I. Introduction

In November 2003, the third field study in the project “A matter of choice? Cost sharing in health and education from a rights of the child perspective” was conducted in Geita District. This paper is a first provisional draft of the ongoing analysis of the material. Please have a bearing with the language and editing. It is an account for a small section of the material.

The aim of the project is to study how different groups of children’s rights to health and education have been effected by the ongoing reforms of the economy, the administration and the reforms in the health and educational sector. In this paper we focus on how the economic base for the household are perceived to have changed, the education sector and the choices the household have to make. That means that the health part is not accounted for. The reason for taking in the economic changes is to access to what extent the households capabilities to meet the cost for education and health have increased in pace with expected contribution from the parents to education and health. When we use the term education, we include secondary education.

In the project, we are trying to illustrate some of the relationship between social development and poverty. While the human rights, aspect could be essential for the promotion of education in Third World countries an even more convincing argument was found in the concept of human capital. Education, and more specifically primary, was seen as a key factor to promote economic growth, and consequently development.

Income is according to Sen (1999) the principal capability deprivation, but to this we have to add a deeper analysis of social exclusion. To express educational performance as per capita income is part of the picture, but tend to neglect the deeper nature and content of poverty. Income is one factor in a complex web of relationships contributing to the ability for a person to expand the individual capability. Measuring internal and external efficiency of education gives us one element in the improved understanding of educational achievements, but we have to account for numerous other social factors in assessing the correlation between education and poverty.

Recent trends in developing thinking have to a large extent taken a poverty approach. Influential in this has been Amartya Sen, not least as a starting point for a more in-depth

---

1 The team consisted of lead researchers: Jonas Ewald (project coordinator), Göteborg University, Sweden; Ibrahim Shao, University of Dar es Salaam; Robert Mhamba University of Dar es Salaam, and field assistants: Zephania Kambele; Nanzia Toroka; Cutberth Kabero and Tumaini Kiro from University of Dar es Salaam and Richard Mhamba from Mwanza. Anders Närman, one of the lead researchers from Göteborg University, made a field visit in Geita as well. In addition lead researcher Lotta Mellander from Göteborg University participated in the analysis of the materials in Göteborg.
discussion on what development is (Shanmugaratnam 2001). According to international agencies, there is a need to focus more on the views and perceptions of the poor themselves (Narayan 2000). In this project, we are trying to link education to health.

The project and its methodology

Field studies have earlier been conducted in Kisarawe, Pangani 1999/2000 and Rombo 2002/03. The field studies are done through a combination of interviews with key informants, focus group discussions on District, Ward and Village level as well as within the health and education sector. Three locations were selected for the field studies; Ikuulwa, Bugogo and Kalangalala ward in Geita town. In each location, around 15 households have been interviewed, in all 44 households, representing different income groups. 20 focus group interviews were conducted with children and adults representing children in school, out of school as well as adults/parents. Focus group discussions were held with village leadership as well as with teachers at the schools. 27 key informant interviews where conducted, including heads of departments of the education, health, culture and agricultural sectors in the District Administration, including the DC. Ward Education Supervisors (WES), Ward Executive officers and Councillors was interviews at ward level. At village level the Village Chairmen, Village Executive Officers and Chairmen of the Vitongojis and Mtaas and head teachers were interviewed. In all about 130 people are consulted in each of the three localities, or about 400 people in the three localities. If we include that often several household members where present at the household interviews a further 50-100 people could be added. Key informant interviews and focus group interviews where conducted with a checklist of questions. The household interviews where conducted with a semi structured question guide. The household where selected together with the village leadership, after explaining that we would like to meet households from all wealth groups. In practice the selection of household often were made at random after discussions with the vitongoji or street chairmen. Each interview took between 2,5-3,5 hours. We have found after wards that we despite all effort most likely have an overrepresentation of better off households. It is of course also a risk that the selection of household was made based on the fact that the chairman of the vitongoji either liked to show how progressive he as leader was or selecting somebody he thought were able to communicate with the research team. We think, however, that we managed to balance this trough thorough discussions with the leaders what we wanted and needed.

