

**UN ‘households’ and local interpretations in Burkina
Faso, Senegal, Uganda and Tanzania**

Sara Randall

Department of Anthropology
UCL, London

Ernestina Coast,

Department of Social Policy
LSE, London

Fatou-Binetou Dial,

CRESS
Dakar

with

Philippe Antoine
Natacha Compaore,
Alexandra Fanghanel,
Sadio Ba Gning,
Bilampoa Gnoumou,
Valerie Golaz
Stephen Ojiambo Wandera

Paper to be presented at ECAS conference:
African dynamics in a multipolar world

Panel: P079

UN policies and local realities in contemporary Africa

Lisbon, June 2013

DRAFT: do not cite without authors’ permission

Abstract

Over the half century since Independence in most African states the UN Statistical Division has played an increasing role in getting member countries to standardise and streamline their data collection and in particular the definitions used for data collection. A key concept in censuses and surveys is the definition of household since this determines the units for which much data are collected and analysed, and thus influences the data which are the basis for many policies.

In this paper we analyse the evolution of the UN household definition over this time period and what aspects of the household this definition appears to be trying to capture. Using detailed census and survey documentary data (from questionnaires, enumerator and supervisor manuals etc) for 4 African countries (Burkina Faso, Senegal, Uganda and Tanzania) we examine the extent to which each country has actually implemented this definition in different data collection activities over the last 50 years, highlighting differences between Anglophone and Francophone practice but also noting where country level idiosyncrasies and adaptations to local conditions are priorities. In a final stage perspectives provided from in-depth interviews with key informants from different levels within the hierarchy of statistical offices in each country, demonstrate the variability in the importance accorded to the UN harmonisation aims and the problems which arise when these standardised approaches interact with local norms and living arrangements.

Acknowledgements

The research in Tanzania was funded by the ESRC (UK) (RES-175-25-0012) under the Survey Design and Measurement Initiative. The research in Burkina Faso, Senegal and Uganda was financed by ESRC (UK) and ANR (France) under the collaborative research programme (RES 062-33-0007). We would like to acknowledge the input of Beth Bishop who identified and pulled together much of the documentation used in this paper and Ellie Hukin who sorted out the references.

Introduction

Collecting and analysing statistical data on different aspects of a national population is a key dimension of being a modern state. Regular national data collection exercises with the production of reliable and valid data can be seen as one way in which nations signal their membership of a global community (Barrett & Tsui 1999). Increasing use of different metrics to measure ‘development’ and ‘progress’ towards achieving targets such as the Millennium Development Goals mean that statistical data are becoming more and more important, although much of the ‘data’ apparently produced by International Organisations such as the World Bank and the ILO are in fact guesstimates or extrapolations (Jerven 2013, Duncan 2013, Sanga 2013).

Since its establishment in 1947 under the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA), the UN Statistical Division (UNSD) has been concerned with the systematic organisation and compilation of country-level statistics and indicators (UNSD 2013: 50). Over the half century since Independence in most African states the UNSD has played an increasing role in encouraging member countries to standardise and streamline their data collection and has provided definitions and guidelines to be used in data collection and training (Ching'anda & Ntozi 1998). Key themes emitting from the UNSD are the development of National Statistical Systems (NSS), regular data collection, improving data collection and standardisation of data collection in order to facilitate comparability.

A key concept in censuses and surveys is the definition of household; this determines the units for which much data are collected and analysed, and thus influences the data which are the basis for many policies. However the degree to which UN guidelines can, and do, accommodate local residence patterns and social organisation may be unclear.

In this paper our aims are threefold (1) to establish the extent to which the UN guidelines influence national data collection and how this has changed over the decades since Independence and (2) to identify the key dimensions of the UN perspective of the household and how these are interpreted and implemented by nation states and (3) reflect on national motivations for compliance – or absence of compliance in an attempt to answer the following questions. Do national statistics office decisions about definitions appear to be driven by attempts to integrate more locally nuanced dimensions into the definitions used in order to represent better their particular situations? Is participation in a UN influenced international endeavour the most important driver of changing national definitions? What is the role of “comparability” in the evolution (or lack of) of definitions?

Methods

Two different research methods and data sources contribute to this work. We draw on a review of UN documentation, national documentation on definitions and concepts and also survey and census enumerators’ manuals in a number of African countries

and then focus on the definition of the household and the collection and management of household level data in order to analyse the relationship between UN guidelines over the last 50 years and actual practice in two Anglophone (Tanzania and Uganda) and two Francophone (Senegal and Burkina Faso) African countries. Further insight is provided by in depth interviews in the same countries with individuals in different positions within the National Statistical Offices from retired and contemporary senior personnel to census and survey enumerators (for more detail see www.householdsurvey.info).

Results

1. UN influence on data production

In most census and many household survey reports there are acknowledgements of technical advice and help provided by outside agencies (e.g.: UNFPA, US Bureau of Census, UNECA etc). However it is rarely made explicit how these relationships work in terms of decisions about definitions and their operationalisation.

References in census documentation give some indications about the importance of conforming to UN principles for some countries.

In Tanzania the 1967 census report stated

"The census was conducted according to modern scientific principles as summarized in recent recommendations by the United Nations and its Economic Commission for Africa." (United Republic of Tanzania 1969: viii)

The introduction to the 1960 Ghana census report, after a detailed and informative history of colonial censuses, outlines the basic principles of the 1960 census programme

*"The 1960 Population census of Ghana is a modern census carried out according to the principles and recommendations laid down by the United Nations, including all the 6 essential features: **Government sponsorship, defined territory, universality, simultaneity, individual enumeration and compilation and publication** (of Census data)."* [emphasis in original] (Republic of Ghana 1962: xi)

The Ghana 1960 census was strictly de facto and was undertaken by enumerating those sleeping by house – a self contained building unit and not households. Even here there are references to UN guidelines

"The part of the definition mentioned here is almost identical with the one recommended by the United Nations for a 'housing unit'; it differs in other parts relating to the peculiar shape and structure of the local compound." (Republic of Ghana 1962: xvii)

The Ghanaian administrative report reporting on the 1960 census states

“The concepts and classifications used in the Census were largely based on international recommendations. Adaptations were made to suit local conditions.” (Republic of Ghana 1964: 112)

Ghana’s documentation as far back as 1960 makes it clear that there is a strong awareness of the UN principles and definitions and these are guiding the way that census data collection has evolved. But because of problems in making these definitions workable in local conditions – there are frequent adaptations. There is frequent reference to the UN and the fact that the Ghanaian census bureau moved from collecting data for occupants of ‘houses’ in 1960 and 1970 to ‘households’ in 1984 is probably further evidence of the influence of the international agenda.

In general, the Anglophone African censuses which were undertaken late in the colonial era and early in Independence, although dependent on outside funding and advice (as acknowledged in the reports), were also very grounded in detailed knowledge about local conditions and social organisation. The guiding principle seems to have been to get the most accurate census count (which means avoiding omissions and double counting – most easily done through a *de facto* approach) and using local vocabulary to define social units, presumably on the assumption that most people would thus be enumerated (this might well have been a false assumption). The census was primarily seen as a national affair, and part of nation-state building post-Independence.

There has been increasing impetus towards harmonised global guidelines and frameworks for statistics (e.g.: International definition and measurement of standards and levels of living (United Nations 1954), Framework for Social and Demographic Statistics (1975), Guidelines on social indicators (1978)). However, it was not really until the 1980s and 1990s when the Human Development Index was first produced that data produced by censuses and surveys really became international goods and this may have generated greater pressure for individual countries to conform in terms of concepts and definitions. Other non-UN international surveys, such as the World Fertility Survey (late 1970s) also served to focus attention on the comparative power of harmonised data, and the subsequent interest in monitoring fertility levels and changes. In the last three decades the demand for social statistics and indicators has grown significantly, in part due to the need to monitor progress towards goals agreed at international summits (e.g.: 1990 World Summit for Children, 1994 International Conference on Population & Development, 1995 World Summit for Social Development, 1995 World Conference on Women, Millennium Development Goals etc.). Because household surveys and censuses are central to the production of data, much work of the UNSD has focused on the production of methodological guidelines (DESASD 2005; DESASD 2008a; DESASD 2008b).

