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### Table 10.1 Family planning knowledge: Percentage of female and male respondents aged 15–24 knowing family planning methods, by marital status, sexual experience, and method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.2 Ever use of contraception: Percentage of sexually active female and male respondents who or whose partner ever used contraceptive methods, by marital status and method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.3 Condoms: Percentage of young people with correct information about condoms and accepting attitudes toward condoms, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Correct Information</th>
<th>Accepting Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.4 Condoms: Percentage of sexually active female and male respondents who used a condom at last sex, partner profile and source of condom, by sex and marital status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.5 Marriage: Timing and context of marriage among married adolescents, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.6 Marriage: Context of marital sexual initiation among married adolescents, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.7 Marriage: Communication and decisionmaking within marriage, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.8 Parenthood: Percent distribution of attitudes related to childbirth and maternal mortality among young people, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.9 Parenthood: Place of first birth and assistance during childbirth, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.1 Family planning knowledge: Percentage of female and male respondents aged 15–24 knowing family planning methods, by marital status, sexual experience, and method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.2 Ever use of contraception: Percentage of sexually active female and male respondents who or whose partner ever used contraceptive methods, by marital status and method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable contraceptives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.3 Condoms: Percentage of young people with correct information about condoms and accepting attitudes toward condoms, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Correct Information</th>
<th>Accepting Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.4 Condoms: Percentage of sexually active female and male respondents who used a condom at last sex, partner profile and source of condom, by sex and marital status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.5 Parenthood: Percent distribution of attitudes related to childbirth and maternal mortality among young women with partners, by type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.6 Parenthood: Percent distribution of spousal discussion and support on matters related to childbirth among young women with partners, by type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.7 Parenthood: Percentage of young people who have ever given birth to or fathered a child, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.8 Parenthood: Percentage of young people/female partners who received antenatal care and reasons for not receiving antenatal care, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.9 Parenthood: Place of first birth and assistance during childbirth, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.1 HIV and AIDS: Percent distribution of youth who have heard of AIDS, by sex and background characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Characteristic</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.2 HIV and AIDS: Knowledge of modes of HIV transmission, by method of transmission, sex, and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Transmission</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.3 HIV and AIDS: Misconceptions and knowledge about HIV and AIDS, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.4 HIV and AIDS: Accepting attitudes toward those living with HIV and AIDS, by sex and type of place of residence (percent agreeing or disagreeing with the statement).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.5 HIV and AIDS: Percentage of youth aged 15–24 who have ever been counseled or received testing for HIV, by sex and selected characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.6 HIV and AIDS: Main reasons for having counseling and testing for HIV, by sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.7 HIV and AIDS: Main reason for not receiving antenatal care, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.8 HIV and AIDS: Main reason for not receiving counseling and testing for HIV, among sexually experienced youth, by sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13.1 Gender-based violence: Percentage of respondents aged 15–24 holding conservative views related to gender relations and violence, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13.2 Gender-based violence: Percentage of sexually experienced respondents having ever experienced forced sex/rape, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13.3 Domestic violence: Percentage of married adolescents who have experienced domestic violence from their spouse/partner, by type of violence, sex, and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13.4 Gender-based violence: Percentage of young people who have heard a message/received information on gender-based violence in the last year and sources of information, by sex and type of place of residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Ethiopia Young Adult Survey in Seven Regions is a population-based survey that took place in 2009 in urban and rural areas of seven regions: Addis Ababa; Afar; Amhara; Beneshangul Gumuz; Oromiya; Southern Nations Nationalities, and People’s Region (SNNPR); and Tigray. Nearly 10,000 young people aged 12–24 were interviewed. The survey provides a baseline for four new initiatives in Ethiopia, including programs devoted to adolescent and youth health and development, gender-based violence, women’s/girls’ empowerment, and female genital cutting/mutilation.

RESEARCH DESIGN

The sample was designed to be representative of the intervention and comparison districts/woredas identified for the four new initiatives on adolescent health and development, gender-based violence, women’s empowerment, and female genital cutting/mutilation. A sample of 10,080 adolescent boys and girls aged 12–24 was drawn, with equal numbers of male and female adolescents selected. In each region, between three to six districts/woredas were selected. In all, 31 districts/woredas were selected for the study. Within selected districts/woredas, 252 enumeration areas (EAs) were selected, or 36 EAs per region. In all, 262 interviewers took part in the survey. All EAs selected for the study first underwent a census of all households, or “household listing,” in order to establish a sampling frame for the locations. Selection of respondents was random with 20 adolescent boys and 20 adolescent girls selected per EA. Only one respondent was selected in each household. Male interviewers interviewed male respondents selected for the survey; females interviewed females. Informed consent was obtained from respondents and their parents or guardians if they were below age 18. Data were entered at Population Council offices by 13 data entry clerks. Data were weighted in order to adjust for unequal probabilities of selection. The survey achieved a 97 percent response rate.

RESULTS

The survey revealed considerable differences in the situations of young men and young women, as well as differences in the experience of urban and rural youth.

Parental presence: A large proportion of young people had lost one or both parents (20 percent). Among all adolescents, significant proportions were not living with either parent, even when they had living parents. This is especially true for girls. Among girls aged 12-17, 25 percent are living with neither parent. This could be related to greater levels of early marriage and migration among girls.

Social participation: Boys’ social networks and participation were greater than girls. Whereas 9 percent of boys reported having no friends, 21 percent of girls reported no friends. Eight percent of boys had visited a youth center in the last year, compared to 4 percent of girls. Limited social connections could be due to greater regulation of girls by their parents, husbands, or other senior members of the household. Nearly 90 percent of girls needed permission before leaving the house, compared to 77 percent of boys. Greater domestic work burdens may also result in girls’ diminishing opportunities for social participation and access to programs.

Parent–child relationships & puberty: Less than one third of adolescents reported having discussions with their parents about HIV and AIDS, sex, and marriage. In addition, only a small minority of mothers or fathers talked to their children about menstruation or wet dreams, with many young people not having foreknowledge of either menstruation or wet dreams. The vast majority of both young people and parents wished that they could communicate more freely with each other. When asked about corporal punishment, boys seemed to be the target of parental beatings to a greater extent than girls.
**Education:** Young people’s educational participation seems to be increasing, as reflected in increased rates of attendance across successive cohorts of young people. Young people, especially those in rural areas, start school extremely late. This is particularly true for rural boys whose mean age at school entry was over 10 years. Reasons for boys leaving school were mainly lack of financial support and farming and herding duties; reasons given by girls were marriage, followed by domestic duties. Less than one third of young people reported receiving family life education (FLE) in school. One in six girls reported that they had missed school in the previous year due to menstruation.

**Livelihoods:** Few young people have received skills training and, among those who have, most have not put the skills to use. Reasons for not putting the skills to use were largely inability to find a job or lack of startup capital. Roughly one third of young people have ever worked for pay. The type of paid work is highly gendered and boys engage in a wider array of work roles than do girls. Girls are mainly engaged in domestic work and petty trade; boys mainly work as farmers, or in a wide variety of other jobs, especially in urban areas. Working young people work extremely long hours, especially urban young people. Boys earn roughly 50 percent more than girls, in part because the jobs that girls are engaged in are low-paying, such as domestic work.

**Alcohol and chat/khat:** A minority of young people were regular drinkers; 8 percent of boys and 2 percent of girls report drinking alcohol two or more times in a week. On average, among those consuming alcohol, they drank 5 or 6 days in the previous month. Compared with alcohol, chat consumption was more regular among users. Twelve percent of boys and 3 percent of girls had tried chat, with 86 percent of male ever-users and 71 percent of female ever-users having chewed in the last month. Overall, 3 percent of male youth consider themselves addicted to chat. Among male users, 16 percent chew 6 to 7 days a week.

**Female genital mutilation/cutting:** Fifty-eight percent of girls in the sample were circumcised. As a practice, circumcision seems to be declining given the declining levels of circumcision across successive cohorts of girls. Circumcision is very high in Afar region (90 percent), where the most extreme form of circumcision is practiced. Fifty-nine percent of all circumcised girls oppose their own circumcision and 43 percent of Afar girls oppose it. Reasons for opposition are mainly founded in the medical complications and illegality of the practice; reasons for supporting FGM/C are overwhelmingly related to custom and tradition. In Afar, 58 percent of boys and 41 percent of girls report that they intend to circumcision their daughters.

