



Government of The Gambia

**POVERTY ANALYSIS
OF THE
THE GAMBIA
INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEY 2003 / 2004**

March 2007



Kaifing Institution al Layout, Bethel Harding Highway, Kaifing, The Gambia
Tel: 220-4377847 Fax:220-4377848 E-mail: gmcens@qanet.gm Website: www.csd.gm
Funded by: Capacity Building and Economic Management Project(CBEMP)

FOREWORD

The 2003/04 Integrated Household Survey (IHS) is the first of its kind ever conducted in The Gambia. The survey lasted for a period of more than one year to take into account the seasonal variations. It covers approximately 4,600 households randomly selected based on probability proportional to size across the 8 Local Government Areas (LGA) of the country.

The primary objectives of the study were to monitor the determinants of poverty and its dynamics, provide the Gambia Government and other policy makers and planners with the necessary socio-economic data for poverty monitoring and policy formulation, to rebase as well as provide weights for the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and to provide the necessary data to update the System of National Accounts (SNA) that will eventually lead to the move from SNA 1968 to SNA 1993.

As such the outputs of the IHS include five reports namely: the poverty analysis, consumption of Gambian households, living standard analysis, the 2004 National Consumption Price Index of The Gambia and the methodology of the analysis.

I hope the different reports of the IHS will meet the data requirements of all stakeholders, especially the Strategy for Poverty Alleviation Coordination Office and the Department of State for Finance and Economic Affairs.

ALIEU S.M. NDOW

STATISTICIAN GENERAL

Acknowledgement

On behalf of The Gambia Government, I would like to thank the World Bank for providing financial and technical assistance through the Capacity Building for Economic Management Project (CBEMP) for the conduct of this important study.

The GBOS registered its appreciation for the timely response of the CBEMP on our needs through out the conduct of the inquiry. Special thanks go to Fatou Leigh, Director of CBEMP and Mr. Alieu Bittaye, deputy director and all other staff of the CBEMP for their invaluable support.

I am grateful to all staff of the GBOS who participated in the different phases of the study, especially Mr. Lamin Fatty and Abu Camara for working on the data analysis and the production of tables of the report both in The Gambia and in Spain at the University of Alicante, under the supervision of Professor Christopher Muller. I also registered my sincere appreciation to Messrs. Malang Keita, Ousman Dibba and Ali D Ceesay for their coordination and supervisory role during the field work.

Special thanks is going to Hoon S. Soh World Bank Country Economist and Graham Eele, World Bank adviser on statistics for their invaluable support.

Lastly, and by no mean the least, I thank all respondents for sharing their time to furnish us with the requisite information.

ALIEU S.M. NDOW

STATISTICIAN GENERAL

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
1. The Context	6
2. The Living Standard Indicators	7
3. The Poverty Measures	8
4. The Poverty Lines	11
4.1. The past poverty lines and the inflated poverty lines	11
4.2. The new poverty lines	16
5. The Preliminary Estimates of February 2005	28
6. The New Poverty Estimates	30
6.1. The aggregate poverty estimates	30
6.2. Comparison with other estimates	31
6.3. Regional poverty	35
6.4. Poverty estimates for other sub-populations	38
Appendix 1: References	43
Appendix 2: Results	48

Executive Summary

This report presents the first final results of the poverty analysis of the Integrated Household Survey in the Gambia. The results correspond to the collection period that covers five quarter in 2003-2004.

The head-count index estimated with the upper poverty line is $P_0 = 57.9$ % with a standard error of 1.99 %. It is of 51.1 % (Standard error 2.13 %) when using instead the lower poverty line. The poverty gap with the upper line is estimated at 25.1 % (respectively 20.8 % with the lower line). The poverty severity index is 13.8 % (respectively 11.0 %). Finally, the estimate of the Watts index is 39.0 % (respectively 31.7 %).

Using per adult-equivalent living standard based on nutritional equivalence scales instead of per capita living standard in the estimation of poverty estimates considerably reduces the estimated poverty head-count indices: 39.7 percent with the lower poverty line and 46.3 percent with the higher poverty line.

Poverty incidence is clearly much lower in Banjul than in the other strata which are all characterised by a large proportion of poor persons. Beyond Banjul, the smallest incidences of poverty are in Kanifing (32.1 percent), Brikama Urban (41.9 percent), Kerewan Urban (42.7 percent) and Basse Urban (44.3 percent). The highest incidences of poverty are in Mansakonko Urban (65.7 percent), Kerewan Rural (67.0 percent), Jangjangbureh Rural (62.9 percent), Basse Rural (63.2 percent) and especially Kuntaur Rural (91.9 percent). However, the standard errors are large at this disaggregation level.

Urban areas have a much lower poverty rate ($P_0 = 39.6$ %) and much lower estimated poverty with P_1 , P_2 and W, than rural areas ($P_0 = 67.7$ %). However, the incidence of poverty out of Banjul and Kanifing remains very substantial even in urban areas ($P_0 = 56.0$ %).

Households with female heads are characterised by higher poverty ($P_0 = 60.3$ % instead of $P_0 = 40.7$ % for households with male heads). Not all ethnic groups are equally

affected by poverty. The poorest groups, with any estimated poverty measure, are the Mandinka ($P_0 = 67.3\%$) and the Fula ($P_0 = 66.3\%$).

Poverty is higher among households whose head are married ($P_0 = 59.4\%$) and lower among households whose head have never been married ($P_0 = 31.8\%$). The union type also matters, with much higher poverty rates among households led by polygamous heads ($P_0 = 68.3\%$) than among households led by monogamous heads ($P_0 = 49.9\%$).

In terms of housing status, owners are less often poor ($P_0 = 46.4\%$) than tenants ($P_0 = 64.6\%$). As expected, non-educated heads are more often poor ($P_0 = 65.0\%$) than heads with education ($P_0 = 40.6\%$). The subjective perception of poverty does not correspond to its economic measure.

Larger households (i.e., with more members) have higher poverty, from $P_0 = 13.3\%$ for households with three or less members, up to 71.1% for households with 10 or more members. Poverty also increases with the age of the household head. Households led by young heads (below 30 years old) have lower poverty rates (39.5%), while households led by elderly heads (50 year old or older) have very high poverty rates (64.6%).

Households whose head is peasant or agricultural worker, unskilled worker or unemployed are poorer (with respectively: $P_0 = 79.3\%$, 65.4% and 62.6%). On the contrary, households whose head works in services are less poor ($P_0 = 31.6\%$).

Households whose head is employed in the agricultural and fishing sector are poorer ($P_0 = 76.3\%$) than other households. This is also the case to a smaller extent for households whose head works in the construction sector ($P_0 = 63.6\%$). By contrast, households whose head works in social and personal services ($P_0 = 45.3\%$), in the sector 'Trade, Hotels and Restaurants' ($P_0 = 48.7\%$), and in Private and Public Financial Administrations ($P_0 = 49.1\%$) are less poor.

Finally, poverty is much higher among groundnut producers ($P_0 = 76.6\%$) versus other households ($P_0 = 46.2\%$).

1. The context

UNDP (2001) provides a review of a common perception of the welfare situation of Gambian households before the publication of the IHS results. The yearly mean expenditure per adult-equivalent was assessed at 5,926 Dalasi in 1998 with on aggregate 66 percent of the consumption expenditure going to food. In this year, about 67 percent of the population and 55 percent of the households were considered as poor according to this publication. In fact, at that time many different figures for poverty could be found in the Gambia and the estimations of poverty were subject to debate.

The poorer areas were general considered to be the Central and Upper River divisions, while Banjul was seen as the richer one. Access to safe sanitary services is considered very low with 7.4 percent. Life expectancy is also poor at 55 years. However, other figures show important progress in social indicators in the last few years. For example, net primary enrolment has shifted from 45 percent in 1990 to 50 percent in 1997; infant mortality from 167 per mil in 1983 to 92 per mil in 1993.

The past information on poverty from various surveys and analyses has been summarized in Republic of The Gambia (2002f). One striking feature is the occurrence of brutal variations of poverty estimates over years (head-count index in rural areas of: 76% in 1989, 41% in 1992, and 80% in 1998; in urban areas: 64% in 1989, 40% in 1992, and 62% in 1998). Such extreme shifts are likely to reflect shortcomings in the collection

design, uncorrected price differences across household and period, and inflexible and inappropriate definitions of the poverty lines, as much as true variations in living standards. This diagnostic is supported by nutritional statistics for children which do not follow this wild temporal pattern (National Nutritional Agency, 2004).

Then, the present poverty estimates provide an opportunity to adjust perceptions about poverty in the Gambia.

We now turn to the description of the living standard indicators and the poverty measures used in the poverty analysis based on the IHS data.

2. The Living Standard Indicators

The household living standard indicators are based on the value of consumption. Household living standard indicators are typically corrected for the two main sources of heterogeneity in household situations: household composition and prices. In order to satisfy this requirement, the living standard indicator for household s is defined as

$$y_s = c_s / (S \cdot I_s)$$

where c_s is the value of consumption of household s , S is the household size (or a household equivalence scale). The deflated living standard indicator is denoted *per capita real living standard* when S is the household size, and *per adult-equivalent real living standard*, when S is another equivalence scale. The non-deflated living standard indicator is denoted nominal living standard. Our preferred definition of the household living

standard indicator is the per capita real consumption, which allows for international comparisons.

Because the collection covered five quarters rather than one year, the estimates cannot be considered, strictly speaking, as describing uniquely the 2003 situation. Future estimates restricted to 2003, and to each of the five quarters of the survey, should be produced. However, the estimation results of this volume have been normalized so that the living standard indicators correspond to 365 days.

The treatment of geographical and temporal price dispersions is crucial. Indeed, if the correction for differences in prices that distinct households face at separate periods is inaccurate, then apparent welfare fluctuations, or welfare differences between households, might mostly result from unaccounted large price differences (Muller, 2002). The correction for price differences is implemented by deflating the living standard indicator with a Laspeyres price index.

3. The Poverty Measures

Our estimates are much based on the Foster-Greer-Thorbecke poverty measures (Foster, Greer and Thorbecke, 1984). We especially focus on P_0 , the *head-count index*, which

corresponds to the percentage of the poor, and on P_2 , the poverty severity index that accounts for the inequality among the poor.

$P_0 = \int_0^z dF(y)$, where F is the cumulative density function (cdf) of the personal living

standard (y) distribution and z is the poverty line.

$P_2 = \int_0^z (1 - y/z)^2 dF(y)$. The Watts index satisfies the monotonicity, transfer and transfer

sensitivity axioms, and is decomposable.

P_1 is the poverty gap index and shows the share in total value of the living standards that

should be theoretically reallocated to eliminate poverty: $P_1 = \int_0^z (1 - y/z) dF(y)$. This

index satisfies the monotonicity axiom, the transfer axiom, the sub-group monotonicity axiom and is decomposable.

The Watts poverty index, introduced by Watts (1968), is $W = \int_0^z -\ln(y/z) dF(y)$. P_2 and W

provide less intuitive statistics than P_0 , but they account for the severity of poverty among the poor, which is not the case for P_0 and P_1 .

Thus, poverty is estimated using classical indicators that can be seen as means of individual poverty functions. Indeed, our poverty measures can all be written as

$P = \int k(y, z) dF(y)$, where k is the kernel function describing the poverty severity for living standard y with poverty line z , and F is the cdf of living standards. The individual poverty functions, $k(y, z)$, are therefore the following ones:

(1) For P_0 : $I(y < z)$, which is the dummy variable identifying the poor. As mentioned above, variable y is the individual living standard and z is the poverty line.

(2) For P_1 : $I(y < z) \cdot ((z-y)/z)$.

(3) For P_2 : $I(y < z) \cdot ((z-y)/z)^2$.

(4) For W : $-I(y < z) \cdot \ln(y/z)$.

In these conditions, the estimator of the poverty measure is the following, based on ratios of the classical Horwitz-Thompson sampling estimator of the mean:

$$\hat{P} = \frac{\sum_{s=1}^n POND_s HHS_s k(y_s, z)}{\sum_{s=1}^n HHS_s POND_s},$$

where $POND_{st}$ is the sampling weight of surveyed household s ($s = 1, \dots, n$) and HHS_s is its household size.

Using the cdf of personal living standards while only household are observed implies to weigh the function in the integral by the household size (or by the adult-equivalent scale

when used in the definition of the living standard variable¹). The introduction of household size weighing justifies the use of ratio estimators. Simpler Horwitz-Thompson sampling mean estimators provide qualitatively similar results. We also estimate sampling errors for poverty indicators. The sampling estimators are discussed in Muller (2004b, 2006). The estimators have been validated by checking subpopulations for each stratum.

4. The Poverty Lines

4.1. The past poverty lines and the inflated poverty lines

A few poverty analyses have already been carried out in The Gambia, notably based on the two previous consumption surveys of 1993 and 1998. The poverty lines estimated in The Gambia (from surveys in 1989, 1993 and 1998) have already been criticized (The Republic of The Gambia, 2002). However, they bring a natural comparison benchmark.

An ILO study (“Poverty in The Gambia”, 1992) established the first poverty line in the Gambia. It was based on a minimum food basket to reach energy requirements per age-gender adult equivalent. In the report of the 1993 survey, it is stated that “The ILO study selected households with a food consumption per adult-equivalent unit corresponding

¹ See Ebert and Moyes (2003).

roughly to the food poverty line... Rural households spending 75 to 125 Dalasi per month per adult-equivalent unit were selected and the food poverty line for rural households was 100 Dalasi per month per adult-equivalent unit. These households spend 25 Dalasi per month per adult-equivalent unit on non-food items.” Therefore, the poverty line for rural household was established at 125 Dalasi. The same procedure for urban households led to a poverty line of 186.50 Dalasi. Unfortunately, the ILO study has been lost and is no longer available in the Gambia or on ILO web site.

Then, in the report of the 1998 survey, there is an updating of the 1992/93 poverty line using the price index for the food basket used (some cost is calculated for this food basket which has seven categories). Therefore, it seems that the 1993 (and 1998) poverty lines have been obtained by merely updating an ad hoc price index for the poor, which unfortunately is excessively determined by the price of the fish item (represented by barracuda, an expensive food item). Moreover, the vegetable used in the ILO study price index cannot be identified.

Several shortcomings appear in the way past poverty lines have been calculated. First, the definition of the population on which the poverty line is anchored, by using consumption baskets, seems too broad to accurately characterise the households with living standards around the expected poverty line. This may have produced bias in that the consumption structure for rich or excessively poor households may have unduly influenced the calculus of the poverty line. Second, the non-food part of the poverty line was calculated by using a proportional rule which may have distorted the important roles of household

income, other household characteristics and prices in determining non-food expenses. In particular, income effects were ignored for extrapolating the non-food poverty line. Using more flexible food demand estimates helps us for correcting for an insufficient account of the heterogeneity of expenditure allocation across households. Third, the price correction was inaccurate and based on non-representative products. For example, the price of barracuda in Banjul, a luxury fish, was used as representative of the whole fish category. Fourth, insufficient stratification prevented to account for regional and temporal variations in consumer baskets. Consequently, we have designed and carried out a new methodology for the calculus of the poverty line. This is important because most of the results of the poverty analysis crucially depend on the level of the poverty threshold.

We found additional deficiencies in the calculation of the poverty line in 1998. First, this poverty line was calculated using the 1993 consumption structure. It would have been more consistent to use the 1998 consumption basis. Moreover, the price data used to calculate the 1998 poverty line only covers about one month in 1998 instead of one year for the price data used in 1993. Finally, the inflation correction with the inflated 1993 poverty line was far from perfect. Indeed, the used price index weight have been criticized and the price index only covers the Banjul area.

It seems that the excessively low level of the 1993 and 1998 inflated poverty lines comes from the fact that they are themselves inflated from a 1989 poverty line of which accurate definition has been lost, but is based on the cost of a fixed basket of consumed items. This is particularly worrying for several reasons. First, the information that we could

gather about the 1989 poverty line (from a document by ILO in 1992) suggests that its empirical basis is weak. Indeed, only a very local survey was implemented (by UNICEF) to produce this 1989 poverty line and the stated consumption basket is based on too few products to be credible. Second, it seems that the measurement units for consumption records were not properly measured both in 1993 and 1998 surveys. So, it is difficult to believe that proper adjustment for inflation anchored on the cost of a typical basket has been done if the quantity information is in fact missing in these surveys. We met the same difficulty with the IHS data, which we solve by anchoring the poverty line on the calorie price of a few well observed basic food products.

Because the complete IHS consumption data was not ready to allow us to estimate a specific poverty line for 2003, we chose in the past to consider the inflated 1993 and 1998 poverty lines by sector for preliminary results (Muller, 2004a). That is: the national price index of the Gambia (in practice a Banjul price index) was used to convert the poverty lines used in the past surveys in the different domains (Banjul and Kanifing, Other Urban, Rural).

Our inflation of the 1993 and 1998 poverty lines based on adult-equivalent scales was implemented as follows. The 1992 poverty lines (per adult-equivalent) were D 2443 for Greater Banjul, D 2404 for Other Urban areas, D 1777 for Rural areas. The 1993 poverty lines (per adult-equivalent) were D 3789 for Greater Banjul, D 3108 for Other Urban areas, D 2756 for Rural areas. Finally, the 1998 poverty lines (per adult-equivalent) were D 5538.78 for Greater Banjul, D 3898.15 for Other Urban areas, D 3087.55 for Rural

areas. Therefore, the conversion using the Banjul price index yields the corresponding poverty lines in 2003 Dalasi:

- Inflated 1993 poverty lines (per adult-equivalent): D 3789 for Greater Banjul, D 3108 for Other Urban areas, D 2756 for Rural areas.

- Inflated 1998 poverty lines (per adult-equivalent): D 7455 for Greater Banjul, D 5246 for Other Urban areas, D 4155 for Rural areas.

Note that we prefer poverty lines per capita that need to be calculated from the poverty lines per adult-equivalent. We now indicate explicitly the detail of the calculus of the inflated monthly poverty lines obtained by inflating the 1993 and 1998 poverty lines, using the Banjul CPI. The inflation correction is based on June. We first calculate poverty lines correspond to living standards calculated in terms of adult-equivalents.

