

PMO-RALG

KIGOMA DC CWIQ
Survey on Poverty, Welfare and
Services in Kigoma DC

OCTOBER 2006

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 Weerd. 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, Geoffrey Bakari, Rukia Charles, Abbanova Gabba, George Gabriel, Jamary Idrissa, Felix James, Batista John, Gloria Joseph, Placidia Josephat, Justina Katoke, Makarius Kiyonga, Faustine Misinde, Jesca Nkonjerwa, Kamugisha Robert, Resti Simon, Pius Sosthenes, Aissa Soud, Adella Theobald, and Honoratha Wyclife. The data processing software was written by Jim Otto and Neil Chalmers. The data entry team consisted of Marystella Andrew and Alieth Mutungi, and was supervised by Thaddaeus Rweyemamu. Formatting the final document layout was in the hands of Amina Suedi. The data analysis and report writing were undertaken by Luis Barron, Ezequiel Kiagho, Edgar Masawe, Mujobu Moyo, and Teddy Neema, under the supervision of Manuel Barron. Assistance from Charles Citinka and Howard Clegg from PMO-RALG is acknowledged.

DEFINITIONS

General

Accessible Village	Within a district, accessible villages are villages located closer to the district capital, all-weather roads, and public transport.
Remote Village	Within a district, remote villages are villages located farther from the district capital, all-weather roads, and public transport.
Socio-economic Group	The socio-economic group of the household is determined by the type of work of the main income earner.
Poverty Predictors	Variables that can be used to determine household consumption expenditure levels in non-expenditure surveys.
Basic Needs Poverty Line	Defined as what a household, using the food basket of the poorest 50 percent of the population, needs to consume to satisfy its basic

food needs to attain 2,200 Kcal/day per adult equivalent. The share of non-food expenditures of the poorest 25 percent of households is then added. The Basic Needs Poverty Line is set at TZS 7,253 per 28 days per adult equivalent unit in 2000/1 prices; households consuming less than this are assumed to be unable to satisfy their basic food and non-food needs.

Education

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

Gross Enrolment Rate	The ratio of all individuals attending school, irrespective of their age, to the population of children of school age.
Net Enrolment Rate	The ratio of children of school age currently enrolled at school to the population of children of school age.
Non-Attendance Rate	The percentage 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, Pertussis ³ , 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
<i>Employment</i>	
Working Individual	An individual who had been engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks preceding the survey.
Underemployed Individual	An individual who was ready to take on more work at the time of the survey.
Non-working Individual	An individual who had not been involved in any type of work in the 4 weeks preceding the survey.
Unemployed Individual	An individual who had not been engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks prior to the survey but had been actively looking for it.
Economically Inactive Individual	An individual who had not been engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks prior to the survey due to reasons unrelated to availability of work (e.g. Illness, old age, disability).
Household duties	Household tasks (cleaning, cooking, fetching

firewood, water, etc.) that do not entail payment

Household worker

A household worker performs household duties but received payment.

Household as employer

A person is said to be employed by his/her household if he/she does domestic/household work for the household they live in (e.g. a housewife or a child that works on his/her parents' fields or shop). It does not include people whose main job was domestic work for other households (private sector).

Welfare

Access to Facilities

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 Introduction	1
1.1 The Kigoma District CWIQ.....	1
1.2 Sampling.....	1
1.3 Constructed variable to disaggregated tables.....	1
1.3.1 Povert Status.....	2
1.3.2 Cluster Location.....	3
1.3.3 Socio-economic Group.....	4
2 VILLAGE , POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS CHARACTERISTICS.....	7
2.1Main Population Characteristics.....	7
2.2 Main Household Characteristics.....	9
2.3 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household.....	11
2.4 Orphan and Foster Status.....	13
3 EDUCATION.....	15
3.1 Overview Education Indicators.....	15
3.1.1 Literacy.....	15
3.1.2 Primary School Access Enrolment and Satisfaction.....	15
3.1.3 Secondary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction.....	16
3.2 Dissatisfaction.....	19
3.3 Non-Attendance.....	20
3.4 Enrolment and Drop Out Rates.....	20
3.5 Literacy.....	21
4 HEALTH.....	23
4.1 Health Indicators.....	23
4.2 Reasons for Dissatisfaction.....	25
4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting When Ill.....	26
4.4 Type of Illness.....	26
4.5 Health Provider.....	27
4.6 Child Deliveries.....	27
4.7 Child Nutrition.....	30

5 EMPLOYMENT.....	33
5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population.....	33
5.1.1 Work Status.....	33
5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads.....	35
5.1.3 Youth Employment.....	35
5.2 Working Population.....	35
5.3 Underemployment Population.....	38
5.4 Unemployed Inactive Population.....	40
5.5 Household Tasks.....	41
5.6 Child Labour.....	42
6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES...	45
6.1 Economic Situation.....	45
6.1.1 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Community.....	45
6.1.2 Perception of Change in the economic Situation of the Household.....	47
6.2 Self- reported Difficultie in Satisfying Household Needs.....	47
6.2.1 Food Needs.....	48
6.2.2 Paying School Fees.....	49
6.2.3 Paying House Rent.....	51
6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills.....	51
6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare.....	52
6.3 Assets and Household Occupancy Status.....	53
6.3.1 Assets Ownership.....	54
6.3.2 Occupancy Documentation	54
6.4 Agriculture.....	54
6.4.1 Agriculture Inputs.....	55
6.4.2 Landholding.....	57
6.4.3 Cattle Ownership.....	57
6.5 Perception of Crime and Security in the Community.....	57
6.6 Household Income Contribution.....	59
6.7 Other House Items.....	59
7 HOUESHOLD AMENITIES.....	61
7.1 Housing Materils ans Typing OF housing Unit.....	61
7.2 Water and Sanitation.....	63
7.3 Type of Fuel.....	65
7.4 Distance to Facilities.....	65
7.5 Anti -Malaria Measures.....	69
8 GOVERNANCE.....	71
8.1 attendance at Meeting.....	71
8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders.....	71
8.3 Public Spending.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure.....	2
Table 1.2 Predicted vs Actual Povert ,Kigoma Region ,2000/01.....	2
Table 1.3 Cluster Location.....	3
Table 1.4 Socio-economic Group.....	4
Table 1.5 Socio-economic Group and gender of household.....	4
Table 1.6 Socio-economic Group and main economic activity.....	5
Table 2.1 Percent distribution of total Ppopulation by gender and age.....	7
Table 2.2 Dependency Ratio	8
Table 2.3 Percent Distribution of Households by Number of Household Members.....	8
Table 2.4 Percent distribution of total population by relation to head of household.....	9
Table 2.5 Percent distribution of the total population age 12 and above by marital status.....	10
Table 2.6 Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by socio-economic group.....	10
Table 2.7 Percent distribution of the total population age 5 and above by highest level of education.....	11
Table 2.8 Percent distribution of heads of households by marital status.....	12
Table 2.9 Percent distribution of heads of households by socio-economic group.....	12
Table 2.10 Percent distribution of heads of household by highest level of education	13
Table 2.11 Percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost their mother and /or fath.....	13
Table 2.12 Percent distribution of children under 18 years old living without mother and/or father.....	14
Table 3.1 Education Indicators.....	17
Table 3.2 Percentage of students currently enrolled in school with reasons for dissatisfaction.....	18
Table 3.3 Percentage of children 7-9 years who ever attended school by raesons not currently attending.....	19
Table 3.4 Primary School enrolment abd drop out rates by age and gender.....	20
Table 3.5 Secondary school enrolment and drop out rates by age and gender.....	21
Table 3.6 Adult literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15 and above).....	21
Table 3.7 Youth literacy rates by age and gender (persons age 15-24).....	22
Table 4.1 Health Indicators.....	23
Table 4.2 Percentage of persons who consulted a Health provider in the 4 weeks proceeding the survey..... and were not satisfied, and the reasons for dissatisfaction.....	24
Table 4.3 Percentage of persons who did not consulted a Health provider in the 4 weeeeks proceding the survey and the reasons for not consulting.....	25
Tble 4.4 Percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks proceeding the survey ,and those sick or injured the percentage by type of sickness/injury.....	26
Table 4.5 Percentage distribution of health consultation in past 4 weeks by type of health provider consulted.....	27
Table 4.6 Percentage of women aged 12-49 who had a live birth in the yaer proceeding the survey by age of the mother and the percentage of those births where the mother received pre-natal care.....	27
Table 4.7 Percentage distribution of births in the five yaesr proceding the survey by place of birth.....	28
Table 4.8 Percentage distribution of births in the five years proceding the survey by person who assisted in delivery of the child.....	29
Table 4.9 Nutrition Status indicators and program participating rates.....	29
Table 4.10 Percent Distribution of Children Vaccination by Type of Vaccination Received.....	31
Table 4.11 Percent Distribution of Children Vaccinated by Source of Information.....	32
Table 5.1 Percentage distribution of the population by working status (age 15 and above).....	33
Table 5.2 Principal labour force indicators (persons age 15 and above).....	34
Table 5.3 Percentage distribution of the population by work status (age 15 -24).....	35
Table 5.4 Percentage distribution of the working population by type of payment in main job.....	36
Table 5.5 Percentage distribution of the working population by employer.....	37
Table 5.6 Percentage distribution of the working population by activity.....	37
Table 5.7 Percentage distribution of the working population by employer ,sex and activity.....	38

Table 5.8 Percentage distribution of the working population by employer ,sex and employment status.....	39
Table 5.9 Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status.....	39
Table 5.10 Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer.....	40
Table 5.11 Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity.....	40
Table 5.12 Percentage distribution of the unemployed population by reason.....	40
Table 5.13 Percentage distribution of the economically inactive population by reason.....	41
Table 5.14 Activities normally undertaken in the household (age 15 and over).....	42
Table 5.15 Activities normally undertaken in the household (age 5 to 14).....	43
Table 5.16 Child Labour (age 5 to 14).....	44
Table 6.1 Percentage of Household by the percentage of the economic situation of the community compared to the year before the survey.....	45
Table 6.2 Percentage distribution of Households by the percentage of the economic situation of the household to the year year before the survey.....	46
Table 6.3 Percentage distribution of Households by the difficult in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey.....	48
Table 6.4 Percentage distribution of households bt the difficult in paying during the year before the survey.....	49
Table 6.5 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in paying house rent during the year before the survey.....	50
Table 6.6 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in paying utility bills during the year before the survey.....	51
Table 6.7 Percent distribution of households by the difficult in paying for health care during the year before the survey.....	52
Table 6.8 Percentage of households owning certain assets.....	53
Table 6.9 Percent distribution of households by accupancy status.....	54
Table 6.10 Percent distribution of household by type of occupancy documentation.....	54
Table 6.11 Percentage of household using agricultural inputs and the percentage using certain inputs.....	55
Table 6.12 Percentage distribution of households using agricultural inputs by the main source of the inputs.....	56
Table 6.13 Percent distribution of households by the area of land owned by the household.....	56
Table 6.14 Percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned by the household.....	57
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.....	58
Table 6.16 Percentage distribution of households by principal contributor to household income.....	59
Table 6.17 Percentage of households owning selected household items.....	60
Table 7.1 Percent distribution of households by material used for roof of the house.....	61
Table 7.2 Percent distribution of household by material used forwalls of the house.....	62
Table 7.3 Percent distribution of households by material used for floors of the house.....	62
Table 7.4 Percent distribution of households by type of housing unit.....	63
Table 7.5 Percent distribution of households by main source of drinking water.....	64
Table 7.6 Percent distribution of households by main type of toilet.....	65
Table 7.7 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for cooking.....	66
Table 7.8 Percent distribution of households by fuel used for lighting.....	66
Table 7.9 Percent distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest drinking water supply and health facility	67
Table 7.10 Percent distribution of households by time(in minutes) to reach the nearest primary and secondary school.....	68
Table 7.11 Percen distribution of household by time (in minutes) to reach nearest food market and public transportation....	69
Table 7.12 Percentage of households taking anti-malaria measures and percentage taking specific measures.....	71
Table 8.1 Percentage distribution of attendance of meetings(any household members within past 12 months).....	72
Table 8.2 Distribution of leaders' satisfaction ratings and reasons for dissatisfaction.....	73
Table 8.3 Percentage distribution of households who received financila information in the past 12 months.....	73
Table 8.4 Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for disssatisfaction.....	74

Generic Core Welfare Indicators (2006)

	Total	Margin of error*	Accessible	Remote	Poor	Non-poor
Household characteristics						
<i>Dependency ratio</i>	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.0
<i>Head is male</i>	85.5	2.2	81.2	89.4	86.4	85.0
<i>Head is female</i>	14.5	2.2	18.8	10.6	13.6	15.0
<i>Head is monogamous</i>	59.5	2.5	58.9	60.0	64.9	56.1
<i>Head is polygamous</i>	21.3	2.0	20.6	22.0	20.6	21.8
<i>Head is not married</i>	19.2	1.7	20.5	18.0	14.5	22.1
Household welfare						
Household economic situation compared to one year ago						
<i>Worse now</i>	60.1	3.4	53.5	66.0	68.2	55.0
<i>Better now</i>	15.2	2.7	16.1	14.4	10.1	18.4
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago						
<i>Worse now</i>	20.7	3.9	20.6	20.9	25.7	17.6
<i>Better now</i>	55.6	4.0	57.4	54.1	54.1	56.6
Difficulty satisfying household needs						
<i>Food</i>	36.4	3.4	37.2	35.6	43.8	31.7
<i>School fees</i>	5.8	1.1	7.6	4.2	9.5	3.5
<i>House rent</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Utility bills</i>	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.0
<i>Health care</i>	33.4	2.8	38.5	28.8	35.9	31.8
Agriculture						
Land owned compared to one year ago						
<i>Less now</i>	1.2	0.5	1.4	1.1	0.8	1.5
<i>More now</i>	3.9	1.0	5.6	2.4	1.1	5.7
Cattle owned compared to one year ago						
<i>Less now</i>	0.7	0.6	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.1
<i>More now</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Use of agricultural inputs						
<i>Yes</i>	15.7	2.3	9.8	20.9	12.2	17.9
<i>Fertilizers</i>	39.8	8.8	63.1	30.1	46.7	36.8
<i>Improved seedlings</i>	38.1	11.2	38.7	37.9	52.5	31.9
<i>Fingerlings</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Hooks and nets</i>	30.4	10.6	3.5	41.5	28.6	31.1
<i>Insecticides</i>	9.9	4.5	6.4	11.3	10.2	9.7
<i>Other</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Household infrastructure						
<i>Secure housing tenure</i>	9.0	2.9	4.0	13.5	8.7	9.2
<i>Access to water</i>	93.5	1.9	91.0	95.7	92.7	94.1
<i>Safe water source</i>	32.9	7.0	30.6	34.9	36.3	30.8
<i>Safe sanitation</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Improved waste disposal</i>	6.3	1.6	3.0	9.3	7.6	5.5
<i>Non-wood fuel used for cooking</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment						
<i>Fixed line phone</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
<i>Mobile phone</i>	4.7	1.2	6.9	2.8	3.4	5.5
<i>Radio set</i>	52.6	2.8	55.7	49.8	36.3	62.9
<i>Television set</i>	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.3	1.1	0.7

		<i>Margin of</i>					
		<i>Total</i>	<i>error*</i>	<i>Accessible</i>	<i>Remote</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Non-poor</i>
Employment							
Employer in the main job							
	<i>Civil service</i>	0.9	0.4	1.5	0.2	0.5	1.1
	<i>Other public serve</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<i>Parastatal</i>	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0
	<i>NGO</i>	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.0
	<i>Private sector formal</i>	1.6	0.5	1.8	1.5	0.4	2.7
	<i>Private sector informal</i>	65.0	2.6	69.1	61.1	61.8	67.8
	<i>Household</i>	27.4	2.4	23.2	31.4	32.4	23.1
Activity in the main job							
	<i>Agriculture</i>	60.5	2.7	63.6	57.6	59.7	61.2
	<i>Mining/quarrying</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<i>Manufacturing</i>	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.0	0.4	0.3
	<i>Services</i>	1.8	0.8	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8
Employment Status in last 7 days							
	<i>Unemployed (age 15-24)</i>	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6
	<i>Male</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<i>Female</i>	0.6	0.6	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.0
	<i>Unemployed (age 15 and above))</i>	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2
	<i>Male</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	<i>Female</i>	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4
	<i>Underemployed (age 15 and above)</i>	21.1	1.6	20.5	21.7	19.6	22.4
	<i>Male</i>	25.8	2.3	25.4	26.2	21.4	29.8
	<i>Female</i>	16.7	1.8	16.0	17.4	17.8	15.8
Education							
Adult literacy rate							
	<i>Total</i>	64.5	2.0	67.4	61.6	64.0	64.9
	<i>Male</i>	77.7	1.9	80.7	74.9	78.4	77.2
	<i>Female</i>	51.0	2.5	54.4	47.5	48.7	52.8
Youth literacy rate (age 15-24)							
	<i>Total</i>	80.1	2.2	81.8	78.3	81.6	78.6
	<i>Male</i>	87.6	2.4	90.0	85.0	90.0	84.6
	<i>Female</i>	72.3	3.1	73.5	70.9	70.5	73.6
Primary school							
	<i>Access to School</i>	79.2	5.1	88.1	69.9	77.1	81.7
	<i>Primary Gross Enrollment</i>	123.7	4.1	132.2	114.9	124.1	123.3
	<i>Male</i>	123.9	6.4	137.5	113.8	125.5	121.7
	<i>Female</i>	123.4	4.7	127.7	116.7	122.0	124.9
	<i>Primary Net Enrollment</i>	81.4	2.6	88.1	74.4	80.1	83.0
	<i>Male</i>	78.1	3.2	86.7	71.8	78.9	77.0
	<i>Female</i>	85.4	2.6	89.3	79.3	81.7	89.2
	<i>Satisfaction</i>	37.6	4.5	48.1	25.1	46.0	27.5
	<i>Primary completion rate</i>	5.8	0.7	6.8	4.7	6.0	5.6

	<i>Margin of</i>					
	<i>Total</i>	<i>error*</i>	<i>Accessible</i>	<i>Remote</i>	<i>Poor</i>	<i>Non-poor</i>
Secondary school						
<i>Access to School</i>	25.8	7.6	37.2	13.0	21.1	31.7
<i>Secondary Gross Enrollment</i>	19.8	3.2	20.2	19.2	17.8	22.2
<i>Male</i>	24.3	3.5	26.3	22.4	19.4	31.2
<i>Female</i>	14.0	3.9	13.6	14.6	15.5	12.4
<i>Secondary Net Enrollment</i>	12.8	2.7	12.0	13.7	11.4	14.6
<i>Male</i>	14.5	2.8	16.0	13.1	13.1	16.6
<i>Female</i>	10.7	3.3	7.7	14.6	9.1	12.4
<i>Satisfaction</i>	35.7	5.7	37.5	33.7	29.6	41.9
<i>Secondary completion rate</i>	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.0
Medical services						
<i>Health access</i>	60.6	7.4	71.4	50.1	56.4	64.7
<i>Need</i>	23.5	1.3	23.1	23.8	24.3	22.6
<i>Use</i>	24.9	1.5	25.7	24.2	25.1	24.8
<i>Satisfaction</i>	80.0	3.2	77.9	82.3	78.6	81.4
<i>Consulted traditional healer</i>	4.7	1.1	3.5	5.9	4.1	5.3
<i>Pre-natal care</i>	98.8	1.2	100.0	97.9	100.0	97.5
<i>Anti-malaria measures used</i>	60.0	3.7	51.4	67.6	53.2	64.3
<i>Person has physical/mental challenge</i>	1.9	0.3	2.5	1.2	1.7	2.0
Child welfare and health						
Orphanhood (children under 18)						
<i>Both parents dead</i>	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.7
<i>Father only</i>	5.7	1.0	6.6	4.7	7.5	3.6
<i>Mother only</i>	1.6	0.4	1.7	1.5	1.1	2.2
Fostering (children under 18)						
<i>Both parents absent</i>	7.9	0.9	6.5	9.3	6.6	9.3
<i>Father only absent</i>	12.3	1.9	13.5	11.2	15.3	9.0
<i>Mother only absent</i>	3.0	0.7	2.2	3.7	3.3	2.6
Children under 5						
<i>Delivery by health professionals</i>	42.0	5.9	39.9	43.9	32.1	52.3
<i>Measles immunization</i>	73.3	2.7	77.3	69.6	72.9	73.6
<i>Fully vaccinated</i>	60.4	4.0	70.6	51.1	57.9	63.0
<i>Not vaccinated</i>	8.8	2.8	2.0	14.9	9.1	8.4
<i>Stunted</i>	29.5	2.3	32.2	26.6	31.7	27.0
<i>Wasted</i>	0.9	0.5	0.4	1.4	0.4	1.4
<i>Underweight</i>	14.6	2.3	13.7	15.7	16.8	12.3

* 1.96 times the standard error

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Kigoma District CWIQ

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

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

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

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

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

1.2 Sampling

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

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

Finally, 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 Introduction

Table 1.1 Variables Used to Predict Consumption Expenditure

<i>Basic Variables</i>	<i>Household Assets</i>
Age of household head	Radio
Household size	Bicycle
Education of household head	Iron
Source of income	Roof material
Main activity of the household head	Wall material
	Total land
<i>Food Security</i>	Watch
Number of meals per day	Motor vehicle
	Wheel barrow
<i>Household Amenities</i>	<i>Village level variables</i>
Type of toilet	Share of households with access to piped water
Fuel used for cooking	

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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.

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

Predicted	Observed		
	Non-Poor	Poor	Total
Non-Poor	61.1	9.3	70.4
Poor	9.1	20.6	29.7
Total	70.2	29.8	100.0

Source: HBS 2000/01

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

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

Once the consumption level of a household has been predicted, it is compared to the Basic Needs Poverty Line

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

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

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

One way of determining the accuracy of the poverty predictors is to see how many mistakes of each type the model makes. To do this the poverty predictor model is applied to the actual consumption expenditure data. Results of this exercise are presented in Table 1.2. The model wrongly predicts a non-poor household to be poor in 9.3 percent of the cases, and vice versa in 9.1 percent of the households. This gives an overall percentage of correct predictions of 81.7 percent.

When the model is applied to the CWIQ data for Kigoma 2006, the estimated population living in poverty is 24 percent, very much consistent with the 23 percent estimated with HBS for Kigoma. Further, the confidence intervals overlap with the estimation of 31 percent of the population in Kigoma living under the poverty line.

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

Table 1.3: Cluster Location

Cluster Location	Median Time (in minutes) to:			Poverty Rate	Estimated Number of Households
	District	All-Weather	Public		
	Capital	Road	Transport		
Remote	180.0	180.0	360.0	35.7	42,255
Accessible	10.0	5.0	120.0	42.7	31,860

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

However, it must be kept in mind that the aim of the model is not estimating poverty rates, but to determine the characteristics of the poor population. Hence, the accuracy of the model does not hinge on the closeness between the estimated and actual poverty rate; but on the percentage of correct predictions as indicated in Table 1.2.

