

## Background to the survey

Six rounds of HBS have been conducted to date as follows: 1972/1973, 1986/1987, 1994/1995, 2002/2003, 2010/2011, and 2017/2018. For comparability purposes, this report uses the 2002/2003 HBS and 2017/2018 CMS/HBS to measure poverty and inequality levels in Lesotho. The 2002/2003 HBS collected information from 5,992 households consisting a total of 26,678 individuals. The 2017/2018 CMS/HBS was administered between January 2017 and February 2018 and covered 4,295 households translating to 17,293 individuals.

**Table 1: Comparison of the 2002/2003 HBS and 2017/2018 CMS/HBS**

	2002/2003	2017/2018
<b>I - SURVEY DESIGN</b>		
Nationally representative sample?	Yes	Yes
Primary Sampling Units	249 EAs	360 EAs
Actual sample size (households)	5995	4300
Sampling ratio (%) (households)	0.015	0.01
Average household size	4.8	3.9
Reference period (survey)	12 months	12 months
<b>II - QUESTIONNAIRE</b>		
Food expenditures (no. of items)		
- Diary vs. recall	Diary and recall	Diary and recall
- Reference period (food consumption)	1 month	7 days
- Food quantities available	no	Yes
Reference period (non-food expenditure)	Last month and last 12 months	Last 7, 30 days and 12 months
Method of data collection	Paper-based	Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI)
<b>III - CONSUMPTION AGGREGATE</b>		
Food expenditures		
- Is self-production accounted for?	Yes	Yes
- Are meals outside the household accounted for?	Yes	Yes
Are consumer durables accounted for?	No	No
Housing		
- Actual rent included?	No	No
- Imputed rent included?	No	No
Health expenditures included?	Yes	Yes
<b>IV - OTHER ADJUSTMENTS</b>		
Outlier detection and treatment	Yes	Yes
Temporal PI	Yes	Yes
Spatial PI	Yes	Yes
Price deflators for price adjustment	CPI	Survey based
Adjustment for household size and composition	Yes	Yes

Direct comparisons between the 2002/2003 HBS and 2017/2018 CMS/HBS is challenging largely because of the changes in the sample design and survey instruments used. First, the 2017/2018 CMS/HBS has more PSUs and less households selected in each PSU, which likely reduced the design effect of the sample and standard errors of

estimation with a smaller sample size. Second, the 2017/2018 CMS/HBS captured consumption data more comprehensively than the 2002/2003 HBS because it included several improvements in the survey instruments. The 2017/2018 survey included fewer diary days (i.e., 7 days vs. 30 days), which likely reduced the “survey fatigue” effect (i.e., respondents are less likely to complete a survey that includes many questions and span over a long period of time). In addition, the 2017/2018 CMS/HBS included other improvements that improved data quality such as a more detailed close-ended module for non-food expenditures and a food consumption module, a detailed module to capture individual consumption and expenditures away from home. The improvements in the 2017/2018 CMS/HBS allow for the construction of an improved definition of welfare. While the 2002/2003 HBS used a monthly food expenditure diary to define household welfare, the 2017/2018 CMS/HBS consumption aggregate was based on actual food consumption derived from a 7-day food consumption recall module.

Table 3 assesses the comparability of the two surveys by considering differences or similarities regarding (i) the survey design, (ii) the questionnaire, (iii) the construction of the nominal consumption aggregate, and (iv) other adjustments including use of temporal and spatial deflators, as well as per capita versus per adult equivalent adjustments to the consumption aggregate.