

GENDER FACTS AND FIGURES

URBAN NORTH WEST SOMALIA

JUNE 2011

Overview

In November-December 2010, FSNAU and partners successfully piloted food security urban survey in five towns of the North West of Somalia namely: Boroma, Gebiley, Berbera, and Zeylac and Hargeisa. A multi-stage cluster sampling with probability proportional to size method¹ was employed in the survey with a sample of 243 households who were selected randomly using systematic sampling method.

To identify the socio-economic factors informed by a gender perspective that correlate with food security vulnerability, the following variables were considered due to their relative importance in determining household food security, namely: household headship; household size and per capita expenditure; source of income; access to productive labour; assets e.g. land, education, health care, remittances and non-productive or basic assets, such as fridge, motor vehicle and mobile phones.

This **Gender Facts and Figures Series** is a snapshot of gender indicators considered influential in determining food security and vulnerability.

Key messages

- *The urban Northwest households are increasingly becoming feminized, with the population of female headed households at 53% percent. The increase is an indicator of increasing economic freedom for women as well as the changing traditional gender roles.*
- *Male and female headed households are able to meet their minimum expenditure baskets (MEB). However, female headed households are able to do so by diversifying their income sources through upholding 2-3 jobs.*
- *Male headed households have larger families, and more stable incomes from formal employment in government institutions and humanitarian agencies. The large household size could be attributed to prevalence of polygynous marriages and also presence of temporary or permanent relatives.*
- *Illiteracy rates are high among female heads of households, at 65 percent, making it difficult for them to access formal employment.*
- *Gender disparity in school attendance is high (in favour of boys) with a GPI of 0.75 and 0.48 in secondary and tertiary school respectively. Policy intervention and affirmative action on education at higher level would facilitate women's future access to formal employment.*
- *Health care facilities are scarce with 82 percent of female headed households compared with 62 percent of male headed households accessing health services from pharmacies at higher cost compared to other health services providers.*
- *Charcoal is the main energy source in majority of households with no difference based on sex of the household head.*

¹ Probability proportional to size (PPS) is a sampling technique for use with surveys or mini-surveys in which the probability of selecting a sampling unit (e.g., village, zone, district, health center) is proportional to the size of its population.

1. Household Headship by Sex

Analysis of Northwest reveals an emerging **feminized urban population**² with overall female headed households (FHH)³ at 53%, compared with male headed households (MHH) at 48%.

2. Formal Education attained by Heads of Households

Literacy levels among heads of households reveal wide gender disparity in tertiary and secondary education, with FHH having low levels of tertiary and secondary education, and are disproportionately represented among the illiterate household heads, at 65%.

Table 2: Formal Education by head of household

	Tertiary	Secondary	Primary	No education
MHH	21%	30%	11%	38%
FHH	11%	9%	15%	65%

3. Formal School attendance for boys and girls

Gender disparity for girls is evident in formal education attendance with GPI⁴ high at tertiary level, narrowing up at primary education level.

Table 3a: Level of education for boys and girls and GPI

	Girls	Boys	Gender Parity Index
Primary	50%	61%	0.83
Secondary	25%	33%	0.75
Tertiary	9%	18%	0.48
Koranic	34%	26%	1.31

3.1 Formal School attendance by sex of household head

FHH have fewer boys and girls attend primary and secondary school level, with significantly higher school attendance in tertiary level, but skewed towards boys.

Table 3b: Level of education for boys and girls – Urban Northwest

Education	Boys Primary	Girls Primary	Boys Secondary	Girls Secondary	Boys Tertiary	Girls Tertiary
MHH	68%	56%	39%	25%	13%	7%
FHH	54%	44%	28%	25%	23%	10%
Total	61%	50%	33%	25%	18%	9%

² FEWSNET (2003), indicated that 20% of the households in Hargeisa were female headed households, compared to 73% in 2010. This increase has most likely resulted in relative civil security and alluring economic opportunities found in cities and towns. The trend is likely to be similar in other towns in the Northwest.

³ In this study, the FHH is an aggregation of de-facto and de-jour households. The FHHs do not constitute a homogeneous group, but include families receiving regular remittance incomes. Indeed, studies have usually concluded that households headed by women who are divorced, widowed or separated are more likely to be poor households than household headed by single or married women (the wives of migrants). Therefore, these households need to be separated in food security vulnerability analysis.

⁴ GPI: Gender Parity Index is a measure of disparity between boys' and girls' school attendance. If the GPI is 1, the country is at gender parity. A GPI above 1 indicates disparity in favour of girls and a GPI below 1 disparity in favour of boys.

4. Type of housing occupied by household by sex of the household head

Stone houses are most common in urban areas. Analysis show 77% of FHH live in stone houses, of which 58% of the houses are privately owned, this compares with 73%, MHH occupying stone houses of which 64% are privately owned.

Table 4: Housing by sex of the household head

	Tarpaulin	Corrugated sheets	Wooden houses	Stone houses
MHH	11%	15%		73%
FHH	10%	10%	2%	77%

5. Main sources of drinking water

44% of FHH have access to piped drinking water compared with 50% of MHH. Other sources of paid water include: water kiosks and trucked water. A review of water costs show that private vendors charge between SSh.3000 – 10,000 per drum (hence erosion of income for poor households). Majority of households spend in the range of 1-20% of their income on water (see table).

Table 5: Sources of drinking water by towns and by sex of the household head

	Water Kiosks	Pipe Water	Tracked Water
MHH	19%	50%	32%
FHH	27%	44%	29%

6. Access to Sanitation⁵

Analysis show no gender difference as regards to access to sanitation with 88% of MHH and 89% of FHH using mainly pit latrines. An insignificant number of households have access to flush toilets, and those without access to toilets use their neighbour's toilet.