We started by a number of selected key informant interviews with district officials in order to get the broader context of Geita District explained (DAS, DED, DC, DMO; DHO, DEO). We then selected three wards (Kalangalala, Ihanamilo and Bukoli) in three different divisions for the field studies. In each ward, we selected one village. The selection was based on getting three different case studies that could illustrate different socioeconomic conditions of the District:

1) Geita Town (Kalangalala ward): “The urban centre of the District”
2) Ikuulwa village (Ihanamilo ward): “A poor, undiversified village with bad communications and thus distant
3) Bugogo village (Bukoli ward): “A better off village, diversified economy with better communications”

2 The field study have unfolded very well, not the least through the excellent assistance from the District Commissioner, the District Administrative Officer, the District Executive Director, the Ward Executive Officers, Village Chairmen and Village Executive Secretaries in Ikuulwa, Kalangalala and Bugogo as well as the village councils, the staff at health and educational facilities. We are also grateful to all the household and individuals that have taken their time to discuss these issues with us.
Structure of the paper

This paper starts with a brief context of the situation in Geita District in general, and the three locations selected for the case studies. After that follows a presentation of some of the findings related to socio economic issues; education and choices.

In the first section, on socio economic issues, we try to understand the households composition, their resource base as well as how different household perceive the economic situation for the household, the village and the district. The aim with that section is to understand how different households capability to pay for education and health services have developed. It is also an assessment of the vulnerability different wealth groups are living with. The section on education and health tries to get different stakeholders perspective on how the situation in the educational and health sector have developed, including what costs that are involved as well as how the quality of the services have developed, according to the users we have interviewed. Lastly, we get the households view on how it managed the costs for health and education, how different household members are prioritised and how choices between health and education or between different family members are made. These information are the triangulated with key informant interviews and focus group discussions. The education section gives account for some of the findings on the education sector. Lastly, we present some of the findings related to choices.

II. Context: Short description of Geita District

Geita district, with its 712195 inhabitants (Census 2002), is the largest district in terms of population in the country besides Kinondoni and Temeke Districts in Dar es Salaam. It is one out of 8 districts in Mwanza Region, situated on the South Eastern banks of Lake Victoria. It has an area of 7825 km$^2$ out of which 6775 km$^2$ is land. It is thus the biggest district both in terms of population and surface of the three districts in our study. Administratively it is divided in seven divisions, 33 wards and 185 villages.

The district has 227 primary schools and only nine secondary schools, out of which three are private.

Geita District has only one government hospital and five health centres. Out of the 40 dispensaries, five are owned by the missionaries.

Thus, provision of both health and educational facilities are inadequate in the District.

Geita used to be an important cotton-growing district. With falling prices, the cotton production until recently has been on the decline. The district is rich in natural resources, including forest and Lake Victoria. The minerals, however, have generated most attention. Geita is situated in the middle of the green stone belt, with rich potentials of gold and other minerals. A gold mine was established already in the 1920s and reached its maximum in the 50s. It was nationalised and later closed down in the end of the sixties. Small scale, informal mining occurred during the 1970s, but exploded in the eighties and early nineties, not the least in Nyarugusu gold field and in remains of the old Geita goldmine. Small-scale mining took place in at least seven different locations LEAT has estimated that at its peak more then 50 000 small-scale miners were active in the district. LEAT moreover estimate that for each miner, four additional jobs are created. Thus, the small-scale mining was one of the most efficient vehicles for poverty reduction. However, the minerals where often extracted under terrible working conditions and causing environmental hazards. The gold is extracted with organic mercury, a metal that carries great environmental risks. Moreover, the extraction was made near Lake Victoria, thus potentially threatening the large but shallow lake and in the end the whole Nile basin. The government was concerned about the environmental threats, and wanted modern large-scale mining. With liberalisation, paradoxically, the uneducated small scale miners who did not know about claims, where chased away when large Transnational
mining companies bought the claims in the areas where the prospecting small scale miners already had found the minerals. In the process, tens of thousands of small-scale miners have lost their income opportunity. Ashanti Gold invested heavily and has now built up Geita goldmine, to the world most modern gold mine in 2003. With only 1800 employees and 12 mega excavators and dumpers between 500 –2000 kg, pure gold is now excavated and flown by special small jet planes once a week from the airstrip that now lies in the mining area. It makes Geita goldmine to the second biggest in Africa outside South Africa and one of the bigger in the world. Little of this wealth trickles, however, over to the district and its inhabitants.

Description of the field sites

Geita Town

To call Geita a town is misleading. It is more like a big unplanned village situated on both side of a dusty and bumpy gravel trunk road connecting Mwanza with Bukoba. In the middle of the “town” is a “commercial centre” consisting of markets, small shops, a few “hotels” (“restaurants”) and guesthouses. A small bank and post office exists. As well as a small Internet café (the Internet café is situated in an old container and consist of 8 small boxes with computers. It worked now and then). The town was established in the 1950s when the land was cleared and cotton cultivation expanded, as well as the goldmine that was established in 1940s. The town has expanded quite fast since early nineties due to expansion of formal and informal mining. A lot of new constructions are taking place. Still the general impression is that it is very runned down and poor.

