

# Living in Urban Areas due for Redevelopment

Views of Children and their Families in  
Addis Ababa and Hawassa

Alula Pankhurst and Agazi Tiumelissan





# **Living in Urban Areas due for Redevelopment**

Views of Children and their Families in  
Addis Ababa and Hawassa

Alula Pankhurst and Agazi Tiumelissan

# Living in Urban Areas due for Redevelopment: Views of Children and their Families in Addis Ababa and Hawassa

Alula Pankhurst and Agazi Tiemelissan

First published by Young Lives in October 2013

© Young Lives 2013

ISBN: 978-1-909403-18-5

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.  
All rights reserved. Reproduction, copy, transmission, or translation of any part  
of this publication may be made only under the following conditions:

- with the prior permission of the publisher; or
- with a licence from the Copyright Licensing Agency Ltd.,  
90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 9HE, UK, or from another national  
licensing agency; or
- under the terms set out below.

This publication is copyright, but may be reproduced by any method without  
fee for teaching or non-profit purposes, but not for resale. Formal permission  
is required for all such uses, but normally will be granted immediately. For  
copying in any other circumstances, or for re-use in other publications, or for  
translation or adaptation, prior written permission must be obtained from the  
publisher and a fee may be payable.

Printed on FSC-certified paper from traceable and sustainable sources.

Funded by



Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the  
Netherlands

**Young Lives**, Oxford Department of International Development,  
University of Oxford, Queen Elizabeth House, 3 Mansfield Road, Oxford OX1 3TB, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)1865 281751 • E-mail: [younglives@younglives.org.uk](mailto:younglives@younglives.org.uk)

# Contents

<b>Summary</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>The Authors</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background to the relocation study	1
1.2 The context of the study	3
1.3 The research and selected sites	4
1.4 Methods and data	6
<b>2. The home environment</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 House ownership and maintenance	6
2.2 Facilities and housing conditions	8
2.3 Aspects of their homes that children like	15
2.3 Aspects of their homes that children dislike	17
<b>3. The neighbourhood</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 Aspects of their neighbourhood that children and caregivers like	21
3.2 Aspects of their neighbourhood that children and caregivers dislike	26
<b>4. Social networks and support</b>	<b>33</b>
4.1 Social networks	33
4.2 Social support	41
<b>5. Summary and conclusions</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Annexes. Supplementary tables</b>	<b>53</b>
Annex A. Home environment	53
Annex B. The neighbourhood	55
<b>References</b>	<b>60</b>

# Summary

This report is the first of three resulting from a sub-study conducted by Young Lives in four communities in Ethiopia, three in Addis Ababa and one in Hawassa, to examine what happens to children and their families living in areas that are due to be redeveloped. The paper presents the views of children and their caregivers about their living conditions prior to the impending move. It considers how children and adults view their home and neighbourhood environment and the extent of their social support networks. The report seeks to document how children and caregivers understand and experience their lives in a context of urban poverty, living in sites which are considered to be 'slums', mainly in areas that are due to be demolished and redeveloped through urban renovation programmes involving both commercial and residential development.

The evidence from this study suggests that children and their families live in crowded and insalubrious conditions in these urban sites. Most households do not own their homes. Children dislike their lack of separate kitchens, latrines, and washing facilities, and more than half the caregivers thought that their neighbourhoods were bad places to bring up children. Despite the conditions of material deprivation, the children and their caregivers value the cohesive social relations. Relations with family and friends are important for children, and they liked living close to their friends, schools, markets, cafés and religious institutions.

Relocation could bring about improvements in their housing and neighbourhood, although this will depend on where they are relocated to, what services and opportunities for work are available, and whether families will be able to afford the new condominium housing on offer. Family relations and school conditions are likely to be crucial for children, whereas caregivers will need to rebuild social networks, and funeral, religious and credit associations can be expected to play a key role in the successful adaptation of relocated households.

# The Authors

**Alula Pankhurst** is the Young Lives Ethiopia Country Director. He has a PhD in social anthropology from the University of Manchester and was previously Associate Professor in Social Anthropology at Addis Ababa University. His research has mainly focused on poverty, well-being, migration, food security, customary institutions, and social exclusion.

**Agazi Tiumelissan** is a Research Assistant for the Young Lives study in Ethiopia. He has a BA in Sociology from Addis Ababa University and has completed his course work for his MA in Sociology. He has carried out qualitative field research for Young Lives and the Well-being in Developing Studies research project.

# Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the children and their caregivers who gave their time to take part in the study and share with us their views about their living conditions. Our thanks also go to all the other respondents who provided valuable insights. We are also indebted to both qualitative and quantitative research officers who collected the data. We would also like to acknowledge the support from our colleagues in the Young Lives teams in Ethiopia and Oxford who believed that this study was important for all the useful feedback on the study design and the reviews of this report. Special thanks go to Caroline Knowles and to Catherine Robinson for the invaluable editing that has improved this report considerably.

## About Young Lives

Young Lives is an international study of childhood poverty, following the lives of 12,000 children in 4 countries (Ethiopia, India, Peru and Vietnam) over 15 years. [www.younglives.org.uk](http://www.younglives.org.uk)

Young Lives is funded from 2001 to 2017 by UK aid from the Department for International Development (DFID), and co-funded by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs from 2010 to 2014.

The views expressed are those of the author(s). They are not necessarily those of, or endorsed by, Young Lives, the University of Oxford, DFID or other funders.

# 1. Introduction

This report is one of a set of three resulting from a Young Lives relocation sub-study conducted in four sites in Ethiopia: three in Addis Ababa and one in Hawassa, the capital of the Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region (SNNPR). The study investigates what happens to children and their families who live in areas of these two cities that are due to be redeveloped. This first paper presents the views of children and caregivers about their living conditions prior to the impending move. It assesses how children and adults view their home and neighbourhood environment, and the extent of their social support networks. The report seeks to document how children and caregivers understand and experience their lives in a context of urban poverty, living in sites which are considered to be 'slums', mainly in areas that are due to be demolished and redeveloped through urban renovation programmes involving commercial development and residential housing. A second report<sup>1</sup> focuses on housing and considers how children and caregivers view the prospect of moving to condominium housing, and their perceptions of their ability to afford the costs involved. A third report will review the attitudes of children and adults to the planned relocation, and their hopes and concerns about the move. The third report will discuss the respondents' attitudes towards relocation and their assessments of the potential positive and negative consequences of relocation on social relations, access to services, and opportunities for employment.

## 1.1 Background to the relocation study

The urban landscape in Ethiopia is currently undergoing a fundamental transformation, with whole neighbourhoods in the centre of major cities being cleared for urban development. The urban renewal programmes have the twin objectives of promoting urban growth and providing improved housing for the urban poor. On the one hand the clearing of areas without high-value buildings is viewed by developers as freeing urban space for the construction of office blocks, shopping centres and real-estate development. On the other hand, low-cost condominium apartments are being constructed by the government and offered to urban residents of the areas that are being demolished who can afford the down-payment and subsequent monthly payments. Some of these condominiums are in areas that are being redeveloped, but a larger number are being constructed in the suburbs.

The redevelopment of urban centres for business and improved housing has historically led to displacement worldwide. The study of the process and consequences of relocation in Africa has focused mainly on rural resettlement, notably due to the construction of large dams such as Kariba, Aswan and Volta and irrigation projects (Brokensha 1963; Chambers 1969, 1970; Colson 1971; Scudder 1968, 1973; Scudder and Colson 1979, 1982). In the Ethiopian context the literature on resettlement has focused largely on rural-to-rural resettlement in the context of drought and famine in the 1980s (Pankhurst 1991; Gebre 2001; Wolde-Sellasie 2002; Pankhurst 2009; Dessalegn 2010). Until recently there were comparatively few studies of urban relocation in Africa, apart from the pioneering work of Peter Marris (1961), based on interviews with families relocated from Lagos slums.

---

1 *Moving to Condominium Housing? Views about the Prospect among Caregivers and Children in Addis Ababa and Hawassa, Ethiopia* (Young Lives Working Paper 106).

The main body of more recent theoretical literature on reactions to resettlement focusing mainly on the household level is based on the equally pioneering work of Michael Cernea, who developed the *Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction Model* (IRR) (Cernea 1997, 2000), which was influential in moulding the World Bank guidelines on resettlement (World Bank 1998). The model rests on three basic concepts: risk, impoverishment and reconstruction. The major displacement-related impoverishment risks are landlessness; joblessness; homelessness; marginalisation; food insecurity and a decline in health; increased morbidity; loss of access to common property resources; social disarticulation; and risks to host populations (Cernea 2000: 22). Cernea first addressed the question of urban relocation in a World Bank discussion paper (Cernea 1993). He noted that there was limited research on urban displacement, and that the first studies were by sociologists in the 1960s in industrialised countries, writing mainly about slum clearance, particularly in the USA. Cernea noted that further sociological contributions were made in the 1970s, including some ex-post impact assessments which influenced US legal regulations on property expropriation and compensatory payments. He argued that there was much less known about urban relocation in developing countries, and certainly not enough to influence domestic policies, legal frameworks, actual projects or donors' assistance programmes. He cited the influential study of *favela* relocation in Rio de Janeiro by Perlman (1976), and a handful of cases in Asian countries such as a study in Delhi by Misra and Gupta (1981), and a few in African countries, such as a Nigerian case study (Adekolu-John 1988).

More recently, Cernea predicted that urban relocation in Africa will become 'larger in Africa than population displacements in any other single sector, dam-building included' (Cernea 2005: 212). He further remarked: 'Against this imminent trend, the paucity of urban relocation in Africa's mega- and medium size cities is hard to explain' (2005: 212). A UN-HABITAT scoping study on Guidelines and Practices on Evictions, Acquisition, Expropriation and Compensation suggests that there is 'evidence to show that market based urban displacement is on the increase as a result of economic development and globalisation' (UN-HABITAT 2010). A further UN-HABITAT publication assessing the impact of evictions notes:

Forced evictions are a global problem. Every year millions of people around the world are evicted from their homes and land, against their will and without consultation or equitable compensation. These evictions are carried out despite the fact that international law explicitly recognises the right to security of tenure and adequate housing; and has repeatedly declared the practice of forced eviction to be a gross and systematic violation of human rights. (UN-HABITAT 2011)

Poverty is seen as a major factor contributing to the eviction of the poor, as Olivier-Smith argues: 'it is their very poverty that subjects the poor to processes of displacement and resettlement' (2009: 18). The fact that the poor often lack formal-tenure security can make them immediately vulnerable to removal from land that is needed or desired by the powerful. The fact that they live in terrible conditions can, in itself, become grounds for their eviction from an area, so that, through their removal, the assets of the wealthy are promoted (UN-HABITAT 2011).

The impacts of evictions can be manifold. As a result of evictions, people's property is damaged or destroyed; their productive assets are lost or rendered useless; their social networks are broken up; their livelihood strategies are compromised; their access to essential facilities and services is lost; and, as violence is often used to force them to comply, they suffer severe and lasting psychological effects. Indeed, the prospect of being forcibly evicted can be so terrifying that it is not uncommon for people to risk their lives in an attempt to



resist; or, even more extreme, to take their own lives when it becomes apparent that the eviction cannot be prevented (Du Plessis 2006). The United Nations Centre for Human Settlements report (UNCHS 1991) distinguished between two levels of impact: (1) impact on the social organisation of the people relocated; and (2) impact on their employment and financial situation. It also drew attention to the impact on women, as a third aspect warranting special focus (UNCHS 1991: 38-40).

Cernea cites three studies of urban displacement, using his IRR model: one in Mauritania (Faure 2004), and two in Ethiopia (Feleke 2004; Dinku 2004). The former was a case of successful resettlement of shantytown dwellers whose livelihoods improved, although Cernea remarked that this was not usually the case, citing his own report of 500,000 people, mainly refugees and squatters, removed from the Sudanese capital Khartoum (Cernea 1993). The study by Dinku of refugees from the war with Eritrea highlights disarticulation of community solidarity and tensions with inhabitants living in the area beforehand, but also rearticulation in patterns of mutual help and development of new solidarities and ways of coping and adjustment, based on social and religious values. The predicament and coping strategies of the same community have more recently been the subject of a book by Lewis Aptekar (2010). The study by Feleke examines peri-urban resettlement of peasants as the city of Addis Ababa expanded, highlighting the loss of housing and grazing and the dilemmas posed by compensation payments, which seldom led to the re-establishment of sustainable livelihoods.

There have been very few studies of urban relocation in Ethiopia from city-centre areas designated for renewal. Most of these studies are Master's theses in Social Anthropology and Regional and Local Development Studies at Addis Ababa University. Four of these focused on the people who moved from the area designated for the building of the Sheraton Hotel (Nebiyu 2000; Ashenafi 2001; Fitsum 2006; Ambaye 2006). These were a rather privileged group, provided with relatively good housing on the outskirts of the capital city; however, despite better housing they no longer had the employment opportunities in the informal sector on which they had relied in the city centre, and also they had to pay the costs of daily commuting, which were initially subsidised. There was also a study by Dejene (2005) on the impacts of the ring road, which split communities (Piguet and Pankhurst 2009; Pankhurst and Piguet 2009).

## **1.2 The context of the study**

The environment in which children grow up provides an important context for their welfare and opportunities for their development, and partly shapes their sense of identity. Children growing up in urban poverty often live in crowded housing, sharing space with many family members in dilapidated houses, sometimes conducting all daily activities in a single room, without adequate kitchens, toilets and washing facilities. Although children and caregivers are aware of deprivations and hardships of life in such conditions, they also may value aspects of their home environment, notably cohesive and supportive social relations within the home.

The neighbourhoods in which the Young Lives children live in the city centres in Addis Ababa and Hawassa are congested and tend to be unhealthy environments, with open sewerage systems and limited facilities for the hygienic disposal of liquid and solid waste. Moreover, children often do not have space to play and may be exposed to anti-social behaviour. Many poor people live in such circumstances not out of choice but for lack of other opportunities. However, there are also aspects of their neighbourhoods that people value, particularly access to informal work opportunities, markets, social relations and supportive social networks.

This paper seeks to understand the views of children and caregivers about their home and neighbourhood environment, considering both negative and positive aspects of life in poor urban neighbourhoods. The paper is organised in three major sections: the home, the neighbourhood and social networks. In the first section we consider house ownership and maintenance, then facilities and housing conditions and finally things that children like and dislike about their homes. In the second section we consider first the aspects of their neighbourhood that children and their caregivers appreciate, followed by a discussion of characteristics that they dislike. The third section deals with the social networks of the children and their caregivers, the associations to which they belong and the sources of support that they receive from institutions and individuals. The conclusions draw out major findings of the study.

### 1.3 The research and selected sites

The research was conducted in four Young Lives sites in two Ethiopian cities. Young Lives is an international study of childhood poverty, commissioned and funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID). The research is conducted in Ethiopia, India, Peru and Vietnam, involving a longitudinal study from 2000 to 2015. In each country 3,000 children were included in the research. The Younger Cohort of 2,000 children, born in the year 2000, were aged 10 or 11 at the time of this study in January 2012. The Older Cohort of 1,000 children were aged 7 to 8 years in 2000 and were around 17 or 18 at the time of this study. In Ethiopia the research is conducted in 20 different sites, in four large regions: Amhara, Oromia, Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples Region (SNNPR) and the city of Addis Ababa. In the twenty sites, three rounds of quantitative surveys were conducted. In five of the sites, one site from each region, there have been three rounds of in-depth qualitative studies with a smaller sample of children and caregivers.

Young Lives has also conducted a number of sub-studies, and this paper is a product of one such initiative. It uses data from a cross-sectional study called 'Relocation Sub-study' conducted in four Young Lives sites, three in Addis Ababa (Bertukan,<sup>2</sup> Duba and Menderin), and one, Leku, in Hawassa, the capital city of the SNNPR. In Bertukan and Menderin the issue of relocation has been raised as an issue of concern in the previous rounds of the main Young Lives survey, and residents have been told that they will have to move. Both these sites are in the central part of the city, in areas where relocation is therefore expected to take place, even though the exact timing is still unknown. Likewise the site in SNNPR is in the centre of the city, and some relocation is believed to be likely. The fourth site, Duba, is on the outskirts of Addis Ababa; relocation does not seem to be a major concern here, and the study included this site for contrast as a 'control' site. However, the main road out of town may stimulate investment, leading to some displacement.

All four urban sites are in poor areas in either the national capital or a regional capital; however, they each present particular characteristics which are worth noting.

**Bertukan** is located in the central part of the capital city in an old quarter developed during the Italian occupation, close to a major market where many of the households find casual employment in the informal sector. The site is heterogeneous in terms of ethnicity (Amhara and Gurage are the largest groups), and also of religion (with Orthodox Christian and Muslim

---

2 The children and their families share a great deal of personal information with us over many years. For this reason, pseudonyms have been used – both for the children mentioned here and for their communities – to preserve anonymity.

communities included). Many Young Lives households rely on informal-sector activities, notably petty trade in the market, street vending, wage labour, the sale of food and beverages, and carpentry. There is a large proportion of female-headed households, and some of the women concerned are involved in commercial sex work, for which the area is known. Several adjacent areas have already been demolished and are being redeveloped, and this neighbourhood is also within the priority areas for redevelopment. Although most of the redevelopment is earmarked for commercial interests, three blocks of condominiums have been built in the area and about a dozen very poor people were able to obtain flats within them with the support of NGOs, although none of these was a Young Lives household.

**Duba** is located on the outskirts of the capital city in an area that was first developed as an industrial zone in the late imperial period. The area is close to a main road and a major river, which is subject to industrial pollution from the factories. It is less congested than the two sites in the centre of the city. The area is mixed in terms of ethnicity, with Oromo, Amhara and Silte being the major groups. The population is predominantly Orthodox Christian. The main forms of livelihood involve wage labour in the informal sector, retail trade, and street vending; some men work in factories. There is relatively good access to health and education services. There are no immediate plans for redeveloping the area, although there has been an increase in industrial development in the vicinity and along the road passing through the area, which may well lead to some displacement along the road.<sup>3</sup>

**Menderin** is in the centre of Addis Ababa in a very congested area which has a reputation of being one of the poorest parts of the city, with badly constructed make-shift dwellings. The area faces problems of pollution from open sewers and waste in the streets, and air pollution from a cigarette factory. The site is mixed in terms of ethnicity with four major ethnic groups, the Amhara, Gurage, Oromo, and Tigraway. The majority of the population are Orthodox Christians, although there are large Muslim and smaller Protestant minorities. There is an important market in the area. The main forms of livelihood are based on informal-sector activities, including petty trade, street vending, retail selling, woodwork and daily labour; some residents earn wages in government or private organisations. Several adjacent areas have already been demolished and are in the process of being redeveloped, and there also some condominiums that have already been built. The area has been designated for redevelopment, and the residents have been informed they will have to move.

**Leku** is located in an old neighbourhood in Hawassa, the capital city of the Southern Nationalities, Nations and Peoples Administrative Region (SNNPR). The ethnic composition of the site is heterogeneous, with three major groups among the Young Lives sample being the Wolayta, Amhara and Oromo. There are also a few Gurage and some Tigraway and Sidama. In terms of religion the site is also mixed, with Orthodox Christians and Protestants representing the largest groups. In terms of livelihoods, most people in the community are engaged in informal-sector activities, notably petty trading, daily labour, street vending, or other forms of self-employment. Children are also involved in such activities. There is a high prevalence of female-headed households. The community is considered to be very poor, and a few NGOs have been engaged in distributing aid and educational materials. Some parts of the area are expected to be demolished for renovation, although the boundaries are not yet clear.

---

3 This site was selected as a 'control' site, as a comparison with the areas where relocation is expected to take place.

## 1.4 Methods and data

The relocation sub-study was carried out in January 2012, comprising both qualitative and quantitative components. The quantitative survey involved a total of 466 caregivers and 451 children (almost 16 per cent of the Young Lives children and 40 per cent of those living in urban areas). Of the 451 children, 299 (64 per cent) are among the Younger Cohort (aged between 11 and 12 years old at the time of the study), whereas 152 (36 per cent) are among the Older Cohort (aged between 17 and 18 at the time of the study). Of the total, 232 (51.4 per cent) are girls and 219 (48.6 per cent) are boys.

In the qualitative component, interviews were conducted with 79 children and their caregivers, 10 boys and 10 girls in each of the four sites. Since Bertukan and Leku are Young Lives qualitative sites, we interviewed the children who are part of our longitudinal qualitative sub-sample.<sup>4</sup> In the other two sites, a qualitative sub-sample was generated from the main survey sample. The selection criteria included the wealth quintile of the household, home ownership, and other social categories such as religion and ethnicity, in an attempt to include a mix of different categories and equal numbers of boys and girls from both cohorts. Key-informant interviews were also conducted with people from formal and customary institutions in each community. Focus group discussions were conducted with children, taking into account their age and gender cohorts, with separate groups for boys and girls for each cohort. Focus group discussions were also held with their caregivers and with influential community members. The interviews were conducted by researchers who had already worked in the Young Lives qualitative-study teams and who were experienced in interviewing children in these sites and familiar with qualitative methods and the ethical issues and procedures that Young Lives has been following. The rationale for the study was to understand the views and attitudes of children and caregivers towards their home and community environment, and their expectations, fears and hopes about plans for relocation. The three main general topics of discussion were house and home environment, neighbourhood and support networks. The sections used for this paper included questions on ownership, rent and maintenance of the house; utilities; aspects that children like and dislike about their homes and neighbourhood; associations to which they belong; forms of support received from associations or individuals; and support that they provided for others. The data were written up by the researchers based on the protocols used in the field to interview the respondents and were analysed for this paper by considering evidence in terms of topic, site, cohort and gender.