We obtain for Greater Banjul 1993: $z_1 = D (2443/12) * (1 + ((2006.21 - 1293.44) / 1293.44))$
= D 315.77 per month = D 3789 per year.

For Other Urban 1993: $z_2 = D (2004/12) * (1 + ((2006.21 - 1293.44) / 1293.44)) = D 259.02$
per month = D 3108 per year.

For Rural 1993: $z_3 = D (1777/12) * (1 + ((2006.21 - 1293.44) / 1293.44)) = D 229.68$.

For Greater Banjul 1998: $D z_4 = D (5538.78/12) * (1 + ((2006.21 - 1490.3) / 1490.3)) = D$
621.34 per month = D 7455 per year.

For Other Urban 1998: $z_5 = D (3898.15/12) * (1 + ((2006.21 - 1490.3) / 1490.3)) = D 437.30$
per month = D 5246 per year.

For Rural 1998: $z_6 = D (3087.55/12) * (1 + ((2006.21 - 1490.3) / 1490.3)) = D 346.36$ per month = D 4155 per year.

Then, the corresponding poverty lines for indicators per capita are obtained by multiplying these lines by the ratio (6.56/8.61) of the mean household equivalent-scale over the mean household size. We obtain:

For Greater Banjul 1993: D 24058.

For Other Urban 1993: D 19734.

For Rural 1993: D 47340.

For Greater Banjul 1998: D 47340.

For Other Urban 1998: D 33318.

For Rural 1998: D 26389.

If wished, exchange rate data can be used to convert those poverty lines into other currencies: (for 3 February 2003) 24.29 Dalasi for 1 US\$ and 24.73 Dalasi for 1 Euro.

Although, a lot of energy has clearly been put in past analyses, more progress is clearly needed for the methodology to define the poverty lines in the Gambia.

4.2. The new poverty lines

4.2.1. The general method

A large literature deals with the construction of poverty lines in Less Developed Countries². However, the technique for updating the poverty line is a question that has not yet reached a consensus among researchers. In this report, we adapt the method promoted by Ravallion (1998) to a situation of missing data for food quantities and using robust extrapolation methods. The poverty line is calculated to correspond to the situation of 2003. We first describe the estimation of the food component for the new 2003 food poverty lines. Then, we explain the extrapolation step taken to produce the final poverty lines.

The poverty lines are based on the a priori choice of a reference group (RG) selected in such a way that the living standards of the households in this group are close to the expected poverty line. Although some arbitrariness is unavoidable in the choice of the RG, one is constrained in this choice by the requirement that very poor households and rich households be excluded from this group.

We calculate specific poverty lines for the three following domains: Banjul and Kanifing; Other Urban areas; Rural areas. We choose to isolate Banjul and Kanifing together because they share higher population densities and similar catering sources. Dividing the country in this way allows us to better account for varying tastes, prices and catering situations across these domains. For each domain, we estimate a lower and a higher poverty lines for 2003. Z^L denotes the lower poverty line. Z^U denotes the upper poverty line.

² Greer and Thorbecke (1986), Calan and Nolan (1991), Ravallion and Bidani (1994), Ravallion and Sen (1996), Barrington (1997), Ravallion (1998).

The method we wanted to apply for the estimation of the *new poverty lines* was in nine steps, all based on sampling estimators.

- (1) We choose a reference group whose living standard is close to the expected poverty line, for each domain j ($j = 1, \dots, 3$).
- (2) We define calorie requirements for households in this reference group in each domain j : CR_j . For this, we estimate the average household size, S_j , the average adult-equivalence scale (and other average household characteristics) for the reference group. The calorie requirement for a young adult male is chosen at 2700 kcal per day, to account for activity levels consistent with work. It is divided by the mean household size and multiplied by the mean equivalence scale. The latter adjustments allow us to account for nutritional requirements increasing by age and gender of household members.
- (3) We estimate the mean composition structure of consumption for the reference group and the mean composition structure of food consumption, in value.
- (4) We estimate the value of the mean food consumption for the reference group in each domain j , V_j .
- (5) Converting the data on consumption quantities, we calculate the calorie level of the mean food consumption for the reference group in each domain j , C_j .

Then, we estimate the calorie unit-value, or ‘calorie price’, for the reference group in each domain j , $CUV_j = V_j/C_j$. *In practice, as we shall explain later, the steps (4) and (5) will need to be adapted because of missing data for food quantities.*

(6) We calculate the food poverty line, z_j^F in each domain j as the estimated value of the calorie requirement for each domain j .

$$z_j^F = CUV_j CR_j = (V_j CR_j)/C_j.$$

(7) We estimate the demand function for food for the group of reference in each domain j . The model is the following.

$$s_{ij} = \alpha_j + \beta_j \ln(x_{ij}/z_j^F) + \gamma_j [\ln(x_{ij}/z_j^F)]^2 + (N_{ij} - N_j^r)' \delta_j + (\log Price_{ij} - \log Price_j^r) \phi_j + \varepsilon_{ij},$$

where α_j , β_j , γ_j , δ_j , ϕ_j are parameter vectors to estimate, s_{ij} is the food share (in percentage) of household i in its total consumption in domain j , x_{ij} is the per capita consumption of household i in domain j , N_{ij} is a vector of household and environment characteristics in domain j and N_j^r is the corresponding vector of mean characteristics for the reference group in domain j , $\log Price_{ij}$ is a vector of logarithms of prices facing household i in domain j , $\log Price_j^r$ is the corresponding vector for the reference group. Finally, ε_{ij} is an error term. These demand equations are consistent with the Quadratic Almost Ideal Demand System proposed by Banks et al. (1997), where unobserved environment and household characteristics are ignored.

(8) From these estimates, we extrapolate the lower poverty line for each domain j : z_j^L
 $= z_j^F (2 - \alpha_j)$.

A few comments are useful to clarify this calculus. The lower poverty line (Z^L) corresponds to households who can just afford to meet their nutritional requirement. The calculus of the lower poverty line is based on two subjacent assumptions: (1) basic non-food needs are satisfied before basic food needs; (2) both food and non-food are normal

goods once survival needs are satisfied. Under these conditions, let us denote $f_j(y)$ the food spending for an income level y in domain j and let z_j^{NF} be the non-food poverty line in domain j (i.e. the complement of the food part in the budget of a ‘just poor person’). The lower poverty line in domain j is $z_j^L = z_j^F + z_j^{NF}$. Consider a person such that $y = z_j^F$. Under the chosen assumptions, anything that this person spends on non-food is considered to be a minimum allowance for basic non-food needs since the person gave up basic food needs. Then, a minimum allowance for non-food basic needs is $y - f_j(y) = z_j^F - f_j(z_j^F)$. Thus, the total poverty line is $z_j^L = z_j^F + z_j^F - f(z_j^F) = 2z_j^F - f(z_j^F)$. If the food demand equation is as above, one obtains for domain j : $z_j^L = z_j^F (2 - \alpha_j)$.

(9) The upper poverty line is the solution of the food demand equation where the food share is made equal to the food poverty line and the unknown variable takes the place of x_{ij} . To be explicit: the upper poverty line, z_j^U is obtained by solving in z the following equation, separately for each domain j : $z_j^F/z = \alpha_j + \beta_j \ln(z/z_j^F) + \gamma_j [\ln(z/z_j^F)]^2$.

In practice, the solution is numerically obtained by iterating the method of Newton. The upper poverty line (Z^U) corresponds to households that actually meet their nutritional requirements.

4.2.2. The new poverty line: practical estimation

We now discuss the practical estimation of the food poverty lines for each domain. The reference group (RG) chosen to anchor the 1998 poverty lines is the set of households

belonging to quintiles 2, 3 and 4 of the per capita real consumption. The RG is broadly representative of the population of households around the calculated poverty lines. It corresponds to substitutions between food and non-food consumption that are consistent with observations of actually satisfied food minima. Restricting the estimation of the food share equation to the RG mostly excludes extremely poor households and rich households, as well as outlier households whose observations are affected by measurement errors. The choice of a broad RG is justified by the necessity of getting sufficient sample sizes for each domain to ensure an accurate estimation of the food equation share.

The recommended calorie needs are 2700 calories per day per person and correspond to what is typically used to account for moderate household members activities (FAO/WHO/UNU, 1985, ICMR, 1981). We extrapolate this figure using the ideal weights of the household members, which are calculated from their age and gender. The equivalence scales used for the 1998 survey have been used to carry out this calculus. The mean recommended needs are estimated for each domain and each reference group because they correspond to different household populations.

The practical stages in the calculus of the poverty lines for the Gambia are as follows.

- The data for households with missing household size or missing consumption value are eliminated, as well as when the per capita consumption is below 100 Dalasi per year.

- The living standard variable is defined as the consumption value for one year, divided by the product of the household size (or the adult-equivalent scale) and the household Paasche price index.
- The reference group is defined as the set of households such that their per capita living standard is between 3894 Dalasi and 9353 Dalasi (second and fourth quintiles of per capital living standards).
- Three domains are defined to account for some geographical differences in consumption habits and catering: Banjul and Kanifing, Other Urban, Rural Areas.
- The calorie reference level is chosen equal to 2700 Calories a day per capita, denoted Z_{nut} . It is multiplied in each domain by the mean household equivalence scale and divided by the mean household size, both for the reference group.

We dispose of an adult-equivalent scale calculated by age in the report of the 1993 survey. With this scale the nutrient requirement for an adult-male of age 23-50 corresponds to 2700 calories per day, and it can be converted in smaller amount for other categories of members.

For the whole country the mean household size is 8.35 and the mean adult-equivalent scale is 6.76. For the reference group in Banjul and Kanifing we obtain respectively: 6.41 and 5.26; respectively for Other Urban: 7.44 and 6.07; respectively for Rural Areas: 9.68 and 7.77.

- We intended to define the food poverty line in each domain as $ZF = Z_{nut} * (x/y)$, where x is the mean value of food consumption in the domain, and y is the mean calorie quantity of food consumption in the domain.

However, because we do not observe the consumed quantities for most food products, we must adapt the method. Ten products are the only ones for which we can observe quantities in good conditions: rice, sugar, bread, groundnut oil, vegetable oil, palm oil, sardine, maggi, teabags, salt. We exclude products corresponding to too high calorie prices, not likely to constitute a substantial share of the diet of the poor. Then, instead of mean values over all products, we rather use the mean value and the mean quantity of calories for four food items: rice, bread, sugar and maggi cube.

The general ‘calorie price’ variable is defined as $pxcal = ZF/Znut$ for the whole food consumption. Similarly calorie prices can be calculated for any of the ten selected products for which we observe consumption. We denote them $pxcal_i, i = 1, \dots, 10$.

Weighing the four selected products according to their budget shares allows us to give a new definition of the food poverty line for each domain:

$$ZFd_j = 2700 \times [(\sum_{i=1}^4 w_i pxcal_{ij}) / ((\sum_{i=1}^6 w_i))] \times [(mean\ household\ equivalence\ scale\ in\ domain\ j\ for\ the\ RG) / (mean\ household\ size\ in\ domain\ j\ for\ the\ RG)],$$

where $pxcal_{ij}$ is the calorie price of product i in domain j , and w_i is the consumption share of food i in the value of consumption, $j = 1, \dots, 3$; $i = 1, \dots, 4$. This is a novel method based on a few products with well-defined measurement units. In practice in this formula we choose to allocate each product calorie price to the category that it represents in the Paasche index. Then, the weights w_i are the budget shares of these categories rather than the budget shares of the elementary products. A better weighing system would have been to use the calorie share of food i in the total calorie amount in food consumption, but this

information is not available. ZF_{dj} is the food poverty line used for our main poverty estimates.

We first tried to calculate calorie prices by products by using the quantities and values recorded in the file 'Ref_prods.dat', which concentrated this information from the budget files. Despite the creation of new variables for quantity and calorie content, correcting for many errors in the treatment of measurement units, the obtained results were not satisfactory. In particular, the obtained calorie prices, notably for the rice, are much too high, which lead to estimated poverty incidence close to 100 percent. Moreover, the obtained calorie price at household level are too variable to be a credible base of estimation. We attribute this problem to the bad quality of the file data.

Accordingly, we moved to a definition of the calorie prices directly from the price data base, which contains better information on value and quantity for a small set of consumed products. These product prices are multiplied by standard calorie contents obtained from the most recent nutritional publications. The resulting calorie prices and their variation across households and domains is much more reasonable than before. The calorie prices of rice, sugar and maggi cube are lower in Banjul and Kanifing, closer to catering sources. In contrast, the calorie price of bread is lower in rural areas.

As a control, we also attempted to base our calorie price on the main staple food in the Gambia, rice. This yields a food poverty line that we denote ZF_{rice} .

The standard calorie contents are as follows for the used product: rice 1297 Kcal per Kg, sugar 3870 Kcal per Kg, bread 2600 Kcal per Kg, palm oil 8839 Kcal per Kg, maggi cube 2333 Kcal per Kg, sardine = 2082 Kcal per Kg, tea bag 8.43 Kcal per Kg.

As we mentioned above, the extrapolation from the estimated food poverty line Z^F to the upper poverty line Z^U is based on an estimation of a linearized Quadratic Almost Ideal Demand System limited to the equation for food. This equation, which incorporates prices, is estimated by a robust regression method. Other estimation methods have been used but we found that the estimates based on Huber estimators perform better. We attempted to instrument the total consumption, where the main instruments were informations about the type of material of the household home, and other domestic capital characteristics. Unfortunately, this did not lead to satisfactory estimates.

We run the estimation simultaneously for the three domains with coefficients specific to each domain. Thus, the extrapolation of the non-food component of the poverty line can be specific to each domain so as to account for regional situations.

The estimation results provide significant intercept terms, a requisite for the success of the extrapolation method. The number of adult members strongly affects the food share. Other important significant regressors are the total expenditure and some prices.

After thoroughly examining the estimation results, we decided to use the results of the Huber robust regression estimation. Beyond the robustness properties of the Huber robust

regression (eliminating outliers caused by excessive data contamination), we decided to select this estimation method because it correspond to the largest set of significant coefficients among all tried estimation methods. Note however, that OLS estimates would provide relatively close poverty line results (as opposed to 2SLS or quantile regression estimates). In all cases, the estimators are corrected to account for the sampling scheme.

Estimates of the food equation

	Banjul and Kanifing	Other Urban	Rural
Number of obs.	759	385	1094
Logarithm of the per capita value of food expenditure	-.1192499 (0.000)	-.0340594 (0.027)	-.0159821 (0.061)
Square of the logarithm of the per capita value of food expenditure	.003355 (0.561)	.0051958 (0.541)	-.0202008 (0.000)
Number of children members (centered by domain)	-.0030174 (0.406)	-.0024565 (0.529)	.0004564 (0.814)
Number of adult members (centered by domain)	-.0111036 (0.000)	-.0125955 (0.000)	-.0085673 (0.000)
Number of elderly members (centered by domain)	-.020153 (0.179)	-.004335 (0.765)	-.0170574 (0.023)
Education of the household head (centered by domain)	-.0003303 (0.792)	-.0023263 (0.169)	-.0029469 (0.013)
Logarithm of the price of rice (centered by domain)	-.0414939 (0.493)	.1451394 (0.011)	.0710594 (0.001)
Logarithm of the price of sugar (centered by domain)	-.3209716 (0.002)	-.1589436 (0.394)	.0343045 (0.685)
Logarithm of the price of bread (centered by domain)	.1328267 (0.187)	.2098645 (0.000)	.0167178 (0.601)
Logarithm of the price of palm oil (centered by domain)	-.1573004 (0.016)	-.2073791 (0.010)	.0252668 (0.534)
Logarithm of the price of salt (centered by domain)	-.0735113 (0.013)	.0443938 (0.165)	-.0120483 (0.606)
Logarithm of the price of magi cube (centered by domain)	-.1419116 (0.034)	.1409468 (0.015)	-.0187251 (0.614)
Logarithm of the price of sardine (centered by domain)	-.0385215 (0.684)	-.030046 (0.811)	.1802039 (0.000)
Logarithm of the price of tea bag (centered by domain)	.1908773 (0.225)	dropped	-.3166419 (0.005)
Logarithm of the price of washing soap (centered by domain)	.2052365 (0.026)	-.1974742 (0.023)	-.0690301 (0.171)
Logarithm of the price of candle (centered by domain)	-.0082443 (0.827)	-.0251637 (0.626)	-.055271 (0.119)
Intercept	.744267 (0.000)	.6547548 (0.000)	.6687323 (0.000)

Dependent variable = food budget share. P-value in parentheses.

4.2.3. A few delicate issues

One very serious issue for the implementation of the method for calculating the poverty line is that consumed food quantities have been very badly observed in the IHS survey. Most of the recorded quantities are in terms of ‘heaps’, ‘cups’, ‘bags’ or other undetermined containers or shapes. Only for a few products can the actual measured quantity be inferred. This makes the general conversion of food consumption into calorie levels impossible.

In these conditions we extrapolate the calorie unit-value V_j/C_j by affecting the few food products with observed quantities to broad food consumption categories. The weight of these categories in the Paasche price index was used to aggregate the obtained calorie unit-values. The obtained index number for the calorie unit-value was used to derive the food poverty line.

Several shortcomings may affect this approach. First, the obtained calorie price may be sensitive to the subset of products with observed quantities. Second, some quantity and calorie data may be doubtful for some of these products. We decided to base the calculation of the calorie price *exclusively* on: rice, the staple food in the Gambia, bread, sugar and maggi cubes. Admittedly, this is an imperfect basis for the calculation of the food poverty line, although much more satisfactory than arbitrary conventions or use of

inflated poverty lines. It has also the advantage of allowing the use of the 2003 budget data to extrapolate the non-food poverty line rather than relying on external sources describing different time or location situations than the Gambia in 2003. Then, one reason to prefer the new poverty lines is that it is necessary to account for the present situation of the Gambia (prices, qualities of consumed goods, environment, household characteristics and perceptions) to estimate the poverty lines.