2. Comparability

The 1954 UN Handbook of Population Census Methods refers to a UN Population Committee session held in 1947 which highlights the key role of comparability in statistical data collection

"For the purposes of international comparability it is desirable that a de facto enumeration be made; that is, a count of all the persons present in the country at the time of enumeration. Any data on a de jure basis which may be desired should be obtained in addition to the de facto data." [emphasis added by author] (Statistical Office of the United Nations 1954: 37)

Most Anglophone censuses followed these de facto instructions and some census instructions emphasised the importance of the de facto enumeration over other concerns. For example the Ugandan enumerator's manual for 1969 states

*a household is defined as a group of persons who normally live and eat together. This is a very loose definition and there may be many cases when you are in doubt as to whether people should be included in the same household or shown as belonging to separate households. It is not possible in these instructions to cover all such cases in detail, and your decision in such cases should be determined by common sense and convenience in the enumeration. It is not a matter of great importance whether or not such persons are included in one household or shown belonging to separate households. **The important thing is that every person should be enumerated.*** [emphasis added by author] (Republic of Uganda 1974: 87)

Censuses and surveys – whilst often covering similar topics – have very different purposes; complete enumeration for censuses versus sample coverage for surveys. However, because the establishment of statistical offices to conduct censuses to a large extent preceded sample survey development, the influence of established UN census design and concepts on survey definitions and methodology is clear:

"The problems of definition encountered are common to population enumeration in any context; therefore, it is suggested that, where the difficulties have been faced and a satisfactory definition of a household has been evolved for purposes of population census, it will usually be desirable to adopt that for sample surveys also. In most cases this will be the international standard definition of private household, developed to promote international comparability in population census results." (Statistical Office of the United Nations 1964: 10)

Unsurprisingly “comparability” is a dominant theme throughout all the UN documentation: it tends to take precedence over other considerations such as local applicability of concepts. In terms of the ways in which these influences affected practices in National Statistical Offices, the emphasis from the UN is clear that they should

"co-operate in the design of standard and uniform procedures for sample surveys to obtain better indicators of levels of living" (UN 1954 cited in Statistical Office of the United Nations 1964: 2)

and from the same report

"Discussion of the value of household inquiries, especially in developing areas, was carried a step further by the Working Group of Experts on Family Living Studies convened by the International Labour Office in 1955. This group recommended inter alia that the international agencies should aid in the development of sound methods of study and encourage international comparability by issuing lists of standard definitions and classifications to be used in household enquiries"

(Statistical Office of the United Nations 1964: 2).

The impetus from the UN towards comparability and standardisation over time is clear, and focused on countries in receipt of funding and technical support for statistical data collection. The comparability of statistics is an important part of statistical training and in analysis of discussions with higher level personal within the Tanzanian statistical office and international organisations it was clear that preoccupations about comparability often overruled other considerations about the validity of demographic data (Randall, Coast and Leone 2011). However although comparability - over time within countries and over space between countries – is frequently talked about, we will show below that in practice there may be significant deviations.

There is evidence that census enumeration units have become more standardised over the last 50 years and all now use “household”, rather than another unit, i.e. dwelling unit or family. For example:

- Gambia changed from the use of family/yard in 1963, to a fairly standardised household definition in 1983.
- Malawi moved from using the dwelling unit to a more standardised standardised household definition between 1977 and 1987.
- South Africa moved from using the family to the household between 1985 and 1991.

However, as will be seen below, although the word ‘household’ is used, the way it is defined and interpreted may still vary considerably.

3. Census: concept of household

It is clear from our interviews with statisticians and other individuals along the chain of data production and use in African statistical offices that many see the UN definition of the household (and their own national interpretation of this) as an alien concept which has been developed for statistical and demographic analysis (under demands for comparability) rather than something which represents a fundamental and locally relevant social unit. It is a technical term that needs to be learnt and then applied in order to generate the ‘comparable’ statistics required.

3.1 Time line of UN concept of household (see table 1, column 2)

The UN documentation on household definition is extremely consistent over time. In 1959 there were discussions about two different approaches to household: the housekeeping unit and household-housing unit concepts of household (Statistical Office of the United Nations 1959) and this document reproduces recommendations from the United Nations document 'Principles and Recommendations for National Population Censuses'

*"A private household should preferably be defined as: (a) one-person household: a person who lives alone in a separate housing unit or who, as a lodger, occupies a separate room or rooms in a part of a housing unit but does not join with any of the other occupants of the housing unit to form part of a multi-person household as defined below; or (b) multi-person household: a group of two or more persons who **combine to occupy the whole or part of a housing unit and to provide themselves with food or other essentials for living. The group may pool their incomes and have a common budget to a greater or lesser extent.** The group may be composed of related persons only or of unrelated persons or of a combination of both, including boarders but excluding lodgers."*

[emphasis added by author] (Statistical Office of the United Nations 1959: 74)

The key dimension here is the ‘housekeeping’ part: this revolves around ‘provide themselves with food’. This phrase is itself ambiguous. Using an example of two wives of a polygamous man: they both obtain the grain for their meals from the family granary which is managed by their joint husband. The granary is filled with grain cultivated on fields “owned” by the husband and his lineage and worked on by his wives, children and maybe some others. The wives take this grain and cook it separately in different kitchens attached to their different houses in the same compound and then feed themselves and their children and each sends some food to their husband. In this, not infrequent case, ‘if ‘provide themselves with food’ refers to the source of food – the communal granary, then both wives, their husband and any dependent children (and others) will form one household. However if ‘provide with food’ is interpreted as being related to the cooking and processing of the food – thus coming down to the ‘cooking pot level’ and eating together, each wife will form a

separate household and a somewhat arbitrary decision will have to be made about which household the husband is assigned to (often on the basis of his sleeping location on census night for a de facto census).

The wording of the UN definition of household for censuses barely changes over the next few decades (see table 1): In 1980

“The concept of “household” is based on the arrangements made by persons, individually or in groups, for providing themselves with food or other essentials for living”.

[emphasis added by author] (Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division 1980: 50).

And in 1997

1.324. *“The concept of household is based on the arrangements made by persons, individually or in groups, for providing themselves with food or other essentials for living”*

1.325. *“The concept of household provided in paragraph 1.324 is known as the “housekeeping” concept. It does not assume that the number of households and housing units is equal. A housing unit, as defined in paragraph 2.331, is a separate and independent place of abode that is intended for habitation by one household, but that may be occupied by more than one household or by a part of a household (for example, two nuclear households that share one housing unit for economic reasons or one household in a polygamous society routinely occupying two or more housing units).*

1.326 [...] *“Some countries use a concept different than the housekeeping concept described in the previous paragraph, namely, the “household-dwelling” concept, which regards all persons living in a housing unit as belonging to the same household. (According to this concept, there is one household per occupied housing unit.) In the household-dwelling concept, then, the number of occupied housing units and the number of households occupying them are equal and the locations of the housing units and households are identical. However, this concept can obscure information on living arrangements, such as doubling up, that is relevant for evaluating housing needs. The definition of household most often used in national censuses conducted during the 1990 round of censuses incorporates both the housekeeping and household-dwelling concepts”.*

[emphasis added by author] (Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division 1997: 50)

All the definitions require co-habitation although the UN documentation demonstrates the subtle differences between households defined as such those based on co-residence alone and those based on housekeeping which ultimately means an

economic unit. However, as we will see below, the housekeeping concept gets reduced in some contexts (particularly Anglophone East Africa) to cooking and eating together which then take priority in national definitions. In such cases culturally determined patterns of cooking and co-eating come to be the principal defining characteristic of the household rather than having a common budget to a greater or lesser extent.

4. Local understanding or comparable units?

There are a number of issues around applying the UN definition to different contexts. Although the UN explanations clarify the difference between a housekeeping household and a housing household, translating this into units of data collection may be difficult in the field. Furthermore, data collection in multi-lingual contexts requires ways of explaining the units for which data are being collected (Randall *et al.* 2013). Hence a tension arises between the UN household unit and actual local living arrangements (Guyer 1981, Guyer and Peters 1987).

