

---

# **PART I:**

## **MKUKUTA CLUSTER I**

---

**GROWTH AND REDUCTION OF POVERTY**



# PERSONAL ECONOMIC SITUATION

The main objectives of public policy in Tanzania are to stimulate economic growth and reduce poverty. The VoP survey asked about people's experiences and views of changes in their personal economic situation and access to services.

## 2.1 Trends in Personal Economic Situation

Adult respondents assessed changes in the previous three years of their personal economic situation, the findings are summarised in Table 2.1. Fewer adults think they are enjoying the fruits of economic growth than those who see their livelihood getting worse. While half the adult population saw their economic situation deteriorate during the previous three years, 26% perceived things to be the same and 24% said their economic situation is better. There was little difference in response between rural and urban respondents.

**Table 2.1 Perceived Changes in Economic Situation 2004-07<sup>3</sup>**

Economic Situation	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural %	All
Worse	46	50	52	50
Same	31	22	25	26
Better	22	27	23	24

Analysis of the economic situation by economic groups reveals the same trend, as shown in Table 2.2. All income groups, including the less poor, perceive falling rather than rising living standards. For the urban poor there are three times as many 'losers' as 'winners.' There are some self-assessed 'winners', even among the urban poor 18% and the rural population 21%.

**Table 2.2 Changes in Economic Situation 2004 - 07 by Income Groups**

Changes in Economic Situation	Urban Poor %	Urban Middle %	Urban Less Poor %	All Urban %	All Rural %	All %
Much better	0.4	0.5	1.2	0.7	0.7	0.7
A little better	18	21	31	23	21	22
The same	24	29	28	26	25	26
A little worse	23	22	21	22	24	23
Much worse	33	27	18	26	29	28

**Note:** Table omits 'no response'

<sup>3</sup> In this table and some of subsequent tables the percentages do not add to 100 % because of rounding figures and no response from some respondents.

In an open-ended question, respondents were asked what was the main improvement in their lives during the last three years - Table 2.3. About 79% of respondents in both urban and rural areas had no improvement to report. House construction, though reported by 7% of the respondents only, was the main achievement in all localities, followed by a major purchase - for example, a mobile phone, bicycle or other goods.

**Table 2.3 Improvements in Life 2004-07**

<b>Improvements in Life</b>	<b>Dar es Salaam %</b>	<b>Other Urban %</b>	<b>Rural %</b>	<b>All %</b>
No improvement	79	76	80	79
Built a house	7	6	8	7
Bought phone, bicycle, other goods	4	6	3	4
Bought livestock	0	1	2	2
Bought land, increased acreage (bought or leased)	3	3	2	2
Increased income	2	3	2	2
Invested in schooling	2	3	1	2
Opened a business	1	1	2	1

# PROMOTING BROAD BASED GROWTH: INFRASTRUCTURE

Economic infrastructure contributes directly and indirectly to growth and poverty reduction. Perceptions on the trend in performance of three major aspects of economic infrastructure were sought.

## 3.1 Roads

The poor condition of roads and the lack of maintenance is a major concern, especially in rural areas. 70% of adult rural respondents considered the condition of the roads a “major problem”, compared with 57% of respondents in other towns and 41% of Dar es Salaam residents. Disaggregating by economic groups shows that the situation is perceived to be worse by more poor people - at 72%, compared to middle and less poor groups - 63% and 60% respectively, as might be expected since poor people are more likely to be resident in rural areas.

**Table 3.1 Percent of Adult Respondents Reporting Condition of Roads to be a Major Problem**

Dar es Salaam %	Other Towns %	Rural Areas %	Poor %	Middle %	Less Poor %	All %
41	57	70	72	63	60	60

This finding is corroborated by perceptions of quality of rural roads. Only 28% of rural respondents perceived improvement in road quality over the last three years, while 47% reported a deterioration (Table 3.2).

**Table 3.2 Opinions on Changes in Road Quality 2004 - 2007**

Condition of the Roads	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural %	All %
Improvement	56	42	28	38
The same	27	28	26	27
Deterioration	16	30	47	36

Improvements in the condition of roads were noted in urban areas - 56% Dar es Salaam and 42% in other urban areas. Examples of the views of respondents on road conditions are presented in Box 2.

### BOX 2 STATE OF THE ROADS

*“Barabara ni mbaya sana. Wakulima hulazimika kusafirisha mazao na wanyama kwa mkokoteni (tela la wanyama).”*

‘The roads are very bad. Farmers are forced to transport their crops, even their livestock, in push-carts.’

- Focus Group, Singida

*“Hakuna utengenezaji wa barabara huku mpaka ujio wa raisi ambaye alipita [Mzee Mwinyi] mara ya mwisho mwaka 1988.”*

‘Roads aren’t maintained: the last time these roads were repaired was when President Mwinyi came here in 1988.’

- Focus Group, Mwanza

*“Barabara hazipitiki, kama kuna Kata zilizosahaulika kimiundombinu ni Igogo.”*

‘Roads are not passable, if there is a Ward that has been forgotten as far as infrastructure is concerned, then it is Igogo.’

