



### CROSS RIVER STATE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

The 2006 Core Welfare Indicators Questionnaire (CWIQ) Survey is a national Sample Survey, designed to provide indicators for monitoring Poverty and Living Standards in the country at National, State and Zonal Levels. A total of 1800 households, i.e. 2.3 per cent of the 77,400 households in the National Sample, represents Cross River State in the

survey sample. Out of the 1800 households sampled in the State, 1380 lived in rural areas, representing (76.7 per cent) while 420 lived in urban areas (23.3 per cent). This flyer presents State aggregates, including rural-urban senatorial and gender differences for selected indicators.

## KEY FINDINGS

### DEPENDENCY RATIO

The dependency ratio in Cross River State was 0.7, which showed that about one person depended on one economically active person. The dependency in urban and rural areas as well as in the senatorial districts followed the State average.

### HOUSEHOLD WELFARE

#### Household Economic Situation Compared with Past Year

About 36.4 per cent of households in the State indicated that their economic situation was worse compared with past year. The urban/rural situation showed that 38.7 per cent of such households lived in rural areas and 31.7 per cent in urban areas. The household economic situation was worse in the south district (44.9 per cent) than in the north (32.1 per cent) and central (31.3 per cent).

#### Neighbourhood Crime/Security Situation Compared to One Year Ago

Few (14.8 per cent) households in the State recorded a worse neighbourhood crime/security situation now than the past year. The situation in urban areas was 15.2 per cent and in rural areas, 14.6 per cent. In the senatorial districts, south had 19.4 per cent, central, 12.6 per cent and north 11.6 per cent of the households indicating that their economic situation was worse now than the past year.

#### Difficulty in Satisfying Household Needs

The household needs considered were in the food category. About 19.7 per cent of households in the state found it difficult to satisfy their food needs; 23.7 per cent in the urban areas compared to the rural areas 17.7 per cent. South senatorial district recorded the

highest rate (33.8 per cent), while north (1.7 per cent) recorded the lowest.

#### Self-Classified Poverty Situation

About 80.3 per cent of households in the State classified themselves as poor. Poverty was more in female-headed households (81.2 per cent) than in male-headed households (80.0 per cent). The households that classified themselves poor were mostly recorded in north district (94.4 per cent), followed by central (89.0 per cent) and south (61.0 per cent).

### HOUSEHOLD INFRASTRUCTURE

#### Secure Housing Tenure

Secure housing tenure is defined for households that have documentation to verify their occupancy status. About 61.9 per cent of households in the State had secure housing tenure. Tenure was less secure in rural (59.6 per cent) than in urban households (66.5 per cent). North district (87.4 per cent) had the highest rate; followed by south (58.5 per cent) and central (45.6 per cent) recorded the lowest.

#### Access to Water From all Sources

About 65.8 per cent of the households in the State had access to reasonable water sources. Access was more in urban areas (80.3 per cent) than in rural areas (58.7 per cent). The highest rate was reported in south district (79.8 per cent), while the rate in north and central was over 56.0 per cent.

#### Safe Water Source

Three out of ten (31.1 per cent) households in the State had access to safe water sources. The households in the urban areas (66.2 per cent) had more access than those in the rural areas (13.7 per cent). 53 per cent of households in south district had the highest access,

while the lowest rate (11.1 per cent) was recorded in central.

### **Safe Sanitation**

Safe sanitation was defined for households using flush toilets, covered pit latrines or ventilated improved pit latrines. There were few (39.4 per cent) households in the State with safe sanitation. The households in urban areas (70.5 per cent) had a higher rate than those in rural areas (24.0 per cent). The district that had the highest rate was south (58.7 per cent) and the lowest rate was recorded in central (20.1 per cent).

### **Improved Waste Disposal**

Only 18.0 per cent of households in the State used improved waste disposal system. The urban areas had 49.8 per cent, higher than the rural areas (2 per cent). South district reported the highest proportion (43.0 per cent), while the lowest was reported in central (1.5 per cent).