**Sexual activity:** Sixteen percent of boys and 36 percent of girls are sexually experienced. Most sexual activity takes place in the context of marriage, especially among girls; 89 percent of girls first had sex with their husband. Girls’ partners are significantly older than they are, with a mean age difference of 7 years, and 15 percent being over 10 years younger than their spouses/partners. Peer pressure was not a significant motivator for sex. Among boys, curiosity and showing love were the main reasons to have sex. For girls, spousal obligation was the main reason, as well as demonstration of love and coercion. One third of girls reported a coercive or nonconsensual condition during their first sexual experience.

**Marriage:** One third of girls had ever been married compared to 9 percent of boys. Five percent of girls were already divorced or widowed. The majority of marriages were arranged (70 percent of girls) with arranged marriages most common in Amhara and Tigray regions. One third of married girls did not want to get married at the time they did; 10 percent were made to leave school because of the marriage; 22 percent did not want their marital sexual initiation at the time it happened.

**Family planning:** Forty-six percent of sexually active married and unmarried females had ever used a family planning method; 35 percent were currently using a method (41 percent urban females; 26 percent rural females). The most common methods were injectables (33 percent ever used), followed by pills (13 percent ever used). Eight percent of women reported that their spouse does not know about their family planning use. Thirty-one percent of females had ever had a child, with less than half receiving at least one antenatal care visit and 80 percent delivering at home.
HIV and AIDS: Over 90 percent of respondents had heard of HIV and AIDS and over 90 percent named sexual intercourse as a mode of transmission. While knowledge was generally high, there are still misconceptions that HIV is mainly transmitted through sharp objects. Twenty-eight percent of males and 36 percent of females have received counseling and testing for HIV. Reasons for not testing among sexually experienced youth were mainly reporting one monogamous partner and not feeling at risk. Among married couples, over one quarter had tested, three quarters of whom tested as couples. Seven percent of married young women fear their husbands will give them HIV and 14 percent suspect their spouses of being unfaithful.

Sexual and gender-based violence: There is widespread acceptance of gender-based violence, especially among rural females. Fifteen percent of sexually experienced young women had ever experienced forced sex/rape and a considerable number blamed themselves for the occurrence and did not tell anyone about it. Ten percent of married young women have experienced physical domestic violence at the hands of their husbands.

Access to and utilization of services: Considering the qualities of health services that young people valued, the most important characteristic was the friendliness of the provider, followed by low-cost or free services and services close to their homes. Given the investment in youth centers in Ethiopia, a special study was conducted within 24 centers. Eleven percent of boys and 6 percent of girls had ever been to a youth center. Youth centers were dominated by boys, most of whom lived in the vicinities of the centers and visited multiple times in a week.

Recommendations: The study findings reveal many results with direct implications for programs:

- Given the large number of young people living away from parents, additional attention should be paid to this sub-group of youth, and to increasing the social networks and safety nets for the most vulnerable young people.
- Few young people received information on sexual and reproductive health or puberty. Boys, in particular, received health information mainly through friends. Additional attention should be given to providing reproductive health information, including information on puberty. This includes providing information through schools, and for young people who are outside of the school environment.
- Young men described considerable violence from parents and teachers. Programs for young men should address this early experience of violence and how this may translate into violence against women later in life. Young men should be given skills to express themselves beyond the use of force and violence.
- Work roles among young people were highly gendered with males engaged in a broader array of work compared to females. In addition, the work that males undertook was generally better paid than paid work of females. Livelihoods programs should go beyond skills training to include job placement and apprenticeship, facilitating a smoother transition for young people into the work world.
- Programs should focus additional attention on marriage as a key driver in early age at sexual initiation and place more emphasis on marital transmission of HIV. In addition, increased attention should be paid to nonconsensual sex, especially for girls.
- Youth centers should be redirected to address the dominance of males at these facilities, either by capitalizing on their presence and implementing programs for boys, or by providing structured sex-specific programs, including girls-only spaces.
- Religious institutions reach a large number of young people in both urban and rural areas. These institutions should be explored as to their potential to further engage in youth educational and development activities.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Ethiopia is the second most populous country in sub-Saharan Africa with an estimated population of 74 million people. Eighty-four percent of the population resides in rural areas. Ethiopian women, adolescents, and youth are disadvantaged. Women’s status is extremely low, with their situation reflected in extremely poor economic, social, and health indicators. Many Ethiopian young people face challenges in attaining educational and livelihoods goals, as well as facing reproductive health and HIV risks.

The status of women in Ethiopia

Girls and women in Ethiopia are at a distinct disadvantage compared to boys and men on a range of issues such as education and health. Ethiopia is ranked 129th out of 136 countries on the gender-related development index (GDI). While levels of educational attainment are low, the disparities between men and women are significant. According to the 2005 Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey (EDHS), two thirds of Ethiopian women and girls have no education, compared to about half of men. Disparities in educational attendance and attainment are particularly apparent at the higher levels, including secondary education and university.

The 2005 EDHS revealed high levels of acceptance of violence against women (VAW). However, few studies in Ethiopia have measured actual levels of sexual or domestic violence. In addition, Ethiopian girls and women experience high rates of maternal mortality and morbidity, including fistula and other reproductive health (RH) problems. Many of the circumstances that make women vulnerable are conditioned during the adolescent years, including lack of education or early school dropout; early marriage that is most often unwanted and without consent, and early first birth that is socially expected soon after marriage.

Young adulthood in Ethiopia

“Adolescents” are defined as the age group 10–19; those aged 15–24 are considered to be “youth.” “Young people” encompasses these two categories and includes those aged 10–24. This is a study of young adulthood in Ethiopia, though the terms “adolescents,” “youth,” “young people” and “young adults” are used interchangeably throughout this report.

The disadvantage and vulnerability of women frequently has roots during adolescence, and Ethiopian girls face particular challenges including limited access to schooling, early and unwanted marriage, lack of parental presence, unsafe and exploitive work roles, and coercive sexual relations. Ethiopian boys face other risks and vulnerabilities. Boys and men are socially expected to dominant, and their role in the family is one of provider and protector. With many Ethiopians being economically challenged, lack of livelihoods opportunities may challenge the male role, perhaps promoting violence.

Studies have highlighted that sexual initiation and childbearing begin early in Ethiopia, with young people often having little knowledge and limited access to reproductive health services. High rates of early marriage take place in regions such as Amhara and Tigray, including marriage during girls’ early adolescence, by their fifteenth birthday. These early marriages include early sexual initiation and early first birth. Further, in some regions, marriage by abduction is practiced, where an unmarried girl is forcefully taken, often followed by rape by her future husband or gang rape by her husband and friends.

---

1 GDI is a composite index measuring average achievement in three basic dimensions: health, education, and standard of living, adjusted to account for inequalities between men and women.


3 Central Statistical Agency (CSA) and ORC Macro. 2006. Ethiopia Demographic and Health Survey 2005, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and Calverton MD.
Educational data from Ethiopia reflect recent gains in the expansion of schooling, particularly for urban populations and at the primary level. Urban–rural differentials in educational participation and attainment are considerable. Attainment of secondary education is significantly more common among urban young people, compared to rural youth.

Yet most programs for Ethiopian adolescents remain largely undifferentiated, generic, and gender-blind. Further, few engage in targeted strategies to identify and support the most vulnerable young people in the population, including rural youth, migrant populations, and married adolescent girls.

**Reproductive health**

In 2005, the estimated contraceptive prevalence rate was 14.7 (47 percent in urban areas versus 11 percent in rural areas). The country has one of the lowest rates of attended births in the world. The maternal mortality ratio is seven deaths per 1,000 live births (i.e., 673 per 100,000 live births), one of the highest in the region. Female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) is very common in Ethiopia. Estimates from 2005 suggest that 74 percent of Ethiopian women have undergone some form of FGM/C. In the Somali region, 84 percent of women have undergone FGM/C, mainly infibulation.

**The HIV epidemic in Ethiopia**

In sub-Saharan Africa, girls and women are disproportionately affected by the HIV epidemic; 59 percent of all infections on the continent are among females. It is estimated that 2.1 percent of the large population of Ethiopia is HIV positive, with the epidemic concentrated among women and in urban areas. The HIV prevalence in urban areas of Ethiopia is an estimated 7.7 percent, with 9.3 percent prevalence among women and 6.2 prevalence among men—a female to male ratio of 1.5 to 1. Moreover, the younger the age group, the greater the gender imbalance in rates of HIV infection, with far greater rates among young women compared to young men. Formerly married women have among the highest rates of infection, with 8.1 percent of divorced/separated women and 5.6 percent of widows living with HIV.