- Focus Group, Mwanza

As a consequence of the poor state of rural roads, economic growth in these areas is seriously constrained. Half of the rural respondents pointed out that due to poor roads, they have difficulties in reaching markets for their produce and in accessing services in towns.

### 3.2 Energy

Most respondents use firewood and charcoal for cooking, and paraffin/kerosene lamps (*koroboi, chemli, karabai*) for lighting, see Table 3.3 below. Use of charcoal is more pronounced in Dar es Salaam where it is used by 83% of respondents. Wood is used as an energy source by 87% of rural respondents and 57% of respondents from other towns. Electricity was reported to be used as a source of lighting overall by 23% of the respondents; in Dar es Salaam by 59% of respondents, and by 43% of respondents from other urban, and 11% from rural areas.

The availability and cost of charcoal and wood for fuel are major problems for most urban and rural residents respectively. In urban areas, 59% of interviewees considered the availability and price of fuel for cooking a 'major problem', as did 50% of the rural respondents. Half of urban and rural respondents considered the availability of electricity a major problem. In urban areas, the electricity supply problems include the cost and difficulty of getting connections, as well as frequent supply interruptions. In rural areas, the problem is that majority of villages do not have access to power from the national grid or other sources.

**Table 3.3 Energy Source for Cooking and Lighting**

Source of Energy	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural %	All %
<b>Cooking</b>				
Charcoal	83	34	12	35
Wood	8	57	87	60
Kerosene stove	7	8	0	3
<b>Lighting</b>				
Electricity	59	43	11	23
Kerosene lamp	36	54	76	72

**Note:** Totals may not add to 100 because of non-response

### 3.3 Telephones

Telephone ownership is four times as common as it had been four years ago. Many more Tanzanians are communicating via mobile phones and text message (SMS) services than previously. About 33% of interviewed adults own mobile phones: 65% in Dar es Salaam, 37% in other urban areas, and 16% in rural areas. In Dar es Salaam, 17% of the poorest third of those interviewed own a mobile phone, compared to 86% of those who are better-off. Table 3.4 shows that, whereas few respondents write letters, a surprisingly large number regularly send text messages.

**Table 3.4 Mode of Communication, by Locality**

Mode	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural %	All %
Make a phone call	53	31	15	28
Send a SMS	42	24	9	21
Send a letter	4	4	3	4

The recent rapid expansion in mobile phone ownership has increased communications across the country phenomenally, albeit along predictable urban-rural and rich-poor lines. However, improved telecommunication may not have contributed much to boosting economic growth as nearly 75% of phone owners reported that they used their phones for personal rather than business purposes and only about 25% reported using their phones for both personal and business purposes.

# ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

People's perceptions of their economic conditions were assessed by several variables including employment and other sources of livelihoods, availability and costs of inputs for productive enterprise and the availability and costs of food and other basic items.

## 4.1 Cost of Living

While the cost of living - the cost of food and basic needs - was said to be a major problem by 67% of adults, affecting both the rural and urban populations, 47% said they never had problems with enough food last year and 63% said they ate three meals a day. Although the poor were more worried about the price of food and other basic goods than the less poor, about 66% of the better-off respondents also considered the cost of living (prices both of food and other essential goods) to be a major problem.

**Table 4.1 Problems Concerning Prices of Essential Goods and Food**

Price as a major problem	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural %	All %
Price of essential goods	65	70	71	69
Price of food	72	72	63	67

Respondents were asked how often they eat meat or fish, how many meals they eat a day on average, and whether they always had enough food during the previous year. Urban residents claimed they ate meat or fish nearly three days a week whereas in rural areas, it was less than two days a week. About three-quarters, 78%, of Dar es Salaam respondents eat three meals a day, compared to two-thirds, 64%, in other urban areas and only 55% in rural areas.

When asked if they had ever experienced hunger in the previous year a fifth of villagers, 19%, replied 'often' and a further 43% replied 'sometimes.' A third, 32% of Dar es Salaam respondents reported that they 'sometimes' went hungry, and 5% said 'often.' Box 3 provides some perceptions on the prices of food, and the relationship between income and food availability.

### BOX 3 PERCEPTIONS OF PRICES OF FOOD

*"Vyakula vinapatikana inategemea na kipato cha mtu... Mazingira ya upatikanaji wa chakula ni magumu kwani bei ni kubwa na kipato ni kidogo na wengine hawana kabisa kipato."*

**Meaning:** 'Food is available depending on one's income. Access to food is difficult because prices are high and incomes are low... other people have no income at all.'

- Focus Group, Dar es Salaam

## 4.2 Rural and Urban Livelihoods

This sub-section covers people's sources of livelihoods. Table 4.2 summarises sources of income for the sample of adults (4,967 aged 25-59).

