PIHS

PAKISTAN INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

ROUND 2: 1996-97

DRAFT: NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

Federal Bureau of Statistics
Government of Pakistan
Islamabad

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Introduction

Basic education

Primary health

Population welfare

Rural water supply & sanitation

Appendices

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The 2nd round (1996-97) of Pakistan Integrated Household Survey (PIHS) has been completed. Field Work of this round, based on 905 urban and rural communities was started in July 96 and was completed in October 97. This report has been prepared in a period of only two months after completion of data collection work. The current year's data combined with last year's information provides a sound baseline of the social and economic status of households and communities across the population.

The most valuable contributors to this report are the respondents from the 12,622 households who provided data for this report. PIHS staff being more experienced this time was able to secure more generous cooperation from the respondents. The timely completion of the 2nd round of the PIHS report has been possible because of the invaluable guidance and constant support provided by the senior officers of the Statistics Division. In addition, the enormous hard work put in by the PIHS management team at headquarters must also be recognized. Moreover, the PIHS field teams, Sample Design section and Data Processing Center of the Federal Bureau of Statistics worked hard with devotion to implement the plan according to schedule. It is indeed a matter of great pride for the whole organization.

Finally, this account will be incomplete without recognizing the contribution of the World Bank, Department for International Development (DFID) of the British Government, consultancy support of Oxford Policy Management (OPM) Group and Multi-Donor Support Unit (MSU) whose officers have remained associated with the PIHS Project from project preparation stage to the completion of the report.

(DR. NOOR MUHAMMAD LARIK)
Director General
Federal Bureau of Statistics
Statistics Division
Islamabad

PREFACE

The objective of the Pakistan Integrated Household Survey (PIHS), a national sample survey, is to provide household and community level data which can be used to monitor, evaluate, and assess the impact of Social Action Program (SAP). The 1996-97 PIHS is the second round of the project, the first one was conducted in 1995-96 and its report was released in Oct 1996. The field operation of this survey was started in July 1996 and completed in Oct 1997. The final report has been prepared within the short time of two months after completion of the field work. The report provides information at the national and provincial levels with an urban / rural break down.

This report contains five chapters i.e. Introduction, Basic Education, Primary Health, Population Welfare and Rural Water Supply & Sanitation.

This report is an invaluable source of information that can be used to study a number of topics of interest from a policy perspective. Besides providing latest year's (1996-97) data, its comparison has been made with the 1995-96 round of PIHS survey and as well as with the 1991 PIHS data. This is a large household survey covering about 12,622 households from which data have been collected on a number of different topics. The tables presented in this report are only a small proportion of tables useful for monitoring the Social Action Program (SAP). Data on diskettes as well as necessary documentation for the 1996-97 PIHS can be purchased from the Federal Bureau of Statistics on payment of a nominal fee. Researchers and institutions interested in acquiring this data should contact the PIHS Section, Federal Bureau of Statistics for further information in this regard.

Comments and suggestions for improving future issues of this report will be most welcome.

(DR. NOOR MUHAMMAD LARIK)
Director General
Federal Bureau of Statistics
Statistics Division
Islamabad

SUMMARY OF KEY INDICATORS

BASIC EDUCATION									
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
PRIMARY GER (CLASS 1-5)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL	**86**	**59**	**73**	**85**	**64**	**75**	**80**	**64**	**72**
Punjab				85	70	78	80	69	75
Sindh				86	62	74	83	62	73
NWFP				80	49	65	74	55	65
Baluchistan				86	63	75	76	46	62
PRIMARY NER (CLASS 1-5)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL	**53**	**39**	**46**	**49**	**38**	**44**	**46**	**37**	**42**
Punjab				50	39	45	45	39	42
Sindh				50	39	45	51	39	45
NWFP				42	28	35	42	32	37
Baluchistan				51	39	45	43	27	36
GIRLS' ENROLMENT (% TOTAL ENROLMENT)									
OVERALL			**39**			**42**			**42**
Punjab						43			44
Sindh						41			41
NWFP						37			41
Baluchistan						39			34
GOVT ENROLMENT (% TOTAL ENROLMENT)	**M**	**F**	**T**	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL	**87**	**85**	**86**	**80**	**78**	**79**	**78**	**78**	**78**
Punjab				79	78	78	75	77	76
Sindh				76	70	74	78	76	77
NWFP				89	86	88	85	87	86
Baluchistan				95	93	94	91	94	92
DROP-OUT RATES (% DROPPING OUT)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
CLASS 1				0.5	1.0	0.7	1.9	1.0	1.5
CLASS 2				2.5	2.5	2.5	3.7	3.2	3.5
CLASS 3				6.0	6.0	6.0	6.3	6.4	6.4
CLASS 4				8.9	10.1	9.3	9.3	10.2	9.6
CLASS 5				13.0	13.9	13.3	13.1	14.3	13.6
CLASS 6				21.8	33.7	26.2	22.0	33.2	26.4
LITERACY RATES (10 YEARS AND OVER)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL	**48**	**21**	**35**	**52**	**26**	**39**	**51**	**28**	**39**
Punjab				52	28	40	51	30	40
Sindh				57	31	45	57	33	45
NWFP				43	14	28	46	17	30
Baluchistan				47	11	30	44	9	27
MIDDLE GER (CLASS 6-8)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL				**64**	**34**	**49**	**59**	**35**	**47**
Punjab				58	35	47	55	36	46
Sindh				65	39	53	66	40	55
NWFP				70	28	49	65	29	47
Baluchistan				72	23	50	53	18	37

PRIMARY HEALTH									
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
AT LEAST 1 IMMUNISATION (5 YEARS AND UNDER)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL	**72**	**68**	**70**	**78**	**77**	**78**	**82**	**81**	**82**
Punjab				83	83	83	87	86	87
Sindh				74	72	73	76	76	76
NWFP				68	66	67	78	73	75
Baluchistan				72	72	72	71	71	71
FULL IMMUNISATION (5 YEARS AND UNDER)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL	**29**	**22**	**25**	**54**	**53**	**54**	**52**	**51**	**51**
Punjab				62	60	61	59	58	58
Sindh				43	39	41	35	34	35
NWFP				41	44	43	51	47	49
Baluchistan				59	59	59	55	56	56
DIARRHOEA LAST 30 DAYS (5 YEARS AND UNDER)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL	**27**	**25**	**26**	**18**	**17**	**18**	**16**	**14**	**15**
Punjab				20	20	20	18	14	16
Sindh				13	13	13	11	12	11
NWFP				17	16	17	21	18	20
Baluchistan				13	10	12	8	8	8
DIARRHOEA CASES WHERE ORS GIVEN (5 YEARS AND UNDER)	**M**	**F**	**T**	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL	**47**	**46**	**47**	**48**	**51**	**49**	**50**	**47**	**48**
Punjab				40	41	40	40	37	39
Sindh				69	76	73	69	62	65
NWFP				62	67	65	64	59	62
Baluchistan				49	36	44	43	52	48
INFANT MORTALITY (PER 1,000 LIVE BIRTHS)	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
OVERALL				**105**	**97**	**101**	**101**	**108**	**105**
Punjab				103	95	99	108	121	115
Sindh				109	112	110	93	105	99
NWFP				102	71	87	81	67	74
Baluchistan				113	122	117	117	99	108
TETANUS TOXOID (% MARRIED WOMEN AGED 15-49)	U	R	T	U	R	T	U	R	T
OVERALL									**83**
Punjab									83
Sindh									85
NWFP									82
Baluchistan									55

POPULATION WELFARE									
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
% WOMEN EVER MARRIED (AGED 15-49 YEARS)	U	R	T	U	R	T	U	R	T
OVERALL									
15-19 YEARS			**73**			**69**			**68**
20-24 YEARS			22			18			14
25-29 YEARS			69			60			60
30-34 YEARS			92			87			87
35-39 YEARS			96			95			95
40-44 YEARS			98			98			98
45-49 YEARS			98			98			98
			100			98			99
MEAN NUMBER OF CHILDREN EVER BORN(WOMEN AGED 15 TO 45 YEARS)	U	R	T	U	R	T	U	R	T
OVERALL			**3.2**			**2.9**			**2.9**
15-19 YEARS			0.1			0.1			0.1
20-24 YEARS			1.2			0.9			0.9
25-29 YEARS			3.0			2.6			2.6
30-34 YEARS			4.7			4.2			4.3
35-39 YEARS			6.2			5.6			5.7
40-44 YEARS			6.8			6.6			6.5
45-49 YEARS			7.0			7.0			7.2
AGE-SPECIFIC & TOTAL FERTILITY RATES(WOMEN AGED 15-49 YEARS)			T			T			T
15-19 YEARS			102			70			65
20-24 YEARS			279			253			253
25-29 YEARS			314			319			321
30-34 YEARS			283			260			263
35-39 YEARS			188			188			183
40-44 YEARS			72			102			106
45-49 YEARS			33			33			33
TOTAL FERTILITY RATE			**6.35**			**6.13**			**6.12**
CONTRACEPTIVE PREVALENCE RATE (WOMEN AGED 15-49 YEARS)			**T**			T			T
OVERALL						**14**			**17**
Punjab						14			18
Sindh						16			18
NWFP						15			15
Baluchistan						6			6

RURAL WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION									
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
MAIN SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER (% HOUSEHOLDS)	U	R	T	U	R	T	U	R	T
TAP IN HOUSE						25			24
TAP OUTSIDE HOUSE						3			3
HAND/MOTOR PUMP						56			52
DUG WELL						8			11
RIVER/CANAL/STREAM						3			9
OTHER						5			2
TOTAL						**100**			**100**
USE OF PROTECTED WATER (% TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS)	U	R	T	U	R	T	U	R	T
Punjab						93			94
Sindh						79			81
NWFP						54			48
Baluchistan						43			38
OVERALL						**83**			**83**
TYPE OF TOILET (% HOUSEHOLDS)	U	R	T	U	R	T	U	R	T
HOUSEHOLD FLUSH						34			42
NON-FLUSH						14			14
COMMUNAL LATRINE						3			
NO TOILET						48			44
TOTAL						**100**			**100**
TYPE OF SANITATION SYSTEM (% HOUSEHOLDS)	**U**	**R**	**T**	U	R	T	U	R	T
UNDERGROUND DRAINS						14			15
OPEN DRAINS						45			39
SOAK PIT						8			
NO SYSTEM						34			45
TOTAL						**100**			**100**

1. Introduction

1.1 Human development in Pakistan

As a recent study of human development in South Asia concludes, Pakistan's social indicators make dismal reading.[1] Although economic growth, above average for the region as a whole, has resulted in a steady reduction in poverty since the early 1970s, studies highlight two important issues.[2] First, substantial poverty persists throughout the country. Second, improvements in human development indicators have been very slow and remain low compared with countries of comparable per capita incomes (see Table 1.1 where Pakistan is compared with selected South Asian countries).[3]

Infant mortality is significantly higher in Pakistan than India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. Attempts by government to expand the coverage of basic services are compounded by a population growth rate of 2.9 per cent per annum which is the highest in South Asia. A contributory factor is a contraceptive prevalence rate that is the lowest in South Asia. Not only are aggregate levels of key social indicators low in Pakistan, but they are disproportionately low for women. Pakistan's literacy rate is amongst the lowest in the world. However, although the adult male literacy rate is much lower than India and Sri Lanka, the rate for females is considerably worse. The adult female literacy rate is less than half the female average for low-income countries.

Although these indicators have been improving since the early 1970s, progress has been slow and has fluctuated according to the priority given the social sectors by successive governments.[4] Low levels of investment, weak implementation, flawed programme design, and low levels of effort have all hampered improvement in the social sectors. Above all, studies highlight a lack of political commitment at all levels in bringing about significant increases in indicators. Addressing these problems is the primary objective of the Government of Pakistan's Social Action Programme.

Commentators are united in the belief that sustained economic growth and poverty reduction can not be achieved without increased investment and institutional reform in the social sectors. The aim of this investment is smaller, healthier and better-educated families. On the one hand, only when social indicators are improved will the poor be able to benefit more widely from the opportunities provided by economic growth. On the other, without a healthy and well-educated work force, economic growth will be held back in the longer run.

1.2 The Social Action Programme

The Social Action Programme (SAP), focusing on primary education, basic health, population welfare, and rural water supply and sanitation, aims to address the low level of human development in Pakistan through improvements in:

- implementation, by strengthening planning, budgeting and operational efficiency;
- service design, with a focus on quality and access, especially for women and girls;
- levels of effort, including government funding and community responsibility; and,
- political will.

[1] For a wide-ranging discussion of human development indicators in the region see Haq, M. (1997) *Human Development in South Asia*, Oxford University Press, Karachi.
[2] See World Bank (1995) *Pakistan Poverty Assessment*, World Bank, Washington, for a discussion of poverty trends in Pakistan (using a consumption measure). It concludes that the incidence of poverty declined from 46 per cent in 1984/85 to 34 per cent in 1990/91. It also tentatively concludes that poverty continued to decline between 1990/91 and 1994/95.
[3] The data in Table 1.1 are drawn from the World Bank's 1997 World Development report. The figures for Pakistan are not taken from the PIHS which accounts for why they differ from the estimates presented in this report. They are listed here for comparative purposes only.
[4] For a discussion of the impact of government policy in Pakistan on social indicators see Cornia. G.A. (1997) "Accelerating Human Development in Pakistan", in T.J. Banuri et al (eds) *Just Development*, Oxford University Press, Karachi.

SAP has been planned over two phases. SAP I, which covered the period from 1993/94 to 1995/96, was successful both in redirecting public expenditure in favour of the social sectors, and within the social sectors, it was also successful in increasing the proportion of expenditure allocated to basic services that benefit the poor. SAP II, which covers the period 1997/98 to 2000/01 will follow a broadly similar approach to SAP I but will build on the lessons learned in delivery and implementation.[5] During SAP II, a greater priority will be given to fostering government/NGO/private sector partnerships. The overall goal of SAP II is to improve the quality of social service provision in Pakistan. In addition, SAP II hopes to address a number of cross-sectoral objectives, including:

- an increase in the non-salary portion of the recurrent budget to ensure adequate provision of quality inputs;
- addressing governance issues such as merit-based staff recruitment, employment incentives and absenteeism, and facility site selection;
- expanding capacity by strengthening government systems of service delivery through improved planning, monitoring and implementation and financing non-government provision of services; and,
- increasing community and beneficiary participation.

1.3 SAP and the PIHS

In order to monitor the success of the various SAP initiatives, data is needed to help identify the beneficiaries of the programme, and the extent to which increased investment in the social sectors actually results in improved service access and welfare outcomes. It was for this purpose that the series of PIHS surveys was launched. Round I (1995/96) was completed in October 1996.[6] The results of Round II (1996/97) are presented in this report. At present, two more rounds are envisaged: Round III in 1998 and Round IV in 2000 so that results are available for the mid-term and final evaluations of SAP II.

An important objective of the PIHS is to try and establish what the distributional impact of SAP has been. Policymakers need to know, for example, whether the poor have benefited from the programme or whether increased government expenditure on the social sectors has been captured by the better-off. In order to do this, a measure of living standards is needed so that benefits from public investment in social services can be compared across different income groups. For this purpose, PIHS includes a measure of household consumption (expenditure on goods and services) against which many of the outcome variables are tabulated. In Round I, the number of items in the consumption module was limited and provided the basis for only a crude measure of household consumption. In Round II, the consumption module has been expanded and refined so that the consumption measure used in this report will be more reliable measure of household welfare than Round I.[7]

Looking ahead, it is hoped that the anticipated amalgamation from 1998 of the PIHS and another of FBS's surveys, the Household Integrated Economic Survey (HIES), will provide a rich source of socio-economic data for both government and independent researchers alike.[8] This would entail dropping the consumption module from the PIHS and replacing it with the full consumption expenditure module from the HIES. The combination of the range of socio-economic data from PIHS with the robust measure of expenditure from the HIES will open up new avenues of research, not just on the impact of SAP, but more generally on the analysis of poverty in Pakistan.

In the remainder of this introduction, a background to the 1996/97 PIHS is provided. In the following four chapters, data relating to the four SAP sectors are presented (basic education, primary health, population welfare, and rural water supply and sanitation).

[5] MSU (1997) "Proposed Second Social Action Program Project: National Aide-Memoire", Islamabad.
[6] See GoP (1996) *Pakistan Integrated Household Survey Round 1, 1995/96*, Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad.
[7] See Appendix C for a description of how the consumption aggregates were estimated.
[8] The Household Integrated Economic Survey used to be called the Household Income and Expenditure Survey.

1.4 The PIHS sample

The sample size of the 1996-97 PIHS survey was fixed by the Federal Bureau of Statistics (FBS) at a level high enough to allow most estimates to be obtained for each province and region (urban/rural). In addition, for key variables, the aim of the sampling strategy was to provide estimates with confidence intervals of plus or minus 5 per cent. In the case of the 1991 PIHS, however, the sample size for the survey was considerably smaller than that for the 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS surveys (see Table 1.2). The reader should bear this in mind when using the information presented in this report.[9]

A two-stage random sampling strategy was adopted for the 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS surveys. At the first sampling stage, a number of clusters or Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) were selected from different parts of the country. Enumerators then compiled lists of all households residing in the selected PSUs. At the second sampling stage, these lists were subsequently used to select a fixed number of households from each PSU for interviews using a systematic sampling procedure with a random start. This two-stage sampling strategy was used in order to reduce survey costs, and to improve the efficiency of the sample. The number of PSUs to be drawn from each strata in the first stage was fixed so as to ensure that there were enough observations to allow representative statistics to be derived for each main strata of interest.

Use of this particular sampling procedure means that households residing in different parts of the country have been selected for the PIHS surveys with differing probabilities of selection. In order to derive representative statistics for each of the provinces, as well as for the country as a whole, raising factors (i.e. sampling weights) have been applied to the 1991, 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS data sets. These raising factors take into account the sampling strategy adopted in both of these surveys, and result in data for different households being weighted by a factor that is inversely proportional to their probability of selection in the sample.

Under this second round of the PIHS, data was collected from some 12,622 households living in 905 different primary sampling units (PSUs) selected throughout the Punjab, Sindh, NWFP, and Baluchistan (see Table 1.2). The data was collected between July 1996 and June 1997, apart from NWFP where the enumeration was completed in October 1997. All households were therefore not enumerated at the same time of the year. The survey is also being implemented in Azad Jammu and Kashmir, FATA, and FANA, the results of which will be presented in a later report.

In each of the selected PSUs, a fixed number of households were selected at random (12 in each urban PSU, 16 in each rural PSU), and a detailed household questionnaire was administered to each of them. In addition, in each PSU, a community questionnaire was also completed which gathered information on the quality of infrastructure, the provision of services, and consumer prices prevailing in the community.

Before moving on to discuss questionnaire content, two issues are worth elaborating with respect to PIHS sampling in Round II: sample size and household selection. With respect to sample size, it was recognised after Round I that the rural Baluchistan sample was too small to make accurate estimates of key variables. Accordingly, the number of Baluchistan rural households was increased from 950 in Round I to 1,111 in Round II. Regarding household selection, in Round II of the PIHS the enumeration team sought to re-interview two-thirds of the households from Round I, and replace one-third with new households. If the original household from Round I could not be found then they were not replaced. The enumeration teams were successful in locating almost all the original households from Round I.

1.5 Household and community questionnaires

At the individual and household level, the PIHS collects information on a wide range of topics using an integrated questionnaire. The household questionnaire comprises a number of different modules, each of which looks at a particular aspect of household behaviour or welfare. Data collected under Round II included educational attainment and health status of all household members. In addition, information was also sought on the maternity history and family planning practices of all eligible household members. Finally, data was also

[9] See Appendix D for a fuller description of PIHS sampling.

collected on the household's consumption of goods and services in the last fortnight / month / year, as well as on housing conditions and access to basic services and amenities.

The modules used for Round II differed slightly from those used in Round I (see Table 1.3 for a comparison). The main changes in the questionnaire included: dropping the sections on vocational education and parental attitudes to education; dropping the sections in the health module covering other illnesses and injuries, and disabilities; revising the consumption module substantially; and including new sections on pre- and post-natal care, and maternal mortality. In addition, many individual questions were revised in several of the sections. Where this has been done, an explanation is provided in the notes under each table.

As the maternity history and family planning sections of the PIHS questionnaire were deemed too sensitive for male interviewers to administer directly to women, female interviewers were included in each of the field teams. This allowed the household questionnaire to be split into two parts. One part was administered to male members 10 years and older and the other to all female members. Children under 10 years were covered in the female questionnaire. Barring exceptional circumstances where individuals were not at home or unable to answer for themselves, all individual level information was obtained directly from each household member.

Data was also collected through the community questionnaire on the quality of infrastructure in the PSU, as well as the range of publicly and privately provided services (education, health, family planning, and water supply and sanitation) in the community. Information was also collected in the community questionnaire on each government health facility and primary school in the PSU. This part included questions on staffing at the facility, the quality of infrastructure, as well as the utilisation of services by members of the community.

PIHS data collected at the household and community level in each PSU provides a very rich source of data. It can be used to assess some of the dimensions of household welfare in different parts of the country, as well as to identify the main beneficiaries of different government policies and programmes.

1.6 Objectives and scope of analysis of the report

Data collected by PIHS provides a rich and unique resource that can be used to study a number of topics of interest from a policy perspective. However, in the interests of publishing the results of each round of the survey as quickly as possible, this report is descriptive rather than analytic in approach. It highlights the main findings of the 1996-97 PIHS and compares them with the previous round (1995-96), and the PIHS undertaken in 1991. Where possible, data from other national level surveys are also provided for comparison. Given that the PIHS is a large, complex household survey that collects information on a number of different topics, the tabulations presented here comprise only a small subset of the large number of tables that could be prepared using data from the survey.

Although the 1991 PIHS is not the ideal baseline for investigating changes over time (it pre-dates SAP by two years), the many similarities between the surveys make it useful for comparison. The surveys use the same sampling frame, and were enumerated by the same institution. Furthermore, data from the 1991 PIHS has been re-analysed so that direct comparisons can be made with the 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS findings. For all tables, the same definitions have been used when comparisons have been made over time, unless stated otherwise.

In order to show how these indicators vary between different groups, wherever possible, the data presented in the report are disaggregated by gender, by geographic group, as well as by the income level of households. However, as the level of disaggregation increases, so do the confidence intervals of key variables. Within these parameters, the report thus allows for an assessment of how different groups have fared in relation to the enhanced investment in the social sectors under the Social Action Programme. In particular, in order to understand gender differences in access to services, estimates are presented separately for both men and women.

In the report prepared from Round I of the PIHS, it was possible to report significant changes in many indicators between 1991 and 1995-96. When examining the results of the 1996-97 PIHS it is important to recognise two things. First, that indicators should not be expected to have moved sharply in any direction in the year that has passed since the 1995-96 survey. Second, that when indicators have moved between Round 1 and Round 2, it is more than likely due to large confidence intervals rather than real shifts. The confidence intervals

for many of the variables are quite high, due in part to the design effect of the two-stage stratified sampling procedure and the sample size (see Appendix A). In sum, the main use of the findings from this round is not to provide accurate estimates of changes in the levels of key indicators between 1995-96 and 1996-97 but to confirm the findings of Round I of the PIHS.

Before moving on to look at the representativeness of the results, it should be noted that, after increasing the sample size for Baluchistan, the confidence intervals are still very large. For the next round of PIHS, the intention is to double the sample size for Baluchistan, and to review the household listing procedure. In addition, to reduce non-sampling error, more resources will be allocated to the overall management of the survey.[10]

1.7 Representativeness of results

Before comparing estimates of social indicators across surveys it is worth investigating the extent to which these surveys are representative of the population of Pakistan as a whole. Unfortunately, there are very few independent and reliable sources of data against which the representativeness of the 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS can be assessed. The last population census in Pakistan was conducted more than 16 years ago, and is therefore of limited use in comparing demographic estimates. However, despite the passage of time, a few key demographic features should nonetheless be similar to those found in the 1981 Pakistan Population Census. Table 1.4, where the age-sex profile of the two recent rounds of the PIHS are compared with the 1991 Population Census, confirms that this is indeed the case. Similarly, both surveys indicate a slightly higher proportion of males compared to females in the overall population, a demographic feature of Pakistan. From the 1996-97 PIHS, average household size in Pakistan is estimated to be 6.8 (Table 1.5).

[10] See Appendix B for a discussion of the sampling in Baluchistan.

TABLE 1. 1 COMPARISION OF SELECTED SOCIAL INDICATORS

INDICATOR	COUNTRY				
	PAKISTAN	SRI LANKA	INDIA	BANGLA-DESH	ALL LOW-INCOME COUNTRIES
GNP per capita (1995, US$)	460	700	340	240	430
Life expectancy (1995, years)	60	72	62	58	63
Infant mortality (1995, per 1,000 live births)	90	16	68	79	69
Total fertility rate (1995, children)	5.2	2.3	3.2	3.5	3.2
Population growth (1990-95, per cent)	2.9	1.3	1.8	1.6	1.7
Contraceptive prevalence rate (1989-95, per cent)	14	Na	43	40	Na
Male adult literacy (1995, per cent)	50	93	65	49	76
Female adult literacy (1995, per cent)	24	87	38	26	55
Boys' primary gross enrolment rate (1993, per cent)	80	106	113	128	112
Boys' primary gross enrolment rate (1993, per cent)	49	105	91	105	98
Access to safe water (1994-95, per cent)	60	57	63	83	Na
Access to sanitation (1994-95, per cent)	30	66	29	30	Na

NOTES:

1. All figures from World Bank (1997) *World Development Report 1997*, World Bank, Washington.
2. "Low-income economies" refers to the poorest 49 economies, ranked according to GNP per capita.

TABLE 1. 2 PROFILE OF THE 1991, 1995-96, AND 1996-97 PIHS SAMPLES

PROVINCE	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PSUs:									
Punjab	76	78	154	184	213	397	184	212	396
Sindh	41	42	83	125	115	240	125	114	239
NWFP	21	21	42	62	87	149	62	88	150
Baluchistan	12	9	21	49	60	109	49	71	120
Overall	**150**	**150**	**300**	**420**	**475**	**895**	**420**	**485**	**905**
HOUSEHOLDS:									
Punjab	1,213	1,247	2,460	2,168	3,388	5,556	2,171	3,373	5,544
Sindh	655	669	1,324	1,492	1,814	3,306	1,497	1,817	3,314
NWFP	336	336	672	679	1,321	2,000	699	1,376	2,075
Baluchistan	192	144	336	569	950	1,519	578	1,111	1,689
Overall	**2,396**	**2,396**	**4,792**	**4,908**	**7,473**	**12,381**	**4,945**	**7,677**	**12,622**
INDIVIDUALS:									
Punjab	8,724	8,814	17,538	14,539	21,732	36,271	14,531	22,024	36,555
Sindh	4,657	4,975	9,632	9,431	11,969	21,400	9,700	12,969	22,669
NWFP	2,620	3,074	5,694	5,310	10,492	15,802	5,345	10,684	16,029
Baluchistan	1,560	1,273	2,833	4,423	6,866	11,289	4,641	7,969	12,610
Overall	**17,561**	**18,136**	**35,697**	**33,703**	**51,059**	**84,762**	**34,217**	**53,646**	**87,863**

NOTES:

1. Only those individuals who were classified as household members in the 1991 PIHS and the 1995-96 PIHS have been included in the above table, and in all tables that follow in this report.

