



National Census Of Agricultural And Livestock
2006/07

Livestock Report

National Statistical Office

First draft

1.1 Preface

The National Census of Agriculture and Livestock [NACAL] was conducted by the Agriculture Statistics Division of the National Statistical Office (NSO) in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security [MoAFS] between October 2006 and October 2007. The livestock census was based on a random sample that covered 32 500 households drawn from all the districts of the country.

A number of reports have been produced from this census, the main report being that giving information on production and structure of the small holder sector. The other reports includes those that focussed on food security, estate sector, gender issues in agriculture, etc. This information was collected in August to October 2007.

It provides information on number of livestock owned or kept by type, type of rearing system, care of livestock, selling, etc. The livestock report is representative of all households in Malawi, agricultural or non-agricultural households.

This The NACAL is the fourth sample census of Agriculture to be conducted in Malawi, the last being that of 1991/92 NSSA. It is part of the concerted effort by the government to provide relevant information on agriculture structure in the country, especially in the view of the importance of agriculture to the economy of the country.

My gratitude goes to the following organisations and individuals who played key roles in making the census operation a success: Norway which provided the bulk of the funds, Statistics Norway which gave technical assistance; the NSO/ MoAFS census team; the Statistics Norway resident technical advisor and the many households and individuals who supplied the required information.

Charles Machinjili

Commissioner of Statistics

Table of contents

1.1	Preface.....	2
	CHARLES MACHINJILI	2
2	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	9
2.1	Number of livestock	9
2.2	Keeping system	10
2.3	Inputs for livestock.....	10
2.4	Veterinary services.....	10
2.5	Sales of livestock and poultry	11
2.6	Animal protection.....	11
3	INTRODUCTION	13
3.1	About Malawi	13
3.2	Agricultural sub-sector	13
3.3	The National Census of Agriculture and Livestock (NACAL).....	14
3.4	Sample, data collection and data processing.....	15
3.4.1	Sampling method.....	15
3.4.2	The Extra sample	16
3.4.3	Data collection	16
3.4.4	Data processing.....	16
4	MAIN DEFINITIONS AND STANDARDS	17
5	OWNERSHIP AND NUMBER OF LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY.....	18
3.1	Introduction.....	18
5.1	Ownership of livestock or poultry	18
5.2	Ownership of major types of livestock and poultry	18
5.3	Number of major types of livestock and poultry	19
5.4	Number of other types of livestock and poultry	19
5.5	Ownership of major types of livestock and poultry at household level	19
5.5.1	Cattle.....	20
5.5.2	Goats.....	20
5.5.3	Sheep	21
5.5.4	Pigs.....	21

5.5.5	Chickens	21
6	KEEPING SYSTEM FOR ANIMALS	31
6.1	Introduction	31
6.2	Keeping system for cattle.....	31
6.3	Keeping system for goats	32
6.4	Keeping system for sheep	32
6.5	Keeping system for pigs	32
6.6	Keeping system for chickens	32
7	INPUTS	46
7.1	Introduction	46
7.2	Inputs for livestock.....	46
7.3	Inputs for poultry	46
8	VETERINARY SERVICES	49
8.1	Introduction	49
8.2	Livestock	49
8.3	Poultry.....	49
6.4	Service providers	49
9	SALES OF LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY	60
9.1	Introduction	60
9.2	Number of livestock and poultry sold.....	60
9.3	Sales of livestock and poultry at household level.....	60
9.4	Proportion of households who had sold various types of livestock and chickens	60
9.4.1	Cattle.....	61
9.4.2	Goats.....	61
9.4.3	Sheep	61
9.4.4	Pigs	62
9.4.5	Chickens	62
10	MARKETS	70
10.1	Introduction	70
10.2	Markets for Cattle	70

10.3	Markets for Goats	70
10.4	Markets for Sheep	70
10.5	Markets for Pigs	71
10.6	Markets for Poultry.....	71
11	ANIMAL PROTECTION	78
11.1	Introduction	78
11.2	Livestock protection.....	78
12	APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE.....	80
12.1.1	Code list for system	81
12.1.2	Code list for system	82

List of Tables

Table 1.	Percentage distribution of households who owned or kept livestock or poultry, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	22
Table 2.	Proportion of households who owned major classes of livestock, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	23
Table 3.	Total number of livestock and poultry owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	24
Table 4.	Population of minor classes of livestock and poultry, according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007	25
Table 5.	Percentage distribution of households who owned cattle by number of cattle owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	26
Table 6.	Percentage distribution of households who owned goats by number of goats owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	27
Table 7.	Percentage distribution of households who owned sheep by number of sheep owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	28
Table 8.	Percentage distribution of households who owned pigs by number of pigs owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	29
Table 9.	Percentage distribution of households who owned chicken by number of chickens owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	30
Table 10.	Percentage distribution of households who owned local cows by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	33
Table 11.	Percentage distribution of households who owned improved cows by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	34
Table 12.	Percentage distribution of households who owned local bulls by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	35
Table 13.	Percentage distribution of households who owned improved bulls by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	36
Table 14.	Percentage distribution of households who owned local goats by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	37
Table 15.	Percentage distribution of households who owned improved goats by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	38
Table 16.	Percentage distribution of households who owned local sheep by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	39
Table 17.	Percentage distribution of households who owned improved sheep by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	40
Table 18.	Percentage distribution of households who owned local pigs by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	41
Table 19.	Percentage distribution of households who owned improved pigs by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	42
Table 20.	Percentage distribution of households who owned local chickens by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	43
Table 21.	Percentage distribution of households who owned exotic layers by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	44
Table 22.	Percentage distribution of households who owned exotic broilers by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	44
Table 23.	Percentage distribution of households who owned black austrolope by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	45

Table 24.	Proportion of households who had bought various inputs for livestock, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	47
Table 25.	Proportion of households who had bought various inputs for poultry, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	48
Table 26.	Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided disease treatment for livestock by frequency of treatment the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	51
Table 27.	Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided dipping for livestock the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007.....	52
Table 28.	Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided vaccination for livestock the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	53
Table 29.	Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided deworming for livestock the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	54
Table 30.	Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided artificial insemination for livestock the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	55
Table 31.	Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided disease treatment for poultry the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007.....	56
Table 32.	Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided vaccination for poultry the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007..	57
Table 33.	Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided de-worming for poultry the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007..	58
Table 34.	Percentage distribution of service providers for treatment of livestock	59
Table 35.	Percentage distribution of service providers for treatment of poultry	59
Table 36.	Total number of livestock and poultry sold last 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	63
Table 37.	Proportion of households who owned various livestock and poultry and sold some during the past 12 months , according to background variables. Malawi 2007.....	64
Table 38.	Percentage distribution of households who sold Cattle by number of Cattle sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	65
Table 39.	Percentage distribution of households who sold goats by number of goats sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	66
Table 40.	Percentage distribution of households who sold Sheep by number of Sheep sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	67
Table 41.	Percentage distribution of households who sold Pigs by number of Pigs sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	68
Table 42.	Percentage distribution of households who sold Chicken by number of Chicken sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007	69
Table 43.	Proportion of households by latest selling place for local cows according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.....	72
Table 44.	Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local bulls according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.	73
Table 45.	Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local goats according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.....	74
Table 46.	Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local Sheep according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.....	75
Table 47.	Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local pigs according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.	76

Table 48.	Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local hens according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.	77
Table 49.	Proportion of households who used various protection methods for their animals, according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.....	79

2 Executive summary

Introduction

Due to the issues of food security and food availability at household level, ownership of livestock and poultry has become very important, both as a source of food and as an asset to be sold if need arises. The livestock information comes from one of the modules from the 2006/07 Census of Agriculture and Livestock[NACAL]. This module was administered in August to October, 2007.

Information for the livestock survey was collected on: number of various types of livestock and poultry, type of keeping systems, sales of livestock and livestock products, types of inputs purchased for livestock and poultry, Veterinary services and Methods used to protect livestock.

In total there were about 32 500 households in the sample for the livestock census. The data collection started in August 2007 and was completed in mid-October 2007.

2.1 Number of livestock

Almost 60 percent of the households in Malawi owned or kept livestock or poultry. About 6 percent of households in Malawi owned at least one head of cattle, about 24 percent owned at least one goat, about two percent owned at least one sheep, about 9 percent owned at least one pig, while almost half the households owned at least one chicken. Comparing among the regions, there were no differences in the ownership of sheep and goats. However, households in the northern region were more likely to own cattle, pigs and chickens as compared to households in the Central and Southern regions.

At the time of data collection, there were about 884,130 heads of cattle in Malawi, about 2,623,000 goats, about 76,600 sheep, about 792,300 pigs and about 7,558,000 chickens. The number of donkeys in Malawi was about 14,000, the number of rabbits about 167,500, the number of Guinea pigs about 34,000, the number of ducks about 429,200, the number of guinea fowls about 281,500, the number of pigeons and doves about 610,500, while the number of turkeys was about 61,000.

More than half the households in Malawi who owned cattle owned less than 5 heads of cattle. About two thirds of the Malawian households who owned goats, owned less than 5 goats. More than three out of four households who owned sheep, owned less than 5. A little less than two out of three Malawian households who owned pigs owned less than 5 pigs. Malawian households generally owned few chickens. About 80 percent of the households who owned chickens, owned less than ten chickens. Around 12 percent of the households owned one chicken, another 12 percent owned two chickens.

2.2 Keeping system

Herding was the major keeping system for households who owned local cows or bulls, used by about 60 percent of the households. For improved cows, about 74 percent used controlled system and only 13 percent used herding. For improved bulls, 42 percent used controlled system.

Free range system was the most common type of keeping system for goats and sheep in Malawi (both local and improved). About 60 percent of the households kept their local pigs in a pigsty.

Almost all local chickens in Malawi were kept under a free range system. For exotic layers, about 33 percent used controlled method while 67 percent used free range. For exotic broilers, about 52 percent used controlled method.

2.3 Inputs for livestock

The results show that a very small proportion of households had bought any input for their livestock during the reference period. The results also show that even a smaller proportion of households had invested in buying inputs for their poultry than what was the case for livestock.

2.4 Veterinary services

The results show that a very small proportion of households had provided any of those services for their livestock during the reference period. Only between 0.3 percent and 1.6 percent of the households had provided any of those services regularly, while more than 90 percent of the households never provided them during the past 12 months. It turns out that though still small, disease treatment was more likely to be provided for poultry than for livestock; about 2 percent

of the households had provided this service regularly. For livestock, the major service provider for all services included, except for artificial insemination, was the Government.

2.5 Sales of livestock and poultry

About 390,000 heads of cattle had been sold during the past twelve months preceding the date of enumeration. For sheep, the number sold was about 40,000, for goats about 342,400, for pigs about 984,000 and for chickens about 1,521,000.

Among the regions, the Central region had the highest number of heads of cattle sold, while the Southern region had the highest number sold of all the other types of livestock and poultry. The Northern region consistently had the lowest number sold of all the types of livestock and poultry included.

About half the households who had sold cattle had only sold one head of cattle. Also, More than half the households who had sold goats had only sold one goat. More than half the households who had sold sheep had only sold one sheep. About one out of four households that had sold chickens had sold only one chicken, while about one out of five households had sold 3 chickens. About one in four households had sold 5 or more chickens.

Markets

Of the farmers who sold local cows in Malawi, the largest proportion sold their animals at the farm gate (41 percent), while about 30 percent sold their cows at local markets and about 21 percent sold their cows to mobile markets. Nationally, about 69 percent of the households sold their sheep at the farm gate and About four in ten households in Malawi sold their local hens at the farm gate while a similar proportion sold them at local markets

2.6 Animal protection

There are several methods or ways to protect domestic animals, hence households were asked for the methods that they uses to safeguard their livestock during past 12 months preceding the survey. Slightly more than half of the livestock owning households in Malawi kept their domestic animals in a kraal for protection or kept the animals in their house. Only a small fraction, about four percent, used magic to protect their animals. About one out of ten livestock owning households did not use any protection method at all.

3 Introduction

3.1 About Malawi

Malawi is a landlocked country with 118,484 sq km and an estimated population of about 13 million. The population growth rate is high and the country has one of the highest population densities in Africa, with 96 inhabitants per square kilometer of land surface and 176 inhabitants per square kilometer of arable land.

About 90 percent of the population live in rural areas dependent on agriculture, About 30 percent of agricultural households are female headed. At the time of the NACAL, the country had about 2,6 million agricultural households

3.2 Agricultural sub-sector

Malawi's agricultural production is derived from two sub sectors: the estate sector, which operates on freehold and leasehold land, and the smallholder sector, which operates under the customary land tenure system.

An estimated 85% of the Malawian population lives a subsistence existence as agricultural small holders and rely mainly or partially on agricultural output, either directly or indirectly, for their livelihood. Agricultural output generates over 90% of export earnings, and 30-40% of GDP, most of which is produced by smallholders. The Government has given high priority to the development of the smallholder agricultural sector. In view of the importance of agriculture to the economy of Malawi, increased agricultural production for both domestic consumption and export is the primary goal of the National Rural Development Programme.

Hence, economic growth and development in Malawi requires agricultural development. For planning of agricultural development, comprehensive, reliable and up to date data on the state of agriculture, ownership and use of agricultural land and the volume and value of production are essential. Reliable data of food and agricultural production for marketing and own consumption are also required for poverty reduction and food security management and estimation of agricultural GDP. Data on various aspects of agriculture are also required for monitoring of agricultural development programmes. The last agricultural sample census was carried out in 1992/1993 and the annual agricultural surveys carried out on are still based upon the structure from this period. Given the large demographic, political, economic and social changes since

1992/93, data reflecting the current situation are needed for the structure of agriculture viz. number and size of crop and livestock holdings, their distribution and main characteristics such as demographic and anthropometric characteristics, type of soil, availability of irrigation; machinery and equipment etc.

The livestock sub-sector constitutes a relatively small sub-sector within Malawi's agriculture. The majority of the livestock activities are carried out by smallholder farmers who operate low-input and low-output management systems, while a relatively small proportions of estate farmers practice intensive husbandry techniques.

The Department of Animal Health and Livestock Development (DAHLD) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security is responsible for controlling livestock diseases, maintaining a steady policy of linking animal health and animal production, livestock improvement and public health programmes.

3.3 The National Census of Agriculture and Livestock (NACAL).

The basic objectives of the 2006/07 National Agricultural Census were:

- To provide data for clarifying the social and economic factors affecting the country's agricultural structure by interrelating various characteristics of the holding;
- To provide aggregate totals for fundamental agricultural data from both smallholder and commercial sectors for use as the benchmark for inter-censal estimates;
- To provide a frame for other agricultural sample surveys;
- To provide basic data for the formulation and implementation of a comprehensive integrated system of food and agriculture;
- To analyse food security on the household level;
- To provide basic data regarding current use and changes in the exploitation of agriculture; and
- To enable government to formulate plans to improve productivity especially of smallholder sector

NACAL had 9 modules as follows;

- Module 1. Household composition;
- Module 2. Land parcel,
- Module 3. Plot details;
- Module 4. Food security and HIV/AIDS;
- Module 5. Marketing,
- Module 6. Welfare Monitoring survey;
- Module 7. Livestock survey;
- Module 8. Village facilities and
- Module 9. Estate survey.

Information for the livestock survey was collected on:

- Number of various types of livestock and poultry
- Type of livestock and poultry keeping systems
- Sales of livestock and livestock products
- Types of inputs purchased for livestock and poultry
- Veterinary services
- Methods used to protect livestock

3.4 Sample, data collection and data processing

The detailed technical aspect of sampling, data collection and data processing is described in the Technical Documentation report from the NACAL. Hence only a short summary is presented below.

3.4.1 Sampling method

A two stage sample design was used where the first sampling units were the Enumeration Areas (EAs) and the second sampling units were farming households. Stratification was done at district level and at EA level.

Each district was stratified by agro-ecological zones and each EA was stratified by land cultivated [small scale farmers and large scale farmers]. This stratification was to improve the precision of the estimates by reducing the variance between EA and within EA.

For NACAL, the total sample size was 25 000 households nationwide. The sample size at EA level was 15 households. The livestock sample comprised of two samples: the NACAL sample from all districts and an extra district sample to cover landless households.

3.4.2 The Extra sample

Since the non farming households had a zero chance of being selected for NACAL, an extra sample was drawn from the population, with the intention of selecting 5 landless households in rural areas and 10 landless or non farming households in urban areas. Hence, in urban areas 10 non farming households were drawn. This was done by systematic sampling from the list of non-farming households. However, in rural areas most often there were no non-farming households in the EA. In such cases the 5 extra households were drawn from the farming households systematically. About 8 000 of these households were enumerated. In total therefore there were about 32 500 households in the sample.

3.4.3 Data collection

The data collection was carried out by the NACAL enumerators, about 600, supervised by about 60 district supervisors and a team of National supervisors to ensure the quality of data collected.

The data collection started in August 2007 and was completed in mid-October 2007.

The questionnaire for the Livestock Survey is shown in Annex 1.

Since the Livestock questionnaire did not provide any background information on the household level such as sex of household head, this information has been added from the 2007 Welfare Monitoring Survey.

3.4.4 Data processing

The data was entered using scanning, then cleaned and analyzed using the SPSS software.

4 Main definitions and standards

Household: This is made up of one person or a group of persons who normally live and eat together. They regularly take all their food from the same pot, and/or share the same grain store (nkhokwe) or pool their incomes together for purposes of purchasing food. They maybe related or unrelated, living in the same house or several dwelling units include all children at boarding schools.

Household Head: This is the person who is responsible for making decisions for the household and his/her authority is acknowledged by the other members of the household.

Poverty quintiles The poverty quintiles (both on household and individual level) are constructed using the model for predicting poverty used for the WMS survey. The poverty quintiles are the same as the quintiles for estimated household consumption per capita. Using quintiles, the sample is divided into five equal parts, each comprising 20 percent of the sample, according to estimated consumption. This means that the lowest quintile comprises the 20 percent of the population with the least estimated household consumption per capita, in other words, the 20 percent most poor, while the highest (5th) quintile, comprises the 20 percent with the highest estimated household consumption per capita, or the 20 percent least poor (or richest) in the sample.

Standards As far as possible FAO standards have been used to classify number of livestock.

5 Ownership and number of Livestock and Poultry

3.1 Introduction

Due to the issues of food security and food availability at household level, ownership of livestock and poultry has become very important, both as a source of food and as an asset to be sold if need arises.

The main objective of this chapter is to present figures on the ownership of, and the total number of, various types of livestock and poultry in Malawi.