**Table 4.2 Occupation/Livelihood Sources**

Livelihood Sources	Male %	Female %	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural Areas %	Total %
Agriculture, livestock, fishing	68	49	4	51	87	58
Self employed, no employees	15	22	41	23	6	19
Homemaker/unpaid farm worker/family business	2	17	23	11	2	10
Employee*	7	4	15	6	5	6
Dependant: retired/student	2	4	7	2	0	3
Self-employed with employees	3	1	6	4	0	3
Unemployed: looking for work	0	1	3	1	0	1
Other	2	0	1	0	1	1

**Employee:** Formal sector 41%  
 Government/parastatals/cooperatives/marketing boards 37%  
 Informal sector 15%  
 Churches, charities and non-governmental organisations 6%

Almost 90% of rural adults (87%) worked in agriculture, with livestock or fishing. In Dar es Salaam, 41% were self-employed and 23% reported that they were homemakers/unpaid family workers, 15% were employed, mostly with formal institutions. In other urban areas, 51% worked in agriculture, with livestock or fishing, 23% were self-employed and 11% were homemakers/unpaid family workers. Few adult respondents reported themselves to be unemployed, even among the respondents in Dar es Salaam and other urban areas. Unemployment was a bigger concern for young people, as will be reported in a later part of this section.

Just over half of the rural adult respondents, 52%, said that they felt their economic situation was worse than it had been three years earlier; 25% said it was the same and 23% said it had improved.

Livelihoods are sometimes diversified in households to reduce risk, but this survey of adults found that a large proportion of the sample had only one source of income. For example, in rural areas 74% and in Dar es Salaam 81% of the adult respondents declared they did not have a secondary source of income. In rural areas, those with secondary sources of income were self-employed 59%, had other rural livelihood activities 26% or a variety of other activities. In Dar es Salaam, the main secondary activity was self-employment 16%. It is possible, of course, that other members of the respondents' households contributed different sources of income to the household. The following sub-sections examine rural livelihoods in a little more detail.



# AGRICULTURE

This chapter looks at the livelihoods of farmers, sub-divided into three groups (terciles) based on a composite wealth indicator made up of assets, quality of housing, water supply and a number of other variables. Farmers include both men and women who declared their main source of livelihood to be agriculture. The poverty-wealth rankings used are based on household rather than individual characteristics, so intra-household inequalities in workload, welfare or consumption are not captured. The three groups are depicted in the following analysis as the 'poorest' third (group 1), the 'middle' third (group 2), and the 'least poor' third (group 3). These three groups are created for analytical purposes only, and are not empirical entities.

## 5.1 Ownership of Land and Farming Technology

The number of plots reported to be owned by farmers in the survey and their total area do not suggest large-scale differentiation among farmers. While the poorest group farmed 1.9 plots of land (*mashamba*) the middle group and least poor had 2.2 plots of land. The total size of land farmed ranged from 4.5 acres for the poor to 6.4 for the least poor, a 42% difference. A major limitation on the size of land holdings is the technology used to till them. Thus, while all farmers used the humble hand-hoe for many farm operations, 42% of the non-poor farmers used ox ploughs, compared with a quarter (25%) of poor farmers. Only 5% of the least poor farmers used a tractor.

Moreover, land markets seem undeveloped, with 82% of farmers cultivating their own land, and less than 20% renting some or all of the land cultivated. There was no tendency for better-off farmers to rent more land than the poor. About 25% of the farmers had secondary sources of income, mostly as petty producers or traders.

## 5.2 Types of Crops Grown

Farmers were asked which food crops they grew and whether the crop was grown mainly for home consumption - Tables 5.1 and 5.2. Almost all farmers grew maize, and 64% of maize growers said all or most of their maize was for home consumption. The poorest farmers were more likely than the least poor to grow sorghum, millet, and cassava, while better-off farmers were more likely to grow beans, fruit and vegetables, potatoes, and bananas. The majority of farmers grew the crops mostly for home consumption.

**Table 5.1 Percent of Farmers Growing Main Food Crops**

Crop	Poorest %	Middle %	Least Poor %	All %
Maize	90	92	94	92
Beans/pulses	49	54	62	55
Fruit/vegetables	37	47	52	45
Potatoes	34	46	49	43
Sorghum/millet	48	48	29	42
Cassava	37	40	33	37
Rice	28	33	26	29
Bananas	12	16	20	16

**Table 5.2 Percent of Farmers Reporting Crop Grown is Mostly for Home Consumption**

Crop	Poorest %	Middle %	Least Poor %	All %
Potatoes	88	87	78	84
Fruit/vegetables	76	81	71	76
Sorghum/millet	71	75	72	73
Beans/pulses	69	69	63	67
Bananas	67	75	57	66
Maize	68	68	57	64
Cassava	59	65	67	64
Rice	57	55	42	51

### 5.3 Major Problems Faced by Farmers

Farmers were asked whether the prices and availability of inputs and other issues were a problem during the twelve months prior to the survey. Table 5.3 summarises their responses. The first ten issues listed in the table were reported to be a “major problem” by half of the respondents or more. In general there was consistency across income groups in the problems they faced.