## 2. The home environment

This section considers the home environment, in particular domestic conditions and facilities, notably kitchens, toilets and sanitation, and then discusses the aspects of their homes that children like and dislike.

### 2.1 House ownership and maintenance

The majority of the caregivers in all the sites (more than three-quarters) do not own the house in which they live. The proportion is higher in the two Addis Ababa sites in the centre of the city (Bertukan and Menderin), where housing conditions are congested. Especially in

---

<sup>4</sup> One boy selected in Bertukan has moved and could not be located.

Bertukan, only about 5 per cent of the caregivers own the house they live in. In contrast, in the Hawassa site home ownership is more prevalent, with just over 40 per cent of homes owner-occupied. See Table 1.

**Table 1.** *Ownership of house*

	Does anyone in your household own your house? (%)	
	No	Yes
Bertukan	94.7	5.3
Menderin	87	13
Duba	74.4	25.6
Leku	58.8	41.2
<b>All sites</b>	<b>78.3</b> <b>(N=365)</b>	<b>21.7</b> <b>(N=101)</b>

Furthermore, the majority of the caregivers who responded said that they do not own title deeds, and again in the two sites in the central part of Addis Ababa, where relocation is expected to take place soon, only about 4 per cent (in Bertukan) and 9 per cent (in Menderin) own them. However, over half (58 per cent) of respondents did not answer this question, which probably means that they did not own title deeds (see Annex, Table A1). The ownership of title deeds would mean that the households would be entitled to compensation, and the findings therefore suggest that only a small proportion would therefore be eligible to make claims.

As shown in Table 2, in all four sites more than two-thirds of the houses that are home to the Young Lives families are owned by the *kebele* local administration. This is a common pattern in the capital city; it derives from the policy of nationalising urban land, adopted during the *Derg*,<sup>5</sup> and from the establishment of some urban housing programmes; thereafter most poor people in the city obtained low-rent housing from the local administrations. Here again, a much higher proportion of houses are owned by the *kebele* in the two sites in central Addis Ababa, whereas in the site in Hawassa slightly fewer than half of the houses are *kebele*-owned. The difference is no doubt related to the much more limited nationalisation of housing and urban housing carried out in the regional city, compared with the national capital.

**Table 2.** *House ownership (for those who do not own their home)*

	Who owns the house? (%)					
	The <i>kebele</i>	Private person (own relative)	Private person (friend)	Private person (other)	Other (specify)	N/A
Bertukan	84.2	0	0	8.8	1.8	5.3
Menderin	75.9	1.9	0	9.3	0	13
Duba	64.8	1.6	0.8	6.4	0.8	25.6
Leku	45.4	4.2	0	9.2	0	41.2
<b>All sites</b>	<b>67.2</b> <b>(N=313)</b>	<b>1.9</b> <b>(N=9)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>	<b>8.4</b> <b>(N=39)</b>	<b>0.6</b> <b>(N=3)</b>	<b>21.7</b>

5 The *Derg* is the name of the previous military government of Ethiopia, which ruled the country for 17 years before it was overthrown in 1991.

In all the sites the vast majority of the people do not rent out rooms. The highest proportion of caregivers who rent out rooms is in the site in Hawassa, where about one quarter of the respondents said that they did. In the other three sites, in Addis Ababa, the proportion is smaller, and in the inner-city sites especially the proportion is still lower (see Annex, Table A2).

Respondents were also asked if they did maintenance work on their house; this question was asked in order to ascertain whether they had invested in the house, which might be relevant in relation to potential compensation claims. Moreover, as we shall see, some suggested that they were restricted from making necessary repairs as they do not own the housing but rent it. The majority of the households said they did not do maintenance work on their house, suggesting that lack of ownership constrains investment in repairs. See Table 3. The site with the highest proportion of positive replies is in Hawassa, which also had the highest proportion of home ownership. However, the link between ownership of house and maintenance of it does not seem to hold in the Addis Ababa sites, since the site with the highest proportion of ownership scores lowest in terms of maintenance. The qualitative data suggest that whereas a few households conducted some maintenance to improve their house, others did limited emergency maintenance out of necessity, such as fixing a leaking roof. However, some complained that because they rented the housing they were not allowed to carry out essential maintenance, and they could not get permission from the *kebele* administration to do repairs.

**Table 3.** *Maintenance*

	Have you done any maintenance work on your house? (%)	
	No	Yes
Bertukan	76.3	23.7
Menderin	74.1	25.9
Duba	86.4	13.6
Leku	68.1	31.9
<b>All sites</b>	<b>76.4</b>	<b>23.6</b>
	<b>(N=356)</b>	<b>(N=110)</b>

## 2.2 Facilities and housing conditions

The houses in the sites under study, especially the two sites in the inner part of Addis Ababa, are congested and dilapidated, and the facilities and amenities often lack even the basics, such as separate spaces for washing, toilets and kitchens – and these facilities, when present, tend to be shared between a number of households. This section reviews domestic utilities and facilities, notably the kitchen, the sources of fuel, availability of drinking water, and toilets.

Table 4 shows that overall about two-thirds of households have a separate kitchen for cooking. The highest proportion is in the Hawassa site. However, in the sites located in the inner part of Addis Ababa almost half the households do not have a separate kitchen. There are respondents in the qualitative sub-sample who are living in a single room, doing everything in it, including cooking. There are others who do not like their kitchen because it is shared with others, or is very small, or does not have a proper wall or door. Some who wanted to make improvements to kitchens could not do so, as they are not the house

owners. Ayenew's mother in Leku said: "The living room has a kitchen which is no longer functional and is difficult to cook food within it and we are not allowed to rebuild it since it is *kebele* house." Some of those who do have a separate kitchen consider themselves to be fortunate, since they are aware that many others do not have such an amenity.

**Table 4.** *Separate kitchen*

	Does your house have a separate kitchen for cooking? (%)		
	No	Yes	DK
Bertukan	49.1	50.9	0
Menderin	45.4	54.6	0
Duba	27.2	72	0.8
Leku	14.3	85.7	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>33.5</b>	<b>66.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>
	<b>(N=156)</b>	<b>(N=309)</b>	<b>(N=1)</b>

Overall, there are three main sources of fuel used, the most important being charcoal (36 per cent of respondents), followed by wood (27 per cent) and electricity (20 per cent). See Table 5. Charcoal is more important in the Addis Ababa sites, especially the site on the outskirts (Duba), whereas wood is much more important in Hawassa, where it represents two-thirds of the fuel sources. Electricity as a source of fuel is most common in one Addis Ababa site in the centre of town (Menderin), where it is used by 41 per cent of households. Although a move to greater use of electricity can be seen to be beneficial from a wider perspective, since it does not involve polluting fossil fuels and reduces dependence on imported fuels, the cost of electricity for cooking and the unreliability of the power supply, with frequent cuts, constitute serious constraints.

**Table 5.** *Main source of fuel*

Main source of fuel (%)	Bertukan	Menderin	Duba	Leku	All sites
Charcoal	40.4	38.9	47.2	23.5	<b>37.5 (N=175)</b>
Wood	7	14.8	20	65.5	<b>27.3 (N=127)</b>
Electricity	21.1	40.7	15.2	3.4	<b>19.5 (N=91)</b>
Kerosene/paraffin	15.8	3.7	3.2	0.8	<b>5.8 (N=27)</b>
Tree branches	2.6	0	9.6	0	<b>3.2 (N=15)</b>
Bio-gas	10.5	0	0	0	<b>2.6 (N=12)</b>
Shavings/sawdust	0	0.9	0	5.9	<b>1.7 (N=8)</b>
Leaves	2.6	0.9	1.6	0	<b>1.3 (N=6)</b>
Cow dung	0	0	3.2	0	<b>0.9 (N=4)</b>
Straw/dead plants	0	0	0	0.8	<b>0.2 (N=1)</b>

Several respondents in the qualitative sub-sample said they were using kerosene. Some of them have shifted to using electricity, as the cost of kerosene has been going up. Those who cannot afford to use electricity and to buy electric stoves and utensils use charcoal and wood instead. However, the price of charcoal and wood has also increased. Some poorer respondents mentioned that they could no longer afford to buy a supply for a month in advance and had to shift to daily purchases.

Table 6 shows that overall almost half the households said they had piped water in their own dwelling or yard, and almost a quarter obtained water from a neighbour's yard. Just over one in ten households said they used a public water source, and almost the same proportion said that they bought water. Most of the respondents in the qualitative sub-sample in all the sites have their own tap water, although some households said they had acquired this only recently. There are also some who share piped water with others within a compound. Some households still buy water, either from a common water point at a relatively low price, or from people who sell water for a higher price.

**Table 6.** *Source of drinking water*

	What is the main source of drinking water for members of your household? (%)					
	Bore well	Bought water	Piped into dwelling/ yard/plot	Piped into neighbour's dwelling/ yard/Plot	Piped into relatives' dwelling/ yard/plot	Public standpipe/ tube well
Bertukan	0.9	8.8	52.6	25.4	0.9	1.8
Menderin	0	15.7	41.7	24.1	0	14.8
Duba	1.6	1.6	52.8	13.6	1.6	25.6
Leku	0	18.5	43.7	32.8	0	4.2
<b>All sites</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>47.9</b>	<b>23.8</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>11.8</b>
	<b>(N=3)</b>	<b>(N=51)</b>	<b>(N=223)</b>	<b>(N=111)</b>	<b>(N=3)</b>	<b>(N=55)</b>

Surprisingly, in all the sites the majority of the caregivers said that the quality of water that they use for drinking is good. The proportion is lowest in Bertukan, which is the only site with a small proportion of respondents (7 per cent) saying that the quality of drinking water is bad. See Table 7.

**Table 7.** *Water quality*

	What is the quality of the water that people drink? (%)			
	Good	Bad	Average	DK
Bertukan	58.8	7	33.3	0.9
Menderin	87	0	13	0
Duba	90.4	0	9.6	0
Leku	89.1	0	10.9	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>81.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>0.2</b>
	<b>(N=380)</b>	<b>(N=8)</b>	<b>(N=77)</b>	<b>(N=1)</b>

Likewise, most of the caregivers in all the sites in the qualitative sub-sample said that the quality of water is good. However, some caregivers in the three sites in Addis Ababa, especially in the two inner-city sites, mentioned that the water smells bad at times. At such times, they either fetch water from other places with better water quality or they purchase a water-purification chemical called *wuha agar*, which they add to drinking water.

Overall about half the children said that they wash themselves in the living room, and this proportion is higher in the two sites in the centre of Addis Ababa, where two-thirds of children wash in the living room. Washing outside the house is the next most common option, for more than a fifth of children in the sites in Hawassa and the site on the outskirts of Addis



Ababa. Fewer than 10 per cent wash in a bathroom, and a slightly higher proportion said that they wash in the kitchen. See Table 8.

**Table 8.** *Location for washing (children)*

	Where do you wash yourself most of the time? (%)							
	Bathroom	Bedroom	Living room	Kitchen	Toilet	Outside	At the river	Others
Bertukan	3.6	1.8	65.2	8.9	0.9	15.2	0	4.5
Menderin	6.9	3	65.3	4	2	5.9	0	12.9
Duba	5.8	5.8	49.6	14	1.7	22.3	0.8	0
Leku	19.7	0.9	26.5	17.1	11.1	21.4	0	3.4
<b>All sites</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>4.9</b>
	<b>(N=41)</b>	<b>(N=13)</b>	<b>(N=230)</b>	<b>(N=51)</b>	<b>(N=18)</b>	<b>(N=75)</b>	<b>(N=1)</b>	<b>(N=22)</b>

Some children in the qualitative sub-sample mentioned that they wash in the only room they have; others wash in the living room, and still others in the bedroom. Some children also mentioned that they wash their bodies in the toilet. For instance, an Older Cohort girl in Menderin said she washes in the living room during the night after everyone in the house has gone to bed. However, a number of children wash outdoors. An Older Cohort boy in Duba and a Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said that they washed outside, near the water pipe. A Younger Cohort boy in Menderin did likewise, whereas his mother washes in the house, and his uncle pays to take a shower. Another Younger Cohort boy in the same site washes in the compound, using water brought from the neighbourhood. In Leku a Younger Cohort boy said that he washes with a friend who lives in the same compound, either in the open air in the compound or in the living room, having fetched water from a well. Several Older Cohort boys in all the sites, and a Younger Cohort boy in Duba, said that they wash in a public bath by paying an entrance fee, usually 2 birr.

Most of the caregivers in the three sites in Addis Ababa said that their households use a communal pit latrine, with the highest proportion evident in the two sites in the inner part of the city. In Duba, on the periphery of Addis Ababa, about a fifth said that they relieve themselves in open spaces. In the site in Hawassa a little under half of the households in the sample use a pit latrine owned by the household; the next most common resource is a communal pit latrine. See Table 9.

**Table 9.** *Toilet facilities (caregivers)*

	What kind of main toilet facility does your household use? (%)								
	Flush toilet/ septic tank	Forest/ field/ open place/ river	Neighbours' toilet	Pit latrine (communal)	Pit latrine (household's)	Relatives' toilet	Simple latrine on pond	Toilet in health post	Other (specify)
Bertukan	0.9	0.0	0.0	87.7	8.8	2.6	0.0	0	0.0
Menderin	0.9	0.0	0.0	88.9	6.5	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0
Duba	1.6	17.6	0.0	61.6	16.8	0.8	1.6	0	0.0
Leku	2.5	0.0	1.7	45.4	47.1	0.0	0.8	0.8	1.7
<b>All sites</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>70.2</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>
	<b>(N=7)</b>	<b>(N=22)</b>	<b>(N=2)</b>	<b>(N=327)</b>	<b>(N=94)</b>	<b>(N=4)</b>	<b>(N=3)</b>	<b>(N=5)</b>	<b>(N=2)</b>

Two households in the qualitative sub-sample in Bertukan who own their houses still have to share a toilet with other people, because they do not have a private toilet. One family in Bertukan uses a shared toilet which does not have a door, so people passing by may use it as they please; as a result it is very dirty. One family in Menderin does not have access to a shared toilet and they have to use a public facility, paying each time. Amira's mother said:

“It is very sad to talk about our toilet. There is no toilet in the compound and near our house so we are supposed to walk 3–5 minutes and pay 0.25 cents to use one. This might be tolerable for adults but it is very difficult for children, so we are using a bed pan for them. The toilet is shared by many people.”

Overall, only 15 per cent of children said that they had a pit toilet in the house, although this proportion was much higher in the Hawassa site (about a third). Only 1 per cent had a flush toilet. Fewer than a third (27 per cent) said that they used a toilet in the compound, with much higher proportions in Hawassa (46 per cent); about the same proportion (29 per cent) said that they used common toilets, with more than half in Duba, the site on the outskirts of Addis Ababa. Only 5 per cent used fields, but this was almost entirely in Duba. See Table 10.

**Table 10.** *Toilet facilities (children)*

	Where do you go to the toilet? (%)							
	Flush toilet in house	Pit toilet in house	Potty/bucket	Toilet in compound	Field outside	River	Others	Common toilets
Bertukan	0.9	5.4	0.0	25.9	0.9	0.0	37.5	29.5
Menderin	1.0	17.8	0.0	26.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	54.5
Duba	0.8	5.0	1.7	15.7	19.0	0.0	40.5	17.4
Leku	1.7	33.3	0.0	46.2	0.0	0.0	0.9	17.9
<b>All sites</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>15.3</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>28.8</b>
	<b>(N=5)</b>	<b>(N=69)</b>	<b>(N=2)</b>	<b>(N=129)</b>	<b>(N=24)</b>	<b>(N=0)</b>	<b>(N=92)</b>	<b>(N=130)</b>

Children involved in the qualitative sub-sample, after mentioning the type of toilet that they use, went on to mention the condition of the toilet they are using. Whereas the quantitative data reveal how the lack of adequate sanitary facilities is an expression of urban poverty, the qualitative data provide a more compelling sense of the extent to which this is an unpleasant aspect of living in these sites. One boy in the Older Cohort in Bertukan said that the toilet is very dirty, “and we should not talk about it”. However, he went to explain that five households (about 17 people) use the toilet. Mothers clean it, but the pit is full and overflows.

However, there are also instances where people share toilets and keep them clean. A Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan and an Older Cohort boy in Duba mentioned they use a shared toilet with an improved design, built by NGOs working in their respective areas. The Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan added: “White people used to come and visit our toilet.” An Older Cohort boy in Duba said that they do not have a toilet and they use the open space in the compound. Another Older Cohort boy in Menderin mentioned that their household uses a public toilet in the neighbourhood which is used by everyone and cleaned by people from the *kebele*.

Bad smells coming from toilets are an issue raised by many of the children, especially those whose house is near the shared toilet. An Older Cohort girl in Duba mentioned that the shared toilet is not only smelly but also a source of conflict among people sharing it. An Older Cohort girl in Menderin said that their shared pit latrine had been full for four years, and

although they had repeatedly informed the *kebele*, nothing had been done about it. As a result they are forced to use a toilet in another neighbourhood, paying 50 cents each time.

One household in Menderin which owns the house in which they live has a flush toilet which they use for themselves and a pit latrine in the compound for people who rent rooms from them.

The qualitative data thus suggest that lack of toilets, shared toilets, and unclean toilets are among the clearest manifestations of urban deprivation, involving the humiliation of sharing repulsive conditions. It also sometimes results in conflict, having to pay for toilet usage or using open spaces without privacy. Moreover, the implications of poor sanitation for hygiene and health are even clearer when we consider the limited access to hand-washing facilities near the toilet.

Most of the caregivers (88 per cent) and somewhat fewer children (80 per cent) said that they did not have hand-washing facilities close to the toilet. The highest proportion is in the two inner-city sites in Addis Ababa. The other two sites, one on the periphery of Addis Ababa and the other in Hawassa, have higher proportions of respondents who said that they did not have a hand-washing facility close to the toilet. However, the proportion of children in Hawassa who reported having hand-washing facilities close to the toilet is much higher than was reported by the caregivers in other sites. See Table 11.

**Table 11.** *Hand-washing facility near toilet*

	Are there hand-washing facilities close to the toilet? (caregivers) (%)				Do you have water to wash your hands near the toilet? (children) (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	98.2	0.9	0.0	0.9	92.0	8.0	0.0	0.0
Menderin	94.4	5.6	0.0	0.0	87.1	12.9	0.0	0.0
Duba	80.8	8.0	0.0	11.2	83.5	7.4	0.0	9.1
Leku	81.5	18.5	0.0	0.0	58.1	41.9	0.0	0.0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>88.4</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.2</b>	<b>79.8</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.4</b>
	(N=412)	(N=39)	(N=0)	(N=15)	(N=360)	(N=80)	(N=0)	(N=11)

In the qualitative sub-sample, caregivers in the two inner-city sites in Addis Ababa did not mention the availability of hand-washing facilities near their toilet. However, in the other two sites, Duba and Leku, some caregivers mentioned the presence of hand-washing facilities.

Table 12 shows that in all the sites, most of the caregivers (83 per cent) and somewhat fewer children (73 per cent) said that they used soap after going to toilet. The highest proportion (94 per cent) was in Menderin for caregivers, but for children the proportion in Menderin was the lowest. However, it may be that respondents found it difficult to admit that they do not use soap regularly, and – given the findings on lack of washing facilities – the results should be considered with caution.

**Table 12.** *Using soap after going to the toilet*

	Do you use soap after going to the toilet? (%)							
	Caregivers				Children			
	No	Yes	DK	NA	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	14	79.8	0.9	5.3	20.5	77.7	0	1.8
Menderin	5.6	93.5	0	0.9	7.9	73.3	0	18.8
Duba	20	70.4	0	9.6	28.9	69.4	0	1.7
Leku	5	90.8	0	4.2	12	70.9	0	17.1
<b>All sites</b>	<b>11.4</b>	<b>83.3</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>17.7</b>	<b>72.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9.5</b>
	(N=53)	N=388)	(N=1)	(N=24)	(N=80)	(N=328)	(N=0)	(N=43)

Likewise, most caregivers in the qualitative sub-sample in all the sites said that they wash their hands using soap after using toilet. Three caregivers, two in Leku and one in Duba, expressed gratitude for the work of Health Extension Workers in promoting the use of soap after going to the toilet. However, some of the caregivers said that they wash their hands using only water, and some respondents admitted to not using soap regularly. One father of a Younger Cohort girl in Menderin said he always washes his hands with water, but he does not use soap, since it is becoming expensive. A father of another Younger Cohort girl in Menderin said he does not wash his hands after going to the toilet as he is not accustomed to it. A mother of a Younger Cohort boy in Leku also said she does not wash her hands after using the toilet – behaviour which she attributed to lack of awareness.

