Challenges in Measuring Poverty in Tanzania

By

Gabriel K. Simbila

For additional information please contact

Name: Gabriel K.Simbila

Affiliation: National Bureau of Statistics. (Tanzania)

Email address: sku.lomba@hotmail.com or skulomba@nbs.go.tz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

Current poverty measures are based on consumption and access to basic services, with Household Budget Surveys as sources of Data. However, there are bottlenecks in measuring poverty and this paper attempts to explain challenges in measuring poverty in Tanzania. In Tanzania Decentralization by Devolution has been adopted aimed at supporting a greater degree of popular participation to enhance service delivery for poverty reduction.

Poverty assessment for targeting usually relies on large scale consumption survey data (HBS). At Local Government Authority level HBS results can only be used as proxy due to small sample, the results are only applicable at national level where it is limited to rural/urban and gender desegregation. Therefore, poverty alleviation efforts at the Local Government Authority level remain fragile and weak due to lack of clear information that can lead to formulation of strategies/efforts to initiate poverty alleviation programs. One of the crucial objectives of poverty statistics is to help the authorities make the right evidence-based decisions at the right moment. It is therefore desirable to have the most refined possible information regarding the poverty progress concurrently with government planning.

This paper proposes alternative way where subjective well-being is the base. The basic idea is to institutionalize monitoring so as to provide planners, policy makers and decision makers at the LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY level with feedback which is not possible with the existing range of results obtained from household surveys available (e.g HBS, ILFS, DHS, Agriculture. Surveys).

INTRODUCTION

Measuring Poverty is important in order to find out how effective our efforts are contributing towards to poverty reduction initiatives. In 2000 the Tanzania Government put in place Decentralization by Devolution, an administrative and political structure that aimed to support a greater degree of popular participation in development activities. D by D was adopted to enhance service delivery and eventually poverty reduction. Power has been devolved to District Local Authorities to enhance service delivery for poverty reduction and since then the government has channeled resources to these Local Government Authorities (LGAs) for development. The Local Government bodies are now the fulcrum of political and administrative authority in Tanzania. D by D mandates LGAs to provide services at sub-national levels.

Poverty reduction strategies were developed with the intention to reduce poverty in Tanzania; starting historically with National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty I (NSRGRP) now we have second generation National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (MKUKUTA II). Policy makers at LGA level need data disaggregated by rural/urban, gender, age group, occupation and sources of income. With this knowledge, inferences about the relevant community can be made. This type of information setting is currently lacking. Current data sources like HBS, Integrated Labour Force Survey, (ILFS) and even the recent National Panel Survey do not have robust samples to give data at LGA levels. At the same time, Routine Data System is very weak and unreliable. Planners, policy makers and decision makers, as a result, have not been practicing evidence based planning, policy and decision making due to lack of data. No wonder there is little dent on reduction of poverty.

Current methods in measuring poverty include the use of consumption expenditure methods which produce poverty lines and incidences of poverty. Household Budget Survey (HBS) results enable us to compute household consumption. Using such results the poor and the non-poor can be determined. However there are some drawbacks, Household Budget Survey is being carried out periodically, normally after every five years, while our planning is on an annual basis. One of the crucial objectives of poverty statistics is to help the authorities make the right evidence-based decisions at the right moment. It is therefore desirable to have the most refined possible information regarding the poverty progress concurrently with government planning. In this

context the household budget results after five years arrive far too late. Moreover, Household Budget Survey relies on samples which limit the results at national and sometimes regional levels. There is a need to look for an alternative method of compiling poverty information annually rather than periodic despite the present situation regarding the resources available.

Another method is the use of Possession Index whereby assets possessed by the households determine poor and non-poor, this methodology doesn't take into account the distribution of assets in the household itself. The consumption patterns of entire members of households may differ due to individual consumption needs which might benefit one person more than the other e.g. using a car every day for own consumption or habit of drinking in the bar this kind of expenditure is not uniformly distributed in the household.

Still another method that can be adopted to determine the poor and non poor include basic needs method where access to basic needs determine the welfare of the household. These basic needs include education services, water, health, sanitation and participation in community to enhance good governance. It is assumed that a household having access to these services has enhanced welfare than that which does not have access at all. In this era of Public, Private Partnership (PPP), that method might not be a good measure despite the fact that it is common. The data to determine the access method comes from the Household Budget Survey as already described which uses small samples that are not suitable for computing district level estimates.