1.2 **OBJECTIVES OF THE SURVEY**

This research contributes to up-to-date and nuanced understanding of HIV behavior, gender issues, and reproductive health among young people in seven regions of Ethiopia. Specific objectives are:

- To document knowledge, attitudes, and practices of adolescents and youth with respect to sexual and reproductive health (SRH), including HIV and gender-based violence (GBV);
- To determine access to and utilization of services related to SRH, HIV prevention and GBV; and
- To measure knowledge, attitudes, and experiences related to violence against women, such as domestic violence, coercion and rape, and FGM/C.

The information will serve as the baseline survey for four new initiatives in Ethiopia related to adolescent health and development, gender-based violence, women's empowerment, and female genital cutting/mutilation. Ultimately, the baseline estimates will be used to measure changes associated with the projects.

1.3 **SAMPLE DESIGN**

The Ethiopia Young Adult Survey in Seven Regions was designed as a baseline survey for four intervention projects in Ethiopia. The survey took place in the seven regions in which the interventions were intended to be implemented: Tigray; Afar; Amhara; Oromiya; Beneshangul Gumuz; Southern Nations, Nationalities, and People’s Region (SNNPR); and Addis Ababa. Somali and Gambela Regions were not included in the study as interventions were not planned for these locations.
The sample was designed to be representative of the intervention and comparison districts/woredas identified for the four initiatives on adolescent health and development, gender-based violence, women’s empowerment, and female genital cutting/mutilation. For the youth survey, a sample of 12,600 individuals were drawn, including 10,080 adolescent boys and girls aged 12–24 and 2,520 male and female parents of adolescents. Equal numbers of male and female adolescents were selected, with 1,440 adolescents and 360 parents selected in each region.

The sample for the study was stratified and clustered. Within the study regions, districts/woredas were listed as to whether they had been identified for the planned interventions or could serve as a comparison area. The ratio of intervention-to-comparison respondents was 2 to 1. In each region, between three to six districts/woredas were selected, with a ratio of roughly two intervention districts selected for every one comparison district. The number of districts selected in a particular region was determined by the populations of the districts. For example, if districts had small populations, additional districts were selected to compensate. In all, 31 districts/woredas were selected for the study. Within selected districts/woredas, 252 enumeration areas (EAs) were selected, or 36 EAs per region (see Appendix Table A1).

Comparison districts were selected to be similar to the intervention districts in terms of population size, density, and socioeconomic activities. They were not contiguous with the intervention districts in order to control for potential contamination of the interventions.

1.4 QUESTIONNAIRES

Four separate questionnaires were designed for the study: a household listing, a questionnaire for young people aged 15–24, an abbreviated questionnaire for adolescents aged 12–14, and an instrument for parents. The questionnaires were drafted by Population Council staff drawing on previous questionnaires from the Population Council, the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS), the Ethiopia Welfare Monitoring Surveys, and various instruments from the World Health Organization (WHO). For example, questions on domestic violence were taken from the specialized DHS module, as well as numerous questions on family planning and HIV. Household assets were largely adapted from the Ethiopia Welfare Monitoring Surveys and DHS. Questions on alcohol were adapted from instruments of the WHO. All questionnaires were reviewed during a series of consultation meetings by the Population Council–Ethiopia study team, as well as technical staff from UNFPA and UNICEF. Questionnaires were finalized in English and translated into three local languages: Amharic, Oromiffa, and Tigrigna. Back-translation was undertaken to ensure accuracy.

A household listing questionnaire was designed for the initial household census, to facilitate identification and selection of study respondents. The household listing format collected information on all household members in selected EAs. Information was collected on household members’ age, sex, marital status, and relationship to the household head. Members were also listed as to whether they are parents of young people aged 12–24.

The adolescent questionnaire contained 16 sections:
1) Background characteristics of respondents;
2) Education and schooling experience;
3) Attitudes and self-esteem;
4) Migration;
5) Families;
6) Livelihoods;
7) Female genital mutilation/cutting;
8) Puberty;
9) Marriage;
10) Sexual experience;
11) HIV and STI knowledge, services, and prevention;
12) Family planning;
13) Maternal health;
14) Drugs and alcohol;
15) Violence; and
16) Service access and utilization.
In addition, the questionnaire had a cover page that collected identifier information as well as an informed consent page. For ethical reasons, younger adolescents aged 12–14 received a shorter questionnaire that omitted sensitive or upsetting questions such as those on marriage or violence. The parents’ questionnaire was also abbreviated and included additional attitudinal and behavioral questions related to young people.

### 1.5 DATA COLLECTION

**Pretesting**

All questionnaires were pretested through four rounds, examining length, respondents’ and interviewers’ experience and perceptions of the questionnaire, understanding of the questions, and accuracy of skip patterns. Pretests were made among both rural and urban respondents outside of the study area, representing a range of ages. Revisions to the questionnaires were made at each round of pretest. In addition, questionnaires translated into local languages were pretested in those languages and additional revisions made after the pretests.

**Training**

In each region, a minimum of 36 interviewers, 6 supervisors, and 3 coordinators were recruited. Recruitment was undertaken with assistance of the Regional Bureaus of Statistics who conduct the EDHS and many other large surveys. Interviewers had a minimum of 10 years of education, were able to speak local languages, were familiar with the area, and had experience in previous surveys, especially the EDHS. In all, over 200 interviewers took part in the survey (See Appendix B).

Training was conducted in each region by Population Council staff. Interviewers were trained for seven days: one day on the household listing format and six days on the questionnaire. The questionnaires were reviewed item by item. Training included multiple practice interviews in pairs and in the larger group. Toward the end of the training, trainers organized a field visit where interviewers practiced the interview on young people recruited from local youth-serving organizations outside of the study areas. Interviewers subsequently discussed the experience of the interview and clarified any remaining queries they had on the instruments.

**Household listing & selection**

All EAs selected for the study first underwent a census of all households, or “household listing,” in order to establish a sampling frame for the locations. Interviewers went house-to-house to enumerate members of the households in the sampled EAs. Guides from the local community were recruited to guide interviewers, ensure all households were covered, and facilitate compliance by households. Supervisors performed random checks to ensure accuracy and coverage of data. Once households were listed, selection of respondents were made using a random number function available in SPSS. In each EA, 20 boys aged 12–24, 20 girls aged 12–24, 20 women aged 25–49, 10 parents, and 10 husbands were selected at random. Only one respondent was selected in each household.

**Fieldwork**

Each data collection team included six interviewers and one supervisor. Regional coordinators worked across teams to facilitate sensitization of local leadership, field logistics, and data quality. At least one Population Council staff member oversaw the data collection in the regions.

Male interviewers interviewed male respondents selected for the survey; females interviewed females. Interviewers visited the selected household to locate and interview the selected respondent. Interviewers were trained to conduct the interview in a private place, out of earshot of other household or community members. If the respondent was not at home, an appointment was made for a follow-up visit. Interviewers paid up to three visits to the household to locate and interview the selected respondent. In cases where he/she refused or could not be located, no replacement of the respondent was made. Prior to the interview, informed consent was obtained from respondents. Where the respondent was below the age of 18, informed consent was also obtained from a parent or guardian.
**Data processing**

Data were entered at Population Council offices by 13 data entry clerks. Data were entered in an Epi-Info data entry screen that included embedded checks and skips to increase quality of entry. Two data managers checked and merged data being entered. Ultimately, these managers cleaned the data by referring to hard copies of the questionnaires to clarify and correct any inconsistencies or inaccuracies in the dataset. The questionnaires were labeled and stored by region and serial number. All data is stored under lock and key at Population Council offices.

Data were weighted in order to adjust for unequal probabilities of selection. Weights were calculated for each stage of sample selection, including selection of woredas, enumeration areas, and respondents within the household.

### 1.6 SPECIAL STUDIES

**Interviews with parents**

Selected parents of adolescents were interviewed, including both mothers and fathers of adolescents. Parents were sampled from households where adolescent respondents were not sampled, in order to limit study respondents to one per household. Parents were interviewed using a similar instrument to that used for young people. Out of 2,520 parents sampled, 2,361 were interviewed, amounting to a 94 percent response rate. In all, 947 fathers and 1,414 mothers were interviewed.

**Studies of special populations**

Smaller scale studies were undertaken to explore areas of particular interest. A study of special youth populations was undertaken, to understand adolescents in particular circumstances, who may not otherwise be sampled in a population and household-based study. Special populations included youth living in the street, commercial sex workers, pastoral youth, and university students. These populations were sampled using purposeful samples: recruiting young people in these categories from places where they congregate. The same questionnaire used for the general population of youth was administered to these special populations. This allows us to compare the background and situation of special categories of youth with the general population of young people. Disabled youth were sampled through the main survey.

