

## RECOUP Working Paper No. 41

# The RECOUP Household Surveys: Methods, implementation and some results

Feyza Bhatti

Mahbub-ul-Haq, Human Development Centre, Pakistan

May 2011

## RECOUP Working Paper No.41

### The RECOUP Household Surveys : Methods, implementation and some results

by

Feyza Bhatti\*

Mahbub-ul-Haq Human Development Centre, Pakistan

**Abstract:** *This paper details the methods employed by the RECOUP Household surveys conducted in Ghana, India and Pakistan between 2006 and 2008, addressing issues of design, access, administration and the results obtained. The paper complements other outputs from RECOUP, by making available some of the relevant quantitative data gathered, and by offering an insight into the rationale for the selected methodology, the obstacles to its implementation, and how these were overcome.*

---

\* **Corresponding Author:** University of Edinburgh, School of Social and Political Science, Chrystal MacMillan Building, 15A George Square, Edinburgh EH8 9LD, email: feyzabhatti@gmail.com

*This paper forms part of the Research Consortium on Educational Outcomes and Poverty (RECOUP). Neither DFID nor any of the partner institutions are responsible for the views expressed here. For details of the objectives, composition and work of the consortium see: [www.educ.cam.ac.uk/RECOUP](http://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/RECOUP)*

## **Introduction**

During the five years of research into the impact of education on the lives and livelihoods of the poor in developing countries, much of the collaborative work has resulted from, and been informed by, the large-scale data gathered in the fieldwork sites. This paper details how the RECOUP Household surveys were designed; including sampling, choice of research sites, access, the construction of the questionnaire, sensitivity to local differences, and the training of enumerators. Three of the tables included in this paper (1, 3 and 4) give an overview of the sampling design and the types of quantitative data obtained in each country. Selected data from each country, given in the appendix, detail the households enumerated and their population, education enrolment and attainment, the structure of the labour force, family planning and child birth, disability, and skill acquisition among the samples. The data allow for comparisons between the countries to be made.

Three quantitative household surveys were conducted under RECOUP<sup>1</sup>: Ghana Urban Household Panel Survey 2006<sup>2</sup>, India RECOUP Household Survey 2007/08 and Pakistan Outcomes of Education and Poverty Household Survey 2006/07<sup>3</sup>. No quantitative survey was carried out in Kenya, but data are presented in the appendix, for purposes of comparison, which are mainly drawn from the Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2008-09<sup>4</sup>. The following sections detail the rationale for the surveys and how they were designed before issues relating to local differences are addressed.

## **Objectives of the surveys**

The household surveys under RECOUP were mainly designed to examine the impact of schooling on social, economic and learning outcomes of people in these countries. The

---

<sup>1</sup> The design of the surveys was led by Geeta Kingdon, (Institute of Education, University of London). The research teams from the partner countries were then responsible for further development of questionnaires and for the implementation of the fieldwork.

<sup>2</sup> The Ghana survey, “Urban Household Panel Survey”, was conducted by the Centre for the Study of African Economies at the University of Oxford in collaboration with the Ghana Statistical Office. The survey was carried out in 2004, 2005, 2006 (RECOUP), 2008 and 2009. The RECOUP themes and questionnaires were incorporated in 2006 with an ongoing study that aimed at collecting data particularly on labour market outcomes in urban areas.

<sup>3</sup> The RECOUP household data sets in India and Pakistan were collected by teams working at Collaborative Research and Dissemination (CORD) and Mahbub ul Haq Human Development Centre (MHHDC), respectively.

<sup>4</sup> The Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2008-2009, compiled by the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics formerly Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) is available online at:  
[http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv\\_id=300&ctry\\_id=20&SrvyTp=available](http://www.measuredhs.com/aboutsurveys/search/metadata.cfm?surv_id=300&ctry_id=20&SrvyTp=available)

surveys collected detailed information on a) the communities visited: infrastructure, access to education and health services, in and out migration<sup>5</sup>; b) the households enumerated: members, income, savings, assets and shocks to households; and c) household members aged 15-60: educational backgrounds, skill acquisition, economic activities, health and fertility status, time use, attitudes, and perceived well-being of household members, learning outcomes through tests. The RECOUP surveys also aimed at collecting detailed information relevant to RECOUP sub-themes in order to enable the combination and/or triangulation of quantitative and qualitative results - in line with the design of the whole project.<sup>6</sup>

In order to provide similar information for Kenya, we utilised the KDHS dataset, collected by the Kenya Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) and obtained from Measure DHS website through special permission for the RECOUP project. The KDHS survey aimed at providing information for guiding planning, implementation and monitoring of population and health programmes in Kenya and therefore does not provide as detailed information as the RECOUP surveys on topics relevant to our sub-themes, with the exceptions of the schooling of household members and their fertility outcomes<sup>7</sup>.

### **Methodology and sample design**

A multi-stage sampling method was used for sampling of households in India and Pakistan. Table 1 provides the sample and the sampling designs of each survey conducted under RECOUP, and details by country are given below.

#### **Pakistan**

The survey was conducted during November 2006- April 2007 by two teams working simultaneously in Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KP)<sup>8</sup>. These two provinces were selected on the basis of a) their higher enrolment and attainment rates than other provinces; b) officials in these provinces providing easier access to communities and households;

---

<sup>5</sup> No community questionnaires were administered in Ghana.

<sup>6</sup> For more information see the Annex on Qualitative Research Methods in Colclough, C. (ed.) (2012) *Education Outcomes and Poverty : a Reassessment*. London: Routledge.

<sup>7</sup> For more information please visit <http://www.measuredhs.com>

<sup>8</sup> Former North West Frontier Province (NWFP).

**Table 1: Sample details and designs for each country**

		Sample details			Location	
	State/Province	District/City	Households	Urban	Rural	
<b>Ghana</b>						
Sample selection	Greater Accra, Central, Western, Ashanti	1 city in each region: 4 cities	744U	70 of a total of 4,217 enumeration areas as used in population census		
Sampling design	Selection of households			Up to 10 households selected from each enumeration area		Not Applicable
<b>India</b>						
Sample selection	Rajasthan & Madhya Pradesh	3 in each state = 6 districts	1017 (300 U, 717 R)	1 ward from district town of each district= 6 wards.		Villages divided into three groups according to rural female literacy. Then 1 chosen randomly from each group and so 3 in each district = 18 villages.
Sampling design	Selection of communities			From 3 randomly selected wards, one ward with high proportion of poor was selected.		From each stratum very small and very large villages were removed in order to select villages of size similar to the sample in Pakistan. 3 villages were chosen randomly.
	Selection of households			Circular systematically <sup>9</sup> –using electoral rolls.50 households from each urban ward.		Circular systematically –using electoral rolls Sample size of households was proportional to village population
<b>Pakistan</b>						
Sample selection	Punjab & KP	6 Punjab, 3 KP	1094 (303 U, 791 R)	1 enumeration block from district town of each district=9 enumeration blocks		2 villages in each district = 18 villages
Sampling design	Selection of communities			1 enumeration block was randomly selected using FBS's enumeration blocks defined for urban areas of each district=9 PSUs		For each district 5 villages were randomly selected based on Population Census organisation's lists of <i>mauzas</i> for 1998 Population Census. Then 2 were chosen from each based on access to the villages and availability of some schools in these villages = 18 villages.
	Selection of Households			Circular systematically –using village household list usually prepared by team supervisors.		Circular systematically –using household list prepared by team supervisors.

<sup>9</sup> In India, households are listed in electoral rolls from one end of village to the other in order of the location of households. Circular systematically selecting households for the sample ensures that the sample is representative as households from different communities are usually located in separate clusters. This was also used in Pakistan through community mapping and listing of households in order of their location.

c) security considerations<sup>10</sup> ; d) geographical proximity to Islamabad (resources and logistical constraints made research in Baluchistan and Sindh unfeasible); e) language and cultural barriers being less constraining.

### ***Universe and sampling frames***

The universe for the Pakistan survey consisted of all urban and rural areas (excluding provincial capitals and major cities) in the provinces of Punjab and KP.

The sample for the survey was the population living in households in Punjab and KP. The sample size was around 8700 individuals from 1094 households<sup>11</sup> living in 9 districts in Punjab (6 districts) and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (3 districts). The selected districts were equally spread out across the southern, central and northern regions of the two provinces. Given that Punjab alone houses 56 per cent of the country's population, the sample reflects the national regional (both provincial and rural-urban) proportions.

The rural sampling frame was the list of villages published by the Population Census Organisation after the National Population Census of 1998. The urban sample was selected from an urban area frame developed and used by the Federal Bureau of Statistics (updated in 2003). This divided each town and city into enumeration blocks of 200-250 households identifiable through a sketch map. A total of 27 communities (18 rural, 9 urban) were selected randomly using those frameworks. Although the best available, these frames and maps were out of date, causing difficulties in identifying the borders of the village or urban enumeration blocks. In such cases, field supervisors redrew the borders (which were usually expanded to cover new *mohallas*) after consulting the nazims and/or officials from the district offices.

### ***Selection of primary and secondary sampling units***

The primary sampling units (PSUs) comprised one urban area and two rural areas in each of the districts. Households within the PSUs were taken as secondary sampling units (SSUs). Every  $n^{\text{th}}$  household was randomly selected from within the PSUs. Depending on the number of households in a village or urban

---

<sup>10</sup> Baluchistan and Sindh are far from the federal area. The security conditions in these provinces at the time of inception of the quantitative survey were deemed more volatile. The security situation in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa deteriorated in 2008 with the start of a military operation. Three sample sites in Swat were affected by the operation and mass displacement of the population from the region occurred.

<sup>11</sup> In India and Pakistan, a household was described for the purposes of the questionnaire as all individuals who met the following criteria: a) They lived under the same roof or within the same compound/homestead at least 15 days out of the year past; b) They shared food from a common source when they were together; c) They contributed to or shared a common resource pool. In Ghana, the households were already defined by the population census sampling frame used for household survey.

block, a suitable sampling interval was chosen to ensure the sample selected was representative of the community.