Currently a poverty measure is an index synthesizing available information about the poor. Such a measure summarizes the extent of poverty generated. Such a one dimensional index of individual welfare is based on income or total expenditure per capita or per adult equivalent. To reach such a step is not a simple matter because conceptual and methodological issues must be addressed in order to synthesize the set of information describing the poor population. The difficult arises because poverty is not an objective concept but a subjective one, requiring a normative analysis in order to lead to a choice of ethical criteria. Poverty is also a multidimensional problem involving a number of monetary and non monetary handicaps. For more than single dimension of community welfare, poverty comparisons are based on a

combination of indicators that have to be aggregated at the individual level first and then across individuals next.

The communities are increasingly sensitive to using non-monetary aspects of poverty such as education, health and other access to services in addition to its monetary side. Data on attributes other than income are now available. Therefore, the multidimensional approach is more than ever needed to better understand the performance of NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GROWTH AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY in the battle against poverty in all its aspects. Lack of income provides part of the picture in terms of the many factors that impact on individuals' level of welfare (UNDP, 1997). Individual welfare level includes longevity, good health, good nutrition, education as well as being integrated into society.

The advent of D by D since 2000 has necessitated the need for a new poverty measure, one that accounts for the multidimensional aspect of poverty altogether. This should be a measure to account for those who do not reach the required minimum for any one attribute. Subjective measures of poverty are better than measures based on official estimates of the poverty line (Pradhan and Ravallion, 2000). The current measures are based on income and expenditure data that are at national level and not user friendly at the LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY level. This study intends to propose a way of institutionalizing LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY data collection efforts when dealing with the multidimensional aspect of poverty at community level. The assumption is that a household in a LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY will be considered poor if its welfare falls in the absolute poor or basic needs poor category.

Proposed Alternative Way

The basic idea is to provide planners, policy and decision makers at the LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY level with feedbacks which are not possible with the existing range of results obtained from household surveys available (e.g HBS, ILFS, DHS, Agriculture. Surveys). Household surveys usually provide some income and consumption expenditure only and at national and sometimes at regional levels while the information needs for LGA planning, policy and decision making at the LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY level consists of

more than income, consumption and basic needs. The policy makers at the LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITY level need a wider range of poverty as well as situational information. The current practice in monitoring and evaluation of wellbeing has fallen short of being inclusive of situational information.

During NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GROWTH AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY, Poverty Policy Week (PPW) 2008, it was suggested by Non-State Actors (NSAs) that there was a need to have an alternative method of measuring poverty reduction progress achieved. Such alternative method, they suggested, should come up with clear picture of levels of poverty and available opportunities in villages and streets that would enable to lift them from poverty. The method should take into account economic and social effects on production and reproduction strategies.
We have decentralization policy, which entails devolution of administrative and planning functions from the center to lower administrative units (district or villages). These create a great demand for highly disaggregated data (i.e. district and lower levels).

Decentralization by Devolution system has shifted responsibilities to the local government authority level. Currently there are 133 local government authorities in the form of City Councils, Municipal and Town Councils.

These institutions are varied in capacities, resources problems and endowments. Household Budget Survey sample size is not robust enough to ensure the sample frame covers the poor as well as homeless, rural people, remote areas and minorities, so that an accurate conclusion about the subgroups can be drawn.

Use of Annual surveys like National Panel Survey and CWIQ have recently been employed to get annual findings, still, the data is not readily available at the sub national levels for evidence based planning and decision making.

The Census and Household Budget Survey results are used to interpolate poverty situations at sub national levels. However, the results are usually of long intervals and the method is highly

mathematical and cannot be carried out by every one in need. This method is used mostly by academicians.

JUSTIFICATION FOR A NEW METHOD

The Local Government Authority role in a district is to enable people to have a fair access now and in the future to the social, economic and environmental resources needed to achieve their wellbeing. An understanding of the combined effects of policies on the way how people experience their lives is important to planning and prioritizing.