Botswana is one example where earlier censuses were fundamentally based on local knowledge and vocabulary about social organisation – with an anthropologist (Isaac Shapera) being cited as the source for the explanation of the enumeration unit.

*“The household is the smallest well defined social unit and, in Professor Shapera's words, "It consists basically of a man with his wife or wives, and their unmarried children, but often includes one or more married sons, brothers or even daughters, with their respective families." **Every household has its own compound, known as a 'lolwapa', consisting of one or more huts and a granary within a courtyard surrounded by a reed fence, a wooden palisade, a low earthen wall or something similar.** In most cases therefore the household is an easily recognised physical entity and it formed the basic enumeration unit. It is the compound which is referred to as the 'dwelling' and not the individual huts within it, and the people living within the compound are referred to as the household”* [emphasis added by author] (Republic of Botswana 1972: 9).

This 1971 definition makes no reference at all to housekeeping, preparation or consumption of food. By 1981 Botswana's approach to the household had moved away from their local anthropological references and closer to the UN approach.

“In general those who live in a 'lolwapa' or its equivalent should be shown as one household if they eat from the same pot. Otherwise they should be regarded as separate households” (Republic of Botswana 1983: A15).

Local vocabulary is retained but the issue of eating from the same cooking pot is introduced with the interpretation of the UN's 'common provision for food' becoming 'eating from the same pot'.

Ghana's earlier censuses also grapple with how to apply a standardised definition of the household:

“For the unit of enquiry the household was proposed. But owing to difficulties of definition which enumerators were expected to encounter it was decided to record in the census individuals by house or compound and to use the household concept only in the PES [Post-enumeration survey]. It was realised that the house or compound may not necessarily correspond to particular economic or social concepts.” (Republic of Ghana 1964: 112)

Later in the report in talking about “household” which was used in the PES

“The definition adopted finally in the PES, “a person or group of persons all living and eating together from the same cooking pot” was in fact, a slightly modified version of the United Nations concept adopted to suit the African social environment.” (Republic of Ghana 1964: 326)

Compared with the UN definition of household published in 1959 (Table 1; Statistical Office of the UN 1959) this Ghanaian definition is actually very different—specifically talking about eating out of the same cooking pot – a phraseology which is never used in the UN documentation.

Having undertaken the 1960 and 1970 census using houses as the unit, in 1984 Ghana moved to households and housekeeping.

“A household was defined as follows: “a household consists of a person or group of persons who live together in the same house or compound, share the same housekeeping arrangements and are catered for as one unit. [...] For instance two brothers who live in the same house with their wives and children may or may not form separate households depending on their catering arrangements. [...] A usual member of household was considered to be any person who, whether present or absent on Census Night has spent (i.e. lived together in the same house or compound, shared the same housekeeping arrangements and been catered for as one unit with the other members of the household) at least the last 6 months with the household.”

[emphasis in original] [NB absent usual members were listed separately] (Republic of Ghana 1984: xiii-xiv).

This definition (and that of the 2000 census) no longer uses the cooking pot and is, in fact, very close to the UN definition (table 1).

There are cases where even the interpretation of the UN guidelines remains ambiguous. For example, the 1987 census in Malawi, done on a de facto basis defines

*“a household consisted of one or more persons, related or unrelated, who make common provision for food and **who regularly take their food from the same pot and/or share the same grainhouse (nkhokwe) or pool their incomes together for the purpose of purchasing food.**”*

[emphasis added by author] (Government of Malawi 1987: 9)

The same definition was used in 1998. In the 1998 Malawi census report on households and household characteristics this definition is specifically referred to as the UN definition.

“In the Census enumeration a household was defined as consisting of one or more persons, related or unrelated, who live together and make common provision for food. They regularly take all their food from the same pot, and/or share the same grain store (Nkhokwe) or pool their incomes for the purposes of purchasing food.”

(Malawi 1998: 120)

Clearly therefore the UN vocabulary is seen as an important guiding role. However the inclusion of the **“and/or”** make this a more inclusive unit than a ‘cooking pot’ only definition.

In most cases we are only able to discern the ways different countries manage to combine UN guidelines with local social organisation through instructions within manuals or comments in reports. In Tanzania our key-informant interviews provided a clear insight into work undertaken to simultaneously integrate local vocabulary with the requirements generated by comparability and conformity with the UN concepts.

“So when we, at NBS (in mid 1970s) when we sent and we discussed this in meeting and we said well, we now have to look for a word in Kiswahili – there were suggestions more than one – as usual – we said well we have the National Kiswahili Council and we have the Department of Kiswahili at UDSM [University of Dar Es Salaam]. We shall send them the definition of the household as we know it from the UN now we shall ask them to suggest what is it the Kiswahili equivalent that would fit that UN definition, that long thing... they also came up with the kaya. Kaya is the arrangement that best suits that definition of the household from the UN.”

(Senior retired Tanzanian Statistician/Demographer)

In this case, where there is a national language and a clear desire to follow UN requirements there was a very specific move towards a particular word. Here there

was a conscious and well articulated piece of research undertaken to specifically identify the best local term. However in many contexts (probably also in multi-lingual Tanzania) there are real problems matching the UN concept onto a slightly different concept or word which already exists in a local language (Randall *et al.* 2013).

“It’s very difficult [in Fulfulde] to find a word like that, but, well, following the definition which has been agreed before the fieldwork, we are forced to explain it. On top of that you add extra things. For example if we say that they have to pool the results of their production, to translate that into Fulfulde... [in the field] when we go people often say, well there are the old men, but we, we have our definitions which are there and we are forced to say “even though the old man is there that doesn’t mean to say that we can’t have different households”..... the definition are there to respond to needs, it’s a standard definition that’s there.” (Burkina; statistician and former INSD enumerator)

“But the majority of these surveys they get the definition from [the statistical office] and they try to use it. Unfortunately what happens is, where the respondents have their own perceptions and also the enumerator they have their own perceptions. A lot of the data that we get in this part of the world is indicative of this question, it’s not quite perfect information because of this confusion.” (UNFPA advisor, East Africa)

In cases where the UN definition is adopted by the statistical office but there are no clear ways of translating it into local languages that would allow for the collection of data on comparable units then the definition needs to be broken down into its constituent parts and explained to both data collectors and respondents. It seems to be these explanations of the UN definition in recent years, that have led the definitions down a pathway one could call the cooking pot pathway. The simplest way of interpreting **“arrangements, for providing themselves with food or other essentials for living”** is to say ‘those people who eat out of the same cooking pot ‘ – which in many contexts is the group who also provisions together to fill that cooking pot.

“The concept of household... ..personally what I use in our household is people who live together like mother, father and children and may be some relatives.... But then when I joined, professionally I have come to learn it is a little broader than that...because like us in the census project what we consider household..... is basically people who eat and live, as long as you eat and live together, that is a household. And it can be one person even or it can be more than one. You may not necessarily be related.”

(Statistician, UBOS, Uganda)

“A household has got a standard definition. We look at two elements to define a household. The first one - actually the most important - is the eating area. People must be dining together. They may live together but as long as they are not feeding from the same pot, then those ones are different households.”

(Uganda: UBOS statistician)

However the cooking pot – and eating out of the same pot, is, in fact only one – the most limited – interpretation of the UN definition. In a number of contexts there may be culturally prescribed patterns of cooking and eating together – such as in polygamous Maasai populations where every wife cooks in her hut for her children yet the economic unit of production and consumption is much wider and would put all those wives in one ‘household’. In other contexts the distribution of a very large household around several cooking pots may be purely practical but would lead to several census households.

Over time the guidance from the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division has become more detailed, although not necessarily with any clear guidance on how to resolve perennial practical tensions. For example, the tensions outlined above between the statistical definition of the household and its applicability to data collection in the field are well-established:

*“While the household concept has not been widely contested as a consumption unit, questions have been raised regarding its meaning as a production unit or income generating unit. The main argument is that persons living in the same housing unit who together make provision for food and other essential items may not necessarily pool their income or make decisions jointly regarding their economic activities. Various situations may arise in different societies. For example, in many African communities an extended family comprising several households may own and cultivate a field together, while cooking and housekeeping arrangements are still made separately by each household level. The consumption unit may also include persons who do not reside with the household although they regularly take their meals in common. **The usual concept of household may therefore require considerable adaptation or elaboration in order to be applied consistently in particular societies.**”*

[emphasis added by author] (United Nations Statistics Division 1984: 99)

The final sentence of this extract is most informative about the problematic relationship between UN guidelines and local implementation of them, because no information or advice is given about how this adaptation might be achieved whilst still maintaining comparability. In fact most countries have ignored this UN awareness of the complexity of African households and their definitions are oriented around a rather minimal group of those who live, cook and eat together.