TABLE 1. 3 COMPARISION OF THE1995-96 AND 1996-97 PIHS QUESTIONNAIRES

1995-96 PIHS	1996-97 PIHS
MALE HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE	**MALE HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE**
1. HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION A: Male Household Roster 2. EDUCATION A: Literacy B: Formal Education C: Vocational /Tech. Training D: Parental Attitudes 3. HEALTH C: Other illnesses or injuries D: Disabilities 4. MARRIAGE AND MATERNITY HISTORY E: Men's Marriage History 5. EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME A: Employment B: Income 6. HOUSING 7. ACCESS TO FACILITIES 8. HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION	1. HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION A: Male Household Roster B: Sources of Income 2. EDUCATION A: Literacy B: Formal Education 4: MARRIAGE AND MATERNITY HISTORY F: Men's Marriage History 5. HOUSING 6. HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION A: Food Expense And Home Production B: Non-Food Expenditure
FEMALE HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE	**FEMALE HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE**
1. HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION A: Female Household Roster 2. EDUCATION A: Literacy B: Formal Education C: Vocational/Tech. Training D: Parental Attitudes 3. HEALTH A: Diarrhoea B: Immunisation C: Other illnesses or injuries D: Disabilities 4. MARRIAGE AND MATERNITY HISTORY A: Pregnancy History B: Family Planning C: Maternity History D: Maternal Mortality 5. EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME A: Employment B: Income	1. HOUSEHOLD INFORMATION A: Female Household Roster 2. EDUCATION A: Literacy B: Formal Education 3. HEALTH A: Diarrhoea B: Immunisation 4. MARRIAGE AND MATERNITY HISTORY A: Maternal Mortality B: Pregnancy History C: Family Planning D: Pre- and Post-Natal Care E: Maternity History
COMMUNITY AND PRICE QUESTIONNAIRE	**COMMUNITY AND PRICE QUESTIONNAIRE**
1. COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS 2. HEALTH FACILITIES 3. PRIMARY SCHOOL 4. CONSUMER PRICE	1.COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS .A: Facilities B: Water Supply & Sanitation 2. HEALTH FACILITIES 3. PRIMARY SCHOOL SURVEY 4. CONSUMER PRICE

TABLE 1. 4 STRUCTURE OF THE POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX

	1981 CENSUS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
AGE-CATEGORY	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
URBAN	**53.5**	**46.5**	**100.0**	**51.2**	**48.8**	**100.0**	**51.3**	**48.7**	**100.0**
0 - 4	7.6	7.4	15.0	6.7	6.5	13.2	6.1	6.4	12.5
5 - 9	7.7	7.2	14.9	7.3	7.5	14.8	7.3	6.9	14.3
10 - 14	6.9	6.2	13.1	7.3	6.8	14.2	7.4	6.9	14.2
15 - 19	5.7	4.9	10.7	6.4	5.6	12.0	6.6	6.1	12.7
20 - 24	4.9	4.0	8.8	4.7	4.4	9.1	5.0	4.3	9.3
25 - 29	4.0	3.3	7.2	3.4	3.6	7.0	3.4	3.5	7.0
30 - 34	3.2	2.7	5.8	2.8	2.9	5.7	2.7	2.7	5.4
35 - 39	2.8	2.5	5.4	2.7	2.7	5.4	2.5	2.8	5.3
40 - 44	2.5	2.2	4.7	2.3	2.0	4.3	2.3	2.1	4.4
45 - 49	2.1	1.6	3.7	1.9	1.4	3.3	2.0	1.5	3.5
50 - 54	1.9	1.4	3.3	1.6	2.0	3.7	1.7	1.9	3.6
55 - 59	1.0	0.8	1.8	1.2	1.1	2.4	1.2	1.1	2.3
60 - 64	1.4	0.9	2.3	1.2	0.9	2.1	1.2	0.9	2.0
65 +	1.9	1.4	3.2	1.7	1.3	3.1	2.0	1.6	3.6
RURAL	**52.1**	**47.9**	**100.0**	**50.5**	**49.5**	**100.0**	**50.3**	**49.7**	**100.0**
0 - 4	7.5	7.9	15.5	7.8	7.6	15.4	7.8	7.5	15.3
5 - 9	8.5	7.9	16.5	8.9	8.0	17.0	9.0	8.1	17.0
10 - 14	7.2	6.0	13.2	7.1	6.7	13.8	7.1	6.7	13.8
15 - 19	4.9	4.1	9.0	5.1	5.0	10.1	5.1	5.3	10.4
20 - 24	3.6	3.4	7.1	3.7	4.2	7.9	3.8	4.1	7.8
25 - 29	3.3	3.1	6.5	3.1	3.5	6.6	3.0	3.6	6.6
30 - 34	2.8	2.7	5.5	2.5	2.9	5.4	2.3	2.9	5.2
35 - 39	2.5	2.5	5.0	2.2	2.4	4.6	2.2	2.4	4.6
40 - 44	2.3	2.4	4.7	1.8	1.7	3.5	1.8	1.9	3.7
45 - 49	1.9	1.8	3.8	1.7	1.5	3.2	1.7	1.5	3.1
50 - 54	2.0	1.7	3.7	1.4	2.1	3.5	1.4	1.8	3.2
55 - 59	1.1	1.0	2.0	1.2	1.2	2.4	1.2	1.3	2.6
60 - 64	1.7	1.2	2.9	1.5	1.2	2.7	1.4	1.1	2.4
65 +	2.7	2.0	4.7	2.5	1.6	4.1	2.5	1.8	4.3
OVERALL	**52.5**	**47.5**	**100.0**	**50.7**	**49.3**	**100.0**	**50.6**	**49.4**	**100.0**
0 - 4	7.6	7.8	15.3	7.4	7.3	14.7	7.3	7.2	14.4
5 - 9	8.3	7.7	16.0	8.4	7.9	16.3	8.5	7.7	16.2
10 - 14	7.1	6.0	13.2	7.1	6.8	13.9	7.2	6.7	13.9
15 - 19	5.1	4.4	9.5	5.5	5.2	10.7	5.6	5.5	11.1
20 - 24	4.0	3.6	7.6	4.0	4.2	8.2	4.1	4.2	8.3
25 - 29	3.5	3.2	6.7	3.2	3.6	6.7	3.1	3.6	6.7
30 - 34	2.9	2.7	5.6	2.6	2.9	5.5	2.4	2.8	5.2
35 - 39	2.6	2.5	5.1	2.4	2.5	4.8	2.3	2.5	4.8
40 - 44	2.4	2.3	4.7	2.0	1.8	3.8	2.0	1.9	3.9
45 - 49	2.0	1.8	3.7	1.8	1.5	3.2	1.8	1.5	3.2
50 - 54	2.0	1.6	3.6	1.5	2.1	3.6	1.5	1.9	3.3
55 - 59	1.0	0.9	2.0	1.2	1.2	2.4	1.2	1.2	2.5
60 - 64	1.6	1.1	2.7	1.4	1.1	2.5	1.3	1.0	2.3
65 +	2.5	1.8	4.3	2.3	1.5	3.8	2.4	1.7	4.1

NOTES:

1. Only those individuals who were classified as household members in the 1991 PIHS and the 1995-96 PIHS have been included in the above table.
2. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 1. 5 AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE

PROVINCE	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
Punjab				6.7	6.3	6.4	6.7	6.5	6.6
Sindh				6.3	6.4	6.4	6.4	7.0	6.7
NWFP				7.8	7.9	7.9	7.7	7.7	7.7
Baluchistan				7.5	7.0	7.1	7.8	7.1	7.2
Overall	**7.3**	**7.4**	**7.3**	**6.6**	**6.6**	**6.6**	**6.7**	**6.8**	**6.8**

2. Basic Education

2.1 Introduction

Compared with other low-income countries, literacy and primary school enrolment rates in Pakistan are low. Many studies of the education system in Pakistan have concluded that the quality of government primary schools is poor, with many schools lacking adequate teachers and resources. The expansion and improvement in quality of publicly provided primary education is a key SAP objective, and commands a large share of the overall budget. The SAP strategy for the sector includes:

- improving the functioning and utilisation of existing schools;
- improving the quality of education;
- increasing girls' enrolment;
- improving access to education; and,
- expanding the primary education system.[11]

In the rest of this chapter, education data is presented with respect to: school attendance; enrolment rates; expenditure on education; early leavers and non-attendance; literacy; katchi class; middle and matric classes; access to schools; and, characteristics of schools and communities.

2.2 School attendance

There has been an increase in the percentage of the population 10 years and over that has ever attended school from 47 per cent to 51 per cent between 1991 and 1996-97 (Table 2.1). The proportion is highest in Sindh (54 per cent) and lowest in Baluchistan (33 per cent). The proportion of males that has ever attended school is nearly double that of females. Although the proportion for Baluchistan looks to have dropped from 1995-96 to 1996-97, the confidence intervals for Baluchistan are large and the difference is therefore more than likely due to sampling.[12] The proportion of the 10-14 years age group that has ever attended school stands at 72 per cent compared with 69 per cent in 1991 (Table 2.2).

There is a positive relationship between school attendance and household income in every province and region. In other words, the better off the household, the more likely it is that its members have ever attended school. In Table 2.3, the percentage of the population that has ever attended school is presented for five different income groups. In some areas there is a striking relationship between income and school attendance. A crude way of capturing these differences is to estimate the quintile ratio (the top quintile divided by the bottom quintile). The highest provincial quintile ratio is in urban NWFP (77/39 = 2), where only 39 per cent of the poorest 20 per cent of the population (the 1st quintile) have ever attended school compared with 77 per cent of the richest 20 per cent (the 5th quintile). In other areas, the difference between the quintiles is not so great. For example, in rural Baluchistan (quintile ratio of 1.2), 32 per cent of the richest quintile have attended school compared with 26 per cent of the poorest quintile.

The population 10 years and over that has completed primary level or higher has increased from 33 per cent in 1991 to 37 per cent in 1996-97 (Table 2.4). The proportion is highest in Sindh (42 per cent) and lowest in Baluchistan (22 per cent). In Pakistan as a whole, the percentage of males who have completed primary level is nearly double that of females; in rural areas it is nearly treble. In rural Baluchistan, only 4 per cent of females over ten years of age have completed primary school. Some 58 per cent of the 15-19 years age group in Pakistan have completed primary school compared with only 14 per cent of the 60+ age group (Table 2.5).

[11] For SAP I strategies see World Bank (1994) "Staff Appraisal Report, Social Action Program Project", World Bank, Washington.
[12] For the confidence intervals of key variables see Appendix A. For a discussion of differences in the Baluchistan data between 1995-96 and 1996-97 see Appendix B.

2.3 Enrolment rates

Under SAP I, an important target was to increase Pakistan's primary level gross enrolment rate GER from 69 to 88 per cent by the end of the Eighth Plan (1998).[13] The GER, sometimes referred to as the participation rate, is the number of children attending primary school divided by the number of children who ought to be attending. The GERs are presented in this report in two different ways: including and excluding the katchi class (Tables 2.6A and 2.6B). The reason for including new tables covering the katchi class is that provincial governments now regard it as part of the primary school cycle.

The PIHS data set provides an accurate way of measuring the GER. It has two main advantages over other sources. First, the PIHS includes data on all types of schools, not just those run by the government. Second, the total number of children in the relevant age groups can be estimated from the survey data, instead of relying on projections based on the 1981 Population Census.

Applying the same definition of the primary GER to the three PIHS datasets, there looks to be almost no change in the overall rate between 1991 and 1996-97: 72 per cent in 1996-97 compared with 73 per cent in 1991 (Table 2.6A). If the katchi class is included in the definition of primary school (i.e. classes 0-5 instead of 1-5), and the age group 5-10 years is examined (instead of 5-9 years), the GER is slightly lower at 70 per cent in the 1996-97 PIHS (Table 2.6B). These findings are supported by other surveys. For example, similar GER levels were reported by UNICEF's Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey (MICS).[14] The MICS national gross enrolment rate for the 5 to 11 age group in 1995 was estimated at 70 per cent (65 per cent for females and 74 per cent for males).

Comparing the GER between the provinces, the rate is highest in Punjab and lowest in Baluchistan. The rate for Baluchistan looks to have fallen between 1995-96 and 1996-97 but it is not possible to confirm that this is not a result of sampling error. The confidence interval for the GER in Baluchistan is nearly 20 percentage points.[15]

The difference between the GER for males and females is considerably higher in rural areas compared to urban areas – both in relative and absolute terms. However, data from the PIHS suggests that the gap between male and female enrolment has been declining. Between 1991 and 1996-97, the female GER has increased from 59 per cent to 64 per cent and the male rate has declined from 86 per cent to 80 per cent. Thus, the gap between males and females has fallen from 27 per cent to 16 per cent.

How do GER growth rates in the 1990s compare with the 1980s? Whilst the female GER has been growing at rate of 1.5 per cent per annum between 1991 and 1996-97, the male GER has declined by –1.3 per cent per annum. These figures may be contrasted with a female GER annual growth rate of 7.1 per cent and a male GER growth rate of 1.7 per cent in the 1980s.[16] In other words, the annual growth in the GER for both males and females looks to have declined since 1991, compared with the previous decade. As a result of these trends, the SAP target of 88 per cent GER by 1998 will not be reached.

A key objective of SAP with respect to the education sector is to boost female enrolment at the primary level. As noted above, girls' enrolment has been increasing at a faster rate than boys' enrolment. Another way of looking at female enrolment is to express it as a percentage of boys' enrolment. This ratio has risen between 1991 and 1996-97 from 39 to 42 per cent, compared with a SAP I target of 45 per cent by 1998 (Table 2.9A). However, a factor contributing to the closing of the gender gap is the fact that the male GER has fallen over this period.

Net enrolment rates (NERs) for Pakistan are much lower than GERs. The NER refers to the number of students enrolled in primary school of primary school age divided by the number of children in the age cohort for that level of education. In other words, with respect to Pakistan, it refers to the number of children aged 5 to 9 years attending primary level divided by the number of children aged 5 to 9 years. Including katchi involves widening the age group to 5 to 10 year olds.

[13] For SAP I targets see GoP (1995) "Report to the Pakistan Consortium", Planning Commission, Islamabad.
[14] GoP/UNICEF (1995) *Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey of Pakistan*, Ministry of Health, Islamabad.
[15] See Appendix A.
[16] Source: Cornia, G.A. (1997) *op cit*.

The national NER for Pakistan in 1996-7 is 42 per cent and looks to have declined since 1991 when the NER stood at 46 per cent (Table 2.7A). Net enrolment is highest in Sindh and lowest in Baluchistan. Whilst the male urban Sindh NER stands at 58 per cent, the female rural Baluchistan rate is a mere 24 per cent. If enrolment in katchi is included, and the age category is extended to include 10 year olds, then the NER is higher, at 55 per cent (Table 2.7B).

The reason for the large difference between the GER and the NER is the significant number of over-age children who attend primary school. Table 2.8 gives a good picture of this situation. Whilst only 29 per cent of 5 year old boys attend primary school, some 56 per cent of 11 year olds (who are supposed to be over age) are at school. The PIHS NERs are much lower than those derived from the MICS where the national NER (5+ to 9+ age cohort) was estimated at 66 per cent in 1995. Given that both surveys report large numbers of over-age children attending school, the reason for the difference may be that the MICS applied different definition of the NER to their data.

The PIHS data suggest a positive relationship between household income and primary enrolment in both urban and rural areas. In Tables 2.10 and 2.11, the gross and net primary level enrolment rates have been estimated for each income group. For example, in rural Punjab, whilst the GER for the poorest 20 per cent of the population is only 46 per cent, it rises to 91 per cent for the richest 20 per cent. Girls' enrolment as a percentage of total enrolment at primary level is tabulated against income groups in Table 2.12. Although the percentage is higher for the richest quintile compared with the poorest quintile in all combinations of region and province except urban Sindh, a relationship is not at all clear and would require further investigation.

The PIHS can present a broader picture of the education sector than EMIS because it provides information on all types of school, not just the government sector. Although SAP aims to increase the number of places at government schools, what has happened to the government sector compared to the private sector since 1991? A smaller percentage of primary students are enrolled in government schools compared with six years ago. Enrolment in government primary schools as a percentage of total primary enrolment has fallen from 86 per cent in 1991 to 78 per cent in 1996-97 (Table 2.13A). It is highest in rural Sindh, where 97 per cent of children go to government primary schools and lowest in urban Punjab (50 per cent). In general, private schools are more important in urban areas. Given that enrolment rates have not been improving since 1991, it would seem that the private primary sector is expanding at a faster rate than the government (public) sector.[17]

As might be expected, it is the better-off households who are able to send their children to private primary schools (Table 2.14). In all combinations of province and region, the percentage of schoolchildren enrolled in government schools falls as income rises. However, in urban areas, a significant proportion of the poor manages to educate their children outside the government sector. For example, in urban Punjab, fully 37 per cent of the poorest quintile educate their children in private primary schools.

2.4 Expenditure on education

Those students attending private primary schools spend, on average, four times as much as those attending government primary schools (Table 2.15). Average annual expenditure in primary level non-government schools is Rupees 2,808 compared with Rupees 761 at government primary schools. Perhaps a surprising feature of expenditure on government primary schools is the low proportion that is accounted for by fees (some 6 per cent). This would suggest that school fees in themselves are not that great a factor in determining attendance. It is the other costs that really add up, like uniforms, books and transport.

[17] In fact, data from the 1995-96 PIHS show that only in the case of rural girls was there any significant increase in the absolute number in public primary schools between 1991 and 1995-96.

2.5 Early leavers and non-attendance

A high proportion of children in Pakistan leave school before completing, or never attend school at all. Looking at the 10-18 year old age group who attended primary school, some 16 per cent left before completing in 1996-97 (Table 2.16). The rate in rural areas is nearly twice as high as urban areas. Girls are more likely to leave early than boys in rural areas; the reverse is true in urban areas.[18]

Another way of looking at the data is to calculate the drop-out rate – the percentage of children of a cohort that leave early. In Table 2.17, the percentage that left each class has been calculated for the 15-19 year age cohort. For rural Pakistan, some 32 per cent of children of this age cohort who started school did not complete class 6, with most dropping out in the last three classes. Some 47 per cent of girls did not complete class 6 in rural Pakistan compared with 24 per cent of boys. There is a strong relationship between dropping out and household income (Table 2.18). Looking at rural Pakistan, some 50 per cent of the poorest quintile dropped out by class 6 compared with only 25 per cent of the richest quintile.

In rural areas, the most frequently quoted reasons as to why girls left early were "too expensive" (19 per cent), "parents didn't allow" (14 per cent), and "completed desired education" (10 per cent) (Table 2.19). For boys in rural areas, the main reasons were "too expensive" (20 per cent), "had to help at work" (13 per cent), and "completed desired education" (11 per cent). In urban areas, cost seems to be the over-riding factor determining why children leave early. Similar reasons are advanced as to why children never attend school, although distance is cited more frequently in rural areas (Table 2.20).

2.6 Literacy

Literacy is the most important indicator with respect to the education sector in the sense that, unlike school attendance or enrolment rates, it relates to an outcome. Furthermore, improvements in literacy are likely to have an impact, in the longer run, on other important indicators. For example, female literacy is usually associated with fertility rates, and infant and child health.

The overall literacy rate for those 10 years of age and over in Pakistan in both the 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS is 39 per cent, compared with 35 per cent in the 1991 PIHS (Table 2.21).[19] The rate is therefore far short of the target for SAP I of 53 per cent. Looking at literacy rates for different age-cohorts, it should be noted that the SAP target of 53 per cent is only exceeded in the 15-19 year old group (Table 2.22).

Urban rates are much higher than in rural areas and there are wide differences between the provinces. Overall, Sindh's rate, at 45 per cent, is the highest, whilst Baluchistan, the lowest, has a rate of only 27 per cent. Although the level for Baluchistan is three percentage points lower in the 1996-97 survey than 1995-96, the confidence interval for literacy in this province is large.[20] Literacy is strongly associated with household income (Table 2.23). Only very small percentages of the poor, particularly in rural areas, are literate. Between 15 and 20 per cent of the poorest quintile in rural areas are literate in Pakistan's four provinces. The rates for poor women are extremely low in rural areas. For example, in Baluchistan, only 2 per cent of the poorest quintile are literate. The situation is not a lot better in the other provinces, where not more than 8 per cent of women in the poorest quintile are literate. It would seem that SAP has a long way to go in reaching the rural poor.

The national female literacy rate, at 28 per cent, is considerably lower than the male rate of 51 per cent. However, using the PIHS data, between 1991 and 1996-97 the female literacy rate is estimated to have grown at an annual rate of 5.4 per cent per annum compared with only 1.1 per cent for males. These growth rates compare with 3.8 per cent per annum for female literacy and 1.7 per cent per annum for male literacy between 1980 and

[18] For a wider discussion of the school drop out/non-attendance problem see GoP (1997) "Education Sector Report", Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad.
[19] The 1991 PIHS also included the ability to perform a simple sum in its definition. In practice, almost all individuals who can read can also perform a simple sum.
[20] See Appendix A.

1990.[21] Even though the annual growth rate in female literacy looks to have increased during the period covered by SAP, nevertheless, this increase in the annual female literacy rate is not sufficient to enable 1998 SAP I target of 40 per cent female literacy by 1998 to be met.

2.7 Katchi class

Now that the katchi (reception) class is becoming part of the official primary system, it is useful to look at some of the characteristics of its pupils. One aspect of katchi is the very wide range of ages that attend, even though it is supposed to be for five-year olds (Table 2.24). Overall, only 29 per cent of the katchi class are actually aged five. Some 29 per cent of katchi are aged 6, and 20 per cent are aged 7. Late entry to katchi is more a feature of rural than urban areas. Overall, the province with the highest proportion of students enrolled in katchi is NWFP with 21 per cent; the lowest is Sindh with only 6 per cent (Table 2.25). The proportion of school students attending katchi is slightly higher in rural than urban areas (15 and 13 per cent respectively).

2.8 Middle and matric levels

A higher percentage of children are enrolled at government schools at middle (class 6-8) and matric (9-10), compared to primary level (class 0-5) (Table 2.26). Whilst some 77 per cent of primary school children are at government schools, the percentage rises to 85 per cent for middle and matric levels. Gross and net enrolment rates for the middle level, presented in Tables 2.27 and 2.28, indicate a sharp decline in enrolment compared to primary level. Gross enrolment for middle level stands at 47 per cent as opposed to 70 per cent for primary level. A feature of enrolment at the middle level is the even larger gap that has opened up between boys' (55 per cent) and girls' (22 per cent) gross enrolment in rural Pakistan. As with primary level, there is a strong positive relationship between enrolment and household income (Tables 2.29 and 2.30). A noteworthy feature of these two tables is the very low female enrolment rates for poor households in rural areas.

At matric level, gross enrolment stands at 42 per cent and net enrolment at 18 per cent (Tables 2.31 and 2.32). However, the gap between boys' and girls' enrolment in rural areas becomes even wider at this level. The NER for girls at matric level in rural Pakistan is only 6 per cent compared with 21 per cent for boys. Like primary and middle level, there is also a strong relationship between enrolment and household income (Tables 2.33 and 2.34).

2.9 Access to schools

The PIHS data suggest that the vast majority of children in Pakistan live within close proximity of a primary school (Table 2.35). For rural areas, the percentage with a return trip less than 2 km is highest in Sindh (94 per cent) and lowest in NWFP (89 per cent). This would suggest that SAP has been successful with respect to the construction of primary schools. It also supports the finding above that distance may not be a major factor determining why children never attend school.

The data on distances from household presented in Table 2.35 may be contrasted with access data from the community questionnaire (Table 2.36). The striking feature here is the difference in access for boys' and girls' government primary schools. Whilst 64 per cent of rural PSUs have a boys' government primary school, only 50 per cent have a girls government primary school. Girls have to travel particularly long distances to school in Baluchistan and Sindh.

2.10 Characteristics of schools and communities

A selection of school and community summary statistics from the community questionnaire are presented in Tables 2.37-2.38. With respect to staffing, some 11 per cent of government girls' primary schools have 50 per cent or more of their sanctioned female posts vacant (compared to 10 per cent in 1995-96) (Table 2.37). Student:teacher ratios are slightly better for girls' (31 pupils per teacher) than boys' (33 pupils per teacher) schools. School management committees are to be found in about half of all government schools, with

[21] Source: Cornia, G.A. (1997) *op cit*.

higher rates in Punjab and Sindh. Around half the school committees have a say in the management of the school budget.

Over the last three years, the number of government girls' primary schools has increased in 5 per cent of PSUs; the same percentage as boys' schools (Table 2.38). These figures may be contrasted with the rapid increase in the number of private primary schools over the same period. Some 18 per cent of PSUs reported an increase in the number of girls' private primary schools, and 45 per cent an increase in the number of private co-ed schools.

Changes in the conditions of government primary schools were not reported to have been dramatic over the last three years (Table 2.38). The number of female staff increased in only around 21 per cent of girls' government primary schools, the highest increase being in Baluchistan. The number of classrooms increased in 13 per cent of girls' primary schools; again, Baluchistan did better than the other provinces in this regard. Although school maintenance was reported to have improved in only a small number of schools, an increase in the availability of books was evident. Nearly half of government girls' schools reported an increase in the book supply at girls' schools, most noticeably in Punjab and Sindh.

TABLE 2. 1 POPULATION THAT HAS EVER ATTENDED SCHOOL - BY REGION AND PROVINCE

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**75**	**49**	**63**	**80**	**57**	**69**	**78**	**57**	**68**
Punjab				80	58	69	77	58	68
Sindh				81	59	71	81	60	71
NWFP				80	44	62	74	41	58
Baluchistan				68	31	50	68	34	52
RURAL AREAS:	**59**	**20**	**40**	**63**	**25**	**44**	**61**	**25**	**43**
Punjab				65	29	47	63	29	46
Sindh				59	14	38	56	16	37
NWFP				62	21	41	62	22	41
Baluchistan				53	15	35	47	11	30
OVERALL:	**64**	**29**	**47**	**69**	**35**	**52**	**66**	**35**	**51**
Punjab				70	38	54	67	38	52
Sindh				70	36	54	68	38	54
NWFP				66	25	44	64	26	44
Baluchistan				56	18	38	50	14	33

NOTES:

1. Population aged 10 years and older that has ever attended school, expressed as a percentage of the total population aged 10 years and older.
2. Attended school: For the 1991, 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS, all those individuals who have ever attended school (either currently attending, or attended in the past) were taken to have attended school.

TABLE 2. 2 POPULATION THAT HAS EVER ATTENDED SCHOOL - BY AGE-CATEGORY

REGION AND AGE-CATEGORY	PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**75**	**49**	**63**	**80**	**57**	**69**	**78**	**57**	**68**
10 - 14 years	88	75	82	90	80	85	90	80	85
15 - 19 years	85	71	79	89	78	83	86	79	83
20 - 24 years	82	59	71	84	69	77	84	70	77
25 - 29 years	78	50	65	81	56	68	77	57	67
30 - 34 years	79	43	62	82	50	66	79	51	65
35 - 39 years	78	32	55	77	43	60	76	44	59
40 - 44 years	66	22	44	73	37	56	73	38	56
45 - 49 years	62	24	45	73	36	57	69	32	53
50 - 54 years	60	17	40	71	23	44	66	24	43
55 - 59 years	52	11	32	68	23	46	65	21	44
60 + years	43	9	29	54	14	37	49	12	33
RURAL AREAS:	**59**	**20**	**40**	**63**	**25**	**44**	**61**	**25**	**43**
10 - 14 years	83	44	64	83	49	66	80	51	66
15 - 19 years	73	35	55	80	41	61	80	42	61
20 - 24 years	69	21	46	73	30	50	72	29	49
25 - 29 years	61	15	39	65	19	41	60	19	37
30 - 34 years	59	10	34	59	12	34	58	13	33
35 - 39 years	53	8	31	57	11	33	55	9	31
40 - 44 years	49	4	27	52	8	31	45	8	26
45 - 49 years	44	7	28	48	7	29	46	7	28
50 - 54 years	34	4	18	43	4	20	42	2	19
55 - 59 years	30	1	16	43	3	23	33	3	18
60 + years	21	2	13	26	4	17	24	3	15
OVERALL PAKISTAN:	**64**	**29**	**47**	**69**	**35**	**52**	**66**	**35**	**51**
10 - 14 years	84	53	69	85	59	72	83	60	72
15 - 19 years	77	46	62	83	53	69	82	55	69
20 - 24 years	73	34	54	77	42	59	76	42	59
25 - 29 years	66	26	47	70	31	49	66	30	47
30 - 34 years	65	19	42	67	24	44	65	24	43
35 - 39 years	61	16	39	64	22	42	62	21	41
40 - 44 years	54	10	32	60	18	40	55	18	37
45 - 49 years	49	12	33	56	15	38	54	15	36
50 - 54 years	43	8	25	52	10	28	50	9	27
55 - 59 years	36	4	21	51	9	30	43	8	25
60 + years	27	4	17	33	6	22	31	6	20

NOTES:

1. Population in the relevant category that has ever attended school, expressed as a percentage of the total population in the age-category.
2. Attended school: For the 1991, 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS, all those individuals who have ever attended school (either currently attending, or attended in the past) were taken to have attended school.

TABLE 2. 3 POPULATION THAT HAS EVER ATTENDED SCHOOL - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER - 1996-97 PIHS					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**77**	**58**	**68**	**63**	**29**	**46**
1st Quintile	58	35	47	52	15	33
2nd Quintile	71	47	59	57	23	39
3rd Quintile	78	58	68	63	28	45
4th Quintile	83	64	73	67	35	51
5th Quintile	93	81	87	72	41	56
SINDH:	**81**	**60**	**71**	**56**	**16**	**37**
1st Quintile	66	37	52	43	10	26
2nd Quintile	73	50	62	50	14	33
3rd Quintile	83	63	73	51	13	33
4th Quintile	85	70	78	63	17	42
5th Quintile	93	79	86	67	24	47
NWFP:	**74**	**41**	**58**	**62**	**22**	**41**
1st Quintile	57	22	39	45	15	28
2nd Quintile	66	28	47	55	13	33
3rd Quintile	73	37	56	61	22	40
4th Quintile	81	54	68	68	26	46
5th Quintile	88	63	77	75	34	54
BALUCHISTAN:	**68**	**34**	**52**	**47**	**11**	**30**
1st Quintile	63	17	41	43	8	26
2nd Quintile	55	20	39	46	9	28
3rd Quintile	62	27	45	45	8	28
4th Quintile	71	39	55	50	13	33
5th Quintile	85	57	72	48	14	32

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Attended school: All those individuals who have ever attended school (either currently attending, or attended in the past) were taken to have attended school.