There is lack of information in Local Government Authorities on how programs contribute towards improving the conditions of communities in their jurisdiction. The community feedback on programs already implemented can assist the Local Government Authority planners and decision makers in both planning and decision making. But how can there be a feedback if the information collected is neither done so at Local Government Authority level nor by Local government authorities themselves? How can Local government authorities target the poor within their Local Government Authorities if they are not sure who is poor, why they are poor and where they are? The Local Government Authorities seldom collect information on how the programs have affected them. Therefore, poverty alleviation efforts at the Local government authority level remain fragile, weak due to lack of clear information on poverty alleviation programs. There is a need to develop a tool to help local governments to respond to their role in reducing poverty and enhancing livelihoods.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Decentralization is an 'omnibus' word widely used by practicing politicians, administrators and academics with many different meanings. Much ambiguity, therefore, surrounds the concept (Turner and Hulme, 1997:152; Wittenhall, 1996:24) and it is not easily defined (Conyers, 1983b; Mawhood, 1983; Rondinelli et al., 1984; Litvac et al., 1998). However Rondinelli, Nellis and Cheema (1984:9) provide one widely accepted definition of decentralization as the transfer of the responsibility for planning, decision-making, or administrative authority from central government to its field organizations. Koehn (1995:72) maintains that, fundamentally genuine decentralization involves the process of transferring power. Decentralization takes many forms,

several dimensions and several variants. Rondinelli et al., (1984:10) have distinguished four major forms of decentralization. These are deconcentration, delegation to semi-autonomous or parastatal agencies, transfer of functions from public to non-governmental institutions and devolution. In Tanzania, political authority has been devolved to the LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUTHORITYs with management, decision-making responsibilities, formulation of policies and the enactment of by-laws for the area. The conceptualization and measurement of poverty are complex issues. It defies precise definition and in general remains the notion of 'lack of or 'deficiency' (Rahnema, 1996). Traditionally, poverty has been defined in terms of consumption or income, undertaken through survey-based measurement (White, 1998:1). A commonly used income definition is subsisting on US$ 1 per day or less. However, it must be noted that the priorities and perceptions of the poor are rarely examined or 'amplified'. Effectiveness in poverty alleviation will be greater if the assessment addresses issues the poor identify as constituting poverty. If the poor are viewed as statistics, figures and ciphers, then the policy that is formulated to alleviate poverty will, in all likelihood, follow suit and be more relevant to manipulation of statistics than to needs of people' (Beck, 1994:6). This was the case during the Poverty Policy Week 2008 in Tanzania where the Household Budget Survey (HBS) results jolted both the NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GROWTH AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY (MKUKUTA) stakeholders and Development Partners because the rates based on the monetary results did not indicate a reasonable decline in poverty.

The sustained interest in decentralization (not withstanding its varied problems), since independence in Africa, is an indication that, in principle, it holds promise to involve local people in the development process. For example, problems of neglected areas or of diverse ethnic groups can be better addressed. Decentralization may empower minorities and vulnerable groups to get involved in the development process at the local level (De Wit, 1997:3). Rondinelli (1981:136), for example, argues that by creating alternative means of decision-making, decentralization can offset the influence or control over development activities by entrenched local elites who are often unsympathetic to national policies and insensitive to the needs of the poor groups in communities, as the case is currently with "fisadis" in our country.

It is proposed that by creating alternative means of measuring wellbeing at community level, LGAs can offset the influence or control over development activities by entrenched central government officials in Ministries Departments and Agencies (MDAs) who are often towing the directives from above to be observed at the sub national levels. The alternative measurement means other than that which relies on income and consumption, will enable the LGAs to know what is required at the communities/villages/households.

The LGAs are physically closer to the people and their development problems than central government so that the LGA members should, theoretically, routinely identify their problems and attempt to solve them. Decentralization was initiated to promote popular grassroots participation. Participation in the administration of the various areas concerned from the stand points of planning, implementation, monitoring and delivery of those services which go to improve the living conditions of the people. This path is expected to lead towards orderly, fair balanced and sustainable development of the whole country. Communities have accepted the fact that they are responsible for the development of their areas. According to Mwl. J.K.Nyerere, no one can develop other people but people can develop themselves. Real development must focus on people and not on mere wealth creation. The government has noted that deliberate and concerted efforts will be made to eradicate the economic, social, cultural and political factors that contribute to mass poverty in the country, within the framework of sustainable development. In order to effectively undertake poverty alleviation activities, LGAs are required to co-ordinate district level sector programmes and projects as well as direct them towards poverty alleviation, with support of donors, Non-governmental Organizations, Community-Based Organizations and private sector enterprises.

