

# Baseline Study on Graduation Component of the NOBO JATRA Development Food Security Activity in Khulna and Satkhira District: Cohort 2



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](http://www.hdrc-bd.com)

Dhaka: June 2018

# **Baseline Study on Graduation Component of the Nobo Jatra Development Food Security Activity in Khulna and Satkhira District: Cohort 2**

*Prepared for*



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

*Prepared by*

Abul Barkat<sup>1</sup>,  
Rabeya Yasmin<sup>2</sup>, Avijit Poddar<sup>3</sup>, Asmar Osman<sup>3</sup>  
Muhammad Badiuzzaman<sup>3</sup>, Shahadat Hossain<sup>3</sup>, Faisal M Ahamed<sup>3</sup>



**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](mailto:info@hdrc-bd.com); [hdrc.bd@gmail.com](mailto:hdrc.bd@gmail.com); Web: [www.hdrc-bd.com](http://www.hdrc-bd.com)

Dhaka: June, 2018

---

<sup>1</sup>Professor, Department of Economics, University of Dhaka & Chief Advisor, HDRC

<sup>2</sup>Team Leader of the Study, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

<sup>3</sup>Research Consultant, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

# CONTENTS

Executive summary .....	i-iii
<b>CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Objective .....	2
1.3 Organization of the Report .....	2
<b>CHAPTER 2: STUDY METHODOLOGY &amp; IMPLEMENTATION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	3
2.2 Overall Baseline Assessment Method .....	4
2.3 Survey Design .....	4
2.4 Ethical Consideration .....	5
2.5 Data/Information Analysis Plan .....	5
2.6 Survey Implementation .....	6
2.7 Quality Control Measures .....	6
<b>CHAPTER 3: HOUSEHOLD BACKGROUND INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 Household Characteristics .....	7
3.2 Age and Sex of Household Members .....	7
3.3 Education .....	9
3.4 Marital Status .....	9
3.5 Occupation .....	10
3.6 Disability .....	11
3.7 Characteristics of Household Head .....	11
3.8 Household Dwelling .....	12
3.9 Energy Use in Households .....	12
<b>CHAPTER 4: HOUSEHOLD EDUCATION STATUS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	13
4.2 Years of Schooling.....	13
4.3 Adult Literacy Status .....	14
4.4 Enrollment at Educational Institutions .....	14
<b>CHAPTER 5: HOUSEHOLD ASSET HOLDING STATUS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	16
5.2 Homestead Landless among the Ultra Poor Households .....	16
5.3 Agriculture Landless among the Ultra Poor Households.....	17
<b>CHAPTER 6: HOUSEHOLD ACCESS TO INSTITUTIONS AND SERVICES .....</b>	<b>20</b>
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
<b>CHAPTER 7: HOUSEHOLD ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES.....</b>	<b>24</b>
7.1 Introduction .....	24
7.2 Wage Earning and Salaried Activities .....	24
7.3 Business and Related Activities .....	25
7.4 Agricultural Activities .....	26
7.5 Livestock Farming .....	26
7.6 Kitchen Garden .....	27

CHAPTER 8: HOUSEHOLD SAVINGS AND CREDIT.....	28
8.1 Introduction .....	28
8.2 Access and Desire to Use Formal Financial Services.....	28
8.3 Household Savings .....	29
8.3.1 Household Savings Scenario .....	29
8.3.2 Savings Scenario of the Key Respondents (Female) .....	30
8.4 Household Credit .....	31
CHAPTER 9: HOUSEHOLD INCOME AND EXPENDITURE .....	33
9.1 Introduction .....	33
9.2 Source of Income .....	33
9.3 Household Annual Average Income .....	34
9.4 Household Annual Average Expenditure (Need to discuss with Mamun) .....	36
CHAPTER 10: FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITIONAL STATUS .....	38
10.1 Food Item and their Frequency of Food Intake .....	38
10.2 Sources of Consumed Food Items .....	39
10.3 Distribution of Food Items within Household .....	39
10.4 Food Consumption Score (FCS) .....	40
10.5 Household Food Insecurity Access Scale (HFIAS) .....	41
10.6 Food Intake .....	41
10.7 Different Food Index Scores .....	42
CHAPTER 11: HEALTH AND HYGIENE.....	43
11.1 Introduction .....	43
11.2 Sickness and Health Seeking Behavior.....	43
11.3 Access to Reproductive Health Services .....	45
CHAPTER 12: WOMEN EMPOWERMENT .....	49
12.1 Introduction .....	49
12.2 Decision Making Ability.....	49
12.3 Marriage and Dowry .....	50
12.4 Health Entitlement .....	50
12.5 Mobility .....	51