### **Access to Electricity**

Fifty-four per cent of households in the State had access to electricity. Access among urban households (85.4 per cent) was more than twice in the rural households (38.9 per cent). In the senatorial districts, south had 66.6 per cent and north had 34.5 per cent with access.

## **OWNERSHIP OF IT/TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT**

### **Personal Computers**

The proportion of household members who owned personal computers in the State was 0.5 per cent. None in rural areas owned the item while 1.6 per cent in urban areas did. In the senatorial districts, 1.4 per cent of the households in south owned personal computers, while it was almost non-existent in the other two districts.

### **Mobile Phones**

Twenty per cent of household members in the State owned mobile phones. In the urban areas, 41.8 per cent had mobile phones compared with 9.8 per cent in rural areas. The south (35.2 per cent) recorded the highest rate, while north (10.9 per cent) had the lowest rate.

## **EMPLOYMENT**

### **Youth Unemployment**

Youth unemployment rate for persons aged 15-24 years in the State was 5.0 per cent. There was a higher unemployment rate in the urban areas (11.9 per cent) than in the rural areas (2.3 per cent). 11.4 per cent of youth were unemployed in south district; the central recorded 3.0 per cent for females and 2.8 per cent for males.

### **General Unemployment**

Unemployment rate for adults (ages 15 and above) in the State was 1.8 per cent. The rate was more in urban areas (3.7 per cent) than in the rural areas (1.0 per

cent). Among the senatorial districts, south recorded the highest proportion of (3.0 per cent) while both the north and central had 1.2 per cent respectively.

### **Under-Employment**

Under-employment was defined for persons aged 15 and above who sought to increase earnings in the seven-day period preceding the survey. Twelve per cent of persons aged 15 and above in the State were under-employed. In the gender differential, 9.0 per cent of female adults and 15.2 per cent of male adults were under-employed. The rate for adults in rural areas was 12.8 per cent and 10.0 per cent in urban areas. In the senatorial districts, south had 15.5 per cent, central, 13.5 per cent and north, 7.7 per cent.

## **EDUCATION**

### **Adult Literacy**

Adult literacy is defined as ability to read and write in any language. Adult literacy rate in any language in the State was 75.5 per cent. The rate in urban (87.4 per cent) was higher than in rural (69.6 per cent) areas. Generally, literacy rates for males were higher than female rates in the sectors and senatorial districts. South senatorial district recorded the highest rate (87.4 per cent), while the lowest rate was recorded in central (72.9 per cent).

### **Youth Literacy**

About 90.7 per cent of youths aged 15-24 years were reported literate in the State. About 91.7 per cent of males and 89.8 per cent of females were literate. The rate in urban areas (94.7 per cent) was more than in rural areas (88.6 per cent). In the senatorial districts, the highest proportion was recorded in the south (94.1 per cent). The rates in the other two districts were 91.2 per cent and 86.5 per cent for north and central respectively.

## **PRIMARY SCHOOL EDUCATION**

### **Access to Primary School**

Access to primary school education is defined for children of primary school (age 6-11) living in households with schools less than 30 minutes away. The proportion of children who had access was 74.4 per cent; 84.2 per cent in urban areas and 70.9 per cent in rural areas. Surprisingly, in the senatorial districts, central (68.3 per cent) recorded the lowest rate, while south and north had more than 75.0 per cent access.

### **Primary School Net Enrolment**

Primary net enrolment rate for the State was 77.0 per cent. About 78.0 per cent of female and 76.0 per cent of male children in the State recorded net enrolment. The rate for rural areas was 78.5 per cent and 73.1 per cent in urban areas. In the north senatorial district, primary net enrolment was 84.0 per cent for females and 89.2 per cent for males. The rates in the central and south districts were above 69.0 per cent.