Most of the children in both cohorts in all the sites also said that they use soap to wash their hands after going to the toilet, but some said they use only water, and a few Younger Cohort children said they do not wash their hands regularly after using the toilet. An Older Cohort boy in Bertukan said that he usually uses soap to wash his hands, but when soap is not available he uses ash to wash his hands.

Overall, more than three-quarters of the caregivers (79 per cent) said that they took out solid waste from their domestic rubbish for regular collection, and a further 13 per cent put it in municipality skips. Other forms of waste disposal were very rare. However, burning was reported by almost a fifth of respondents in Hawassa. See Table 13.

**Table 13.** *Solid-waste disposal*

	How does your household dispose of solid waste? (%)						
	Burn	Bury	Take out for regular collection	Throw in river	Throw in field	In a municipal skip	Other (specify)
Bertukan	0.0	0.0	96.5	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.9
Menderin	1.6	0.0	79.2	0.0	1.6	16.8	0.8
Duba	1.9	0.0	79.6	0.9	0.0	17.6	0.0
Leku	19.3	4.2	61.3	0.0	1.7	13.4	0.0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>79.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>12.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>
	(N=27)	(N=5)	(N=368)	(N=1)	(N=4)	(N=59)	(N=2)

Both children and caregivers in the qualitative sub-sample in all the sites also said that they dispose of solid waste by giving it to people who collect it regularly, some saying that it was collected on a weekly basis. Many suggested that this has resulted in better sanitation, at least in their compound and near their houses. However, there are some exceptions. One

household in Duba, in the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa, said that their house is farther away and the people who collect solid waste do not come there, so they burn the solid waste every 15 days. Likewise, an Older Cohort boy and two Younger Cohort girls in Leku said that they burn the solid waste in their compound. A mother of a Younger Cohort child in Leku said that solid-waste management is conducted by the community members: they collect the waste, put it on a cart and dispose of it on the edge of the city. A mother of another Younger Cohort boy in the same site and her son both said that they dispose of their solid waste behind their toilet. A Younger Cohort boy in Leku said they dispose of the solid waste near the toilet, and it is not properly handled. Likewise an Older Cohort boy in Leku said that they have a pit in the back of their house where they put solid waste, following the teaching of the Health Extension Workers. A Younger Cohort girl in Duba and an Older Cohort girl and boy in Menderin said that they take solid waste to a municipal skip.

Overall, the main form of liquid-waste disposal is in a channel (45 per cent), with this being practised by the vast majority in the inner-city sites, in one of which (Bertukan) it is almost the only form of waste disposal. The next most frequent means is in the street, mentioned by more than a quarter of respondents (28 per cent): this is the most common means of disposal in the site on the outskirts of Addis Ababa, with more than two-thirds of respondents using this method. Disposal in a well was the most common means in Hawassa (40 per cent). See Table 14.

**Table 14.** *Liquid-waste disposal*

	How does your household dispose of liquid waste? (%)					
	In a channel	In a pit	In a well	In a toilet	In a street	Other (specify)
Bertukan	98.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.0
Menderin	63.0	0.0	6.5	0.9	10.2	19.4
Duba	22.4	4.0	10.4	0.0	63.2	0.0
Leku	0.8	22.7	40.3	1.7	33.6	0.8
<b>All sites</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>6.9</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>28.3</b>	<b>4.7</b>
	<b>(N=209)</b>	<b>(N=32)</b>	<b>(N=68)</b>	<b>(N=3)</b>	<b>(N=132)</b>	<b>(N=22)</b>

Among the respondents in the qualitative sub-sample, most of the households in Bertukan and Duba dispose of liquid waste in the open drainage ditches near their houses or compounds. Those in Duba and Leku dispose of liquid waste either in their compound, or outside on the streets, or in open spaces. There are a few cases of respondents mentioning a different way of disposing of liquid waste. A caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba and two Younger Cohort girls in Leku said that they have a pit for the disposal of their liquid waste in their compound. A Younger Cohort girl and a boy in the same cohort in Leku, and a Younger Cohort boy in ET 03, said that they dispose of liquid waste in the toilet.

### 2.3 Aspects of their homes that children like

The housing conditions and the facilities in the study sites, especially those in the inner part of the city, where living conditions are congested, may give the impression that children and their parents do not appreciate anything about their home environment. However, some aspects – notably home and family relations – are appreciated by significant proportions of the respondents.

### *Pleasant family atmosphere*

Most of the children in all the sites agreed with the statement that a nice family atmosphere in which there are good relations between household members made them appreciate their homes. The proportion of children who agreed was highest in the site in Hawassa (91 per cent) and the site on the periphery of the city of Addis Ababa (90 per cent). In the other two sites the proportion was about 85 per cent.

Although this view was also prevalent in the qualitative sub-sample, Kudus in Leku said he was having a difficult time since his parents divorced. He stated:

“My father and mother divorced a year ago and currently I am living with my mother. I feel bad because of the separation of my parents. The family atmosphere was good before the divorce and my father used to take me to recreational places. All of my needs were fulfilled before the divorce. But now life is very difficult.”

### *Spending time with parents*

Here again, most of the children agree with the statement that spending time with parents makes them like their homes. The proportion was highest in the site in Hawassa (97 per cent), followed by Menderin (95 per cent). The proportions were somewhat lower in the other two Addis Ababa sites (Bertukan with 81 per cent and Duba with 80 per cent).

### *Spending time with siblings*

Although most of the children agreed with the statement that spending time with siblings makes them like their homes, even more mentioned spending time with parents. Here again, the proportion in the site in Hawassa was the highest, with 92 per cent, followed by Menderin with 88 per cent. The proportion in the two other Addis Ababa sites was lower (Bertukan with 70 per cent and Duba with 65 per cent).

### *Eating with family*

Most of the children agreed with the statement that eating with the family made them like their homes. Here again the proportion was highest in the site in Hawassa, with a little more than 97 per cent, followed by Menderin with about 97 per cent. Similarly the proportion was lower in the other two Addis Ababa Sites (Bertukan with 75 per cent and Duba with 69 per cent).

### *Compounds and neighbourhood*

Some respondents in the qualitative sub-sample also mentioned that they like their homes because they have a compound, particularly in Duba, on the periphery of Addis Ababa, and to some extent in the site in Hawassa. A Younger Cohort girl in Duba said she liked her home because they had a compound of their own and sufficient space in the house. She also liked the fact that she had her own bedroom. Unlike most of the houses in Menderin, which do not have a nice compound, a Younger Cohort boy said that he liked their compound, the trees in it and the fresh air. A few children in the other two inner-city sites also said they liked their home because of the neighbourhood.

### *Summary of aspects of their homes that children like*

Overall, regarding the aspects of their homes that children like, a nice family atmosphere and spending time with parents were appreciated by the highest proportion of children. See Table 15. The range of difference between the sites was rather small for 'nice family atmosphere', suggesting similar views in all four sites. Duba and Leku each had the same proportion, and the lowest was in Menderin. However, the range was large for 'spending time with parents'. The highest was in the site in Hawassa, while the lowest was in Duba. Eating with family and spending time with siblings had somewhat lower proportions, ranked third and fourth. Here again the range for both is wide, with the site in Hawassa having the highest proportion, while the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa had the lowest in both respects. This suggests that a higher proportion of the children in the site in Hawassa value family cohesion, which may be related to the high in-migrant population, with a more rural orientation.

**Table 15.** *Summary of aspects of their homes that children like*

Aspects that children like (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Nice family atmosphere	85.7	90.1	85.1	90.1	<b>88.0 (N=397)</b>
Spending time with parents	81.3	80.2	95.0	96.6	<b>88.0 (N=397)</b>
Eating with family	75.0	68.6	97.0	97.4	<b>84.0 (N=379)</b>
Spending time with siblings	69.6	65.3	88.1	92.3	<b>78.5 (N=354)</b>

## **2.3 Aspects of their homes that children dislike**

In this section the things that children dislike about their homes are discussed. These range from the conditions of the house to a lack of particular facilities and concerns about the quality of amenities.

### *Room size and room in attic*

Interestingly, most of the children do not dislike their homes because the rooms are small. However, the proportions agreeing with this statement are higher for the two sites in the inner part of Addis Ababa (35.7 per cent for Bertukan and 32.7 per cent for Menderin), which suggests that the small size may be more of a problem in these congested inner-city areas. In contrast, in the site in Hawassa only about a fifth of the children said they dislike their home because they have small rooms. However, in the qualitative sub-sample most caregivers living in the two inner part of Addis Ababa did express a dislike of their homes either because their rooms are small or because they have only one room. Miki's caregiver, his grandmother, said:

"We are living here because we do not have any other option. Our house is very small. We do all things here. We cook here, we eat here, we sleep here and all of our belongings are here."

Samrawit's mother in Bertukan had to send two children to live with her sister. She said:

"My house is a very small single room, which is not enough even for me. So my two daughters live with my sister. They spend the night there and also stay there during the day. I prepare food and they come and take it from here."

Another caregiver, the mother of Rahina in Bertukan, said that they had to rent a room adjacent to the house that they rent from the *kebele* because the room is very small and could not accommodate all eleven household members.

In the qualitative sub-sample most children in the two inner-city sites (Bertukan and Menderin), as well as some in the other two sites, said that they dislike their home because the rooms are small. Some children said they dislike their homes because they live in a single room where they have to perform all activities. One Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said she dislikes her home because it is small and has only one room, while all the neighbours have two rooms.

In two of the congested inner-city sites there are a number of children who live in makeshift attics within the house, called *qot*. These are made from wood with an entrance at the corner of the room, which children access by means of a ladder. About a quarter of the children in Bertukan and a fifth in Menderin agree with the statement that they dislike their home because they have to sleep in attics. In the qualitative interviews people mentioned renting out the *qot*, despite not having enough space for themselves. Miki's grandmother in Bertukan said:

"I used to rent the *qot* for 15 birr but I heard that the government would take it so I stopped renting it and now my grandson sleeps there."

The child of this caregiver mentioned studying in the library, and otherwise in the *qot* where he sleeps. Another caregiver mentioned renting out the *qot*, while three children mentioned sleeping in a *qot*.

### *Sharing a room and a bed, lack of privacy*

Most of the children did not agree with the statement that sharing room made them dislike their homes. This suggests that notions of privacy may not be very pronounced, or that children do not consider having a room to themselves as an option. However, more than a quarter of the children agreed with the statement in Bertukan, whereas more than a fifth of the children agreed in the other three sites.

Only about three per cent overall said that they disliked their home because they share a bed, even though 73 per cent of the children do share a bed with a parent (29 per cent), with a sibling (24 per cent), with two family members (21 per cent), or with more than two (10 per cent). This suggests that sharing a bed is considered normal by children. There were some site differences: six per cent of the children in Duba said they disliked their home because they shared a bed, while the corresponding figure was about five per cent each in the other two sites in Addis Ababa. However, no child in the site in Hawassa said that they disliked the home because of having to share a bed.

Similarly, lack of privacy was not a major reason for disliking the home environment. Among those who agreed with the statement, the highest proportion was in Hawassa, with 27 per cent, followed by Menderin, with 19 per cent. In the other two sites the proportion was about 12 per cent. Nor was lack of privacy emphasised as a problem by most children in the qualitative sub-sample. However, an Older Cohort girl in Duba mentioned that because they did not have several rooms in their house and she did not have her own bedroom, she was unable to have private time to herself.



### *Absence (and condition) of toilets*

Overall, the children did not dislike their homes because of lack of toilet facilities. The average was about 13 per cent for all of the sites. However, about a fifth of children in Duba agreed with the statement that they disliked their home because of the lack of toilet facilities, whereas it was 17 per cent for Menderin, and about 11 per cent for Bertukan. The lowest proportion was in the site in Hawassa, with 7 per cent.

However, the qualitative sub-sample presents a different picture. Some caregivers and children in the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa mentioned that they did not have a toilet and that they had to relieve themselves in the field. An Older Cohort girl in Duba said she disliked their home because they do not have a toilet, and she is frightened to go alone during the night. There were also three households in Menderin who had to use public toilets because they did not have their own toilet.

The majority of the children did not agree with the statement that a dirty/smelly toilet made them dislike their homes. However, in Menderin the majority (about 55 per cent) agreed with the statement. The next highest proportion of children who agreed was found in the site in Hawassa, with about 46 per cent. The proportions in Bertukan and Duba were 39 and 36 per cent respectively.

Respondents in the qualitative sub-sample did mention their dislike of dirty and smelly toilets, as already noted in the previous section. A Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said she dislikes their toilet not only because it is smelly, but also because its walls are damaged and people can see through when a person uses the toilet. Besides, the toilet of neighbours, located on the edge of the compound, is also very smelly.

### *Leaking roofs*

The proportion of children in the two sites located in the inner part of the city who dislike their home because of a leaking roof is higher than in the other two sites. For Bertukan it was 23 per cent, while it was 22 per cent for Duba. In the qualitative sub-sample some people also mentioned the problem of a leaking roof. For example, Hailu's mother in Duba said:

“The roof of my house lets water in when it rains. So, I put plates everywhere to prevent the household items from being spoiled by the water.”

Yenew's mother in Menderin said:

“We can't afford to change the roof so we are wearing plastic over the blankets in order to get protection from rain.”

In Leku, damaged roofs are maintained by the *kebele*. Denbel's mother said:

“The older corrugated iron sheets of the roof were replaced by the *kebele* this year since they were unable to protect us from rain and sunlight.”

Children also mentioned disliking their homes because of leaking roofs. A Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan said he does not like his house because it lets in water when it rains. This was also mentioned by two boys in the same cohort in Duba. Another boy in the Younger Cohort in Leku said that although the roof leaks he does not dislike the house, because he is living in it anyway. Another Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan mentioned the help of an NGO to repair their leaking roof. Among the Older Cohort children, only one boy in Leku, and none of the girls, mentioned a leaking roof.

### *Other concerns*

Other aspects of their homes that some caregivers and children in the qualitative sub-sample mentioned included the absence or poor condition of their kitchen, or the difficulties of using a shared kitchen, since people do not keep it clean and in some cases the communal kitchen lacks wall, roof and doors. Some other children mentioned that they disliked their houses because their houses are dilapidated – the walls and floors being damaged. Yet other children mentioned that they disliked their homes because they did not have a compound to play in, especially in the sites in the inner part of Addis Ababa, where children do not have open spaces in which to play and they have to use the streets as playgrounds. A few people mentioned that they were not happy with the houses in which they were living because they were living in a private rented house.

### *Summary of aspects of their homes that children dislike*

Of all the aspects that children said they disliked, dirty toilets ranked first – a feature mentioned considerably more often than the second most-cited aspect, which was the necessity of sharing a room. The range of emphasis placed on toilets across the sites was also fairly large, inner-city Menderin having the highest proportion; the lowest was in Duba, on the periphery of Addis Ababa. However, the proportion of children who disliked their home because it lacked a toilet (ranked fifth in Table 16) is the highest in this site, where a significant proportion of children said they relieve themselves in open fields.

**Table 16.** *Summary of aspects of their homes that children dislike*

Aspects that children dislike (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Dirty toilet	39.3	36.4	54.5	46.2	<b>43.7 (N=197)</b>
Sharing room	25.6	21.5	22.8	22.2	<b>23.5 (N=106)</b>
Family dispute	21.4	20.7	16.8	20.5	<b>20.0 (N=90)</b>
Lack of privacy	12.5	12.4	18.8	27.4	<b>17.7 (N=80)</b>
No toilet	10.7	19	16.8	6.8	<b>13.3 (N=60)</b>
Sharing bed	4.5	5.8	5.0	0.0	<b>3.8 (N=17)</b>
Presence of <i>deba</i> <sup>6</sup>	0.9	0.0	2.0	1.7	<b>1.1 (N=5)</b>

The aspect cited by the second highest proportion of children was sharing rooms; the range was small and the proportion of children in all the sites was about similar. The same was true for family disputes. For lack of privacy the range was fairly wide; a greater proportion of the children in the site in Hawassa disliked their homes because of lack of privacy, and the proportion was lowest in Duba. Sharing beds and the presence of *deba*, non-family members or lodgers sharing the space, were two aspects that were not very significant, mentioned by only small proportions of interviewees.

6 The word *deba* refers to a person who is not a family member who is 'additional' and may be a distant relative, someone given shelter, or a lodger.

## 3. The neighbourhood

The neighbourhood in which the sites are located provides the context in which the children grew up and where they are now living. This can have both positive and negative impacts on the children. This section deals with the views of children and caregivers about aspects of their neighbourhoods that they like and dislike.

### 3.1 Aspects of their neighbourhood that children and caregivers like

This sub-section deals with aspects of the neighbourhood that children appreciated, including social relations, notably meeting friends, being close to families and relatives, and belonging to social institutions such as *iddir* funeral associations and *mehaber* religious associations, as well as access to services, notably the school, youth clubs, markets, cafés and religious institutions.

#### *Meeting friends*

Most of the children and the caregivers in all the four sites agreed with the statement that they liked their neighbourhood because they meet friends there. The highest proportion of interviewees agreeing with this statement was in the site in Hawassa (about 90 per cent of the children and 89 per cent of the caregivers). The next highest proportion was in Bertukan, with 82 per cent for the children and 70 per cent for the caregivers. In Menderin and Duba the proportions were 78 and 73 per cent for the children and 69 and 65 per cent for the caregivers respectively.

Most of the children in the qualitative sub-sample, and especially Younger Cohort girls, mentioned that they like their neighbourhoods because they meet friends and go with them to play in the neighbourhood. They said that they would miss their friends if relocation happened and they had to move to different places. Some of them were of the view that the move might be good for their life in general, but they are afraid of losing their social contacts and friendships.

#### *Being close to family and relatives*

Here again, most of the children and the caregivers agreed with the statement that being close to their family and relatives made them like their neighbourhood. The highest proportion for children expressing this view is found in the site in Hawassa (76 per cent), while the highest proportion of caregivers agreeing with it was in Bertukan (80 per cent), followed by Bertukan for children (70 per cent) and Duba for the caregivers, with a little more than 79 per cent. The proportions were two-thirds in Duba (66 per cent) for children and 79 per cent for caregivers in Leku; while in Menderin the proportion was 63 per cent for the children and 64 per cent for the caregivers.

#### *The iddir (funeral associations)<sup>7</sup>*

Only a small proportion of children felt that *iddir* burial associations made them appreciate their neighbourhood. The highest proportion was in Bertukan, with about 13 per cent,

---

<sup>7</sup> These are the most important form of community-initiated social organisation.

followed by Leku and Duba with about 11 per cent each. The proportion of children who agreed in Menderin was only 1 per cent. However, for the caregivers the proportions were much higher. The highest was in the site in Hawassa, with over 92 per cent, followed by Menderin with about 76 per cent. For Duba and Bertukan the proportions were 62 and 49 per cent respectively. The difference between the children and the caregivers may be due to the fact that the caregivers are members of *iddir* and are more aware of its benefits, whereas the children are not members, as we shall see in the section on belonging to associations and social support.

### *The mehaber (rotating socio-religious associations)<sup>8</sup>*

Similarly, only a small proportion of children agreed with the statement that *mehaber* made them like their neighbourhood. The highest proportion was in Hawassa, with about 16 per cent, followed by Menderin with about 10 per cent. The proportions for the other two sites, Bertukan and Duba, were only 5 and 3 per cent respectively. Although the proportions for the caregivers were higher than for the children, they were relatively small in comparison with caregivers' responses about *iddir*. The highest was in the site in Hawassa with about 39 per cent, followed by Duba and Menderin with 22 and 29 per cent respectively. However, the proportion was much lower in Bertukan, with only 9 per cent.

### *The market*

The majority of the children in Menderin (about 63 per cent) agreed with the statement that the market made them like their neighbourhood. In Leku the proportion of children who agreed was a little less than half, whereas it was 43 and 34 per cent in Bertukan and Duba. Some children in the qualitative sub-sample in Menderin and Duba also mentioned the presence of shops in/near their neighbourhoods. The proportions of caregivers who liked their neighbourhoods because of the market were generally higher, in comparison with the children. As with the children, Menderin had the highest proportion: 90 per cent. However, the second highest proportion for the caregivers was in Bertukan, with 80 per cent. For Leku and Duba the proportions were 66 and 54 per cent respectively.

### *Cafés*

There are differences between the sites regarding whether children like their neighbourhood because of the presence of cafés. In Leku and Menderin more than half of the children agreed with the statement that cafés were a reason to like their neighbourhood, whereas only a quarter of the children in Bertukan and a fifth of the children in Duba agreed with the same statement. The proportion of caregivers having a favourable attitude towards their neighbourhoods because of the presence of cafés was smaller. The highest was in Menderin with 45 per cent, followed by Leku with 35 per cent, and for Duba it was about 21 per cent. However, in Bertukan the proportion was only 7 per cent.