In the 1997 Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses (DESASD 1997) two whole pages were dedicated to explain the concept of the household, the different dimensions of this and how these things should be recorded (see page 7-8 above for some extracts). The document section still commences with “[those] who make common provision for food or other essentials for living” [emphasis added by author] (DESASD 1997: 65) but then develops a huge wealth of detail and clarification. However one of the key concepts in many national definitions – that of cooking and eating together is not mentioned – the cooking pot is absent.

5. Case study countries: diversity in evolution of definitions

Our comparative case study countries were selected because they experienced different colonial histories and different post colonial political ideologies, with contrasting geographic (East and West) and linguistic (Anglophone and Francophone) settings. Yet all are members of the United Nations and all have invested considerably in statistical development. The aim here is to establish where there are clear temporal trends across the countries in terms of their relationship with the UN definitions and guidelines. Table 1 (see end of paper) provides detailed extracts from census documentation and Table 2 summarises the themes over time.

The UN definition remains constant throughout, with the ambiguity of ‘joint provision of food or essentials of living’. Burkina Faso, whose first census was in 1985 follows the UN closely for their first two censuses (1985, 1996). Then in 2006 they added in the necessity of having one household head and a condition that a household cannot contain two married couples: they must be recorded as separate households. Both these decisions diverge both from the UN guidelines and from formal comparability with earlier censuses.

Tanzania always takes a de facto census and in 1967 Tanzania follows the UN definition closely. In the 1970s there might be a slight divergence in that those living geographically close but in separate houses can be part of the same household if they eat together. Priority is thus given to the cooking pot. In 1988 and 2002 there is no mention of eating together but shared living costs are the criterion for household membership. It is unclear how “shared living costs” can be operationalised in a census which has always been de facto. In fact the enumerators we interviewed interpreted the guidelines as meaning eating together.

Like Tanzania, Uganda’s censuses are de facto. However in Uganda there is a much more restricted interpretation of “joint provision of food or essentials of living” which is summarised as ‘eat together’. This cooking pot dimension is prioritised in all of our Ugandan key informant interviews.

Senegal is totally different, not only in comparison with Anglophone Tanzania and Uganda, it is also different from other Francophone countries and has a very clear

individual set of definitions which prioritise what are seen to be Senegalese characteristics. Pilon and Vignikin (2006) show that in all comparative analyses (census or surveys) Senegal has substantially larger households than any other African country; this is probably a consequence of their approach to definitions. In 1976 Senegal avoided the problems posed by the household by avoiding the concept altogether and censusing (in a de jure manner) compounds (concessions) and their constituent family nuclei (noyaux). In 1988 and 2002 Senegal abandoned this approach for the household (ménage) but the household was defined as living together (in the same compound), generally eating together and under the authority of one head. Furthermore clear examples of the units required were given by providing local words – which almost certainly means that during enumeration these local words were used in preference to the precise explanation.

Each country has taken a different route to reconciling local conditions with the UN definition. Senegal has largely remained detached from UN recommendations apart from changing from concession and noyaux to ‘household’. By retaining the importance of the household head and the use of local words it is clear that they are prioritising local organisation rather than international comparability. Burkina Faso started off very compliant to UN definitions but has recently imposed their own vagaries – about married couples. Tanzania made huge efforts to conform to the UN and Uganda has concentrated on a particular and minimalist interpretation of UN joint provision by focusing on the cooking pot.

6. Census: Household structure and relationships within them

In early censuses data were collected on people within ‘households’ because that was seen to be the most effective way of enumerating the whole population (see table 1 Uganda 1969). Relationships within households, and thus by extension analysis of the structure of households, has become an increasingly important dimension of household data collection because of the importance for understanding support and welfare:

"It has been realized more and more that household composition, and the changes therein that occur in connexion with industrialization and urbanization, is a subject that deserves special attention on the occasion of population censuses, because of the far-reaching consequences such changes have in regard to housing, child education, the care of aged people and invalids, etc."
(Statistical Office of the UN 1954: 123)

The 1954 UN Handbook of Population Census Methods outlines how this should be done. UN documentation over the years reiterates this approach exactly but national censuses clearly oscillate between following UN guidance and trying to cope with making these data meaningful in the local context.

The practical problems of recording standardised relationships within the statistical household are well-established:

“traditional kinship systems especially in developing countries, may permit several interpretations of 'mother', 'brother', 'sister', 'wife', 'widow' and other kin and therefore, special knowledge is required in order to translate data based on these relationships into internationally comparable form”

(Statistical Office of the UN 1964: 33)

UN advice again acknowledges challenges of application in the field whilst explicitly exhorting the need for comparability. Collecting data on household structure via relationship with the household head (a) assumes that the household head is a valid concept (b) assumes that individuals are members of that household through some sort of relationship (usually kinship) with the person named as household head and (c) may pose problems of coherence when the household head is absent if the data collection exercise is being done on a de facto basis (and thus all absent individuals are excluded) or, when the recognised household head has migrated elsewhere temporarily and has been absent for longer than the residential cut off (often 3 months or 6 months). By only allowing relationships (and a limited number of them) with the household head other household structures can be obscured.

From the 1950s until the 1970s collecting data on household structure through the relationship with the household head, although it might prove misleading for a minority of African households, probably was the most effective way of getting some idea of the variety of household structures, given the relative ease of coding such data. This is outlined regularly throughout the UN statistical documentation over the past 5 decades, for example:

“2.73. After identification of the head or other reference member of the household, each of the remaining members of the household should be distinguished in relation to that person, as appropriate, as one of the following: (a) spouse, (b) child, (c) spouse of child, (d) grandchild or great-grandchild, (e) parent (or parent of spouse), (f) other relative, (g) domestic employee or (h) other person not related to the head or other reference member. Where this classification is considered too detailed for successful collection of the information, categories (e) and (f) may be consolidated as Other relative and (g) and (h) can be consolidated as Other unrelated person.” (DESASD 1997: 66)

This limited classification may work well in populations where the majority of households are small and constituted of nuclear families or their close derivatives. Their ability to represent the diversity and complexity of many African households, let alone contribute to understanding how support is provided for the socially or physically vulnerable [one of the stated aims of the data collection] is fairly limited.

Recent computer developments mean that relationships could now be recorded in more meaningful ways which include relationships between different household members. It would still be possible to retain comparability by simultaneously recording relationships to household head as outlined above.

Understanding changing household composition was recognised in the UN documentations as early as 1954- hence the detailed guidelines on data collection. However approaches to this issue have not really been revisited in Africa in the light of new technology and the possible inappropriateness of the categories. Nevertheless the potential comparative analysis of household structure from the different codes in recent censuses (Table 3) is very limited.

Table 3: relationship codes in the most recent census in study countries

Country	Year	Question	Permitted response codes
Tanzania (United Republic of Tanzania 2002)	2002	What is the relationship of [NAME] to the head of household?	Head Spouse Son/ Daughter Parent Grandchild Other relative Not related
Uganda (Republic of Uganda 2002)	2002	What is (NAME'S) relationship to the head of household?	Usual household head (absent) Usual household head (present) Spouse Child Step child Parent of head or spouse Brother/sister of head or spouse Other relative Non-relative
Senegal (Republique du Senegal 2002b)	2002	Lien de Parenté avec le Chef de Ménage: Encerclez le code correspondant au lien de parenté avec le Chef de Ménage:	1. Chef de ménage 2. Epouse/Epoux 3. Fils /Fille 4. Père/Mère 5. Grand-père/mère 6. Frère/Soeur 7. Petit(e) Fils /Fille 8. Autre Parenté 9. Sans lien de parenté
Burkina Faso	2006	Quel est le lien de parenté de (NOM) avec le chef de ménage	1= Chef de Ménage 2= Époux/Épouse 3= Fils/fille 4= Frère/soeur 5= Père/mère 6= Petit fils/fille 7= Neveu/nièce 8= Oncle/Tante 9= Autre parent 0= Sans lien

Not every country follows UN guidelines. In Ghana 1970, although enumeration continued to be de facto and on the basis of houses (and specifically not households) (Republic of Ghana 1975: xi) they repeated their concerns outlined in 1960 that the UN relationships did not match well onto African usage.