**Table 5.3 Major Problems Experienced by Farmers**

Major Problem Reported by Farmers	Poorest %	Middle %	Least Poor %	All %
Input prices	87	87	82	85
Availability of inputs	77	71	64	71
Appropriateness/quality of inputs	75	72	61	70
Pests, disease, wild animals	73	69	65	69
Condition of roads	67	67	63	66
Unreliable rainfall pattern	71	68	58	66
Market prices for products	62	64	59	62
Extension advice	68	57	55	60
Distance to markets/transport costs	50	51	49	50
Access to market information	50	52	47	50
Soil fertility/erosion	42	42	42	42
Shortage of land for farming	44	43	40	42
Scattered plots/time to reach fields	38	40	42	40
Water for irrigation	43	40	35	39
Cooperative society/farmers' association	34	35	33	34
Storage facilities for crops	37	35	29	34
Crime and theft	28	29	30	29
Crop boards	22	26	24	24
Cesses, taxes, deductions	19	19	16	18
Local government controls	12	15	14	13

## 5.4 Use of Fertiliser and Other Inputs

The majority of farmers have never used chemical fertilisers, or other chemical inputs, or improved seeds. Among the middle income group only a handful have used these inputs, and few have used agro-chemical pesticides, herbicides or fungicides. More than two-thirds, 69%, of the least poor farmers have also never used chemical fertilisers.

<b>Table 5.4 Use of Commercial and Natural Agricultural Inputs</b>				
<b>Use of Agricultural Inputs</b>	<b>Poorest %</b>	<b>Middle %</b>	<b>Least Poor %</b>	<b>All %</b>
<b>Chemical fertiliser</b>				
More	0	1	9	3
About the same	1	4	10	5
Less	1	5	12	6
Never used	98	90	69	86
<b>Agro-chemicals (pesticides, herbicides, insecticides)</b>				
More	2	5	9	3
About the same	6	12	19	12
Less	8	11	12	10
Never used	84	72	60	72
<b>Natural Fertiliser</b>				
More	11	17	16	15
About the same	12	17	19	16
Less	7	10	14	10
Never used	70	56	52	60
<b>Improved Seeds</b>				
More	3	6	11	7
About the same	3	9	14	9
Less	4	8	9	7
Never used	89	76	66	77

## 5.5 Agricultural Extension Advice Provided to Farmers

Table 5.5 reports the extent of extension advice that farmers received in the year prior to the survey from public and private sources. The participation of the private sector in provision of extension services is notably low. A minority of farmers, better-off and poor alike, received extension advice. For example, Lindi farmers explained during group interviews that they know that there is a *bwana shamba*

<b>Table 5.5 Extension Advice to Farmers</b>				
	<b>Poorest %</b>	<b>Middle %</b>	<b>Least Poor %</b>	<b>All %</b>
<b>Received any advice from a government extension officer (last year)</b>				
<b>Yes</b>	18	24	22	21
<b>No</b>	82	76	78	79
<b>Received any advice from a private company (last year)</b>				
<b>Yes</b>	1	3	3	2
<b>No</b>	99	97	97	98

(extension officer) whose responsibilities include extension and other support, but his/her visits are erratic, and many farmers do not receive any advice year after year (see Box 4).

#### BOX 4 AVAILABILITY OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICES

*“Wataalamu wanakaa wilayani tu vijijini tunayumba.”*

Meaning: ‘The [extension] experts remain at the district headquarters while in the villages we become disoriented.’

- Focus Group, Lindi

### 5.6 Marketing

Respondents were asked how they sold their main cash crop. The most common channel for both poor and less poor farmers was sale to a private buyer, followed by direct sale to consumers or local markets. Few farmers sold their crops through cooperative societies. Farmers were then asked which marketing arrangements they preferred. While nearly a third, 30%, of respondents had no strong preference in terms of crop marketing, similar proportions preferred cooperative, private, or mixed marketing channels - 21% to 26%. Differences between the poor and less poor farmers were not significant. It is interesting to note that almost a quarter, 23%, of farmers still preferred cooperative marketing alone, and another 21% preferred a mix of co-operative and private marketing channels, suggesting that farmers, both poor and non-poor, did not appreciate the demise of the cooperative marketing system.

### 5.7 Trends in Agricultural Services

Farmers were further asked what trends they had observed during the previous three years in the provision of agricultural services, whether state or privately delivered.

**Table 5.6 Trends in the Availability of Agricultural Services, Changes in the Last Three Years, by Poverty Headcount**

Availability of Agricultural Service	Poorest %				Middle %				Less Poor %			
	Imprve	No Chnge	Gettng Worse	Don't Know	Imprve	No Chnge	Gettng Worse	Don't Know	Imprve	No Chnge	Gettng Worse	Don't Know
Availability of fertiliser	7	31	31	31	11	32	32	25	21	32	30	17
Cost of fertiliser	2	24	36	38	2	24	44	29	5	25	50	21
Availability of agro-chemicals	7	30	34	28	11	31	35	22	20	29	34	16
Cost of agro-chemicals	2	22	43	33	3	25	47	26	6	24	51	19
Availability of credit	3	21	40	37	4	23	42	32	7	23	41	28
Cost of credit	0	15	27	57	2	15	32	52	2	16	31	51
Performance of crop board	1	15	9	75	1	19	10	70	1	16	12	71
Performance of private buyers	5	25	33	38	7	30	35	31	8	25	35	32
Performance cooperative unions	2	18	18	62	3	22	19	56	3	18	21	58
Prices paid for produce	4	24	47	25	7	29	46	19	7	25	45	23
Taxes/cesses/ deductions	6	35	19	40	7	36	21	36	9	36	16	39
Extension services	9	36	41	14	13	37	33	17	12	33	36	19
Availability of market information	5	35	32	28	6	37	31	26	6	34	35	25