TABLE 2. 4 POPULATION THAT HAS COMPLETED PRIMARY LEVEL OR HIGHER

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**57**	**36**	**47**	**64**	**44**	**54**	**62**	**45**	**54**
Punjab				63	45	54	61	46	54
Sindh				67	48	57	64	49	57
NWFP				59	29	44	57	31	44
Baluchistan				51	19	36	51	24	38
RURAL AREAS:	**40**	**12**	**27**	**43**	**14**	**28**	**42**	**15**	**28**
Punjab				45	17	30	43	18	30
Sindh				41	8	25	42	10	27
NWFP				40	9	24	43	12	27
Baluchistan				38	6	23	33	4	19
OVERALL:	**46**	**19**	**33**	**50**	**23**	**37**	**49**	**25**	**37**
Punjab				50	25	37	49	26	37
Sindh				54	27	41	53	29	42
NWFP				44	13	28	46	15	30
Baluchistan				41	9	26	36	7	22

NOTES:

1. Population 10 years and older that has completed primary level (i.e. Class 5) or higher, expressed as a percentage of the total population aged 10 years and older.
2. Completed primary level: For the 1991,1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS all those individuals who report having completed Class 5 or higher (either in the past, or who are currently enrolled in class 6 or higher) are taken to have completed primary level.

TABLE 2. 5 POPULATION THAT HAS COMPLETED PRIMARY LEVEL - BY AGE-CATEGORY

AGE-CATEGORY	PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER - 1996-97 PIHS								
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS			OVERALL PAKISTAN		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
OVERALL:	**62**	**45**	**54**	**42**	**15**	**28**	**49**	**25**	**37**
10 - 14 years	43	39	41	33	17	25	36	24	30
15 - 19 years	76	73	75	67	32	49	70	46	58
20 - 24 years	76	65	71	60	24	41	66	37	52
25 - 29 years	69	53	61	48	15	30	55	26	40
30 - 34 years	72	45	59	48	10	27	56	21	37
35 - 39 years	67	39	52	44	7	25	52	18	34
40 - 44 years	65	33	50	35	6	20	46	15	31
45 - 49 years	60	28	46	36	6	22	44	12	30
50 - 54 years	57	22	38	33	1	15	41	8	23
55 - 59 years	55	18	37	23	2	12	33	6	19
60 + years	39	10	27	15	2	10	21	4	14

NOTES:

1. Population in the relevant category that has completed primary level (i.e. Class 5) or higher, expressed as a percentage of the total population in the age-category.
2. Completed primary level: For the 1996-97 PIHS, all those individuals who report having completed Class 5 or higher (either in the past, or who are currently enrolled in class 6 or higher) are taken to have completed primary level.

TABLE 2. 6 GROSS ENROLMENT RATE AT THE PRIMARY LEVEL

REGION AND PROVINCE	GROSS PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
A. EXCLUDING KATCHI CLASS:									
URBAN AREAS:	**97**	**87**	**92**	**95**	**90**	**92**	**95**	**91**	**93**
Punjab				95	92	93	91	95	93
Sindh				95	90	93	100	93	96
NWFP				88	82	85	99	70	84
Baluchistan				97	72	86	99	73	86
RURAL AREAS:	**82**	**48**	**66**	**81**	**54**	**68**	**74**	**53**	**64**
Punjab				82	62	72	76	59	68
Sindh				78	39	59	71	41	56
NWFP				79	42	61	70	52	62
Baluchistan				84	61	73	73	41	58
OVERALL:	**86**	**59**	**73**	**85**	**64**	**75**	**80**	**64**	**72**
Punjab				85	70	78	80	69	75
Sindh				86	62	74	83	62	73
NWFP				80	49	65	74	55	65
Baluchistan				86	63	75	76	46	62
B. INCLUDING KATCHI CLASS:									
URBAN AREAS:				**93**	**84**	**88**	**91**	**84**	**87**
Punjab				91	87	89	89	88	89
Sindh				96	84	90	92	81	87
NWFP				92	80	86	93	71	82
Baluchistan				86	63	75	89	69	79
RURAL AREAS:				**77**	**50**	**64**	**73**	**52**	**63**
Punjab				77	57	67	76	59	68
Sindh				75	34	55	60	35	48
NWFP				81	45	63	77	53	65
Baluchistan				70	50	61	69	38	55
OVERALL:				**81**	**60**	**71**	**78**	**61**	**70**
Punjab				81	65	73	80	67	73
Sindh				84	56	70	74	54	64
NWFP				82	51	66	79	56	68
Baluchistan				73	52	63	72	42	58

NOTES:

1. A: Gross enrolment rate: [Number of children attending primary level (primary level includes class 1-5 : - enrolment in katchi is excluded) divided by number of children aged 5 - 9 years] multiplied by 100.
2. B: Gross enrolment rate: [Number of children attending primary level (primary level includes class 0-5 : - enrolment in katchi is included) divided by number of children aged 5 - 10 years] multiplied by 100.
3. Numerator of GER: Raised sum of all individuals who report currently attending primary level.
4. Denominator of GER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 5 - 9 years, or 5 - 10 years as applicable, who respond to the relevant questions.

TABLE 2. 7 NET ENROLMENT RATE AT THE PRIMARY LEVEL

REGION AND PROVINCE	NET PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
A. EXCLUDING KATCHI CLASS:									
URBAN AREAS:	**61**	**57**	**59**	**56**	**55**	**55**	**56**	**55**	**55**
Punjab				55	55	55	54	56	55
Sindh				58	57	57	58	56	57
NWFP				52	50	51	55	45	50
Baluchistan				57	41	49	53	47	50
RURAL AREAS:	**50**	**31**	**41**	**47**	**31**	**39**	**43**	**30**	**37**
Punjab				49	34	42	42	32	38
Sindh				45	24	35	46	28	37
NWFP				40	24	32	40	30	35
Baluchistan				49	39	44	42	24	34
OVERALL:	**53**	**39**	**46**	**49**	**38**	**44**	**46**	**37**	**42**
Punjab				50	39	45	45	39	42
Sindh				50	39	45	51	39	45
NWFP				42	28	35	42	32	37
Baluchistan				51	39	45	43	27	36
B. INCLUDING KATCHI CLASS:									
URBAN AREAS:				**71**	**67**	**69**	**71**	**67**	**69**
Punjab				71	69	70	72	72	72
Sindh				71	67	69	71	64	67
NWFP				74	63	68	73	58	65
Baluchistan				63	47	55	66	54	60
RURAL AREAS:				**58**	**38**	**48**	**58**	**40**	**49**
Punjab				59	42	51	60	45	53
Sindh				51	27	39	49	28	39
NWFP				61	36	49	62	43	53
Baluchistan				52	40	47	51	29	41
OVERALL:				**61**	**46**	**54**	**61**	**48**	**55**
Punjab				62	49	56	63	52	58
Sindh				59	44	52	58	43	51
NWFP				63	41	52	63	45	55
Baluchistan				54	41	48	53	32	44

NOTES:

1. A: Net enrolment rate: [Number of children aged 5 - 9 years attending primary level (primary level includes class 1-5 : - enrolment in katchi is excluded) divided by number of children aged 5 - 9 years] multiplied by 100.
2. B: Net enrolment rate: [Number of children aged 5 - 10 years attending primary level (primary level includes class 0 - 5 - enrolment in katchi is included) divided by number of children aged 5 - 10 years] multiplied by 100.
3. Numerator of NER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 5 - 9 years, or 5 - 10 years as applicable, who report currently attending primary level.
4. Denominator of NER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 5 - 9 years, or 5 - 10 years as applicable, who respond to the relevant questions.

TABLE 2. 8 PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN ATTENDING PRIMARY AND SECONDARY LEVEL

AGE IN COMPLETED YEARS	PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN - 1996-97 PIHS					
	BOYS			GIRLS		
	PERCENT IN PRIMARY	PERCENT IN SECONDARY	PERCENT NOT IN SCHOOL	PERCENT IN PRIMARY	PERCENT IN SECONDARY	PERCENT NOT IN SCHOOL
5 YEARS	29	...	71	26	...	74
6 YEARS	54	...	46	44	...	56
7 YEARS	66	...	34	54	...	46
8 YEARS	73	...	27	54	...	46
9 YEARS	77	...	23	57	1	42
10 YEARS	70	4	26	53	3	44
11 YEARS	56	20	24	43	15	42
12 YEARS	35	34	31	29	21	50
13 YEARS	17	51	32	15	29	56

NOTES:

1. Children enrolled in primary level: Enrolled in class 0 - 5.
2. Children enrolled in secondary level: Enrolled in class 6 - 10.
3. ... A few outliers from these cells have been deleted.
4. Row totals for boys and girls may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 2. 9 GIRLS' ENROLMENT AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT - 1996-97 PIHS					
	EXCLUDING KATCHI CLASS			INCLUDING KATCHI CLASS		
	1991	1995-96	1996-97	1991	1995-96	1996-97
URBAN AREAS:	**47**	**49**	**48**		**48**	**47**
Punjab		49	49		49	49
Sindh		49	46		47	46
NWFP		50	44		49	45
Baluchistan		40	41		40	42
RURAL AREAS:	**35**	**38**	**39**		**38**	**39**
Punjab		40	41		40	41
Sindh		32	35		31	36
NWFP		34	40		35	39
Baluchistan		39	32		39	32
OVERALL:	**39**	**42**	**42**		**41**	**42**
Punjab		43	44		43	43
Sindh		41	41		40	41
NWFP		37	41		38	40
Baluchistan		39	34		39	34

NOTES:

1. Girls enrolled in primary level, expressed as a percentage of the total number of children enrolled in primary level .

TABLE 2. 10 GROSS PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	GROSS PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT) - 1996-97 PIHS					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:						
1st Quintile	69	63	66	55	36	46
2nd Quintile	79	83	81	74	51	63
3rd Quintile	99	99	99	81	65	74
4th Quintile	109	107	108	91	74	83
5th Quintile	108	104	106	95	85	91
SINDH:						
1st Quintile	69	54	62	47	20	34
2nd Quintile	89	83	86	57	35	46
3rd Quintile	106	86	96	64	34	50
4th Quintile	100	99	99	69	43	56
5th Quintile	114	101	108	74	51	63
NWFP:						
1st Quintile	81	48	63	58	40	49
2nd Quintile	87	60	73	73	42	58
3rd Quintile	100	77	90	76	52	65
4th Quintile	107	92	99	86	61	74
5th Quintile	92	95	94	102	79	91
BALUCHISTAN:						
1st Quintile	77	51	63	52	26	41
2nd Quintile	84	60	74	63	33	49
3rd Quintile	80	58	69	76	42	61
4th Quintile	100	88	94	81	47	64
5th Quintile	116	100	108	84	44	66

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Gross enrolment rate: (Number of children attending primary level (i.e. class 0 - 5) divided by number of children aged 5 - 10 years) multiplied by 100.

TABLE 2. 11 NET PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	NET PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT) - 1996-97 PIHS					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:						
1st Quintile	53	47	50	41	28	35
2nd Quintile	65	66	66	57	37	47
3rd Quintile	79	83	81	65	51	58
4th Quintile	85	86	85	70	57	64
5th Quintile	93	92	92	77	69	73
SINDH:						
1st Quintile	47	41	44	37	15	26
2nd Quintile	68	62	65	47	28	37
3rd Quintile	83	71	77	55	31	43
4th Quintile	79	77	78	52	34	43
5th Quintile	95	88	92	59	42	51
NWFP:						
1st Quintile	60	38	48	47	32	40
2nd Quintile	70	51	60	63	38	51
3rd Quintile	72	59	66	62	40	52
4th Quintile	87	75	81	66	47	57
5th Quintile	78	82	80	78	66	72
BALUCHISTAN:						
1st Quintile	61	44	52	42	20	32
2nd Quintile	61	45	55	48	24	37
3rd Quintile	57	45	52	57	38	49
4th Quintile	74	65	70	55	31	44
5th Quintile	81	77	79	58	34	47

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Net enrolment rate: (Number of children aged 5 - 10 years attending primary level (i.e. class 0 - 5) divided by number of children aged 5 - 10 years) multiplied by 100.

TABLE 2. 12 GIRLS' ENROLMENT AS PERCENTAGE OF PRIMARY ENROLMENT

REGION AND	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT - 1996-97 PIHS

INCOME GROUP	PUNJAB	SINDH	NWFP	BALUCHISTAN
URBAN AREAS:				
1st Quintile	44	42	42	41
2nd Quintile	53	49	41	34
3rd Quintile	51	45	38	39
4th Quintile	48	49	47	47
5th Quintile	48	40	57	47
RURAL AREAS:				
1st Quintile	38	28	40	29
2nd Quintile	39	39	35	33
3rd Quintile	40	33	38	31
4th Quintile	43	37	40	36
5th Quintile	44	40	44	30

NOTES:

1. Girls enrolled in primary level (Class 0 - 5), expressed as a percentage of the total number of children enrolled in primary level in the quintile indicated.
2. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
3. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.

TABLE 2. 13 GOVT. PRIMARY ENROLMENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIMARY ENROLMENT

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
A. EXCLUDING KATCHI CLASS:									
URBAN AREAS:	**68**	**72**	**70**	**57**	**58**	**57**	**54**	**59**	**56**
Punjab				55	55	55	47	53	50
Sindh				54	58	56	59	63	60
NWFP				73	72	72	70	72	71
Baluchistan				87	87	87	82	88	85
RURAL AREAS:	**95**	**94**	**95**	**90**	**91**	**91**	**89**	**91**	**90**
Punjab				87	91	89	87	90	88
Sindh				97	94	96	98	97	97
NWFP				92	92	92	89	91	89
Baluchistan				97	94	96	93	96	94
OVERALL:	**87**	**85**	**86**	**80**	**78**	**79**	**78**	**78**	**78**
Punjab				79	78	78	75	77	76
Sindh				76	70	74	78	76	77
NWFP				89	86	88	85	87	86
Baluchistan				95	93	94	91	94	92
B. INCLUDING KATCHI CLASS:									
URBAN AREAS:				**53**	**55**	**54**	**51**	**57**	**54**
Punjab				52	52	52	45	53	49
Sindh				48	54	51	54	59	56
NWFP				68	74	71	68	69	69
Baluchistan				87	86	87	81	86	83
RURAL AREAS:				**90**	**91**	**90**	**89**	**90**	**89**
Punjab				87	90	88	86	88	87
Sindh				97	94	96	98	97	97
NWFP				91	91	91	88	90	89
Baluchistan				97	95	96	94	96	94
OVERALL:				**79**	**77**	**78**	**77**	**77**	**77**
Punjab				77	77	77	74	75	75
Sindh				72	67	70	75	73	74
NWFP				87	86	87	85	86	85
Baluchistan				95	93	94	92	94	92

NOTES:

1. A: Children attending primary level in a government school, expressed as a percentage of all children attending primary level - enrolment in katchi is excluded).
2. B: Children attending primary level in a government school, expressed as a percentage of all children attending primary level - enrolment in katchi is included).

TABLE 2. 14 GOVT. PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:						
1st Quintile	59	68	63	88	90	89
2nd Quintile	59	62	61	92	89	91
3rd Quintile	44	55	50	92	95	93
4th Quintile	38	48	43	81	84	82
5th Quintile	22	26	24	76	83	79
SINDH:						
1st Quintile	87	86	86	99	100	99
2nd Quintile	63	70	66	98	100	99
3rd Quintile	44	64	53	96	93	95
4th Quintile	49	43	46	98	100	99
5th Quintile	22	20	22	97	91	95
NWFP:						
1st Quintile	86	90	88	97	96	96
2nd Quintile	85	79	82	93	93	93
3rd Quintile	77	91	82	92	98	95
4th Quintile	49	68	58	88	97	92
5th Quintile	33	29	31	70	70	70
BALUCHISTAN:						
1st Quintile	94	94	94	95	100	96
2nd Quintile	86	93	88	97	100	98
3rd Quintile	89	92	90	95	100	97
4th Quintile	70	83	76	93	94	93
5th Quintile	63	74	68	89	84	87

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Children attending primary level in a government school, expressed as a percentage of all children attending primary level (including katchi class) in the quintile indicated.

TABLE 2. 15 AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL ON EDUCATION

REGION AND PROVINCE	AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURE IN RUPEES - 1996-97 PIHS								
	GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS			PRIVATE SCHOOLS			OVERALL		
	FEES	OTHER	TOTAL	FEES	OTHER	TOTAL	FEES	OTHER	TOTAL
URBAN AREAS:	**340**	**1,384**	**1,724**	**1,879**	**1,878**	**3,757**	**898**	**1,563**	**2,461**
Primary level	96	851	947	1,595	1,520	3,115	788	1,160	1,948
Middle level	201	1,364	1,565	2,437	2,561	4,998	759	1,663	2,422
Secondary level	422	1,807	2,229	2,356	2,787	5,142	873	2,035	2,908
Higher level	1,334	2,827	4,161	3,536	3,607	7,143	1,746	2,973	4,718
RURAL AREAS:	**122**	**1,013**	**1,135**	**958**	**1,353**	**2,311**	**205**	**1,047**	**1,252**
Primary level	33	670	703	889	1,229	2,118	125	730	856
Middle level	179	1,402	1,581	1,001	1,598	2,599	238	1,417	1,655
Secondary level	293	1,905	2,198	1,241	1,793	3,034	363	1,897	2,260
Higher level	1,108	3,481	4,589	1,679	2,232	3,910	1,170	3,345	4,515
OVERALL PAKISTAN:	**191**	**1,130**	**1,321**	**1,606**	**1,723**	**3,329**	**478**	**1,250**	**1,728**
Primary level	48	714	761	1,377	1,431	2,808	354	879	1,233
Middle level	188	1,388	1,575	2,048	2,301	4,349	466	1,524	1,991
Secondary level	347	1,864	2,211	2,057	2,521	4,578	600	1,961	2,561
Higher level	1,251	3,067	4,318	3,097	3,282	6,379	1,546	3,101	4,648

NOTES:

1. "Fees" include admission, tuition, and examination fees. "Other" includes expenditure on uniforms, books and supplies, private tuition, transport, and other education-related expenses.
2. "Government" school includes all government schools offering education at the indicated level. "Private" school includes all private schools, deeni madrassa, NGO/Foundation sponsored schools and other offering education at the indicated level.
3. "Primary" includes class 0 - 5, "Middle" includes Grades 6 - 8, "Secondary" includes Grades 9 - 10, and "Higher" includes Grade 11 and all other higher education codes reported.
4. Figures across rows may not add up because of rounding.

TABLE 2. 16 CHILDREN 10-18 YEARS THAT LEFT SCHOOL BEFORE COMPLETING PRIMARY LEVEL

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN THAT LEFT SCHOOL								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**14**	**12**	**13**	**13**	**8**	**11**	**13**	**8**	**11**
Punjab				15	8	12	15	7	11
Sindh				12	7	9	13	9	11
NWFP				12	18	14	9	10	10
Baluchistan				5	11	8	9	11	10
RURAL AREAS:	**17**	**27**	**20**	**15**	**26**	**19**	**17**	**25**	**20**
Punjab				17	25	20	20	26	22
Sindh				11	17	12	10	18	12
NWFP				17	35	23	15	29	20
Baluchistan				7	19	9	9	22	11
OVERALL:	**16**	**20**	**17**	**15**	**17**	**16**	**15**	**17**	**16**
Punjab				16	18	17	18	17	18
Sindh				11	9	10	11	11	11
NWFP				16	31	21	14	25	18
Baluchistan				7	16	9	9	17	11

NOTES:

1. Children aged 10 -18 years that left school before completing primary level, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 10-18 years that have attended school in the past, or are currently attending school (excluding those children currently attending school that are presently enrolled in Class 5 or lower). Note that this is not the drop-out rate from primary level (primary level includes class 1-5 only: - enrolment in katchi is excluded).
2. Percentage left school: Numerator is the total number of individuals aged 10-18 years who attended school, but left before completing primary level. The denominator is the numerator + total number of individuals aged 10-18 years who completed class 5 or higher, or who are currently attending class 6 or higher.

TABLE 2. 17 DROP-OUT RATES - CHILDREN'S COHORT AGED 15-19 YEARS

GENDER AND CLASS	PERCENTAGE OF COHORT THAT LEFT SCHOOL BEFORE COMPLETING CLASS					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
BOYS:						
CLASS 1	0.1	0.7	0.5	1.3	2.3	1.9
CLASS 2	2.2	2.8	2.5	2.4	4.6	3.7
CLASS 3	5.3	6.4	6.0	4.7	7.4	6.3
CLASS 4	7.6	9.7	8.9	7.3	10.5	9.3
CLASS 5	10.7	14.4	13.0	10.7	14.7	13.1
CLASS 6	18.7	23.8	21.8	18.4	24.2	22.0
GIRLS:						
CLASS 1	0.6	1.4	1.0	0.3	1.6	1.0
CLASS 2	1.1	3.8	2.5	0.9	5.3	3.2
CLASS 3	2.7	9.2	6.0	2.8	9.8	6.4
CLASS 4	5.1	14.9	10.1	4.4	15.7	10.2
CALSS 5	7.2	20.3	13.9	6.2	22.0	14.3
CLASS 6	17.9	48.8	33.7	18.4	47.4	33.2
BOTH SEXES:						
CLASS 1	0.3	1.0	0.7	0.9	2.1	1.5
CLASS 2	1.7	3.1	2.5	1.7	4.8	3.5
CLASS 3	4.2	7.3	6.0	3.8	8.2	6.4
CLASS 4	6.5	11.4	9.3	6.0	12.4	9.6
CLASS 5	9.2	16.4	13.3	8.6	17.3	13.6
CLASS 6	18.4	32.0	26.2	18.4	32.4	26.4

NOTES:

1. The cohort is of children 15 – 19 year olds that have attended primary school. Taking this cohort to be 100 percent, the table shows what percentage of this cohort dropped out of school before completing each class indicated. Those children in this cohort that are still attending school but have not completed primary school as yet, have been excluded from this table.

TABLE 2. 18 DROP-OUT RATES - CHILDREN'S COHORT AGED 15-19 YEARS - BY INCOME GROUP

INCOME GROUP	% COHORT THAT LEFT SCHOOL BEFORE COMPLETING CLASS 6		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
1st Quintile	23.8	49.8	44.7
2nd Quintile	28.9	33.5	35.5
3rd Quintile	19.4	34.7	30.4
4th Quintile	13.2	30.6	24.4
5th Quintile	6.0	25.0	14.4

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. The cohort is of children 15 – 19 year olds that have attended school . Taking this cohort to be 100 percent, the table shows what percentage of this cohort dropped out of school before completing grade 6. Those children in this cohort that are still attending school but have not completed primary school as yet, have been excluded from this table.

TABLE 2. 19 REASON FOR LEAVING SCHOOL BEFORE COMPLETING PRIMARY (10-18 YR OLDS)

PROVINCE AND REASON	PERCENTAGE OF CASES WHERE REASON WAS CITED - 1996-97 PIHS					
	BOYS			GIRLS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:						
Parents didn't allow	4	1	2	6	10	9
Too expensive	33	19	23	47	22	26
Too far	0	7	5	5	6	6
Education not useful	3	4	4	0	6	5
Had to help at work	6	12	10	2	3	3
Had to help at home	6	11	9	4	11	10
Completed desired education	16	13	14	7	8	8
Other	31	33	33	28	35	34
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:						
Parents didn't allow	5	0	3	15	27	20
Too expensive	19	13	17	24	2	15
Too far	2	2	2	2	11	6
Education not useful	4	6	5	2	3	2
Had to help at work	2	17	8	0	0	0
Had to help at home	0	6	2	10	6	9
Completed desired education	15	10	13	15	16	15
Other	52	46	50	32	35	33
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:						
Parents didn't allow	0	0	0	13	23	22
Too expensive	38	29	30	28	19	20
Too far	0	4	3	0	11	10
Education not useful	1	6	6	0	1	1
Had to help at work	26	13	14	0	2	2
Had to help at home	0	2	2	16	5	7
Completed desired education	5	6	6	11	13	13
Other	30	40	39	31	25	26
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:						
Parents didn't allow	0	0	0	8	4	5
Too expensive	34	6	12	11	9	10
Too far	0	5	4	0	14	10
Education not useful	3	4	4	10	41	32
Had to help at work	7	28	23	0	0	0
Had to help at home	6	18	16	0	4	3
Completed desired education	11	8	9	22	27	26
Other	39	30	32	49	2	14
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Parents didn't allow	4	0	2	10	14	13
Too expensive	29	20	23	35	19	23
Too far	1	6	4	3	7	6
Education not useful	3	5	4	1	5	4
Had to help at work	6	13	10	1	2	2
Had to help at home	4	9	7	8	9	9
Completed desired education	15	11	13	11	10	10
Other	38	36	36	31	32	32
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Children aged 10 - 18 years that cited the reason indicated for leaving school, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 10 -18 years that left school before completing primary level.
2. Reasons for leaving school before completing primary level: "Other" includes '3 Teacher does not teach', '4 Teacher not present', '5 Teacher beats kids', '6 No female teachers', '7 Poor discipline', '11 Child too sick', '12 No escort', '13 No transport', '14 Marriage', '17 Service' and '18 Other'.
3. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 2. 20 REASON FOR NEVER ATTENDING SCHOOL (10-18 YR OLDS)

PROVINCE AND REASON	PERCENTAGE OF CASES WHERE REASON WAS CITED - 1996-97 PIHS					
	BOYS			GIRLS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:						
Parents didn't allow	4	3	4	17	25	24
Too expensive	45	34	37	52	30	33
Too far	1	9	7	2	19	16
Education not useful	5	9	8	2	2	2
Had to help at work	8	14	12	5	5	5
Had to help at home	7	8	8	7	7	7
Other	31	23	25	15	13	13
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:						
Parents didn't allow	5	2	3	33	16	20
Too expensive	53	25	32	24	10	13
Too far	2	18	14	5	22	18
Education not useful	7	2	3	6	4	4
Had to help at work	9	16	14	0	1	1
Had to help at home	2	6	5	11	14	13
Other	22	31	29	21	34	31
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:						
Parents didn't allow	0	0	0	36	31	32
Too expensive	55	28	32	49	37	38
Too far	3	23	20	2	18	16
Education not useful	5	5	5	2	1	1
Had to help at work	16	12	13	0	0	0
Had to help at home	0	6	5	2	3	3
Other	21	26	25	10	10	10
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:						
Parents didn't allow	5	1	1	63	62	62
Too expensive	33	11	13	12	2	3
Too far	1	29	27	4	15	14
Education not useful	7	5	5	3	4	4
Had to help at work	2	8	7	0	0	0
Had to help at home	12	23	22	5	2	2
Other	39	24	26	13	16	15
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Parents didn't allow	4	3	3	27	27	27
Too expensive	48	29	33	41	25	28
Too far	2	15	12	3	19	16
Education not useful	5	6	6	3	2	2
Had to help at work	9	14	12	2	3	3
Had to help at home	5	8	8	8	7	7
Other	28	26	26	16	17	17
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Children aged 10 - 18 years that cited the reason indicated for never attending school, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 10 -18 years that have never attended .
2. Reasons for not attending school: "Other" includes '3 Teacher does not teach', '4 Teacher not present', '5 Teacher beats kids', '6 No female teachers', '7 Poor discipline', '11 Child too sick', '12 No escort', '13 No transport', '15 Too young', and '16 Other'.
3. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 2. 21 LITERACY - POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**66**	**49**	**57**	**65**	**50**	**58**
Punjab	65	50	58	64	51	57
Sindh	68	53	60	67	54	61
NWFP	58	31	45	58	34	46
Baluchistan	58	23	41	61	27	45
RURAL AREAS:	**45**	**16**	**31**	**44**	**17**	**31**
Punjab	46	20	33	45	21	32
Sindh	47	10	29	46	12	30
NWFP	40	11	25	43	13	27
Baluchistan	45	8	28	41	5	24
OVERALL PAKISTAN:	**52**	**26**	**39**	**51**	**28**	**39**
Punjab	52	28	40	51	30	40
Sindh	57	31	45	57	33	45
NWFP	43	14	28	46	17	30
Baluchistan	47	11	30	44	9	27

NOTES:

1. Population aged 10 years and older that is literate, expressed as a percentage of the population aged 10 years and older.
2. Literacy: For the 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS, literacy was taken as the ability to read a newspaper, and to write a simple letter.
3. This table uses a different definition of literacy compared to the 1995-96 PIHS report. Under the new definition, the ability to perform simple sum has been excluded.