Expenditure surveys, such as the 2000/2001 Household Budget Survey, are much better suited for informing on poverty rates. However, such large scale surveys have insufficient number of observations to inform on district-level trends. The Kigoma CWIQ, on the other hand, is sufficiently large to allow detailed district-level analysis. The accuracy with which households can be classified by poverty status using the CWIQ gives credence to the use of predicted poverty level as a variable throughout this report.

1.3.2 Cluster Location

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

1 Introduction

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

Socio-Economic Group	Poverty Rate	Percentage Living in	
		Remote Clusters	Accessible Clusters
Employee	21.4	58.3	41.7
Self-Employed Agriculture	43.1	42.9	57.1
Self-Employed Other	21.8	40.8	59.2
Other	20.2	20.5	79.5

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

Table 1.3 shows that the poverty rates differ by cluster location: households in remote villages are less likely to be poor than households in accessible villages. Whereas the poverty rate in remote villages is 36 percent, the figure for accessible villages is 43 percent of the households.

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 'Employee'. 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 where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture. Furthermore, households in the category "employee" are more likely to be located in accessible villages,

whereas the remaining categories are more likely to be located in remote villages.

The gender composition of the socio-economic group is shown in Table 1.5. 85 percent of the households in the district are headed by a male. Heads where the main income earner is an employee or self-employed in non-agricultural activities are overwhelmingly males. Female household heads are mostly self-employed in agriculture or in the "other" category.

Table 1.6 shows the breakdown of socio-economic groups by main activity of the household heads. As expected, the main economic activity in the district is agriculture, to which 3 out of 4 main income earners are dedicated. Virtually in all households from the employee category the household head is dedicated to mining, manufacturing, energy or construction. Household heads from the self-employed agriculture category are mostly dedicated to agriculture (93 percent). Similarly, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities are almost fully dedicated to services (98 percent). Finally, the household heads from the "other" category are divided between agriculture (75 percent) and household duties (18 percent).

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

Socio-economic Group	Male	Female	Total
Employees	95.2	4.8	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	83.9	16.1	100.0
Self-Employed Other	91.1	8.9	100.0
Other	88.2	11.8	100.0
Total	85.5	14.5	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

	Agriculture	Mining Manufacturing Energy Construction	Private and Public Services	Household Duties	Other	Total
Socio-economic Group						
Employees	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Agriculture	93.1	0.3	4.4	2.2	0.0	100.0
Self-Employed Other	2.5	0.0	97.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	22.0	0.0	0.0	78.0	0.0	100.0
Total	74.2	5.5	17.8	2.5	0.0	100.0

Source: CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1 Introduction

2 VILLAGE, POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 Introduction

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

2.2 Main Population Characteristics

Table 2.1 shows the percent distribution of the population by cluster location and poverty status, by gender and age. Overall, the district's population is young. For instance, 6 percent of the population is over 60 years old, whereas 48 percent is under 15 years old. The remaining 46 percent is between 15 and 59 years old. The location of the household does not seem to show strong correlation with the age of the population. However, poverty status does seem to be correlated with age. Poor households have higher shares of population in the 0-14 cohort, and lower shares in the rest.

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

working age takes care of.

The mean dependency ratio is 1.1, meaning that one adult has to take care of more than 1 person. There seems to be no strong correlation between cluster location and the dependency ratio. However, on average poor households present a higher dependency ratio (1.2) than non-poor households (1.0).

The dependency ratio increases with the number of household members, from 0.5 for households with 1 or 2 members, to 1.3 for households with 7 or more members. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that the 'other' group has the highest dependency ratio (1.7), whereas the remaining groups have a rate of 1.1. There are no strong differences by gender of the household head.

Table 2.3 shows the percent distribution of households by number of household members. The mean household size is 5.4 individuals. Households with at most two individuals only represent 15 percent of all households in the district. Households with 7 or more members represent 33 percent of the total.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages have higher shares with 1 or 2 members and lower shares with 5 members or more. Similarly, the breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households tend to have more members than non-poor. Around 53 percent of them have 7 or more members, compared to just 21 percent of non-poor. In turn 3 percent of poor households have 1 or 2 members, whereas the share for non-poor households is 22 percent. This results in mean household sizes of 6.8 and 4.5 members, respectively.

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	25.8	22.7	3.5	51.9	22.4	23.4	2.3	48.1	48.2	46.1	5.8	100.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	22.5	22.7	3.1	48.3	25.4	23.7	2.6	51.7	47.9	46.4	5.7	100.0
Remote	29.0	22.7	3.8	55.6	19.4	23.0	2.0	44.4	48.4	45.7	5.8	100.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	28.4	21.9	2.6	53.0	23.9	21.5	1.6	47.0	52.3	43.4	4.3	100.0
Non-poor	23.3	23.4	4.2	50.9	20.9	25.2	3.0	49.1	44.2	48.6	7.2	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

2 Village, population and household characteristics

Regarding socio-economic groups, the employees have the highest mean household size, at 5.3, and the 'other' the lowest, at 3.4 members.

Finally, households headed by males are larger than female-headed households: the former have 5.6 members in average, whereas the latter have only 4.1 members. This difference partly owes to the fact that, as shown in Section 2.4, female household heads rarely have a spouse.

Table 2.2: Dependency ratio

	0-4 years	5-14 years	0-14 years	15-64 years	65+ years	Total	Dependency ratio
Total	0.9	1.7	2.6	2.6	0.2	5.4	1.1
Cluster Location							
Accessible	0.9	1.8	2.7	2.8	0.2	5.7	1.1
Remote	0.9	1.6	2.5	2.5	0.2	5.1	1.1
Poverty Status							
Poor	1.2	2.4	3.6	3.1	0.2	6.8	1.2
Non-poor	0.7	1.3	2.0	2.3	0.2	4.5	1.0
Household size							
1-2	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.1	0.4	1.5	0.5
3-4	0.7	0.5	1.3	2.1	0.2	3.5	0.7
5-6	1.0	1.7	2.7	2.6	0.2	5.4	1.1
7+	1.3	3.4	4.7	3.7	0.1	8.5	1.3
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	1.1	2.3	3.4	2.9	0.0	6.3	1.1
Self-employed - agric	0.9	1.7	2.5	2.6	0.2	5.3	1.1
Self-employed - other	1.0	1.9	2.9	2.8	0.1	5.8	1.1
Other	0.2	0.9	1.1	1.3	1.1	3.4	1.7
Gender of Household Head							
Male	0.9	1.8	2.7	2.7	0.2	5.6	1.1
Female	0.5	1.3	1.9	2.0	0.3	4.1	1.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

	1-2 persons	3-4 persons	5-6 persons	7+ persons	Total	household size
Total	14.5	25.3	27.1	33.2	100.0	5.4
Cluster Location						
Accessible	10.7	24.7	25.9	38.8	100.0	5.7
Remote	17.8	25.9	28.1	28.2	100.0	5.1
Poverty Status						
Poor	3.1	10.2	33.7	53.1	100.0	6.8
Non-poor	21.7	34.9	22.9	20.6	100.0	4.5
Socio-economic Group						
Employed	6.7	17.0	30.8	45.5	100.0	6.3
Self-employed - agric	13.8	27.9	26.2	32.1	100.0	5.3
Self-employed - other	15.4	16.9	31.4	36.3	100.0	5.8
Other	60.2	0.0	19.6	20.2	100.0	3.4
Gender of Household Head						
Male	12.3	24.2	28.1	35.4	100.0	5.6
Female	27.3	31.6	20.9	20.1	100.0	4.1

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

	Head	Spouse	Child	Parents	Other relative	Not related	Total
Total	18.5	15.3	56.2	0.8	9.2	0.1	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	17.5	14.3	58.4	1.0	8.8	0.0	100.0
Remote	19.4	16.3	54.1	0.5	9.5	0.1	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	14.6	12.8	61.5	0.8	10.2	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	22.2	17.7	51.1	0.7	8.1	0.1	100.0
Age							
0- 9	0.0	0.0	86.5	0.0	13.3	0.2	100.0
10-19	0.0	2.1	85.1	0.0	12.8	0.0	100.0
20-29	18.4	40.0	36.5	0.0	5.1	0.0	100.0
30-39	51.1	44.4	2.6	0.0	2.0	0.0	100.0
40-49	54.3	41.4	1.3	0.8	2.2	0.0	100.0
50-59	63.7	31.8	0.0	3.0	1.5	0.0	100.0
60 and above	68.6	17.5	0.0	9.3	4.5	0.0	100.0
Gender							
Male	30.4	0.6	59.0	0.1	9.8	0.0	100.0
Female	5.6	31.3	53.2	1.5	8.4	0.1	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

2.3 Main Household Characteristics

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

No strong trends emerge when analysing by remoteness of the village. However, it seems clear that poor households have lower shares as heads and spouses, and higher shares of the population as child of the household head.

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 30, most of the population is either head of their own household or spouse to the head of the household.

The gender split-up shows that males are more likely to be household heads than females, with shares of 30 and 6 percent, respectively. In turn, females are more likely to be spouses to the household head.

Table 2.5 shows the percent distribution of the population aged 12 and above by marital status. Overall, 41 percent of the population has never been married. In addition, 37 percent is married and monogamous, and 14 percent is married and polygamous. Despite less than 1 percent

being 'officially' divorced, up to 4 percent of the population is 'unofficially' separated. Informal unions are practically non-existent and 6 percent of the population is widowed.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that people from accessible clusters are more likely to have never been married and less likely to be in a monogamous marriage than people from remote clusters. Similarly, the breakdown by poverty status shows that people from poor households tend to be in the category 'never married' with higher frequency than people from non-poor households, and in the category 'married – monogamous' with less frequency.

The age breakdown shows that 'polygamous – married' category peaks for the 40-49 group, with almost one-third of the individuals in that age-group being in a polygamous marriage. For the population after 25 years old, 'married – monogamous' is the most common category. Divorce does not show a trend but, as would be expected, the categories 'separated' and 'widowed' both increase with age. 'Never married' also shows correlation with age, decreasing for the older cohorts.

Around 47 percent of the men have never been married, but for women the figure is only 34 percent. While 8 percent of women are widowed, only 2 percent of men are in this category. Furthermore, females tend to be separated more commonly than men.

2 Village, population and household characteristics

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

	Never married	Married monog	Married polyg	Informal, loose union	Divorced	Separated	Widowed	Total
Total	40.7	36.8	13.7	0.1	0.4	3.6	4.7	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	44.9	34.2	12.3	0.2	0.5	2.4	5.5	100.0
Remote	36.4	39.4	15.1	0.0	0.3	4.9	3.9	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	47.4	33.8	11.1	0.0	0.2	3.2	4.3	100.0
Non-poor	34.9	39.4	15.9	0.2	0.5	4.0	5.1	100.0
Age								
12-14	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	94.3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.2	100.0
20-24	46.2	44.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	100.0
25-29	19.5	62.9	11.7	1.2	1.1	3.7	0.0	100.0
30-39	1.8	64.9	25.7	0.0	0.2	4.2	3.2	100.0
40-49	2.2	54.0	32.8	0.0	0.4	5.3	5.3	100.0
50-59	1.0	52.4	27.3	0.0	1.2	5.5	12.6	100.0
60 and above	0.0	45.6	18.8	0.0	1.2	8.9	25.5	100.0
Gender								
Male	46.8	36.2	12.6	0.1	0.2	2.5	1.7	100.0
Female	34.3	37.5	14.9	0.1	0.6	4.9	7.9	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

Table 2.6 shows the percent distribution of the population age 5 and above by socio-economic group. Overall, 37 percent of the population is self-employed in agriculture, with 56 percent in other activities. Individuals living in remote villages seem to be somewhat less likely to be self-employed in agriculture, as poor households. Members of poor households are more likely to be in the 'other' category.

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

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	1.7	37.2	5.0	56.1	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	2.0	38.6	4.6	54.8	100.0
Remote	1.4	35.8	5.3	57.5	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	1.2	34.1	3.1	61.6	100.0
Non-poor	2.2	40.1	6.8	50.9	100.0
Age					
5- 9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
10-14	0.3	0.4	0.0	99.2	100.0
15-19	1.0	16.9	2.0	80.1	100.0
20-29	2.8	63.3	9.4	24.5	100.0
30-39	4.2	76.7	13.0	6.0	100.0
40-49	3.1	76.8	11.3	8.8	100.0
50-59	4.2	78.7	7.5	9.6	100.0
60 and above	1.3	74.9	5.8	18.1	100.0
Gender					
Male	3.1	31.7	7.5	57.7	100.0
Female	0.2	43.2	2.2	54.4	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

The analysis of the age-groups is particularly interesting. The share of self-employed in agriculture increases with age, peaking at 79 percent for the 50 to 59 group. The category 'other' decreases steadily with age, showing a sharp decrease between 15-19 and 20-29, from 80 to 25 percent, then decreases to under 10 percent for the 30-39, 40-49, and 50-59 cohorts, and finally increases to 18 percent for the 60+ cohort.

The gender breakdown shows that males are more likely to be employees or self-employed in non-agricultural activities than women. In turn, females are more likely to be self-employed in agriculture than males.

Table 2.7 shows the percent distribution of the total population aged 5 and above by highest level of education. 36 percent of the population has no formal education, 37 percent some primary, 19 percent completed primary and 6 percent some studies after primary school.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that individuals from accessible villages have higher shares in the higher education levels than individuals from remote villages, who report a higher share with no education. A similar trend is observed when analysing by poverty status, but the only important differences are in 'some primary' and 'completed primary'.

The age breakdown shows that 69 percent of the children between 5 and 9 have no formal education, but 93 percent of the children 10-14 have at least some primary. Rates of no education are lowest for the population 10-19 (6 and 9 percent for the 10-14 and 15-19 groups, respectively) and higher for the older groups. In the groups between 20 and 39 years old, the most common is completed primary.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher share of uneducated population than males: 41 against 31 percent. Conversely, a higher share of males reported some primary.

2.4 Main Characteristics of the Heads of Household

Table 2.8 shows the percent distribution of household heads by marital status. Overall, 60 percent of the household heads is married and monogamous, 18 divorced, separated or widowed, 21 percent married and polygamous, 1 percent has never been married virtually no household head lives in an informal union.

There are no strong differences by cluster location. Regarding poverty status, heads of non-poor households are more likely to be single (never married, divorced, separated or widowed). In turn, heads of poor households are more likely to be 'married – monogamous'. Analysis by age-groups shows that 'married -

monogamous' is the category with the highest share of household for all age-groups. For instance, the 'married - monogamous' category decreases with age, as 'divorced/separated or widowed' increases. The share of household heads married and polygamous peaks at 32 percent of the 40-49 age-groups.

Overwhelmingly, most female household heads are divorced, separated or widowed (87 percent), whereas for males, this category roughly represents 7 percent. Most male household heads are married, monogamous or polygamous (92 percent).

Table 2.9 shows the percent distribution of household heads by socio-economic group. It is worth remembering that the socio-economic group of the household is determined by the type of employment of the main income earner of the household, who not always the household head. As expected, the great majority of the district's household heads belongs to the self-employed in agriculture, with a share of 79 percent. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities represent 14 percent of the household heads, the 'other' category (unemployed, inactive and household workers) represents 2 percent, and the employees are only 5 percent.

The analysis by cluster location shows no strong differences. However, the share of household heads in the 'self-employed – agriculture' category in poor households is

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

	None	Nursery school	Some primary	Completed primary	Some secondary	Completed secondary	Post secondary	Total
Total	35.6	2.5	37.7	18.8	2.9	0.1	2.5	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	31.0	2.6	39.5	20.0	3.2	0.1	3.5	100.0
Remote	40.1	2.3	35.9	17.5	2.7	0.0	1.5	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	36.2	2.2	40.1	17.2	2.6	0.1	1.7	100.0
Non-poor	35.0	2.7	35.5	20.2	3.3	0.0	3.3	100.0
Age								
5- 9	68.7	10.7	20.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
10-14	6.3	0.7	92.8	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-19	9.1	0.0	59.7	21.2	10.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
20-29	31.7	0.0	17.4	40.7	9.0	0.4	0.8	100.0
30-39	30.5	0.6	14.4	50.5	0.9	0.0	3.1	100.0
40-49	37.6	0.4	17.2	36.3	0.9	0.0	7.7	100.0
50-59	49.6	0.0	29.0	12.7	0.8	0.0	7.9	100.0
60 and above	64.8	0.0	21.6	1.3	0.0	0.0	12.4	100.0
Gender								
Male	30.6	2.6	41.2	19.0	3.5	0.0	3.1	100.0
Female	41.1	2.3	33.8	18.5	2.3	0.1	1.8	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

2 Village, population and household characteristics

higher than in non-poor households, with

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

	Never married	Married monogamous	Married polygamous	Informal, loose union	Divorced Separated Widowed	Total
Total	0.6	59.5	21.3	0.2	18.4	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	0.2	58.9	20.6	0.3	19.9	100.0
Remote	1.0	60.0	22.0	0.0	17.0	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.0	64.9	20.6	0.0	14.5	100.0
Non-poor	1.0	56.1	21.8	0.3	20.9	100.0
Age						
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	1.7	89.6	1.7	1.3	5.8	100.0
30-39	1.5	67.1	20.8	0.0	10.6	100.0
40-49	0.0	51.9	31.6	0.0	16.5	100.0
50-59	0.0	48.4	26.9	0.0	24.7	100.0
60 and above	0.0	50.6	17.6	0.0	31.8	100.0
Gender						
Male	0.7	69.1	23.1	0.2	6.9	100.0
Female	0.0	2.8	10.7	0.0	86.5	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

	Employed	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	4.9	79.4	13.9	1.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	6.0	80.0	13.0	1.0	100.0
Remote	4.0	78.9	14.6	2.4	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	2.7	88.5	7.8	0.9	100.0
Non-poor	6.3	73.7	17.7	2.2	100.0
Age					
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	3.4	84.0	11.3	1.2	100.0
30-39	8.3	72.4	19.3	0.0	100.0
40-49	4.2	78.8	17.0	0.0	100.0
50-59	5.5	81.2	10.6	2.6	100.0
60 and above	1.9	85.0	8.0	5.2	100.0
Gender					
Male	5.5	77.9	14.8	1.8	100.0
Female	1.6	88.4	8.6	1.4	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

shares of 89 and 74 percent, respectively. On the other hand, the heads of non-poor households belong to the 'employee' or 'self-employed other' groups more often than the heads of poor households.

The breakdown by age of the household head shows no strong patterns. However, the breakdown by gender of the household head shows that in male-headed households, the main income earner is more likely to be an employee or self-employed in non-agricultural activities than in female-headed households. In the latter, the main income earner is more likely to be from the 'other' category.

Table 2.10 shows the percent distribution of the heads of household by highest level of education. Overall, less than 8 percent of the household heads has any education after primary. Around 35 percent of the household heads has no education, 25 percent some primary and 32 percent have completed primary.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that, as would be expected, household heads in remote villages are more likely to have no education than the ones from accessible villages, with shares of 36 and 33 percent, respectively. Furthermore, household heads in accessible villages are more likely to have post-primary education, with a share of 10 percent against 4 percent of household heads in remote villages.

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

	None	Some primary	Completed primary	Some secondary	Completed secondary	Post secondary	Total
Total	34.8	25.3	32.2	1.2	0.0	6.4	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	32.9	22.3	33.9	1.3	0.0	9.5	100.0
Remote	36.4	28.0	30.7	1.2	0.0	3.7	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	35.0	23.4	36.2	0.4	0.0	5.0	100.0
Non-poor	34.6	26.5	29.7	1.8	0.0	7.4	100.0
Age							
15-19	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
20-29	37.5	30.9	30.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-39	26.0	15.9	52.2	1.8	0.0	4.1	100.0
40-49	23.6	17.5	50.8	1.7	0.0	6.4	100.0
50-59	36.2	39.6	16.9	1.3	0.0	6.0	100.0
60 and above	54.6	30.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	13.3	100.0
Gender							
Male	28.9	27.5	35.0	1.4	0.0	7.1	100.0
Female	69.5	12.3	15.9	0.0	0.0	2.2	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

Poverty status does not appear to be correlated with the education of the household head. The age breakdown shows that 55 percent of household heads aged 60 or over has no education, and a further 30 percent just some primary. 38 percent of the 20-29 cohorts have no education, 31 percent some primary and 30 percent completed primary. Completed primary represents around 50 percent for the groups between 30 and 49; but only 17 percent in the 50-59, where 'some primary' gains importance. The analysis by gender shows that female household heads are more likely to have no education than males, with rates of 70 and 29 percent, respectively. 35 percent of the male household heads has completed primary, against 16 percent of females.

their father. There do not seem to be important gender differences 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

Table 2.11 Percent distribution of children under 18 years old who have lost their mother and or/ father

	Children who lost mother only	Children who lost father only	Children who lost both father & mother
Total	1.6	5.7	0.4
Cluster Location			
Accessible	1.7	6.6	0.5
Remote	1.5	4.7	0.4
Poverty Status			
Poor	1.1	7.5	0.2
Non-poor	2.2	3.6	0.7
Age			
0-4	0.1	2.4	0.0
5-9	1.0	4.2	0.4
10-14	3.4	7.9	0.5
15-17	2.5	11.6	1.5
Gender			
Male	1.8	6.3	0.7
Female	1.3	4.9	0.1

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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, less than 1 percent of children under 18 lost both parents, 2 percent lost only their mother and 6 percent lost only their father. This amounts to 8 percent of all children under 18 who lost at least one parent at the time of the survey.

The age breakdown shows that orphan status is correlated with age: as can be expected older children are more likely to be orphans than younger children. Around 15 percent of the children between 15 and 17 years lost a parent, and 12 of the children in that age-group lost

2 Village, population and household characteristics

respect to another). The table shows that 23 percent of children under 18 were living in non-nuclear households at the time of the survey.

There is no strong relation between cluster location and foster status, but children from poor households tend to live with more often with their mother only than children from non-poor households (with shares of 15 and 9 percents, respectively).

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	12.3	3.0	7.9	23.2
Cluster Location				
Accessible	13.5	2.2	6.5	22.3
Remote	11.2	3.7	9.3	24.1
Poverty Status				
Poor	15.3	3.3	6.6	25.2
Non-poor	9.0	2.6	9.3	20.9
Age				
0-4	12.1	0.9	2.6	15.6
5-9	9.6	3.1	11.0	23.6
10-14	14.6	3.5	7.6	25.7
15-17	14.8	5.9	12.4	33.1
Gender				
Male	12.9	2.8	8.0	23.7
Female	11.7	3.1	7.8	22.5

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

3 EDUCATION

3.1 Overview of the Education indicators

3.1.1 Literacy

Table 3.1 shows the main education indicators for the district. Literacy as defined by respondents would in this context refer to the ability of an individual to read and write in any language. Consequently, individuals who are able to read but can not write are considered as illiterate. The adult literacy rate (ALR) as defined for the population with 15 years of age and above, is put at about 65 percent. A close look at the data as presented in Table 3.1 suggests a correlation between ALR and village accessibility. It is clearly shown that ALR is about 5 percentage points higher in accessible villages than in remote villages.