**KEY:** **Imprve** = Improvement  
**Gettng Worse** = Getting Worse

**No Chnge** = No Change  
**Don't Know** = Don't know/No Opinion

**Table 5.7 Trends in the Availability of Agricultural Services, Changes in the Last Three Years**

	Improvement %	No Change %	Getting Worse %	Don't Know %
Availability of fertilisers	13	31	31	24
Cost of fertiliser	3	24	43	30
Availability of pesticide/herbicide/insecticide	13	30	35	22
Cost of pesticide/herbicide/insecticide	4	23	47	26
Availability of credit	4	22	41	33
Cost of credit (Interest and repayment schedules)	1	15	30	54
Overall performance of export crop boards	1	16	10	72
Overall performance of private crop buyers	7	25	34	34
Overall performance of cooperative unions	3	19	19	59
Prices paid for crops/livestock	6	26	45	23
Taxes/cesses/other deductions	7	35	19	39
Agricultural/livestock extension services	11	35	36	17
Availability of market information, prices	6	35	33	26

The majority of farmers either saw most services, agencies or markets not changing significantly over the last three years, or offered no opinions. Of those who did report a change, many more saw a downward rather than an upward trend. Poorer farmers were more critical of trends than the better-off. In no instance did as many as 10% of poor farmers confirm an improvement. Deterioration in prices paid for produce and the cost of fertiliser and agro-chemicals were consistently criticised by all three income groups. By contrast, some better-off farmers noted improvements in the availability of fertiliser and other chemical inputs, and extension services. Yet even these improvements were countered by larger numbers of farmers noting deterioration.

### 5.8 Government Assistance to Farmers

Despite government policy in provision of subsidised farm inputs, increasing crop research and propagating the results through agricultural extension, 75% of farmers reported that the government provides them with no services whatsoever. Moreover, there is a significant disparity between income groups, with over 82% of the poor farmers declaring that the state provides them with no services compared to 66% of the least poor.

**Table 5.8 Government Assistance to Farmers**

Government Assistance	Poor %	Middle %	Least Poor %	All %
Nothing	82	76	66	75
Subsidised fertiliser	1	5	15	7
Supplies improved seeds	4	6	6	5
Markets	2	4	3	3
Provides loans and credit	1	1	1	1
Extension	1	3	2	2
Other	2	1	1	1
Don't know/No response	7	4	5	6

Finally, in an open-ended question, farmers were asked “What is a single most important thing the government can do to help farmers like you?” - Table 5.9. By far the most common response, by 42% of farmers, was for improved availability of farm inputs, in particular fertiliser. This is understandable, given the dire need for farm inputs and the fact that the Government has already shown commitment to increasing the availability of subsidised fertiliser to farmers.

**Table 5.9 Desired Government Assistance to Improve Agricultural Production**

Desired Government Assistance	Poor %	Middle %	Rich %	All %
Improve availability of inputs	43	42	42	42
Loans, credit	21	19	16	19
Farm machinery	9	10	12	11
Find, improve markets for crops	8	7	7	7
No response/Don't know/nothing	6	8	9	7
Improved extension, education	7	7	7	7
Other	3	3	4	3
Better prices for produce	1	1	1	1
Infrastructure improvement	1	2	1	1
Reduces taxes on farmers	1	1	1	1

### 5.9 Pastoralists and Agro-pastoralists

A total of 616 livestock-keepers were surveyed and asked about the same issues and problems as those discussed with farmers. Free-range indigenous cattle, sheep, goats and poultry were the most commonly kept animals. Indigenous cattle fed on open grazing land were kept by 62% of respondents; sheep and goats were kept by 58% and poultry by 56%. Very few respondents were keeping indigenous cattle enclosed with zero grazing - 3%.

Respondents were asked whether specific issues affecting their livelihood were problematic during the twelve months prior to the survey.

**Table 5.10 Problems Facing Pastoralists**

Problems Facing Pastoralists	Major Problem %	Small Problem %	Not a Problem %	Not Applicable %
Cost of animal medicines/services	78	8	11	3
Availability of veterinary services	63	9	27	1
Extension advice	58	11	29	2
Drought	54	15	27	3
Pests, disease, wild animals	53	21	23	2
Distance to markets/transport costs	49	14	28	9
Prices for animals	48	17	28	8
Access to land for pasture	39	16	38	7
Access to market information	38	19	36	7
Access to cooperative society /farmers' association	26	9	24	41
Crime and theft	22	19	57	1
Local government controls	13	11	56	20
Cesses, taxes and deductions	13	14	44	30

The most commonly cited ‘major problem’ was the cost of veterinary medicines and services. The non-availability of veterinary services and extension advice, drought, disease, pests and wild animals, distance to markets, market prices for their animals, are also cited as problems to the majority of respondents.