Geita “town” have about 53 000 inhabitants, according to an old estimation. According to the WEO much more people live in the town, maybe up 120 000 people. It is divided in 5 different “streets”\(^3\), the administrative unit in towns. The challenge in Geita is that the town has grown so very fast the last 10 years that the administrative set up do not at all correspond to the number of people living in the town. For instance is the whole town administrated by 1 (one) ward executive officer, plus elected on unpaid sub street chairmen and secretaries and street chairmen and secretaries. The administrative structure will be change in a near future and Geita will get municipal status and thus a municipal council. We selected one of the streets, Kalangalala\(^4\). Kalangalala Street stretched from the agricultural areas on the plain east of town, over the towns “commercial centre” to the poor areas on top of the hill. Through selecting that street we would get an opportunity to get both the poorest and the richest of the households in Geita town. In addition, the street is most “town like” of the wards in Geita town.

Ikulwa & Bugogo

Ikulwa and Bugogo were selected as two of the team members had made field studies there in late eighties up to mid nineties, at different occasions. We thus had a reference point for the changes as well as background information on the situation in the villages. The villages was originally selected as they constituted two different case studies, where Ikulwa is an example of a remote poor less diversified village with bad communications and Bugogo a more developed village with better communications. That division is still valid. Bugogo with its closeness to the Nyarugusu goldfield has a much broader and more diversified economy then Ikulwa. However, Bugogo expanded rapidly in the nineties, but with the establishment of

\(^3\) The names of the streets are Mkorani, Nyankumbu, Kalangalala, Ihayabuyaga and Buharahara.

\(^4\) Note that the street has the same name as the ward.
formal mines, the informal miners has been chased away, which have led to deterioration of the economy in Bugogo.

*Ikulwa*

Ikulwa is a typical poor rural village, where the economy is based on mainly small-scale agricultural activities. Bugogo is situated on the newly built trunk road between Geita and Kahama, while Ikulwa is “off track”, connected to the rest of the world with simple bush road. Even if Ikulwa is situated only around 10 km from Geita, there is no buses or other means of regular transport to Geita. Bicycle of walking is the main means of communication.

Ikulwa has about 452 households; approximately, there are 3,500 people (2001). The village has 7 vitongojis: Nyakahangala, Ihanamilo, Shikonoka, Wigembya, Bugando, Shiravera and Mwavasavi.

We selected three different vitongojis for the case studies: Ihanamilo, the “centre of the village” with the ward administrative office, the cooperative office and godown, the village office and a few dukas and hotels. Nyakahangala, the most distant and poor part of the village and Bugando, the average part of the village. There is no dispensary in the village, but one village school.

*Bugogo*

Bugogo is situated close to the areas where large-scale informal mining of gold and other minerals took place. With liberalisation, these areas have now been leased out to large-scale modern TNC mining companies. Ten of thousands of small-scale miners are evicted, under mining the economy of Bugogo.

Bugogo looks more like a small town then a village, but agriculture is still the mainstay of the economy.

**III. Socioeconomic issues- findings from Geita District**

*Households their resource base and composition*

- Household structures a highly complex and varied with complicated patterns of remittances and responsibilities to a larger or smaller group
- The “grandparents household” comparatively usual, but not as usual as in Rombo. Divorce/remarriages is very common.
- Different types of children in live in most households (some belong to the immediate others not to the immediate family, including children from earlier relations, orphans, siblings children, other relatives children). In most cases, the different types of children have different social status within the family. It was not unusual to have up to 3-5 or even up to 11 children that did not belong to the immediate family in the household. And/or that one or several of the adults in the family have children together with adults outside the family. The core children tend to get better access to education than the non-core children. It is less discrimination of non-core children when it comes to health care.
- Richer households with its economic base in agriculture tend to be large, while richer house holds with economic base in “modern economy” tend to be smaller.
- Poor families tend to be smaller than the middle and better off families, because they have less resources to support an extended family
- Muslim families tend to be larger, one obvious reason is that Islam allows several wifes, but it might as well be other factors involved.
• High social mobility in Geita Town, but low in rural areas, depending on better opportunity in the expanding town.
• There are very large differences in the economic base for the households in Geita – both within localities and between localities. It is obvious that today even rural district have a sharp hierarchy of wealth groups. A small group of rich people are integrated in the global economy, possessing mobile phones, TV-sets and cars. While at the same time the vast majority live on subsistence level. A “middle class” of relatively better off is emerging, consisting on the one hand of employed people and those involved in small and medium sized business or large-scale farming. In order to make a meaningful discussion on households’ capabilities, a distinction has to be made between different wealth groups. We decided to use a five-tier stratification: Rich, better off, average, poor and very poor. The households have been wealth ranked both thru the indicators below, thru self-assessment and assessment by other households. The indicators have been developed in cooperation with the villagers.

