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## Important technical note for readers

The EICV5 has three main components: cross-sectional sample of households, VUP Panel Survey receiving VUP benefits and EICV5 Panel Survey.

The EICV5 cross-sectional survey is designed to represent the current household-based population of Rwanda. The NISR national master sampling frame was used for selecting the sample villages in each district. This master sample was based on the 2012 Rwanda Census frame. The villages were selected for the Master Sample, stratified by district. Within each district the sample villages were selected systematically with probability proportional to size (PPS), where the measure of size was based on the number of households in each village from the 2012 Census frame. Within each district the villages in the master sampling frame were not explicitly stratified by urban and rural areas. However, the frame of villages within each district was ordered by urban and rural codes, and the systematic selection of the sample villages (with PPS) provides an implicit stratification of the Master Sample by urban and rural areas within each district, with a proportional allocation of the sample villages to each stratum.

Similar to the EICV4 cross-sectional survey methodology, a nationally-representative sample of clusters was assigned for the EICV5 data collection each cycle out 10 cycles, so that the sample is geographically representative over time. This process ensured that the final distribution of the sample clusters to cycles and sub-cycles was geographically representative within each district.

The objectives of the EICV5 Panel Survey are to measure the trends in key socioeconomic indicators over time for a nationally representative panel of households. The baseline survey was EICV3, and in EICV4 the panel households which moved or split were tracked and interviewed at their new location. The Panel Survey includes the panel households that remained in the original sample villages, and the split households that were tracked in EICV4. Any panel households that moved or split from this initial sample of panel households in EICV5 were also tracked. However, the additional tracking will be limited to following the original eligible members (13 years or older in EICV3, with relationship being: Household Head, Spouse of household head, son/daughter of household head, or step child/ adopted child of household head) of the EICV3 panel households.

The main objective of the VUP Panel Survey is to provide longitudinal data for a nationallyrepresentative panel of households that received VUP benefits at the time of the EICV4, in order to obtain reliable estimates of trends in the socioeconomic indicators for these households. The VUP Survey conducted with EICV4 was based on a sample of 2,460 households selected from the VUP administrative frame using a stratified two-stage sample design. However, only the sample households indicated that they were receiving VUP benefits at the time of the EICV4 survey were considered to be the sample for the VUP Panel Survey.

If the entire household moved or an eligible member moved, it was necessary to identify their new address so that they can be tracked there. The eligibility criteria for household members to be tracked and the tracking procedures are similar to those used for the EICV5 Panel Survey.

Regarding data collection, the NISR collected the data for the EICV5 cross-sectional, VUP panel and EICV5 panel surveys using computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) with computer tablets for the first time using the same questionnaire, including the listing operation.

## Rounding of estimates

Estimates presented in the tables are shown rounded to one decimal place. To improve readability, estimates referred to in the interpretation of results have been rounded to the nearest integer, except for the discussion of relatively small percentages. Moreover, estimates of total population or total number of households are shown in tables expressed in '000's. Due to the rounding, the sum of subpopulation totals (e.g. Provinces or age groups) can be minimally different from the total population estimated at national level.

## Consumption quintiles

The results are presented by quintile. Quintiles are developed by sorting the sample of households by annual consumption expenditure values, and then dividing the population into five equal shares. The $20 \%$ of individuals with the highest annual consumption are allocated to quintile 5 , and the $20 \%$ of individuals with the lowest levels of annual consumption are allocated to quintile 1 . The poorest households and their members are found in quintile 1 and the richest are found in quintile 5 .

Consumption is used as a proxy for income, as is usual when estimating poverty. Quintiles are a relative measure of individuals' consumption in comparison to the rest of the population during a specific period.

## Executive Summary

## Background to the EICV5 and the EICV series

This report presents and discusses detailed results from the EICV5 and compares them with EICV4 in the areas of household and personal characteristics according to gender.

The survey was conducted over a period of 12 months between October 2016 and October 2017. The sampling in this survey was three fold. It included cross-sectional sample, panel sample, and individuals and households sampled from VUP list of beneficiaries.

In cross-sectional analysis, a new sample of 14,580 households was drawn using the 2012 Rwanda Population and Housing Census as sampling frame for enumeration areas as primary sampling units. Households and household members interviewed as part of the panel survey that remained in the same village as in EICV4 were also included in the cross-sectional sample, bringing the total number of households analysed to 14,580 .

The EICV5 took place three years after the EICV4 was conducted and aimed to provide even more timely evidence to support policy making and continuous evaluation of the EDPRS2. EICV methodology has remained unchanged since its series started in 2000/01. This has allowed calculating indicators in a consistent way for more than one survey round in order to investigate trends and to inform the planning framework of the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS) as well as other target indicators, such as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In this report, the majority of tables provide results for both EICV4 and EICV5 and highlight developments over time, as well as different patterns across provinces in Rwanda, both in urban and rural areas. Emphasis has been placed on including disaggregated results for men and women and male and female-headed households to explore gender-related aspects in key social and economic characteristics of persons and households in Rwanda, as well as other types of disaggregation, such as age group, type of habitat, etc. Where necessary, districts tables have been provided in annex.

## Household's headship

Findings from EICV5 (2016/17) show that 25\% of households are headed by female while 6\% of households were headed by female in the absence of a male head (De facto female-headed households). The overall sex ratio for the country is 108 females for every 100 males. This implies that there is a deficit of males within the population of Rwanda. Female household heads were found much older than male household heads. About $35.8 \%$ of female household heads were over 60 years old and above, compared with $13 \%$ of male household heads of the same age. On the other hand, $4.1 \%$ of female- heads were under 25 years compared to $5.7 \%$ of male heads.

## Poverty incidence of male /female-headed households

Considering poverty status, the data from EICV5 shows that $39.5 \%$ of female-headed households are classified as poor compared to $37.6 \%$ of male-headed households in 2016/17.

## Housing characteristics and access to services and facilities

The housing characteristics and conditions of female-headed households are almost similar to those of male-headed households, except for the main source of lighting, where the percentage of male-headed households using electricity as the main source of lighting (29.2\%) is higher than that of female-headed households (20.3\%). Female-headed households using firewood as the main source of lighting has decreased by 3 percentage points from $10 \%$ in 2013/14 to $7 \%$ in $2016 / 17$, while male headed households that used firewood as the main source of lighting has decreased by 1.6 percentage point from $4 \%$ in the same period. The proportion of femaleheaded households that use improved drinking water sources has slightly increased from 86\% to $87 \%$ between $2013 / 14$ and $2016 / 17$ compared to male headed household which increased from $84 \%$ to $88 \%$.

## Agricultural activities and assets

Ownership of land is critical to social and economic empowerment of women. Female-headed households owning farm land has decreased by 7 percentage points from $89 \%$ in 2013/14 to $82 \%$ in $2016 / 17$ while male-headed household has decreased by 10 percentage points from $89.5 \%$ to $80 \%$ in the same period. On the other side the average size of land cultivated per female head of household remained constant in the last three years at national level ( 0.5 ha ), and the same case applies for male headed household too ( 0.6 ha ). Overall, there has been a reduction in the percentage of households raising any livestock. Data indicate that, $57.3 \%$ of female headed household own any type of livestock compared to $60.3 \%$ of male heads.

## Economic activity

About $86 \%$ of all working age persons were employed in 2016/17. Working females are $87 \%$ while working males are $86 \%$. The findings of EICV5 show that about $63 \%$ of working females are in agriculture related occupations compared to only $43 \%$ among working males. Majority of female owning businesses have not completed primary school level (36\%) compared to a slightly higher rate of $39.8 \%$ for their male counterparts. Female with university level owning businesses stands at $3.1 \%$ against $4.2 \%$ among male. The percentage of female aged 18 years and above with a bank account is almost twice lower the one of male of same age bracket ( $22.4 \%$ compared to $38 \%$ ). Furthermore, as the survey results show, only $3.2 \%$ of female aged 18 years and above have secured loan from a formal source compared to $6.9 \%$ of male, while $35.4 \%$ of female have acquired loan from informal source compared to $39.4 \%$ of male. Women are less likely to borrow larger amount of money compared to men, especially from formal financial sources. The findings from EICV5 show that, majority (22.5\%) of female who have secured a loan from a formal financial institution have received 5,000 Frws or less, while for male, majority ( $28 \%$ ) have secured above 1,000,000 Frws.

## Health Conditions

Males and females aged 5 and plus had almost the same rate for disability (4.2\%) in Rwanda in $2016 / 17$, with a slight decrease of $0.4 \%$ among female and $0.1 \%$ among male since 2013/14. Approximately, 75\% of the female population reported having health insurance in Rwanda in 2016/17 with a slight difference compared to male (73\%).

## Education and training

The level of school attendance of children is the primary indicator of a population's access to education and, indirectly, its socioeconomic development.

Nationwide, access to primary school for children aged between 7 and 12 years remained somewhat steady in the last three years. Findings indicate that the net attendance rate (NAR) of female at primary school level is slightly higher than that of male ( $88 \%$ compared to $87 \%$ respectively) while the female gross attendance rate (GAR) is slightly lower than for male ( $131.5 \%$ compared to $133 \%$ respectively). At primary level, both Net Attendance Rate and Gross Attendance Rate show a minor decrease between 2013/14 and 2016/17.

Furthermore, data reveals that $69 \%$ of the female population aged 15 and above are literate (able to read and write) in at least one language compared to $77.5 \%$ of males. In addition, according to EICV5, a person is considered "computer literate" if he/she expressed her/himself confident with using a computer. In Rwanda only $7 \%$ of female aged 15 years and above are computer literate compared to $11 \%$ male of same age bracket. The findings indicate also the same gender imbalance for age group 15-24 years where female still lag behind compared to their male counterparts ( $10 \%$ compared to $11 \%$ ).
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## Definition of Key Gender Concepts

Gender: Gender refers to socially constructed differences in attributes and opportunities associated with being female or male and to the social interactions and relations between women and men. Gender determines what is expected, allowed and valued in a woman or a man in a given context. In most societies, there are differences and inequalities between women and men in roles and responsibilities assigned, activities undertaken and access to and control over resources, as well as in decisionmaking opportunities.

Gender analysis: Gender analysis is a critical examination of how differences in gender roles, activities, needs, opportunities and rights/entitlements affect women, men, girls and boys in certain situations or contexts, Gender analysis examines the relationships between females and males and their access to and control of resources and the constraints they face relative to each other.

Sex disaggregated statistics: Sex-disaggregated statistics are data collected and tabulated separately for women and for men. They allow for the measurement of differences between women and men in various social and economic dimensions and are one of the requirements for obtaining gender statistics.

Gender equality: Gender equality means equal opportunities, rights and responsibilities for women and men, girls and boys. Equality does not mean that women and men are the

Same but that woman's and men's opportunities, rights and responsibilities do not depend upon whether they are born female or male.

Gender equity: The fair and just distribution of all means of opportunities and resources between women and men.

Gender gap: It is the disparities between socioeconomic characteristics of males and females. Pro-male gender gap is the gap that favors males; pro-female gender gap is the gap that favors females

Gender gaps: This is a status whereby as a result of customary practices, religious biases, social assumption, myths or taboos, one gender is discriminated against to such an extent that it is prevented from getting its fair share of resources or services.

Gender mainstreaming: Gender mainstreaming (general) is defined as the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels.

Sex ratio: It is the number of males in specific population or subgroup of population divided by corresponding number of females, conventionally multiplied by 100. Source of data is population censuses and surveys.

De facto female-headed households: Households temporarily headed by females due to the absence of the male heads for a certain period of time

Informal Unions/Marriages: Are couples married monogamously without legal certificates or couples living together without legal certificates

Gender parity index: This is a social-economic index designed to measure the relative access to education of male and female pupils or students. It is calculated as the quotient of the number of females by the number of males enrolled in a given level of education.

## Chapter 1: Introduction

Rwanda is a country that has made commendable gains towards promoting gender equality in different domain including political participation, health, education, etc. Gender equality is both a human right and indispensable component for sustainable development and hence one of cross-cutting areas in key national development frameworks/documents such as Vision 2020, the First National Strategy for Transformation (NST1), Vision 2050, regional such AU Agenda 2063; EAC Vision 2050 as well as international ones like SGDs.

In order to sustain the progress in promoting gender equality and deal with the remaining gender gaps and imbalances, surveys like EICV5 where gender disaggregated data are gathered become very key in informing on how male and female get involved in the development of the country and enjoys the opportunities. The Gender report at hand is one of six different thematic reports of EICV 5 namely: Youth, Economic Activity, Utilities and amenities, Education, Environment and Natural Resources. It focuses on household and personal characteristics according to gender and household headship.

The data presented here, were collected through the EICV5 fieldwork, which was carried out by the NISR between October 2016 and October 2017. EICV5 provides a key input into the evaluation of the development programmes such as: Vision 2020, EDPRS2, NST1, SDGs, Vision 2050, AU Agenda and EAC Vision 2050.

Along with the short methodological notes in preliminary pages, chapters 2 and 3 of this report describe the population according to their demographic characteristics and their poverty incidence. Chapters 4,5 and 6 present information on the household characteristics, agriculture activity occupied by household head and their economic activities. Finally, chapters 7 and 8 describe health conditions of household head and their education characteristics.

The annexes provide district-level estimates for selected indicators as well as confidence intervals.

## Chapter 2: Demographic Characteristics

This chapter analyses the demographic differences between female and male in terms of size and evolution of their respective population.

### 2.1. Demographic information and the sex ratio

According to EICV5, the population of Rwanda is estimated at 11.8 million compared to EICV4 results, which estimated Rwandan population at 11.4 million. Rwanda has had an increase of 0.4 million people since EICV4. Females comprise $52 \%$ of the total population both in EICV5 and EICV4. The findings show that there are minor differences between male and female at young age groups up to 15-19 years, and a significant difference from age group 20-24 where females outnumber males.

Table 2. 1: Population structure (\%), by sex and five-year age group, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | EICV4 |  |  |  | EICV5 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sex |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Estimated } \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { population } \\ (000 s) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Sex |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Estimated } \\ \text { Total } \\ \text { population } \\ (000 \mathrm{~s}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 47.8 | 52.2 | 100 | 11,424 | 48.0 | 52.0 | 100 | 11,893 |
| 5 year age group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-4 | 7,0 | 6.9 | 13.9 | 1,587 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 14.4 | 1,709 |
| 5-9 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 14.6 | 1,662 | 6.3 | 6.6 | 12.9 | 1,530 |
| 10-14 | 6.5 | 7,0 | 13.5 | 1,538 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 13.7 | 1,626 |
| 15-19 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 10.5 | 1,198 | 5.2 | 5.3 | 10.5 | 1,250 |
| 20-24 | 4.5 | 4.9 | 9.5 | 1,080 | 4.1 | 4.7 | 8.8 | 1,052 |
| 25-29 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 8.0 | 910 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 7.7 | 920 |
| 30-34 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 7.4 | 842 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 7.4 | 885 |
| 35-39 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 4.9 | 557 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 724 |
| 40-44 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 3.9 | 446 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 502 |
| 45-49 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 357 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 3.4 | 407 |
| 50-54 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 362 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 333 |
| 55-59 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 297 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 312 |
| 60-64 | 0.8 | 1,0 | 1.8 | 204 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.9 | 225 |
| 65+ | 1.3 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 384 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 418 |

Source: EICV5 and EICV4. Base population: all persons

Figure 2. 1: Population Pyramid by sex and five-year age group (EICV5)


Source: EICV5 and EICV4
The sex ratio is the number of females in specific population or subgroup of population divided by corresponding number of males, conventionally multiplied by 100. Figures from EICV5 indicate that the overall sex ratio for the country is 108 female for every 100 male while there were 109 female for every 100 male in EICV4 (table 2.2 and figure 2.2). This implies that there is a deficit of males within the population of Rwanda in 2016/17. According to the province, with the exception of Kigali city, there are more females than males in all provinces. This may largely be due to the higher prevalence of male migrations to Kigali city in search for works and better living standards. It should be noted that, at older ages (55 years and above) females largely outnumber males.

Figure 2.1 Sex Ratio, by five-year age group (EICV5, EICV4)


Source: EICV5 and EICV4

Table 2. 2: Number of females per 100 males, by province and age group, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Kigali <br> City | Southern <br> Province | Western <br> Province | Northern <br> Province | Eastern <br> Province | TOTAL | Estimated <br> Total <br> population <br> $\mathbf{( 0 0 0 s )}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 8 9 3}$ |  |
| Age group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $00-04$ | 96 | 101 | 96 | 101 | 103 | 100 | 1,709 |  |
| $05-09$ | 107 | 101 | 100 | 106 | 108 | 104 | 1,530 |  |
| $10-14$ | 98 | 98 | 96 | 112 | 100 | 100 | 1,626 |  |
| $15-19$ | 127 | 90 | 102 | 97 | 105 | 102 | 1,250 |  |
| $20-24$ | 99 | 114 | 125 | 121 | 120 | 115 | 1,052 |  |
| $25-29$ | 101 | 115 | 117 | 114 | 107 | 110 | 920 |  |
| $30-34$ | 109 | 121 | 126 | 100 | 106 | 112 | 885 |  |
| $35-39$ | 72 | 117 | 108 | 124 | 115 | 107 | 724 |  |
| $40-44$ | 90 | 128 | 132 | 132 | 107 | 117 | 502 |  |
| $45-49$ | 61 | 121 | 123 | 123 | 126 | 113 | 407 |  |
| $50-54$ | 76 | 110 | 112 | 118 | 113 | 108 | 333 |  |
| $55-59$ | 132 | 148 | 129 | 133 | 148 | 139 | 312 |  |
| $60-64$ | 145 | 118 | 138 | 126 | 116 | 126 | 225 |  |
| $65+$ | 131 | 169 | 151 | 155 | 150 | 154 | 418 |  |


| EICV4 | Kigali <br> City | Southern <br> Province | Western <br> Province | Northern <br> Province | Eastern <br> Province | TOTAL | Estimated <br> Total <br> population <br> (000s) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{1 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 , 4 2 4}$ |  |
| Age group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $00-04$ | 91 | 98 | 106 | 101 | 97 | 99 | 1,587 |  |
| $05-09$ | 100 | 108 | 96 | 96 | 102 | 101 | 1,662 |  |
| $10-14$ | 118 | 99 | 110 | 106 | 110 | 107 | 1,538 |  |
| $15-19$ | 122 | 94 | 106 | 100 | 96 | 101 | 1,198 |  |
| $20-24$ | 114 | 106 | 118 | 107 | 101 | 109 | 1,080 |  |
| $25-29$ | 98 | 118 | 125 | 114 | 110 | 113 | 910 |  |
| $30-34$ | 94 | 106 | 122 | 119 | 118 | 113 | 842 |  |
| $35-39$ | 88 | 130 | 119 | 124 | 129 | 120 | 557 |  |
| $40-44$ | 83 | 142 | 126 | 120 | 108 | 117 | 446 |  |
| $45-49$ | 113 | 134 | 121 | 121 | 138 | 128 | 357 |  |
| $50-54$ | 115 | 116 | 117 | 98 | 111 | 112 | 361 |  |
| $55-59$ | 103 | 135 | 112 | 138 | 109 | 120 | 297 |  |
| $60-64$ | 123 | 148 | 138 | 160 | 113 | 136 | 204 |  |
| $65+$ | 229 | 177 | 129 | 154 | 159 | 158 | 384 |  |

Source: EICV5 and EICV4

### 2.2. Households headship

### 2.2.1 Male/Female headed households

In Rwanda, the man is culturally considered the head of the household, but the recent law no $32 / 2016$ of 28/08/2016 governing persons and family states that spouses (female and male) jointly provide management of the household including moral and material support to the household as well as its maintenance. Table 2.3 presents the differences between women and men in terms of household headship where about $25 \%$ of total households are reported to be permanently headed by females in $2016 / 17$ compared to $26 \%$ in $2013 / 14$ due to the fact that women live longer than men and probably also the genocide against the Tutsi which left more widows than widowers. Contrary to the case of female where their headship is always linked with the absence of a husband, the majority of male-headed households includes those where both the husband and wife are present. There is also a small percentage of male who are heads of households and at the same time widower, separated or divorced (Table 2.4)

### 2.2.2 Hidden or de facto female-headed households

In addition to $25 \%$ of the households that are headed by women, there are other households found to be temporarily headed by females due to the absence of the male heads for a certain period of time. These households were referred as de facto female-headed households. Overall, table 2.3 shows that $6.4 \%$ of households were temporary headed by females whose husbands had been away for long periods of time (six months and above)

Table 2. 3: Sex of the household heads by province, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male- <br> headed | Female- <br> headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> headed | Total | Total <br> number of <br> HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Province | 73.8 | 21.0 | 5.2 | 100 | 410 |
| Kigali City | 65.3 | 28.0 | 6.7 | 100 | 626 |
| Southern Province | 68.7 | 24.7 | 6.7 | 100 | 574 |
| Western Province | 68.4 | 24.0 | 7.5 | 100 | 422 |
| Northern Province | 68.5 | 25.5 | 6.0 | 100 | 677 |
| Eastern Province | $\mathbf{6 8 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 0 8}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |


| EICV4 | Male- <br> headed | Female- <br> headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> headed | Total | Total <br> number of <br> HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Province | 72.6 | 22.8 | 4.6 | 100 | 295 |
| Kigali City | 64.3 | 29.2 | 6.6 | 100 | 597 |
| Southern Province | 67.5 | 24.5 | 8.0 | 100 | 559 |
| Western Province | 68.8 | 24.7 | 6.5 | 100 | 394 |
| Northern Province | 69.8 | 24.7 | 5.5 | 100 | 647 |
| Eastern Province | $\mathbf{6 8 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 9 3}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV5 and EICV4

### 2.3. Characteristics of male/ female household heads

Figure 2.2 shows that, generally, female household heads are much older than male household heads. About $35.8 \%$ of female household heads are over 60 years old and above in 2016/17 compared with $13 \%$ of male household heads of the same age. On the other hand, $4.1 \%$ of female- heads are under 25 years, compared to $5.7 \%$ of male heads in 2016/17.

Figure 2. 2 Age profile of Household heads (\%of each category), EICV5


[^0]Table 2.4 shows that with regard to the marital status of female household heads, $63 \%$ of them are widows compared to only $2 \%$ of male household heads: widowed males are remarried in higher rate and shorter period than widowed females. The same applies to divorced males and females. Fifteen percent of female heads are separated from their husbands compared to $2 \%$ of male.

Table 2.4: Marital status of household heads, (EICV5, EICV4)

|  | EICV5 |  |  | EICV4 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male <br> Headed | Female <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female <br> Headed | Male <br> Headed | Female <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female <br> Headed |
| Marital status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Married <br> monogamously with <br> legal certificate | 59.7 | 1.8 | 63.5 | 63.8 | 1.0 | 63 |
| Married <br> monogamously without <br> legal certificate/ Living <br> together | 26.4 | 1.7 | 30.5 | 24.2 | 1.0 | 27.3 |
| Married polygamously | 2.2 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 9.7 |
| Divorced | 0.2 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 |
| Separated | 1.7 | 15.0 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 13.4 | 0.0 |
| Single | 7.7 | 15.3 | 0.0 | 5.1 | 11.6 | 0.0 |
| Widow or widower | 2.0 | 62.7 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 69.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: EICV5 and EICV4
Despite the continued effort in sensitizing couples to regularise their marriages, findings from EICV5 reveal that there are still many couples living in informal unions despite the consequences for women's rights and for the family in general. Data in table 2.5 indicates the percentages of couples living in informal unions/marriages in relation to the total number of couples by area of residence.

The big percentage is found in the Eastern Province with $43 \%$ followed by the Kigali City with $42 \%$ compared to the $34 \%$ at country level. Northern Province has the smallest percentage of couples in informal unions representing $26.5 \%$ of all couples.

Table 2.5: Percentage of household in informal unions by urban/rural and Province

| Area of residence | Households in <br> informal unions | Total Household (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| All Rwanda | $\mathbf{3 3 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 5 2}$ |
| Urban | 38.1 | 326 |
| Rural | 32.6 | 1526 |
| Province | 42.0 | 246 |
| Kigali City | 27.5 | 420 |
| Southern Province | 29.1 | 416 |
| Western Province | 26.5 | 311 |
| Northern Province | 43.4 | 460 |
| Eastern Province |  |  |

[^1]The study also presents the proportion of couples living in polygamous union. These are men who have reported having two or more wives. Polygamy has been reported by many studies as one of the main causes of land disputes and a challenge to women's access to household property (Bayisenge, Höjer and Espling, 2014; MIGEPROFE 2005; MINITERE, DFID, \& HTSPE 2007). In Rwanda, ubuharike (de jure polygamy) was a common family structure practiced by 30 percent of the population during the pre-colonial period (Koff 1997). Currently, ubuharike is practiced at a low degree in some areas and is generally being replaced by ubushoreke (concubinage/new forms of polygamy or de facto polygamy). Both ubuharike and ubushoreke are illegal in Rwanda, as the 2003 Constitution of Rwanda officially recognizes only a monogamous marriage (Article 26). The Law n${ }^{\circ} 59 / 2008$ on prevention and punishment of Gender-Based Violence (GBV) and the New Penal Code of 2012, Article 244-49, clearly state the penalties for people convicted of either ubuharike or ubushoreke. Despite the legal previsions discouraging this practice, the findings from EICV5 (Table 2.6) indicates that the proportion of $3.5 \%$ of all the couples country wide live in polygamous unions. Considering the status per province, Western province has the highest percentage representing 5.5\% and Kigali City has $2 \%$ being the smallest percentage.