“the conventional relationship titles which are so deeply rooted in African society had to be avoided so as to make analysis of the household pattern meaningful”
(Republic of Ghana 1964: 327)

This led to the development of a large number of detailed codes such as ‘mother’s brother’s son/daughter’. In 1970, because of the de facto enumeration they identified temporary heads (99) with one code separately from head (11) and had 14 relationship codes which enabled the identification of people in the house who were relatives of the head – with a code for those who were relatives of the head’s spouse (Republic of Ghana 1975: xiv).

Other deviations from UN guidelines can be seen in Kenya. In 1962 the ‘relationship to head of household’ is the instruction on the census form. In 1969 this has become ‘relationship’ and in 1979 ‘what is the relationship of this person to the head of household **or other members of the household?**’ the instructions here (note 74 in the enumerator’s manual) state

“sometimes a person is related to more than one person in the household. In such cases concentrate first on relating parents and their children, then on relating husbands and wives and then on relating persons to the head of household or other members of it.”
(Republic of Kenya 1981: 19).

However these confusing instructions are followed by more concise details indicating that they should write things like “daughter of 4” – using line numbers. However by 1989 the relationship codes in Kenya reverted back to a precise repetition of the UN guidelines and only recorded relationship to the head of household (Republic of Kenya 1989).

According to Uganda’s 1991 census questionnaire they too also asked for relationship to head **or other member** of household. It is not clear why these more flexible approaches have been abandoned but one suspects it is the influence of international standardisation and comparability.

Yet again Senegal demonstrates its independent approach to data collection in this respect. In 1976 households were not even mentioned – they enumerated those in the compound (concession) and the nuclei (noyaux) within the concession. It is explained thus: the familial nucleus (noyau) is the smallest possible family cell that can exist. It

is made up of the spouses (or one spouse) and their directly descended unmarried descendents – that means parents and their unmarried children. These people must live in the same compound (concession). By extension the same family nucleus can include the husband, several wives and their unmarried children as long as they live in the same compound. By extension the same family nucleus can include direct ascendants (mother of the head of the family nucleus), brothers and sisters, close unmarried kin (nephews, nieces, uncles etc) on condition that they live with the head of the familial nucleus and don't have their own unmarried children in the compound.

Although this notion was abandoned for the subsequent two censuses it is going to be used again in the 2013 census where the enumerator's manual states:

“The familial nucleus corresponds to the « biological » family. It is made up of the parents (or one of the parents) and their unmarried / unpartnered direct descendents (biological children). Thus a household can be made up of one or several familial nuclei. Note that a polygamous household which includes unmarried children makes up one single nucleus if all the members live and take their meals together in the same compound. A nucleus can also include direct ascendants, brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts, grandchildren, unmarried nephews and nieces who are supported by the head of the nucleus.

Enumerating household members depends on the principle of the closest kin link. The household head is the first person to record on the questionnaire. Then you enumerate close kin of the household head before moving onto distant kin and those with no kinship link with him, keeping track, where possible each person's membership of a specific familial nucleus.”

[our translation] (Republique du Senegal 2013: 51).

From our key informant interviews it is clear that many Senegalese researchers and statisticians believe that this idea of nucleus and the relationships within it is excellent for capturing the essence of African familial and household structure.

“It (the notion of familial nucleus) is an excellent thing, especially for censuses. It helps us avoid many errors, because the concept of noyau allows you, when you are in a household, which is usually polygamous,, to be certain that you have first identified all the biological children for each wife and all the other people who have no biological links with the household head. And there is the advantage that, when you are with a polygamous couple you can, for each wife, identify her biological children and the children who are related by more distant kinship links. So if you do that you can be sure that you haven't omitted a single person, because when you are interested in the biological family what is certain is that there is a strong chance no-one will be left out.... It's a way of checking, but also for analysis, it allows you in some

way to have a good understanding of the exact composition of the household. But particularly for data collection this approach ensures exhaustivity.”

(Statistician ANSD)

Although noyaux have not been used in the two most recent censuses they continue to be used in Senegal in surveys.

“At first it was just to improve data collection, to be able to organise household members according to closeness in terms of kinship. But if you take the “Enquête sur les Priorités” which was done in 1991-2 we had a column ‘kinship link’ which identified the heads of ‘noyaux’. This was so we could do analysis by ‘noyau’.”

(Specialist in economic surveys)

Thus Senegal has attempted to solve the problems of enumerating complex African families and their residential and economic arrangements through focusing on local management of data collection rather than following the UN guidelines.

7. Concept of household in nationally representative surveys: the influence of censuses

Censuses and surveys – whilst often covering similar topics – have very different purposes; complete enumeration for censuses versus sample coverage for surveys. However, because the establishment of statistical offices to conduct censuses to a large extent preceded sample survey development, and because of the demands of comparability, the influence of established UN census design and concepts on survey definitions and methodology is clear:

“The problems of definition encountered are common to population enumeration in any context; therefore, it is suggested that, where the difficulties have been faced and a satisfactory definition of a household has been evolved for purposes of population census, it will usually be desirable to adopt that for sample surveys also. In most cases this will be the international standard definition of private household, developed to promote international comparability in population census results.”

(Statistical Office of the UN 1964: 10)

The merits of standardisation were heavily promoted by different international organisations even at this early stage

“Discussion of the value of household inquiries, especially in developing areas, was carried a step further by the Working Group of Experts on Family Living Studies convened by the International Labour Office in 1955. This group recommended inter alia that the international agencies should aid in the development of sound methods of study and encourage international

comparability by issuing lists of standard definitions and classifications to be used in household enquiries." (Statistical Office of the UN 1964: 2)

Comparisons of the definitions used in most recent household surveys in our sample countries suggest that this standardisation and harmonisation really has not been achieved – despite the production by many countries and several international organisations of documents specifically outlining harmonised concepts (e.g.: NBS 2005; UBOS 2012).

In 1964 however the United Nations document did recognise that global diversity might present problems for standardised approaches:

- ***“problems of application of household definition in 'under-developed' countries "where variations from the so-called 'normal' family structure are present”***

-*the diversity of social customs which affect the applicability of this definition:*

- *lots of informal family relationships which are shifting and temporary in character*
- *large families living in compounds resulting in what might appear to be separate households gravitating around a family head*
- *prevalence of polygamy, which results in one man being head of several households occupying separate housing units*
- *other types of communal living*

- *in such circumstances, application of the recommended international definition of a household requires care.”*

[emphasis added by author] (Statistical Office of the UN 1964: 12)

This seems to suggest that they are promoting standardised definitions and approaches to household definitions in surveys in contexts with ‘normal family structures’ by which one assumes is meant nuclear families (themselves now considerably eroded in the contexts where they were ‘normal’ in the 1960s (Cherlin 2012). At the same time there is a recognition that standardised definitions may be problematic.

There are times where the UN documentation clearly recognises the problems the standardisation enterprise has set – especially with respect to survey data collection: since, unlike the census which is primarily a count of the total population, surveys tend to be more detailed, more focused and cover a range of different issues for which different definitions may be more appropriate.

“While the household concept has not been widely contested as a consumption unit, questions have been raised regarding its meaning as a production unit or income generating unit. The main argument is that persons living in the same housing unit who together make provision for food and other essential items may not necessarily pool their income or make decisions jointly regarding their economic activities. Various situations may arise in different societies. For example, in many African communities an extended family comprising

several households may own and cultivate a field together, while cooking and housekeeping arrangements are still made separately by each household level. The consumption unit may also include persons who do not reside with the household although they regularly take their meals in common. The usual concept of household may therefore require considerable adaptation or elaboration in order to be applied consistently in particular societies."