5.1 Ownership of livestock or poultry

Almost 60 percent of the households in Malawi owned or kept livestock or poultry (Table1). However there were differences in ownership of livestock among various household groups. The proportion who owned or kept livestock was larger among male headed households as compared to female headed households, 61 percent and 48 percent respectively.

Households in the Northern region were more likely to have kept livestock than households in the other regions, 77 percent compared to 51 and 57 percent for the southern and central regions, respectively.

5.2 Ownership of major types of livestock and poultry

The major types of livestock and poultry analysed in this publication are cattle, goats, sheep, pigs and chickens.

Cattle comprise local cows, local bulls, improved cows and improved bulls.

Goats comprise local goats and improved goats.

Sheep comprise local sheep and improved sheep.

Pigs comprise local pigs and improved pigs.

Chickens comprise local hens, local cocks, exotic layers, exotic broilers and black austrlope.

About 6 percent of households in Malawi owned at least one head of cattle, about 24 percent owned at least one goat, about two percent owned at least one sheep, about 9 percent owned at least one pig, while almost half the households owned at least one chicken, (Table 2.)

Except for sheep, the general trend was that male headed households were more likely to own the major types of livestock and poultry as compared to female headed households.

Comparing among the regions, there were no differences in the ownership of sheep and goats. However, households in the northern region were more likely to own cattle, pigs and chickens as compared to households in the Central and Southern regions.

5.3 Number of major types of livestock and poultry

At the time of data collection, there were about 884,130 heads of cattle in Malawi, about 2,623,000 goats, about 76,600 sheep, about 792,300 pigs and about 7,558,000 chickens (table 3).

Almost half the number of cattle was found in the Northern region. The Southern region had the largest number of goats, while sheep were evenly distributed between the regions. The Central region had the largest number of pigs. The Central region also had the largest number of chickens. In general, the poorer households had less of the numbers for all the major classes of livestock compared to the less poor households.

5.4 Number of other types of livestock and poultry

The livestock census also collected data on other types of livestock and poultry, such as donkeys, rabbits, guinea pigs, ducks, guinea fowls, doves and turkeys. (table 4).

As depicted from table the number of donkeys in Malawi was about 14,000, the number of rabbits about 167,500, the number of Guinea pigs about 34,000, the number of ducks about 429,200, the number of guinea fowls about 281,500, the number of pigeons and doves about 610,500, while the number of turkeys was about 61,000.

5.5 Ownership of major types of livestock and poultry at household level

Even though it is very important to know the stock of various types of livestock and poultry at the national and regional levels, it is equally important to know how those animals are distributed between households. From a household food security point of view, and also from a household

asset point of view, the number of various livestock and poultry owned by households can be an indicator of vulnerability and/or ability to cope in times of scarcity, both as regards food and access to cash.

Initially, the grouping of number of livestock and poultry followed recommendations from FAO. However, given the very small scale operation of small holder agriculture in Malawi, the lowest category recommended by FAO comprised almost all households owning the livestock or poultry in question. Hence a much more detailed grouping of number of animals is used at the lowest end of the scale, while virtually no households owned the maximum number included in FAO's recommendations.

5.5.1 Cattle

More than half the households in Malawi who owned cattle owned less than 5 heads of cattle, while about 15 percent of the households owned more than 10 heads of cattle. About 12 percent of the households owned only one head of cattle, about 17 percent owned two heads of cattle, about 17 percent owned three heads of cattle and about 10 percent owned 4 heads of cattle.

Generally, there were no differences between male headed and female headed households concerning number of heads of cattle owned. However, the results show that the poorer the household was, the smaller the chance of owning more than 5 heads of cattle, and the higher the chance of owning only one head of cattle. For instance, among the poorest households, about 33 percent owned at least 5 heads of cattle, as compared to about 45 percent among the least poor households. (Table 5).

5.5.2 Goats

About two thirds of the Malawian households who owned goats, owned less than 5 goats, while more than 90 percent owned less than 10 goats. About 17 percent owned only one goat, about 20 percent owned 2 goats, about 16 percent owned 3 goats and about 13 percent owned 4 goats. Generally, female headed households were less likely to own many goats as compared to male headed households.

Also, the poorer the household was, the greater the chance of owning less than 5 goats. . (Table 6)

5.5.3 Sheep

More than three out of four households who owned sheep, owned less than 5. About half the households owned only one or two sheep. No significant differences were observed between male headed and female headed households, or between households grouped according to poverty status, (Table 7).

5.5.4 Pigs

A little less than two out of three Malawian households who owned pigs owned less than 5 pigs while more than 90 percent owned less than 10 pigs. Almost 30 percent of the households owned only one pig, while about one in four households owned two pigs.

A larger proportion of female headed than male headed households owned only one or two pigs, 64 percent as compared to 51 percent..

The poorer the household was, the more likely it was that the household owned only one pig. (Table 8).

5.5.5 Chickens

Malawian households generally owned few chickens. About 80 percent of the households who owned chickens, owned less than ten chickens. Around 12 percent of the households owned one chicken, another 12 percent owned two chickens, and the same proportion of households owned three or four chickens. Only about 5 percent of the households owned 20 or more chickens. Male headed households were more likely to own a larger number of chickens than female headed households.

The poorer households were more likely to own fewer chickens as compared to less poor households. . (Table 9).

Table 1. Percentage distribution of households who owned or kept livestock or poultry, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Household owned or kept livestock or poultry		
		Yes	No	Total
	Malawi	57	43	100
Sex of household head	Male	61	39	100
	Female	48	52	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	53	47	100
	Second quintile	58	42	100
	Third quintile	58	42	100
	Fourth quintile	60	40	100
	Highest quintile	51	49	100
Region	Northern	77	23	100
	Central	57	43	100
	Southern	51	49	100
ADD	Karonga	81	19	100
	Mzuzu	75	25	100
	Kasungu	65	35	100
	Salima	49	51	100
	Lilongwe	55	45	100
	Machinga	49	51	100
	Blantyre	51	49	100
	Shire Valley	60	40	100
	District	Chitipa	83	17
	Karonga	81	19	100
	Rumphi	82	18	100
	Nkhata Bay	71	29	100
	Likoma	88	12	100
	Mzimba	81	19	100
	Mzuzu city	28	72	100
	Kasungu	71	29	100
	Ntchisi	70	30	100
	Dowa	61	39	100
	Nkhotakota	49	51	100
	Salima	49	51	100
	Dedza	56	44	100
	Ntcheu	56	44	100
	Lilongwe rural	56	44	100
	Lilongwe city	50	50	100
	Mchinji	61	39	100
	Balaka	52	48	100
	Mangochi	44	56	100
	Machinga	46	54	100
	Zomba rural	58	42	100
	Zomba City	27	73	100
	Chiradzulu	59	41	100
	Blantyre rural	55	45	100
	Blantyre city	26	74	100
	Thyolo	65	35	100
	Mulanje	47	53	100
	Phalombe	52	48	100
	Mwanza	70	30	100
	Chikwawa	58	42	100
	Nsanje	63	37	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 2. Proportion of households who owned major classes of livestock, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Cattle	Goats	Sheep	Pigs	Chickens
	Malawi	6	24	2	9	49
Sex of household head	Male	7	25	2	10	52
	Female	5	20	2	5	41
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	5	23	2	7	44
	Second quintile	6	24	2	10	50
	Third quintile	8	26	2	11	48
	Fourth quintile	7	25	2	8	55
Region	Highest quintile	5	19	2	7	46
	Northern	25	22	3	21	70
	Central	4	23	1	9	45
ADD	Southern	3	21	2	5	40
	Karonga	36	19	2	32	72
District	Mzuzu	20	24	4	16	69
	Kasungu	8	25	2	13	53
	Salima	1	17	2	4	37
	Lilongwe	3	23	0	8	43
	Machinga	2	19	2	2	38
	Blantyre	2	21	2	6	41
	Shire Valley	9	31	4	7	45
	Chitipa	35	27	2	22	78
	Karonga	37	14	1	39	68
	Rumphi	12	21	5	15	72
	Nkhata Bay	5	18	1	4	73
	Likoma	2	41	3	0	73
	Mzimba	29	29	5	21	75
	Mzuzu city	1	1	0	2	24
	Kasungu	6	23	4	15	58
	Ntchisi	10	31	0	21	56
	Dowa	6	30	2	11	49
	Nkhotakota	1	9	3	3	42
	Salima	2	23	1	4	33
	Dedza	3	29	1	10	48
	Ntcheu	4	25	0	10	44
	Lilongwe rural	2	26	0	7	42
	Lilongwe city	2	11	0	5	37
	Mchinji	11	21	0	10	53
	Balaka	2	22	3	4	43
	Mangochi	2	19	1	1	33
	Machinga	2	17	4	1	34
	Zomba rural	2	21	2	2	46
Zomba City	4	2	0	3	19	
Chiradzulu	7	41	8	11	50	
Blantyre rural	3	20	1	6	45	
Blantyre city	0	6	0	0	22	
Thyolo	3	20	2	10	54	
Mulanje	1	27	2	1	37	
Phalombe	3	25	1	12	37	
Mwanza	5	28	4	13	64	
Chikwawa	11	31	4	7	43	
Nsanje	7	32	4	6	50	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 3. Total number of livestock and poultry owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Cattle	goats	sheep	pigs	Chicken	
Region	Malawi	884,132	2,623,017	76,613	792,364	7,557,746	
	Northern	434,743	420,964	25,622	187,275	1,520,189	
	Central	262,745	1,118,254	25,189	452,937	3,282,044	
	Southern	186,644	1,083,799	25,801	152,151	2,755,513	
ADD	Karonga	147,256	45,273	2,017	79,070	395,226	
	Mzuzu	287,487	375,691	23,605	108,205	1,124,963	
	Kasungu	155,264	393,838	11,922	197,991	1,149,008	
	Salima	8,054	105,065	9,534	32,714	292,338	
	Lilongwe	99,427	619,351	3,733	222,231	1,840,697	
	Machinga	45,808	382,624	18,945	21,749	1,031,434	
	Blantyre	39,246	486,143	4,689	101,012	1,345,551	
	Shire Valley	101,590	215,031	2,167	29,390	378,529	
	District	Chitipa	59,382	28,736	1,686	19,686	183,186
		Karonga	87,874	16,537	331	59,384	212,041
Rumphu		13,564	32,813	3,742	22,558	170,685	
Nkhata Bay		3,110	21,329	741	3,829	167,738	
Likoma		76	2,645	8,988	
Mzimba		269,754	318,375	18,959	80,625	740,687	
Mzuzu city		982	529	163	1,193	36,865	
Kasungu		46,191	123,195	4,011	75,957	440,587	
Ntchisi		19,408	57,168	755	40,051	159,164	
Dowa		36,396	157,165	7,016	45,206	289,072	
Nkhotakota		2,714	26,528	7,728	9,538	153,800	
Salima		5,340	78,537	1,806	23,177	138,538	
Dedza		42,629	141,972	1,949	59,955	383,481	
Ntcheu		21,991	102,846	206	41,311	245,094	
Lilongwe rural		25,170	257,579	1,577	83,354	560,804	
Lilongwe city		9,636	116,955	..	37,612	651,318	
Mchinji		53,270	56,310	141	36,777	260,185	
Balaka		7,648	53,822	5,042	7,980	155,304	
Mangochi		15,771	139,957	6,953	2,875	270,704	
Machinga		8,921	82,241	3,296	1,912	208,464	
Zomba rural		11,394	105,336	3,552	8,076	358,128	
Zomba City		2,075	1,268	101	906	38,834	
Chiradzulu		4,064	77,381	1,645	12,424	149,277	
Blantyre rural		7,600	49,560	899	9,172	149,691	
Blantyre city		354	53,989	..	773	277,979	
Thyolo		3,290	80,479	3	37,927	338,347	
Mulanje		2,174	115,052	1,397	3,842	162,658	
Phalombe		10,300	60,882	351	17,710	103,603	
Mwanza		11,464	48,800	393	19,164	163,995	
Chikwawa		74,065	138,359	1,919	18,544	240,633	
Nsanje	27,525	76,672	248	10,846	137,895		

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 4. Population of minor classes of livestock and poultry, according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007

		Donkeys	Rabbits	Guinea pigs	Ducks	Guinea fowls	Pegions/Doves	Turkeys
Region	Malawi	14,191	167,501	34,011	429,171	281,514	610,575	61,081
	Northern	3,144	18,839	3,693	66,120	63,586	215,288	25,193
	Central	2,779	86,199	19,185	156,261	124,485	173,937	10,464
	Southern	8,268	62,463	11,133	206,790	93,442	221,350	25,423
ADD	Karonga		1,834	52	16,194	9,992	54,802	796
	Mzuzu	3,144	17,005	3,640	49,926	53,594	160,485	24,397
	Kasungu	516	42,773	1,357	41,259	46,352	106,151	1,374
	Salima		5,894	441	20,972	22,315	13,016	623
	Lilongwe	2,264	37,532	17,387	94,029	55,818	54,770	8,468
	Machinga	2,465	17,808	4,538	105,856	39,652	121,183	8,430
	Blantyre	5,351	42,196	5,477	52,839	21,390	80,213	13,177
	Shire Valley	452	2,459	1,118	48,095	32,400	19,954	3,816
District	Chitipa		1,832		4,812	3,472	21,891	796
	Karonga		2	52	11,382	6,521	32,911	
	Rumphi		5,366	2	12,109	3,873	15,305	153
	Nkhata Bay		3,224		19,609	9,903	14,668	9,410
	Likoma				271	52	102	102
	Mzimba	3,144	6,043	3,638	14,313	38,449	127,682	13,391
	Mzuzu city		2,371		3,624	1,317	2,728	1,342
	Kasungu	421	12,047	425	4,210	20,743	50,455	6
	Ntchisi	31	9,353	88	8,984	13,707	5,917	185
	Dowa	63	19,364	585	18,568	5,538	35,444	6
	Nkhotakota		3,702	441	4,633	5,515	4,670	201
	Salima		2,192		16,339	16,800	8,345	422
	Dedza		18,055	737	34,123	11,836	8,994	6,027
	Ntcheu		4,414	4,291	5,940	6,301	21,665	565
	Lilongwe rural	1,653	9,234	12,359	15,492	25,104	20,377	1,331
	Lilongwe city	610	5,828		38,474	12,578	3,733	545
	Mchinji		2,009	260	9,497	6,364	14,335	1,177
	Balaka	27	4,867	1,181	10,542	7,764	16,184	1,440
	Mangochi	1,149	818	1,823	42,059	8,837	52,585	480
	Machinga	510	3,445	508	18,154	14,644	28,209	551
	Zomba rural	387	7,080	506	32,818	8,016	23,638	5,908
	Zomba City	392	1,599	521	2,282	391	567	51
	Chiradzulu	242	5,923	177	10,333	3,738	18,792	6,974
	Blantyre rural		1,468	2,639	8,505	3,438	11,912	2,574
	Blantyre city		226		2,559		1,083	483
	Thyolo	510	13,176	1,393	7,488	4,152	22,737	181
	Mulanje	4,575	14,246	660	10,340	2,519	6,260	544
	Phalombe	1	3,924		10,436	3,972	10,531	2,309
	Mwanza	23	3,233	608	3,179	3,571	8,898	112
	Chikwawa	115		1	21,264	13,710	14,223	2,570
	Nsanje	336	2,459	1,117	26,831	18,691	5,731	1,246