### BOX 5 PASTORALISTS’ LAND AND EXTENSION PROBLEMS

*“Maeneo ya kulima hakuna, ni machache mno. Matatizo tunayopata kuhusiana na upatikanaji wa ardhi ni ule urasimu wa kufuatilia kugawiwa ardhi. Mambo haya yanaanzia wilayani badala ya kuanzia maeneo ya kata na vijiji ambao wanafahamu matatizo yetu zaidi. ... Sisi wafugaji tunapata matatizo makubwa kutokana na uwekezaji wa makampuni makubwa na watu binafsi katika ardhi. Hawa ni kikwazo cha upatikanaji wa ardhi hapa kijijini kwetu.”*

**Meaning:** ‘There is no farming land, there are too few [areas]. The problems we face on land shortage arise from the bureaucracy in land allocation. These issues are decided at the district level, instead of the ward or villages where they know about our problems better...For us livestock keepers we experience great problems because of the investments on land by large companies owned by private people... These [people] are a hindrance on access to land in our village.’

• Focus Group, Manyara

*“Mtaalamu aliyepo hapa ni wa serikali ila ukimhitaji ni mpaka umfuate na umlipe... Mshauri wa mifugo hapa hayupo kabisa ila ukihitaji ni mpaka uende mjini na ni mbali na utamleta kwa gharama zako. Hivyo ushauri kwa kilimo na mfugo ni adimu hapa.”*

**Meaning:** ‘There is a government officer here but if you need him until you follow him and pay him... There is no livestock extension here until you go to town; it is far and you have to bear all costs. Therefore agricultural and livestock keeping extension is difficult to get here.’

• Focus Group, Tanga

As with farmers, livestock-keepers were asked whether they had received extension advice. About 41% of respondents received such advice during the previous year, a much higher contact rate than agricultural extension. Half the sample had never received extension advice though. The text box below presents perceptions of respondents from pastoral areas regarding bureaucracy in land allocation for pastoral activities and availability of extension services.

Although over 40% of livestock keepers reported having received extension advice, when asked what the government is doing to help them, 76%, thought the government was doing nothing to help them (Table 5.11). Only a few respondents mentioned extension (advice). This suggests that either the services are not highly valued or that they are coming from the private sector or non-governmental organisations. The implication is that perhaps contact with government officials may have been more to do with disease control (for example, Rift Valley Fever) than with giving advice. When asked what the government should do to help livestock keepers, the most common response, by a third of respondents, was to improve the availability of animal vaccines and medicines, suggesting that they (like farmers) still consider the state an important actor in the supply of inputs.

**Table 5.11 Government Assistance Provided to Improve Livestock Production**

Government Assistance Provided	%
Nothing	76
Extension advice	9
Price of animal medicine reduced	4
Other	3
Loans/credit to buy livestock	3
No response	4

**Table 5.12 Assistance Desired from Government to Improve Livestock Production**

Desired Government Assistance	%
Improve availability of medicines, vaccines	31
Extension advice	16
Veterinary services	13
Cattle dips	11
Loans/credit	9
No response	7
Reduce prices, provide medicines free	6
Other	6

### 5.10 Fishers

The survey solicited information from 32 ocean and 42 fresh-water fishers on their livelihoods. Only a third of these were full-time fishers, the remainder were also farmers, livestock-keepers, small businessmen or traders. Most, 76%, owned, shared or rented a small fishing boat called a *mtumbwi*. While over half, 57%, owned, shared or rented fishing nets, very few owned any other fishing gear. The majority, 72%, fished with one or more other fishers.

Asked about trends in catches, 70% said they were falling, and only 16% said they were improving. Of those who said catches were getting smaller, half (51%) said there were too many small fishers, though half disagreed that this was the cause. There was a similar disagreement about whether fishers using finer mesh nets were the cause of declining catches. Fewer respondents mentioned commercial fishing, the arrival of fishers from other areas, and the use of dynamite as reasons for falling yields. When asked about problems facing fishers, nearly half 47% saw the use of beach nets as problematic. Box 6 provides some perceptions of problems facing fishers.

#### BOX 6 IMPEDIMENTS TO FISHING

*“Samaki wanapungua sana, kila siku wanapungua sana. Hali imeshuka kupita kiasi – kwa uvuvi wa mishipi. Sababu: Tuliingiliwa na uvuvi endelevu unaitwa mtando.”*

Meaning: ‘The fish stock is depleting significantly, and the situation is worse for line fishing because we were invaded by ‘sustainable modern’ fishing using seine nets.’