A difficulty with the inflated lines used in the past is that they were heavily based on the CPI. Unfortunately, this price index is not the one that one would like to dispose of. Indeed, without mentioning the well-known weaknesses of the present CPI, the price level and the price structure for the reference group are not necessarily the ones for the whole population. A specific price index representing better the consumption structure of the poor would be desirable since some items used in the definition of the weights of the national price index are typically not consumed by the poor. Also, regional price indices for urban and rural areas would be important since the distribution of poverty across domain is not only of interest, but also a basic component of the method on which the lines are based. Naturally, such concerns are also partly valid for the new poverty lines. However, one expects that our new method captures part of the price differences across time and households.

Other few words of precaution about price differences are useful. In other countries, it has been observed that much of the cost-of-living differences between city and countryside come from the non-food component that is little present in our Paasche price

index. Since we do not observe quantities for most homogeneous non-food products, there is little that can be done to correct this in these data. Another issue is that rents may be the central ingredient of the non-food component for some households. However, rent transactions are rare in the Gambia and badly observed in these data. Moreover, they normally do not concern the poorest households who are the focus of the poverty study.

4.2.4. The estimates of the poverty lines

We finally obtain the following values for the poverty lines:

ZF = D 4488 in domain Banjul and Kanifing;

ZF = D 4337 in domain Other Urban;

ZF = D 4615 in domain Rural.

ZL = D 5636 in domain Banjul and Kanifing;

ZL = D 5835 in domain Other Urban;

ZL = D 6145 in domain Rural.

ZU = D 6388 in domain Banjul and Kanifing;

ZU = D 6771 in domain Other Urban;

ZU = D 7009 in domain Rural.

5. The Preliminary Poverty Estimates of February 2005

We first return to the preliminary poverty estimates calculated in February 2005. These estimates that were based on the population of persons and on per capita expenditure (excluding own-consumption and profits) were as follows, with the confidence intervals in brackets:

	Inflated 1993 poverty line	Inflated 1998 poverty line
•P0 :	54.1%	73.8%
	[50.1%, 58.1%]	[70.7%, 77.0%]
•P1:	24.0%	39.3%
•P2:	13.5%	25.1%
•Watts:	37.8%	67.5%

These results are now obsolescent. These statistics were preliminary, based on a small sample of surveyed households and incompletely cleaned data files. The data covered only monetary consumption (not including own-consumption and consumption from gifts). No correction for price differences had been implemented. These issues have now been dealt with since the data has been completely cleaned. Moreover, new poverty lines have been calculated and can be used instead of inappropriate inflated poverty lines.

Two important issues, which were affecting the validity of the preliminary results, can now be solved with the complete and cleaned data. The frequency of purchase has now been taken into account in the estimates of household consumption, which was not possible before because the information about the collection dates were not available.

This allows a much improved extrapolation of observed consumption records to the year, for the calculation of the consumption indicator of each surveyed household. Finally, the own-consumption and the consumed gifts have been incorporated in the final living standard indicators and poverty estimates.

We now discuss the new poverty estimates.

6. The New Poverty Estimates

6.1. Aggregate poverty measures

As mentioned before, our poverty analyses are based on the living standard variable $y_i = c_i / (S_i P_i)$, where P_i is the *household* Paasche price index, S_i is the household equivalence scale (or household size), c_i is the value of the annual household consumption. Our preferred indicator is the per capita real consumption so as to allow for easy comparisons with poverty estimates in other countries.

The estimation results based on the population of persons and per capita expenditure show that the head-count index estimated with the upper poverty line is of 57.9 % with a standard error of 1.99 %. It is of 51.1 % (Standard error 2.13 %) when using instead the lower poverty line. The poverty gap with the upper line is estimated at 25.1 % (respectively 20.8 % with the lower line). The poverty severity index is 13.8 %

(respectively 11.0 %). Finally, the estimate of the Watts index is 39.0 % (respectively 31.7 %). These estimates meet the expectations of many observers about poverty in the Gambia.

We now discuss a few other poverty estimates for comparison purposes.

6.2. Comparison with other estimates

6.2.1. Senegal and other countries

According to the final publications of the Direction de la Prévision et de la Statistique du Sénégal, the incidence of poverty in Senegal, has dropped from the 1994 levels of 61.4 percent of households and 67.9 percent of persons (ESAM I), to lower levels for 2002 (ESAM II): 48.5 percent of poor households and 57.1 percent of poor persons. These figures reinforce the idea of high poverty level in the region.

However, the 2002 Senegal survey was only implemented over four months instead of one year as initially planned. This may partly explain why the poverty figures proposed by the Senegal administration have much varied during the past few years. In comparison

the IHS Gambian survey cover a period larger than one year and can therefore provide more representative poverty estimates less sensitive to seasonal variations. It is nonetheless reassuring that our estimates of poverty incidence have the same order of magnitude than what had been found in Senegal, a similar context. Moreover, in Senegal groundnut farmers are found generally poorer than other households. We find the same feature in the Gambia.

Other African countries are characterised by similar level of poverty incidence than the Gambia. For example, one can extract from the World Bank development indicators the following estimates poverty head-count indices, based on national poverty lines (respectively below \$1 a day in parentheses): 45.3 (44.9) percent in 1998 Burkina Faso, 40.2 (17.1) percent in 2001 Cameroon, 44.2 (26.3) percent in 1999-00 Ethiopia, 40.0 percent in 1994 Guinea, 63.8 (72.8) percent in 1998 Mali, 46.3 (25.9) percent in 2000 Mauritania, (61.4) percent in 1995 Niger, 51.2 percent in 1993 Rwanda. Although it is fair to say that some of these statistics may be doubtful, the general picture is of high poverty level, of comparable magnitude to the one found in the Gambia for Mali, Niger and Rwanda. On the whole, the perception that the poverty in the Gambia is as serious as in these three countries and more than in Cameroon and Guinea does not seem unwarranted.

6.2.2. Past estimates and other poverty lines for the Gambia

As we mentioned above, directly comparing estimates with 1993 ($P_0 = 33\%$) and 1998 ($P_0 = 68\%$) does not make much sense for methodological reasons.

Even using inflated poverty lines with the 2003 data yields incorrect poverty estimates. Indeed, with the new 2003 data using the inflated poverty lines based on 1993 and per capita living standards yields estimates of the head-count index of 9.1 percent, a ridiculously low level. Using the inflated 1998 poverty lines yields an estimated head-count index of about 25.8 percent, again a too low level to be realistic.

Another approach of calculating a poverty line could have been to define it as equal to \$ PPP³ 1 a day per capita, as routinely done in The World Bank publications. PPP GDP is GDP converted into international dollars using purchasing power parity (PPP) conversion factors. It is used because nominal exchange rates do not always reflect international differences in relative prices. At the PPP rate, one international dollar has the same purchasing power over domestic GDP that the US dollar has over US GDP. PPP rates allow a standard comparison of real price levels between countries, just as conventional price indexes allow comparison of real values over time. The usual PPP conversions are derived from price surveys covering many countries conducted by the International Comparison Program. Unfortunately, this survey has just been implemented in the Gambia a few months ago and was not available to describe the 2003 situation. Then, PPP estimates for the Gambia were derived from statistical models using available data and have little credibility. Population below \$1 PPP a day is the percentage of the population living on less than \$1.08 a day at 1993 international prices. The \$1 a day

³ Purchasing Power Parity.

standard, measured in 1985 international prices and adjusted to local currency using PPPs was chosen for the World Bank's World Development Report 1990. However, PPP rates were designed not for making international poverty comparisons but for comparing aggregates from national accounts.

However, the PPP conversion factor used for the Gambia is highly unrealistic. When used with the new data, this poverty line yields an estimate of the head-count index equal to 3.4 percent, again much too low to be meaningful.

Another attempt was done of using the official exchange rate of the Dalasi to reinterpret a poverty line equal to 1 \$ a day per capita. Unfortunately, this official exchange rate has little meaning for welfare statistics, and using it yields an estimate of P_0 equal to 77.9 percent.

6.2.3. Imperfect poverty lines

Not correcting the calculus of the poverty line for the variation of nutritional needs across age and gender yields slightly higher poverty rates: 62.6 percent with the lower poverty line and 68.5 percent with the higher poverty line.

Even using only six products for constructing the poverty line (the four products finally kept, plus sardines and palm oil) lead to poverty rates close to 100 percent. Another common error is to use the calorie content of raw brown rice instead of that of cooked rice, which is much lower. This mistake would have led to much too low poverty rates, about 27 percent when using only rice as a basis for the poverty line.

Using only rice, while the correct calorie content of cooked rice, to calculate the food poverty line, is better but produces overestimation of poverty with 74 percent for the head-count index.

6.2.4. Food poverty and equivalence scales

With our food poverty line, our food poverty estimates are too high to be credible and we do not present them. It seems that the omission of own-consumption and gifts is the main reason for the overestimation of food poverty. Hopefully, the extrapolation based on the food demand equation helps us to redress the problem.

Using per adult-equivalent living standard based on nutritional equivalence scales instead of per capita living standard in the estimation of poverty estimates considerably reduces the estimated poverty head-count indices: 39.7 percent with the lower poverty line and 46.3 percent with the higher poverty line.

The reliability of nutritionally-based adult-equivalent scales has often been attacked (e.g., Osmani, 1992). Because (1) the topics of how to define the equivalence scale is very contentious in economics, and (2) we would need additional IHS data to be cleaned to validate these equivalence scales (e.g. anthropometric data), we choose to base the present most poverty estimates on per capita consumption indicators. A full investigation of the equivalence scale issue should be carried out in the future to produce more accurate poverty analyses. Our imperfect solution has the advantage of yielding a method easier to communicate for the first set of poverty statistics based on accurate consumption data in the Gambia.

6.3. Regional poverty

Our poverty estimates across strata provide a more detailed picture of poverty in the country. In fact, as we shall explain, this picture is little accurate. Let us have a quick look at the head-count index per strata.

	P ₀	Mean Paasche price index	Mean per capita consumption.
			consumption
Banjul U	6.63 (4.0)	1.042	23,656 (1,666)
Kanifing U	32.1 (4.0)	1.035	11,450 (860)
Brikama U	41.9 (9.4)	1.137	8,503 (894)
Brikama R	50.0 (4.7)	1.073	8,850 (842)
Mansak. U	65.7 (12.7)	0.888	5,806 (1,131)
Mansak. R	55.9 (8.2)	0.824	9,007 (3,210)
Kerewan U	42.7 (10.3)	0.931	7,567 (1,338)
Kerewan R	67.0 (5.9)	0.918	5,796 (1,112)
Kuntaur U	57.1 (9.2)	0.897	5,302 (404)
Kuntaur R	91.9 (3.8)	0.886	3,026 (259)
Janjang. U	53.0 (22.1)	0.845	6,665 (1,773)
Janjang. R	62.9 (8.4)	0.900	5439 (5,030)
Basse U	44.3 (7.9)	0.952	9788 (1,250)
Basse R	63.2 (7.9)	0.904	6542 (1,284)

U = Urban ; R = Rural. Standard error in parentheses.

Poverty incidence is clearly much lower in Banjul than in the other strata which are all characterised by a large proportion of poor persons. Beyond Banjul, the smallest incidences of poverty are in Kaninfinfing (32.1 percent), Brikama Urban (41.9 percent), Kerewan Urban (42.7 percent) and Basse Urban (44.3 percent). The highest incidences of poverty are in Mansakonko Urban (65.7 percent), Kerewan Rural (67.0 percent), Jangjangbureh Rural (62.9 percent), Basse Rural (63.2 percent) and especially Kuntaur Rural (91.9 percent). However, the differences in poverty incidence across strata should often be considered as statistical artefacts, as the large standard errors in parentheses show, except in the case of Banjul that stands clearly apart. The size of standard errors, and therefore of the corresponding confidence intervals are caused by small sub-sample sizes in some strata and by the presence of households with large observed consumption at the time of the survey. They invite the reader to be cautious and sceptical while comparing poverty estimates across strata. For example, it is found that in Mansakonko, the poverty estimates are lower for the rural areas than for the urban areas. The estimated standard error of the difference of P_0 between rural and urban Mansakonko shows that this difference is not significant at 5 percent level. In other strata, higher poverty rates are found in rural areas. On the whole, these results confirm the usual opinion that poverty in the Gambia is higher in rural areas.

However, the comparison of urban and rural areas in the Gambia is blurred by the definition of these areas that often correspond to arbitrary administrative limits that may have little reality on the ground. Indeed, some areas described as rural (as in Brikama) are now largely urbanised, and other ones described as urban (as in Mansakonko) are largely devoid of urban dwellings. This situation is worsened by the random selection of enumeration areas for the survey that has led to surveyed districts characterised by agglomerated dwellings in rural areas and surveyed districts containing few houses in otherwise officially urban areas. Clearly, there is a need for a new definition of urban and rural areas in the Gambia, perhaps based on the new spatial satellite data and the new census data.

The per capita mean consumption estimates for urban and rural areas for the same LGA show that in some cases higher per capita mean consumption has been found in rural areas, although again the differences between rural and urban estimates are often insignificant. This is the case in Brikama and Mansakonko, but not in Kerewan, Kuntaur, Janjangbureh and Basse, where per capita mean consumption is found higher in the urban part of the LGA.

There are price differences between areas that affect the differential of living standards between urban and rural areas. As our living standard indicators are based on deflated consumption values using these price indices, it is not illogical to find in some areas higher poverty, when basic products are more expensive there.

The calculus of the poverty line itself introduces a (relevant) difference of treatment between rural and urban areas. This is in part caused by the fact that the mean food basket necessary to reach a given nutritional minimum is more expensive in rural areas, possibly because of transport costs for imported food products reaching Banjul first. Indeed, food prices are higher in rural areas for rice, sugar and magi cube, but not for bread.

6.4. Poverty estimates for other sub-populations

Detailed results of poverty are provided in Tables 1 to 45 for the lower and upper poverty line and for subpopulations defined by the values of the variables: Domain, Rural/Urban, LGA, Strata, household size, various characteristics of the household head (gender, ethnic group, marital status, marriage type, housing status, subjective poverty status, education, age, professional occupation, working industry). More cross-variables should be constructed to enrich the analyses on consumption, living standard and poverty.

We only briefly comment a few general features obtained with the upper poverty line. The results with the lower poverty line are in agreement, while with lower levels of poverty.

Urban areas have a much lower poverty rate ($P_0 = 39.6\%$) and much lower estimated poverty with P_1 , P_2 and W , than rural areas ($P_0 = 67.7\%$). However, the incidence of

poverty out of Banjul and Kanifing remains very substantial even in urban areas ($P_0 = 56.0\%$).

Households with female heads are characterised by higher poverty ($P_0 = 60.3\%$ instead of $P_0 = 40.7\%$ for households with male heads).

Not all ethnic groups are equally affected by poverty. The poorest groups, with any estimated poverty measure, are the Mandinka ($P_0 = 67.3\%$) and the Fula ($P_0 = 66.3\%$). The Wollof ($P_0 = 57.5\%$) and a mixed group 'Others' ($P_0 = 58.7\%$) are also characterised by a majority of poor persons. The Jola, Sarahule and Serer are generally much less affected by poverty.

Poverty is higher among households whose head are married ($P_0 = 59.4\%$) and lower among households whose head have never been married ($P_0 = 31.8\%$). The union type also matters, with much higher poverty rates among households led by polygamous heads ($P_0 = 68.3\%$) than among households led by monogamous heads ($P_0 = 49.9\%$).

In terms of housing status, owners are less often poor ($P_0 = 46.4\%$) than tenants ($P_0 = 64.6\%$).

As expected, non-educated heads are more often poor ($P_0 = 65.0\%$) than heads with education ($P_0 = 40.6\%$).

The subjective perception of poverty does not correspond to its economic measure. If 71.2 % of households having declared themselves 'very poor' are indeed measured as poor based on their per capita living standards, only 45.3 % of those who declare themselves poor are economically poor in that sense. Moreover, 60.9 % of those who declare themselves non-poor have per capita living standards below the poverty line. These results indicate that subjective opinions about poverty should *not* be used as a substitute for measurement of poverty based on consumption surveys.

Larger households (i.e., with more members) have higher poverty, from $P_0 = 13.3$ % for households with three or less members, up to 71.1 % for households with 10 or more members. Note however, that this result is sensitive to the used adult-equivalent scale and would be attenuated when using equivalence scales allocating very small weight to children.

Poverty also increases with the age of the household head. Households led by young heads (below 30 years old) have lower poverty rates (39.5 %), while households led by elderly heads (50 year old or older) have very high poverty rates (64.6 %).

The occupation of the household head affects poverty, although less strongly than expected. This is probably due to an imperfect definition of the occupation variable (no code was used in the questionnaire for this variable). However, households whose head is peasant or agricultural worker, unskilled worker or unemployed are poorer (with

respectively: $P_0 = 79.3 \%$, 65.4% and 62.6%). On the contrary, households whose head works in services are less poor ($P_0 = 31.6 \%$).

Similarly, the industry variable is not precisely defined in the questionnaire and should be corrected. However, the estimations results based on this variable show that households whose head is employed in the agricultural and fishing sector are poorer ($P_0 = 76.3 \%$) than other households. This is also the case to a smaller extent for households whose head work in the construction sector ($P_0 = 63.6 \%$). By contrast, households whose head works in social and personal services ($P_0 = 45.3 \%$), in the sector 'Trade, Hotels and Restaurants' ($P_0 = 48.7 \%$), and in Private and Public Financial Administrations ($P_0 = 49.1 \%$) are less poor.

We finally, turn to the estimation of poverty for groundnut producers. The variable 'groundnut producer' is defined as 'household that has been observed at two consecutive seasons as producing groundnuts'. In practice in the sample this is almost the same as defining them as having been observed during one season only. That is: they are the people stating as an answer to a question that they were cultivating groundnut. Note that this part of the data has not been fully checked. Moreover, one problem with the identification of groundnut producers in the survey file is that there are many missing values. We arbitrarily considered that these observations were equivalent to zero production. Then, our estimates should be considered as a preliminary attempt rather than a safe set of estimates.

