

Baseline Study on Graduation Component of the NOBO JATRA Development Food Security Activity in Khulna and Satkhira District: **Cohort 1**



Prepared for

World Vision

Prepared by

Abul Barkat

Rabeya Yasmin, Avijit Poddar, Asmar Osman

Muhammad Badiuzzaman, Shahadat Hossain, Faisal M Ahamed



Human Development Research Centre

humane development through research and action

www.hdrc-bd.com

Dhaka: May 2018

Baseline Study on Graduation Component of the NOBO JATRA Development Food Security Activity in Khulna and Satkhira District: Cohort 1

Prepared for



Abedin Tower, Level-2, 35 Kemal Ataturk Avenue
Dhaka 1213, Bangladesh

Prepared by

Abul Barkat¹,
Rabeya Yasmin², Avijit Poddar³, Asmar Osman³
Muhammad Badiuzzaman³, Shahadat Hossain³, Faisal M Ahamed³



Human Development Research Centre

humane development through research and action

Road 8, House 5, Mohammadia Housing Society Mohammadpur, Dhaka - 1207, Bangladesh

Phone: (+88 02) 58150381, 58157621; Fax: (+88 02) 58157620

Email: info@hdrc-bd.com; hdrc.bd@gmail.com; Web: www.hdrc-bd.com

Dhaka: May 26, 2018

¹Professor, Department of Economics, University of Dhaka & Chief Advisor, HDRC

²Team Leader of the Study, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

³Research Consultant, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i-iii
CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Objective	1
CHAPTER 2: STUDY METHODOLOGY & IMPLEMENTATION	2
2.1 Introduction	2
2.2 Overall Baseline Assessment Method	3
2.3 Survey Design	3
2.4 Ethical Consideration	4
2.5 Data/Information Analysis Plan	4
2.6 Survey Implementation	5
2.7 Quality Control Measures	5
2.8 Limitation of the Study	5
CHAPTER 3: HOUSEHOLD BACKGROUND INFORMATION	6
3.1 Household Characteristics	6
3.2 Age and Sex of Household Members	7
3.3 Education and Literacy	8
3.4 Marital Status	8
3.5 Occupation	9
3.6 Disability	10
3.7 Characteristics of Household Head	10
3.8 Household dwelling	11
3.9 Energy Use in Households	11
CHAPTER 4: HOUSEHOLD EDUCATION AND TRAINING STATUS	12
4.1 Introduction	12
4.2 Years of Schooling.....	12
4.3 Adult Literacy Status	13
4.4 Enrollment at Educational Institutions	13
4.5 Skills Development Status	15
CHAPTER 5: HOUSEHOLD ASSET HOLDING STATUS	16
5.1 Introduction	16
5.2 Homestead Landless among the Ultra Poor Households	16
5.3 Agriculture Landless among the Ultra Poor Households.....	17
CHAPTER 6: HOUSEHOLD ACCESS TO INSTITUTIONS AND SERVICES	20
6.1 Introduction	20
6.2 Access to Social Safety Net Programmes (SSNPs)	20
6.3 Access to Institutional Services	21
6.3.1 Access to Various Institutional Services.....	21
CHAPTER 7: HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES.....	23
7.1 Introduction	23
7.2 Wage Earning and Salaried Activities	23
7.3 Business and Related Activities	24
7.4 Agricultural Activities	25
7.5 Livestock Farming	25
7.6 Kitchen Garden	26
CHAPTER 8: HOUSEHOLD SAVINGS AND CREDIT.....	27
8.1 Introduction	27
8.2 Access to and Use of Formal Financial Services	27
8.3 Household Savings	28
8.3.1 Household Savings Scenario	28