(United Nations Statistics Division 1984: 99)

Although this recognises the problem in Africa, it does not really elaborate on how the concept of household should be adapted for surveys and what this might do to the whole comparability paradigm. It is unclear whether it is expected that respondents should be reconfigured to make them fit with the definition or the definition should be used flexibly to be able to match local conditions.

Conclusions

In this paper we set out to understand the role of UN guidelines in determining the ways in which data are collected in African countries and the extent to which documentation indicates the importance, or otherwise, of participating in the international statistical community.

A number of themes have emerged. Firstly, the earlier censuses after Independence were primarily preoccupied with getting a complete enumeration of the population and avoiding double counting and omissions. The units of data collection reflected this and there were often attempts to use local terminology or very strict de facto approaches in order to do the best 'counting' operation possible. This in itself was seen as an essential part of the modern state – being able to organise and undertake a competent census for the purposes of monitoring and planning.

In the 1970s and 1980s the movement towards referring to UN guidelines in the documentation of individual countries and the use of 'household' and the reiteration of UN notions of household became more important. However a major problem arose, and persists, because of ambiguity in the UN definition of household and the fact that it included residence, housekeeping and a reference to provision of food. Different countries have tended to emphasise this in different ways and in some the provision of food has been reduced to those eating out of the same cooking pot (e.g. Uganda) – under the assumption that this reflects 'provision of food' and thus fulfils the UN definition – which to an extent it does but could be seen as a very minimalist interpretation.

Since the beginning of the 21st Century however it seems as though some countries have begun to reassert their independence from the UN guidelines by including in their definitions concepts which are not mentioned in the UN like 'answer to one

household head'. In Burkina the decision to restrict households to one married couple is a further elaboration with a different pathway from the UN guidelines.

Senegal stands out as a nation with confidence in its own statistical collection and approaches. Even when it started to use the UN terminology of household (*ménage*) the instructions retained local language terms, an approach abandoned elsewhere in Africa after the 1960s. The structure of Senegalese data collection retains this independence with many surveys retaining the idea of 'noyaux' and in fact we understand the 2013 census will also revert to this approach.

Throughout the past half century a number of tensions emerge: between the requirement for comparability over time and space (recognised by all the documentation in all countries) and the need to accommodate changing social contexts (urbanisation etc) and diverse forms of social organisation: the desire to do the best data collection possible – which in the census means enumerating everyone once and once only, and the national recognition that this may not be achievable through using the UN definition of household. The fundamental tension seems to be that of applying a concept of household which remains largely Eurocentric and organised around complete enumeration where most households are composed of small nuclear families or fragments of them and very different patterns of social organisation in much of Africa. Different nations have chosen different approaches. In some cases the UN definition is adopted (and slightly modified) and these households become the somewhat alien statistical category just used for data collection (Uganda) whereas others, like Senegal have forged their own, more independent pathway. The increased power of computer-aided data collection, entry and processing means that simultaneously collecting and organising both standardised, internationally comparable data and locally-defined and relevant data on the ways in which people live should be possible, and is desirable.

References

- Barrett, D., & Tsui, A. O. (1999). Policy as symbolic statement: International Response to National Population Policies. *Social Forces*, 78(1), 213-233.
- Bureau of Statistics. (1971). *1967 Population Census Vol. 5 Census Methodology Tanzania*. Dar es Salam: Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Economic Affairs and Development Planning.
- Cherlin, A. (2012). Goode's World Revolution and Family Patterns: a reconsideration at 50 years. *Population and Development Review*, 38(4), 577-607.
- Ching'anda, E. F., & Ntozi, J. P. M. (1998). Training Employees for African Statistical Offices. *International Statistical Review*, 66(2), 235-244.
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division. (1980). *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses*. New York: United Nations.
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division. (1997). *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses Revision 1*. New York: United Nations.
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division. (2005). *Household Sample Surveys in Developing and Transition Countries*. New York: United Nations.
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division. (2008a). *Designing Household Survey Samples: Practical Guidelines*: United Nations.
- Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division. (2008b). *Principles and Recommendations for Population and Housing Censuses Revision 2*. New York: United Nations.
- Duncan, M. E. (2013). *National Income Accounting Revision in Liberia? The weakness of the Statistical Infrastructure exposed*. Paper presented at the workshop on "African Economic Development: Measuring Success and Failure", 18 - 20 April, Vancouver.
- East African Statistical Department, T. (1958). *Tanganyika. Report on the Census of the Non-African Population taken on the night of 20th/21st February, 1957*. Dar es Salaam: Government Printer.
- Government of Malawi. (1987). *Malawi Population and Housing Census 1987 Vol. VI Methodological Report Zomba*: National Statistical Office.
- Government of Malawi. (1998). *1998 Malawi Population and Housing Census: Report of Preliminary Results*. Zomba: National Statistical Office.
- Guyer, J. I. (1981). Household and Community in African Studies. *African Studies Review* 24(2/3), 87-137.
- Guyer, J. I., & Peters, P. E. (1987). Introduction. *Development and Change*, 18(2), 197-214.
- Jerven, M. (2013). *Poor Numbers: How We Are Misled by African Development Statistics and What to Do about It*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- National Bureau of Statistics. (2005). *Concepts and Definitions for Official Statistics in Tanzania*. Dar Es Salaam: National Bureau of Statistics.
- Pilon, M., & Vignikin, K. (2006). *Ménages et Familles en Afrique subsaharienne*. Paris: Editions des archives contemporaines.
- Randall, S., Coast, E., Compaore, N., & Antoine, P. (2013). The Power of the Interviewer: a qualitative perspective on African data collection. *Demographic Research*, 28, 763-792 doi: 10.4054/DemRes.2013.28.27

- Randall, S. C., Coast, E., & Leone, T. (2011). Cultural constructions of the concept of household in sample surveys. *Population Studies*, 65(2), 217-229.
- Republic of Botswana. (1972). Report on the Population Census 1971. Botswana: Central Statistics Office.
- Republic of Botswana. (1983). 1981 Population and Housing Census. Census Administrative/ Technical Report and National Statistical Tables. Gaborone, Botswana: Central Statistics Office.
- Republic of Ghana. (1962). 1960 Population Census of Ghana. Volume 1: The Gazetteer Alphabetical List of Localities. Accra, Ghana: Census Office.
- Republic of Ghana. (1964). 1960 Population Census of Ghana. Volume V: General Report. Accra: Census Office.
- Republic of Ghana. (1975). 1970 Population Census of Ghana. Volume III - Demographic Characteristics of Local Authorities, Regions, and Total Country. Accra: Census Office.
- Republic of Ghana. (1984). 1984 Population Census of Ghana: Preliminary Report. Accra, Ghana: Central Bureau of Statistics.
- Republic of Kenya. (1981). Kenya Population Census 1979: Volume I. Nairobi: Central Bureau of Statistics.
- Republic of Kenya. (1989). Kenya Population Census 1989: Volume 1. Nairobi: Central Bureau of Statistics.
- Republic of Uganda. (1974). *Report on the 1969 Population Census Vol. III The Administrative Report*. Entebbe, Uganda: The Statistics Division, President's Office.
- Republic of Uganda. (1995). *The 1991 Population and Housing Census: Analytical Report. Vol. III Housholds and Housing Characteristics*. Entebbe, Uganda: Statistical Department, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning.
- Republic of Uganda. (2002). *2002 Uganda Population and Housing Census Questionnaire*
https://international.ipums.org/international/resources/enum_materials_pdf/enum_form_ug2002.pdf. Retrieved from
https://international.ipums.org/international/resources/enum_materials_pdf/enum_form_ug2002.pdf.
- Republique du Senegal. (2002a). Manuel de l'agent recenseur. Troisieme recensement general de la population et de l'habitat. Dakar: Ministere de l'economie et des finances. Direction de la prevision et de la statistique.
- Republique du Senegal. (2002b). *Questionnaire Menage*
https://international.ipums.org/international/resources/enum_materials_pdf/enum_form_sn2002.pdf. Dakar: Ministere de l'economie et des finances. Direction de la prevision et de la statistique Retrieved from
https://international.ipums.org/international/resources/enum_materials_pdf/enum_form_sn2002.pdf.
- Republique du Senegal. (2013). *Manuel de l'agent recenseur*. Dakar: Ministère de l'Économie et des Finances. Agence Nationale de la Statistique et de la Démographie (Ansd), RGPHAE
- Sanga, D. (2013). *The challenges of the Narrative of African Countries' Development: Data Demand and supply mismatches*. Paper presented at the workshop on "African Economic Development: Measuring Success and Failure", 18 - 20 April, Vancouver.