Table 6: Type of Sanitation used by household disaggregated by sex of household head

Sex of Household Head	Pit Latrine	Toilet With Flush	Neighbours Toilet	Public Toilet
MHH	88%	7%	3%	2%
FHH	89%	6%	5%	1%

7. Main sources of energy for cooking

96% in all the surveyed households use charcoal for household fuel, with no significant gender difference in FHH and MHH.

Table 7: Main sources of energy for cooking

Sex of the household head	Firewood	Charcoal	Electricity
MHH	3%	96%	1%
FHH	2%	98%	0%

⁵ Access to water and sanitation is an indicator for socio-economic status of a household, a key determinant for food security. In addition lack of access to improved water and sanitation are indicators of malnutrition in early childhood.

8. Access to health services

Only 4% of MHH, and 6% of FHH access “free of charge” mother and child health (MCH). Conversely, as high as 82% of FHH access health services from pharmacies compared with 62% MHHs. Considering that the services availed by pharmacies (diagnostic and medicine dispensation services) are found to be more efficient and therefore expensive, majority of FHH spend more of their household incomes on “for purchase” healthcare services.

Table 8: Access to Health Services by sex of HH

	Hospital	MCHs	Pharmacies	Not accessed
MHH	26%	4%	62%	8%
FHH	10%	6%	82%	2%

9. Income sources

More male heads of households compared to female receive social support (17% and 12% respectively)⁶. Similarly they dominate in government (14%) and humanitarian work (12%). Conversely, FHH engage in more than one income generating activity, through remittances at 13% and retail trade at 12% respectively. Diversification contributes to greater resilience from loss of income shock in FHH.

Table 9: Main Sources of Income by sex of household head

Activities	MHH	FHH
Remittance - social support	17%	12%
Government work - paid labour	14%	8%
Engaged in more than one income generating activity	6%	13%
Humanitarian work - paid labour	12%	3%
Retail trade - self employment	4%	12%
Construction work - Paid labour	9%	0%
Hawking - self employment		8%
Wholesale trade (store) - self employment	3%	7%
Vegetable sales - self employment		7%
Portage - Paid labour	4%	0%
Restaurant work - Paid labour	2%	7%
Driving - Paid labour	6%	0%

10. Households and Food Security Based on MEB Threshold

Northwest urban area is relatively food secure, with all households showing capacity to meet their Minimum Expenditure Basket.

Table 10: Households and Food Security Based on MEB Threshold

Sex of household head	Mean Income	Mean MEB Threshold
Female	1,595,558	779,889
Male	1,540,748	779,889

⁶ This may vary depending on factors such as global economic situation which could affect external remittances, and internal factors such as rainfall, civil security and humanitarian and development assistance.

11. Households with other household members working

There is no significant gender difference in FHH and MHH members' access to work in the two types of households. However the increasing number of women accessing labour is an indicator for women's economical freedom in an urban setting, often leading to changes in gender roles and relaxing of cultural gender norms.

	MHH	FHH	Total
Percentage of Female Household Members working	N=109	N=112	N=221
	49%	51%	100%
Percentage of Male household Members working	N=114	N=120	234
	49%	51%	100%

12. Household per capita income

Analysis of the **per capita expenditure vis-à-vis household size** in urban Northwest indicate that MHH have larger household sizes and therefore have higher level of vulnerability. This is partly because culturally, majority of MHH are polygynous. They are also mainly responsible for taking care of their elderly parents. The fact that FHHs are smaller in size could mean they should be less vulnerable since the vulnerable tend to be concentrated in larger households. However, FHH experience negative ripple effect associated with women's triple workload and multiple income generating activities; leading to poor health and poor child feeding practices. These factors should be taken into account while determining household vulnerability.

Sex of the household	Female	Male
Mean Household Size	6.8	8.6
Per capita household income	182,781	167,107

Expenditure on food show no significant variation in FHH and MHH, with both households have similar food consumption pattern with majority spending 51% of their income on food. (see table 12b below).

Range	1-20%	21-40%	41-60%	61-80%
Male HH	4%	5%	74%	17%
Female HH	6%	3%	70%	20%
Total	5%	4%	72%	19%

13. Tangible Household Assets

In urban Northwest, MHH and FHH have equal access to mobile phones at 81% and 80% respectively. However, ownership of wheelbarrows (11%) is skewed towards men, showing relationship between the occupation of sex of the household head and **basic assets found in the family**. While the ownership of the assets such as fridge, TV sets, computers and motor vehicle may indicate a food secure household, the absence of the same/or the need to sell such items may provide some useful insights for locating food insecure households.

Sex of household head	Livestock	Farm Machinery	Farm Tools	Wheelbarrows 11%	Donkey Carts	TV Sets	Fridge	Mobile Phones	Computers
MHH	9%	6%	0%	3%	5%	66%	13%	81%	15%
FHH	6%	0%	3%		4%	61%	10%	80%	12%

14. Access to Land

In Northwest, overall, 11% of MHH own **land for cultivation** which is privately owned, compared with 8.7% among the FHH and additional 2.4% cultivating rented land. Ownership of assets such as cultivated land decreases the likelihood that the household will be food insecure.

Table 14: Access to land

Sex of the household head	owned land	rented land	no land owned
MHH	11%	0%	89%
FHH	9%	2%	89%

15. Social Capital

17% of MHH compared with 12% of FHH are in receipt of remittances (internal and external) to smoothen households incomes (see table 9).