## Satisfaction with Primary Education

About 63.0 per cent of primary school pupils in the State expressed satisfaction with their schools. There was slight disparity for the urban (70.4 per cent) and rural (60.2 per cent) areas. The rate in the senatorial districts was 75.2 per cent, 69.1 per cent and 44.6 per cent for south, north and central respectively.

## Primary School Completion Rate

The primary school completion rate for the State was 16.8 per cent. Completion rate reported for urban areas (15.7 per cent) was lower than for rural areas (17.2 per cent). The survey results showed that north, south and central districts reported 19.0 per cent, 16.9 per cent and 14.6 per cent respectively

## SECONDARY SCHOOL EDUCATION

### Access to Secondary School

In the State, access to secondary school education was 55.0 per cent. Access in rural areas was 49.3 per cent and 67.2 per cent in urban areas. The rate of access in the south and north districts were over 60.0 per cent, while 38.7 per cent was reported in the central.

### Secondary School Net Enrolment

Secondary school net enrolment rate in the State was 62.4 per cent. The proportion in urban areas (68.5 per cent) was higher than in rural areas (59.5 per cent). Secondary net enrolment was higher in central senatorial district (65.4 per cent) than in the north (58.6 per cent). Disaggregation by gender showed that female enrolment (65.1 per cent) was higher than male enrolment (59.7 per cent).

### Satisfaction with Secondary Education

The satisfaction rate in the State was 51.0 per cent. There was significant variation among urban (69.0 per cent) and rural (42.7 per cent) dwellers. Satisfaction in central senatorial district was 30.3 per cent, and in north, 49.2 per cent. The highest rate was recorded in south district (75.0 per cent).

### Secondary School Completion Rate

The secondary completion rate in the State was 30.5 per cent. Completion rate in urban areas (46.4 per cent) was higher than rural areas (22.9 per cent). The central senatorial district recorded the lowest rate (22.5 per cent), while the highest was reported in south (44.6 per cent).

## MEDICAL SERVICES

### Access to Medical Services

Access to health care was determined by the ability of household members to reach a health facility within 30 minutes. Access in the State was 56.7 per cent. The rate was 52.6 per cent in rural areas and 65.9 per cent in urban areas. Most households (62.9 per cent) in the north senatorial district had access to medical services; central had 46.1 per cent while south had 60.8 per cent.

## Need for Medical Services

The need for medical services was defined for those who were sick or injured in the four weeks preceding the survey. This showed that 10.6 per cent in the State needed medical services. The rates for Central district was 11.5 per cent north 10.7 per cent, while south district had the lowest rate (9.7 per cent)

## Usage of Medical Services

The use of medical services in the State was 10.4 per cent. The rate in rural areas was 11.2 per cent and in urban areas, 8.6 per cent. The people in central senatorial district made the highest use of medical services (11.2 per cent).

## Satisfaction with Medical Services

Only 53.5 per cent of households in the State expressed satisfaction with medical services. In the rural areas, the rate was 52.9 per cent and 55.5 per cent in urban areas. At the district level, the south derived the highest satisfaction (73.9 per cent), followed by north (53.1 per cent) and central (35.5 per cent).

## CHILDREN UNDER 5

### Birth Registration

The proportion of children whose births were registered in the State was 26.5 per cent. The rate in urban areas (39.7 per cent) was more than in rural areas (20.6 per cent). Disaggregation by gender did not show any significant variation. Registration of births was higher in central district (30.8 per cent) than in south (29.3 per cent) and north (18.6 per cent).

### Immunization

About 59.3 per cent of children under-5 years were fully immunized in the State, while 8.0 per cent were not immunised. Immunization was higher in the urban areas (71.6 per cent) than in the rural areas (54.4 per cent). South district recorded the highest percentage of under-5 children who were fully immunized, while 49.2 per cent were fully immunized in the north districts.

## GENDER

### Circumcision

Circumcision for females regarded as females genital mutilation was 41.4 per cent in the State. The rates of circumcision in urban and rural areas were over 43.1 per cent, 40.8 per cent respectively. In the senatorial districts, more than half of females were circumcised in south and north, while the rate in central was 37.6 per cent.