Table 2. 6: Percentage of households in polygamous by urban; rural and province (EICV5)

| Area of residence | HH in polygamous <br> union | Total Household (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| All Rwanda | $\mathbf{1 8 5 2}$ |  |
| Urban | 3.5 | 326 |
| Rural | 2.5 | 1,526 |
| Province | 3.8 | 246 |
| Kigali City |  |  |
| Southern Province | 1.7 | 420 |
| Western Province | 2.8 | 416 |
| Northern Province | 5.5 | 311 |
| Eastern Province | 3.3 | 460 |

Source: EICV5 and EICV4

## Chapter 3: Poverty incidence by sex of head of households

This chapter analyses the differences between female and male in terms of poverty rate related to consumption of their households.

### 3.1 Poverty levels by sex of household head

Although poverty levels declined in female-headed households since 2013/14, the findings of this study still show that female-headed households were slightly more likely to be poor than male-headed households, with $39.5 \%$ of female-headed households being poor compared to $37.6 \%$ of male-headed households being poor in 2016/17 (Table 3.1).

Regarding de facto female-headed households, those are households whose male heads were absent for more than six months in the previous 12 months preceding the survey. These are seemingly poorer ( $41.3 \%$ ) than permanently male and female-headed households. With regard to the change since EICV4, despite a slight general decrease in poverty levels, data in figure 3.1 shows that, the poverty level of female headed households has declined by 4.4 percentage points since 2013/14 from $43.9 \%$ to $39.5 \%$ in 2016/17, while for male headed household, the poverty level has slightly increased by 0.7 percentage point from $36.9 \%$ to $37.6 \%$ in the same period.

Figure 3.1 : Poverty levels by sex of the household head (EICV5, EICV4)


Source EICV4 and EICV5

Table 3.1: Poverty levels by sex of the household head (EICV5, EICV4)

| Household head | Poverty status |  | Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Extremely <br> poor | Moderately <br> poor |  |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 6 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| All Household | 15.0 | 22.6 | 62.4 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Male headed | 17.8 | 21.7 | 60.5 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Female headed | 20.8 | 20.5 | 58.7 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Defacto female headed | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{6 0 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| EICV4 | 14.6 | 22.3 | 63.1 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| All Household | 19.5 | 24.4 | 56.2 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Male headed | 24.2 | 22.6 | 53.2 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Female headed |  |  |  |  |
| Defacto female headed |  |  |  |  |

[^2]
## Chapter 4: Housing characteristics and access to services and facilities

This chapter analyses the differences between women and men in terms of living conditions of their households.

### 4.1. Housing characteristics

The characteristics of male/female headed households by type of habitat as shown in Table 4.1 indicate that $60 \%$ of female and $58 \%$ of male -headed households live in Imidugudu. An increase of 11 percentage points for female and 9 percentage points for male heads since $2013 / 2014$ is observed.

Table 4.1: Type of habitat by sex of the household head (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male- <br> Headed | Female- <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total <br> Total <br> of <br> (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Typs of habitat |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male- <br> Headed | Female- <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total <br> Total <br> of HHs <br> (000s) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of habitat | 49 | 49.2 | 50.9 | $\mathbf{4 9 . 2}$ | 1,227 |
| Umudugudu | 8.8 | 8.3 | 9.2 | $\mathbf{8 . 7}$ | 216 |
| Unplanned clustered <br> rural housing | 24.9 | 27.4 | 25.5 | $\mathbf{2 5 . 6}$ | 637 |
| Isolated rural housing | 13.4 | 11.7 | 10.9 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 8}$ | 318 |
| Unplanned urban | 2.3 | 2.0 | 1.8 | $\mathbf{2 . 2}$ | 55 |
| Small settlement | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.7 | $\mathbf{1 . 6}$ | 40 |
| Modern planned area | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 2,493 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4
As shown in Table 4.2, the pattern of own occupier by household head is almost the same for male and female-headed households ( $76.3 \%$ and $76.2 \%$ respectively). However, the number of female-headed households owning dwelling provided free of charge (9\%) is higher than the number of male- headed households (5\%) with free of charge dwelling in 2016/17. It should also be noted that $14 \%$ of female heads are living in rented accommodation compared to $18 \%$ of male heads of household.

Table 4.2: Current occupancy status, by sex of the household head, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male- <br> Headed | Female- <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total | Total <br> number of <br> HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Current occupancy | 76.3 | 76.2 | 80.1 | $\mathbf{7 6 . 5}$ | 2,073 |
| Owner-occupier | 17.9 | 14.1 | 13.9 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 7}$ | 451 |
| Tenancy (renting) | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.1 | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ | 12 |
| Dwelling provided by <br> employer | 5.1 | 9.0 | 5.5 | $\mathbf{6 . 0}$ | 163 |
| Dwelling provided free <br> of charge | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | 5 |
| Temporary camp | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ | 4 |
| Other | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 0 8}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male- <br> Headed | Female- <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total | Total <br> number of <br> HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Current occupancy | 80.6 | 81.1 | 82.5 | $\mathbf{8 0 . 9}$ | 2,016 |
| Owner-occupier | 14.7 | 10.3 | 12.9 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 5}$ | 336 |
| Tenancy (renting) | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | $\mathbf{0 . 3}$ | 7 |
| Dwelling provided by <br> employer | 4.1 | 8.1 | 4.0 | $\mathbf{5 . 1}$ | 128 |
| Dwelling provided free <br> of charge | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | 6 |
| Temporary camp | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | 1 |
| Other | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 9 3}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4
As shown in Table 4.3, the percentage of male headed households using metal sheets as main roofing materials is slightly higher compared to the female headed households ( $68 \%$ against $66 \%$ ). Regarding the change since last EICV4, male-headed households using metal roofing sheets increased by 6 percentage points and by 5 percentage points for female-headed households. The households using leaves as roofing material no longer exist.

Table 4.3: Main roofing material, by sex of the household head, (EICV5, EIC4)

| EICV5 | Male-Headed | Female- <br> Headed | De facto Female- <br> Headed | Total | Total number <br> of HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Roofing material |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thatch or leaves | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Metal sheets | 67.9 | 66.4 | 64.2 | $\mathbf{6 7 . 3}$ | 1,823 |
| Clay tiles | 32.0 | 33.4 | 35.6 | $\mathbf{3 2 . 6}$ | 882 |
| Concrete | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Plastic or <br> plywood | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | 1.0 |
| Industrial tiles | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | 1.0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 1.0 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male-Headed | Female- | De facto | Total | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  |  | Headed | Female- <br> Headed | number <br> of HHs <br> $\mathbf{( 0 0 0 s )}$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Roofing material | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ | 8 |
| Thatch or leaves | 61.7 | 60.7 | 55.8 | $\mathbf{6 1 . 1}$ | 1,523 |
| Metal sheets | 37.7 | 39.0 | 43.6 | $\mathbf{3 8 . 4}$ | 958 |
| Clay tiles | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | 1 |
| Concrete | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | $\mathbf{0 . 1}$ | 2 |
| Plastic or <br> plywood | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $\mathbf{0 . 0}$ | 1 |
| Other | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 9 3}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4
Data from Table 4.4 shows that the main materials for the wall construction in Rwanda are Mud bricks, Tree trunks with mud and Mud bricks covered with cement for male and female headed households. The three main materials combined all together represent $89 \%$ for male heads and $89 \%$ for female heads. With reference to the change since EICV4, it is found that the three main wall construction materials all together amount to $89.1 \%$ for male heads and $89.2 \%$ for female heads. There is no tangible change in the wall construction materials for both male and female headed household is experienced.

Table 4.4: Main construction material of exterior wall by sex of the household head, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male-Headed | Female- <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total | Total number of <br> HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Construction material | 35.1 | 36.0 | 36.3 | $\mathbf{3 5 . 4}$ | 959 |
| Mud bricks | 31.9 | 25.3 | 32 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 3}$ | 820 |
| Tree trunks with mud | 21.7 | 27.7 | 19.6 | $\mathbf{2 3 . 1}$ | 625 |
| Mud bricks covered with <br> cement | 6.6 | 7.2 | 5.6 | $\mathbf{6 . 7}$ | 181 |
| Tree trunks with mud and <br> cement | 2.8 | 2.0 | 4.3 | $\mathbf{2 . 7}$ | 74 |
| Oven fired bricks | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.9 | $\mathbf{0 . 8}$ | 22 |
| Wooden planks | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | $\mathbf{0 . 4}$ | 11 |
| Cement bricks | 0.6 | 0.9 | 0.8 | $\mathbf{0 . 7}$ | 18 |
| Other | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 0 8}$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male-Headed | Female- <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total | Total number of <br> HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Construction material | 36 | 36.4 | 34.6 | $\mathbf{3 6}$ | 898 |
| Mud bricks | 27.7 | 33.1 | 27.3 | $\mathbf{2 9 . 1}$ | 725 |
| Tree trunks with mud | 25.4 | 19.7 | 28.7 | $\mathbf{2 4 . 2}$ | 602 |
| Mud bricks covered with <br> cement | 6.1 | 7.1 | 4.8 | $\mathbf{6 . 3}$ | 157 |
| Tree trunks with mud and <br> cement | 3.0 | 2.1 | 3.0 | $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ |  |
| Oven fired bricks | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.7 | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ |  |
| Wooden planks | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ | 15 |
| Cement bricks | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | $\mathbf{0 . 5}$ | 13 |
| Other | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 13 |
| Total |  |  | $\mathbf{2 0 , 4 9 3}$ |  |  |

Source: EICV4
As indicated in Table 4.5, the main materials for the floor construction in Rwanda are beaten earth and cement for male and female headed households. The two main materials combined all together represent 94.1 \% for male heads and 94.4 \% for female heads. With reference to the change since EICV4, it is found that the two main floor construction materials all together amount to $95 \%$ for male heads and 95.2 \% for female heads. So no tangible change in the floor construction materials for both male and female headed household is experienced.

Table 4.5: Main floor material, by sex of household head, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto <br> Female-Headed | Total | Total number <br> of HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Main floor material |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beaten earth | 67.1 | 72.0 | 64.5 | 68.2 | 1,846 |
| Hardened dung | 2.6 | 3.2 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 78 |
| Cement | 27.0 | 22.4 | 27.2 | 25.8 | 699 |
| Bricks | 1.2 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.2 | 33 |
| Other | 2.1 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 52 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 0 8}$ |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto Female- <br> Headed | Total | Total number <br> of HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Main floor material |  |  |  |  |  |
| Beaten earth | 73.1 | 76.8 | 72.1 | 74.0 | 1,844 |
| Hardened dung | 2.6 | 3.1 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 67 |
| Cement | 21.9 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 23.3 | 21.1 |

Source: EICV4

### 4.2. Access to services, infrastructure and amenities

As Rwandans depend on fuels as energy source; firewood is an essential day-to-day environmental resource that allows Rwandan households to maintain their standard of living, however use of firewood can contribute to air pollution and related problems, which can endanger human health, especially female ones who perform the domestic work of cooking.

Findings from table 4.6 show that $85 \%$ of female-headed households use firewood in 2016/17 while male-headed households stand at $78.2 \%$. Charcoal is more used by male-headed households than female-headed households. Comparing these data with the EICV4, it can be seen that there was a slight decrease in the use of firewood for female and male headed households.

Table 4.6: Main type of cooking fuel by sex of household head, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total | Total <br> number of <br> HHs (000s) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Type of cooking fuel |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Firewood | 78.2 | 18.8 | 84.7 | 78.9 | 79.9 |  |
| Charcoal | 0.6 | 13.0 | 19.5 | 17.4 | 2,163 |  |
| Crop waste | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 472 |  |
| Gas or biogas | 1.2 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 37 |  |
| Other | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 0.6 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 26 |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 0 8}$ |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| EICV 4 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total <br> Total | number of <br> HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Type of cooking fuel | 82.2 | 16.2 | 86.3 | 82.8 | $\mathbf{8 3 . 3}$ |
| Firewood | 0.6 | 12.2 | 15.9 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 2}$ | 2,076 |
| Charcoal | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.8 | $\mathbf{0 . 8}$ | 378 |
| Crop waste | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.4 | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | 19 |
| Gas or biogas | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 0.2 | 0.1 | $\mathbf{0 . 6}$ | 4 |
| Other | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 9 3}$ |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4
As illustrated in table 4.7, the percentage of households using electricity as the main source of energy for lighting has increased over the last three years. Electricity use as a source of lighting among female headed households has increased slightly by 4 percentage points from $16 \%$ in $2013 / 14$ to $20 \%$ in $2016 / 17$ compared to male headed households which increased by 8 percentage points from $21 \%$ to $29 \%$ in the same period. In 2016/17, the percentage of femaleheaded households using firewood for lighting is low $7 \%$ compared to $2 \%$ of male-headed households. It should be noted that the biggest gain was in use of solar panel, which shows the strong impact of government promoting the use of solar panel to rapidly increase the access to electricity to the population. For female headed household, the use of solar panel has increased from $1 \%$ to $4.5 \%$ while for male headed household it has increased from $2 \%$ to $8.5 \%$ in three years.

Table 4.7: Main source of lighting by sex of household head, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total | Total number <br> of HHs (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Source of lighting |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electricity distributor | 29.2 | 20.3 | 31.4 | $\mathbf{2 7 . 1}$ | 734 |
| Oil Lamp | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.9 | $\mathbf{1 . 4}$ | 39 |
| Firewood | 2.4 | 7.1 | 3.9 | $\mathbf{3 . 7}$ | 100 |
| Candle | 6.0 | 6.6 | 5.6 | $\mathbf{6 . 1}$ | 167 |
| Lantern | 3.3 | 4.4 | 3.1 | $\mathbf{3 . 5}$ | 96 |
| Batteries/Torch | 6.6 | 6.5 | 5.9 | $\mathbf{6 . 5}$ | 177 |
| Rechargeable batteries | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | 6 |
| Torch/Phone | 41.8 | 48.1 | 41.7 | 43.4 | 1,175 |
| Solar panel | 8.5 | 4.5 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 199 |
| Other | 0.5 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 17 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 7 0 8}$ |
| Soure |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto FemaleHeaded | Total | Total number of HHs (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source of lighting |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electricity distributor | 21.1 | 16.2 | 20.9 | 19.8 | 494 |
| Oil Lamp | 5.1 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 5.0 | 125 |
| Firewood | 3.8 | 10.0 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 138 |
| Candle | 7.3 | 7.3 | 8.5 | 7.4 | 184 |
| Lantern | 12.8 | 14.6 | 11.3 | 13.1 | 328 |
| Batteries | 45.0 | 42.3 | 43.5 | 44.2 | 1,101 |
| Solar panel | 1.9 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 42 |
| Other | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 81 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 2,493 |

Source: EICV4

Overall, the percentage of households with access to the internet at home has almost doubled, from $9 \%$ in $2013 / 14$ to $17 \%$ in $2016 / 17$. This is also the case for female-headed households that have increased by 5 percentage points from $8 \%$ in 2013/14 to $13 \%$ in 2016/17, and for male-headed households that have doubled from $9.6 \%$ in 2013/14 to $18.2 \%$ in 2016/17 (Table 4.8).

Figure 4.1. Households with internet access at home, (EICV5, EICV4)


Source: EICV5 and EICV4
Table 4.8: Households with internet access at home, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | \% of HH with internet access <br> at home | Total number of HHs (000s) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rwanda | 17.2 |  |  | $\mathbf{2 , 7 0 8}$ |
| Households heads | 18.2 | $\mathbf{1 , 8 5 8}$ |  |  |
| Male-Headed | 13.2 | $\mathbf{6 7 7}$ |  |  |
| Female-Headed | 22.5 | $\mathbf{1 7 4}$ |  |  |
| De facto Female-Headed |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | \% of HH with internet access <br> at home | Total number of HHs (000s) |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| Rwanda |  |  |  |
| Households heads | 9.3 | $\mathbf{2 , 4 9 3}$ |  |
| Male-Headed | 9.6 | $\mathbf{1 , 6 9 8}$ |  |
| Female-Headed | 8.0 | $\mathbf{6 3 6}$ |  |
| De facto Female-Headed | 11.8 | $\mathbf{1 5 9}$ |  |

Source: EICV4
Findings revealed that access to improved drinking water sources has slightly increased for both female and male headed households in the past three years. As table 4.9 shows, the proportion of female-headed households that use improved drinking water sources has slightly increased from $86 \%$ to $87 \%$ between $2013 / 14$ and $2016 / 17$ compared to male headed household which increased from $84 \%$ to $88 \%$. Results show also that the percentage of both male and female-headed households using unimproved and other drinking water sources has decreased within the period of the two surveys (EICV4 and EICV5). The findings reveal also that, $42 \%$ of female-headed households have access to piped water within the compound/dwelling yard or outside compared to $46 \%$ for male-headed households. When access to a protected spring or well is included, $83 \%$ of female and $80 \%$ male-headed households at the national level have access to improved water.

Table 4.9: Improved drinking water source, Unimproved \& other drinking water sources by sex of household head (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male-Headed | Female- <br> Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total <br> \% of Households use improved <br> drinking water source <br> Type of drinking water sources <br> Protected spring$\quad \mathbf{8 7 . 6}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male-Headed | FemaleHeaded | De facto FemaleHeaded | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of Households use improved drinking water source | 84.3 | 85.9 | 85.9 | 84.8 |
| Type of Improved drinking water source |  |  |  |  |
| Piped into dwelling/yard | 8.5 | 7.0 | 8.5 | 8.1 |
| Public standpipe | 34.6 | 32.7 | 32.9 | 34.0 |
| Borehole | 3.3 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.2 |
| Protected well | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 |
| Protected spring | 36.8 | 41.7 | 40.5 | 38.3 |
| Type of Unimproved \& other drinking water source |  |  |  |  |
| Rain water | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Unprotected well | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| Unprotected spring | 6.8 | 6.4 | 6.9 | 6.7 |
| Surface water | 5.5 | 5.0 | 4.2 | 5.3 |
| Other | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.4 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV4
As data from table 4.10 shows, $81 \%$ of female-headed households are using an improved sanitation facility compared to $88 \%$ of male heads. However, it should be noted that $7 \%$ of female-headed households have no toilet compared to $3 \%$ of male-headed households. Comparing the results with EICV4, there has been an increase of 4 percentage points for female headed households using an improved sanitation facility, and 2 percentage points for male headed households.

Table 4.10: Households using improved sanitation, by type of sanitation used, by sex of household head, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% of Households using improved sanitation | 88.3 | 80.6 | 85.8 | 86.2 |
| \% of Households using improved type of sanitation, but not shared with other Households | 68.7 | 59.1 | 67.8 | 66.2 |
| Types of improved sanitation Used |  |  |  |  |
| Flush toilet | 1.9 | 1.5 | 3.1 | 1.9 |
| Pit latrine with solid slab | 86.3 | 79.1 | 82.7 | 84.3 |
| Type of Unimproved sanitation |  |  |  |  |
| Pit latrine without solid slab | 8.8 | 12.4 | 10.5 | 9.8 |
| Other | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| No toilet whatsoever | 2.8 | 6.8 | 3.6 | 3.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto <br> Female- <br> Headed | Total <br> \% of Households using improved <br> sanitation <br> \% of Households using improved type <br> of sanitation, but not shared with other <br> Households <br> Type of Improved sanitation <br> Flush toilet <br> Pit latrine with solid slab <br> Type of Unimproved sanitation <br> Pit latrine without solid slab <br> Other <br> No toilet whatsoever <br> Total$\quad \mathbf{6 6 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{7 6 . 5}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{8 3 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{8 3 . 4}$ |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4

### 4.3. Ownership of ICT tools by households

Regarding the ownership of ICT tools (table 4.11), the findings shows that ownership of mobile phone is the most dominant ICT tool used by female and male heads of households. Although it is the predominant ICT tool, female heads of households owning at least one mobile phone is 16.7 percentage points less than for male heads ( $54.4 \%$ for female against $71.1 \%$ for male). With regard to the change since EICV4, there has been a same increase of 3 percentage points for female and male -headed households owning at least one mobile phone between 2013/14 and 2016/17. The status of ownership of computer and accessories has remained almost the same where female-headed households owning at least one computer stands at $2 \%$ compared to $3 \%$ of male-headed households in 2013/14 and 2016/17 respectively.

Table 4.11: Ownership of household ICT tools by sex of household head (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 |  | MaleHeaded | FemaleHeaded | De facto FemaleHeaded | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household ICT tools |  |  |  |  |  |
| Radio (with or without CD player) | None | 48.1 | 72.1 | 55.6 | 54.6 |
|  | One | 47.0 | 26.4 | 39.9 | 41.4 |
|  | Two or more | 4.9 | 1.5 | 4.4 | 4.0 |
| Mobile telephone | None | 29.0 | 45.6 | 27.5 | 33.0 |
|  | One | 35.4 | 34.7 | 31.7 | 35.0 |
|  | Two or more | 35.7 | 19.7 | 40.8 | 32.0 |
| TV set | None | 88.3 | 94.3 | 86.0 | 89.6 |
|  | One | 11.3 | 5.5 | 13.8 | 10.0 |
|  | Two or more | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| Computer and accessories | None | 96.6 | 97.7 | 93.8 | 96.7 |
|  | One | 2.5 | 2.0 | 4.9 | 2.6 |
|  | Two or more | 0.8 | 0.3 | 1.2 | 0.7 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV 4 |  | MaleHeaded | FemaleHeaded | De facto FemaleHeaded | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household ICT tools |  |  |  |  |  |
| Radio (with or without CD player) | None | 32.9 | 58.5 | 44.6 | 40.2 |
|  | One | 58.9 | 38.1 | 49.0 | 53.0 |
|  | Two or more | 8.2 | 3.4 | 6.4 | 6.8 |
| Mobile telephone | None | 32.1 | 49.1 | 30.8 | 36.3 |
|  | One | 34.2 | 32.6 | 29.9 | 33.5 |
|  | Two or more | 33.8 | 18.3 | 39.4 | 30.2 |
| TV set | None | 88.8 | 93.8 | 88.4 | 90.1 |
|  | One | 10.6 | 5.9 | 11.6 | 9.5 |
|  | Two or more | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 |
| Computer and accessories | None | 97.2 | 98.2 | 96.3 | 97.4 |
|  | One | 2.2 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 2.1 |
|  | Two or more | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.5 |

[^3]
## Chapter 5: Agricultural activities

This chapter analyses the differences between women and men in terms of ownership of land and use as well as ownership of livestock.

### 5.1. Agricultural land ownership

Ownership of land is critical to social and economic empowerment of women. Data from table 5.1 indicates that female-headed households owning farm land has decreased by 7 percentage points from $89 \%$ in 2013/14 to $82 \%$ in 2016/17 and male-headed households owning farm land has decreased by 10 percentage points from $90 \%$ in 2013/14 to $80 \%$ in 2016/17. An upward trend is only observed in the percentage of female-headed households that sharecropped any land in the past 12 months preceding the survey, from $10 \%$ in 2013/14 to $11 \%$ in $2016 / 17$ and for male heads from $10 \%$ to $11.2 \%$ in the same period.

Table 5.1: Land ownership by sex of household head, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male <br> headed | Female <br> headed | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HH or any member currently owning farm land | 79.6 | 81.8 | 80.1 |
| HH bought land in last 12 months | 11.6 | 3.6 | 9.6 |
| HH sold land in the last 12 months | 8.2 | 7.4 | 8.0 |
| HH rented out land in the last 12 months | 9.7 | 12.6 | 10.4 |
| HH sharecropped any land in the past 12 months | 6.8 | 11.2 | 7.9 |
| HH received land gift in the last 12 months | 5.7 | 3.2 | 5.0 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male <br> headed | Female <br> headed | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| HH or any member currently owning farm land | 89.5 | 88.8 | 89.3 |
| HH bought land in last 12 months | 16.4 | 5.0 | 13.5 |
| HH sold land in the last 12 months | 8.5 | 7.1 | 8.1 |
| HH rented out land in the last 12 months | 10.3 | 14.7 | 11.4 |
| HH sharecropped any land in the past 12 months | 6.9 | 10.0 | 7.7 |
| HH received land gift in the last 12 months | 7.9 | 3.7 | 6.8 |

Source: EICV4

Most Rwandan households cultivate at least a parcel of land, and most of them are directly reliant on agriculture as their main or only source of income, especially in rural areas. With the growing population, land in Rwanda is getting scarcer and scarcer. As illustrated in table 5.2, the average size of land cultivated per female head of household remained constant in the last three years at national level ( 0.5 ha ), and the same case applies for male headed household too ( 0.6 ha).