TABLE 2. 22 LITERACY - POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER - BY AGE-CATEGORY

AGE-CATEGORY	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER - 1996-97 PIHS								
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS			OVERALL PAKISTAN		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
OVERALL:	**65**	**50**	**58**	**44**	**17**	**31**	**51**	**28**	**39**
10 - 14 years	54	57	56	41	27	34	45	36	41
15 - 19 years	75	74	75	65	33	49	69	47	58
20 - 24 years	75	67	71	60	25	42	65	38	52
25 - 29 years	68	54	61	48	15	30	55	27	40
30 - 34 years	71	46	58	47	11	27	55	21	37
35 - 39 years	68	41	53	44	8	25	52	19	35
40 - 44 years	66	35	51	35	6	20	46	16	31
45 - 49 years	62	32	49	39	6	23	47	14	32
50 - 54 years	59	23	40	35	1	16	44	8	24
55 - 59 years	57	22	40	28	2	15	37	7	22
60 + years	44	12	30	18	2	12	25	5	17

NOTES:

1. Population aged 10 years and older that is literate, expressed as a percentage of the population aged 10 years and older.
2. Literacy: For the 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS, literacy was taken as the ability to read a newspaper, and to write a simple letter.
3. This table uses a different definition of literacy compared to the 1995-96 PIHS report. Under the new definition, the ability to perform simple sum has been excluded.

TABLE 2. 23 LITERACY - POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER - 1996-97 PIHS					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**64**	**51**	**57**	**45**	**21**	**32**
1st Quintile	36	26	31	28	8	18
2nd Quintile	52	38	45	37	14	25
3rd Quintile	62	50	56	44	18	31
4th Quintile	73	58	65	49	26	38
5th Quintile	88	77	83	59	33	46
SINDH:	**67**	**54**	**61**	**46**	**12**	**30**
1st Quintile	50	28	39	32	7	19
2nd Quintile	51	42	47	37	9	24
3rd Quintile	67	55	61	41	9	26
4th Quintile	74	63	69	55	11	35
5th Quintile	87	77	83	59	20	41
NWFP:	**58**	**34**	**46**	**43**	**13**	**27**
1st Quintile	33	13	23	24	7	15
2nd Quintile	48	20	34	37	7	21
3rd Quintile	50	28	40	38	11	24
4th Quintile	66	45	56	49	13	30
5th Quintile	82	59	72	60	25	42
BALUCHISTAN:	**61**	**27**	**45**	**41**	**5**	**24**
1st Quintile	53	10	32	38	2	20
2nd Quintile	43	12	28	41	3	22
3rd Quintile	56	21	40	43	4	25
4th Quintile	65	33	49	40	7	25
5th Quintile	83	51	67	42	10	27

NOTES:

1. Population aged 10 years and older that is literate, expressed as a percentage of the total population aged 10 years and older in the quintile indicated.
2. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
3. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
4. Literacy: For the 1996-97 PIHS, literacy was taken as the ability to read a newspaper, and to write a simple letter.
5. This table uses a different definition of literacy compared to the 1995-96 PIHS report. Under the new definition, the ability to perform simple sum has been excluded.

TABLE 2. 24 CHILDREN CURRENTLY ENROLLED IN KATCHI CLASS - BY SEX AND AGE

GENDER AND AGE	% CHILDREN ENROLLED IN KATCHI CLASS - 1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
MALE:			
5 years	36	23	27
6 years	35	29	31
7 years	18	23	21
8 years	6	16	13
9 years	3	6	5
10+ years	3	3	3
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
FEMALE:			
5 years	36	29	32
6 years	26	29	28
7 years	20	18	18
8 years	9	12	11
9 years	6	5	6
10+ years	3	7	6
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
BOTH SEX:			
5 years	36	26	29
6 years	31	29	29
7 years	19	21	20
8 years	7	14	12
9 years	4	6	5
10+ years	3	5	4
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

TABLE 2. 25 ENROLMENT IN KATCHI CLASS AS PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIMARY ENROLMENT

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PRIMARY LEVEL ENROLMENT		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
URBAN AREAS:	**14**	**12**	**13**
Punjab	16	14	15
Sindh	10	8	9
NWFP	14	17	15
Baluchistan	9	10	9
RURAL AREAS:	**15**	**15**	**15**
Punjab	17	17	17
Sindh	1	2	1
NWFP	23	20	22
Baluchistan	10	8	10
OVERALL:	**15**	**14**	**15**
Punjab	17	16	16
Sindh	6	5	6
NWFP	22	19	21
Baluchistan	10	9	10

NOTES:

1. Children enrolled in katchi class, expressed as a percentage of the total number of children in primary level including katchi class.

TABLE 2. 26 CHILDREN CURRENTLY ATTENDING SCHOOL – BY LEVEL AND TYPE OF SCHOOL

LEVEL AND TYPE OF SCHOOL	ENROLMENT RATE AT DIFFERENT LEVELS					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PRIMARY:						
Government	54	90	78	54	89	77
Private	40	8	19	44	10	22
Deeni madrassa	1	0	1	1	1	1
NGO/Trust	5	1	3	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
MIDDLE:						
Government	73	95	85	75	93	85
Private	23	5	12	24	6	14
Deeni madrassa	0	0	0	0	1	1
NGO/Trust	3	1	2	0	1	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
MATRIC:						
Government	76	95	87	77	93	85
Private	20	4	11	20	5	12
Deeni madrassa	0	0	0	1	0	0
NGO/Trust	3	1	2	1	0	0
Other	1	0	0	2	2	2
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL:						
Government	61	91	80	62	90	79
Private	34	7	17	36	9	19
Deeni madrassa	1	0	0	1	1	1
NGO/Trust	4	1	2	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Children enrolled in a specific type of school at various levels of school expressed as percentage of children enrolled in all type of schools.
2. Primary level includes class 0 - 5, Middle level includes class 6 - 8, and Matric level includes class 9 - 10.

TABLE 2. 27 GROSS ENROLMENT RATE AT THE MIDDLE LEVEL

REGION AND PROVINCE	MIDDLE LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**68**	**61**	**65**	**67**	**64**	**66**
Punjab	62	63	62	64	64	64
Sindh	75	61	68	71	68	69
NWFP	88	53	69	72	54	63
Baluchistan	72	45	59	62	53	58
RURAL AREAS:	**59**	**21**	**41**	**55**	**22**	**39**
Punjab	56	22	40	51	23	38
Sindh	56	18	39	62	15	41
NWFP	66	22	45	64	24	43
Baluchistan	73	17	48	51	12	33
OVERALL:	**64**	**34**	**49**	**59**	**35**	**47**
Punjab	58	35	47	55	36	46
Sindh	65	39	53	66	40	55
NWFP	70	28	49	65	29	47
Baluchistan	72	23	50	53	18	37

NOTES:

1 Gross enrolment rate: [Number of children attending middle level (middle level includes class 6 - 8) divided by number of children aged 11 - 13 years] multiplied by 100.
2. Numerator of GER: Raised sum of all individuals who report currently attending middle level (class 6 - 8)
3. Denominator of GER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 11 - 13 years who respond to the relevant questions.

TABLE 2. 28 NET ENROLMENT RATE AT THE MIDDLE LEVEL

REGION AND PROVINCE	MIDDLE LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**40**	**37**	**38**	**41**	**37**	**39**
Punjab	39	37	38	41	39	40
Sindh	41	37	39	42	37	40
NWFP	40	33	36	42	32	37
Baluchistan	33	23	28	29	20	25
RURAL AREAS:	**29**	**10**	**20**	**31**	**13**	**22**
Punjab	28	10	19	29	14	22
Sindh	32	10	22	36	7	23
NWFP	31	12	22	35	15	25
Baluchistan	30	6	19	22	6	14
OVERALL:	**33**	**19**	**26**	**34**	**20**	**28**
Punjab	31	19	25	33	21	27
Sindh	36	23	30	39	22	31
NWFP	32	16	24	37	18	27
Baluchistan	30	10	21	23	8	16

NOTES:

1. Net enrolment rate: [Number of children aged 11 - 13 years attending middle level (middle level includes class 6 - 8) divided by number of children aged 11 - 13 years] multiplied by 100.
2. Numerator of NER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 11 - 13 years who report currently attending middle level.
3. Denominator of NER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 11 - 13 years who respond to the relevant questions.

TABLE 2. 29 GROSS ENROLMENT RATE AT THE MIDDLE LEVEL - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	MIDDLE LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**64**	**64**	**64**	**51**	**23**	**38**
1st Quintile	39	31	35	27	7	18
2nd Quintile	70	55	62	38	13	25
3rd Quintile	55	72	63	52	18	35
4th Quintile	77	74	76	62	45	55
5th Quintile	88	99	93	89	47	70
SINDH:	**71**	**68**	**69**	**62**	**15**	**41**
1st Quintile	59	42	51	37	7	21
2nd Quintile	51	53	52	59	9	34
3rd Quintile	75	80	77	60	14	40
4th Quintile	75	78	76	69	19	47
5th Quintile	103	116	108	86	41	71
NWFP:	**72**	**54**	**63**	**64**	**24**	**43**
1st Quintile	39	21	30	36	9	21
2nd Quintile	85	33	63	58	27	43
3rd Quintile	64	55	60	48	12	29
4th Quintile	105	80	89	75	27	51
5th Quintile	76	78	77	99	48	74
BALUCHISTAN:	**62**	**53**	**58**	**51**	**12**	**33**
1st Quintile	56	15	34	34	5	18
2nd Quintile	33	32	33	29	3	18
3rd Quintile	55	68	61	59	9	38
4th Quintile	89	54	74	63	5	34
5th Quintile	81	107	93	71	49	62

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Gross enrolment rate: (Number of children attending middle level divided by number of children aged 11 - 13 years) multiplied by 100.

TABLE 2. 30 NET ENROLMENT RATE AT THE MIDDLE LEVEL - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	MIDDLE LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**41**	**39**	**40**	**29**	**14**	**22**
1st Quintile	24	13	19	15	3	10
2nd Quintile	42	33	37	19	6	12
3rd Quintile	33	39	36	34	10	22
4th Quintile	51	49	50	37	26	32
5th Quintile	60	69	64	50	33	42
SINDH:	**42**	**37**	**40**	**36**	**7**	**23**
1st Quintile	26	19	23	22	5	13
2nd Quintile	27	22	25	34	5	20
3rd Quintile	53	48	51	31	4	19
4th Quintile	43	49	46	39	11	27
5th Quintile	65	69	66	53	15	40
NWFP:	**42**	**32**	**37**	**35**	**15**	**25**
1st Quintile	20	15	17	19	6	12
2nd Quintile	44	16	32	36	17	27
3rd Quintile	37	22	31	29	9	18
4th Quintile	61	51	55	42	15	29
5th Quintile	56	56	56	50	32	41
BALUCHISTAN:	**29**	**20**	**25**	**22**	**6**	**14**
1st Quintile	21	13	16	10	3	6
2nd Quintile	22	16	20	17	3	11
3rd Quintile	20	16	18	31	5	20
4th Quintile	46	21	36	24	2	13
5th Quintile	35	38	36	27	22	25

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Net enrolment rate: (Number of children aged 11-13 years attending middle level divided by number of children aged 11 - 13 years) multiplied by 100.

TABLE 2. 31 GROSS ENROLMENT RATE AT THE MATRIC LEVEL

REGION AND PROVINCE	MATRIC LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**57**	**49**	**53**	**60**	**54**	**57**
Punjab	55	50	52	49	61	54
Sindh	57	51	54	74	49	61
NWFP	61	38	49	74	47	60
Baluchistan	78	25	50	78	28	51
RURAL AREAS:	**50**	**15**	**33**	**53**	**15**	**34**
Punjab	47	18	33	49	16	32
Sindh	59	12	36	47	13	32
NWFP	48	10	30	74	16	42
Baluchistan	54	9	32	68	4	35
OVERALL:	**52**	**26**	**40**	**55**	**28**	**42**
Punjab	50	28	39	49	29	40
Sindh	58	31	45	60	32	46
NWFP	51	15	33	74	21	45
Baluchistan	58	12	36	70	9	38

NOTES:

1. Gross enrolment rate: [Number of children attending Matric level (middle level includes class 9 - 10) divided by number of children aged 14 - 15 years] multiplied by 100.
2. Numerator of GER: Raised sum of all individuals who report currently attending Matric level.
3. Denominator of GER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 14 - 15 years who respond to the relevant questions.

TABLE 2. 32 NET ENROLMENT RATE AT THE MATRIC LEVEL

REGION AND PROVINCE	MATRIC LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**24**	**24**	**24**	**27**	**26**	**27**
Punjab	24	26	25	24	27	25
Sindh	24	25	25	32	28	30
NWFP	20	18	19	24	19	21
Baluchistan	18	12	15	22	13	17
RURAL AREAS:	**17**	**6**	**11**	**21**	**6**	**13**
Punjab	17	6	12	21	6	13
Sindh	21	3	13	20	7	15
NWFP	17	5	11	25	7	15
Baluchistan	7	6	7	13	1	7
OVERALL:	**19**	**12**	**16**	**23**	**13**	**18**
Punjab	19	12	16	22	12	17
Sindh	22	14	18	26	18	22
NWFP	17	7	12	24	9	16
Baluchistan	9	7	8	14	3	9

NOTES:

1. Net enrolment rate: [Number of children aged 14-15 years attending Matric level (middle level includes class 9 - 10) divided by number of children aged 14 - 15 years] multiplied by 100.
2. Numerator of NER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 14-15 years who report currently attending Matric level.
3. Denominator of NER: Raised sum of all individuals aged 14 - 15 years who respond to the relevant questions.

TABLE 2. 33 GROSS ENROLMENT RATE AT THE MATRIC LEVEL - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	MATRIC LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**49**	**61**	**54**	**49**	**16**	**32**
1st Quintile	15	15	15	12	6	9
2nd Quintile	29	40	34	32	7	19
3rd Quintile	45	69	56	57	7	33
4th Quintile	69	91	79	65	28	46
5th Quintile	94	94	94	75	30	54
SINDH:	**74**	**49**	**61**	**47**	**13**	**32**
1st Quintile	44	31	37	21	0	10
2nd Quintile	50	34	42	22	6	14
3rd Quintile	82	55	67	37	20	32
4th Quintile	102	52	76	72	15	44
5th Quintile	100	82	92	76	33	59
NWFP:	**74**	**47**	**60**	**74**	**16**	**42**
1st Quintile	39	20	30	41	3	19
2nd Quintile	44	25	34	69	10	32
3rd Quintile	65	41	52	85	6	38
4th Quintile	83	36	59	84	25	57
5th Quintile	162	132	146	81	36	59
BALUCHISTAN:	**78**	**28**	**51**	**68**	**4**	**35**
1st Quintile	61	6	34	46	3	24
2nd Quintile	46	23	32	60	0	24
3rd Quintile	93	28	57	56	4	30
4th Quintile	91	45	68	92	0	42
5th Quintile	93	36	62	79	12	48

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Gross enrolment rate: (Number of children attending Matric level divided by number of children aged 14 - 15 years) multiplied by 100.

TABLE 2. 34 NET ENROLMENT RATE AT THE MATRIC LEVEL - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	MATRIC LEVEL ENROLMENT RATE (PERCENT)					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**24**	**27**	**25**	**21**	**6**	**13**
1st Quintile	5	2	4	7	2	4
2nd Quintile	13	9	11	12	2	7
3rd Quintile	21	31	26	30	4	17
4th Quintile	30	40	34	25	10	17
5th Quintile	56	53	55	28	11	20
SINDH:	**32**	**28**	**30**	**20**	**7**	**15**
1st Quintile	16	16	16	12	0	6
2nd Quintile	23	14	18	6	3	4
3rd Quintile	34	33	34	18	12	16
4th Quintile	47	32	39	25	6	16
5th Quintile	44	52	47	36	20	30
NWFP:	**24**	**19**	**21**	**25**	**7**	**15**
1st Quintile	7	18	12	13	0	5
2nd Quintile	4	10	7	24	3	11
3rd Quintile	15	12	13	26	5	13
4th Quintile	40	10	25	33	12	24
5th Quintile	67	56	61	24	17	21
BALUCHISTAN:	**22**	**13**	**17**	**13**	**1**	**7**
1st Quintile	23	6	15	11	3	7
2nd Quintile	17	17	17	13	0	5
3rd Quintile	24	5	13	13	0	6
4th Quintile	22	20	21	6	0	3
5th Quintile	22	14	18	20	4	12

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Net enrolment rate: (Number of children aged 14-15 years attending Matric level divided by number of children aged 14 - 15 years) multiplied by 100.

TABLE 2. 35 RETURN DISTANCE FROM HOME TO PRIMARY SCHOOL

REGION AND PROVINCE	DISTANCE FROM HOME TO SCHOOL - 1996-97 PIHS					
	0-2 km	2-5 km	5-10 km	10-20 km	20 + km	TOTAL
URBAN AREAS:						
Punjab	90	7	2	1	0	100
Sindh	88	10	2	1	0	100
NWFP	83	14	2	0	1	100
Baluchistan	88	11	1	0	0	100
RURAL AREAS:						
Punjab	91	6	2	0	0	100
Sindh	94	4	1	1	0	100
NWFP	89	9	1	1	1	100
Baluchistan	92	6	2	0	0	100
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Punjab	91	7	2	1	0	100
Sindh	90	7	2	1	0	100
NWFP	88	10	1	0	1	100
Baluchistan	91	7	1	0	0	100

NOTES:

1. Percentage of children attending primary level including katchi class according to return distance from home to school.

TABLE 2. 36 ACCESS TO PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN RURAL AREAS: 96-97 COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

PROVINCE AND TYPE OF SCHOOL	PERCENTAGE OF RURAL PRIMARY SAMPLING UNITS WITH SCHOOL ...						
	IN THE PSU	WITHIN 0-2 KM	WITHIN 2-5 KM	WITHIN 6-10 KM	WITHIN 11-20KM	WITHIN 20+ KM	TOTAL
PUNJAB:							
Govt. Primary Girls	70	9	16	5	0	0	100
Govt. Primary Boys	70	18	12	0	0	0	100
Govt. Primary Co-ed.	19	14	12	8	14	33	100
Private Primary Girls	1	3	17	35	27	16	100
Private Primary Boys	2	3	19	38	25	13	100
Private Primary Co-ed.	14	6	25	38	11	6	100
SINDH:							
Govt. Primary Girls	30	3	20	8	35	5	100
Govt. Primary Boys	68	1	3	1	27	0	100
Govt. Primary Co-ed.	20	0	13	3	25	39	100
Private Primary Girls	3	1	7	17	14	58	100
Private Primary Boys	1	3	12	11	24	50	100
Private Primary Co-ed.	0	1	6	5	14	73	100
NWFP:							
Govt. Primary Girls	40	4	48	4	4	0	100
Govt. Primary Boys	45	3	46	6	0	0	100
Govt. Primary Co-ed.	0	2	47	6	13	33	100
Private Primary Girls	2	0	23	3	5	67	100
Private Primary Boys	1	0	28	2	11	58	100
Private Primary Co-ed.	8	6	29	9	12	36	100
BALUCHISTAN:							
Govt. Primary Girls	15	7	21	25	4	28	100
Govt. Primary Boys	62	2	12	13	3	8	100
Govt. Primary Co-ed.	16	0	1	1	2	80	100
Private Primary Girls	0	0	1	0	2	96	100
Private Primary Boys	0	0	1	1	2	96	100
Private Primary Co-ed.	0	1	6	0	2	90	100
OVERALL PAKISTAN:							
Govt. Primary Girls	50	7	23	8	7	5	100
Govt. Primary Boys	64	10	17	3	4	1	100
Govt. Primary Co-ed.	16	6	11	4	11	52	100
Private Primary Girls	1	2	12	19	16	51	100
Private Primary Boys	1	2	15	21	17	45	100
Private Primary Co-ed.	10	5	21	23	10	31	100

NOTES:

1. Primary school means all schools that offer education at the primary level (i.e. Class 1 - 5).
2. Observations included: Observations for rural PSUs where the distance to the nearest school was missing, or Don't know" were excluded. All other reported distances were recoded into the above categories.
3. Total number of observations: Government primary girls school: 406 PSUs, Government primary boys school: 389 PSUs, Government primary co-education school: 165 PSUs, Private primary girls school: 191 PSUs, Private primary boys school: 203 PSUs, Private primary co-education school: 398 PSUs.
4. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 2. 37 SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF GOVT. PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN RURAL AREAS

CHARACTERISTICS	1996-97 PIHS COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE				
	PUNJAB	SINDH	NWFP	BALUCHISTAN	PAKISTAN
1. Schools with posts sanctioned for female staff (per cent):					
Government Girls Primary	100	96	95	100	97
2. Schools with sanctioned female posts where there is no female staff (per cent):					
Government Girls Primary	1	0	0	0	1
3. Female teaching staff as a proportion of total teaching staff (per cent):					
Government Girls Primary	97	93	96	67	96
4. Schools where 50% or more of the sanctioned female posts are vacant (per cent):					
Government Girls Primary	10	17	15	0	11
5. Student / teacher ratio:					
Government Boys Primary	35	24	39	28	33
Government Girls Primary	29	20	50	36	31
6. Schools with a school management committee (SMC/VEC/PTA) (per cent):					
Government Boys Primary	74	52	20	16	54
Government Girls Primary	59	53	3	29	50
7. % schools where the management committee has a say in the management of the budget:					
Government Boys Primary	49	41	65	31	48
Government Girls Primary	55	57	92	100	56

NOTES:

1. Government primary schools includes all government schools that offer primary level education (i.e. Class 1 - 5).
2. Based on Section 3: School Survey Questionnaire in the 1996-97 PIHS Community Questionnaire.

TABLE 2. 38 CHANGES DURING LAST 3 YEARS - SELECTED SCHOOLING CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTICS	PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES - 1996-97 PIHS COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE				
	PUNJAB	SINDH	NWFP	BALUCHISTAN	PAKISTAN
1. Communities where there has been an increase in the past 3 years in schools of the type indicated (per cent):					
Government Primary Boys	1	22	10	0	5
Government Primary Girls	2	17	12	0	5
Government Primary Co-ed	0	24	0	0	4
Private Primary Boys	36	0	31	0	31
Private Primary Girls	15	46	0	0	18
Private Primary Co-ed.	51	0	14	0	45
2. Communities where there has been an increase in enrolment in the past 3 years in schools of the type indicated (per cent):					
Government Primary Boys	65	41	67	77	60
Government Primary Girls	59	26	42	97	58
3. Communities where there has been an increase in number of staff in the past 3 years in schools of the type indicated (per cent):					
Government Primary Boys	24	25	26	28	25
Government Primary Girls	21	19	23	52	21
4. Communities where there has been an increase in number of classrooms in the past 3 years in schools of the type indicated (per cent):					
Government Primary Boys	15	7	14	7	12
Government Primary Girls	11	9	14	60	13
5. Communities where there has been an improvement in the maintenance of buildings in the past 3 years in schools of the type indicated (per cent):					
Government Primary Boys	21	15	17	7	17
Government Primary Girls	15	11	19	8	15
6. Communities where there has been an improvement in availability of books in the past 3 years in schools of the type indicated (per cent):					
Government Primary Boys	57	2	7	32	36
Government Primary Girls	57	36	2	11	47

NOTES:

1. Government primary schools includes all government schools that offer primary level education (i.e. Class 1 - 5).
2. Based on Section 3: School Survey Questionnaire in the 1996-97 PIHS Community Questionnaire.
3. Note that all these tabulations are based on respondent recall rather than on direct observation or site verification as such

3. Primary Health

3.1 Introduction

Although some progress has been made over recent years, particularly in urban areas, health indicators remain poor in Pakistan. Health problems are most severe for young children and their mothers, particularly in rural areas. One of the most pressing needs addressed by SAP is in the improvement in women's access to government health care. The SAP strategy for primary health includes:

- improving the efficiency and utilisation of basic health care;
- improving programme design by paying more attention to quality;
- increasing access to health care by constructing more facilities;
- increasing women's access by recruiting more female staff; and,
- promoting community participation in the design and management of health care services.

In this chapter, health data is presented with respect to: immunisation, diarrhoea; infant mortality; access to health facilities; pre- and post-natal care; and, facility characteristics.

3.2 Immunisation

Expanding the coverage of immunisation in Pakistan is a primary objective of SAP – the coverage rate is planned to rise from 80 per cent in 1992-93 to 90 per cent by 1997-98.[22] Data on immunisation is not easy to collect or interpret as coverage is often reported on the basis of respondent recall rather than written record. Parents are often not able to say whether their children have received the full 8 recommended immunisations, as they have no clinic card.[23] Immunisation data in the PIHS report are thus presented either by recall or by written record.

Based on parents' recall, the PIHS data indicate that 82 per cent of children five years and under have received at least one immunisation (Table 3.1). This represents a steady improvement since 1991 when this indicator stood at 70 per cent. The rate is highest in Punjab and lowest in Baluchistan. The rate for Baluchistan looks to have fallen between 1995-96 and 1996-97 but this is more likely due to sampling error as the confidence interval for this variable in Baluchistan is large.[24] There is no significant difference between immunisation rates for boys or girls. Looking at the lower age group (0 – 11 months), some 62 per cent of children aged 0 to 11 months have received at least one immunisation compared with 56 per cent in 1991. These figures may be compared against a national figure of 73 per cent for children (age unspecified) who are fully or partially immunised in 1995 according to the National Health Survey of Pakistan (NHSP).[25]

If a tighter definition of immunisation is applied then the rates are much lower but the increase between 1991 and 1996-97 has been more dramatic (Table 3.2). The percentage of those children fully immunised doubled from 25 per cent in 1991 to 51 per cent in 1996-97.[26] Looking at the 12 to 23 month age group, the 1996-97 figure stands slightly lower at 45 per cent (Table 3.3). These large increases in immunisation coverage were borne out by qualitative research on health access undertaken by the PIHS team earlier in 1997.[27] In this

[22] For a listing of SAP targets see GoP (1995) "Social Action Programme, Report to the Pakistan Consortium", Planning Commission, Islamabad.
[23] Full immunisation refers to: BCG, DPT1, DPT2, DPT3, Polio1, Polio2, Polio3, and measles.
[24] See Appendices A and B for a discussion of this issue.
[25] GoP (1996) "National Health Survey of Pakistan, Preliminary Report", Pakistan Medical Research Council, Islamabad.
[26] Looking at the rates for full immunisation, based on record, the figure for rural Sindh looks to have fallen dramatically between 1995-96 and 1996-97 (Tables 3.2 and 3.3). The significance of this result is being further investigated. It is worth noting at this stage, however, that the Sindh PIHS staff reported anecdotal evidence of a decline in the number of visits by immunisation teams in 1996-97.
[27] GoP (1997) "Access and Usage of Basic Health Services in Pakistan", Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad.

research, respondents in rural areas of both Swat and Rawalpindi reported that the only government health service that had improved significantly since 1993 was immunisation.

Are better-off households more likely to have fully immunised children? In Table 3.4, immunisation coverage has been tabulated against income groups. Although the relationship looks weak, there seems to be positive relationship in some, particularly urban, areas. For example, in urban Punjab, 50 per cent of the children in the poorest quintile are fully immunised, compared with 75 per cent in the richest.

3.3 Diarrhoea

Childhood diarrhoea has been a serious health problem in Pakistan and both its prevention through improved water and sanitation and its treatment through oral rehydration salts (ORS) are major goals of SAP. The percentage of children who have suffered from diarrhoea has fallen between 1991 and 1996-97, particularly in rural areas (Table 3.5). In 1996-97, some 15 per cent of children under five had suffered from diarrhoea in the last 30 days compared with 26 per cent in 1991. Looking at the 1996-97 data, rural and urban rates are now about the same. These figures are much lower than those reported in the NHSP which reported that 43 per cent of children had suffered from diarrhoea in the last 14 days. In contrast, the MICS survey found that 26 per cent of children had suffered from diarrhoea in the last two weeks.[28]

With respect to the treatment of diarrhoea, in some 80 per cent of diarrhoea cases a practitioner was consulted compared with 84 per cent in 1991 (Table 3.7). The percentage of cases where ORS was given to the child, some 48 per cent, is virtually unchanged since 1991. ORS is more likely to be used in Sindh and NWFP, and in urban areas generally. The NHSP also found that ORS was more widely used in Sindh and NWFP. The MICS figure for ORS usage for childhood diarrhoea, at 46 per cent, is very close to the PIHS.

Where do parents take their children when they become ill with diarrhoea? The most likely practitioner to be consulted is a private doctor, followed by compounder/chemist (Table 3.8). The basic health unit (BHU) was only used in 2 per cent of cases in rural Pakistan, which gives some indication of the very limited coverage of the government primary health network. These findings are supported by the NHSP, where it was found that parents were most likely to take children with diarrhoea to dispensers/paramedics (35 per cent) and private doctors (34 per cent). There does not appear to be any relationship between household income and the incidence of childhood diarrhoea (Table 3.9).