## **India**

The RECOUP survey in India was conducted between October 2007 and February 2008 in Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh. These States, which had also been chosen for the qualitative studies, were among the educationally less developed states and yet had made rapid progress in school participation in recent years. NFHS II showed that in the late 1990s the median level of schooling completed by 15 to 19 year old boys was almost class 8 so it was to be expected that there would be some educated adults even among the poor households.<sup>12</sup>

### ***Selection of districts***

The qualitative survey preceded the household survey and one district from each state was chosen for this purpose. The sample of three districts in each state for the household survey included the district chosen for the qualitative studies and two other randomly chosen districts from the same agro-economic zone. This was to allow for triangulation of information from the quantitative and qualitative surveys. The sample districts are not therefore representative of the states, but of a specific agro-economic zone within the state. The districts finally chosen were Dhaulpur, Alwar and Pali in Rajasthan (North Eastern region) and Dewas, Ratlam and Shajapur in Madhya Pradesh (Malwa region).

### ***Selection of villages and households***

A sample of approximately 1000 households was chosen from the two survey states. As regards the rural sample, villages were chosen through stratified random sampling. Villages in each district were stratified by rural female literacy rates (census 2001) into three groups, and one village was chosen randomly from each stratum (after removing very small and very large villages). The village size was thus similar to the Pakistan sample villages (in the range of 1400 to 5000 population). From each village, households were chosen systematically from the electoral rolls. The sample size in each village was roughly proportional to population.

For the urban sample three wards were chosen randomly from each district capital and from them the one with highest proportion of poor households was selected for the survey. Using electoral rolls 50 households were chosen systematically from each ward.

---

<sup>12</sup> The choice of states were also influenced by practical considerations – familiarity of language (Hindi is the main language spoken in both states) and distance from Delhi (sample areas in both the states could be reached with 16 to 20 hours train journey)

The survey collected data on household consumption expenditure. Households in rural and urban areas were divided into five quintiles according to per capita monthly consumption expenditure. In rural Rajasthan, nearly 45% of the households were in the lowest two quintiles, in contrast to 35% in rural MP. This indicates greater poverty levels in the Rajasthan sample. The urban situation was also similar. By contrast, however, other published data suggest a lower poverty-level in Rajasthan as compared to Madhya Pradesh. Part of the explanation for this lies in the choice of regions – a relatively prosperous region was chosen in Madhya Pradesh. By contrast, Rajasthan had been suffering successive drought years prior to the survey, which may explain the higher poverty-levels found.

## Ghana

The RECOUP survey in Ghana, conducted in 2006, was organised as a follow-up to a panel survey of urban workers that began in 2004. The sampling frame was drawn from the population census and covered five urban areas in Ghana (Table 2). Roughly 1.7 per cent of households in these towns were selected randomly, using the enumeration areas of the census. This provided a sample that was representative of the urban population. In addition, since the CSAE had been surveying workers in manufacturing firms for some time these were also included in the survey.

**Table 2: Urban samples in Ghana**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Enumeration Areas in census</b>	<b>Enumeration Areas in sample</b>	<b>Sampling proportion</b>
Accra	1,724	29	0.0168
Tema	486	7	0.0144
Kumasi	1,436	24	0.0167
Sekondi & Takoradi	403	7	0.0174
Cape Coast	168	3	0.0179
<b>Total</b>	4,217	70	0.0166

The sampling procedure was to select at random a number of EAs (enumeration areas) used in the census and then to choose up to 10 households within those EAs. The sampling unit was the household as defined by the population census. The objective of surveying these households was to obtain a sample that was representative of the urban population.



### *Some comparisons*

- In Pakistan and India the surveys were carried out in rural and urban areas; whereas in Ghana the survey was conducted in urban centers only.
- In India the districts already covered by the qualitative studies were also selected for the household survey. Accordingly, there was an element of purposiveness in the selection process. Coverage was similar too in Pakistan, but since the quantitative survey was conducted first, a relatively random selection of survey districts was achieved.
- In India the universe was the NSSO sample sub-region which included the districts for qualitative studies. In Pakistan the universe was all districts in Punjab and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, excluding provincial capitals (Lahore, Peshawar) and highly urbanised cities like Faisalabad. In Ghana, it was urban centres.
- The selection of villages was different in India and Pakistan. In India, all villages within the district were divided into three groups (based on female literacy rates), one from each being selected randomly for enumeration. In Pakistan five villages were selected randomly using Census lists. Two of these were selected for enumeration after a visit by the supervisors, who checked the availability of heterogeneous income groups and primary schooling facilities and secured permission to survey the communities.
- Villages were excluded in India if they were too small or too large to be comparable with Pakistan.

### **Questionnaires**

The questionnaires were designed to allow as much common information as possible to be collected from the sites in the three countries. There were minor differences in coverage, mainly due to differences in cultural contexts. For example, in India and Pakistan, the section on fertility was administered only to married women aged 15-60 as it is rare and culturally unacceptable for a woman to be sexually active before her first marriage. In Ghana, on the other hand, the fertility questionnaire was administered to all women aged 15-60.

The range of data collected by the surveys is summarised in Tables 3 and 4. The household questionnaire was a detailed four-section document, collecting information on both the household, which was tightly defined<sup>13</sup>, as well as the details of household members. Original aspects of the questionnaire include the following:

Several new questions were asked in the case of Pakistan regarding children's education, including:

1. Distance (and walking time) to the nearest primary/secondary school when of school-going age were asked of *all* individuals (regardless of enrolment status when of school-going age)
2. Whether an individual took board examinations 'privately' or as a 'regular' candidate, and whether the individual took any private tuition when studying for given exam levels were pertinent questions in the South Asian context because a number of individuals (particularly girls) never enrol in secondary school but still complete various levels of education 'privately'.

A special feature of the Economic Activities section of the questionnaire was that it captured information on both current and most recent previous employment. This allowed us to construct a pseudo-panel dataset to see not only how education affects earnings at a point in time but also how it affects changes in occupation/industry/firm-size/sector or growth in earnings, over time. A distinguishing feature of the questionnaire was that it classified unpaid family workers as economically active rather than inactive. This allowed us to capture labour which works toward economic gain but is not paid, particularly among women in rural households who work in fields or for family businesses and are not paid (See Appendix: "Structure of Labour Force" tables for each country, I5, K5, G5 and P5).

For the questions on disability, enumerators were trained to report even the most basic levels of impairment which, though not usually considered to be disabling, nevertheless have implications for individuals' full participation in economic or social activities. The definition of disability was designed by academic experts in the field, thereby ensuring their relevance to the objectives of the larger study<sup>14</sup> (See Appendix: "Disability" tables for India, I7 and Pakistan, P7).

The questionnaire also elicited information on cognitive ability, including literacy and numeracy skills, as one pathway through which education impacts outcomes. Questionnaires were translated into national languages (Urdu in Pakistan and Hindi in India) and piloted before the fieldwork. The language tests were

---

<sup>13</sup>In India and Pakistan, a household was described for the purposes of the questionnaire as all individuals who met the following criteria: a) They lived under the same roof or within the same compound/homestead at least 15 days out of the year past; b) They shared food from a common source when they were together; c) They contributed to or shared a common resource pool.

<sup>14</sup> For further details of the larger study, and how the research was conducted see the Annex on qualitative research methods in Colclough, C. (ed.) (2012) *Education Outcomes and Poverty: a Reassessment*. London: Routledge

also translated in national languages (and also in Pushto for KP). One questionnaire per household was completed in India while in Pakistan two questionnaires (one for females & one for males) were completed for each household and then combined into one on the same day.

The experience was different in Ghana, which used handheld computers rather than paper based questionnaires. In Ghana the questionnaire was coded in English, and the enumerators who were fluent in English as well as in several of the local languages translated the questions simultaneously. Being the Ghanaian population fluent in English and not extremely ethnically divided and the availability of an expert team of enumerators, proved to be an effective approach which also saved time in data entry and checking for Ghana.

For the test, all three teams used laminated sheets. The answers were recorded on the handheld computers in Ghana and to two-page answer sheets in India and Pakistan. These were checked and entered daily into section 11 after the fieldwork in Pakistan and India.

### **Training, piloting and conducting questionnaires**

One week of training was provided to all enumerators and supervisors in Islamabad just before the inception of the fieldwork. The training was mainly in Urdu and it was followed by a piloting exercise in a rural community near Islamabad, after which we received feed-back and finalised the questionnaires.

In India after a week's training in New Delhi, two days piloting in each Rajasthan and MP (with the Rajasthan and MP enumerators separately) was conducted. This followed by incorporating the inputs from enumerators and finalisation of the questionnaires.

### **Supervisors and enumerators**

In Pakistan, the survey was conducted by an extremely dedicated teams consisting of 12 males and 11 female enumerators who were accompanied by four supervisors. The enumerators were fluent in Urdu (national language) and one provincial language (Punjabi for Punjab and Pushto for KP) with varying skills in English language. All enumerators had at least completed a bachelor's degree in social sciences and were unmarried. This created some issues especially for the fertility section of the questionnaire as it was culturally perceived as "not good" for unmarried girls to talk about fertility issues. The female enumerators had to say they were married otherwise the women, especially some of the older ones, would not answer questions about fertility.

Each team was supervised by a female and a male supervisor in order to prevent any obstacles to field activities and to be able to check the performances of female enumerators during and after interviewing. This was designed to avoid problems relating to gender segregation, especially in KP. The supervisors were responsible for identifying the households to enumerate and for providing an initial check of the questionnaires.

In India the enumerators were identified through the lists provided by NGOs with long history of working in the area. From a list of 20 or more people, 10 were hired for the survey in each State– 5 males and 5 females – on the basis of fieldwork experience and a test on coding. There was one supervisor in each area too. They worked in teams of two. CORD staff made several visits in each district to support and check questionnaires.

### **Fieldwork: Accessing communities, households and individual members**

In Pakistan, access to the sampled communities was gained through local government systems. This was in addition to personal contacts with federal or provincial level politicians and government officials, arranged by senior management. The *zila nazims* (or elected representatives heading district governments) were approached as the first point of contact in a line of gatekeepers that extended to the village head or head teacher. The *nazims* and district officials were relied on more heavily in urban than in rural areas, while in rural areas union counsellors (again contacted through nazims) were more helpful in rapport-building with the communities as they themselves were living in the same community or in the vicinity.

Once the objective of the survey was explained and the team's purpose and expected time in the communities was explained, the *nazims* or union counsellors were able to help by providing a person that was known (more often than not) by the people in the community and trusted and so could act as a liaison and a first introduction when setting up interviews with the households.