Table 5.2 shows that the proportion of female headed households cultivating less than 0.3 ha has declined to $61 \%$ in $2016 / 17$ from $53 \%$ in 2013/14, while for male headed household it has declined to $54 \%$ from $42 \%$ in the same period. This suggests that the small land is being redistributed within the family members and showing much pressure on the cultivated land of the growing population.

Table 5.2: Size of total land cultivated by sex of head of household according to urban/rural (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Sex of HH | Average total area cultivated per HHs | Size of total land cultivated |  |  |  | Total | Total no. of HHs cultivating land for crop production (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Less than 0.3 ha | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \text { to } \\ & 0.9 \text { ha } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \text { to } 3 \\ \text { ha } \end{gathered}$ | More than 3 ha |  |  |
| All <br> Rwanda | Male | 0.6 | 54.3 | 32.3 | 11.9 | 1.5 | 100 | 1,674 |
|  | Female | 0.5 | 60.6 | 29.6 | 8.5 | 1.3 | 100 | 573 |
| Urban | Male | 1.1 | 68.7 | 19.0 | 8.3 | 4.0 | 100 | 154 |
|  | Female | 0.8 | 66.5 | 21.4 | 8.4 | 3.8 | 100 | 48 |
| Rural | Male | 0.5 | 52.9 | 33.6 | 12.2 | 1.3 | 100 | 1,520 |
|  | Female | 0.5 | 60.1 | 30.3 | 8.5 | 1.1 | 100 | 525 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Sex of HH | Average total area cultivated per HHs | Size of total land cultivated |  |  |  | Total | Total no. of HHs cultivating land for crop production (000s)) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Less than 0.3 ha | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \text { to } \\ & 0.9 \text { ha } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.9 \text { to } 3 \\ \text { ha } \end{gathered}$ | More than 3 ha |  |  |
| All <br> Rwanda | Male | 0.6 | 42.1 | 38.8 | 17.3 | 1.8 | 100 | 1,610 |
|  | Female | 0.5 | 53.0 | 33.3 | 12.8 | 1.0 | 100 | 568 |
| Urban | Male | 0.6 | 54.2 | 28.2 | 15.0 | 2.7 | 100 | 139 |
|  | Female | 0.5 | 63.0 | 24.4 | 11.8 | 0.7 | 100 | 48 |
| Rural | Male | 0.6 | 41.0 | 39.8 | 17.5 | 1.7 | 100 | 1,471 |
|  | Female | 0.5 | 52.1 | 34.1 | 12.9 | 1.0 | 100 | 520 |

Source: EICV4
In a country like Rwanda, where land resources are scarce, irrigation of land can help to mitigate the effects of land scarcity. It is therefore another important issue for the land sector, given that irrigation schemes allow increased cultivation of otherwise unused or underused lands. The study, however, revealed that the overall proportion of female headed households' land irrigated is low as compared to male headed households ( $3.5 \%$ against $7 \%$ respectively). This proportion is also very low among female headed households regardless of area of residence (urban-rural) as compared to male headed household land.

Among agricultural practices that can help in land scarce environments is soil erosion control. In this perspective, Table 5.3 shows that only $62.5 \%$ of female headed households' cultivated land is protected against erosion compared to $70 \%$ of male headed household cultivated land. With regard to land consolidation, the results of this study showed that only $11 \%$ of female headed household cultivated land has been used in land consolidation schemes compared to $16 \%$ of male headed households' land. Comparing the findings with the EICV4, female headed household land irrigated has slightly increased since the last EICV as well as for male headed household.

Table 5.3: Percentage of land area irrigated, protected against soil erosion, and affected by land consolidation by sex of head of household and urban/ rural (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Sex of head of HH | Percentage of land irrigated, protected against soil erosion, and affected by land consolidation |  |  | Total cultivated land area (in 000 ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% of land irrigated | $\%$ of land protected against soil erosion | $\%$ of land affected by land consolidation |  |
| All Rwanda | Male | 7.0 | 70.2 | 17.4 | 9,994 |
|  | Female | 3.5 | 62.5 | 11.0 | 2,902 |
| Urban | Male | 11.3 | 57.5 | 29.0 | 1,720 |
|  | Female | 1.8 | 54.3 | 4.1 | 385 |
| Rural | Male | 6.1 | 72.9 | 15.0 | 8,274 |
|  | Female | 3.7 | 63.8 | 12.0 | 2,516 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Sex of head of HH | Percentage of land irrigated, protected against soil erosion, and affected by land consolidation |  |  | Total cultivated land area (in 000 ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% of land irrigated | \% of land protected against soil erosion | \% of land affected by land consolidation |  |
| All Rwanda | Male | 4.4 | 72.9 | 16.6 | 1,024 |
|  | Female | 2.6 | 71.5 | 12.3 | 287 |
| Urban | Male | 7.4 | 62.3 | 14.8 | 87 |
|  | Female | 2.1 | 68.4 | 8.6 | 23 |
| Rural | Male | 4.1 | 74.0 | 16.8 | 937 |
|  | Female | 2.6 | 71.7 | 12.6 | 264 |

Source: EICV4
Use of fertilisers is an important issue, especially in Rwanda whereby land is getting scarcer, because it allows a more efficient use of the scarce land resources. The findings in Table 5.4 reveal that, only $28 \%$ of female heads of household are spending on buying fertilizers compared to $41 \%$ among male heads of household, whereas only $10 \%$ of female heads are spending on organic fertilizers as compared to $14 \%$ of male heads of household. Also Table 5.4 shows that the percentage of female heads of household incurring expenditure on chemical fertilisers has slightly increased from $26 \%$ in 2013/14 to $28 \%$ in $2016 / 17$ while for male heads of household it has remained almost the same. The expenditure on organic fertilizers among female heads of household has also increased slightly from $8 \%$ to $10 \%$ in the same period while for male heads of household it has remained almost the same.

Table 5.4: Percentage of Household Heads incurring expenditure on fertilisers (inorganic and organic) by sex of head of household and urban/ rural (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Sex of HH | Percentage of HHs incurring expenditure on fertilizers (inorganic and organic) |  | Households engaging in crop production (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Chemical fertilizers | Organic fertilizers |  |
| All Rwanda | Male | 40.8 | 13.8 | 1,657 |
|  | Female | 27.6 | 9.9 | 570 |
| Urban | Male | 25.7 | 11.7 | 141 |
|  | Female | 16.9 | 10.5 | 46 |
| Rural | Male | 42.2 | 14.0 | 1516 |
|  | Female | 28.6 | 9.9 | 524 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Percentage of HHs incurring expenditure <br> on fertilisers (inorganic and organic) | Households <br> engaging in <br> crop |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Chemical <br> fertilisers | Organic fertilisers | production <br> (000s) |
|  | Male | 40.2 | 13.4 | 1,610 |
|  | Female | 25.7 | 7.9 | 568 |
| Urban | Male | 28.5 | 14.3 | 139 |
|  | Female | 18.5 | 8.3 | 48 |
| Rural | Male | 41.3 | 13.3 | 1,471 |
|  | Female | 26.3 | 7.9 | 520 |

Source: EICV4

### 5.2. Livestock

Livestock ownership is often highly correlated with economic growth, poverty reduction and with a reduction to vulnerability and risk of food insecurity at the household level. Findings in table 5.5 indicate that, $57.3 \%$ of female headed household own any type of livestock compared to $60.3 \%$ of male heads. Slightly more male heads in urban area own any livestock than female heads, and the same pattern is observed in rural area. When the province is considered, more female heads in Northern province own a livestock than in any other province, and the same trend is observed for male heads. In general, it should be noted that, ownership of any livestock increases with the increase in consumption quintile for both female and male heads of households. With regards to change since EICV4, there has been a slight decrease in the percentage of female headed households raising any livestock, as well as for male headed household.

Table 5.5: Any livestock raised, by sex of household head, area of residence and consumption quintile, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Any livestock |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male Headed | Female Headed | Total |
| All Rwanda | 60.3 | 57.3 | 59.6 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |
| Urban | 27.2 | 22.9 | 26.3 |
| Rural | 68.7 | 64.4 | 67.6 |
| Province |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 23.8 | 23.7 | 23.8 |
| Southern Province | 68.6 | 64.1 | 67.3 |
| Western Province | 67.1 | 58.1 | 64.9 |
| Northern Province | 72.7 | 68.3 | 71.6 |
| Eastern Province | 62.7 | 60.2 | 62 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 59.9 | 50.9 | 57.6 |
| Q2 | 66.1 | 59.1 | 64.4 |
| Q3 | 68.2 | 63.0 | 66.9 |
| Q4 | 68.4 | 65.7 | 67.8 |
| Q5 | 44.1 | 48.4 | 45.1 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV 4 | Any livestock |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male Headed | Female Headed | Total |
| All Rwanda | 66.2 | 59.5 | 64.5 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |
| Urban | 31.1 | 29.4 | 31 |
| Rural | 74.3 | 65.1 | 71.4 |
| Province |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 27.1 | 28.7 | 27.5 |
| Southern Province | 73.8 | 66.8 | 71.3 |
| Western Province | 69.9 | 58 | 66 |
| Northern Province | 77.6 | 66.3 | 74.1 |
| Eastern Province | 70.2 | 62.4 | 67.8 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 62.6 | 52.2 | 59.5 |
| Q2 | 69.7 | 62.5 | 67.7 |
| Q3 | 72.7 | 65.2 | 70.9 |
| Q4 | 71.9 | 65.4 | 70.3 |
| Q5 | 55.6 | 52.6 | 54.9 |

Source: EICV4
As the data in table 5.6 reveals, male-headed households outnumbered female-headed households in raising different types of livestock in 2016/17, except for goats. With regard to the change since EICV4, findings show that the percentage of female-headed households raising different animal types rose slightly over time except chickens which decreased by 4 percentage points from 39\% in 2013/14 to 35.3\% in 2016/17.

Table 5.6: Animal types raised, by sex of household head (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male <br> Headed | Female Headed | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Animal types | 50.2 | 40.1 | $\mathbf{4 7 . 8}$ |
| Cattle | 13.3 | 12.3 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 1}$ |
| Sheep | 49.9 | 57.3 | $\mathbf{5 1 . 7}$ |
| Goats | 31.9 | 26.8 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 7}$ |
| Pigs | 19.9 | 15.9 | $\mathbf{1 8 . 9}$ |
| Rabbits | 46.4 | 35.3 | $\mathbf{4 3 . 7}$ |
| Chickens | 2.0 | 0.8 | $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ |
| Other poultry | 4.4 | 1.6 | $\mathbf{3 . 7}$ |
| Other livestock |  |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Male <br> Headed | Female Headed | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Animal types | 53.3 | 40.8 | $\mathbf{5 0 . 4}$ |
| Cattle | 14.4 | 12.4 | $\mathbf{1 3 . 9}$ |
| Sheep | 49.8 | 56.4 | $\mathbf{5 1 . 3}$ |
| Goats | 33.7 | 26.2 | $\mathbf{3 1 . 9}$ |
| Pigs | 19.1 | 15.8 | $\mathbf{1 8 . 3}$ |
| Rabbits | 47.3 | 39.4 | $\mathbf{4 5 . 5}$ |
| Chickens | 1.9 | 1.4 | $\mathbf{1 . 8}$ |
| Other poultry | 6.5 | 5.7 | $\mathbf{6 . 3}$ |
| Other livestock |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4

## Chapter 6: Economic activity

Female economic activity is a common measure of gender equality in an economy. Women in Rwanda make enormous contributions to the national economy, mainly on farms, in businesses, or as employees, or by doing unpaid care work at home for their families.

During the EICV5 survey, a series of questions on jobs a person had done during 12 months prior to the interview was asked. As some people were involved in more than one job during that period, each person who reported more jobs was asked to identify the job for which she/he spent most of time and that was considered as the main job. The current methodology to identify the main job is slightly different from the one used in previous series of EICV reports. For the sake of comparison, the same methodology used in EICV5 was applied to EICV4. The present chapter presents the main job with respect to individual characteristics of workers as well as the labour market characteristics of the main job itself.

The analysis in the present section focuses on the main job in a period of 12 months preceding the interview. The analysis of indicators based on short reference period ( 7 days) such as unemployment and underemployment, etc. is no longer part of EICV report. Instead, these indicators are analysed in the labour force survey introduced by NISR in 2016

### 6.1. Usual working status

Women make up more than half of the Rwanda workforce, and their earnings are essential to the economic security of families across the nation. Yet, gender equality at work remains elusive. Females who work full-time a day, year-round still earn 13 percent less than their male counterparts on monthly basis (Labour force survey, August 2017).

According to table 6.1, majority of female heads of households (62\%) work as independent farmers compared to only $43 \%$ male head of households in 2016/17. Concerning the change since EICV4, the percentage of independent farmers has significantly been dropped for female heads by 7.4 percentage points since 2013/14 compared to 6.8 percentage points for male heads. The wage farm on the other hand has significantly increased in the three years period from $16 \%$ to $21.4 \%$ for female heads and from $12 \%$ to $16.3 \%$ for male heads.

Table 6. 1: Percentage distribution of household heads by usual work status according to sex of household head (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male head of household | Female head of household | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Usual work status |  |  |  |
| Wage Farm | 16.3 | 21.4 | 17.5 |
| Wage Non-farm | 29.1 | 8.7 | 24.1 |
| Independent farmer | 43.1 | 62.3 | 47.8 |
| Independent non farmer | 11.3 | 7.4 | 10.3 |
| Unpaid non farmer \& NS | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Total number of Households (000s) | 1,942 | 632 | 2,574 |

Source: EICV5: All Household-heads in work in the previous 12months (excluding defacto heads)

| EICV4 | Male Head of <br> household | Female Head of <br> household |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total |  |  |  |
| Usual work status | 12.0 | 15.9 | 13 |
| Wage Farm | 25.5 | 6.2 | 20.6 |
| Wage Non-farm | 49.9 | 69.7 | 54.8 |
| Independent farmer | 12.6 | 8.0 | 11.4 |
| Independent non farmer | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 |
| Unpaid non farmer \& NS | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 , 7 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 3 6 5}$ |
| Total number of Households <br> (000s) |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4.Base: All Household-heads in work in the previous 12months (excluding defacto heads)

### 6.2. Economic activity of all adults

The workforce to population ratio measures the proportion of working age population who carried out any economic activity during 12 months prior to the interview. In previous series of EICV reports it was referred to as usual employment rate.

Table 6.2 shows that $86 \%$ of all working age persons were working in 12 months preceding the EICV5 survey. Among working population, about $87 \%$ are females while $86 \%$ are males. The working population ratio for female is higher than the one for male. This applies to all provinces except Kigali city where $81 \%$ of males and $73 \%$ of females are classified as working in 2016/17. The analysis of workforce to population ratio by age group reveals that at lower age (16-24 years) the workforce to population ratio is slightly higher for females than for males (69\% compared to 67\%).

In general this rate is quite low compared to older age from 25 years and above as there is an important number of working age female and male who are still at school. It should also be noted that, the workforce population ratio for female from age 25-44 is slightly lower than that of male, probably due to female child bearing at this reproductive age.

The workforce to population ratio increases with age and it reaches a pick for female at age between 45 and 54 years old (98\%), while for male it reaches a pick at age between 35 and 44 years old (97\%) before decreasing for both sexes. It keeps decreasing slightly till the age of 64 for both female and male, after which a sharp decreasing is apparent as most female and male are retiring and get out of economic activity. There are no major changes observed in terms of trend since 2013/14 for female and male.

Table 6. 2: Workforce to population ratio by sex, age group and area of residence (EICV5, EICV4)

| Area of residence | Usual employment (12-month reference period) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |
| EICV5 |  |  |  |
| Rwanda | 85.8 | 86.6 | 86.2 |
| Area of residence |  |  |  |
| Urban | 79.6 | 73.1 | 76.3 |
| Rural | 87.6 | 89.8 | 88.8 |
| Province |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 81.3 | 73.3 | 77.3 |
| Southern Province | 85.1 | 88.5 | 86.9 |
| Western Province | 86.2 | 88.9 | 87.6 |
| Northern Province | 86.5 | 89.0 | 87.8 |
| Eastern Province | 89.0 | 89.2 | 89.1 |
| Total | 85.8 | 86.6 | 86.2 |
| Age Group |  |  |  |
| 16-24 | 67.4 | 69.4 | 68.4 |
| 25-34 | 95.5 | 93.2 | 94.3 |
| 35-44 | 97.2 | 97.0 | 97.1 |
| 45-54 | 95.2 | 97.6 | 96.5 |
| 55-64 | 92.3 | 95.1 | 93.9 |
| 65+ | 75.9 | 79.6 | 78.1 |
| Total | 85.8 | 86.6 | 86.2 |
| Population aged 16+ years (000s) | 3,159 | 3,598 | 6,756 |

Source: EICV5

| Area of residence | Usual employment (12-month reference period) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EICV4 | Male | Female | Total |
| Rwanda | 86.6 | 86.7 | 86.6 |
| Area of residence |  |  |  |
| Urban | 79.5 | 72.0 | 75.6 |
| Rural | 88.4 | 90.0 | 89.2 |
| Province |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 81.8 | 70.7 | 76.1 |
| Southern Province | 85.3 | 88.3 | 86.9 |
| Western Province | 86.8 | 89.3 | 88.2 |
| Northern Province | 90.1 | 90.9 | 90.5 |
| Eastern Province | 88.2 | 87.8 | 87.9 |
| Age Group |  |  |  |
| 16-24 | 71.5 | 70.1 | 70.7 |
| 25-34 | 96.4 | 94.7 | 95.5 |
| 35-44 | 97.1 | 97.1 | 97.1 |
| 45-54 | 95.0 | 97.3 | 96.3 |
| 55-64 | 89.9 | 94.7 | 92.6 |
| 65+ | 77.4 | 77.7 | 77.6 |
| Population aged 16+ years (000s) | 2,970 | 3,430 | 6,400 |

Source: EICV4

Occupation refers to the kind of work done by a person employed, irrespective of the branch of economic activity or the status in employment of the person. This survey provides data on the distribution of working persons by major occupational groups for men and women separately (Table 6.3). Skilled agricultural, forestry and fishery workers constitute the largest occupational group among females ( $63 \%$ ) as well as for males ( $43 \%$ ) which implies that more females are still in agriculture related jobs than males.

The second largest occupation among female is the elementary occupations with $24 \%$ as well as for male where it stands at $32 \%$. With regard to the change since EICV4, it can be noted an upward trend for both female and male working in elementary occupations since 2013/14 from $17 \%$ to $24 \%$ for female and from $27 \%$ to $32 \%$ for male. On the other hand, the percentage of female in agricultural related occupations has declined by 7 percentage points from $70 \%$ in 2013/14 to $63 \%$ in 2016/17, while for male it has declined by 6 percentage points from $49 \%$ to $43 \%$ in the same period.

Table 6. 3: Main occupation by sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| Occupation (EICV5) | Sex |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male | Female |  |
| Managers | 0.6 | 0.1 | 3.2 |
| Professionals | 4.3 | 2.2 | 0.6 |
| Technical and associate professionals | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Clerical support workers | 0.2 | 0.4 | 10.3 |
| Services and sales workers | 11.9 | 8.9 | 53.6 |
| Skilled agricultural, forestry, and fishery | 43.1 | 62.7 | 2.7 |
| Craft and related trades workers | 4.3 | 1.3 |  |
| Plant and machine operators, and |  | 0.2 | 1.2 |
| assemble | 2.4 | 24.0 | 27.8 |
| Elementary occupations | 32.2 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{3 , 1 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 8 2 5}$ |
| Count(,000s) | $\mathbf{2 , 7 1 1}$ |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| Occupation (EICV4) | Sex |  | Total |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
|  | Male | Female |  |
| Managers | 1.3 | 0.2 | 2.6 |
| Professionals | 3.2 | 2.1 | 0.6 |
| Technicians and associate professionals | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| Clerical support workers | 0.4 | 0.4 | 9.2 |
| Service and sales workers | 10.4 | 8.2 | 60.3 |
| Skilled agriculture, forestry and fishery | 48.7 | 70.3 | 3.4 |
| Craft and related trade workers | 5.9 | 1.2 |  |
| Plant and machine operators and |  |  | 1.3 |
| assemble | 2.7 | 0.1 | 21.5 |
| Elementary occupations | 26.6 | 17.1 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 5 4 5}$ |
| Count(,000s) | $\mathbf{2 , 5 7 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 9 7 2}$ |  |

Source: EICV4

Table 6.4 presents the distribution of working female and male population by job type, according to the area of residence. The findings reveal that, $63 \%$ of female employed population is classified as independent farmers against $43 \%$ among male population. As the analysis of economic activity reveals, wage non-farm worker in urban areas is predominant
among male with $67 \%$ compared to only $42 \%$ for females; while independent farmers is predominant among female in rural areas ( $71 \%$ ) compared to males ( $51 \%$ ).

When considering change since EICV4, the findings shown in figure 6.1 reveal that the proportion of independent farmers for both female and male in the total workers has decreased over time, but with more speed rate of decrease observed for males than for females. Figure 6.1 shows that, female independent farmers represent $63 \%$ of all workers in 2016/17 (EICV5) compare to only $43 \%$ of males. The corresponding proportion in 2013/14 (EICV4) was $66 \%$ for females, indicating a decrease of 3 percentage points between EICV4 and EICV5, while for male, it was $41 \%$, indicating a slight increase of 2 percentage points in the same period. The findings also reveal that, the proportion of female workers in paid farming activities has increased by 4 percentage points between the two surveys from $13 \%$ to $17 \%$ for wage farm, while for male it has increased by 3 percentage points from $12 \%$ to $15 \%$ in the same period. Paid non-farming activities has increased by 2 percentage points among females from $10 \%$ to $12 \%$, while for male, it has slightly decreased by 1 percentage point from $33 \%$ to $32 \%$ in the same period. The proportion of independent non farmers has been almost the same from EICV4 to EICV5 for both female and male.

Figure 6. 1: Percentage distribution of working population by job type according to area of residence and sex (EICV4, EICV5)


Source: EICV4, EICV5

Table 6.4: Percentage distribution of working population by job type according to area of residence and sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| Usual job type |  | Population Currently working |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total |
| EICV5 |  |  |  |  |
| Rwanda | Wage Farmer | 14.5 | 16.7 | 15.6 |
|  | Wage Non Farmer | 32.2 | 11.5 | 21.1 |
|  | Independent farmer | 42.6 | 62.6 | 53.3 |
|  | Independent non farmer | 10.2 | 7.8 | 8.9 |
|  | Unpaid non farmer \& NS | 0.5 | 1.4 | 1 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Urban | Wage Farmer | 3.5 | 8.1 | 5.7 |
|  | Wage Non Farmer | 66.9 | 42.4 | 55.1 |
|  | Independent farmer | 10.7 | 22.5 | 16.4 |
|  | Independent non farmer | 17.7 | 22.6 | 20.1 |
|  | Unpaid non farmer \& NS | 1.2 | 4.5 | 2.8 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Rural | Wage Farmer | 17.3 | 18.3 | 17.9 |
|  | Wage Non Farmer | 23.3 | 5.4 | 13.5 |
|  | Independent farmer | 50.8 | 70.5 | 61.6 |
|  | Independent non farmer | 8.3 | 4.9 | 6.5 |
|  | Unpaid non farmer \& NS | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Usual job type | Population Currently working |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Rwanda | Wage Farmer | 11.7 | 12.5 | 12.2 |
|  | Wage Non Farmer | 33.2 | 9.9 | 20.8 |
|  | Independent farmer | 41.3 | 66.2 | 54.6 |
|  | Independent non farmer | 13.1 | 9.6 | 11.2 |
|  | Unpaid non farmer \& NS | 0.6 | 1.7 | 1.2 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Urban | Wage Farmer | 2.7 | 5.2 | 3.9 |
|  | Wage Non Farmer | 65.6 | 40.1 | 53.3 |
|  | Independent farmer | 9.8 | 26.3 | 17.7 |
|  | Independent non farmer | 20.6 | 23.9 | 22.2 |
|  | Unpaid non farmer \& NS | 1.4 | 4.5 | 2.9 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Rural | Wage Farmer | 13.7 | 13.8 | 13.7 |
|  | Wage Non Farmer | 26.3 | 4.8 | 14.6 |
|  | Independent farmer | 48.1 | 72.9 | 61.6 |
|  | Independent non farmer | 11.4 | 7.2 | 9.1 |
|  | Unpaid non farmer \& NS | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.9 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV4
The vast majority of working female (98\%) are in the private sector compared to $96 \%$ of male, while only $2 \%$ of female work in the public sector compared to $4 \%$ of male. However, in urban areas the public sector employs $6 \%$ and $8 \%$ of the female and male working population respectively (Table 6.5). It should be noted that, comparing the 2013/14 data, the same trend is observed for female and male.