Indicators for wealth ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very poor</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Better off</th>
<th>Rich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grass house or mud house or no house at all</td>
<td>Mud house or house in bad shape, straw roof of iron sheet in bad shape</td>
<td>Mud or brick house, reasonable well maintained, with iron sheets or straw roof in good shape</td>
<td>Good permanent house with tiles or iron sheets in good standard</td>
<td>One or several permanent houses of good quality, concrete walls and floors, iron sheet or tile roofing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 acres of land, infertile, or do not cultivate, no time work on others farm (in rural areas)</td>
<td>1-3 acres of land, less fertile (in rural areas)</td>
<td>3-5 acres of land (in rural areas)</td>
<td>5-15 acres of good or reasonable fertile land (in rural areas)</td>
<td>Land: 15 acres and above (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cattle or other animals (except eventual hens) (in rural areas)</td>
<td>No cattle at home, but eventually 1-2 staying with someone else’s herd, but eventually goats or sheep and hens (in rural areas)</td>
<td>1-5 cows (in rural areas)</td>
<td>More then 5-30 cows (in rural areas)</td>
<td>More then 30 cows (rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity most of the time (1 meal or less per day, low nutritious/low quality)</td>
<td>Food insecurity at times</td>
<td>Food security, but not necessarily nutritious food</td>
<td>Enough food at all times, plus nutritious foods</td>
<td>No problem with foods at any time, high quality food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad or inadequate clothing</td>
<td>Inadequate clothing for all family members</td>
<td>Inadequate clothing for some of the family members (e.g., children, mother)</td>
<td>Sufficient and decent clothing for all family members</td>
<td>Good food and good clothes for all family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never able to meet basic needs</td>
<td>Not able to meet basic needs all year round</td>
<td>Able to meet basic needs most of the times, but not always</td>
<td>Always able to meet basic needs</td>
<td>Access to consumer goods and social services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No assets</td>
<td>Few assets, but</td>
<td>Radio, several</td>
<td>Assets: Bicycles,</td>
<td>Several good houses,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Wealth groups in the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth group</th>
<th>number of household</th>
<th>% of the sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Rich</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better off</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Wealth groups in the sample
Assets

We found very large variations in the households’ assets. In the rural areas, land and cattle are the most important assets. In town, the buildings together with investments in business activities are the most important, together with land. Poor peoples houses have, however, little value.

Control of resources

The control of the households resources are to a large extent in the hand of the husband, even if several households claim that the spouses consult each other before economic decisions are made. But even if consultations are made, the husband decides in the end. In a few cases the woman held the responsibility for the economy, mainly in urban areas.

Expenditures

Poor families have comparatively high expenditures as they depend on buying food. The poor household estimated that they spend between 250 and 1000 Tsh per day depending on size of the family. I.e., 7500-30000 per month.

The average and better off families are often self sufficient in food. If they depend on buying food the cost range between 2000-8000 Tsh per day depending of size of family and quality of food. Which correspond to 60000-240000 per month. Largest cost for most households is food, followed by cloths and there after education and health.

Social networks

- Richer household have larger and more diversified networks than the poorer households.
- The most important network among the poor is the relatives, while among the rich it is the friends
- Possibility to get a loan or assistance depends on social status. The lower social status, the more difficult it is to get a loan. It is difficult for most poor household to get a loan, because they have little capacity to pay back. Thus they are much more vulnerable then the rich households.

Social capital

Richer household generally more social capital than the poor, and thus can mobilise more resources in times of crises.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>could have bicycle and radio</th>
<th>bicycles.</th>
<th>motorbikes, mobile phones, machine</th>
<th>car, motorbike, mobile phones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depending on casual labour and sell own produce</td>
<td>Small-scale business (small shop, hotel etc)</td>
<td>Medium sized business</td>
<td>One or more business activities generating substantial income of at least 500 000/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If employed, salary up to 50 000 Tsh (minimum wage)</td>
<td>If employed, salary 50-200 000 Tsh</td>
<td>Or at least one monthly salary in the household of above 200 000 Tsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trust

There is a strong feeling that the social cohesion and trust have been reduced. There is a slight difference between the different wealth groups. Around 60% of the better off and the average perceived that social trust have been reduced, while as many as 73% of the poor perceive the same. The reason for the higher figure among the poor might be explained with that poor people are more dependent on the community.