Why are parents unwilling to take their children to a government practitioner? The 1996-97 PIHS indicates that in only 19 per cent of diarrhoea cases was a government practitioner consulted first, compared with 21 per cent in 1991 (Table 3.10). Government practitioners were more likely to be consulted first in NWFP (39 per cent) and Baluchistan (32 per cent). The reasons most often cited as to why government facilities were not visited for diarrhoea treatment were “too far away” (47 per cent), “not enough medicines” (13 per cent) and “staff not courteous” (9 per cent) (Table 3.11). In Baluchistan, a lack of doctors at government facilities was highlighted. These findings may be compared with qualitative work on health care access undertaken by the FBS presented in Box 3.1.

3.4 Infant mortality

Looking at the three-year period (1992-1994) prior to the 1996-97 PIHS survey, the infant mortality rate for Pakistan is estimated to be 105 per 1,000 live births. It is highest in Punjab and lowest in NWFP. The rate for urban areas (83) is much lower than for rural areas (112). Although this figure is higher than the rate reported in the 1995-96 PIHS (which covered the period 1991-1993), the confidence interval for this variable is large and the difference is therefore likely to due to sampling error.[29] There does not appear to be any obvious relationship between infant mortality and household income (Table 3.13).

[28] GoP/UNICEF (1995) *Multiple Indicators Cluster Survey of Pakistan*, Ministry of Health, Islamabad.
[29] See Appendix A.

3.5 Pre- and post-natal care

Some 30 per cent of mothers who had given birth in the last three years went for pre-natal consultations during their last pregnancy (Table 3.14). The attendance rate was much higher in urban (54 per cent) than rural areas (22 per cent). In rural areas, NWFP had the highest rate and Baluchistan the lowest. In rural Pakistan, the three most commonly cited sources were government hospital (36 per cent), private clinic (23 per cent) and private hospital (19 per cent). Some 83 per cent of mothers had received a tetanus toxoid injection either during their last pregnancy or a previous pregnancy (Table 3.15). In rural areas, the percentage was highest in NWFP and lowest in Baluchistan.

The vast majority of births, some 82 per cent, take place at home (Table 3.16). In rural areas, some 89 per cent were at home compared with 64 per cent in towns and cities. These figures are slightly lower than the overall (urban and rural) rate of 89 per cent of births at home reported in the NHSP. The most commonly cited source of assistance in rural areas was a traditional birth attendant (44 per cent of cases), followed by trained dai (23 per cent) and family member/relative (18 per cent). The NHSP reported a midwife/dai assisting with 79 per cent of deliveries followed by relatives (16 per cent).

Box 3.1 Why do so few rural households in Pakistan use basic health services?

The research

To investigate further the reasons why government basic health services are used so little in Pakistan, the FBS undertook qualitative fieldwork in two contrasting districts of rural Pakistan (Rawalpindi and Swat). A range of qualitative methodologies was employed, including: group interviews; village social mapping; focus group interviews; household interviews; key informant interviews; and, direct observation.

The findings

A striking feature of both the study villages was the despair felt across all sections of the community towards the delivery of basic health care. It was seen as low quality, corruptly run, and not to have improved in recent years. The only publicly delivered health service that was praised was immunisation.

In both areas the over-riding reason for not using the BHU was the absence of medicine. If someone was sick, it was best to take them straight away to a private practitioner where both the diagnosis and medicine could be obtained quickly. Another problem found at the BHU was the manner in which patients were treated by staff. BHU staff were frequently described as rude, dismissive, and unconcerned with the problems of the community, especially the poor who could not give them 'private fees'.

Other important reasons why villagers did not attend the BHU were poor attendance by the doctor, and the lack of female doctors. In both the villages studied, the frequent absence of the doctor was a great cause for concern. Many respondents complained of the frustration involved in taking a sick relative to the BHU in the morning only to find that the doctor was not there. They were often told to come back in the afternoon when the doctor would see them privately. The lack of a female doctor was also cited as a reason why many of the female patients refused to go to the BHU.

When asked what improvements could be made to the BHU to make it more attractive, the results were predictable. Respondents wanted doctors to attend when they were supposed to, more female doctors to be appointed, more medicine to be made available, and staff to be less rude. In addition, given that the community had no control over the BHU, communities were concerned that the district authorities exert more discipline over BHU staff.

Source: GoP (1997) "Access and Usage of Basic Health Services in Pakistan", Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad.

Post-natal consultation rates were much lower than the pre-natal rates cited above (Table 3.17). Only 11 per cent of mothers received a post-natal check up within six weeks of delivery during their last pregnancy. Urban areas (19 per cent) had much higher rates than rural areas (8 per cent). Rural rates were highest in Sindh and lowest in Baluchistan. The three most commonly cited sources of post-natal care in rural areas were government hospitals (27 per cent), private clinics (23 per cent) and home traditional birth attendant (20 per cent). The vast majority of mothers, some 96 per cent, breastfed their last child (Table 3.18). There was very little difference between regions and provinces. By 6 months, some 65 per cent of mothers were giving the child semi-solid foods.

3.6 Access to health facilities

Given that distance is cited by many households as one of the main reasons that they do not use government health facilities, how accessible are facilities in Pakistan? The PIHS has data on facilities from both the household and community questionnaires. In Table 3.19, data from the household questionnaire is presented with respect to distances to the source of ORS and immunisation. Access to immunisation is good, with some 89 per cent of households reporting that the round trip to the source of immunisation was less than 2 km.[30] In rural areas, access is best in Baluchistan and poorest in NWFP. Access to ORS is not as good with only 63 per cent of households living within a 2 km round trip. Looking at the rural areas, Baluchistan is the worst and NWFP the best. Access to government health facilities in Pakistan is much poorer than for basic education, noted in the previous chapter (Table 3.20). In only 45 per cent of PSUs was there a basic health unit within 5 km. Access to the BHU was worst in Sindh, where the basic health unit was within 5 km in only 25 per cent of BHUs.

3.7 Facility characteristics

Selected characteristics of government and private health facilities are presented in Tables 3.21. Some 30 per cent of government health facilities have no female staff. Although this figure appears quite high, given that increasing the number of female staff has been a SAP objective, the corresponding figure for private facilities is even higher (70 per cent). In general, private facilities are more likely to have doctors available every day, have a doctor available for longer hours, and have electricity.

[30] This table may under-estimate distances. Data is only collected on those children who have been immunised or have used ORS. It may be the case that the distances to sources would be much greater for those children who have not been immunised or who have not used ORS.

TABLE 3. 1 CHILDREN 5 YEARS AND UNDER THAT HAVE BEEN IMMUNISED

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN 5 YEARS AND UNDER THAT HAVE BEEN IMMUNISED								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
A. BASED ON RECALL - AT LEAST ONE IMMUNISATION:									
URBAN AREAS:	**82**	**80**	**81**	**88**	**86**	**87**	**90**	**88**	**89**
Punjab				87	86	86	90	88	89
Sindh				90	87	89	92	89	90
NWFP				84	84	84	88	87	87
Baluchistan				79	79	79	79	84	81
RURAL AREAS:	**68**	**64**	**66**	**74**	**74**	**74**	**80**	**78**	**79**
Punjab				81	82	81	86	85	86
Sindh				62	61	62	65	67	66
NWFP				65	63	64	76	71	74
Baluchistan				70	70	70	70	69	70
OVERALL:	**72**	**68**	**70**	**78**	**77**	**78**	**82**	**81**	**82**
Punjab				83	83	83	87	86	87
Sindh				74	72	73	76	76	76
NWFP				68	66	67	78	73	75
Baluchistan				72	72	72	71	71	71
B. BASED ON RECORD - FULLY IMMUNIZED:									
URBAN AREAS:	**43**	**37**	**40**	**62**	**60**	**61**	**61**	**58**	**59**
Punjab				66	65	66	64	62	63
Sindh				58	50	54	52	49	50
NWFP				58	61	60	68	67	68
Baluchistan				68	67	68	60	71	65
RURAL AREAS:	**24**	**17**	**20**	**51**	**50**	**51**	**49**	**47**	**48**
Punjab				61	58	60	57	56	56
Sindh				30	30	30	22	21	22
NWFP				38	41	40	48	43	45
Baluchistan				56	57	56	54	54	54
OVERALL:	**29**	**22**	**25**	**54**	**53**	**54**	**52**	**51**	**51**
Punjab				62	60	61	59	58	58
Sindh				43	39	41	35	34	35
NWFP				41	44	43	51	47	49
Baluchistan				59	59	59	55	56	56

NOTES:

1. Based on recall: Children reported as having received at least one immunisation, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 5 years and under.
2. Based on record: Children who reported having received full immunisation who also have an immunisation card, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 5 years and under (children who report having received at least one immunisation, but who do not have a card, have been excluded both from the numerator as well as the denominator in making these calculations).
3. Immunisations: The list of immunisation received comprises 'BCG', 'DPT 1', 'DPT 2', 'DPT 3', 'Polio 1', 'Polio 2', 'Polio 3', and 'Measles'.

TABLE 3. 2 CHILDREN 0 - 11 MONTHS THAT HAVE BEEN IMMUNISED

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN 0 - 11 MONTHS THAT HAVE BEEN IMMUNISED								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
A. BASED ON RECALL - AT LEAST ONE IMMUNISATION:									
URBAN AREAS:	**71**	**75**	**73**	**72**	**70**	**71**	**71**	**74**	**73**
Punjab				68	67	68	68	75	72
Sindh				76	74	75	79	77	78
NWFP				80	78	79	74	62	69
Baluchistan				55	44	50	47	47	47
RURAL AREAS:	**51**	**45**	**48**	**51**	**55**	**53**	**56**	**59**	**58**
Punjab				51	60	55	61	64	62
Sindh				44	34	39	42	47	45
NWFP				57	58	57	61	58	59
Baluchistan				37	69	55	29	44	37
OVERALL:	**57**	**54**	**56**	**57**	**59**	**58**	**60**	**63**	**62**
Punjab				55	62	58	62	67	65
Sindh				58	52	55	56	60	58
NWFP				61	60	61	63	58	61
Baluchistan				44	63	54	33	44	39
B. BASED ON RECORD - FULLY IMMUNIZED:									
URBAN AREAS:				**12**	**12**	**12**	**8**	**10**	**9**
Punjab				13	15	14	8	15	12
Sindh				12	7	9	1	4	3
NWFP				12	14	13	28	4	17
Baluchistan				6	11	8	13	17	14
RURAL AREAS:				**7**	**12**	**9**	**8**	**10**	**9**
Punjab				7	13	10	7	9	8
Sindh				10	10	10	2	7	5
NWFP				5	9	7	17	12	15
Baluchistan				6	21	15	8	17	13
OVERALL:				**9**	**12**	**10**	**8**	**10**	**9**
Punjab				9	13	11	7	10	9
Sindh				11	9	10	2	6	4
NWFP				6	10	8	19	11	15
Baluchistan				6	18	12	9	17	13

NOTES:

1. Based on recall: Children reported as having received at least one immunisation, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 0 - 11 months.
2. Based on record: Children who reported having received full immunisation who also have an immunisation card, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 0 - 11 months (children who report having received at least one immunisation, but who do not have a card, have been excluded both from the numerator as well as the denominator in making these calculations).
3. Immunisations: The list of immunisation received comprises ‘BCG’, ‘DPT 1’, ‘DPT 2’, ‘DPT 3’, ‘Polio 1’, ‘Polio 2’, ‘Polio 3’, and ‘Measles’.

TABLE 3. 3 CHILDREN 12 - 23 MONTHS THAT HAVE BEEN IMMUNISED

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN 12 - 23 MONTHS THAT HAVE BEEN IMMUNISED								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
A. BASED ON RECALL - AT LEAST ONE IMMUNISATION:									
URBAN AREAS:				**89**	**84**	**86**	**94**	**89**	**91**
Punjab				85	87	86	93	85	89
Sindh				95	82	89	95	96	96
NWFP				80	78	79	93	92	92
Baluchistan				83	77	80	80	89	84
RURAL AREAS:				**77**	**69**	**73**	**80**	**80**	**80**
Punjab				84	76	80	88	88	88
Sindh				59	73	61	65	68	66
NWFP				72	59	65	76	73	74
Baluchistan				76	60	68	68	66	67
OVERALL:				**80**	**73**	**77**	**84**	**82**	**83**
Punjab				84	79	81	89	87	88
Sindh				75	71	73	78	79	78
NWFP				74	61	67	78	75	77
Baluchistan				77	64	71	71	69	70
B. BASED ON RECORD - FULLY IMMUNIZED:									
URBAN AREAS:				**50**	**50**	**51**	**52**	**48**	**50**
Punjab				56	58	57	62	54	57
Sindh				43	40	42	34	28	31
NWFP				46	51	48	74	74	74
Baluchistan				67	59	63	63	78	70
RURAL AREAS:				**40**	**40**	**41**	**41**	**45**	**43**
Punjab				46	42	44	45	53	49
Sindh				28	31	30	26	21	24
NWFP				39	37	38	40	39	40
Baluchistan				60	47	53	58	55	57
OVERALL:				**44**	**43**	**44**	**44**	**46**	**45**
Punjab				48	46	47	49	54	51
Sindh				35	36	36	30	24	27
NWFP				40	39	40	45	44	45
Baluchistan				62	50	55	59	58	59

NOTES:

1. Based on recall: Children reported as having received at least one immunisation, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 12 - 23 months.
2. Based on record: Children who reported having received full immunisation who also have an immunisation card, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 12 - 23 months (children who report having received at least one immunisation, but who do not have a card, have been excluded both from the numerator as well as the denominator in making these calculations)..
3. Immunisations: The list of immunisation received comprises 'BCG', 'DPT 1', 'DPT 2', 'DPT 3', 'Polio 1', 'Polio 2', 'Polio 3', and 'Measles'.

TABLE 3. 4 CHILDREN 5 YRS AND UNDER THAT HAVE BEEN FULLY IMMUNISED-BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN FULLY IMMUNISED - 1996-97 PIHS					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**64**	**62**	**63**	**57**	**56**	**56**
1st Quintile	53	48	50	47	50	49
2nd Quintile	51	57	54	55	52	54
3rd Quintile	66	67	67	61	53	57
4th Quintile	80	70	75	57	64	60
5th Quintile	77	73	75	67	64	66
SINDH:	**52**	**49**	**50**	**22**	**21**	**22**
1st Quintile	47	43	45	13	22	17
2nd Quintile	38	54	47	18	23	20
3rd Quintile	59	47	53	30	20	25
4th Quintile	50	47	49	28	26	27
5th Quintile	67	55	61	24	13	19
NWFP:	**68**	**67**	**68**	**48**	**43**	**45**
1st Quintile	65	74	70	42	36	39
2nd Quintile	59	54	57	43	35	39
3rd Quintile	66	53	60	44	37	40
4th Quintile	73	71	72	53	52	53
5th Quintile	84	85	85	63	62	62
BALUCHISTAN:	**60**	**71**	**65**	**54**	**54**	**54**
1st Quintile	56	60	58	50	51	51
2nd Quintile	63	70	66	57	59	58
3rd Quintile	60	75	68	57	60	59
4th Quintile	60	74	66	62	54	57
5th Quintile	67	78	73	42	42	42

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on basis of per-capita household consumption. For details please refer to Appendix C.
2. Children who reported having received full immunisation who also have an immunisation card, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 5 years and under (children who report having received at least one immunisation, but who do not have a card, have been excluded both from the numerator as well as the denominator in making these calculations).
3. Immunisations: The list of immunisation received comprises 'BCG', 'DPT 1', 'DPT 2', 'DPT 3', 'Polio 1', 'Polio 2', 'Polio 3', and "Measles'.

TABLE 3. 5 CHILDREN 5 YEARS AND UNDER SUFFERING FROM DIARRHOEA IN PAST 30 DAYS

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN 5 YEARS AND UNDER								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**22**	**23**	**22**	**15**	**14**	**15**	**14**	**14**	**14**
Punjab				18	14	16	15	15	15
Sindh				11	13	12	12	13	12
NWFP				19	21	20	27	20	24
Baluchistan				9	8	9	6	8	7
RURAL AREAS:	**29**	**26**	**27**	**19**	**18**	**19**	**17**	**14**	**15**
Punjab				21	22	22	19	14	17
Sindh				14	12	13	11	11	11
NWFP				17	16	16	20	17	19
Baluchistan				14	11	13	8	8	8
OVERALL:	**27**	**25**	**26**	**18**	**17**	**18**	**16**	**14**	**15**
Punjab				20	20	20	18	14	16
Sindh				13	13	13	11	12	11
NWFP				17	16	17	21	18	20
Baluchistan				13	10	12	8	8	8

NOTES:

1. Children who suffered from diarrhoea in the 30 days prior to the interview, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 5 years and under.
2. Diarrhoea in past 30 days: All three surveys contained a question addressed to all children aged 5 years and under where they were asked if they had suffered from an episode of diarrhoea in the past 30 days (Q. 1 in Section 3, Part A in the 1995-96 PIHS and 1996-97 questionnaires).

TABLE 3. 6 DIARRHOEA CASES: DURATION OF EPISODE

DURATION	PERCENTAGE OF DIARRHEA CASES					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
1. AVERAGE DURATION OF DIARRHEA EPISODE: - 1995-96						
1 - 3 DAYS	24	26	25	21	25	23
4 - 7 DAYS	42	41	42	43	40	42
8 -14 DAYS	18	20	19	19	17	18
15+ DAYS	15	13	14	18	17	17
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
2. AVERAGE DURATION OF DIARRHEA EPISODE: - 1996-97						
1 - 3 DAYS	25	32	28	23	24	24
4 - 7 DAYS	41	40	41	44	44	44
8 -14 DAYS	19	18	19	18	17	18
15+ DAYS	15	10	12	15	14	14
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100

NOTES:

1. Children who suffered from diarrhoea for the number of days indicated, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 5 years and under who suffered from diarrhoea during the past 30 days.
2. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 3. 7 TREATMENT OF DIARRHOEA IN CHILDREN 5 YEARS AND UNDER

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF DIARHHEA CASES								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
1. DIARRHOEA CASES WHERE A PRACTITIONER WAS CONSULTED:									
URBAN AREAS:	**93**	**87**	**90**	**89**	**85**	**87**	**85**	**80**	**83**
Punjab				89	86	88	86	82	84
Sindh				91	88	90	85	82	83
NWFP				85	74	79	80	72	77
Baluchistan				70	84	77	83	69	76
RURAL AREAS:	**85**	**79**	**82**	**85**	**86**	**85**	**81**	**77**	**79**
Punjab				84	85	85	81	78	80
Sindh				95	91	93	86	89	88
NWFP				82	90	86	85	75	80
Baluchistan				64	52	59	32	32	32
OVERALL:	**87**	**81**	**84**	**86**	**86**	**86**	**82**	**78**	**80**
Punjab				85	85	85	82	79	81
Sindh				94	90	92	86	86	86
NWFP				83	87	85	84	74	80
Baluchistan				65	57	62	38	37	38
2. DIARRHOEA CASES WHERE ORS WAS GIVEN TO THE CHILD:									
URBAN AREAS:	**57**	**51**	**54**	**53**	**55**	**54**	**54**	**50**	**52**
Punjab				48	44	46	48	44	46
Sindh				62	69	66	60	56	58
NWFP				61	56	59	63	61	62
Baluchistan				62	73	68	67	73	70
RURAL AREAS:	**44**	**44**	**44**	**47**	**50**	**48**	**48**	**45**	**47**
Punjab				38	40	39	39	34	37
Sindh				73	83	78	76	66	71
NWFP				63	70	66	65	59	62
Baluchistan				47	29	40	39	49	44
OVERALL:	**47**	**46**	**47**	**48**	**51**	**49**	**50**	**47**	**48**
Punjab				40	41	40	40	37	39
Sindh				69	76	73	69	62	65
NWFP				62	67	65	64	59	62
Baluchistan				49	36	44	43	52	48

NOTES:

1. 1: Diarrhoea cases where a practitioner was consulted, expressed as a percentage of all diarrhoea cases during past 30 days in children 5 years and under.
2. 2: Diarrhoea cases where ORS was administered to the child, expressed as a percentage of all diarrhoea cases during past 30 days in children 5 years and under.
3. Cases where a practitioner was consulted: For all the children that reported an episode of diarrhoea in the past 30 days, the parents were asked if they consulted a practitioner for the ailment. The statistics reported here represent the percentage of cases where a practitioner was consulted.
4. Cases where ORS was administered: For all the children that reported an episode of diarrhoea in the past 30 days, the parents were asked if ORS had been given to the child. The statistics reported here represent the percentage of cases where ORS was given to the child.

TABLE 3. 8 TYPE OF PRACTITIONER CONSULTED FOR DIARRHOEA TREATMENT AND USE OF ORS

REGION AND PRACTITIONER	PERCENTAGE OF DIARRHEA CASES			
	1995-96 PIHS		1996-97 PIHS	
	CASES WHERE PRACTIONER WAS CONSULTED	CASES WHERE ORS WAS GIVEN TO THE CHILD	CASES WHERE PRACTIONER WAS CONSULTED	CASES WHERE ORS WAS GIVEN TO THE CHILD
URBAN AREAS:				
Private practitioner	56	62	46	62
Compound/Chemist	11	29	17	43
Govt. hospital	12	72	8	75
Govt. dispensary	2	62	8	58
Other	6	52	4	71
No-one consulted	13	22	17	18
RURAL AREAS:				
Private practitioner	41	52	35	52
Compound/Chemist	18	42	25	50
Govt. hospital	12	65	7	76
Govt. dispensary	6	74	4	73
Basic Health Unit	4	84	2	70
Other	5	40	6	57
No-one consulted	15	12	21	14

NOTES:

1. Column 1: Diarrhoea cases in which the practitioner indicated was consulted for treatment of diarrhoea, expressed as a percentage of all diarrhoea consultations
2. Column 2: Diarrhoea cases in which ORS was actually given to the child, expressed as a percentage of all diarrhoea cases in which the practitioner was consulted.
3. In diarrhoea cases where no-one was consulted, Column 2 gives the percentage of cases in which ORS was given to the child for treatment of diarrhoea.

TABLE 3. 9 DIARRHOEA CASES IN PAST 30 DAYS - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN 5 YEARS AND UNDER - 1996-97 PIHS					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**15**	**15**	**15**	**19**	**14**	**17**
1st Quintile	16	17	16	18	16	17
2nd Quintile	14	15	14	19	12	16
3rd Quintile	15	13	14	19	14	17
4th Quintile	15	18	17	16	14	15
5th Quintile	11	12	11	21	15	18
	12	13	12	11	11	11
SINDH:	**14**	**11**	**12**	**7**	**11**	**9**
1st Quintile	13	13	13	9	9	9
2nd Quintile	13	19	16	8	11	10
3rd Quintile	11	11	11	16	13	14
4th Quintile	7	8	7	17	14	16
5th Quintile	27	20	24	20	17	19
	32	21	27	16	14	15
NWFP:	**18**	**16**	**17**	**17**	**14**	**16**
1st Quintile	33	23	29	19	20	20
2nd Quintile	24	18	21	27	19	23
3rd Quintile	29	21	25	25	21	23
4th Quintile	6	8	7	8	8	8
5th Quintile	4	7	5	6	7	7
	4	5	5	8	7	7
BALUCHISTAN:	**10**	**12**	**11**	**10**	**14**	**12**
1st Quintile	8	10	9	6	6	6
2nd Quintile	8	3	5	15	7	11
3rd Quintile	60	75	68	57	60	59
4th Quintile	60	74	66	62	54	57
5th Quintile	67	78	73	42	42	42

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on basis of per-capita household consumption. For details please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Children who suffered from diarrhoea in the 30 days prior to the interview, expressed as a percentage of all children aged 5 years and under.

TABLE 3. 10 DIARRHOEA CASES WHERE GOVT. HEALTH PRACTITIONER WAS CONSULTED FIRST

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CONSULTATIONS								
	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**19**	**14**	**16**	**13**	**21**	**17**	**19**	**20**	**19**
Punjab				11	22	15	8	16	12
Sindh				12	18	15	27	20	23
NWFP				27	27	27	41	47	44
Baluchistan				22	37	30	33	14	24
RURAL AREAS:	**21**	**23**	**22**	**26**	**27**	**27**	**18**	**19**	**18**
Punjab				22	24	23	10	9	10
Sindh				37	36	36	20	27	23
NWFP				33	33	33	37	39	38
Baluchistan				52	59	54	29	41	35
OVERALL:	**21**	**20**	**21**	**23**	**26**	**25**	**18**	**20**	**19**
Punjab				19	23	21	10	11	10
Sindh				28	28	28	23	24	23
NWFP				32	32	32	38	40	39
Baluchistan				48	54	50	30	34	32

NOTES:

1. Diarrhoea cases in which a government health practitioner was consulted first, expressed as a percentage of all diarrhoea cases in which a practitioner was consulted.
2. Government and Non-government: 1991 PIHS: Government includes 'Government Dispensary', 'Government Hospital', 'Government Basic Health Unit', and 'Government Rural Health Centre', whereas non-government includes 'Siana', 'Herbalist/Hakeem/Homeopath', 'Compounder/Chemist', 'Private Doctor', 'Private Hospital', 'Faith Healer', and 'Other'1995-96 PIHS: Government includes 'Government Dispensary', 'Government Hospital', 'Basic Health Unit', 'Rural Health Centre', 'MCH Centre', and 'Community Health Worker', whereas non-government includes 'Hakeem/Herbalist', 'Homeopath', 'Compounder/Chemist', 'Private Doctor', 'Private Hospital', 'Faith Healer', 'Siana', and "Other'. 1996-97 PIHS: Government includes 'Government Dispensary', 'Government Hospital', 'Basic Health Unit', 'Rural Health Centre', 'MCH Centre', 'Family welfare centre' and 'Community Health Worker', whereas non-government includes 'NGO, Hakeem/Herbalist', 'Homeopath', 'Compounder/Chemist', 'Private Dispensary', 'Private Hospital', 'Faith Healer', 'Siana', and "Other'.

TABLE 3. 11 REASON FOR NOT VISITING GOVT. FACILITY FIRST FOR DIARRHOEA TREATMENT

REGION AND REASON	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES - 1996-97 PIHS				
	PUNJAB	SINDH	NWFP	BALUCHISTAN	PAKISTAN
URBAN AREAS:					
Too far away	50	24	32	3	40
Not enough medicines	7	6	13	8	7
Doctor not available	1		1	31	1
Staff not courteous	13	7	12	8	11
Other reasons	30	63	42	50	41
TOTAL:	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
RURAL AREAS:					
Too far away	54	30	42	44	49
Not enough medicines	18	6	15	7	15
Doctor not available	3	5	2	22	3
Staff not courteous	6	2	24	4	9
Other reasons	19	57	16	23	24
TOTAL:	100	100	100	100	100
OVERALL:					
Too far away	53	28	41	32	47
Not enough medicines	15	6	15	7	13
Doctor not available	2	3	2	25	3
Staff not courteous	8	5	23	5	9
Other reasons	21	60	20	31	28
TOTAL:	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Diarrhoea cases in which a government health practitioner was not consulted, expressed as a percentage of all diarrhoea cases in which a government health practitioner was not consulted.
2. Other reasons includes ‘Cannot treat complications’, ‘No female staff’, ‘Timings not suitable, ‘Medicines not effective’, and ‘Other’.
3. Total may not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 3. 12 INFANT MORTALITY – BY REGION AND PROVINCE

REGION AND PROVINCE	DEATHS PER THOUSAND LIVE BIRTHS					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
URBAN AREAS:	**77**	**85**	**81**	**82**	**85**	**83**
Punjab	68	77	73	84	93	89
Sindh	82	100	91	73	75	74
NWFP	92	56	74	94	60	77
Baluchistan	127	114	120	120	118	119
RURAL AREAS:	**115**	**101**	**108**	**108**	**117**	**112**
Punjab	114	101	108	116	130	123
Sindh	129	121	125	107	124	116
NWFP	104	73	89	79	68	74
Baluchistan	110	124	117	117	96	106
OVERALL:	**105**	**97**	**101**	**101**	**108**	**105**
Punjab	103	95	99	108	121	115
Sindh	109	112	110	93	105	99
NWFP	102	71	87	81	67	74
Baluchistan	113	122	117	117	99	108

NOTES:

1. Infant mortality rates from the 1995-96 PIHS were taken to be the total number of children who died before they were 1 years old, divided by the total number of live births between January 1991 and December 1993 - i.e. the 3 year period prior to the survey (based on data from Section 4, Part C: Maternity History in the 1995-96 PIHS Questionnaire).
2. Infant mortality rates from the 1996-97 PIHS were taken to be the total number of children who died before they were 1 years old, divided by the total number of live births between January 1992 and December 1994 - i.e. the 3 year period prior to the survey (based on data from Section 4, Part E: Maternity History in the 1996-97 PIHS Questionnaire).
3. Note that there were 32 deaths reported in the 1995-96 PIHS and 21 deaths reported in the 1996-97 PIHS for the period 1991-1993 and for the period 1992-1994 for which there was no information on how long the child survived. These observations have been excluded here, which means that infant mortality rate from the 1995-96 and 1996-97 surveys reported here may be a slight underestimate. However, it is also possible that these deaths were stillbirths, in which case these would have no effect on the infant mortality rates calculated.