Rural areas and villages required the permission and blessing of the head of the village or a senior person in the village. There were differences in hierarchies and structures of power within and across provinces. In southern and one district in central Punjab for example, the hold of the landlords and village elders was far stronger than in Northern Punjab. In rural areas the village leaders were the gatekeepers to the communities, and they made the first introductions and usually sent along a trusted and well known person from the village (usually the *chawkidar* - translates literally to gatekeeper) with the team for the duration of the stay. Other times the *numberdar* (toll collector) from the village was the main contact. The presence of these

trusted people from within the community was instrumental, even crucial, to gaining access to the community.

At the individual household level, the male members of the family usually acted as the gatekeepers and the first point of contact. Once the permission was acquired and a time set, a team of male and female members were sent to the household to interview the families. The cultural norms of the communities required that women speak only to women and the men only to men. The code of *pardah* (veil) was strictly observed in rural and urban communities whilst in KP the dress code required full covering of the body and face with a long white *chaddar*. We did find, however, that women in the rural areas were more mobile within the village than the women in the urban communities. They were also more vocal, particularly in Punjab.

It was common practice for the households to offer tea or food to the 'guests' (the team members) who had come to their home. It was considered rude to refuse food or tea. The neighbouring families as well as the elders of the household, especially in the rural setting, would be very curious about what the enumerators wanted to ask and many times the interviews were conducted in the presence of a large group of people. The enumerators had been trained, and in some cases adapted, techniques to distract the others present while the subjects filled out the questionnaire or the tests.

Access to communities was not a problem in India as CORD had contacts with local NGOs. CORD staff made a pre-survey visit to each area and met the district collector to ask permission. They also visited each village and met the village panchayat member, school teacher and other prominent persons. In the urban wards they met the elected ward member. During the survey these elected representatives asked a local person to help the survey team identify households.

### **Reciprocity**

In Pakistan small radios were distributed to the households enumerated and the gatekeepers or hosts within the community. The main reason for this approach was twofold: first of all to thank our respondents for their time (around three hours per household) and also to build rapport for the next round of the survey, which was planned but could not be realised in Pakistan.

In some cases these gifts, despite being of little value, caused people to volunteer their families so they could receive the gift. In the interest of maintaining the randomness of the sample and avoiding selection bias, the team resisted these attempts as far as possible. In some cases false questionnaires were filled in order to satisfy particularly persistent individuals in Punjab. There was an ethical dilemma at times when we were not able to help some of the most destitute in any way.

In India such gifts were avoided as these problems were anticipated. However, reflecting the ethical concerns of the research, it was decided to give every household booklets on the Right to Information Act and the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA). In addition, the village schools were given a set of children's books for their libraries.

### **Data processing: Entry and editing**

In Pakistan, the questionnaires were checked twice by the supervisors - once during fieldwork and once before entry. Data were entered into an Excel-based data entry programme, which was specially developed for the Pakistani questionnaire. The data entry programme had a similar structure to that of the questionnaire thereby facilitating data entry, which was done by four of the field enumerators. The data entry was conducted in Islamabad.

The data set required extensive cleaning in order to match various information and sections of the survey. The teams went back to the original paper questionnaires whenever necessary to ensure that the information entered was correct.

During data collection, supervisors in each of the states in India sat and discussed coding and other issues with the investigators at the end of each day. Enumerators had already been given a list for consistency checks during training. CORD staff also made frequent visits to the states and checked the questionnaires and discussed any inconsistency or ambiguity found. Before data entry the questionnaires were thoroughly cleaned and edited in CORD office and some variables were restructured keeping data analysis in mind. Data entry in India was done in ACCESS. After merging the data from different sections and sample sites, another round of checking was done in Stata software and further editing was done on the basic data sets before re-merging the corrected data.

**Table 3: Data obtained from the Community and Household Questionnaires**

	<b>Topics covered</b>		<b>Ghana</b>	<b>India</b>	<b>Pakistan</b>	
<b>Community Questionnaire</b>	Characteristics and infrastructure	Population	Not administered	√	√	
		Land holdings by caste		√	√	
	Services	Transport		√	√	
		Availability of schools		√	√	
		Religious institutions		√	√	
		Settlements by access to services		√	√	
		Availability of health services		√	√	
	Migration: Out & In community			√	√	
	Programmes and organisations working in the community			√	√	
	School visit			√	√	
Health care provider/centre visit		√	√			
<b>Household questionnaire</b>	Interview details	District/Locality/mohalla	√	√	√	
		Religion	√	√	√	
		Caste		√	√	
		Ethnicity	√	√	√	
	Household details	Household services	√	√	√	
		Consumption	√	√	√	
		Asset ownership	√	√	√	
		Debt/borrowing	√	√	√	
		Saving	√	√	√	
		Shocks	√	√	√	
		Sources of livelihood/income from employment	√	√	√	
	Failed visa applications		√			
	Roster	Education status, grade completed		√	√	√
		Religious education (Hafz)				√
		Economic activity, type of employment		√	√	√
Weight/height		√	√	√		
Arm circumference		√	√	√		
Immunisation		√	√	√		

**Table 4: Data obtained from the Individual Questionnaires**

		Topics covered	Ghana	India	Pakistan
<b>Individual Questionnaire (aged 15-60)</b>	Basic (Grades 1-8) & secondary schooling (Grades 9-12) received	Grade completed	√	√	√
		Distance/time to nearest school	√	√	√
		Ability to read	√	√	√
		Type of formal/informal school	√	√	√
		Repetition	√	√	√
		Private tuition	√	√	√
		Fee	√	√	√
		Medium instruction	√	√	√
	Secondary and post-secondary schooling	School quality indicators	√	√	√
		Subject,	√	√	√
		Regular/private candidate		√	√
		Private tuition	√	√	√
	Vocational schooling/ Apprenticeship/ On the job training	Division obtained/result	√	√	√
		Current/Ever acquisition of skill	√	√	√
		Type of skill	√	√	√
		Type of institution	√	√	√
		Duration and cost	√	√	√
		Entry requirements	√		
		Language of instruction	√		
		Certificate received	√		
	Economic activity and labour force participation	Future training plans	√		
		Future work plans also including possible sources of capital	√		
		Public/Private, occupation and industry classification	√	√	√
		Earnings/profits	√	√	√
		Allowances	√	√	√
		Hours worked	√	√	√
	Health	Training received	√	√	√
		Retrospective information	√	√	√
		Illness/accidents in the last year (2-3 episodes)	√	√	√
		Costs- days lost, financial costs	√	√	√
		Consultation	√	√	√
	Disability	Tobacco use	√	√	√
		Registration for national health scheme	√		
		Types- seeing, hearing, speaking, walking, learning, personal care	√	√	√
		Degree of disability	√	√	√
	Time allocation	Age of onset	√	√	√
		Impact on amount/kind of activity	√	√	√
	Subjective-well being	Activities during usual 24 hours		√	√
		Satisfaction: life, financial condition, work	√	√	√
	Social attitudes	Control over life	√	√	√
Membership to social, political groups		√	√	√	
Exposure to media	Religious beliefs and practices	√	√	√	
	Radio, TV, Newspaper	√	√	√	
Empowerment	Education levels of parents, maternal grandfather and siblings	√	√	√	
	Say in choice of spouse		√	√	
	Value of dowry given/expected		√	√	
	Purdah- onset and decision		√	√	
Tests	Health knowledge, Maths (short, long), literacy (short, long), English, Raven's Progressive Matrices	√	√	√	
<b>Women only</b>	Fertility	Age at marriage	√	√	√
		Child birth- age at first birth, number of children, assistance during last delivery, ultra-sound check-up	√	√	√
		Child and under-five mortality by sex	√	√	√
		Breastfeeding practices by sex of the child	√	√	√
		Family planning- preferences, awareness and usage	√	√	√
		Distance and visits to natal home		√	√



## Appendix: Summary tables of data from the RECOUP surveys, and of similar data for Kenya.

The tables which follow provide comparable information on some of the most interesting variables on which data were gathered in each of the three RECOUP household surveys. They provide a useful summary picture of the households surveyed, and of the ways in which their characteristics differed between each of the countries. Although a RECOUP survey was not undertaken in Kenya, data for that country, drawn from a 2008/9 national household survey, are included for comparative purposes. These and other data are analysed in depth in many of the publications produced under the RECOUP programme. A selection of these are provided in the RECOUP Working Paper series, and a comprehensive list (to the end of 2010) can be found in the RECOUP Final Report, each of which are available on the web site.

### India RECOUP survey results

**Table I1: Households enumerated and their composition, India**

	Rural		Urban		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total number of households</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>70.5</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>29.5</b>	<b>1017</b>	<b>100</b>
Rajasthan	360	50.2	150	50.0	510	50.1
Madhya Pradesh	357	49.8	150	50.0	507	49.9
<b>Average HH size</b>	6.3		5.9		6.2	
<b>% of HHs headed by females</b>	7.4		10.0		8.2	
<b>Education level of the HH head</b>						
None	275	38.4	74	24.7	349	34.4
Some primary or middle	328	45.8	108	36.0	436	42.9
Some secondary and above	113	15.8	118	39.3	231	22.7

**Table I2: Household population, India**

	Total		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>All Sample</b>	6260	100	3346	53.5	2914	46.6
<b>State</b>						
Rajasthan	3160	50.5	1710	54.1*	1450	45.9*
Madhya Pradesh	3100	49.5	1636	52.8*	1464	47.2*
<b>Locality</b>						
Rural	4482	71.6	2414	53.9*	2068	46.1*
Urban	1778	28.4	932	52.4*	846	47.6*
<b>Age groups</b>						
<15	2179	34.8	1191	35.6	988	33.9
15-29	1704	27.2	951	28.4	753	25.8
30-59	1819	29.1	935	27.9	884	30.3
60 <	558	8.9	269	8.0	289	9.9
<b>Marital status (ages 15 and above)</b>						

Never married**	946	23.2	661	30.6	285	14.8
Currently married	2809	68.8	1403	65.1	1406	73.0
Widowed/divorced/seperated	326	8.0	91	4.2	235	12.2