- Statistical Office of the United Nations. (1959). *Handbook of Population Census Methods: Volume III - Demographic and Social Characteristics of the Population*. New York: United Nations.
- Statistical Office of the United Nations, D. o. E. A. (1954). *Handbook of Population Census Methods*. New York: United Nations.
- Statistical Office of the United Nations, D. o. S. a. E. A. (1964). *Handbook of Household Surveys: A Practical Guide for Inquiries on Levels of Living (Provisional Edition)*. New York: United Nations.
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics. (2001). *Compendium of Statistical Concepts and Definitions used in the Uganda Statistical System and Services. Concepts and Definitions, Vol. 1*. Kampala, Uganda: Uganda Bureau of Statistics Retrieved from <http://www.ubos.org/Compendium2012/Household.html>. .
- Uganda Bureau of Statistics. (2012). *Compendium of Statistical Concepts and Definitions: 4th Edition*. Kampala: Uganda Bureau of Statistics Retrieved from http://www.ubos.org/onlinefiles/uploads/ubos/pdf%20documents/Compendium_Vol4.pdf.
- Uganda Protectorate. (1961). *Uganda Census 1959 African Population*. Place not specified: Statistics Branch, Ministry of Economic Affairs.
- United Nations. (1954). *International Definition and Measurement of Standards and Levels of Living*.
- United Nations Statistics Division. (1984). *Handbook of Household Surveys (Revised Edition)*.
- United Nations Statistics Division. (2013). *Major work areas and accomplishments*.
- United Republic of Tanzania. (1969). *1967 Population Census Volume I: Statistics for Enumeration Areas*. Dar es Salaam: Central Statistical Bureau.
- United Republic of Tanzania. (1982). *1978 Population Census Volume IV: A Summary of Selected Statistics*. Dar es Salaam: Bureau of Statistics.
- United Republic of Tanzania. (1988). *1988 Population Census: Methodology*. Dar es Salaam: Bureau of Statistics.
- United Republic of Tanzania. (2002). *Census Enumerator Form*. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Retrieved from https://international.ipums.org/international/resources/enum_materials_pdf/enum_form_tz2002.pdf.
- United Republic of Tanzania. (2003). *2002 Population and Housing Census: Volume I - Methodology Report*. Dar es Salaam: Central Census Office, National Bureau of Statistics.

Table 1: UN and country specific definitions of household and guidelines

	UN	Burkina	Senegal	Tanzania	Uganda
1950s	<p>"A private household should preferably be defined as: (a) one-person household:(b) multi-person household: a group of two or more persons who combine to occupy the whole or part of a housing unit and to provide themselves with food or other essentials for living. The group may pool their incomes and have a common budget to a greater or lesser extent. The group may be composed of related persons only or of unrelated persons or of a combination of both, including boarders but excluding lodgers." (Statistical Office of the UN 1959: 74)</p>	No census	<p>1955 census (from census questionnaire) Doivent être inscrits les membres de la famille ou du ménage. R - PRÉSENTS ET TEMPORAIREMENT ABSENTS : Toutes les personnes de la famille habitant normalement le logement ou l'unité d'habitation y compris celles qui sont temporairement absentes à l'époque du recensementSont également considérés comme habitant normalement le logement ou l'unité d'habitation et par conséquent à inscrire au même titre que les membres de la famille ou du ménage: - les domestiques, apprentis et salariés logés chez vous. - les pensionnaires et sous-locataires logés chez vous, les enfants en nourrice chez vous. Si les sous-locataires habitent des pièces indépendantes, on considère que ces pièces indépendantes forment un logement distinct. pour lequel une feuille collective distincte doit être établie. B. - SAISONNIERS ET VISITEURS : Les personnes ne résidant pas d'une façon permanente dans le logement, mais présentes au moment du recensement seront portés sur la feuille : Personnes y revenant régulièrement chaque année (travailleurs saisonniers) et personnes occasionnellement de passage [voyageurs, touristes, visiteurs etc ...I</p>	<p>1957 census [from census questionnaire] Every person whether member of family, visitor, boarder or servant of all races and nationalities who passed the night of 20th February in this dwelling and was alive at midnight OR arrived in this dwelling on the morning of 21st February 1957 not having been enumerated elsewhere. No-one else must be included. i.e. de facto based on where slept on census night Code for if have a different 'usual residence' and (separate) list for members of household (not defined on form) away on census night (age/sex and relationship to hhh) (EASD 1958: Appendix II)</p>	<p>1959 Defacto census. "In the course of the sample census, one schedule was completed for each household. The family of a man with more than one wife living with him was regarded as one household. A married son or daughter living in the same compound as the parents was regarded as a separate household". In Karamoja, "the extended family unit (ere or manyatta) was treated in this district as the 'household'"(Uganda Protectorate 1961: 33)</p>

<p>1960s</p>	<p>1950s definition referred to through 1960s</p>	<p>no census</p>	<p>no census</p>	<p>1967 “A household is a group of persons who live together and share their living expenses. Usually, this will be the husband, wife and children. Other relatives, boarders, visitors and servants should be included as members of the household if they were present in the household on census night. Persons living alone should be considered as a separate household” (Bureau of Statistics 1971: 85)</p> <p>“The existence of polygamous households in Tanzania was one of the problems facing field staff in the enumeration” (Bureau of Statistics 1971: 85)</p>	<p>1969 Defined a HH as a group of persons who normally live and eat together. Strictly de facto census.</p> <p>“a household is defined as a group of persons who normally live and eat together. This is a very loose definition and there may be many cases when you are in doubt as to whether people should be included in the same household or shown as belonging to separate households. It is not possible in these instructions to cover all such cases in detail, and your decision in such cases should be determined by common sense and convenience in the enumeration. It is not a matter of great importance whether or not such persons are included in one household or shown belonging to separate households. The important thing is that every person should be enumerated. Difficult cases generally occur in towns rather than rural areas, and here common sense should always be followed” (Republic of Uganda 1974: 87)</p>
<p>1970s</p>		<p>No census</p>	<p>1976 Notion of household (ménage) is not mentioned. Have compound (concession) and nuclei (noyaux) within compounds.</p> <p>‘Concession is used in the commonly understood way’</p>	<p>1978 “A private household is a group of persons who live together and share their living expenses. Usually this means husband, wife and children. Other relatives, boarders, visitors and servants must be included as members of the</p>	<p>No census</p>

			<p>Il s'agit d'une case ou d'un groupe de cases ou d'autres types de locaux d'habitation entourés ou non d'une clôture en définissant clairement les limites. Le noyau familial est la plus petite cellule familiale pouvant exister. Il est composé des époux (ou d'un des époux) et de leurs descendants directs non mariés, c'est-à-dire des parents et leurs enfants non mariés. Ces personnes doivent habiter la même concession. par extension, le même noyau familial peut comprendre le mari, plusieurs épouses et les enfants non mariés dès l'instant où ils habitent la même concession. Par extension, le même noyau familial peut comprendre des ascendants directs (mère du chef de noyau familial), des frères et sœurs, des proches parents non mariés (neveux, nièces, oncles etc...) à condition que ceux-ci cohabitent avec le chef du noyau familial et n'aient pas d'enfants non mariés dans la concession</p>	<p>household if they were present on census night.</p> <p>Family members staying in more than one house, however close they may be, will be included in the same household if they live and eat together.” (United Republic of Tanzania 1982: 92)</p> <p>De facto: if a member of the household usually lives at home but is away on census night – do not enumerate him – he will be enumerated where he actually is. If however he is away because of nightwork then he must be enumerated. (United Republic of Tanzania 1982: 92)</p>	
1980s	<p>“2. Household [or family] 1. 223. The concept of "household" is based on the arrangements made by persons, individually or in groups, for providing themselves with food or other essentials for living.... 1.226. Households usually occupy the whole, part of or more than one housing unit but they may also be found living in camps, boarding houses or hotels or as administrative personnel in institutions, or they</p>	<p>1985 <i>Unité socio-économique de base au sein de laquelle les différents membres apparentés ou non, vivent ensemble dans la même concession, mettent en commun leurs ressources et satisfont en commun l'essentiel de leurs besoins alimentaires et autres besoins vitaux</i></p> <p>Quelques exemples de ménages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Tout homme marié, constitue avec sa femme et ses enfants non mariés un</i> 	<p>1988 Le ménage est un ensemble de personnes, parents ou non, vivant dans la même concession, prenant en commun leur repas quotidiens, sous l'autorité d'une seule et même personne appelée chef de ménage (CM). Ce concept correspond à l'appellation « ndieul » en wolof, « ngank » en serer ou « hirande » en toucouleur. Si une personne loge dans la concession et prend ses repas dans un ménage de cette concession, il faut la recenser dans ce ménage. Si elle loge hors de la concession mais y prend ses repas,</p>	<p>1988 methodology handbook and questionnaire</p> <p>“Private households : persons who shared living costs were considered as members of one household. However during enumeration persons who were enumerated were those who slept in the household on census night. Two types of questionnaire were used. A detailed questionnaire was used to enumerate private households in sampled EAs while the general</p>	<p>1980 census undertaken but most of questionnaires lost before processing (because of security situation)</p>