TABLE 3. 13 INFANT MORTALITY - BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	DEATHS PER THOUSAND LIVE BIRTHS - 1996-97 PIHS					
	URBAN AREAS			RURAL AREAS		
	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH	MALE	FEMALE	BOTH
PUNJAB:	**84**	**93**	**89**	**116**	**130**	**123**
1st Quintile	74	62	68	96	76	86
2nd Quintile	82	94	89	108	162	134
3rd Quintile	61	126	94	86	111	98
4th Quintile	116	104	111	150	179	164
5th Quintile	91	92	92	163	142	153
SINDH:	**73**	**75**	**74**	**107**	**124**	**116**
1st Quintile	59	112	87	78	87	83
2nd Quintile	63	43	52	51	75	63
3rd Quintile	91	73	82	121	99	109
4th Quintile	84	86	85	169	191	181
5th Quintile	67	46	57	141	203	175
NWFP:	**94**	**60**	**77**	**79**	**68**	**74**
1st Quintile	64	33	48	50	83	66
2nd Quintile	59	120	91	119	46	84
3rd Quintile	99	77	90	47	49	48
4th Quintile	131	65	99	57	77	66
5th Quintile	144	0	60	136	95	115
BALUCHISTAN:	**120**	**118**	**119**	**117**	**96**	**106**
1st Quintile	136	185	158	95	62	82
2nd Quintile	77	155	115	81	175	126
3rd Quintile	166	67	105	174	57	108
4th Quintile	158	130	142	132	131	131
5th Quintile	61	9	38	130	51	85

NOTES:

1. Quintiles: Income groups made on basis of per-capita household consumption. For details please refer to Appendix C.
2. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
3. Infant mortality rates from the 1996-97 PIHS were taken to be the total number of children who died before they were 1 years old, divided by the total number of live births between January 1992 and December 1994 - i.e. the 3 year period prior to the survey (based on data from Section 4, Part E: Maternity History in the 1996-97 PIHS Questionnaire).

TABLE 3. 14 PRE-NATAL CONSULTATIONS

PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CASES - 1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
1. PERCENTAGE OF PREGNANT WOMEN VISITING HEALTH FACILITY FOR PRE-NATAL CONSULTATION:			
PAKISTAN:	**54**	**22**	**30**
Punjab	43	22	27
Sindh	76	23	44
NWFP	44	26	28
Baluchistan	25	5	8
2. PERSON / FACILITY CONSULTATED:			
Home TBA	8	11	9
Home LHW	1	1	1
Home LHV	1	3	2
Home Doctor	0	1	1
Govt. hospital	34	36	35
Govt. clinic	6	6	6
Private hospital	29	19	24
Private clinic	21	23	22
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who were pregnant and have attended pre-natal consultations during the last pregnancy, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who were pregnant.
2. Percentage of currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who were pregnant and have attended pre-natal consultations during the last pregnancy.

TABLE 3. 15 PREGNANT WOMEN THAT HAVE RECEIVED TETANUS TOXOID INJECTION

PROVINCE / PLACE	PERCENTAGE OF PREGNANT WOMEN - 1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PAKISTAN:	**90**	**77**	**83**
Punjab	88	79	83
Sindh	94	65	85
NWFP	81	82	82
Baluchistan	76	37	55

NOTES:

1. Currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who were pregnant and have received a tetanus toxoid injection during the last pregnancy, or during an earlier pregnancy, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who were pregnant.
2. Total number of observations: 1996-97 PIHS: 2,156 cases.

TABLE 3. 16 CHILD DELIVERY - LOCATION AND TYPE OF ASSISTANCE

PLACE	PERCENTAGE OF CASES - 1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
1. PLACE WHERE CHILD WAS DELIVERED:			

Home	64	89	82
Govt. hospital	15	4	7
Govt. clinic	2	1	1
Private hospital	13	4	6
Private clinic	6	3	4
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**
2. PERSON THAT ASSISTED WITH DELIVERY:			
F.member/relative	8	18	16
Neigbour	1	2	2
TBA	26	44	40
Trained dai	26	23	24
Doctor	33	9	15
LHV	4	3	3
Other	3	1	1
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Based on births during past three years (last pregnancy only) to all currently married women aged 15 - 49 years.

TABLE 3. 17 POST-NATAL CONSULTATIONS

PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CASES - 1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
1. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN VISITING HEALTH FACILITY AFTER DELIVERY FOR POST-NATAL CONSULTATION:			
PAKISTAN:	**19**	**8**	**11**
Punjab	13	8	9
Sindh	30	11	19
NWFP	11	8	8
Baluchistan	15	1	3

2. PERSON / FACILITY CONSULTED:			
Home TBA	12	20	16
Home LHW	1	4	3
Home LHV	3	2	3
Home Doctor	0	2	1
Govt. hospital	27	27	27
Govt. clinic	5	3	4
Private hospital	35	19	26
Private clinic	17	23	20
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who have received post-natal check-up expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who were pregnant. (Q. 9 in Section 4, Part D of the 1996-97 PIHS questionnaire).
2. Percentage of currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who received post-natal check-up by source of check-up (Q. 10 in Section 4, Part D of the 1996-97 PIHS questionnaire).

TABLE 3. 18 BREAST FEEDING AND WEANING PRACTICES

PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CASES - 1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
1. PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN THAT BREAST FED THEIR LAST CHILD:			
PAKISTAN:	**96**	**96**	**96**
Punjab	95	96	96
Sindh	98	98	98
NWFP	91	95	95
Baluchistan	94	94	94
2. AGE AT WHICH SEMI-SOLID FOODS FIRST INTRODUCED:			
3 months	4	2	2
4 months	31	13	17
5 months	22	17	19
6 months	23	29	27
7 months	7	11	10
8 months	6	11	10
9 months	1	4	3
10 months	3	4	4
11 months	1	1	1
12+ months	3	8	6
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who breast feed the last child, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15 - 49 years who replied to Q.11.
2. Percentage of currently married women aged 15-49 years who started feeding last child semi-solid foods by age indicated

TABLE 3. 19 ACCESS TO ORS AND IMMUNISATION SERVICES

PROVINCE AND DISTANCE	PIHS 1996-97					
	ORS			IMMUNISATION SERVICES		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL

PUNJAB:						
0 - 2 km	87	55	64	87	94	93
2 - 5 km	10	18	16	10	2	4
5 -10 km	1	15	11	2	2	2
10 -20 km	1	6	4	1	1	1
20+ km	1	7	5	0	1	1
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:						
0 - 2 km	89	45	61	84	87	85
2 - 5 km	11	21	17	13	6	10
5 -10 km		9	5	2	4	3
10 -20 km		13	8	1	2	2
20+ km		13	8	0	1	1
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:						
0 - 2 km	86	60	64	75	77	77
2 - 5 km	9	16	15	17	12	13
5 -10 km	4	10	9	6	5	5
10 -20 km		6	5	1	3	3
20+ km	1	8	7	0	3	2
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:						
0 - 2 km	75	27	39	84	97	95
2 - 5 km	19	53	45	13	2	4
5 -10 km	3	4	3	3	0	1
10 -20 km	4	13	11	1		0
20+ km		4	3		0	0
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
0 - 2 km	87	54	63	85	91	89
2 - 5 km	10	19	16	12	4	7
5 -10 km	1	12	9	2	3	2
10 -20 km	1	7	6	1	1	1
20+ km	1	8	6	0	1	1
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

TABLE 3. 20 ACCESS TO HEALTH FACILITIES IN RURAL AREAS - COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

PROVINCE AND TYPE OF FACILITY	PERCENTAGE OF RURAL PSUs WITH FACILITY ...						
	PRESENT IN PSU	WITHIN 0-2 KM	WITHIN 2-5 KM	WITHIN 5-10 KM	WITHIN 10-20 KM	20 + KM	TOTAL
PUNJAB:							
Government hospital	1	0	6	17	27	49	100
Government dispensary	3	3	24	33	19	18	100
Rural health centre	1	2	21	37	23	16	100
Basic health unit	8	15	38	33	6	1	100
MCH centre	1	1	10	25	26	37	100
RHS centre	0	0	4	9	16	71	100
SINDH:							
Government hospital	0	1	6	10	18	65	100
Government dispensary	8	4	19	26	23	19	100
Rural health centre	2	2	11	13	21	52	100
Basic health unit	7	3	15	18	46	11	100
MCH centre	1	2	14	15	53	15	100
RHS centre	1	3	15	34	23	26	100
NWFP:							
Government hospital	0	2	11	5	17	64	100
Government dispensary	1	6	14	21	22	36	100
Rural health centre	1	1	15	6	38	40	100
Basic health unit	6	5	28	21	11	29	100
MCH centre	3	4	14	5	7	66	100
RHS centre	0	2	15	3	8	72	100
BALUCHISTAN:							
Government hospital	1	0	14	5	1	78	100
Government dispensary	2	2	7	9	3	77	100
Rural health centre	8	0	16	2	8	66	100
Basic health unit	14	1	8	1	3	73	100
MCH centre	0	0	4	8	2	87	100
RHS centre	0	0	4	1	2	94	100
OVERALL PAKISTAN:							
Government hospital	1	1	8	12	20	58	100
Government dispensary	3	4	19	26	17	31	100
Rural health centre	2	2	17	21	24	35	100
Basic health unit	8	9	28	24	12	19	100
MCH centre	1	2	10	17	22	48	100
RHS centre	0	1	7	8	12	72	100

NOTES:

1. Total number of observations: Government Hospital: 458 PSUs Government Dispensary: 428 PSUs Rural Health Centre: 414 PSUs Basic Health Unit: 443 PSUs Mother Child Health Centre 422 PSUs RHS centre 374 PSUs.
2. Observations included: Observations for rural PSUs where the distance to the nearest health facility was missing, or "Don't know" were excluded. All other reported distances were recoded into the above categories.

TABLE 3. 21 SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF GOVERNMENT HEALTH FACILITIES

CHARACTERISTIC OF HEALTH FACILITY	1996-97 PIHS COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE				
	PUNJAB	SINDH	NWFP	B'CHISTAN	PAKISTAN
1. PERCENTAGE OF FACILITIES WHERE DOCTOR WAS NORMALLY AVAILABLE EVERY DAY	42	81	92	19	47
2. HOURS PER WEEK DOCTOR NORMALLY AVAILABLE	36	31	38	9	33
3. PERCENTAGE OF FACILITIES WITH NO FEMALE STAFF:	6	47	16	92	30
4. PERCENTAGE OF FACILITIES CHARGING A GENERAL FEE:	50	91	99	5	51
5. AVERAGE MINIMUM GENERAL FEE CHARGED (RUPEES):	1	3	1	2	2
6. PERCENTAGE OF FACILITIES WITH IN-PATIENT BEDS:	35	53	16	2	29
7. AVERAGE NUMBER OF PATIENTS DURING PAST WEEK	96	109	178	192	121
8. PERCENTAGE OF FACILITIES WITH ELECTRICITY:	95	84	87	43	82

NOTES:

1. Based on Section 2: Health Facilities Questionnaire in the 1996-97 PIHS Community Questionnaire.
2. Total number of observations: 1996-97 PIHS: The total sample by province of the 178 Government Health Facilities covered in the 1996-97 Community Questionnaire is as follows:

Facility	Punjab	Sindh	NWFP	B'stan	Overall
Government Hospital	1	0	5	0	6
Basic Health Unit	39	19	23	11	92
Rural Health Centre	5	3	5	9	22
Family Planning Clinic	26	1	0	0	27
Other government facility	5	18	2	6	31
Total	76	41	35	26	178

4. Population Welfare

4.1 Introduction

Giving parents the opportunity to choose smaller families is an important goal of the Social Action Programme. Despite the existence of government-sponsored family planning programmes for more than 30 years, access to family planning remains poor. Moreover, Pakistan's high population growth rate puts added pressure on the government's efforts to expand and improve the delivery of basic social services. The SAP strategy for promoting population welfare includes:

- improving the operation and utilisation of existing family planning services;
- expanding access and improving the quality of family planning services;
- encouraging interest in family planning; and,
- promoting community participation in the design and management of family planning services.

In the rest of this chapter, population welfare data is presented with respect to: birth, marriages and fertility rates; awareness and family planning use; source of family planning; and, access to family planning facilities.

4.2 Births, marriages and fertility rates

The PIHS data on births, marriages and fertility rates suggest that population welfare programmes may have had some impact since 1991. Women are marrying later and having fewer children. Between 1991 and 1996-97, the percentage of women aged 15 to 49 years who have ever married fell from 73 to 68 per cent (Table 4.1). The fall for the 20 to 24 year old age group has been particularly dramatic, from 69 to 60 per cent. Furthermore, the mean number of children ever born to women aged 15 to 49 years fell from 3.2 in 1991 to 2.9 in 1996-79 (Table 4.2). This fall has taken place in both rural and urban areas and for nearly all age groups.

The PIHS data also suggest that there has been a steady decline in the total fertility rate (TFR) between the 1991 PIHS and the 1995-96 PIHS (Table 4.3). Data from the 1991 PIHS (covering the period 1987-1989) indicate a TFR of 6.35 compared with 6.2 from the 1992 PDS (covering the period 1989-1991), and 6.12 from the 1996-97 PIHS (covering the period 1992-1994). Although the fall in the TFR has taken place in both urban and rural areas, the fall in urban areas has been much greater.

4.3 Awareness and use of family planning

A key objective of SAP is to increase the awareness and use of modern family planning methods. Data from the 1996-97 PIHS indicates that both awareness and use have been increasing since 1991. Some 91 per cent of currently married women aged between 15 and 49 years know about family planning (Table 4.4). In rural areas, awareness is higher in Sindh and lower in Baluchistan. The percentage of currently married women who have ever used family planning more than doubled from 10 per cent in 1991 to 21 per cent in 1996-97. Looking at rural areas again, the percentage ever used is highest in NWFP and lowest in Baluchistan. The contraceptive prevalence rate (CPR) has risen from 8 per cent in 1991 to 17 per cent in the 1996-97 PIHS.[31]

When the awareness and use variables from the 1995-96 PIHS were compared with the 1994-95 Pakistan Contraceptive Prevalence Survey (PCPS) they gave much lower estimates of key variables. The reason for this was thought to be a difference in the way the questions were posed. Unlike the PIHS, the PCPS probed for answers if respondents did not answer spontaneously. In the light of this problem, the awareness and use questions were revised for the 1996-97 PIHS along the lines of the PCPS questionnaire. In sum, the new figures

[31] The contraceptive prevalence rate is the total number of women (in the relevant category) currently using family planning methods, expressed as a percentage of all currently married non-pregnant women aged 15-49 years.

presented in this report are based on more detailed questioning and are therefore likely to give higher and more accurate estimates.

How, therefore, does the 1996-97 PIHS data compare with the PCPS? With respect to the percentage of married women who know about family planning, the estimates are identical, with both surveys reporting 91 per cent. However, the percentage ever used is much higher in the PCPS than the 1996-97 PIHS (28 per cent compared with 21 per cent).[32] Comparing the 1996-97 PIHS contraceptive prevalence rates with the previous PIHS, the re-phrasing of the question has given higher estimates which are broadly comparable with the 1994-95 PCPS. The current CPR, at 17 per cent, represents a considerable improvement on the 12 per cent reported in the 1990-91 Pakistan Demographic and Health Survey (PDHS).

CONTRACEPTIVE PREVALENCE RATE

PROVINCE	CONTRACEPTIVE PREVALENCE RATE			
	1990-91 PDHS	1994-95 PCPS	1995-96 PIHS	1996-97 PIHS
Pakistan	**12**	**18**	**14**	**17**
Punjab	13	20	14	18
Sindh	12	15	16	18
NWFP	9	15	15	15
Baluchistan	2	4	6	6

What socio-economic characteristics are associated with family planning? As might be expected, family planning use is associated with income, age, education and number of children. There would look to be a weak positive relationship between household income and awareness and use (Table 4.5). The better-off income groups in urban areas are more likely to know about and use family planning. For example, some 37 per cent of the richest quintile in urban Baluchistan use family planning compared with only 4 per cent of the poorest quintile. However, the relationship looks less clear in rural areas.

As might be expected, older women are more likely to use family planning (Table 4.6). Some 25 per cent of the 35-39 age group of currently married women use family planning compared with only 3 per cent of the 15-19 year old group. Family planning is much less likely to be practised by those who have received no education. Only 12 per cent of married women with no education practice family planning compared with 36 per cent for those who have attended class 8 or higher. Interestingly, the CPR doubles for those who have attended only two years of primary school, compared with those with no education. Lastly, the more children a woman has the more likely it is that she has begun to start using family planning. Some 23 per cent of those with 5 or more children use family planning compared with 0 per cent of those with no children.

The main reason why women did not use family planning were fairly uniform across regions and provinces (Table 4.7). “Wanted children” was the most often cited, followed by “religious reasons” and “spouse prefers not”.

4.4 Source of family planning

What type of family planning do women use and where do they get it from? The three most commonly known methods in both urban and rural areas are the pill, injection and tubal ligation (Table 4.9). The three most commonly used methods are tubal ligation (32 per cent), condoms (17 per cent), and IUD (15 per cent). There are a few important differences between the regions and provinces. The pill is the most commonly used method in Baluchistan, where the rate in rural areas is very high (71 per cent). Injections are the most common method in NWFP (27 per cent). Condoms are much more popular in urban as opposed to rural areas.

The three most commonly cited sources of family planning are government hospital (36 per cent), private (doctor, hospital, hakeem etc) (19 per cent), and spouse/relative/friend (13 per cent) (Table 4.10).

[32] Explanations for this difference are being looked into.

Shops/chemists are important in urban areas (19 per cent). Availability (supply) of family planning would seem to be less of a constraint in Pakistan. Women report family planning methods (pills, injections, condoms) being available regularly at source in all provinces (Table 4.11).

With respect to women's attitudes to publicly provided family planning services, some 72 per cent of women found them satisfactory (Table 4.12). However, women in rural areas were much less satisfied with the service provided (53 per cent compared with 88 per cent in urban areas). Satisfaction in NWFP was also much lower than in the other three provinces. The overwhelming problem that women face with government family planning services was that they were too far away. Some 69 per cent of women finding government services to be unsatisfactory cited this as the main reason for their dissatisfaction. This was a greater problem in rural than urban areas.

4.5 Access to family planning facilities

Distances to family planning sources look much greater than for access to ORS and immunisation (compare Table 4.13 with Table 3.19). In rural Pakistan, the contraceptive source is within 5 km (return trip) for only 42 per cent of women. Rural access is best in Baluchistan and worst in Punjab. Summary statistics on distances from rural PSUs to maternal care and family planning facilities are presented in Table 4.14. There is a family welfare centre within 5 km in only 19 per cent of PSUs. Village based family planning workers are within 5 km in 28 per cent of PSUs.

TABLE 4. 1 PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN AGED 15-49 YEARS EVER MARRIED

PROVINCE AND AGE-CATEGORY	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:				**64**	**70**	**68**	**62**	**68**	**66**
15 - 19 Years				7	18	15	7	14	12
20 - 24 Years				48	60	57	45	60	55
25 - 29 Years				88	87	87	84	86	86
30 - 34 Years				97	95	95	96	95	95
35 - 39 Years				98	98	98	97	98	98
40 - 44 Years				99	98	99	99	98	99
45 - 49 Years				98	97	97	100	98	98
SINDH:				**62**	**76**	**69**	**61**	**76**	**68**
15 - 19 Years				10	27	18	8	20	14
20 - 24 Years				47	77	62	48	78	63
25 - 29 Years				78	92	85	82	93	88
30 - 34 Years				92	97	94	91	98	94
35 - 39 Years				94	99	96	97	99	98
40 - 44 Years				98	99	99	97	99	98
45 - 49 Years				98	100	99	100	99	100
NWFP:				**69**	**74**	**73**	**66**	**72**	**71**
15 - 19 Years				19	29	27	18	24	23
20 - 24 Years				60	73	71	54	70	68
25 - 29 Years				85	91	90	86	90	89
30 - 34 Years				90	94	93	93	95	95
35 - 39 Years				98	98	98	97	97	97
40 - 44 Years				97	94	95	96	96	96
45 - 49 Years				91	99	98	94	100	99
BALUCHISTAN:				**73**	**80**	**78**	**69**	**84**	**82**
15 - 19 Years				20	32	29	13	32	28
20 - 24 Years				63	76	73	59	94	88
25 - 29 Years				95	94	94	90	98	97
30 - 34 Years				98	99	99	100	99	99
35 - 39 Years				100	99	99	98	100	100
40 - 44 Years				100	100	100	98	100	100
45 - 49 Years				100	100	100	100	100	100
OVERALL PAKISTAN:	**68**	**76**	**73**	**64**	**72**	**69**	**62**	**71**	**68**
15 - 19 Years	14	26	22	9	22	18	8	18	14
20 - 24 Years	58	74	69	49	66	60	47	66	60
25 - 29 Years	87	94	92	84	89	87	84	89	87
30 - 34 Years	96	97	96	94	95	95	94	96	95
35 - 39 Years	99	98	98	97	98	98	97	98	98
40 - 44 Years	98	98	98	99	98	98	98	98	98
45 - 49 Years	99	100	100	98	98	98	99	98	99

NOTES:

1. Total number of women in the relevant age-category that have ever been married, expressed as a percentage of all women in the age-category.
2. Figures given next to “Punjab”, “Sindh”, “NWFP”, “Baluchistan”, and “Overall Pakistan” are the percentages for all women aged 15-49 years.
3. Women married or not: This is based on the question on marital status in the Family Roster of both surveys.

TABLE 4. 2 MEAN NUMBER OF CHILDREN EVER BORN TO WOMEN AGED 15-49 YEARS

PROVINCE AND AGE-CATEGORY	1991 PIHS			1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:				**2.7**	**2.8**	**2.8**	**2.6**	**2.8**	**2.8**
15 - 19 Years				0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
20 - 24 Years				0.7	0.9	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.8
25 - 29 Years				2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.5
30 - 34 Years				4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2
35 - 39 Years				5.3	5.6	5.5	5.3	5.7	5.6
40 - 44 Years				6.4	6.4	6.4	6.1	6.5	6.3
45 - 49 Years				6.6	6.8	6.7	6.8	7.1	7.0
SINDH:				**2.6**	**3.0**	**2.8**	**2.5**	**3.1**	**2.8**
15 - 19 Years				0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
20 - 24 Years				0.8	1.2	1.0	0.6	1.1	0.8
25 - 29 Years				2.4	2.9	2.6	2.2	2.9	2.6
30 - 34 Years				3.5	4.4	4.0	3.7	4.8	4.3
35 - 39 Years				5.2	5.8	5.5	5.3	5.8	5.5
40 - 44 Years				6.2	7.1	6.7	6.2	7.2	6.7
45 - 49 Years				6.9	8.3	7.6	6.9	8.3	7.5
NWFP:				**3.1**	**3.2**	**3.2**	**3.0**	**3.2**	**3.2**
15 - 19 Years				0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
20 - 24 Years				1.2	1.2	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.2
25 - 29 Years				2.9	3.2	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.1
30 - 34 Years				4.1	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.9	4.9
35 - 39 Years				5.8	6.3	6.2	6.3	6.5	6.4
40 - 44 Years				7.1	7.3	7.3	6.2	6.9	6.7
45 - 49 Years				6.4	7.8	7.6	7.0	7.5	7.4
BALUCHISTAN:				**3.5**	**3.5**	**3.5**	**3.3**	**3.6**	**3.6**
15 - 19 Years				0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
20 - 24 Years				1.3	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.6
25 - 29 Years				3.6	3.2	3.3	3.6	3.5	3.5
30 - 34 Years				5.1	5.3	5.2	4.9	5.4	5.3
35 - 39 Years				6.0	6.6	6.5	6.3	6.6	6.5
40 - 44 Years				8.0	6.8	7.1	7.2	6.8	6.9
45 - 49 Years				6.9	6.5	6.6	7.1	7.6	7.5
OVERALL PAKISTAN:	**3.0**	**3.3**	**3.2**	**2.7**	**3.0**	**2.9**	**2.6**	**3.0**	**2.9**
15 - 19 Years	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
20 - 24 Years	0.9	1.3	1.2	0.8	1.0	0.9	0.7	1.0	0.9
25 - 29 Years	2.8	3.1	3.0	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.4	2.7	2.6
30 - 34 Years	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.0	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.5	4.3
35 - 39 Years	5.7	6.4	6.2	5.3	5.7	5.6	5.4	5.9	5.7
40 - 44 Years	6.7	6.8	6.8	6.4	6.7	6.6	6.2	6.7	6.5
45 - 49 Years	7.1	7.0	7.0	6.7	7.2	7.0	6.9	7.3	7.2

NOTES:

1. Mean number of children ever born: This is based on all women in the relevant age-categories (i.e. both married as well as unmarried). (Q. 6, 7, and 8 in Section 4, Part A in the 1995-96 PIHS questionnaire, Q. 4, 5, and 6 in Section 4, Part B in the 1996-97 PIHS questionnaire). Women who had never been married were assigned zero births.
2. Figures given next to “Punjab”, “Sindh”, “NWFP”, “Baluchistan”, and “Overall Pakistan” are the mean number of children ever born for all women aged 15-49 years.

TABLE 4. 3 AGE-SPECIFIC AND TOTAL FERTILITY RATES - WOMEN AGED 15-49 YEARS

REGION AND AGE-CATEGORY	1987-1989 (average) (1991 PIHS)	1989-1991 (average) (PDS)	1991-1993 (average) (95-96 PIHS)	1992-94 (average) (96-97)
URBAN AREAS:				
15 - 19 Years	68	47	48	42
20 - 24 Years	266	236	233	232
25 - 29 Years	289	304	298	295
30 - 34 Years	250	249	221	208
35 - 39 Years	146	140	150	133
40 - 44 Years	48	64	65	65
45 - 49 Years***	20	20	20	20
TOTAL FERTILITY RATE:	**5.43**	**5.29**	**5.17**	**4.97**
RURAL AREAS:				
15 - 19 Years	118	88	80	75
20 - 24 Years	285	281	262	263
25 - 29 Years	324	324	329	333
30 - 34 Years	301	280	281	289
35 - 39 Years	204	209	208	209
40 - 44 Years	83	107	120	126
45 - 49 Years***	40	40	40	40
TOTAL FERTILITY RATE:	**6.77**	**6.64**	**6.60**	**6.67**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:				
15 - 19 Years	102	73	70	65
20 - 24 Years	279	266	253	253
25 - 29 Years	314	317	319	321
30 - 34 Years	283	270	260	263
35 - 39 Years	188	187	188	183
40 - 44 Years	72	94	102	106
45 - 49 Years***	33	33	33	33
TOTAL FERTILITY RATE:	**6.35**	**6.20**	**6.13**	**6.12**

NOTES:

*** In the 1995-96 and 1996-97 PIHS, birth histories were taken down only for those women who were aged 15 - 49 years at the time of the interview. It was therefore impossible from the survey data to calculate the age-specific fertility rate for the 45-49 year age-group for the period indicated (i.e. for 1992-94 and 1991-93). Instead, the fertility rate for this age-group has been assumed to be the same as that reported by the 1992 PDS when calculating the total fertility rate.

TABLE 4. 4 AWARENESS AND USE OF FAMILY PLANNING METHODS

REGION AND PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN 15 - 49 YEARS					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	KNOW ABOUT	EVER USED	CURRENTLY USING	KNOW ABOUT	EVER USED	CURRENTLY USING
URBAN AREAS:	**73**	**30**	**25**	**95**	**35**	**29**
Punjab	70	29	23	94	36	30
Sindh	80	31	29	99	34	32
NWFP	66	39	27	93	33	22
Baluchistan	50	12	8	81	16	15
RURAL AREAS:	**54**	**13**	**10**	**88**	**15**	**11**
Punjab	53	13	11	89	17	13
Sindh	59	6	5	99	6	6
NWFP	61	20	13	89	20	14
Baluchistan	29	6	5	49	5	5
OVERALL:	**60**	**18**	**14**	**91**	**21**	**17**
Punjab	58	17	14	91	22	18
Sindh	69	17	16	99	19	18
NWFP	62	23	15	90	22	15
Baluchistan	33	7	6	53	6	6

NOTES:

1. Total number of women in the relevant category (know about, ever used, currently using), expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years.
2. Know about family planning method: Both the 1996-97 PIHS and 1995-96 PIHS asked all currently married women aged 15-49 if they knew about family planning. These tabulation are based on the answers given to the question: i.e. which family planning method the women knew about.
3. Ever used family planning method: Expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years.
4. Currently using family planning method: Expressed as percentage of all currently married non-pregnant women aged 15-49 years.