**Situation analysis of youth centers**

The study team sought to understand the performance and utilization of youth centers, based on data from users and youth center staff. Four youth centers were selected in six of the seven study regions. No youth centers were selected in Beneshangul Gumuz as the study team was unable to identify any centers in that region. Centers were selected to represent the range of centers from both the government and nongovernmental organizational (NGO) sectors. Study teams composed of a supervisor and three interviewers visited each youth center for five days. All youth centers were inventoried and staff were interviewed, as well as selected youth center clients. During the five days at each center, all clients visiting the center were registered, with basic demographic details taken to build a profile of youth center visitors. In all, 6,738 visitors to the youth centers were registered in the 24 centers. From the register, clients were selected at random for exit interview. In all, 1,704 youth center clients were interviewed on exit.

**In-depth interviews with selected youth**

In-depth interviews were conducted among 56 youth in the seven study regions. An in-depth discussion guide was developed to reflect the same themes explored in the survey, allowing the research team to collect more detailed information and experiences within the study areas. In each region, one supervisor coordinated a team of two male and two female interviewers. In-depth interview respondents were chosen by convenience and all interviews were tape recorded. Recorded interviews were translated into English and transcribed by two transcribers at Population Council offices.
Response rates are a measure of data quality, with higher response rates reflecting higher quality and more representative data. Table 1.1 shows the individual response rates for the youth survey, by sex of the respondent. The total number of adolescents sampled was 10,080, with 9,728 of those selected eligible for the survey. Nearly 3 percent of sampled respondents were no longer eligible for the survey as they had moved between the time of household listing and survey, reflecting the relatively high mobility of this age group. Among those eligible for the survey, 97 percent of sampled males and 98 percent of sampled females were interviewed. Response rates were lower in Addis Ababa (94 percent, not shown) compared to the other regions in the study.

### Table 1.1 Response rates of adolescent survey, by sex of respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys aged 12–24</th>
<th>Girls aged 12–24</th>
<th>All young people aged 12–24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals sampled</td>
<td>5,040 100%</td>
<td>5,040 100%</td>
<td>10,080 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible for survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved away/away for extended period</td>
<td>152 3.0%</td>
<td>124 2.5%</td>
<td>276 2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure not found/out of age range</td>
<td>46 0.9%</td>
<td>30 0.6%</td>
<td>76 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ineligible for survey</td>
<td>198 3.9%</td>
<td>154 3.1%</td>
<td>352 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of eligible individuals sampled</td>
<td>4,842</td>
<td>4,886</td>
<td>9,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9 0.2%</td>
<td>7 0.1%</td>
<td>16 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at home/unable to locate after three visits</td>
<td>42 0.9%</td>
<td>32 0.7%</td>
<td>74 0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incapacitated</td>
<td>12 0.2%</td>
<td>8 0.2%</td>
<td>20 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>83 1.7%</td>
<td>39 0.8%</td>
<td>122 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonresponse</td>
<td>146 3.0%</td>
<td>86 1.8%</td>
<td>232 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible individuals interviewed /response rate</td>
<td>4,696 97.0%</td>
<td>4,800 98.2%</td>
<td>9,496 97.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 shows the background characteristics of the sample of young people aged 12–24. Weighted percentages are presented in the table, along with unweighted Ns. Ninety-one percent of boys aged 12–24 in the sample had never been married compared to 66 percent of girls. A larger proportion of boys were in school at the time of survey (55 percent), compared to girls (47 percent). Twenty-one percent of boys and 27 percent of girls had no education and most young people (60 percent of boys and 54 percent of girls) had attained only primary education. Two thirds of respondents were Orthodox Christian, 18 percent were Muslim and 15 percent were Protestant.
TABLE 1.2 Percent distribution of the sample, by sex of respondent and selected background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Weighted percent</th>
<th>Weighted percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of males</td>
<td>Number of females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>2731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>2168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>2610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>7263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/cohabiting</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>1808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated/widowed</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>3611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>5885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>4852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>4643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>2431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>5336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox Christian</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>5101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER TWO: HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

2.1 HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

Table 2.1 shows the household size and headship among young people in Ethiopia. Overall, nearly 10 percent of young people aged 12–24 are heads of their households, with 13 percent of males and 7 percent of females being household heads. Among respondents below the age of 18, girls are slightly more likely to be heading households than boys (1.8 percent of girls; 1.6 percent of boys). Urban households are more likely to have an adolescent head (3 percent) than rural households (1 percent).

The average household size is over 5 members, which is comparable to the EDHS (2005). Young females tend to live in smaller households (mean 5.1 members) compared to young males (mean 5.5 members). Similar to findings from the EDHS, rural households are larger (mean 5.6 members) than urban households (mean 4.9 members).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sex of respondent</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n=4,682)</td>
<td>Female (n=4,783)</td>
<td>Urban (n=3,597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent is household head (all)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage respondent (&lt;18 yrs) is household head</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of usual household members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9+</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean household size</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 HOUSEHOLD POSSESSIONS & AMENITIES

Household facilities and possessions reflect the general status and well-being of members of the household, as well as potential health threats from unsafe facilities. Respondents were asked about sources of their household’s drinking water, type of toilet, and other basic possessions in the household.

Most urban households had improved water sources including water piped into the compound (50 percent) and water from a public tap (32 percent). Most rural households had nonimproved sources such as rivers, lakes, or ponds (33 percent), or unprotected wells and springs (30 percent). Twenty percent of rural households have
access to piped water or water from a tap. While only 63 percent of respondents considered their drinking water unsafe, 90 percent did nothing to treat the drinking water.

Time to the source of drinking water varied between urban and rural areas. Most urban households (83 percent) took less than 10 minutes to and from the source of their drinking water and 6 percent travelled 30 minutes or more to and from the source. By contrast, 29 percent of rural respondents spent less than 10 minutes fetching water and 43 percent spent 30 minutes or longer. Among young people, 91 percent of female respondents and 56 percent of male respondents reported that they take part in fetching water (not shown).

### TABLE 2.2 Household drinking water: Percentage of households by source of water, time to source, perceived safety, and access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Urban (n=3,599)</th>
<th>Rural (n=5,878)</th>
<th>Total (n=9,477)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved source</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tap</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped in compound</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well/spring</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piped in dwelling</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased bottled water</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonimproved source</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River, lake, or pond</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well/spring</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time to obtain drinking water (round trip)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 minutes</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–29 minutes</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes or longer</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water treated prior to drinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not treated</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiled</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtered</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WaterGuard/Pur™</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more methods*</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water considered “safe”/will not cause sickness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household’s access to safe water increased, decreased, or unchanged in last year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained the same</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/new member of household</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates two or more methods including boiling, filtering, or use of WaterGuard/Pur.
Table 2.3 shows the toilet facilities and possessions of respondents’ households. Eighty-nine percent of urban households had improved toilets whereas less than 48 percent of rural households had them. The most common type of toilet was a pit latrine (61 percent), followed by fields or forests (36 percent).

Compared to rural areas, urban households have significantly higher levels of ownership of personal effects. Seventy-seven percent of urban households own a radio compared to 34 percent of rural households; 51 percent of urban households possess a television, compared to 1 percent of rural households; 52 percent of urban households own a mobile phone compared to 4 percent of rural households.

In contrast, rural households are more likely to possess agricultural land or animals. Ninety percent of rural households possess agricultural land compared to 15 percent of urban households; 88 percent of rural households have farm animals compared to 16 percent of urban households.

**TABLE 2.3  Household sanitation facilities and possessions: Percentage of households by type of toilet/latrine and possessing various household effects and assets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Urban (n=3,611)</th>
<th>Rural (n=5,885)</th>
<th>Total (n=9,496)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of toilet/latrine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine, private</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pit latrine, shared</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush toilet, private</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flush toilet, shared</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonimproved source</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container (from household items)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field or forest</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household amenities and effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmobile/fixed phone</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household has electricity</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of agricultural land</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership of farm animals**</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes workplace such as office, school, and neighbor’s toilet. **Cattle, horse, mule, donkey, oxen.