### *The school*

Surprisingly, with regard to the statement that the school was a reason for liking their neighbourhood, only in the sites in Hawassa and Menderin did the majority of the children

---

<sup>8</sup> These associations are generally formed by Orthodox Christians under the name of a particular saint; they meet in rotation once a month at each other's houses.

agree. In the other two Addis Ababa sites, fewer than half of the children agreed with the statement.

However, most of the children in all the sites who were attending the school said that the school is accessible. Nonetheless, there are some children in all the sites who went to better schools who had to travel to reach to schools; although the distance is a constraint, they were pleased with the better quality of education. A Younger Cohort child in the site in Hawassa mentioned that a new wide road was constructed recently and this was not good for the safety of the children crossing on their way to school, as there were many cars and *bajaj*. Amina in Duba said she did not like the school, because the boys and the teachers were badly behaved. She said:

“I do not like the behaviour of boys in the school, as they force girls to become their girlfriends. The teachers did the same as well. Last year, my homeroom teacher asked me to be his girlfriend. But when I refused, he reduced my results and told me that I had failed and I was going to repeat the grade. Then, my father went and talked with the teacher and gave him a warning that he was going to take the case to the women’s affairs office. The teacher then corrected the results and gave me a certificate of promotion to the next grade.”

### *The church/mosque*

Most of the children in all the sites except Duba agreed with the statement that the presence of the church/mosque made them like their neighbourhood. For Leku and Menderin the proportion was about 80 per cent; it was two-thirds for Bertukan, whereas in the fourth site, Duba, slightly fewer than half of the children agreed with the statement.

In all the sites most of the respondents in the qualitative sample mentioned that a church is accessible to their neighbourhood, and that they like their neighbourhood for this reason. In two of the sites in Addis Ababa (Bertukan and Duba), some Muslims said that they had a mosque in the neighbourhood. However, two mothers in Menderin said that they did not have a mosque nearby and they are unable to go to the mosque as frequently as they would have liked.

### *Youth clubs*

A significant proportion of children in all the sites did not agree with the statement that youth clubs made them like their neighbourhood. Only about 12 per cent of the children in Duba, about 9 per cent in Leku and Bertukan, and 6 per cent in Menderin agreed with the statement, suggesting that youth clubs are not an important source of pride among children. Youth clubs exist at the level of *kebele* administrations, although these are often small political groups, and sometimes they operate in schools. The responses seem to suggest that belonging to youth clubs is not very important for the interviewed children, as is confirmed later in the section on belonging to associations.

### *Neighbours*

Most of the caregivers in all the sites agreed that the presence of neighbours was a reason for liking the area in which they lived. The highest proportion was in the site in Hawassa, with about 92 per cent; followed by Bertukan with 86 per cent. The proportions for Duba and Menderin were 82 and 81 per cent respectively.

### *Access to work*

Overall, a little more than 40 per cent of the caregivers said they liked their neighbourhoods because of access to work close by. The highest proportion was in Duba with 45 per cent, followed closely by Bertukan and Menderin with 43 and 42 per cent. The proportion for Leku was 35 per cent.

### *Access to shops*

A significant proportion of caregivers said they liked their neighbourhoods because of access to shops: more than 80 per cent overall. The highest proportion was in Menderin, with about 95 per cent of the caregivers; this was followed by Leku with 88 per cent, and Bertukan with 83 per cent. The lowest was in Duba with 62 per cent.

### *Access to health care and education*

Most of the caregivers like their neighbourhood because of the access to health services. The overall average was over 72 per cent. The highest proportion was found in Menderin with about 94 per cent, followed by Leku with 76 per cent, and Bertukan with 67 per cent, while the lowest was in Duba with 54 per cent.

Access to education was also appreciated by most of the caregivers. The highest proportion appreciating access to education is in Menderin, with about 93 per cent, followed by Leku, with about 90 per cent. The proportions were much lower in the other two sites, with 68 per cent in Bertukan and 54 per cent in Duba.

### *Safety at night*

Overall, more than half of the caregivers appreciated having relative safety at night. This was true for the three sites, except Bertukan, where fewer than 40 per cent of the caregivers said they liked their neighbourhoods because they felt safe during the night. The highest proportion was found in Leku, with about 70 per cent, followed by Menderin with 62 per cent and Duba with a little more than half of the caregivers confirming that they feel safe at night. This may suggest that the recent introduction of *kebele* policing is making for a safer environment.

### *Kebele recreation centre and bars*

On average a little more than a fifth of all the caregivers said that the presence of a *kebele* recreation centre made their neighbourhood attractive, which suggests that this is not a major source of recreation. However, the difference between the highest and the lowest proportions was large. The highest was in Menderin, with 48 per cent, followed by Duba with 23 per cent. The other two sites had much smaller proportions, both with 8 per cent.

Overall, the caregivers did not express positive views about bars as a reason for liking their neighbourhoods. This is because the areas are known for having many bars and drinking houses which often result in conflicts and which sometimes encourage commercial sex work. The highest proportion of caregivers who said they liked their neighbourhoods because of bars was in Menderin with about 32 per cent, followed by Leku, with 13 per cent. The other two sites, where the problems of bars are well known, had much smaller proportions (Duba had 8 per cent; and Bertukan 5 per cent).

### *Summary of aspects of their neighbourhoods that children and caregivers like*

The aspect of their neighbourhoods that the highest proportion of children liked was the opportunity to meet friends. The highest proportion was in the site in Hawassa, while the lowest was in one of the inner-city sites in Addis Ababa, Menderin (with a range of about 13 per cent). Being close to family and friends was the second most important factor; here again the highest proportion was in Leku and the lowest was in Menderin (with a range of about 14 per cent). The church/mosque and the school were the next in the order of importance. In both instances the highest proportion expressing this view was in the site in Hawassa, and the lowest was in the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa, with ranges of 30 per cent and 34 per cent respectively. The market and the cafés were appreciated by lower proportions, the highest being in Menderin and the lowest in Duba (with ranges of about 29 per cent and 34 per cent respectively). See Table 17.

**Table 17.** *Summary of aspects that children like about their neighbourhood*

Aspects that children like (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Meeting friends	82.1	72.7	78.2	90.6	<b>80.9 (N=365)</b>
Being close to family and friends	69.6	66.1	62.4	76.1	<b>68.7 (N=310)</b>
The church/mosque	66.1	49.6	80.2	80.3	<b>68.5 (N=309)</b>
The school	49.1	45.5	79.2	80.3	<b>63.0 (N=284)</b>
The market	43.8	33.9	63.4	47.9	<b>46.6 (N=210)</b>
Cafés	25.0	20.7	54.5	50.4	<b>37.0 (N=167)</b>
The youth club	8.9	11.6	5.9	9.4	<b>9.1 (N=41)</b>
<i>Iddir</i>	12.5	10.7	1.0	11.1	<b>9.1 (N=41)</b>
<i>Mehaber</i>	5.4	2.5	9.9	16.2	<b>8.4 (N=38)</b>

For the first six items mentioned there was no difference between the views of boys and girls; but for the last three the priorities of the boys follow the overall pattern, while for girls the order of importance was *mehaber*, *iddir* and youth clubs. Besides, unlike for youth clubs, the proportion of girls expressing positive views was higher for *mehaber* and for *iddir*. The data analysis according to age cohort suggests a different pattern. 'Meeting friends' came first overall, because of a higher proportion of Younger Cohort children. For Older Cohort children, 'the church/mosque' came first. The second and third highest proportions for the Younger Cohort children were being close to family/relatives and closeness to the school. The church/mosque and the market were cited by the fourth and fifth highest proportions of Younger Cohort children; while the market and the school received the highest numbers of positive mentions by the Older Cohorts. Both cohorts put cafés in sixth place. Youth club, *iddir* and *mehaber* came next for Older Cohorts, while in terms of appreciation for these the proportion of Younger Cohort children was significantly lower.

Table 18 shows the different aspects that caregivers appreciated about their neighbourhoods. In most of the aspects the highest proportion of positive mentions was found among caregivers in Leku; Menderin came next, with the second highest proportions for many of the aspects mentioned. The other two sites had most of the lowest proportions.

**Table 18.** Summary of aspects that caregivers like about their neighbourhood

Aspects that caregivers like (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Neighbours	86	82.4	80.6	91.6	<b>85.2 (N=397)</b>
Access to shops	83.3	62.1	95.4	88.2	<b>81.7 (N=380)</b>
Friends	70.2	64.8	68.5	89.1	<b>73.2 (N=341)</b>
Family	79.8	79.2	63.9	79	<b>75.8 (N=353)</b>
Access to education	68.4	54	62.6	89.9	<b>75.7 (N=352)</b>
Access to health centre	66.7	54	94.4	75.6	<b>72.0 (N=335)</b>
Access to market	79.8	53.6	89.8	65.5	<b>71.5 (N=333)</b>
<i>Iddir</i>	49.1	62.4	75.9	92.4	<b>70.0 (N=326)</b>
Safety at night	38.6	50.8	62	69.7	<b>55.3 (N=257)</b>
Access to work	43	45.2	41.7	35.3	<b>41.3 (N=192)</b>
Cafés	7	20.8	45.4	34.5	<b>26.6 (N=124)</b>
<i>Mehaber</i>	8.8	22.4	19.4	38.7	<b>22.5 (N=105)</b>
<i>Kebele</i> recreation centre	7.9	23.2	48.1	7.6	<b>21.2 (N=99)</b>
Bars	5.3	8	32.4	13.4	<b>14.4 (N=67)</b>
<i>Iqqub</i>	0.9	3.2	8.3	18.5	<b>7.7 (N=36)</b>

Contact with neighbours was cited most often, by slightly more than 85 per cent of interviewees. The highest proportion was in Leku, while the lowest was in Menderin. (The range was about 11 per cent.) Menderin had the highest proportion for the next aspect, access to shops, while the lowest was in Duba. (The range was large: about 33 per cent.) Access to friends and family was mentioned by the next highest proportions. For friends, the highest proportion was in Leku and the lowest was in Duba (with a range of 24 per cent). For family, the highest was in Bertukan, while the lowest was in Menderin (with a range of about 15 per cent). Access to education, health care and markets was also perceived as important. For all of the three, the lowest proportion of positive mentions was in Duba. Regarding access to education, Leku had the highest proportion, while Menderin had the highest proportion for access to health centre and market. (The range was significant in all three instances: 36 per cent for access to education and market, and 40 per cent for access to the health centre.) *Iddir* and safety at night are ranked next, mentioned by more than half the caregivers. In both instances the highest proportion was in Leku, while the lowest was in Bertukan. Access to work, cafés, *mehaber* and *kebele* recreation centres was less important. Duba had the highest proportion for access to work. Leku had the highest proportion for *mehaber*. Menderin had the highest proportion for the other two – cafés and *kebele* recreation centres. Access to work and *kebele* recreation centres had the lowest proportions in Leku, while cafés and *mehaber* had the lowest in Bertukan. (The range for cafés, *mehaber* and *kebele* recreation centres was large: 28, 30 and 40 per cent respectively.) Bars and *iqqub* were the least significant, coming last in the ranking.

### 3.2 Aspects of their neighbourhood that children and caregivers dislike

#### *Pollution of rivers, air and noise*

Most of the children and caregivers alike in all the sites did not see water/river pollution as a reason for disliking their neighbourhood. However, a little more than a quarter of children and caregivers agreed with the statement in Menderin, and about a fifth of children and



caregivers agreed with it in Bertukan. There was a difference between children and caregivers in Leku, where about 17 per cent of caregivers agreed with the statement, but only 3 per cent of children did so.

Overall, most children and caregivers did not agree with the statement that noise pollution made them dislike their neighbourhood. The highest proportion for caregivers was recorded in Bertukan (about 47 per cent), while for children the highest proportion was in the site in Hawassa (about 39 per cent). There were also differences between children and caregivers in Bertukan.

According to children and caregivers in the qualitative sub-sample, households in Bertukan, Menderin and Leku are affected by noise pollution, but this was not raised as a serious issue in Duba. The sources of the noise include music shops, cars, carts, and *bajaj*. A Younger Cohort boy in Menderin said that the cigarette factory near his neighbourhood not only polluted the air but also caused noise pollution. A boy in the same cohort in Leku said that a blacksmith in their neighbourhood created much noise.

Regarding noise pollution from religious institutions there were mixed views. A Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan said that such noise is not an issue in his area. Another boy in the Older Cohort in the same site said there is no disturbing noise from churches or mosques, because they are not close by. However, in Leku a Younger Cohort girl said that bars and religious institutions are causes of noise pollution in her area. Although most of the respondents in Duba said that noise pollution was not an issue in their area, the mother of Zewditu expressed strong views on this – but she suggested that people adapt to the noise. She said:

“Our ears are deafened with the noise of the church and the mosque; but we are now used to this, and it only disturbs newcomers to the area.”

Air pollution, mainly from car fumes and factories, was seen as a greater cause for concern among caregivers and children in the inner-city sites. In Bertukan just over half the caregivers (56 per cent) said they disliked their neighbourhood for this reason, and the proportion was 49 per cent in Menderin. In contrast, only 8 per cent in the other Addis Ababa site on the outskirts and a third of the sample in the Hawassa site mentioned air pollution as a reason for disliking their neighbourhood. Although the proportion of children disliking the neighbourhood because of air pollution is small, it was highest in Menderin, followed by Bertukan and Leku. However, as with the caregivers, air pollution is not a major concern for children in Duba, on the periphery of Addis Ababa.

Most of the caregivers and children in the qualitative sub-sample in the two inner-city sites of Addis Ababa complained about the air being polluted. A Younger Cohort boy and a caregiver, both in Menderin, mentioned the cigarette factory located near their neighbourhood as a cause of air pollution. In contrast, air pollution was seen as less of a problem in the site on the outskirts of Addis Ababa and in the site in Hawassa, where some people suggested that the air is relatively clean.

### *Dirty streets*

Overall, a little over half of the caregivers and a little under half of the children said that they disliked the area where they live because of dirty streets. However, the proportion who expressed this view was much higher in the two inner-city sites in Addis Ababa, where more than 70 per cent of caregivers and children agreed with the statement.

Most of the children and the caregivers in the qualitative sub-sample mentioned that the area where they live is very dirty, and that this made them dislike their neighbourhood. This was especially true for the two sites in the inner-city part of Addis Ababa. A Younger Cohort boy in Menderin said: "There is no place in the neighbourhood that is not dirty." In Duba on the city outskirts only a few respondents saw this as a serious problem. In the site in Hawassa, most people mentioned dust as more of a problem than dirt. A few children in both Duba and Leku suggested that their neighbourhoods were clean.

### *Smells in the streets*

Overall, more than half the caregivers and children agreed with the statement that smells in the streets made them dislike the area they live in. As with dirt in the streets, the proportion of caregivers and children who dislike their area because of smells in the streets is higher in the sites in the inner-city sites of Addis Ababa. However, in the other two sites the proportion of children who see this as a problem is higher than that of the caregivers.

Most of the children and caregivers in the qualitative sub-sample in the two inner-city sites in Addis Ababa mentioned that the smell is mainly due to the liquid waste disposed in channels. Some said there were people who even connected their toilets directly to the drainage ditches, and as a result the smell was awful. Only a few children mentioned similar problems in Duba, and they were perceived as even less of a problem in the site in Hawassa. A Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan said he loved the neighbourhood, and the only thing he disliked was the dirty and smelly channels, which are especially not good for the health of his mother, who is asthmatic. An Older Cohort girl in Bertukan said: "People urinate and throw their waste in the streets, which smells bad when the sun touches it." However, another Older Cohort girl in Bertukan mentioned improvement in this regard. She said that the open drainage in her neighbourhood had a very bad smell previously, but after the open channels had been closed, this was no longer a problem.

### *Crowded living conditions*

Although about half the sample agree with the statement that they dislike their area because of the crowded living conditions, this figure disguises a significant variation between the sites in the inner city, where the proportion are high (72 per cent in Menderin and 62 per cent in Bertukan), and the sites on the outskirts (29 per cent) and the Hawassa site (37 per cent), where they are much lower.

### *Prevalence of commercial sex work*

Most children and adults did not consider the prevalence of prostitution as a reason for disliking their neighbourhood.<sup>9</sup> However, in the site in Hawassa and one of the sites in the inner-city part of Addis Ababa the proportion of those who agreed was high. In Leku more than a third (34 per cent) of the Older Cohort children and 29 per cent of caregivers agreed with the statement that the prevalence of prostitution made them dislike their neighbourhood. In Menderin about a fifth (19 per cent) of Older Cohort children and a quarter (24 per cent) of adults agreed with the statement. Lower proportions of interviewees in the other two sites in Addis Ababa agreed with the proposition, and the lowest score was recorded in the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa: only 3 and 4 per cent of Older Cohort children and adults respectively held this view.

---

<sup>9</sup> Only Older Cohort children were asked this question.

### *Lack of recreation (children)*

Although most of the children did not agree with the statement that lack of recreation made them dislike their neighbourhood, a sizeable proportion, ranging from 41 to 48 per cent, did agree. The highest proportion is in Duba (about 48 per cent of children), closely followed by Menderin (47 per cent). In the site in Hawassa, 45 per cent agreed with the statement, and in Bertukan the proportion was 41 per cent.

Qualitative evidence suggests that lack of recreation is one of the things that unites all the children and caregivers in all the sites. Although this was a problem in all the sites, it seems to be more serious in Bertukan and Menderin. Some children in Duba said that even though there were no recreation centres there were some open spaces in the neighbourhood for children to play, and some households have compounds; however, others in the same site mentioned lack of space and children having no alternative but to play on the streets. Likewise, opinions were divided in the site in Hawassa: some said there were spaces for children to play, while others saw lack of recreational space as a problem. In all the sites where children lack recreation facilities, they play on the road, which renders them vulnerable to accidents.

### *Safety during the day (children)*

The majority of the children did not dislike their neighbourhood for being unsafe during the day. This is especially true in the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa, where a little more than 99 per cent of the children disagreed. Of those who agreed with the proposition, the proportion was highest in Menderin (about 23 per cent), followed by Leku (about 19 per cent), whereas about 13 per cent of the children agreed in Bertukan.

### *Safety during the night (children)*

Similarly, most of the children did not agree with the statement that they disliked their neighbourhood because it is unsafe during the night. However, Menderin is an exception: here about 52 per cent of the children agreed with the statement. The next highest proportion agreeing with it was found in Bertukan (about 38 per cent), followed by Leku (31 per cent) and Duba (26 per cent).

Safety during the night was considered for girls as well as boys. Surprisingly, in all sites except one, fewer girls than boys considered lack of safety at night as an issue. This may be in part because boys are more likely to go out and are therefore more at risk from violence, while girls tend to stay at home. The exception was Menderin, where there was the highest proportion of children agreeing with the statement, and where 58 per cent of girls agreed, compared with 45 per cent of the boys. This may be a reflection of extreme poverty in this site, where girls have to go out to look for work, and where youth unemployment and crime rates are high.

However, in the qualitative sub-sample most girls in both cohorts mentioned that their neighbourhoods were not safe in the evening and that they did not go out of their house in the evening. Some Younger Cohort boys also said their neighbourhoods were not safe during the night. For instance, an Older Cohort girl in Duba said that drunken men in the neighbourhood harass girls and women, and because of this girls do not want to go out of their houses in the evening. Similarly, a Younger Cohort girl in Menderin said she disliked the neighbourhood because there are people who stand in the dark and insult others who are walking in the roads. Likewise, another Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said it was not safe

during the night in the neighbourhood, and she was scared. A Younger Cohort boy in Leku said there was a security problem in the night, because the police do not patrol the streets.

A Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan mentioned that she was afraid of sexual harassment, not because she had witnessed this in her neighbourhood, but because she had seen on TV that even very small children were raped. She also said she fears that children may be stolen. Another Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan also said she fears child theft, as it is an issue that some people talk about, and she especially fears Jamaican people (Rastamen), as it was said that they kidnap children. She also fears gangsters sitting by the roadside.

### *Exposure to bad habits (children)*

Overall, fewer than a third of children said that they dislike the area where they live because they are exposed to bad habits. The proportion that saw this as a problem was highest in the two inner-city sites in Addis Ababa (ET 03, with 41 per cent agreeing with the statement, and Bertukan with 38 per cent).

A Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said that she did not like to spend time in the neighbourhood because there are people who are addicted to different things. Another girl in the same cohort and site said she feared that she might develop the bad habit of smoking, as people send her to buy cigarettes. An Older Cohort girl in Duba said she did not like the neighbourhood because it has many *chat* and *shisha* houses, and the male customers in those places insult girls.<sup>10</sup>

### *Bad place for up bringing children (caregivers)*

Caregivers were also asked about the area where they live regarding the task of bringing up children. Most of the caregivers in the two inner-city sites agreed that they disliked the area as a bad place to bring up children. The proportions who agreed with the statement were 68 per cent in Bertukan and 63 per cent in Menderin. In contrast, in the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa more than three-quarters disagreed with the statement, which suggests that most caregivers feel that it is a good place to bring up children. Slightly fewer than half of the caregivers in the site in Hawassa said that the area was not good for bringing up children.