Notes: \* Row percentages

\*\* Includes the cases for official marriage but not gauna

**Table I3: Enrolment (ages 5-9 and 10-14, irrespective of grades enrolled), India**

	% of children enrolled (ages 5-9)				% of children enrolled (ages 10-14)			
	Girls	Boys	Ratio G/B*	All	Girls	Boys	Ratio G/B*	All
<b>State</b>								
Rajastan	80.2	88.5	0.91	85.0	71.6	87.2	0.82	80.1
Madhya Pradesh	88.4	86.0	1.03	87.0	85.2	84.4	1.01	84.8
<b>Location</b>								
Urban	91.2	93.2	0.98	92.3	87.5	85.0	1.03	86.1
Rural	81.3	85.9	0.95	84.0	74.8	86.4	0.87	80.8
<b>Wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest 20%	82.1	83.3	0.99	82.7	75.4	82.8	0.91	79.2
Second	83.3	88.0	0.95	86.1	78.2	87.5	0.89	83.1
Middle	89.3	84.9	1.05	86.6	71.2	84.3	0.84	78.2
Fourth	80.6	90.2	0.89	86.2	81.5	84.8	0.96	83.3
Highest 20%	86.4	96.2	0.90	93.3	87.3	93.4	0.93	90.5
<b>All</b>	<b>83.9</b>	<b>87.4</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>85.9</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>86.0</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>82.2</b>

Notes: \* A value of 1 indicates equality

**Table I4: Educational attainment (ages 15 and above), India**

	# of resp.	No schooling	Some primary	Comp primary	Some secondary	Comp. Secondary	Above secondary	Total	Mean years of schooling	% attended private school**
		%	%	%	%	%	%			%
<b>State</b>										
Rajastan	1956	40.5	5.0	8.7	26.2	5.3	14.1	100	5.1	17.0
Madhya Pradesh	2125	34.2	9.5	9.4	28.4	4.8	13.6	100	5.2	13.2
<b>Location</b>										
Rural	2834	43.9	7.6	9.6	26.3	4.3	8.2	100	4.2	6.7
M	1506	21.8	9.3	10.1	38.3	7.0	13.5	100	6.2	6.4
F	1326	69.0	5.7	9.0	12.6	1.4	2.3	100	2.0	7.4
Urban	1247	22.2	6.6	7.9	29.9	6.7	26.7	100	7.2	28.4
M	649	14.0	6.5	6.9	32.5	8.6	31.4	100	8.2	31.3
F	598	31.1	6.7	9.0	27.1	4.5	21.6	100	6.2	24.6
<b>Age groups</b>										
15-19	679	8.0	6.2	8.1	53.8	10.0	14.0	100	7.4	25.6

20-34	1409	26.5	7.3	10.1	30.9	4.7	20.4	100	6.3	16.7
35-49	1035	45.9	8.2	8.8	21.1	3.4	12.5	100	4.4	4.6
50-64	582	60.5	6.4	7.6	13.9	4.6	7.0	100	3.1	2.0*
65 and over	376	70.7	8.2	10.1	4.5	2.7	3.7	100	1.8	NA*
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>										
Lowest 20%	809	45.7	9.1	9.3	28.4	3.0	4.4	100	3.7	8.0
Second	825	42.7	7.4	8.4	29.0	4.1	8.5	100	4.4	16.8
Middle	827	38.7	6.5	10.2	28.1	5.3	11.0	100	4.9	10.8
Fourth	810	33.5	7.9	9.3	25.4	5.8	18.1	100	5.7	16.0
Highest 20%	810	25.6	5.6	8.5	25.9	7.0	27.4	100	7.1	21.1
<b>All</b>	4081	37.2	7.3	9.1	27.4	5.0	13.9	100	5.1	15.0

Notes: \* Data covers till age group 60 for this indicator.

\*\*Among those who had acquired primary/middle schooling i.e. grades 1 to 8.

**Table I5: Structure of labour force, India**

	# of respondents	In labour force (%)					Unemp. but available and wants to work	Out of labour force (%)	Total
		Wage employee		Self-employed	Unpaid family worker or apprentice	Unemp.			
		Govt	Private						
<b>State</b>									
Rajasthan	1956	1.8	21.2	17.9	16.4	2.1	40.5	100	
Madhya Pradesh	2125	1.7	25.0	15.0	24.6	1.3	32.4	100	
<b>Location</b>									
Rural	2834	1.1	23.9	17.5	26.6	1.0	29.9	100	
M	1506	1.5	31.3	29.1	16.4	1.3	20.4	100	
F	1328	0.5	15.6	4.4	38.1	0.8	40.6	100	
Urban	1247	3.5	21.3	13.8	7.2	3.3	50.8	100	
M	649	5.2	34.5	22.7	9.6	2.8	25.3	100	
F	598	1.7	7.0	4.2	4.7	3.8	78.6	100	
<b>Age groups</b>									
5-14	1572	2.4		0.1	4.5	0.3	92.8	100	
15-19	679	0.0	22.7	2.9	20.0	3.8	50.5	100	
20-34	1409	1.4	28.9	12.3	26.2	2.1	29.1	100	
35-49	1035	3.4	27.6	25.7	19.6	0.8	22.9	100	
50-64	582	3.1	14.9	29.2	19.8	1.2	31.8	100	
65 and over	376	3.2		10.4	5.3	0.0	81.1	100	
<b>Education</b>									
No schooling	1520	0.3	21.2	12.4	25.2	0.9	40.1	100	
Some primary	298	0.7	28.5	18.8	21.5	0.7	29.9	100	
Completed primary	371	1.3	24.5	18.1	18.9	0.8	36.4	100	
Some secondary	1117	0.8	27.8	18.1	19.1	3.0	31.3	100	
Completed	206	3.4	18.4	23.8	18.9	1.9	33.5	100	

secondary									
Above secondary	566	8.5	17.0	18.9	12.9	2.5	40.3	100	
<b>Wealth quintile</b>									
Lowest 20%	809	0.5	33.0	12.6	15.0	3.1	35.8	100	
Second	825	1.7	26.8	14.4	18.7	2.1	36.4	100	
Middle	827	1.8	25.0	16.4	20.4	1.8	34.5	100	
Fourth	810	2.0	19.9	17.3	20.9	1.2	38.8	100	
Highest 20%	810	3.0	11.1	21.2	28.4	0.4	35.9	100	
<b>All</b>	<b>4081</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>23.2</b>	<b>16.4</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>100</b>	

**Table I6: Family planning and child birth, India**

	Family planning, all ever married women ages 15-60				Child birth, all mothers ages 15-60			
	Mean age at marriage	Family planning awareness	Use of contraception*		Mean age at first birth	Mean number of children ever born	Delivery care	
			Ever %	Current %			Home %	Clinic/hospital %
<b>State</b>								
Rajasthan	16.6	86.8	56.7	43.5	19.6	4.5	69.3	30.7
Madhya Pradesh	15.7	94.6	78.6	73.8	18.9	3.6	61.2	38.8
<b>Location</b>								
Rural	15.5	89.0	68.0	61.7	18.9	4.1	77.1	22.9
Urban	17.5	95.8	70.1	56.1	20.2	3.7	32.7	67.3
<b>Age groups</b>								
15-19	16.2	72.3	41.2	26.5	17.4	1.3	35.7	64.3
20-34	16.6	92.7	64.4	58.0	19.1	2.9	57.2	42.8
35-49	15.8	91.5	76.8	65.2	19.4	4.4	67.3	32.7
50-60	15.2	88.9	66.0	59.6	19.4	5.8	80.2	19.8
<b>Education</b>								
No schooling	15.3	88.0	66.2	58.7	18.9	4.6	79.0	21.0
Some primary	16.0	95.2	73.8	63.8	18.6	3.4	60.5	39.5
Completed primary	16.5	91.4	68.9	64.2	19.4	2.8	42.9	57.1
Some secondary	17.2	96.0	73.5	64.5	19.7	2.9	38.8	61.2
Completed secondary	18.6	100.0	76.2	66.7	20.8	2.7	25.0	75.0
Above secondary	19.8	100.0	71.2	52.6	22.3	2.3	15.1	84.9
<b>Wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest 20%	15.8	87.0	63.5	55.6	18.9	4.6	68.8	32.2
Second	16.0	89.4	60.8	51.5	19.2	4.3	66.3	33.7
Middle	16.1	91.9	66.3	57.4	19.2	4.0	65.0	35.0
Fourth	16.1	92.2	73.7	67.1	19.2	3.8	66.4	33.6
Highest 20%	16.5	94.0	78.7	68.5	19.7	3.4	59.0	41.0
<b>All</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>90.9</b>	<b>68.6</b>	<b>60.0</b>	<b>19.2</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>65.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>

Notes: \* Among those who are aware of family planning.

**Table I7: Disability (sample aged 15-60), India**

	# of PWDs	Reported disability (as % of all sample aged 15-60)			Reported disability (as % of PWDs)		
		All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
<i>All</i>	<b>604</b>	<b>18.0</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>17.4</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Rural	434	18.8	19.7	17.9	71.9	73.7	69.8
Urban	170	16.3	16.2	16.4	28.1	26.3	30.2
<b>Type of disability</b>							
Seeing	408	12.2	11.6	12.8	45.9	42.9	49.4
Hearing	79	2.4	2.5	2.2	8.9	9.2	8.6
Speaking	23	0.7	1.0	0.3	2.6	3.8	1.2
Walking	174	5.2	5.6	4.8	19.6	20.7	18.4
Learning	34	1.0	1.2	0.9	3.8	4.3	3.3
Personal care	28	0.8	1.0	0.7	3.2	3.6	2.6
Multiple disability	142	4.2	4.2	4.3	16.0	15.6	16.5
<b>Age groups</b>							
15-19	43	7.0	6.1	8.1	7.1	6.5	7.8
20-34	119	9.3	10.1	8.5	19.7	20.1	19.2
35-49	253	25.4	26.1	24.7	41.9	40.9	43.1
50-60	189	41.2	43.2	38.9	31.3	32.5	29.9
<b>Schooling</b>							
No schooling	278	24.7	34.0	21.5	46.2	29.7	65.0
Some primary	54	22.0	29.2	13.0	9.0	12.4	5.0
Completed primary	56	18.7	24.7	12.7	9.3	11.5	6.8
Some secondary	139	13.7	13.8	13.5	23.1	30.0	15.0
Completed secondary	166	13.3	13.0	14.0	3.7	5.0	2.1
Above secondary	53	11.1	10.9	11.2	8.8	11.5	6.1
<b>Wealth quintile</b>							
Lowest 20%	118	17.9	20.8	15.0	19.5	21.1	17.8
Second	115	17.4	17.6	17.3	19.0	17.6	20.6
Middle	118	17.3	18.4	16.1	19.5	20.4	18.5
Fourth	128	19.1	19.4	18.8	21.2	21.4	21.0
Highest 20%	125	18.5	16.9	20.3	20.7	19.5	22.1