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 5. Percentage distribution of households who owned cattle by number of cattle owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10+	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	12	17	17	10	17	12	15	100
	Male	12	18	18	8	18	11	15	100
Poverty quintiles	Female	11	12	15	17	16	16	13	100
	Poorest quintile	19	19	19	11	10	9	13	100
	Second quintile	15	16	19	8	18	9	16	100
	Third quintile	9	18	18	9	20	13	12	100
Region	Fourth quintile	13	17	10	10	19	19	11	100
	Highest quintile	7	16	22	11	14	10	22	100
	Northern	12	14	17	8	17	17	15	100
	Central	8	19	18	14	21	6	14	100
ADD	Southern	15	23	14	6	10	14	19	100
	Karonga	19	18	13	10	19	12	9	100
District	Mzuzu	7	10	20	7	16	20	20	100
	Kasungu	11	16	14	12	26	4	17	100
	Salima	18	7	34	7	7	17	10	100
	Lilongwe	3	25	22	18	17	6	9	100
	Machinga	7	30	20	10	7	12	13	100
	Blantyre	26	29	16	4	8	7	10	100
	Shire Valley	12	12	8	4	13	20	32	100
	Chitipa	20	17	13	14	18	9	9	100
	Karonga	19	19	13	8	20	13	9	100
	Rumphi	21	13	32	9	20	2	3	100
	Nkhata Bay	64	13	4	8	0	7	4	100
	Likoma	3	0	97	0	0	0	0	100
	Mzimba	3	10	20	6	16	23	23	100
	Mzuzu city	28	29	0	0	41	0	2	100
	Kasungu	8	25	12	5	25	3	23	100
	Ntchisi	5	14	29	3	38	6	6	100
	Dowa	4	13	9	22	29	10	13	100
	Nkhotakota	43	0	30	0	2	25	0	100
	Salima	0	11	37	11	12	11	17	100
	Dedza	3	19	5	19	29	3	22	100
	Ntcheu	2	14	24	21	24	7	8	100
	Lilongwe rural	5	31	15	19	12	12	6	100
	Lilongwe city	0	36	54	10	0	0	0	100
	Mchinji	21	12	12	15	19	1	20	100
	Balaka	0	14	32	9	10	30	6	100
	Mangochi	10	41	9	16	0	3	21	100
	Machinga	0	16	28	0	21	21	15	100
	Zomba rural	7	31	23	11	10	11	8	100
Zomba City	18	36	27	9	0	9	0	100	
Chiradzulu	41	24	21	7	0	6	0	100	
Blantyre rural	12	25	24	1	23	7	8	100	
Blantyre city	1	99	0	0	0	0	0	100	
Thyolo	28	57	13	0	2	0	0	100	
Mulanje	15	61	5	1	0	0	17	100	
Phalombe	19	15	17	4	20	3	21	100	
Mwanza	36	2	13	9	0	24	17	100	
Chikwawa	12	14	8	1	14	19	32	100	
Nsanje	11	7	9	13	9	22	29	100	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 6. Percentage distribution of households who owned goats by number of goats owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10-19	20+	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	17	20	16	13	16	10	6	2	100
	Male	16	19	16	13	17	10	8	2	100
	Female	22	21	17	14	14	8	3	2	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	20	23	17	12	17	8	3	1	100
	Second quintile	20	21	16	13	18	6	5	0	100
	Third quintile	16	17	17	12	16	12	8	2	100
	Fourth quintile	20	15	19	16	14	8	6	4	100
	Highest quintile	9	24	11	12	15	15	13	2	100
Region	Northern	17	14	13	10	16	10	11	9	100
	Central	18	19	18	13	15	9	7	1	100
	Southern	16	22	15	14	17	12	4	1	100
ADD	Karonga	33	27	21	7	6	4	3	0	100
	Mzuzu	12	9	11	11	19	12	14	12	100
	Kasungu	18	17	17	15	14	12	6	1	100
	Salima	20	15	13	16	17	10	9	0	100
	Lilongwe	18	20	19	11	16	7	8	1	100
	Machinga	15	19	16	17	18	9	4	0	100
	Blantyre	17	24	14	12	16	13	3	0	100
	Shire Valley	15	21	12	10	17	13	9	3	100
	District	Chitipa	27	23	25	9	9	5	2	0
	Karonga	42	32	15	4	2	2	4	0	100
	Rumphu	14	22	18	9	16	10	10	1	100
	Nkhata Bay	27	16	13	15	14	13	2	1	100
	Likoma	16	13	8	17	18	22	7	0	100
	Mzimba	10	6	9	11	20	12	16	15	100
	Mzuzu city	0	3	3	74	0	0	21	0	100
	Kasungu	15	20	15	13	16	11	10	1	100
	Ntchisi	6	16	25	20	18	10	5	0	100
	Dowa	18	14	13	14	17	14	6	3	100
	Nkhotakota	14	17	3	25	16	21	4	0	100
	Salima	22	15	16	13	18	6	11	0	100
	Dedza	14	27	19	15	17	6	2	1	100
	Ntcheu	16	21	24	14	16	5	4	1	100
	Lilongwe rural	19	22	22	10	14	8	5	1	100
	Lilongwe city	30	0	3	2	19	8	38	0	100
	Mchinji	29	20	21	15	5	9	1	0	100
	Balaka	24	11	26	16	13	8	1	0	100
	Mangochi	13	21	12	20	19	11	4	0	100
	Machinga	10	16	17	16	18	10	11	1	100
	Zomba rural	17	24	13	14	20	8	3	1	100
	Zomba City	32	41	7	0	1	19	0	0	100
	Chiradzulu	12	28	24	14	14	6	3	0	100
	Blantyre rural	18	18	18	13	16	9	7	0	100
	Blantyre city	3	5	0	43	2	43	3	0	100
	Thyolo	25	28	14	7	15	7	2	0	100
	Mulanje	21	27	7	5	20	19	1	0	100
	Phalombe	14	24	22	11	20	5	3	0	100
	Mwanza	18	19	15	15	13	12	5	3	100
	Chikwawa	12	23	14	10	17	14	7	3	100
	Nsanje	21	17	9	11	15	12	12	3	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 7. Percentage distribution of households who owned sheep by number of sheep owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10-19	20+	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	22	31	6	19	10	8	3	2	100
	Male	27	32	7	10	11	7	3	2	100
	Female	8	28	3	42	8	9	4	0	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	27	26	10	10	7	16	2	3	100
	Second quintile	19	31	6	14	21	5	5	0	100
	Third quintile	16	37	9	11	12	11	2	3	100
	Fourth quintile	13	27	3	39	12	3	4	0	100
	Highest quintile	22	49	3	9	0	9	5	4	100
Region	Northern	27	32	3	27	3	3	2	3	100
	Central	21	27	10	14	13	11	3	0	100
	Southern	15	33	6	15	15	10	5	2	100
ADD	Karonga	8	38	18	16	19	0	0	0	100
	Mzuzu	29	32	2	28	2	3	2	3	100
	Kasungu	18	27	5	16	10	18	5	0	100
	Salima	7	30	19	12	23	6	4	0	100
	Lilongwe	49	23	6	12	2	8	0	0	100
	Machinga	18	38	6	11	11	13	3	0	100
	Blantyre	2	16	0	37	42	0	3	0	100
	Shire Valley	0	26	20	0	0	0	28	26	100
	Chitipa	11	24	18	22	25	0	0	0	100
	Karonga	1	83	16	0	0	0	0	0	100
District	Rumphi	58	6	6	16	5	2	7	0	100
	Nkhata Bay	16	46	16	6	16	0	0	0	100
	Likoma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mzimba	24	37	0	31	1	3	1	3	100
	Mzuzu city	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Kasungu	0	46	0	24	0	12	17	0	100
	Ntchisi	5	19	2	18	4	50	1	0	100
	Dowa	27	20	8	12	14	19	0	0	100
	Nkhotakota	4	32	19	1	31	8	5	0	100
	Salima	16	22	20	42	0	0	0	0	100
	Dedza	51	11	0	19	0	19	0	0	100
	Ntcheu	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Lilongwe rural	33	40	12	10	5	0	0	0	100
	Lilongwe city	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mchinji	0	5	0	0	95	0	0	0	100
	Balaka	30	5	6	9	25	25	0	0	100
	Mangochi	0	75	0	2	7	14	3	0	100
	Machinga	33	10	10	32	12	0	3	0	100
	Zomba rural	22	32	15	12	1	10	9	0	100
	Zomba City	93	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	100
	Chiradzulu	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	100
	Blantyre rural	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Blantyre city	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Thyolo	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Mulanje	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	100
	Phalombe	0	99	0	1	0	0	0	0	100
	Mwanza	39	0	0	0	0	0	61	0	100
	Chikwawa	0	30	10	0	0	0	30	30	100
	Nsanje	2	0	81	0	2	0	16	0	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 8. Percentage distribution of households who owned pigs by number of pigs owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10-19	20+	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	28	24	11	9	12	9	6	1	100
	Male	28	23	12	9	13	9	6	1	100
	Female	33	31	10	7	6	7	6	0	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	38	20	12	8	9	9	2	0	100
	Second quintile	32	25	15	6	8	8	6	1	100
	Third quintile	32	25	8	8	15	6	3	2	100
	Fourth quintile	22	23	14	14	11	9	7	0	100
	Highest quintile	20	27	11	10	6	12	13	1	100
Region	Northern	33	28	14	7	8	5	3	1	100
	Central	24	19	9	10	15	11	10	1	100
	Southern	32	27	13	8	9	9	2	1	100
ADD	Karonga	41	25	12	7	8	3	4	0	100
	Mzuzu	27	31	16	7	9	7	2	2	100
	Kasungu	24	19	10	13	11	12	10	1	100
	Salima	23	18	4	4	4	15	32	0	100
	Lilongwe	23	20	8	9	21	10	7	2	100
	Machinga	31	38	6	4	12	7	1	2	100
	Blantyre	33	26	14	8	7	9	2	0	100
	Shire Valley	31	17	13	11	12	13	2	2	100
	Chitipa	42	22	14	13	4	3	1	1	100
	Karonga	41	26	11	5	9	3	5	0	100
District	Rumphu	27	28	14	4	7	11	2	6	100
	Nkhata Bay	18	36	22	9	5	10	0	0	100
	Likoma	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Mzimba	27	31	16	7	9	7	1	1	100
	Mzuzu city	36	25	0	3	24	1	12	0	100
	Kasungu	23	20	13	12	8	13	11	1	100
	Ntchisi	18	22	7	19	9	17	8	0	100
	Dowa	22	15	7	19	13	12	10	2	100
	Nkhotakota	25	32	0	0	3	27	13	0	100
	Salima	23	10	7	6	4	8	43	0	100
	Dedza	33	17	12	9	15	2	11	2	100
	Ntcheu	30	18	12	2	10	19	6	3	100
	Lilongwe rural	21	21	8	16	8	16	9	1	100
	Lilongwe city	1	24	0	0	76	0	0	0	100
	Mchinji	35	16	12	3	16	7	11	0	100
	Balaka	26	26	10	11	8	19	0	0	100
	Mangochi	0	87	2	1	11	0	0	0	100
	Machinga	26	59	0	0	8	0	6	0	100
	Zomba rural	43	23	7	0	20	2	0	5	100
	Zomba City	55	43	0	2	0	0	0	0	100
	Chiradzulu	35	23	21	7	9	0	4	0	100
	Blantyre rural	29	24	26	4	5	12	1	0	100
	Blantyre city	1	0	0	99	0	0	0	0	100
	Thyolo	33	32	15	4	2	15	0	0	100
	Mulanje	51	34	0	0	2	0	13	0	100
	Phalombe	44	23	4	14	12	3	0	0	100
	Mwanza	15	19	16	17	18	11	4	0	100
	Chikwawa	30	19	15	9	11	13	2	1	100
	Nsanje	32	13	10	15	14	12	0	5	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 9. Percentage distribution of households who owned chicken by number of chickens owned, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 - 6	7 - 9	10-19	20+	Total	
Sex of head	Malawi	12	13	12	12	18	13	15	5	100	
	Male	11	12	12	12	17	13	17	5	100	
	Female	16	16	12	12	18	12	10	4	100	
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	14	17	15	11	19	12	8	4	100	
	Second quintile	15	14	12	12	18	13	13	3	100	
	Third quintile	12	11	16	12	17	15	13	5	100	
	Fourth quintile	10	13	9	13	19	12	19	4	100	
	Highest quintile	13	8	9	12	13	14	19	13	100	
Region	Northern	9	13	10	13	20	14	15	6	100	
	Central	12	12	12	12	17	13	19	4	100	
	Southern	14	15	13	12	17	12	11	5	100	
ADD	Karonga	8	10	11	16	22	15	15	2	100	
	Mzuzu	10	14	10	11	19	13	15	8	100	
	Kasungu	13	13	12	9	19	16	13	5	100	
	Salima	13	15	12	13	15	15	14	5	100	
	Lilongwe	12	10	12	13	16	10	23	4	100	
	Machinga	15	14	11	13	15	14	13	3	100	
	Blantyre	13	15	15	10	18	11	9	7	100	
	Shire Valley	13	16	9	14	17	13	15	3	100	
	District	Chitipa	5	7	11	17	25	13	17	3	100
		Karonga	11	12	10	15	20	17	14	1	100
Rumphi		5	12	10	11	20	22	20	2	100	
Nkhata Bay		12	6	10	10	20	16	18	7	100	
Likoma		5	13	11	7	11	16	34	2	100	
Mzimba		10	17	10	11	19	11	12	9	100	
Mzuzu city		9	8	20	11	19	9	8	15	100	
Kasungu		12	13	11	11	15	15	18	4	100	
Ntchisi		9	8	7	8	26	26	14	2	100	
Dowa		8	10	16	9	24	15	15	3	100	
Nkhotakota		7	8	15	13	14	21	19	3	100	
Salima		19	22	8	12	15	8	8	7	100	
Dedza		12	14	13	11	17	14	14	5	100	
Ntcheu		14	10	14	13	13	19	13	4	100	
Lilongwe rural		14	11	12	17	24	9	10	2	100	
Lilongwe city		5	3	9	6	2	4	65	8	100	
Mchinji		20	19	13	8	16	11	4	9	100	
Balaka		13	12	16	12	18	17	9	3	100	
Mangochi		15	15	9	16	14	16	13	3	100	
Machinga		18	14	11	13	16	8	16	4	100	
Zomba rural		15	15	11	12	14	16	14	3	100	
Zomba City		5	9	6	7	14	6	24	28	100	
Chiradzulu		13	9	18	12	16	15	14	3	100	
Blantyre rural		15	12	12	13	24	12	9	3	100	
Blantyre city		4	16	25	0	11	4	0	40	100	
Thyolo		16	18	15	11	19	11	8	2	100	
Mulanje		13	19	15	8	22	12	9	3	100	
Phalombe		22	19	9	12	19	8	8	2	100	
Mwanza		8	11	12	15	17	15	18	5	100	
Chikwawa		11	16	9	13	17	15	16	4	100	
Nsanje	15	17	9	16	17	10	13	2	100		

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

6 Keeping system for animals

6.1 Introduction

Animals can be kept or looked after in various ways. Livestock keeping systems have a major impact on the health, security and productivity of the animals.

The NACAL distinguished between the following keeping systems:

- **Free range system**

This is the system whereby an animal is left to find food for itself and moves freely. This is practised in many areas when crops have been harvested.

- **Controlled system**

Fenced pasture

- **Tethering system**

This is the practice whereby livestock is tied to a rope and put where there is pasture for the whole day. This is normally done when crops are not yet harvested.

- **Pigsty**

This is a controlled system of keeping pigs in kraal (Khola).

- **Herding**

This is a system where animals are being looked after or controlled by a herd boy

6.2 Keeping system for cattle

Herding was the major keeping system for households who owned local cows or bulls, used by about 60 percent of the households. However, tethering and free range keeping systems were more likely to be used as a keeping system both for local cows and local bulls in the Northern region as compared to the other regions, while herding was most predominant in the Central region, (Table 10). For improved cows, about 74 percent used controlled system and only 13 percent used herding. For improved bulls, 42 percent used controlled system and 28 percent used free range. (table 10 and 13)

6.3 Keeping system for goats

Free range system was the most common type of keeping system for local goats in Malawi, with almost half of the households (48 percent) who kept their local goats using such a system. Only 14 percent of the households use controlled system and the same percentage used herding system, while about a quarter used tethering as a way of keeping their goats. The central region had the largest proportion of households using free range keeping system, about 71 percent of the households. (Table 14). The pattern is the same for improved goats (table 15).

6.4 Keeping system for sheep

As was the case with goats, free range was the most commonly used keeping system method for sheep in Malawi. (Table 16 and (table 17)

6.5 Keeping system for pigs

About 60 percent of the households kept their local pigs in a pigsty (Table 18. and table 19). This is true also for improved pigs.

6.6 Keeping system for chickens

Almost all local chickens in Malawi were kept under a free range system 98 percent (Table 20). For exotic layers, about 33 percent used controlled method while 67 percent used free range. For exotic broilers, about 52 percent used controlled method while for black austrolope 96 percent used free range, (table 21 to table 23.).