TABLE 4. 5 AWARENESS AND USE OF FAMILY PLANNING METHODS – BY INCOME GROUP

PROVINCE AND INCOME GROUP	PERCENTAGE OF CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN 15 - 49 YEARS					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	KNOW ABOUT	EVER USED	CURRENTLY USING	KNOW ABOUT	EVER USED	CURRENTLY USING
PUNJAB:	**94**	**36**	**30**	**89**	**17**	**13**
1st Quintile	93	30	25	88	15	12
2nd Quintile	93	29	22	88	14	11
3rd Quintile	94	33	27	89	19	15
4th Quintile	94	38	30	92	20	16
5th Quintile	96	47	40	90	17	13
SINDH:	**99**	**34**	**32**	**99**	**6**	**6**
1st Quintile	100	19	18	97	4	4
2nd Quintile	99	32	29	98	5	5
3rd Quintile	99	35	32	100	7	7
4th Quintile	99	36	33	99	7	6
5th Quintile	99	45	43	99	7	7
NWFP:	**93**	**33**	**22**	**89**	**20**	**14**
1st Quintile	86	26	14	78	19	14
2nd Quintile	95	38	24	88	16	12
3rd Quintile	96	37	27	92	20	13
4th Quintile	95	35	27	95	20	15
5th Quintile	93	30	18	90	23	14
BALUCHISTAN:	**81**	**16**	**15**	**49**	**5**	**5**
1st Quintile	67	7	4	51	4	4
2nd Quintile	80	5	5	41	5	5
3rd Quintile	77	12	11	39	5	5
4th Quintile	86	20	20	47	5	4
5th Quintile	93	37	37	66	5	6

NOTES:

NOTES:

1. Total number of women in the relevant category (know about, ever used, currently using), expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years.
2. Know about family planning method: Both the 1996-97 PIHS and 1995-96 PIHS asked all currently married women aged 15-49 if they knew about family planning. These tabulation are based on the answers given to the question: i.e. which family planning method the women knew about.
3. Ever used family planning method: Expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years.
4. Currently using family planning method: Expressed as percentage of all currently married non-pregnant women aged 15-49 years.
5. Quintile: Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details please refer to Appendix C

TABLE 4. 6 WOMEN CURRENTLY USING FAMILY PLANNING

CHARACTERISTIC	CPR - CURRENTLY MARRIED NON-PREGNANT WOMEN AGED 15-49 YRS 1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
BY AGE-CATEGORY:			
15-19 years	9	2	3
20-24 years	14	4	7
25-29 years	26	9	14
30-34 years	36	14	21
35-39 years	38	18	25
40-44 years	34	17	23
45-49 years	24	13	16
Overall:	**29**	**11**	**17**
BY EDUCATION LEVEL:			
No education	21	10	12
Class 1 - 2:	28	24	25
Class 3 - 4:	37	18	27
Class 5 - 7:	34	21	27
Class 8 or higher:	42	19	36
Overall:	**29**	**11**	**17**
BY NUMBER OF CHILDREN:			
No Children	0	0	0
1 Child	18	2	6
2 Children	31	6	14
3-4 Children	34	11	19
5+ Children	35	18	23
Overall:	**29**	**11**	**17**

NOTES:

1. Total number of women in the relevant category currently using family planning, expressed as a percentage of all currently married non-pregnant women aged 15-49 years in the relevant category.

TABLE 4. 7 MAIN REASON FOR NOT EVER PRACTICING FAMILY PLANNING

PROVINCE AND MAIN REASON	1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:			
Wanted children	40	43	42
Spouse prefers not	7	8	8
Did not know enough	2	3	3
Religious reasons	7	10	9
Fear of bad side effects	8	5	6
Other	36	32	33
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:			
Wanted children	44	52	49
Spouse prefers not	10	16	14
Did not know enough	2	5	4
Religious reasons	5	5	5
Fear of bad side effects	3	1	2
Other	36	21	26
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:			
Wanted children	43	44	44
Spouse prefers not	7	8	8
Did not know enough	5	4	4
Religious reasons	11	15	15
Fear of bad side effects	7	5	6
Other	27	23	24
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:			
Wanted children	52	55	55
Spouse prefers not	11	12	12
Did not know enough	3	2	3
Religious reasons	8	6	7
Fear of bad side effects	8	5	5
Other	17	19	19
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:			
Wanted children	42	46	45
Spouse prefers not	8	10	9
Did not know enough	2	3	3
Religious reasons	7	10	9
Fear of bad side effects	6	4	5
Other	35	27	29
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Percentage of women that indicated the reason given, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15 - 49 years that have never practiced family planning.
2. Reason for not using family planning: In the 1996-97 PIHS, respondents could report only one reason for not practising family planning (Q. 3 in Section 4, Part C in the 1996-97 PIHS questionnaire).
3. Categories - Other: For the 1996-97 PIHS, “Other” includes “Not available”, Too expensive” , “Not effective”, “Not available regularly”, "Self opposed”, “Relative opposed”, “Husband Away”, "Lactating”, “Infertility”, “Hysterectomy”, “Menopause”, and “Other”.

TABLE 4. 8 COMMONLY KNOWN METHODS OF FAMILY PLANNING

REGION AND FAMILY PLANNING METHOD	WOMEN THAT KNOW ABOUT EACH PARTICULAR METHOD AS % OF CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN 15-49 YEARS KNOWING ABOUT FAMILY PLANNING				
	1996-97 PIHS				
	PUNJAB	SINDH	NWFP	BALUCHISTAN	PAKISTAN
URBAN:					
Pill	88	98	93	81	92
Injection	87	97	92	79	91
Tubal ligation	88	92	83	52	88
IUD	85	86	89	59	85
Condom	73	83	84	48	77
Other	68	73	75	46	70
RURAL:					
Pill	79	97	89	48	82
Injection	81	96	88	45	83
Tubal ligation	83	80	82	24	79
IUD	76	89	79	22	75
Condom	55	67	76	10	58
Other	46	69	54	20	50
OVERALL:					
Pill	82	98	89	53	85
Injection	83	96	88	50	85
Tubal ligation	85	85	82	28	82
IUD	78	87	80	27	78
Condom	60	74	77	15	64
Other	52	71	57	24	56

NOTES:

1. Women knowing about indicated family planning method, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years that know about family planning.
2. Know about family planning method: In the PIHS 1996-97 respondents could report up to 11 methods of family planning that they knew about (Q. 1 in Section 4, Part C in the 1996-97 PIHS questionnaire).
3. Categories:1996-97 PIHS “Other” includes “Rhythm”, “Spermicide/foam/Diaphragm”, “Norplant/Implant”, “Vasectomy”, “Withdrawal”, and “Other”.

TABLE 4. 9 TYPE OF FAMILY PLANNING METHOD CURRENTLY BEING USED

PROVINCE AND FAMILY PLANNING METHOD	1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL

PUNJAB:			
Pill	6	4	5
Injection	5	8	7
Tubal ligation	27	38	33
IUD	12	21	17
Condom	24	7	15
Other	26	23	24
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:			
Pill	7	9	7
Injection	7	15	9
Tubal ligation	30	52	34
IUD	10	10	10
Condom	31	6	26
Other	16	7	14
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:			
Pill	22	14	16
Injection	17	30	27
Tubal ligation	19	24	23
IUD	14	19	18
Condom	18	7	10
Other	10	6	7
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:			
Pill	17	71	52
Injection	19	8	12
Tubal ligation	19	7	11
IUD	8	3	5
Condom	26	2	10
Other	10	9	10
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:			
Pill	7	8	8
Injection	7	13	10
Tubal ligation	28	36	32
IUD	11	19	15
Condom	26	7	17
Other	21	18	19
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Percentage of women that are using the family planning method indicated, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years that are currently practicing family planning.
2. Type of family planning method currently being used: Based on Q.6 in Section 4 Part C in the PIHS 1996-97 questionnaire.
3. Categories: For the 1996-97 PIHS, "Other" includes "Rhythm", "Spermicide/Foam/Diaphragm", "Norplant/implant," "Vasectomy", "Withdrawal", and "Other".
4. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 4. 10 PLACE / PERSON FROM WHERE FAMILY PLANNING METHOD OBTAINED

PLACE/PERSON METHOD OBTAINED FROM	PERCENTAGE OF CURRENTLY MARRIED WOMEN 15-49 YEARS CURRENTLY PRACTICING FAMILY PLANNING					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
Spouse/relative/friend	17	11	14	18	8	13
Govt. F. Planning Clinic	12	13	13	11	14	12
Govt. Hospital	34	40	37	30	42	36
Govt. Health Worker	1	8	4	2	9	5
NGO	2	3	2	1	2	1
Private	22	20	21	18	20	19
Shop or Chemist	13	5	9	19	4	12
Other	0	0	0	0	1	1
TOTAL:	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Women obtaining method from place / person indicated, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years that are currently practising family planning.
2. Categories: "Government Health Worker" includes "Rural Family Planning Worker" and "Health Worker" while "NGO" refers to "NGO Family Planning Clinic", "Private" includes "Private Doctor / Hospital", "Hakeem", "Homeopath", and "Dai".
3. Total may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 4. 11 WOMEN FINDING FAMILY PLANNING METHOD AVAILABLE REGULARLY

TYPE OF FAMILY P. METHOD / PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN FINDING METHOD AVAILABLE REGULARLY					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
TYPE OF FAMILY PLANNING METHOD:						
Pill	95	90	92	98	97	97
Injection	97	91	94	95	95	95
Condom	97	93	96	99	99	99
Overall:	**97**	**91**	**94**	**98**	**97**	**98**
PROVINCE:						
Punjab	93	91	92	97	95	96
Sindh	99	87	97	99	100	99
NWFP	100	95	97	98	97	97
Baluchistan	100	70	77	97	99	99
Overall:	**97**	**91**	**94**	**98**	**97**	**98**

NOTES:

1. Women finding method indicated to be available regularly, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years that are currently practising that particular family planning method.

TABLE 4. 12 ATTITUDES TOWARDS GOVERNMENT FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES

PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CASES 1996-97 PIHS 1. WOMEN FINDING SERVICES SATISFACTORY (%)		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
Punjab	87	46	66
Sindh	90	76	88
NWFP	69	54	58
Baluchistan	96	96	96
OVERALL	**88**	**53**	**72**
REASON	**2. REASON FOR DISSATISFACTION (%)**		
Too far away	62	72	69
Staff not available	3	6	5
Charges too high	5	5	5
Unsuitable atmosphere	7	6	6
Staff not co-operative	14	6	8
No female staff	1	2	2
Other	8	4	5
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Part 1: Women finding government family planning services to be satisfactory, expressed as a percentage of all currently married women aged 15-49 years that are currently practising family planning.
2. Part 2: Women finding government family planning services to be unsatisfactory for the reason indicated, expressed as a percentage of all women finding government family planning services to be unsatisfactory.
3. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 4. 13 DISTANCE TO FAMILY PLANNING SOURCE

PROVINCE AND DISTANCE GROUP	DISTANCE IN KM (ROUND TRIP) - PIHS 1996-97		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:			
0 - 2 km	57	21	39
2 - 5 km	17	12	15
5 -10 km	10	14	12
10 -20 km	6	19	13
20+ km	10	33	22
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:			
0 - 2 km	54	34	50
2 - 5 km	33	8	28
5 -10 km	7	15	8
10 -20 km	3	9	5
20+ km	3	35	9
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:			
0 - 2 km	62	40	46
2 - 5 km	17	20	19
5 -10 km	11	17	15
10 -20 km	2	7	6
20+ km	9	16	14
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:			
0 - 2 km	55	72	66
2 - 5 km	30	19	23
5 -10 km	5	6	5
10 -20 km		4	2
20+ km	11		4
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:			
0 - 2 km	56	28	43
2 - 5 km	24	14	19
5 -10 km	8	15	11
10 -20 km	4	15	9
20+ km	7	29	17
TOTAL	**100**	**100**	**100**

TABLE 4. 14 ACCESS TO MATERNAL CARE AND FAMILY PLANNING FACILITIES IN RURAL AREAS
(1996-97 PIHS COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE)

PROVINCE & TYPE OF HEALTH FACILITY	PERCENTAGE OF RURAL PRIMARY SAMPLING UNITS WITH FACILITY						
	WITHIN PSU	WITHIN 0-2 KM	WITHIN 2-5 KM	WITHIN 6-10 KM	WITHIN 11-20 KM	20+ KM	TOTAL
PUNJAB:							
Family Welfare Centre	2	2	21	41	23	10	100
F. Plan Mobile Unit	7	1	13	18	21	40	100
Vil. Based FP Worker	14	7	27	28	10	13	100
Dai (Untrained)	32	9	23	16	14	6	100
TBA	82	0	14	1	1	2	100
Lady Health Worker	55	6	18	12	3	6	100
SINDH:							
Family Welfare Centre	1	2	14	17	20	46	100
F. Plan Mobile Unit	3	2	13	14	20	48	100
Vil. Based FP Worker	2	5	16	27	25	25	100
Dai (Untrained)	31	4	20	23	12	10	100
TBA	72	4	9	9	4	2	100
Lady Health Worker	25	7	19	24	12	13	100
NWFP:							
Family Welfare Centre	2	3	13	6	7	69	100
F. Plan Mobile Unit	0	2	11	3	9	75	100
Vil. Based FP Worker	1	4	14	5	6	70	100
Dai (Untrained)	8	3	15	17	7	50	100
TBA	74	0	14	1	2	9	100
Lady Health Worker	12	4	16	15	12	42	100
BALUCHISTAN:							
Family Welfare Centre	0	1	5	5	1	87	100
F. Plan Mobile Unit	0	2	6	0	1	90	100
Vil. Based FP Worker	0	1	4	0	1	92	100
Dai (Untrained)	4	1	5	6	9	75	100
TBA	61	1	5	0	2	31	100
Lady Health Worker	3	1	6	1	2	88	100
OVERALL PAKISTAN:							
Family Welfare Centre	1	2	16	25	16	40	100
F. Plan Mobile Unit	4	1	11	11	15	58	100
Vil. Based FP Worker	6	5	17	15	8	50	100
Dai (Untrained)	22	6	18	15	11	27	100
TBA	76	1	12	2	2	7	100
Lady Health Worker	29	5	15	12	6	33	100

NOTES:

1. Total number of observations: Family Welfare Centre: 421 PSUs Family Planning Mobile Service Unit: 364 PSUs Village-based Family Planning Worker: 293 PSUs Dai (Untrained): 439 PSUs Trained Birth Attendant: 450 PSUs Lady Heath Worker 345 PSUs.
2. Observations included: Observations for rural PSUs where the distance to the nearest maternal care and family planning facility was missing, or “Don’t know” were excluded. All other reported distances were recoded into the above categories.
3. Total may not add up to 100 because of rounding

5. Rural water supply and sanitation

5.1 Introduction

Many households in rural Pakistan lack access to an adequate supply of safe water. In addition, a large proportion of the population do not have toilets and communities lack sanitation systems. The SAP strategy for rural water supply and sanitation (RWSS) includes:

- improving the performance and utilisation of local systems;
- improving quality and expanding access to safe drinking water;
- improving rural sanitation; and,
- promoting community responsibility for the management and maintenance of systems

In the rest of this chapter, the RWSS data is presented with respect to: source of drinking water; and, toilets and sanitation.

5.2 Source of drinking water

The main source of drinking water in rural Pakistan is a hand/motor pump, with some 62 per cent of households getting their water from this source (Table 5.1). However, hand/motor pumps are more important in rural Punjab (80 per cent) and Sindh (55 per cent). In rural NWFP and Baluchistan, the main source of drinking water is river/canals/streams; wells are also important in these two provinces. In urban areas, taps are a common source. Are better off households more likely to use safer forms of water? In Table 5.2, the main source of water is tabulated against income groups. In both urban and rural areas, the richer the household, the less likely it is that they get their water from a hand/motor pump and the more likely it is that they have a tap in their house.

In rural Pakistan only a very small proportion of households pay for their supply of drinking water (Table 5.3). Some 7 per cent pay for their supply of water compared to 46 per cent in urban areas. For those paying for their water, the average monthly payment in rural areas for those with taps in their houses is Rupees 34 compared with Rupees 68 in urban areas. For those paying for water, the amount paid does not vary much across income groups (Table 5.4). However, the richest 20 per cent in both urban areas appear to pay more, possibly due to higher consumption.

Around 83 per cent of households in Pakistan get their water from a protected source (Table 5.5). The percentage is highest in Punjab (94 per cent) and lowest in Baluchistan (38 per cent). Protected water is more common in urban (95 per cent) than rural (77 per cent) areas.[33]

5.3 Toilets and sanitation

Some 61 per cent of households in rural Pakistan do not have a toilet (Table 5.6). The percentage is highest in rural Punjab (71 per cent) and lowest in rural Sindh (36 per cent). Only 7 per cent of households in urban areas lack a toilet. Overall, the percentage of households with a flush toilet has increased from 28 per cent in 1991 to 42 per cent in 1996-97.[34] As might be expected, it is the better-off households who are able to afford a toilet (Table 5.7). In rural Pakistan, some 79 per cent of the poorest 20 per cent of the population have no toilet compared with 49 per cent of the richest 20 per cent.

[33] Protected water includes: tap water both inside and outside the house; hand pump and motor pump; tube well outside; and, well closed inside and outside the house.
[34] For 1991 PIHS data on water and sanitation see GoP (1996) *Pakistan Integrated Household Survey Round 1, 1995/96*, Federal Bureau of Statistics, Islamabad.

In rural Pakistan, some 61 per cent of households have no sanitation system (Table 5.8). The percentage with no system is highest in rural Baluchistan (96 per cent) and lowest in rural Punjab (52 per cent). Sanitation is much better in urban areas - only 10 per cent of households in urban areas have no sanitation system. In rural areas there does not look to be a strong relationship between income and type of sanitation system. However, the richest quintile is less likely to have no system compared with the other four quintiles (Table 5.9). In urban areas, the relationship looks clearer; the percentage of households with no sanitation system falls as income rises, from 19 per cent for the poorest quintile to 3 per cent for the richest.

The existence of garbage collection committees were reported in some urban areas but hardly at all in rural areas (Table 5.10). In urban areas, some 27 per cent of households reported committees, the highest percentage being in NWFP and the lowest in Sindh. Of the urban and rural households reporting a committee just under half paid a monthly fee to the committee.

Some insights into changes in rural water supply over the last three years can be gained from the community questionnaire (Table 5.11). Some 27 per cent of communities have more public taps compared with three years ago, with the biggest increase being in Baluchistan. Compared to three years ago, some 18 per cent of communities have water available for more time each day. The existence of water management committees is an indicator of the SAP strategy of promoting community responsibility in water management. However, water management committees, in existence in only three per cent of PSUs, are very scarce. Of those communities with a committee, water fees are levied in around a third of them.

TABLE 5. 1 MAIN SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER BY PROVINCE AND WATER SOURCE

PROVINCE AND WATER SOURCE	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:						
Tap in house	45	8	18	45	6	17
Tap outside house	2	1	1	3	1	2
Hand Pump/M.Pump	50	83	74	44	80	70
Dug well	1	6	5	9	8	8
River/Canal/Stream	0	1	1	0	3	3
Other	2	1	2	0	1	1
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:						
Tap in house	71	9	39	72	8	40
Tap outside house	6	1	4	6	2	4
Hand Pump/M.Pump	14	58	37	12	55	33
Dug well	4	12	8	5	16	11
River/Canal/Stream	0	17	9	0	17	9
Other	5	2	3	5	2	4
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:						
Tap in house	49	37	31	52	23	28
Tap outside house	11	9	9	12	5	6
Hand Pump/M.Pump	22	12	14	13	9	10
Dug well	15	25	23	22	22	22
River/Canal/Stream	0	4	3	1	38	32
Other	3	23	19	0	3	2
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:						
Tap in house	71	16	26	70	13	21
Tap outside house	8	3	4	6	3	4
Hand Pump/M.Pump	6	15	11	3	13	11
Dug well	10	29	25	11	20	19
River/Canal/Stream	2	13	11	2	44	38
Other	3	25	21	7	6	7
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Tap in house	56	11	25	56	9	24
Tap outside house	4	2	3	4	2	3
Hand Pump/M.Pump	33	66	56	29	62	52
Dug well	3	11	8	8	12	11
River/Canal/Stream	0	5	3	0	13	9
Other	3	6	5	2	2	2
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Households obtaining water from the source indicated, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households.
2. Categories: "Hand-pump" includes hand-pumps both inside and outside, motor pump and tube well outside the house, "Dug well" includes well open and well closed both inside and outside the house, "Canal/river/stream" includes canal, river, spring, stream and "Other water" includes public standpipe, water seller, and other.
3. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 5. 2 MAIN SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER - BY INCOME GROUP

REGION AND WATER SOURCE	1996-97 PIHS					
	1st QUINTILE	2nd QUINTILE	3rd QUINTILE	4th QUINTILE	5th QUINTILE	OVERALL
URBAN AREAS:						
Tap in house	28.7	42.2	56.9	63.2	73.1	55.8
Tap outside house	4.9	5.5	5.4	4.1	2.7	4.3
Hand pump/M.pump	54.7	40.4	29.0	22.0	12.9	29.0
Dug well	8.9	9.6	6.3	7.7	9.0	8.3
Other	2.3	1.9	2.3	2.8	1.9	2.2
OVERALL:	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
RURAL AREAS:						
Tap in house	5.4	6.7	9.9	10.8	11.0	9.1
Tap outside house	1.3	2.4	1.7	2.5	2.1	2.0
Hand pump/M.pump	77.4	67.3	58.1	56.1	56.7	62.0
Dug well	4.3	9.0	11.7	13.7	16.7	12.3
River/Canal/Stream	7.4	12.5	16.4	15.3	12.3	13.0
Other	1.2	2.2	2.2	1.5	1.1	1.6
OVERALL:	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Tap in house	8.5	13.1	17.8	26.0	42.4	23.7
Tap outside house	2.1	2.5	3.4	3.0	2.7	2.7
Hand pump/M.pump	74.0	61.3	52.8	46.7	35.0	51.7
Dug well	6.9	10.6	11.8	12.2	12.4	11.0
River/Canal/Stream	7.1	10.2	12.4	10.3	6.0	9.0
Other	1.4	2.3	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.8
OVERALL:	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Households obtaining water from the source indicated, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households .
2. Water source: “Hand-pump” includes hand-pumps both inside and outside, motor pump and tube well outside the house, “Dug well” includes wells both inside and outside the house, “Canal/river/stream” includes canal, river, spring, stream and “Other water” includes public standpipe, water seller, and other.
3. Quintile Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
4. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.

TABLE 5. 3 PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS PAYING FOR WATER

REGION AND WATER SOURCE	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	%H'HOLDS GETTING WATER FROM SOURCE	%H'HOLDS PAYING FOR WATER USED	AVERAGE AMOUNT PAID PER MONTH (RUPEES)	%H'HOLDS GETTING WATER FROM SOURCE	%H'HOLDS PAYING FOR WATER USED	AVERAGE AMOUNT PAID PER MONTH (RUPEES)
URBAN AREAS:						
Tap in house	56	70	47	56	76	68
Tap outside house	4	18	...	4	9	...
Hand pump/M.pump	33	6	...	29	2	...
Dug well	3	17	...	8	15	...
Other	3	61	...	2	50	...
OVERALL:	**100**	**44**	**47**	**100**	**46**	**75**
RURAL AREAS:						
Tap in house	11	45	28	9	57	34
Tap outside house	2	7	...	2	17	...
Hand pump/M.pump	66	1	...	62	1	...
Dug well	11	3	...	12	3	...
River/Canal/Stream	5	0	...	13	0	...
Other	6	2		2	8	
OVERALL:	**100**	**6**	**27**	**100**	**7**	**43**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Tap in house	25	62	43	24	71	61
Tap outside house	3	12	...	3	13	...
Hand pump/M.pump	56	2	...	52	1	...
Dug well	8	5	...	11	6	...
River/Canal/Stream	3	0	...	9	0	...
Other	5	14		2	24	
OVERALL:	**100**	**18**	**42**	**100**	**19**	**68**

NOTES:

1. The first column gives the percentage of households obtaining water from the source indicated. The second column gives the households that pay for water, expressed as a percentage of the households that obtain water from the source indicated. The third column gives the average amount paid per month by those households that pay for water.
2. In computing average expenditure on water, 8 outliers were excluded.
3. Water source: "Hand-pump" includes hand-pumps both inside and outside, motor pump and tube well outside the house, "Dug well" includes well open and well closed both inside and outside the house, "Canal/river/stream" includes canal, river, spring, stream and "Other water" includes public standpipe, water seller, and other.
4. Totals for column 1 may not add up to 100 because of rounding.
5. ... Insufficient observations to allow accurate statistics to be derived for these cells

TABLE 5. 4 AVERAGE AMOUNT PAID PER MONTH FOR WATER - BY INCOME GROUP

REGION AND WATER SOURCE	1996-97 PIHS					
	1st QUINTILE	2nd QUINTILE	3rd QUINTILE	4th QUINTILE	5th QUINTILE	OVERALL
URBAN AREAS:						
Tap in house	49.1	53.8	58.4	58.8	87.0	68.2
RURAL AREAS:						
Tap in house	29.8	29.5	32.9	31.7	39.6	34.3
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Tap in house	44.4	40.4	47.1	51.6	73.6	61.0

NOTES:

1. Households paying for water from the source indicated, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households
2. Quintile Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
3. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.

TABLE 5. 5 USE OF PROTECTED WATER - BY PROVINCE

PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH PROTECTED WATER SOURCE					
	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:	96	92	93	98	92	94
SINDH:	91	69	79	92	69	81
NWFP:	82	48	54	82	41	48
BALUCHISTAN:	85	34	43	80	31	38
OVERALL PAKISTAN:	93	79	83	95	77	83

NOTES:

1. Households using protected drinking water, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households.
2. i) Protected water includes tap water both inside outside the house, hand pump, motor pump, tube well outside and well closed inside and outside the house.
3. ii) Unprotected water includes, well open, canal, river, stream, spring and other water.

TABLE 5. 6 TYPE OF TOILET USED - BY PROVINCE

PROVINCE AND TYPE OF TOILET	1995-96 PIHS			1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:						
Household Flush	73	20	34	85	23	40
Non-Flush	9	5	6	5	6	6
Communal Latrine	5	1	2			
No Toilet	13	74	58	11	71	54
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:						
Household Flush	82	11	45	90	23	56
Non-Flush	12	36	24	8	41	25
Communal Latrine	3	11	7			
No Toilet	3	42	24	2	36	19
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:						
Household Flush	59	15	23	64	20	27
Non-Flush	32	26	27	28	36	34
Communal Latrine	1	1	1			
No Toilet	9	57	49	8	45	38
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:						
Household Flush	41	6	13	67	18	25
Non-Flush	42	24	27	24	21	22
Communal Latrine	2	1	1			
No Toilet	15	69	59	9	61	53
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Household Flush	75	17	34	85	22	42
Non-Flush	13	14	14	8	17	14
Communal Latrine	4	3	3			
No Toilet	9	66	48	7	61	44
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Households having the type of toilets indicated, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households.
2. Communal latrine was not included as a separate category in the 1996-97 PIHS questionnaire.
3. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 5. 7 TYPE OF TOILET USED - BY INCOME GROUP

REGION AND TYPE OF TOILET	1996-97 PIHS					
	1st QUINTILE	2nd QUINTILE	3rd QUINTILE	4th QUINTILE	5th QUINTILE	OVERALL
URBAN:						
Household Flush	65	77	84	92	97	85
Non-Flush	15	14	10	4	2	8
No Toilet	20	9	6	4	2	7
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
RURAL:						
Household Flush	10	15	21	23	34	22
Non-Flush	14	19	17	18	17	17
No Toilet	79	66	61	59	49	61
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL:						
Household Flush	17	29	36	43	68	42
Non-Flush	16	17	17	15	9	14
No Toilet	67	55	47	42	23	44
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Households having the type of toilets indicated, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households in each income group.
2. Quintile Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
3. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
4. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 5. 8 TYPE OF SANITATION SYSTEM USED - BY PROVINCE

PROVINCE AND SANITATION SYSTEM	1995-96 PIHS			1996-67 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
PUNJAB:						
Underground Drains	35	2	11	38	2	12
Open Drains	56	52	53	52	47	48
Soak Pit	2	6	5			
No System	7	39	31	9	52	40
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
SINDH:						
Underground Drains	60	2	30	66	2	33
Open Drains	33	23	28	27	22	24
Soak Pit	4	29	17			
No System	3	46	26	8	77	43
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
NWFP:						
Underground Drains	3	0	1	5	1	2
Open Drains	78	38	45	74	28	36
Soak Pit	0	1	1			
No System	18	61	54	21	71	63
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
BALUCHISTAN:						
Underground Drains	8	1	2	9	0	1
Open Drains	47	7	15	49	4	11
Soak Pit	9	11	10			
No System	37	81	73	43	96	88
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL PAKISTAN:						
Underground Drains	42	2	14	46	1	15
Open Drains	48	43	45	44	37	39
Soak Pit	3	10	8			
No System	7	46	34	10	61	45
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Households connected to the drainage system indicated, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households.
2. “Soak pit” was not included as a separate category in the 1996-97 PIHS questionnaire.
3. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 5. 9 TYPE OF SANITATION SYSTEM USED - BY INCOME GROUP

REGION AND TYPE OF TOILET	1996-97 PIHS					
	1st QUINTILE	2nd QUINTILE	3rd QUINTILE	4th QUINTILE	5th QUINTILE	OVERALL
URBAN:						
Underground Drains	16	30	41	53	70	46
Open Drains	65	54	48	41	26	44
No System	19	16	12	6	3	10
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
RURAL:						
Underground Drains	1	2	1	2	2	1
Open Drains	34	36	35	36	43	37
No System	65	63	64	62	55	61
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**
OVERALL:						
Underground Drains	3	5	9	15	35	15
Open Drains	39	41	39	40	39	39
No System	58	54	52	46	26	45
Total	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**	**100**

NOTES:

1. Households connected to the drainage system indicated, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households.
2. Quintile Income groups made on the basis of per-capita household consumption. For details on how the quintiles were derived, please refer to Appendix C.
3. The 1st quintile contains individuals with the lowest consumption level, whereas the 5th quintile contains individuals with the highest consumption level.
4. Totals may not add up to 100 because of rounding.