Table 6.5: Percentage distribution of working population by institutional sector according to sex and type of residence (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Institutional Sector | Male | Female | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rwanda | Public | 3.8 | 2 | 2.8 |
|  | Private | 95.7 | 97.7 | 96.8 |
|  | NGO | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
|  | Others | 0.1 | 0 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Urban | Public | 7.6 | 5.7 | 6.6 |
|  | Private | 90.6 | 93.3 | 92 |
|  | NGO | 1.6 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
|  | Others | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Rural | Public | 2.8 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
|  | Private | 97 | 98.6 | 97.9 |
|  | NGO | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
|  | Others | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Institutional Sector | Male | Female | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Rwanda | Public | 3.6 | 1.8 | 2.6 |
|  | Private | 93.8 | 95.7 | 94.8 |
|  | Others | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
|  | NS | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.2 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| Rural | Public | 8.1 | 5.7 | 7 |
|  | Private | 84.2 | 83.3 | 83.7 |
|  | Others | 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.3 |
|  | NS | 6.2 | 10 | 8.1 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
|  | Public | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.7 |
|  | Private | 95.9 | 98.0 | 97.1 |
|  | Others | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
|  | NS | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: EICV4
Data in Table 6.6 shows the rate of business ownership by educational level of females and male. Majority of female owning businesses have not completed primary school level (36\%) compared to a slightly higher rate of $40 \%$ for their male counterparts. Female with university level owning businesses stands at 3\% against 4\% for male. It should be noted that, according to area of residence, slightly more male in urban area with primary level of education own businesses compared to their female counterparts ( $23 \%$ against $21 \%$ respectively), while the same trend is observed in rural area with $28 \%$ of male who completed primary education level owning a business compared to $21 \%$ of female. Regardless of area of residence, females who have never attended school and those with upper secondary level are likely to own a business than their male counterparts, while the contrary is observed among those with University level. With regards to the change since EICV4, the trend is more or less the same for female and male.

Table 6.6: Percentage of individuals (16+) owning businesses by Educational level according area of residence and sex (EICV5 and EICV4)

| EICV5 <br> Educational level | Ownership of business |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rwanda |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Never attended school | 8.3 | 10.2 | 9.2 | 4.5 | 7.3 | 6.0 | 10.4 | 12.8 | 11.4 |
| Primary not Completed | 39.8 | 36.4 | 38.2 | 29.5 | 30.6 | 30.1 | 45.4 | 41.6 | 43.8 |
| Primary Completed | 26.4 | 21.2 | 24.0 | 23.1 | 20.9 | 21.9 | 28.2 | 21.4 | 25.4 |
| Post primary | 1.9 | 3.7 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 3.5 | 2.4 |
| Lower secondary | 11.2 | 11.8 | 11.5 | 15.9 | 13.5 | 14.6 | 8.7 | 10.4 | 9.4 |
| Upper secondary | 8.2 | 13.7 | 10.8 | 15.1 | 18.4 | 16.9 | 4.4 | 9.5 | 6.5 |
| University | 4.2 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 9.6 | 5.5 | 7.4 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 <br> Educational level | Ownership of business |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rwanda |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Never attended school | 7.9 | 12.5 | 9.9 | 4.3 | 8.2 | 6.4 | 9.5 | 16.6 | 12.1 |
| Primary not Completed | 40.6 | 38.1 | 39.5 | 26.3 | 32.1 | 29.4 | 47.5 | 43.8 | 46.1 |
| Primary Completed | 32.7 | 30.4 | 31.7 | 34.9 | 32.7 | 33.7 | 31.6 | 28.3 | 30.4 |
| Post primary | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 5.6 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.6 |
| Lower secondary | 5.5 | 6.5 | 5.9 | 7.5 | 9.4 | 8.5 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 4.2 |
| Upper secondary | 6.9 | 7.2 | 7.0 | 13.4 | 9.3 | 11.2 | 3.8 | 5.2 | 4.3 |
| University | 2.8 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 8.0 | 2.6 | 5.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV4
Table 6.7 shows the distribution of workers by broad economic activity, according to level of education attained by sex. The majority of female workers with no educational level are working in agriculture (92\%) compared to only $77 \%$ of male with same educational level. It is worth noting that majority of female with University level are working in service sector (87\%) slightly higher than that of male with same level ( $82 \%$ ). As it can be observed in this table, the higher educational level that female and male have, the higher probability of working outside the agriculture sector. If compared to $2013 / 14$ data, the same trend was observed among female and male.

Table 6.7: Distribution of workers by broad economic activity, according to level of education attained and sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Education <br> Attainment | Agriculture | Industry | Services | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Both <br> sexes | None | 86.4 | 3.7 | 9.9 | 100 |
|  | Primary not <br> Completed | 75.6 | 6.9 | 17.4 | 100 |
|  | Primary Completed | 68.9 | 8.6 | 22.5 | 100 |
|  | Post primary | Lower secondary | 51.6 | 17.5 | 30.9 |
|  | Upper secondary | 51.1 | 11.5 | 37.4 | 100 |
|  | University | 31.7 | 10.6 | 57.7 | 100 |
|  | Not stated | 7.9 | 8.3 | 83.8 | 100 |


| EICV5 | Education Attainment | Agriculture | Industry | Services | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 69.8 | 7.5 | 22.7 | 100 |
| Male | None | 76.5 | 7.5 | 16.0 | 100 |
|  | Primary not Completed | 65.3 | 12.0 | 22.7 | 100 |
|  | Primary Completed | 58 | 14.1 | 27.9 | 100 |
|  | Post primary | 41.8 | 25.2 | 33.1 | 100 |
|  | Lower secondary | 41.1 | 17.2 | 41.7 | 100 |
|  | Upper secondary | 24.7 | 17.7 | 57.6 | 100 |
|  | University | 7.2 | 11.3 | 81.5 | 100 |
|  | Not stated | 46.3 | 0.0 | 53.7 | 100 |
|  | Total | 58.5 | 13 | 28.5 | 100 |
| Female | None | 91.9 | 1.5 | 6.6 | 100 |
|  | Primary not Completed | 85.0 | 2.3 | 12.7 | 100 |
|  | Primary Completed | 79.0 | 3.5 | 17.6 | 100 |
|  | Post primary | 62.3 | 9.2 | 28.5 | 100 |
|  | Lower secondary | 62.2 | 5.1 | 32.7 | 100 |
|  | Upper secondary | 38.9 | 3.2 | 57.9 | 100 |
|  | University | 8.9 | 4.0 | 87.1 | 100 |
|  | Not stated | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 |
|  | Total | 79.6 | 2.8 | 17.6 | 100 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Education <br> Attainment | Agriculture | Industry | Services | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Both <br> sexes | None | 87.7 | 3.3 | 9.0 | 100 |
|  | Primary not <br> Completed | 77.0 | 6.9 | 16.2 | 100 |
|  | Primary <br> Completed | Post primary | 69.2 | 7.5 | 23.3 |


| EICV4 | Education <br> Attainment | Agriculture | Industry | Services | Total |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Post primary | 70.1 | 6.2 | 23.6 | 100 |
|  | Lower secondary | 61.7 | 5.5 | 32.8 | 100 |
|  | Upper secondary | 26.6 | 3.9 | 69.5 | 100 |
|  | University | 4.6 | 4.7 | 90.7 | 100 |
|  | Not stated | 45.1 | 0.0 | 54.9 | 100 |
|  | Total | 81.8 | 2.1 | 16.1 | 100 |

Source: EICV4

Table 6.8 presents data on mean weekly working hours by consumption quintiles and broad sector of economic activity by sex. It should be noted that, in general, female spend less time per week in the generating income activities in the three broad sectors of economy compared to male. On average, female spend 8.6 hours less per week in all the three broad category of economic activities than their male counterparts (29.3 hours against 37.9 hours respectively). If the agriculture sector is considered, female spend about 4.1 hours less per week compared to male ( 24.3 hours per week against 28.4 hours respectively) although majority of them are in agriculture occupations, while in service sector female spend on average about 2.9 hours less per week than their male counterparts ( 50.1 hours per against 53 hours respectively). In the industry sector, female spend 3.9 hours less than male ( 38.4 hours per week against 42.3 hours respectively). This may be due to domestic work which social norms have attributed to females in our society. It should be noted in general that, the more higher quintile a female belongs the more time she spend in generating income activities in the three broad sector of the economy. The same trend applies to their male counterparts. If compared to the 2013/14 EICV 4 data, female now spend about 5 hours more in service sector work in 2016/17 than they were in $2013 / 14$ while for male, there was about an increase of about 2 hours per week in the same period.

Table 6.8: Mean weekly working hours by consumption quintiles and broad sector of economic activity and sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| All | Quintile | EICV4 |  |  | EICV5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Both | Male | Female | Both |
|  | Q1 | 29.9 | 25 | 27.1 | 29.4 | 25 | 26.8 |
|  | Q2 | 31 | 25.7 | 28 | 32 | 25.6 | 28.4 |
|  | Q3 | 34.2 | 26.3 | 30 | 33.8 | 26.3 | 29.6 |
|  | Q4 | 37.3 | 27.2 | 32 | 37.2 | 27.3 | 32 |
|  | Q5 | 46.6 | 37.2 | 42.2 | 48.5 | 40.2 | 44.5 |
|  | Total | 36.9 | 28.4 | 32.4 | 37.9 | 29.3 | 33.3 |
| Agriculture | Q1 | 27.6 | 24.6 | 25.7 | 26.5 | 24.1 | 25 |
|  | Q2 | 28 | 25.1 | 26.2 | 27.6 | 24.7 | 25.8 |
|  | Q3 | 30.3 | 25.5 | 27.4 | 28.2 | 24.6 | 25.9 |
|  | Q4 | 30.1 | 24.8 | 26.9 | 29 | 24.4 | 26.2 |
|  | Q5 | 32.6 | 25.1 | 28 | 31.2 | 23.5 | 26.5 |
|  | Total | 29.5 | 25 | 26.8 | 28.4 | 24.3 | 25.9 |


| All | Quintile | EICV4 |  |  | EICV5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female | Both | Male | Female | Both |
| Industry | Q1 | 33.8 | 29.1 | 32.9 | 35 | 29.6 | 34 |
|  | Q2 | 34.8 | 29.7 | 34.1 | 40.3 | 35.8 | 39.7 |
|  | Q3 | 38.8 | 32.9 | 37.9 | 41.2 | 37.5 | 40.3 |
|  | Q4 | 42.2 | 37.3 | 41.6 | 40 | 37.7 | 39.6 |
|  | Q5 | 45 | 38.8 | 44.1 | 48.4 | 43 | 47.3 |
|  | Total | 39.9 | 34.2 | 39 | 42.3 | 38.4 | 41.6 |
| Services | Q1 | 40 | 30.5 | 36.4 | 41.4 | 37 | 39.7 |
|  | Q2 | 45.6 | 34.3 | 41.2 | 44.5 | 36.1 | 41.7 |
|  | Q3 | 46.9 | 34.9 | 43.1 | 49.2 | 42.1 | 46.8 |
|  | Q4 | 50.3 | 41 | 47 | 54 | 44.7 | 50.7 |
|  | Q5 | 54.6 | 52.3 | 53.7 | 56.1 | 55.2 | 55.7 |
|  | Total | 51.1 | 45.7 | 49 | 53 | 50.1 | 51.9 |

Source: EICV4 and EICV5

### 6.3. Access to Finance

Increasing access to and use of quality financial products and services is essential to inclusive economic growth and poverty reduction. Increasing women's financial inclusion is especially important as women disproportionately experience poverty, stemming from unequal divisions of labour and a lack of control over economic resources. Despite important advances in expanding access to formal financial services in Rwanda in recent years, a significant access gap remains between men and women. This is illustrated through a basic measure of financial inclusion: account ownership.

### 6.3.1 Ownership of bank account

Findings in table 6.9 show that, only $22 \%$ of female population aged 18 years and above hold a bank account, compared to $38 \%$ of their male counterparts. This gender gap is even more pronounced between men and women according to place of residence where almost half ( $48 \%$ ) of male population in urban area hold a bank account compared to only $30 \%$ of female counterparts. In rural area, about 1 in 5 women hold a bank account compared to about 1 in 3 male. According to province, female population lag behind their male counterparts in holding a bank account in all the provinces, with the lowest rate among females in the Eastern province ( $16 \%$ against $33 \%$ among males). It should be noted that, the higher consumption quintile a female belongs, the higher likelihood of holding a bank account. The same pattern is observed among male population. With regards to the change in possession of bank account since EICV4, the results reveal that, the percentage of female holding a bank account remains almost the same ( $22 \%$ ) in both surveys, compared with a slightly decrease from $40 \%$ to $38 \%$ for males (figure 6.2).

Figure 6. 2: Percentage of individuals (18+) with bank account by Area of residence and Sex (EICV4, EICV5)


Source: EICV4, EICV5

Table 6.9: Percentage of individuals (18+) with bank account by sex, and Area of residence and consumption quintile (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | \% with bank account |  |  | Population aged 18+ years (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 38.1 | 22.4 | 29.7 | 6,206 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 48.3 | 30.3 | 39.3 | 1,286 |
| Rural | 35.1 | 20.5 | 27.2 | 4,920 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 47.7 | 32.0 | 40.0 | 992 |
| Southern Province | 37.2 | 26.5 | 31.3 | 1,425 |
| Western Province | 34.9 | 19.7 | 26.6 | 1,327 |
| Northern Province | 40.0 | 21.1 | 29.7 | 963 |
| Eastern Province | 33.3 | 16.1 | 24.0 | 1,498 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 23.3 | 15.5 | 18.9 | 995 |
| Q2 | 28.5 | 16.4 | 21.8 | 1,100 |
| Q3 | 31.6 | 19.0 | 24.7 | 1,199 |
| Q4 | 39.1 | 21.0 | 29.5 | 1,319 |
| Q5 | 55.3 | 36.1 | 45.8 | 1,593 |

Source EICV5

| EICV4 | \% with bank account |  |  | Population aged 18+ and above (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 39.6 | 21.8 | 30.0 | 5,906 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 52.0 | 34.3 | 42.9 | 1,115 |
| Rural | 36.5 | 19.0 | 27.0 | 4,791 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 54.9 | 35.1 | 44.8 | 757 |
| Southern Province | 35.9 | 22.5 | 28.6 | 1,392 |
| Western Province | 35.5 | 19.5 | 26.8 | 1,333 |
| Northern Province | 37.5 | 16.2 | 25.9 | 926 |
| Eastern Province | 39.5 | 20.2 | 29.2 | 1,498 |


| EICV4 | \% with bank account |  |  | Population aged 18+ and above <br> (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male |  | Female |  |

Source:EICV4

As shown in table 6.10, majority of female population possessing bank account have them in savings and credit cooperative (SACCOs) at $66 \%$ which is quite higher compared to male at $57 \%$ for male. The second common institutions where female hold their bank accounts is the commercial banks with $26 \%$ compared to $33 \%$ for male. With regards to the change since EICV4, the proportion of female possessing a bank account in SACCOs has increased by 5 percentage points from $61 \%$ in $2013 / 14$ while for male it has increased by 4 percentage points from $53 \%$ (figure 6.3). On the other hand, the proportion of female possessing a bank account in commercial bank has declined by 5 percentage points from $31 \%$ in 2013/14 to $26 \%$ in 2016/17, while for male it has declined by 6 percentage points from $39 \%$ to $33 \%$ in the same period.

Figure 6. 3: Percentage of population aged 18 and above with a bank account by financial institution and sex (EICV4, EICV5)


Source: EICV4, EICV5

Table 6.10: Percentage of population aged 18 and above with a bank account by financial institution and sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Institution | National |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| Saving with | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Commercial Bank | 33.3 | 26.4 | 30.5 | 65.4 | 64.8 | 65.2 | 20.7 | 12.9 | 17.5 |
| Microfinance | 7.0 | 5.8 | 6.5 | 11.5 | 9.2 | 10.6 | 5.2 | 4.6 | 4.9 |
| Cooperative Bank | 2.4 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.9 |
| Savings and credit cooperatives (SACCOs) | 57.4 | 66.1 | 60.9 | 19.8 | 24.2 | 21.5 | 72.2 | 80.9 | 75.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV5.: Base population: Population aged 18+ years owning a bank account

| EICV4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Institution <br> Saving with | National |  |  | Male |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Commercial <br> Bank | 38.5 | 30.7 | 35.4 | 78.5 | 71.2 | 75.4 | 26.2 | 16.1 | 22.4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Microfinance | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.5 | 7.5 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cooperative <br> Bank | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Savings and <br> credit <br> cooperative <br> (SACCOs) | 53.4 | 61.0 | 56.3 | 12.4 | 19.3 | 15.3 | 66.2 | 76.3 | 70.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4: Base population: Population aged 18+ years owning a bank account

### 6.3.2. Access to loan (credit)

Limited access to loans is widely regarded a major hindrance to successful development, especially for women. Data from table 6.11 and figure 6.4 shows a very low rate of use of formal source to acquire loan, only $5 \%$ of population. The formal sources of credit discussed here are the Commercial banks, Microfinance institutions, Cooperative bank and SACCOs. As the results show, only $3 \%$ of female aged 18 years and above have secured loan from a formal source compared to $7 \%$ of male, while $29 \%$ of female have acquired loan from informal source compared to $33 \%$ among male. Considering the area of residence, about $5 \%$ of female in urban area have secured a loan from a formal source compared to $10 \%$ of male, while in rural area, only $3 \%$ of female have secured a loan from formal source compared to $6 \%$ of male. It should be noted that, the use of informal source for acquiring loan is quite higher in rural area than in urban area for both female and male. With regards to the change since EICV4, data shows that the rate of female securing a loan from a formal source has slightly declined, except in rural area, while for male it has slightly increased at national level and in urban and rural areas (figure 6.4).

Figure 6. 4: Percentage of population aged 18 and above with loan by loan source and sex (EICV5, EICV4)


Source: EICV4, EICV5
Table 6.11: Percentage of population aged 18 and above with loan by loan source and sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loan source | National |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Loan from formal source | 7.2 | 3.2 | 5.1 | 10.3 | 5.0 | 7.6 | 6.4 | 2.8 | 4.4 |
| Loan from informal source | 32.6 | 28.8 | 30.6 | 20.2 | 18.0 | 19.1 | 36.1 | 31.4 | 33.5 |
| No loan | 60.2 | 68.0 | 64.4 | 69.5 | 76.9 | 73.2 | 57.5 | 65.9 | 62.1 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loan source | National |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Loan from formal source | 6.8 | 3.3 | 4.9 | 8.8 | 6.6 | 7.7 | 6.3 | 2.7 | 4.3 |
| Loan from informal source | 34.1 | 27.3 | 30.5 | 19.0 | 15.3 | 17.1 | 38.7 | 29.8 | 33.9 |
| No loan | 59.1 | 69.4 | 64.6 | 72.3 | 78.1 | 75.3 | 55.0 | 67.5 | 61.8 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV4
As indicated in table 6.12, out of the total female population which acquired a loan from a formal financial institution, majority ( $32 \%$ ) has secured their loans from SACCOs while for male, commercial bank is the main source (36\%). It should be noted that, the least financial institution used as source of credit for female and male population is the microfinance with $12 \%$ and $10 \%$
respectively. When the area of residence is considered, majority of female and male secure their loan from commercial banks in urban area ( $63 \%$ and $68 \%$ respectively), while in rural area, SACCOs are the most popular for female and male to secure loan ( $39 \%$ and $44 \%$ respectively). With regard to the change since EICV4, cooperative bank was the most used formal financial institution by female at national level to acquire a loan in 2013/14 while the SACCOs is in $2016 / 17$. For male, commercial banks remain the main source of loan since 2013/14.

## Table 6.12: Percentage of population aged 18 and above with loan from formal Financial institutions by sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| Formal Financial <br> institutions <br> (EICV5) | National |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Commercial Bank | 36.0 | 30.8 | 34.2 | 68.0 | 63.3 | 66.3 | 22.0 | 16.2 | 20.0 |
| Cooperative Bank | 19.3 | 24.6 | 21.1 | 10.4 | 9.7 | 10.1 | 23.2 | 31.4 | 26.0 |
| Microfinance | 9.9 | 12.6 | 10.9 | 8.4 | 11.0 | 9.3 | 10.6 | 13.4 | 11.6 |
| SACCOs | 34.8 | 31.9 | 33.8 | 13.3 | 16.1 | 14.2 | 44.2 | 39.1 | 42.5 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV5

| Formal Financial <br> institutions <br> (EICV4) | National Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Commercial Bank | 35.9 | 29.7 | 33.6 | 70.5 | 53.6 | 62.8 | 24.7 | 17.4 | 22.2 |
| Cooperative Bank | 23.07 | 34.7 | 27.4 | 12.0 | 14.9 | 13.3 | 25.5 | 42.1 | 31.2 |
| Microfinance | 9.6 | 10.0 | 9.7 | 7.2 | 14.1 | 10.3 | 9.8 | 7.6 | 9.0 |
| SACCOs | 31.5 | 25.6 | 29.3 | 10.2 | 17.5 | 13.6 | 40.1 | 32.8 | 37.6 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: EICV4
Women are less likely to borrow larger amount of money compared to men, especially from formal financial sources. Data from Table 6.13 shows that, majority ( $22.5 \%$ ) of female who have secured a loan from a formal financial institution have received 5,000 Frws or less, while for male, majority ( $28 \%$ ) have secured above $1,000,000$ Frws. It should be noted that, in general, as the amount of money received from loan increases the less number of women are observed. When the area of residence is considered, majority of female and male in urban area have secured a loan amounting above $1,000,000$ million Frws ( $41 \%$ for female and $57 \%$ for male), while in rural area, majority of female ( $30 \%$ ) have secured a loan amounting to 5,000 Frws or less, and majority ( $23 \%$ ) of male secured a loan amounting between 200,001-to- 500,000 Frws. It is worth noting that, female and male in urban area are likely to secure a bigger amount of loan compared to their counterparts in rural area.

With regard to the change since EICV4, the findings show that, there has been a shift among female from taking small loan amount of money to a bigger amount, and the same trend is observed among male as well. In 2013/14, only $11 \%$ of female secured a loan amounting to above $1,000,000$ Frws while in $2016 / 17$ the rate has increased to $18 \%$. For male, the rate was $21 \%$ in $2013 / 14$ against $28 \%$ in $2016 / 17$. On the other hand, $32 \%$ of female secured a loan amounting to 5,000 Frws or less in 2013/14 which declined to $22.5 \%$ in 2016/17, while for male, the rate declined from $18 \%$ in 2013/14 to $12.5 \%$ in 2016/17.