Table 10. Percentage distribution of households who owned local cows by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Tethering	Controlled	Herding	Total
	Malawi	22	10	9	58	100
Sex of head	Male	22	9	10	58	100
	Female	25	11	7	58	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	17	11	8	64	100
	Second quintile	23	14	7	57	100
	Third quintile	20	10	15	55	100
	Fourth quintile	32	9	6	53	100
	Highest quintile	21	5	14	59	100
Region	Northern	29	18	4	49	100
	Central	16	0	11	72	100
	Southern	18	3	20	58	100
ADD	Karonga	15	41	9	35	100
	Mzuzu	39	1	0	60	100
	Kasungu	15	0	3	82	100
	Salima	29	6	11	54	100
	Lilongwe	18	1	24	57	100
	Machinga	17	5	19	59	100
	Blantyre	8	3	26	63	100
	Shire Valley	26	--	18	56	100
District	Chitipa	22	9	14	55	100
	Karonga	11	62	6	21	100
	Rumphu	6	5	4	85	100
	Nkhata Bay	48	2	1	49	100
	Likoma	--	100	--	--	100
	Mzimba	42	--	0	58	100
	Mzuzu city	63	11	--	26	100
	Kasungu	6	--	1	93	100
	Ntchisi	15	0	4	80	100
	Dowa	24	--	7	69	100
	Nkhotakota	25	--	0	75	100
	Salima	34	12	24	29	100
	Dedza	12	--	28	60	100
	Ntcheu	25	3	10	62	100
	Lilongwe rural	17	0	8	75	100
	Lilongwe city	16	--	84	--	100
	Mchinji	14	--	2	84	100
	Balaka	--	--	30	70	100
	Mangochi	31	--	27	41	100
	Machinga	1	11	--	88	100
	Zomba rural	11	12	14	63	100
	Zomba City	--	--	2	98	100
	Chiradzulu	--	0	78	22	100
	Blantyre rural	20	--	17	63	100
	Blantyre city	--	--	--	--	--
	Thyolo	0	19	4	77	100
	Mulanje	31	--	2	67	100
	Phalombe	2	--	23	75	100
	Mwanza	0	0	5	95	100
	Chikwawa	33	--	23	44	100
	Nsanje	6	--	4	90	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 11. Percentage distribution of households who owned improved cows by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Tethering	Controlled	Herding	Total
	Malawi	10	3	74	13	100
Sex of household head	Male	11	2	73	14	100
	Female	1	9	80	9	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	--	41	17	42	100
	Second quintile	2	--	81	17	100
	Third quintile	6	--	74	20	100
	Fourth quintile	27	--	62	11	100
	Highest quintile	3	2	95	--	100
Region	Northern	3	5	70	22	100
	Central	63	1	31	5	100
	Southern	3	2	83	12	100
ADD	Karonga	17	38	45	0	100
	Mzuzu	1	--	74	25	100
	Kasungu	64	2	28	7	100
	Salima	100	--	--	--	100
	Lilongwe	--	--	100	0	100
	Machinga	4	--	80	16	100
	Blantyre	5	2	89	4	100
	Shire Valley	3	--	--	97	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 12. Percentage distribution of households who owned local bulls by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free	Tethering	Controlled	Herding	Total	
		range					
	Malawi	23	11	9	56	100	
Sex of household head	Male	23	11	9	57	100	
	Female	26	14	9	51	100	
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	15	12	8	65	100	
	Second quintile	24	18	4	54	100	
	Third quintile	21	12	15	52	100	
	Fourth quintile	33	8	7	52	100	
	Highest quintile	20	8	9	64	100	
Region	Northern	31	19	3	46	100	
	Central	13	0	15	71	100	
	Southern	14	2	16	68	100	
ADD	Karonga	15	49	8	28	100	
	Mzuzu	41	1	0	58	100	
	Kasungu	12	0	6	83	100	
	Salima	37	8	25	31	100	
	Lilongwe	13	0	28	59	100	
	Machinga	4	--	12	84	100	
	Blantyre	5	--	18	77	100	
	Shire Valley	24	3	17	56	100	
	District	Chitipa	26	8	15	51	100
		Karonga	9	68	5	18	100
		Rumphi	5	8	3	84	100
		Nkhata Bay	6	--	5	89	100
		Likoma	--	--	--	--	--
		Mzimba	45	--	0	55	100
		Mzuzu city	--	--	--	100	100
		Kasungu	7	--	1	92	100
		Ntchisi	20	0	10	71	100
Dowa		20	--	12	68	100	
Nkhotakota		13	--	25	62	100	
Salima		53	13	25	9	100	
Dedza		3	--	32	65	100	
Ntcheu		30	--	7	63	100	
Lilongwe rural		12	1	14	73	100	
Lilongwe city		10	--	54	36	100	
Mchinji		3	--	3	94	100	
Balaka		--	--	--	100	100	
Mangochi		11	--	10	78	100	
Machinga		--	--	0	100	100	
Zomba rural		--	--	26	74	100	
Zomba City		--	--	--	--	--	
Chiradzulu		--	--	--	100	100	
Blantyre rural		--	--	19	81	100	
Blantyre city		--	--	--	--	--	
Thyolo		--	--	--	100	100	
Mulanje		65	--	--	35	100	
Phalombe		3	--	35	63	100	
Mwanza		--	--	--	100	100	
Chikwawa		33	4	24	39	100	
Nsanje		2	--	--	98	100	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 13. Percentage distribution of households who owned improved bulls by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Tethering	Controlled	Herding	Total
	Malawi	28	20	42	10	100
Sex of household head	Male	35	11	44	10	100
	Female	5	49	35	10	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	7	48	30	15	100
	Second quintile	19	--	52	29	100
	Third quintile	37	28	28	7	100
	Fourth quintile	22	8	53	18	100
	Highest quintile	40	--	59	1	100
Region	Northern	46	--	53	1	100
	Central	56	12	24	9	100
	Southern	9	27	52	12	100
ADD	Karonga	100	--	--	--	100
	Mzuzu	--	--	99	1	100
	Kasungu	59	15	22	4	100
	Salima	--	100	--	--	100
	Lilongwe	48	--	30	22	100
	Machinga	8	47	37	7	100
	Blantyre	0	11	79	9	100
	Shire Valley	57	--	--	43	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 14. Percentage distribution of households who owned local goats by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Tethering	Controlled	Herding	Total
	Malawi	49	25	13	13	100
Sex of household head	Male	49	24	12	14	100
	Female	47	26	15	12	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	40	30	16	14	100
	Second quintile	54	24	11	11	100
	Third quintile	50	24	13	14	100
	Fourth quintile	54	22	11	13	100
	Highest quintile	44	30	11	14	100
Region	Northern	34	19	8	39	100
	Central	68	16	8	8	100
	Southern	32	35	21	12	100
ADD	Karonga	25	38	13	24	100
	Mzuzu	37	13	6	44	100
	Kasungu	70	8	7	14	100
	Salima	83	9	7	1	100
	Lilongwe	65	21	9	5	100
	Machinga	44	27	18	11	100
	Blantyre	14	46	27	13	100
	Shire Valley	74	13	4	9	100
District	Chitipa	34	25	17	24	100
	Karonga	13	56	6	25	100
	Rumphu	17	31	10	42	100
	Nkhata Bay	20	47	29	5	100
	Likoma	6	74	--	21	100
	Mzimba	45	2	1	52	100
	Mzuzu city	54	12	29	4	100
	Kasungu	51	10	6	33	100
	Ntchisi	75	5	18	2	100
	Dowa	87	3	2	9	100
	Nkhotakota	62	20	14	4	100
	Salima	89	6	5	0	100
	Dedza	69	13	11	6	100
	Ntcheu	56	9	21	15	100
	Lilongwe rural	62	31	5	2	100
	Lilongwe city	83	16	--	1	100
	Mchinji	65	17	12	5	100
	Balaka	46	15	26	13	100
	Mangochi	65	21	8	5	100
	Machinga	39	15	20	26	100
	Zomba rural	15	49	26	10	100
	Zomba City	1	23	48	28	100
	Chiradzulu	10	66	21	3	100
	Blantyre rural	14	44	14	28	100
	Blantyre city	8	85	4	4	100
	Thyolo	7	48	37	8	100
	Mulanje	6	45	44	4	100
	Phalombe	29	28	23	21	100
	Mwanza	38	10	12	41	100
	Chikwawa	63	17	6	14	100
	Nsanje	88	8	2	1	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 15. Percentage distribution of households who owned improved goats by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Tethering	Controlled	Herding	Total
	Malawi	59	17	12	12	100
Sex of household head	Male	55	15	15	15	100
	Female	78	19	2	1	100
	Poorest quintile	68	18	14	--	100
Poverty quintiles	Second quintile	44	30	19	7	100
	Third quintile	53	17	9	21	100
	Fourth quintile	70	10	11	9	100
	Highest quintile	55	13	6	26	100
Region	Northern	56	18	3	22	100
	Central	78	8	6	8	100
	Southern	39	24	23	14	100
ADD	Karonga	62	38	--	--	100
	Mzuzu	50	0	6	43	100
	Kasungu	88	3	0	8	100
	Salima	36	--	32	32	100
	Lilongwe	68	13	12	7	100
	Machinga	15	20	44	20	100
	Blantyre	19	28	18	10	74
	Shire Valley	86	0	9	5	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 16. Percentage distribution of households who owned local sheep by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free	Tethering	Controlled	Herding	Total	
		range					
	Malawi	54	11	17	18	100	
Sex of household head	Male	48	15	16	21	100	
	Female	71	2	16	10	100	
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	34	7	16	42	100	
	Second quintile	52	22	11	15	100	
	Third quintile	55	13	16	16	100	
	Fourth quintile	67	2	25	5	100	
	Highest quintile	49	5	11	36	100	
Region	Northern	53	0	8	38	100	
	Central	67	13	12	8	100	
	Southern	39	17	31	12	100	
ADD	Karonga	15	1	36	48	100	
	Mzuzu	58	0	5	37	100	
	Kasungu	85	0	0	15	100	
	Salima	49	21	30	--	100	
	Lilongwe	63	23	6	7	100	
	Machinga	37	23	29	11	100	
	Blantyre	28	--	50	22	100	
	Shire Valley	100	--	--	--	100	
	District	Chitipa	12	--	46	41	100
		Karonga	21	2	15	62	100
Rumphi		28	--	4	68	100	
Nkhata Bay		26	5	0	69	100	
Likoma		--	--	--	--	--	
Mzimba		73	--	6	21	100	
Mzuzu city		--	--	--	100	100	
Kasungu		51	--	--	49	100	
Ntchisi		96	--	4	--	100	
Dowa		100	--	--	0	100	
Nkhotakota		44	20	36	--	100	
Salima		73	27	--	--	100	
Dedza		80	--	0	20	100	
Ntcheu		100	--	--	--	100	
Lilongwe rural		41	47	12	--	100	
Lilongwe city		--	--	--	--	--	
Mchinji		95	5	--	--	100	
Balaka		17	19	58	6	100	
Mangochi		81	--	--	19	100	
Machinga		0	53	33	13	100	
Zomba rural		35	31	34	--	100	
Zomba City		100	--	--	--	100	
Chiradzulu		--	--	50	50	100	
Blantyre rural		--	--	100	--	100	
Blantyre city		--	--	--	--	--	
Thyolo		--	--	100	--	100	
Mulanje		64	--	36	--	100	
Phalombe		1	--	--	99	100	
Mwanza		100	--	--	--	100	
Chikwawa		100	--	--	--	100	
Nsanje	100	--	--	--	100		

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 17. Percentage distribution of households who owned improved sheep by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Controlled	Herding	Total
	Malawi	61	37	1	100
Sex of household head	Male	60	38	1	100
	Female	71	28	1	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	100	--	--	100
	Second quintile	76	--	24	100
	Third quintile	63	37	--	100
	Fourth quintile	100	--	--	100
	Highest quintile	11	89	--	100
Region	Northern	13	81	7	100
	Central	69	31	--	100
	Southern	97	2	1	100
ADD	Karonga	100	--	--	100
	Mzuzu	--	92	8	100
	Kasungu	36	64	--	100
	Salima	100	--	--	100
	Lilongwe	100	--	--	100
	Machinga	71	18	11	100
	Blantyre	100	--	--	100
	Shire Valley	100	--	--	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 18. Percentage distribution of households who owned local pigs by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Tethering	Controlled	Pigsty	Total
	Malawi	17	5	13	65	100
Sex of household head	Male	18	5	13	65	100
	Female	17	7	14	62	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	26	5	11	58	100
	Second quintile	18	5	15	61	100
	Third quintile	16	6	13	65	100
	Fourth quintile	14	4	10	72	100
	Highest quintile	17	7	14	63	100
Region	Northern	16	16	7	61	100
	Central	19	0	14	67	100
	Southern	16	0	21	64	100
ADD	Karonga	12	35	6	46	100
	Mzuzu	19	0	7	73	100
	Kasungu	20	0	14	66	100
	Salima	36	4	10	51	100
	Lilongwe	17	0	14	68	100
	Machinga	15	--	25	60	100
	Blantyre	10	0	20	70	100
	Shire Valley	50	--	12	38	100
	District	Chitipa	10	15	7	68
	Karonga	13	41	6	40	100
	Rumphi	3	1	18	78	100
	Nkhata Bay	10	5	20	65	100
	Likoma	--	--	--	--	0
	Mzimba	23	0	4	73	100
	Mzuzu city	2	--	45	53	100
	Kasungu	8	--	8	85	100
	Ntchisi	35	--	4	61	100
	Dowa	30	1	31	38	100
	Nkhotakota	23	--	--	77	100
	Salima	48	7	20	25	100
	Dedza	20	--	26	55	100
	Ntcheu	5	2	8	83	99
	Lilongwe rural	19	0	16	65	100
	Lilongwe city	24	--	--	76	100
	Mchinji	15	--	15	70	100
	Balaka	14	--	9	76	100
	Mangochi	1	--	93	6	100
	Machinga	7	--	15	78	100
	Zomba rural	18	--	24	58	100
	Zomba City	2	--	--	98	100
	Chiradzulu	--	2	7	91	100
	Blantyre rural	--	--	--	100	100
	Blantyre city	--	--	--	100	100
	Thyolo	7	--	26	67	100
	Mulanje	30	--	48	22	100
	Phalombe	21	--	31	48	100
	Mwanza	9	1	6	84	100
	Chikwawa	45	--	11	44	100
	Nsanje	56	--	13	32	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 19. Percentage distribution of households who owned improved pigs by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Tethering	Controlled	Pigsty	Total
	Malawi	18	4	12	66	100
Sex of household head	Male	17	3	12	68	100
	Female	23	9	14	55	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	13	15	29	44	100
	Second quintile	25	8	12	55	100
	Third quintile	24	1	5	69	100
	Fourth quintile	29	1	3	67	100
	Highest quintile	7	--	15	78	100
Region	Northern	11	10	16	62	100
	Central	32	0	2	65	100
	Southern	11	1	20	68	100
ADD	Karonga	13	19	4	64	100
	Mzuzu	10	--	29	60	100
	Kasungu	55	--	0	45	100
	Salima	7	--	--	93	100
	Lilongwe	25	1	5	69	100
	Machinga	6	--	54	40	100
	Blantyre	4	1	16	78	100
	Shire Valley	60	--	--	40	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 20. Percentage distribution of households who owned local chickens by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Controlled	Total
	Malawi	98	2	100
Sex of household head	Male	98	2	100
	Female	99	1	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	99	1	100
	Second quintile	99	1	100
	Third quintile	99	1	100
	Fourth quintile	97	3	100
	Highest quintile	96	4	100
Region	Northern	99	1	100
	Central	97	2	100
	Southern	99	1	100
ADD	Karonga	98	2	100
	Mzuzu	99	1	100
	Kasungu	99	1	100
	Salima	98	1	99
	Lilongwe	96	3	99
	Machinga	98	1	100
	Blantyre	99	1	99
	Shire Valley	95	5	100
	Chitipa	95	5	100
District	Karonga	100	0	100
	Rumphu	99	0	99
	Nkhata Bay	100	0	100
	Likoma	100	--	100
	Mzimba	100	0	100
	Mzuzu city	98	2	100
	Kasungu	100	0	100
	Ntchisi	100	--	100
	Dowa	100	0	100
	Nkhotakota	99	1	100
	Salima	97	2	98
	Dedza	97	2	100
	Ntcheu	99	0	100
	Lilongwe rural	99	0	99
	Lilongwe city	87	13	100
	Mchinji	96	3	100
	Balaka	97	3	100
	Mangochi	98	2	100
	Machinga	100	--	100
	Zomba rural	99	0	100
	Zomba City	94	6	100
	Chiradzulu	94	6	100
	Blantyre rural	100	--	100
	Blantyre city	97	3	100
	Thyolo	100	0	100
	Mulanje	99	1	100
	Phalombe	100	0	100
	Mwanza	100	--	100
	Chikwawa	98	2	100
	Nsanje	100	0	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 21. Percentage distribution of households who owned exotic layers by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Controlled	Total
	Malawi	67	33	100
Sex of household head	Male	74	26	100
	Female	55	45	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	96	4	100
	Second quintile	100	--	100
	Third quintile	75	25	100
	Fourth quintile	76	24	100
	Highest quintile	38	62	100
Region	Northern	77	23	100
	Central	93	7	100
	Southern	22	77	100
ADD	Karonga	100	--	100
	Mzuzu	75	25	100
	Kasungu	87	13	100
	Salima	99	1	100
	Lilongwe	95	5	100
	Machinga	39	61	100
	Blantyre	7	93	100
	Shire Valley	73	27	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 22. Percentage distribution of households who owned exotic broilers by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Tethering	Controlled	Total
	Malawi	48	0	52	100
Sex of household head	Male	47	0	52	100
	Female	48	--	52	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	86	1	13	100
	Second quintile	70	--	30	100
	Third quintile	56	--	44	100
	Fourth quintile	88	--	12	100
	Highest quintile	27	0	73	100
Region	Northern	71	--	29	100
	Central	93	0	7	100
	Southern	10	0	90	100
ADD	Karonga	100	--	--	100
	Mzuzu	69	--	31	100
	Kasungu	97	--	3	100
	Salima	100	0	0	100
	Lilongwe	91	--	9	100
	Machinga	35	3	62	100
	Blantyre	6	--	94	100
	Shire Valley	57	--	43	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 23. Percentage distribution of households who owned black aurolope by type of livestock keeping system, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Free range	Controlled	Total
	Malawi	96	4	100
Sex of household head	Male	95	5	100
	Female	99	1	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	100	--	100
	Second quintile	96	4	100
	Third quintile	100	--	100
	Fourth quintile	96	4	100
	Highest quintile	90	10	100
Region	Northern	100	--	100
	Central	97	3	100
	Southern	92	7	99
ADD	Karonga	100	--	100
	Mzuzu	100	--	100
	Kasungu	93	7	100
	Salima	98	2	100
	Lilongwe	99	1	100
	Machinga	90	9	99
	Blantyre	92	8	100
	Shire Valley	100	0	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

7 Inputs

7.1 Introduction

Buying feeds, drugs etc for livestock and poultry is an important indicator of how well domestic animals are cared for. It also shows to what extent the owners tend to invest in their livestock in order to get a greater profit and also to get a greater output from their animals in terms of weight, offspring etc.

7.2 Inputs for livestock

The households participating in the survey were asked whether they had bought various inputs for their livestock during the past 12 months. The inputs were feeds, drugs, housing equipment, feeding utensils and any other unspecified inputs.

The results show that a very small proportion of households had bought any input for their livestock during the reference period. For instance, only about three percent had bought feeds and only about two percent had bought drugs. (Table 24)

7.3 Inputs for poultry

The same information was asked for poultry. The results show that even a smaller proportion of households had invested in buying inputs for their poultry than what was the case for livestock. (Table 25)

Table 24. Proportion of households who had bought various inputs for livestock, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Feeds	Drugs	Housing equipment	Feeding utensils	Other inputs
	Malawi	3	2	1	0.3	0.5
Sex of head	Male	3	2	2	0.3	0.7
	Female	1	1	1	0.2	0.2
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	1	1	1	0.2	0.2
	Second quintile	2	1	1	0.1	0.3
	Third quintile	4	2	2	0.4	1.4
	Fourth quintile	4	2	2	0.2	0.3
	Highest quintile	3	3	2	0.4	0.4
Region	Northern	5	7	2	0.6	0.6
	Central	2	1	2	0.2	0.7
	Southern	2	1	1	0.2	0.3
ADD	Karonga	10	8	1	0.4	0.7
	Mzuzu	3	6	2	0.6	0.6
	Kasungu	4	2	2	0.4	0.6
	Salima	1	0	1	0.1	0
	Lilongwe	2	1	2	0.1	0.9
	Machinga	1	1	1	0.2	0.2
	Blantyre	4	1	1	0.2	0.4
	Shire Valley	1	2	1	0.2	0.2
	Chitipa	11	10	1	1.1	1
District	Karonga	9	7	0	0	0.4
	Rumphi	2	4	1	0.2	0.1
	Nkhata Bay	3	5	1	0	0
	Likoma	0	0	0	0	0
	Mzimba	4	7	2	0.9	0.9
	Mzuzu city	2	0	1	0.8	0
	Kasungu	4	3	2	0.7	1.4
	Ntchisi	3	2	3	0.6	1
	Dowa	4	1	2	0.3	0.1
	Nkhotakota	2	0	2	0.3	0
	Salima	1	0	0	0	0
	Dedza	3	2	1	0.1	0.7
	Ntcheu	3	1	0	0.3	0
	Lilongwe rural	2	1	3	0.1	1.8
	Lilongwe city	0	0	0	0	0
	Mchinji	4	1	0	0	0
	Balaka	1	1	1	0.1	0.2
	Mangochi	0	0	0	0	0
	Machinga	1	1	1	0.5	0.6
	Zomba rural	1	1	1	0.3	0.2
	Zomba City	1	0	0	0	0.1
	Chiradzulu	8	2	2	0.3	0.9
	Blantyre rural	4	0	0	0.6	0.4
	Blantyre city	0	3	0	0	0
	Thyolo	7	2	3	0.2	1
	Mulanje	1	0	2	0.3	0.1
	Phalombe	5	1	1	0	0.2
	Mwanza	4	1	0	0	0.2
	Chikwawa	1	2	1	0	0.3
	Nsanje	2	2	1	0.6	0

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 25. Proportion of households who had bought various inputs for poultry, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Feeds	Drugs	Housing equipment	Feeding utensils	Other inputs	
	Malawi	1	3	1.0	0.4	0.2	
Sex of head	Male	2	4	1.1	0.3	0.2	
	Female	1	2	0.6	0.7	0.3	
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	1	2	0.5	0.4	0.2	
	Second quintile	1	2	0.4	0.1	0.2	
	Third quintile	1	3	1.0	0.4	0.1	
	Fourth quintile	1	4	1.8	0.3	0.2	
	Highest quintile	4	5	1.4	1.0	0.2	
Region	Northern	2	4	1.7	1.0	0.3	
	Central	1	3	1.3	0.1	0.1	
	Southern	2	3	0.4	0.5	0.2	
ADD	Karonga	2	4	0.6	0.0	0.0	
	Mzuzu	2	3	2.1	1.5	0.4	
	Kasungu	1	4	1.1	0.1	0.3	
	Salima	1	1	2.3	0.0	0.0	
	Lilongwe	1	3	1.1	0.1	0.0	
	Machinga	1	3	0.5	0.4	0.4	
	Blantyre	2	3	0.3	0.6	0.1	
	Shire Valley	2	1	0.8	0.1	0.1	
	District	Chitipa	2	5	0.9	0.0	0.0
		Karonga	3	4	0.4	0.0	0.0
Rumphi		1	4	0.3	0.0	0.1	
Nkhata Bay		1	2	1.8	0.3	0.0	
Likoma		2	10	2.0	0.0	0.0	
Mzimba		2	4	2.6	2.2	0.6	
Mzuzu city		3	1	2.4	1.1	0.0	
Kasungu		2	5	1.2	0.0	0.1	
Ntchisi		1	4	1.1	0.4	1.0	
Dowa		1	4	2.0	0.1	0.5	
Nkhotakota		1	1	4.6	0.0	0.0	
Salima		0	0	0.5	0.0	0.0	
Dedza		1	2	0.5	0.2	0.1	
Ntcheu		1	3	0.5	0.0	0.0	
Lilongwe rural		1	5	2.3	0.0	0.0	
Lilongwe city		0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Mchinji		1	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Balaka		2	2	0.4	0.1	0.1	
Mangochi		0	1	0.1	0.0	0.1	
Machinga		2	1	1.2	1.9	1.6	
Zomba rural		1	8	0.5	0.0	0.1	
Zomba City		3	3	0.0	0.0	0.1	
Chiradzulu		1	2	1.4	0.3	0.0	
Blantyre rural		2	3	0.5	0.5	0.4	
Blantyre city		5	5	0.0	2.2	0.0	
Thyolo		1	3	0.3	0.0	0.1	
Mulanje		1	1	0.3	0.0	0.0	
Phalombe		0	4	0.1	0.0	0.0	
Mwanza		1	3	0.0	0.0	0.5	
Chikwawa		2	1	0.9	0.0	0.0	
Nsanje	2	1	0.5	0.2	0.2		

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

8 Veterinary services

8.1 Introduction

Even the use of veterinary services is an indicator of how well the domestic animals are looked after and to which extent the owners either have the means or the ability to access such service.