Respondents were read a list of items and asked if they personally own or possess them (Table 2.4). Possessions included basic items such as shoes, a blanket, and a change of clothing, as well as status items such as a mobile phone. Personal ownership of all items was higher in urban areas compared to rural areas. Roughly 1 in 5 rural young people do not have shoes; one third of boys and half of girls do not have blanket. Boys were more likely to own radios or mobile phones compared to girls. Twenty-one percent of urban boys and 12 percent of rural boys owned their own radio, compared to 14 percent of urban girls and 6 percent of rural girls. Ownership of mobile phones was greater in urban areas (24 percent of boys and 18 percent of girls). Few rural young people owned mobile phones (2 percent of boys and <1 percent of girls) perhaps related to limited coverage of services in rural areas.
TABLE 2.4 Individual ownership of items, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Item</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (n=1,795)</td>
<td>Rural (n=2,901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanket</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of clothing (3 or more outfits)</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 PARENTAL PRESENCE & ORPHANHOOD

Overall, 27 percent of young people have lost at least one parent and 5 percent are double orphans. Among underage adolescents aged 12–17, 20 percent have lost at least one parent and 3 percent are double orphans. As expected, the percentage of young people who are orphans increases with age.

TABLE 2.5 Orphanhood status: Percent distribution of young people aged 12–24, by sex of respondent, survival status of parents, and background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,677)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,782)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both parents alive</td>
<td>Only mother alive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 12–24</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total age &lt;18</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Urban areas were home to more orphans than rural areas. Thirty percent of urban young people had lost at least one parent compared to 25 percent of rural young people. Six percent of urban young people are double orphans. Among double orphans, 25 percent of males and 16 percent of females were heads of their households. Overall, young people’s fathers were more likely to be dead than mothers.

When asked whether their parents had died of AIDS, 6 percent of young people with deceased parents reported at least one parental death due to AIDS. Thirty-two percent of respondents did not know whether or not AIDS caused the death of their parent(s) (data on cause of death not shown).

### TABLE 2.6 Parental presence: Percent distribution of young people aged 12–24, by living arrangements with parents, by background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,641)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Females (n=4,758)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live with both parents</td>
<td>Live with mother only</td>
<td>Live with father only</td>
<td>Not living with either parent</td>
<td>Live with both parents</td>
<td>Live with mother only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 12–24</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total age &lt;18</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.6 shows the percentage of young people living with parent(s). Among young people aged 12–24, only 52 percent of boys and 38 percent of girls live with both parents; 25 percent of boys and 46 percent of girls live with neither parent. Among those under age 18, 14 percent of boys and 24 percent of girls live with neither parent. That girls are living away from parents at a young age is partly explained by many young girls being married at an early age. However, even among the never married, girls are more likely to live with neither parent than boys (27 percent of never married girls; 21 percent of never married boys). Where young people are living with a single parent, they are more likely to be living with their mother than their father.

2.4 MIGRATION

Considerably more females than males had migrated to the area. Twenty-nine percent of girls and 19 percent of boys had migrated to their current place of residence. More urban young people were migrants than rural young people; 38 percent of urban boys and 49 percent of urban girls had migrated compared to 8 percent of rural boys and 15 percent of rural girls. Reasons for migration differed by sex and urban–rural residence. Boys in urban areas mainly migrated for schooling (43 percent), work (35 percent), or simply to accompany other family members who were moving (25 percent). Girls in urban areas has migrated for schooling (35 percent), work (27 percent) to accompany family (19 percent) or to join a spouse (12 percent). Few young people in rural areas migrated there for schooling. A significant proportion of rural girls migrated to join a partner or after marriage (60 percent). Roughly 12 percent of rural young people migrated to their place of residence because of famine.

I don’t know anything about my father because he left after I was born, but my mother died in 2008. I was there for her when she was sick for two years before she died.

Female, age 18, Amhara

I cried, because I didn’t want to leave my mother. She was weak and fragile. But she told me she wasn’t able to care for us. She said, ‘If you go with him [uncle] he will look after you…. As I now think over everything, I realize that he was using us as free labor.

Male, age 24, Addis Ababa

A friend of mine told me that big cities have better work opportunities, and life is also better.

Female, age 22, Oromiya
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,688)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,794)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul-Gumuz</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of place of origin*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason(s) for migrating**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For schooling</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For work</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompanying family</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal problems at home</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of parents/guardians</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To live with spouse/partner</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famine/poverty in other area</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Among migrants. ** Percentages may sum to over 100, as more than one response was possible.
3.1 BIRTH REGISTRATION

Six percent of respondents were registered at birth. A greater percentage of urban young people have been registered (17 percent of boys; 14 percent of girls), compared to rural young people (1 percent). Young people in Addis Ababa, especially young males, were more likely to have registered births (35 percent of Addis Ababa boys; 25 percent of Addis Ababa girls).

3.2 SOCIAL NETWORKS, SUPPORT & REGULATION

Having friends and the number of friends can reflect the extent of social engagement and participation by young people (Table 3.2). On average, boys reported having 2.5 friends while girls reported an average of 1.9 friends (not shown). In contrast, having no friends could reflect social isolation and limited participation. Among young people aged 12–24, 9 percent of boys and 21 percent of girls reported having no friends. Respondents who were out of school and married were more likely to report having no friends. Girls, in particular, were less likely to report having friends, especially urban girls (26 percent reported no friends), married girls (28 percent), and out-of-school girls (28 percent).

### TABLE 3.1 Birth registration: Percentage of young people whose births are registered with civil authorities, by sex and background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,682)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,793)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3.2 Friendship networks: Percent distribution of young people reporting friends, by sex and background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,685)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,792)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has no friends</td>
<td>Has 1 to 5 friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>90.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>88.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth 12–24</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total age &lt;18</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>87.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 shows the extent of social support and regulation reported by male and female young people, by urban–rural residence. Compared to their urban counterparts, young people in rural areas tend to have more social support, as reflected in having a person from whom to borrow money, having an alternative place to stay, and having support in case of a medical problem. In particular, urban girls reported lower levels of social support on all dimensions.
TABLE 3.3 Social support and regulation: Percentage of young people who report support mechanisms and regulation, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,684)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females (n=4,797)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has someone from whom to borrow money</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a place to stay if encounters a problem</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has help in case of a medical emergency</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs permission before leaving the house</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>82.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs permission before going to a youth group</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/spouse know respondent’s whereabouts at all times</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher levels of regulation were reported among rural respondents, in particular by rural girls. Over 90 percent of rural girls reported needing permission before leaving the house or going to a youth club; 95 percent reported that their parents/spouse know their whereabouts at all times. Urban males reported the lowest levels of regulation.

Table 3.4 shows participation and exposure to institutions and programs in the year prior to survey. Religious institutions were visited by the majority of young people in both urban and rural areas. Youth centers, peer educators, and youth clubs were more common in urban areas than in rural areas. Participation in programs such as youth centers and community conversations were more common among urban boys (15 percent visited youth centers and 14 percent attended community conversations) compared to urban girls (7 percent visited youth centers and 9 percent attended community conversations). Health extension workers have reached a significant percentage of rural youth (16 percent of boys and 19 percent of girls).

TABLE 3.4 Exposure to youth programs, community conversations, health extension workers, and religious institutions in the last year, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution/individual</th>
<th>Males (n=4,653)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females (n=4,750)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church or Mosque</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health extension workers</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Community conversation”</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth center</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer educator</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth club</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 PARENT–CHILD RELATIONSHIPS

Parent–child communication

Roughly one third of young people report that their parents have talked to them about HIV and AIDS (Table 3.5). A greater percentage of urban parents have discussed the topic than rural parents. At the same time, only 1 in 5 young people report that their parents have discussed sex with them, suggesting that the discussion on HIV and AIDS may not have been detailed or specific. One third of girls and 24 percent of boys report that their parents have discussed marriage with them. When asked whether they have discussed HIV, marriage, or sex with their children, a greater proportion of parents report having discussed the topic, compared to young people. For example, 18 percent of boys and 21 percent of girls report having discussed sex with their parents, whereas 28 percent of fathers and 29 percent of mothers report having had the discussion.
Over 70 percent of boys believe their parents value schooling compared to only 63 percent of girls. Among rural girls, only 55 percent report that their parents value education, compared to 63 percent of rural boys, which may reflect differential opinions of parents related to girls’ education versus boys’. Few young people believe their parents respect their opinion on marriage. In particular, only a minority of rural young people believe their parents respect their opinions on marriage (29 percent of rural boys and 25 percent of rural girls). The vast majority of both parents and young people wish they could discuss issues more freely.