8.3.2	Savings Scenario of the Key Respondents (Female)	29
8.4	Household Credit	30
CHAPTER 9: HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND EXPENDITURE		32
9.1	Introduction	32
9.2	Source of Income	32
9.3	Household Annual Average Income	33
9.4	Household Annual Average Expenditure	34
CHAPTER 10: FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITIONAL STATUS		35
10.1	Food Item and their Frequency of Food Intake	35
10.2	Sources of Consumed Food Items	36
10.3	Distribution of Food Items within Household	36
10.4	Food Consumption Score (FCS)	37
10.5	Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS)	38
10.6	Food Intake	38
10.7	Different Food Index Scores	39
CHAPTER 11: HEALTH AND HYGIENE		40
11.1	Introduction	40
11.2	Sickness and Health Seeking Behavior	40
11.3	Access to Reproductive Health Services	41
CHAPTER 12: WOMEN EMPOWERMENT		46
12.1	Introduction	46
12.2	Decision Making Ability	46
12.3	Marriage and Dowry	47
12.4	Health Entitlement	47
12.5	Mobility	48

List of Figures

Figure 2.1:	Target Area of NOBO JATRA Graduation Program	2
Figure 2.2:	Design for this assignment	3
Figure 3.1:	Population pyramid of control HHs	7
Figure 3.2:	Population pyramid of treatment HHs	7
Figure 3.3:	Status of literacy and education	8
Figure 3.4:	Marital status of 18+ aged household members	9
Figure 3.5:	Status of people with disability	10
Figure 3.6:	Characteristics of household head	11
Figure 3.7:	Energy use in households	11
Figure 4.1:	Mean years of schooling completed by household members aged 5 years and above	12
Figure 4.2:	Adult literacy status of 15 years and above household members (in %)	13
Figure 4.3:	Household member's (aged 5-24 years) enrollment at educational institutions (in %)	14
Figure 4.4:	Household with at least one member (aged 5-16 years) not going to any educational institutions (in %)	14
Figure 4.5:	Household's status regarding skills development (in %)	15
Figure 5.1:	Homestead landless: comparison between treatment and control	17
Figure 5.2:	Access to agriculture land: comparison between treatment and control	17
Figure 5.3:	Ownership of agricultural land (up to 5 decimal): comparison between treatment and control	18
Figure 5.4:	Access to water bodies: comparison between treatment and control	18
Figure 5.5:	Ownership of livestock rearing: comparison between treatment and control	19
Figure 5.6:	Ownership of poultry rearing: comparison between treatment and control	19
Figure 5.7:	Ownership of mobile phone: comparison between treatment and control	19
Figure 6.1:	Percentage distribution of SSNPs beneficiaries by Sex	21
Figure 7.1:	Mostly reported (top five) wage and salaried activities (in %)	24

Figure 8.1:	Percentage distribution of household saving incidence by source of savings	29
Figure 10.1:	Average days of food consumption by food items in a week	35
Figure 10.2:	Share of purchased food items among consumed food items	36
Figure 10.3:	Equitable distribution of food among household members	37
Figure 10.4:	Percentage distribution of households by FCS score	37
Figure 10.5:	Percentage distribution of households according to HFIAS score	38
Figure 10.6:	Poverty status according to direct calorie intake	39
Figure 11.1:	Household burden of diseases: morbidity episodes (#), duration (days) and cost (BDT)	40
Figure 11.2:	Reported five major disease in study area.....	41
Figure 11.3a:	Contraceptive use Method mix (Treatment)	42
Figure 11.3b:	Contraceptive use Method mix (Control).....	42
Figure 11.4:	Source of contraceptive of Supply in treatment and control areas (%)	42
Figure 11.5:	State of Maternal Health in treatment and control areas (%).....	43
Figure 11.6:	State of Immunization (%).....	43
Figure 11.7a:	Location drinking water Source: TREATMENT.....	44
Figure 11.7b:	Location drinking water Source: CONTROL	44
Figure 11.8a:	Type of Latrine in treatment area (%).....	45
Figure 11.8b:	Types of latrine in control area (%)	45
Figure 12.1:	Percentage distribution of responses by major place of treatment (multiple responses).....	48