8.2 Livestock

The households were asked how often they had provided the following services for their livestock during the past 12 months:

- Disease treatment
- Dipping
- Vaccinations
- Deworming
- Artificial insemination

The results show that a very small proportion of households had provided any of those services for their livestock during the reference period. Only between 0.3 percent and 1.6 percent of the households had provided any of those services regularly, while more than 90 percent of the households never provided them during the reference period. (Table 26 to Table 30)

8.3 Poultry

The same information on provision of services, except for dipping and artificial insemination was asked for poultry.

It turns out that disease treatment was more likely to be provided for poultry than for livestock; about 2 percent of the households had provided this service regularly. Otherwise the picture is very much the same as for livestock. (Table 32 to table 33).

6.4 Service providers

Veterinary services can be provided either by the government, by private organizations or through village drug boxes.

For livestock, the major service provider for all services included, except for artificial insemination, was the Government. (Table 34)

For poultry, the role of the government as service provider was less prominent, while other service providers than those specified, played a major role. (Table 35)

Table 26. Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided disease treatment for livestock by frequency of treatment the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Regularly	Once	When available	Never	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	1.4	3.3	2.8	92.5	100.0
	Male	1.4	3.7	3.0	91.9	100.0
Poverty quintiles	Female	1.5	2.1	2.1	94.3	100.0
	Poorest quintile	0.7	1.3	1.2	96.8	100.0
	Second quintile	1.6	2.0	1.9	94.5	100.0
	Third quintile	1.6	4.1	2.6	91.7	100.0
	Fourth quintile	1.8	4.1	4.1	90.0	100.0
Region	Highest quintile	2.0	5.9	4.6	87.5	100.0
	Northern	3.0	5.6	2.9	88.5	100.0
	Central	1.2	3.1	3.7	92.1	100.0
ADD	Southern	1.1	2.6	1.8	94.4	100.0
	Karonga	2.6	6.5	3.7	87.3	100.0
District	Mzuzu	3.2	5.1	2.5	89.2	100.0
	Kasungu	1.5	3.2	3.7	91.6	100.0
	Salima	0.2	1.7	4.0	94.0	100.0
	Lilongwe	1.1	3.3	3.5	92.0	100.0
	Machinga	1.0	0.9	0.7	97.4	100.0
	Blantyre	1.0	3.4	1.0	94.5	100.0
	Shire Valley	1.9	3.3	8.0	86.8	100.0
	Chitipa	4.1	8.1	4.5	83.3	100.0
	Karonga	1.7	5.5	3.2	89.6	100.0
	Rumphi	1.0	2.5	3.7	92.9	100.0
	Nkhata Bay	8.8	5.2	4.4	81.5	100.0
	Likoma	0.1	0.0	0.0	99.9	100.0
	Mzimba	3.3	5.7	1.9	89.0	100.0
	Mzuzu city	1.6	10.6	3.1	84.8	100.0
	Kasungu	1.0	2.2	5.0	91.8	100.0
	Ntchisi	1.8	5.5	8.9	83.7	100.0
	Dowa	1.5	1.1	1.6	95.8	100.0
	Nkhotakota	0.0	0.2	4.1	95.7	100.0
	Salima	0.4	3.3	3.9	92.3	100.0
	Dedza	2.4	3.9	4.2	89.5	100.0
Ntcheu	1.8	3.5	1.2	93.5	100.0	
Lilongwe rural	0.4	1.9	2.2	95.5	100.0	
Lilongwe city	0.0	7.4	10.6	82.0	100.0	
Mchinji	2.0	6.4	1.3	90.3	100.0	
Balaka	0.0	1.5	1.6	96.8	100.0	
Mangochi	1.1	0.5	0.1	98.3	100.0	
Machinga	0.0	0.3	0.7	99.0	100.0	
Zomba rural	1.8	1.5	0.9	95.8	100.0	
Zomba City	6.5	0.0	0.1	93.4	100.0	
Chiradzulu	2.8	3.1	1.9	92.2	100.0	
Blantyre rural	1.2	0.8	0.0	98.0	100.0	
Blantyre city	0.8	17.1	0.0	82.1	100.0	
Thyolo	0.4	2.5	0.7	96.4	100.0	
Mulanje	1.1	0.9	1.5	96.5	100.0	
Phalombe	0.0	1.8	1.2	96.9	100.0	
Mwanza	1.5	2.9	1.7	93.9	100.0	
Chikwawa	2.5	2.9	11.0	83.7	100.0	
Nsanje	0.9	4.1	2.6	92.4	100.0	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 27. Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided dipping for livestock the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Regularly	Once	When available	Never	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	1.3	1.5	0.8	96.4	100.0
	Male	1.4	1.8	0.8	96.0	100.0
Poverty quintiles	Female	0.9	0.7	0.5	97.9	100.0
	Poorest quintile	0.3	0.5	0.2	98.9	100.0
	Second quintile	1.5	0.8	0.8	96.9	100.0
	Third quintile	1.9	2.8	0.4	95.0	100.0
	Fourth quintile	1.8	2.0	1.3	94.9	100.0
Region	Highest quintile	0.8	1.8	1.2	96.1	100.0
	Northern	4.1	3.7	1.4	90.7	100.0
	Central	1.0	1.0	0.8	97.2	100.0
ADD	Southern	0.7	1.1	0.5	97.7	100.0
	Karonga	3.0	5.1	2.4	89.5	100.0
	Mzuzu	4.8	2.9	0.8	91.4	100.0
	Kasungu	2.1	0.7	0.9	96.3	100.0
	Salima	0.4	1.5	2.4	95.7	100.0
	Lilongwe	0.3	1.1	0.4	98.2	100.0
	Machinga	0.5	1.1	0.1	98.3	100.0
	Blantyre	0.6	0.8	0.2	98.3	100.0
	Shire Valley	1.6	2.2	2.4	93.8	100.0
District	Chitipa	3.2	4.2	0.4	92.3	100.0
	Karonga	2.9	5.7	3.7	87.8	100.0
	Rumphi	3.0	0.3	1.8	94.9	100.0
	Nkhata Bay	5.3	4.0	4.6	86.0	100.0
	Likoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Mzimba	5.3	3.6	0.2	90.9	100.0
	Mzuzu city	2.1	4.3	0.9	92.7	100.0
	Kasungu	1.6	1.5	1.4	95.6	100.0
	Ntchisi	2.1	0.4	1.6	96.0	100.0
	Dowa	0.4	0.5	0.6	98.5	100.0
	Nkhotakota	0.0	1.6	1.7	96.6	100.0
	Salima	0.7	1.4	3.1	94.8	100.0
	Dedza	0.8	0.6	0.7	97.9	100.0
	Ntcheu	0.4	0.0	0.3	99.3	100.0
	Lilongwe rural	0.0	0.2	0.4	99.5	100.0
	Lilongwe city	0.0	7.8	0.0	92.2	100.0
	Mchinji	6.1	0.0	0.1	93.8	100.0
	Balaka	0.3	0.6	0.0	99.1	100.0
	Mangochi	0.7	0.8	0.2	98.4	100.0
	Machinga	0.0	0.0	0.4	99.6	100.0
	Zomba rural	0.7	2.3	0.0	96.9	100.0
	Zomba City	0.5	0.0	0.0	99.5	100.0
	Chiradzulu	2.0	1.0	1.1	95.9	100.0
	Blantyre rural	1.1	0.2	0.0	98.8	100.0
	Blantyre city	0.8	0.0	0.0	99.2	100.0
	Thyolo	0.1	2.0	0.0	97.9	100.0
	Mulanje	0.2	0.1	0.0	99.7	100.0
	Phalombe	0.0	0.7	0.3	99.0	100.0
	Mwanza	1.0	0.0	0.0	99.0	100.0
	Chikwawa	2.0	2.7	2.4	92.9	100.0
	Nsanje	0.9	1.5	2.4	95.1	100.0

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 28. Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided vaccination for livestock the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Regularly	Once	When available	Never	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	1.5	3.5	2.0	92.9	100.0
	Male	1.6	3.7	2.1	92.7	100.0
Poverty quintiles	Female	1.5	2.8	1.9	93.8	100.0
	Poorest quintile	0.5	2.1	0.8	96.6	100.0
	Second quintile	0.7	3.0	1.6	94.6	100.0
	Third quintile	1.5	4.7	1.7	92.2	100.0
	Fourth quintile	3.4	3.5	2.9	90.3	100.0
Region	Highest quintile	2.1	4.6	2.9	90.4	100.0
	Northern	5.8	8.9	3.6	81.6	100.0
	Central	0.6	2.7	1.6	95.0	100.0
ADD	Southern	0.6	2.0	1.8	95.6	100.0
	Karonga	6.1	10.9	7.1	75.9	100.0
District	Mzuzu	5.7	7.8	1.6	84.9	100.0
	Kasungu	1.0	3.8	2.2	93.0	100.0
	Salima	0.3	1.3	3.3	95.1	100.0
	Lilongwe	0.4	2.2	0.9	96.6	100.0
	Machinga	0.4	1.5	0.4	97.7	100.0
	Blantyre	0.6	1.9	1.0	96.6	100.0
	Shire Valley	1.3	3.7	8.7	86.3	100.0
	Chitipa	9.9	15.4	4.8	69.9	100.0
	Karonga	3.7	8.0	8.6	79.7	100.0
	Rumphi	1.6	3.9	3.1	91.5	100.0
	Nkhata Bay	0.8	2.3	3.1	93.8	100.0
	Likoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Mzimba	7.5	9.8	1.0	81.8	100.0
	Mzuzu city	4.8	3.3	3.4	88.5	100.0
	Kasungu	0.2	6.8	1.7	91.3	100.0
	Ntchisi	4.4	5.7	9.9	80.0	100.0
	Dowa	0.8	1.2	0.3	97.7	100.0
	Nkhotakota	0.0	0.8	2.7	96.5	100.0
	Salima	0.6	1.8	3.9	93.6	100.0
	Dedza	1.3	3.1	1.7	94.0	100.0
Ntcheu	0.1	2.0	0.2	97.7	100.0	
Lilongwe rural	0.1	1.0	0.8	98.1	100.0	
Lilongwe city	0.0	5.0	0.0	95.0	100.0	
Mchinji	0.0	2.2	0.0	97.8	100.0	
Balaka	0.2	1.5	1.4	96.9	100.0	
Mangochi	0.7	1.4	0.2	97.7	100.0	
Machinga	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
Zomba rural	0.4	2.5	0.3	96.8	100.0	
Zomba City	0.0	0.0	0.1	99.9	100.0	
Chiradzulu	1.2	1.6	2.3	95.0	100.0	
Blantyre rural	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
Blantyre city	0.8	0.0	0.0	99.2	100.0	
Thyolo	0.3	3.8	1.1	94.7	100.0	
Mulanje	1.1	2.5	0.4	96.0	100.0	
Phalombe	0.0	1.2	0.7	98.0	100.0	
Mwanza	0.8	0.5	2.1	96.7	100.0	
Chikwawa	0.9	4.7	11.7	82.7	100.0	
Nsanje	1.9	1.8	3.4	92.9	100.0	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 29. Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided deworming for livestock the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Regularly	Once	When available	Never	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	0.6	0.9	0.6	98.0	100.0
	Male	0.5	0.9	0.7	97.9	100.0
Poverty quintiles	Female	0.7	0.7	0.4	98.2	100.0
	Poorest quintile	0.4	0.1	0.3	99.2	100.0
	Second quintile	0.4	0.4	0.6	98.6	100.0
	Third quintile	0.8	1.1	0.4	97.7	100.0
	Fourth quintile	0.5	1.3	0.8	97.4	100.0
Region	Highest quintile	0.9	1.9	0.9	96.4	100.0
	Northern	1.4	1.8	0.8	96.1	100.0
	Central	0.3	0.7	0.7	98.3	100.0
ADD	Southern	0.5	0.6	0.5	98.4	100.0
	Karonga	2.1	0.9	1.6	95.4	100.0
	Mzuzu	1.0	2.3	0.3	96.4	100.0
	Kasungu	0.7	0.8	1.1	97.5	100.0
	Salima	0.0	0.7	2.3	97.0	100.0
	Lilongwe	0.0	0.6	0.2	99.2	100.0
	Machinga	0.3	0.0	0.3	99.5	100.0
District	Blantyre	0.7	0.9	0.2	98.2	100.0
	Shire Valley	0.7	0.7	2.2	96.4	100.0
	Chitipa	4.6	1.0	3.3	91.2	100.0
	Karonga	0.5	0.9	0.5	98.1	100.0
	Rumphi	1.0	1.5	0.5	96.9	100.0
	Nkhata Bay	1.7	1.4	0.0	96.9	100.0
	Likoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Mzimba	0.9	2.7	0.3	96.1	100.0
	Mzuzu city	0.0	0.9	0.1	99.0	100.0
	Kasungu	0.0	1.0	0.7	98.3	100.0
	Ntchisi	2.8	1.1	5.2	90.9	100.0
	Dowa	0.6	1.0	0.0	98.4	100.0
	Nkhotakota	0.0	0.6	1.8	97.6	100.0
	Salima	0.0	0.9	2.8	96.3	100.0
	Dedza	0.1	1.0	0.4	98.4	100.0
	Ntcheu	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Lilongwe rural	0.0	0.6	0.1	99.2	100.0
	Lilongwe city	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Mchinji	0.1	0.0	0.0	99.9	100.0
	Balaka	0.2	0.0	1.4	98.5	100.0
Mangochi	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
Machinga	0.0	0.0	0.3	99.7	100.0	
Zomba rural	0.8	0.0	0.0	99.2	100.0	
Zomba City	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
Chiradzulu	2.1	0.3	0.2	97.3	100.0	
Blantyre rural	0.6	0.1	0.0	99.3	100.0	
Blantyre city	0.8	0.0	0.0	99.2	100.0	
Thyolo	0.6	1.9	0.0	97.5	100.0	
Mulanje	0.0	1.0	0.6	98.4	100.0	
Phalombe	0.0	1.2	0.0	98.8	100.0	
Mwanza	0.5	0.5	0.9	98.2	100.0	
Chikwawa	0.4	0.7	1.9	97.0	100.0	
Nsanje	1.3	0.7	2.7	95.3	100.0	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 30. Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided artificial insemination for livestock the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Regularly	Once	When available	Never	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	0.3	0.4	0.2	99.0	100.0
	Male	0.4	0.4	0.3	98.9	100.0
	Female	0.2	0.3	0.1	99.4	100.0
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	0.3	0.1	0.0	99.6	100.0
	Second quintile	0.5	0.2	0.3	99.0	100.0
	Third quintile	0.5	0.5	0.1	98.9	100.0
	Fourth quintile	0.0	0.7	0.5	98.8	100.0
	Highest quintile	0.4	0.6	0.4	98.6	100.0
Region	Northern	0.7	0.3	0.0	99.0	100.0
	Central	0.3	0.4	0.4	98.9	100.0
	Southern	0.2	0.4	0.2	99.2	100.0
ADD	Karonga	0.1	0.3	0.1	99.5	100.0
	Mzuzu	1.1	0.2	0.0	98.7	100.0
	Kasungu	0.7	0.6	0.4	98.3	100.0
	Salima	0.0	0.5	2.0	97.6	100.0
	Lilongwe	0.0	0.3	0.0	99.7	100.0
	Machinga	0.1	0.3	0.1	99.5	100.0
	Blantyre	0.3	0.4	0.1	99.2	100.0
	Shire Valley	0.0	1.0	0.6	98.4	100.0
District	Chitipa	0.4	0.8	0.0	98.9	100.0
	Karonga	0.0	0.0	0.2	99.8	100.0
	Rumphi	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Nkhata Bay	0.0	1.4	0.0	98.6	100.0
	Likoma	0.0	0.1	0.0	99.9	100.0
	Mzimba	1.5	0.2	0.0	98.3	100.0
	Mzuzu city	1.1	0.1	0.0	98.8	100.0
	Kasungu	0.0	0.5	0.2	99.3	100.0
	Ntchisi	3.9	1.9	0.0	94.2	100.0
	Dowa	0.3	0.2	0.0	99.5	100.0
	Nkhotakota	0.0	0.3	1.2	98.5	100.0
	Salima	0.0	0.6	2.8	96.6	100.0
	Dedza	0.0	1.0	0.0	99.0	100.0
	Ntcheu	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Lilongwe rural	0.0	0.1	0.0	99.9	100.0
	Lilongwe city	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Mchinji	0.2	0.1	1.7	98.1	100.0
	Balaka	0.2	0.0	0.6	99.2	100.0
	Mangochi	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Machinga	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Zomba rural	0.1	0.8	0.0	99.1	100.0
	Zomba City	0.1	6.4	0.0	93.5	100.0
	Chiradzulu	1.0	1.6	0.0	97.4	100.0
	Blantyre rural	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Blantyre city	0.0	0.8	0.0	99.2	100.0
	Thyolo	0.0	0.2	0.3	99.5	100.0
	Mulanje	0.3	0.0	0.0	99.7	100.0
	Phalombe	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Mwanza	1.1	0.0	0.0	98.9	100.0
	Chikwawa	0.0	1.4	0.6	98.0	100.0
	Nsanje	0.0	0.2	0.7	99.0	100.0