- Focus Group, Lindi

*“Serikali inalazimisha tukavue vina virefu wakati nyavu zetu ni chakavu, na boti tunazotumia ni zile za kuendesha kwa mkono hivyo kuongeza umaskini hapa kwetu.”*

Meaning: ‘The government forces us to fish in deep waters while our equipments are worn out and [the boats] are hand steered, hence increasing poverty on our area.’

- Focus Group, Tanga

When asked whether they favoured exporting fish or selling exclusively to local markets, a slight majority 53% favoured export while 38% favoured local sale. The main reason given for the majority preference was higher revenues from exporting over from local sales.

Finally, fishers were asked (in open-ended questions) what assistance government is providing to improve fisheries and what government should do to help improve fisheries. Over 80% of respondents mentioned that the government is doing nothing to improve fishing whereas a small percentage, 5%, mentioned controls over fine mesh nets. Table 5.12 provides responses on assistance desired from Government to improve fisheries. Most of the fishers responded that they wished the government



would provide capital goods such as engines and nets, with only a handful mentioning 'education', a more obvious state responsibility.

**Table 5.13 Assistance Desired from Government to Improve Fishing Industry**

Desired Government Assistance	%
Providing fishing gear (nets)	34
Provide boat engines	22
Don't know/No response	14
Credit/Loans	9
Other	9
Education on breeding and conservation	8
Control illegal fishing practice	4

### 5.11 Use of Natural Resources

To conclude on rural livelihoods, a few questions were asked of the rural respondents about accessing natural resources for enhancing livelihoods.

**Table 5.14 Use of Natural Resources**

Natural Resources	Obtain Free %	Buy %	Don't Use %
Grass/thatch for roofing	42	35	23
Poles for house construction	32	54	14
Herbs for medicine	31	40	29
Wild fruit, nuts, honey, tubers	27	42	31
Raffia for mats, beds	20	51	29
Wood for stockades, crop protection	10	38	52
Domestic utensils and storage	9	76	15
Wood for stools, chairs, tables, beds	7	83	10
Bush meat	6	22	72
Fish	3	84	13
Timber for canoes, boats	2	6	92
Musical instruments	2	15	83
Carvings and crafts	2	19	79

Grass/thatch for roofing houses, stores and *banda* huts, is most frequently procured free than purchased. About 20% to 32% of respondents obtained wild food and raffia, medicinal herbs and building poles free, while 40% to 54% of respondents purchased these items.



# LIVELIHOOD SOURCES FOR THE YOUTH

A total of 974 young people 15 to 24 years who were no longer in full-time education were questioned on issues concerning their working lives and most pressing problems. There were 620 females and 354 males.

## 6.1 Economic Situation of Young People

First, the occupational profile of out-of-school youth was recorded, as shown in Table 6.1. About one-third of the young people, 35%, were unemployed, mostly living at home with parents and siblings. A further 31% of males and 23% of females were involved in rural occupations and 34% of males and 23% of females said they were employed, about half of whom were self-employed. Although female respondents were less numerous in the 'rural occupations' category (mostly farmers), it is probable that quite a number of those describing themselves as 'homemakers' and 'housewives' were also involved in farming.

**Table 6.1 Economic Status of Youth by Gender**

Economic Status	Male %	Female %	All %
Unemployed/not active	33	35	35
Rural occupations	31	23	26
Self-employed	13	10	11
Homemaker	2	16	11
Employee part time/casual	11	5	7
Employee	7	6	6
Self-employed with employees	3	2	2
Other	1	2	2

## 6.2 Trends in their Economic Situation

Young people out of school were asked about changes in their economic situation compared with three years ago. The most common response, by about 39%, was that it had not changed (Table 6.2). Overall 32% of out-of-school young respondents consider their economic situation to have declined over the last three years (got much worse or a little worse) and 26% see an improvement. The views of males and females were almost identical.

**Table 6.2 Trends in the Economic Situation of Youth**

Changes in Economic Situation in last 3 Years	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural Areas %	Male %	Female %	All %
Much worse	15	18	15	19	18	18
A little worse	14	13	14	13	14	14
Same	40	31	41	39	38	39
A little better	27	32	27	27	24	25
Much better	1	1	1	0	2	1
Don't know/No response	2	5	3	3	4	4

Asked to be more specific about recent improvements, 79% of the respondents could not mention any; female respondents were more likely to identify 'no improvements' than males (Table 6.3 next page).

**Table 6.3 Recent Improvements in the Lives of Youth**

Major Improvement	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural Areas %	Male %	Female %	All %
None	75	79	83	75	82	79
Income has risen	8	4	5	8	5	6
Bought durable good	7	7	3	7	4	5
Completed school	5	6	3	5	4	5
Other	5	3	4	3	5	4
Bought a plot/land	1	1	2	2	1	1

Young people's economic expectations are reported in Table 6.4. Nearly a quarter of males, 23%, and 31% of females were not sure. Of those who did have an opinion, a majority - 70% of the males and 66% of the females, were looking forward to a better life in the next three years. There was little difference between rural and urban youth.