TABLE 5. 10 GARBAGE COLLECTION COMMITTEES - BY PROVINCE

PROVINCE	PERCENTAGE OF CASES 1996-97 PIHS		
	URBAN	RURAL	OVERALL
1. HOUSEHOLDS REPORTING GARBAGE COMMITTEE (%)			
Punjab	32	1	9
Sindh	18	3	10
NWFP	41	0	7
Baluchistan	23	0	3
OVERALL	**27**	**1**	**9**
2. HOUSEHOLDS PAYING GARBAGE FEE (%)			
Punjab	46	55	47
Sindh	60	60	60
NWFP	16	50	17
Baluchistan	69	0	69
OVERALL	**44**	**56**	**45**

NOTES:

1. Part 1: Households reporting a garbage collection committee in the locality, expressed as a percentage of the total number of households.
2. Part 2: Households paying garbage collection fee, committee, expressed as a percentage of all households reporting a garbage committee in the locality.

TABLE 5. 11 SELECTED WATER SUPPLY CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMUNITIES

CHARACTERISTICS	1996-97 PIHS				
	PUNJAB	SINDH	NWFP	B.CHISTAN	OVERALL
1. PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES WITH MORE PUBLIC TAPS COMPARED WITH 3 YEARS AGO	23	24	30	47	27
2. PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES WITH LESS PUBLIC TAPS COMPARED WITH 3 YEARS AGO	0	2	18	23	9
3. PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES WITH WATER AVAILABLE FROM PUBLIC TAPS FOR MORE TIME EACH DAY COMPARED WITH 3 YEARS AGO	18	14	24	0	18
4. PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES WITH WATER AVAILABLE FROM PUBLIC TAPS FOR LESS TIME EACH DAY COMPARED WITH 3 YEARS AGO	0	0	16	53	8
5. PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES WITH WATER MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	3	2	4	1	3
6. PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES WITH WATER MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE WHERE FEES ARE CHARGED	79	54	2	0	37
7. PERCENTAGE OF COMMUNITIES WITH NO COMMITTEE WHO ARE READY TO FORM WATER MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	37	36	3	18	28

NOTES:

1. Based on Section 1 part B Water Supply and Sanitation Section in the 1996-97 PIHS Community Questionnaire.

APPENDIX A: CONFIDENCE INTERVALS

	ESTIMATE	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	STANDARD ERROR	95% INTERVAL MIN.	MAX.
PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER THAT HAS EVER ATTENDED SCHOOL					
URBAN AREAS:	**68.1**	**24,755**	**0.89**	**66.3**	**69.8**
Punjab	67.9	10,690	1.33	65.3	70.5
Sindh	71.2	7,202	1.32	68.7	73.8
NWFP	58.1	3,795	2.23	53.8	62.5
Baluchistan	51.7	3,068	2.31	47.1	56.2
RURAL AREAS:	**42.6**	**35,896**	**0.67**	**41.3**	**43.9**
Punjab	45.7	15,167	0.89	44.0	47.5
Sindh	37.0	8,655	1.53	34.0	40.0
NWFP	41.0	7,004	1.52	38.0	44.0
Baluchistan	29.6	5,070	2.44	24.8	34.4
OVERALL:	**50.9**	**60,651**	**0.57**	**49.8**	**52.0**
Punjab	52.4	25,857	0.79	50.8	54.0
Sindh	53.9	15,857	1.05	51.9	56.0
NWFP	44.1	10,799	1.31	41.5	46.6
Baluchistan	33.2	8,138	2.20	28.9	37.5
A.2 PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER THAT HAS COMPLETED PRIMARY LEVEL OR HIGHER					
URBAN AREAS:	**54.0**	**24,754**	**1.03**	**52.0**	**56.1**
Punjab	54.1	10,690	1.51	51.1	57.0
Sindh	56.9	7,201	1.63	53.6	60.1
NWFP	44.4	3,795	2.25	39.9	48.8
Baluchistan	37.9	3,068	2.44	33.1	42.6
RURAL AREAS:	**28.5**	**35,896**	**0.60**	**27.3**	**29.6**
Punjab	30.3	15,167	0.84	28.6	31.9
Sindh	26.7	8,655	1.26	24.2	29.2
NWFP	26.6	7,004	1.30	24.1	29.2
Baluchistan	19.2	5,070	1.58	16.1	22.3
OVERALL:	**36.8**	**60,650**	**0.57**	**35.6**	**37.9**
Punjab	37.4	25,857	0.83	35.8	39.0
Sindh	41.6	15,856	1.06	39.5	43.7
NWFP	29.8	10,799	1.14	27.5	32.0
Baluchistan	22.2	8,138	1.47	19.4	25.1

NOTES:

1. The column marked "Estimate" gives the value of the estimate of the variable that has been derived using data from the 1996-97 PIHS, "Number of Observations" gives the number of observations on the basis of which this estimate was calculated, "Standard Error" the standard error of the estimate, taking into account sample design (i.e. the fact that a two-stage stratified sampling procedure was used to draw the sample for the survey), and "MIN" and "MAX" denote the 95% confidence intervals calculated for the estimate, once again taking into account design effects.

	ESTIMATE	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	STANDARD ERROR	95% INTERVAL MIN.	MAX.
A.3 GROSS ENROLMENT RATES (INCLUDING KATCHI)					
URBAN AREAS:	**87.2**	**7,262**	**1.54**	**84.2**	**90.2**
Punjab	88.7	2,954	2.13	84.5	92.8
Sindh	86.8	1,945	2.69	81.6	92.1
NWFP	81.5	1,172	4.55	72.6	90.5
Baluchistan	79.2	1,191	4.25	70.8	87.5
RURAL AREAS:	**63.0**	**12,798**	**1.25**	**60.6**	**65.5**
Punjab	68.0	5,011	1.71	64.7	71.4
Sindh	48.0	2,970	2.84	42.5	53.6
NWFP	65.3	2,636	2.50	60.4	70.2
Baluchistan	54.5	2,181	5.56	43.6	65.4
OVERALL:	**69.7**	**20,060**	**1.01**	**67.7**	**71.7**
Punjab	73.5	7,965	1.40	70.7	76.2
Sindh	64.3	4,915	2.01	60.3	68.2
NWFP	67.7	3,808	2.19	63.4	72.0
Baluchistan	58.0	3,372	4.91	48.4	67.6
A.4 LITERACY RATES – POPULATION 10 YEARS AND OLDER					
URBAN AREAS:	**57.6**	**24,754**	**1.05**	**55.6**	**59.7**
Punjab	57.4	10,690	1.54	54.4	60.4
Sindh	61.1	7,201	1.67	57.8	64.4
NWFP	45.8	3,795	2.32	41.2	50.3
Baluchistan	44.8	3,068	2.30	40.3	49.3
RURAL AREAS:	**30.7**	**35,896**	**0.62**	**29.5**	**31.9**
Punjab	32.4	15,167	0.85	30.7	34.1
Sindh	29.8	8,655	1.40	27.0	32.5
NWFP	27.1	7,004	1.38	24.4	29.8
Baluchistan	24.0	5,070	2.00	20.0	27.9
OVERALL:	**39.4**	**60,650**	**0.58**	**38.3**	**40.6**
Punjab	39.9	25,857	0.82	38.3	41.5
Sindh	45.3	15,856	1.12	43.1	47.5
NWFP	30.4	10,799	1.21	28.1	32.8
Baluchistan	27.4	8,138	1.83	23.8	31.0

NOTES:

1. The column marked "Estimate" gives the value of the estimate of the variable that has been derived using data from the 1996-97 PIHS, "Number of Observations" gives the number of observations on the basis of which this estimate was calculated, "Standard Error" the standard error of the estimate, taking into account sample design (i.e. the fact that a two-stage stratified sampling procedure was used to draw the sample for the survey), and "MIN" and "MAX" denote the 95% confidence intervals calculated for the estimate, once again taking into account design effects.

	ESTIMATE	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	STANDARD ERROR	95% INTERVAL MIN.	MAX.
A.5 CHILDREN 5 YRS AND UNDER THAT HAVE RECEIVED AT LEAST ONE IMMUNISATION (RECALL)					
URBAN AREAS:	**89.0**	**5,395**	**0.81**	**87.4**	**90.6**
Punjab	89.0	2,153	1.21	86.6	91.4
Sindh	90.2	1,428	1.33	87.5	92.8
NWFP	87.1	899	1.47	84.2	90.0
Baluchistan	81.3	915	2.25	76.9	85.7
RURAL AREAS:	**78.9**	**10,272**	**0.90**	**77.1**	**80.6**
Punjab	85.8	3,944	0.84	84.2	87.5
Sindh	66.0	2,531	2.74	60.6	71.4
NWFP	73.6	2,175	1.97	69.7	77.4
Baluchistan	69.5	1,622	4.26	61.1	77.9
OVERALL:	**81.6**	**15,667**	**0.68**	**80.2**	**82.9**
Punjab	86.6	6,097	0.69	85.3	88.0
Sindh	75.8	3,959	1.76	72.4	79.3
NWFP	75.5	3,074	1.70	72.2	78.8
Baluchistan	71.3	2,537	3.61	64.2	78.3
A.6 CHILDREN 5 YEARS AND UNDER SUFFERING FROM DIARRHOEA IN PAST 30 DAYS					
URBAN AREAS:	**14.4**	**5,404**	**0.71**	**13.0**	**15.8**
Punjab	14.8	2,159	1.06	12.7	16.8
Sindh	12.3	1,431	1.07	10.2	14.4
NWFP	23.6	899	1.98	19.7	27.4
Baluchistan	7.1	915	1.02	5.1	9.1
RURAL AREAS:	**15.4**	**10,311**	**0.58**	**14.2**	**16.5**
Punjab	16.5	3,980	0.84	14.9	18.2
Sindh	10.9	2,531	0.79	9.4	12.5
NWFP	18.9	2,176	1.42	16.1	21.7
Baluchistan	8.4	1,624	1.35	5.7	11.0
OVERALL:	**15.1**	**15,715**	**0.47**	**14.2**	**16.0**
Punjab	16.1	6,139	0.69	14.7	17.4
Sindh	11.5	3,962	0.64	10.2	12.8
NWFP	19.5	3,075	1.26	17.1	22.0
Baluchistan	8.2	2,539	1.17	5.9	10.5

NOTES:

1. The column marked "Estimate" gives the value of the estimate of the variable that has been derived using data from the 1996-97 PIHS, "Number of Observations" gives the number of observations on the basis of which this estimate was calculated, "Standard Error" the standard error of the estimate, taking into account sample design (i.e. the fact that a two-stage stratified sampling procedure was used to draw the sample for the survey), and "MIN" and "MAX" denote the 95% confidence intervals calculated for the estimate, once again taking into account design effects.

	ESTIMATE	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	STANDARD ERROR	95% INTERVAL MIN.	MAX.
A.7 INFANT MORTALITY					
URBAN AREAS:	**83.4**	**3,169**	**6.23**	**71.2**	**95.6**
Punjab	88.6	1,276	9.60	69.7	107.4
Sindh	74.0	844	9.12	56.1	91.9
NWFP	77.2	525	14.55	48.7	105.8
Baluchistan	119.0	524	18.73	82.2	155.7
RURAL AREAS:	**112.3**	**6,088**	**5.13**	**102.2**	**122.4**
Punjab	123.1	2,382	7.52	108.3	137.8
Sindh	116.2	1,543	10.48	95.6	136.8
NWFP	73.7	1,248	8.67	56.7	90.8
Baluchistan	106.4	915	9.21	88.3	124.5
OVERALL:	**104.7**	**9,257**	**4.17**	**96.5**	**112.9**
Punjab	114.6	3,658	6.23	102.3	126.8
Sindh	99.2	2,387	7.25	84.9	113.4
NWFP	74.2	1,773	7.71	59.1	89.4
Baluchistan	108.2	1,439	8.33	91.9	124.6
A.8 MEAN NUMBER OF CHILDREN EVER BORN TO WOMEN AGED 15-49 YRS					
URBAN AREAS:	**2.63**	**7,814**	**0.04**	**2.55**	**2.71**
Punjab	2.63	3,355	0.06	2.52	2.74
Sindh	2.52	2,306	0.07	2.38	2.66
NWFP	3.02	1,190	0.14	2.75	3.29
Baluchistan	3.29	963	0.14	3.02	3.57
RURAL AREAS:	**2.99**	**11,239**	**0.04**	**2.91**	**3.07**
Punjab	2.85	4,806	0.05	2.75	2.95
Sindh	3.13	2,607	0.07	2.99	3.26
NWFP	3.18	2,287	0.06	3.06	3.30
Baluchistan	3.63	1,539	0.09	3.45	3.81
OVERALL:	**2.87**	**19,053**	**0.03**	**2.82**	**2.93**
Punjab	2.79	8,161	0.04	2.71	2.86
Sindh	2.82	4,913	0.05	2.72	2.92
NWFP	3.15	3,477	0.06	3.04	3.26
Baluchistan	3.58	2,502	0.08	3.42	3.73

NOTES:

1. The column marked "Estimate" gives the value of the estimate of the variable that has been derived using data from the 1996-97 PIHS, "Number of Observations" gives the number of observations on the basis of which this estimate was calculated, "Standard Error" the standard error of the estimate, taking into account sample design (i.e. the fact that a two-stage stratified sampling procedure was used to draw the sample for the survey), and "MIN" and "MAX" denote the 95% confidence intervals calculated for the estimate, once again taking into account design effects.

	ESTIMATE	NUMBER OF OBSERVATIONS	STANDARD ERROR	95% INTERVAL MIN.	MAX.
A.9 USE OF FAMILY PLANNING METHODS – CONTRACEPTIVE PREVALANCE RATE					
URBAN AREAS:	**29.4**	**4,146**	**0.99**	**27.5**	**31.4**
Punjab	29.5	1,741	1.43	26.7	32.4
Sindh	31.7	1,194	1.64	28.5	34.9
NWFP	22.3	635	2.03	18.3	26.3
Baluchistan	15.2	576	2.32	10.7	19.8
RURAL AREAS:	**11.4**	**6,773**	**0.58**	**10.3**	**12.5**
Punjab	13.2	2,693	0.81	11.6	14.8
Sindh	5.9	1,628	0.95	4.0	7.8
NWFP	13.7	1,326	1.40	10.9	16.4
Baluchistan	4.6	1,126	1.61	1.4	7.7
OVERALL:	**16.9**	**10,919**	**0.51**	**15.9**	**17.9**
Punjab	17.9	4,434	0.71	16.5	19.3
Sindh	18.0	2,822	0.95	16.1	19.8
NWFP	15.0	1,961	1.22	12.7	17.4
Baluchistan	6.1	1,702	1.47	3.2	9.0

NOTES:

1. The column marked "Estimate" gives the value of the estimate of the variable that has been derived using data from the 1996-97 PIHS, "Number of Observations" gives the number of observations on the basis of which this estimate was calculated, "Standard Error" the standard error of the estimate, taking into account sample design (i.e. the fact that a two-stage stratified sampling procedure was used to draw the sample for the survey), and "MIN" and "MAX" denote the 95% confidence intervals calculated for the estimate, once again taking into account design effects.

APPENDIX B: SAMPLING IN BALUCHISTAN

B 1 COMPARISON OF BALUCHISTAN SAMPLES

	SAMPLE FOR BALUCHISTAN

VARIABLE OF INTEREST	95-96 ONLY	OVERLAPPING SAMPLE 95-96	96-97	96-97 ONLY
Number of PSUs	37	72	72	48
Average annual hh. Expenditure (Rupees)	51,824	52,713	51,384	48,494
School attendance:				
Male	59.4	58.5	60.3	59.4
Female	46.2	38.7	36.9	40.2
Literacy rates:				
Male	49.3	47.9	48.9	46.2
Female	15.0	12.1	11.6	12.2
Immunisation rates:				
Male	80.6	71.5	71.7	75.5
Female	75.9	70.4	74.8	75.0
% of hhs with tap Inside the house	41.6	45.2	45.7	32.0

NOTES:

Average annual household expenditure has been adjusted to take into account differences in mean annual household expenditure between the two surveys (on average, household expenditures were 1.44 times higher in the 1996-97 compared to 1995-96).

Definitions: school attendance: percentage of 5-10 year olds currently enrolled in school (including katchi); literacy rates: percentage of population 10 years and older that is literate; immunisation rate: percentage of children <=5 years that have received at least one injection; water connection: percentage of households with tap inside the household.

Data is unweighted and will therefore not match that presented in the preceding tables.

Results from the 1996-97 PIHS show most social indicators in Baluchistan province to be, on average, worse than those indicated by the 1995-96 PIHS. The results are somewhat perplexing, as they suggest that there has been a worsening in social conditions in the province in the one year between the two surveys. To what extent is this result indicative of actual changes in the province during this period, or is this due to differences in the sample population between the two survey rounds?

In order to investigate this further, a more detailed PSU level analysis was undertaken for a few key variables for Baluchistan from the two surveys. As discussed earlier, the sampling strategy adopted for the 1996-97 round of the PIHS was to retain roughly two-thirds of the same PSUs that had been covered in the 1995-96 PIHS round. In addition, the Baluchistan sample was increased by an additional 11 PSUs because standard errors were high in the 1995-96 PIHS.

In carrying out this analysis, we thus had three main groups of interest: (1) those PSUs that were covered in the 1995-96 round only - 37 PSUs, (2) those PSUs that were covered in both rounds of the survey - 72 PSUs, and (3) those PSUs that were covered in the 1996-97 round only - 48 PSUs.

As Table B.1 shows, in PSUs that were included in both rounds of the PIHS, selected indicators shown above were found to be virtually identical by the two surveys. However, in the samples that were exclusive to each round (i.e. were either covered only in the 1995-96 round, or were covered only in the 1996-97 round), there was considerable difference between the two surveys. On average, these indicators were found to be better in the 1995-96 round rather than the 1996-97, which explains why there has been an overall drop in these indicators between the two surveys.

APPENDIX C: CONSTRUCTING CONSUMPTION AGGREGATES

In order to assess the extent to which poorer households have benefited from improved service access and welfare outcomes, data is needed on household consumption or income in order to rank households on the basis of their aggregate consumption or income level. The 1996-97 PIHS collects information on household consumption, which was used to construct an aggregate measure of living standards.

The 1996-97 PIHS questionnaire contained a short consumption module that included questions on 22 main food and 24 main non-food items. This consumption section was considerably less detailed than that in FBS's Household Integrated Economic Survey (HIES), and so estimates of per capita annual consumption obtained from the 1996-97 PIHS may not be strictly comparable with these surveys. However, while estimates of mean consumption may not be comparable across surveys, these limitations do not apply to comparisons across households covered in the survey itself. In this report, per capita consumption aggregates have been used to divide households in each province and region into five income groups - households with the lowest per capita consumption are grouped together into the 1st income quintile, those with higher per capita consumption into the 2nd quintile, and so on.

Four different income quintile variables were derived. In the first instance, income quintiles were derived separately for each of the 8 main groups of interest (4 provinces x 2 regions: urban and rural). There are three points that need emphasising in this regard. First, quintiles are numbered so that households with the lowest per capita consumption are in quintile 1 and those with the highest consumption in quintile 5. Second, as these quintiles were derived separately for each of the 8 domains of interest, they are not necessarily comparable across domains - in other words households in the 2nd quintile in urban Punjab may on average have a level of expenditure that is quite different from that for households in the 2nd quintile for rural Sindh. Finally, quintiles were calculated taking sampling weights into account so as to yield an equal number of individuals (not households) in all quintiles in each domain.

In deriving the second quintile variable, income quintiles were derived separately for each of the 4 provinces. For the same reasons as discussed above, these income quintiles are not comparable across provinces, as households in the 2nd quintile in one province may on average have a level of expenditure that is quite different to households in another province. In the third instance, income quintiles were derived separately for urban and rural areas. Finally, one overall quintile variable was also derived in which households living throughout the country were divided into 5 groups overall.

These four separate quintile variables that were derived have been used separately in different parts of this report, depending on which particular quintile variable was most appropriate for the type of analysis being carried out. The footnotes that accompany the tables point out (where necessary) the particular quintile variable that was used. A few summary statistics on the income quintiles thus derived are presented below.

C 1 PROVINCE AND URBAN - RURAL QUINTILES

REGION AND INCOME GROUP	INCOME GROUP				
	1st QUINTILE	2nd QUINTILE	3rd QUINTILE	4th QUINTILE	5th QUINTILE
	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS				
URBAN AREAS:					
Punjab	326	367	428	478	572
Sindh	229	241	268	306	453
NWFP	107	115	136	165	176
Baluchistan	95	96	112	131	144
RURAL AREAS:					
Punjab	502	574	643	759	895
Sindh	299	315	357	394	452
NWFP	240	248	272	275	341
Baluchistan	184	178	203	246	300
	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS (APPLYING RAISING FACTORS)				
URBAN AREAS:					
Punjab	3,556,426	3,574,547	3568,008	3,556,721	3,580,297
Sindh	2,333,634	2,340,200	2,336,484	2,342,777	2,344,709
NWFP	481,928	485,138	477,321	490,963	484,232
Baluchistan	154,658	155,025	154,808	155,002	155,089
RURAL AREAS:					
Punjab	8,843,464	8,848,738	8,849,893	8,849,944	8,857,826
Sindh	2,631,985	2,643,493	2,637,349	2,639,172	2,646,063
NWFP	2,403,530	2,408,976	2,413,096	2,407,679	2,411,043
Baluchistan	827,907	825,703	833,890	827,899	830,988
	MEAN PER CAPITA ANNUAL EXPENDITURE (Rs.)				
URBAN AREAS:					
Punjab	5,182	7,243	9,269	12,790	30,500
Sindh	6,852	9,215	11,374	14,741	32,180
NWFP	5,562	7,631	9,346	12,342	25,666
Baluchistan	6,448	8,032	9,496	11,999	22,195
RURAL AREAS:					
Punjab	4,323	5,848	7,243	9,114	16,101
Sindh	5,143	6,723	8,052	9,908	16,092
NWFP	5,626	7,147	8,308	9,782	15,808
Baluchistan	5,315	6,589	7,398	8,615	13,906

C 2 PROVINCE QUINTILES

REGION AND INCOME GROUP	INCOME GROUP				
	1st QUINTILE	2nd QUINTILE	3rd QUINTILE	4th QUINTILE	5th QUINTILE
	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS				
Punjab	772	894	1074	1222	1582
Sindh	552	594	625	697	846
NWFP	336	350	373	421	595
Baluchistan	251	227	305	372	534
	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS (APPLYING RAISING FACTORS)				
Punjab	12,397,873	12,417,858	12,423,897	12,423,400	12,422,836
Sindh	4,975,513	4,980,100	4,971,939	4,980,438	4,987,876
NWFP	2,890,487	2,887,072	2,896,859	2,885,806	2,903,682
Baluchistan	982,699	981,553	987,467	982,784	986,466
	MEAN PER CAPITA ANNUAL EXPENDITURE (Rs.)				
Punjab	4,487	6,170	7,720	9,945	20,746
Sindh	5,629	7,619	9,436	12,091	24,522
NWFP	5,611	7,214	8,431	10,051	17,670
Baluchistan	5,421	6,722	7,639	9,082	15,529

C 3 URBAN - RURAL QUINTILES AND OVERALL PAKISTAN QUINTILES

REGION AND INCOME GROUP	INCOME GROUP				
	1st QUINTILE	2nd QUINTILE	3rd QUINTILE	4th QUINTILE	5th QUINTILE
	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS				
Urban	738	897	957	1,069	1,284
Rural	1,067	1,345	1,573	1,728	1,964
Overall	1,691	2,181	2,521	2,807	3,422
	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS (APPLYING RAISING FACTORS)				
Urban	6,544,586	6,545,670	6,546,210	6,541,466	6,550,035
Rural	14,714,123	14,737,340	14,721,792	14,736,370	14,729,013
Overall	21,266,444	21,277,278	21,262,879	21,280,259	21,279,745
	MEAN PER CAPITA ANNUAL EXPENDITURE (Rs.)				
Urban	5,652	7,946	10,111	13,561	30,632
Rural	4,625	6,279	7,613	9,371	15,956
Overall	4,833	6,659	8,204	10,423	21,128

APPENDIX D: PIHS SAMPLE FRAME

Objectives

The PIHS has been designed to provide data for monitoring and evaluating the impact of the Social Action Program (SAP) in the following four sectors:

i) Primary education
ii) Basic health
iii) Population welfare
iv) Rural water supply & sanitation

The survey aims to give estimates of key variables within plus or minus 5 per cent (at the 95 confidence interval).

Universe

The universe of the PIHS survey consists of all urban and rural areas of all four provinces, Azad Jammu & Kashmir, FATA and FANA, as defined by the provincial governments. Military restricted areas and protected areas of NWFP have been excluded from the scope of the survey. The population of the excluded areas constitutes about 2 per cent of total population.

Sample frame

The Federal Bureau of Statistics (FBS) uses different sample frames for urban and rural areas. For urban areas, the FBS has developed its own *urban area frame*. This frame has been constructed using *quick count record survey* techniques. According to this method, all urban areas known as cities/towns of the urban domain of the sampling frame are divided into small compact areas known as enumeration blocks (EBs). Each EB comprises 250-350 households. Each EB is divided into low, middle and high income groups, keeping in view the status of the majority of households. This frame has recently been completely updated. It has been used for drawing samples from the urban areas of the universe. With regard to the rural areas, the lists of village/mouzas/dehs are taken from those published by the Population Census, following the 1981 sampling frame. The number of EBs (urban) and villages (rural) in Pakistan are:

Province	No. of EBs	No. of Villages
Punjab	12,554	25,449
Sindh	7,884	5,849
NWFP	1,624	7,809
Baluchistan	498	6,110
Azad Jammu & Kashmir	175	773
Northern Areas	49	1,581
Total:	**22,784**	**47,571**

Sample size

The target number of Primary Sampling Units (PSUs) and Secondary Sampling Units (SSUs) for the 1996-97 PIHS was as follows:

	SAMPLE PSUs			SAMPLE SSUs		
Province	Urban	Rural	Total	Urban	Rural	Total
Punjab	184	212	396	2,208	3,392	5,600
Sindh	125	114	240	1,500	1,824	3,324
NWFP	62	88	151	744	1,408	2,152
Baluchistan	49	71	108	588	1,136	1,724
Total:	420	485	895	5,040	7,760	12,800

PIHS 1996-97 is a panel survey where two-thirds of the sample was retained from Round I and the remaining one-third was selected afresh.

Stratification plan

With respect to urban areas, cities having a population of 500,000 and above and provincial capitals have been included as independent self-representing cities (SRCs). Each of these cities constitutes a separate stratum and has been further sub-stratified according to low, middle, high income groups based on the information collected in respect of each EB. After excluding the population of the SRCs, the remaining urban population in each administrative division in all provinces has been treated as an independent stratum. Azad Jammu & Kashmir and FANA have been considered as independent strata.

With respect to the rural areas, the population of each district in Punjab, Sindh and NWFP provinces have been grouped together to form a stratum. For Baluchistan province, a division has been treated as a stratum. Azad Jammu & Kashmir and FANA have been considered as independent strata in rural areas too.

Sampling procedure

A two-stage stratified random sample design was adopted for the PIHS. With respect to the first stage, enumeration blocks in urban areas and villages in rural areas have been treated as first stage PSUs. Sample PSUs have been selected with probability proportional to size. With respect to the second stage, households within each sample PSU have been taken as SSUs. SSUs (households) within sample PSUs have been selected by a systematic sampling technique with a random start. Some 12 households were selected in urban PSUs, and 16 in rural PSUs.