The main reason for decreased social trust was attributed to that people have become much more self-centred or *binafsii*. Other reasons included increased economic hardship and increasing criminality and lack of security.

Economic development

There has been some improvement on the macro level in the district, but the situation for the majority have apparently improved marginally or even deteriorated. As emerged from table 3, around 60% of the better off and average households perceive that the household’s economic situation has deteriorated the last five years, while *all* poor perceive that situation has become worse.

The household that improve appear largely to have come from outside, not the least from Kilimanjaro region.

Improved cotton prices are the major reason for improvement in the rural areas, for those growing cotton. This clearly displays how vulnerable the rural economies are for changes outside their control. World market prices fluctuate rapidly and drop will again have severe implications for the economy in the cotton growing areas. Lack of rain the last years was one common reason for the deterioration of the living standards. Which again point at how vulnerable the rain fed and little diversified agricultural economy are. Cotton prices have increased, but still access to credits to buy inputs is a problem. As well as enough inputs at the right time. Declining soil fertility and lack of land where other sources of deterioration.

When it comes to the perception of the changes at village level, (table 4 below) we get a slightly different pattern. Still 38% of the better off, 50% of the average and 41,5% of the poor thinks the situation has deteriorated, while 23%, respective 21,5% and 41,5% thinks the situation has improved – but just for a few better off. If we take these two statements together, we get that 51% of the better off, 71,5% of the average and 90% of the poor perceive that the situation either has deteriorated, or just improved for a few.

---

5 It might as well be a methodological question involved here. We ask how people *perceive* their households economic situation now compared with around 5 years back. It might be that households situation actually has improved – but that peoples expectations on what they need and want have increased. In any case is this relative deprivation as real for people as a factual deprivation.
We get a similar, but slightly less depressing picture when it comes to perceptions at the district level. The great difference is still between the poor and the rest. While as many as 38.5% of the better off and 42.5% of the average thinks the situation has improved generally at the district level, only 8.5% of the poor perceive that the situation has improved (table 5). This result might be explained by:

The establishment of GGM have resulted in a loss of income opportunities for small-scale miners in Kalangalala, without compensation. This is one of the reasons why so comparably many have the better off and rich claims that the situation has deteriorated. Several of the rich and better off claim that the business climate change when the small scale miners where chased away.

Table 4: Perceived change of the economic situation the last five years in the village/street level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Improved, but for a few better off</th>
<th>Deteriorated</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Perceived change of the economic situation in Geita District the last 5 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>Improved, but for a few better off</th>
<th>Deteriorated</th>
<th>Unchanged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better off</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is, however, unclear how much income the small scale miners actually managed to get. It might be that the life style and consumption patterns of the small scale miners led to a situation where the miners where comparatively poor, while the ones servicing the miners made the largest profits, including the buyers of the gold.

Several of the evicted villagers from Mtakuja village live in Kalangalala Street. Many of them have got a more difficult situation after the eviction. All are not compensated yet and the compensation is lower than promised. (Corruption in the former districts administration – court case in the pipeline)

- With large scale, modern mining follows new opportunities for income generation. The rich do have better opportunities and capacity to take advantage of the new opportunities. The poor lack education, skills, capital, trust and health to do that to the same extent.
There exists an over establishment in several of the economic sectors that people from Geita have entered into. For example maize milling, shops and construction. That have led to a press downward on the prices, and even made it difficult for traders to get enough goods to sell. Lack of entrepreneurship and knowledge create a “follow John” mentality.

Even if even the poorest have got some little improvement, the rift between the poor and rich has increased. A situation that might generate increased frustration if no change start to trickle down to the most impoverished.

Taken together it appear clearly that the poor and very poor, as well as for a large part of the average category, little if none improvement have taken place the last years. Thus has not the capability to pay for expenses for health and education in these groups increased, which in turn threatens the rights to health and education for the children in these families.

