Self-employed - other	91.6	20.9	9.7	2.1	7.6	72.9	2.3	11.4	0.1	0.0	16.0
Other	95.5	37.8	12.7	0.0	1.5	29.8	0.0	29.0	0.0	0.0	11.6
Gender of the head of household											
Male	94.6	19.7	10.2	2.1	7.8	75.7	2.6	11.6	0.1	0.0	22.5
Female	89.1	24.4	15.4	4.8	7.7	64.8	0.0	16.5	0.0	0.0	24.7

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

lowest access rate to health facilities at 63 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong differences in access to water sources, but households headed by males have higher access rates to health facilities, with 76 percent living less than 30 min of health facilities, 12 percent points above female-headed households.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 87 percent of households are located within 30 minutes of a primary school and 50 percent of households live within 30 min of a secondary school. Moreover, 18 percent of households are located 61 min or more away from the nearest secondary school. Access to school was also analysed in chapter 3 but with a different focus. In chapter 3, access to school was analysed at child level, i.e. the access rate of each child. In this section the focus is the distance of the house to the nearest school.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 91 percent of households in accessible clusters have access to primary school, against 82 percent of remote clusters. For secondary school, the rates go down to 63 and 38 percent, respectively.

88 percent of non-poor households are located within 30 minutes from a primary school, 9 percentage points above poor households. Similarly, non-poor households have higher rates of access to secondary school than poor households, with shares of 51 and 40 percent, respectively.

The size of the household does not appear to be correlated with access to school, either primary or secondary. However, households with 7 or more members have the highest rate of access to primary school at 90 percent.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the category ‘employee’ have the highest rates of access to both primary and secondary schools at 90 and 63 percent respectively, and that the ‘self-employed other’ have the lowest rates at 81 and 25 percent respectively.

Households headed by females have a higher access rate to secondary school than male-headed households, at 55 percent, against 49 percent of males. There is no strong difference in the access to primary school.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation.

Overall, 89 percent of households have access to a food market, and 94 percent to public transportation. The analysis of cluster location, poverty status and household size shows no strong correlation with time taken by households to reach both food market and public transportation.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' category has the highest rates of access to food markets and public transportation, with rates of 96 and 100 percent respectively. The employees are in second place, with rates of 94 and 98 percent, respectively, to each facility. The self-employed in agriculture and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities report almost similar shares of access to each facility.

There does not appear to be strong difference according to the gender of the household head with access to both facilities.

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, 94 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken are insecticide treated nets (74 percent), use of window or door nets (23 percent), maintenance of good sanitation (12 percent), use of bed nets (20 percent) and insecticide (11 percent).

The analysis of cluster location shows that 34 percent of households in accessible clusters use window or door nets against malaria, compared to 12 percent of households in remote clusters. While 94 percent of non-poor households take measures against malaria, and 25 percent of them uses window or door nets the shares for poor households are 89 and 7 percent respectively.

The share of households taking measures increases with the size of the household but there are no clear trends by measure taken. The analysis of socio-economic status shows that 99 percent of households in the category 'employee' takes measures, 95 percent of the 'other' category, 92 percent of 'self-employed other' category, and 88 percent of the 'self-employed agriculture' category .

Finally, households headed by males are more likely to take measures against malaria than households headed by females. In turn female-headed households use bed-nets and insecticide more frequently than male-headed households. In addition, a higher share of the latter uses insecticide treated nets than the former.

8 GOVERNANCE

The PMO-RALG CWIQ expanded the standard CWIQ survey instrument with several questions on governance. This chapter discusses the responses to these questions. The first section discusses attendance at mtaa, ward and district meetings. Section 2 shows the results of questions aimed at measuring satisfaction with leaders at each of these levels. Section 3 concerns public spending at mtaa, ward and 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 3 times with the dots replaced by mtaa, ward and district. The results show that 35 percent of households had at least one member attending at least one mtaa meeting in the past 12 months. Ward and district level meetings report lower attendance rates at 10 and 5 percent, respectively.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote clusters report remarkably higher attendance rates at all levels. Looking at the breakdown of the results by poverty status, it can be seen poor households report higher attendance rates than non-poor households. The analysis of the results by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in agriculture report the highest attendance rate at mtaa level, at 85 percent, whereas the 'other' socio-economic group reports the highest attendance rates at ward and district level, with rates of 17 and 12 percent.

8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders

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

The results, displayed in Table 8.2, show a clear trend of satisfaction with leaders going up as the level of government goes down. While 65 percent of respondents said to be satisfied with mtaa leaders, only 54 and 52 percent, respectively, said the same of ward and district leaders. The satisfaction rate with the district councillor is lower, at 43 percent. This does not, however, mean that respondents specifically reported dissatisfaction with leaders at higher levels of government. In fact, the percentage of people claiming they are dissatisfied with leaders does not differ much between mtaa, ward and district leaders. It actually decreases from 23 percent for mtaa leaders to 17 percent to district leaders. Rather, the number of people responding 'I don't know' increases for higher levels of government: from 13 percent for mtaa leaders to 31 percent for district leaders. In the case of the district councillor, the share of dissatisfied population is 51 percent, and the share that report not knowing whether they are satisfied is 6 percent.