**Table I8: Skill acquisition (sample aged 15-60), India**

	# of respondents	% acquired skill	% acquired skills through		
			Technical vocational training	Apprenticeship	On the job training
<b>State</b>					
Rajasthan	1688	17.8	5.6	11.8	1.8
Madhya Pradesh	1855	15.3	9.0	6.3	0.8

<b>Location</b>						
Rural	2445	<b>11.5</b>	4.7	6.8	0.9	
M	1321	17.0	5.8	11.1	1.6	
F	1124	5.0	3.4	1.7	0.1	
Urban	1098	27.7	13.4	13.7	2.1	
M	574	35.9	12.9	22.0	3.5	
F	524	18.7	13.9	4.6	0.6	
<b>Age groups</b>						
15-19	664	15.2	7.8	8.0	0.3	
20-34	1392	22.0	10.8	11.3	1.4	
35-49	1025	12.9	5.2	7.2	1.6	
50-60	462	9.7	1.5	6.9	1.7	
<b>Schooling</b>						
No schooling	1161	3.4	0.1	3.1	0.4	
Some primary	259	12.7	3.1	8.5	2.7	
Completed primary	317	12.6	1.9	10.4	1.6	
Some secondary	1083	19.8	4.8	14.5	1.3	
Completed secondary	187	23.5	12.3	10.7	1.6	
Above secondary	533	40.0	32.3	9.0	2.3	
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>						
Lowest 20%	700	11.1	3.0	8.3	0.4	
Second	721	12.8	3.6	8.5	2.1	
Middle	728	16.8	6.3	9.7	1.5	
Fourth	714	19.9	9.5	10.4	0.7	
Highest 20%	720	21.8	14.6	7.8	1.6	
<b>All</b>	<b>3543</b>	<b>16.5</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>8.9</b>	<b>1.3</b>	

**Kenya (from the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics formerly Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) Demographic and Health Survey 2008/09)**

**Table K1: Households enumerated and their composition, Kenya**

	<b>Rural</b>		<b>Urban</b>		<b>All</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Total number of households</b>	<b>6707</b>	<b>74,1</b>	<b>2350</b>	<b>25,9</b>	<b>9057</b>	<b>100,0</b>
<b>Region</b>						
Nairobi	0	0,0	801	34,1	801	8,8
Central	917	13,7	163	6,9	1080	11,9
Coast	295	4,4	460	19,6	755	8,3
Eastern	1345	20,1	165	7,0	1510	16,7
Nyanza	1248	18,6	164	7,0	1412	15,6
Rift Valley	1918	28,6	445	18,9	2363	26,1
Western	822	12,3	115	4,9	937	10,3
North Eastern	162	2,4	37	1,6	199	2,2

<b>Average HH size</b>	4,7		3,2		4,3	
<b>% of HHs headed by females</b>	35,8		28,6		33,9	
<b>Education level of the HH head</b>						
None	1429	21,3	178	7,6	1607	17,7
Some primary	3635	54,2	672	28,6	4307	47,6
Some secondary and above	1623	24,2	1490	63,4	3113	34,4

**Table K2: Household population, Kenya**

	<b>Total</b>		<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>All Sample</b>	38717	100,0	18857	48,7*	19860	51,3*
<b>Regions</b>						
Nairobi	2404	6,2	1198	49,8*	1205	50,1*
Central	3970	10,3	1907	48,0*	2063	52,0*
Coast	3013	7,8	1454	48,3*	1559	51,7*
Eastern	6709	17,3	3239	48,3*	3470	51,7*
Nyanza	6459	16,7	3194	49,5*	3265	50,5*
Rift Valley	10487	27,1	5057	48,2*	5430	51,8*
Western	4599	11,9	2249	48,9*	2350	51,1*
North Eastern	1077	2,8	559	51,9*	518	48,1*
<b>Locality</b>						
Rural	31186	80,5	15197	48,7*	15989	51,3*
Urban	7532	19,5	3660	48,6*	3871	51,4*
<b>Age groups</b>						
<15	17212	44,5	8710	46,2	8502	42,8
15-29	10079	26,0	4761	25,2	5317	26,8
30-59	9118	23,6	4321	22,9	4798	24,2
60 <	2308	6,0	1065	5,6	1243	6,3
<b>Marital status (ages 15 and above)</b>						
Never married	6837	32,1	3932	39,2	2905	25,8
Currently married	12042	56,5	5649	56,3	6393	56,8
Widowed/divorced/separated	2420	11,4	461	4,6	1959	17,4

Notes: \* Row percentages

**Table K3: Enrolment (ages 6-10 and 11-15, irrespective of grades enrolled), Kenya**

	<b>% of children enrolled (ages 6-10)</b>				<b>% of children enrolled (ages 11-15)</b>			
	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Ratio G/B*</b>	<b>All</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Ratio G/B*</b>	<b>All</b>
<b>Region</b>								
Nairobi	96,9	95,9	1,01	96,5	91,6	99,1	0,92	95,1
Central	94,2	94,2	1,00	94,2	99,7	99,7	1,00	99,7
Coast	87,9	87,2	1,01	87,6	95,6	98,2	0,97	96,8
Eastern	80,5	79,8	1,01	80,2	98,7	97,3	1,01	98,0
Nyanza	95,3	93,6	1,02	94,6	99,1	97,9	1,01	98,5
Rift Valley	76,3	78,0	0,98	77,2	93,6	92,3	1,01	93,0
Western	87,2	86,7	1,01	86,9	98,3	97,9	1,00	98,1

North Eastern	35,1	43,1	0,81	39,5	66,9	79,0	0,85	93,4
<b>Locality</b>								
Rural	82,6	81,6	1,01	82,1	95,9	95,5	1,00	95,7
Urban	86,9	94,0	0,92	90,5	94,7	97,9	0,97	96,1
<b>Wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest 20%	67,4	65,9	1,02	66,6	85,4	87,8	0,97	86,6
Second	85,4	84,2	1,01	84,7	98,5	98,0	1,01	98,3
Middle	88,7	86,5	1,03	87,6	99,7	98,5	1,01	99,1
Fourth	86,6	92,0	0,94	89,4	99,3	98,0	1,01	98,7
Highest 20%	93,0	96,2	0,97	94,6	96,1	98,8	0,97	97,3
<b>All</b>	<b>83,2</b>	<b>83,4</b>	<b>1,00</b>	<b>83,3</b>	<b>95,7</b>	<b>95,8</b>	<b>1,00</b>	<b>95,7</b>

Notes: \* A value of 1 indicates equality

**Table K4: Educational attainment (ages 15 and above), Kenya**

	# of respondents	No schooling	Some primary	Comp. primary	Some secondary	Comp. Secondary	Above secondary	Total	Mean years of schooling
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<b>Region</b>									
Nairobi	1688	3,2	6,6	17,1	10,0	28,8	34,2	100	11,5
Central	2474	7,9	23,1	31,5	12,9	17,8	6,8	100	7,9
Coast	1688	22,7	22,5	22,7	8,9	16,4	6,8	100	6,8
Eastern	3736	15,1	33,1	26,0	9,9	11,8	4,1	100	6,7
Nyanza	3502	8,2	34,0	25,0	13,8	11,6	7,4	100	7,7
Rift Valley	5430	16,3	27,2	24,1	9,4	17,4	5,7	100	7,2
Western	2432	8,8	41,3	22,0	13,1	11,8	3,0	100	7,0
North Eastern	498	70,2	12,4	7,0	3,4	4,1	2,9	100	2,5
<b>Locality</b>									
Rural	16479	15,9	32,9	25,1	10,7	11,5	3,8	100	6,6
M	7728	9,6	33,1	26,4	11,8	14,7	4,5	100	7,3
F	8751	21,6	32,8	24,0	9,7	8,6	3,3	100	6,0
Urban	4966	6,1	12,1	20,8	11,7	28,3	21,0	100	10,1
M	2392	2,9	10,1	19,8	11,3	30,7	25,1	100	10,8
F	2574	9,1	14,0	21,6	12,0	26,0	17,2	100	9,4
<b>Age groups</b>									
15-19	3889	3,2	46,5	20,0	22,8	6,8	0,7	100	7,5
20-34	8541	6,2	25,0	28,2	10,3	19,7	10,5	100	8,7
35-49	4788	10,8	22,7	27,1	7,8	21,2	10,3	100	7,9
50-64	2687	30,9	23,1	21,3	6,1	10,5	8,0	100	5,4
65 and over	1539	60,4	24,5	7,4	1,7	3,2	2,8	100	2,3
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>									
Lowest 20%	3544	35,6	37,7	17,7	5,7	2,7	0,6	100	4,3
Second	4011	14,7	40,9	26,0	9,9	7,5	1,0	100	6,2
Middle	4216	12,4	33,6	28,7	11,7	11,7	1,9	100	6,8
Fourth	4521	8,5	24,8	26,3	14,3	19,5	6,6	100	8,0



Highest 20%	5152	3,3	10,0	21,5	11,5	29,7	23,9	100	10,6
<i>All</i>	<i>21445</i>	<i>13,6</i>	<i>28,1</i>	<i>24,1</i>	<i>10,9</i>	<i>15,3</i>	<i>7,8</i>	<b>100</b>	<i>7.4</i>