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 31. Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided disease treatment for poultry the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Regularly	Once	When available	Never	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	2.3	4.7	3.1	89.9	100.0
	Male	2.7	4.8	3.0	89.4	100.0
Poverty quintiles	Female	1.1	4.2	3.2	91.5	100.0
	Poorest quintile	1.0	1.9	1.7	95.4	100.0
	Second quintile	0.9	4.8	2.3	92.0	100.0
	Third quintile	1.8	4.4	4.3	89.5	100.0
	Fourth quintile	3.3	4.8	3.6	88.3	100.0
Region	Highest quintile	6.0	7.0	4.0	83.0	100.0
	Northern	2.5	6.4	2.8	88.2	100.0
	Central	2.5	5.2	4.2	88.2	100.0
ADD	Southern	2.1	3.3	2.1	92.5	100.0
	Karonga	1.0	1.7	5.5	91.8	100.0
	Mzuzu	3.2	8.5	1.6	86.7	100.0
District	Kasungu	1.8	5.8	3.3	89.1	100.0
	Salima	1.3	2.7	6.6	89.4	100.0
	Lilongwe	3.2	5.1	4.4	87.3	100.0
	Machinga	1.0	3.2	0.8	95.0	100.0
	Blantyre	3.4	3.4	1.5	91.6	100.0
	Shire Valley	0.4	2.8	8.0	88.8	100.0
	Chitipa	1.9	2.6	3.8	91.7	100.0
	Karonga	0.4	1.2	6.6	91.8	100.0
	Rumphi	1.3	12.0	2.4	84.4	100.0
	Nkhata Bay	0.9	2.4	1.9	94.7	100.0
	Likoma	0.0	0.0	1.2	98.8	100.0
	Mzimba	4.0	9.3	1.5	85.2	100.0
	Mzuzu city	7.1	3.2	0.0	89.7	100.0
	Kasungu	1.9	5.4	3.6	89.1	100.0
	Ntchisi	1.6	5.9	4.5	88.0	100.0
	Dowa	2.4	7.2	4.0	86.4	100.0
	Nkhotakota	1.5	2.3	5.6	90.7	100.0
	Salima	1.1	3.2	7.8	87.9	100.0
	Dedza	0.7	5.0	8.6	85.7	100.0
	Ntcheu	2.2	4.2	2.1	91.6	100.0
	Lilongwe rural	6.0	4.8	3.2	86.1	100.0
	Lilongwe city	0.6	6.6	4.1	88.7	100.0
	Mchinji	0.8	4.9	1.0	93.3	100.0
	Balaka	1.6	1.7	0.4	96.3	100.0
	Mangochi	0.1	0.8	0.9	98.2	100.0
	Machinga	1.4	3.8	0.7	94.2	100.0
	Zomba rural	1.1	5.5	0.9	92.5	100.0
	Zomba City	1.7	9.0	3.3	86.0	100.0
	Chiradzulu	0.8	1.0	0.2	98.0	100.0
	Blantyre rural	4.7	1.0	2.0	92.2	100.0
Blantyre city	14.8	9.0	0.0	76.2	100.0	
Thyolo	1.9	3.7	0.9	93.5	100.0	
Mulanje	0.5	3.3	2.9	93.3	100.0	
Phalombe	2.6	4.1	0.6	92.6	100.0	
Mwanza	0.8	0.9	4.9	93.4	100.0	
Chikwawa	0.2	4.2	11.9	83.7	100.0	
Nsanje	0.6	0.7	2.1	96.6	100.0	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 32. Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided vaccination for poultry the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Regularly	Once	When available	Never	Total
	Malawi	1.4	4.8	1.9	92.0	100.0
Sex of head	Male	1.3	5.1	1.9	91.7	100.0
	Female	1.6	3.9	1.8	92.7	100.0
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	1.2	2.8	1.2	94.8	100.0
	Second quintile	1.2	5.5	1.3	92.0	100.0
	Third quintile	1.4	4.7	3.0	90.9	100.0
	Fourth quintile	1.2	4.4	1.8	92.6	100.0
	Highest quintile	2.4	7.6	2.1	87.9	100.0
Region	Northern	1.4	3.6	2.9	92.0	100.0
	Central	1.1	4.1	1.3	93.5	100.0
	Southern	1.7	5.9	1.9	90.5	100.0
ADD	Karonga	2.4	2.9	8.0	86.7	100.0
	Mzuzu	1.0	3.9	0.8	94.3	100.0
	Kasungu	1.7	4.6	1.0	92.6	100.0
	Salima	0.1	0.3	0.4	99.2	100.0
	Lilongwe	0.9	4.3	1.7	93.2	100.0
	Machinga	0.9	5.5	1.5	92.1	100.0
	Blantyre	2.6	7.5	1.6	88.3	100.0
	Shire Valley	0.4	0.8	4.2	94.6	100.0
District	Chitipa	4.2	3.5	2.0	90.2	100.0
	Karonga	1.1	2.5	12.0	84.4	100.0
	Rumphi	2.8	6.6	0.5	90.1	100.0
	Nkhata Bay	0.8	4.7	1.6	92.9	100.0
	Likoma	3.2	3.2	0.0	93.6	100.0
	Mzimba	0.6	2.6	0.7	96.1	100.0
	Mzuzu city	1.1	14.3	0.0	84.7	100.0
	Kasungu	3.0	5.3	1.0	90.7	100.0
	Ntchisi	1.5	10.9	3.6	84.1	100.0
	Dowa	1.3	3.5	0.5	94.7	100.0
	Nkhotakota	0.0	0.5	0.4	99.1	100.0
	Salima	0.2	0.0	0.5	99.3	100.0
	Dedza	1.1	6.1	1.7	91.2	100.0
	Ntcheu	0.1	1.4	0.3	98.2	100.0
	Lilongwe rural	1.2	2.0	1.4	95.5	100.0
	Lilongwe city	0.3	9.1	3.4	87.3	100.0
	Mchinji	0.0	1.2	0.3	98.5	100.0
	Balaka	0.9	9.5	2.6	87.0	100.0
	Mangochi	0.1	0.8	0.2	99.0	100.0
	Machinga	2.6	3.6	1.8	92.0	100.0
	Zomba rural	0.6	9.4	1.9	88.2	100.0
	Zomba City	0.3	0.1	5.2	94.4	100.0
	Chiradzulu	6.6	9.3	5.2	78.9	100.0
	Blantyre rural	5.9	3.9	2.7	87.6	100.0
	Blantyre city	2.6	12.0	0.0	85.5	100.0
	Thyolo	1.1	4.9	0.7	93.3	100.0
	Mulanje	1.5	13.0	0.3	85.2	100.0
	Phalombe	1.7	5.8	0.8	91.7	100.0
	Mwanza	0.6	4.2	4.3	91.0	100.0
	Chikwawa	0.6	1.1	6.6	91.7	100.0
	Nsanje	0.2	0.3	0.6	98.9	100.0

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 33. Percentage distribution of households by the frequency they provided deworming for poultry the past 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Regularly	Once	When available	Never	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	0.6	0.5	0.3	98.7	100.0
	Male	0.5	0.5	0.3	98.7	100.0
Poverty quintiles	Female	0.7	0.3	0.2	98.7	100.0
	Poorest quintile	0.7	0.2	0.1	99.0	100.0
	Second quintile	0.4	0.3	0.1	99.2	100.0
	Third quintile	0.9	0.9	0.3	97.9	100.0
	Fourth quintile	0.5	0.5	0.3	98.7	100.0
Region	Highest quintile	0.5	0.2	0.6	98.6	100.0
	Northern	0.9	1.0	0.2	97.9	100.0
	Central	0.3	0.3	0.1	99.3	100.0
ADD	Southern	0.7	0.4	0.4	98.5	100.0
	Karonga	1.3	0.1	0.3	98.3	100.0
	Mzuzu	0.8	1.3	0.2	97.7	100.0
	Kasungu	0.5	0.5	0.0	99.0	100.0
	Salima	0.0	0.1	0.0	99.8	100.0
	Lilongwe	0.3	0.2	0.2	99.4	100.0
	Machinga	0.8	0.4	0.1	98.7	100.0
	Blantyre	0.9	0.4	0.6	98.1	100.0
District	Shire Valley	0.0	0.3	0.4	99.3	100.0
	Chitipa	3.2	0.3	0.7	95.8	100.0
	Karonga	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Rumphi	0.5	0.1	0.2	99.1	100.0
	Nkhata Bay	1.2	0.5	0.0	98.3	100.0
	Likoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Mzimba	0.8	1.9	0.2	97.1	100.0
	Mzuzu city	0.0	0.4	1.1	98.5	100.0
	Kasungu	0.0	0.7	0.0	99.2	100.0
	Ntchisi	2.0	0.0	0.0	98.0	100.0
	Dowa	0.6	0.0	0.0	99.4	100.0
	Nkhotakota	0.0	0.3	0.0	99.7	100.0
	Salima	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Dedza	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Ntcheu	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Lilongwe rural	0.6	0.4	0.4	98.6	100.0
	Lilongwe city	0.1	0.0	0.0	99.9	100.0
	Mchinji	0.0	1.2	0.0	98.8	100.0
	Balaka	1.4	0.0	0.0	98.6	100.0
	Mangochi	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Machinga	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
	Zomba rural	1.8	1.3	0.2	96.7	100.0
	Zomba City	0.2	0.0	0.0	99.7	100.0
	Chiradzulu	0.2	0.0	0.0	99.8	100.0
	Blantyre rural	2.8	0.0	0.0	97.2	100.0
	Blantyre city	2.5	0.0	0.0	97.5	100.0
	Thyolo	0.0	0.3	1.3	98.4	100.0
	Mulanje	0.5	0.6	1.0	98.0	100.0
	Phalombe	0.8	1.0	0.2	98.1	100.0
	Mwanza	0.3	1.4	1.0	97.4	100.0
Chikwawa	0.0	0.3	0.1	99.5	100.0	
Nsanje	0.0	0.2	0.7	99.0	100.0	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 34. Percentage distribution of service providers for treatment of livestock

	Disease treatment	Dipping	Vaccination	Deworming	Artificial insemination
Government	51	57	54	49	46
Private	13	4	13	4	2
Village drug boxes	6	3	4	1	0
Other	30	36	30	46	52
Total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 35. Percentage distribution of service providers for treatment of poultry

	Disease treatment	Vaccination	Deworming
Government	32	38	13
Private	15	14	3
Village drug boxes	14	12	4
Other	40	35	80
Total	100	100	100

9 Sales of livestock and poultry

9.1 Introduction

It should be noted that the number of livestock owned, gives the stock of every animal type at the time of the interview. Concerning the numbers of livestock and poultry sold, those refer to all sales that had taken place during the 12 months preceding the date of enumeration. Hence, it might very well happen that the number of various livestock and poultry sold during this period of time, exceeds the number owned at the time of the survey.

9.2 Number of livestock and poultry sold.

About 390,000 heads of cattle had been sold during the past twelve months preceding the date of enumeration. For sheep, the number sold was about 40,000, for goats about 342,400, for pigs about 984,000 and for chickens about 1,521,000. (Table 36)

Among the regions, the Central region had the highest number of heads of cattle sold, while the Southern region had the highest number sold of all the other types of livestock and poultry. The Northern region consistently had the lowest number sold of all the types of livestock and poultry included.

9.3 Sales of livestock and poultry at household level

As mentioned before, livestock and poultry can be important assets for providing cash needed to buy items vital for household welfare, from food stuffs to school fees and health services. Hence, it is important to know not only the proportion of households who has sold livestock and poultry, but also the number sold.

9.4 Proportion of households who had sold various types of livestock and chickens

Basis for the figures presented below, is households who owned the various types of livestock and poultry analyzed.

A very small proportion of household who owned cattle had actually sold cattle during the past twelve months preceding the survey, about three percent.

About 27 percent, 28 percent, 29 percent of households had sold pigs, goats and chickens respectively. About one out of every ten households had sold sheep.

Proportion of households who had sold animals did not vary systematically neither according to sex of household head nor according to poverty status of the household (Table 37)

9.4.1 Cattle

About half the households who had sold cattle had only sold one head of cattle. About 14 percent of the households had sold 5 or more heads of cattle. Generally, female headed households were less likely to have sold more than two heads of cattle as compared to male headed households. (Table 38)

9.4.2 Goats

More than half the households who had sold goats had only sold one goat. Only about three percent had sold 5 or more goats.

Female headed household a bit more often than male headed households had sold only one goat, 58 percent as compared to 52 percent.

The poorer the household was, the more likely it was that the household had sold only one goat. (Table 39)

9.4.3 Sheep

More than half the households who had sold sheep had only sold one sheep. Only about 5 percent had sold 5 or more sheep.

A larger proportion of female headed than male headed households had only sold one sheep, 63 percent as compared to 54 percent. It was also a tendency that the poorer the household was, the more likely it was that they had only sold one sheep. (Table 40)

9.4.4 Pigs

More than half the household who had sold pigs had only sold one pig. About nine percent had sold 5 or more pigs. No significant differences were observed between male headed and female headed households. However, it was a tendency that the poorer the household was, the more likely it was that the household had sold only one pig, (Table 41)

9.4.5 Chickens

About one out of four households that had sold chickens had sold only one chicken, while about one out of five households had sold 3 chickens. About one in four households had sold 5 or more chickens.

No significant differences were observed between male headed and female headed households. The poorer the household was, the more likely it was that the household had sold only one chicken, and the less likely it was that 5 or more chickens had been sold, (Table 42).

Table 36. Total number of livestock and poultry sold last 12 months, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Cattle	Sheep	Goats	Pigs	Chicken
Region	Malawi	389,091	45,975	342,414	983,920	1,521,213
	Northern	90,935	12,151	47,399	43,114	261,118
	Central	196,151	11,902	134,074	136,919	549,909
	Southern	102,005	21,922	160,941	803,887	710,186
ADD	Karonga	38,731	2,503	6,245	18,256	70,395
	Mzuzu	52,204	9,648	41,154	24,859	190,724
	Kasungu	28,055	7,514	63,394	92,388	260,188
	Salima	8,005	1,706	10,492	14,906	44,464
	Lilongwe	160,090	2,683	60,187	29,624	245,257
	Machinga	36,133	7,002	51,352	15,974	250,048
	Blantyre	44,748	12,501	82,602	768,662	372,724
	Shire Valley	21,124	2,419	26,987	19,251	87,414
	District	Chitipa	14,819	1,626	4,593	6,051
Karonga		23,913	877	1,652	12,205	26,411
Rumphu		5,205	1,369	5,180	3,918	22,378
Nkhata Bay		1,073	260	5,639	975	8,368
Likoma		32	..	393	32	1,287
Mzimba		45,567	7,993	29,908	19,800	156,527
Mzuzu city		327	26	34	133	2,163
Kasungu		13,051	1,538	20,916	10,219	93,933
Ntchisi		5,753	2,770	8,340	65,142	22,263
Dowa		8,232	3,205	25,986	10,982	86,803
Nkhotakota		4,175	197	1,344	2,464	32,367
Salima		3,830	1,508	9,149	12,442	12,096
Dedza		2,751	319	15,961	6,497	62,300
Ntcheu		1,056	239	8,718	4,147	56,505
Lilongwe rural		149,092	2,125	33,313	17,096	123,389
Lilongwe city		7,192	..	2,195	1,885	3,062
Mchinji		1,019	..	8,152	6,046	57,189
Balaka		2,606	1,662	9,063	3,375	70,183
Mangochi		48	874	14,509	22	48,724
Machinga		12,836	1,239	9,520	5,070	65,685
Zomba rural		16,453	1,533	17,227	5,863	57,391
Zomba City		4,190	1,694	1,032	1,644	8,065
Chiradzulu		25,814	7,118	19,044	602,538	89,555
Blantyre rural		1,963	979	6,428	6,703	27,371
Blantyre city		84	216	15,565	1,370	40,642
Thyolo		4,257	1,273	11,298	50,711	78,117
Mulanje		1,864	1,688	16,331	88,503	50,371
Phalombe		9,400	493	7,739	5,648	40,809
Mwanza		1,367	734	6,197	13,187	45,858
Chikwawa		17,653	1,561	14,579	5,285	62,080
Nsanje		3,471	858	12,408	13,966	25,334

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 37. Proportion of households who owned various livestock and poultry and sold some during the past 12 months , according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		Cattle	Pigs	Sheep	Goats	Chickens
	Malawi	3	27	11	28	29
Sex of head	Male	3	27	12	29	28
	Female	3	30	8	24	30
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	2	23	17	27	30
	Second quintile	2	22	14	27	27
	Third quintile	4	29	13	28	33
	Fourth quintile	3	35	6	28	29
	Highest quintile	2	34	10	31	24
Region	Northern	9	27	24	35	31
	Central	2	29	9	26	26
	Southern	2	25	7	29	30
ADD	Karonga	11	27	6	22	35
	Mzuzu	8	26	27	39	29
	Kasungu	3	29	10	30	33
	Salima	1	56	15	29	20
	Lilongwe	2	27	0	22	23
	Machinga	1	33	14	28	29
	Blantyre	2	25	3	32	32
	Shire Valley	4	19	3	24	28
Jdistricy	Chitipa	15	28	14	28	50
	Karonga	9	27	0	14	24
	Rumphi	6	31	2	24	31
	Nkhata Bay	2	36	9	23	15
	Likoma	2	0	0	31	40
	Mzimba	11	25	35	45	33
	Mzuzu city	1	20	0	1	9
	Kasungu	2	27	7	34	37
	Ntchisi	4	36	64	24	33
	Dowa	3	34	13	32	33
	Nkhotakota	1	41	9	15	25
	Salima	1	65	34	34	14
	Dedza	1	22	0	27	24
	Ntcheu	1	26	0	21	30
	Lilongwe rural	2	33	0	23	30
	Lilongwe city	2	24	0	12	1
	Mchinji	1	18	0	25	26
	Balaka	1	33	26	34	43
	Mangochi	0	2	15	24	23
	Machinga	2	9	8	24	31
	Zomba rural	1	43	12	30	27
	Zomba City	5	86	70	63	25
	Chiradzulu	11	27	6	28	41
	Blantyre rural	1	38	0	22	28
	Blantyre city	0	100	0	79	31
	Thyolo	2	23	1	25	25
	Mulanje	1	11	0	39	35
	Phalombe	2	25	0	24	30
	Mwanza	2	19	2	24	42
	Chikwawa	4	17	3	20	31
	Nsanje	4	23	3	31	24