Based on these definitions, poverty is much higher among groundnut producers ($P_0 = 76.6\%$) versus other households ($P_0 = 46.2\%$). These statistics are confirmed by the mean per capita living standard that is much lower for groundnut producers (5393 Dalasi per capita versus 10,269 Dalasi per capita for non-producers). These features are robust to the separation of urban and rural areas. In urban areas, the incidence of poverty is higher for groundnut producers ($P_0 = 63.9\%$) than for non-producers ($P_0 = 38.3\%$). It is also the case for rural areas (respectively $P_0 = 77.3\%$ and 55.2%).

When turning the attention towards the respective situation of groundnut producers and groundnut non-producers for each LGA, we observe that, a part from Banjul where there is no observed groundnut producer, the mean per capita living standard is always lower, and the poverty rate is always higher (except for Kanifing for which the difference is not significant), for groundnut producers. Then, households producing groundnut appear to form a destitute class all over the country without distinction of geographical location. One obvious question to investigate is if it is the mediocre return to groundnut production that pushed these households into poverty, or if it is poverty itself which confined these households to groundnut production, by restricting the access to other activities.

Appendix 1: References

Barrington, L., "Estimating Earnings Poverty in 1939: A Comparison of Orshansky-Method and Price-Indexed Definitions of Poverty", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 406-470, 1997.

Biemers, P.P., R.M. Groves, L.E. Lyberg, N.A. Mathiowetz and S. Sudman, "*Measurement Errors in Surveys*," John Wiley and Sons, 1991.

Calan, T. and B. Nolan, "Concepts of Poverty and the Poverty Line," *Journal of Economic Surveys*, Vol. 5, No. 3, 1991.

Central Statistics Department, "*1992-93 Household Economic Survey Report. The Gambia*," Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, Banjul, The Gambia, 1994.

Central Statistics Department, "1993-94 Household Education and Health Survey Report. The Gambia," Social Dimensions of Adjustment, 1995.

Ebers, C., J. Lanjouw and P. Lanjouw, "Micro-Level Estimation of Poverty and Inequality," *Econometrica*, Vo. 71, No. 1, 355-364, January 2003.

Ebert U., "Using Equivalence Income of Equivalent Adults to Rank Income Distributions," *Soc. Choice Welfare*, 16, 233-258, 1999.

Ebert U. and P. Moyes, "Equivalence scales reconsidered," *Econometrica*. 71, 319-343, 2003.

Foster, J., J. Greer and E. Thorbecke, "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures," *Econometrica*, vol. 52, n. 3, 761-766, May 1984.

Government of the Gambia, “1998 National Household Poverty Survey Report,” Banjul, The Gambia, June 2000.

Greer, J. and E. Thorbecke, “A Methodology for Measuring Food Poverty Applied to Kenya,” *Journal of Development Economics*, 24, 59-74, 1986.

Muller, C., “Prices and Living Standards. Evidence for Rwanda,” *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 68, 187-203, 2002.

Muller, C, “Data Assessment and Analysis of the Integrated Household Survey CSD in The Gambia,” CBEMP, Banjul, 2004a.

Muller, C, “Model of the Sampling Procedure and Sampling Estimators for the Integrated Household Survey CSD of The Gambia,” CBEMP, Banjul, 2004b.

Muller, C, Preliminary Results of the Integrated Household Survey CSD in The Gambia: 3. Living Standard Distribution and Poverty,” CBEMP, Banjul, 2004c.

Muller, C., “The Share of Seasonal Transient Poverty. Evidence from Rwanda,” mimeo, 2004c.

Muller, C., “Methodology of the Analysis of the Integrated Household Survey CSD in the Gambia,” CBEMP, Banjul, May 2006.

National Nutritional Agency, “Malnutrition trend among the underfives 1985-date. Results of the Gambia National Surveillance Programme”, mimeo, 2004.

Ravallion, M., “Poverty Lines in Theory and Practice”, Living Standards Measurement Study Working Paper No. 133, July 1998.

Ravallion, M. and B. Bidani, “How Robust Is a Poverty Profile”, *The World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 8, No. 1, 75-102, 1994.

Ravallion, M. and B. Sen, “When Method Matters: Monitoring Poverty in Bangladesh”, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 762-791, 1996.

Republic of The Gambia, “*The Gambia Participatory Poverty Assessment. 1999-2000 Report. Voice of the People on Poverty, Volume 1*” September 2002a.

Republic of The Gambia, “*The Gambia Participatory Poverty Assessment. 1999-2000 Report. Voice of the People on Poverty, Volume 2*” September 2002b.

Republic of The Gambia, “*The Gambia Participatory Poverty Assessment. 1999-2000 Report. Voice of the People on Poverty, Volume 3*” September 2002b.

Republic of The Gambia, “*The Gambia Participatory Poverty Assessment. Poverty from the Perspective of the Poor themselves. Greater Banjul Area Synthesis 1999-2002*”
December 2002a.

Republic of The Gambia, “*The Gambia Participatory Poverty Assessment. Poverty from the Perspective of the Poor themselves. Western Division Synthesis 1999-2002*”
December 2002b.

Republic of The Gambia, “*The Gambia Participatory Poverty Assessment. Poverty from the Perspective of the Poor themselves. Lower River Division Synthesis 1999-2002*”
December 2002c.

Republic of The Gambia, “*The Gambia Participatory Poverty Assessment. Poverty from the Perspective of the Poor themselves. Central River Division Synthesis 1999-2002*”
December 2002d.

Republic of The Gambia, “*The Gambia Participatory Poverty Assessment. Poverty from the Perspective of the Poor themselves. Upper River Division Synthesis 1999-2002*”
December 2002e.

Republic of The Gambia, “*Strategy for Poverty Alleviation (SPAII) (PRSP)*,” Department of State for Finance and Economic Affairs, April 2002f.

République du Sénégal, “*Enquête Sénégalaise auprès des ménages. ESAM. Mars 1994-Avril 1995. Rapport de Synthèse*,” Direction de la Prévision et de la Statistique, October 1997a.

The Gambia Multimedia Unit, “J22 Special: Achievements, Challenges & Prospects,” Banjul, 22 July 2004.

UNDP, “*The Gambia Human Development Report 2000*,” January 2001.

Wadda, R. and R. Craig, “*1992 Priority Survey Report. The Gambia*,” Social Dimensions of Adjustment, 1993.

Watts, H.W., ‘An Economic Definition of Poverty’ in: D.P. Moynihan (ed.), *On Understanding Poverty*, 316-29, Basic Book, New York, 1968.

Appendix 2: Results

A. Aggregate Results

Table 1: Poverty indicators at national level

Poverty Index	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count	51.2	2.1
Poverty gap	20.9	1.3
Poverty severity	11.1	1.0
Watts Index	31.8	2.6

Note: Based on lower poverty line and per capita living standards

Table 2: Poverty indicators at national level

Poverty Index	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head Count	58.0	2.0
Poverty gap	25.1	1.4
Poverty severity	13.9	1.1
Watts Index	39.0	2.8

Note: Based on upper poverty line and per capita living standards

Table 3: Poverty indicators at national level

Poverty Index	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head Count	39.8	2.1
Poverty gap	14.6	1.2
Poverty severity	7.3	0.8
Watts Index	21.5	2.2

Note: Based on lower poverty line and per adult-equivalent living standards

Table 4: Poverty indicators at national level

Poverty Index	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head Count	46.4	2.1
Poverty gap	18.1	1.3
Poverty severity	9.4	0.9
Watts Index	27.2	2.4

Note: Based on upper poverty line and per adult-equivalent living standards

A. Results with the lower poverty line

Table 5: Poverty by area

Poverty	Area	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Urban	33.4	3.0
	Rural	60.6	2.8
Poverty gap	Urban	11.8	1.3
	Rural	25.7	1.9
Poverty severity	Urban	5.5	0.8
	Rural	14.1	1.5
Watts index	Urban	16.5	2.0
	Rural	39.9	3.8

Note: Based on the lower line

Table 6: Poverty by Local government area

poverty	LGA	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Banjul	6.6	4.0
	Kanifing	32.1	4.0
	Brikama	49.0	4.3
	Mansakonko	57.6	7.2
	Kerewan	63.6	5.4
	Kuntaur	90.0	3.8
	Janjangbureh	62.2	7.9
	Basse	61.1	7.0
Poverty gap	Banjul	1.5	0.9
	Kanifing	11.4	1.7
	Brikama	20.0	2.5
	Mansakonko	16.4	3.2
	Kerewan	30.5	4.6
	Kuntaur	45.0	3.8
	Janjangbureh	23.0	4.9
	Basse	23.2	4.8
Poverty severity	Banjul	0.5	0.3
	Kanifing	5.1	0.9
	Brikama	11.1	1.8
	Mansakonko	7.1	1.9
	Kerewan	18.2	4.1
	Kuntaur	25.2	3.0
	Janjangbureh	10.9	3.1
	Basse	11.6	3.4
Watts index	Banjul	1.9	1.1
	Kanifing	15.7	2.5
	Brikama	31.1	4.6

Mansakonko	22.5	4.9
Kerewan	51.5	11.0
Kuntaur	67.5	6.9
Janjangbureh	32.0	7.7
Basse	34.1	8.6

Note: Based on the lower line

Table 7: Poverty by strata

Poverty	Strata	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	<i>Banjul Urban</i>	6.6	4.0
	<i>KMC urban</i>	32.1	4.0
	<i>Brikama Urban</i>	41.9	9.4
	<i>Brikama Rural</i>	50.1	4.8
	<i>Mansakonko Urban</i>	65.8	12.8
	<i>Mansakonko Rural</i>	55.9	8.3
	<i>Kerewan Urban</i>	42.7	10.3
	<i>Kerewan Rural</i>	67.1	5.9
	<i>Kuntaur Urban</i>	57.1	9.2
	<i>Kuntaur Rural</i>	91.9	3.8
	<i>Janjangbureh Urban</i>	53.0	22.4
	<i>Janjangbureh Rural</i>	63.0	8.4
	<i>Basse Urban</i>	44.4	7.9
	<i>Basse Rural</i>	63.3	8.0
Poverty gap	<i>Banjul Urban</i>	1.5	0.9
	<i>KMC urban</i>	11.4	1.7
	<i>Brikama Urban</i>	16.2	4.7
	<i>Brikama Rural</i>	20.6	2.8
	<i>Mansakonko Urban</i>	29.6	8.4
	<i>Mansakonko Rural</i>	13.6	3.3
	<i>Kerewan Urban</i>	16.5	6.5
	<i>Kerewan Rural</i>	32.8	5.2
	<i>Kuntaur Urban</i>	21.6	5.6
	<i>Kuntaur Rural</i>	46.4	4.0
	<i>Janjangbureh Urban</i>	12.5	5.7
	<i>Janjangbureh Rural</i>	23.8	5.3
	<i>Basse Urban</i>	7.9	3.0
	<i>Basse Rural</i>	25.2	5.6
Poverty severity	<i>Banjul Urban</i>	0.5	0.3
	<i>KMC urban</i>	5.1	0.9
	<i>Brikama Urban</i>	8.2	3.0
	<i>Brikama Rural</i>	11.5	2.0
	<i>Mansakonko Urban</i>	17.6	5.4
	<i>Mansakonko Rural</i>	5.0	1.9
	<i>Kerewan Urban</i>	8.0	4.7
	<i>Kerewan Rural</i>	19.9	4.6

	<i>Kuntaur Urban</i>	10.6	3.3
	<i>Kuntaur Rural</i>	26.1	3.1
	<i>Janjangbureh Urban</i>	3.3	1.5
	<i>Janjangbureh Rural</i>	11.4	3.3
	<i>Basse Urban</i>	3.2	1.6
	<i>Basse Rural</i>	12.7	3.9
Watts index	<i>Banjul Urban</i>	1.9	1.1
	<i>KMC urban</i>	15.7	2.5
	<i>Brikama Urban</i>	23.7	7.8
	<i>Brikama Rural</i>	32.2	5.2
	<i>Mansakonko Urban</i>	47.4	14.4
	<i>Mansakonko Rural</i>	17.3	4.9
	<i>Kerewan Urban</i>	23.8	11.5
	<i>Kerewan Rural</i>	56.1	12.6
	<i>Kuntaur Urban</i>	30.3	8.4
	<i>Kuntaur Rural</i>	69.7	7.2
	<i>Janjangbureh Urban</i>	14.5	6.6
	<i>Janjangbureh Rural</i>	33.4	8.4
	<i>Basse Urban</i>	10.5	4.3
	<i>Basse Rural</i>	37.2	9.9

Note: Based on the lower line

Table 8: Poverty by domain

Poverty	Domains	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Banjul+ Kanifing	29.1	3.6
	Other urban	45.9	5.1
	Rural	60.6	2.8
Poverty gap	Banjul+ Kanifing	10.2	1.5
	Other urban	16.2	2.7
	Rural	25.7	1.9
Poverty severity	Banjul+ Kanifing	4.6	0.8
	Other urban	8.0	1.8
	Rural	14.1	1.5
Watts index	Banjul+ Kanifing	14.1	2.2
	Other urban	23.6	4.6
	Rural	39.9	3.8

Note: Based on the lower line

Table 9: Poverty by area

Poverty	Area	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Urban	39.6	3.1
	Rural	67.8	2.6
9Poverty gap	Urban	14.8	1.5
	Rural	30.5	2.0
Poverty severity	Urban	7.3	0.9
	Rural	17.4	1.6
Watts index	Urban	21.4	2.4
	Rural	48.4	4.1

Note: Based on the upper line

Table 10: Poverty by gender of the household head

Poverty	Gender	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Male	34.8	3.4
	Female	53.5	2.2
Poverty gap	Male	11.6	1.5
	Female	22.2	1.5
Poverty severity	Male	5.3	0.9
	Female	11.9	1.1
Watts index	Male	16.1	2.3
	Female	34.0	2.9

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 11: Poverty by ethnicity of the household head

Poverty	Ethnicity	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Mandinka	59.8	3.4
	Fula	55.6	4.3
	Wolof	51.3	3.3
	Jola	33.3	4.3
	Sarahulleh	34.6	7.8
	Sererr	34.5	6.6
	Others	52.4	4.6
Poverty gap	Mandinka	25.3	2.5
	Fula	21.7	2.7
	Wolof	19.5	1.8
	Jola	13.9	2.4
	Sarahulleh	11.3	3.2

	Sererr	9.1	2.0
	Others	25.4	3.4
Poverty severity	Mandinka	13.7	1.9
	Fula	10.8	2.0
	Wollof	10.0	1.2
	Jola	7.5	1.8
	Sarahulleh	4.8	2.1
	Sererr	3.1	0.7
	Others	14.9	2.7
Watts index	Mandinka	39.0	4.9
	Fula	31.4	5.1
	Wollof	29.0	3.1
	Jola	21.6	4.7
	Sarahulleh	15.4	5.2
	Sererr	11.4	2.4
	Others	40.8	7.0

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 12: Poverty by age of the household head

Poverty index	Age group	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	15-29	35.0	4.9
	30-39	42.8	3.3
	40-49	47.1	2.9
	50+	57.4	2.8
Poverty gap	15-29	12.7	2.7
	30-39	17.1	1.9
	40-49	18.7	1.6
	50+	23.9	1.8
Poverty severity	15-29	6.8	2.0
	30-39	8.9	1.3
	40-49	9.8	1.1
	50+	12.8	1.4
Watt's index	15-29	19.5	5.0
	30-39	25.4	3.3
	40-49	28.0	3.0
	50+	36.7	3.7

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 13: Poverty by occupation of the household head

Occupation	Occupation	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Highly qualified white collared	36.8	5.5
	Median qualified white collared	40.9	6.2
	Service and sales worker	27.8	4.7
	Peasant agric. Worker	68.3	7.2

	Craft & related trade worker	51.9	5.2
	Unqualified worker	58.2	3.0
	Unemployed	54.6	4.6
	Inactive	38.8	6.6
	Not stated	41.7	6.0
Poverty gap	Highly qualified white collared	14.4	2.6
	Median qualified white collared	16.4	3.7
	Service and sales worker	9.2	2.2
	Peasant agric. Worker	29.9	4.2
	Craft & related trade worker	21.0	2.8
	Unqualified worker	24.3	1.9
	Unemployed	20.1	3.0
	Inactive	17.4	3.8
	Not stated	18.0	3.5
Poverty severity	Highly qualified white collared	8.0	1.8
	Median qualified white collared	9.1	3.1
	Service and sales worker	4.9	1.5
	Peasant agric. Worker	15.9	2.9
	Craft & related trade worker	10.8	1.8
	Unqualified worker	12.9	1.4
	Unemployed	10.1	2.2
	Inactive	10.0	2.8
	Not stated	10.1	2.6
Watt's index	Highly qualified white collared	22.5	4.6
	Median qualified white collared	27.9	9.4
	Service and sales worker	13.7	3.7
	Peasant agric. Worker	45.0	7.5
	Craft & related trade worker	30.6	4.5
	Unqualified worker	36.5	3.6
	Unemployed	29.6	5.6
	Inactive	30.1	8.3
	Not stated	28.2	6.5

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 14: Poverty by working industry of the household head

Poverty index	Industry	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Agriculture and fishing	68.5	3.4
	Manufacturing and energy	43.5	6.5
	Construction	57.8	6.5
	Trade, hotels and restaurants	41.7	4.1
	Transport and communication	44.9	6.3
	Private and public financial admn.	45.4	6.2
	Social and personal service	39.8	4.1
	Not stated	46.5	3.4
Poverty gap	Agriculture and fishing	29.1	2.3

	Manufacturing and energy	19.4	4.0
	Construction	27.8	4.2
	Trade, hotels and restaurants	13.5	1.8
	Transport and communication	21.6	4.1
	Private and public financial admn.	21.0	3.6
	Social and personal service	15.7	2.5
	Not stated	17.9	1.9
Poverty severity	Agriculture and fishing	15.5	1.8
	Manufacturing and energy	10.9	2.8
	Construction	15.6	3.0
	Trade, hotels and restaurants	6.1	1.0
	Transport and communication	12.7	2.9
	Private and public financial admn.	11.8	2.4
	Social and personal service	9.0	1.9
	Not stated	9.1	1.3
Watt's index	Agriculture and fishing	43.8	4.6
	Manufacturing and energy	30.5	7.3
	Construction	42.2	7.2
	Trade, hotels and restaurants	18.6	2.7
	Transport and communication	34.0	7.2
	Private and public financial admn.	32.6	6.2
	Social and personal service	25.9	5.3
	Not stated	27.1	3.6