**Table K5: Structure of labour force, Kenya**

	Women (ages 15-49)					Men (ages 15-54)				
	# of women	Employed (%)			Not working (%)	# of men	Employed (%)			Not working (%)
		Wage	Self-emp	Family worker			Wage	Self-emp	Family worker	
<b>Region</b>										
Nairobi	728	38,5	21,1	1,2	39,2	325	66,5	18,4	3,6	11,6
Central	905	21,2	39,4	8,3	31,1	368	35,9	32,5	24,9	6,7
Coast	674	17,4	33,0	2,2	47,5	265	50,0	28,0	3,9	18,1
Eastern	1376	18,6	35,0	6,3	40,1	581	25,1	34,6	35,2	5,1
Nyanza	1389	12,2	44,1	10,9	32,6	550	35,7	25,2	28,5	10,6
Rift Valley	2262	15,9	40,3	3,1	40,6	935	43,0	28,2	16,5	12,2
Western	927	10,7	32,5	2,8	54,0	372	31,4	38,9	17,5	12,2
North Eastern	184	2,4	13,6	1,5	82,6	70	32,6	32,2	3,2	32,0
<b>Locality</b>										
Rural	6296	12,9	38,9	6,1	42,1	2562	31,6	32,7	25,2	10,5
Urban	2148	30,9	28,6	2,3	38,1	903	61,4	20,8	5,7	12,2
<b>Age groups</b>										
15-19	1761	6,3	6,4	8,4	78,9	776	14,4	6,6	42,2	36,8
20-34	4378	20,0	40,1	4,6	35,3	1574	47,1	30,4	17,1	5,4
35-49	2306	21,3	51,8	3,8	23,1	908	49,2	40,7	9,3	0,8
50-54	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	207	31,4	60,0	7,7	1,0
<b>Education</b>										
No schooling	752	4,9	44,4	4,3	46,4	141	37,0	46,7	13,1	3,2
Some primary	2526	12,6	37,2	5,4	44,8	921	33,2	27,4	24,7	14,6
Completed primary	2272	14,9	42,9	5,0	37,2	876	39,6	37,6	17,9	4,9
Some secondary	1030	10,5	30,1	6,5	52,9	493	30,0	21,0	26,4	22,7
Completed secondary	1243	26,2	32,4	5,8	35,5	695	42,6	31,1	18,5	7,8
Above secondary	620	56,1	16,3	2,3	25,3	339	63,4	16,8	10,4	9,4
<b>Wealth quintile</b>										
Lowest 20%	1393	8,8	37,9	5,4	48,0	503	22,2	37,8	26,7	13,3
Second	1483	10,7	39,3	5,7	44,4	603	28,0	35,1	25,5	11,4
Middle	1613	11,9	40,3	7,1	40,7	620	26,7	35,9	28,5	8,8
Fourth	1736	16,7	35,4	6,0	41,9	771	39,9	25,7	22,1	12,3
Highest 20%	2220	32,2	31,0	2,7	34,1	969	63,1	20,9	6,3	9,7
<i>All</i>	<i>8444</i>	<i>17,5</i>	<i>36,3</i>	<i>5,2</i>	<i>41,0</i>	<i>3465</i>	<i>39,4</i>	<i>29,6</i>	<i>20,1</i>	<i>11,0</i>

**Table K6: Family planning and child birth, Kenya**

	Family planning, all ever married women ages 15-49				Child birth, all mothers ages 15-49			
	Mean age at first intercourse	Family planning awareness	Use of contraception*		Mean age at first birth	Mean number of children ever born	Delivery care	
			Ever %	Current %			Home %	Clinic/hosp %
<b>All Sample</b>								
Nairobi	19,1	97,5	65,0	37,3	21,1	1,4	9,4	90,6
Central	17,8	98,0	73,4	46,2	19,8	2,4	25,5	74,5
Coast	17,0	97,7	52,4	26,7	18,9	2,6	50,8	49,2
Eastern	17,0	93,3	58,9	36,1	19,5	2,7	50,1	49,9
Nyanza	16,0	98,3	59,7	30,2	18,3	2,9	52,7	47,3
Rift Valley	17,3	93,6	55,0	28,2	18,9	2,9	66,2	33,8
Western	16,7	95,3	53,3	29,9	19,1	3,0	70,7	29,3
North Eastern	17,3	48,5	3,2	2,4	18,6	3,4	81,4	18,6
<b>Locality</b>								
Rural	16,7	93,7	55,3	30,5	18,8	3,0	60,7	39,3
Urban	18,3	97,2	64,9	36,6	20,3	1,7	24,1	75,9
<b>Age groups</b>								
15-19	15,1	86,4	14,1	5,9	16,4	0,2	49,5	50,5
20-34	17,3	97,1	68,2	37,9	18,9	2,3	51,1	48,9
35-49	17,6	96,2	71,1	40,8	19,9	5,2	62,3	37,7
<b>Education</b>								
No schooling	16,4	77,1	27,7	12,2	18,3	4,7	82,6	17,4
Some primary	15,7	94,0	53,3	27,9	17,9	3,1	68,8	31,2
Completed primary	17,0	97,2	64,0	35,9	19,0	2,7	49,4	50,6
Some secondary	17,0	95,9	54,2	28,3	19,0	1,8	39,4	60,6
Completed secondary	19,0	98,1	69,1	42,5	21,3	1,9	23,2	76,8
Above secondary	20,5	99,8	72,3	43,7	23,5	1,4	10,2	89,8
<b>Wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest 20%	16,2	84,0	34,9	15,5	18,3	3,7	81,0	19,0
Second	16,4	95,3	55,3	28,0	18,5	3,2	67,7	32,3
Middle	16,6	97,3	60,4	35,0	18,7	3,0	54,7	45,3
Fourth	17,3	97,0	64,3	38,6	19,3	2,5	44,6	55,4
Highest 20%	18,6	97,1	66,6	37,6	20,6	1,7	19,0	81,0
<b>All</b>	<b>17,2</b>	<b>94,6</b>	<b>57,7</b>	<b>32,0</b>	<b>19,2</b>	<b>2,7</b>	<b>53,1</b>	<b>46,9</b>

Notes: \* These proportions are of those who are aware of family planning.

## Ghana RECOUP survey results

**Table G1: Households enumerated and their composition, Ghana**

	All/Urban	
	N	%
Number of households	744	100.0
Accra	359	48.3
Cape Coast	58	7.8
Kumasi	236	31.7
Takoradi	90	12.1
Average HH size	2.3	
Percentage of HHs headed by females	40.0	
Education level of the HH head		
None	89	11.9
Some primary	99	13.3
Some secondary and above	556	75.8

**Table G2: Sampled population aged 15 years and above, Ghana**

	Total		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>All Sample</i>	<i>1661</i>	<i>100.0</i>	<i>735</i>	<i>44.3</i>	<i>926</i>	<i>55.7</i>
<b>City</b>						
Accra	753	45,3	352	47,9	401	43,3
Cape Coast	86	5,2	34	4,6	52	5,6
Kumasi	623	37,5	258	35,1	365	39,4
Takoradi	199	12,0	91	12,4	108	11,7
<b>Age groups</b>						
15-29	866	52,2	376	51,1	490	52,9
30-59	666	40,1	302	41,1	364	39,3
60 <	129	7,8	57	7,8	72	7,8
<b>Marital status (ages 15 and above)</b>						
Not currently married	535	32.2	225	30,6	310	33,5
Currently married	1019	61.3	460	62,6	559	60,4
Not known	107	6.8	50	6.8	57	6.2

**Table G3: Enrolment (ages 5-9 and 10-14, irrespective of grades enrolled), Ghana**

	% of children enrolled (ages 5-9)				% of children enrolled (ages 10-14)			
	Girls	Boys	Ratio G/B*	All	Girls	Boys	Ratio G/B*	All
<b>City</b>								
Accra	91,1	87,3	0,96	89,0	91,7	90,9	0,99	91,3

Cape Coast	100,0	100,0	1,00	100,0	100,0	77,8	0,78	85,7
Kumasi	93,8	97,2	1,04	95,2	87,0	89,8	1,03	88,4
Takoradi	100,0	88,2	0,88	93,9	100,0	100,0	1,00	100,0
<b>Wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest 20%	85,7	81,3	0,95	83,8	90,9	87,5	0,96	89,1
Second	95,5	93,8	0,98	94,7	86,4	93,8	1,09	89,5
Middle	100,0	92,6	0,93	95,0	100,0	91,7	0,92	95,0
Fourth	93,5	95,5	1,02	94,3	92,0	78,9	0,86	86,4
Highest 20%	96,0	90,0	0,94	92,7	87,5	96,8	1,11	92,1

Notes: \* A value of 1 indicates equality

**Table G4: Educational attainment (ages 15 and above), Ghana**

	# of respondents	No schooling	Some primary	Comp. primary	Some secondary	Comp. Secondary	Above secondary	Total	Mean years of schooling
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
<b>City</b>									
Accra	745	11,1	2,0	12,2	49,0	20,9	4,7	100	9,2
Cape Coast	84	6,0	0,0	23,8	44,0	15,5	10,7	100	9,3
Kumasi	608	12,3	1,6	16,0	54,3	10,4	5,4	100	8,6
Takoradi	194	9,3	2,1	9,3	50,5	22,7	6,2	100	9,3
<b>Age groups</b>									
15-19	247	6,9	2,4	25,9	54,7	9,7	0,4	100	8,3
20-34	825	7,4	1,1	12,7	49,6	21,8	7,4	100	9,4
35-49	376	13,3	2,7	11,4	54,0	13,3	5,3	100	9,1
50-64	142	27,5	2,8	7,7	47,9	9,9	4,2	100	7,7
65 and over	24	41,7	0,0	12,5	33,3	12,5	0,0	100	7,3
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>									
Lowest 20%	301	18,9	2,3	16,3	52,2	8,6	0,7	100	7,5
Second	289	13,8	1,4	19,4	51,6	10,0	3,8	100	8,2
Middle	294	7,5	2,4	11,9	53,1	19,4	5,8	100	9,1
Fourth	293	7,2	1,7	12,3	55,3	18,1	4,4	100	9,4
Highest 20%	294	8,8	1,4	8,5	41,2	29,3	10,5	100	10,5
<b>All</b>	<b>1639</b>	<b>11,0</b>	<b>1,8</b>	<b>13,8</b>	<b>50,6</b>	<b>16,8</b>	<b>5,4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>9,0</b>

**Table G5: Structure of labour force (ages 15 and above), Ghana**

	No of respondents	In labour force (%)			Out of labour force	Total
		Wage employee	Self-employed	Unemployed		