The findings generally suggest that ALR is influenced more by village accessibility and gender as major factors as opposed to other socio-economic factors. There appear to be no important differences in literacy rates between individuals living in poor and non-poor households. While the literacy rate among non-poor households stands at 65 percent, the individuals in poor households have a literacy rate of 64 percent.

Data disaggregation by socio-economic group of the household shows slightly higher literacy rates among the employees (74 percent) and in 'self-employed other' (71 percent) than 'self-employed in agriculture' (63 percent) and the 'other' category (35 percent).

Further disaggregation by gender shows an important literacy rate gap between men and women. The literacy rate among men is nearly 26 percentage points higher than that of women at 78 and 51 percent respectively.

Orphaned children have a literacy rate of 71 percent, whereas the rate for non-orphaned is 20 percentage points lower, at 91 percent. On the other hand, fostered children have lower literacy rate than non-fostered children, at 73 and 89 percent, respectively.

3.1.2 Primary School Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

Access

Primary school access rate is defined as the proportion of primary school-age children (7 to 13 years) reporting to live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school. 79 percent of primary school-age children live within 30 minutes of a primary school. Primary school access is significantly higher in accessible clusters than in remote clusters. In fact, the rate of primary school access in accessible clusters is 18 percentage points different higher at 88 and 70 percent respectively.

It worth to note that over three quarters of the children aged 7 to 13 live within 30 minutes of the nearest primary school regardless of the socio-economic status of their household. The breakdown by socio-economic groups shows that children leaving in households belonging to the 'employee' or 'other' categories have higher access to primary schools than children living in households of 'self-employed other' socio-economic groups. It is further noted that a proportion (24 percent) of children aged 7 to 13 in the 'self-employed agriculture' group do not have access to primary education.

Data disaggregation by gender shows that primary school access is higher by 6 percentage point different among between girls and boys at 82 and 76 percent respectively.

The analysis shows that 74 percent of the orphaned children were reported to have access to primary schools and that of non-orphaned children is 80 percent. On the other hand, 80 percent of the non-fostered children have access to primary schools as compared to the rate for fostered children at 70 percent.

Enrolment

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

3 Education

proportion of non-school-age individuals attending school, the GER may exceed 100 percent. Primary school GER informs on the ratio of all individuals in primary school to the population of individuals of primary school-age (7 to 13 years) in the district.

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

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

The primary school GER at the time of the survey was 124 percent. This figure indicates that all individuals who were at primary school constitute 124 percent of all children of primary school-age in the district. The figure further suggests a larger proportion of non-primary school age children in school. The NER (81 percent) shows that a large proportion of primary school-age children in the district are not attending school (19 percent). Clusters located in the accessible areas recorded higher rates for both GER and NER than in the case for clusters located in remote areas.

Primary school enrolment is not influenced much by household poverty status. Despite of a slight difference recorded in the 'self-employed other' category (75 percent), no much variation is observed for both GER and NER across other socioeconomic categories. Furthermore, disaggregating the data by gender shows that while there are no differences in GER, the NER for females is higher.

The breakdown by orphan status shows higher GER and lower NER for orphaned children. On the other hand, higher GER

and NER were observed among non-fostered children.

Satisfaction

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

The satisfaction rate was 38 percent. A larger satisfied proportion of children was recorded in the 'other' socio-economic category than in rest of categories. The lowest satisfaction rate was recorded for children in the 'self-employed other' category. Disaggregation by accessibility suggests that more than half of all primary school children in both accessible and remote areas were not satisfied with the schools they were attending. A similar situation is observed by poverty status of the household.

On the other hand, 'orphaned' children had a satisfaction rate of 47 percent while the rate for non-orphaned was 36 percent. Similarly, the satisfaction rate was higher among non-fostered children than among fostered children.

3.1.3 Secondary school Access, Enrolment and Satisfaction

Access

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

Around 16 percent of secondary school pupils live within 30 minutes of the nearest secondary school. The difference in access to secondary school between people living in accessible and remote clusters is noticeable at 22 and 9 percent respectively. The access rate for individuals living in non-poor households is higher (21 percent) than that of individuals in poor households (11 percent).

The socio-economic status of the household seems to be strongly correlated

Table 3.1: Education indicators

	Adult Literacy rate	Primary				Secondary			
		access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction	access	gross enrollment	net enrollment	satisfaction
Total	64.5	79.2	123.7	81.4	37.6	15.2	19.8	12.8	35.7
Cluster Location									
Accessible	67.4	88.1	132.2	88.1	48.1	21.7	20.2	12.0	37.5
Remote	61.6	69.9	114.9	74.4	25.1	7.9	19.2	13.7	33.7
Poverty Status									
Poor	64.0	77.1	124.1	80.1	46.0	10.5	17.8	11.4	29.6
Non-poor	64.9	81.7	123.3	83.0	27.5	21.1	22.2	14.6	41.9
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	73.8	89.8	125.9	91.1	49.5	24.4	43.6	19.3	30.1
Self-Employee - agric	63.3	76.1	124.0	82.0	38.6	14.1	18.5	12.7	37.9
Self-Employee - other	70.8	88.7	121.9	74.7	26.1	17.7	19.6	11.9	28.4
Other	34.5	100.0	115.3	84.0	70.5	28.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender									
Male	77.7	76.6	123.9	78.1	35.6	14.0	24.3	14.5	33.9
Female	51.0	82.4	123.4	85.4	40.1	16.7	14.0	10.7	39.8
Orphan status									
Orphaned	71.1	73.8	127.9	79.3	47.2	11.2	6.1	6.1	0.0
Not-orphaned	91.1	79.8	120.5	81.6	36.2	15.5	11.0	10.6	28.8
Foster status									
Fostered	72.8	70.3	90.1	66.2	32.4	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not-fostered	88.7	80.3	122.9	82.5	37.3	14.9	11.4	11.0	26.2

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Literacy is defined for persons age 15 and above.

2. Primary school:

Access is defined for children of primary school age (7-13) in households less than 30 minutes from a primary school.

Enrollment (gross) is defined for all persons currently in primary school (Kindergarden, Grade 1 to Grade 8) regardless of age.

Enrollment (net) is defined for children of primary school age (7-13) currently in primary school (Kindergarden, Grade 1 to Grade 8).

Satisfaction is defined for all persons currently in primary school who cited no problems with school.

3. Secondary school:

Access is defined for children of secondary school age (14-19) in households less than 30 minutes from a secondary school.

Enrollment (gross) is defined for all persons currently in secondary school (Form 1 to Form 5) regardless of age.

Enrollment (net) is defined for children of secondary school age (14-19) currently in secondary school (Form 1 to Form 5).

Satisfaction is defined for all persons currently in secondary school who cited no problems with school.

with the secondary school access rate. The 'other' category has the highest rate of access to secondary school at 28 percent, followed by the 'employee' (24 percent) and 'self-employed other' (18 percent). Children in the 'self-employed agriculture' socio-economic category recorded the lowest rate of access to secondary school at 14 percent.

The data show that girls seem to have relatively higher access rate to secondary school as compared to boys at 17 and 14 percent respectively. The access rate for orphaned children is 11 percent, lower than that for non-orphans, at 16 percent. The difference between fostered and non-fostered children is remarkable, their shares being at 5 and 15 percent respectively.

Enrolment

As explained in the previous section, 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.

Like the access rates, the GER and NER at secondary school are very low compared to primary school level. Overall, GER and NER were 20 and 13 percent respectively. There is no much difference in both the

3 Education

secondary school GER and NER between households located in accessible and remote clusters. The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have lower GER and NER than non-poor households.

The breakdown by socio-economic groups of the household shows that 'employees' recorded highest NER and GER, followed by the self-employed groups. The 'other' category shows practically null enrolment rates.

There are noticeable gender differences in both the GER and NER. The GER is 10 percentage points higher for boys than girls. The NER also shows a difference in favour of boys, though lower, at 4 percentage points.

Finally, the breakdown by orphaned and fostered status shows that orphaned and fostered children have lower GER and NER than their respective counterparts.

Satisfaction

Almost two-thirds (63 percent) of the total population enrolled in secondary schools are dissatisfied with their schools. Only 37 percent of this population is satisfied with the secondary schools they attend. The satisfaction rate is higher in accessible than in remote villages. Similarly, non-poor households report higher satisfaction rates than poor households.

Satisfaction by socio-economic group shows that people living in households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture the highest satisfaction rate (39 percent), followed by households belonging to the 'employee' or 'self employed other' socio-economic groups (roughly 30 percent).

Among the individuals enrolled in secondary schools, females were reported a higher satisfaction rate with their schools than males. The satisfaction rate among

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

	Percent dissatisfied	Reasons for dissatisfaction							
		Books/ supplies	Poor Teaching	Lack of teachers	Teachers absent	Lack of space	Facilities in bad condition	High fees	Other
Total	61.4	32.2	26.6	82.4	15.1	18.4	20.3	2.3	1.1
Cluster Location									
Accessible	51.6	42.4	22.3	73.7	10.8	16.5	28.4	4.0	0.0
Remote	73.1	23.6	30.3	89.7	18.8	20.0	13.5	0.9	2.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	54.8	36.7	19.8	85.5	11.8	21.8	17.6	3.0	0.6
Non-poor	69.1	28.1	32.9	79.7	18.2	15.3	22.8	1.6	1.6
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	47.9	60.8	19.6	75.6	27.7	54.2	60.8	14.2	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	60.7	31.5	24.9	81.5	10.7	17.3	19.2	1.7	0.7
Self-employed - other	73.5	26.7	36.5	88.1	27.2	12.2	12.7	1.1	3.0
Other	29.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender									
Male	63.7	33.5	28.1	83.8	15.7	16.8	17.0	2.3	0.9
Female	58.5	30.3	24.7	80.6	14.3	20.6	24.8	2.3	1.3
Type of school									
Primary	62.4	30.2	28.4	83.2	16.0	17.6	20.1	0.0	1.2
Government	62.6	30.2	28.4	83.2	16.0	17.6	20.1	0.0	1.2
Private	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Secondary	64.3	51.2	10.9	79.7	6.3	25.7	23.0	23.2	0.0
Government	58.9	50.6	13.7	86.6	7.9	21.9	17.3	15.9	0.0
Private	100.0	84.2	0.0	43.1	0.0	63.8	63.8	63.8	0.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	68.4	0.0	0.0	12.9	31.6	0.0
Other	36.1	27.1	26.6	67.7	21.3	19.3	16.4	0.0	0.0
Government	33.2	33.5	16.2	76.6	26.4	23.9	20.3	0.0	0.0
Private	63.9	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	47.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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	Pregn	Got married	Useless/uninteresting	Failed exam	Awaits admission	Dis-missed
Total	11.8	25.8	0.5	13.0	1.7	5.1	3.0	5.9	29.4	29.3	2.8	0.0
Cluster Location												
Accessible	13.2	25.9	0.0	11.1	0.0	7.1	2.2	3.2	31.5	31.8	2.5	0.0
Remote	10.0	25.5	1.2	16.1	4.2	2.0	4.2	10.2	26.0	25.2	3.3	0.0
Poverty Status												
Poor	11.5	14.7	0.9	17.7	3.1	3.2	5.7	6.2	31.1	26.5	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	12.1	38.1	0.0	7.8	0.0	7.2	0.0	5.7	27.5	32.4	6.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group												
Employed	9.3	0.0	0.0	20.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.8	28.5	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	12.2	31.9	0.6	13.0	2.0	4.5	3.7	6.1	24.7	30.0	0.9	0.0
Self-employed - other	10.8	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	10.8	0.0	7.4	50.9	26.9	15.1	0.0
Other	9.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender												
Male	9.8	25.6	0.0	14.7	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	37.9	15.7	1.7	0.0
Female	14.2	25.9	0.8	11.7	3.0	4.3	5.5	10.8	22.4	40.4	3.7	0.0
Age												
7-13	2.9	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	24.8	0.0	0.0	72.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14-19	24.0	30.0	0.0	15.1	1.9	1.9	3.5	6.9	22.5	34.0	3.3	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

females is almost 5 percent point higher than their counterpart males at 40 and 34 percent respectively.

3.2 Dissatisfaction

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

Overall, 61 percent of all students enrolled in either primary or secondary schools reported dissatisfaction with the schools they were attending. The data as presented in Table 3.2 show that majority (82 percent) of the dissatisfied individuals

attributed their dissatisfaction to lack of teachers. In addition, 32 percent reported dissatisfaction with their schools because of lack of books and supplies. While high school fees was not cited among main reasons for dissatisfaction (2 percent), poor teaching (27 percent), poor facilities (20 percent) and lack of space (18 percent) emerged as important factors for school satisfaction.

The dissatisfaction rate for children living remote villages is about 20 percentage points higher than that of those living in accessible villages. The dissatisfaction rate among non-poor households is also higher than that among poor households at 69 and 55 percent respectively.

Dissatisfaction by socio-economic group shows that the dissatisfaction rates among households whose main income earner is self-employed in activities other than agriculture indicated higher dissatisfaction rate (74 percent) about 10 percent point higher than the self-employed in agriculture at 61 percent. Dissatisfaction rate is slightly higher among boys (64 percent) than girls (59 percent).

Table 3.2 shows that dissatisfaction is reported almost equally among children in primary schools and secondary schools. While lack of teachers is the main

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	78.1	85.4	81.4	0.7	1.2	0.9
7	42.7	62.0	50.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
8	73.4	77.2	75.1	0.0	0.5	0.2
9	74.1	95.2	84.2	4.9	0.0	2.6
10	88.9	93.6	91.3	0.0	0.5	0.3
11	96.3	84.7	91.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12	85.6	86.1	85.9	0.0	6.3	2.9
13	95.8	96.4	96.1	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

dissatisfaction factor for both government primary and secondary schools, lack of books, lack of space, facilities in bad condition and high fees are major attributing factors for children's dissatisfaction in private secondary schools.

3.3 Non-attendance

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

The district has about 12 percent of 7 to 19 year olds who were not attending school. Around 25 percent of the non-attending population did not attend because they had completed standard seven, O-level or A-level. About 30 percent of children reported to have dropped school after their failed standard four, seven or form four examinations and an equal proportions of them simply became reported finding school useless or uninteresting. While 13 percent were not attending school due to cost, 5 percent of the respondents reported non-attendance because of illness. On the other hand the district is not exempted from non-attendance due to pregnancy or marriage at 3 and 6 percent respectively.

Children from accessible villages have higher rates of non-attendance than children from remote villages. Larger shares of children in the 'employed' and 'self-employed other' households (both twice the share in the self-employed in agriculture) reported finding school to be useless or uninteresting.

The gender breakdown shows that females have a higher percent not attending school than boys. As would be expected, primary school children report a lower share not attending school than secondary school children, at 3 and 25 percent, respectively.

3.4 Enrolment and Drop-out rates

This section takes a closer look at the primary and secondary school enrolment and drop-out rates. Rather than looking at primary or secondary school-aged children as a whole, data will be categorised by age and gender.

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. At the time of the survey the primary school drop-out rate was less than 1 percent, too low to arrive to solid statistical conclusions. Therefore, only net enrolment rates will be analysed.

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	14.5	10.7	12.8	3.8	4.6	4.2
14	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	0.0	4.2
15	4.5	8.9	6.6	3.9	7.1	5.4
16	4.6	18.3	11.3	0.0	4.4	2.2
17	9.9	6.7	9.0	7.8	5.1	7.0
18	38.0	14.7	27.4	0.0	7.6	3.5
19	48.3	17.6	33.2	0.0	3.3	1.6

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

Overall, about 81 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), 85 percent of girls and 78 percent of boys were enrolled. The required age at which children should start standard one is 7 years. However, at the time of the survey only 50 percent of all seven year olds were enrolled. Girls are more likely to be enrolled than boys at younger ages. The age breakdown shows that enrolment rates increase with age.

Secondary School

Table 3.5 shows secondary net enrolment patterns by age. As noted earlier, Secondary school enrolment rates are much lower than those at primary level. While 81 percent of primary school-aged children were enrolled, only 13 percent of secondary school-aged children reported to be enrolled. For a person following a normal school curriculum, i.e. started standard one at age 7, he/she is expected to start form one at age 14. NER increases with age, but no children are enrolled by age 14. Though a relatively large number of girls (18 percent) are enrolled by age 16, the biggest proportion in enrolment rates in the district regardless of gender is observed at 18 and 19 years of age. It is also noted from the table that the share of boys enrolled in secondary school at the age of 15 was half of that of girls enrolled in secondary school at the same age at 5 and 10 percent respectively.

Secondary school drop-out rates among secondary school-age individuals (14 to 19 years) are higher compared to those of primary school. 4 percent of children of secondary school-age students had dropped out in the year prior to the survey. In general, the highest drop-out rate (7 percent) is observed among 17 years-olds. The gender breakdown shows that 18 year

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	77.7	51.0	64.5
15-19 years	91.8	83.2	88.0
20-29 years	78.9	55.4	65.4
30-39 years	73.2	55.3	63.9
40-49 years	80.3	41.4	59.9
50-59 years	78.6	17.5	50.5
60+ years	51.8	6.6	33.7
Accessible	80.7	54.4	67.4
15-19 years	92.6	84.6	89.0
20-29 years	82.8	58.5	68.7
30-39 years	77.5	63.9	70.1
40-49 years	82.9	44.9	63.1
50-59 years	70.6	18.1	46.7
60+ years	61.2	7.2	36.2
Remote	74.9	47.5	61.6
15-19 years	90.9	81.6	86.9
20-29 years	75.4	52.5	62.2
30-39 years	69.8	47.0	58.4
40-49 years	77.6	37.9	56.6
50-59 years	86.7	17.0	54.3
60+ years	44.4	6.0	31.3

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is population age 15+

old girls and 14 years old boys are the most likely to drop-out.

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 illiterates. 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.

Adult Literacy

Overall, 65 percent of the population aged 15 and above in the district is literate. The

3 Education

difference in literacy rates among men and women is about 27 percentage points at 78 and 51 percent respectively. The 15-19 cohorts has the highest literacy rate (88 percent) and the smallest gender difference (9 percent).

The literacy rate is remarkably higher in accessible than in remote villages at 67 and 62 percent, respectively. The difference by cluster location is smallest for the 15-19 age-groups. The gender gap is roughly similar in accessible and remote villages

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 80 percent, but the gender difference is important. While the literacy rate for men is 88 percent, the rate for women is almost 16 percentage points lower, at 72 percent. Analysis by age-groups shows that 15 to 17 year olds have the highest literacy rate at 91 percent. The gender difference is similar in accessible and remote villages, at around 15 percentage points.

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

	Male	Female	Total
Total	87.6	72.3	80.1
15-17 years	92.3	88.6	90.7
18-20 years	91.3	60.9	75.6
21-22 years	76.5	64.3	69.5
23-24 years	61.8	66.6	64.4
Accessible	90.0	73.5	81.8
15-17 years	92.2	87.3	89.9
18-20 years	93.7	67.6	81.5
21-22 years	83.6	46.9	64.5
23-24 years	68.2	68.9	68.7
Remote	85.0	70.9	78.3
15-17 years	92.4	90.5	91.7
18-20 years	88.7	55.8	70.2
21-22 years	67.1	78.9	74.6
23-24 years	57.7	60.7	58.8

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is population aged 15-24

4 HEALTH

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

4.1. Health Indicators

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

Table 4.1 - Health Indicators

	Medical Services			
	Access	Need	Use	Satisfaction
Total	60.6	23.5	24.9	80.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	71.4	23.1	25.7	77.9
Remote	50.1	23.8	24.2	82.3
Poverty Status				
Poor	56.4	24.3	25.1	78.6
Non-poor	64.7	22.6	24.8	81.4
Socio-economic group				
Employed	85.2	19.2	22.9	97.1
Self-employed - agriculture	57.4	23.6	25.6	77.6
Self-employed - other	69.9	22.9	22.4	87.9
Other	37.5	45.8	21.5	83.8
Gender				
Male	58.7	22.2	22.9	82.2
Female	62.7	24.8	27.2	78.1
Age				
0-4	59.3	38.2	61.3	88.2
5-9	61.3	16.3	15.7	73.2
10-14	60.2	11.7	10.0	71.1
15-19	61.7	16.7	14.5	82.1
20-29	67.3	18.0	15.5	77.5
30-39	62.4	23.4	22.3	74.8
40-49	61.5	30.6	26.4	75.1
50-59	56.9	27.8	27.8	100.0
60+	51.5	36.1	27.4	70.3

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

4 Health

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

	Percent dissatisfied	Reasons for dissatisfaction						
		Facilities not clean	Long wait	No trained professionals	Cost	No drugs available	Treatment unsuccessful	Other
Total	20.0	1.5	28.2	3.5	42.1	18.1	26.2	1.5
Cluster Location								
Accessible	22.1	0.9	21.3	1.3	59.6	16.7	17.8	1.7
Remote	17.7	2.4	37.1	6.3	19.5	19.9	36.9	1.3
Poverty Status								
Poor	21.4	0.0	24.6	3.1	53.4	12.2	24.4	1.1
Non-poor	18.6	3.3	32.2	3.8	29.6	24.7	28.2	2.1
Socio-economic group								
Employed	2.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	22.4	0.6	30.5	1.8	44.4	18.8	25.8	0.6
Self-employed - other	12.1	13.0	7.4	13.0	24.4	4.4	25.5	12.3
Other	16.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender								
Male	17.8	1.2	31.7	2.4	42.4	5.6	25.9	1.7
Female	21.9	1.8	25.5	4.2	41.9	27.4	26.4	1.4
Type of provider								
Public hospital	21.7	1.6	41.1	4.2	23.0	28.0	31.7	1.1
Private hospital	27.4	0.0	18.6	0.0	81.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Religious hospital	43.2	0.0	33.6	0.0	24.2	0.0	45.3	21.1
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	15.3	0.0	0.0	3.1	91.3	0.0	4.9	0.7
Trad. Healer	21.8	9.8	0.0	0.0	38.8	0.0	61.2	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

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, 61 percent of the households have access to medical services.

As would be expected, household in accessible villages have higher access to medical services than households in remote villages. Both show similar proportions of need and use, but households in remote villages report higher satisfaction rates (83 percent) than households in accessible villages (78 percent).

Non-poor households have higher access rates than poor households, with shares of 65 and 56 percent, respectively. The breakdown by poverty status does not

show sharp differences by need, use or satisfaction.

Regarding socio-economic status, the employees show the highest access, at 85 percent. Households in the 'other' groups report the lowest access rate, at 38 percent. Households where the main income earner was self-employed in agriculture showed the lowest satisfaction rate, at 78 percent.

The gender breakdown shows that female shave a higher access rate than males, at 63 and 59 percent, respectively. Females report slightly higher need and use rates, and a lower rate of satisfaction.