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 15: Poverty by marital status of the household head

Poverty	Marital status	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Never married	29.0	9.3
	Married	52.4	2.2
	Divorced/Separated	42.3	6.8
	Widowed	36.7	5.6
Poverty gap	Never married	10.1	3.0
	Married	21.5	1.4
	Divorced/Separated	17.6	3.1
	Widowed	11.8	2.3
Poverty severity	Never married	4.5	1.7
	Married	11.5	1.1
	Divorced/Separated	8.8	1.8
	Widowed	5.3	1.2
Watts index	Never married	14.0	4.5
	Married	32.9	2.8
	Divorced/Separated	25.1	4.6
	Widowed	16.0	3.3

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 16: Poverty by marriage type of the household head

Poverty	Union type	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Monogamous	43.1	2.5
	Polygamous	61.4	3.0
	Not married	35.5	7.4
Poverty gap	Monogamous	16.9	1.6
	Polygamous	25.7	2.0
	Not married	15.9	3.5
Poverty severity	Monogamous	9.1	1.2
	Polygamous	13.5	1.4
	Not married	8.2	2.0
Watts index	Monogamous	26.3	3.3
	Polygamous	38.6	3.7
	Not married	22.9	5.2

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 17: Poverty by housing status of the household head

Poverty	Housing status	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Owning	37.1	5.5
	Renting	57.4	2.4
	Provided rent free	23.0	2.7
Poverty gap	Owning	15.1	2.6
	Renting	23.8	1.6
	Provided rent free	7.1	1.0
Poverty severity	Owning	7.6	1.6
	Renting	12.8	1.2
	Provided rent free	3.1	0.5
Watts index	Owning	22.3	4.3
	Renting	36.4	3.2
	Provided rent free	9.7	1.5

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 18: Poverty by subjective poverty status of the household head

Poverty	Poverty status	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Extremely poor	64.6	4.8
	Poor	40.9	4.5
	Non poor	53.4	2.3
Poverty gap	Extremely poor	26.6	2.8
	Poor	17.8	2.8
	Non poor	21.5	1.5
Poverty severity	Extremely poor	14.0	1.9
	Poor	10.1	2.1
	Non poor	11.3	1.1
Watts index	Extremely poor	39.5	4.7
	Poor	28.2	5.3
	Non poor	32.7	2.8

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 19: Poverty by education of the household head

Poverty	Education	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	No education	58.2	2.4
	Education	33.8	3.8
Poverty gap	No education	24.0	1.6
	Education	13.3	1.9
Poverty severity	No education	12.7	1.2
	Education	7.1	1.2
Watts index	No education	36.3	3.0
	Education	20.7	3.5

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 20: Poverty by literacy status of the household head

Poverty	Literacy status	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Non-literate	59.1	...
	Literate	28.7	...
Poverty gap	Non-literate	24.6	...
	Literate	10.6	...
Poverty severity	Non-literate	12.9	...
	Literate	5.2	...
Watts index	Non-literate	37.0	...
	Literate	15.3	...

Note: Based on lower poverty line

... - Missing SE due to stratum with single sampling unit

C. Results with the upper poverty line

Table 21: Poverty by Local Government Area (LGA)

Poverty	LGA	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Banjul	7.6	4.8
	Kanifing	37.6	4.1
	Brikama	56.7	4.1
	Mansakonko	62.6	6.9
	Kerewan	69.8	4.8
	Kuntaur	94.9	2.0
	Janjangbureh	75.7	6.0
	Basse	67.9	6.6
Poverty gap	Banjul	2.2	1.2
	Kanifing	14.1	1.9
	Brikama	24.2	2.7
	Mansakonko	21.9	3.6
	Kerewan	35.1	4.6
	Kuntaur	50.9	3.6
	Janjangbureh	29.0	5.0
	Basse	28.4	5.0
Poverty severity	Banjul	0.8	0.5
	Kanifing	6.8	1.1
	Brikama	13.7	1.9
	Mansakonko	10.0	2.2
	Kerewan	21.6	4.2
	Kuntaur	30.5	3.1
	Janjangbureh	14.4	3.5
	Basse	15.0	3.7
Watts index	Banjul	2.7	1.5
	Kanifing	20.0	2.9
	Brikama	38.2	5.1
	Mansakonko	30.6	5.7
	Kerewan	60.5	11.5
	Kuntaur	79.6	7.1
	Janjangbureh	41.4	8.4
	Basse	42.7	9.3

Note: Based on the upper line

Table 22: Poverty by strata

Poverty	Strata	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	<i>Banjul Urban</i>	7.6	4.8
	<i>KMC urban</i>	37.6	4.1
	<i>Brikama Urban</i>	53.6	8.8
	<i>Brikama Rural</i>	57.1	4.5
	<i>Mansakonko Urban</i>	75.7	7.3
	<i>Mansakonko Rural</i>	59.9	8.1
	<i>Kerewan Urban</i>	50.7	11.2
	<i>Kerewan Rural</i>	73.0	5.1
	<i>Kuntaur Urban</i>	64.4	6.3
	<i>Kuntaur Rural</i>	96.7	2.0
	<i>Janjangbureh Urban</i>	67.5	17.8
	<i>Janjangbureh Rural</i>	76.3	6.4
	<i>Basse Urban</i>	52.2	9.7
	<i>Basse Rural</i>	70.0	7.6
Poverty gap	<i>Banjul Urban</i>	2.2	1.2
	<i>KMC urban</i>	14.1	1.9
	<i>Brikama Urban</i>	20.7	5.3
	<i>Brikama Rural</i>	24.7	3.0
	<i>Mansakonko Urban</i>	35.2	8.6
	<i>Mansakonko Rural</i>	19.1	3.8
	<i>Kerewan Urban</i>	20.7	6.9
	<i>Kerewan Rural</i>	37.5	5.1
	<i>Kuntaur Urban</i>	26.8	5.8
	<i>Kuntaur Rural</i>	52.3	3.7
	<i>Janjangbureh Urban</i>	19.1	7.8
	<i>Janjangbureh Rural</i>	29.7	5.3
	<i>Basse Urban</i>	13.6	3.2
	<i>Basse Rural</i>	30.4	5.8
Poverty severity	<i>Banjul Urban</i>	0.8	0.5
	<i>KMC urban</i>	6.8	1.1
	<i>Brikama Urban</i>	10.9	3.5
	<i>Brikama Rural</i>	14.1	2.2
	<i>Mansakonko Urban</i>	21.4	6.2
	<i>Mansakonko Rural</i>	7.6	2.2
	<i>Kerewan Urban</i>	10.7	5.2

	<i>Kerewan Rural</i>	23.5	4.7
	<i>Kuntaur Urban</i>	14.1	3.9
	<i>Kuntaur Rural</i>	31.5	3.3
	<i>Janjangbureh Urban</i>	6.5	2.9
	<i>Janjangbureh Rural</i>	15.0	3.8
	<i>Basse Urban</i>	5.1	1.9
	<i>Basse Rural</i>	16.2	4.3
Watts index	<i>Banjul Urban</i>	2.7	1.5
	<i>KMC urban</i>	20.0	2.9
	<i>Brikama Urban</i>	31.0	9.0
	<i>Brikama Rural</i>	39.3	5.6
	<i>Mansakonko Urban</i>	57.8	15.8
	<i>Mansakonko Rural</i>	24.9	5.8
	<i>Kerewan Urban</i>	30.8	12.8
	<i>Kerewan Rural</i>	65.4	13.1
	<i>Kuntaur Urban</i>	39.1	9.4
	<i>Kuntaur Rural</i>	82.0	7.4
	<i>Janjangbureh Urban</i>	23.5	9.7
	<i>Janjangbureh Rural</i>	42.8	9.1
	<i>Basse Urban</i>	17.8	4.9
	<i>Basse Rural</i>	45.9	10.8

Note: Based on the upper line%

Table 23: Poverty by domain

Poverty	Domain	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Banjul+ Kanifing	34.0	3.7
	Other urban	56.0	5.0
	Rural	67.8	2.6
Poverty gap	Banjul+ Kanifing	12.7	1.7
	Other urban	21.1	3.0
	Rural	30.5	2.0
Poverty severity	Banjul+ Kanifing	6.1	1.0
	Other urban	10.8	2.0
	Rural	17.4	1.6
Watts index	Banjul+ Kanifing	18.0	2.6
	Other urban	31.2	5.2
	Rural	48.4	4.1

Note: Based on the upper line

Table 24: Poverty by gender of the household head

Poverty	Gender	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Male	40.7	3.8
	Female	60.5	2.0
Poverty gap	Male	14.8	1.7
	Female	26.5	1.5
Poverty severity	Male	7.1	1.0
	Female	14.8	1.2
Watts index	Male	21.1	2.7
	Female	41.5	3.1

Note: Based on upper poverty line

Table 25: Poverty by ethnicity of the household head

Poverty	Ethnicity	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Mandinka	67.3	3.0
	Fula	66.4	3.5
	Wollof	57.5	3.2
	Jola	36.5	5.2
	Sarahulleh	43.0	8.6
	Sererr	41.1	4.8
	Others	58.7	4.4
Poverty gap	Mandinka	30.2	2.5
	Fula	26.4	2.7
	Wollof	23.9	1.9
	Jola	16.5	2.6
	Sarahulleh	14.7	3.5
	Sererr	12.5	2.4
	Others	29.2	3.4
Poverty severity	Mandinka	17.0	2.0
	Fula	13.8	2.2
	Wollof	12.7	1.3
	Jola	9.3	1.9
	Sarahulleh	6.7	2.3
	Sererr	4.9	1.0
	Others	17.7	2.8
Watts index	Mandinka	47.5	5.2
	Fula	39.3	5.4
	Wollof	36.2	3.4
	Jola	26.3	5.1
	Sarahulleh	20.6	5.7
	Sererr	16.2	3.1

Others	48.2	7.4
--------	------	-----

Note: Based on upper poverty line

Table 26: Poverty by marital status of the household head

Poverty	Marital status	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Never married	31.9	9.4
	Married	59.4	2.1
	Divorced/Separated	46.6	6.7
	Widowed	43.4	5.9
Poverty gap	Never married	12.6	3.7
	Married	25.8	1.5
	Divorced/Separated	20.8	3.5
	Widowed	15.3	2.6
Poverty severity	Never married	6.1	2.0
	Married	14.3	1.1
	Divorced/Separated	11.2	2.1
	Widowed	7.2	1.5
Watts index	Never married	18.0	5.4
	Married	40.3	3.0
	Divorced/Separated	30.8	5.3
	Widowed	21.3	3.9

Note: Based on upper poverty line

Table 27: Poverty by union type of the household head

Poverty	Union type	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Monogamous	49.9	2.4
	Polygamous	68.4	2.7
	Not married	41.4	6.8
Poverty gap	Monogamous	20.6	1.6
	Polygamous	30.6	2.0
	Not married	18.6	3.8
Poverty severity	Monogamous	11.4	1.3
	Polygamous	16.9	1.6
	Not married	10.3	2.4
Watts index	Monogamous	32.4	3.6
	Polygamous	47.2	4.0
	Not married	27.8	6.0

Note: Based on upper poverty line

Table 28: Poverty by housing status of the household head

Poverty	Housing status	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Owning	46.4	5.2

	Renting	64.6	2.2
	Provided rent free	26.9	2.7
Poverty gap	Owning	18.4	2.9
	Renting	28.4	1.6
	Provided rent free	9.4	1.2
Poverty severity	Owning	9.7	1.8
	Renting	15.9	1.3
	Provided rent free	4.3	0.7
Watt's index	Owning	27.8	4.8
	Renting	44.5	3.4
	Provided rent free	13.0	1.8

Note: Based on upper poverty line

Table 29: Poverty by subjective poverty status of the household head

Poverty	Poverty status	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Extremely poor	71.3	4.3
	Poor	45.3	4.3
	Non poor	60.9	2.1
Poverty gap	Extremely poor	31.8	3.0
	Poor	20.9	3.0
	Non poor	26.0	1.5
Poverty severity	Extremely poor	17.5	2.1
	Poor	12.3	2.3
	Non poor	14.2	1.2
Watt's index	Extremely poor	48.5	5.2
	Poor	33.8	5.8
	Non poor	40.3	3.0

Note: Based on upper poverty line

Table 30: Poverty by education of the household head

Poverty	Education	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	No education	65.1	2.1

	Education	40.6	3.7
Poverty gap	No education	28.7	1.6
	Education	16.2	2.1
Poverty severity	No education	15.9	1.3
	Education	8.9	1.4
Watt's index	No education	44.5	3.3
	Education	25.6	3.8

Note: Based on upper poverty line

Table 31: Poverty by household size

Poverty index	Household size	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	1-3	10.7	2.0
	4-6	28.0	2.6
	7-9	43.2	3.0
	10+	64.1	2.8
Poverty gap	1-3	3.7	0.8
	4-6	8.7	1.0
	7-9	15.0	1.4
	10+	27.9	1.9
Poverty severity	1-3	1.7	0.4
	4-6	3.9	0.5
	7-9	7.1	0.9
	10+	15.4	1.5
Watt's index	1-3	5.1	1.2
	4-6	12.2	1.6
	7-9	21.4	2.4
	10+	43.3	3.8

Note: Based on lower poverty line

Table 32: Poverty by household size

Poverty index	Household size	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	1-3	13.3	2.2
	4-6	35.2	2.7
	7-9	50.0	3.0
	10+	71.1	2.5
Poverty gap	1-3	4.7	0.9
	4-6	11.5	1.2
	7-9	18.9	1.5
	10+	32.9	1.9
Poverty severity	1-3	2.3	0.5

	4-6	5.3	0.7
	7-9	9.4	1.0
	10+	18.9	1.6
Watt's index	1-3	6.7	1.4
	4-6	16.3	1.8
	7-9	27.6	2.7
	10+	52.3	4.0

Note: Based on upper poverty line

Table 33: Poverty by age of the household head

Poverty index	Age	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	15-29	39.5	4.9
	30-39	50.3	3.2
	40-49	53.2	2.9
	50+	64.6	2.5
Poverty gap	15-29	15.7	2.8
	30-39	20.7	2.0
	40-49	22.7	1.7
	50+	28.5	1.9
Poverty severity	15-29	8.5	2.1
	30-39	11.2	1.4
	40-49	12.4	1.3
	50+	15.9	1.5
Watt's index	15-29	24.3	5.5
	30-39	31.5	3.6
	40-49	34.8	3.2
	50+	44.8	4.0

Note: Upper poverty line

Table 34: Poverty by occupation of the household head

Poverty index	Occupation	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Highly qualified white collared	43.8	5.4
	Median qualified white collared	51.7	6.1
	Service and sales worker	31.6	5.0
	Peasant agric. Worker	73.4	6.5
	Craft & related trade worker	57.7	5.1
	Unqualified worker	65.5	2.5
	Unemployed	64.6	4.1
	Inactive	42.3	6.7
	Not stated	44.0	6.1

Poverty gap	Highly qualified white collared	17.6	2.8
	Median qualified white collared	20.2	3.7
	Service and sales worker	11.8	2.4
	Peasant agric. Worker	35.0	4.4
	Craft & related trade worker	25.2	3.0
	Unqualified worker	29.1	1.9
	Unemployed	24.9	3.1
	Inactive	20.3	4.0
	Not stated	21.1	3.7
Poverty severity	Highly qualified white collared	9.9	2.0
	Median qualified white collared	11.2	3.2
	Service and sales worker	6.2	1.7
	Peasant agric. Worker	19.7	3.2
	Craft & related trade worker	13.6	2.0
	Unqualified worker	16.1	1.5
	Unemployed	13.0	2.4
	Inactive	12.0	3.0
	Not stated	12.3	2.8
Watt's index	Highly qualified white collared	27.8	5.1
	Median qualified white collared	34.1	9.9
	Service and sales worker	17.7	4.1
	Peasant agric. Worker	54.4	8.1
	Craft & related trade worker	37.9	5.0
	Unqualified worker	44.8	3.9
	Unemployed	37.4	6.0
	Inactive	35.5	8.9
	Not stated	33.9	7.1

Note: Upper poverty line

Table 35: Poverty by working industry of the household head

Poverty index	Industry	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count index	Agriculture and fishing	76.4	2.7
	Manufacturing and energy	50.0	6.4
	Construction	63.6	6.6
	Trade, hotels and restaurants	48.8	4.1
	Transport and communication	52.4	6.2
	Private and public financial admn.	49.2	6.2
	Social and personal service	45.4	4.4
	Not stated	53.5	3.3
Poverty gap	Agriculture and fishing	34.5	2.3
	Manufacturing and energy	22.7	4.1
	Construction	32.0	4.2
	Trade, hotels and restaurants	17.6	2.0
	Transport and communication	24.9	4.2
	Private and public financial admn.	24.2	3.9
	Social and personal service	19.1	2.6
	Not stated	21.8	2.0
Poverty severity	Agriculture and fishing	19.3	1.9
	Manufacturing and energy	13.3	3.1
	Construction	18.9	3.2
	Trade, hotels and restaurants	8.3	1.2
	Transport and communication	15.1	3.2
	Private and public financial admn.	14.4	2.7
	Social and personal service	11.0	2.1
	Not stated	11.6	1.5
Watt's index	Agriculture and fishing	53.5	4.9
	Manufacturing and energy	36.6	7.9
	Construction	50.4	7.8
	Trade, hotels and restaurants	24.6	3.1
	Transport and communication	40.4	7.9
	Private and public financial admn.	38.9	6.9
	Social and personal service	31.6	5.7
	Not stated	33.6	3.9

Note: Upper poverty line

D: Preliminary results for groundnut producers

Table 36: Percentage distribution of groundnut & non-producers

Producer	Estimate
Groundnut producers	28.0
Non-Groundnut producers	72.0
All Producers	100.0

Note: Figures are in percentage

Table 37: Mean per capita living standard by producers and non-producers of groundnut, and by area

Producers	Area	Estimate	Std. Err.
Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	7,862	1861
	<i>Rural</i>	5,260	335
Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	11,478	617
	<i>Rural</i>	9,241	902