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 38. Percentage distribution of households who sold Cattle by number of Cattle sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 +	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	49	14	4	18	14	100
	Male	48	12	5	19	16	100
	Female	52	20	4	16	9	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	54	6	9	16	15	100
	Second quintile	50	14	4	26	6	100
	Third quintile	40	11	4	16	30	100
	Fourth quintile	61	22	2	12	3	100
Region	Highest quintile	42	24	5	22	7	100
	Northern	47	19	3	26	6	100
	Central	47	10	2	13	28	100
ADD	Southern	53	12	8	15	12	100
	Karonga	60	23	1	5	11	100
	Mzuzu	39	17	3	38	2	100
	Kasungu	50	12	5	27	6	100
	Salima	73	10	0	0	17	100
	Lilongwe	41	8	0	3	48	100
	Machinga	49	3	4	23	21	100
	Blantyre	53	13	11	16	8	100
	Shire Valley	55	18	5	7	14	100
	District	Chitipa	57	27	3	9	5
Karonga		64	19	0	0	18	100
Rumphi		58	2	7	27	6	100
Nkhata Bay		84	4	0	0	11	100
Likoma		100	0	0	0	0	100
Mzimba		35	19	3	42	2	100
Mzuzu city		40	0	54	5	0	100
Kasungu		41	28	0	12	19	100
Ntchisi		15	4	8	72	0	100
Dowa		61	4	9	25	1	100
Nkhotakota		82	0	0	0	18	100
Salima		63	20	0	0	17	100
Dedza		64	15	0	21	0	100
Ntcheu		88	12	0	0	0	100
Lilongwe rural		11	3	0	0	86	100
Lilongwe city		79	15	0	0	6	100
Mchinji		94	6	0	0	0	100
Balaka		31	5	4	27	32	100
Mangochi		94	3	0	0	3	100
Machinga		76	2	0	6	16	100
Zomba rural		39	6	10	13	32	100
Zomba City		0	0	0	96	3	100
Chiradzulu		29	20	19	24	8	100
Blantyre rural		43	0	0	25	31	100
Blantyre city		0	0	0	91	9	100
Thyolo		81	8	6	3	1	100
Mulanje		87	0	0	13	0	100
Phalombe		67	8	0	3	22	100
Mwanza		88	0	0	12	0	100
Chikwawa		48	19	3	10	20	100
Nsanje		69	18	10	0	2	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 39. Percentage distribution of households who sold goats by number of goats sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 +	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	54	32	7	4	3	100
	Male	52	33	7	4	4	100
	Female	58	28	8	4	2	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	63	27	6	2	3	100
	Second quintile	54	40	2	3	2	100
	Third quintile	53	32	8	4	3	100
	Fourth quintile	55	25	10	4	5	100
	Highest quintile	31	48	10	6	5	100
Region	Northern	66	22	4	5	2	100
	Central	54	31	6	5	4	100
	Southern	51	34	9	3	3	100
ADD	Karonga	71	27	0	0	2	100
	Mzuzu	65	22	4	6	2	100
	Kasungu	47	34	8	6	5	100
	Salima	58	38	2	1	1	100
	Lilongwe	60	26	6	4	4	100
	Machinga	53	27	15	3	2	100
	Blantyre	51	41	6	2	1	100
	Shire Valley	47	24	9	7	13	100
	District	Chitipa	66	34	0	1	0
	Karonga	84	7	0	0	8	100
	Rumphi	46	39	11	2	2	100
	Nkhata Bay	29	18	22	4	27	100
	Likoma	39	37	24	0	0	100
	Mzimba	71	19	2	7	1	100
	Mzuzu city	0	84	16	0	0	100
	Kasungu	46	25	14	11	4	100
	Ntchisi	46	48	2	0	4	100
	Dowa	43	40	6	1	10	100
	Nkhotakota	63	23	14	0	0	100
	Salima	57	41	0	2	1	100
	Dedza	66	28	3	2	0	100
	Ntcheu	69	25	4	0	2	100
	Lilongwe rural	49	27	9	7	8	100
	Lilongwe city	92	8	0	0	0	100
	Mchinji	57	27	5	12	0	100
	Balaka	66	25	3	3	3	100
	Mangochi	59	21	16	0	4	100
	Machinga	40	31	27	0	1	100
	Zomba rural	43	33	17	7	1	100
	Zomba City	83	17	0	0	0	100
	Chiradzulu	41	51	4	3	1	100
	Blantyre rural	55	30	12	1	1	100
	Blantyre city	0	99	1	0	0	100
	Thyolo	60	32	7	1	1	100
	Mulanje	79	19	2	0	0	100
	Phalombe	65	12	21	0	2	100
	Mwanza	44	29	10	9	8	100
	Chikwawa	50	27	0	8	14	100
	Nsanje	43	20	20	6	11	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 40. Percentage distribution of households who sold Sheep by number of Sheep sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 +	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	57	37	2	1	3	100
	Male	54	38	2	2	4	100
Poverty quintiles	Female	63	34	2	0	1	100
	Poorest quintile	64	31	4	0	1	100
	Second quintile	72	19	0	2	6	100
	Third quintile	49	47	2	1	1	100
	Fourth quintile	49	41	0	0	10	100
Region	Highest quintile	48	42	6	3	1	100
	Northern	53	41	2	0	4	100
	Central	36	50	2	0	12	100
ADD	Southern	66	30	2	2	0	100
	Karonga	64	25	7	0	4	100
	Mzuzu	50	46	0	0	4	100
	Kasungu	27	69	2	0	2	100
	Salima	30	12	0	0	58	100
	Lilongwe	68	0	0	0	32	100
	Machinga	46	43	2	8	0	100
	Blantyre	65	32	3	0	0	100
	Shire Valley	100	0	0	0	0	100
District	Chitipa	48	44	0	0	8	100
	Karonga	85	0	15	0	0	100
	Rumphi	29	71	0	0	0	100
	Nkhata Bay	93	1	6	0	0	100
	Likoma	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mzimba	52	43	0	0	5	100
	Mzuzu city	0	100	0	0	0	100
	Kasungu	57	34	9	0	0	100
	Ntchisi	1	97	0	0	3	100
	Dowa	29	68	0	0	2	100
	Nkhotakota	71	29	0	0	0	100
	Salima	0	0	0	0	100	100
	Dedza	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Ntcheu	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Lilongwe rural	39	0	0	0	61	100
	Lilongwe city	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mchinji	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Balaka	62	27	4	7	0	100
	Mangochi	0	59	16	24	0	100
	Machinga	85	3	0	12	0	100
	Zomba rural	31	61	0	8	0	100
	Zomba City	21	79	0	0	0	100
	Chiradzulu	61	39	0	0	0	100
	Blantyre rural	0	91	0	0	9	100
	Blantyre city	3	95	0	2	0	100
	Thyolo	91	9	0	0	0	100
	Mulanje	74	14	12	0	0	100
	Phalombe	52	14	34	0	0	100
	Mwanza	95	5	0	0	0	100
	Chikwawa	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Nsanje	99	0	1	0	0	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 41. Percentage distribution of households who sold Pigs by number of Pigs sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 +	Total
	Malawi	54	27	7	4	9	100
Sex of head	Male	53	26	8	4	9	100
	Female	54	31	6	3	7	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	54	27	5	4	10	100
	Second quintile	67	20	4	2	7	100
	Third quintile	52	29	5	6	8	100
	Fourth quintile	48	29	12	4	8	100
	Highest quintile	45	28	9	4	14	100
Region	Northern	50	33	9	2	6	100
	Central	50	28	7	5	9	100
	Southern	57	23	6	4	10	100
ADD	Karonga	54	27	13	2	4	100
	Mzuzu	48	37	6	2	7	100
	Kasungu	49	38	7	1	6	100
	Salima	22	17	11	4	46	100
	Lilongwe	58	18	7	10	6	100
	Machinga	54	22	6	2	17	100
	Blantyre	58	24	6	4	8	100
	Shire Valley	63	15	0	11	10	100
District	Chitipa	46	39	8	3	4	100
	Karonga	57	21	16	1	4	100
	Rumphi	50	41	6	3	1	100
	Nkhata Bay	81	19	0	0	0	100
	Likoma	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Mzimba	43	38	7	2	10	100
	Mzuzu city	72	28	0	0	0	100
	Kasungu	50	42	3	2	3	100
	Ntchisi	55	35	3	1	5	100
	Dowa	39	45	13	0	3	100
	Nkhotakota	14	23	40	15	8	100
	Salima	25	14	0	0	61	100
	Dedza	63	8	5	14	10	100
	Ntcheu	73	24	0	3	0	100
	Lilongwe rural	37	26	13	14	9	100
	Lilongwe city	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Mchinji	56	16	8	0	19	100
	Balaka	50	26	2	7	15	100
	Mangochi	94	0	0	6	0	100
	Machinga	64	0	0	0	36	100
	Zomba rural	63	12	13	0	12	100
	Zomba City	15	84	0	0	0	100
	Chiradzulu	56	35	1	4	4	100
	Blantyre rural	56	11	19	1	13	100
	Blantyre city	99	1	0	0	0	100
	Thyolo	51	24	13	4	9	100
	Mulanje	28	41	0	7	23	100
	Phalombe	78	7	0	7	8	100
	Mwanza	54	26	16	0	4	100
	Chikwawa	81	2	0	12	5	100
	Nsanje	45	28	0	11	15	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 42. Percentage distribution of households who sold Chicken by number of Chicken sold, according to background variables. Malawi 2007

		1	2	3	4	5 +	Total
Sex of head	Malawi	26	21	17	10	25	100
	Male	26	21	17	10	25	100
Poverty quintiles	Female	28	21	16	9	26	100
	Poorest quintile	33	21	11	9	26	100
	Second quintile	26	21	18	11	24	100
	Third quintile	31	17	16	13	22	100
	Fourth quintile	20	28	19	8	26	100
Region	Highest quintile	21	19	21	9	31	100
	Northern	29	26	14	7	24	100
	Central	24	26	19	10	22	100
ADD	Southern	27	18	15	12	29	100
	Karonga	32	27	17	8	16	100
	Mzuzu	27	26	13	6	28	100
	Kasungu	27	26	17	9	21	100
	Salima	31	12	21	6	29	100
	Lilongwe	19	28	21	11	21	100
	Machinga	24	17	14	12	33	100
	Blantyre	30	19	14	12	25	100
District	Shire Valley	20	15	22	10	34	100
	Chitipa	27	30	18	7	18	100
	Karonga	39	22	17	9	14	100
	Rumphi	40	30	8	6	16	100
	Nkhata Bay	54	26	8	1	11	100
	Likoma	33	29	8	18	12	100
	Mzimba	21	25	15	7	32	100
	Mzuzu city	29	26	1	0	44	100
	Kasungu	30	29	14	7	20	100
	Ntchisi	37	28	14	7	14	100
	Dowa	24	25	28	6	17	100
	Nkhotakota	29	8	26	6	31	100
	Salima	36	21	10	6	26	100
	Dedza	25	25	13	13	23	100
	Ntcheu	19	23	16	9	33	100
	Lilongwe rural	16	33	28	10	14	100
	Lilongwe city	0	11	39	0	49	100
	Mchinji	20	20	10	18	33	100
	Balaka	25	8	14	17	36	100
	Mangochi	19	36	14	7	24	100
	Machinga	22	7	13	12	46	100
	Zomba rural	29	21	17	9	25	100
	Zomba City	7	18	6	18	51	100
	Chiradzulu	17	14	8	14	47	100
	Blantyre rural	38	22	8	10	22	100
	Blantyre city	3	0	36	28	32	100
	Thyolo	39	17	12	11	21	100
	Mulanje	34	38	14	3	11	100
	Phalombe	30	18	20	12	21	100
	Mwanza	41	15	10	10	24	100
	Chikwawa	21	7	25	12	36	100
	Nsanje	17	31	15	5	31	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

10 Markets

10.1 Introduction

Access to markets can decide both how easy produce can be sold, as well as the price that can be obtained for the produce sold. Formal marketing agents such as ADMARC can be expected to pay a fairer price for produce than for instance local vendors or the price obtained from a roadside stall. This chapter analyses markets that are used for selling livestock and poultry. It should, however be noted, that virtually all livestock and poultry sold by small holder farmers are sold through informal market systems, such as at the farm gate, local markets, mobile markets etc.

10.2 Markets for Cattle

Of the farmers who sold local cows in Malawi, the largest proportion sold their animals at the farm gate (41 percent), while about 30 percent sold their cows at local markets and about 21 percent sold their cows to mobile markets. (Table 43)

A similar trend was found for the sales of local bulls. (Table 44)

10.3 Markets for Goats

About 4 out of 10 households, who sold local goats, sold their animals at the farm gate, while about one in three households sold their goats at local market and about 17 percent used mobile livestock markets, (Table 45)

10.4 Markets for Sheep

Nationally, about 69 percent of the households sold their sheep at the farm gate, while 20 percent of the households used a local market,(Table 46)

Regionally, about 81 percent of the households in the Southern region sold their sheep at the farm gate, as compared to 66 percent and 63 percent in the Northern and Central regions.

10.5 Markets for Pigs

Almost half of the households (46 percent) who sold local pigs in Malawi sold them at the farm gate while about one third of the households used local markets, and slightly above one-tenth used the livestock mobile market, (Table 47).

10.6 Markets for Poultry

About four in ten households in Malawi sold their local hens at the farm gate while a similar proportion sold them at local markets. (Table 48)

Table 43. Proportion of households by latest selling place for local cows according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.

		Farm gate	Roadside	Local market	Nearest town	Livestock mobile market	Total
	Malawi	33	3	36	3	25	100
Sex of household head	Male	30	3	38	3	26	100
	Female	51	0	23	3	23	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	31	8	7	4	50	100
	Second quintile	21	1	53	0	24	100
	Third quintile	36	3	47	5	10	100
	Fourth quintile	43	4	30	6	17	100
	Highest quintile	51	0	29	2	17	100
Region	Northern	29	1	33	1	36	100
	Central	28	0	55	8	9	100
	Southern	54	11	9	0	26	100
ADD	Karonga	58	2	18	2	19	100
	Mzuzu	8	0	44	0	48	100
	Kasungu	31	0	50	11	8	100
	Salima	75	0	0	25	0	100
	Lilongwe	20	0	66	3	10	100
	Machinga	54	31	4	0	12	100
	Blantyre	22	0	8	0	70	100
	Shire Valley	61	6	11	0	22	100
	Chitipa	69	3	13	3	12	100
	Karonga	40	2	27	1	30	100
District	Rumphi	39	0	61	0	0	100
	Nkhata Bay	70	1	29	0	0	100
	Likoma	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mzimba	5	0	42	0	53	100
	Mzuzu city	0	0	100	0	0	100
	Kasungu	55	0	25	20	0	100
	Ntchisi	13	0	70	0	17	100
	Dowa	5	0	67	9	19	100
	Nkhotakota	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Salima	75	0	0	25	0	100
	Dedza	22	0	36	15	27	100
	Ntcheu	0	0	44	0	56	100
	Lilongwe rural	37	0	49	5	9	100
	Lilongwe city	16	0	84	0	0	100
	Mchinji	34	0	65	0	1	100
	Balaka	89	0	11	0	0	100
	Mangochi	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Machinga	31	29	0	0	40	100
	Zomba rural	39	61	0	0	0	100
	Zomba City	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Chiradzulu	0	0	9	0	91	100
	Blantyre rural	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Blantyre city	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Thyolo	0	0	0	100	0	100
	Mulanje	33	0	67	0	0	100
	Phalombe	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Mwanza	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Chikwawa	58	7	14	0	21	100
	Nsanje	74	0	0	0	26	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 44. Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local bulls according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.

		Farm gate	Roadside	Local market	Nearest town	Livestock mobile market	Total
	Malawi	29.8	0.5	24.7	17.1	27.9	100
Sex of household head	Male	32.1	0.3	13.0	18.8	35.8	100
	Female	23.5	1.0	55.4	12.8	7.2	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	42.5	0.0	27.4	0.0	30.1	100
	Second quintile	16.1	1.9	11.1	4.6	66.4	100
	Third quintile	52.9	0.1	16.0	18.0	13.0	100
	Fourth quintile	23.1	0.0	42.8	32.0	2.1	100
Region	Highest quintile	50.9	0.0	20.7	4.8	23.6	100
	Northern	18.9	0.7	25.7	21.4	33.3	100
	Central	50.0	6.2	25.7	12.7	5.4	100
ADD	Southern	52.7	0.0	15.1	1.0	31.2	100
	Karonga	30.4	2.1	22.0	28.0	17.5	100
District	Mzuzu	13.2	0.0	27.6	18.2	41.1	100
	Kasungu	57.3	0.2	20.6	17.3	4.5	100
	Salima	18.7	0.0	81.3	0.0	0.0	100
	Lilongwe	54.3	24.0	0.1	10.9	10.8	100
	Machinga	78.5	0.0	0.0	21.5	0.0	100
	Blantyre	68.2	0.0	13.7	0.0	18.1	100
	Shire Valley	46.0	0.0	16.5	0.0	37.4	100
	Chitipa	15.4	4.9	14.9	52.3	12.6	100
	Karonga	41.9	0.0	27.5	9.3	21.3	100
	Rumphi	73.0	0.0	26.9	0.0	0.1	100
	Nkhata Bay	37.4	0.0	62.6	0.0	0.0	100
	Likoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	Mzimba	5.3	0.0	26.9	20.8	47.1	100
	Mzuzu city	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	Kasungu	62.7	0.0	6.0	31.3	0.0	100
	Ntchisi	0.0	1.9	53.8	0.0	44.3	100
	Dowa	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100
	Nkhotakota	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100
	Salima	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
	Dedza	0.0	68.8	0.0	31.2	0.0	100
	Ntcheu	98.9	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6	100
	Lilongwe rural	23.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	76.4	100
	Lilongwe city	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
	Mchinji	99.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	100
	Balaka	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
	Mangochi	21.1	0.0	0.0	78.9	0.0	100
	Machinga	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
	Zomba rural	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Zomba City	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	
Chiradzulu	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	99.0	100	
Blantyre rural	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	
Blantyre city	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	
Thyolo	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	
Mulanje	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100	
Phalombe	57.4	0.0	42.6	0.0	0.0	100	
Mwanza	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	
Chikwawa	22.7	0.0	14.6	0.0	62.6	100	
Nsanje	62.1	0.0	17.8	0.0	20.1	100	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 45. Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local goats according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.