### Access to Resources

Only 13.8 per cent of adult members of household in the State had access to credit. More males (16.6 per cent) than females (11.2 per cent) had access to credit at sectoral of and senatorial district levels. Only north district had credit rate (22.3 per cent) higher than the State average (13.8 per cent).

	Total	Margin of error	Rural	Rural poor	Urban	Urban poor	Central	North	South
<b>Household characteristics</b>									
<i>Dependency ratio</i>	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7
<b>Household welfare</b>									
Household economic situation compared to one year ago									
<i>Worse now</i>	36.4	2.1	38.7	49.5	31.7	31.4	31.3	32.1	44.9
<i>Better now</i>	28.4	1.6	26.3	12.7	32.6	25.4	28.7	34.0	23.6
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago									
<i>Worse now</i>	14.8	1.5	14.6	17.4	15.2	20.1	12.6	11.6	19.4
<i>Better now</i>	48.7	2.9	51.6	35.5	42.6	47.9	58.4	62.8	27.9
Difficulty satisfying household needs									
<i>Food</i>	19.7	2.1	17.7	31.6	23.7	34.5	19.2	1.7	33.8
Households self classified as poor									
<i>All households</i>	80.3	2.2	88.8	92.6	63.3	89.3	89.0	94.4	61.0
<i>Male headed households</i>	80.0	2.3	89.0	93.3	62.3	88.3	89.7	93.4	60.1
<i>Female headed households</i>	81.2	3.0	88.1	91.2	66.6	91.8	86.9	98.4	63.8
<b>Household infrastructure</b>									
<i>Secure housing tenure</i>	61.9	3.0	59.6	46.9	66.5	50.7	45.6	87.4	58.5
<i>Access to water</i>	65.8	3.4	58.7	46.9	80.3	50.2	56.6	59.6	79.8
<i>Safe water source</i>	31.1	4.1	13.7	6.4	66.2	36.5	11.1	28.5	53.0
<i>Safe sanitation</i>	39.4	3.3	24.0	13.5	70.5	32.0	20.1	39.1	58.7
<i>Improved waste disposal</i>	18.0	3.8	2.0	1.2	49.8	9.6	1.5	6.1	43.0
<i>Has electricity</i>	54.3	3.8	38.9	25.4	85.4	63.8	56.9	34.5	66.6
Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment									
<i>Personal computer</i>	0.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.4
<i>Mobile phone</i>	20.3	2.3	9.8	2.2	41.8	12.1	12.7	10.9	35.2
<b>Employment</b>									
Employment Status in last 7 days									
<i>Unemployed (age 15-24)</i>	5.0	1.5	2.3	1.8	11.9	6.1	2.8	2.9	11.4
<i>Male</i>	6.2	2.2	3.6	1.5	12.3	1.8	3.0	5.1	11.0
<i>Female</i>	3.9	1.7	1.3	2.0	11.5	10.7	2.7	0.7	11.8
<i>Unemployed (age 15 and above)</i>	1.8	0.4	1.0	0.6	3.7	1.5	1.2	1.2	3.0
<i>Male</i>	1.8	0.5	1.2	0.7	3.2	0.7	1.3	1.6	2.6
<i>Female</i>	1.7	0.5	0.8	0.4	4.2	2.3	1.2	0.8	3.4
<i>Underemployed (age 15 and above)</i>	12.0	1.3	12.8	17.0	10.0	11.5	13.5	7.7	15.5
<i>Male</i>	15.2	1.7	16.4	23.7	12.5	13.8	17.2	10.5	18.4