Note: Figures are in Dalasis

Table 38: Mean per capita living standard by producer & non-producer of groundnut

Producer	Estimate	Std. Err.
Groundnut producers	5,393	339
Non-Groundnut producers	10,269	520

Note: Figures are in dalasis

Table 39: Poverty indicators by producer & non-producer of groundnut

Poverty Indices	Producer	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count	Groundnut producers	68.3	3.2
	Non-Groundnut producers	40.5	2.5
Poverty gap	Groundnut producers	29.5	2.3
	Non-Groundnut producers	15.6	1.3
Poverty severity	Groundnut producers	16.0	1.7
	Non-Groundnut producers	8.1	0.9
Watts index	Groundnut producers	44.9	4.3
	Non-Groundnut producers	23.8	2.5

*Note: Based on lower poverty line
: Figures are in percentage*

Table 40: Poverty indicators by producer & non-producer of groundnut

Poverty Indices	Producer	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count	Groundnut producers	76.6	2.7
	Non-Groundnut producers	46.2	2.5
Poverty gap	Groundnut producers	35.0	2.3
	Non-Groundnut producers	19.0	1.4
Poverty severity	Groundnut producers	19.8	1.9
	Non-Groundnut producers	10.3	1.0
Watts index	Groundnut producers	54.6	4.6
	Non-Groundnut producers	29.4	2.7

*Note: Based on upper poverty line
: Figures are in percentage*

Table 41: Mean per capita living standard by producer and non-producer of groundnut and LGA

Producer	LGA	Estimate	Std. Err.
Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	13,169	4,737
	<i>Brikama</i>	5,490	471
	<i>Mansakonko</i>	5,825	447
	<i>Kerewan</i>	4,851	521
	<i>Kuntaur</i>	3,391	309
	<i>Janjangbureh</i>	5,265	607
	<i>Basse</i>	6,316	876
Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Banjul</i>	22,086	2,730
	<i>Kanifing</i>	11,067	777
	<i>Brikama</i>	8,875	811
	<i>Mansakonko</i>	12,085	4,818
	<i>Kerewan</i>	9,096	2,142

<i>Kuntaur</i>	4,309	889
<i>Janjangbureh</i>	6,558	1,059
<i>Basse</i>	11,009	1,595

Note: Figures are in dalasis

Table 42: Poverty indicators by producer and non-producer of groundnut and LGA

Poverty indices	Producer	LGA	Estimate	Std. Err.		
Head count	Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	34.6	19.6		
		<i>Brikama</i>	58.8	7.3		
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	68.9	7.9		
		<i>Kerewan</i>	72.4	5.0		
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	92.1	4.0		
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	62.5	7.9		
		<i>Basse</i>	64.3	7.7		
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Banjul</i>	6.6	4.0		
		<i>Kanifing</i>	32.1	4.0		
		<i>Brikama</i>	46.0	4.7		
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	52.3	8.1		
		<i>Kerewan</i>	47.8	7.6		
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	81.2	8.2		
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	61.5	13.7		
		<i>Basse</i>	41.2	8.1		
		Poverty gap	Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	11.9	8.3
				<i>Brikama</i>	24.4	4.7
<i>Mansakonko</i>	18.0			3.6		
<i>Kerewan</i>	35.3			4.4		
<i>Kuntaur</i>	46.4			4.1		
<i>Janjangbureh</i>	24.3			5.3		
<i>Basse</i>	25.6			5.5		
Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Banjul</i>		1.5	0.9		
	<i>Kanifing</i>		11.4	1.7		
	<i>Brikama</i>		18.7	2.7		
	<i>Mansakonko</i>		16.0	4.8		
	<i>Kerewan</i>		22.2	5.5		
	<i>Kuntaur</i>		45.7	7.5		
	<i>Janjangbureh</i>		19.0	5.3		
	<i>Basse</i>		8.4	3.1		
	Poverty severity		Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	5.7	4.4
				<i>Brikama</i>	13.8	3.6
<i>Mansakonko</i>		7.3		2.2		
<i>Kerewan</i>		20.6		3.9		
<i>Kuntaur</i>		26.0		3.2		
<i>Janjangbureh</i>		11.7		3.4		
<i>Basse</i>		12.9		3.9		

	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Banjul</i>	0.5	0.3
		<i>Kanifing</i>	5.1	0.9
		<i>Brikama</i>	10.3	1.8
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	7.1	3.1
		<i>Kerewan</i>	13.9	4.7
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	28.6	5.8
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	8.0	3.1
		<i>Basse</i>	3.6	1.8
Watts index	Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	16.4	11.8
		<i>Brikama</i>	38.8	9.1
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	23.8	5.4
		<i>Kerewan</i>	56.9	9.8
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	69.5	7.3
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	34.1	8.4
		<i>Basse</i>	37.7	9.9
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Banjul</i>	1.9	1.1
		<i>Kanifing</i>	15.7	2.5
		<i>Brikama</i>	28.9	4.8
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	22.4	7.8
		<i>Kerewan</i>	41.3	13.8
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	73.1	13.5
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	25.5	7.9
		<i>Basse</i>	11.3	4.6

*Note: Based on lower poverty line
: Figures are in percentage*

Table 43: Poverty indicators by producer and non-producer of groundnut and LGA

Poverty indices	Producer	LGA	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count	Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	34.6	19.6
		<i>Brikama</i>	70.4	5.2
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	74.5	7.4
		<i>Kerewan</i>	77.8	4.5
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	96.7	2.0
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	78.2	6.1
		<i>Basse</i>	71.2	7.5
		Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Banjul</i>	7.6
	<i>Kanifing</i>		37.7	4.0
	<i>Brikama</i>		52.4	4.6
	<i>Mansakonko</i>		56.2	8.3
	<i>Kerewan</i>		54.8	7.2
	<i>Kuntaur</i>		84.7	6.5
	<i>Janjangbureh</i>		70.1	12.9
	<i>Basse</i>		46.7	9.6
	Poverty gap	Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	14.6
<i>Brikama</i>			29.6	4.7
<i>Mansakonko</i>			24.9	3.9
<i>Kerewan</i>			40.3	4.3
<i>Kuntaur</i>			52.3	3.8
<i>Janjangbureh</i>			30.4	5.3
<i>Basse</i>			30.8	5.7
Non-Groundnut producers			<i>Banjul</i>	2.2
		<i>Kanifing</i>	14.1	1.9
		<i>Brikama</i>	22.5	2.9
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	20.7	5.2
		<i>Kerewan</i>	25.9	5.6
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	50.4	7.3
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	24.9	6.0
		<i>Basse</i>	13.3	3.3
Poverty severity		Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	7.4
	<i>Brikama</i>		16.9	3.8
	<i>Mansakonko</i>		10.7	2.5
	<i>Kerewan</i>		24.7	4.0
	<i>Kuntaur</i>		31.4	3.4
	<i>Janjangbureh</i>		15.4	3.8
	<i>Basse</i>		16.5	4.3
	Non-Groundnut producers		<i>Banjul</i>	0.8
		<i>Kanifing</i>	6.8	1.1
		<i>Brikama</i>	12.7	2.0
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	9.8	3.5
		<i>Kerewan</i>	16.3	4.8

		<i>Kuntaur</i>	33.2	6.1
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	11.4	3.6
		<i>Basse</i>	5.5	2.1
Watts index	Groundnut producers	<i>Kanifing</i>	20.8	13.9
		<i>Brikama</i>	47.6	9.7
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	33.6	6.2
		<i>Kerewan</i>	67.0	10.2
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	81.9	7.6
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	43.7	9.1
		<i>Basse</i>	46.6	10.7
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Banjul</i>	2.7	1.5
		<i>Kanifing</i>	20.0	2.9
		<i>Brikama</i>	35.5	5.3
		<i>Mansakonko</i>	29.5	8.8
		<i>Kerewan</i>	48.2	14.5
		<i>Kuntaur</i>	84.3	14.3
		<i>Janjangbureh</i>	34.3	9.1
		<i>Basse</i>	17.8	5.1

*Note: Based on upper poverty line
: Figures are in percentage*

Table 44: Poverty indicators by producers and non-producers of groundnut and area

Poverty indices	Producers	Area	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count	Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	56.9	8.3
		<i>Rural</i>	68.9	3.3
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	32.1	3.1
		<i>Rural</i>	50.0	4.0
Poverty gap	Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	23.5	4.9
		<i>Rural</i>	29.8	2.4
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	11.0	1.3
		<i>Rural</i>	20.7	2.4
Poverty severity	Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	12.9	3.8
		<i>Rural</i>	16.1	1.8
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	5.0	0.7
		<i>Rural</i>	11.7	1.8
Watts index	Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	36.2	9.3
		<i>Rural</i>	45.3	4.5
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	15.3	1.9
		<i>Rural</i>	33.4	4.9

*Note: Based on lower poverty line
: Figures are in percentage*

Table 45: Poverty indicators by producers and non-producers of groundnut and area

Poverty indices	Producers	Area	Estimate	Std. Err.
Head count	Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	63.9	8.9
		<i>Rural</i>	77.3	2.9
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	38.3	3.1
		<i>Rural</i>	55.3	3.9
Poverty gap	Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	28.8	5.1
		<i>Rural</i>	35.3	2.4
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	14.0	1.5
		<i>Rural</i>	24.6	2.6
Poverty severity	Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	16.3	4.0
		<i>Rural</i>	20.0	1.9
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	6.8	0.9
		<i>Rural</i>	14.3	1.9
Watts index	Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	45.3	10.0
		<i>Rural</i>	55.1	4.8
	Non-Groundnut producers	<i>Urban</i>	19.9	2.3
		<i>Rural</i>	40.3	5.3

*Note: Based on upper poverty line
: Figures are in percentage*

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE GAMBIA
CENTRAL STATISTICS DEPARTMENT / CBEMP

**INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEY ON CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE
AND POVERTY LEVEL ASSESSMENT - 2002/03**

PART ONE: HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE

A. DATA COLLECTION

Interviewer Date
Supervisor Checking date

B. DATA ENTRY

Operator Entry date
Supervisor Editing date
Operator Re-entry date

L.G.A.	Banjul	1	[]
	KMC	2	
	Brikama	3	
	Mansakonko	4	
	Kerewan	5	
	Kuntaur	6	
	Janjangbureh	7	
	Basse	8	

District name []

Area 1 - Urban 2 - Rural []

Quarter []

E.A. Number []

Sub-sample []

Selected household []

Name of Household Head

Time interview commenced [] Address:

Tel:

Survey form number for this household [] of []

Section 0: HOUSEHOLD PARTICULARS

No.	Questions	Categories & code	Code
1	Has the above household been identified and accepted to be interviewed?	Yes Y >> Q3 No, different household D } Refer to No, dwelling not found N } supervisor No, illness, death I } for repla- No, refusal R } cement and >> Q2 No, dwelling empty E No, Other O specify:	[]
2	HOUSEHOLD TO BE INTERVIEWED Name of head Address Telephone	Supervisor will code this question after assigning a new household for interview	[]

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD (Person responsible for main decisions)

No.	Questions	Categories & code	Code
3	Sex of the household head?	Male M Female F	[]
4	Is the head of household present?	Yes Y >> Q7 No N	[]
5	How long has he/she been absent?	Less than one week 1 Between 1 week and 1 mont 2 Between 1 and 3 months 3 More than 3 months 4	[]
6	In this person's absence, who is responsible for the main decisions?	Insert ID number after completing Q9	[]

INTERVIEW DETAILS

No.	Questions	Categories & code	Code
7	Language used by respondent at inte	Mandinka M Wollof W Fula F Other O specify:	[]
8	Interpreter?	Yes Y No N	[]

Write down the name of the head of the household and all persons who normally live and eat together in this household (6 out of last 12 months)

9	Name	ID Number
	Head	1
		2
		3
		4
		5
		6
		7
		8
		9
		10
		11
		12
		13
		14
		15
		16
		17
		18
		19
		20
		21
		22
		23
		24
		25
10a	Are there any other members of the household not now present who normally live and eat here such as persons temporarily away for marriage, seasonal work, illness, giving birth or school? (if 'yes', add these names to the list)	Yes Y No N []
10b	Are there any other persons who are part of the household because they acknowledge the Head's authority and who live in the household? (if 'yes', add these names to the list)	Yes Y No N []
10c	Are there any strange farmers or boarders/lodgers who have lived with this household for more than 6 months of the last year? (If 'yes', use a separate form for this/these person(s).)	Yes Y No N []
10d	Number of usual members of this household <input type="text"/>	

SECTION 5b:

LIVESTOCK

Does the household own livestock?

Yes Y
No N

(>> Section 6)

Type of livestock	1. Code	2. Does any member of the household own...? Yes Y No N	3. How many are owned by men?	4. How many are owned by women?	5. How many were owned by men 12 months ago?	6. How many were owned by women 12 months ago?	7. How many women own....?
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Horses	1						
Oxen	2						
Donkeys	3						
Cattle	4						
Sheep	5						
Goats	6						
Pigs	7						
Poultry	8						
Other, specify...	9						

Section 6: NON-FARM ENTERPRISE

Does this household conduct any non-farm enterprise(s) (including fishing)?

Yes Y
No N (>>Section 7)

For the three economically most important enterprises owned by the household

No.	Question	Categories and Codes	Skip to	Enterprise No. 1	Enterprise No.2
1	What is the main activity of this enterprise(s)?	Describe	
		INDUSTRY CODE			
2	Who is responsible for the enterprise?	ID number			
3	ID of person interviewed	ID number			
4	Has this person received any training in entrepreneurship?	Yes Y	Q6a		
		No N			
5	Which organisation provided the training	IBAS I			
		GAWFA G Other, specify O			
6a	How long has this enterprise been operating? (If more than one year indicate years only. If less than	Years			
6b	one year indicate months only).	Months			
7	For how many months has the enterprise been operating for the past 12 months?	Months			
8	Does the income of this enterprise belong entirely to you and this household?	Entirely E	Q10		
		Partially P			
9	What percentage of the income of this enterprise goes to you and this household?	Indicate percentage			
10	Has the enterprise got a bank account?	Yes Y			
		No N			
11	Has the enterprise got a loan from any source?	Yes Y	Q13		
		No N			
12	Name the name of the institution or source	Bank B			
		IBAS I Osusu S GAWFA G NDEFA N VISACA V Other specify: O			

Section 6: NON-FARM ENTERPRISE continued

13	During the past 12 months how many persons have usually worked in this enterprise? (Include household members, apprentices and hired labour, but exclude person responsible).	Number				
14	Are formal contracts issued to any of the employees?	Yes No	Y N			
15	Do any of the employees receive paid leave?	Yes No	Y N			
16	Do any of the employee receive sick leave	Yes No	Y N			
17	How does the gross income of this enterprise over the last 12 months compare with the income of the year before?	This Year is: Higher Same Lower Not applicable	H S L N			
18	Does this enterprise have in place safety/fire protection equipment/measures?	Yes No	Y N			
19	What main type of waste did this enterprise generate?	Other Solid waste Liquid waste Chemical waste Clinical waste Other, specify	S L C H O			
20	How was this waste stored?	Dustbin Barrel Bucket Carton Sack/bag Other, specify	D B K C S O			
21	How was this waste finally disposed of?	Burning Buried Tipped Recycled Municipal council Private collector Other, specify	B U T R M P O			

Section 6a: ASSETS OF NON-FARM ENTERPRISE 1

ITEM	22. Code	23. Does this enterprise own...?	24. For how much would you be able to selltoday	25. Did the enterprise obtain any...during the past 12 months?	26. How much did the enterprise pay for the...that was obtained during the last 12 months	27. Did the enterprise sell any... during the past 12 months?	28. How much did the enterprise receive from the sale of...during the past 12 months?
		Yes Y No N >>Next Item	Amount	Yes Y No N >>Next Item	If Gift write 0 Amount	Yes Y No N >>Next Item	
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Building	1						
Land	2						
Equipment/ tools/machinery	3						
Stocks of goods and raw materials	4						
Bicycles	5						
Carts	6						
Cars, Vans, Buses	7						
Boats	8						
Other vehicles	9						
Other Specify	0						

Section 6b: INCOME AND EXPENDITURES OF NON-FARM ENTERPRISE 1

Income and Expenditure items	29. Code	30. During the past 12 months has the enterprise received for /spent on? Yes Y No N (>> Next item)	31. How much did you receive for / spend on..... during the last 12 months? Amount	32. During the past 12 months was this item ever unavailable to you when you wished to purchase or use it?		33. Calculated monthly income and expenditures Amount per month Item 31a x factor of time-unit		
				Time Unit	If Yes probe: OFTEN or just ONCE OR TWICE			Factors:
				Day D Week W Month M Year Y	Yes often 1 Yes once or twice 2 No 3	Day x 30 Week x 4.33 Month x 1 Year / 12		
Income	29	30	31a	31b	32	33a	33b	34
Income from cash sales	1							
Income from barter / exchange	2							
Household use of goods	3							
Rental income	4							
Other income	5							
						Total income per month <i>(sum of items 1 to 5 above)</i>		
Expenditures								
Hired labour	6							
Raw materials & articles for resale	7							
Rental of land / buildings	8							
Rent of machinery and vehicles	9							
Maintenance, repairs & parts	10							
Electricity and water	11							
Taxes, licences, etc.	12							
Interest/other charges on loans	13							
Other expenses	14							
						Total expenditure per month <i>(sum of items 6 to 14 above)</i>		
Q35: If gross profits are negative, please give reason:						Gross profits per month <i>(Income minus expenditure)</i>		

Section 6c: ASSETS OF NON-FARM ENTERPRISE 2

ITEM	22. Code	23. Does this enterprise own...?	24. For how much would you be able to selltoday	25. Did the enterprise obtain any...during the past 12 months?	26. How much did the enterprise pay for the...that was obtained during the last 12 months	27. Did the enterprise sell any... during the past 12 months?	28. How much did the enterprise receive from the sale of...during the past 12 months?
		Yes Y No N >>Next Item	Amount	Yes Y No N >>Next Item	If Gift write 0 Amount	Yes Y No N >>Next Item	
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Building	1						
Land	2						
Equipment/ tools/machinery	3						
Stocks of goods and raw materials	4						
Bicycles	5						
Carts	6						
Cars, Vans, Buses	7						
Boats	8						
Other vehicles	9						
Other Specify	0						