Table 6.13: Percentage of population aged 18 and above with loan from formal sources by amount received, area of residence and sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| Loan Amount <br> (in <br> Frws),EICV5 | National |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Femal <br> e | Total |
| 5,000 or less | 12.5 | 22.5 | 15.9 | 1.7 | 6.3 | 3.3 | 17.3 | 29.8 | 21.5 |
| $5,001-100,000$ | 13.1 | 16.9 | 14.4 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 17.5 | 23.5 | 19.6 |
| $100,001-$ <br> 200,000 | 10.2 | 11.8 | 10.7 | 5.5 | 8.5 | 6.5 | 12.3 | 13.2 | 12.6 |
| $200,001-$ <br> 500,000 | 21.7 | 20.6 | 21.3 | 19.2 | 27.2 | 22.0 | 22.7 | 17.6 | 21.0 |
| $500,001-$ <br> $1,000,000$ | 14.5 | 10.1 | 13.0 | 13.4 | 14.8 | 13.9 | 14.9 | 7.9 | 12.5 |
| Above <br> $1,000,000$ | 28.1 | 18.2 | 24.7 | 57.1 | 40.8 | 51.5 | 15.3 | 8.0 | 12.8 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: EICV5

| Loan Amount <br> (in <br> Frws),EICV4 | National |  |  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Male | Female | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5,000 or less | 18.4 | 32.3 | 23.5 | 3.7 | 6.4 | 4.9 | 24.3 | 45.2 | 31.5 |
| $5,001-100,000$ | 15.7 | 13.7 | 15.0 | 1.5 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 20.8 | 17.0 | 19.5 |
| $100,001-$ <br> 200,000 | 14.2 | 12.6 | 13.6 | 6.3 | 15.7 | 10.6 | 17.2 | 11.7 | 15.3 |
| $200,001-$ <br> 500,000 | 18.4 | 16.7 | 17.8 | 18.1 | 20.9 | 19.4 | 16.5 | 14.0 | 15.7 |
| 500,001- <br> $1,000,000$ | 12.2 | 13.9 | 12.8 | 18.5 | 25.4 | 21.6 | 10.5 | 8.1 | 9.7 |
| Above <br> $1,000,000$ | 21.2 | 10.7 | 17.3 | 52.0 | 26.5 | 40.4 | 10.7 | 4.0 | 8.4 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: EICV4
Table 6.14 presents the various reasons for borrowing as stated by female and male with credit. Business expansion is the main reason for borrowing for both female and male (33\%). The second most important reason for borrowing among male is home improvement (19\%) while for female it is others reasons (not identified here) at 16\%. While majority of female are in agriculture occupations, only $1.5 \%$ of female at national level borrow for agriculture inputs compared to $3.3 \%$ of male, and almost the same percentage of female and male are borrowing for agriculture equipment ( $6.9 \%$ and $6.6 \%$ respectively). Considering the area of residence, slightly higher percentage of females in urban area borrow for business expansion than males ( $40 \%$ compared to $37 \%$ ), while the opposite case is observed in rural area ( $30 \%$ for female against $31 \%$ for male). Concerning the change since EICV4, it should be noted that, the rate of borrowing for business expansion declined for both female and male from 39.5\% among female and $39 \%$ among male to only $33 \%$ for both sexes between 2013/14 and 2016/17.

Table 6.14: Percentage of population aged 18 and above who received loan/credit from formal sources by Purpose of the loan, area of residence and sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| Purpose of <br> Loan/borrowing <br> (EICV5) | National |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Agricultural <br> equipment | 6.9 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 9.2 |
| Agricultural inputs | 3.3 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 3.9 |
| Business expansion | 33.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 | 36.7 | 40.4 | 38.0 | 31.4 | 29.6 | 30.8 |
| Home improvement | 19.4 | 13.4 | 17.3 | 30.7 | 19.8 | 26.9 | 14.4 | 10.5 | 13.1 |
| Education | 7.1 | 9.9 | 8.1 | 7.2 | 6.1 | 6.8 | 7.0 | 11.6 | 8.6 |
| Medical treatment | 1.5 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 1.9 | 2.8 | 2.2 |
| Ceremonial (eg: <br> marriage, funeral, <br> etc...) | 1.9 | 2.6 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 2.7 |
| Purchase of a house | 5.0 | 8.9 | 6.3 | 5.8 | 10.3 | 7.4 | 4.6 | 8.2 | 5.8 |
| Livestock purchase | 4.0 | 5.7 | 4.6 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 5.0 | 7.7 | 5.9 |
| Others | 18.0 | 16.4 | 17.4 | 15.6 | 18.4 | 16.6 | 19.1 | 15.4 | 17.8 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Source: EICV5

| Purpose of Loan/borrowing (EICV4) | National |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Agricultural equipment | 8.9 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 11.9 | 10.6 | 11.5 |
| Agricultural inputs | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 3.8 |
| Business expansion | 38.9 | 39.5 | 39.1 | 37.2 | 43.5 | 40.1 | 39.2 | 33.1 | 37.1 |
| Home improvement | 21.1 | 11.0 | 17.4 | 37.0 | 19.1 | 28.9 | 15.5 | 7.8 | 12.9 |
| Education | 7.2 | 14.8 | 10.0 | 7.7 | 24.2 | 15.2 | 7.6 | 12.5 | 9.3 |
| Medical treatment | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 0.9 | 1.5 | 1.1 | 4.6 | 5.2 | 4.8 |
| Ceremonial (eg: marriage, funeral, etc...) | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.3 |
| Purchase of house | 5.2 | 8.5 | 6.4 | 8.9 | 6.4 | 7.8 | 4.2 | 9.1 | 5.9 |
| Livestock purchase | 4.0 | 1.7 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 4.4 | 2.5 | 3.7 |
| Others | 7.2 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 6.9 | 12.6 | 8.9 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV4

### 6.3.3 Use of land and house as collateral

In general, regardless of the background characteristics of household head, data in table 6.15 shows that, a female head of household is slightly less likely to have the right to sell or use any of their parcel/land as collateral for a loan application compared to a male head of household ( $77 \%$ against 80\%). According to consumption quintile, the male and female differentials are intangible.

Table 6. 15: Percentage of Households head with the right to sell or use land as collateral by urban/rural, province and consumption quintile (EICV5)

| EICV5 | Male Headed | Female Headed | Total | Total number of Household (000's) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Rwanda | 80.2 | 77.4 | 79.5 | 2,248 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 62.3 | 58.6 | 61.4 | 202 |
| Rural | 82.0 | 79.2 | 81.3 | 2,045 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 60.5 | 60.5 | 60.5 | 127 |
| Southern Province | 78.7 | 74.1 | 77.4 | 582 |
| Western Province | 82.4 | 77.2 | 81.2 | 511 |
| Northern Province | 88.4 | 90.3 | 88.9 | 397 |
| Eastern Province | 78.7 | 76.1 | 78.0 | 630 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 78.7 | 73.6 | 77.4 | 401 |
| Q2 | 80.9 | 75.3 | 79.5 | 443 |
| Q3 | 81.9 | 78.7 | 81.1 | 484 |
| Q4 | 81.3 | 80.2 | 81.0 | 503 |
| Q5 | 77.7 | 78.3 | 77.8 | 417 |

Source: EICV5. Base population: Household cultivating land for crop production
It is worth mentioning that land has several uses. Besides providing household income, land can be used as a security in times of hardship either by selling it or by using it as collateral for loan application. Findings in table 6.16 show the percentage of households with loan from formal sources using land as collateral by urban/rural, province, quintile and sex of head of household in the year preceding the survey. Overall, the results show that $46.8 \%$ of female headed household used their land as collateral for loan application compared to almost the same rate among male heads, $47 \%$. It should be noted that, female heads living in Kigali city, Eastern and Northern provinces were likely to use their land as collateral more than their male counterparts. The opposite is true in the Western and Southern provinces. As expected, land use as collateral to get a loan is more pronounced among rural female heads compared to urban ones, and so is the case among their male counterparts largely due to the availability of land in rural area than in urban area. Meanwhile, it is worth noting that, a lower percentage of female heads in the lowest consumption quintile (Q1) use their land as collateral to get a loan compared to male heads in the same quintile category ( $24 \%$ against $59 \%$ ), while in the fourth consumption quintiles, the percentage of female heads using their land as collateral (63\%) is quite higher than for their male counterparts (54\%). However for the highest consumption quintile, the percentage of female heads using their land as collateral is slightly higher to their male counterparts.

Table 6.16: Percentage of Households that used land as collateral by urban/rural, province, consumption quintile and sex of head of household (EICV5)

| EICV5 | Male Headed | Female Headed | Total | Total no. of HHs accessing formal sources of credit (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Rwanda | 47.0 | 46.8 | 47.0 | 301 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 20.4 | 18.8 | 20.3 | 93.0 |
| Rural | 59.1 | 57.0 | 58.9 | 208 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 17.0 | 23.7 | 17.7 | 65 |
| Southern Province | 54.5 | 53.5 | 54.3 | 62 |
| Western Province | 49.8 | 33.3 | 47.5 | 59 |
| Northern Province | 62.3 | 71.6 | 63.3 | 52 |
| Eastern Province | 55.9 | 56.8 | 56.0 | 63 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 59.1 | 23.6 | 54.3 | 15 |
| Q2 | 60.7 | 64.1 | 61.2 | 27 |
| Q3 | 59.0 | 42.8 | 56.7 | 40 |
| Q4 | 53.6 | 63.1 | 54.8 | 68 |
| Q5 | 37.4 | 38.2 | 37.5 | 150 |

Source: EICV5. Base population: Household using formal sources of credit
Ownership of a house is also of paramount importance in Rwanda as it can be used as collateral for loan application. Findings in table 6.17 show that, $17 \%$ of female heads of household are using their house to secure a loan from a formal financial institution compared to a slightly higher rate for male heads ( $18 \%$ ). Female heads living in urban area are more likely to use their houses as collateral than their male counterparts ( $41 \%$ against only $32 \%$ respectively) while in rural area the opposite pattern is observed. It should be noted that, according to province of residence, female heads of household in Kigali city, Northern and Southern provinces are more likely to use their house to secure a loan than male heads, while in Western and Eastern provinces, the opposite trend is being observed. The likelihood of female heads of household using their house as collateral to obtain a loan from a formal financial source increases with the consumption quintile, and the same pattern is observed among male heads. It should be noted that, more female in the richest quintile (Q5) use their houses to secure a loan than their male counterparts in the same consumption quintile ( $31 \%$ against $24 \%$ ).

Table 6.17: Percentage of households with the loan from formal sources of credit using house as collateral by urban/rural, consumption quintile and sex of head of household (EICV5)

| EICV5 | Male <br> Headed | Female <br> Headed | Total | Total no. of HHs accessing formal sources of credit (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Rwanda | 17.6 | 16.7 | 17.5 | 301 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 31.6 | 40.6 | 32.5 | 93 |
| Rural | 11.3 | 8.0 | 10.9 | 208 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 33.3 | 42.1 | 34.2 | 65 |
| Southern Province | 9.8 | 10.2 | 9.9 | 62 |
| Western Province | 15.8 | 9.8 | 15.0 | 59 |
| Northern Province | 10.7 | 12.6 | 10.9 | 52 |
| Eastern Province | 16.3 | 10.8 | 15.7 | 63 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 15 |
| Q2 | 6.2 | 0.0 | 5.4 | 27 |
| Q3 | 10.7 | 7.5 | 10.2 | 40 |
| Q4 | 15.7 | 8.6 | 14.8 | 68 |
| Q5 | 23.6 | 31.0 | 24.3 | 150 |

Source: EICV5. Base population: Household using formal sources of credit

## Chapter 7: Health Conditions

This chapter analyses the differences between women and men in terms of prevalence of disabilities and access to medical insurance

### 7.1. Disability

Findings reveal that, $4.2 \%$ of female population aged 5 and above in Rwanda are living with disability, and the same percentage is observed among male population. This is a vulnerable group of the population that requires special attention and assistance from the entire community. There was a predominance of disability with legs (walking) among both female and male populations living with disability. With regard to change since EICV4, the findings reveal that, the percentage of female population with disability has slightly decreased from $4.6 \%$ in 2013/14 to $4.2 \%$ in 2016/17, while for male, it has decreased from $4.3 \%$ in 2013/14 to $4.2 \%$ in 2016/17.

Table 7. 1: Population aged 5 and above with disability, by sex, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Population with disability |  |  | Total population aged 5 and above (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| \% with disability at National level | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 10,184 |
| Disability type |  |  |  |  |
| Vision disability | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 28 |
| Deaf or mute | 8.8 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 37 |
| Disability in the arms | 13.0 | 12.8 | 12.9 | 55 |
| Disability in the legs | 28.8 | 21.1 | 24.8 | 106 |
| Mental disability | 20.7 | 17.0 | 18.8 | 80 |
| Trauma | 1.9 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 10 |
| Very old | 8.9 | 19.0 | 14.2 | 61 |
| Other | 11.2 | 12.4 | 11.8 | 51 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 428 |

Source: EICV5: Base population: Person aged 5 and above

| EICV4 | Population with disability |  |  | Total population <br> aged 5 years and <br> above (000s) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | 9,837 |
| \% with disability at <br> National level | $\mathbf{4 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | 36 |
| Disability type |  |  |  | 9.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Vision disability | 8.7 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 37 |
| Deaf or mute | 13.9 | 11.2 | 8.5 | 55 |
| Disability in the arms | 28.6 | 22.6 | 12.4 | 111 |
| Disability in the legs | 17.4 | 17.7 | 25.3 | 77 |
| Mental disability | 1.8 | 3.4 | 17.5 | 12 |
| Trauma | 15.0 | 24.7 | 2.6 | 89 |
| Very old | 5.3 | 4.6 | 20.3 | 22 |
| Other | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | 4.9 | 438 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV4: Base population: Person aged 5 and above

### 7.2. Health insurance

As shown in table 7.2, the percentage of female population with a health insurance amount to
$74.5 \%$ compared to $73.4 \%$ for male. With regards to the change since EICV4, there has been almost a 4 percentage points increase for female as well as for male (figure 7.1). The most common health insurance is the community based health (Mutuelle de santé) where overwhelming majority of females $94 \%$ and $93 \%$ for males have this type of health insurance.

Figure 7. 1: Percentage of population with health insurance by sex, (EICV5, EICV4)


Source: EICV5 and EICV4
Table 7.2: Percentage of population with health insurance, by type of insurance and by sex, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Population with health insurance |  |  | Total population (000s) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  |  | $\mathbf{1 1 , 8 9 3}$ |
| \% with health insurance | $\mathbf{7 3 . 4}$ | $\mathbf{7 4 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 . 9}$ |  | $\mathbf{3 7 5}$ |  |  |
| Type of insurance | 4.6 | 3.9 | 4.3 | $\mathbf{8 , 2 2 5}$ |  |  |
| RAMA | 92.8 | 94.2 | 93.5 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 0}$ |  |  |
| Mutual insurance | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | $\mathbf{1 0 8}$ |  |  |
| Employer | 1.4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | $\mathbf{6 9 . 0}$ |  |  |
| MMI | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.8 | $\mathbf{8 , 7 9 4}$ |  |  |
| Other insurance | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Population with health insurance |  |  | Total population (000s) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  |

Source: EICV4

## Chapter 8: Education and training

Girls' education is a strategic development priority. Better educated women tend to be healthier, participate more in the formal labour market, earn higher incomes, have fewer children, marry at a late age, and enable better health care and education for their children. All these factors combined can help lift households, communities, and nations out of poverty. This chapter, therefore, analyses the differences between female and male in terms of education: school attendance, education attainment, and literacy and computer skills.

### 8.1. School attendance at Primary and Secondary

The level of school attendance of children is the primary indicator of a population's access to education and, indirectly, its socioeconomic development.

Net school attendance ratios measure school attendance among children who have reached the official school age. At the primary school level, the Net attendance rate (NAR) is the percentage of the primary school age population (age 7-12 in Rwanda) that actually attends primary school. Results in Table 8.1 indicate that the net attendance rate of female at primary is slightly higher than that of male ( $88 \%$ compared to $87 \%$ respectively). According to province the highest NAR among female and male is found in the Northern Province (91\%) and lowest in Eastern province ( $85 \%$ ). Taking into account the consumption quintile, the highest NAR is observed among the girls and boys in the richest quintile. It is worth noting that the NAR is higher among rural females than in urban, while the opposite is observed among males. With regard to the change since EICV4, the NAR for female in the last 3 years slightly drop from 89\% in 2013/14 to 88\% in $2016 / 17$, while for male it has slightly increased from $86.8 \%$ to $87.1 \%$ in the same period.

The GAR measures the level of participation of children in the primary school education irrespective of their age divided by the total population aged $7-12$ years. Findings in table 8.1 show that, overall, the female GAR is slightly lower than for male ( $131.5 \%$ compared to $133 \%$ respectively). Taking into account the change since EICV4, the percentage of female GAR slightly dropped by about 3 percentage points since 2013/14 from $135 \%$ to $131.5 \%$, while for male, it has dropped from $134 \%$ to $133 \%$ in the same period. This shows that over-age enrolments have been declining in the last 3 years.

Table 8.1: Net and gross attendance rates in primary school by urban/rural, province, and consumption quintile, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Net attendance rate NAR (\%) |  |  | Gross attendance rate GAR (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| All Rwanda | 87.1 | 88.2 | 87.6 | 133 | 131.5 | 132.3 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 89.5 | 85.3 | 87.3 | 133.8 | 123.5 | 128.5 |
| Rural | 86.7 | 88.6 | 87.7 | 132.9 | 132.9 | 132.9 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 88.9 | 88.3 | 88.6 | 129.8 | 128.9 | 129.4 |
| Southern Province | 87.1 | 89.7 | 88.4 | 133.0 | 134.1 | 133.5 |
| Western Province | 88.2 | 88.2 | 88.2 | 133.7 | 133.4 | 133.6 |
| Northern Province | 91.2 | 91.2 | 91.2 | 142.8 | 135.2 | 138.8 |
| Eastern Province | 83.2 | 84.9 | 84.1 | 128.2 | 126.3 | 127.2 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 79.3 | 82.0 | 80.7 | 122.8 | 126.5 | 124.7 |
| Q2 | 87.9 | 87.6 | 87.7 | 128.3 | 129.0 | 128.6 |


| Q3 | 89.7 | 89.8 | 89.7 | 141.6 | 133.0 | 137.2 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Q4 | 90.4 | 92.8 | 91.6 | 139.9 | 137.8 | 138.9 |
| Q5 | 92.8 | 92.6 | 92.7 | 139.2 | 135.5 | 137.4 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Net attendance rate NAR (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Gross attendance rate GAR (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |  |
| All Rwanda | $\mathbf{8 6 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 . 0}$ | $\mathbf{8 7 . 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 4 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 4 . 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 4 . 4}$ |  |  |
| Urban/rural | 91.8 | 86.0 | 91.2 | 139 | 135.4 | 137.2 |  |  |
| Urban | 90.7 | 88.7 | 87.4 | 133.4 | 134.4 | 133.9 |  |  |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Province | 92.5 | 88.8 | 90.6 | 139.0 | 129.1 | 133.7 |  |  |
| Kigali City | 85.7 | 87.5 | 86.6 | 135.0 | 136.4 | 135.7 |  |  |
| Southern Province | 85.4 | 88.9 | 87.2 | 132.2 | 137.0 | 134.6 |  |  |
| Western Province | 90.7 | 92.7 | 91.7 | 136.6 | 137.7 | 137.2 |  |  |
| Northern Province | 84.7 | 88.2 | 86.5 | 132.1 | 131.0 | 131.5 |  |  |
| Eastern Province | 80.7 | 84.2 | 82.4 | 122.2 | 129.4 | 125.7 |  |  |
| Quintile | 85.2 | 89.4 | 87.4 | 131.5 | 134.2 | 132.9 |  |  |
| Q1 | 89.2 | 90.6 | 89.9 | 138.8 | 133.8 | 136.3 |  |  |
| Q2 | 91.3 | 90.9 | 91.1 | 144.4 | 141.9 | 143.1 |  |  |
| Q3 | 92.0 | 92.3 | 92.1 | 141.9 | 136.3 | 139.0 |  |  |

Source: EICV4

Table 8.2 presents NAR in secondary school by geographic area and consumption quintile. At the secondary school level, the Net attendance rate (NAR) is the percentage of the secondary school age population (age 13-18 in Rwanda) that actually attends secondary school. The findings indicate that, across all Rwanda, 25 female students out of 100 are attending secondary school compared to only 21 male students out of 100 .

Despite relative advances since 2013, secondary school attendance is still predominant among female living in urban compared to rural areas ( $39 \%$ against $22 \%$ respectively), and the same trend applies to male ( $40 \%$ in urban against $17.5 \%$ in rural areas). At the provincial level, Kigali continues to possess the highest secondary school attendance for female children aged 13 to 18 years old (around $37 \%$ compared to a high rate of $42 \%$ among male) while the Eastern province recorded the least ( $22 \%$ compared to low rate of $16 \%$ among male).

According to the consumption quintiles, the NAR for secondary school is skewed to female and male children belonging to the consumption quintile as $43 \%$ and $39 \%$ of them respectively attend this education level whereas children in the poorest consumption quintile account for only $9 \%$ among female and $9 \%$ among male.

With regard to the change since EICV4, in general, the NAR and GAR in attending secondary school for girls and boys did not show major improvement since EICV4.

Table 8.2: Net and gross attendance rates in secondary school by urban/rural, province, and consumption quintile (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Net attendance rate |  |  | Gross attendance rate |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | NAR (\%) |  |  | GAR (\%) |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| All Rwanda | $\mathbf{2 1 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 5 . 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{3 4 . 8}$ |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 39.8 | 39.3 | $\mathbf{3 9 . 5}$ | 60.6 | 50.8 | $\mathbf{5 5 . 3}$ |
| Rural | 17.5 | 21.6 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 6}$ | 27.9 | 32.5 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 2}$ |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 42.0 | 36.7 | $\mathbf{3 9 . 2}$ | 59.3 | 46.2 | $\mathbf{5 2 . 3}$ |
| Southern Province | 17.4 | 22.3 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ | 27.5 | 33.7 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 5}$ |
| Western Province | 20.3 | 22.8 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 6}$ | 32.9 | 35.3 | $\mathbf{3 4 . 1}$ |
| Northern Province | 21.1 | 28.2 | $\mathbf{2 4 . 7}$ | 31.4 | 39.6 | $\mathbf{3 5 . 5}$ |
| Eastern Province | 16.4 | 21.6 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 0}$ | 29.0 | 31.5 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 2}$ |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 8.7 | 8.6 | $\mathbf{8 . 7}$ | 12.9 | 12.9 | $\mathbf{1 2 . 9}$ |
| Q2 | 14.3 | 16.9 | $\mathbf{1 5 . 6}$ | 22.2 | 23.3 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 8}$ |
| Q3 | 18.6 | 24.1 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 3}$ | 31.7 | 34.5 | $\mathbf{3 3 . 1}$ |
| Q4 | 26.0 | 33.6 | $\mathbf{2 9 . 6}$ | 41.4 | 50.7 | $\mathbf{4 5 . 8}$ |
| Q5 | 39.2 | 42.9 | $\mathbf{4 1 . 1}$ | 59.8 | 60.1 | $\mathbf{6 0 . 0}$ |

Source: EICV5

| Area of Residence | Net attendance rate |  |  | Gross attendance rate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NAR (\%) |  |  | GAR (\%) |  |  |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | EICV4 |
| All Rwanda | 20.8 | 25.0 | 23.0 | 39.5 | 42.7 | 41.1 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 39.8 | 38.2 | 38.9 | 67.0 | 61.4 | 63.9 |
| Rural | 16.9 | 21.6 | 19.3 | 33.7 | 37.9 | 35.8 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 36.8 | 36.9 | 36.9 | 64.4 | 59.8 | 61.8 |
| Southern Province | 17.7 | 22.2 | 19.9 | 33.1 | 38.8 | 35.9 |
| Western Province | 18.1 | 21.5 | 19.9 | 38.3 | 40.3 | 39.3 |
| Northern Province | 21.3 | 27.0 | 24.2 | 36.7 | 40.8 | 38.8 |
| Eastern Province | 19.2 | 23.4 | 21.3 | 38 | 41 | 39.5 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 9.7 | 11.6 | 10.6 | 17.1 | 17.6 | 17.4 |
| Q2 | 15.4 | 18.1 | 16.8 | 29.4 | 30.3 | 29.9 |
| Q3 | 17.8 | 23.2 | 20.5 | 37.1 | 43.6 | 40.3 |
| Q4 | 22.8 | 29.5 | 26.3 | 46.5 | 52.3 | 49.5 |
| Q5 | 38.3 | 41.3 | 39.8 | 67.4 | 68.1 | 67.8 |

Source: EICV4

Table 8.3 includes a third school attendance indicator: the gender parity index (GPI), which is the ratio of the NAR/GAR for females to the NAR/GAR for males. The narrower the gap between the sexes, the closer the index is to 1 . The GPI for primary school is 1.01 which means there are 101 females attending primary school to 100 males. The findings also reveal that there are only minimal variations between female and male students attending school at primary according to province and consumption quintile. This indicates a very low disparity between the sexes. However, there is a greater variation according to area of residence where there is only 95 female students attending primary school to 100 males in urban area while in rural area 102 female students are attending primary school to 100 males.

The GPI for secondary school is 0.99 ; this indicates that there are 99 female students attending secondary school to 100 males. The inequality is greater in urban areas, which have a GPI of 0.92 compared with 1.00 in rural areas.

Concerning the change since EICV4, the data shows that, there is an increase in number of female students attending school at primary level compared to male, while attendance of female at secondary school has declined.