There is no doubt, therefore, that the current local government authority system is a comprehensive administrative system in which functions, powers, responsibilities and resources are transferred to the LGAs. Furthermore, decentralization provides an elaborate framework for the enhancement of popular participation at the local level and also provides machinery for economic and social development. However, for many decades poverty has been defined and categorized by those who have never been affected by it. According to Chambers and Conway,

"They apply top-down schemes to elicit data that fit into preset boxes""
(Chambers and Conway, 1992:4).

These concepts and measurements fail to capture the complex and diverse realities of household life, and account for the many failures of intervention programmes. Poverty is an extremely complex issue, multi-dimensional and multi-layered in nature. It is therefore important to consult those affected by poverty so they can unwrap the complex issues involved. Households and communities are best placed to determine their own priorities and implement programmes, seeking to improve their well-being and security in a sustainable way (Korboe, 1998).

Poverty alleviation has to be linked to the overall planning at the LGA level. The current practice is for the central government to intervene in that sub national level in order to fulfill basic needs while the development of an environment enabling people to overcome their own poverty is neglected. For the LGAs to have a role in poverty alleviation and enhance local wellbeing, there is a need to put in place a transparent monitoring and evaluation system using locally specific indicators to monitor changes.

THE NEW MEASURE BASED ON SUBJECTIVE WELLBEING

The current measurements of poverty are in terms of income, consumption or access to services. Using income or consumption, one can get what National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSRGRP) calls income poverty. However, poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon, characterized by income as well as a number of non-income dimensions. The non-income dimensions of poverty include health, wealth, knowledge, natural spheres, economic sphere, social sphere, political sphere, which are jointly influenced by infrastructure and services. Local government authorities need to know all dimensions of poverty in order to reduce vulnerability and increase the welfare of its people by mainstreaming poverty alleviation programs in LGA plans. It is clear that using income or consumption as the sole indicator of welfare and poverty cannot enable LGAs to capture the real poverty affecting them. The missing information is very useful in informing policy on how to achieve maximum human achievement with the meager budget available at the LGA level. It is therefore still imperative to adopt measurements capturing the multidimensionality of poverty. To capture all facets of poverty and wellbeing, a

multidimensional concept of inclusiveness is necessary. Subjective wellbeing is influenced by health, wealth and knowledge. These in turn are influenced by natural sphere, economic sphere, social sphere and political sphere. These spheres are jointly influenced by infrastructure and services. Subjective wellbeing is highly individualistic and emotional. Personal feelings of happiness, safety, inclusion and contentedness contribute to the overall subjective wellbeing. In the communities poverty is an individual's inability to obtain gainful employment in order to secure enough income to care for the family, poverty is having very small or no land, poverty is laziness, poverty is ill-health, poverty is disability, poverty is inability to clothe oneself or inability to contributing to community needs and being ignored and not listened to.

The concepts of wealth and well-being are described in terms of individual employment status (economic activity), income, and health, possession of physical assets, such as land, sheep, cattle, bicycle and cars. Wealth and wellbeing also include ability to save, ability to help community development and ability to help other people. Wealth and wellbeing also encompass ability to provide adequately for the family in terms of provision of food, shelter, clothing, and access to social services -water, education, health and sanitation.

In all communities, there are three categories of wellbeing, where people are either very poor, basic needs poor or non poor. Very poor are those who are unable to work and earn income and therefore cannot afford food. There are those who cannot afford basic necessities and services and have to depend on others for their livelihood, those in hardship unemployed or underemployed in low paid casual labour and those without productive assets, unable to manage and afford basic necessities, such as shelter, clothing and at least two meals a day, are basic needs poor.

It must be noted that poverty and well-being, as perceived by people is multidimensional and does not correspond with the narrow measure. So the analysis of poverty issues has been narrowed by the elites to what can be measured. Only one dimension of poverty is assessed when there are so many. Chambers (1997:46) maintains that the simple definition of the bad condition -poverty -is made, then, not by the poor, from their experience, but by the 'well-off, (elite) for

their convenience. Planners' and academics' need for a single scale of numbers narrows, distorts and simplifies their perception.