					Unpaid family worker or apprentice	Actively looking for work	Not actively looking for work	(%)	
		Govt	Private						
<b>City</b>									
Accra	753	3,3	24,0	32,8	8,5	3,7	24,2	3,5	100
Cape Coast	86	9,3	14,0	19,8	8,1	5,8	39,5	3,5	100
Kumasi	623	3,0	17,7	34,8	12,0	4,8	27,6	0,0	100
Takoradi	199	6,5	18,1	35,2	8,5	3,5	28,1	0,0	100
<b>Sex</b>									100
M	926	2,6	12,4	42,9	9,7	3,8	26,5	2,2	100
F	735	5,6	30,5	21,0	9,9	4,8	27,1	1,2	100
<b>Age groups</b>									100
5-14	3	0,0	0,0	0,0	66,7	0,0	33,3	0,0	100
15-19	265	0,0	5,3	3,0	13,6	4,5	72,5	1,1	100
20-34	825	2,9	24,6	27,4	14,1	5,7	23,8	1,6	100
35-49	378	6,6	23,3	58,7	0,8	1,9	6,3	2,4	100
50-64	143	10,5	18,2	52,4	2,8	2,1	11,9	2,1	100
65 and over	29	3,4	13,8	31,0	6,9	3,4	41,4	0,0	100
<b>Education</b>									100
No schooling	182	0,5	7,7	62,1	5,5	2,7	19,8	1,6	100
Some primary	29	0,0	13,8	62,1	6,9	0,0	17,2	0,0	100
Completed primary	231	1,7	13,0	28,6	14,3	5,6	36,4	0,4	100
Some secondary	845	1,9	21,4	34,2	12,3	3,9	24,4	1,9	100
Completed secondary	277	6,9	32,9	18,1	4,7	4,3	30,7	2,5	100
Above secondary	89	27,0	20,2	12,4	1,1	6,7	30,3	2,2	100
<b>Wealth quintile</b>									100
Lowest 20%	305	0,7	20,7	37,0	7,9	5,9	25,6	2,3	100
Second	292	4,5	18,8	35,3	10,6	4,5	25,3	1,0	100
Middle	300	1,3	24,7	31,7	9,7	4,0	27,7	1,0	100
Fourth	295	5,8	19,3	35,9	9,2	3,1	24,4	2,4	100
Highest 20%	297	7,1	19,2	29,3	9,8	2,7	30,0	2,0	100
<b>All</b>	<b>1661</b>	<b>3,9</b>	<b>20,4</b>	<b>33,2</b>	<b>9,8</b>	<b>4,2</b>	<b>26,7</b>	<b>1,7</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table G6: Family planning and child birth, Ghana**

	Family planning, all ever married women ages 15-60				Child birth, all mothers ages 15-60			
	Mean age at marriage	Family planning awareness	Use of contraception		Mean age at first birth	Mean number of children ever born	Delivery care	
			Ever %	Current %			Home %	Clinic/hospital %
<b>City</b>								
Accra	20,9	89,8	42,2	25,4	24,6	2,9	10,1	89,9
Cape Coast	24,0	83,3	57,1	38,1	26,7		0,8	99,2

Kumasi	21,2	87,5	24,8	9,9	23,8	3,2	7,2	92,8
Takoradi	22,7	91,2	37,4	18,7	25,6		8,5	91,5
<b>Age groups</b>								
15-19		73,0	22,9	8,1	16,5	1,0	0,0	100,0
20-34	21,5	91,7	34,3	20,2	22,4	2,1	8,2	91,8
35-49	21,4	91,3	44,5	27,9	26,0	3,8	5,6	94,4
50-60	21,7	88,5	37,7	1,9	27,5	4,0	16,7	83,3
<b>Education</b>								
No schooling	20,6	81,4	35,0	16,3	24,7	4,2	13,4	86,6
Some primary	24,5	85,0	30,0	10,0	28,2	2,3	46,3	53,7
Completed primary	20,3	79,8	34,2	17,7	23,1	3,0	10,6	89,4
Some secondary	21,4	92,0	35,1	20,4	24,4	2,8	3,3	96,7
Completed secondary	22,8	91,2	38,9	17,5	24,9	1,8	3,0	97,0
Above secondary	26,0	100,0	32,4	23,5	28,5	4,0	6,7	93,3
<b>Wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest 20%	20,7	89,6	40,5	24,4	23,7	3,0	11,8	88,2
Second	21,8	85,5	39,2	20,8	24,4	2,8	11,6	88,4
Middle	21,3	87,9	36,4	20,6	24,6	3,4	9,7	90,3
Fourth	21,7	95,3	35,4	18,1	25,0	3,2	1,8	98,2
Highest 20%	21,8	90,0	27,1	10,0	25,8	3,2	4,5	95,5
<b>All</b>	<b>21,5</b>	<b>88,6</b>	<b>35,2</b>	<b>18,9</b>	<b>24,6</b>	<b>3,0</b>	<b>8,1</b>	<b>91,9</b>

**Table G7: Skill acquisition (ages 15-60), Ghana**

	# of respondents	% acquired a skill	% acquired skills through		
			Technical vocational training	Apprenticeship	On the job training
<b>City</b>					
Accra	762	34.3	11.4	26.9	17.8
Cape Coast	86	19.8	3.5	15.1	1.2
Kumasi	632	31.6	2.7	27.7	6.5
Takoradi	203	31.0	7.4	23.6	10.8
<b>Sex</b>					
M	728	36.7	7.7	28.6	14.6
F	896	29.8	7.7	25	10.0
<b>Age groups</b>					
15-19	321	13.1	2.8	11.2	4
20-34	812	41.9	9.2	34.6	15.4
35-49	365	32.6	10.1	24.1	11.5
50-60	137	27	4.4	21.2	13.1
<b>Schooling</b>					
No schooling	143	19.6	0.5	18.9	7
Some primary	79	21.5	2.5	20.3	8.9

Completed primary	92	31.5	2.2	28.3	14.1
Some secondary	898	38.1	4.5	34.3	15
Completed secondary	235	27.2	16.2	16.6	6.8
Above secondary	183	30.1	24.6	8.7	8.7
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>					
Lowest 20%	208	48.1	10.6	42.3	17.3
Second	199	41.7	5.5	36.7	16.1
Middle	262	39.7	10.3	32.8	13.0
Fourth	143	34.3	7.0	27.3	16.1
Highest 20%	203	32.0	7.9	21.7	14.8
<i>All</i>	<i>1635</i>	<i>32.9</i>	<i>7.8</i>	<i>26.5</i>	<i>12.1</i>

### Pakistan RECOUP survey results

**Table P1: Households enumerated and their composition, Pakistan**

	Rural		Urban		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Number of households</b>	<b>791</b>	<b>72.3</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>27.7</b>	<b>1094</b>	<b>100</b>
Punjab	607	76.7	234	77.2	841	76.9
KP	184	23.3	69	22.8	253	23.1
<b>Average HH size</b>	8.1		7.9		8.0	
<b>% of HHs headed by females</b>	5.1		7.6		5.8	
<b>Education level of the HH head</b>						
None	353	44.6	82	27.1	435	39.8
Some primary or middle	282	35.7	98	32.3	380	34.7
Some secondary and above	156	19.7	123	40.6	279	25.5

**Table P2: Household population, Pakistan**

	Total		Male		Female	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>All Sample</b>	8752	100.0	4461	51.0	4291	49.0
<b>Province</b>						
Punjab	6368	72.8	3273	51.4*	3095	48.6*
KP	2384	27.2	1188	49.8*	1196	50.2*
<b>Locality</b>						
Rural	6374	72.8	3249	51.0*	3125	49.0*
Urban	2378	27.2	1212	51.0*	1166	49.0*
<b>Age groups</b>						
<15	3546	40.5	1799	40.3	1747	40.7
15-29	2522	28.8	1231	27.6	1291	30.1
30-59	2067	23.6	1096	24.6	971	22.6
60 <	614	7.0	332	7.4	282	6.6
<b>Marital status (ages 15 and above)</b>						

Never married**	1648	31.7	979	36.8	669	26.3
Currently married	3242	62.3	1587	59.7	1655	65.1
Widowed/divorced/seperated	313	6.0	93	3.5	220	8.6

Notes: \* Row percentages

\*\* Includes the cases for nikkah but no rukhsati

**Table P3: Enrolment (ages 5-9 and 10-14, irrespective of grades enrolled), Pakistan**

	% of children enrolled (ages 5-9)				% of children enrolled (ages 10-14)			
	Girls	Boys	Ratio G/B*	All	Girls	Boys	Ratio G/B*	All
<b>Province</b>								
Punjab	68.4	79.6	0.86	74.2	63.5	78.8	0.81	71.4
KP	68.6	80.4	0.85	74.5	61.2	90.8	0.67	76.0
<b>Location</b>								
Urban	81.6	87.7	0.93	84.8	76.9	88	0.87	82.9
Rural	64.4	77.2	0.83	70.8	57.8	79.41	0.73	68.5
<b>Wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest 20%	44.3	70.5	0.63	57.4	45.5	70.9	0.64	57.8
Second	66.9	81.3	0.82	74.0	56.8	78.1	0.73	68.2
Middle	83.0	81.1	1.02	82.0	70.9	88.6	0.80	80.3
Fourth	81.3	87.2	0.93	84.4	72.1	87.7	0.82	80.7
Highest 20%	92.3	86.6	1.07	89.4	88.0	93.0	0.95	90.3
<b>All</b>	<b>68.5</b>	<b>79.8</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>74.3</b>	<b>62.9</b>	<b>81.7</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>72.6</b>

Notes: \* A value of 1 indicates equality

**Table P4: Educational attainment (ages 15 and above), Pakistan**

	# of respondents	No schooling	Some primary	Comp. primary	Some secondary	Comp. Secondary	Above secondary	Total	Mean years of schooling	% attended private schools **
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%		%
<b>Province</b>										
Punjab	3746	42.0	6.0	10.7	18.3	13.6	9.4	100	4.8	9.7
KP	1457	36.5	8.4	7.0	20.6	14.2	13.3	100	5.4	7.2
<b>Location</b>										
Rural	3753	45.7	7.1	9.6	18.1	11.5	8.0	100	4.3	6.6
M	1924	28.7	7.4	9.6	27.7	16.4	10.2	100	5.8	4.9
F	1829	63.6	6.7	9.6	8.0	6.3	5.7	100	2.7	9.9
Urban	1450	26.8	5.7	9.8	21.1	19.8	16.8	100	6.6	13.3
M	735	14.4	5.7	9.8	26.3	25.7	18.1	100	7.8	10.7
F	715	39.6	5.6	9.8	15.8	13.7	15.5	100	5.4	16.7
<b>Age groups</b>										
15-19	885	21.8	9.3	10.8	36.9	13.8	7.3	100	6.0	18.4
20-34	2179	30.0	6.5	10.2	19.0	17.2	17.0	100	6.2	7.3
35-49	1066	50.5	6.7	10.0	14.4	11.6	6.8	100	3.9	3.2



50-64	670	63.6	5.2	8.5	9.3	8.8	4.6	100	2.8	3.0*
65 and over	403	73.0	4.5	4.7	7.2	9.2	1.5	100	2.0	N/A
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>										
Lowest 20%	1108	56.9	8.9	8.6	15.6	6.5	3.3	100	3.0	5.0
Second	1105	48.2	7.1	9.8	18.4	11.0	5.5	100	4.0	5.4
Middle	1065	37.7	6.5	10.5	21.3	15.4	8.5	100	5.1	7.0
Fourth	959	34.0	4.9	10.0	20.8	17.0	13.3	100	5.7	10.1
Highest 20%	966	22.2	5.6	9.4	18.9	20.3	23.6	100	7.4	14.8
<b>All</b>	5203	40.5	6.7	9.6	18.9	13.8	10.5	100	4.9	8.9

Notes: \* Data covers till age group 60 for this indicator.