Access does not vary widely by age-groups, but the rate of need does. It starts at 38 percent for children under 5, reduces for the population aged between 5 and 19, and then starts going up again, peaking at 36 percent for the 60+ group. The rate of use follows a similar trend: it starts decreasing with age but then increases for the older cohorts. Satisfaction is highest for the 50-59 groups, and lowest for the 10-14 cohorts.

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

	Percent not consulting	Reasons for not consulting				
		No need	Cost	Distance	No confidence	Other
Total	75.1	95.9	3.0	1.5	0.2	0.3
Cluster Location						
Accessible	74.3	95.7	3.4	1.0	0.1	0.3
Remote	75.8	96.0	2.6	1.9	0.3	0.3
Poverty Status						
Poor	74.9	94.8	3.6	1.8	0.2	0.6
Non-poor	75.2	96.9	2.5	1.2	0.2	0.0
Socio-economic group						
Employed	77.1	98.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
Self-employed - agriculture	74.4	96.3	2.7	1.2	0.2	0.3
Self-employed - other	77.6	95.0	4.5	1.2	0.5	0.0
Other	78.5	64.7	21.4	28.7	0.0	0.0
Gender						
Male	77.1	95.9	2.9	1.4	0.1	0.4
Female	72.8	95.8	3.1	1.5	0.3	0.1
Type of sickness/injury						
Fever/malaria	7.2	6.6	70.3	28.4	5.8	5.7
Diarrhea/abdominal pains	16.6	1.9	68.7	49.4	11.1	0.0
Pain in back, limbs or joints	33.1	0.0	85.3	39.3	2.9	0.0
Coughing/breathing difficulty	21.4	13.5	71.2	23.5	10.7	0.0
Skin problems	16.5	0.0	56.3	43.7	0.0	0.0
Ear, nose, throat	17.7	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Eye	26.0	0.0	100.0	77.2	0.0	0.0
Dental	33.2	0.0	100.0	42.1	0.0	0.0
Accident	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	14.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

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, 1 in 5 users of healthcare facilities is dissatisfied, mostly because of cost (42 percent), long waits (28 percent) and lack of success in the treatment (26 percent).

The analysis by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages are more commonly dissatisfied by the cost of the treatment (60 percent, against 20 percent for households in remote villages), whereas households in remote villages report long waits and unsuccessful treatment more often (roughly 37 against 20 percent each).

The breakdown by poverty status shows similar dissatisfaction rates. However, the reasons for dissatisfaction are different: whereas poor households are cite the cost of the treatment more often than non-poor households (53 and 30 percent, respectively), the latter are more commonly dissatisfied by the long wait (32 against 25 percent).

Employees are the socio-economic group with the lowest dissatisfaction rate at 3 percent, while self-employed in agriculture report the highest dissatisfaction rate at 22 percent.

The breakdown by gender shows that females are more commonly dissatisfied than males, at 22 and 18 percent respectively. Males point out the long waits more often than females (32 against 26 percent, respectively). In turn females are more likely to point out lack of drugs at 27 and 6 percent, respectively.

4 Health

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

	Sick or injured	Fever or malaria	Diarrhea/ abdominal pain	Pain in back, limbs or joints	Coughing/ breathing difficulty	Skin problem	Ear, nose, throat,	Eye	Dental	Accident	Other
Total	23.5	53.1	26.2	12.8	11.5	3.0	1.4	2.0	1.1	1.2	2.2
Male Total	22.2	52.8	23.9	14.0	10.3	3.2	2.0	2.4	1.0	1.4	2.8
0-4	43.5	67.4	21.2	0.0	13.0	2.8	1.6	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.9
5-9	15.3	55.2	22.6	6.0	4.7	6.3	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4
10-14	11.8	31.0	23.9	8.5	16.0	10.4	7.4	0.0	0.0	11.7	0.0
15-29	14.3	64.5	29.6	8.5	3.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0
30-49	18.9	51.1	30.7	14.7	9.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.8	3.3	0.0
50-64	31.6	40.9	17.7	36.3	16.2	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	3.6
65+	49.0	15.4	23.6	59.8	10.1	2.9	6.1	17.3	5.3	0.0	0.0
Female Total	24.8	53.4	28.3	11.5	12.7	2.7	0.9	1.7	1.3	1.0	1.6
0-4	32.9	57.4	41.3	0.0	12.3	7.6	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.8	1.2
5-9	17.6	78.7	32.7	0.0	3.5	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9
10-14	11.6	58.1	15.5	3.5	22.9	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15-29	21.2	58.6	28.0	3.6	10.2	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.5	0.0	3.8
30-49	33.3	47.2	25.1	18.5	8.8	1.7	2.6	1.5	1.3	1.0	0.9
50-64	31.2	19.6	19.9	36.9	25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	3.8	0.0
65+	41.8	38.9	10.6	52.5	29.8	0.0	0.0	7.1	4.8	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

Regarding health provider, the main cause of dissatisfaction in public hospitals is the long wait; in private hospitals and pharmacies, the cost. The most cited cause for dissatisfaction with religious hospitals and traditional healers is the lack of success in the treatment. Furthermore, religious hospitals show the highest rates of dissatisfaction.

4.3 Reasons for Not Consulting When Ill

The distribution of the population who did not consult a health provider in the four weeks preceding the survey is shown Table 4.3. The table shows that overall, 75 percent of the population did not consult a health provider, typically because there was no need (96 percent of the cases).

Neither cluster location nor poverty status seems to be correlated with the reasons for not consulting. Nevertheless, the division by socio-economic group shows such differences. For households in the 'other' the share was 75 percent. The main reasons for this group were cost (21 percent) and distance (29 percent).

There are no strong differences by gender. The split-up by type of illness shows that for most infirmities, the main cause for not consulting a health practitioner is cost. It is worth noticing the relatively low percentage of people not receiving attention (7 percent) for fever/malaria.

4.4 Type of Illness

Table 4.4 shows the percentage of population sick or injured in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, fever or malaria is the most common sickness, affecting almost 53 percent of the sick population. Diarrhoea and abdominal pain come in second, with 26 percent.

The gender breakdown reveals no difference in the shares of population affected between males and females, nor in the types of illnesses. The age breakdown shows that the share of sick/injured population is highest for the youngest and oldest cohorts (0-4 and 65+), being lower for the intermediate age-groups. The ill population affected by malaria increases with the age.

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	Pharmacist/chemist	Traditional healer	Other	Total
Total	59.5	2.3	1.4	0.1	0.5	31.4	4.7	0.1	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	60.8	3.1	2.3	0.2	0.0	30.0	3.5	0.1	100.0
Remote	58.1	1.6	0.4	0.0	1.1	32.8	5.9	0.1	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	59.0	1.1	1.2	0.2	0.7	33.6	4.1	0.1	100.0
Non-poor	60.0	3.5	1.5	0.0	0.4	29.2	5.3	0.1	100.0
Socio-economic group									
Employed	62.8	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	31.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	59.9	2.2	1.1	0.1	0.4	30.6	5.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	55.3	4.2	1.7	0.0	1.6	35.8	0.9	0.5	100.0
Other	64.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	35.2	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is population who consulted a health provider

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

	12-14 yrs	15-19 yrs	20-24 yrs	25-29 yrs	30-39 yrs	40+ yrs	Total	Pre-natal care
Total	0.0	11.7	23.4	32.7	30.7	3.3	16.5	98.8
Cluster Location								
Accessible	0.0	8.0	21.1	26.3	33.0	2.8	13.9	100.0
Remote	0.0	16.0	25.7	37.8	28.5	3.9	19.6	97.9
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.0	13.8	24.6	52.9	33.8	2.7	18.5	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	9.7	22.6	22.7	27.2	3.9	14.8	97.5
Socio-economic group								
Employed	0.0	0.0	13.9	0.0	28.4	0.0	11.1	100.0
Self-employed - agric	0.0	15.2	25.5	37.4	29.9	2.5	17.6	98.6
Self-employed - other	0.0	0.0	19.6	24.1	38.8	8.5	14.4	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is females aged 12 or older.

4.5 Health Provider

Table 4.5 shows the percent distribution of health consultations in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Overall, 60 percent of the consultations were made in a public hospital, 31 percent to a pharmacist or chemist, and 5 percent to traditional healers. Private hospitals were consulted in just 2 percent of the cases.

The breakdown by cluster location shows no strong correlation with health provider. Members of poor households tend to consult chemists more often than members of non-poor households (34 and 29 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that employees and 'other' are the groups with the highest shares of consultations made in public hospitals (63 and 65 percent), whereas 'self-employed other' has the lowest at 55 percent.

4.6 Child Deliveries

Table 4.6 shows the percentage of women aged 12 to 49 who had a live birth in the year preceding the survey. Overall, 17 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 12 percent of the females between 15 and 19 gave birth. The rate peaks at 33 percent for the 25-29 group, and then goes down, ending in 3 percent for the group aged 40

4 Health

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	15.8	3.6	7.3	0.0	72.2	1.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	15.9	6.4	4.5	0.0	71.1	2.1	100.0
Remote	15.6	1.1	10.0	0.0	73.3	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	12.7	1.9	5.5	0.0	78.8	1.1	100.0
Non-poor	18.9	5.5	9.3	0.0	65.4	0.9	100.0
Socio-economic group							
Employed	23.1	0.0	7.2	0.0	69.7	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	13.5	3.8	7.2	0.0	74.1	1.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	24.9	4.2	6.8	0.0	64.1	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	58.5	0.0	41.5	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

to 49. In addition, 99 percent of pregnant women received prenatal care.

Women from remote villages and poor households have higher rates of pregnancy than women from accessible villages and non-poor households for almost all age-groups.

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that the highest rates correspond to the self-employed in agriculture, whereas the employees generally show the lowest rates.

Table 4.7 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey. Roughly, 16 percent of births in the 5 years preceding the survey took place in a hospital, almost 72 percent at home, 7 percent at a dispensary and 4 percent in a health centre. The ordering remains across cluster location, poverty status, and socio-economic group of the household head.

There are no strong differences by cluster location. The breakdown by poverty status shows that women from non-poor households are more likely have given birth in a hospital than women from poor households at 19 and 13 percent, respectively, whereas the latter have a higher share of child deliveries at home (79 percent, against 65 percent of women from non-poor households).

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows employees and self-employed other have the highest shares of deliveries in a hospital (23 and 25

percent), 'other' has the highest share of deliveries in dispensaries (59 percent) and self-employed in agriculture has the highest share of deliveries at home (74 percent).

Table 4.8 shows the percentage distribution of births in the five years preceding the survey by person who assisted in the delivery of the child. Overall, 42 percent of the deliveries were attended by a health professional, mostly midwives (26 percent of births). Traditional birth assistants (TBA) and trained TBA accounted for 15 and 32 percent, whereas doctors or nurses attended 1 percent of the deliveries in the district.

The analysis by cluster location shows that TBA was more common in accessible villages whereas trained TBA and 'no assistance' were more common in remote villages.

As expected, the non-poor show a higher share of deliveries attended by a professional, 82 percent, against 79 for the poor. In turn, poor households report slightly higher share of deliveries attended by doctors (13 and 11 percent, respectively).

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households belonging to the 'employee' or 'other' categories report the highest shares of deliveries attended by professionals: 57 and 59 percent, against 50 percent of 'self-employed other' and 40 percent of self-employed in agriculture.

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

	Doctor		Trained		Other	Don't	Total	Delivery by health prof.
	Nurse	Midwife	T.B.A.	T.B.A.	Self	know		
Total	0.8	25.9	15.1	31.8	26.5	0.0	100.0	41.8
Cluster Location								
Accessible	1.6	25.6	12.2	39.5	21.0	0.0	100.0	39.5
Remote	0.0	26.2	17.7	24.7	31.4	0.0	100.0	43.9
Poverty Status								
Poor	0.3	19.8	11.8	36.6	31.4	0.0	100.0	32.0
Non-poor	1.3	32.4	18.5	26.7	21.2	0.0	100.0	52.1
Socio-economic group								
Employed	0.0	30.3	26.3	20.3	23.2	0.0	100.0	56.5
Self-employed - agriculture	0.4	24.0	14.6	32.2	28.8	0.0	100.0	39.0
Self-employed - other	2.8	33.1	13.6	34.1	16.4	0.0	100.0	49.4
Other	0.0	58.5	0.0	41.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	58.5

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is children under 5 years old.

Table 4.9: Nutritional status indicators and program participation rates

	Nutritional status indicators			Program participation		
	2SD)	2SD)		Nutrition	Weigh-in	Vaccinated
Total	29.5	0.9	14.6	42.1	91.5	91.2
Cluster Location						
Accessible	32.2	0.4	13.7	47.4	97.3	98.0
Remote	26.6	1.4	15.7	37.2	86.2	85.1
Poverty Status						
Poor	31.7	0.4	16.8	36.8	87.4	90.9
Non-poor	27.0	1.4	12.3	47.6	95.7	91.6
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	31.5	2.8	11.3	53.3	94.7	95.0
Self-employed - agriculture	29.4	0.6	15.2	42.1	90.2	89.8
Self-employed - other	27.8	1.6	13.9	38.5	96.8	96.8
Other	58.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Gender and age in completed years						
Male	31.7	0.4	14.0	37.8	91.5	89.8
0.0	26.5	0.0	3.4	36.7	93.8	94.1
1.0	28.6	0.0	18.2	40.5	92.7	93.8
2.0	33.1	1.8	17.3	37.7	89.1	93.6
3.0	26.5	0.0	8.8	40.3	86.0	76.3
4.0	44.0	0.0	17.7	31.9	97.0	91.2
Female	27.2	1.4	15.3	46.4	91.4	92.7
0.0	0.0	3.3	11.2	42.5	86.3	85.9
1.0	30.5	4.7	11.1	39.2	96.1	100.0
2.0	23.8	0.0	13.4	41.9	90.7	97.2
3.0	42.4	0.0	22.6	55.5	92.7	92.7
4.0	30.9	0.0	17.0	56.8	94.7	90.3
Orphan status						
Orphaned	17.5	0.0	7.3	6.5	74.7	86.9
Not-orphaned	29.8	0.9	14.7	43.1	92.0	91.7
Foster status						
Fostered	42.6	0.0	31.2	51.5	100.0	100.0
Not-fostered	29.2	0.9	14.3	42.0	91.3	91.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

4.7 Child Nutrition

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

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

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

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

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

Another measurement commonly used is weight-for-age. A child who is below minus two standard deviations from the median of the reference population is considered to be underweight. However, a child may be underweight because he/she

is stunted, wasted or both. Interpretation of this indicator is complex and inconclusive; for this reason it was not incorporated into this report.

Overall, 1 percent of the children are wasted, and 30 percent are stunted. Around 42 percent of the children participate in nutrition programs.

Children from households in accessible villages and from poor households are more likely to be stunted than their counterparts. Regarding program participation, children from accessible villages are more likely to be enrolled in nutrition and weigh-in programs, as well as to have been vaccinated. Children from non-poor households, in turn, have higher shares of participation in these programs than children from poor households.

Regarding socio-economic status, households in the 'other' category show the highest rate of stunted children, at 59 percent. Employees report the highest rate of participation in nutrition programs (53 percent) and the self-employed in agriculture report the lowest shares of vaccination and participation weigh-in programs.

The gender breakdown shows no difference in rates of wasted children, but the rate of stunted males is higher than that of stunted females (32 against 27 percent, respectively). Girls are more likely to be in nutrition programs than boys, in particular girls between 3 and 4 years old.

The breakdown by orphan status shows important differences between orphans and non-orphans. A child is considered orphan if he/she is under 18 years old and has lost at least one parent. Orphaned children show a lower rate of stunting, but also lower program participation rates.

A child is considered fostered when at least one of his/her parents does not live at home. The split-up by foster status shows that foster children are more likely to be stunted, and a lower share of them participated in nutrition or weigh-in programs or received vaccinations.

Table 4.10 shows the percent distribution of children vaccinated by type of vaccination received. Overall, 73 percent of children fewer than 5 have vaccination against measles, 95 against BCG, and

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	73.3	95.1	93.2	90.0	84.7	82.1	92.9	89.4	84.4	70.9
Cluster Location										
Accessible	77.3	99.3	95.9	92.0	88.6	90.2	95.7	91.8	87.7	77.4
Remote	69.6	91.2	90.7	88.2	81.1	74.7	90.4	87.2	81.3	64.9
Poverty Status										
Poor	72.9	96.2	94.4	89.8	83.8	81.2	93.0	88.7	83.1	70.5
Non-poor	73.6	93.9	91.9	90.2	85.6	83.1	92.9	90.2	85.7	71.3
Socio-economic group										
Employed	77.6	97.3	100.0	100.0	90.0	89.5	100.0	100.0	90.0	67.6
Self-employed - agriculture	71.9	94.2	92.0	88.4	83.0	79.7	91.2	87.6	83.4	70.2
Self-employed - other	78.0	98.8	96.1	94.1	91.0	92.4	98.8	94.1	86.9	76.7
Other	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	58.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	41.5
Gender and age in completed years										
Male										
0	21.4	89.6	88.7	74.1	48.6	80.6	78.4	70.3	48.5	21.4
1	78.9	93.8	93.8	93.8	92.3	79.3	93.8	93.8	89.6	75.9
2	92.5	96.4	92.5	91.3	91.3	82.7	96.4	92.5	91.3	85.5
3	89.4	100.0	94.7	89.4	89.4	86.4	93.0	89.4	89.4	84.1
4	97.9	97.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	85.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.0
Female										
0	14.3	82.1	76.1	69.0	53.4	66.8	77.9	63.9	49.1	15.3
1	84.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	83.3	100.0	100.0	98.2	81.5
2	96.5	98.5	96.5	96.5	96.5	81.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.0
3	91.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.9
4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.2	88.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	97.9

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

roughly between 82 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 remarkable by poverty status, but households in accessible villages have higher shares in every vaccine, as well as in Vitamin A supplements. The breakdown by socio-economic group does not show clear trends.

The gender breakdown shows no strong differences. The age breakdown shows that the shares of children with vaccinations and consuming vitamin A tend to increase with age, as would be expected.

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

There is no difference by cluster location or poverty status. The main difference by

socio-economic group is that all vaccinated children from the 'employee' and 'other' categories had vaccination cards, whereas in the other categories the share was around 95 percent.

The age breakdown shows that children between 0 and 11 months had vaccination cards in 85 and 82 percent of the cases, for boys and girls, respectively. In addition, roughly 5 percent of boys aged 2 or 3 lacked vaccination cards. The rest presented vaccination cards in every case.

4 Health

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

	Health Card	Other	Total
Total	95.1	4.9	100.0
Cluster Location			
Accessible	93.9	6.1	100.0
Remote	96.2	3.8	100.0
Poverty Status			
Poor	93.0	7.0	100.0
Non-poor	97.3	2.7	100.0
Socio-economic group			
Employed	100.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	94.6	5.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	95.2	4.8	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	100.0
Gender and age in completed years			
Male	94.5	5.5	100.0
0	84.6	15.4	100.0
1	100.0	0.0	100.0
2	96.0	4.0	100.0
3	93.0	7.0	100.0
4	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	95.7	4.3	100.0
0	82.0	18.0	100.0
1	100.0	0.0	100.0
2	100.0	0.0	100.0
3	100.0	0.0	100.0
4	100.0	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

5 EMPLOYMENT

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

5.1 Employment Status of Total Adult Population

The adult population of the district is categorised into two main groups: working and non-working. The working population includes all adults who had engaged in any type of work in the 4 weeks preceding the survey. Within the working population, a distinction is made between those employed to capacity and those who are underemployed. The underemployed are

those individuals who report willingness to take on additional work. This category reflects the population that is not working as much as they want, so they reflect surplus in the labour supply.

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

5.1.1 Work Status

Table 5.1 shows that 72 percent of the adult population is employed and 19 percent underemployed. Unemployment is lower than 1 percent and the inactivity rate is 9 percent. This shows that underemployment is a bigger problem in the area than unemployment. There are no

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

	Working			Not working			Total
	Employed	Under emp.	Total	Unemploy.	Inactive	Total	
Total	72.0	19.3	91.4	0.1	8.5	8.6	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	72.1	18.6	90.7	0.0	9.3	9.3	100.0
Remote	72.0	20.0	92.0	0.2	7.8	8.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	74.6	18.2	92.8	0.0	7.2	7.2	100.0
Non-poor	70.0	20.3	90.2	0.2	9.6	9.8	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	65.8	22.9	88.7	0.0	11.3	11.3	100.0
15-29	72.9	14.6	87.6	0.0	12.4	12.4	100.0
30-49	55.2	38.3	93.5	0.0	6.5	6.5	100.0
50-64	71.3	17.8	89.1	0.0	10.9	10.9	100.0
65+	56.3	18.6	74.9	0.0	25.1	25.1	100.0
Female	78.4	15.7	94.1	0.2	5.7	5.9	100.0
15-29	81.6	13.2	94.8	0.4	4.8	5.2	100.0
30-49	76.5	21.3	97.7	0.0	2.3	2.3	100.0
50-64	79.7	14.4	94.1	0.0	5.9	5.9	100.0
65+	61.4	5.6	66.9	0.0	33.1	33.1	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

5 Employment

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

	Total population			Heads of household		
	Active population	Unemployment rate	Underemployment rate	Active population	Unemployment rate	Underemployment rate
Total	91.5	0.1	21.1	91.6	0.0	32.9
Cluster Location						
Accessible	90.7	0.0	20.5	92.1	0.0	32.8
Remote	92.2	0.2	21.7	91.1	0.0	33.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	92.8	0.0	19.6	92.8	0.0	30.4
Non-poor	90.4	0.2	22.4	90.9	0.0	34.5
Gender and age						
Male	88.7	0.0	25.8	90.8	0.0	33.3
15-29	87.6	0.0	16.7	88.3	0.0	41.0
30-49	93.5	0.0	41.0	93.9	0.0	39.3
50-64	89.1	0.0	20.0	91.6	0.0	20.4
65+	74.9	0.0	24.8	78.1	0.0	26.4
Female	94.3	0.2	16.7	96.5	0.0	30.6
15-29	95.2	0.4	13.9	100.0	0.0	68.0
30-49	97.7	0.0	21.8	100.0	0.0	35.8
50-64	94.1	0.0	15.3	91.7	0.0	31.9
65+	66.9	0.0	8.3	95.7	0.0	10.6

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

differences by cluster location. In turn, poor households show a higher employment rate than non-poor households. For both genders, underemployment peaks for the cohort aged between 30 and 49. Around 38 percent of the males in this group are underemployed, whereas the share for females is 21 percent

The adult population that was not working in the 4 weeks preceding the survey was mostly inactive, rather than unemployed. This means that most of them were students, sick people, etc. rather than people looking for work and ready for it. For the population under 65 years, inactivity fluctuates around 5 percent. For the population over 65 the number of inactive population goes up, as would be expected, reaching 25 percent for males and 33 percent for females.