### TABLE 3.5 Parent–child communication: Percentage of young people and parents reporting discussion with parents/children and perception of parents, by topic, sex, and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussed topic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,224)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,354)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV and AIDS</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of parents</th>
<th>Males (n=4,224)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,354)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe parents value education</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe parents respect opinions on marriage</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to communicate more freely with parents</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussed topic</th>
<th>Fathers (n=947)</th>
<th>Mothers (n=1,414)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV and AIDS</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would like to communicate more freely with children</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Among respondents with parents.
**Parental violence**

Over 50 percent of adolescents report that their fathers drink and over 40 percent report that their mothers drink (Table 3.6). Compared to rural young people, more urban adolescents report that their parents abstain from drinking. About 4 percent of boys and 9 percent of girls report that their fathers drink frequently; fewer adolescents report that their mothers are frequent drinkers. Boys are more likely to be beaten with 50 percent of boys reporting that their fathers beat them compared to 37 percent of girls. One quarter of young people (24 percent) report that their fathers occasionally or frequently beat their mothers.

**TABLE 3.6 Parent–child relationships: Parental drinking and violence, by sex and type of place of residence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,381)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,451)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental alcohol consumption</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father drinks Occasionally</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother drinks Occasionally</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father beats you Never</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother beats you Never</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father beats mother Never</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Among respondents with parents.*
CHAPTER FOUR: PUBERTY

4.1 MENARCHE & MENSTRUATION

Seventy percent of girls in the sample had started menstruating, with mean age at menarche being 14.5 years. Rural girls experienced first menstruation slightly later than urban girls (mean age 14.8 years among rural girls; 14.3 years among urban girls—data not shown).

Among girls who had started menstruating, only 62 percent of girls knew about menstruation before it happened to them (70 percent of urban girls and 55 percent of rural girls). Younger age groups were more informed about menstruation than older age groups, suggesting improvements in communication to girls about menstruation. The most common sources of information on menstruation were teachers (42 percent), grandmothers (26 percent), and friends (24 percent). Only 8 percent of mothers gave their daughters information on menstruation beforehand.

Only 51 percent of respondents (62 percent of urban girls and 40 percent of rural girls) told anyone about their first menstruation (not shown).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.1 Menstruation: Percent distribution of girls who knew about menstruation before it happened and source of information, by type of place of residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of information on menstruation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages may sum to over 100, as more than one response possible.

Table 4.2 shows the main methods used by girls to manage their menstruation. Overall, use of rags is the most common among 59 percent of girls. Pads are also common (19 percent), but almost exclusively in urban areas, among 37 percent of urban girls and 2 percent of rural girls. A significant proportion of girls report doing nothing to manage menstruation: simply washing or secluding themselves in the forest, desert, or field; suggesting severe constraints to girls’ activities during menstruation. This was reported by 25 percent of rural girls and 4 percent of urban girls.
### TABLE 4.2 Menstruation: Main method of managing menstruation, by type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method used</th>
<th>Females (n=3,303)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rags</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pads</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing (washing only, go to forest, field, desert, etc.)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional clothes or underwear</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves/plants</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School absenteeism due to menstruation**

Among girls who were in school at the time of survey, 17 percent reported having missed class due to menstruation in the last year, with roughly equal proportions of urban girls missing class compared to rural girls. The most common reasons cited for missing class were pain/discomfort (69 percent), fear of having an “accident” at school (19 percent), embarrassment (15 percent), and having nothing to manage their period (12 percent) (not shown). The likelihood of absenteeism seemed to vary by the ways girls manage their menstruation (Table 4.3). Girls who only put on additional clothing or did nothing/sequestered themselves during menstruation were more likely to miss school than those who used rags or pads. In addition, girls who had been teased in the past about menstruation were more likely to miss school compared to girls who had not been teased. The reported privacy of toilets at school was not associated with increased likelihood of missing school due to menstruation.

**When it [my period] comes, I just don’t want to go to school...Every month, when my period starts, I am absent from school.**

Female, age 18, Amhara

**I have never stayed home [from school because of my period] because I have good pads to manage it.**

Female, age 18, Beneshangul Gumuz

**Interviewer: Did you ever miss class because of menstruation?**

**Respondent: Yes, I was scared that the students may see it and laugh at me.**

Female, age 22, Oromiya
TABLE 4.3 Menstruation: Percentage of female students missing class in the last year due to menstruation, methods of menstruation management, experience of teasing, and privacy of school toilets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage of female students missing school (n=1,959)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of place of residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of managing menstruation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional clothes</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing (washing only, go to forest, field, desert, etc.)</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rags</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pads</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever teased about menstruation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilets at the school are private</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 SPERMARCHE & WET DREAMS

Fifty percent of boys reported having had wet dreams with more urban boys (63 percent) reporting the experience compared to rural boys (42 percent). On average, boys reported they had their first wet dream at 15.6 years (not shown). A minority of boys (42 percent) knew about wet dreams before they experienced them, with more urban boys being aware (48 percent), compared to rural boys (37 percent). Among boys with prior information, the main source of information was their friends (85 percent), followed by teachers (24 percent). Few boys had family members who gave them information about wet dreams.

TABLE 4.4 Wet dreams: Percent distribution of boys who knew about wet dreams before they happened and source of information, by type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=2,318)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ages</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of information on wet dreams*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages may sum to over 100, as more than one response possible.
CHAPTER FIVE: EDUCATION

5.1 EDUCATIONAL PARTICIPATION & ATTAINMENT

Among young people aged 12–24, 80 percent of boys and 73 percent of girls have ever been to school (Table 5.1). Younger adolescents are more likely to have ever been to school, reflecting recent increases in school attendance. Increases in schooling are particularly apparent for girls. Among girls aged 21–24, only 58 percent had ever been to school, compared to 92 percent of girls aged 12–14. The highest level of ever-attendance of school occurs in Addis Ababa (97 percent of boys and 89 percent of girls), followed by SNNPR (95 percent of boys and 89 percent of girls) and Oromiya (83 percent of boys and 76 percent of girls).

TABLE 5.1 Education: Percentage of young people who have ever been to school and reasons for nonattendance, by sex and background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,689)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,794)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul-Gumuz</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason(s) for not attending school*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family does not approve</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family could not afford</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many domestic/farming/herding duties</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got married</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school in vicinity/no school places</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of parents or family members</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest in schooling/formal school</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sickness or disability</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages may sum to more than 100, as more than one reason possible.
Reasons for not attending school differed for boys compared to girls. Among both boys and girls, family disapproval was the main reason for not attending. However, girls reported family disapproval to a far greater extent than boys (38 percent of boys and 50 percent of girls), probably reflecting families’ disproportionately disapproving of girls getting an education. A considerable proportion of both boys and girls mentioned domestic duties as a reason for not attending school (23 percent of boys and 16 percent of girls) and 18 percent of girls mentioned marriage as the reason for not attending. Roughly 12 percent of young people reported no school in their vicinity.

### TABLE 5.2 Education: Percentage currently in school, age at school entry, leaving, and reasons for leaving school, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,689)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,794)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of school</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at entry into school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 years</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–8 years old</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10 years old</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–12 years old</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13+ years old</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age at entry into school</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at school leaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–12 years old</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–14 years old</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17 years old</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18+ years old</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age at school leaving</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason(s) for leaving school*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family could not afford schooling</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many domestic/farming/herding duties</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got married</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed schooling cycle</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest in school</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor performance</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents disapprove of school</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death/sickness of family member</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal sickness or disability</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To work/support oneself</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School too far/no school places</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages may sum to over 100, as more than one reason is possible.
** Other includes migration, not knowing the language of instruction, disagreement with teacher or student, teacher violence, etc.
More boys than girls were in school (55 percent of boys and 47 percent of girls), and urban youth were more likely to be in school than rural youth (Table 5.2). While the official age for school entry in Ethiopia is 7 years, most young people started school after age 7. A significant number of rural youth started school extremely late, after age 10 (43 percent of rural boys and 29 percent of rural girls).

Reasons for leaving school differed by sex and urban–rural residence. The main reason cited by boys was poverty (34 percent), while the main reason cited by girls was marriage (29 percent); in particular, rural girls mentioned marriage as the reason for school leaving (40 percent). Many urban young people cited completion of a schooling cycle (either primary or secondary) as the reason for not being in school (19 percent of boys and 14 percent of girls). Poor performance and lack of interest were also significant reasons for nonattendance, among roughly 15 percent of respondents. Contrary to popular assumption, pregnancy was a negligible reason for girls dropping out (4 percent of females).