**Table 6.4 Economic Expectations of Youth**

Expected Change in Economic Situation in Next 3 Years	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural Areas %	Male %	Female %	All %
Much worse	6	8	5	6	4	5
A little worse	2	2	2	3	2	3
Same	19	15	19	13	18	16
A little better	38	36	37	43	34	37
Much better	12	14	11	11	12	12
Don't Know/No response	25	26	25	23	31	28

### 6.3 Problems Facing the Youth

Finding work was a major concern for young people across the country, as indicated by 63% of the respondents (Table 6.5). Many said they would continue with their studies if they had the resources. Other issues were flagged as "major" problems, but none by a majority of the young people. Similar to responses from their adult relatives, the cost of living measured by the price of food and other basic needs, and low disposable income were cited as major problems by 47% and 39% of young people respectively. Further, substantial numbers of young people, especially in rural areas, complained about the state of the roads and non-availability of loans or credit and problems of water supplies.

Generally, differences between the sexes were not very large although males were more negative about jobs, working conditions and income than females.

**Table 6.5 Problems Facing Youth**

Major Problems	Dar es Salaam %	Other Urban %	Rural Areas %	All %
Finding work	63	67	61	63
Price of food and other basic goods	46	45	48	47
Poor working conditions/low income	36	40	40	39
Condition of roads used most frequently	37	52	69	54
Obtaining credit/a loan	41	47	51	47
Water for crops and livestock	8	26	44	27
Access to land and agricultural inputs	8	33	39	26

# COMPARISON WITH SURVEY RESULTS FROM 2003 AND 2007 ABOUT GROWTH AND INCOME POVERTY

Reported in this section are some broad comparisons of information from the Views of the People Survey and from the Policy and Service Satisfaction Survey (PSSS), which was undertaken in September 2003 (REPOA, 2003). Table 7.1 looks at issues related to growth and income poverty.

There are similar findings, in particular with respect to the proportion of respondents who considered their economic situation to have deteriorated. The prices of food and other essential goods are the two main problems identified by both surveys, though the proportion of respondents identifying high prices as a problem is larger in this survey compared to the Policy and Service Satisfaction Survey - 67% compared to 63% for food prices, and 69% compared to 58% for prices of other essentials. There is clearly a popular perception of a significant increase in the cost of non-food items.

Poor employment opportunities figure highly in both surveys, particularly in urban areas.

Difficulties with the supply and cost of firewood and charcoal are reported to have increased in the last four years, and in the 2007 survey, more than half of the adult respondents cited this as a major problem.

**Table 7.1 Ranking of Major Problems as Reported in 2003 and 2007**

Dar es Salaam		Rural Areas		All	
2003	2007	2003	2007	2003	2007
Price of food	Price of food	Price of food	Roads	Price of food	Basic goods
Employment	Basic goods	Basic goods	Basic goods	Basic goods	Price of food
Basic goods	Work	Drought	Price of food	Employment	Roads
Cost of rent	Firewood	Employment	Firewood	Drought	Employment
-	Electricity	Firewood	Markets/services	Firewood	Firewood
-	-	Markets/services	Electricity	Markets/services	Electricity

**Notes:** 'Markets/services' refers to distance/accessibility

PSSS (2003) surveyed heads of households; VoP (2007) surveyed adult females and males

Different regions were surveyed in 2003

Findings from the Pew Global Attitudes Project (April 2007)<sup>4</sup> found that 52% of Tanzanian respondents in a national survey considered their present economic situation to be 'good' or 'very good' compared to 47% who considered it 'bad' or 'very bad'. Slightly more respondents thought they were better off five years ago than now, 38%, as compared to 34% who thought the opposite. In the Pew study, nearly half of respondents, 46%, thought the next generation would be worse off than the present generation while 36% thought they would be better off.

Another notable finding from the comparison of the surveys' results is with respect to ownership of telephones, in particular mobile telephones. Comparison with PSSS results (2003) reveal that telephone ownership has more than quadrupled, from 8% in 2003 to 35% in 2007.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to [www.pewglobal.org](http://www.pewglobal.org) for survey reports

Nevertheless, perceptions are relative, and if respondents have seen others advancing faster than themselves, they may conclude that their own situation has actually deteriorated (which it has in terms of status or 'relative deprivation'). In fact, growing inequality can undermine even an improved standard of living. PSSS (2003) and numerous other studies established that the vast majority of Tanzanians perceive increasing inequality. In the VoP (2007), for every Tanzanian adult seeing an improvement in his or her standard of living, there are two who consider themselves worse off.

However, the actual level of household poverty and inequality cannot be established from this survey. Household budget survey data suggest that inequality rose slightly in the decade of 1992 to 2002, with little change in rural areas and a more significant trend in Dar es Salaam (URT, 2002). The next data on inequality will emerge from the Household Budget Survey (2007) being conducted by the National Bureau of Statistics.

The VoP (2007) and the complementary Views of the Children survey specifically sought the views of young people and children. The young people in the survey, 15-24 years old, have a positive outlook on their future. It will be important that future comparative analyses are able to assess the extent to which these optimistic views are sustained and are associated with positive outcomes.