5.1.2 Employment of Household Heads

Table 5.2 shows the principal labour force indicators for the adult population compared to the household heads. Activity rates are similar for total population and household heads, but underemployment is higher among the latter. There is no difference by cluster location, but poor households have a higher underemployment rate than non-poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that in the general population males are more likely to be underemployed than females, with rates of 26 and 17 percent, respectively. However, there is no gender difference in underemployment of the household heads, with roughly one third of each group being underemployed.

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, at 91 percent. However, underemployment is lower: only 1 of every 10 workers is underemployed, as opposed to 1 of every 5 workers for the overall population. Furthermore, the youth from poor households and the youth from households in remote villages have higher underemployment than their counterparts.

A breakdown by gender shows that underemployment rates among the male and female youth are similar at around 10 percent. It can be seen that underemployment is higher in the 20-24 group.

5.2 Working population

Table 5.4 shows that the vast majority of the working population is formed by self-employed in agriculture at 62 percent, or in other activities (inactive, unemployed, unpaid workers, domestic workers) at 26 percent. Moreover, employees only account for 3 percent of the working population. The population self-employed

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

	Active population				Active Total	Inactive	Total
	Employed	Under emp.	Working	Unemployed			
Total	80.0	10.3	90.3	0.3	90.5	9.5	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	80.2	8.8	89.0	0.0	89.0	11.0	100.0
Remote	79.8	11.8	91.7	0.5	92.2	7.8	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	81.8	11.3	93.1	0.0	93.1	6.9	100.0
Non-poor	78.3	9.3	87.6	0.5	88.1	11.9	100.0
Gender and age							
Male	76.5	10.4	87.0	0.0	87.0	13.0	100.0
15-16	88.1	3.4	91.5	0.0	91.5	8.5	100.0
17-19	75.4	8.5	84.0	0.0	84.0	16.0	100.0
20-21	76.9	13.2	90.1	0.0	90.1	9.9	100.0
22-23	55.8	26.6	82.5	0.0	82.5	17.5	100.0
Female	83.7	10.1	93.8	0.5	94.3	5.7	100.0
15-16	95.1	0.9	96.0	0.0	96.0	4.0	100.0
17-19	86.4	8.3	94.7	1.9	96.6	3.4	100.0
20-21	72.5	15.9	88.3	0.0	88.3	11.7	100.0
22-23	76.6	19.2	95.8	0.0	95.8	4.2	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

5 Employment

Table 5.4 - Percentage distribution of the working population by type of payment in main job

	Employee	Self-employed	Self-employed	Other	Total
		Agriculture	Other		
Total	2.9	62.4	8.3	26.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	3.6	66.3	7.5	22.6	100.0
Remote	2.2	58.7	9.1	30.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	2.2	61.8	5.5	30.5	100.0
Non-poor	3.5	62.9	10.7	22.9	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	5.6	55.3	13.1	26.0	100.0
15-29	3.9	30.5	7.8	57.9	100.0
30-49	7.8	70.6	21.6	0.0	100.0
50-64	7.6	78.4	12.7	1.3	100.0
65+	0.0	87.2	7.0	5.8	100.0
Female	0.4	69.3	3.7	26.7	100.0
15-29	0.4	51.5	3.4	44.6	100.0
30-49	0.5	84.8	4.2	10.5	100.0
50-64	0.0	88.5	1.5	10.0	100.0
65+	0.0	76.7	8.6	14.7	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

Table 5.5 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer

	State/NGO/	Private	Household	Total
	Other			
Total	1.1	72.5	26.4	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	1.9	75.6	22.5	100.0
Remote	0.3	69.5	30.1	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	1.0	68.4	30.6	100.0
Non-poor	1.1	76.0	22.8	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	2.1	72.2	25.7	100.0
15-29	0.4	42.4	57.2	100.0
30-49	3.9	96.1	0.0	100.0
50-64	3.4	95.3	1.3	100.0
65+	0.0	94.2	5.8	100.0
Female	0.2	72.8	27.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	55.9	44.1	100.0
30-49	0.5	88.4	11.1	100.0
50-64	0.0	90.0	10.0	100.0
65+	0.0	76.7	23.3	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

in agriculture is higher in accessible villages, whereas the 'other' group is bigger in remote villages. Poor households report a lower share of self-employed workers in non-agricultural activities and a higher share in other activities than non-poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that a higher share of males works as employees or is self-employed in non-agricultural activities, whereas almost 70 percent of females are self-employed in agriculture. The cut down by age-groups shows that the share of employees peaks for males in the 30-64 cohort (8 percent), the self-employed in agriculture for 50-64 females (89 percent), the 'self-employed other' for 30-49 males (22 percent) and 'other' for 15-29 males.

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 more almost 75 percent of the working population, which combined with individuals who work for their own households represent up to 99 percent of the working population.

As would be expected, positions in State/NGO are more common in accessible villages. Households employ higher shares of workers in remote villages and poor households; and the private sector employs higher shares of workers in accessible villages and non-poor households.

There are no gender differences in the shares working for each type of employer. In the 15-29 cohorts, males have a higher share working for the household than

Table 5.6 - Percentage distribution of the working population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	Pub & priv services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	69.3	1.7	6.2	19.8	3.0	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	68.2	2.6	7.7	21.1	0.4	100.0
Remote	70.4	0.9	4.7	18.5	5.5	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	69.8	1.7	4.9	22.7	0.9	100.0
Non-poor	68.9	1.8	7.2	17.3	4.8	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	59.1	3.6	9.0	22.3	6.1	100.0
15-29	38.7	2.8	6.1	49.2	3.2	100.0
30-49	71.1	5.9	11.9	0.0	11.2	100.0
50-64	78.4	2.3	13.2	2.0	4.2	100.0
65+	87.2	0.0	3.0	5.8	4.1	100.0
Female	79.1	0.0	3.4	17.3	0.1	100.0
15-29	63.5	0.0	4.2	32.3	0.0	100.0
30-49	94.2	0.0	3.5	2.0	0.3	100.0
50-64	95.4	0.0	1.5	3.2	0.0	100.0
65+	76.7	0.0	0.0	23.3	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

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

	Employee		Self-employed Agriculture		Self-employed Other		Other		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Agriculture	2.8	0.0	80.8	95.0	14.0	37.0	0.0	0.0	59.1	79.1
Mining & non-primary	14.2	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0
Services	53.7	100.0	8.5	3.9	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.0	9.0	3.4
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.9	85.3	62.3	100.0	0.0	22.3	17.3
Other	29.3	0.0	6.5	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.1

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

females (57 and 44 percent, respectively). However, higher shares of men in the cohorts after 30 years old work for the private sector. The share of females working in the private sector increases gradually with age, but is always lower than the respective shares of males.

Table 5.6 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by main activity. The categories are agriculture; mining, manufacturing, energy and construction; services (transport, trade, private and public services); domestic duties; and other. Overall, agriculture and domestic duties together account for 89 percent of the working population. 69 percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, and 20 percent in domestic duties.

The split-up by remoteness of the village and poverty status of the household does not show important differences.

The gender breakdown shows that the most common activities for females are agriculture and household duties, accounting for 97 percent of the working population. These are the main activities for men as well, but they are less concentrated, with 18 percent in other activities.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that younger cohorts have higher shares dedicated to household duties. The share of males in agriculture increases steadily with age. In turn, the share of women in agriculture is lower for the youngest and the oldest cohorts, where the shares dedicated to domestic duties increase.

5 Employment

Table 5.8- Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status

	Employee	Self-employed Agriculture	Self-employed Other	Other	Total
Total	2.0	83.5	12.1	2.4	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	4.2	86.8	8.4	0.6	100.0
Remote	0.0	80.5	15.5	4.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	3.1	85.8	9.3	1.8	100.0
Non-poor	1.2	81.8	14.1	2.8	100.0
Gender and age					
Male	2.6	80.7	15.1	1.6	100.0
15-29	3.8	77.5	13.1	5.6	100.0
30-49	2.9	80.7	16.4	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	79.1	20.9	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	1.1	87.6	7.7	3.5	100.0
15-29	0.0	80.4	12.3	7.4	100.0
30-49	2.3	93.2	3.1	1.4	100.0
50-64	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	31.6	68.4	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

Table 5.7 shows the percentage distribution of the working population by employment status, gender and activity. Female employees are strongly concentrated in services. Overall, around 60 percent of the male labour force is in agriculture, whereas the share for females is almost 80 percent. Domestic duties have the second highest shares for both genders: 22 percent for males and 17 percent for females. Each of the remaining activities occupies less than 10 percent of the labour force for each gender, but with the shares for males higher than those for females.

Around half the male employees (54 percent) work in services, and the remaining 'other' and mining, manufacturing, energy and construction. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities work mostly in domestic duties. The population in the 'other' group is concentrated in domestic duties. Virtually no females fall in this category

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 split between services, agriculture, and mining, manufacturing, energy and construction (39, 31 and 30 percent, respectively). None of the women in the survey where working for a private agent. Individuals whose main activity is household duties either work in agriculture or undertake domestic tasks.

5.3 Underemployed Population

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employment status is shown in Table 5.9. Overall, 83 percent of the underemployed population is self-employed in agriculture, 12 percent self-employed in other activities, and the remaining 5 percent is split between 'other' and employees. Even though self-employed in agriculture are 63 percent of the population, they represent almost 84 percent of the underemployed.

The shares of employees and self-employed in agriculture are higher in accessible villages, and self-employed other and 'other' are higher in remote villages. The breakdown by poverty status shows that the share of self-employed in agriculture is higher for poor households. At the same time, the share of self-employed other is higher among non-poor households.

The gender breakdown shows that in the underemployed population, females are more likely than males to be self-employed in agriculture (with rates of 88 and 81 percent, respectively). In turn, males are more likely than females to be self-employed in other activities (with rates of 15 and 8 percent, respectively).

For the underemployed females, the share of self-employment in agriculture increases with age until the 50-64 cohorts. Self-employed other is highest for the 65+ age-group. For males, the shares on self-employed agriculture and self-employed other increases with age, stating that the former reporting higher shares.

Table 5.9 - Percentage distribution of the working population by employer, sex and activity

	Government		Private		Household		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Agriculture	0.0	0.0	30.6	0.0	60.2	79.3	59.1	79.1
Mining & non-primary	0.0	0.0	30.4	0.0	3.4	0.0	3.6	0.0
Services	100.0	100.0	39.0	0.0	7.3	3.3	9.0	3.4
Domestic duties	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.8	17.3	22.3	17.3
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2	0.1	6.1	0.1

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is working population aged 15+

Table 5.10 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer

	State/NGO/Other	Private	Household	Total
Total	1.4	95.7	3.0	100.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	2.8	96.6	0.6	100.0
Remote	0.0	94.9	5.1	100.0
Poverty Status				
Poor	1.5	96.7	1.8	100.0
Non-poor	1.2	95.0	3.8	100.0
Gender and age				
Male	1.5	96.9	1.6	100.0
15-29	0.0	94.4	5.6	100.0
30-49	2.9	97.1	0.0	100.0
50-64	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Female	1.1	93.9	5.0	100.0
15-29	0.0	92.6	7.4	100.0
30-49	2.3	96.3	1.4	100.0
50-64	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	31.6	68.4	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

Table 5.10 shows the percentage distribution of the underemployed population by employer. Overall, the underemployed population mostly works for a private employer at 96 percent.

Neither poverty status nor cluster location seem to be correlated with type of employer of the underemployed population. The gender breakdown reveals that the underemployed male population is vastly concentrated in private employers at 97 percent. The share for females is lower, at 94 percent. The age-group analysis shows that only the young cohorts have positive shares of underemployed workers working for the household.

The percentage distribution of the underemployed population by main economic activity is presented in Table 5.11. Overall, 85 percent of the underemployed workers are dedicated to agriculture.

The breakdown by poverty status does not show important differences. In accessible villages, 87 percent of the underemployed population works in agriculture, 9 percent in services. In remote villages, the share of unemployed population in agriculture and services are somewhat lower, at 84 percent and 6 percent.

The gender breakdown shows that underemployed women have a higher share dedicated to agriculture than underemployed males, who have slightly higher shares in mining, manufacturing,

5 Employment

Table 5.11 - Percentage distribution of the underemployed population by activity

	Agriculture	Mining/manuf/ energy/constr	private services	Domestic duties	Other	Total
Total	85.1	2.6	7.5	1.3	3.4	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	86.8	3.4	9.2	0.6	0.0	100.0
Remote	83.6	1.8	6.0	2.0	6.5	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	85.8	3.1	7.9	1.8	1.4	100.0
Non-poor	84.6	2.2	7.3	1.0	4.9	100.0
Gender and age						
Male	81.5	4.3	7.7	0.8	5.7	100.0
15-29	80.3	5.5	11.4	2.8	0.0	100.0
30-49	80.7	5.2	6.9	0.0	7.3	100.0
50-64	79.1	0.0	6.3	0.0	14.6	100.0
65+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	90.5	0.0	7.4	2.2	0.0	100.0
15-29	85.9	0.0	12.3	1.9	0.0	100.0
30-49	94.6	0.0	5.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
50-64	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	31.6	0.0	0.0	68.4	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is underemployed population aged 15+

energy and construction, and 'other' activities. No particular trends emerge when analysing by age-groups

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. In the whole

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	Infirmary	Retired	Other	Total
Total	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Remote	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Non-poor	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Female	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
15-29	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
30-49	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
50-64	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
65+	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is unemployed population aged 15+

sample only 0.1 percent of the adult population is unemployed, resulting in a sample size too small to draw solid statistical conclusions. However, they are all from non-poor households, remote villages 15 and 29 years old. The only cause cited is 'no work available'.

Table 5.13 shows the main causes of economic inactivity. Overall, infirmity is the main reason for inactivity, affecting almost half of the inactive population (31 percent). Being a student has the second highest share (23 percent), followed by being too old or retired (14 percent), seasonal inactivity (13 percent), and household duties (6 percent). Around 14 percent of the inactive population reported other causes.

Seasonal inactivity is more important in remote clusters than in accessible clusters. In turn, in accessible clusters being a student or too old are more important causes for inactivity. The breakdown by poverty status shows that in non-poor households infirmity is a more important cause of inactivity than in poor households.

The breakdown by age-groups shows that infirmity occurs across the whole inactive population, but the share of females reporting infirmity is higher than that for

males (48 percent of males, 22 percent of females). The second most important cause for males was being a student (26 percent), whereas for females was being too old (21 percent).

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.

In remote villages, household activities are undertaken by similar or higher shares of the population than in accessible villages. Similarly, in poor households household activities are undertaken by similar or higher shares of the population than in 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 most rates fluctuating between 85 and 95 percent. The shares for males fluctuate around 40 percent, except for taking care of the sick and elderly (89 percent).

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

	No work available	Seasonal inactivity	Student	HH/Family duties	Age: too old	Age: too young	Infirmity	Retired	Other	Total
Total	0.0	12.9	22.7	5.9	13.0	0.0	30.6	1.1	13.9	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	0.0	7.0	28.0	6.4	15.8	0.0	31.4	2.1	9.4	100.0
Remote	0.0	19.9	16.3	5.3	9.7	0.0	29.6	0.0	19.2	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	0.0	12.3	23.9	4.6	14.6	0.0	25.6	3.0	15.9	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	13.3	21.9	6.7	12.0	0.0	33.5	0.0	12.7	100.0
Gender and age										
Male	0.0	17.2	25.9	4.6	8.8	0.0	22.0	1.7	19.8	100.0
15-29	0.0	6.7	52.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	14.2	0.0	22.4	100.0
30-49	0.0	36.6	0.0	14.5	0.0	0.0	5.9	9.3	33.6	100.0
50-64	0.0	22.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.2	0.0	17.0	100.0
65+	0.0	22.0	0.0	0.0	52.2	0.0	25.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	4.2	16.1	8.4	21.4	0.0	47.8	0.0	2.1	100.0
15-29	0.0	0.0	41.4	21.6	0.0	0.0	31.5	0.0	5.5	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	9.3	0.0	90.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
65+	0.0	12.1	0.0	0.0	58.3	0.0	29.5	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

1. Base is inactive population aged 15+

5 Employment

The analysis of age-groups shows that for males the shares decrease with age in all activities, but regain importance in the oldest cohort. Similarly, in the case of females the shares decrease with age, showing sharp decreases in the oldest cohort.

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	65.3	63.4	65.5	59.8	60.6	91.3
Cluster Location						
Accessible	64.7	60.1	65.8	60.0	58.1	91.3
Remote	66.0	66.7	65.2	59.7	62.9	91.3
Poverty Status						
Poor	66.8	66.4	65.3	60.6	66.8	93.5
Non-poor	64.1	61.0	65.7	59.2	55.5	89.6
Gender and age						
Male	39.5	40.9	41.2	24.1	39.4	89.4
15-29	67.8	57.8	49.4	38.5	39.3	88.2
30-49	16.9	22.9	34.1	11.0	44.9	94.5
50-64	14.3	32.3	35.3	12.8	29.2	87.6
65+	21.8	35.3	35.7	18.8	39.2	78.8
Female	91.6	86.3	90.2	96.2	82.1	93.3
15-29	98.2	90.1	93.5	97.7	84.1	95.8
30-49	96.4	90.6	96.0	99.0	90.4	96.4
50-64	78.0	79.0	83.0	95.6	76.3	92.3
65+	39.9	47.3	45.3	69.4	29.8	57.5

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

	Fetching water	Fetching firewood	Cleaning toilet	Cooking	Care of children	Care or elderly/sick
Total	93.7	56.0	45.5	44.9	58.6	60.6
Cluster Location						
Accessible	94.8	58.9	48.5	53.3	60.0	62.9
Remote	92.5	53.0	42.3	36.0	57.2	58.3
Poverty Status						
Poor	93.4	62.5	43.9	43.6	61.4	62.8
Non-poor	94.0	47.9	47.5	46.4	55.2	58.0
Gender and age						
Male	91.9	52.6	41.3	32.0	51.7	57.4
5-9	89.0	34.9	25.1	16.9	44.0	34.5
10-14	94.7	69.3	56.7	46.4	59.1	79.1
Female	95.8	60.2	50.5	60.4	67.0	64.5
5-9	94.0	41.9	24.1	28.0	58.5	43.6
10-14	97.3	75.9	73.1	88.3	74.3	82.5
Orphan status						
Orphaned	91.7	56.6	47.9	54.3	48.0	70.6
Not-orphaned	94.1	56.1	45.3	44.0	59.9	59.8
Foster status						
Fostered	88.2	43.6	31.4	25.6	48.1	39.9
Not-fostered	93.9	57.0	46.6	45.8	59.8	61.7

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

5.6 Child Labour

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

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

The breakdown by orphan status shows that orphaned children are more likely to help cooking and to take care of elderly and sick, whereas non-orphaned children are more likely to take care of children. The breakdown by foster status shows that non-fostered children have higher shares performing each activity.

The main descriptive statistics for child labour are presented in Table 5.16. The most important result of the table is that 55 percent of the children are economically active. Their main economic activity is mostly household duties at 91 percent. The share of working children is higher in accessible villages and poor households. The particular activity does not show evident correlation with remoteness, poverty status, or even gender.

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 work in the household, with counted exceptions working for a private employer.

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 81 and 54 percent, respectively. In turn, fostered children are more likely to be working than non-fostered children, but the difference is somewhat lower (69 and 54 percent). Orphaned children are more

likely to work in agriculture than non-orphaned children, more likely to do household duties.

Table 5.16 Child Labour (age 5 to 14)

	Working	Main activity			Employer	
		Agriculture	Household	Other	Private	Household
Total	54.9	2.1	90.8	7.1	7.9	92.1
Cluster Location						
Accessible	57.0	1.9	91.2	6.9	6.3	93.7
Remote	52.8	2.3	90.4	7.2	9.6	90.4
Poverty Status						
Poor	57.4	1.5	90.9	7.6	7.0	93.0
Non-poor	52.1	2.8	90.7	6.4	9.0	91.0
Gender and age						
Male	55.8	3.8	89.7	6.5	7.8	92.2
5-9	37.9	0.0	87.0	13.0	13.0	87.0
10-14	97.3	7.2	92.1	0.6	3.0	97.0
Female	53.9	0.1	92.2	7.8	8.0	92.0
5-9	34.6	0.0	83.5	16.5	17.9	82.1
10-14	99.1	0.1	99.2	0.6	0.0	100.0
Orphan status						
Orphaned	81.1	5.4	92.5	2.0	4.4	95.6
Not-orphaned	53.5	1.7	90.6	7.6	8.3	91.7
Foster status						
Fostered	69.0	11.2	83.1	5.7	15.6	84.4
Not-fostered	53.6	1.5	91.4	7.2	7.1	92.9

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

5 Employment

6 PERCEPTIONS ON WELFARE AND CHANGES WITHIN COMMUNITIES

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

6.1 Economic Situation

The analysis of this section is based solely on the perception of the interviewees. The main respondent for this part of the questionnaire was the household head. In cases where the household head was not able to respond i.e. was travelling, sick or had little information on the household's daily practices, then the best-informed household member responded. The respondents were asked to comment on whether the situation had changed for the better/worse or remained the same compared to the year prior 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 17 percent of all households in the district reported a positive change in the economic situation of their community. 20 percent of the population reported observing no changes in their community's economic situation. Even though the majority reported the

(28 percent) reported the situation to be much worse while the rest reported it to be worse.

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	27.6	30.7	19.9	17.2	0.2	4.4	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	21.9	29.8	20.7	23.1	0.0	4.6	100.0
Remote	32.6	31.6	19.2	12.0	0.4	4.2	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	32.6	31.1	16.1	16.0	0.0	4.2	100.0
Non-poor	24.4	30.5	22.3	17.9	0.3	4.5	100.0
Household size							
1-2	25.5	32.5	20.5	13.9	0.0	7.7	100.0
3-4	24.4	27.3	25.5	16.2	0.8	5.8	100.0
5-6	23.1	34.7	20.1	18.0	0.0	4.1	100.0
7+	34.6	29.4	15.3	18.7	0.0	2.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	37.1	22.5	10.9	20.2	2.6	6.7	100.0
< 1 ha	24.9	25.9	22.3	23.2	0.0	3.7	100.0
1-1.99 ha	21.8	25.1	27.9	18.0	0.0	7.2	100.0
2-3.99 ha	22.1	34.8	25.1	13.2	0.0	4.8	100.0
4-5.99 ha	27.2	33.9	16.8	19.1	0.0	3.1	100.0
6+ ha	34.3	29.9	15.6	17.2	0.0	3.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	27.9	29.5	20.4	17.3	0.3	4.5	100.0
Small only	27.2	32.7	19.2	16.7	0.0	4.2	100.0
Large only	17.4	41.7	14.5	26.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	30.9	69.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	29.8	18.8	20.2	27.0	0.0	4.2	100.0
Self-employed - ag	27.4	31.8	20.7	15.6	0.3	4.3	100.0
Self-employed - oth	27.7	32.0	16.4	20.7	0.0	3.3	100.0
Other	28.5	5.5	11.8	35.7	0.0	18.5	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	28.6	30.5	19.0	17.9	0.2	3.7	100.0
Female	21.5	32.0	25.5	12.7	0.0	8.3	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	67.3	32.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	29.3	27.9	19.0	19.4	0.0	4.4	100.0
Polygamous	26.1	35.5	23.2	10.8	1.0	3.5	100.0
Loose union	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	22.8	34.6	20.0	17.1	0.0	5.5	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	27.3	32.2	20.9	12.8	0.0	6.8	100.0
Primary	27.5	32.2	18.4	18.7	0.4	2.9	100.0
Secondary +	29.5	13.1	26.9	25.8	0.0	4.6	100.0

community economic condition to have deteriorated (59 percent) over a quarter

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

About a half (52 percent) of the people living in accessible clusters report a deterioration in their community's economic situation compared to 65 percent of those living in remote clusters. Poverty status of the household shows correlation with the perceived economic change, as there is a difference of 11 percentage points between the poor and non-poor who reported deterioration in

their community's economic situation, at 64 and 55 percent respectively.