Section 6d: INCOME AND EXPENDITURES OF NON-FARM ENTERPRISE 2

Income and Expenditure items	29. Code	30. During the past 12 months has the enterprise received for /spent on? Yes Y No N (>> Next item)	31. How much did you receive for / spend on..... during the last 12 months? Amount	32. During the past 12 months was this item ever unavailable to you when you wished to purchase or use it?		33. Calculated monthly income and expenditures Amount per month Item 31a x factor of time-unit	34	
				Time Unit	If Yes probe: OFTEN or just ONCE OR TWICE			Factors:
				Day D Week W Month M Year Y	Yes often 1 Yes once or twice 2 No 3	Day x 30 Week x 4.33 Month x 1 Year / 12		
Income	29	30	31a	31b	32	33a	33b	34
Income from cash sales	1							
Income from barter / exchange	2							
Household use of goods	3							
Rental income	4							
Other income	5							
						Total income per month <i>(sum of items 1 to 5 above)</i>		
Expenditures								
Hired labour	6							
Raw materials & articles for resale	7							
Rental of land / buildings	8							
Rent of machinery and vehicles	9							
Maintenance, repairs & parts	10							
Electricity and water	11							
Taxes, licences, etc.	12							
Interest/other charges on loans	13							
Other expenses	14							
						Total expenditure per month <i>(sum of items 6 to 14 above)</i>		
Q35: If gross profits are negative, please give reason:						Gross profits per month <i>(Income minus expenditure)</i>		

Section 6e: ASSETS OF NON-FARM ENTERPRISE 3

ITEM	22. Code	23. Does this enterprise own...?	24. For how much would you be able to selltoday	25. Did the enterprise obtain any...during the past 12 months?	26. How much did the enterprise pay for the...that was obtained during the last 12 months	27. Did the enterprise sell any... during the past 12 months?	28. How much did the enterprise receive from the sale of...during the past 12 months?
		Yes Y No N >>Next Item	Amount	Yes Y No N >>Next Item	If Gift write 0 Amount	Yes Y No N >>Next Item	
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
Building	1						
Land	2						
Equipment/ tools/machinery	3						
Stocks of goods and raw materials	4						
Bicycles	5						
Carts	6						
Cars, Vans, Buses	7						
Boats	8						
Other vehicles	9						
Other Specify	0						

Section 6f: INCOME AND EXPENDITURES OF NON-FARM ENTERPRISE 3

Income and Expenditure items	29. Code	30. During the past 12 months has the enterprise received for /spent on? Yes Y No N (>> Next item)	31. How much did you receive for / spend on..... during the last 12 months? Amount	32. During the past 12 months was this item ever unavailable to you when you wished to purchase or use it?		33. Calculated monthly income and expenditures Amount per month Item 31a x factor of time-unit	34	
				Time Unit	If Yes probe: OFTEN or just ONCE OR TWICE			Factors:
				Day D Week W Month M Year Y	Yes often 1 Yes once or twice 2 No 3	Day x 30 Week x 4.33 Month x 1 Year / 12		
Income	29	30	31a	31b	32	33a	33b	34
Income from cash sales	1							
Income from barter / exchange	2							
Household use of goods	3							
Rental income	4							
Other income	5							
						Total income per month <i>(sum of items 1 to 5 above)</i>		
Expenditures								
Hired labour	6							
Raw materials & articles for resale	7							
Rental of land / buildings	8							
Rent of machinery and vehicles	9							
Maintenance, repairs & parts	10							
Electricity and water	11							
Taxes, licences, etc.	12							
Interest/other charges on loans	13							
Other expenses	14							
						Total expenditure per month <i>(sum of items 6 to 14 above)</i>		
Q35: If gross profits are negative, please give reason:						Gross profits per month <i>(Income minus expenditure)</i>		

SECTION 7: HOUSING

1. How many rooms does this household occupy?	2. On what basis does the household occupy the dwelling?	3. What is the main source of drinking water?	4. What is the main source of light?	5. What type of toilet has the dwelling got?	6. Main construction materials of outside walls?	7. Main roofing material	8. Main flooring material	9. How is this household's solid waste disposed of?
(Do not include bath-rooms, toilets & Kitchens)	Owning O Renting R Provided Rent Free F	Piped indoors/ compound PR Public stand pipe PU Well in compound WR Well with pump (public) WP Well without pump (public) WO Stream/River SR Other.specify... OS	Electricity E Kerosene K Candles C Solar S Other (Specify) O	Own flush toilet OF Shared flush toilet SF Own bucket/pan OB Shared bucket/pan SB Own pit latrine SP Public pit PP No Toilet NT Other.specify OR	Mud M Wood W Brick B Cement/ concrete C Thatched\ grass T Other,spec O	Thatch T Corrugated iron I Asbestos A Cement/ concrete C Other O	Mud/ earth M Wood W Tiles T Cement/ concrete C Other O	Burning B Buried U Tipped T Recycled R Municipal M Private firm P Municipal M Other,spec O
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	

SECTION 8: ENVIRONMENT

No.	Question	Categories and Codes	Code
1	What is your main environmental concern?	Coastal erosion CE Bush fires BF Deforestation DF Disposal of solid waste SW Dust DS Global warming GW Depletion of the ozone layer OL Other, specify OH	
2	Do you think the authorities are doing enough to arrest this environmental concern?	Yes Y No N	
3	What can you do to help arrest the problem? environmental management activity?		
4	Has any member of this household taken part in any	Yes Y No N	>>Q6
5	Which activity was it?	Tree planting TP Cleaning/set-setal CS Soil conservation SC Dyke construction DC Creating buffer to prevent bush fire CB Other, specify OH	
6	What is this household's main cooking fuel?	Firewood F Charcoal C Gas G Electricity E Solar S Other, specify O Don't Cook N	>>Q10
7	What is the main type of cooking stove used?	Three stones T Mud Stove U Kumba Gaye K Sinkirikuto S Cooker (gas, electric) C Gas Bottle G Other, specify O Not applicable N	
8	What other type of cooking fuel does this household use?	Firewood F Charcoal C Gas G Electricity E Solar S Other, specify O	
9	Where does this household obtain its main cooking fuel?	Bush B Unprotected forest U Protected forest P Retailer/supplier R NAWEC N Other, specify O	

SECTION 8: ENVIRONMENT Continued

10	How can we stop the destruction of our forests?	A. Promote alternative sources of household energy	YES Y	NO N	Don't Know D	A= B= C= D= E= F=
		B. Stop the cutting down of the remaining forests	Y	N	D	
		C. Reforestation	Y	N	D	
		D. Community forest	Y	N	D	
		E. Check the rate of growth of the human population	Y	N	D	
		F. Other, specify	Y	N	D	
		11	How do you find the quality of the air within your residential area?	Clean Polluted	C P	
12	What is polluting the air?	Bush fires Dust Pesticide Smoke from factories Household smoke Cigarette smoke Vehicles Waste dump site Other, specify	B D P F H C V W O			
13	How do you find the quality of your drinking water?	Clean Polluted	C P			Q15, if "C"
14	What is polluting the water?	Pesticides and fertilizers Factories Waste dump sites Septic tanks and pit latrines Salt water Other, specify	P F W T S O			
15	Now I would like you to tell me to what extent you agree or disagree about the following statements made by some people:					
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
15.1	Sand is an abundant natural resource and there should be no restriction on its mining	1	2	3	4	5
15.2	Over exploitation of natural resources e.g. sand, water, forest, etc. leads to deterioration of the environment	1	2	3	4	5
15.3	Communities have greater role in protecting the environment	1	2	3	4	5
15.4	Communities should contribute towards the maintenance of social amenities	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 9: PERCEPTION ABOUT POVERTY (To be answered by household heads or persons to represent them only)

1	What is poverty in your opinion?
2	What is the poverty status of your own household according to your own rating?	Extremely poor E Poor P Non-poor N
3	Give main reason for your response to Q2.

SECTION 12: RESPONDENTS TO THE SECOND ROUND

1. Which household members are mainly responsible for preparing food in the household	ID Number

2. Which household members are mainly responsible for making the household purchase?	ID Number

Time interview concluded

Thank the respondent and apologize for the time taken to respond to your question; and then remind him/her that you would like to meet appropriate persons for certain modules such as Non-farm enterprise, those with children under-5 for anthropometry as well as those for whom he/she could not give information about. Also let him/her know that you will be going back to the household for part two administration and the regular filling of the daily record form for a period of thirty (30) days.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE GAMBIA
CENTRAL STATISTICS DEPARTMENT / CBEMP

**INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEY ON CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE
AND POVERTY LEVEL ASSESSMENT - 2002/03**

PART TWO: HOUSEHOLD CONSUMPTION & EXPENDITURE QUESTIONNAIRE

A. DATA COLLECTION

Interviewer Date

Supervisor Checking date

B. DATA ENTRY

Operator Entry date

Supervisor Editing date

Operator Re-entry date

- | | | | |
|--------|--------------|---|-----|
| L.G.A. | Banjul | 1 | [] |
| | KMC | 2 | |
| | Brikama | 3 | |
| | Mansakonko | 4 | |
| | Kerewan | 5 | |
| | Kuntaur | 6 | |
| | Janjangbureh | 7 | |
| | Basse | 8 | |

District name []

Area 1 - Urban 2 - Rural []

Quarter []

E.A. Number []

Sub-sample []

Selected household []

Name of Household Head

Time interview commenced [] Address:

Tel:

Survey form number for this household [] of []

FORM A. BASELINE DATA

Starting time: Ending time:

Sr. No.	All persons						Persons age 3 and over			Persons age 7 and over							
	DEMOGRAPHIC PARTICULARS						EDUCATION			USUAL ACTIVITIES DURING LAST 12 MONTHS							
	Names of usual members of household and visitors who spent last night here.	Usual members and visitors	Relation-ship to head of household	Sex	Age on last birthday	Nationality	Marital status	School attendance	High Class	NO. OF DAYS DURING LAST 12 MONTHS			IF WORKING MOST OF THE TIME DURING LAST 12 MONTHS, WHAT WAS YOUR USUAL			MONTHLY SALARY OF PAID EMPLOYEES	IF NOT AVAILABLE FOR WORK MOST OF THE TIME WERE YOU:
										Work-ing for	Avail-able	Not Avail-able	Occupation	Industry	Employ-ment status		
A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	A10	A10	A11	A12	A13	A14	A15	A16	A17	A18
1																	
2																	
3																	
4																	
5																	
6																	
7																	
8																	
9																	
10																	
11																	
12																	
13																	
14																	
15																	

(Circle only one dominant item in each column)

B. HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Date..... Starting Time.....

MATERIALS OF CONSTRUCTION OF DWELLING UNITS		TOILET FACILITY	PRINCIPAL SOURCE OF WATER SUPPLY	PRINCIPAL SUPPLY OF FUEL FOR		NO. OF ROOMS INCLUDING SHARED ROOMS	YEAR OF CONSTRUCTION	TENANCY OF DWELLING UNIT	RENT OR INPUTED RENT
ROOF	WALLS			COOKING	LIGHTING				
B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10
1. Corrugated iron 2. Asbestos 3. Concrete 4. Tile 5. Thatch (Grass /palm leaves) 6. Other, specify:	1. Cement block/burnt brick 2. Mud 3. Kirinting 4. plastered with mud 5. Corrugate 6. Other, specify.....	1. W. C./Flushed 2. Private Pan 3. Public Latrine 4. Private Pit 5. Public Pit 6. Ventilated improved pit (VIP) 7. Bush/River 8. Other, specify.....	1. Piped indoors/ compound 2. Public stand pipe 3. Well in compound 4. Well with pump (public) 5. Well without pump (public) 6. Stream or river 7. Other, specify.....	1. Firewood 2. Kerosene 3. Briquette 4. Charcoal 5. Gas 6. Electricity 7. Own solar or generator 8. Other, specify...	1. Firewood 2. Kerosene 3. Briquette 4. Charcoal 5. Gas 6. Electricity 7. Own solar or generator 8. Other, specify.....	Exclude toilets, bathrooms, pantry kitchen, hall and storerooms. (WRITE DOWN NUMBER)	YEAR	1. Owned out right 2. Owned with mortgage or loan 3. Rent free 4. Renting (furnished) 5. Renting (unfurnished) 6. Other, specify.....	1. If renting, what is rent per month? D _ _ _ _ _ 2. If not renting, how much would have paid, if you have to rent it? D _ _ _ _ _ 3. Subsidy per month D _ _ _ _ _

C. HOUSEHOLD DURABLES

Do you or any usual household members own or operate the following items by renting from the others?

ASK EACH ITEM AND WRITE: 1 - Own, 2 - Rent, 3 - Operate, 4 - No

NAME OF ITEMS	1 or 2 or 3 or 4	NAME OF ITEMS	1 or 2 or 3 or 4
54. Motor Car		61. Iron / Sewing Machine	
55. Motor Cycle / Scooter		62. Air Conditioner / Fan	
56. Other motorised vehicle		63. Refrigerator / Freezer	
57. Cycle		64. Electric/Gas Cooker / Oven	
58. Telephone		65. Washing Machine / Dryer	
59. T.V./ Video / Radio / Cassette		66. Generator	
60. Musical instrument		67. Any other electrical appliance (specify:)	

(Circle the item numbers of durables owned or rented by household and WRITE 1 or 2 or 3 or 4)

D. AVERAGE MONTHLY HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Please record the total income of all members of household corresponding to the source in the appropriate column (i.e. total wages, salaries and profit in cash or in kind and income from other sources* during last year). If the household is engaged in farming, record the total income accrued during last last year under the yearly column)

*Income from other sources - (1) Property income (rent interest, dividends, etc.); (2) Current Transfers and Benefits (remittance received, pension, life insurance annuities, social security benefit, etc.

Date..... Starting Time.....

Code	Sources of Income	Amount		(For Field Use) Monthly Average	(For Office Use)
		Monthly	Yearly		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
01	Sale of Export Crop [see Q10 of Sect. 5a, Part 1]				
02	Sale of Food Crop [see Q10 of Sect. 5a, Part 1]				
03	Livestock & Livestock Products [see Sect. 5b, Part1]				
04	Fishing				
05	Other Farming Income				
06	Non-Farm Enterprise 1 [see Q34 of Sect. 6b, Part 1]				
07	Non-Farm Enterprise 2 [see Q34 of Sect. 6b, Part 1]				
08	Non-Farm Enterprise 3 [see Q34 of Sect. 6b, Part 1]				
09	Other Non-Farm Enterprise(s) [see Sect. 6 continuation(s)]				
10	Public and Parastatal Sector Salary [see A16 of Form A, Part 2]				
11	Private Sector Salary [see A16 of Form A, Part 2]				
12	Rent Received				
13	Remittances Received				
14	Transfer Payments Received (pensions, scholarships, insurances, etc.)				
15	Other Sources, specify.....				
16	Other Sources, specify.....				
17	Other Sources, specify.....				
18	Total				

DATE.....

Starting Time.....

E. EXPENDITURE ON CLOTHING AND FOOTWEAR DURING LAST 3 MONTHS

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis) (3)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis) (4)	Sub-totals Purchases (5)	Average (OFFICE USE)	
Description (1)	Code (2)				Purchases (Dalasis) (6)	In kind (Dalasis) (7)
		Last 3 months				
CLOTHING 21		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Clothing Material (Drill)	2101					
Clothing Material (Poplin)	2102					
Tailoring Charges	2103					
Men's Suit (Ready Made)	2111					
Men's Safari (Ready Made)	2112					
Men's Trousers	2113					
Men's Shirts	2114					
Men's Underwear	2115					
Men's Socks	2116					
Men's Other Clothing	2117					
Ladies Docket	2121					
Ladies Headtie	2122					
Ladies Shirt/Lappa	2123					
Ladies Underwear	2124					
Ladies Underwear - brassiere	2125					
Ladies Socks	2126					
Ladies Other Clothing	2127					
Boy's Dress (Excluding School Uniform)	2131					
Boy's Other Clothing	2132					
Girl's Dress (Excluding School Uniform)	2141					
Girl's Other Clothing	2142					
Babies Clothing	2151					
Repair Of Clothing	2161					
Other Clothing	2171					
FOOTWEAR 22		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Men's Shoes	2211					
Men's Slippers, Leather	2212					
Men's Slippers, Plastic	2213					
Ladies Shoes	2221					
Ladies Slippers, Leather	2222					
Ladies Slippers, Plastic	2223					
Boy's Shoes	2231					
Boy's Slippers, Leather	2232					
Boy's Slippers, Plastic	2233					
Girl's Shoes	2241					
Girl's Slippers, Leather	2242					
Girl's Slippers, Plastic	2243					
Repair Of Footwear	2251					
Other Footwear	2261					

DATE.....
Starting Time.....

**F. EXPENDITURE ON HOUSING, FUEL AND POWER DURING LAST 3 MONTHS
EXPENDITURE ON FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS DURING LAST 12 MONTHS**

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis)	Sub-totals Purchases	Average (OFFICE USE)	
Description	Code				Purchases (Dalasis)	In kind (Dalasis)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Last 3 months						
HOUSING 31		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
House rent	3111					
<i>Check the rent here with the rent in B10</i>						
<i>Check whether city rate is part of the rent paid out. If it is so, DO NOT WRITE PAYMENT OF CITY RATE.</i>						
Rental value of rent-free housing	3121					
Rental value of owner-occupied house	3131					
City rate/compound or area council rate	3141					
Water charges	3151					
Garbage disposal	3163					
REGULAR MAINTENANCE & REPAIR OF DWELLING	32					
OTHER SERVICES RELATING TO THE DWELLING	33					
ELECTRICITY, GAS AND OTHER FUELS 34						
Electricity	3411					
Gas	3421					
kerosene	3431					
Wood	3441					
Coal	3442					
Charcoal	3443					
Candle	3451					
Other	3461					
Last 12 months						
FURNITURE, FIXTURES, FLOOR COVER 41		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Beds/Tables/Chairs/Desks	4111					
Cupboards/Wardrobe/Closet	4121					
Other furniture	4131					
Carpets/Mats/Linoleum/Mattresses	4141					
Repairs	4151					
HOUSEHOLD TEXTILES; FURNISHINGS 42						
Curtains/Bedsheet/Towels/Table cloth/Mosqui	4211					
Mirror	4221					
Flower boxes & pots	4222					
Waste paper baskets, Garbage boxes	4223					
Other household textiles and furnishings	4231					
Repairs	4241					

DATE.....
Starting Time.....