Table 8.3: Gender Parity Index (GPI) for primary and secondary school attendance for girls compared to boys by urban/rural, province, age groups and consumption quintile, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Gender Parity Index (GPI) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary |  | Secondary |  |
|  | EICV5 | EICV4 | EICV5 | EICV4 |
| All Rwanda | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.08 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.92 | 0.89 |
| Rural | 1.02 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.04 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 0.99 | 0.93 | 0.99 | 0.88 |
| Southern Province | 1.03 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.08 |
| Western Province | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.00 | 0.95 |
| Northern Province | 1.00 | 1.01 | 0.95 | 1.01 |
| Eastern Province | 1.02 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.1 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 1.03 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 0.94 |
| Q2 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.01 | 1.03 |
| Q3 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.94 | 0.97 |
| Q4 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.04 |
| Q5 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.02 |

Source: EICV5 and EICV4: Note: Gender Parity Index (GPI)is then calculated by dividing the female Gross Enrolment Ratio by the male Gross Enrolment Ratio for the given level of education.

Figure 8.1 shows that $3 \%$ of female aged 16 to 30 years are currently attending tertiary level compared to $3.5 \%$ of male. With regards to the change since EICV4, it is worth noting that, there has been an increase in the percentage of female aged 16-30 years attending University from $2.5 \%$ to $3 \%$ while for male there was almost no change since 2013/14.

Figure 8. 1: Percentage of population aged 16 to 30 years currently attending tertiary education by sex, (EICV5 , EICV4)


Source: EICV5 and EICV4

### 8.2. Education attainment

Women are more likely to have attended a lower educational level than men. There are marked differences between women and men at different levels. Figures in table 8.4 show that, more men attained primary school level than women ( $69 \%$ compared to 65\%), while for secondary school the figures show a reverse trend $14.5 \%$ for females compared to 14.4 \% for males. Females with university educational level, stands at $2.6 \%$ compared to $3.7 \%$ for males. Nearly $15 \%$ of females aged 10 years and above have never been to school, compared to $10 \%$ of males. In urban as well as in rural areas, a higher percentage of female than male have never been to school ( $9 \%$ as against $4 \%$ in urban areas, $17 \%$ against $11 \%$ in rural areas). With regard to the change since EICV4, there is a slight decline in the percentage of female who have no education level from $16.3 \%$ to $15.2 \%$ while for male it declined from $9.9 \%$ to $9.7 \%$.

Table 8. 4: Distribution of population aged 10 and above by level of education attained, area of residence and sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Rwanda |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{\text { © }}{\stackrel{\pi}{\pi}}$ |  | 퓽 | $\frac{\mathbb{N}}{\sum_{i}^{\pi}}$ | \# | ? | シ |  | - |
| Never attended school | 12.1 | 18.9 | 15.7 | 4.3 | 8.5 | 6.4 | 11.1 | 16.7 | 14.1 |
| Primary not Completed | 42.3 | 40.2 | 41.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Primary Completed | 26.2 | 24.9 | 25.5 | 50.5 | 50.0 | 50.2 | 73.8 | 68.7 | 71.1 |
| Post primary | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 5.8 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.9 |


| EICV5 | Rwanda |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\frac{0}{\mathbb{N}}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ज़ } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{0}{\sum_{x}^{\pi}}$ |  | ت़゙ँ | ¢ | 或 | - |
| Lower secondary | 7.4 | 6.4 | 6.9 | 26.9 | 26.8 | 26.8 | 11.3 | 11.7 | 11.5 |
| Upper secondary | 7.0 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 12.4 | 10.4 | 11.4 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| University | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Not stated | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Source: EICV5: Base Population aged 10 years and above

| EICV4/ <br> Educational Level <br> Attained | Rwanda |  |  |  | Urban |  |  | Rural |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |  |
| Never attended <br> school | 12.2 | 20.3 | 16.5 | 4.6 | 7.8 | 6.3 | 11.1 | 18.2 | 14.9 |  |
| Primary not <br> Completed | 43.5 | 41.4 | 42.4 | 36.1 | 37.9 | 37.0 | 58.2 | 54.2 | 56.1 |  |
| Primary Completed | 26.8 | 24.9 | 25.8 | 25.6 | 25.7 | 25.7 | 21.7 | 20.9 | 21.3 |  |
| Post primary | 1.6 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.9 |  |
| Lower secondary | 7.2 | 5.9 | 6.5 | 10.4 | 9.9 | 10.1 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 4.0 |  |
| Upper secondary | 5.5 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 11.5 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 2.3 |  |
| University | 3.1 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 9.7 | 6.1 | 7.8 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.5 |  |
| Not stated | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |  |

Source: EICV4: Base Population aged 10 years and above

### 8.3. Literacy and computer skills

This section compares women and men literacy rates defined as the percentage of the population aged 15 and above whom can both read and write a simple statement on his or her everyday life. Findings in table 8.5 show that in Rwanda, about $69 \%$ of the female population aged 15 and above are able to read and write in at least one language compared to $77.5 \%$ of males. In all provinces, males are more literate than females, while the opposite is observed according to consumption quintile. The literacy rate is generally higher in urban areas (83\% for females and $91 \%$ for males) than in rural areas ( $66 \%$ for females and $74 \%$ for males), as expected, the literacy rate for female population aged 15-24 years is higher than that of their male counterparts ( $88.5 \%$ compared to $84 \%$ ). It should be noted that, across all the characteristics, area of residence, province or consumption quintile, the literacy rate of female is higher than that of male. With regards to the change since EICV4, in general, the literacy rate has slightly increased for both female and male population aged 15 years and above and for population 15-24 years old.

Table 8.5: Literacy rate (\%) of population aged 15 and above, according to urban/rural, province, consumption quintile and sex, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Literacy rate (\%) for population aged 15-24 years |  |  | Populationaged 15-24years(000s) | Literacy rate (\%) for population aged 15+ years |  |  | Population aged 15+ years (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 84.3 | 88.5 | 86.5 | 2,302 | 77.5 | 69.4 | 73.2 | 7,028 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 91.6 | 92.4 | 92.0 | 512 | 90.6 | 83.2 | 86.9 | 1,428 |
| Rural | 82.3 | 87.4 | 84.9 | 1,790 | 73.9 | 66.1 | 69.7 | 5,599 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 90.5 | 92.6 | 91.6 | 378 | 89.6 | 85.6 | 87.6 | 1,093 |
| Southern Province | 82.2 | 89.0 | 85.6 | 505 | 73.0 | 67.6 | 70.1 | 1,615 |
| Western Province | 83.1 | 85.5 | 84.4 | 513 | 74.8 | 64.1 | 69.0 | 1,519 |
| Northern Province | 84.7 | 90.6 | 87.7 | 361 | 76.7 | 67.9 | 72.0 | 1,097 |
| Eastern Province | 83.0 | 86.6 | 84.9 | 545 | 76.3 | 67.1 | 71.4 | 1,704 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 75.4 | 78.7 | 77.1 | 384 | 75.4 | 78.7 | 77.1 | 384 |
| Q2 | 80.5 | 85.8 | 83.3 | 394 | 80.5 | 85.8 | 83.3 | 394 |
| Q3 | 85.0 | 88.8 | 87.0 | 441 | 85.0 | 88.8 | 87.0 | 441 |
| Q4 | 86.0 | 91.8 | 88.9 | 478 | 86.0 | 91.8 | 88.9 | 478 |
| Q5 | 90.7 | 93.7 | 92.3 | 604 | 90.7 | 93.7 | 92.3 | 604 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 |  |  |  | Populationaged 15-24years$(000 \mathrm{~s})$ | Literacy rate (\%) for population aged $15+$ years |  |  | Population aged 15+ years (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 84.9 | 87.5 | 86.2 | 2,278 | 77.3 | 67.6 | 72.1 | 6,636 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 92.7 | 92.5 | 92.6 | 488 | 90.8 | 84.4 | 87.5 | 1,255 |
| Rural | 82.9 | 86.1 | 84.5 | 1,790 | 74.1 | 63.8 | 68.6 | 5,381 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 94.2 | 93.4 | 93.8 | 313 | 92.1 | 86.1 | 89 | 844 |
| Southern Province | 81.1 | 88.9 | 85.0 | 490 | 72.6 | 66 | 69.1 | 1,556 |
| Western Province | 85.2 | 85.5 | 85.3 | 522 | 75.6 | 63.9 | 69.3 | 1,493 |
| Northern Province | 85.4 | 88.9 | 87.2 | 364 | 76.7 | 66.4 | 71.2 | 1,053 |
| Eastern Province | 82.9 | 84.0 | 83.4 | 589 | 75.8 | 64.3 | 69.7 | 1,689 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 75.9 | 78.9 | 77.4 | 369 | 64.4 | 54.9 | 59.1 | 1,116 |
| Q2 | 84.5 | 85.9 | 85.2 | 403 | 72.2 | 62.1 | 66.6 | 1,213 |
| Q3 | 85.5 | 86.9 | 86.2 | 437 | 75.3 | 66.2 | 70.4 | 1,291 |
| Q4 | 86.8 | 88.8 | 87.8 | 469 | 79.5 | 69.6 | 74.2 | 1,388 |
| Q5 | 88.8 | 93.2 | 91.1 | 600 | 88.6 | 81.1 | 84.8 | 1,628 |

Source: EICV4

According to EICV5, a person is considered "computer literate" if he/she expressed her/himself confident with using a computer. Table 8.6 shows computer literacy rates in 2013/14 and 2016/17 between female and male aged 15 to 24 and those aged 15 and above by geographic,
sex and socio-economic characteristics. The findings show that, only $7 \%$ of female aged 15 years and above are computer literate compared to $11 \%$ male of same age bracket. The results further indicate the same gender imbalance in computer literacy for age group 15-24 years, female still lag behind compared to their male counterparts ( $10 \%$ compared to $11 \%$ ).

The use of computer is more common among urban dwellers, especially in Kigali as well as in the highest consumption quintiles. According to EICV5 results, computer literacy rate among female aged 15 years and above is lower in urban area compared to their male counterparts ( $22 \%$ against $30.5 \%$ respectively) while in rural area the rate is slightly lower ( $4 \%$ for female against $5.5 \%$ for male). The same pattern is observed among female and male aged 15-24 years old. Likewise, computer literacy rates are higher among male compared to female ones in all Provinces and consumption quintiles.

With regards to change since EICV4, there is a very little variation for both female and male (regardless of the age bracket) computer literacy rate between the two survey periods.

Table 8.6: Computer literacy rate (\%) of population aged 15 and above, according to urban/rural, province, consumption quintile and sex, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Computer literacy rate (\%) of population aged 15-24 years |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Population } \\ \text { aged } 15- \\ 24 \text { years } \\ \text { (000s) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Computer literacy rate (\%) of population aged 15+ years |  |  | Population aged 15+ years (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 11.4 | 9.7 | 10.5 | 2,302 | 10.9 | 7.2 | 8.9 | 7,028 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 29.4 | 21.0 | 24.9 | 512 | 30.5 | 21.6 | 26 | 1,428 |
| Rural | 6.4 | 6.3 | 6.3 | 1,790 | 5.5 | 3.8 | 4.6 | 5,599 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 26.8 | 21.0 | 23.7 | 378 | 27.0 | 21.5 | 24.3 | 1,093 |
| Southern Province | 7.2 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 505 | 6.8 | 5.2 | 5.9 | 1,615 |
| Western Province | 9.8 | 6.5 | 8.1 | 513 | 8.4 | 4.3 | 6.2 | 1,519 |
| Northern Province | 9.7 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 361 | 9.2 | 5.6 | 7.3 | 1,097 |
| Eastern Province | 7.3 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 545 | 6.7 | 4.2 | 5.4 | 1,704 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 384 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1,171 |
| Q2 | 4.1 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 394 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 1,260 |
| Q3 | 5.9 | 4.7 | 5.3 | 441 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 1,362 |
| Q4 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 478 | 7.1 | 4.8 | 5.9 | 1,473 |
| Q5 | 27.7 | 23.2 | 25.3 | 604 | 30.3 | 23.3 | 26.8 | 1,762 |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Computer literacy rate (\%) of population aged 15-24 years |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Population } \\ \text { aged } 15- \\ 24 \text { years } \\ (000 \mathrm{~s}) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Computer literacy rate (\%) of population aged 15+ years |  |  | Population aged 15+ years (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 11.5 | 10.3 | 10.9 | 2,278 | 10.3 | 6.8 | 8.4 | 6,636 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 28.7 | 23.1 | 25.7 | 488 | 30.7 | 22.1 | 26.3 | 1,255 |
| Rural | 7.1 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 1,790 | 5.3 | 3.4 | 4.3 | 5,381 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 27.9 | 22.5 | 24.9 | 313 | 28.3 | 20.7 | 24.4 | 844 |
| Southern Province | 8.0 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 490 | 6.5 | 4.9 | 5.7 | 1,556 |
| Western Province | 9.4 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 522 | 8.1 | 4.9 | 6.4 | 1,493 |
| Northern Province | 11.8 | 9.4 | 10.6 | 364 | 8.9 | 5.3 | 6.9 | 1,053 |
| Eastern Province | 7.9 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 589 | 7.2 | 4.6 | 5.8 | 1,689 |
| Quintile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q1 | 4.0 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 369 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1,116 |
| Q2 | 5.1 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 403 | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 1,213 |
| Q3 | 6.9 | 6.1 | 6.5 | 437 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 1,291 |
| Q4 | 10.1 | 8.7 | 9.4 | 469 | 6.6 | 4.6 | 5.5 | 1,388 |
| Q5 | 25.0 | 23.6 | 24.3 | 600 | 28.2 | 21.1 | 24.6 | 1,628 |

Source: EICV4

## Annex A: District tables for selected indicators

Table A 1: Number of females per 100 males, by district, (EICV5, EICV4)

|  | EICV5 | EICV4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Rwanda | 108 | 109 |
| District |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 101 | 97 |
| Gasabo | 99 | 102 |
| Kicukiro | 101 | 116 |
| Nyanza | 108 | 113 |
| Gisagara | 114 | 113 |
| Nyaruguru | 116 | 109 |
| Huye | 110 | 108 |
| Nyamagabe | 104 | 113 |
| Ruhango | 108 | 107 |
| Muhanga | 110 | 112 |
| Kamonyi | 105 | 111 |
| Karongi | 104 | 111 |
| Rutsiro | 109 | 112 |
| Rubavu | 108 | 108 |
| Nyabihu | 109 | 109 |
| Ngororero | 120 | 111 |
| Rusizi | 102 | 112 |
| Nyamasheke | 115 | 120 |
| Rulindo | 105 | 112 |
| Gakenke | 107 | 108 |
| Musanze | 120 | 114 |
| Burera | 114 | 106 |
| Gicumbi | 111 | 107 |
| Rwamagana | 103 | 119 |
| Nyagatare | 110 | 106 |
| Gatsibo | 106 | 103 |
| Kayonza | 110 | 103 |
| Kirehe | 110 | 105 |
| Ngoma | 116 | 110 |
| Bugesera | 112 | 109 |

Source: EICV5

Table A. 2: Sex of the Household-heads by district, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto FemaleHeaded | Total | Total number of households (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Rwanda | 68.6 | 25.0 | 6.4 | 100 | 2,708 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 72.4 | 22.6 | 5.0 | 100 | 81 |
| Gasabo | 73.7 | 22.1 | 4.3 | 100 | 230 |
| Kicukiro | 75.2 | 17.3 | 7.5 | 100 | 98 |
| Nyanza | 67.0 | 28.1 | 4.9 | 100 | 79 |
| Gisagara | 60.1 | 33.5 | 6.4 | 100 | 82 |
| Nyaruguru | 68.3 | 25.3 | 6.4 | 100 | 64 |
| Huye | 59.7 | 31.6 | 8.8 | 100 | 82 |
| Nyamagabe | 69.5 | 25.3 | 5.2 | 100 | 77 |
| Ruhango | 63.9 | 28.2 | 8.0 | 100 | 71 |
| Muhanga | 65.9 | 26.9 | 7.2 | 100 | 78 |
| Kamonyi | 68.7 | 24.6 | 6.6 | 100 | 93 |
| Karongi | 68.4 | 23.7 | 7.9 | 100 | 78 |
| Rutsiro | 75.5 | 20.7 | 3.8 | 100 | 73 |
| Rubavu | 70.1 | 23.1 | 6.8 | 100 | 96 |
| Nyabihu | 66.5 | 26.7 | 6.8 | 100 | 67 |
| Ngororero | 60.7 | 27.5 | 11.9 | 100 | 82 |
| Rusizi | 72.1 | 22.7 | 5.1 | 100 | 95 |
| Nyamasheke | 67.0 | 28.7 | 4.3 | 100 | 83 |
| Rulindo | 68.1 | 27.6 | 4.3 | 100 | 78 |
| Gakenke | 67.7 | 23.9 | 8.3 | 100 | 84 |
| Musanze | 70.0 | 20.5 | 9.4 | 100 | 91 |
| Burera | 61.8 | 26.3 | 11.9 | 100 | 82 |
| Gicumbi | 73.9 | 22.5 | 3.6 | 100 | 88 |
| Rwamagana | 66.4 | 27.4 | 6.2 | 100 | 89 |
| Nyagatare | 71.1 | 24.1 | 4.9 | 100 | 132 |
| Gatsibo | 71.6 | 25.1 | 3.3 | 100 | 108 |
| Kayonza | 62.6 | 26.2 | 11.2 | 100 | 83 |
| Kirehe | 68.5 | 25.3 | 6.2 | 100 | 87 |
| Ngoma | 66.2 | 27.8 | 6.0 | 100 | 83 |
| Bugesera | 70.6 | 23.7 | 5.7 | 100 | 95 |

[^4]| EICV4 | Male-Headed | Female-Headed | De facto FemaleHeaded | Total | Total number of households (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Rwanda | 68.1 | 25.5 | 6.4 | 100 | 2,493 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 76.9 | 19.6 | 3.5 | 100 | 73 |
| Gasabo | 71.6 | 24.0 | 4.3 | 100 | 147 |
| Kicukiro | 70.4 | 23.5 | 6.1 | 100 | 76 |
| Nyanza | 63.5 | 30.9 | 5.6 | 100 | 77 |
| Gisagara | 64.4 | 28.1 | 7.5 | 100 | 79 |
| Nyaruguru | 64.6 | 26.2 | 9.2 | 100 | 61 |
| Huye | 58.5 | 34.4 | 7.1 | 100 | 79 |
| Nyamagabe | 65.6 | 25.4 | 9.0 | 100 | 73 |
| Ruhango | 65.0 | 28.0 | 7.0 | 100 | 77 |
| Muhanga | 66.0 | 30.2 | 3.8 | 100 | 73 |
| Kamonyi | 66.8 | 29.1 | 4.2 | 100 | 79 |
| Karongi | 64.4 | 28.1 | 7.5 | 100 | 75 |
| Rutsiro | 66.9 | 26.2 | 6.9 | 100 | 73 |
| Rubavu | 74.6 | 21.4 | 4.0 | 100 | 92 |
| Nyabihu | 66.4 | 22.4 | 11.2 | 100 | 64 |
| Ngororero | 65.6 | 20.0 | 14.5 | 100 | 81 |
| Rusizi | 68.2 | 26.4 | 5.4 | 100 | 89 |
| Nyamasheke | 64.8 | 27.2 | 8.0 | 100 | 86 |
| Rulindo | 61.8 | 29.2 | 9.0 | 100 | 69 |
| Gakenke | 71.0 | 23.4 | 5.5 | 100 | 80 |
| Musanze | 66.9 | 26.4 | 6.8 | 100 | 86 |
| Burera | 71.7 | 21.2 | 7.2 | 100 | 74 |
| Gicumbi | 71.8 | 23.8 | 4.4 | 100 | 86 |
| Rwamagana | 68.6 | 27.5 | 3.8 | 100 | 85 |
| Nyagatare | 69.9 | 23.6 | 6.5 | 100 | 113 |
| Gatsibo | 69.4 | 23.8 | 6.8 | 100 | 105 |
| Kayonza | 69.9 | 24.7 | 5.4 | 100 | 86 |
| Kirehe | 70.5 | 24.5 | 4.9 | 100 | 84 |
| Ngoma | 67.8 | 27.6 | 4.6 | 100 | 81 |
| Bugesera | 72.2 | 22.2 | 5.6 | 100 | 94 |

Source: EICV4

Table A. 3: Percentage of Households in informal Unions, by district (EICV5)

| District | Percentage of households in <br> informal unions | District | Percentage of households in <br> informal unions |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Nyarugenge | 49.9 | Ngororero | 31.5 |
| Gasabo | 42.4 | Rusizi | 17.4 |
| Kicukiro | 34.9 | Nyamasheke | 14 |
| Nyanza | 29.4 | Rulindo | 18 |
| Gisagara | 32.1 | Gakenke | 14.9 |
| Nyaruguru | 31.5 | Musanze | 41.6 |
| Huye | 29.1 | Burera | 34.8 |
| Nyamagabe | 26.2 | Gicumbi | 20.7 |
| Ruhango | 24.8 | Rwamagana | 43.3 |
| Muhanga | 17.1 | Nyagatare | 52.1 |
| Kamonyi | 30.2 | Gatsibo | 41.5 |
| Karongi | 17.7 | Kayonza | 47.6 |
| Rutsiro | 30.6 | Kirehe | 37.6 |
| Rubavu | 45.6 | Ngoma | 35.1 |
| Nyabihu | 49.2 | Bugesera | 42.6 |

Source: EICV5

Table A4: Any livestock raised, by sex of household head and District, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Male Headed |  | Female Headed |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Any Livestock |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| All Rwanda | 39.7 | 60.3 | 42.7 | 57.3 | 40.4 | 59.6 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 81.9 | 18.1 | 83.7 | 16.3 | 82.3 | 17.7 |
| Gasabo | 71.1 | 28.9 | 71.9 | 28.1 | 71.3 | 28.7 |
| Kicukiro | 82.8 | 17.2 | 81.6 | 18.4 | 82.6 | 17.4 |
| Nyanza | 32.4 | 67.6 | 47.3 | 52.7 | 36.6 | 63.4 |
| Gisagara | 37.3 | 62.7 | 41.4 | 58.6 | 38.7 | 61.3 |
| Nyaruguru | 26.2 | 73.8 | 32.1 | 67.9 | 27.7 | 72.3 |
| Huye | 38.3 | 61.7 | 32.0 | 68.0 | 36.3 | 63.7 |
| Nyamagabe | 21.4 | 78.6 | 25.9 | 74.1 | 22.5 | 77.5 |
| Ruhango | 23.5 | 76.5 | 37.1 | 62.9 | 27.3 | 72.7 |
| Muhanga | 26.6 | 73.4 | 33.4 | 66.6 | 28.4 | 71.6 |
| Kamonyi | 42.1 | 57.9 | 35.1 | 64.9 | 40.4 | 59.6 |
| Karongi | 24.3 | 75.7 | 32.7 | 67.3 | 26.2 | 73.8 |
| Rutsiro | 25.9 | 74.1 | 41.8 | 58.2 | 29.2 | 70.8 |
| Rubavu | 56.2 | 43.8 | 67.1 | 32.9 | 58.7 | 41.3 |
| Nyabihu | 41.0 | 59.0 | 48.6 | 51.4 | 43.0 | 57.0 |
| Ngororero | 20.7 | 79.3 | 35.0 | 65.0 | 24.6 | 75.4 |
| Rusizi | 29.7 | 70.3 | 40.7 | 59.3 | 32.2 | 67.8 |
| Nyamasheke | 28.9 | 71.1 | 28.5 | 71.5 | 28.8 | 71.2 |
| Rulindo | 30.1 | 69.9 | 34.6 | 65.4 | 31.3 | 68.7 |
| Gakenke | 12.5 | 87.5 | 19.0 | 81.0 | 14.0 | 86.0 |
| Musanze | 46.1 | 53.9 | 43.2 | 56.8 | 45.5 | 54.5 |
| Burera | 28.0 | 72.0 | 32.3 | 67.7 | 29.2 | 70.8 |
| Gicumbi | 18.5 | 81.5 | 29.9 | 70.1 | 21.1 | 78.9 |
| Rwamagana | 39.7 | 60.3 | 36.9 | 63.1 | 38.9 | 61.1 |
| Nyagatare | 43.9 | 56.1 | 44.4 | 55.6 | 44.0 | 56.0 |
| Gatsibo | 31.7 | 68.3 | 37.6 | 62.4 | 33.2 | 66.8 |
| Kayonza | 42.1 | 57.9 | 46.4 | 53.6 | 43.2 | 56.8 |
| Kirehe | 30.5 | 69.5 | 41.9 | 58.1 | 33.4 | 66.6 |
| Ngoma | 29.7 | 70.3 | 40.2 | 59.8 | 32.6 | 67.4 |
| Bugesera | 40.7 | 59.3 | 30.4 | 69.6 | 38.3 | 61.7 |