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

	Mtaa Meeting	Ward Meeting	District Meeting
Total	34.8	10.0	5.0
Cluster Location			
Accessible	29.8	6.2	2.3
Remote	39.8	13.8	7.6
Poverty Status			
Poor	51.0	21.2	15.1
Non-poor	33.0	8.8	3.8
Socio-economic Group			
Employee	34.6	6.3	0.2
Self-employed - agriculture	84.2	12.2	0.0
Self-employed - other	31.9	11.3	7.1
Other	38.2	16.8	12.2
No. of Obs.	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

There are no strong differences in the share of satisfied population by cluster location, except for district councillors, where accessible clusters report a higher satisfaction rate than remote clusters. In turn, non-poor households report higher satisfaction rates than poor households, except for district councillor, where no stark differences are observed.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the employees tend to report the highest shares, followed by the self-employed in non-agricultural activities. The self-employed in agriculture come third, and the 'other' socio-economic group reports the lowest attendance rates at all levels.

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

The reasons for dissatisfaction are very different across the different levels of government. The main reasons for dissatisfaction with mtaa leaders were seeing no results and embezzlement/corruption (35 and 32 percent, respectively) and 'they do not listen to people' (23 percent). The main reason for dissatisfaction with ward and district leaders were their failure to visit people, at 50 and 65 percent, respectively, followed by seeing on results, at 32 percent for ward leaders and 28 percent for district leaders. Finally, the most cited

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

	Mtaa Leaders	Ward Leaders	District Leaders	District Councillor
Total				
Satisfied	64.8	53.9	51.9	43.1
Not Satisfied	22.5	19.1	16.9	51.0
Don't Know	12.7	27.0	31.2	5.8
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location				
Accessible	64.3	52.7	52.1	47.3
Remote	65.3	55.1	51.6	39.1
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status				
Poor	49.6	44.5	44.3	45.6
Non-poor	66.5	55.0	52.7	42.9
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group				
Employee	74.1	56.7	56.3	40.7
Self-employed - agriculture	56.9	47.4	37.4	57.9
Self-employed - other	62.0	53.8	51.6	44.5
Other	47.1	40.2	35.7	22.3
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)				
Political differences	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7
Embezzlement/corruption	32.2	14.2	8.9	12.2
They do not listen to people	23.2	9.2	5.8	19.8
Favouritism	9.5	6.0	1.5	7.3
Lazy/inexperienced	11.1	6.3	7.6	17.9
Personal Reasons	10.3	7.3	5.4	3.8
I see no results	34.7	31.6	28.3	56.9
They never visit us	16.9	49.7	65.0	57.1
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	449

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

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

reasons for dissatisfaction with the district councillor were seeing no results and failure to visit people, at 57 percent each.

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 mtaa finances seems to reach the largest share of households at 12 percent. Information on ward and district finances reaches 5 and 4 percent of the households, respectively.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that remote clusters report a higher share of households receiving information on mtaa finances and a lower share receiving information on district finances than accessible clusters. In turn, the breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report higher shares receiving information on mtaa and ward finances.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the 'other' category reports the highest rates at all levels of government, followed by the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities, while the self-employed in agriculture tend to report the lowest shares.

For those that received financial information, the source of this information was probed for. The results in Table 8.3 show that at all levels of government the most important method of acquiring information was rumours or hear-say. In the case of mtaa finances, the second and third most important sources are meetings and notice boards. In the case of ward finances notice boards occupy the second place and meetings the third place. In the case of district finances, the second most important source is radio or newspapers.

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 constant at all levels of government, of roughly 25 percent. However, the share of respondents reporting 'I don't know' increases, from 38 percent for mtaa spending to 48 percent for district spending.

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

	Mtaa Finances	Ward Finances	District Finances
Total	12.3	5.1	3.6
Cluster Location			
Accessible	9.9	4.0	6.1
Remote	14.7	6.3	1.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	20.7	16.7	1.5
Non-poor	11.4	3.8	3.8
Socio-economic Group			
Employee	14.0	1.5	1.9
Self-employed - agriculture	2.3	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	12.0	6.5	4.2
Other	16.5	16.5	8.8
Source			
Letter	0.0	0.0	0.0
Notice board	10.2	25.1	8.6
Meeting	39.0	18.5	1.7
Rumours/hear-say	43.2	59.3	69.9
Radio/newspapers	0.0	0.0	19.8
No. of Obs.	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC

Respondents living in accessible clusters tend to show higher satisfaction rates than respondents living in remote clusters. Similarly, the breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report higher satisfaction rates than poor households, at all levels. The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the employees and the self-employed in non-agricultural activities display the highest satisfaction rates, while the self-employed in agriculture and the 'other' socio-economic group report the lowest shares.

When respondents were further queried why they were not satisfied, or why they did not know whether they were satisfied, the most common response was that they did not receive any information at 70 percent for mtaa spending, 74 percent for ward spending, and 82 percent for district spending. This was followed by seeing no results (ranging from 32 to 41 percent) and embezzlement or corruption (ranging from 20 to 28 percent).

Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction

	Mtaa Spending	Ward Spending	District Spending
Total			
Satisfied	26.5	24.2	25.9
Not Satisfied	35.4	29.9	25.7
Don' Know	38.1	45.9	48.4
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location			
Accessible	32.6	30.4	33.4
Remote	20.6	18.2	18.5
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status			
Poor	11.6	10.6	20.1
Non-poor	28.2	25.7	26.5
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group			
Employee	29.9	23.1	26.3
Self-employed - agriculture	10.2	10.2	17.9
Self-employed - other	26.7	26.2	26.7
Other	13.6	12.0	16.5
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)			
I see no results	40.6	34.9	32.3
Embezzlement/corruption	28.3	23.3	19.5
Favouritism	2.2	2.5	1.0
This is what I hear	5.6	4.8	4.1
They give no information	70.1	74.1	81.6
No. of Obs.	450	450	450

Source:CWIQ 2007 Temeke MC