		Farm gate	Roadside	Local market	Nearest town	Livestock mobile market	Total
Sex of household head	Malawi	42	5	35	3	15	100
	Male	42	4	36	4	14	100
	Female	38	10	32	3	17	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	55	5	22	1	17	100
	Second quintile	35	2	45	4	14	100
	Third quintile	46	4	33	1	15	100
	Fourth quintile	41	7	32	7	13	100
	Highest quintile	37	3	45	5	9	100
Region	Northern	29	3	38	10	20	100
	Central	34	6	42	4	15	100
	Southern	55	4	25	2	13	100
ADD	Karonga	46	4	35	0	14	100
	Mzuzu	23	3	37	15	22	100
District	Kasungu	45	3	39	0	13	100
	Salima	56	7	28	2	8	100
	Lilongwe	21	8	48	7	17	100
	Machinga	45	8	25	4	18	100
	Blantyre	57	2	29	0	11	100
	Shire Valley	75	2	12	2	10	100
	Chitipa	29	5	45	1	20	100
	Karonga	88	0	11	0	1	100
	Rumphi	36	6	49	6	3	100
	Nkhata Bay	18	0	74	6	1	100
	Likoma	69	0	0	31	0	100
	Mzimba	25	1	37	11	26	100
	Mzuzu city	0	0	100	0	0	100
	Kasungu	76	3	17	0	3	100
	Ntchisi	40	9	48	0	3	100
	Dowa	14	1	59	1	25	100
	Nkhotakota	57	14	10	0	19	100
	Salima	56	6	30	2	6	100
	Dedza	18	10	48	4	19	100
	Ntcheu	5	20	45	4	27	100
	Lilongwe rural	30	3	42	10	14	100
	Lilongwe city	7	0	92	0	0	100
	Mchinji	50	2	34	0	14	100
	Balaka	24	3	19	5	50	100
	Mangochi	60	7	16	8	8	100
	Machinga	36	11	48	0	6	100
	Zomba rural	48	12	22	1	15	98
	Zomba City	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Chiradzulu	60	5	5	0	30	100
	Blantyre rural	85	0	15	0	0	100
Blantyre city	1	0	99	0	0	100	
Thyolo	53	7	33	0	7	100	
Mulanje	84	0	8	1	8	100	
Phalombe	57	3	28	0	13	100	
Mwanza	51	3	9	0	36	100	
Chikwawa	75	3	19	0	3	100	
Nsanje	74	1	3	4	18	100	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 46. **Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local Sheep according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.**

		Farm gate	Roadside	Local market	Nearest town	Livestock mobile market	Total
	Malawi	84	4	10	1	1	100
Sex of household head	Male	88	1	8	2	1	100
	Female	69	12	18	0	0	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	52	12	26	9	0	100
	Second quintile	88	7	5	0	0	100
	Third quintile	97	1	2	0	0	100
	Fourth quintile	88	0	9	0	3	100
	Highest quintile	52	7	36	0	5	100
Region	Northern	77	1	19	0	3	100
	Central	93	1	7	0	0	100
	Southern	68	12	13	5	2	100
ADD	Karonga	91	0	5	0	5	100
	Mzuzu	56	3	41	0	0	100
	Kasungu	84	0	16	0	0	100
	Salima	93	7	0	0	0	100
	Lilongwe	94	0	6	0	0	100
	Machinga	59	18	20	0	3	100
	Blantyre	77	0	0	23	0	100
	Shire Valley	98	0	2	0	0	100
District	Chitipa	75	0	13	0	12	100
	Karonga	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Rumphi	0	39	61	0	0	100
	Nkhata Bay	52	0	48	0	0	100
	Likoma	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mzimba	48	0	52	0	0	100
	Mzuzu city	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Kasungu	86	0	14	0	0	100
	Ntchisi	0	0	100	0	0	100
	Dowa	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Nkhotakota	84	16	0	0	0	100
	Salima	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Dedza	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Ntcheu	0	0	100	0	0	100
	Lilongwe rural	98	0	2	0	0	100
	Lilongwe city	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mchinji	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Balaka	55	12	32	0	0	100
	Mangochi	50	50	0	0	0	100
	Machinga	72	0	28	0	0	100
	Zomba rural	49	29	0	0	22	100
	Zomba City	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Chiradzulu	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Blantyre rural	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Blantyre city	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Thyolo	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mulanje	0	0	0	100	0	100
	Phalombe	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Mwanza	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Chikwawa	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Nsanje	11	0	89	0	0	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 47. Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local pigs according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.

		Farm gate	Roadside	Local market	Nearest town	Livestock mobile market	Total
	Malawi	50	4	31	1	13	100
Sex of household head	Male	49	4	32	1	12	100
	Female	51	4	27	2	16	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	51	0	32	0	17	100
	Second quintile	37	6	32	0	24	100
	Third quintile	61	1	32	1	6	100
	Fourth quintile	44	5	36	1	14	100
Region	Highest quintile	51	6	27	6	10	100
	Northern	50	3	35	3	9	100
	Central	44	5	35	1	15	100
ADD	Southern	65	3	16	2	14	100
	Karonga	45	3	37	2	13	100
District	Mzuzu	57	3	32	4	4	100
	Kasungu	39	2	39	0	20	100
	Salima	65	0	28	0	8	100
	Lilongwe	45	9	32	2	12	100
	Machinga	57	3	28	0	12	100
	Blantyre	63	3	16	2	15	100
	Shire Valley	86	0	2	0	12	100
	Chitipa	23	5	46	0	25	100
	Karonga	51	3	35	2	9	100
	Rumphi	28	4	49	8	10	100
	Nkhata Bay	43	0	37	19	0	100
	Likoma	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mzimba	69	3	26	0	3	100
	Mzuzu city	99	0	0	1	0	100
	Kasungu	66	0	31	0	2	100
	Ntchisi	26	3	40	0	30	100
	Dowa	5	4	70	0	22	100
	Nkhotakota	43	0	41	0	15	100
	Salima	86	0	14	0	0	100
	Dedza	31	7	35	5	20	100
	Ntcheu	24	28	33	0	14	100
	Lilongwe rural	63	6	20	1	10	100
	Lilongwe city	0	0	100	0	0	100
	Mchinji	58	0	4	0	38	100
	Balaka	27	9	46	0	18	100
	Mangochi	100	0	0	0	0	100
	Machinga	84	0	16	0	0	100
	Zomba rural	60	0	24	0	17	100
Zomba City	100	0	0	0	0	100	
Chiradzulu	72	0	10	0	18	100	
Blantyre rural	99	0	0	1	0	100	
Blantyre city	0	0	100	0	0	100	
Thyolo	66	0	19	0	15	100	
Mulanje	5	0	6	89	1	100	
Phalombe	47	13	20	0	20	100	
Mwanza	62	0	8	7	23	100	
Chikwawa	86	0	3	0	11	100	
Nsanje	85	0	0	0	15	100	

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

Table 48. Percentage distribution of households by latest selling place for local hens according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007.

		Farm gate	Roadside	Local market	Nearest town	Livestock mobile market	Total
	Malawi	46	9	36	3	7	100
Sex of household head	Male	43	9	38	3	7	100
	Female	55	8	28	2	7	100
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	39	9	39	3	10	100
	Second quintile	44	12	37	1	6	100
	Third quintile	46	7	38	2	6	100
	Fourth quintile	56	9	28	3	4	100
	Highest quintile	50	3	34	3	10	100
Region	Northern	31	8	54	2	5	100
	Central	54	8	29	3	5	100
	Southern	42	9	32	2	15	100
ADD	Karonga	18	8	66	5	4	100
	Mzuzu	39	8	46	1	6	100
	Kasungu	50	10	35	3	3	100
	Salima	53	13	26	3	6	100
	Lilongwe	58	5	26	4	7	100
	Machinga	30	11	39	2	18	100
	Blantyre	49	8	27	2	14	100
	Shire Valley	40	12	37	1	10	99
	Chitipa	7	3	79	6	5	100
District	Karonga	31	14	49	4	2	100
	Rumphi	32	4	42	2	20	100
	Nkhata Bay	54	3	42	0	1	100
	Likoma	46	0	53	1	0	100
	Mzimba	37	8	50	0	5	100
	Mzuzu city	78	21	0	0	0	98
	Kasungu	71	1	27	1	0	100
	Ntchisi	32	6	38	21	3	100
	Dowa	11	26	56	1	6	100
	Nkhotakota	38	6	48	0	8	100
	Salima	66	18	6	5	5	100
	Dedza	15	3	71	4	7	100
	Ntcheu	10	13	42	12	23	100
	Lilongwe rural	72	5	16	3	5	100
	Lilongwe city	95	5	0	0	0	100
	Mchinji	67	9	18	1	4	100
	Balaka	13	8	17	0	62	100
	Mangochi	62	13	20	0	4	100
	Machinga	14	13	63	9	1	100
	Zomba rural	25	11	55	0	9	100
	Zomba City	72	0	14	0	14	100
	Chiradzulu	31	3	56	0	10	100
	Blantyre rural	62	3	28	0	7	100
	Blantyre city	98	0	0	0	2	100
	Thyolo	63	2	29	5	0	100
	Mulanje	8	18	26	2	46	100
	Phalombe	37	19	38	0	6	100
	Mwanza	61	8	9	0	22	100
	Chikwawa	34	15	45	1	4	98
	Nsanje	48	8	27	1	17	100

Source: NACAL 2007, National Statistical Office

11 Animal protection

11.1 Introduction

Animal protection is an integral part of animal husbandry. This chapter looks at ways households used in order to protect their animals against theft, pests and diseases, or being prey to wild animals.

11.2 Livestock protection.

There are several methods or ways to protect domestic animals, hence households were asked for the methods that they uses to safeguard their livestock during past 12 months preceding the survey. Slightly more than half of the livestock owning households in Malawi kept their domestic animals in a kraal for protection or kept the animals in their house. Only a small fraction, about four percent, used magic to protect their animals. About one out of ten livestock owning households did not use any protection method at all. (Table 49)

A larger proportion of the male headed households had their animals in a kraal as compared to female headed households, 53 percent as compared to 45 percent, On the other hand, female headed households were a bit more likely to keep their animals in the house as compared to male headed households, 57 percent as compared to 54 percent.

Table 49. Proportion of households who used various protection methods for their animals, according to background characteristics. Malawi 2007

		Putting animals in kraal	Kept animals in the house	Used herd boys	Used magic	No protection method used	Other
	Malawi	51	55	8	4	10	5
Sex of head	Male	53	54	8	4	10	5
	Female	45	57	7	4	12	6
Poverty quintiles	Poorest quintile	46	52	6	5	13	6
	Second quintile	51	56	6	5	12	6
	Third quintile	53	52	10	4	11	6
	Fourth quintile	49	60	7	3	8	3
Region	Highest quintile	56	54	9	4	7	4
	Northern	65	41	11	2	14	6
	Central	51	55	8	2	9	2
ADD	Southern	45	59	6	7	11	8
	Karonga	55	47	10	3	24	9
District	Mzuzu	69	38	12	2	10	5
	Kasungu	62	44	11	2	9	3
	Salima	57	28	5	1	23	3
	Lilongwe	43	67	7	2	7	1
	Machinga	46	53	5	6	11	5
	Blantyre	43	65	5	8	10	10
	Shire Valley	52	55	11	7	10	11
	Chitipa	53	57	16	1	17	4
	Karonga	57	40	5	4	29	12
	Rumphi	61	25	14	1	22	1
	Nkhata Bay	54	16	4	2	21	22
	Likoma	20	13	0	3	43	37
	Mzimba	76	47	14	2	3	2
	Mzuzu city	28	43	3	3	38	1
	Kasungu	64	42	15	5	10	3
	Ntchisi	75	37	10	4	10	2
	Dowa	65	44	11	1	7	5
	Nkhotakota	75	31	5	3	6	0
	Salima	41	25	4	0	38	6
	Dedza	50	63	11	2	6	1
	Ntcheu	60	38	11	3	18	0
	Lilongwe rural	43	74	5	1	5	1
	Lilongwe city	20	81	3	1	1	0
	Mchinji	50	49	9	0	11	1
	Balaka	50	44	3	2	20	4
	Mangochi	57	44	9	5	8	0
	Machinga	51	39	8	13	12	12
Zomba rural	31	75	2	3	11	3	
Zomba City	27	82	3	0	0	1	
Chiradzulu	37	73	4	9	7	7	
Blantyre rural	32	63	2	2	10	3	
Blantyre city	27	81	0	0	3	30	
Thyolo	43	63	5	9	18	9	
Mulanje	38	79	7	10	3	8	
Phalombe	62	45	6	13	15	10	
Mwanza	68	39	12	8	8	9	
Chikwawa	57	48	13	9	13	14	
Nsanje	41	68	9	4	4	6	

Source: NACAL NSO 2007

12 Appendix 1: Questionnaire



+

+

**NATIONAL STATISTICAL OFFICE
ZOMBA**

**CONFIDENTIAL
NATIONAL CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE AND LIVESTOCK**

Module 7: LIVESTOCK INFORMATION

Important information for the interviewer:

Create a reference number by combining the cluster, household and module numbers. Write this number NOW on the top of all pages.

CLUSTER NUMBER	HOUSEHOLD NUMBER	MODULE NUMBER	REFERENCE NUMBER
		7	7

A. Interview Information

A1. Interviewer's number/ name	+	
A2. Head of household		
A3. District code/name		
A4. TA /Town/ Area		

A5. Date

Day	Month	Year

A6. Respondent

Member number

+

+

+

									7
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

+

Livestock and poultry

D1 Does this household own or keep livestock or poultry?

- D11 ← Yes 1
- No 2

D2 What is the number of livestock owned or kept and type of livestock keeping system do your household have?

	Code	Number owned	Number kept	System code
Cattle_local_cow	1	+		
Cattle_local_bull	2			
Cattle_improved_cow	3			
Cattle_improved_bull	4			
Goats_Local	5			
Goats_Improved	6			
Sheep_local	7	+		
Sheep_Improved	8			
Pigs_Local	9			
Pigs_Improved	10			
Donkeys	11			
Rabbits	12			
Guinea pigs	12			
Other	14			
None				

12.1.1 Code list for system

1= Free range, 2= Tethering, 3= Controlled, 4= Pigsty, 5= Herding, 6=None.

+

+

D5 What is the number of own poultry and total amount of money received from sales and where was it sold? IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, MULTIPLE RESPONSE.

Type	Code	Number	Amount (Mk)	Latest selling
Chicken_local_hens	1	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Chicken_local_chicks	2	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Chicken_local cocks	3	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Chicken_exotic_layer	4	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Chicken_exotic_broiler	5	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Chicken_black_austrolope	6	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Ducks	7	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Guinea Fowls	8	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Pigeons/Doves	9	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Turkeys	10	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Bee keeping (number of bee hives)	11	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
Other	12	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
None		<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Codes for latest selling place:

1=Farm-gate, 2=Roadside, 3= Local Market, 4= Nearest Town 5= ADMARC 6= Mobile market
7= None

D6 What kind of derived products were produced or sold? What was the value of the sales and where was the last sale? IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS, MULTIPLE RESPONSE.

Kind of Product	Unit of quantity	Code	Produced quantity	Sold quantity	Amount (MK)	Latest selling place
Milk	Litres	1	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>			
Eggs	No	2	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>			
Honey	Litres	3	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>			
Manure	Kg	4	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>			
Skins/hides	No	5	<input style="width: 100%; height: 20px;" type="text"/>			

+

+

+

+

D10 Did you provide the following for your livestock or poultry in the last 12 months? MULTIPLE RESPONSE

Livestock

Poultry

	Frequency	Service provider	Frequency	Service provider
Disease treatment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Dipping	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vaccination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deworming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Artificial insemination	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Frequency codes 1= Regularly 2= Once 3= When available 4= Not at all
 Service providers 1= Govt 2= Private 3= Village drug boxes 4= Other

Winter Cropping

D11 Has your household done any winter cropping this season?

+

- D15** ← Yes 1
 ← No 2

D12 What type of winter cropping did you practice? MULTIPLE RESPONSE

- Irrigation sprinkler 1
- Irrigation drip 1
- Irrigation treadle pump 1
- Irrigation gravity fed 1
- Irrigation motorised pump 1
- Residual moisture 1
- Watering can 1

D13 What crops did you grow?

Type of Crop

- Maize 1
- Rice 1
- D15** ← Other 1

+

+

D14 What crops did you grow, what were the area planted and the production?

Type of crop	Area planted (ha)	Production (kg)
Maize		
Rice		

Fertilizer subsidy program

D15 Did your household receive any vouchers from the fertiliser subsidy program in the 2006/07 agricultural season?

- D19** ← Yes 1
- No 2

D16 How many vouchers for fertiliser subsidy for maize or tobacco did your household receive in the 2006/07 agricultural season?

Number of maize vouchers

Number of tobacco vouchers

+

D17 What did your household do with the coupons?

- | | maize coupons | tobacco coupons |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| D19 ← Bought fertilizer | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Sold the vouchers | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Lost the vouchers | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Gave to family friends | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 <input type="checkbox"/> |

D18 Why did your household not buy the fertiliser with the coupons?

- Had no money 1
- There was no subsidised fertiliser available in this area 2
- Other 3

+

+

+

+

Social capital in farming

D19 People often lend money to each other. Did you or any member of the household lend out money to anybody in these groups during the last 12 months?

	Yes	No	Do not know
Your own family members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Your relatives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in your own village	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People outside your village	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People from same church/mosque	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D20 People often lend tools like axes, hoes and other tools to each other. Did you or any member of the household lend out tools to anybody in these groups during the last 12 months?

	Yes	No	Do not know
Your relatives outside the household	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People in your own village	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People outside your village	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
People from same church/mosque	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D21 Have you or any member of the household participated in cooperative (exchange) work for farming activities (e.g. Chikimva, Chilimira, Chinzake, Dima) during the last 12 months?

- | | | | | |
|------------|------|---|--------------------------|---|
| | Yes | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | + |
| D23 | ← No | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

D22 Who participated in the work exchange: MULTIPLE RESPONSE

Relatives and/or close friends	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
People living in the village	1	<input type="checkbox"/>
People living outside the village	1	<input type="checkbox"/>

D23 Is this a tenant household?

- | | | |
|-----|---|--------------------------|
| Yes | 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| No | 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> |

+

+

+

+

Interview Completion Information

D24. Result

- Completed with selected household 1
- Incomplete 2
- Refusal 3 +
- Not found 4
- Too ill 5

D25. Comments

+

+