	<p>may be homeless. Households consisting of extended families that make common provision for food or of potentially separate households with a common head, resulting from polygamous unions, or households with vacation or other second homes may occupy more than one housing unit.</p>	<p><i>ménage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Chacun des enfants d'un homme, constitue avec sa femme ou ses femmes et leurs enfants non mariés un ménage, même s'ils sont ensemble dans la même maison ou concession, mettent en commun leurs ressources et satisfont ensemble à l'essentiel de leurs besoins fondamentaux</i> - <i>Toute personne de sexe masculin ou féminin, qui vit seule et pourvoit seule à ses besoins forme un ménage, etc.</i> 	<p>il ne faut pas la recenser dans ce ménage. En outre si une personne vit seule et prend ses repas seule, il faut la considérer comme un ménage distinct ne comportant qu'une seule personne (cas d'un isolé).</p> <p>Un ménage n'est plus exclusivement constitué d'au moins deux personnes. Les liens de parenté ne sont plus pris en compte dans la définition</p> <p>La concession est un ensemble de constructions entourées ou non d'un mur ou de tout autre type de clôturer (palissade)..... La notion de résidence se définit comme une vie habituelle dans un lieu pendant une certaine durée. Pour le RGPH 1988, ce lieu est la concession et cette durée est conventionnellement fixée à 6 mois</p>	<p>questionnaire was used to cover other private households in non sample EAs" (United Republic of Tanzania 1988: 52)</p> <p>De facto: all persons staying in the household at the time of census must be listed (United Republic of Tanzania 1988: 52)</p>	
1990s	<p>1.324. "The concept of household is based on the arrangements made by persons, individually or in groups, for providing themselves with food or other essentials for living" [emphasis added by author] (Department of Economic and Social Affairs Statistics Division 1997: 50)</p>	<p>1996</p> <p><i>Unité socio-économique de base au sein de laquelle les différents membres (apparentés ou non), vivent ensemble dans la même maison ou concession, mettent en commun leurs ressources et satisfont en commun à l'essentiel de leurs besoins vitaux. Ils reconnaissent en général l'autorité d'un des membres du ménage en tant que chef de ménage, indépendamment du sexe de celui-ci.</i></p> <p>Quelques exemples de ménages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Tout homme marié, constitue avec sa (ou ses) femme(s) et ses enfants non mariés, un ménage</i> 	No census in 1990s	No census in 1990s	<p>1991</p> <p>Still followed de facto census approach</p> <p>A household is "a group of persons who normally live and eat together". Although a HH is close to a family, the two are not identical and there is no clear relationship between the two. [...] A HH can only have one HH head and vice versa." [emphasis in original] (Republic of Uganda 1995: 5)</p>

		<p>- Chacun des enfants d'un homme constitue avec sa (ou ses) femme(s) et leurs enfants non mariés un ménage, même s'ils vivent ensemble dans la même maison ou concession, mettent en commun leurs ressources et satisfont ensemble à l'essentiel de leurs besoins fondamentaux</p> <p>- Toute personne qui vit seul et pourvoit seul à ses besoins constitue un ménage</p>			
2000s		<p>2006 <i>Basic socio-economic unit whose members can be related or not. They live together in the same compound, pool their resources and share food and other general needs. They acknowledge one member as household head irrespective of sex.</i></p> <p><i>A household usually consists of a man, his wife /wives, his unmarried children, other kin and unmarried domestic servants who live with them</i> <i>NB in compounds or houses occupied by parents with their married children, you should treat the parents as a separate household from those of their married children. Each married child (with his wife/wives and their unmarried children) constitutes a household. On the other hand if one or the other of the parents depends on his/her married child he belongs to that child's household</i></p>	<p>2002 <i>A household is generally defined as being a group of people, related or not, who live together under the same roof, pool some or all of their resources to meet their basic needs of accommodation and food. These individuals, called household members generally take their meals together and recognise the authority of a single person, the household head (CM). In our national languages the ideas of « njël » in wolof, « ngank » in sereer, « hirande », in pulaar and « stiitik » in diola are reliable translations of the concept of the household (translated by authors) (Republique du Senegal 2002a:9)</i></p>	<p>2002 methodology report “For the purpose of the 2002 population and housing census a ‘private household’ was a group of persons who lived together and shared living expenses. Usually these were a husband, wife and children. Other relatives, boarders, visitors and servants were included as members of the household if they were present in the household on census night.” [emphasis added by author] (United Republic of Tanzania 2003: 51)</p> <p>de facto – “for comparability” (United Republic of Tanzania 2003: 50)</p> <p>questionnaire: “please give the names of persons who spent the census night in your household starting with the name of the head of household” (United Republic of Tanzania 2003:</p>	<p>2002 A household is a group of persons who normally live and eat together. Very often the household will be a family living in the same house or compound and eating together. A household will normally consist of a man, his wife and children and sometimes relatives and maids. The following constitutes a household: (i) A household may consist of one person who lives and eats on his or her own. (ii) A household may consist of several persons who are not related to each other. What matters is that they live together in the same house or compound and eat together. (iii) If a man has two or more wives and they and their children live and eat together, they form one household. If the wives and their children live and eat separately, they will form more than one household. (iv) If two or more groups of persons, each of which has its</p>

				77)	own separate eating and housekeeping arrangements, live in the same dwelling, treat them as separate households. (UBOS 2001)
2010s			<p>2013 As for 2002</p> <p>On notera cependant que les définitions de «ménage» et «membre de ménage» ne sont pas très rigoureuses et que dans la pratique ils peuvent revêtir divers aspects. Des précisions sont donc nécessaires pour mieux comprendre le contenu de chacun de ces termes. (manuel enquêteur)</p>		

Table 2: Summary of key elements in census household definition by country and decade

Decade	UN	Burkina Faso	Senegal	Tanzania	Uganda
1960s	housing unit, food, other essentials	-	-	Live together, share living expenses	Live and eat together De facto: states actual household membership not important
1970s	Presumably same as 1960s	-	No household but compounds (concessions) and nuclei (noyaux). Live together (concession) and are closely related (noyaux)	Live together and eat together (includes living close by in different house)	-
1980s	Joint Provision of food or essentials of living.	Live together (concession), pool resources and joint provision of food or essentials of living	Live together (concession), eat daily meals together; under authority of household head. Local language terminology provided	Household = those who shared living costs. BUT census household those who slept under roof on census night. De facto	na
1990s	Live together under same roof. Joint Provision of food or essentials of living	Live together (house or concession), pool resources and joint provision of food or essentials of living	-	-	Normally live and eat together. De facto
2000s	Presumably as 1990s	Live together (concession), pool resources and joint provision of food or essentials of living. Under one household head. Household cannot contain more than one married couple.	Live together under same roof, pool resources, eat together and under one household head. Local language terminology provided	Live together and share living expenses De facto: only those present on census night	Live together (house or compound) and eat together