\*\* Among those who had acquired primary/middle schooling i.e. grades 1 to 8.

**Table P5: Structure of labour force, Pakistan**

	# of respondents	In labour force (%)						Out of labour force (%)	Total
		Wage employee		Self-employed	Unpaid family worker or apprentice	Unemployed			
		Govt	Private			Actively looking for work	Not actively looking for work		
<b>Province</b>									
Punjab	3746	5.2	17.9	17.4	10.5	4.4	1.5	42.7	100
KP	1457	5.5	13.2	13.2	3.8	3.0	4.3	56.8	100
<b>Location</b>									
Rural	3753	5.4	16.1	16.2	10.2	4.3	2.1	45.4	100
M	1924	8.6	28.2	27.9	8.8	3.4	1.1	21.5	100
F	1829	1.3	4.2	3.9	10.6	5.4	3.2	71.6	100
Urban	1450	5.9	16.8	16.3	4.5	3.2	2.7	50.1	100
M	735	9.0	27.8	25.9	7.3	3.5	1.5	24.5	100
F	715	2.8	5.5	6.6	1.5	2.9	3.9	76.5	100
<b>Age groups</b>									
5-14	2412	0.0	1.5	0.3	2.4	0.6	0.3	94.7	100
15-19	885	0.9	13.1	4.3	11.2	3.6	3.6	63.2	100
20-34	2179	6.3	20.5	15.2	11.7	5.8	2.6	37.4	100
35-49	1066	8.7	20.2	24.2	6.0	3.0	1.6	36.1	100
50-64	670	4.9	10.9	23.3	4.0	2.4	3.6	50.4	100
65 and over	403	1.2	2.2	14.9	1.0	0.7	0.2	79.7	100
<b>Education</b>									
No schooling	2105	0.8	13.3	11.9	10.8	4.1	1.6	56.8	100
Some primary	347	1.2	17.0	22.8	9.5	2.6	2.3	44.4	100
Completed primary	502	2.4	16.1	20.5	9.0	4.0	3.6	44.0	100
Some secondary	985	4.5	19.7	19.8	8.0	4.4	2.4	41.1	100
Completed secondary	717	14.6	19.7	19.5	6.1	3.5	2.2	33.9	100
Above secondary	545	18.9	17.8	14.1	3.5	5.0	3.5	36.9	100
<b>Wealth quintile</b>									
Lowest 20%	1108	2.5	23.3	13.4	8.8	4.9	1.5	44.9	100

Second	1105	4.1	17.6	16.8	11.1	3.5	2.4	44.3	100
Middle	1065	4.9	17.5	16.2	7.5	3.8	2.0	47.7	100
Fourth	959	5.7	13.1	18.4	6.8	3.9	2.5	49.5	100
Highest 20%	966	10.0	9.9	16.7	8.5	4.0	3.2	47.3	100
<b>All</b>	<b>5203</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>16.6</b>	<b>16.2</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>46.6</b>	<b>100</b>

**Table P6: Family planning and child birth, Pakistan**

	Family planning, all ever married women ages 15-60				Child birth, all mothers ages 15-60			
	Mean age at marriage	Family planning awareness	Use of contraception*		Mean age at first birth	Mean number of children ever born	Delivery care	
			Ever %	Current %			Home %	Clinic/hospital %
<b>Province</b>								
Punjab	18.9	82.9	42.2	25.3	20.8	4.8	78.7	21.3
KP	17.7	73.1	48.7	30.1	19.3	4.7	60.2	39.8
<b>Location</b>								
Rural	18.5	78.4	44.2	25.5	20.4	4.8	75.6	24.4
Urban	18.8	84.5	43.3	29.1	20.4	4.6	67.9	32.1
<b>Age groups</b>								
15-19	16.3	77.0	29.8	25.5	16.9	1.4	48.6	51.4
20-34	18.7	87.3	43.8	31.1	20.1	3.3	62.9	37.1
35-49	18.8	78.2	48.8	26.3	21.0	6.0	81.3	18.7
50-60	18.4	59.4	35.7	4.0	20.7	7.1	93.8	6.2
<b>Education</b>								
No schooling	18.0	74.0	43.6	25.0	19.9	5.4	83.4	16.6
Some primary	18.5	88.7	39.5	19.8	20.5	4.2	62.4	37.6
Completed primary	19.1	89.0	43.1	25.5	20.7	4.1	68.7	31.3
Some secondary	18.8	84.2	46.9	31.3	20.2	3.4	56.6	43.4
Completed secondary	20.9	96.0	44.8	33.3	22.4	3.0	53.4	46.6
Above secondary	21.8	96.4	48.1	34.6	23.2	2.1	25.0	75.0
<b>Wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest 20%	18.0	76.7	40.5	26.2	19.9	5.5	86.5	13.5
Second	18.0	77.7	43.1	22.0	19.8	5.2	75.1	24.9
Middle	18.8	78.3	41.9	27.8	20.6	4.6	72.2	27.8
Fourth	19.0	84.7	44.6	28.1	20.7	4.3	67.2	32.8
Highest 20%	19.2	83.3	49.4	28.5	21.1	4.0	64.7	35.3
<b>All</b>	<b>18.6</b>	<b>80.3</b>	<b>47.8</b>	<b>28.9</b>	<b>20.4</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>73.5</b>	<b>26.5</b>

Notes: \* Among those who are aware of family planning.

**Table P7: Disability, Pakistan**

	# of PWDs	Disability prevalence (% of all sample aged 15-60)			PWDs by background characteristics (as % of PWDs)		
		All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
<i>All</i>	<b>923</b>	<b>20.8</b>	<b>16.1</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>
Rural	633	19.9	15.9	23.9	68.6	66.8	69.8
Urban	290	22.8	19.2	25.5	31.4	33.2	30.2
<b>Type of disability</b>							
Seeing	743	16.0	10.7	28.4	63.9	53.6	70.9
Hearing	62	1.3	0.9	2.4	5.3	4.5	5.9
Speaking	34	0.7	1.0	0.6	2.9	4.9	1.6
Walking	133	2.9	4.0	2.2	11.4	20.2	5.5
Learning	38	0.8	0.9	1.0	3.3	4.5	2.5
Personal care	33	0.7	0.6	1.2	2.8	2.8	2.9
Multiple disability	49	1.1	1.9	4.3	10.3	9.6	10.8
<b>Age groups</b>							
15-19	65	7.7	7.5	7.8	7.0	8.2	6.3
20-34	225	10.9	9.4	12.3	24.4	24.7	24.1
35-49	361	33.9	22.8	45.7	39.1	33.2	43.3
50-60	272	54.8	46.2	63.8	29.5	33.9	26.3
<b>Schooling</b>							
No schooling	450	27.5	22.3	29.5	48.8	27.4	63.7
Some primary	66	21.7	16.7	26.6	7.2	6.6	7.6
Completed primary	96	21.2	19.7	22.6	10.4	11.3	9.8
Some secondary	133	16.6	13.9	16.6	14.4	23.9	7.7
Completed secondary	102	16.1	16.0	16.3	11.1	18.2	6.1
Above secondary	76	14.9	16.1	13.3	8.2	12.6	5.2
<b>Wealth quintile</b>							
Lowest 20%	187	20.2	17.8	22.6	20.3	21.8	19.2
Second	183	19.1	15.1	22.7	19.8	19.2	20.3
Middle	203	22.1	16.5	28.1	22.0	20.5	23.0
Fourth	157	19.0	15.6	22.2	17.0	16.3	17.5
Highest 20%	193	23.6	21.1	26.0	20.9	22.1	20.1

**Table P8: Skill acquisition, Pakistan**

	Number of respondents	% acquired a skill	% acquired skills through		
			Technical vocational training	Apprenticeship	On the job training
<b>Province</b>					
Punjab	3335	26.7	10.1	18.6	2.0

	KP	1300	17.7	9.4	10.4	4.2
<b>Location</b>						
	Rural	3330	21.9	8.0	15.5	2.4
	M	1704	20.4	8.9	12.9	3.6
	F	1626	23.4	7.0	18.1	1.2
	Urban	1305	30.0	14.9	18.4	3.2
	M	656	30.0	14.2	18.4	4.1
	F	649	29.9	15.6	18.3	2.3
<b>Age groups</b>						
	15-19	885	16.8	6.1	11.4	0.8
	20-34	2179	28.8	12.9	9.2	3.1
	35-49	1068	23.5	8.2	16.9	2.9
	50-60	503	18.1	7.4	11.1	3.2
<b>Schooling</b>						
	No schooling	1684	18.5	1.2	17.6	0.7
	Some primary	320	19.4	4.4	15.9	0.9
	Completed primary	466	27.5	5.2	24.2	2.1
	Some secondary	953	18.3	6.0	14.0	1.6
	Completed secondary	713	32.3	21.7	14.4	5.0
	Above secondary	488	43.2	38.1	11.9	9.4
<b>Wealth quintiles</b>						
	Lowest 20%	982	21.1	4.8	16.5	1.8
	Second	996	20.0	6.6	15.9	1.6
	Middle	947	24.3	9.2	16.3	2.3
	Fourth	848	28.6	14.0	18.1	3.6
	Highest 20%	862	28.4	16.1	15.3	4.2
<b>All</b>		<b>4635</b>	<b>24.1</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>16.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>