### *Dangerous /unsafe (caregivers)*

The majority of the caregivers in all the sites did not seem to dislike their neighbourhood for being dangerous/unsafe. This was especially true in Duba, on the periphery of Addis Ababa, where 96 per cent of the caregivers disagreed with the statement. From among those who agreed with it, the highest proportion was in Menderin, with 38 per cent, followed by Bertukan, with 33 per cent, and the site in Hawassa (about 31 per cent).

### *Drunken behaviour (caregivers)*

Although most of the caregivers did not agree with the statement that drunken behaviour made them dislike their neighbourhood, a significant proportion agreed with it, suggesting that this is perceived as a problem. The highest proportion was in Bertukan, where more than

---

<sup>10</sup> *Chat* is a mildly narcotic plant, the leaves of which are chewed in many parts of the Horn of Africa. *Shisha* is the water pipe or hubble-bubble used to smoke tobacco, prevalent in the Middle East and becoming popular among some youth in Ethiopian cities.

40 per cent of the caregivers agreed. Next was the site in Hawassa, with a little over 35 per cent agreeing. This was followed by Menderin, with about 32 per cent. The lowest proportion was in Duba, with only 12 per cent.

### *Street fighting (caregivers)*

The majority of the caregivers did not agree with the statement that street fighting made them dislike their neighbourhood. The rate of disagreement was highest in Duba, with more than 98 per cent of the caregivers disagreeing. From among those who agreed with the statement, the highest proportion was in Menderin (37 per cent), suggesting that this inner-city site, where youth unemployment is rife, is considered to be a place where there are conflicts. This was followed by Bertukan and Leku, with 30 and 29 per cent respectively.

However, most of the children and caregivers in the qualitative sub-sample did not mention street fighting as a problem, although some of them mentioned conflict between people living in the neighbourhood. This might occur as a result of sharing toilets and kitchens. However, a Younger Cohort girl in Menderin and an Older Cohort girl in Bertukan did say that many people fight in the neighbourhood.

### *Prevalence of theft (caregivers)*

The majority of caregivers did not agree with the statement that prevalence of theft made them dislike their neighbourhood. A significant exception was Menderin, where about 55 per cent of the caregivers agreed. The next highest proportion of caregivers who agreed was found in Leku, where a little less than half of the caregivers agreed. This was closely followed by Bertukan, where about 47 per cent of the caregivers agreed. The proportion for Duba, on the periphery of Addis Ababa, was the lowest, with only about 14 per cent agreeing.

Some children and caregivers in the qualitative sub-sample mentioned that there had been a decline in theft, due to community policing. However, an Older Cohort girl in Duba said there was theft in the neighbourhood despite there being many policemen; she further suggested that the policemen did not serve the community honestly – implying that they were unconcerned or corrupt.

### *Summary of aspects of their neighbourhood that children dislike*

Table 19 shows that the aspects that made the highest proportion of children dislike their neighbourhoods were smelly and dirty streets, with more than half the respondents perceiving these as problems. There was a wide range between the sites. In both respects the highest proportions were in the two inner-city sites, and the lowest was in Leku, the site in Hawassa, where fewer than half the children agreed with the statement. Lack of recreation was the third most unpopular aspect of their neighbourhood mentioned by the children in all the sites. The range was only about 7 per cent, suggesting that this was a common concern, most common in Duba, the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa, and the least common in Bertukan, one of the inner-city sites of Addis Ababa. Lack of safety in the area at night was the next most important factor overall, with this view most pronounced in inner-city Menderin, while the lowest was in Duba, with a fairly wide range of 25 points. Although the view that the area was unsafe in the day came at the end of the list, it was again expressed by the highest proportion in Menderin and by the lowest in Duba, where only one child said that the site was unsafe in the day; the range was about 21 points. The next most commonly expressed concerns were noise pollution in the neighbourhood and exposure to bad habits. While the

lowest proportion of responses for all of these was in Duba, the highest proportion for the area being noisy and exposing children to bad habits was in Bertukan, and the site in Hawassa, Leku, had the highest proportion for noise pollution. The range on the question of the area being noisy was about 22 points, while for that of noise pollution it was about 19 points. The next three aspects mentioned in the list were crowded neighbourhood, air pollution and river pollution. For all these aspects Menderin had the highest proportions; while for the first two Duba had the lowest proportions, with ranges of about 30 and 28 points respectively. For river pollution, the lowest proportion of concerns was recorded in the site in Hawassa, and the range was about 23 points. Prevalence of prostitution was the next factor in the list, with the highest proportion of concern being expressed in the site in Hawassa, followed by Menderin; while the lowest was in Duba, the other Addis Ababa site. The range was very wide, at 31 points.

**Table 19.** *Summary of aspects of their neighbourhood that children dislike*

Aspects that children dislike (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Smell in the streets	73.2	43.8	77.2	42.7	<b>58.3 (N=263)</b>
Dirty streets	71.4	46.3	76.2	39.3	<b>57.4 (N=259)</b>
Lack of recreational space	41.1	47.9	47.5	43.6	<b>45.0 (N=203)</b>
Lack of safety at night	37.5	26.4	51.5	30.8	<b>35.9 (N=162)</b>
Noise pollution	32.1	19.8	32.7	38.5	<b>30.6 (N=138)</b>
Exposure to bad habits	38.4	17.4	40.6	26.5	<b>30.2 (N=136)</b>
Over-crowding	33.9	14.9	44.6	21.4	<b>27.9 (N=126)</b>
Air pollution	30.4	7.4	34.7	25.6	<b>23.9 (N=108)</b>
Pollution of rivers	21.4	14.9	25.7	3.4	<b>16.0 (N=72)</b>
Prevalence of commercial sex work	5	2.5	19.4	34.3	<b>14.6 (N=22)</b>
Lack of safety in the day	13.4	0.8	22.8	18.8	<b>13.5 (N=61)</b>

Table 20 shows that of all the factors that made the caregivers dislike their neighbourhoods, smell in the streets and dirty streets were the most commonly expressed concerns: in both cases more than half the sample considered this to be a problem. For smell in the streets, the highest recorded proportion of concern was in Bertukan, while for dirty streets the highest was in Menderin. In both cases the lowest proportion was recorded in Duba. The range was a significant 45 per cent for smell in the streets and about 38 per cent for dirty streets. Interestingly, in terms of all the factors listed in Table 20, Duba, the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa, consistently recorded the lowest proportions of concern. Next in the list come overcrowding, 'bad place for bringing up children', and theft. Of these, the first and the last prompted the highest proportions of concern in Menderin, while the second one, 'bad place for bringing up children', was mentioned by the highest proportion in Bertukan, the other inner-city site. The ranges were 42, 46 and 41 per cent respectively. Air pollution, noise pollution and drunken behaviour came next. For these three factors the highest proportion was recorded in Bertukan. The ranges were significant: 47, 32 and 30 per cent respectively. The next factors were the area being dangerous/unsafe, street fighting and water/river pollution. For these the highest proportion was found in Menderin, and the range was 34, 35 and 13 per cent respectively. The least important factor was perceived as prevalence of commercial sex work; the highest proportion of positive responses was found in the Hawassa site, and the range was about 25 per cent.

**Table 20.** Summary of aspects of their neighbourhood that caregivers dislike

Aspects that caregivers dislike (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Smell in streets	78.1	32.5	76.9	41.2	<b>56.9 (N=265)</b>
Dirty streets	71.9	34.4	73.1	42.9	<b>54.7 (N=255)</b>
Crowded living conditions	62.3	29.6	72.2	37	<b>49.4 (N=230)</b>
Bad place for upbringing children	68.4	21.6	63	47.1	<b>49.1 (N=229)</b>
Theft	47.4	13.6	54.6	49.6	<b>40.6 (N=189)</b>
Air pollution	56.1	8.8	49.1	32.8	<b>35.8 (N=167)</b>
Noise pollution	46.5	13.6	34.3	37	<b>32.4 (N=151)</b>
Drunken behaviour	42.1	12	32.4	35.3	<b>30.0 (N=140)</b>
Dangerous/unsafe	32.5	4	38	31.1	<b>25.8 (N=120)</b>
Street fighting	29.8	1.6	37	29.4	<b>23.8 (N=111)</b>
Water/river pollution	20.2	15.2	27.8	16.8	<b>19.7 (N=92)</b>
Commercial sex work	7.9	4	24.1	28.6	<b>15.9 (N=74)</b>

## 4. Social networks and support

This section discusses where children spend their time; what associations they participate in; whom they contact when they face problems or need loans; which social relations, institutions and activities they value most; and from which types of association and individual they receive social support.

### 4.1 Social networks

#### *Meeting friends*

Table 21 shows that overall children mentioned school as the place where they most usually meet their friends; this was followed by 'in the streets', then their own home and their friends' homes. Very few met at the *kebele*, at religious institutions, or in cafés. There were some site variations. In Duba the highest proportion of children met their friends in the streets, while in Menderin it was in their home, suggesting that the homes in Duba are more crowded and less convenient for meeting friends.

**Table 21.** Places to meet friends

	Where do you meet your friends most of the time? (%)							
	At school	In the streets	In your home	In their home	At kebele	At church/mosque	Don't meet friends	At cafés
Bertukan	37.5	36.6	8	13.4	0	2.7	0.9	0.9
Duba	39.7	43.8	8.3	8.3	0	0	0	0
Menderin	31.7	11.9	40.6	6.9	5	1	3	0
Leku	37.6	12.8	32.5	11.1	5.1	0.9	0	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>26.8</b>	<b>21.7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.2</b>
	<b>(N=166)</b>	<b>(N=121)</b>	<b>(N=98)</b>	<b>(N=45)</b>	<b>(N=11)</b>	<b>(N=5)</b>	<b>(N=4)</b>	<b>(N=1)</b>

When the same data were analysed in terms of sex-related differences, for the girls the order of preference was the school, followed by their own house, the streets and their friends' house, whereas for the boys it was the streets, school, their home and their friends' home, which suggests that the home environment is more important for girls and the streets are more important for boys.

### *Children's participation in associations*

Overall, just over one fifth of children participate in school clubs, and one fifth in religious groups. About one tenth of children belong to sports clubs, and the same proportion to anti-HIV/AIDS clubs. In terms of site variations, the highest proportion for school clubs, with almost one third, was recorded in Menderin, and Bertukan scored highest for membership of religious institutions. A slightly higher proportion of children belong to sports clubs in Leku. Participation in anti-HIV/AIDS clubs was much more common in Menderin, where almost one fifth of children belong to such groups. See Table 22.

**Table 22.** *Associations in which children participate*

<b>Associations (%)</b>	<b>Bertukan</b>	<b>Duba</b>	<b>Menderin</b>	<b>Leku</b>	<b>All sites</b>
School club	15.2	19	31.7	22.2	<b>21.7 (N=98)</b>
Religious group (church/mosque)	31.3	24.8	8.9	12.8	<b>19.7 (N=89)</b>
Sports club	11.6	8.3	7.9	13.7	<b>10.4 (N=47)</b>
Anti-HIV/AIDS club	5.4	4.1	19.8	10.3	<b>9.5 (N=43)</b>

The qualitative data also showed that participation in a wide variety of school clubs is quite common; these clubs promote activities that include sports, the arts, music, civics and ethics, humanitarian concerns, science, health, the Red Cross, HIV/AIDS, peace and security, children's rights, girls' clubs, scouts and 'student parliaments'. The following examples illustrate the involvement of both boys and girls in such clubs. An Older Cohort girl in Bertukan said that she used to be a member of a child-rights club in her previous school, but now she is in a Technical and Vocational Education and Training school which does not have any extra-curricular activities. Another Older Cohort girl in Bertukan is a member of three clubs: a civics and ethics club, a humanitarian club and an Anti-AIDS club. She had already participated in different clubs in elementary school, where she held positions of responsibility, and in high school she became the leader of the civics and ethics club. She mentioned that members of the humanitarian club contribute 15 birr every month and help students who cannot afford school materials. An Older Cohort boy in Menderin participates in mini-media and sport clubs in his school. Another Older Cohort boy in Leku participates in an anti-HIV club which was set up recently. An Older Cohort girl in Menderin has been a member of an anti-HIV club in her school for two years. Another Older Cohort girl in Duba is a member of a 'students' parliament' in which students from two schools participate, holding meetings on Fridays. She is also a member of the 'Know Your Country' club, which is supposed to organise visits; she also belongs to a sports club but it has not organised any activities so far. Another girl in the same cohort and site said that she is a member of a science club in the school. An Older Cohort girl in Menderin said she is a member of an *iqqub* rotating-credit association within the art club in school, and for the past two years members have been saving two birr when they meet. They use half of the *iqqub* savings for the club, and the rest is shared between members. An Older Cohort girl in Leku said that she participates in the school parliament, which has been involved in trying to stop child-labour abuse. Another girl in the same site and cohort participates in four



school clubs: peace and security, anti-HIV, a children's club and a girls' club. She serves as secretary in the peace and security club. A Younger Cohort boy in Duba is a member of the scouts group in his school. Another boy in the same site and cohort is a member of the scouts and also of the Red Cross group. Another Younger Cohort boy in Menderin said he is a member of the scouts group that was set up recently. A Younger Cohort girl in Leku said she is a member of the child-rights and music clubs. Another girl in the same site and cohort said that she is a member of the school health club.

The qualitative data also revealed that there are two kinds of *mehaber* (religion-based social associations, in which children are members): one is for Muslims and the other for Orthodox Christians. An Older Cohort girl in Bertukan said that they have a Muslim *mehaber* called 'Jema Muhaba', and the ten members meet every 15 days. Another Older Cohort girl in Duba said she had been one of 24 members of the 'Yasin jema' Muslim *mehaber*. They contributed 5 birr per month each and prepared tea, coffee and biscuits, but the club ceased to meet three months ago. An Older Cohort girl in Bertukan is a member of a Christian *mehaber* called *Kidane Mihiret* (Holy Saviour) Children's *Mehaber*. They prepare roasted grain snacks and tea or soft drinks monthly on the 16th of each month (the day dedicated to the Holy Saviour). An Older Cohort boy in Bertukan said he belonged to two religious *mehabers*, along with his brother. They meet on the Saint's days of *Mariam* (Mary) and *Kidane mihiret* (Holy Saviour), when they pray and eat lunch together, and they also support one another during periods of mourning. A Younger Cohort girl in Menderin is a member of a *mehaber* in the name of the Virgin Mary; they contribute 2 birr per month each and hold the meetings in each other's houses in turn. However, not all children participate in *mehabers*, and some said they were unable to do so. An Older Cohort girl in Bertukan said it is only those people who have peaceful families and those who have money who can belong to *mehaber* or *iqqub* credit associations. She said that her family is poor and there are conflicts, so she could not become involved in such kinds of things.

Regarding funerals, although none of the children themselves belongs to an *iddir* funeral group, an Older Cohort boy in Bertukan said he sometimes attended funerals and helped in whatever way he could. Another Older Cohort boy in Duba also said that although he did not participate in any associations, he visits neighbours during funerals and periods of mourning. An Older Cohort boy in Leku said something similar. An Older Cohort girl in Duba said that she participates in mourning if close friends of hers are involved, although she is not a member of any funeral group. Another Older Cohort girl in Bertukan also said that she participates in funerals and mournings in the neighbourhood. Even a Younger Cohort boy in Duba said that he may attend a funeral, but only when he knows the people involved. However, a Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan mentioned that he does not like even to pass by funeral places.

Very few children in the qualitative sub-sample were involved in any other associations. An Older Cohort boy in Menderin participates in a sport club which provides materials. An Older Cohort girl in Menderin is a member of the youth league (which focuses on political issues), and a youth association for art (theatre), and she is also a member of a youth forum. Another girl in the same site and cohort said that she is a member of the youth association and serves as its cashier; she is also involved in a political group. Another Younger Cohort girl in Menderin said that she is a member of an Orthodox Christian Sunday School in Kirkos Church; she is also a member of an English club at her school.

### *Caregivers' participation in associations*

Table 23 shows that *iddir* funeral associations are the most common type of association to which caregivers belong, with almost 90 per cent taking part. Other types of association were much less frequently mentioned, with women's association membership reported at just over one-fifth, *mehaber* socio-religious groups at 16 per cent, and *iqqub* credit groups at 12 per cent. The lowest participation was in political groups, at 8 per cent. In terms of site variations, *iddir* were somewhat more common in Duba and Leku, where almost all the caregivers are members; membership of women's associations was highest in Bertukan, and *mehaber*, *iqqub* and political-group membership was most common in Leku.

**Table 23.** *Associations in which caregivers participate*

<b>Associations (%)</b>	<b>Bertukan</b>	<b>Duba</b>	<b>Menderin</b>	<b>Leku</b>	<b>All sites</b>
Funeral group/ <i>iddir</i>	77.2	96.8	86.1	95.8	<b>89.3 (N=416)</b>
Women's association/league	27.2	20.2	20	18.5	<b>21.5 (N=97)</b>
Socio-religious group/ <i>mehaber</i>	4.4	16.7	12.4	28.6	<b>15.7 (N=71)</b>
Credit group/ <i>iqqub</i>	6.1	9.6	9.5	23.5	<b>12.4 (N=56)</b>
Political group	10.5	6.1	3.8	10.9	<b>8.0 (N=36)</b>

Most of the caregivers in the qualitative sub-sample are members of at least one *iddir* funeral association, and some households belonged to two (one for males and the other for females). In the site in Hawassa several caregivers belonged to three *iddirs*. One household in Menderin even belonged to four *iddirs* (two male and two female), and another in the same site belonged to five *iddirs*. However, many of the caregivers mentioned concerns about the increasing level of membership fees in *iddirs*, which they related to the effects of inflation, and some were worried whether they could afford to continue being members.

The other important types of association that caregivers belonged to were *mehaber* socio-religious associations and *iqqub* saving groups. Some caregivers said they could no longer afford to continue saving through *iqqub*. However, a male caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said that he had set up *iqqub* to repay a debt of 1,000 birr.

Another association peculiar to the site in Hawassa is one where people contribute money regularly each month in advance in order to celebrate a given holiday or holidays. Most of the caregivers belonged to this group, to enable them to purchase an ox to celebrate *Mesqel*, the festival of the Finding of the Cross.

Women's associations and political parties were the other types of association mentioned by a few caregivers. A caregiver of a Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said that she is a member of the women's league, pays 6 birr as an annual contribution, and has a membership card. A caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Menderin said she is a member of the women's association and pays 3 birr annually. Likewise, a caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said she is a member of the women's association but was unable to pay the contribution for more than six months. A caregiver of an Older Cohort child in Bertukan, who is his elder brother, said he is a member of a youth league and of the ruling political party, and is also a member of an Orthodox Church group, paying 18 birr per month. Another caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Duba said she is a member of the ruling political party and contributes 10 birr every two months, which she thought was used for printing the Party newspaper.

### *Seeking help to resolve problems*

Asked whom they contact when they face problems, by far the highest proportion of children (81 per cent) mentioned their mother; in contrast only 54 per cent mentioned their father;<sup>11</sup> just over one third mentioned an older brother, and roughly the same proportion mentioned an older sister. Teachers were the next most important person after the mother, mentioned by 60 per cent of respondents. Friends were also important, with 39 per cent mentioning male friends and 36 per cent female friends. Other caregivers and adult relatives were less important but still significant at 27 per cent each, and other adults accounted for 15 per cent. The sources of support least commonly cited were priests and younger siblings. In all of the cases, Leku had the highest proportions of responses, followed in most cases by Menderin. Duba had the lowest proportion in seven out of 13 cases mentioned, while Bertukan had the lowest proportion in six out of 13 cases. See Table 24.

**Table 24.** *Children's contacts when they face problems*

<b>Contacts of children (%)</b>	<b>Bertukan</b>	<b>Duba</b>	<b>Menderin</b>	<b>Leku</b>	<b>All sites</b>
Mother	75	78.5	78.2	91.5	<b>80.9 (N=365)</b>
Teacher	32.1	40.5	83.2	85.5	<b>59.6 (N=269)</b>
Father	41.1	54.5	52.5	65.8	<b>53.7 (N=242)</b>
Male friend	31.3	25.6	47.5	53.8	<b>39.2 (N=177)</b>
Female friend	32.1	28.1	41.6	42.7	<b>35.9 (N=162)</b>
Older brother	33	19.8	41.6	47.9	<b>35.3 (N=159)</b>
Older sister	26.8	29.8	34.7	47.9	<b>34.8 (157)</b>
Other caregiver	25.9	23.1	24.8	35.9	<b>27.5 (N=124)</b>
Adult relatives	21.4	19	31.7	37.6	<b>27.3 (N=123)</b>
Other adults	7.1	10.7	18.8	23.9	<b>15.1 (N=68)</b>
Priest	8	3.3	4	15.4	<b>7.8 (N=35)</b>
Younger brother	1.8	2.5	11.9	10.3	<b>6.4 (N=29)</b>
Younger sister	1.8	0.8	5.9	12.8	<b>5.3 (N=24)</b>

When the data are considered by gender, mother and teacher were most commonly cited as sources of support by both girls and boys. However, in third place, although 'father' was most commonly mentioned overall, for the girls it was female friends and for the boys it was male friends. Father came in fourth place for both girls and boys. For girls, older sister and older brother came next, while it was the reverse for boys. Another interesting gender-related difference concerned contacts with priests and health extension workers: more girls than boys had contact with both of them.<sup>12</sup> For priests, the girls' proportion was 10.8 per cent, while the boys' proportion was 4.6 per cent. For health extension workers the proportion of girls was 8.2 per cent, while for boys it was only 2.3 per cent.