The elites justify their claim for appraising the needs of the poor on the grounds that it provides the planners with a 'scientific' basis for their anti-poverty planning. This largely ignores the location, condition, perceptions and priorities of the poor themselves and is enough to indicate the bureaucratic and highly ineffective nature of the exercise. Rahnema (1996) has noted that "after separating the poor person's 'needs' from him as an active and living human being, it reduces him to only an inadequate ingredient of economic growth".

METHODOLOGY

The basic idea is to provide policy makers at the LGA level with feedback and at a more disaggregated level possible, which is not possible with the existing range of results obtained from available household surveys (e.g Household Budget Survey, Integrated Labour Force Survey, Demographic Health Survey, Agriculture, Surveys). Household surveys usually provide some income and consumption expenditure only and at national and sometimes at regional levels while the information needs for policy and decision making at the local government level should consists of more than income, consumption and basic needs. The policy makers at the local government level need a wider range of poverty as well as situational information. The District wellbeing model should include many spheres, such as; Wealth, Health and Knowledge. These are the factors that affect the subjective wellbeing immediately. The next level consists of enabling sector environment, with four factors abbreviated to NESP, meaning Natural sphere, Economic sphere, Social sphere and Political Sphere. At a more general level, there are two overall cross cutting desired environments which are Infrastructure and Services affecting the wellbeing of the households in their settings.

Therefore for effective review at the District level, all the three levels with all the NINE particular sector specifics should be included. The subjective wellbeing is the ultimate goal while Core wellbeing (Material wealth, Knowledge and Health), Enabling environment context (NESP) and the intersectional environments including Infrastructure and Services are the other tenets that go together to enhance the fulfillment of subjective wellbeing.

By definition, subjective wellbeing are feelings of an individual; feelings of prosperity, happiness, feelings of being acknowledged; feelings of being poor or well off. These feelings are usually general and are influenced by all other aspects of life. Therefore, besides gauging core wellbeing, we also need to consider other objectives of people's lives. That is why there are calls in different spheres where the people are required to change the MINDSET.

Core wellbeing refers to basic material and non material needs, including nutrition and health, knowledge and material wealth. The important information is whether respondents have had these basic needs fulfilled in the last 12 months. Therefore, when a household is in a state of poverty, observations of basic needs do not provide information about the potential for escaping poverty in the future.

Enabling environments (context) are the living environments that affect core wellbeing issues. Information on enabling environments can help poverty alleviation efforts by providing a picture of a household's potential for escaping poverty. Enabling environments are the surrounding environments. Sometimes the surrounding environments can be hostile towards poverty alleviation. The enabling environments are divided into FOUR issues or spheres abbreviated to NESP – Natural sphere, Economic sphere, Social sphere and Political sphere. These FOUR enabling environmental spheres ensure that households have the opportunity to constantly improve the quality of their lives and can at the same time reduce vulnerability which usually occurs in the form of shortage of basic needs.

Lastly, by definition, the inter-sector environment, includes Infrastructure and services.

QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN
In the current poverty monitoring convention, poverty thresholds are set from poverty lines. The Poverty line is calculated to make it easier to determine the welfare situation at three levels, namely whether the household is food poor, basic needs poor or non poor. A household is either Very Poor (absolute poverty-destitute), food poor or relative poor (basic needs poor) or non poor. Therefore in designing the questionnaire to capture both the poverty situation and the

opportunities available that can be used to bail out the household, community, village or district, questions in each category should be structured to capture these three levels.

While in the Household Budget Survey, the codes in the questionnaire are mere identities and have no value, in this proposed type of questionnaire, codes of 1, 2, and 3 have values. The first level should indicate worst scenario indicated by level 1; second level should be followed by a much improved situation represented by code 2 and last scenario should be represented by best situation represented by code 3. In this way, value code 1 represents a critical condition while code 3 represents a good situation and middle value 2 reflects a medium/average situation. In this way it is possible to tell in which way welfare/poverty situation is, so that attempts to reduce poverty and vulnerability can be deduced accurately. At the same time it can be revealed which of the nine dimensions is doing well or badly to warrant special attention.

DATA ANALYSIS

With such a household questionnaire, for each sphere there are several questions with three possible answers showing the three levels of worst, average, and good. In case of two possible answers, the levels will be coded 1 or 3 and indices will be calculated to provide a picture of the households and village living situation according to each of the NINE spheres. Also the villages when aggregated will provide a Local Government Authority situation. It is important for the Local Government Authority to have information at both the community and village level because it can influence situation from that level onwards. This will also aid in targeting. The picture provided will be showing the comparative advantage or lack of that for each community, village and in the forms of:

1. Fulfillment of core wellbeing in the form of nutrition and health, wealth, knowledge
2. The enabling sector environments in the form of Natural spheres, Economic spheres, Social spheres and Political spheres
3. The overall enabling inter-sector environments in the form of Infrastructure and Services.