**TABLE 5.3 Education: Literacy (among all respondents) and number of years of schooling attained (among those aged 15 and above), by sex and type of place of residence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,689)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,794)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads easily</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reads with difficulty</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot read at all</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–4 years</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–8 years</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9–10 years</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–12 years</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of educational attainment was restricted to those aged 15 and above, in order to provide a better estimate of ultimate educational attainment, after the age of school leaving. Educational attainment is significantly lower among young people in rural areas; 61 percent of rural boys and 71 percent of rural girls have less than 5 years of education, compared to 16 percent of urban boys and 28 percent of urban girls. In contrast, 57 percent of urban boys and 46 percent of urban girls have over 8 years of education, compared to 10 percent of rural boys and 7 percent of rural girls. Only 1 percent of young people attained the university level of education.

*Girls have housework, so boys get better grades... Our parents believe that a girl is born to work.*

*Female, age 20, Tigray*

*We sat on stones at my first school. It was in the 7th grade that I started to sit on chairs.*

*Male, age 21, Tigray*
TABLE 5.4 Educational attainment: Mean years of schooling attained among those aged 15 and above, by sex, type of place of residence, age group and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=3,181)</th>
<th>Females (n=3,558)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul-Gumuz</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational attainment was highest among urban boys in SNNPR (mean 8.8 years education), Addis Ababa (8.3 years), and Tigray (8.2 years) (Table 5.4). Lowest levels of attainment were among rural girls in Afar (<1 year), Amhara (2.3 years), and Beneshangul Gumuz (2.8 years). There were considerable gender differences in levels of educational attainment in Beneshangul Gumuz, with nearly 2 years difference between mean educational attainment of boys (5.0 years) compared to girls (3.1 years).

5.2 EXPERIENCE OF SCHOOLING

Government schools were, by far, the most common type of school that young people attended (89 percent), followed by private schools (5 percent) (Table 5.5). Virtually all schools attended by young people were mixed sex (98 percent). Most students lived with parents while they were schooling. Many urban boys rented a room (12 percent), while considerably fewer urban girls rented (6 percent). More urban girls lived with other relatives (17 percent), than did urban boys (10 percent). On average, young people spent about one hour a day traveling to and from school. Rural youth spent considerably more time in transit, an average of 77 minutes.

TABLE 5.5 Schooling experience: Type of school & living arrangements during most recent school, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=3,385)</th>
<th>Females (n=3,373)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government school</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private school</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/community-run school</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church based/religious school</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental organization school</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living arrangements during schooling*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living at home / with parents</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with other relatives</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renting a room</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarding in a dormitory</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel time to/from school (mean minutes)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current or most recent school.
Gender attitudes toward schooling
Many young people and their parents held inequitable attitudes about the relative abilities of girls and boys in school and the priority given to girls and boys. Nearly half of the respondents agreed with the statement that “Boys are usually better at math than girls,” and over one third of young people agreed with the statement “Girls are usually lazy in school” (Table 5.6). However, parents’ attitudes about education were not more inequitable than young people’s attitudes. On three of the four statements related to education, a greater proportion of parents held equitable attitudes than young people. Parents were only slightly more likely to believe boys should be sent to school before girls when money is scarce.

### TABLE 5.6 Education: Gender attitudes among young adults and parents toward education, by sex (percentage holding inequitable attitudes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Male youth (n=4,669)</th>
<th>Female youth (n=4,786)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree with &quot;Boys are usually better at math than girls.&quot;</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with &quot;Most girls are lazy in school.&quot;</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with &quot;Girls are not as good as boys in school.&quot;</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with &quot;When a family is poor and cannot send all children to school, boys should be sent before girls.&quot;</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers (n=947)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with &quot;Boys are usually better at math than girls.&quot;</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with &quot;Most girls are lazy in school.&quot;</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with &quot;Girls are not as good as boys in school.&quot;</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with &quot;When a family is poor and cannot send all children to school, boys should be sent before girls.&quot;</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discrimination, violence, and harassment
Most students (86 percent) reported that teachers in their current or most recent schools treated boys and girls equally (Table 5.7). Roughly one in ten young people reported that boys are favored by teachers over girls. Boys reported a greater degree of corporal punishment at the hands of teachers than did girls (20 percent of boys and 15 percent of girls). However, girls were more likely to report that they had been harassed by boys/men at school (8 percent) or harassed on the way to school (9 percent), than were boys (4–5 percent).

### TABLE 5.7 Schooling experience: Treatment of teachers and experience of harassment, by sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=3,828)</th>
<th>Females (n=3,370)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers treated boys and girls equally</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most teachers favor boys over girls</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment and corporal punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A teacher of yours hit or beat you in the last year/school year</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students of the opposite sex tease(d) or harass(ed) you at school</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of the opposite sex bother(ed) or harass(ed) you on the way to and from school</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current or most recent school
Family life education
Twenty-seven percent of respondents who had attended school reported receiving life skills/family life education in the course of their school (Table 5.8). Respondents who reported receiving family life education in school were asked about what they learned or topics covered, in an unprompted/spontaneous-response format. The most common topic mentioned was health and hygiene, followed by HIV and AIDS, and family planning. Only a minority of respondents reported that they learned about puberty or marriage in family life education.\(^{10}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5.8 Schooling experience: Percentage of students receiving life skills/family life education and topics covered, by sex and type of place of residence*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received family life education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics covered**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV and AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current or most recent school. ** Among those reporting life skills/family life education; unprompted format.

They [teachers] want to use power… It makes you hate them. They are not acting like teachers. They can even take a whip, and that scares me very much.

* Male, age 19, Addis Ababa

I liked my teachers at times because they encouraged me. I loved the advice they used to give us to make us better people for tomorrow.

* Male, age 23, SNNPR

\(^{10}\) Underreporting of topics may be possible because of the unprompted format of the question.
CHAPTER SIX: LIVELIHOODS

6.1 SKILLS TRAINING

Only 3 percent of boys and 4 percent of girls have received vocational or skills training (Table 6.1). Less than 1 percent of rural adolescents have received vocational or skills training, while 7 percent of urban boys and 9 percent of urban girls have received such training. The most common types of vocational training received by males were auto mechanic (11 percent), woodworking (11 percent), metal work (10 percent), and construction (6 percent). The most common courses taken by females were accounting (8 percent), computer (7 percent), food preparation (7 percent), and textile production (6 percent) (information on types of training not shown).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,666)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,782)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever received vocational or skills training</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of training*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed training</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped out of training</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still in training</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has put skills to use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for not putting skills to use**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not find a job</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No start-up capital</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not know how to start</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No place to locate business</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever received entrepreneurship/business skills training</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever received micro-credit/small business loan</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Among those ever enrolled for training. **Among those who have completed training.

Most respondents had not put their skills to use and the most common reason given was not being able to find a job (67 percent of boys and 76 percent of girls), lack of start-up capital (11 percent of boys and 13 percent of girls), and not knowing how to start (15 percent of boys and 8 percent of girls). This suggests the need for more than just skills training, but additional entrepreneurship training and job placement. Only 1 percent of adolescents have received entrepreneurship training and 2 percent have received a micro-loan.

6.2 PAID WORK

Thirty-eight percent of males and 23 percent of females had ever worked for pay. Rural young people start working at considerably younger ages than urban youth. Among young people who had worked for pay, 54 percent of rural boys and 40 percent of rural girls started work before age 15, compared to 39 percent of urban boys and 27 percent of urban girls.
Types of paid work
Generally, urban young people were engaged in a much wider array of work roles than rural young people. The most common work roles for boys was farming or herding, among 71 percent of rural boys and 46 percent of boys, overall. Among girls, the most common form of paid work was domestic work/cleaner, especially among urban girls (37 percent), and 22 percent of girls, overall. Petty trade and construction absorbed significant proportions of young people. Thirteen percent of boys and 18 percent of girls were engaged in petty trade; 15 percent of boys and 10 percent of girls were engaged in construction/portering/daily labor.

TABLE 6.2 Livelihoods: Percentage of young people who have ever worked for pay, age at first paid work, and type of work, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,652)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females (n=4,762)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever worked for pay</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age first worked for pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–14 years</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19 years</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 20+</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age first worked for pay</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current paid work*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer, shepherd, poultry keeper, etc.</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic worker, cleaner, nanny, etc.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty trade</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, porter, daily laborer</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades (mechanic, carpenter, plumber, mason, electrician, etc.)</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, teacher</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson, office assistant, messenger</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale food or drink production</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitress, waiter, bartender</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver, assistant driver, car wash</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers, basketry, craftsman</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser, barber, dressmaker, tailor</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoeshine</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages may sum to over 100, as more than one form of work is possible.