Furthermore, the percentage of households with seven or more members who reported worsening of the community's economic situation is slightly higher than that of households with one or two members at 65 and 59 percent respectively. Similarly, there is a difference of 5 percentage points between households owning six or more

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	32.9	27.2	24.7	14.4	0.8	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	23.7	29.7	30.4	15.3	0.9	0.0	100.0
Remote	41.0	24.9	19.7	13.6	0.8	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	39.0	29.2	21.6	9.6	0.6	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	29.1	25.9	26.6	17.4	1.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	36.0	20.3	31.9	11.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	30.3	27.1	29.6	11.3	1.6	0.0	100.0
5-6	32.9	26.5	22.3	17.5	0.8	0.0	100.0
7+	33.6	30.8	19.7	15.2	0.6	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	43.1	20.5	12.6	23.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	40.6	22.8	31.9	4.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	28.3	23.6	34.8	13.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	31.3	31.6	23.1	11.0	3.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	31.7	28.4	22.5	17.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	33.0	26.1	25.7	15.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	32.9	26.5	25.5	14.5	0.6	0.0	100.0
Small only	34.2	28.4	23.1	12.8	1.5	0.0	100.0
Large only	17.4	24.3	14.5	43.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	0.0	69.1	30.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	27.3	17.1	20.7	34.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	33.2	27.3	25.6	12.8	1.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	33.5	32.1	17.6	16.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	29.4	11.8	50.4	8.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	33.3	26.9	23.0	15.8	1.0	0.0	100.0
Female	30.5	28.6	34.8	6.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	84.4	15.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	31.8	26.8	22.5	18.2	0.7	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	33.0	30.1	24.7	10.3	1.9	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	34.9	25.7	32.8	6.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	37.8	26.6	25.8	9.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	32.1	27.2	24.1	15.5	1.1	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	17.2	29.2	24.1	26.6	2.8	0.0	100.0

hectares of land and those owning no land

who reported worse conditions in the community's economic situation at 64 and 60 percent respectively. All households (100 percent) owning both small and large livestock report worse conditions in their community's economic situation compared to 57 percent of households owning no livestock.

Disaggregation of the data further shows that while 59 percent of households whose main income earner is self-employed in agriculture reported the community's economic situation as worse, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is only 49 percent. Furthermore, while all (100 percent) households where the household head is single report worse economic conditions in their communities, the share for 'loose union' is virtually null.

It is also observed that 60 percent of household heads who have primary or no education report deterioration in the economic conditions of their communities compared to 43 percent of household heads who have secondary education or more. Likewise, a larger percentage of male-headed households report worse economic conditions in their communities than female-headed households.

6.1.2 Perception of Change in the Economic Situation of the Household

Table 6.2 shows the percent distribution of households by the perception of their economic situation compared to the year before the survey. Only 15 percent reported an improvement in the economic conditions of the household, while a quarter (25 percent) reported same conditions compared to the year preceding the survey.

While about two thirds (66 percent) of those living in remote clusters reported economic deterioration of the household, the share for accessible clusters was 54 percent. The same pattern is observed between the poor and non-poor households. Poor households express negative views on their household's economic condition more often than non-poor households, at 68 and 55 percent respectively.

The percentage of households reporting worse economic conditions is higher for

larger households. Furthermore, while a quarter (25 percent) of households owning no land report an improvement in the economic conditions of their households, the share for households owning six or more hectares of land is only 14 percent. Likewise, 58 percent of households owning large livestock report better economic conditions compared to 13 percent of households owning small livestock and 15 percent of households who own no livestock.

35 percent of 'employees' report better household economic conditions compared to only 8 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group. Similarly, the percentage of male-headed households who report better economic conditions is higher than that of female-headed households at 17 and 6 percent respectively. Furthermore, while all (100 percent) households where the household head is single report deterioration in their households' economic conditions, the share of households where the head has a loose union (not officially married) is virtually null. Finally, the percentage of households reporting much worse economic conditions is higher for household heads who have no education than for household heads who have secondary education or more at 38 and 17 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 the survey. These household needs are such as food, school fees, house rent, utility bills and healthcare. For each household, the respondent was asked to say whether they never, seldom, often or always experience difficulties in satisfying the specified household need.

6.2.1 Food Needs

Table 6.3 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in satisfying the food needs of the household during the year before the survey. Overall, 64 percent of the district's households never/seldom experience food shortages while the remaining population experience food

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

shortages frequently (often/always). While more than a quarter (26 percent) of households in accessible clusters has never experienced food shortages, the share for households in remote clusters is 19 percent. Likewise, 28 percent of non-poor households have never experienced food shortages compared to 14 percent of poor households.

Households with larger landholdings tend to report frequent problems satisfying food

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	22.5	41.1	34.4	2.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	26.5	36.2	35.7	1.6	100.0
Remote	19.0	45.4	33.2	2.4	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	14.9	41.3	41.7	2.0	100.0
Non-poor	27.3	40.9	29.7	2.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	16.6	42.0	39.5	1.8	100.0
3-4	31.2	34.4	32.6	1.9	100.0
5-6	20.4	37.4	39.2	3.0	100.0
7+	20.2	48.9	29.5	1.4	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	8.6	49.1	37.8	4.5	100.0
< 1 ha	6.3	20.1	70.9	2.6	100.0
1-1.99 ha	11.9	29.1	53.6	5.4	100.0
2-3.99 ha	27.5	33.5	37.3	1.7	100.0
4-5.99 ha	21.6	53.8	24.6	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	31.1	45.9	21.3	1.6	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	22.0	40.2	36.3	1.5	100.0
Small only	25.5	40.3	31.5	2.7	100.0
Large only	0.0	82.6	0.0	17.4	100.0
Both	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	24.7	30.3	45.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agricul	21.7	42.2	33.8	2.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	28.5	41.0	28.7	1.8	100.0
Other	5.5	19.6	74.9	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	23.5	42.7	32.3	1.5	100.0
Female	16.6	31.4	46.7	5.4	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	15.6	84.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	25.5	43.4	29.2	1.9	100.0
Polygamous	19.9	42.8	37.3	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	16.3	29.8	49.2	4.8	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	19.8	44.0	33.5	2.7	100.0
Primary	22.5	40.1	35.5	1.9	100.0
Secondary +	35.0	35.5	29.5	0.0	100.0

the survey, only 23 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported frequent problems satisfying food needs compared to 42 percent of the landless households. Similarly, while 42 percent of households with one or two members experience food shortages frequently (often/always), the share for households with seven or more members is 31 percent. Furthermore, there is also some correlation between livestock ownership and satisfying food needs. While 37 percent of households owning no livestock frequently experience food shortages, the share for households owning both small and large livestock is virtually null. All households owning both small and large livestock seldom experience food shortages compared to only 40 percent of those owning small livestock and those owning no livestock.

The socio-economic group of the household also shows some correlation with the household's ability to satisfy its food needs. While three quarters (75 percent) of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group report frequent problems satisfying food needs, the share for households whose main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities is only 29 percent. Furthermore, while 38 percent of polygamous households and 31 percent of monogamous households experienced frequent problems satisfying food needs (often/always), the share for households where the household head is single and households where the head has a loose union (not officially married) is virtually null.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households report having more food shortages than male-headed households as 51 percent of female-headed households experienced frequent food shortages compared to 34 percent of male-headed households. Likewise, households where the heads has primary or no education are more likely to experience food shortages than households where the head has secondary education or more.

needs with less frequency. At the time of

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	91.6	2.5	5.7	0.1	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	88.8	3.5	7.4	0.3	100.0
Remote	94.1	1.7	4.2	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	86.7	3.8	9.1	0.3	100.0
Non-poor	94.7	1.7	3.5	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	97.6	1.0	1.4	0.0	100.0
5-6	91.6	2.1	6.3	0.0	100.0
7+	83.3	5.2	11.0	0.4	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	92.7	3.7	3.7	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	89.2	1.2	8.5	1.1	100.0
2-3.99 ha	92.3	3.4	4.2	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	93.9	2.3	3.8	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	87.1	3.0	9.9	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	93.2	1.6	4.9	0.2	100.0
Small only	89.0	4.2	6.8	0.0	100.0
Large only	56.3	17.4	26.4	0.0	100.0
Both	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	88.1	0.0	11.9	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	91.8	2.1	5.9	0.2	100.0
Self-employed - other	90.6	6.2	3.1	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	91.9	3.0	5.2	0.0	100.0
Female	90.2	0.0	8.9	0.9	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	92.1	1.9	6.0	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	88.2	6.6	5.2	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	93.6	0.0	5.7	0.7	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	95.8	1.8	2.0	0.4	100.0
Primary	90.1	2.9	7.0	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	84.1	3.1	12.9	0.0	100.0

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, 92 percent of the households in the district reported that they never had problems paying school fees and only 6 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).

Households located in remote clusters report less problems paying school fees than households located in accessible clusters. While 94 percent of households

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

Table 6.5: Percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	98.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	98.8	1.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	97.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	96.1	3.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	94.7	5.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	88.4	11.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	94.6	5.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
2-3.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	98.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	97.3	2.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Small only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	95.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	97.1	2.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	98.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	98.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	97.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	98.8	1.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Primary	97.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	96.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	100.0

located in remote clusters never had problems with paying school fees the share for households located in accessible clusters is 89 percent. Likewise, 95 percent of people living in non-poor households have never had problems paying school fees compared to 87 percent of people living in poor households.

It is observed that while all (100 percent) households with one or two members have never had problems paying school fees, the share for households with seven or

more members is 84 percent. Similarly, all (100 percent) households owning no land report that they never have problems paying school fees compared to 88 percent of households with six or more hectares of land.

While all households owning both large and small livestock never had problems paying school fees, the share for households owning large livestock is only 42 percent. Similarly, all households whose main income earner belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group never had problems with paying school fees compared to 88 percent of households whose main income earner is an employee.

Furthermore, while all households where the head is single or in a loose union never had problems paying school fees, the share for polygamous households is 89 percent. Lastly, households where the household head has secondary education or more claim to have problems paying school fees more often than households where the head has primary or no education.

6.2.2 Paying House Rent

Table 6.5 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying house rent during the year before the survey. Almost all (98 percent) households in the district report that they never have problems paying house rent. Although a small percentage 12 percent of households owning no land report that they seldom have problems paying house rent. Other selected household characteristics such as poverty status, cluster location, household size, livestock ownership, socio-economic group, gender, marital status and education level do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay house rent.

6.2.4 Paying Utility Bills

Table 6.6 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying 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. 97 percent of households in the district did not face problems with paying utility bills. However, it is observed that 7 percent of households owning one acre of land and 8 percent of households heads who have secondary education or more report

seldom having problems with paying utility bills. Other household characteristics such as poverty status, cluster location, household size, livestock ownership, socio-economic group, gender, marital status, do not show strong correlation with the ability to pay utility bills.

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

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always	Total
Total	97.5	2.2	0.0	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	97.4	2.1	0.0	0.6	100.0
Remote	97.6	2.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	96.8	2.5	0.0	0.7	100.0
Non-poor	97.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size					
1-2	98.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	98.5	0.4	0.0	1.1	100.0
5-6	99.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	94.9	5.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	97.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	92.7	7.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
1-1.99 ha	96.4	1.3	0.0	2.3	100.0
2-3.99 ha	98.3	1.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	97.9	2.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	98.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	97.9	1.7	0.0	0.4	100.0
Small only	96.1	3.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Large only	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Both	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	95.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	98.2	1.5	0.0	0.3	100.0
Self-employed - other	94.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	97.7	2.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	96.5	1.6	0.0	1.9	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	97.8	2.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Polygamous	95.6	4.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	98.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	99.2	0.0	0.0	0.8	100.0
Primary	97.2	2.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Secondary +	91.6	8.4	0.0	0.0	100.0

6.2.5 Paying for Healthcare

Table 6.7 shows the percent distribution of households by the difficulty in paying for healthcare during the year before the survey. 66 percent of households interviewed at the time of the survey reported that they never/seldom

experience problems paying for healthcare. Disaggregation of the data further shows that while 71 percent of households located in remote clusters never/seldom experience problems paying for healthcare, the share for households located in accessible clusters is 61 percent. Likewise, the percentage of non-poor households who reported that they never/seldom experience problems paying for healthcare is higher than that of poor

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	25.2	41.4	30.8	2.5	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	21.3	40.1	36.7	1.8	100.0
Remote	28.7	42.5	25.6	3.1	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	22.5	41.6	32.1	3.8	100.0
Non-poor	27.0	41.3	30.0	1.7	100.0
Household size					
1-2	19.0	39.4	37.0	4.6	100.0
3-4	31.9	36.9	29.6	1.6	100.0
5-6	27.6	37.8	31.5	3.1	100.0
7+	20.9	48.7	28.5	1.9	100.0
Area of land owned by the household					
None	22.6	37.5	30.7	9.2	100.0
< 1 ha	18.4	37.2	42.5	1.9	100.0
1-1.99 ha	19.8	37.6	38.8	3.8	100.0
2-3.99 ha	25.1	38.4	35.9	0.6	100.0
4-5.99 ha	25.2	47.0	24.5	3.3	100.0
6+ ha	30.4	43.8	24.6	1.3	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household					
None	25.5	40.0	31.4	3.1	100.0
Small only	24.4	45.8	28.6	1.2	100.0
Large only	24.3	17.4	58.3	0.0	100.0
Both	30.9	69.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	39.7	35.1	25.2	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	23.9	42.3	31.3	2.5	100.0
Self-employed - other	30.0	41.9	28.2	0.0	100.0
Other	5.5	16.7	47.5	30.3	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	26.3	43.5	28.2	2.1	100.0
Female	19.2	28.9	46.6	5.3	100.0
Marital status of the head of household					
Single	15.6	84.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	25.3	44.6	28.5	1.7	100.0
Polygamous	30.1	36.4	31.0	2.5	100.0
Loose union	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	19.0	36.0	39.5	5.5	100.0
Education level of the head of household					
None	22.2	38.1	36.1	3.6	100.0
Primary	27.0	43.6	27.2	2.2	100.0
Secondary +	26.0	40.0	34.0	0.0	100.0

households at 68 and 63 percent respectively.

42 percent of households with one or two members report often/always having problems paying for healthcare compared to 31 percent of households with seven or more members. Likewise, while 40 percent of households owning no land report often/always having problems paying for healthcare, the share for households with large acreages of land (six or more) is 27 percent. Similarly, while more than three quarters (77 percent) of households owning large livestock often experience problems paying for healthcare, the share for households owning both large and small animals is virtually null. It is also observed that three quarters (75 percent) of the households belonging to the 'employee' socio-economic group never/seldom have problems paying for healthcare compared to 23 percent of households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group.

While all (100 percent) households whose head has a loose union (not officially married) never had problems paying for healthcare, the share for households where the household head is single is only 16 percent. More than a half (52 percent) of female-headed households often/always experienced problems paying for healthcare compared to 30 percent of male-headed households. Lastly, 40

percent of households where the head has no education often/always had problems paying for healthcare compared to 34 percent of households where the head has secondary education or more.

6.2 Assets and Household Occupancy Status

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

Table 6.8: Percentage of households owning certain assets

	Home	Land	Livestock			Vehicle	Motor-cycle	Bicycle	Wheel barrow
			Small	Large	Both				
Total	88.6	92.1	27.2	1.3	0.5	0.0	0.1	27.6	1.1
Cluster Location									
Accessible	92.4	94.2	27.4	2.2	0.3	0.0	0.2	30.2	1.4
Remote	85.3	90.2	27.1	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	25.3	0.8
Poverty Status									
Poor	91.1	95.2	31.5	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.1	1.8
Non-poor	87.1	90.1	24.5	1.6	0.8	0.0	0.2	34.3	0.7
Household size									
1-2	87.5	80.0	15.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.5	0.0
3-4	80.2	90.0	21.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.4	34.0	0.0
5-6	88.0	94.5	25.0	0.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	21.5	0.0
7+	96.1	96.9	38.7	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.9	3.3
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	77.7	85.3	26.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	89.8	94.3	28.1	1.7	0.6	0.0	0.1	29.1	1.4
Self-employed - other	84.5	80.7	21.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.0	0.0
Other	100.0	100.0	38.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	88.1	91.7	28.8	1.6	0.6	0.0	0.1	30.7	1.3
Female	91.5	94.1	17.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.2	0.0

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

Table 6.9: Percent distribution of households by occupancy status

Total	88.6	6.2	3.1	2.1	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	92.4	2.2	3.1	2.2	100.0
Remote	85.3	9.7	3.1	1.9	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	91.1	4.3	2.9	1.7	100.0
Non-poor	87.1	7.4	3.2	2.3	100.0
Household size					
1-2	87.5	8.6	3.9	0.0	100.0
3-4	80.2	11.7	3.6	4.5	100.0
5-6	88.0	5.4	4.5	2.1	100.0
7+	96.1	1.6	1.2	1.1	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	77.7	9.9	9.5	2.9	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	89.8	6.1	2.7	1.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	84.5	6.0	3.5	6.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	88.1	6.5	2.9	2.4	100.0
Female	91.5	4.3	4.2	0.0	100.0

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	3.6	0.8	4.6	12.0	78.9	100.0	9.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	1.2	0.5	2.3	11.6	84.4	100.0	4.0
Remote	5.7	1.1	6.6	12.4	74.1	100.0	13.5
Poverty Status							
Poor	3.6	0.4	4.7	7.6	83.6	100.0	8.7
Non-poor	3.6	1.1	4.5	14.8	76.0	100.0	9.2
Household size							
1-2	4.3	4.2	2.6	8.4	80.5	100.0	11.0
3-4	4.3	0.8	6.7	15.6	72.6	100.0	11.8
5-6	2.9	0.0	1.1	8.3	87.7	100.0	4.0
7+	3.3	0.0	6.7	14.0	76.0	100.0	10.1
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	5.6	4.8	7.4	23.1	59.2	100.0	17.8
Self-employed - agriculture	4.2	0.5	4.8	9.9	80.7	100.0	9.4
Self-employed - other	0.0	1.5	3.2	20.3	75.1	100.0	4.7
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.2	84.8	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	3.7	0.7	4.9	12.2	78.6	100.0	9.3
Female	2.9	1.5	2.9	11.4	81.2	100.0	7.3

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

only 1 percent of all households owns large livestock. While more than a quarter (28 percent) of all households owns a bicycle, the share for households owning a car or a motorcycle is virtually

Table 6.9 shows the percent distribution of households by occupancy status. 92 percent of households located in accessible clusters own their dwellings compared to 85 percent of households located in remote clusters. Likewise, the percentage of poor households owning their own dwellings is slightly higher than that of non-poor households at 91 and 87 percent respectively. Disaggregation of the data shows that 96 percent of households with seven or more members own their dwellings compared to 81 percent of households with three or four members. Furthermore, while all households whose main income earner belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group own their dwellings, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is 78 percent. Disaggregation of the data further shows that 31 percent of male-headed households own a bicycle compared to only 9 percent of female-headed households. Likewise, 35 percent of households with seven or more members own a bicycle compared to only 14 percent of households with one or two members.

6.3.1 Occupancy Documentation

The percent distribution of households by type of occupancy documentation is shown in Table 6.10. Most residents in the district do not have any documentation to verify their occupancy status. Only 10 percent of the households possess formal occupancy documentation, which include a title deed, renting contract or payment receipt. 79 percent of households in this district have no documentation at all.

6.4 Agriculture

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

6.3.1 Asset Ownership

Table 6.8 shows the percent distribution of households owning a selected group of assets. Overall, 89 percent of the district's households own their dwellings while 92 percent owns some land. 27 percent of all households own small livestock while

Table 6.11 Percentage of households using agriculture inputs and the percentage using certain inputs

	% of hhs using	Fertilizer	Improved seedling	Fingerlings	Hooks and nets	Insecticides	Other
Total	15.7	39.8	38.1	0.0	30.4	9.9	0.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	9.8	63.1	38.7	0.0	3.5	6.4	0.0
Remote	20.9	30.1	37.9	0.0	41.5	11.3	0.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	12.2	46.7	52.5	0.0	28.6	10.2	0.0
Non-poor	17.9	36.8	31.9	0.0	31.1	9.7	0.0
Household size							
1-2	9.2	12.0	52.6	0.0	51.3	0.0	0.0
3-4	16.6	48.1	28.6	0.0	25.5	6.2	0.0
5-6	15.1	24.3	42.2	0.0	33.5	11.8	0.0
7+	18.2	50.5	38.8	0.0	27.0	13.3	0.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	1.9	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	15.9	44.6	43.6	0.0	21.4	12.3	0.0
Self-employed - other	20.2	13.2	13.3	0.0	73.5	0.0	0.0
Other	8.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	17.9	39.0	38.4	0.0	31.1	10.1	0.0
Female	2.5	74.4	25.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

6.4.1 Agricultural Inputs

The survey collected information on agricultural practices. Data gathered was on 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 16 percent of all farmers apply agricultural inputs to their farms and 41 percent of those who use farm inputs apply fertilizers. The percentage of households located in remote clusters using agricultural inputs is more than twice that of household's located in accessible clusters, at 21 and 10 percent respectively. Likewise, the percentage of non-poor households using agricultural inputs is higher than that of poor households at 17 and 13 percent respectively.

Disaggregation of the data shows that 17 percent of households with seven or more household members use farm inputs compared to 9 percent of households with one or two members. Likewise, use of

agricultural inputs in male-headed households is higher than in female-headed households at 18 and 3 percent respectively. Furthermore, while 20 percent of households, whose main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities use agricultural inputs, the share for households whose main income earner is an employee is only 2 percent.

Most households that use agricultural inputs purchase them at an open market (77 percent) and only 9 percent obtain them from government. While 6 percent of the households get their inputs from cooperatives, 8 percent obtain them by preparing them themselves and none report donor agencies as their main source.