ADVANTAGES OF THE APPROACH

This holistic approach starting from the household to the village, to the LGA avails us the opportunity to know in what way households or village or district is considered poor according to the NINE spheres so that steps to intervene can be deduced accurately. At the same time such data is useful in programs providing assistance to the households, families or poor people because all demographic and poverty data can easily be looked at simultaneously so that basic consideration for decision making will be done more comprehensively.

REFERENCES

- Beck, T. (1994) The Experience of Poverty: Fighting for Respect and Resources in
- Village India, IT Publications, London.
- Conyers, D. (1983b) 'Decentralisation and Development: A Review of the literature',
- Public Administration and Development, vol. 4, 87-197.
- Chambers, R. and Conway, R. (1992) The Crisis of Africa's Poor: Perceptions and
- Priorities, IDS, Discussion Paper 296, Brighton.
- Chambers, R. (1997) Whose Reality Counts. Putting the First Last, Intermediate
- Technology Publications, London.
- Chema, G.S. Shabbir, G. and Rondinelli, D.A. (eds) (1983) Decentralisation and
- Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- De Wit, J. W. (1997) Decentralisation, Empowerment and Poverty Alleviation in Urban
- India: Roles and Responses of Government, NGOS and Slum Communities, Working
- Paper
- Series no.267,
- Koehn, P .H. (1995) Decentralisation for Sustainable Development in Rasheed, S. and
- Fashole, L. (eds) Development Management in Africa. Towards Dynamism,
- Empowerment and Entrepreneurship, Westview press.
- Korboe, D. (1998) Handing Over the Stick: Synthesised Report on The Ghana Social
- Assessment. A study Commissioned by the World Bank in Collaboration with National
- Development Planning Commission, Accra.
- Korboe, D. K. (1994) Extended Poverty Study (phase 3). Access to and Utilisation of
- Basic Social Services by the Poor in Ghana. Report commissioned by UNICEF -Ghana
- World Bank under Phase 3 of the Ghana Participatory Poverty Assessment
- Series, Kumasi.
- Litvack, J. et al. (1998) Rethinking Decentralisation in Developing Countries, World
- Bank, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management, Washington DC.
- Mahood, P. (1988) Local Government in the Third World, John Wily, Chichester.
- OECD, (1997) Participatory Development and Good Governance Part 1 and 2, Final
- Report of the DAC Ad Hoc Working Group, OECD Publication, Paris.

- Rahnema, M. (1996) Poverty. In Wolfgang Sachs (ed) The Development Dictionary: A
- Guide to Knowledge as Power, Zed Books, London.
- Rondinelli, D.A. (1981) 'Government Decentralisation in Comparative Perspective:
- Theory and Practice in Developing Countries', International Review of Administrative
- Sciences, Vol. 47,22-42.
- Rondinelli, D. A. Nellis, J.R. and Cheema, G. S. (1984) Decentralisation in Developing
- Countries, A review of Recent Experience, World Bank Staff Working Papers No.581.
- Turner, M. and Hulme, D. (1997) Governance, Administration and Development.
- Making the State Work, Macmillan, London.
- Wethenhall, R. (1996) 'Notes on the Language of Decentralisation', Teaching Public
- administration, vol. xvi, No.1, pp.20-35.
- White, H. (1998) Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches to Poverty Analysis: Conflict,
- Complementary or Synergy? A paper presented at DSA Conference University of
- Bradford.

APPENDIX 1 SIMPLE DEFINITIONS

Subjective Wellbeing is someone's feelings or mindset and includes, Feeling of being Prosperous, Feeling of being Poor, Feeling of being Happy

Core Wellbeing includes Health, nutrition, material wealth and knowledge.

Health and Nutrition consists of Lack of food or having difficulties in obtaining food, Access to clean drinking water, Access to health care service

Material Wealth includes, Condition of housing, Ownership of assets and wealth

Knowledge covers whether know how to read and write, Number of children at school, Possession of informal knowledge like non-farm skills.