<sup>11</sup> Although we do not have figures about the exact proportion of those who have fathers, we do know that female-headed households are quite prevalent and that in most of these cases the father is not present.

<sup>12</sup> These were not included on the table above because they were not significant overall.

### *Potential sources of loans*

Asked from whom they might obtain a loan, the highest proportion, a little under a third, mentioned their mother, compared with only 15 per cent who mentioned their father, and the same proportion mentioning an older sibling. A quarter mentioned a male friend, whereas only 18 per cent mentioned a female friend and 12 per cent an adult friend. About one tenth mentioned a shopkeeper, and the lowest proportion mentioned other caregivers or adult relatives. Regarding site variations, Bertukan had the highest proportions for mothers, older siblings, shopkeeper and other caregivers; Leku had the highest proportions for male and female friends; and Menderin had the highest for father, adult friend and adult relative. See Table 25.

**Table 25.** *Potential sources of loans for children (Older Cohort only)*

Potential sources of loans (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Mother	45	32.5	29.7	11.1	<b>30.1 (N=46)</b>
Male friend	25	15	29.7	30.6	<b>24.8 (N=38)</b>
Female friend	20	5	16.2	30.6	<b>17.6 (N=27)</b>
Father	15	17.5	21.6	5.6	<b>15.0 (N=23)</b>
Older brother	25	15	13.5	5.6	<b>15.0 (N=23)</b>
Older sister	25	12.5	13.5	8.1	<b>14.9 (N=23)</b>
Adult friends	7.5	5	21.6	13.9	<b>11.8 (N=18)</b>
Shopkeeper	20	0	5.4	13.9	<b>9.8 (N=15)</b>
Other caregiver	15	5	8.1	0	<b>7.2 (N=11)</b>
Adult relatives	5	5	8.1	5.6	<b>5.9 (N=9)</b>

Most of the children (more than 90 per cent) said that they did not have any debt. Among the few who did, most said they had borrowed from female friends, followed by male friends and mothers in roughly equal proportions. This was also found to be the case in the qualitative sub-sample, where most of the children said they did not have any outstanding debts. However, a few older boys did mention taking loans, as the following cases illustrate. An Older Cohort boy in Bertukan said he once borrowed 200 birr from a neighbour to buy football wear, which he repaid when his sister sent him some money from Beirut. Another boy in the same site and cohort said that he borrows money (up to 20 birr) from friends for food when he has no work. His grandmother used to support him, but recently he has not been on good terms with her and he now works for a living. An Older Cohort boy in Duba said that he borrowed 20 birr from a friend for unspecified purposes recently, but he had never borrowed money before. Another Older Cohort boy in Menderin said that he borrows money from friends or a nearby shop because at times he needs money for transportation to his work place. A Younger Cohort girl in Leku said that her mother obtained exercise books and pencils for her from a nearby shop on credit because the girl needed them urgently; she repaid the loan when she got money.

### *Importance of relations and institutions for children*

The children were asked how important relations and institutions were for them. Regarding relations that were viewed as 'very important', the highest proportion mentioned 'parents', followed by 'family' and 'siblings', with much lower proportions mentioning 'friends', 'neighbours' and 'religious groups'. There were some site variations. The proportions of respondents who emphasised parents were similar in all the sites, and the range was small. Family had the highest proportion of 'very important' ratings in Bertukan, with 90 per cent,

and the lowest in Menderin, with 66 per cent. For siblings, Menderin had the highest proportion, with 82 per cent, while the lowest was in Bertukan, with 72 per cent. For neighbours, the highest proportion was in Leku, with 43 per cent, and the lowest was in Bertukan, with 33 per cent. For religious groups, the highest proportion was in the site in Hawassa, with about 33 per cent, while the lowest was in Duba, where this category was mentioned by slightly fewer than one fifth of the children. See Table 26.

**Table 26.** *Importance of relations for children (%)*

	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important
<b>Parents</b>				
Bertukan	96.4	3.6	0.0	0.0
Duba	95.9	3.3	0.0	0.0
Menderin	92.1	5.9	1.0	1.0
Leku	94.0	4.3	0.9	0.9
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>94.7</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>
	<b>(N=427)</b>	<b>(N=19)</b>	<b>(N=2)</b>	<b>(N=2)</b>
<b>Family</b>				
Bertukan	90.2	9.8	0.0	0.0
Duba	86.8	10.7	0.8	0.8
Menderin	66.3	33.7	0.0	0.0
Leku	73.5	25.6	0.9	0.0
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>79.6</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.2</b>
	<b>(N=359)</b>	<b>(N=88)</b>	<b>(N=2)</b>	<b>(N=1)</b>
<b>Siblings</b>				
Bertukan	72.3	11.6	1.8	1.8
Duba	74.4	9.9	4.1	3.3
Menderin	82.2	10.9	0.0	2.0
Leku	80.3	12.0	1.7	0.9
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>77.2</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>(N=348)</b>	<b>(N=50)</b>	<b>(N=9)</b>	<b>(N=9)</b>
<b>Friends</b>				
Bertukan	36.6	53.6	4.5	5.4
Duba	39.7	53.7	5.0	1.7
Menderin	51.5	45.5	3.0	0.0
Leku	53.0	40.2	6.0	0.9
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>48.3</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>(N=203)</b>	<b>(N=218)</b>	<b>(N=21)</b>	<b>(N=9)</b>
<b>Neighbours</b>				
Bertukan	33.0	47.3	17.0	2.7
Duba	35.5	42.1	18.2	4.1
Menderin	40.6	51.5	5.9	2.0
Leku	42.7	39.3	16.2	1.7
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>44.8</b>	<b>14.6</b>	<b>2.7</b>
	<b>(N=171)</b>	<b>(N=202)</b>	<b>(N=66)</b>	<b>(N=12)</b>
<b>Religious group</b>				
Bertukan	22.3	20.5	20.5	32.1
Duba	19.8	19.0	9.1	46.3
Menderin	22.8	23.8	6.9	12.9
Leku	33.3	10.3	2.6	4.3
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>24.6</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>9.8</b>	<b>24.4</b>
	<b>(N=111)</b>	<b>(N=82)</b>	<b>(N=44)</b>	<b>(N=110)</b>

*Importance of institutions and activities for children*

Regarding institutions and activities, Table 27 shows that school was ranked highest overall as very important, by 86 per cent of respondents, followed by religion with 84 per cent. Only half the children thought that work was very important; 43 per cent said leisure time was very important; 39 per cent emphasised service to others. For school, 95 per cent of respondents in Menderin said it was very important, while in Bertukan 77 per cent said so. For religion, Duba had the highest proportion, with 88 per cent, while Leku had the lowest, with 79 per cent. For leisure the highest proportion was recorded in the site in Hawassa, with slightly fewer than half of the children, while the lowest was in Duba, with about 39 per cent. Service to others was important for respondents in the site in Hawassa, where it was very important for more than half of the children; the other three sites had much lower and roughly similar proportions.

**Table 27.** *Importance of institutions and activities for children (%)*

	Very important	Important	Not very important	Not at all important
<b>School</b>				
Bertukan	76.8	17.9	1.8	0.9
Duba	81.0	14.9	0.0	3.3
Menderin	95.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Leku	94.0	5.1	0.0	0.0
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>86.5</b> <b>(N=390)</b>	<b>10.2</b> <b>(N=46)</b>	<b>0.4</b> <b>(N=2)</b>	<b>1.1</b> <b>(N=5)</b>
<b>Religion</b>				
Bertukan	83.9	16.1	0.0	0.0
Duba	87.6	9.1	1.7	1.7
Menderin	85.1	9.9	3.0	1.0
Leku	78.6	17.1	1.7	0.9
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>83.8</b> <b>(N=378)</b>	<b>13.1</b> <b>(N=59)</b>	<b>1.6</b> <b>(N=7)</b>	<b>0.9</b> <b>(N=4)</b>
<b>Work</b>				
Bertukan	35.7	31.3	2.7	23.2
Duba	42.1	33.1	15.7	8.3
Menderin	75.2	10.9	9.9	2.0
Leku	52.1	24.8	8.5	2.6
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>50.6</b> <b>(N=228)</b>	<b>25.5</b> <b>(N=115)</b>	<b>9.3</b> <b>(N=42)</b>	<b>9.1</b> <b>(N=41)</b>
<b>Leisure time</b>				
Bertukan	42.9	49.1	6.3	0.9
Duba	38.8	52.1	6.6	2.5
Menderin	41.6	57.4	1.0	0.0
Leku	48.7	48.7	2.6	0.0
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>43</b> <b>(N=194)</b>	<b>51.7</b> <b>(N=233)</b>	<b>4.2</b> <b>(N=19)</b>	<b>0.9</b> <b>(N=4)</b>
<b>Service to others</b>				
Bertukan	34.8	40.2	18.8	5.4
Duba	33.9	34.7	24.0	5.8
Menderin	32.7	64.4	3.0	0.0
Leku	53.0	38.5	4.3	0.9
<b>Average rating</b>	<b>38.8</b> <b>(N=175)</b>	<b>43.7</b> <b>(N=197)</b>	<b>12.9</b> <b>(N=58)</b>	<b>3.1</b> <b>(N=14)</b>

## 4.2 Social support

### *Support from associations*

Caregivers said that they received support from a broad range of associations, although the proportion saying that they did so was very small, with the highest overall rating given to NGOs and *iddirs* (8 per cent each). Fewer than 5 per cent said they received support from religious groups, family groups, credit associations, and women's associations, and support from government was hardly mentioned. In terms of site variations, Bertukan had the highest proportion citing support from NGO groups and government assistance. Menderin had the highest proportions receiving support from other religious groups and from a women's association/league. Duba had the highest proportion mentioning support received from funeral groups/*iddirs*. See Table 28.

**Table 28.** *Support from associations (for caregivers)*

Support from associations (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
NGO group	12.3	4.1	8.6	5.9	<b>7.6 (N=35)</b>
Funeral group/ <i>iddir</i>	7.9	8.8	7.4	5.9	<b>7.5 (N=35)</b>
Religious group/ <i>mehaber</i>	2.6	2.5	3.8	8.4	<b>4.3 (N=20)</b>
Family group	4.4	3.3	1	7.6	<b>4.1 (N=19)</b>
Other religious group	2.6	3.3	3.8	3.4	<b>3.3 (N=15)</b>
Credit group/ <i>iqqub</i>	0.9	3.3	1	5.9	<b>2.8 (N=13)</b>
Women's association/league	0	1.6	4.8	4.2	<b>2.6 (N=12)</b>
Government assistance	2.6	0.8	1	0.8	<b>1.3 (N=9)</b>

In the qualitative sub-sample there was also limited mention of support from associations. A caregiver of a Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said that she had lost her father, and his *iddir* supported her in preparing everything for the funeral. However, she added that this could not compensate for the loss of her father. A caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said they had received 1,500 birr from the *iddir*. The grandmother of an Older Cohort boy in Bertukan said she was receiving wheat and corn as support from the government.

### *Support from individuals (caregivers)*

As with the children, when caregivers were asked if they had received support in the past year, the proportion of positive responses was less than one fifth. The most important source of support was reported to be neighbours, followed by close friends living in the same area. Fewer than ten per cent of respondents mentioned support from relatives in the same urban area. About the same proportion got help from parents and children living outside the family. There were smaller proportions mentioning support from persons working in the same occupation or members of a religious group, and five per cent or less mentioned support from relatives in urban and rural areas, and very few mentioned support from close friends in other areas. See Table 29.

**Table 29.** *Support from individuals (for caregivers)*

Support from individuals (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Neighbour	9.6	8.1	21.9	31.9	<b>17.8 (N=82)</b>
Close friends living in same area	4.4	4.1	22.9	29.4	<b>15.0 (N=69)</b>
Other relative living in same urban area	6.1	1.6	16.2	16	<b>9.8 (N=45)</b>
Parents living outside family	5.3	2.4	10.2	20.2	<b>9.4 (N=44)</b>
Child living outside family	7	8.2	8.6	11.8	<b>8.9 (N=41)</b>
Person working in same occupation	3.5	1.6	11.4	14.3	<b>7.6 (N=35)</b>
Member of a religious group	6.1	2.4	6.7	9.2	<b>6.1 (N=28)</b>
Other relative living in other urban area	4.4	2.4	9.5	5	<b>5.2 (N=24)</b>
Other relative living in rural area	2.6	0	6.7	5.9	<b>3.7 (N=17)</b>
Close friend living in other area of town	0.9	0	5.7	5	<b>2.8 (N=13)</b>
Close friend living in other area	1.8	0.8	1	1.7	<b>1.3 (N=6)</b>

In the case of six out of 11 sources of support, the highest proportion of respondents mentioning them was in Leku; Menderin had the highest score for four other sources. The site in Duba consistently recorded the lowest proportions of responses, except in terms of support received from children living outside the family (for which Bertukan had the lowest proportion). This suggests that social support may be stronger in Hawassa, with many migrants having moved there from rural areas. It is also significant that most of the cases of assistance from people working in the same occupation are in Hawassa, which suggests strong networks of migrants helping each other out. Menderin, one of the inner-city sites, which is located in a very poor area, had the highest proportions of respondents mentioning support from relatives living in the same area, and from relatives in other areas of town and in other urban and rural areas; this suggests the presence of strong networks – which was not the case in the other inner-city area. With one exception, every source of support was mentioned least often by respondents in Duba, the site on the outskirts of Addis Ababa, suggesting that it is a site with far fewer social and economic linkages.

Sources of support mentioned in the qualitative sub-sample include assistance from NGOs, and especially from relatives living in other parts of the country or who are migrants abroad. The NGOs included Christian Children’s Fund (CCF) and another referred to simply as ‘Society’ in Bertukan. For instance, a caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Bertukan who is his older brother said that his two younger brothers get support from both Society and CCF. Society provides oil and wheat, while CCF used to give 200 birr per month and school materials once a year. His sister, who works in Beirut, sends 50 USD per month. Likewise a female caregiver of a Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said that one of her sons received support from CCF for school materials. A caregiver of a Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said there are people who have been giving them 1,000 birr a year for the Young Lives child for the past two years; they give this for children who have lost one or both of their parents. There were also cases of support from missions, as was mentioned by the caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Leku who said that the child is supported by the Full Gospel Church with clothes and school materials.

There seems to be much more support from relatives living abroad than from relatives living within Ethiopia. Support from relatives within the country included cases of parents or uncles living in other areas. A caregiver of an Older Cohort boy who is his grandmother said that her son who lives in Gondar used to pay 15 birr for her *iddir* membership. A caregiver of an Older



Cohort girl in Duba said that her parents living in the countryside had sent her 4 kg of *kocho* (food from the 'false banana' plant) the previous year.

There was also mention of support provided by adult children who had become independent, or by relatives living close by. For instance, a caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Menderin said she gets support from her two daughters who are living independently. A caregiver of a Younger Cohort boy in Leku said that since her divorce she has been getting assistance from her older brothers for her household expenditures, for the child's schooling and for school materials.

There are also many cases of remittances from relatives, including parents, who have gone abroad –especially to the Gulf and other Arab countries, including Lebanon and Sudan, but also the USA, Greece and Australia. The support is generally given as cash, but also in the form of clothing and other gifts, as the following cases illustrate. A mother of a Younger Cohort girl in Duba said that her sister who lives in an Arab country sent clothes for her and her children, and a mobile phone for her. A caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Leku said that the only support they get is from her son who lives in USA. Likewise, a mother of a Younger Cohort boy in Leku said that his father sends remittances from the USA for his two children, and that the other family members are also benefiting. A grandfather caregiver of a Younger Cohort girl said that the household gets support from children who are based outside Ethiopia; but he did not want to tell how much they send, or how frequently. A male caregiver of a Younger Cohort girl said that they receive money from his wife, who is living outside Ethiopia. A caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said that her children send 2,000 birr per month, while her son pays the school fees of her three younger children (approximately 4,000 birr per month). Another caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said that her daughter had been living in Sudan for the past three years and had sent 2,000 birr for her daughter's school fees. This caregiver has also received 50 kilos of barley from her relatives. A caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said that the mother of the Young Lives child, who is a migrant abroad, sent 3,000 birr for the commemoration of the eightieth day since the grandfather's death.<sup>13</sup> A caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Duba said that they got 4,000 birr from her husband's nephew. He was living in Australia and he came back to Ethiopia after a long time. A grandmother of a Younger Cohort girl in Menderin said that her daughter, the mother of the Young Lives child, who had moved from an Arab country to Greece, used to send her money and covered the child's school fees; however, because of the economic crisis in Greece she is no longer sending money.

There were a few mentions of charitable help given by unrelated people. For example, the grandmother of a Younger Cohort girl in Duba said that some people give her clothes, food and some other things: for instance, someone gave her paint for her house a week before the interview. She added that one of her sons gave her some money for Christmas.

### *Support from individuals (children)*

Children were also asked if they had received direct support from individuals in the last 12 months. Table 30 shows that the proportions overall were fairly low, with the highest rating given to support from relatives living in the same urban area (18 per cent), followed by

---

<sup>13</sup> This is a commemorative day for a deceased person; it may be on the fortieth or eightieth day following their death and is regarded as more important than the funeral since the family may not have had time to prepare a proper commemoration and relatives living far away may not have heard. The people who come and eat at the commemoration bless the soul of the deceased.

friends in the same area (14 per cent) and neighbours (13 per cent). One in ten children mentioned support from parents living outside the family; 7 per cent mentioned relatives living abroad, and a similar figure mentioned siblings outside the family, suggesting that remittances are important for some children. Likewise 6 per cent mentioned relatives living in other urban areas. Leku, the site in Hawassa, had the highest proportions for most of the categories (6 out of 10) and it had no lowest proportion. Menderin had the highest proportion for 4 out of 10 sources of support and one lowest proportion. Duba had the lowest proportion in 5 out of 10, while Bertukan scored 4 out of 10. Only five per cent said that they received support from NGOs; the proportion in Bertukan was double the average in this respect.

**Table 30.** *Support from individuals and institutions (for children)*

Support from (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Relative living in same urban area	16.4	14.3	21.2	20.9	<b>18.1 (N=80)</b>
Close friends living in same area	3.6	4.2	20.2	27	<b>13.5 (N=60)</b>
Neighbour	7.3	7.6	14.1	22.6	<b>12.9 (N=57)</b>
Parents living outside family	6.3	10.7	10.9	12.8	<b>10.2 (N=46)</b>
Family members	17.3	0	3	12.2	<b>8.1 (N=36)</b>
Relative living abroad	11.8	3.4	9.1	6.1	<b>7.4 (N=33)</b>
Siblings living outside family	5.5	5.9	7.1	7.8	<b>6.5 (N=29)</b>
Relative living in other urban area	6.4	4.2	7.1	6.1	<b>5.9 (N=26)</b>
NGO group	10	1.7	6.1	1.7	<b>4.7 (N=21)</b>
Close friend living in other area of town	0.9	0	9.1	7	<b>4.1 (N=18)</b>
Member of a religious group	3.6	0	2	7	<b>3.2 (N=14)</b>
Other relative living in rural area	3.6	1.7	0	4.3	<b>2.5 (N=11)</b>

Evidence from the qualitative sub-sample shows that some children receive support from NGOs, while others receive remittances from relatives living abroad, and a few receive support from both NGOs and relatives. Among the NGOs mentioned in Bertukan were CCF, Mary Joy, and one referred to as 'Society'. For instance, an Older Cohort boy in Bertukan receives support, school materials and clothes from Mary Joy. He also gets support from another NGO which runs a boarding school and provides him with meals from Monday to Friday. He will also receive training in metal work and wood work if he does not succeed in his schooling in the future. An Older Cohort girl in Leku used to receive support from Mary Joy, but she said that it has stopped and she now relies on her aunt for assistance.

Regarding remittances, the mother of an Older Cohort boy in Bertukan who stays with his grandmother lives in Bahrain and sent 1,000 birr to her son; however, he said that this was the first and only time he had received money from his mother. The same boy said they used to get support from an NGO called CCF. Another Older Cohort boy in the same site said that his sister sends them 100 USD every month, which they use for household expenses. He said: "When she sends more than 100 USD, we save it for her, otherwise we use the 100 USD every month." He said that they also get support from NGOs called CCF and Society in the form of oil (every two months) and exercise books (once a year). A Younger Cohort boy in Menderin said he receives support in the form of school material from NGOs, one called EMGM and the other Hope for the Hopeless Children. Another Younger Cohort boy in Duba said that an NGO supports him to get free medical treatment. Sometimes his neighbours also buy him pens and exercise books.