List of Tables

Table 2.1:	Distribution of sample households by upazila	4
Table 3.1:	Demographic indicators for surveyed household	7
Table 3.2:	Age distribution (%) of surveyed household members by survey area and Bangladesh	7
Table 3.3:	Selected statistics on school going children	8
Table 3.4:	Primary occupation of working aged (15-60 years) population	9
Table 3.5:	Secondary occupation of working aged (15-60 years) population	10
Table 4.1:	Type of educational institutions where students are enrolled (in %)	14
Table 7.1:	Household member's involvement in wage and salary earning activities	23
Table 7.2:	Major business activities reported by households (in %)	24
Table 7.3:	Household's involvement in crop agriculture	25
Table 7.4:	Household's involvement in livestock rearing.....	25
Table 7.5:	Household's involvement in kitchen gardening.....	26
Table 8.1:	Percentage distribution of saving incidence by controller of savings.....	29
Table 8.2:	Percentage distribution of credit incidence by credit source.....	30
Table 8.3:	Percentage distributions of household credit incidence by primary use of credit.....	31
Table 9.1:	Distribution of Household income sources by treatment and control area (%)	32
Table 9.2:	Percentage distribution of household according to their number of income source	33
Table 9.3:	Distribution of Household annual gross income by sources (Taka)	33
Table 9.4:	Distribution of household net income by sources (Taka)	34
Table 9.5:	Household average annual expenditure by broader items.....	34
Table 10.1:	Pearson correlation among different food security index scores in surveyed areas	39
Table 11.1:	Percentage distribution of households by main source of drinking water	44
Table 12.1:	Distribution of households by women's decision making ability on selected issues.....	47
Table 12.2:	Percentage distribution of households by status of mobility of female respondents	49

Annexure

Annex 1:	Data Tables	50-89
Annex 2:	Data Collection Instruments (DCIs).....	90-115
Annex 3:	Food Security Index	116-118
Annex 4:	Study Team	119-121

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Bangladesh has made impressive achievement in poverty reduction. Head count poverty ratio has declined from 56.6% in 1991-92 to 24.3% in 2016 (using upper poverty line). Over the decades, the evolution of development practices in this country has unfolded the obvious fact that poor are heterogeneous and “poverty never results from the lack of one thing, but from many interlocking factors” (Sen 2005). In this context, Murdoch (1999) strongly argues that poorer households should be served by other interventions than [alone] credit”.

NOBO JATRA¹ is one such integrated approach that targets 14,000 poorest households to achieve “*Improved gender equitable food security, nutrition and resilience of vulnerable people within Khulna & Satkhira districts in Bangladesh*”; it uses a set of sequential interventions to achieve this goal. The overall objective of this assignment was to prepare a baseline benchmark for the selected potential outputs and indicators of the NOBO JATRA Graduation Program.

The baseline survey was conducted in Khulna and Satkhira district. It covered extreme poor households as sample in treatment area of Cohort 1 before inception of the NoboJatra graduation program intervention as well as similar (the counterfactuals) households in control within identical geographical location. Shymnagar, Kaliganj, Koyra and Dacope Upazilas were considered as treatment areas. On the other hand, Assasuni Upazila of Satkhira district was selected as control area. The survey used structured questionnaire to collect data.

Sample drawn in this survey was stratified and selected in two stages. The quantitative survey included 816 households equally distributed between treatment and control area. Literacy centers formed by the program were contemplated as primary sampling unit (PSU) for treatment area while villages within selected control area were considered as PSU. PSUs were selected through Probability Proportional to Size (PPS) method.

The average household size in treatment and control area were 3.7 and 3.5 respectively. The economic condition of households differed in case where the household head is a female and/or a person in the household have some form of disability. The summary of the major findings of baseline study on NOBO JATRA cohort 1 is presented below.

Food consumption

The food expenditure, irrespective of treatment and control area, was the highest in amount. Still, none of the households in intervention or control area was food secured. The study explored that 74.09 percent and 78.65 percent of the total expenditure was made for food consumption in treatment and control households respectively. There had lack of protein and fruit consumption which proves that their dietary diversity was not satisfactory and requires improvement. 13.8 percent treatment households were severely food insecure. The corresponding percentage was even higher among control (25.4%) households.

Livelihood

17.4 percent of treatment and 24.8 percent of control households lived below US\$ 1.25 per day threshold. Moreover, 40.7 percent household in treatment and 59.1 percent household in control area lived below US\$ 1.90 threshold. Around 90 percent households both in the treatment and control area reported that at least one member of their households was involved

¹NoboJatra Program, Graduation Program Operational Manual, World Vision Bangladesh, June, 2017

in day labour activities. Surprisingly, more than 60 percent household members were agricultural day laborer in both areas. Survey results indicate that only 18.4 percent household in treatment area were involved in kitchen gardening while they were about 7 percent in control. This difference is found statistically significant ($P= 0.000$). Moreover, 19.4 percent household in treatment and 19.1 percent in control owned livestock.