Enabling Environment which is referred to as the Context includes the natural, economic, social, political spheres capped by infrastructure and services.

Natural Sphere means access to forests/lakes/playground, Natural Environment degradation levels, Excessive extraction of natural resources and Water quality in rivers and lakes

Economic Sphere means Income sources, Income stability, Access to credit,

Social sphere means Level of mutual help, Level of Trust, Conflicts

Political Sphere Access to natural Resources, Access to information and Involvement in decision making

Infrastructure and services is self explanatory

APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: IDENTIFICATION

Region:……………………………District……………………..Ward……………….

Rural……………………...………Urban………………………………………..………..

Name of ward/Village……………………………………………………….….……………

Name of Interviewee……………………………………………………………….…….

PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION

A1: How many household members live in this household?

A2: How many are adults?

A3: How many are children under 17 years?

A4: How do members of this household feel about the level of their wellbeing?

    1. Poor wellbeing 2. Average wellbeing   3. Well off

A5: Compared to other households in this area, what level is the wellbeing of this household?

    1. Less than others 2. Same as others   3. Better than others

A6. What was the level of wellbeing of this household last year?

    1.   below the standard level 2. Just above standard level 3. Very good

Part B: HEALTH

B1: Was any member of the household so ill last year that he/she could not work or attend school for 2 weeks?

1. No   3.Yes

B2: Was any member in your household so ill last year that she/he was admitted to a hospital bed?

1. No   3.Yes

B3: Did any household member seek medical care at the Health Facility during last year?

1. No   3.Yes

B4: Did any member of the household seek medical care at the District hospital dur4ing last year?

1. No   3.Yes

B5: Does the household experience a shortage of food?

1. Always 2. Sometimes   3. Never

B6. How many times per week on average did this household consume meat last month?
1. Less than 2 times 2. Between 3-5 times   3. More than 6 times

B7. How many times per week on average did this household consume eggs last month?

1. Less than 2 times 2. Between 3-5 times   3. More than 6 times

B8. How many times per week on average did this household consume fish last month?

1. Less than 2 times 2. Between 3-5 times   3. More than 6 times

B9. How many times per week on average did this household consume chicken last month?

1. Less than 2 times 2. Between 3-5 times   3. More than 6 times

B10. How many times per week on average did this household consume vegetables last month?

1. Less than 2 times 2. Between 3-5 times   3. More than 6 times

C. WEALTH

C1. Does this household have a toilet inside the house?

1 No   3.Yes

C2. What is the condition of the house in which this household lives?

1. Below village standard   2. Standard (Average), 3. Above average

C3. Does the household have electricity?

1. No 2. Yes but out of order 3. Yes and functioning

C4. During last year, did any household member purchase new clothes?

1. No   2. Yes 1-2 times   3. Yes more than 2 times

C5. During last year, did any household member purchase new shoes?
1. No   2. Yes 1-2 times   3 Yes more than 2 times

C6. During last week, did any household member purchase new blankets/bed sheets?

1. No   2. Yes 1-2 times   3 Yes more than 2 times

D. SERVICES

D1. How is the availability of school textbooks in school here?

1. Not available   2. Partly available,   3. Completely available   9. Not relevant

D2. How is the situation of presence of teachers in Primary Schools here?

1. Low, more often absent 2. Sometimes present, more often present 3. Always present 9. Not relevant

D3. How is the presence of medical staff and availability of medicines in the Health Facility?

1. Absent/ not available, 2. Sometimes present/available 3. Always present/available 9. Not relevant

D4. How is the situation of clean and safe water in the village/

1. Absent/ not available 2. Sometimes present/available 3. Always present/available 9. Not relevant

D5. How were the village development assistance programmes for LGA implemented (e.g Development grants, agriculture assistance etc.) during last year?

1. Never implemented   2. Implemented but disappointing 3. Satisfying

D6. How useful were LGA aid programs for your household during last year?

1. Not useful   2. Not based on need 3. Useful   9. Do not know

E. KNOWLEDGE

E1. What is the highest level of education of adults in this household?
1. Not completed primary School 3. Completed primary school 3. Completed secondary school and higher

E2. Are there children of school going age in this household?

1. No   3. Yes

E3. Are these children attending school?

1. Never attending school 2. Sometimes attending school   3. Always attending school   9. Not relevant

E4. Has any household member attended training or course?