Support from migrant relatives comes mainly from female relatives working in Arab countries, such as the mother of an Older Cohort boy in Menderin, and the sister of an Older Cohort girl in Duba who bought her a mobile phone and sends her clothing, shoes and cosmetics every year. There are a few cases of parents living in the USA sending support. The father of an Older Cohort girl in Menderin living in America sends her money every three months, and likewise the mother of an Older Cohort boy sends him money every month. A Younger Cohort boy in Leku said his father sends them 200 dollars from the USA every three or four months. A Younger Cohort boy receives support to pay his school fees from his uncle, who travels outside Ethiopia for work. They also receive help from neighbours. A Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said that both her parents are living out of Ethiopia, and they support her by sending money.

Some children receive support from other relatives, notably older siblings or uncles. For instance, an Older Cohort girl in Duba said that her brother sometimes gives her money. He is in Grade 8 but sometimes misses school to work as a shoe shiner. She added that he earns a good sum of money, but he does not know how to manage it well. Another Older Cohort girl in Menderin receives financial support from her step-sister, who lives in another area in Addis. A Younger Cohort boy in the same site said that he receives support from his uncle for school materials and at times money. A Younger Cohort girl in Leku said that her uncle covers everything related to her schooling, because she is an outstanding student, while her parents support her in other ways. There are also children who receive support from a divorced parent living elsewhere, such as a Younger Cohort child in Leku who said he gets regular support for school fees from his father. Sometimes the father may be working in another part of the country, as in the case of a Younger Cohort girl in Leku who said that her father, who lives in Wolayta, supports her by providing school materials and other things. Support may also come from other relatives, as in the case of another Younger Cohort girl in the same site who gets support from grandparents and other relatives living in the southern town of Hossana.

A few children complained about having no sources of support. For instance, an Older Cohort girl in Duba said she sometimes becomes hungry by lunch time and her friend buys her bread, especially since the school feeding programme was stopped three years ago. An Older Cohort girl in Duba said that the only support she has ever received is 30 birr from the quantitative researcher of this study. A girl in the same cohort in Bertukan also said that her family had never received support other than the Young Lives allowance, and that she buys books with the money. Another Younger Cohort girl in Duba mentioned the 30 birr that she was given by the quantitative researchers; she added that her father also gives her money for holidays or when she needs money for school.

A couple of children mentioned that their mother's loss of work had forced them to find work themselves. In one case an Older Cohort boy in Duba said that his mother used to work in a cafeteria but was laid off, so he started to work as a taxi assistant. In the other case another Older Cohort boy in Menderin said that his mother had lost her job as an office worker, and that they have faced financial difficulties since the death of his uncle, who used to support him between Grades 1 and 8. The boy had become a dancer in traditional restaurants, earning 30 to 150 birr per day.

### *Provision of support to others (caregivers)*

Caregivers were also asked if they had provided support in the last 12 months to other individuals. Here again the proportions were under one fifth, the highest proportions of

respondents mentioning neighbours and close friends living in the same area. The proportions were under ten per cent for the rest, with the highest being for persons working in the same occupation and other relatives in the same urban areas, with 7 per cent each. The rest were rated by proportions of 5 per cent or less, with the highest being other relatives living in rural area. Here again the site in Hawassa had the highest proportions, suggesting that close networks among migrants are important. Site differences concerning the provision of support displayed the same pattern as for receiving support: ET04 came second for all provisions of support bar one, and Duba had the lowest proportions in all cases except one. See Table 31.

**Table 31.** *Provision of support to others (by caregivers)*

Provision of support (%)	Bertukan	Duba	Menderin	Leku	All sites
Neighbour	7	4.9	23.8	32.8	<b>16.9 (N=78)</b>
Close friends living in same area	3.5	0.8	21.9	29.4	<b>13.7 (N=63)</b>
Parents living outside family	7	4	10.2	15.1	<b>9.0 (N=42)</b>
Person working in same occupation	3.5	0.8	10.5	15.1	<b>7.4 (N=34)</b>
Other relative living in same urban area	6.1	0.8	9.5	11.8	<b>7.0 (N=32)</b>
Other relative living in rural area	6.1	1.6	5.7	8.4	<b>5.4 (N=25)</b>
Member of a religious group	3.4	2.4	4.8	10.1	<b>5.2 (N=24)</b>
Child living outside family	0.9	2.4	4.8	10.1	<b>4.6 (N=21)</b>
Other relative living in other urban area	1.8	1.6	2.9	4.2	<b>2.6 (N=12)</b>
Close friend living in other area of town	0.9	0	3.8	2.5	<b>1.7 (N=8)</b>
Close friend living in other area	0.9	0	1	2.5	<b>1.1 (N=8)</b>

There were a few instances in the qualitative sub-sample of caregivers providing support to others, including relatives such as a grandmother, siblings living with them, children of relatives or neighbours, especially if orphaned, neighbours, relatives living in the countryside or visiting, or only to beggars. An uncle who is living with the mother of a Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan said that they send 300–500 birr per month to their mother, the child's grandmother. They also hosted the wedding of a friend, incurring expenses of 200 birr. A caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Menderin said that the only support that she is providing to anyone is to her sister and her daughter, who are living with her. A caregiver of a Younger Cohort boy in Duba said she contributed 20 birr for the wedding of a neighbour. A caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Bertukan said she supports a neighbour's 8-year-old child, who lives with his grandfather following the death of his father. She said: "At the last minute he made me promise to look after his son." She covers his school costs and clothing and provides him with breakfast and lunch. A mother of a Younger Cohort boy in Bertukan said that she helps her neighbours by writing letters for them when they ask her to. A caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said she had twice sent two kilos of sugar and one kilo of salt and *mitmita* (a hot spice mixture) to her parents, who are living outside Addis Ababa. A caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said she did not support anyone other than relatives coming from rural areas.

A caregiver of an Older Cohort boy in Leku said that his family has assisted a number of individuals seeking financial assistance for medical costs, for orphans, for those whose family head is imprisoned, and for individuals affected by HIV/AIDS. A grandfather of a Younger Cohort girl in Bertukan said that the only assistance that he provides to others is to beggars

when he goes to church. The same view was expressed by the mother of an Older Cohort boy in Duba.

When asked if they gave support to others, several caregivers said that they are too poor to do so. Moreover, a caregiver of an Older Cohort girl in Duba said that people used to support one another, and they also used to eat and drink together; but now because of the high cost of living “all this is impossible.”

## 5. Summary and conclusions

### *Housing*

Most of the families living in the study sites do not own the houses in which they live, especially in the inner-city sites of Addis Ababa, where the bulk of the housing is owned by the *kebele* local administration. Despite the poor state of their houses, the vast majority of respondents did not do maintenance, repair or improvements to their homes, either because they could not afford the cost or because the houses were owned by the *kebele*, which is in theory responsible for repair, and they were not allowed to maintenance work on the properties. This has important policy implications, because these rented houses are becoming increasingly dilapidated, due to lack of upkeep. Therefore ways of enabling the *kebeles* to carry out repairs or allowing tenants to carry out maintenance themselves deserve consideration.

### *Household facilities*

About a third of the households did not have a separate kitchen, especially in the inner-city sites. Many do not even have a kitchen at all: they use their one sole room for everything – for sleeping, cooking and even washing clothes. These conditions make life difficult for the families, and especially for the children, and the provision of condominium housing with separate kitchens can be seen as an important improvement. Regarding fuel for cooking, more than one third of households use charcoal and more than a quarter use wood; this has broader implications for the well-being of residents and the health of the environment, in terms of pollution and depletion of dwindling forest reserves. However, use of electricity is on the increase and in one inner-city site has exceeded 40 per cent. Nonetheless, qualitative data suggest that kerosene usage is still prevalent, and that increases in the cost of kerosene and the high cost of electricity are leading some households to revert to using charcoal.

Most of the households share communal pit latrines; only one fifth overall have their own latrine, and only seven households in total have a flush toilet. Sharing of communal pit latrines is most prevalent in the inner-city sites, and some respondents said that they have no option but to pay for using public toilets; in the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa almost one fifth of the households still go out to fields to relieve themselves. The poor standards of hygiene, the smell of toilets and the shortage of toilets, which are often shared by many families, are major issues mentioned by significant proportions of children as reasons for disliking their homes. The vast majority said that they did not have access to washing facilities close to the toilet, particularly in the inner-city sites. There was, however, a reported increase in the use of soap after using the toilet, sometimes attributed to the teachings of Health Extension Workers, but qualitative evidence suggests that many adults and children

may not use soap regularly, and this has been considered an issue of particular concern in the promotion of improved sanitation and reduction of water-borne diseases.

However, the situation regarding clean water supplies seems better than the conditions of sanitation. More than half the households said that they have access to clean water piped to their own dwelling or yard. Some households reported getting piped water in their own compounds recently. Moreover, the vast majority of respondents described the quality of their drinking water as good, and only in one inner-city site did a small proportion describe it as bad. However, one in ten households said they used public water sources, paying by the jerry-can.

Although access to water may have improved, the lack of washing facilities is still a major problem. About half the children overall and two-thirds in the inner-city sites said that they wash in the living room, and in the site in Hawassa one fifth wash outside the home. Fewer than ten per cent wash in a bathroom; a higher proportion wash in the kitchen. The qualitative data suggested that some children have to wash in spaces used by other household members, or even in the compound, which infringes their privacy and is difficult for girls; some children reported having to go to public baths and pay for showers.

The management of solid waste seems to have improved, as respondents in all the sites and most of the households reported that it is collected at regular intervals. However, the neighbourhood environment is still often polluted, especially in the two inner-city sites in Addis Ababa, and smelly and dirty streets ranked first in the aspects that children and caregivers disliked about their neighbourhoods. Moreover, disposal of liquid waste has been posing a problem in all the sites, especially in the inner-cities, where there are no open spaces or compounds in which to dispose of liquid waste but only open drainage ditches, to which some households connect their sewerage. However, in one neighbourhood in Bertukan conditions had improved, as the open channels have been closed over, and in two sites respondents mentioned digging pits to dispose of waste, following instructions by Health Extension Workers. The sanitation problems deserve further attention, especially given the increased emphasis given to disease prevention within the health system.

### *What children like or dislike about their homes*

What children said they liked was mainly concerned with home relations: for all the four aspects mentioned – nice family atmosphere (i.e. a good quality of relationships), spending time with parents, eating with family, and spending time with siblings – the site in Hawassa had the highest proportion of positive responses, which suggests cohesive social relations among recent migrants to the city, while the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa had the lowest proportion (except for 'nice family atmosphere').

In terms of things that children disliked about their homes, more than half of them mentioned having to use a dirty toilet or not having a toilet at all. Sharing rooms was mentioned by just under a quarter, family disputes by one fifth, and lack of privacy by just under a fifth. Sharing a bed and having a lodger were only mentioned by a few children. There were some site differences, with dirty toilets or no toilets mentioned by more than 70 per cent in one of the inner-city sites. Lack of toilets was mentioned by a fifth of children in the site on the outskirts of Addis Ababa. Lack of privacy was highest in the site in Hawassa, mentioned by more than a quarter of children. Qualitative interviews also revealed problems relating to the lack of kitchens, or the need to share kitchens, and the lack of compounds in which to play.

### *Views of children and their caregivers about their neighbourhood*

Meeting friends and being close to family and friends were the aspects that children liked most in all the sites. In third place came the presence of religious institutions, mentioned by more than two-thirds; fewer than half the children mentioned the market; more than a third mentioned cafés; much smaller proportions (less than ten per cent) mentioned youth clubs or social institutions such as funeral or socio-religious organisations. The site in Hawassa scored most highly in respect of five aspects that children liked: meeting friends, being close to family and friends, the church/the mosque, the school and the *mehaber*, a pattern which suggests cohesive social relations within the neighbourhood. Two of the highest proportions of positive responses were recorded in Menderin, one of the inner-city sites: they related to the market and the cafés, which can be explained by the bustling market context. Bertukan, the other inner-city site, and Duba, the site on the city outskirts, each have one highest proportion (for the youth club and the *iddir* respectively). However, Duba had the lowest proportions of positive responses in six out of the nine aspects mentioned, which may suggest less strong neighbourhood relations. The findings thus indicate that the children in the site in Hawassa have more reasons to like their neighbourhood than the children in the other sites, while the lowest proportions of positive responses were recorded in interviews with children in Duba, on the periphery of Addis Ababa.

Caregivers valued most highly the presence of neighbours, friends and family, as well as shops and access to education: all of these were mentioned by more than three-quarters of respondents; and 70 per cent appreciated *iddir* funeral associations. More than half the caregivers valued safety at night, although only 39 per cent mentioned this in one of the inner-city sites (Bertukan). Access to work was mentioned by 41 per cent overall. Just over a quarter of caregivers mentioned cafés, more than a fifth mentioned socio-religious associations, and a fifth mentioned *kebele* recreation centres (cited by almost half of the respondents in Menderin). Bars and *iqqub* credit associations were mentioned least, the former being relatively more important in Menderin and the latter more important in the Hawassa site.

Among the aspects mentioned by children that made them dislike their neighbourhood, smelly and dirty streets were the most important and were mentioned by much higher proportions in the two inner-city sites. Lack of recreation was mentioned by almost half the respondents. Noise pollution was mentioned by higher proportions than air pollution and river pollution. Exposure to bad habits was mentioned by 30 per cent (although 41 per cent mentioned this in Menderin). Crowded neighbourhoods were mentioned by 28 per cent (a figure that was as high as 44 per cent for one of the inner-city sites and one third in the other). Prevalence of commercial sex work was mentioned by 15 per cent, although more than a third of children mentioned this in the Hawassa site, and a fifth mentioned it in Menderin.

Most of the aspects mentioned by children that made them dislike their neighbourhood, including being unsafe at night and during the day, living in a crowded neighbourhood, and air and river pollution, were mentioned by the highest proportion in Menderin, which is known to be one of the poorest areas in Addis Ababa. Bertukan, the other inner-city site, had the second highest proportions of children who said they felt unsafe at night, or disliked the crowded neighbourhood, the air and river pollution. The site in Hawassa had the highest proportion of respondents complaining about noise pollution and prevalence of commercial sex work. Duba, the site on the periphery of Addis Ababa, scored only one highest proportion: for lack of recreation. Otherwise this site consistently scored the lowest

proportions. The findings suggest a clear difference between the inner-city sites, where children expressed stronger dislike of aspects of their neighbourhood, and the site on the outskirts.

As with the children, smelly and dirty streets ranked highest in terms of the proportions of caregivers disliking their neighbourhood for these reasons. On the other hand, crowded living conditions came third, mentioned by half the caregivers – with much higher proportions in the inner-city sites: 72 per cent in Menderin and 62 per cent in Bertukan. Moreover, half the caregivers thought that their neighbourhoods were bad places for bringing up children, again with higher proportions in the inner-city sites. Unlike the children, the caregivers disliked air pollution more strongly than noise pollution; river pollution was mentioned by lower proportions, as in the case of the children. Other serious concerns were theft, mentioned by 41 per cent, drunken behaviour (30 per cent), and dangerous or unsafe environments and street fighting (about 25 per cent each). Commercial sex work came last, with very slightly higher proportions of caregivers, compared with children, seeing this as a problem.

### *Social networks and support*

Most children reported meeting friends at school and in the streets, with smaller proportions meeting them in their own homes or friends' homes. Regarding networks, one fifth of the children belonged to school clubs and religious groups, and about one tenth to sports and anti-HIV/AIDS clubs. The qualitative data also revealed that participation in a variety of school clubs is quite common; the activities and themes of these clubs include sports, arts, music, civics and ethics, humanitarian concern, science, health, the Red Cross, anti-HIV/AIDS, peace and security, child rights and girls' clubs, scouts and 'student parliaments'. Very few children reported being involved in political associations such as Youth Leagues. However, some children were members of Orthodox Christian or Muslim *mehaber* religious associations, whereas none was involved directly in *iddir* funeral associations (although some helped out at funerals).

For caregivers, membership of *iddir* funeral groups was very important for about 90 per cent of respondents overall. The qualitative data show that some households have both male and female *iddir* members, and there are also cases of households with membership of several *iddirs*. Although the proportions were much less significant, one fifth of caregivers belonged to women's associations or leagues, 16 per cent to *mehaber* socio-religious groups, 12 per cent to *iqqub* credit groups, and only 8 per cent to political groups. In the qualitative survey, some caregivers expressed worries that they could no longer afford to save money with the *iqqub*, due to inflation. A few caregivers were involved in political associations such as the women's association or league or the ruling Party.

Asked whom they would first contact when faced with problems, most children mentioned their mothers rather than their fathers, and just over a third mentioned older siblings. In second place to mothers, teachers were the most important contacts, mentioned by 60 per cent, and friends were also important, with 39 per cent mentioning male friends and 36 per cent mentioning female friends. With all kinds of persons to contact, the Hawassa site had the highest proportions, suggesting stronger cohesive social relations in this site. Similarly, when requiring loans, children are most likely to go to their mothers than to their fathers, and to friends rather than siblings. Only ten per cent said they would go to a shopkeeper; more than 90 per cent said they did not have debts, and those who did have debts borrowed mainly from friends and from their mothers. Qualitative data showed cases of children taking



loans from neighbours, friends, or shops for various purposes, including the purchase of food, school equipment and football wear.

In terms of relations for children, parents were considered as very important by 95 per cent, whereas family was mentioned by 80 per cent and siblings by 77 per cent; friends, neighbours, and religious organisations were seen as less important. School and religion were regarded as the most important institutions, mentioned by more than 80 per cent, and half the children said that work was very important, whereas leisure time and service to others were seen as less important.

Closely linked with the networks of the children and the caregivers was the support that they obtained when they needed it. The proportion of children saying that they received support was relatively small, and most sources were from individuals. A third of children overall said that they received support from relatives, most of these being family members living in the same urban area; 7 per cent reported receiving support from relatives living abroad. About 18 per cent said they received support from friends, mainly those living close by, and 13 per cent received support from neighbours. Ten per cent received support from a parent outside the family and 7 per cent from a sibling who had left the family. Small proportions of caregivers reported receiving support from associations, mostly from NGOs and *iddir* funeral associations: about 8 per cent each. The site in Hawassa had the highest proportions receiving support from almost all sources, suggesting stronger relations of support in this site, which has large proportions of migrants. Respondents living in Duba on the outskirts receive the least support, a fact which suggests less cohesive relations. Qualitative data also revealed cases of support from different sources. A few NGOs provided school materials, clothing and food. Migrant parents living in the Gulf and other Arab countries, in the USA and in Europe, sent cash, clothing or gifts. Children also received support from siblings and uncles, from divorced parents, and from fathers or other relatives living elsewhere in the country. A few children complained about having no source of support, and a couple of them said that they had to work when their mothers lost their jobs.

The caregivers mentioned getting support mainly from NGO groups and *iddir* funeral groups, with smaller proportions receiving support from *mehaber* religious groups, family groups, and *iqqub* credit groups, and very small proportions receiving support from women's associations/leagues and government-funded assistance programmes. The qualitative data provided cases of households who had received support for funeral costs from *iddir* associations. Support from NGOs was most common in Bertukan, where it often included school materials, clothing or food. There were cases of remittances from parents who had gone to the Gulf and other Arab countries such as Lebanon and Sudan, as well as the USA, Greece and Australia. Support was sent in the form of cash or gifts such as clothing and mobile phones. Caregivers also mentioned receiving support from neighbours, close friends, and other relatives living in same area. Smaller proportions mentioned getting support from parents and children living outside the family, from persons working in the same occupation, from members of religious groups, and from other relatives or close friends living in other urban or rural areas. A few mentioned receiving charity from unrelated people who provided clothing, food and other goods.

Asked if they provided help to others, caregivers said that they mainly gave support to neighbours and close friends living in the same area. For the rest, the proportions were under ten per cent, with the highest being for persons working in the same occupation and other relatives in the same urban areas (7 per cent each). Here again, the site in Hawassa had the highest proportions and Duba had the lowest proportions in almost all categories, suggesting

a pattern similar to that for support received. The qualitative data suggest that a few households are able to provide support to others, such as grandmothers, siblings living with them, children of relatives or neighbours, especially if orphaned, to neighbours, and relatives in the countryside or visiting. A few households said they only gave help to beggars, and some commented that they were too poor to help anyone else, or that the increased cost of living is making it impossible to offer help to others.

The social networks and forms of support discussed above, notably the support received from remittances by migrants and assistance to poor children given by NGOs, are important aspects which enable poor households and the children living within them to cope with the challenges of living in urban poverty.