Source: EICV4

| EICV4 | Male Headed |  | Female Headed |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Any Livestock |  | Any Livestock |  | Any Livestock |  |
|  | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| All Rwanda | 33.8 | 66.2 | 40.5 | 59.5 | 35.5 | 64.5 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 78.7 | 21.3 | 77.8 | 22.2 | 78.5 | 21.5 |
| Gasabo | 67.5 | 32.5 | 66.2 | 33.8 | 67.2 | 32.8 |
| Kicukiro | 77.4 | 22.6 | 75.5 | 24.5 | 76.9 | 23.1 |
| Nyanza | 39.5 | 60.5 | 45.2 | 54.8 | 41.3 | 58.7 |
| Gisagara | 21.4 | 78.6 | 28.4 | 71.6 | 23.4 | 76.6 |
| Nyaruguru | 20.6 | 79.4 | 27.9 | 72.1 | 22.5 | 77.5 |
| Huye | 30.8 | 69.2 | 35.4 | 64.6 | 32.4 | 67.6 |
| Nyamagabe | 18.0 | 82.0 | 22.0 | 78.0 | 19.0 | 81.0 |
| Ruhango | 38.6 | 61.4 | 45.2 | 54.8 | 40.4 | 59.6 |
| Muhanga | 23.9 | 76.1 | 32.7 | 67.3 | 26.6 | 73.4 |
| Kamonyi | 18.8 | 81.2 | 31.6 | 68.4 | 22.5 | 77.5 |
| Karongi | 19.8 | 80.2 | 30.5 | 69.5 | 22.8 | 77.2 |
| Rutsiro | 19.9 | 80.1 | 34.9 | 65.1 | 23.8 | 76.2 |
| Rubavu | 57.9 | 42.1 | 66.0 | 34.0 | 59.6 | 40.4 |
| Nyabihu | 29.3 | 70.7 | 46.9 | 53.1 | 33.3 | 66.7 |
| Ngororero | 19.5 | 80.5 | 29.1 | 70.9 | 21.4 | 78.6 |
| Rusizi | 28.9 | 71.1 | 43.5 | 56.5 | 32.7 | 67.3 |
| Nyamasheke | 34.6 | 65.4 | 49.2 | 50.8 | 38.6 | 61.4 |
| Rulindo | 21.4 | 78.6 | 28.4 | 71.6 | 23.5 | 76.5 |
| Gakenke | 12.2 | 87.8 | 14.8 | 85.2 | 12.9 | 87.1 |
| Musanze | 35.3 | 64.7 | 43.2 | 56.8 | 37.3 | 62.7 |
| Burera | 27.4 | 72.6 | 38.3 | 61.7 | 29.7 | 70.3 |
| Gicumbi | 21.1 | 78.9 | 38.8 | 61.2 | 25.3 | 74.7 |
| Rwamagana | 33.9 | 66.1 | 41.0 | 59.0 | 35.8 | 64.2 |
| Nyagatare | 33.4 | 66.6 | 39.5 | 60.5 | 34.8 | 65.2 |
| Gatsibo | 26.7 | 73.3 | 41.9 | 58.1 | 30.3 | 69.7 |
| Kayonza | 35.5 | 64.5 | 34.8 | 65.2 | 35.3 | 64.7 |
| Kirehe | 27.7 | 72.3 | 32.7 | 67.3 | 29.0 | 71.0 |
| Ngoma | 30.4 | 69.6 | 34.0 | 66.0 | 31.4 | 68.6 |
| Bugesera | 27.2 | 72.8 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 28.5 | 71.5 |

Source: EICV5
Table A.5: Percentage of population aged 18 and above with loan by loan source and sex (EICV5)

| District Name | Loan Type | Sex |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female |  |
| Nyarugenge | Formal Loan | 5.0 | 3.3 | 4.1 |
|  | Informal Loan | 18.0 | 11.1 | 14.5 |
|  | No Loan | 77.1 | 85.6 | 81.4 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Gasabo | Formal Loan | 8.6 | 4.7 | 6.7 |
|  | Informal Loan | 30.0 | 26.6 | 28.4 |
|  | No Loan | 61.4 | 68.6 | 64.9 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


| District Name | Loan Type | Sex |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female |  |
| Kicukiro | Formal Loan | 12.6 | 5.3 | 9.0 |
|  | Informal Loan | 14.6 | 9.8 | 12.3 |
|  | No Loan | 72.8 | 84.8 | 78.7 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Nyanza | Formal Loan | 6.0 | 3.4 | 4.6 |
|  | Informal Loan | 26.9 | 23.7 | 25.2 |
|  | No Loan | 67.1 | 72.9 | 70.2 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Gisagara | Formal Loan | 3.9 | 2.8 | 3.2 |
|  | Informal Loan | 30.1 | 33.5 | 32.0 |
|  | No Loan | 66.1 | 63.8 | 64.8 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Nyaruguru | Formal Loan | 6.4 | 4.3 | 5.2 |
|  | Informal Loan | 38.2 | 46.9 | 42.9 |
|  | No Loan | 55.4 | 48.9 | 51.8 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Huye | Formal Loan | 5.2 | 3.0 | 4.0 |
|  | Informal Loan | 46.1 | 52.5 | 49.7 |
|  | No Loan | 48.7 | 44.5 | 46.3 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Nyamagabe | Formal Loan | 5.8 | 2.9 | 4.3 |
|  | Informal Loan | 34.7 | 38.3 | 36.6 |
|  | No Loan | 59.5 | 58.7 | 59.1 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Ruhango | Formal Loan | 6.2 | 3.9 | 5.0 |
|  | Informal Loan | 24.3 | 26.2 | 25.4 |
|  | No Loan | 69.4 | 69.9 | 69.7 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Muhanga | Formal Loan | 8.5 | 4.0 | 6.1 |
|  | Informal Loan | 31.1 | 28.2 | 29.5 |
|  | No Loan | 60.4 | 67.8 | 64.4 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kamonyi | Formal Loan | 7.3 | 2.9 | 4.9 |
|  | Informal Loan | 25.4 | 19.8 | 22.4 |
|  | No Loan | 67.3 | 77.3 | 72.6 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Karongi | Formal Loan | 5.7 | 2.7 | 4.1 |
|  | Informal Loan | 30.2 | 27.6 | 28.9 |
|  | No Loan | 64.1 | 69.7 | 67.1 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rutsiro | Formal Loan | 5.2 | 1.5 | 3.2 |
|  | Informal Loan | 30.2 | 19.3 | 24.3 |
|  | No Loan | 64.6 | 79.3 | 72.5 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rubavu | Formal Loan | 8.1 | 2.8 | 5.3 |
|  | Informal Loan | 19.4 | 18.0 | 18.7 |
|  | No Loan | 72.5 | 79.2 | 76.0 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Nyabihu | Formal Loan | 9.8 | 4.0 | 6.6 |
|  | Informal Loan | 26.6 | 26.3 | 26.4 |
|  | No Loan | 63.6 | 69.7 | 67.0 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Ngororero | Formal Loan | 4.9 | 2.0 | 3.3 |
|  | Informal Loan | 53.4 | 45.9 | 49.2 |
|  | No Loan | 41.7 | 52.0 | 47.5 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rusizi | Formal Loan | 7.8 | 4.0 | 5.8 |
|  | Informal Loan | 47.0 | 40.2 | 43.4 |
|  | No Loan | 45.2 | 55.8 | 50.8 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |


| District Name | Loan Type | Sex |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female |  |
| Nyamasheke | Formal Loan | 6.4 | 3.1 | 4.5 |
|  | Informal Loan | 35.4 | 30.3 | 32.5 |
|  | No Loan | 58.2 | 66.6 | 63.0 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rulindo | Formal Loan | 9.4 | 4.1 | 6.6 |
|  | Informal Loan | 33.1 | 29.8 | 31.4 |
|  | No Loan | 57.4 | 66.1 | 62.0 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Gakenke | Formal Loan | 8.5 | 3.0 | 5.5 |
|  | Informal Loan | 38.9 | 34.0 | 36.2 |
|  | No Loan | 52.6 | 63.0 | 58.3 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Musanze | Formal Loan | 8.2 | 2.6 | 5.2 |
|  | Informal Loan | 23.2 | 17.4 | 20.1 |
|  | No Loan | 68.6 | 80.0 | 74.8 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Burera | Formal Loan | 8.1 | 2.3 | 4.9 |
|  | Informal Loan | 39.6 | 31.9 | 35.4 |
|  | No Loan | 52.3 | 65.8 | 59.6 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Gicumbi | Formal Loan | 8.0 | 4.2 | 5.9 |
|  | Informal Loan | 20.7 | 18.9 | 19.7 |
|  | No Loan | 71.3 | 76.9 | 74.4 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Rwamagana | Formal Loan | 6.9 | 2.7 | 4.7 |
|  | Informal Loan | 38.7 | 38.1 | 38.4 |
|  | No Loan | 54.3 | 59.2 | 56.9 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Nyagatare | Formal Loan | 7.6 | 2.1 | 4.7 |
|  | Informal Loan | 49.1 | 33.3 | 40.8 |
|  | No Loan | 43.3 | 64.6 | 54.5 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Gatsibo | Formal Loan | 6.5 | 1.5 | 3.8 |
|  | Informal Loan | 32.0 | 22.4 | 26.9 |
|  | No Loan | 61.5 | 76.1 | 69.2 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kayonza | Formal Loan | 4.5 | 3.4 | 3.9 |
|  | Informal Loan | 35.5 | 27.9 | 31.5 |
|  | No Loan | 60.0 | 68.7 | 64.6 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Kirehe | Formal Loan | 4.9 | 1.4 | 3.0 |
|  | Informal Loan | 50.2 | 41.3 | 45.4 |
|  | No Loan | 44.8 | 57.3 | 51.6 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Ngoma | Formal Loan | 7.0 | 3.7 | 5.2 |
|  | Informal Loan | 29.3 | 24.6 | 26.7 |
|  | No Loan | 63.7 | 71.7 | 68.1 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Bugesera | Formal Loan | 7.5 | 3.0 | 5.1 |
|  | Informal Loan | 32.1 | 29.6 | 30.8 |
|  | No Loan | 60.4 | 67.4 | 64.1 |
|  | Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

[^5]Table A 6: Percentage of individuals (18+) with bank account by sex (EICV5, EICV4)

| District Name | Sex | Have bank account |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No |  |
| Nyarugenge | Male | 48.0 | 52.0 | 100 |
|  | Female | 29.5 | 70.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 38.7 | 61.3 | 100 |
| Gasabo | Male | 46.5 | 53.5 | 100 |
|  | Female | 31.5 | 68.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 39.2 | 60.8 | 100 |
| Kicukiro | Male | 50.0 | 50.0 | 100 |
|  | Female | 35.2 | 64.8 | 100 |
|  | Total | 42.7 | 57.3 | 100 |
| Nyanza | Male | 38.9 | 61.1 | 100 |
|  | Female | 26.9 | 73.1 | 100 |
|  | Total | 32.5 | 67.5 | 100 |
| Gisagara | Male | 40.1 | 59.9 | 100 |
|  | Female | 30.2 | 69.8 | 100 |
|  | Total | 34.5 | 65.5 | 100 |
| Nyaruguru | Male | 47.2 | 52.8 | 100 |
|  | Female | 40.5 | 59.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 43.5 | 56.5 | 100 |
| Huye | Male | 35.4 | 64.6 | 100 |
|  | Female | 28.3 | 71.7 | 100 |
|  | Total | 31.4 | 68.6 | 100 |
| Nyamagabe | Male | 47.5 | 52.5 | 100 |
|  | Female | 33.9 | 66.1 | 100 |
|  | Total | 40.2 | 59.8 | 100 |
| Ruhango | Male | 28.9 | 71.1 | 100 |
|  | Female | 17.5 | 82.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 22.6 | 77.4 | 100 |
| Muhanga | Male | 35.5 | 64.5 | 100 |
|  | Female | 25.2 | 74.8 | 100 |
|  | Total | 29.8 | 70.2 | 100 |
| Kamonyi | Male | 27.5 | 72.5 | 100 |
|  | Female | 13.9 | 86.1 | 100 |
|  | Total | 20.2 | 79.8 | 100 |
| Karongi | Male | 40.8 | 59.2 | 100 |
|  | Female | 22.1 | 77.9 | 100 |
|  | Total | 30.8 | 69.2 | 100 |
| Rutsiro | Male | 35.6 | 64.4 | 100 |
|  | Female | 20.3 | 79.7 | 100 |
|  | Total | 27.4 | 72.6 | 100 |
| Rubavu | Male | 31.9 | 68.1 | 100 |
|  | Female | 18.5 | 81.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 24.8 | 75.2 | 100 |
| Nyabihu | Male | 33.9 | 66.1 | 100 |
|  | Female | 18.0 | 82.0 | 100 |
|  | Total | 25.0 | 75.0 | 100 |
| Ngororero | Male | 34.5 | 65.5 | 100 |


| District Name | Sex | Have bank account |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Yes | No |  |
|  | Female | 16.5 | 83.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 24.2 | 75.8 | 100 |
| Rusizi | Male | 31.2 | 68.8 | 100 |
|  | Female | 14.3 | 85.7 | 100 |
|  | Total | 22.1 | 77.9 | 100 |
| Nyamasheke | Male | 37.9 | 62.1 | 100 |
|  | Female | 28.2 | 71.8 | 100 |
|  | Total | 32.3 | 67.7 | 100 |
| Rulindo | Male | 52.7 | 47.3 | 100 |
|  | Female | 30.7 | 69.3 | 100 |
|  | Total | 40.9 | 59.1 | 100 |
| Gakenke | Male | 45.4 | 54.6 | 100 |
|  | Female | 23.9 | 76.1 | 100 |
|  | Total | 33.7 | 66.3 | 100 |
| Musanze | Male | 32.9 | 67.1 | 100 |
|  | Female | 16.5 | 83.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 24.0 | 76.0 | 100 |
| Burera | Male | 34.3 | 65.7 | 100 |
|  | Female | 19.1 | 80.9 | 100 |
|  | Total | 26.0 | 74.0 | 100 |
| Gicumbi | Male | 35.9 | 64.1 | 100 |
|  | Female | 16.7 | 83.3 | 100 |
|  | Total | 25.4 | 74.6 | 100 |
| Rwamagana | Male | 38.2 | 61.8 | 100 |
|  | Female | 22.5 | 77.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 29.8 | 70.2 | 100 |
| Nyagatare | Male | 26.0 | 74.0 | 100 |
|  | Female | 11.4 | 88.6 | 100 |
|  | Total | 18.2 | 81.8 | 100 |
| Gatsibo | Male | 34.0 | 66.0 | 100 |
|  | Female | 13.0 | 87.0 | 100 |
|  | Total | 22.9 | 77.1 | 100 |
| Kayonza | Male | 25.9 | 74.1 | 100 |
|  | Female | 17.4 | 82.6 | 100 |
|  | Total | 21.4 | 78.6 | 100 |
| Kirehe | Male | 27.3 | 72.7 | 100 |
|  | Female | 9.0 | 91.0 | 100 |
|  | Total | 17.3 | 82.7 | 100 |
| Ngoma | Male | 42.8 | 57.2 | 100 |
|  | Female | 20.5 | 79.5 | 100 |
|  | Total | 30.6 | 69.4 | 100 |
| Bugesera | Male | 43.1 | 56.9 | 100 |
|  | Female | 22.1 | 77.9 | 100 |
|  | Total | 31.8 | 68.2 | 100 |

[^6]Table A. 7 Population with disability, by district (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Population with disability (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |
| \% with disability | 4.2 | 4.2 | 4.2 |
| District |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 3.1 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| Gasabo | 3.6 | 5.5 | 4.5 |
| Kicukiro | 3.1 | 1.4 | 2.3 |
| Nyanza | 5.4 | 7.1 | 6.3 |
| Gisagara | 2.6 | 3.8 | 3.3 |
| Nyaruguru | 4.6 | 3.6 | 4.1 |
| Huye | 2.8 | 2.3 | 2.6 |
| Nyamagabe | 5.8 | 5.9 | 5.9 |
| Ruhango | 3.7 | 5.0 | 4.3 |
| Muhanga | 6.6 | 5.5 | 6.0 |
| Kamonyi | 2.8 | 3.6 | 3.2 |
| Karongi | 4.2 | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| Rutsiro | 4.9 | 7.5 | 6.3 |
| Rubavu | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 |
| Nyabihu | 4.4 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| Ngororero | 4.5 | 3.8 | 4.1 |
| Rusizi | 3.7 | 4.7 | 4.2 |
| Nyamasheke | 3.8 | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| Rulindo | 2.9 | 2.2 | 2.5 |
| Gakenke | 7.4 | 4.4 | 5.9 |
| Musanze | 6.0 | 5.3 | 5.6 |
| Burera | 5.7 | 4.6 | 5.1 |
| Gicumbi | 3.2 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| Rwamagana | 3.4 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| Nyagatare | 3.1 | 1.9 | 2.4 |
| Gatsibo | 4.6 | 3.6 | 4.1 |
| Kayonza | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| Kirehe | 4.8 | 5.1 | 5.0 |
| Ngoma | 6.0 | 5.2 | 5.6 |
| Bugesera | 4.8 | 4.5 | 4.7 |

Source: EICV5 and EICV4

Table A. 8: Percentage of individuals (6+) that have ever attended school by sex and District, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | \% ever attended school |  |  | Population aged 6+ years <br> (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 89.5 | 85.1 | 87.2 | 9,901 |
| District |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 93.3 | 92.0 | 92.7 | 269 |
| Gasabo | 95.6 | 89.9 | 92.8 | 754 |
| Kicukiro | 95.9 | 94.1 | 95.0 | 353 |
| Nyanza | 89.5 | 84.4 | 86.8 | 272 |
| Gisagara | 82.6 | 84.2 | 83.5 | 288 |
| Nyaruguru | 85.7 | 79.4 | 82.3 | 251 |
| Huye | 88.7 | 85.2 | 86.9 | 291 |
| Nyamagabe | 88.5 | 82.4 | 85.3 | 294 |
| Ruhango | 90.2 | 89.3 | 89.7 | 264 |
| Muhanga | 90.0 | 87.0 | 88.4 | 291 |
| Kamonyi | 91.1 | 89.9 | 90.5 | 351 |
| Karongi | 89.2 | 83.6 | 86.3 | 305 |
| Rutsiro | 84.3 | 78.7 | 81.4 | 279 |
| Rubavu | 86.7 | 81.7 | 84.1 | 363 |
| Nyabihu | 91.2 | 82.5 | 86.5 | 255 |
| Ngororero | 85.3 | 82.9 | 84.0 | 306 |
| Rusizi | 90.1 | 86.9 | 88.5 | 381 |
| Nyamasheke | 90.3 | 85.0 | 87.4 | 324 |
| Rulindo | 90.9 | 84.5 | 87.5 | 276 |
| Gakenke | 88.9 | 85.7 | 87.2 | 302 |
| Musanze | 91.0 | 86.6 | 88.6 | 339 |
| Burera | 89.4 | 80.1 | 84.4 | 289 |
| Gicumbi | 88.2 | 83.3 | 85.6 | 330 |
| Rwamagana | 88.8 | 87.7 | 88.2 | 303 |
| Nyagatare | 88.0 | 82.1 | 84.9 | 498 |
| Gatsibo | 87.0 | 82.9 | 84.9 | 410 |
| Kayonza | 88.3 | 83.4 | 85.8 | 310 |
| Kirehe | 90.5 | 84.9 | 87.5 | 324 |
| Ngoma | 88.5 | 83.8 | 85.9 | 296 |
| Bugesera | 87.5 | 82.4 | 84.8 | 334 |


| EICV4 | \% ever attended school |  |  | Population aged 6+ years (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| All Rwanda | 88.8 | 83.8 | 86.1 | 9,517 |
| District |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 95.6 | 93.7 | 94.6 | 276 |
| Gasabo | 95.1 | 92.8 | 93.9 | 541 |
| Kicukiro | 96.7 | 93.2 | 94.8 | 293 |
| Nyanza | 86.8 | 82.2 | 84.4 | 286 |
| Gisagara | 83.1 | 78.4 | 80.6 | 286 |
| Nyaruguru | 82.1 | 77.5 | 79.7 | 243 |
| Huye | 88.6 | 86.2 | 87.3 | 303 |
| Nyamagabe | 88.9 | 81.8 | 85.1 | 282 |
| Ruhango | 86.6 | 83.6 | 85 | 287 |
| Muhanga | 93.2 | 86.7 | 89.8 | 262 |
| Kamonyi | 89.7 | 85 | 87.2 | 287 |
| Karongi | 89.5 | 85.2 | 87.2 | 289 |
| Rutsiro | 84.6 | 77.3 | 80.7 | 277 |
| Rubavu | 87.2 | 78.5 | 82.6 | 365 |
| Nyabihu | 87.4 | 79.8 | 83.4 | 248 |
| Ngororero | 83.9 | 79.1 | 81.4 | 300 |
| Rusizi | 89.7 | 84.5 | 86.9 | 364 |
| Nyamasheke | 90.6 | 85.2 | 87.6 | 335 |


| EICV4 | \% ever attended school |  |  | Population aged 6+ years (000s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total |  |
| Rulindo | 87.6 | 82.3 | 84.8 | 263 |
| Gakenke | 91 | 87.7 | 89.2 | 298 |
| Musanze | 91.8 | 87 | 89.2 | 332 |
| Burera | 89.3 | 79.5 | 84.3 | 296 |
| Gicumbi | 87.5 | 80.4 | 83.8 | 336 |
| Rwamagana | 90 | 86.1 | 87.9 | 321 |
| Nyagatare | 88.2 | 80.5 | 84.2 | 452 |
| Gatsibo | 87.3 | 83.1 | 85.1 | 391 |
| Kayonza | 87.4 | 83.9 | 85.6 | 329 |
| Kirehe | 86.6 | 80.2 | 83.3 | 317 |
| Ngoma | 86.5 | 81.2 | 83.7 | 313 |
| Bugesera | 86.3 | 84.2 | 85.2 | 346 |

Source: EICV5
Table A.9: Net and gross attendance rates in primary school by District, (EICV5, and EICV4)

| EICV5 | Net attendance rate NAR (\%) |  |  | Gross attendance rate GAR (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| All Rwanda | 87.1 | 88.2 | 87.6 | 133.0 | 131.5 | 132.3 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 87.0 | 90.9 | 89.1 | 127.7 | 125.4 | 126.5 |
| Gasabo | 86.3 | 86.5 | 86.4 | 128.0 | 132.4 | 130.1 |
| Kicukiro | 95.6 | 89.5 | 92.4 | 135.1 | 125.4 | 130.1 |
| Nyanza | 88.6 | 88.4 | 88.5 | 137.1 | 122.2 | 129.4 |
| Gisagara | 79.5 | 86.8 | 83.4 | 125.5 | 123.7 | 124.5 |
| Nyaruguru | 86.0 | 86.9 | 86.5 | 132.9 | 134.7 | 133.8 |
| Huye | 83.7 | 84.6 | 84.1 | 130.5 | 124.4 | 127.5 |
| Nyamagabe | 90.8 | 91.3 | 91.0 | 141.3 | 146.8 | 143.9 |
| Ruhango | 89.2 | 94.7 | 91.8 | 133.7 | 144.9 | 139.0 |
| Muhanga | 89.8 | 95.4 | 92.5 | 125.5 | 138.3 | 131.5 |
| Kamonyi | 88.1 | 90.5 | 89.3 | 136.0 | 140.1 | 138.0 |
| Karongi | 90.5 | 92.2 | 91.3 | 149.5 | 137.6 | 143.7 |
| Rutsiro | 85.5 | 86.9 | 86.2 | 124.7 | 128.2 | 126.5 |
| Rubavu | 88.0 | 84.2 | 86.0 | 134.3 | 117.0 | 125.0 |
| Nyabihu | 87.2 | 84.8 | 86.0 | 125.8 | 124.4 | 125.1 |
| Ngororero | 88.7 | 89.4 | 89.1 | 136.1 | 137.8 | 137.0 |
| Rusizi | 87.6 | 89.2 | 88.3 | 121.5 | 146.4 | 132.2 |
| Nyamasheke | 89.9 | 91.3 | 90.6 | 147.9 | 145.1 | 146.5 |
| Rulindo | 92.1 | 86.3 | 89.0 | 144.5 | 120.9 | 131.8 |
| Gakenke | 90.4 | 89.4 | 89.9 | 132.3 | 131.8 | 132.0 |
| Musanze | 90.5 | 93.6 | 92.3 | 135.4 | 127.9 | 131.3 |
| Burera | 93.3 | 94.2 | 93.8 | 155.1 | 146.2 | 150.2 |
| Gicumbi | 90.1 | 91.0 | 90.5 | 149.9 | 149.3 | 149.6 |
| Rwamagana | 84.9 | 91.3 | 88.1 | 131.7 | 132.7 | 132.2 |
| Nyagatare | 76.9 | 79.7 | 78.4 | 132.6 | 119.3 | 125.4 |
| Gatsibo | 86.4 | 86.7 | 86.5 | 134.9 | 137.1 | 136.0 |
| Kayonza | 79.2 | 81.6 | 80.5 | 124.6 | 112.2 | 118.0 |
| Kirehe | 82.9 | 87.9 | 85.3 | 132.9 | 132.9 | 132.9 |
| Ngoma | 87.1 | 88.5 | 87.8 | 115.2 | 124.1 | 119.8 |
| Bugesera | 85.9 | 82.0 | 84.1 | 121.7 | 128.9 | 125.1 |