Data also shows that the percentage of households located in remote clusters who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is higher than that of households located in accessible clusters at 80 and 72 percent respectively. Likewise, the percentage of non-poor households who purchase agricultural inputs at an open market is 5 percentage points higher than that of poor households.

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

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	78.1	8.2	0.0	5.8	7.9	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	71.6	9.6	0.0	5.1	13.8	100.0
Remote	80.9	7.6	0.0	6.1	5.4	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	73.9	7.1	0.0	6.7	12.3	100.0
Non-poor	80.0	8.7	0.0	5.4	6.0	100.0
Household size						
1-2	59.2	28.7	0.0	0.0	12.0	100.0
3-4	77.2	13.9	0.0	0.0	8.8	100.0
5-6	88.2	0.0	0.0	8.2	3.6	100.0
7+	75.9	5.5	0.0	9.1	9.4	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	72.6	10.2	0.0	7.2	9.9	100.0
Self-employed - other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	78.2	8.4	0.0	5.9	7.5	100.0
Female	74.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.6	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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	7.9	5.6	12.2	27.2	22.2	25.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	5.8	5.3	14.5	33.0	22.6	18.8	100.0
Remote	9.8	5.8	10.1	22.0	21.9	30.4	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	4.8	4.0	15.0	30.5	25.8	19.9	100.0
Non-poor	9.9	6.5	10.4	25.1	20.0	28.1	100.0
Household size							
1-2	20.0	10.6	14.9	13.3	16.1	25.1	100.0
3-4	10.0	6.5	11.7	27.9	20.0	23.8	100.0
5-6	5.5	5.7	11.5	37.2	21.0	19.1	100.0
7+	3.1	2.5	11.9	24.5	27.5	30.6	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	14.7	9.0	22.7	35.8	12.2	5.6	100.0
Self-employed - agric	5.7	3.7	11.9	26.4	24.7	27.6	100.0
Self-employed - other	19.3	12.4	8.8	29.8	13.7	16.0	100.0
Other	0.0	24.5	23.6	16.7	5.5	29.7	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	8.3	4.8	10.2	26.4	23.0	27.3	100.0
Female	5.9	10.1	23.6	31.5	17.5	11.4	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

72 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture purchase their agricultural inputs at an open market compared to 100 percent of the other socio-economic categories. Furthermore, while more than

a quarter (26 percent) of female-headed households obtains agricultural inputs by preparing them themselves, the share for male-headed households is only 8 percent. In contrast, male-headed households are more likely to obtain agricultural inputs

from government than female-headed households. Similarly, while 29 percent households with one or two members obtain agricultural inputs from government, the share for households with seven or more members is only 6 percent.

6.4.2 Landholding

Table 6.13 shows the percent distribution of households by the area of land owned. Around 27 percent of households own less than two acres of land (including 8 percent of landless households). 27 percent owns between two and four acres and 47 percent owns four or more acres.

Landless households are more common in remote clusters and non-poor households. Regarding household size, while 20 percent of households with one or two members are landless, the share for households with seven or more members is only 3 percent. In contrast, larger households seem to own larger landholdings.

While households where the main income earner is self-employed in non-agricultural activities report the highest share of landless households (19 percent), the share for households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' socio-economic group is virtually null. Finally, male-headed households have larger landholdings (4 or more acres) compared to female-headed households at 50 and 30 percent respectively.

6.4.2 Cattle Ownership

Table 6.14 shows the percent distribution of households by the number of cattle owned. Almost all (99 percent) of households own no cattle at all, and only 1 percent own between one and two heads of cattle. All selected household characteristics such as poverty status, cluster location, household size, socio-economic group and gender 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. 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

More than half (55 percent) the households reported it was better, 24 percent said it was the same while 22 percent reported it was worse. The percentage of households located in accessible clusters who reported the current crime and security situation as better is slightly higher than that of households located in remote clusters at 58 and 53 percent respectively. In turn, the percentage of poor households who reported the current crime and security situation as worse than that of the previous year is higher than that of non-poor households at 27 and 18 percent respectively.

While 59 percent of households with seven or more members reported the current crime and security situation as better, the share for households with one or two members is 47 percent. Similarly, 57 percent of households owning six or more hectares of land reported the current crime and security situation as better compared to only 35 percent of landless households. While 31 percent of households owning both small and large livestock reported the current crime and security situation as much worse, the share for households owning large livestock is virtually null.

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	98.2	0.4	1.1	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	97.5	0.8	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	98.8	0.0	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	99.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	97.6	0.0	1.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	99.1	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	97.5	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	97.3	1.1	0.7	1.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	97.7	0.4	1.4	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	100.0	0.0	0.0	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	97.9	0.4	1.3	0.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

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

	Much Worse		Same	Better	Much Better	Don't Know	Total
Total	9.4	11.3	23.3	45.8	9.8	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	5.7	14.9	22.1	47.0	10.4	0.0	100.0
Remote	12.7	8.2	24.4	44.8	9.3	0.6	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	12.1	13.6	20.2	46.6	7.5	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	7.7	9.9	25.3	45.3	11.2	0.5	100.0
Household size							
1-2	8.1	3.4	40.8	30.8	16.2	0.7	100.0
3-4	9.9	15.0	23.7	40.8	9.8	0.8	100.0
5-6	5.8	13.4	21.9	52.0	6.8	0.0	100.0
7+	12.5	10.3	16.6	51.2	9.4	0.0	100.0
Area of land owned by the household							
None	8.2	4.5	52.0	23.1	12.2	0.0	100.0
< 1 ha	11.8	8.0	24.3	41.7	10.4	3.7	100.0
1-1.99 ha	7.9	20.7	23.3	40.5	6.8	0.9	100.0
2-3.99 ha	3.8	14.2	17.3	53.2	11.4	0.0	100.0
4-5.99 ha	10.7	8.2	25.8	45.0	10.2	0.0	100.0
6+ ha	14.8	9.3	18.4	49.3	8.2	0.0	100.0
Type of livestock owned by the household							
None	11.1	10.0	24.4	44.7	9.4	0.4	100.0
Small only	5.1	14.9	22.0	47.4	10.6	0.0	100.0
Large only	0.0	14.5	0.0	68.1	17.4	0.0	100.0
Both	30.9	0.0	0.0	69.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	5.6	13.0	19.7	57.5	0.0	4.2	100.0
Self-employed - agric	10.9	11.3	20.2	47.0	10.4	0.1	100.0
Self-employed - other	2.5	11.0	38.8	38.1	9.6	0.0	100.0
Other	5.5	11.3	53.9	20.2	9.2	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	9.9	11.3	23.6	45.1	9.7	0.4	100.0
Female	6.3	11.4	21.9	50.3	10.1	0.0	100.0
Marital status of the head of household							
Single	0.0	0.0	82.9	0.0	17.1	0.0	100.0
Monogamous	11.0	13.8	22.9	42.8	9.2	0.3	100.0
Polygamous	8.2	6.0	16.9	62.2	6.8	0.0	100.0
Loose union	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Widow/div/sep	6.1	10.2	30.5	37.7	14.9	0.6	100.0
Education level of the head of household							
None	10.3	11.4	26.0	41.5	10.5	0.3	100.0
Primary	8.9	10.8	22.4	48.2	9.4	0.4	100.0
Secondary +	8.9	15.7	18.8	47.4	9.2	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

Furthermore, 61 percent of female-headed households reported the current crime and security situation as better compared to 54 percent of male-headed households. Similarly, while about 10 percent of households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture or non-agricultural activities, or belongs to the 'other' category reported a much better crime and security situation, the share of

households where the main income earner is an employee is virtually null. On the other hand, while 25 percent of monogamous households reported the current crime and security situation as worse, the shares for households where the household head is single and those whose head has a loose union (not officially married) is virtually null. Lastly, the percentage of households whose head had no education and reported same crime and

security situation is higher than that of household heads with secondary education or more, at 27 and 19 percent respectively.

6.4 Household Income Contributions

Table 6.16 shows the percent distribution of households by main contributor to the household's 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 (88 percent) of households the head is the main contributor.

TABLE 6.16

While 96 percent of households with one or two members report the household head as the main income contributor, the share for households with seven or more members is 87 percent. Furthermore, all (100 percent) households belonging to the 'employee' category report the head as the main income contributor compared to 56 percent of households belonging to the 'other' category.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that up to 12 percent of male-headed households report the spouse as the main income contributor compared to 3 percent of female-headed households.

6.5 Other Household Items

Table 6.17 shows the percentage distribution of households owning selected household items. 72 percent of households

own at least one mattress or bed, 53 percent own a radio, 40 percent own a watch or clock and 13 percent own an electric iron. Although no household owns a fixed line phone, 4 percent own a mobile phone.

Households in accessible clusters have higher rates of ownership in almost every selected item except in ownership of a mattress or bed, watch or clock and electric iron. In turn, non-poor households have higher rates of ownership in every selected item, the largest differences being in ownership of a mattress or bed and of a radio.

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

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

	Principal contributor of income				Total
	Head	Spouse	Child	Other	
Total	87.8	10.4	1.1	0.7	100.0
Cluster Location					
Accessible	87.3	10.2	1.9	0.6	100.0
Remote	88.2	10.6	0.4	0.8	100.0
Poverty Status					
Poor	85.7	12.9	0.9	0.4	100.0
Non-poor	89.1	8.9	1.2	0.9	100.0
Household size					
1-2	95.5	2.6	0.0	1.8	100.0
3-4	86.5	11.3	2.2	0.0	100.0
5-6	84.4	14.5	0.6	0.5	100.0
7+	88.1	9.9	1.1	0.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group					
Employee	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	86.6	12.1	0.9	0.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	94.0	4.7	1.2	0.0	100.0
Other	56.2	8.4	11.8	23.6	100.0
Gender of the head of household					
Male	87.1	11.7	0.6	0.7	100.0
Female	91.9	3.2	3.9	0.9	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

6 Perceptions on welfare and changes within communities

Table 6.17: Percentage of households owning selected household items

	Electric iron	Refrigerator	Sewing machine	Modern stove	Mattress or bed	Watch or clock	Radio	Television	Fixed line phone	Mobile phone
Total	13.2	0.0	4.0	4.4	72.6	39.9	52.6	0.9	0.0	4.7
Cluster Location										
Accessible	13.1	0.0	4.7	5.4	69.9	34.4	55.7	0.4	0.0	6.9
Remote	13.3	0.0	3.4	3.5	75.1	44.9	49.8	1.3	0.0	2.8
Poverty Status										
Poor	7.6	0.0	2.5	2.0	60.4	23.9	36.3	1.1	0.0	3.4
Non-poor	16.7	0.0	5.0	6.0	80.3	50.0	62.9	0.7	0.0	5.5
Household size										
1-2	9.2	0.0	1.8	3.7	66.8	36.8	45.3	1.8	0.0	3.5
3-4	9.7	0.0	3.6	5.7	72.8	31.7	54.0	0.4	0.0	3.1
5-6	16.4	0.0	4.4	3.9	72.9	34.7	48.1	0.3	0.0	3.8
7+	15.0	0.0	5.0	4.2	74.8	51.9	58.4	1.2	0.0	7.3
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	33.6	0.0	4.8	0.0	69.5	56.3	67.6	0.0	0.0	11.5
Self-employed - agric	9.0	0.0	2.6	4.2	71.4	36.5	49.8	0.6	0.0	3.2
Self-employed - other	28.7	0.0	12.3	7.7	81.9	54.1	69.0	2.6	0.0	12.0
Other	22.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	65.1	39.2	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	13.5	0.0	4.5	4.6	74.3	43.2	57.9	1.0	0.0	4.7
Female	11.1	0.0	1.6	3.2	62.8	20.8	21.2	0.0	0.0	5.2

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

7 HOUSEHOLD AMENITIES

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

7.1 Housing Materials and Type of Housing Unit

Table 7.1 shows the distribution of households according to the main material used in the roof of the house. Overall, 25 percent of households have iron sheets as their main roof material and 75 percent have thatch.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in remote villages are more likely to use thatch than households in accessible villages. In turn, households

in accessible villages tend to use iron sheets more often. Similarly, poor households tend to use thatch more often, and non-poor households, iron sheets.

The breakdown by household size shows that smaller households tend to use thatch, but as the size of the household increases, the share of households using iron sheets also increases. The split-up by socio-economic group shows that the self-employed in agriculture is the category with highest share of households using thatch for the roof (at 79 percent), and that employees are the group with the lowest use of thatch (46 percent).

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows that female-headed households use thatch more often than male-headed households, at rates of 89 and 73 percent, respectively.

Table 7.2 shows the distribution of households by type of material used in the walls. Overall, 85 percent of houses are built with mud or mud bricks. Burnt bricks occupy the second place, with a share of 15 percent.

The analysis of cluster location reveals that households in remote villages have a

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	75.1	0.3	24.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	0.0	67.5	0.6	31.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	0.0	81.8	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	0.0	83.5	0.7	15.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	0.0	69.8	0.0	30.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	0.0	92.4	0.0	7.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	0.0	81.1	0.0	18.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.0	73.9	1.0	25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	0.0	63.9	0.0	36.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	0.0	46.4	0.0	53.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	0.0	79.1	0.0	20.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.0	63.5	1.9	34.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	68.6	0.0	31.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	0.0	72.8	0.3	26.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	0.0	88.8	0.0	11.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

7 Household amenities

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

	Mud/ mud bricks	Stone	Burnt bricks	Cement/ sandcrete	Wood/ bamboo	Iron sheets	Cardboard	Total
Total	84.6	0.0	14.8	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location								
Accessible	76.5	0.0	22.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	91.8	0.0	8.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status								
Poor	88.7	0.0	11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	82.0	0.0	16.9	1.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size								
1-2	92.8	0.0	6.2	0.7	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	89.2	0.0	10.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	79.4	0.0	19.7	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	81.9	0.0	17.4	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group								
Employee	81.9	0.0	16.2	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	84.0	0.0	15.5	0.5	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	88.7	0.0	10.6	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	88.7	0.0	11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household								
Male	83.3	0.0	15.9	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	92.1	0.0	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

	Mud/ earth	Wood/ plank	Tiles	Concrete/ cement	Grass	Other	Total
Total	93.9	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location							
Accessible	92.2	0.0	0.0	7.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Remote	95.4	0.0	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status							
Poor	99.3	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	90.5	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Household size							
1-2	96.5	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	94.1	0.0	0.0	5.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
5-6	91.5	0.0	0.0	8.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	94.5	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group							
Employee	76.2	0.0	0.0	23.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	97.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	81.7	0.0	0.0	18.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household							
Male	93.9	0.0	0.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Female	94.2	0.0	0.0	5.8	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

higher share of mud and mud bricks than households in accessible villages. The rates are 92 and 77 percent, respectively. Likewise, poor households use mud or mud bricks more often than non-poor households (89 and 82 percent, respectively). Smaller households (up to 4 members) tend to have higher share of

mud or mud bricks than larger households (5 or more members).

'Self-employed other' and 'other' are the categories with highest shares living in houses made of mud or mud bricks (89 percent each), whereas employees have the highest share living in houses made of burnt bricks (16 percent each).

The gender breakdown shows that households headed by males use burnt bricks more often than female-headed households, at rates of 16 and 8 percent. The distribution of households by type of material used in the floor is shown in Table 7.3. Overall, the floor in 94 percent of households is made of mud or dirt and in 6 percent of concrete.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that households in accessible villages, with a rate of 8 percent, have more houses with concrete floor than households in remote villages, with a rate of 5 percent.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households have a higher share of houses with mud or dirt floor (99 percent, against 91 percent of the non-poor households). Up to 10 percent of non-poor households have concrete flooring.

The split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that employees have

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

	Single room	Flat	Two or more rooms	Whole building	Other	Total
Total	1.0	0.0	4.1	94.9	0.0	100.0
Cluster Location						
Accessible	0.4	0.0	4.3	95.3	0.0	100.0
Remote	1.6	0.0	4.0	94.5	0.0	100.0
Poverty Status						
Poor	0.4	0.0	2.6	97.0	0.0	100.0
Non-poor	1.4	0.0	5.1	93.5	0.0	100.0
Household size						
1-2	4.7	0.0	1.6	93.7	0.0	100.0
3-4	1.4	0.0	5.9	92.7	0.0	100.0
5-6	0.0	0.0	2.8	97.2	0.0	100.0
7+	0.0	0.0	4.9	95.1	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group						
Employee	1.9	0.0	15.6	82.5	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	1.1	0.0	2.9	96.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - other	0.7	0.0	7.4	91.9	0.0	100.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household						
Male	0.8	0.0	4.7	94.5	0.0	100.0
Female	2.1	0.0	0.7	97.2	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

the lowest share of mud or dirt and the highest share of concrete floors. The self-employed in non-agricultural activities have the second lowest share of mud or dirt and the second highest share of concrete floors. 'Self-employed – agriculture' and 'other' show similar shares, with the highest share of dirt-floor and the lowest of concrete or cement flooring.

Finally, households headed by males have a higher share of mud or dirt floor than female-headed households. In turn, 15 percent of female-headed households have concrete or cement flooring, against 9 percent of male-headed households.

Table 7.4 shows the percent distribution of households by type of housing unit they occupy. Overall, 95 percent of households occupy the whole building where they live.

There are no strong differences by cluster location. The breakdown by poverty status shows that non-poor households report a lower share occupying the whole building at 94 percent against 97 percent of poor households.

The breakdowns by household size or gender of the household head show no strong difference. The analysis of socio-

economic groups shows that the 'other' category has the highest share of households occupying the whole building, at 100 percent, and the employees are the category with the highest share using two or more rooms, at 16 percent.

7.2 Water and Sanitation

The percentage distribution of households by source of drinking water is shown in Table 7.5. Overall, 33 percent of households have a safe source of water, whereas 39 percent of them get it from a river, lake or pond. Safe sources of drinking water are treated pipes, bore holes, hand pumps, and protected wells.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 31 percent of households in accessible villages has a safe source of drinking water, whereas the share of households in remote villages is 35 percent. Households from remote villages are more likely to obtain water from a river, lake or pond than households from accessible villages. In turn, the latter are more likely than the former to obtain water from unprotected wells, at 21 and 16 percent, respectively.

Similar differences are observed by poverty status, with poor households reporting a rate of access to safe water of

7 Household amenities

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	10.6	9.4	19.0	3.3	18.3	0.0	39.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	32.9
Cluster Location											
Accessible	12.3	15.1	12.0	6.3	21.4	0.0	32.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	30.6
Remote	9.1	4.4	25.1	0.8	15.6	0.0	45.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	34.9
Poverty Status											
Poor	9.0	6.9	24.2	3.1	15.7	0.0	41.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	36.3
Non-poor	11.6	11.0	15.6	3.5	19.9	0.0	38.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	30.8
Household size											
1-2	7.4	6.5	14.6	2.1	28.5	0.0	40.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	24.1
3-4	8.9	9.1	22.2	4.7	21.6	0.0	33.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	35.8
5-6	10.0	9.5	20.5	4.3	14.0	0.0	41.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	34.8
7+	13.8	10.9	17.1	2.1	14.8	0.0	41.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	33.0
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	28.6	11.3	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	50.7	0.0	0.0	100.0	28.6
Self-employed - agric	8.2	8.3	22.5	4.2	18.2	0.0	38.5	0.0	0.0	100.0	34.9
Self-employed - other	17.4	13.4	7.6	0.0	21.7	0.0	39.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	25.0
Other	17.3	21.0	0.0	0.0	18.5	0.0	43.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	17.3
Gender of the head of household											
Male	11.0	9.8	18.1	3.7	18.3	0.0	39.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	32.7
Female	8.6	7.3	24.3	1.1	18.0	0.0	40.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	33.9

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

36 percent, whereas non-poor households report a share of 31 percent

When analysing by household size it comes out those smaller households have a lower rate of access to safe water. The split-up by gender of the household head does not show striking differences either, but the breakdown by socio-economic group of the household does. Households where the main income earner is self-employed in agriculture show the highest rate of access to safe sources of drinking water, followed by the employees, the self-employed in non-agricultural activities and the 'other'.

Table 7.6 shows the percentage distribution of households by main type of toilet. 84 percent of households in the district have safe sanitation.

The cluster breakdown shows that 26 percent of households in accessible villages have safe sanitation, while in

households in remote villages the share is 30 percent. The analysis by poverty status shows that 73 percent of non-poor households use covered pit latrines, driving the share with safe sanitation down to 24 percent, 13 percentage points below poor households.

Households with 1 or 2 members have the lowest percentage of safe sanitation, at 75 percent. The rates for other groups fluctuate between 79 and 92 percent. It stands out that up to 12 percent of households with up to 2 members have no toilet.

The breakdown by socio-economic status shows that 'other' have highest rate of safe sanitation, at 100 percent. The rates for employees and self-employed in non agricultural activities are roughly 90 percent. The self-employed in agriculture report the lowest rate at 82 percent.

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	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.8	9.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	83.8
Cluster Location										
Accessible	3.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.2	4.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	92.2
Remote	9.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	76.4	13.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	76.4
Poverty Status										
Poor	11.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	78.9	9.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	78.9
Non-poor	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	86.9	9.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	86.9
Household size										
1-2	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.0	13.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	75.0
3-4	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	79.1	14.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	79.1
5-6	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	82.8	8.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	82.8
7+	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	92.1	4.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	92.1
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	90.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	90.0
Self-employed - agriculture	7.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	81.7	10.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	81.7
Self-employed - other	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	91.8	3.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	91.8
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.9	9.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	83.9
Female	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.2	10.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	83.2

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

There are no differences by gender of the household head.

7.3 Type of Fuel

Table 7.7 shows the distribution of households by fuel used for cooking. Overall, 94 percent of households uses firewood. There are no differences by cluster location. The breakdown by poverty status reveals that virtually all poor households use firewood, while up to 10 percent of non-poor households uses charcoal.

The breakdown by household size shows that the share of households using firewood increases with the number of household members, from 92 percent for households with 1 or 2 members, to 97 percent for households with 7 or more members.

There are no differences by gender of the household head. However, the split-up by socio-economic group of the household shows that almost 20 percent of the employees uses charcoal for cooking, whereas the other two categories use firewood from 90 to 100 percent.

Table 7.8 shows the distribution of households according to the fuel used for

lighting. Overall, 96 percent of the households in the district uses kerosene or paraffin, and 3 percent uses firewood. No household in the district uses electricity.

There are no differences by cluster location or poverty status of the household. The breakdown by household size reveals that in households with up to 2 members, firewood is more likely to be used as source of lighting than in the rest of households, with a share of 17 percent.

The analysis by socio-economic group of the household shows that households belonging to the 'other' category have the highest rate of use of firewood, at 19 percent.

Finally, female-headed households are more likely to use firewood and less likely to use kerosene/paraffin than male-headed households, at 91 and 97 percent, respectively.