***List of Figures***

Figure 2.1: Target Area of NOBO JATRA Graduation Program.....	3
Figure 2.2: Design for this assignment .....	4
Figure 3.1: Population Pyramid of treatment HHs .....	8
Figure 3.2: Population Pyramid of control HHs.....	8
Figure 3.3: Status of literacy and education .....	9
Figure 3.4: Marital status of 18+ aged household members .....	10
Figure 3.5: Status of people with disability .....	11
Figure 3.6: Characteristics of household head .....	12
Figure 3.7: Energy use in households .....	12
Figure 4.1: Average years of schooling by household members aged 5 years and above .....	13
Figure 4.2: Adult literacy status of 15 years and above household members (in %) .....	14
Figure 4.3: Household member's aged 5-16 years enrollment at educational institutions (in %).....	15
Figure 4.4: Household with at least one member aged 5-16 years not going to any educational institutions (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 6.2:	Percentage distribution of respondents by their 'very good' assessment of most received services at UP.....	23
Figure 7.1:	Mostly reported (top five) wage and salaried activities (in %) .....	25
Figure 8.1:	Percentage distribution of household members by source of savings.....	30
Figure 9.1:	Household income by sources (%).....	33
Figure 9.2a:	Household average gross income by sources (Taka) TREATMENT .....	34
Figure 9.2b:	Household average gross income by sources (Taka) CONTROL .....	35
Figure 9.3a:	Household average net income by sources (Taka) TREATMENT.....	35
Figure 9.3b:	Household average net income by sources (Taka) CONTROL.....	36
Figure 9.4a:	Household expenditure by sources (Average) TREATMENT .....	37
Figure 9.4b:	Household expenditure by sources (Average) CONTROL.....	37
Figure 10.1:	Average days of food consumption by food items in a week .....	38
Figure 10.2:	Share of purchased food items among consumed food items .....	39
Figure 10.3:	Equitable distribution of food among household members .....	40
Figure 10.4:	Percentage distribution of households by FCS score .....	40
Figure 10.5:	Percentage distribution of households according to HFIAS score .....	41
Figure 10.6:	Poverty status according to direct calorie intake .....	42
Figure 11.1:	Household's disease Profile .....	43
Figure 11.2a:	Household burden of disease .....	44
Figure 11.2b:	Average cost of treatment (Tk.) per household.....	44
Figure 11.3a:	Household FP use (TREATMENT).....	45
Figure 11.3b:	Household FP use (CONTROL) .....	45
Figure 11.4:	Source of Supply .....	46
Figure 11.5:	State of maternal health in treatment and control areas (%) .....	46
Figure 11.6:	State of immunization (%) .....	47
Figure 11.7a:	Location of drinking water source (%): TREATMENT .....	48
Figure 11.7b:	Location of drinking water source (%): CONTROL .....	48
Figure 11.8a:	Access to sanitation by types (%): TREATMENT .....	48
Figure 11.8b:	Access to sanitation by types (%):CONTROL .....	48
Figure 12.1:	Percentage distribution of households by major place of treatment (multiple responses) ..	51
Figure 12.2:	Percentage distribution of responses by the level of mobility for going to educational institutes .....	52

### **List of Tables**

Table 2.1:	Distribution of sample households by upazila .....	5
Table 3.1:	Demographic indicators for surveyed household .....	8
Table 3.2:	Age distribution (%) of surveyed household members by survey area and Bangladesh .....	8
Table 3.3:	Primary occupation of working aged (15-60 years) population .....	10
Table 3.4:	Secondary occupation of working aged (15-60 years) population .....	10
Table 7.1:	Household member's involvement in wage and salary earning activities .....	24
Table 7.2:	Major business activities reported by households (in %).....	25
Table 7.3:	Household's involvement in crop agriculture .....	26
Table 7.4:	Household's involvement in livestock rearing.....	27
Table 7.5:	Household's involvement in kitchen gardening.....	27
Table 8.1:	Percentage distribution of savings incidence by controller of savings .....	30