Source: EICV5

| ICV4 | Net attendance rate NAR (\%) |  |  | Gross attendance rate GAR (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| All Rwanda | 86.8 | 89.0 | 87.9 | 134.2 | 134.6 | 134.4 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 86.5 | 84.5 | 85.5 | 135.4 | 117.2 | 125.9 |
| Gasabo | 94.7 | 90.2 | 92.3 | 141.3 | 134.9 | 137.9 |
| Kicukiro | 94.5 | 90.2 | 92.1 | 138.2 | 129.1 | 133.1 |
| Nyanza | 80.1 | 84.8 | 82.5 | 123.2 | 127.2 | 125.3 |
| Gisagara | 80.0 | 82.8 | 81.4 | 130.5 | 129.7 | 130.1 |
| Nyaruguru | 85.1 | 85.4 | 85.3 | 140.4 | 134.8 | 137.6 |
| Huye | 84.6 | 86.1 | 85.3 | 128.7 | 137.0 | 132.8 |
| Nyamagabe | 89.3 | 89.3 | 89.3 | 155.3 | 139.5 | 146.5 |
| Ruhango | 89.1 | 88.4 | 88.8 | 142.7 | 139.7 | 141.3 |
| Muhanga | 91.0 | 92.0 | 91.5 | 132.8 | 138.8 | 135.6 |
| Kamonyi | 87.0 | 91.9 | 89.3 | 129.1 | 144.9 | 136.6 |
| Karongi | 88.1 | 95.0 | 91.7 | 144.2 | 148.1 | 146.2 |
| Rutsiro | 84.6 | 90.1 | 87.4 | 134.6 | 143.1 | 138.9 |
| Rubavu | 80.4 | 80.8 | 80.6 | 118.9 | 115.8 | 117.3 |
| Nyabihu | 81.7 | 88.8 | 85.2 | 125.5 | 133.8 | 129.7 |
| Ngororero | 87.3 | 88.9 | 88.1 | 127.1 | 133.2 | 130.0 |
| Rusizi | 87.3 | 91.1 | 89.4 | 138.8 | 141.4 | 140.2 |
| Nyamasheke | 88.9 | 90.4 | 89.7 | 141.8 | 150.3 | 146.0 |
| Rulindo | 88.1 | 90.0 | 89.1 | 134.5 | 127.3 | 130.9 |
| Gakenke | 90.7 | 88.9 | 89.8 | 135.0 | 127.1 | 131.1 |
| Musanze | 93.1 | 96.7 | 95.0 | 141.5 | 142.1 | 141.8 |
| Burera | 89.1 | 92.1 | 90.5 | 136.2 | 147.6 | 141.5 |
| Gicumbi | 92.0 | 94.3 | 93.2 | 136.2 | 141.9 | 139.1 |
| Rwamagana | 90.3 | 89.6 | 89.9 | 134.4 | 132.2 | 133.1 |
| Nyagatare | 81.3 | 84.9 | 83.1 | 134.1 | 137.8 | 136.0 |
| Gatsibo | 87.6 | 89.6 | 88.6 | 137.4 | 138.6 | 138.0 |
| Kayonza | 78.0 | 87.9 | 82.9 | 121.3 | 126.4 | 123.8 |
| Kirehe | 87.0 | 87.8 | 87.4 | 132.2 | 134.6 | 133.4 |
| Ngoma | 83.1 | 88.1 | 85.8 | 129.2 | 118.1 | 123.2 |
| Bugesera | 88.2 | 90.5 | 89.5 | 135.1 | 127.7 | 131.1 |

Source: EICV4
Table A.10: Net and Gross Attendance Rate in secondary school, by District, (EICV5, EICV4)

| EICV5 | Net attendance rate <br> NAR (\%) |  |  | Gross attendance rate <br> GAR (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
|  | All Rwanda | $\mathbf{2 0 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 . 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 3 . 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 6 . 2}$ |
| District |  |  |  |  |  | $\mathbf{3 4 . 8}$ |
| Nyarugenge | 36.3 | 41.9 | $\mathbf{3 9 . 3}$ | 52.7 | 50.4 | $\mathbf{5 1 . 5}$ |
| Gasabo | 35.7 | 26.7 | $\mathbf{3 1 . 0}$ | 56.9 | 34.9 | $\mathbf{4 5 . 3}$ |
| Kicukiro | 47.6 | 48.5 | $\mathbf{4 8 . 1}$ | 70.5 | 67.3 | $\mathbf{6 8 . 7}$ |
| Nyanza | 19.7 | 25.1 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 0}$ | 30.4 | 40.5 | $\mathbf{3 4 . 7}$ |
| Gisagara | 7.5 | 16.3 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 7}$ | 16.1 | 24.5 | $\mathbf{2 0 . 2}$ |
| Nyaruguru | 15.4 | 23.2 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 4}$ | 20.8 | 34.1 | $\mathbf{2 7 . 6}$ |
| Huye | 17.0 | 23.5 | $\mathbf{2 0 . 0}$ | 27.1 | 32.8 | $\mathbf{2 9 . 8}$ |
| Nyamagabe | 17.1 | 18.9 | $\mathbf{1 8 . 0}$ | 29.1 | 32.4 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 7}$ |
| Ruhango | 20.8 | 19.7 | $\mathbf{2 0 . 3}$ | 30.5 | 37.6 | $\mathbf{3 4 . 0}$ |
| Muhanga | 19.6 | 24.8 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 3}$ | 30.4 | 31.3 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 9}$ |
| Kamonyi | 20.0 | 25.0 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 4}$ | 33.8 | 37.0 | $\mathbf{3 5 . 4}$ |
| Karongi | 18.8 | 23.4 | $\mathbf{2 0 . 8}$ | 32.5 | 36.0 | $\mathbf{3 4 . 1}$ |
| Rutsiro | 22.0 | 21.5 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 7}$ | 36.4 | 33.8 | $\mathbf{3 5 . 0}$ |
| Rubavu | 26.2 | 25.5 | $\mathbf{2 5 . 8}$ | 43.0 | 37.9 | $\mathbf{4 0 . 3}$ |
| Nyabihu | 20.1 | 23.5 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 8}$ | 29.3 | 31.8 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 5}$ |
| Ngororero | 10.9 | 12.5 | $\mathbf{1 1 . 8}$ | 18.5 | 19.1 | $\mathbf{1 8 . 8}$ |


| EICV5 | Net attendance rate <br> NAR (\%) |  |  | Gross attendance rate <br> GAR (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| Rusizi | 21.0 | 24.1 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 6}$ | 30.5 | 41.9 | $\mathbf{3 6 . 3}$ |
| Nyamasheke | 19.8 | 28.0 | $\mathbf{2 4 . 0}$ | 37.7 | 45.2 | $\mathbf{4 1 . 5}$ |
| Rulindo | 20.9 | 33.6 | $\mathbf{2 6 . 8}$ | 30.6 | 46.0 | $\mathbf{3 7 . 7}$ |
| Gakenke | 19.3 | 24.0 | $\mathbf{2 1 . 7}$ | 25.5 | 33.9 | $\mathbf{2 9 . 8}$ |
| Musanze | 23.5 | 36.9 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 9}$ | 42.2 | 51.6 | $\mathbf{4 7 . 5}$ |
| Burera | 20.0 | 21.1 | $\mathbf{2 0 . 5}$ | 31.1 | 29.4 | $\mathbf{3 0 . 3}$ |
| Gicumbi | 20.6 | 24.9 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 8}$ | 29.0 | 36.9 | $\mathbf{3 3 . 0}$ |
| Rwamagana | 21.5 | 25.4 | $\mathbf{2 3 . 4}$ | 35.1 | 36.2 | $\mathbf{3 5 . 6}$ |
| Nyagatare | 15.9 | 22.6 | $\mathbf{1 9 . 1}$ | 28.1 | 38.1 | $\mathbf{3 2 . 8}$ |
| Gatsibo | 11.0 | 20.8 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 2}$ | 27.2 | 27.2 | $\mathbf{2 7 . 2}$ |
| Kayonza | 13.4 | 22.9 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 7}$ | 23.9 | 41.5 | $\mathbf{3 1 . 9}$ |
| Kirehe | 17.3 | 17.7 | $\mathbf{1 7 . 5}$ | 23.9 | 24.6 | $\mathbf{2 4 . 3}$ |
| Ngoma | 21.2 | 24.1 | $\mathbf{2 2 . 8}$ | 45.1 | 33.7 | $\mathbf{3 8 . 6}$ |
| Bugesera | 16.2 | 16.4 | $\mathbf{1 6 . 3}$ | 25.7 | 21.0 | $\mathbf{2 3 . 2}$ |

Source: EICV5

| EICV4 | Net attendance rate NAR (\%) |  |  | Gross attendance rate GAR (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Male | Female | Total | Male | Female | Total |
| All Rwanda | 20.8 | 25.0 | 22.9 | 39.5 | 42.7 | 41.1 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 32.7 | 34.3 | 33.6 | 55.5 | 57.3 | 56.5 |
| Gasabo | 34.9 | 40.0 | 37.6 | 65.2 | 64.5 | 64.8 |
| Kicukiro | 45.7 | 33.8 | 38.8 | 72.2 | 53.5 | 61.4 |
| Nyanza | 17.6 | 15.8 | 16.7 | 40.1 | 39.0 | 39.6 |
| Gisagara | 12.2 | 13.8 | 13.0 | 22.9 | 30.3 | 26.3 |
| Nyaruguru | 18.3 | 21.2 | 19.7 | 34.8 | 40.6 | 37.7 |
| Huye | 22.6 | 20.1 | 21.3 | 35.2 | 33.4 | 34.3 |
| Nyamagabe | 17.7 | 24.1 | 20.9 | 34.9 | 39.5 | 37.2 |
| Ruhango | 19.1 | 25.3 | 22.1 | 32.5 | 37.3 | 34.8 |
| Muhanga | 14.8 | 28.1 | 21.5 | 30.9 | 42.0 | 36.5 |
| Kamonyi | 18.5 | 28.3 | 23.4 | 34.1 | 49.8 | 41.8 |
| Karongi | 16.6 | 26.3 | 21.8 | 34.3 | 49.0 | 42.2 |
| Rutsiro | 9.6 | 8.8 | 9.2 | 22.8 | 19.6 | 21.3 |
| Rubavu | 29.4 | 23.3 | 26.2 | 53.5 | 39.6 | 46.4 |
| Nyabihu | 13.3 | 25.7 | 20.1 | 33.4 | 46.3 | 40.5 |
| Ngororero | 17.6 | 15.5 | 16.5 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 29.2 |
| Rusizi | 21.4 | 27.9 | 24.8 | 44.5 | 45.5 | 45.0 |
| Nyamasheke | 14.0 | 19.4 | 16.9 | 41.0 | 48.1 | 44.7 |
| Rulindo | 22.4 | 36.5 | 29.3 | 41.1 | 51.2 | 46.0 |
| Gakenke | 14.9 | 31.0 | 23.7 | 31.4 | 42.1 | 37.2 |
| Musanze | 30.4 | 33.2 | 31.9 | 47.6 | 45.9 | 46.7 |
| Burera | 18.2 | 12.6 | 15.4 | 31.9 | 32.9 | 32.4 |
| Gicumbi | 19.6 | 22.4 | 21.0 | 31.7 | 33.6 | 32.7 |
| Rwamagana | 16.9 | 31.3 | 25.3 | 39.7 | 48.7 | 44.9 |
| Nyagatare | 21.3 | 22.1 | 21.7 | 36.5 | 36.7 | 36.6 |
| Gatsibo | 15.3 | 18.2 | 16.8 | 31.6 | 32.8 | 32.2 |
| Kayonza | 22.8 | 25.5 | 24.1 | 38.2 | 48.1 | 43.0 |
| Kirehe | 19.9 | 18.1 | 18.9 | 47.7 | 29.1 | 37.8 |
| Ngoma | 15.4 | 24.6 | 19.6 | 35.2 | 50.0 | 42.0 |
| Bugesera | 21.2 | 24.9 | 23.1 | 41.0 | 47.3 | 44.2 |

Source: EICV4

## Annex B: 95\% confidence intervals for selected indicators

Table B.1: \% of male-headed households, EICV5

| EICV5 | Estimate (\%) | Standard error | Confidence interval |  | Unweighted count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |
| All Rwanda | 68.6 | 0.5 | 67.7 | 69.5 | 14,580 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 71.3 | 1.3 | 68.9 | 73.8 | 2,526 |
| Rural | 67.9 | 0.5 | 67.0 | 68.9 | 12,054 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 73.8 | 1.6 | 70.7 | 76.8 | 1,620 |
| Southern Province | 65.3 | 0.8 | 63.8 | 66.9 | 3,840 |
| Western Province | 68.7 | 0.9 | 67.0 | 70.4 | 3,360 |
| Northern Province | 68.4 | 1.0 | 66.5 | 70.4 | 2,400 |
| Eastern Province | 68.5 | 0.9 | 66.8 | 70.3 | 3,360 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 72.4 | 2.2 | 68.0 | 76.7 | 540 |
| Gasabo | 73.7 | 2.5 | 68.7 | 78.6 | 540 |
| Kicukiro | 75.2 | 2.0 | 71.3 | 79.1 | 540 |
| Nyanza | 67.0 | 2.3 | 62.6 | 71.4 | 480 |
| Gisagara | 60.1 | 2.5 | 55.1 | 65.1 | 480 |
| Nyaruguru | 68.3 | 2.5 | 63.5 | 73.1 | 480 |
| Huye | 59.7 | 2.0 | 55.9 | 63.5 | 480 |
| Nyamagabe | 69.5 | 2.0 | 65.5 | 73.5 | 480 |
| Ruhango | 63.9 | 2.3 | 59.4 | 68.3 | 480 |
| Muhanga | 65.9 | 2.3 | 61.4 | 70.3 | 480 |
| Kamonyi | 68.7 | 1.9 | 65.1 | 72.4 | 480 |
| Karongi | 68.4 | 2.1 | 64.2 | 72.6 | 480 |
| Rutsiro | 75.5 | 2.1 | 71.4 | 79.7 | 480 |
| Rubavu | 70.1 | 2.2 | 65.7 | 74.4 | 480 |
| Nyabihu | 66.5 | 2.0 | 62.5 | 70.4 | 480 |
| Ngororero | 60.7 | 2.1 | 56.5 | 64.8 | 480 |
| Rusizi | 72.1 | 2.7 | 66.8 | 77.4 | 480 |
| Nyamasheke | 67.0 | 2.2 | 62.6 | 71.4 | 480 |
| Rulindo | 68.1 | 2.3 | 63.7 | 72.5 | 480 |
| Gakenke | 67.7 | 2.2 | 63.4 | 72.1 | 480 |
| Musanze | 70.0 | 2.1 | 65.9 | 74.2 | 480 |
| Burera | 61.8 | 2.3 | 57.3 | 66.4 | 480 |
| Gicumbi | 73.9 | 2.4 | 69.3 | 78.6 | 480 |
| Rwamagana | 66.4 | 2.4 | 61.8 | 71.1 | 480 |
| Nyagatare | 71.1 | 2.2 | 66.7 | 75.4 | 480 |
| Gatsibo | 71.6 | 2.4 | 66.9 | 76.4 | 480 |
| Kayonza | 62.6 | 2.4 | 57.9 | 67.3 | 480 |
| Kirehe | 68.5 | 2.0 | 64.5 | 72.5 | 480 |
| Ngoma | 66.2 | 2.2 | 61.8 | 70.6 | 480 |
| Bugesera | 70.6 | 2.5 | 65.6 | 75.5 | 480 |

Source: EICV5 and EICV4

Table B.2: \% of Female-headed households, EICV5

| Area of residence | Estimate <br> (\%) | Standard error | Confidence interval |  | Unweighted count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |
| All Rwanda | 25.0 | 0.4 | 24.2 | 25.8 | 14,580 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 22.1 | 1.2 | 19.8 | 24.4 | 2,526 |
| Rural | 25.7 | 0.4 | 24.8 | 26.5 | 12,054 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 21.0 | 1.5 | 18.1 | 23.9 | 1,620 |
| Southern Province | 28.0 | 0.8 | 26.5 | 29.5 | 3,840 |
| Western Province | 24.7 | 0.8 | 23.1 | 26.2 | 3,360 |
| Northern Province | 24.0 | 0.9 | 22.3 | 25.8 | 2,400 |
| Eastern Province | 25.5 | 0.8 | 23.9 | 27.1 | 3,360 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 22.6 | 2.1 | 18.5 | 26.8 | 540 |
| Gasabo | 22.1 | 2.4 | 17.3 | 26.8 | 540 |
| Kicukiro | 17.3 | 1.9 | 13.6 | 21.1 | 540 |
| Nyanza | 28.1 | 2.4 | 23.5 | 32.8 | 480 |
| Gisagara | 33.5 | 2.8 | 28.0 | 38.9 | 480 |
| Nyaruguru | 25.3 | 2.1 | 21.3 | 29.4 | 480 |
| Huye | 31.6 | 2.0 | 27.6 | 35.5 | 480 |
| Nyamagabe | 25.3 | 2.0 | 21.4 | 29.2 | 480 |
| Ruhango | 28.2 | 1.8 | 24.7 | 31.6 | 480 |
| Muhanga | 26.9 | 2.3 | 22.4 | 31.5 | 480 |
| Kamonyi | 24.6 | 1.8 | 21.1 | 28.2 | 480 |
| Karongi | 23.7 | 1.7 | 20.4 | 27.0 | 480 |
| Rutsiro | 20.7 | 2.1 | 16.5 | 24.8 | 480 |
| Rubavu | 23.1 | 2.4 | 18.3 | 27.9 | 480 |
| Nyabihu | 26.7 | 2.2 | 22.5 | 31.0 | 480 |
| Ngororero | 27.5 | 1.8 | 23.9 | 31.0 | 480 |
| Rusizi | 22.7 | 2.1 | 18.6 | 26.9 | 480 |
| Nyamasheke | 28.7 | 2.2 | 24.4 | 32.9 | 480 |
| Rulindo | 27.6 | 2.1 | 23.5 | 31.7 | 480 |
| Gakenke | 23.9 | 2.1 | 19.9 | 28.0 | 480 |
| Musanze | 20.5 | 1.7 | 17.1 | 23.9 | 480 |
| Burera | 26.3 | 2.0 | 22.4 | 30.2 | 480 |
| Gicumbi | 22.5 | 2.1 | 18.4 | 26.6 | 480 |
| Rwamagana | 27.4 | 2.1 | 23.4 | 31.5 | 480 |
| Nyagatare | 24.1 | 2.3 | 19.6 | 28.6 | 480 |
| Gatsibo | 25.1 | 2.1 | 20.9 | 29.2 | 480 |
| Kayonza | 26.2 | 2.2 | 22.0 | 30.5 | 480 |
| Kirehe | 25.3 | 1.8 | 21.7 | 28.9 | 480 |
| Ngoma | 27.8 | 1.6 | 24.6 | 31.1 | 480 |
| Bugesera | 23.7 | 2.5 | 18.9 | 28.5 | 480 |

Source: EICV5

Table B. 3: \% of De facto female-headed households, EICV5

| Area of residence | Estimate <br> (\%) | Standard error | Confidence interval |  | Unweighted count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Lower | Upper |  |
| All Rwanda | 6.4 | 0.2 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 14,580 |
| Urban/rural |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban | 6.6 | 0.7 | 5.3 | 7.8 | 2,526 |
| Rural | 6.4 | 0.3 | 5.9 | 6.9 | 12,054 |
| Province |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kigali City | 5.2 | 0.7 | 3.9 | 6.5 | 1,620 |
| Southern Province | 6.7 | 0.4 | 5.8 | 7.5 | 3,840 |
| Western Province | 6.7 | 0.5 | 5.7 | 7.7 | 3,360 |
| Northern Province | 7.5 | 0.6 | 6.4 | 8.7 | 2,400 |
| Eastern Province | 6.0 | 0.5 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 3,360 |
| District |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nyarugenge | 5.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 7.0 | 540 |
| Gasabo | 4.3 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 6.3 | 540 |
| Kicukiro | 7.5 | 1.1 | 5.4 | 9.5 | 540 |
| Nyanza | 4.9 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 7.1 | 480 |
| Gisagara | 6.4 | 1.0 | 4.5 | 8.3 | 480 |
| Nyaruguru | 6.4 | 1.1 | 4.3 | 8.4 | 480 |
| Huye | 8.8 | 1.9 | 5.1 | 12.4 | 480 |
| Nyamagabe | 5.2 | 1.1 | 3.0 | 7.4 | 480 |
| Ruhango | 8.0 | 1.4 | 5.2 | 10.7 | 480 |
| Muhanga | 7.2 | 1.2 | 4.9 | 9.4 | 480 |
| Kamonyi | 6.6 | 1.0 | 4.7 | 8.6 | 480 |
| Karongi | 7.9 | 1.2 | 5.5 | 10.3 | 480 |
| Rutsiro | 3.8 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 5.4 | 480 |
| Rubavu | 6.8 | 1.4 | 4.1 | 9.6 | 480 |
| Nyabihu | 6.8 | 1.5 | 3.9 | 9.7 | 480 |
| Ngororero | 11.9 | 1.5 | 8.9 | 14.9 | 480 |
| Rusizi | 5.1 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 8.0 | 480 |
| Nyamasheke | 4.3 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 6.6 | 480 |
| Rulindo | 4.3 | 1.0 | 2.4 | 6.3 | 480 |
| Gakenke | 8.3 | 1.4 | 5.6 | 11.1 | 480 |
| Musanze | 9.4 | 1.4 | 6.8 | 12.1 | 480 |
| Burera | 11.9 | 1.7 | 8.5 | 15.3 | 480 |
| Gicumbi | 3.6 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 5.3 | 480 |
| Rwamagana | 6.2 | 1.3 | 3.7 | 8.6 | 480 |
| Nyagatare | 4.9 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 6.7 | 480 |
| Gatsibo | 3.3 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 4.9 | 480 |
| Kayonza | 11.2 | 2.0 | 7.3 | 15.0 | 480 |
| Kirehe | 6.2 | 1.1 | 4.1 | 8.3 | 480 |
| Ngoma | 6.0 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 8.5 | 480 |
| Bugesera | 5.7 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 8.1 | 480 |

Source: EICV5

## Annex C: Persons who contributed to the implementation of the EICV5

## National Coordinators

- Yusuf MURANGWA, Director General of NISR
- Ivan MURENZI, Deputy Director General of NISR


## National technical Coordinator

- Dominique Habimana, Director of SMRP
- Roger Kamana, Team Leader


## Sampling Experts

- David Megill
- Roger Kamana,


## National fieldwork Coordinator

- Juvenal MUNYARUGERERO


## Regional data collection Supervisors

- Jean Baptiste Serugendo
- Astrid SEGAHWEGE
- Jean Claude Nzabonimpa
- Serge Mugabo
- Alice Uwimana
- Ali Baba Mwango


## Data collection IT supervisors

- Jimmy Mukasa
- Massud HARERIMANA
- Donat Nkundimana
- Jean Jacques Faustin Sharangabo
- Jean Marie Vianney NKURUNZIZA


## EICV5 Data Analysis and report writing

- Alice UWIMANA
- MUCHOCHORI KANOBANA Dominique


## EICV5 Proof reading, designing and copy-editing

- Doctor Jeannette BAYISENGE
- Nyirimanzi Jean Claude
- Muhayiteto Ruben


## Editing and Designing

- Jean Claude Nyirimanzi



[^0]:    Source: EICV5

[^1]:    Source: EICV5

[^2]:    Source: EICV5 and EICV4

[^3]:    Source: EICV4

[^4]:    Source: EICV5

[^5]:    Source: EICV5

[^6]:    Source: EICV5