7.4 Distances to Facilities

Table 7.9 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest drinking water supply and health facility. Although each table gives more detailed information, the analysis of this section will be focused on the 30 minute threshold

7 Household amenities

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	93.8	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	94.1	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Remote	93.6	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	99.6	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Non-poor	90.2	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Household size										
1-2	91.8	8.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
3-4	91.2	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
5-6	93.6	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
7+	96.8	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	80.6	19.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - agriculture	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	91.3	8.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Other	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	95.3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Female	85.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

	Kerosene/paraffin	Gas	Mains electricity	Solar panels/generator	Battery	Candles	Firewood	Other	Total
Total	96.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.3	100.0
Cluster Location									
Accessible	97.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	100.0
Remote	95.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.5	100.0
Poverty Status									
Poor	97.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.7	100.0
Non-poor	95.6	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	100.0
Household size									
1-2	83.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	100.0
3-4	95.2	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	3.3	1.1	100.0
5-6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
7+	99.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	100.0
Socio-economic Group									
Employee	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Self-employed - agric	96.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	97.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	100.0
Other	81.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.5	0.0	100.0
Gender of the head of household									
Male	97.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.3	100.0
Female	90.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	0.0	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

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

	Drinking water supply				Total	Health facility				Total
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+		<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	
Total	66.2	27.4	5.3	1.2	100.0	28.7	29.2	15.5	26.6	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	59.5	31.5	6.6	2.4	100.0	34.2	34.9	13.1	17.9	100.0
Remote	72.0	23.7	4.1	0.2	100.0	24.0	24.2	17.6	34.2	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	62.4	30.2	6.0	1.4	100.0	26.3	28.4	18.4	26.9	100.0
Non-poor	68.5	25.6	4.8	1.1	100.0	30.3	29.7	13.6	26.4	100.0
Household size										
1-2	61.1	24.3	9.9	4.7	100.0	21.9	20.8	17.6	39.7	100.0
3-4	70.1	27.5	2.4	0.0	100.0	26.6	33.6	16.7	23.2	100.0
5-6	71.5	22.2	5.3	1.0	100.0	29.0	28.9	12.4	29.7	100.0
7+	60.9	32.8	5.4	0.8	100.0	33.2	29.8	16.1	20.9	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	66.4	28.0	5.6	0.0	100.0	36.5	47.0	5.3	11.2	100.0
Self-employed - agriculture	64.6	28.8	5.0	1.5	100.0	27.1	28.6	16.6	27.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	75.4	17.5	7.1	0.0	100.0	36.9	26.8	13.5	22.8	100.0
Other	61.9	38.1	0.0	0.0	100.0	17.3	27.1	9.2	46.4	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	68.5	26.6	4.3	0.6	100.0	27.2	30.9	15.8	26.0	100.0
Female	52.2	32.0	11.0	4.7	100.0	37.7	19.0	13.4	29.8	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

Overall, 94 percent of households are located under 30 minutes of a drinking water supply. In addition, 58 percent of the households are located under 30 minutes of a health facility.

The breakdown by cluster location shows that 91 percent of households in accessible villages have access to a drinking water source and 69 percent to a health facility, whereas the shares for households in remote villages are 96 and 48 percent. Poor households have a lower access rate to health facilities, at 55 percent against 60 percent of non-poor households.

The breakdown by household size shows that the smallest households (1 or 2 members) have the lowest rates of access to sources of drinking water and health facilities.

Households where the main income earner belongs to the 'other' category have higher rate of access to drinking water, but the lowest to healthcare facilities. Employees have the highest rates of access to healthcare facilities, at 84 percent.

The breakdown by gender of the household head shows no strong

differences in access to healthcare, but households headed by males have higher access rates drinking water sources.

Table 7.10 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest primary and secondary school. Overall, 75 percent of households are located within 30 minutes of a primary school, but just 25 percent of households are located within 30 min of a secondary school. Access to school was also analysed in chapter 3 but with a different focus. In chapter 3, access to school was analysed at child level, i.e. the access rate of each child. In this section the focus is the distance of the house to the nearest school.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 81 percent of households in accessible villages have access to primary school, against 70 of remote. For secondary school, the rates go down to 35 and 16 percent, respectively. There are no differences by poverty status.

Household size is correlated with access to school at both levels. Regarding primary school, the rates go from 57 percent for the smallest households to 83 percent for the largest households. In the case of secondary schools, the rates run from 15 to 28 percent.

7 Household amenities

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

	Primary school				Total	Secondary school				Total
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+		<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	
Total	48.2	26.9	14.8	10.1	100.0	11.5	13.3	14.4	60.8	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	52.5	28.7	13.3	5.5	100.0	15.9	18.9	15.1	50.0	100.0
Remote	44.5	25.3	16.1	14.1	100.0	7.5	8.3	13.8	70.4	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	44.2	31.0	13.2	11.6	100.0	12.0	13.8	12.8	61.5	100.0
Non-poor	50.7	24.3	15.8	9.1	100.0	11.1	12.9	15.5	60.5	100.0
Household size										
1-2	41.1	15.7	20.2	23.0	100.0	4.6	9.9	15.0	70.5	100.0
3-4	52.0	21.1	19.0	7.9	100.0	12.0	11.8	17.1	59.0	100.0
5-6	46.3	31.5	13.3	8.9	100.0	13.0	14.5	13.4	59.1	100.0
7+	50.0	32.5	10.4	7.1	100.0	12.8	14.8	13.0	59.5	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	55.7	19.7	24.6	0.0	100.0	23.8	15.7	20.8	39.6	100.0
Self-employed - agric	46.4	27.5	14.2	11.9	100.0	11.6	11.5	14.5	62.4	100.0
Self-employed - other	55.2	26.1	16.4	2.3	100.0	6.8	21.0	10.3	61.9	100.0
Other	55.6	26.0	0.0	18.5	100.0	8.4	23.1	25.6	42.9	100.0
Gender of the head of household										
Male	47.9	27.7	15.4	9.0	100.0	10.9	13.4	14.5	61.2	100.0
Female	49.9	22.2	11.3	16.6	100.0	14.6	12.7	14.2	58.5	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

	Food market				Total	Public transportation				Total
	<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+		<= 15	16-30	31-60	61+	
Total	53.1	25.8	8.5	12.6	100.0	63.9	11.2	7.9	17.1	100.0
Cluster Location										
Accessible	51.7	29.6	9.9	8.8	100.0	68.4	15.6	10.1	5.9	100.0
Remote	54.3	22.5	7.2	16.1	100.0	59.9	7.2	5.9	26.9	100.0
Poverty Status										
Poor	48.2	29.8	11.4	10.6	100.0	61.8	12.0	8.4	17.8	100.0
Non-poor	56.2	23.3	6.6	13.9	100.0	65.2	10.6	7.5	16.6	100.0
Household size										
1-2	50.7	13.9	6.9	28.5	100.0	60.6	4.2	10.0	25.2	100.0
3-4	57.7	23.0	9.0	10.3	100.0	64.1	10.2	3.8	22.0	100.0
5-6	48.9	31.5	8.5	11.1	100.0	61.1	15.3	9.9	13.6	100.0
7+	54.0	28.5	8.7	8.8	100.0	67.5	11.5	8.4	12.6	100.0
Socio-economic Group										
Employee	64.8	26.7	5.6	2.9	100.0	91.7	2.7	0.0	5.6	100.0
Self-employed - agric	48.9	27.9	9.2	14.0	100.0	59.9	12.7	8.6	18.8	100.0
Self-employed - other	67.9	16.7	5.4	10.1	100.0	74.7	6.6	7.3	11.4	100.0
Other	91.6	0.0	8.4	0.0	100.0	81.5	0.0	0.0	18.5	100.0
Gender of head of household										
Male	52.3	27.7	8.5	11.4	100.0	61.8	12.0	8.8	17.3	100.0
Female	57.9	14.4	8.0	19.7	100.0	76.1	6.2	2.2	15.6	100.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

The breakdown by socio-economic group shows that households in the category 'self-employed other' and 'other' have the highest rates of access to primary and that employees have the highest rates of access to secondary schools

Households headed by males have higher access rates to primary school than female-headed households, at 76 percent, against 72 percent of males. In turn, female-headed households have a higher rate of access to secondary schools than male-headed households, at 27 and 24 percent, respectively.

Table 7.11 shows the percent distribution of households by time to reach the nearest food market and public transportation. Overall, 79 percent of households have access to a food market, and 75 percent to public transportation.

The analysis of cluster location shows that 81 percent of households in accessible villages live within 30 minutes of a food market and, against 77 of households in remote villages. The shares for public transportation are 84 for accessible and 67 percent for households in remote villages. The breakdown by poverty status shows no strong differences.

The breakdown by size of the household shows that the group of households with 1 or 2 members have the lowest rates of access to these facilities, whereas there are no important differences between the remaining groups.

Employees have the highest rates of access to food markets and public transportation, with rates of 92 and 94 percent. The 'other' group also reports a rate of access to food markets of 92 percent. The self-employed in agriculture report the lowest access rates to both facilities, at 77 percent for food market and 73 percent for public transportation.

Male-headed households report a higher

access rate to markets than female-headed households. In turn, the latter report a higher rate of access to public transportation.

7.5 Anti-Malaria Measures

The percent distribution of households taking anti-malaria measures and the specific measures they take is shown in Table 7.12. Overall, 60 percent of households take measures against malaria. The most commonly taken are bed-nets (44 percent of households taking anti-malaria measures), insecticide treated nets (34.4 percent), and anti-malarial drugs (14 percent).

The analysis of cluster location shows that 51 percent of households in remote villages take measures against malaria, compared to 68 percent of households in accessible villages. Insecticide and good sanitation are more common in accessible villages than in remote villages. In contrast, anti-malarial drugs and insecticide treated nets are more commonly used in the latter than in the former.

The breakdown by poverty status shows that poor households report higher shares using insecticide and anti-malarial drugs, whereas non-poor households report

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

	Share taking measures	Use bed net	Insecticide	Anti-malaria drug	Fumigation	Insecticide treated net	Maintain good drainage	Maintain good sanitation	Herbs	Burn leaves	Window/door net
Total	60.0	44.0	10.2	14.4	0.9	33.9	0.0	7.1	3.3	0.7	0.0
Cluster Location											
Accessible	51.4	42.6	13.1	6.9	1.1	31.2	0.0	13.9	2.8	0.0	0.0
Remote	67.6	44.8	8.2	19.5	0.7	35.8	0.0	2.5	3.6	1.2	0.0
Poverty Status											
Poor	53.2	45.6	19.3	17.7	1.3	24.4	0.0	5.5	3.3	0.5	0.0
Non-poor	64.3	43.1	5.4	12.7	0.7	38.9	0.0	7.9	3.3	0.8	0.0
Household size											
1-2	50.7	52.7	3.6	18.2	3.7	22.2	0.0	3.7	4.2	5.8	0.0
3-4	53.2	37.3	8.0	9.2	0.0	46.3	0.0	9.0	2.9	0.0	0.0
5-6	67.5	38.6	15.0	10.0	0.0	37.1	0.0	6.8	3.5	0.0	0.0
7+	63.1	49.9	9.7	20.3	1.2	27.3	0.0	7.3	3.0	0.0	0.0
Socio-economic Group											
Employee	67.3	52.9	11.1	0.0	0.0	28.9	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - agric	56.3	44.4	9.0	13.0	1.2	35.6	0.0	8.6	3.5	0.0	0.0
Self-employed - other	81.0	38.9	15.3	25.4	0.0	30.8	0.0	3.5	1.3	0.9	0.0
Other	39.2	52.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	47.1	0.0
Gender of the head of household											
Male	63.8	43.5	10.1	15.0	1.0	35.4	0.0	5.5	3.3	0.8	0.0
Female	37.6	48.5	11.2	8.5	0.0	19.4	0.0	23.3	2.7	0.0	0.0

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

7 Household amenities

higher share using insecticide-treated nets.

The share of households taking measures is higher for larger households but there are no clear trends by measure taken. The analysis of socio-economic status shows that 81 percent of 'self-employed other' take anti-malaria measures, compared to 67 percent of households in the category 'employee', 56 percent of 'self-employed agriculture', and only 39 percent of 'other'.

Finally, households headed by males are more likely to take measures against malaria than households headed by females, with shares of 64 and 38 percent. Male-headed households use bed-nets and insecticide treated nets and herbs more frequently than female-headed households.

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 in Kigoma DC. The first section discusses attendance at kitongoji, village, ward and district meetings. Section 2 shows the results of questions aimed at measuring satisfaction with leaders at each of these levels. Section 3 concerns public spending at kitongoji, village, ward and district level and discusses to what extent financial information reaches households, as well as their satisfaction with public spending at each level.

8.1 Attendance at Meetings

Table 8.1 summarises responses to the following question ‘Did you or anyone in your household attend a meeting at [...] level in the past 12 months’. This question was repeated 4 times with the dots replaced by kitongoji, village, ward and district. In general, attendance ratios decrease with increase in the administration level. 83 percent of the interviewed households had at least one member who attended a kitongoji meeting the year prior the survey. Attendance rates at the village, ward and district levels are 79 percent, 37 percent and 11 percent respectively.

As seen in table 8.1, information on attendance was broken down by cluster location. Attendance rates at kitongoji and village level are 3 percentage points higher in remote clusters than in accessible clusters. While attendance rates at the ward level do not seem to differ much, there is a big difference in attendance rates at the district level among households located in remote and accessible clusters. Attendance rates among households located in accessible clusters are more than three times higher than attendance rates among households located in remote clusters at 18 and 5 percent respectively. Attendance rates by poverty status show that there are no differences in the attendance rates at the kitongoji, village and ward level between poor and non-poor households. On the other hand, 14 percent of non-poor households reported at least one member

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

	Kitongoji Meeting	Village Meeting	Ward Meeting	District Meeting
Total	82.0	79.1	36.4	11.0
Cluster Location				
Accessible	80.3	78.0	38.0	17.9
Remote	83.6	80.2	35.0	4.9
Poverty Status				
Poor	81.3	79.0	35.4	13.7
Non-poor	82.5	79.2	37.0	9.3
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	75.9	85.4	52.9	20.7
Self-employed - agriculture	82.5	79.3	37.1	10.8
Self-employed - other	79.3	75.8	28.9	10.3
Other	100.0	81.5	17.3	0.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

attending district level meetings compared to 10 percent of those belonging to poor households. The socio-economic group of households show some correlation with attendance to meetings. Households which belong to the ‘other’ socio-economic group (includes those involved in domestic work, unemployed and students) have the highest attendance rate (100 percent) at kitongoji level meetings followed by those in self-employed-agriculture, self-employed-other and finally employee households at 83 percent, 80 percent and 76 percent respectively.

8.2 Satisfaction with Leaders

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

The results, displayed in Table 8.2, show that satisfaction with government leaders

tends to decrease as the government level increases. Almost 80 percent of households reported to be satisfied with their leaders at kitongoji level, 75 at village level, 72 at ward level and roughly 60 percent at district level (district leaders and district councillor). According to the breakdown by cluster location, households located in accessible clusters report higher shares of satisfaction with their leaders than households located in remote clusters except at village level. However, it is important to note that the dissatisfaction results displayed do not entirely reflect dissatisfaction as they include those who responded 'I don't know'.

Analysis of dissatisfaction by poverty status shows that poor households report a higher share of dissatisfied households

than non-poor households.. There tends to be a bigger gap in the satisfaction rates between poor and non-poor households at lower levels of government. The satisfaction gap among the poor and non-poor is 8 percentage points at the kitongoji level compared to 5 percentage points at district level. Breakdown of the results by socio-economic category shows that households where the main income contributor is self-employed in a non-agricultural sector report the highest satisfaction with their leaders at kitongoji level. Households belonging to the employee socio-economic group report the highest satisfaction rates at village level while those belonging to the self-employed-agriculture group report the same at ward level. Dissatisfaction with district councillors tends to be highest

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

	Kitongoji Leaders	Village Leaders	Ward Leaders	District Leaders	District Councillor
Total					
Satisfied	78.4	74.5	71.2	57.6	60.6
Not Satisfied	19.6	21.7	19.8	20.0	30.6
Don't Know	2.0	3.9	8.9	22.4	8.8
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location					
Accessible	79.3	70.7	74.5	63.2	64.7
Remote	77.5	77.8	68.3	52.6	56.9
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status					
Poor	72.9	70.0	67.0	54.4	59.9
Non-poor	81.8	77.3	73.9	59.6	61.0
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group					
Employee	80.4	80.4	66.0	61.4	46.5
Self-employed - agriculture	77.6	75.4	72.5	58.9	61.3
Self-employed - other	83.1	69.9	69.4	50.3	59.6
Other	70.3	50.1	43.2	43.2	73.5
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)					
Political differences	7.0	5.4	3.3	2.2	7.6
Embezzlement/corruption	15.4	17.0	13.7	8.2	7.4
They do not listen to people	28.3	24.1	18.9	7.0	13.4
Favouritism	22.2	24.1	14.3	6.1	5.0
Lazy/inexperienced	11.2	5.2	4.0	0.3	4.5
Personal Reasons	3.0	3.0	1.5	0.0	1.4
I see no results	29.7	32.7	34.4	28.5	43.6
They never visit us	18.8	20.2	43.5	70.9	39.2
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450	450

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

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

among households where the main income contributor is an employee followed by self-employed-agriculture, self-employed-other and finally the 'other' socio-economic group.

Households that reported dissatisfaction with their leaders or responded 'I don't know' were asked to give reasons as to why this was so. Three most prominent reasons given for dissatisfaction at the kitongoji and village levels were 'I see no results' followed by 'they do no listen to people' and in third place by 'favouritism'. At the ward level, 41 percent of dissatisfied household's complaint that their leaders never visit them, 35 percent said that they see no results and 20 percent reported that their leaders do not listen to them. Above two-thirds (70 percent) reported being dissatisfied because their district level leaders never visit them while 28 percent reported dissatisfaction for seeing no results. Households that are dissatisfied with their district councillors claim that the cause is that their district councillors never visit them and that they see no results. It is important to note that there are very few households that reported dissatisfaction due to political differences, laziness/inexperience or personal reasons.

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.

Overall, financial information at kitongoji, village, ward and district levels only reaches 9, 10, 5 and 4 percent of the households respectively. In general, more households tend to have information on the kitongoji and village finances than on ward and district finances. Analysis of financial information by cluster location shows that households located in remote clusters have more information on public spending at the kitongoji and village levels than those living in accessible clusters while those living in accessible clusters have more information on public spending at the ward and district levels than those living remote clusters.

There are no strong differences in access to financial information by poverty status. The breakdown by socio-economic group of the household shows that 20 percent of

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

	Kitongoji Finances	Village Finances	Ward Finances	District Finances
Total	9.1	10.6	5.3	3.9
Cluster Location				
Accessible	6.3	10.4	6.8	5.9
Remote	11.6	10.7	4.0	2.1
Poverty Status				
Poor	7.3	9.5	4.6	3.4
Non-poor	10.2	11.2	5.7	4.1
Socio-economic Group				
Employee	11.9	13.8	13.8	11.9
Self-employed - agriculture	8.7	10.9	4.8	4.1
Self-employed - other	9.5	8.8	5.8	0.0
Other	18.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Source				
Letter	6.7	5.8	6.6	9.1
Notice board	0.0	5.9	3.8	3.8
Meeting	92.5	78.9	61.3	50.3
Rumours/hear-say	6.5	18.8	19.9	13.0
Radio/newspapers	3.9	3.3	13.9	30.0
No. of Obs.	450	450	450	450

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

8 Governance

households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group report the highest rates of access to financial information at kitongoji level followed by employee, self-employed-other and self-employed-agriculture. It is important to notice that households belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group do not have any financial information beyond the kitongoji level and those belonging to the self-employed other category have no information on public spending at the district level.

Respondents were further asked to identify the means through which they received the financial information. Most respondents reported receiving financial information through meetings. 92, 77, 64 and 55 percent of the households received information on finances through meetings at kitongoji, village, ward and district levels respectively. The second most prominent source of information is rumours/hear-say. Very few households receive financial information through letters and notice boards. None of the households have reported receiving information through notice boards at the kitongoji level. The same is reported for radios/newspapers at the kitongoji and village levels. Radios/newspapers tend to play a role in spreading financial information at the ward and district levels.

Respondents were asked whether they were satisfied with spending at different levels of government and were requested to respond with either 'yes', 'no' or 'don't know'. Table 8.4 shows that while satisfaction with public spending decreases with increase in government level, 'don't know' responses increase with increase in government level. Public spending at kitongoji level shows the highest rate of satisfaction (34 percent of the households), while the figure for district spending is 24 percent.

Ratios on satisfaction with public spending seem to be higher among those living in accessible clusters than those living in remote clusters. Differences in satisfaction between the two groups tend to increase with increase in government level. At kitongoji level 35 percent of those living in accessible clusters and 33 percent of those living in remote clusters reported being satisfied with public spending while the figures for district level are 28 and 21 percent. Breakdown of the information by poverty status shows that although the satisfaction rates

between poor and non-poor households do not differ much, satisfaction rates among non-poor households are higher at all levels of government than those reported by poor households.

Household belonging to the 'other' socio-economic group (including those involved in domestic work, unemployed and students) report higher satisfaction rates with public spending than households belonging to other socio-economic groups. At the same time, households where the main income contributor is an employee report the lowest satisfaction rate with public spending at all levels. Besides the differences in satisfaction rates, a common trend for all socio-economic groups is that all groups report less satisfaction as the level of government increases.

Households that claimed dissatisfaction or responded 'don't know' were asked to give reasons for their responses. The most prominent reason at all levels was that the administration at respective levels did not provide any information. 24 to 32 percent of the households said that they are dissatisfied because they see no results. 11 to 16 percent reported dissatisfaction on public spending due to corruption/embezzlement, 3 to 4 percent because of favouritism and 1 percent say they are dissatisfied because of what they hear from others.

Table 8.4: Satisfaction with public spending and reasons for dissatisfaction

	Kitongoji Spending	Village Spending	Ward Spending	District Spending
Total				
Satisfied	34.8	31.3	27.6	24.5
Not Satisfied	23.3	24.9	23.1	18.9
Don' Know	41.8	43.8	49.3	56.6
Share Satisfied by Cluster Location				
Accessible	35.8	33.2	31.0	28.9
Remote	33.9	29.6	24.6	20.6
Share Satisfied by Poverty Status				
Poor	28.1	30.4	26.1	22.5
Non-poor	39.0	31.9	28.5	25.7
Share Satisfied by Socio-economic Group				
Employee	27.5	21.9	21.9	17.8
Self-employed - agriculture	33.8	30.5	28.0	25.2
Self-employed - other	40.7	38.2	26.3	22.7
Other	53.6	38.3	38.3	26.5
Reasons for Dissatisfaction (incl. don't know)				
I see no results	23.5	29.8	31.8	29.2
Embezzlement/corruption	13.8	16.4	14.5	12.5
Favouritism	4.1	3.6	4.1	3.2
This is what I hear	0.5	1.4	0.8	0.3
They give no information	59.9	65.8	68.2	72.7
No. of Obs.	449	450	450	450

Source CWIQ 2006 Kigoma DC