<i>Female</i>	9.0	1.1	9.7	11.5	7.1	8.9	10.2	5.2	12.5
<b>Education</b>									
Adult literacy rate-any language									
<i>Total</i>	75.5	1.6	69.6	61.3	87.4	78.1	72.9	65.8	87.4
<i>Male</i>	83.2	1.4	78.4	70.5	92.2	87.5	81.4	77.6	90.0
<i>Female</i>	68.3	2.0	61.6	53.0	82.5	68.9	65.2	54.8	84.9
Youth literacy rate-any language (age 15-24)									
<i>Total</i>	90.7	1.2	88.6	82.3	94.7	91.2	86.5	91.2	94.1
<i>Male</i>	91.7	1.5	90.0	85.5	95.0	89.6	85.8	94.1	93.9
<i>Female</i>	89.8	1.5	87.2	78.8	94.5	92.5	87.1	88.2	94.3
Primary school									
<i>Access to School</i>	74.4	3.3	70.9	44.8	84.2	66.4	68.3	77.2	77.7
<i>Primary Net Enrollment</i>	77.0	1.7	78.5	73.8	73.1	72.7	77.0	86.6	69.1
<i>Male</i>	76.5	2.5	79.4	75.2	68.4	66.1	78.1	89.2	64.2
<i>Female</i>	77.6	2.0	77.5	72.4	78.0	78.9	75.5	84.0	74.1
<i>Satisfaction</i>	62.7	3.8	60.2	55.4	70.4	55.7	44.6	69.1	75.2
<i>Primary completion rate</i>	16.8	1.4	17.2	14.9	15.7	13.5	14.6	19.0	16.9
Secondary school									
<i>Access to School</i>	55.0	3.9	49.3	26.4	67.2	38.0	38.7	61.9	64.3
<i>Secondary Net Enrollment</i>	62.4	1.9	59.5	51.2	68.5	64.5	65.4	58.6	63.3
<i>Male</i>	59.7	2.5	57.5	52.8	65.3	59.9	61.0	58.5	59.7
<i>Female</i>	65.1	2.9	61.8	49.1	71.1	69.3	70.4	58.7	66.0
<i>Satisfaction</i>	51.0	3.8	42.7	39.3	69.0	51.6	30.3	49.2	75.0
<i>Secondary completion rate</i>	30.5	3.3	22.9	13.2	46.4	18.8	22.5	24.3	44.6
<b>Medical services</b>									
<i>Health access</i>	56.7	3.5	52.6	27.9	65.9	49.8	46.1	62.9	60.8
<i>Need</i>	10.6	0.6	11.5	13.7	8.6	15.3	11.5	10.7	9.7
<i>Use</i>	10.4	0.6	11.2	12.7	8.7	15.2	11.2	10.4	9.6
<i>Satisfaction</i>	53.5	3.2	52.9	50.0	55.5	42.3	35.5	53.1	73.9
<b>Child welfare and health</b>									
Children under 5									
<i>Birth registration</i>	26.5	3.1	20.6	9.9	39.7	30.1	30.8	18.6	29.3
<i>Male</i>	27.8	3.7	21.4	10.0	39.7	29.1	32.2	20.1	30.3
<i>Female</i>	25.0	3.8	20.0	9.7	39.7	31.6	29.3	17.2	28.2
<i>Fully vaccinated</i>	59.3	3.2	54.4	47.7	71.6	54.6	57.6	49.2	69.2
<i>Not vaccinated</i>	8.0	1.8	9.2	18.4	5.0	5.1	13.5	5.1	6.0
<b>Gender</b>									
<i>Female Circumcision</i>	41.4	2.8	40.8	40.4	43.1	42.9	37.6	39.4	47.1
<i>Access to credit facility</i>	13.8	1.2	14.4	6.8	12.5	9.1	6.5	22.3	11.9
<i>Male</i>	16.6	1.5	17.4	8.9	15.0	9.6	7.1	27.4	14.3
<i>Female</i>	11.2	1.2	11.7	4.9	10.0	8.7	5.9	17.4	9.4

All correspondence about the survey including definitions of terms and concepts should be addressed to:  
The Director-General, National Bureau of Statistics, Plot 762 Independence Avenue, Central Business District, Abuja