III. Education and Poverty in Tanzania – a general overview

Tanzania is one of the countries that have been assessed as one of the many countries that are not likely to achieve the millennium goal of basic education for all in the year 2015. This is not the place to go into a more detailed account of education in Tanzania. What we can note is the huge changes that the country has experienced since independence. In the early years the Nyerere “Education for Self-Reliance” could have been made into a model for African education. The characteristics for this model was a priority on primary education and literacy. Education should not be for an individualistic career, but be promoting the collective good. From this also follows a strong emphasis on practical skills in education. Within the educational system, pupils were to be prepared for a commitment to the total community. Still it was never implemented and in the early 1980s Tanzania was on the way into a mainstream Third World system.

In terms of numbers, Tanzania had a total of some 500,000 pupils in primary school at independence in 1961. This was increased gradually up to the early 1980s, reaching a peak of 3.5 millions. Thereafter, followed a decline in actual numbers, which was not back to similar levels until almost a decade later. Presently, it is with a certain dismay that we can look at what has happened to Tanzanian education up to the 1980s. Like in neighbouring countries Tanzania introduced various systems of cost-sharing, such as fees and numerous contributions. This has made schooling very competitive and a matter of financial means. Equal opportunities as a moral value has been replaced by a policy favouring the economically most advantaged. Even if fees are now formally abolished it is doubtful whether the commercialisation of schooling has seized.

During most of the 1990s the Gross Enrolment Rate (GER) shifted slightly around the 75 percent mark nationally. However, these statistics neglect various educational deficiencies, such as repetition, drop out and a generally poor quality. A better representation on how well the educational sector is doing can be given by the Net Enrolment Rate (NER). In the decade between 1988 and 1998 this figure increased moderately from 54 to 57 percent. This means that Tanzania, like almost the whole of Sub-Saharan Africa, is far away from the objective of reaching Education for All in 2015. In addition to that there are substantial regional and social inequalities. Regionally the southern parts of the country have always been lagging far behind in socio-economic development.

Education in Geita District.

Geita District had a total of 210 primary schools in 2002, out of which all but one were public schools. There were many primary schools built in the early years after Independence, but during the last 15 years the increase has been, as low as only some 10 percent. At the same time the total Geita population was as high as above 700,000, making it one of the most
populous districts in the country. Another way of expressing this is that there are more primary schools than the total number of villages (163). The brief on education in Geita district is taken from regional plans, coupled to interviews with officials and individual households in the district. What is here taken up are preliminary results from a material that is presently being analysed.

UPE (Universal Primary Education) has been a target for Geita, as part of the national policies. It was estimated that in 2002 there were close to 20,000 children of the age of seven. At the same time the total number enrolled at St 1 was not less than 41,000 pupils. Consequently, the year of entry into primary school can vary largely. On the other hand we do not know how many of these pupils have been enrolled at school also previously, before dropping out. After all it would be a little bit absurd to see that we have a GER or some 200 percent. Another matter for debate is what is actually to be regarded as a success in educational achievements. When a ward educational officer say that there are 80 percent enrolment, we have to ask; is this really good or not?

Total enrolment in the whole of Mwanza region increased considerably from independence and up to the late 1980s, just as the national situation. Since that time the expansion has been rather moderate, if any, until the PEDP reform in 2001 had a distinct effect on the number enrolled in school. In the case of Geita there was an increase from 90,000 up to almost 120,000 in that one year (or some 30 percent). Even so, there are still many children of school going ages not in school in Geita. It has been estimated that there are a total of 130,000 children in the ages 7 to 13. A calculation of GER gives some 89 percent, but this is a poor representation of the actual situation. An assessment of 15,000 children in school going ages out of school is presumably a gross under-estimation. On top of that the sex ratio is clearly in favour of boys compared to girls (112 percent). This is comparatively high both nationally and in relation to Mwanza region. From official discussions the steep increase in enrolment was mentioned as an acute problem for them to handle.

School efficiency is often measured in relation to drop out, which was given at 1.955 for the year 2000. Unfortunately, there is no figure given for a later date to compare with the exact number of pupils, but it would still be some 2 to 3 percent. A special problem mentioned by educational officials was the value of cattle among the Sukuma, regarding schooling as a waste of time.

- Lack of priority of education to parents.
- Some parents admit that the children are kept at home, because of domestic duties.
  - I need them (children) for domestic activities and agriculture.
  - I sometimes need a child to stay at home especially when others are sick. But I have to obtain a permit from teachers.
- In another case we could feel the negative view to such practice, but also that it is a matter of financial conditions.

- No child labour is used in the household. We employ labourers...

At the same there were other activities that attracted a lot of children, such as mining and fishing. Girls were also sometimes refused to go to school.