Relocation from the areas in which the children and their families have been living could bring about improvements in their housing and neighbourhood if they can move into better housing. However, this will depend in part on where they will be relocated, whether they will be able to afford condominium housing, and what services and opportunities for work are available. The move is also likely to have an impact on their social relations and require them to adapt to a new social environment. Family relations and school conditions are likely to be crucial for children, whereas caregivers will need to rebuild social networks; funeral, religious and credit associations can be expected to play a key role in their successful adaptation.

## Annexes. Supplementary tables

### Annex A. Home environment

#### *House ownership and maintenance*

**Table A1.** *Title deeds (caregivers)*

	Do you own title deeds? (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	N/A
Bertukan	0.9	4.4	0.9	93.9
Menderin	3.7	9.3	0.0	87.0
Duba	9.6	16.0	0.0	74.4
Leku	11.8	29.4	0.0	58.8
<b>All sites</b>	<b>6.7</b> <b>(N=31)</b>	<b>15.0</b> <b>(N=70)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>	<b>78.1</b> <b>(N=364)</b>

**Table A2.** *Renting rooms (caregivers)*

	Do you rent out rooms? (%)		
	No	Yes	N/A
Bertukan	93.9	2.6	3.5
Menderin	94.4	4.6	0.9
Duba	92.0	8.0	0.0
Leku	59.7	26.9	13.4
<b>All sites</b>	<b>84.8</b> <b>(N=395)</b>	<b>10.7</b> <b>(N=50)</b>	<b>4.5</b> <b>(N=21)</b>

#### *Aspects of their homes that children dislike*

**Table A3.** *Sharing room (children)*

	Dislike home because of sharing room (%)		
	No	Yes	N/A
Bertukan	72.3	27.7	0.0
Menderin	76.2	22.8	1.0
Duba	78.5	21.5	0.0
Leku	74.4	22.2	3.4
<b>All sites</b>	<b>75.4</b> <b>(N=340)</b>	<b>23.5</b> <b>(N=106)</b>	<b>1.1</b> <b>(N=5)</b>

**Table A4.** *Lack of privacy (children)*

	Dislike home because of lack of privacy (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	86.6	12.5	0.9	0
Menderin	80.2	18.8	1	0
Duba	87.6	12.4	0	0
Leku	69.2	27.4	1.7	1.7
<b>All sites</b>	<b>80.9</b> <b>(N=365)</b>	<b>17.7</b> <b>(N=80)</b>	<b>0.9</b> <b>(N=4)</b>	<b>0.4</b> <b>(N=2)</b>

**Table A5.** *Sharing bed (children)*

	Dislike home because of sharing bed (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	83.9	4.5	0.9	10.7
Menderin	72.3	5	0	22.8
Duba	70.2	5.8	0	24
Leku	70.9	0	0	29.1
<b>All sites</b>	<b>74.3</b> <b>(N=335)</b>	<b>3.8</b> <b>(N=17)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>	<b>21.7</b> <b>(N=98)</b>

**Table A6.** *Family disputes (children)*

	Dislike home because of family disputes (%)		
	No	Yes	DK
Bertukan	78.6	21.4	0
Menderin	83.2	16.8	0
Duba	78.5	20.7	0.8
Leku	79.5	20.5	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>79.8</b> <b>(N=360)</b>	<b>20</b> <b>(N=90)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>

**Table A7.** *Presence of *debal* (children)*

	Dislike home because of presence of <i>debal</i> (%)		
	No	Yes	NA
Bertukan	82.1	0.9	17
Menderin	77.2	2	20.8
Duba	81.8	0	18.2
Leku	76.9	1.7	21.4
<b>All sites</b>	<b>79.6</b> <b>(N=359)</b>	<b>1.1</b> <b>(N=5)</b>	<b>19.3</b> <b>(N=87)</b>

**Table A8.** *No toilet (children)*

	Dislike home because there is no toilet (%)		
	No	Yes	NA
Bertukan	86.6	10.7	2.7
Duba	74.4	19	6.6
Menderin	51.5	16.8	31.7
Leku	36.8	6.8	56.4
<b>All sites</b>	<b>62.5</b> <b>(N=282)</b>	<b>13.3</b> <b>(N=60)</b>	<b>24.2</b> <b>(N=109)</b>

**Table A9.** *Dirty/smelly toilet (children)*

	Dislike home because of dirty/smelly toilet (%)		
	No	Yes	NA
Bertukan	58.9	39.3	1.8
Menderin	45.5	54.5	0
Duba	57.9	36.4	5.8
Leku	52.1	46.2	1.7
<b>All sites</b>	<b>53.9</b> <b>(N=243)</b>	<b>43.7</b> <b>(N=197)</b>	<b>2.4</b> <b>(N=11)</b>

## Annex B. The neighbourhood

*Aspects of their neighbourhood that children and caregivers like*

**Table B1.** *Church/ mosque (children)*

	Like neighbourhood because of the church/mosque (%)		
	No	Yes	DK
Bertukan	33.9	66.1	0
Menderin	16.8	80.2	3
Duba	50.4	49.6	0
Leku	16.2	80.3	3.4
<b>All sites</b>	<b>29.9</b> <b>(N=135)</b>	<b>68.5</b> <b>(N=309)</b>	<b>1.6</b> <b>(N=7)</b>

**Table B2.** *Cafés (children)*

	Like neighbourhood because of the cafes (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	73.2	25	1.8	0
Menderin	43.6	54.5	2	0
Duba	77.7	20.7	1.7	0
Leku	45.3	50.4	3.4	0.9
<b>All sites</b>	<b>60.5</b> <b>(N=273)</b>	<b>37</b> <b>(N=167)</b>	<b>2.2</b> <b>(N=10)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>

**Table B3.** *Youth club (children)*

	Like neighbourhood because of the youth club (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	86.6	8.9	4.5	0
Menderin	90.1	5.9	1	3
Duba	85.1	11.6	3.3	0
Leku	76.9	9.4	3.4	10.3
<b>All sites</b>	<b>84.5</b> <b>(N=381)</b>	<b>9.1</b> <b>(N=41)</b>	<b>3.1</b> <b>(N=14)</b>	<b>3.3</b> <b>(N=15)</b>

**Table B4.** *Iddir (children)*

	Like neighbourhood because of the iddir (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	86.6	12.5	0	0.9
Menderin	81.2	1	0	17.8
Duba	81	10.7	3.3	5
Leku	59.8	11.1	0.9	28.2
<b>All sites</b>	<b>76.9</b> <b>(N=347)</b>	<b>9.1</b> <b>(N=41)</b>	<b>1.1</b> <b>(N=5)</b>	<b>12.9</b> <b>(N=58)</b>

**Table B5.** *Mehaber (children)*

	Like neighbourhood because of the mehaber (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	93.8	5.4	0	0.9
Menderin	69.3	9.9	0	20.8
Duba	90.9	2.5	4.1	2.5
Leku	54.7	16.2	0	29.1
<b>All sites</b>	<b>77.4</b> <b>(N=349)</b>	<b>8.4</b> <b>(N=38)</b>	<b>1.1</b> <b>(N=5)</b>	<b>13.1</b> <b>(N=59)</b>

**Table B6.** *Market (children)*

	Like neighbourhood because of the market (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	56.3	43.8	0	0
Menderin	34.7	63.4	1	1
Duba	66.1	33.9	0	0
Leku	49.6	47.9	0.9	1.7
<b>All sites</b>	<b>52.3</b> <b>(N=236)</b>	<b>46.6</b> <b>(N=210)</b>	<b>0.4</b> <b>(N=2)</b>	<b>0.7</b> <b>(N=3)</b>

**Table B7.** *Access to market (caregivers)*

	Does access to market make the area where you live attractive? (%)		
	No	Yes	DK
Bertukan	19.3	79.8	0.9
Menderin	10.2	89.8	0
Duba	46.4	53.6	0
Leku	34.5	65.5	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>28.3</b> <b>(N=132)</b>	<b>71.5</b> <b>(N=333)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>

*Aspects of their neighbourhoods that children and caregivers dislike*

**Table B8.** *Dirty streets (caregivers and children)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because of dirty streets (%)				
	Caregivers			Children	
	No	Yes	DK	No	Yes
Bertukan	28.1	71.9	0	28.6	71.4
Menderin	26.9	73.1	0	23.8	76.2
Duba	65.6	34.4	0	53.7	46.3
Leku	55.5	42.9	1.7	60.7	39.3
<b>All sites</b>	<b>44.8</b> <b>(N=209)</b>	<b>54.7</b> <b>(N=255)</b>	<b>0.4</b> <b>(N=2)</b>	<b>42.6</b> <b>(N=192)</b>	<b>57.4</b> <b>(N=259)</b>

**Table B9.** *Lack of recreation (children)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because of lack of recreation (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	57.1	41.1	0.9	0.9
Menderin	52.5	47.5	0	0
Duba	52.1	47.9	0	0
Leku	56.4	43.6	0	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>54.5</b> <b>(N=246)</b>	<b>45</b> <b>(N=203)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>

**Table B10.** *Air pollution (children)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because of air pollution (%)		
	No	Yes	DK
Bertukan	68.8	30.4	0.9
Menderin	64.4	34.7	1
Duba	92.6	7.4	0
Leku	74.4	25.6	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>75.6</b> <b>(N=341)</b>	<b>23.9</b> <b>(N=108)</b>	<b>0.4</b> <b>(N=2)</b>

**Table B11.** *River pollution (children)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because of river pollution (%)			
	No	Yes	DK	NA
Bertukan	67.9	21.4	2.7	8
Menderin	51.5	25.7	5.9	16.8
Duba	81.8	14.9	1.7	1.7
Leku	60.7	3.4	16.2	19.7
<b>All sites</b>	<b>66.1</b> <b>(N=298)</b>	<b>16</b> <b>(N=72)</b>	<b>6.7</b> <b>(N=30)</b>	<b>11.3</b> <b>(N=51)</b>

**Table B12.** *Over-crowding (children)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because it is over- crowded (%)		
	No	Yes	NA
Bertukan	66.1	33.9	0
Menderin	55.4	44.6	0
Duba	84.3	14.9	0.8
Leku	78.6	21.4	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>71.8</b> <b>(N=324)</b>	<b>27.9</b> <b>(N=126)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>

**Table B13.** *Noise pollution (children)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because of noise pollution (%)		
	No	Yes	NA
Bertukan	67.9	32.1	0
Menderin	67.3	32.7	0
Duba	79.3	19.8	0.8
Leku	61.5	38.5	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>69.2</b> <b>(N=312)</b>	<b>30.6</b> <b>(N=138)</b>	<b>0.2</b> <b>(N=1)</b>

**Table B14.** *Unsafe during the day (children)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because it is unsafe during the day (%)	
	No	Yes
Bertukan	86.6	13.4
Menderin	77.2	22.8
Duba	99.2	0.8
Leku	81.2	18.8
<b>All sites</b>	<b>86.5</b> <b>(N=390)</b>	<b>13.5</b> <b>(N=61)</b>



**Table B15.** *Unsafe at night (children)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because it is unsafe at night (%)		
	No	Yes	DK
Bertukan	62.5	37.5	0
Menderin	46.5	51.5	2
Duba	72.7	26.4	0.8
Leku	69.2	30.8	0
<b>All sites</b>	<b>63.4</b> <b>(N=286)</b>	<b>35.9</b> <b>(N=162)</b>	<b>0.7</b> <b>(N=3)</b>

**Table B16.** *Prevalence of commercial sex work (Older Cohort children only)*

	Dislike neighbourhood because prevalence of commercial sex work (%)		
	No	Yes	DK
Bertukan	95	5	0
Menderin	77.8	19.4	2.8
Duba	97.5	2.5	0
Leku	62.9	34.3	2.9
<b>All sites</b>	<b>84.1</b> <b>(N=127)</b>	<b>14.6</b> <b>(N=22)</b>	<b>1.3</b> <b>(N=2)</b>

## References

- Adekolu-John, E. O. (1988) 'Housing and Health of a Resettlement Exercise in Nigeria', *Public Health* 102: 147–59.
- Ambaye, Ogato (2006) 'The Consequences of Urban Development on the Affected People in Addis Ababa: The Case of Gurara', MA thesis in Social Anthropology, Addis Ababa University.
- Aptekar, Lewis (2010) *In the Mouth of the Lion: Hope and Heartbreak in Humanitarian Assistance*, USA: XLibris.
- Ashenafi, Gossaye (2001) 'Inner-City Renewal in Addis Ababa. The Impact of Resettlement on the Socio-economic and Housing Situation of Low-Income Residents'. PhD thesis, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.
- Brokensha, David (1963) 'Volta Resettlement and Anthropological Research', *Human Organisation* 22 (4): 286–90.
- Cernea, M. M. (1993) 'The Urban Environment and Population Relocation', World Bank Discussion Paper 152, Washington DC: World Bank.
- Cernea, M. (1997) 'The Risks and Reconstruction Model for Resettling Displaced Populations', *World Development* 25(10): 1569–87.
- Cernea, M.M. (1999) 'The Economics of Involuntary Resettlement, Questions and Challenges', Washington DC: World Bank.
- Cernea, M. (2000) 'Risks, Safeguards and Reconstruction: a Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement', in M. Cernea and C. McDowell (eds) *Risks and Reconstruction: Experiences of Resettlers and Refugees*, Washington DC: World Bank, pp. 15-44 .
- Cernea, M.M (2005) 'Concept and Method: Applying the IRR Model in Africa to Resettlement and Poverty', in I. Ohta and Y. Gebre (eds) *Displacement Risks in Africa: Resettlers and Their Host Population*, Kyoto: Kyoto University Press / Transpacific Press, pp. 195–258.
- Chambers, R. (1969) *Settlement Schemes in Tropical Africa: A Study of Organisations and Development*, New York: Praeger.
- Chambers, Robert (1970) *The Volta Resettlement Experience*, London: Pall Mall Press.
- Colson, Elizabeth (1971) *The Social Consequence of Resettlement. The Impact of Kariba Resettlement Upon the Gwebe Tonga*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Dejene, Teshome (2005) 'The Socio-Economic and Cultural Effects of Urban Development in Addis Ababa: A Case Study of the Belt Highway Project', MA thesis in Social Anthropology, Addis Ababa University.
- Dessalegn, Rahmato (2010) *Resettlement in Ethiopia: The Tragedy of Population Relocation in the 1980s*, Addis Ababa: Forum for Social Studies.
- Dinku, Lamessa (2004) 'Socio-Cultural Dimensions of Conflict-Induced Displacement: The Case of Displaced Persons in Addis Ababa', in A. Pankhurst and F. Piguet (eds).

- Du Plessis, J. (2006) 'Forced Evictions, Development and the Need for Community-based, Locally Appropriate Alternatives: Lessons and Challenges from South Africa, Ghana and Thailand', in M. Huchzermeyer and A. Karam (eds) *Informal Settlements: A Perpetual Challenge?*, Cape Town: UCT Press, pp.180–206.
- Feleke, Tadele (2004) 'The New Resettlement Programme in Ethiopia: Reflections on the Design and Implementation approach', in A. Pankhurst and F. Piguet (eds).
- Fitsum, Resome (2006) 'Development and Risks: Causes, Consequence and Challenges of Inner City Development-Induced Displacement: The Case of Kebele 14 of Arada Sub City in Addis Ababa Metropolitan Area', MA thesis, Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Addis Ababa University.
- Gebre, Yntiso (2001) 'Population Displacement and Food Insecurity in Ethiopia: Resettlement, Settlers, and Hosts', PhD Dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of Florida.
- Marris, Peter (1961) *Family and Social Change in an African City: A Study of Rehousing in Lagos*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Misra, Girish K. and Rakesh Gupta (1981) *Resettlement Policies in Delhi*, New Delhi: Centre for Urban Studies, Indian Institute of Public Administration.
- Nebiyu, Baye (2000) 'The Impact of Development-Induced Urban Resettlement Schemes on Relocated Households: The Case of Sheraton Addis Hotel Project, Addis Ababa', MA thesis in Regional and Local Development Studies, Addis Ababa University.
- Pankhurst, A. (1991) 'Settling for a New World: People and the State in an Ethiopian Resettlement Village', PhD. thesis, University of Manchester.
- Pankhurst, A. (2009) 'Revisiting Resettlement under Two Regimes: The 2000s Programme Reviewed in the Light of the 1980s Experience' in Pankhurst A. and F. Piguet (eds), pp. 130–79.
- Pankhurst, A. and F. Piguet (2009) 'Displacement, Migration and Relocation: Challenges for Policy, Research and Coexistence', in A. Pankhurst and F. Piguet (eds) , pp. 246–64.
- Pankhurst, A. and F. Piguet (eds) (2009) *Moving People: Displacement, Development and the State in Ethiopia*, Oxford: James Currey
- Perlman, Janice E. (1976) *The Myth of Marginality: Urban Poverty and Politics in Rio de Janeiro*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Piguet, F. and A. Pankhurst (2009) 'Migration, Resettlement and Displacement in Ethiopia: A Historical and Spatial Overview', A. Pankhurst and F. Piguet (eds), pp. 1–23.
- Scudder, T. (1968) 'Social Anthropology, Man-made Lakes and Population Relocation in Africa', *Anthropological Quarterly* 41 (3): 168–76.
- Scudder, T. (1973) 'The Human Ecology of Big Projects: River Basin Development and Resettlement', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 2: 45–55.
- Scudder T. and E. Colson (1979) 'Long-term Research in the Gwembe Valley, Zambia', in G. Foster et al. (eds) *Long Term Field Research in Social Anthropology*, New York: Academic Press, pp. 227–54.
- Scudder T. and E. Colson (1982) 'From Welfare to Development: A Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of Dislocated People', in A. Hansen and A. Oliver-Smith (eds) *Involuntary*

*Migration: The Problems and Responses of Dislocated People*, Boulder: Westview Press, pp. 267–88.

UN-HABITAT (2010) *The Ethiopia Case of Condominium Housing: The Integrated Housing Development Programme*, Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

UN-HABITAT (2011) *Losing Your Home: Assessing the Impact of Eviction*, Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

Wolde-Sellassie, Abbute (2002) 'Gumuz and Highland Settlers: Differing Strategies of Livelihood and Ethnic Relations in Metekel, Northwestern Ethiopia', PhD thesis, University of Göttingen.

World Bank (1998) 'Involuntary Resettlement, Operational Policy and Background Paper', Washington DC: World Bank.

# Living in Urban Areas due for Redevelopment: Views of Children and their Families in Addis Ababa and Hawassa

This report is the first of three resulting from a sub-study conducted by Young Lives in four communities in Ethiopia, three in Addis Ababa and one in Hawassa, to examine what happens to children and their families living in areas that are due to be redeveloped. The paper presents the views of children and their caregivers about their living conditions prior to the impending move. It considers how children and adults view their home and neighbourhood environment and the extent of their social support networks. The report seeks to document how children and caregivers understand and experience their lives in a context of urban poverty, living in sites which are considered to be 'slums', mainly in areas that are due to be demolished and redeveloped through urban renovation programmes involving both commercial and residential development.

The evidence from this study suggests that children and their families live in crowded and insalubrious conditions in these urban sites. Most households do not own their homes. Children dislike their lack of separate kitchens, latrines, and washing facilities, and more than half the caregivers thought that their neighbourhoods were bad places to bring up children. Despite the conditions of material deprivation, the children and their caregivers value the cohesive social relations. Relations with family and friends are important for children, and they liked living close to their friends, schools, markets, cafés and religious institutions.

Relocation could bring about improvements in their housing and neighbourhood, although this will depend on where they are relocated to, what services and opportunities for work are available, and whether families will be able to afford the new condominium housing on offer. Family relations and school conditions are likely to be crucial for children, whereas caregivers will need to rebuild social networks, and funeral, religious and credit associations can be expected to play a key role in the successful adaptation of relocated households.

## About Young Lives

Young Lives is an international study of childhood poverty, involving 12,000 children in 4 countries over 15 years. It is led by a team in the Department of International Development at the University of Oxford in association with research and policy partners in the 4 study countries: Ethiopia, India, Peru and Vietnam.

Through researching different aspects of children's lives, we seek to improve policies and programmes for children.

## Young Lives Partners

Young Lives is coordinated by a small team based at the University of Oxford, led by Professor Jo Boyden.

- *Ethiopian Development Research Institute, Ethiopia*
- *Pankhurst Development Research and Consulting plc*
- *Save the Children (Ethiopia programme)*
- *Centre for Economic and Social Sciences, Andhra Pradesh, India*
- *Save the Children India*
- *Sri Padmavathi Mahila Visvavidyalayam (Women's University), Andhra Pradesh, India*
- *Grupo de Análisis para el Desarrollo (GRADE), Peru*
- *Instituto de Investigación Nutricional, Peru*
- *Centre for Analysis and Forecasting, Vietnamese Academy of Social Sciences, Vietnam*
- *General Statistics Office, Vietnam*
- *University of Oxford, UK*

## Contact:

**Young Lives**  
Oxford Department of  
International Development,  
University of Oxford,  
3 Mansfield Road,  
Oxford OX1 3TB, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)1865 281751  
Email: [younglives@younglives.org.uk](mailto:younglives@younglives.org.uk)  
Website: [www.younglives.org.uk](http://www.younglives.org.uk)