

Togo 2018

1 Survey Description

Survey: Enquete Harmonisee sur le Conditions de Vie des Menages 2018-2019

Link to the document: <https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/catalog/4291>

Sample: The Togo EHCVM 2018/19 is a nationally representative survey of 6,100 households, which are also representative of the geopolitical zones (at both the urban and rural level). The survey uses two main survey instruments: a household/individual questionnaire, and a community-level questionnaire. The surveys took place in two waves with each wave covering half of the sample. The first wave was fielded between October 2018 and December 2018, while the second wave occurred between April 2019 and July 2019. The two-wave approach was chosen to account for seasonality of consumption. , 13,550 individuals in the total sample and 9,552 individuals in the analysis sample. Section 3 of this document describes the prevalence and pattern of missing data.

Weights: 1 weight for all the households in each enumeration area

Outcome: The outcome is the total annual expenditure for consumption per household adjusted for the CPI PPP value considering the US dollar value as of 2017.¹

Circumstances:

- Sex (*sex*: male and female)
- Race (*religion*: 5 religions, described in Table 1)
- Father's education (*father_edu*: 5 levels of education, described in Table 2)
- Mother's education (*mother_edu*: 5 levels of education, described in Table 2)
- Father's occupation (*father_occ*: 8 categories, described in Table 3)
- Mother's occupation (*mother_occ*: 8 categories, described in Table 3).

¹consumption variable was equivalized using the square root scale.

2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 1: Respondant's socio-demographics - 2018

	Analysis sample	Total sample
	(N=9,552)	(N=13,550)
Gender		
0 Female	5,655 (59.2%)	7,431 (54.8%)
1 Male	3,897 (40.8%)	6,117 (45.1%)
Missing	0 (0%)	2 (0.0%)
Religion		
1 Muslim	1,714 (17.9%)	2,722 (20.1%)
2 christian	4,807 (50.3%)	6,972 (51.5%)
3 animist	2,301 (24.1%)	2,875 (21.2%)
4 other	53 (0.6%)	68 (0.5%)
5 atheist	677 (7.1%)	911 (6.7%)
Missing	0 (0%)	2 (0.0%)

Table 2: Parental education - 2018

	Analysis sample	Total sample
	(N=9,552)	(N=13,550)
Mother's education (levels)		
1 no school	8,158 (85.4%)	9,556 (70.5%)
2 primary	1,081 (11.3%)	1,303 (9.6%)
3 secondary I cycle	257 (2.7%)	310 (2.3%)
4 secondary II cycle	31 (0.3%)	37 (0.3%)
5 superior	25 (0.3%)	28 (0.2%)
Missing	0 (0%)	2,316 (17.1%)
Father's education (levels)		
1 no school	7,030 (73.6%)	8,545 (63.1%)
2 primary	1,511 (15.8%)	1,969 (14.5%)
3 secondary I cycle	660 (6.9%)	948 (7.0%)
4 secondary II cycle	207 (2.2%)	319 (2.4%)
5 superior	144 (1.5%)	221 (1.6%)
Missing	0 (0%)	1,548 (11.4%)

Table 3: Parental occupation - 2018

	Analysis sample	Total sample
	(N=9,552)	(N=13,550)
Mother's occupation (categories)		
1 senior executive	2 (0.0%)	4 (0.0%)
2 middle manager	27 (0.3%)	37 (0.3%)
3 skilled worker	40 (0.4%)	46 (0.3%)
4 Unskilled worker	36 (0.4%)	40 (0.3%)
5 manual worker	12 (0.1%)	12 (0.1%)
6 Employer	33 (0.3%)	37 (0.3%)
7 self employed	7,965 (83.4%)	8,456 (62.4%)
8 altro	1,437 (15.0%)	1,463 (10.8%)
Missing	0 (0%)	3,455 (25.5%)
Father's occupation (categories)		
1 senior executive	75 (0.8%)	121 (0.9%)
2 middle manager	254 (2.7%)	415 (3.1%)
3 skilled worker	372 (3.9%)	599 (4.4%)
4 Unskilled worker	207 (2.2%)	301 (2.2%)
5 manual worker	46 (0.5%)	67 (0.5%)
6 Employer	89 (0.9%)	121 (0.9%)
7 self employed	8,472 (88.7%)	10,424 (76.9%)
8 altro	37 (0.4%)	47 (0.3%)
Missing	0 (0%)	1,455 (10.7%)

Table 4: Respondant's consumption - 2018

	N	Mean	SD	Median	Min	Max	Missing
Analysis sample	9,552	3,605	3,145	2,779	196.3	44,520	0
Total sample	13,550	3,897	3,429	2,956	196.3	44,520	0

2.1 Missing patterns




Figure 1: Missing patterns: *Left*: Marginal distribution of missing observations per variable. *Right*: Combination of missingness across cases

2.2 Differences in expected total equivalized household consumption between samples




Figure 2: Differences in expected equivalized household consumption between the sample with non-missing circumstances and the total sample

2.3 Gini coefficient

Table 5: Gini coefficient in analysis sample and total sample

Wave	Sample	Gini	Lower bound	Upper bound	Average consumption
Wave 2018	Analysis sample	0.382	0.360	0.376	3,095
Wave 2018	Total sample	0.393	0.371	0.384	3,287

2.4 Differences in Gini coefficient between samples




Figure 3: Differences in Gini coefficient between the sample with non-missing circumstances and the total sample