1. No 3. Yes

E5. Has any household member special skills that can generate income e.g midwifery, iron smith, carpentry?

1. No   3. Yes

E6. Are there any household members that are illiterate?

1. Yes   3. No

E7. During last month have you watched the News on TV?
1. No   3. Yes
E8. During last month have you watched the News on TV?

1. No   3. Yes

E9. During last month have you listened to news on the radio?

1. No   3. Yes

E10. During last month have you read a newspaper?

1. No   3. Yes

F. ECONOMY

F1. Did the household harvest any food crops last year?

1. No   3. Yes

F2. Does the household own hectares of fallow land?

1. No   3. Yes

F3. Does any household member have a regular income?
1. No   3. Yes

F4. Is the main source of income for this household the sale of livestock?
1. No   3. Yes

F5. Is the main source of income for this household the sale of SME products?

1. No   3. Yes

F6. Is the main source of income for this household the sale of Food Crops?

1. No   3. Yes

F7. Is the main source of income for this household the sale of Cash crops?

1. No   3. Yes

F8. Is the main source of income for this household Remittance?

1. No   3. Yes

F9. Was your household able to be food secure during last year?

1. Never 2. Sometimes   3 All the times

F10. How easy was it for your household to purchase basic goods last year?

1. Not available in the village   2. Sometimes available   3. Always available

F11. Does this household own tree crops even only on a small scale?

1. No   3. Yes

F12. Does any household member hold any valuable goods like saving bank account, share certificates, gold?

1. No   3. Yes

G. NATURAL RESOURCES

G1. Does any member of this household depend upon natural resources for income?

1. No   3. Yes

G2. Does any member of this household depend upon Tourism for income?

1. No   3. Yes

H. SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

H1. What is the status of self-help and self reliance in this area?

1. Weak   2. Average because few people participate/donate 3. Strong because many people
      participate/donate

H2. What is the level of mutual trust in this area?

1. No trust (conflict between groups)
2. Average (there is some level of trust))
3. Strong mutual trust (unities).

H3. Were there any conflicts between villagers and outsider last year?
      1. Yes resulting in material damage, people wounded or killed
      2. There were tensions
      3. No, there were no conflicts

APPENDIX 3: HOW TO CALCULATE INDICES

Question number	Coded answers	Actual Score as collected from a household questionnaire	Weight Values as in the Questionnaire	Minimum as indicated by the codes in the questionnaire	Maximum as indicated by the codes in the questionnaire
1	Access to Communications 1=No access 2= Little access 3= Full access	2	1, 2, 3	1	3
2	Are there spiritual services 1=No, 3=Yes	3	1, 3	1	3
3	Are you conversant or Have you ever heard of NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GROWTH AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY 1=Never, 2= Yes, but not conversant 3= I know about NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GROWTH AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY	2	1, 2, 3	1	3
Total		7		3	9

Index Calculation= {Sum of Scores – Sum of Minimum Scores} X 100

{Sum of Maximum scores – Sum of Minimum Scores}

$$\frac{7-3}{9-3} \times 100 = \frac{4}{6} = 67$$

NORMALIZING DATA

When constructing a composite index, data should be made equal for the purpose of aggregation.

Standard Value = (Value Obtained – Min Value)/ Range (Max-Min).

Q1. = 100/3 = 33.33

Q2. = 100/2 = 50.00

Q3. = 100/3 = 33.33

(116.66)/3 = 38.88 Approximated to 39.

Getting the mid value 100 – 39 = 61

The three ranges are   0 – 39

40 – 60

61- 100

The calculation help to determine whether or not households, villages or sub districts are poor and in what way they are considered poor so that steps to reduce poverty can be deduced accurately. The index provides a village's living conditions by showing community feelings, fulfillment of basic needs (Core) and conditions of enabling environments (Context). It is this way that National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty II (NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GROWTH AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY II) can pick what to attack in its program activities.

This methodology will help to determine whether or not households, villages, Wards or sub-districts are poor and in what way they are considered poor so that steps to reduce poverty can be deduced accurately. The index provides a village's living conditions by showing community feelings, fulfillment of basic needs (Core) and conditions of enabling environments (Context). It is this way Poverty reduction strategy II (NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR GROWTH AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY II) can pick what to prioritize in its annual program activities.