G. EXPENDITURE ON HOUSEHOLD EQUIPMENT

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis)	Sub-totals Purchases	Average (OFFICE USE)	
Description	Code				Purchases (Dalasis)	In kind (Dalasis)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Last 12 months						
COOLING, HEATING, COOKING AND OTHER APPLIANCES		43	purchases	>>>>>>	>> expenditure summary	
Refrigerator, Freezer	4311					
Air conditioner, Fan	4312					
Generator	4321					
Lantern	4322					
Washing machine	4323					
Heater	4324					
Other cooling and cooking appliances	4331					
Repairs	4341					
GLASSWARE, TABLEWARE, UTENSILS		44				
Drinking glasses	4411					
Dinner & Tea utensils	4442					
Cutlery	4413					
Thermo Flasks	4421					
Pans, pots & Kitchen utensils	4422					
Other glassware	4431					
Tablespoons and utensils	4433					
Repairs	4441					
TOOLS FOR THE HOUSE AND GARDEN		45				
Last 3 months						
GOODS, SERVICE FOR HOUSEHOLD MAINTENANCE		46	purchases	>>>>>>	>> expenditure summary	
NON-DURABLE GOODS						
Laundrysoap, Toiletsoap	4611					
Detergent	4612					
Insecticide, Pesticide	4613					
Bulbs, Plugs, Wire	4621					
Paint, putty	4622					
Toilet paper	4623					
Cloth hanger	4631					
Broom, Brushes	4632					
Ropes, strings	4633					
Needles, nuts, bolts, screw, nails	4634					
Other non-durable goods	4641					
HOUSEHOLD SERVICE						
Maids, Cooks, Cleaners, Gardeners, Security	4651					
Plumbing and repairs and other services	4661					
Hire of furniture and furnishings	4671					
Other services	4681					

DATE.....
Starting Time.....

H. EXPENDITURE ON HEALTH DURING LAST 3 MONTHS/12 MONTHS

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis)	Sub-totals Purchases	Average (OFFICE USE)	
Description	Code				Purchases (Dalasis)	In kind (Dalasis)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Last 3 months						
MEDICAL AND PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCTS 51a		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Headache/Pain killer medicine	5111					
Cough medicine	5112					
Mentholatum	5113					
Worm medicine	5114					
Laxative	5115					
Tetracycline/antibiotics	5116					
Malaria pill	5117					
Injections	5118					
Other medicine	5119					
Last 12 months						
THERAPEUTIC APPLIANCES AND EQUIPMENT 51b		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Spetacles and contact lens	5120					
Wheelchairs	5121					
Crutches	5122					
Other appliances and equipment	5123					
Last 3 months						
NON-HOSPITAL MEDICAL, PARAMEDICAL, DENTAL SERVICES 52		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Doctor fees/Druggist fees	5221					
Dental fees	5222					
Traditional/herbal practitioners	5223					
Others	5224					
HOSPITAL SERVICES 53						
Hospital surgery/accommodation	5331					
Out Patient fees	5332					
Ambulance fees and others	5333					
SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE SERVICES 54						
Sickness insurance premia	5411					
Accident insurance premia	5412					
Other health related insurance premia	5413					

DATE.....
Starting Time.....

I. EXPENDITURE ON TRANSPORT DURING LAST 3 MONTHS/12 MONTHS

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis)	Sub-totals Purchases	Average (OFFICE USE)	
Description	Code				Purchases (Dalasis)	In kind (Dalasis)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Last 12 months						
PURCHASE OF VEHICLES 61		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Car	6111					
Motorcycle	6112					
Bicycle	6113					
Boat	6114					
Other personal transport equipment	6115					
Last 3 months						
OPERATION OF PERSONAL TRANSPORT EQUIPMENT 62		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Tyres, tubes, parts	6221					
Other accessories	6222					
Petrol, diesel, oils and greases	6223					
Chauffeur and driver service	6224					
Other expenditure including repair and servicing	6225					
TRANSPORT SERVICES 63						
Road transport	6331					
Inland water transport	6332					
Air transport	6333					
Ocean transport	6334					
Other transport	6335					

DATE.....
Starting Time.....

J. EXPENDITURE ON LEISURE, ENTERTAINMENT & CULTURAL SERVICES LAST 12 MONTHS & LAST MONTH

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis)	Sub-totals Purchases	Average (OFFICE USE)		
Description	Code				Purchases (Dalasis)	In kind (Dalasis)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
Last 12 months							
EQUIPMENT & ACCESSORIES INCLUDING REPAIRS		71	purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
TV, Video, Radio, Cassette Player, Tape recorder, Record Player	7111						
Musical instruments	7112						
Camera, Video camera & other durable photographic equip	7113						
Typewriter	7114						
Binoculars, sports equipment	7115						
Other accessories and repairs	7116						
Last month							
NON-DURABLE GOODS			purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Transistor batteries/films & other non-durable photo items	7121						
Other non-durable items	7122						
RECREATIONAL, ENTERTAINMENT AND CULTURAL SERVICES		72					
Football, cinema, video tickets & charges	7211						
Membership of sports/video societies & other clubs	7112						
NEWSPAPERS, BOOKS & STATIONERY (OTHER THAN		73					
Books and magazines	7331						
Newspapers	7332						
WRITING AND DRAWING EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES							
Stationery supplies - writing pad, pens, ball pens, pencils, ink, etc	7333						
Drawing equipment and accessories	7334						
Other items and repairs	7335						

DATE.....
Starting Time.....

K. EXPENDITURE ON EDUCATION DURING LAST 3 MONTHS/12 MONTHS

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis)	Sub-totals Purchases	Average (OFFICE USE)		
Description	Code				Purchases (Dalasis)	In kind (Dalasis)	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
Last 12 months							
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES 81		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary		
School fees	8111						
School transport	8112						
Boarding, lodging at school	8113						
Other expenses on educational services	8114						
EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS 82							
School books and stationery	8211						
School furniture	8212						
School uniform and wearing apparel	8213						
School bags	8214						
Other expenses on educational materials	8215						
ANCILLARY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES 83							
Out of school private lectures	8311						
Lunch expenses	8312						
Other expenses on additional educational services	8313						

L.. EXPENDITURE ON HOTELS, CAFES AND RESTAURANTS DURING LAST MONTH

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis)	Sub-totals Purchases	Average (OFFICE USE)	
Description	Code				Purchases (Dalasis)	In kind (Dalasis)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Last 1 month						
EXPENDITURE ON HOTELS, CAFES AND RESTAURANTS 91		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Catering	9111					
Accommodation	9112					

DATE.....
Starting Time.....

M. EXPENDITURE ON MISCELLANEOUS GOODS AND SERVICES DURING LAST 3 MONTHS/12 MONTHS

Group/Sub-group/Item		Purchases (Dalasis)	Receipts in kind (Dalasis)	Sub-totals Purchases	Average (OFFICE USE)	
Description	Code				Purchases (Dalasis)	In kind (Dalasis)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Last 3 months						
PERSONAL SERVICES 101		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Barber, beauty saloon	10111					
Other personal care services	10112					
PERSONAL EFFECTS n.e.c. 102						
Toothbrush, toothpaste/cosmetics	10221					
Shaving equipment/permanent wave set	10222					
Other personal effects	10223					
Last 12 months						
JEWELLERY AND WATCHES		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Necklaces, bangles, rings	10224					
Other jewellery	10225					
Watches/clocks	10226					
OTHER PERSONAL GOODS						
Umbrella/hats/raincoats	10227					
Walking sticks/travelling bags	10228					
Iron/Sewing machine/hair dryer	10229					
Other personal goods	10230					
Last 1 month						
COMMUNICATIONS 103		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
Post and telegraph, telex, fax, etc.	10331					
Telephone	10332					
Telecentre services	10333					
Internet services	10334					
Mobile communication	10335					
Other communication services	10336					
Last 12 months						
MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES		purchases	>>>>>>		>> expenditure summary	
SOCIAL SERVICES	104					
FINANCIAL SERVICES n.e.c.	105					
SERVICES NOT ELSEWHERE CLASSIFIED	106					
EXPENDITURE ON PACKAGE TOURS 107						
Transport fares, accommodation	8661					
Food and other elements	8662					

DATE.....

Starting Time.....

N. NON-CONSUMPTION EXPENDITURE DURING LAST 12 MONTHS

Item	Last 12 Months	Item Code	Average	Item	Last 12 Months	Item Code	Average
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11151 Direct taxes				111534 Life insurance premia			
111551 Income tax				111535 Health insurance premia			
111512 Other direct taxes				111536 Property insurance premia			
111521 Taxes, duties, fees & other Compulsory charges				111537 Other insurance premia			
11153 Pension & social security con- tributions & insurance premia				111541 Remittances, gifts and similar transfers			
111531 Pension contributions				111551 Subscriptions,			
111532 Provident fund Contributions				111561 Interest on consumer debt			
111533 Social security Contributions				111571 Total			

Subscriptions and contributions mean membership fees & contributions to religious & relief funds.

O. DISBURSEMENTS OTHER THAN EXPENDITURE

Item	Last 12 months	Item Code	Average	Item	Last 12 months	Item Code	Average
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
111611 Additions to bank deposits And savings				111651 Amounts invested in real Estate			
111621 Amounts disbursed in repayment Of loans taken				111661 Amounts invested in co- Operative or household Enterprise			
111631 Amounts given out as loans				111671 Other disbursements Including donations			
111641 Amounts invested in stocks, Shares, debentures, etc.				111681 Total			

Other Disbursements & Donations cover giving out money or gifts on special occasions like marriage, birth, death and others or to needy people.

DATE.....
Starting Time.....

P. RECEIPT FROM SALE OF USED ITEMS

Group/Sub-group/Item		Last month	Last 3 months	Last 12 months	Average sales
Description	Code	(Dalasis)	(Dalasis)	(Dalasis)	(Dalasis)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(7)
Books, magazines, newspapers	111111				
Drawing equipment	111112				
Clothing & footwear	111211				
Car/motor cycle/bicycle/boat etc.	111221				
Old tyres/tubes/parts	111231				
School books	111241				
Furniture/fixtures/floor coverings	111311				
Household textiles and other furnishings	111321				
Cooling, cooking & other appliances	111331				
Glassware, tableware & utensils	111341				
Spectacles & other Medical	111351				
School uniform	111361				
TV/Video/Casste/Radio	111371				
Musical instruments	111381				
Cameras/typrwriter/bi-noculars /sports Equipment	111391				
Jewellery,watches & clock	111401				
Umbrella/hats/raincoats/bags	111411				
Iron/sewing machines/hair dryer	111421				
Other personal goods	111431				

DATE.....

Starting Time.....

Q. MISCELLANEOUS INCOME AND EXPENDITURE

1. During the past 12 months, what income in cash and kind, did the household receive from the following sources?

FROM CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT			FROM OTHER SOURCES				
1. Social security	2. State Pension	3. OTHER (Specify)	4. Private pension/ insurance	5. Osusu	6. Dowry	7. Sale of Land	8. Other Specify
AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	VALUE	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

2. During the past 12 months, how much did the household spend (in cash and kind) on:

9. Contributions to self-help projects	10. Weddings, dowry, naming ceremonies	11. Religious and other ceremonies (Tobaski, Koriteh, etc.)	12. Contributions to osusu	13. Other miscellaneous expenditure (specify)	14. How much money do you think will be enough to cover this household's basic needs in a month?
AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT
9	10	11	12	13	14

DATE.....

Starting Time.....

R. TRANSFER PAYMENTS MADE BY HOUSEHOLD

1. During the past 12 months, has the household sent any money or goods (as gifts or support) to an absent household member or any other person? Yes Y

No N >>Next section

2. LIST THE NAME OF EACH PERSON TO WHOM MONEY OR GOODS WAS SENT	3. ID CODE CODE 99 IF NON-HOUSEHOLD MEMBER (HOUSEHOLD MEMBER >>6)	IF NOT A HOUSEHOLD MEMBER		6. Where does this recipient live? This village/town T Capital city C Other urban U Rural R Abroad A	7. Were these monies or goods sent regularly? YES: Monthly M Quarterly Q Annually A Other O NO N	8. Will they be repaid at some future time? Yes Y No N	9. What was the total value of cash sent or given to this person during the past 12 months? IF NONE WRITE O	10. What was the total value of food sent or given to this person during the past 12 months? IF NONE WRITE O	11. What was the value of other goods sent or given to this person during the past 12 months? IF NONE WRITE O
		4. RELATIONSHIP	5. SEX				AMOUNT	AMOUNT	VALUE
2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Total Transfers sent							=	+	+
							To summary sheet		

DATE.....

Starting Time.....

T. HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE SUMMARY

(Copy summary data from individual sheets to this form)

Sheet	Group	Description	Period	1 month	3 months	12 months
E	21	Expenditure on clothing	3 months			
E	22	Expenditure on footwear	3 months			
F	31	Expenditure on housing, fuel and power	3 months			
F	41/42	Expenditure on furniture and furnishings	12 months			
G	43-45	Expenditure on household equipment	12 months			
G	46	Expenditure on routine household maintenance	3 months			
H	51a	Expenditure on health -medicines	3 months			
H	51b	Therapeutical appliances and equipment	12 months			
H	52-54	Medical, paramedical and dental services, insurance	3 months			
I	61	Expenditure on transport - purchase of vehicles	12 months			
I	62-63	Operation of transport equipment, transport services	3 months			
J	71	Expenditure on leisure, entertainment and cultural services - equipment	12 months			
J	72-73	Recreational, entertainment and cultural services	1 month			
K	81-83	Expenditure on education	12 months			
L	91	Expenditure on hotels, cafes and restaurants	1 month			
M	101 -	Expenditure on misscellaneous goods and services -	3 months			
M	10223	personal services and other personal effects				
M	10227-	Jewelry and watches, other personal goods	12 months			
M	10230					
M	103	Communications	1 month			
M	104 -	Social services; Financial services n.e.s.; Services not	12 months			
M	107	elsewhere classified; Expenditure on package tours				
N		Non-consumption expenditure	12 months			
O		Disbursements other than expenditure	12 months			
Q		Miscellaneous income and expenditure	12 months			
R		Transfer payments made by the household (in cash)	12 months			
		Diary of daily household expenditures on FOOD	1 month			
		Total expenditures by period				
			<i>Multiplier</i>	1	1/3	1/12
		TOTAL Monthly expenditures			+	+
P		Receipt of sale of used items - books, newspapers, etc	1 month			
		clothing and footwear, , drawing equipment	3 months			
		all other used goods	12 months			
S		Transfer payments received by the household (in cash)	12 months			

**THE GOVERNMENT OF THE GAMBIA
CENTRAL STATISTICS DEPARTMENT/CBEMP**

**INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEYS ON CONSUMPTION & EXPENDITURE
AND POVERTY LEVEL ASSESSMENT – 2002/03**

DAILY RECORD FORM

A DATA COLLECTION

Interviewer..... Date.....

Supervisor..... Checking Date.....

B DATA ENTRY

Operator..... Entry Date.....

Supervisor..... Editing Date.....

Operator..... Re-entry Date.....

L.G.A.	Banjul	1	[]
	KMC	2	
	Brikama	3	
	Mansakonko	4	
	Kerewan	5	
	Kuntaur	6	
	Janjangbureh	7	
	Basse	8	

District Name:.....[]

Area 1 – Urban 2 – Rural []

Quarter []

E.A. Number []

Sub-Sample []

Selected Household []

Name of Household Head.....

Time interview commenced [] Address.....

Tel.:.....

Survey form number for this household [] of []

CENTRAL STATISTICS DEPARTMENT, BANJUL
INTEGRATED HOUSEHOLD SURVEYS – CONSUMPTION & EXPENDITURE AND POVERTY LEVEL ASSESSMENT – 2002/03

DAILY RECORD BOOK FOR EXPENDITURE ON FOOD, DRINKS, CIGARETTES AND NON-FOOD ITEMS

Kindly record the Daily Expenditure which is divided into three parts as follows:

- I. **PURCHASE OF ALL ITEMS** – Food, drinks and cigarettes for consumption at home or outside home and all non-food items purchased for use on cash payment or credit by usual members of household.

- Date - date of purchase
- Place of purchase - Place where purchase is made like market or name of shop or place or on taxi or bus.
- Description of item - Name of item such as rice, cassava, vegetables, fish, coke, beer, cigarettes, clothing, furniture, bus and taxi fare and so on.
- Quantity or weight - Quantity is in number or dozens and weight can be in local unit with equivalent standard unit (such as pound or kilogramme if possible).
- Total Price - The price paid in cash or on credit to purchase the item.
- Office use - Do not write in it.

- II. **CONSUMPTION OF OWN PRODUCE** – Covers items which you produce and consume yourselves such as rice, cassava, potato leaves, vegetables, fruits, palm oil and wine and so on produced on your own farm or trees; chicken and goats you kept in your house; fish and game you caught by yourselves; chairs, tables, cloth and so on made by yourselves and firewood, fruits and roots collected by yourselves.

Please write

- Date - date of consumption or use of items.
- Description - name if item.
- Quantity or weight - as before, in number or local weight with approximate standard weight (pounds or kilogramme).

Estimated value - value which you would have paid if purchased.

Office use - Leave blank.

III. **CONSUMPTION OF OTHER ACQUISITION** – Covers items which the household members received free of charge as gifts or payment in kind or as barter or drawn from your business stock.

Date - date of consumption or use of items.

Description of item, Quantity or weight and Estimated value will be the same as above.

The head and members of household are requested to cooperate with the Central Statistics Department by filling in the Daily Record Book. Please try to provide complete information which will be used for the welfare of the people. We assure you that information will be treated as “confidential”.

If the household member who is entering expenditure in the Daily Record Book has any problem seek help from the Enumerator.