- Parents believe that they (girls) have nothing to bring to the family once they are educated because they will get married.

In a few cases we have also seen a drop out due to pregnancies. The overall reasons are for non-enrolment and drop outs are many and complex.

- Many failures are contributed by lack of priority of education to parents and children themselves. Other reason is the economic hardship at home whereby other children concentrate on business activities than studies.

With no fees some children have been able to return to school after some time of interruptions. However, others say that even after fees the cost is still about the same for a lot
of other school expenditures. One reason that seems to be important for children not going to school is the distance. Some indicate that the children have some 5 to 6 kms to walk and, therefore, they often pretend to be sick to be allowed not to go.

With the increase in pupils an already difficult situation concerning facilities was further exaggerated. Classrooms were deficient to 60 percent, and toilets by 77 percent in 2002. Few teachers had been allocated houses, which is a problem related to motivation and probably also teachers attendance in school. It is surprising to hear from many parents that both buildings and toilets are good. From the educational official interviewed the view was that the schools were experiencing a slight decline.

The number of teachers is, in itself, a dilemma nationally and not least in Geita. In 1996 there was a deficiency of close to 500 teachers, or 26 percent. Of the total numbers of teachers an absolute majority were not qualified. In 2002 there were a total of 1,623 teachers, against a required number of 3,131 (or a 48 percent deficit). From earlier studies it can be said that even the teachers indicated in this kind of statistics might be way to high – a high proportion of “ghost” teachers. Officially Geita has got an extreme average rate of pupils to teachers of 72, against an average figure of 40. According to the official rules there should have been 56 teachers per pupil. One explanation to the situation was that teachers preferred to go other areas that were not so remote. This was confirmed in interviews with the teachers themselves. As an example it was mentioned that the district had one year been allocated 434 teachers, but only 26 turned up. This shortage of teachers was mentioned by education officials as a serious problem. It was further argued that even if a teacher was formally qualified that did not necessarily mean that he/she was competent. Still we find many views such as:

Teachers are more motivated then those of our days.
Teachers are dedicated to their work and are motivated.

However, we also find the opposite;

I expect the teachers to teach more. There are some who are drunk and do mind their own business.

One primary school drop out gave as one reason for terminating school the teacher behaviour;

Teachers are not motivated and quite a few teach seriously while some are drunkards, who miss classes even for a week due to drinking especially when they get their salaries.

The views expressed on school quality vary, but it seems that most parents regard this to be improved. Of course, the opposite view has also been expressed.

The quality is good buildings are good but in our time we used to sit under trees and on stones instead of desks. Nowadays there are some desks.

The quality of education is currently better than before.

However, it is also very common to find the different stand-point, such as

The quality of education I think has dropped, on the period I was young those who go to school manage to read English when their St 4. Nowadays you can find a child in St 3 or 4 but cannot read even Kiswahili.

Nowadays students do complete school without writing and reading skills and teachers do not make any effort to direct them.

On quality of teachers it is also possible to find a divergent view. Some claim that previously teachers were drinking and misbehaved, while other say this habit has now declined considerably. The situation might be different in one school from the other one. Some parents are indicating a corrupt practice among teachers to open exam questionnaires and sell (give) to some pupils. In one case a parent said they give the questions to the rich, as they do not want the poor to succeed.
... there are rumours that teachers do open exams and assist some few students that they wish to pass. There are no stern measures that are taken to discover the truth. Do you think children of the poor parents will pass?

During examination time children are given answers before. There is a huge leakage of examination that is assisted by teachers.

Tanzania is known for an extremely low transition rate from primary to secondary school. In the case of Geita it is less than 9 percent. Therefore, the potential opportunities after a basic education are limited. This is also a factor that parents mentioned in many interviews that primary school is not enough to get some kind of employment. Even if many are not able to continue at secondary level there is many parents saying that still school is relevant. Primary school can also in some cases lead to employment. Of course, some reading and writing skills are also important for any kind of self-employment.

In spite of everything else one of the most common answers to the value of education was that;

*Education is very useful in life. Anything without education is difficult, even getting employed one need to be educated.*

One interesting point in connection to the rights of the child was expressed in this way:

*Students were afraid of teachers just as they were afraid of their parents but today because of Child rights concept children do not care, they are rude to teachers, parents and elderly people.*

**IV. Choices**

In this last section we tried to understand how families tried to meet the costs for health and education and which prioritisation they did. We also inquired which strategies different households developed to meet the cost in health and education.