Access to financial services/ savings and lending practices

The study highlight that a large portion of the respondents had no access to formal financial institutions. Only 15.9 percent of the respondents in treatment and 45.1 percent in control maintained account in formal financial institutions (banks, or bKash, or Rocket). Around one-fourth (26.2%) of the households in treatment and one-third (33.6%) in control area had cash savings in formal financial institutions (Private Commercial Bank/ Government Commercial Bank/ Post Office/NGO). Most of the households (treatment: 93.4% and control: 95.2%) saved less than 5,000 BDT. About three-fourths of the households' saving incidence (treatment: 70.2% and control: 75%) occurred in 'NGOs', followed by 'Local Samiti/Cooperative' (treatment: 19.9% and control: 19.7%).

Data amply corroborates that 52.7 percent households in treatment and 61.3 percent in control area received credit in last one year. Majority of the households (treatment: 66.8% and control: 53%) received credit less than 10,000 BDT. For households in treatment area 29.1 percent credit incidence was sourced from 'NGOs', 15.9 percent from local money lenders and rest were from relatives/friends. *Credit was found to be primarily used for purchasing food; the next important use of the major portion of credit was for payment of loan/credit.*

Education

The literacy rate is 50.4 percent households in treatment and 45.2 percent in control area. Nearly one-fourth of the population is at school going age (5-16 years) but a significant percentage of such population is not continuing school (treatment: 25.3% and control: 19.5%). This study assessed education component of human capital where average years of schooling, adult literacy rate, children's school enrollment status and skills development training received are the proxy indicators for assessment in the baseline situation. *The estimated mean years of schooling for the population of 5 years and above in the treatment area is 2.90 while the same is 3.30 in the control area and this difference is found statistically significant ($p=0.012$).*

Landholding

Homestead landlessness among the households was very high. They usually constructed houses on *Khas* land or lived on other people's lands. Findings confirm that 40.2 percent treatment households had no homestead of their own whereas it was 26.7 percent among control households. Agriculture landlessness was much more prevalent among the rural ultra poor households compared to homestead landlessness.

Social Safety Net

Around four-fifths of the surveyed households (treatment: 80.4% and control: 78.4%) received support from the Social Safety Net Programmes (SSNPs). However, this apparently high rate of inclusion in the SSNPs was attributed to mainly two programmes: i) Vulnerable Group Feeding - an irregular programme with very limited food support, ii) Stipend for Students - a universal programme. However, *if the irregular SSNPs (Vulnerable Group*

Feeding, Gratuitous Relief, and Test Relief) and universal education Stipend Programme are excluded from the analysis, then it is found that only 20.3 percent of the households in treatment area received benefits from other SSNPs. It is worth mentioning that a large portion of the old age population did not receive 'Old Age Allowance'. Among the females who received, the rates were 21.4 percent and 17.1 percent respectively in treatment and control households.

Health

In the study areas, irrespective of treatment and control, the status of health indicators except the use of family planning methods was found low. The contraceptive prevalence rate was 79.4 percent in treatment area and 77.9 percent in control. Most of the current users depend on public health sources. An 86.8 percent household in treatment and 76.5 percent in control area collect drinking water from safe sources. Data confirms that 74.5 percent households in treatment and 50.0 percent in control area used hygienic latrine.

Women

The average age of women who got married in last two years preceding the survey was 16.6 years in treatment and 16.2 years in control area. Women's involvement in decision making regarding marriage of their son/daughter (treatment: 58.3% and control: 41.6%) and selling of land (treatment: 19.4% and control: 15.1%) was much lower. However, the rate of savings (treatment: 67.3% and control: 52.7%) and lending practice (treatment: 63.1% and control: 49.7%) among women was much higher.

A large percentage of women in treatment and control area enjoyed mobility in terms of going to local shops/hat/bazar, visiting parents/relatives/friends, and workplaces alone.