Table 8.2:	Percentage distribution of household credit incidence by credit source .....	31
Table 8.3:	Percentage distributions of household credit incidence by primary use of credit .....	32
Table 9.1:	Household income by sources (%).....	34
Table 9.2:	Percentage distribution of household according to their number of income source .....	36
Table 9.3:	Distribution of Household annual gross income by sources (BDT) .....	37
Table 10.1:	Pearson correlation among different food security index scores in surveyed areas .....	42
Table 11.1:	Percentage distribution of households by main source of drinking water .....	47
Table 12.1:	Distribution of households by women’s decision making ability on selected issues.....	50
Table 12.2:	Percentage distribution of households by status of mobility of female respondents .....	52

***Annexure***

Annex 1:	Data Tables .....	53-88
Annex 2:	Data Collection Instruments (DCIs).....	89-114
Annex 3:	Food Security Index .....	115-117
Annex 4:	Study Team .....	118-120

## 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 JATRA<sup>1</sup> 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 2 before inception of the Nobo Jatra 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 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 4.0 and 3.7 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 75.0 percent and 72.7 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. 17.2 percent treatment households were severely food insecure. The corresponding percentage was even higher among control (28.7%) households.

### **Livelihood**

A 36.8 percent household in treatment area and 48.0 percent households in control area were living below USD 1.25 line. Moreover, 69.1 percent households in treatment area and 85.8 in control area were living below US\$ 1.90 threshold.

---

<sup>1</sup>NoboJatra Program, Graduation Program Operational Manual, World Vision Bangladesh, June, 2017



Around 80 percent households both in the treatment and control area reported that at least one member of their households was involved in day laboring activities. Surprisingly, more than 50 percent household members were agricultural day laborer in both areas. Survey results indicate that only 9.1 percent household in treatment area were involved in kitchen gardening while they were about 2 percent in control. This difference is found statistically significant ( $P= 0.000$ ). Moreover, only 24.8 percent household in treatment and 16.7 percent in control owned livestock.

### **Access to financial services/ savings and lending practices**

A 37.7 percent of the households in treatment and 22.1 percent in control group had cash savings in formal financial institutions (Private Commercial Bank/ Government Commercial Bank/ Post Office/NGO). Most of the households (treatment: 92.9% and control: 96.2%) saved less than BDT 5,000. About three-fourths of the households' saving incidence (treatment: 71.4% and control: 83.7%) occurred in 'NGOs', remotely followed by 'Local Samiti/Cooperative' (treatment: 19.5% and control: 13.5%).

Data amply corroborates that 60.5 percent households in treatment and 50.9 percent in control group received credit in last one year. A large portion of the households (treatment: 46.9% and control: 65.3%) received credit less than 10,000 BDT. For households in treatment area 45.3 percent credit incidence was sourced from 'NGOs', 5.8 percent from local money lenders and rest were from relatives/friends and local cooperatives/samitis *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 in treatment area is 35.2 percent and 36.6 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: 17.9% and control: 24.7%). 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 2.80 in the control area and this difference is not statistically significant ( $p=0.313$ ).*

### **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 41.2 percent treatment households had no homestead of their own whereas it was 42.6 percent among control households. Agriculture landlessness was much more prevalent among the rural ultra poor households compared to homestead landlessness.

### **Social Safety Net**

More than three-fourths of the surveyed households (treatment: 81.6% and control: 75.5%) received support from the Social Safety Net Programs (SSNPs). However, this apparently high rate of inclusion in the SSNPs was attributed to mainly two programs: i) Vulnerable Group Feeding - an irregular program with very limited food support, ii) Stipend for Students



- a universal program. However, *if the irregular SSNPs (Vulnerable Group Feeding, Gratuitous Relief, and Test Relief) and universal education Stipend Program are excluded from the analysis, then it is found that only 26.7 percent of the treatment households received benefits from other SSNPs.* It is worth mentioning that a large portion of the old age population did not receive ‘Old Age Allowance’. In treatment group, only 18.8 percent of the older age females received it.

## **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 79.0 percent in treatment and 88.3 percent in control areas. Most of the current users depend on public health sources. A 70.2 percent household in treatment and 96.0 percent in control area collect drinking water from safe sources. Data confirms that 53.0 percent households in treatment and 84.1 percent in control area used hygienic latrine.

## **Women**

*Around half of women (55.6% in treatment and 45.5% in control) who got married in last two years preceding the survey were below 18 years of age.* Women’s involvement in decision making regarding marriage of their son/daughter (treatment: 63.8% and control: 39.8%) and selling of land (treatment: 13.5% and control: 11.7%) was much lower. However, savings (treatment: 56.9% and control: 53.5%) and lending practice (treatment: 57.7% and control: 54.1%) among women was high.

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