Has it become more difficult to meet the cost for health and education for household in Geita?

Almost all poorer families and several of the average claimed that it has been more difficult to meet the cost for health and education. Even if the abolishment of school fees had lowered the cost for primary education. But secondary education now has become a new burden in many households. The richer household did not in general find it difficult to meet the cost for health and education. However, with increased incomes, the better off and rich families start to demand higher quality education, and as that, it is more expensive, they at time still find it difficult to meet the expenses.

**Prioritising**

Health always gets priority before education. Unhealth/Illness is regarded as an emergency while education is an investment. *Education can wait.*

When it comes to health no strong prioritisation appeared to be made between different children and other members of the household. In some families *the mother should get priority before the children, as she is the three and the children the branches.* In others, the husband because he is the breadwinner. And in some the children, because the adults better could stand the sickness.

In education the choices are explicit. In particular when it comes to secondary education. In the rural setting the boys got priority before the girls. With the argument that boys will be leaders in their families and thus needs capacity to lead. Boys are supposed to support the parents at old age. Investment in boys stays within the family. While investment in girls gives little return because *the girls walks away with the education* when they gets married [In the
patriarchal Sukuma tradition]. Other argument was that the girls are not stable. The easily become cheated and lured by men that destroy their life so they become useless. It could also be negative to have the girls at school because the get exposed to different cultures and with children that have not been brought up properly, thus risking that the girls get into trouble.

In the urban areas the priority for the boys what not that strong, and even in the rural areas a few families said that they should support the girl. The arguments was that the girls are more well behaved then the boys, that they where more disciplined and doing better. Girls are more good-hearted and considerable and support parents and siblings. If girls do not go to school they risk getting pregnant by the street boys. Most urban families would support that child that performed best at school, irrespective of gender, they said.

Children belonging to the core family (with both parents in the household) will get priority before other children (when it comes to education).

Children with handicapped appear to get priority because they in that way can get a living and in that way reduce the burden of the parents.

Mentally retarded children, however, will not get priority.

The first-born child, particularly if it is a boy will get priority before the younger children, in most cases. In some households, however, the last born would get priority as they will take care of the parents.

If the resources are limited and an adult and a child is sick, it appears that the child in most cases will get priority. But not in many rural families where the father should get the priority. In a few cases the mother should get the priority.

Decisions

In most cases consultations take place, but in the end it seem that the man is the most important decision maker. If the father is sick the mother has to consult with the fathers relatives.

When it comes to STD among children the girls consult with their mothers and their friends. While boys only consult with their friends.

Strategies to meet cost for health and education

If the resources are insufficient to cover health and educational expenditures, the possibilities to raise funds varies between education and health and between different income groups.

- It is easier to raise funds for health expenditures then education
- Poor families have less possibilities than the rich families. The rich families could both borrow from friends, business associates, neighbours, the bank (for education) and shops as well as relatives. While the poor only could borrow from relatives and sometimes from neighbours, friends and the shop, but with much more difficulty than the rich.
- To sell properties was an option, but only as a last resort. A number of household said they would never sale cattle to pay for education. Health is regarded as an emergency which could require the need to sell cattle.

V. Conclusion

The reforms in the economic sector, health and education have started to give effect on local level. Impressive number of classrooms have been built, secondary schools erected and teachers enrolled. The abolishment of school fees in conjuncture with a change in attitude to education has resulted in massive increase of enrolments in the schools. Still however, the cost for health and education combined is a heavy burden, not the least for families with many children in school going age. Private cost for cloths and textbook is a heavy cash expense for a subsistence agricultualists. If we add the cost for participating in building secondary schools, and eventually,
sending children to the new schools, the cost for education is still very high for most average and poor families. It means that the rights to both education and health for children in poor families still not are respected. In particular, children that have lost one or both parents either through sickness or economic reasons are still not getting adequate attention. The heavy mobilisation for secondary school education have thus as side effect that even if the school fees for primary school is abolished, the total cost for education will increase. (And almost all households we met responded very positively on the urge to send children to secondary schools.)

In addition, the quality of the provided education still lags far behind, and might even have deteriorated in terms of number of children to provided resources. We wonder if the motivation, particularly from average household and the few poor that could manage, to send children to secondary school will be sustained if on the one hand the quality is not improved in the schools, and secondly, if the children do not get better life chances after secondary school. This might create frustration both among parents and children.

Lastly, the large focus on education currently, and the less focus on health might lead to that investments that are done in the education sector might be undermined or destroyed due to ill-health.