Hours in paid work
Urban young people devoted considerably more hours to paid work than rural young people (Table 6.3). On average, urban girls working for pay worked 47 hours and urban boys worked 45 hours per week. Rural young people worked an average of 30 hours in paid work in the previous week (not shown). A considerable proportion of urban youth worked very long hours; 28 percent of urban girls and 22 percent of urban boys reported working over 60 hours in the previous week.

Earnings from paid work
On average, working urban boys earned the most (mean 455 Birr), followed by rural boys (mean 287 Birr) and urban girls (mean 250 Birr). Most young people earned only cash payment for their work (88 percent). Few earned payments in kind such as housing, food, or clothing. Eight percent of working females and 6 percent
of working males received food as part of their in-kind payment; 4 percent of males and 1 percent of females received housing (data not shown).

Table 6.4 reveals the mean monthly income reported by various categories of work. Note that only cash earnings are included; in-kind payments such as food, seeds, or housing are not included in the calculation of earnings. The work with the lowest cash payment was domestic work (mean 142 Birr per month) followed by shoeshine (221 Birr per month). The best paid professions were the tradesmen, earning an average of 524 Birr per month, drivers (561 Birr per month) and professionals/teachers (681 Birr per month). Few respondents admitted to being engaged in sex work. However, those that did earned an average of 664 Birr per month.

There are things that are difficult for boys like making enjera. Boys are better at jobs outside, like farming, electrician or working on factories. They are good at jobs that include labor.

As soon as I left home, I started working as a maid. After that, I asked my family to send me abroad to one of the Arab countries and I stayed there for two years [working as a maid], but then I came back to Ethiopia empty handed.
After he [father] died, my mother went out to make a living for the family... but, she couldn’t make it work... I try to send her money once or twice a month. She is always happy when I send her money - sometimes up to 200 Birr.

Male, age 24, Addis Ababa

### TABLE 6.4 Livelihoods: Mean monthly earnings, by type of current work* (n=2,274)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of current work</th>
<th>Mean monthly earnings (Birr**)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic worker, cleaner, nanny, etc.</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoeshine</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer, shepherd, poultry keeper, etc.</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavers, basketry, craftsman</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, porter, daily laborer</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitress, waiter, bartender</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale food or drink production</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty trade</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairdresser, barber, dressmaker, tailor</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesperson, office assistant, messenger</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades (mechanic, carpenter, plumber, mason, electrician, etc.)</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver, assistant driver, car wash</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex worker</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, teacher</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include in-kind payments  **At the time of printing $1=13.5 Birr

### 6.3 SAVINGS

Table 6.5 shows the proportion of respondents who have cash savings in case of emergencies or for future plans. Most savers store their savings at home, in particular, rural respondents (76 percent of rural males and 70 percent of rural females). Saving in a bank or with a traditional savings association, or “ekub,” is more common among urban respondents; 28 percent of urban savers kept their money in the bank, compared to only 6 percent of rural males and 10 percent of rural females.

### TABLE 6.5 Livelihoods: Percentage of respondents with personal cash savings, and method of storage, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,666)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,779)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has personal cash savings</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where savings are kept*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekub</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With friend or relative</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-finance organization</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages may sum to over 100, as more than one storage place is possible.
7.1 ALCOHOL

The majority of young people do not drink alcohol (63 percent of boys and 83 percent of girls) (Table 7.1). A minority of young people drink regularly, at least two or more times a week (8 percent of boys and 2 percent of girls). Use of alcohol seems to increase with age; whereas 31 percent of boys 15–17 drink occasionally or regularly, 46 percent of boys aged 21–24 drink occasionally or regularly. Drinking alcohol is much more common in rural areas than urban areas. Eleven percent of rural boys drink during at least two occasions per week, compared to 4 percent of urban boys. Young people with no education appear to engage in drinking to a greater extent than young people with higher levels of education.

| TABLE 7.1 Alcohol: Percentage of respondents 15–24 who drink alcohol, by frequency, sex, and selected background characteristics |
|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|                   | Males (n=3,193)  | Females (n=3,572) |
|                   | Never        | Monthly or less | 2 to 4 times a month | 2+ times per week | Never        | Monthly or less | 2 to 4 times a month | 2+ times per week |
| Age group         |              |                 |                    |                 |              |                 |                    |                 |
| 15–17             | 69.6        | 10.9            | 14.2               | 5.3             | 86.0        | 8.3             | 4.7               | 1.0             |
| 18–20             | 64.8        | 10.5            | 15.9               | 8.8             | 80.7        | 10.6            | 5.7               | 3.0             |
| 21–24             | 54.3        | 14.4            | 21.0               | 10.3            | 81.5        | 9.6             | 6.0               | 2.9             |
| Place of residence|              |                 |                    |                 |              |                 |                    |                 |
| Urban             | 76.0        | 10.6            | 9.5                | 3.9             | 92.2        | 5.9             | 1.4               | 0.5             |
| Rural             | 54.7        | 12.5            | 21.8               | 11.0            | 75.1        | 12.4            | 8.7               | 3.8             |
| Region            |              |                 |                    |                 |              |                 |                    |                 |
| Tigray            | 34.0        | 27.6            | 31.5               | 6.9             | 39.2        | 31.5            | 27.1              | 2.2             |
| Afar              | 96.8        | 1.4             | 1.8                | 0.0             | 97.2        | 2.7             | 0.0               | 0.1             |
| Amhara            | 24.3        | 18.2            | 37.4               | 20.1            | 73.2        | 11.7            | 9.1               | 6.0             |
| Oromiya           | 87.8        | 5.0             | 4.4                | 2.8             | 92.5        | 6.7             | 0.5               | 0.3             |
| Beneshangul Gumuz | 66.1        | 3.8             | 14.4               | 15.7            | 72.5        | 10.6            | 12.0              | 4.9             |
| SNNPR             | 91.9        | 4.4             | 2.7                | 1.0             | 96.4        | 3.2             | 0.2               | 0.2             |
| Addis Ababa       | 82.6        | 11.9            | 4.3                | 1.2             | 92.5        | 6.7             | 0.6               | 0.2             |
| Education         |              |                 |                    |                 |              |                 |                    |                 |
| No education      | 44.5        | 17.4            | 23.0               | 15.1            | 73.8        | 13.7            | 7.4               | 5.1             |
| Primary           | 60.3        | 10.5            | 19.1               | 10.1            | 82.7        | 8.3             | 7.1               | 1.9             |
| Secondary & higher| 74.2        | 10.3            | 12.2               | 3.3             | 89.8        | 7.1             | 2.6               | 0.5             |
| All               | 63.4        | 11.7            | 16.8               | 8.1             | 82.5        | 9.6             | 5.5               | 2.4             |

Among males, the most common alcohol consumed was tela/boarde (89 percent of consumers), areke (19 percent), beer (13 percent), and tej (8 percent). Consumption patterns were similar for girls: tela/boarde (89 percent), areke (20 percent), tej (4 percent), wine (4 percent), and beer (3 percent) (data not shown).11

11 Percentages may sum to over 100 as more than one type of alcohol may be consumed regularly.
Considering only respondents who consume alcohol, roughly 11 percent of boys and 16 percent of girls consume during 13 or more days in a month (Table 7.2). Rural alcohol consumers drink more frequently than urban consumers. On average rural males consumed 7 drinks in the previous month, and rural females consumed 6 drinks, compared to 5 drinks consumed by urban males and 2 drinks consumed by urban females. Only 4 percent of alcohol drinkers reported that they had been drunk in the previous three months (not shown).

While rural young people seemed to drink more than those in urban areas, the majority of rural consumers spend no money on alcohol (80 percent), compared to 61 percent of urban consumers (not shown). On average, urban male drinkers spent 13 Birr in the last month on alcohol compared to 3 Birr spent by rural males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=989)</th>
<th>Females (n=726)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days drank in the last month*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 days</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 7 days</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–12 days</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 + days</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number of days consumed alcohol (last month)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money spent in the last month on alcohol (Birr)</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Among regular consumers of alcohol.

I drink but never with my own money... People usually buy me drinks and it’s not just one person who buys me drinks... but on the second drink, I’m not myself and by the third or fourth drink, I’m totally drunk.

Female, age 24, SNNPR

Men drink alcohol and, at times, they might spend the night out. Some come late and beat their wives or children. Alcohol hurts everyone.

Male, age 12, Amhara

7.2 CHAT (KHAT)

Twelve percent of boys and 3 percent of girls have ever chewed chat/khat (Table 7.3). As with alcohol, chat use increases with age, with 19 percent of boys aged 21–24 having tried chat, compared to 6 percent of boys aged 15–17. Chat use is more common in Afar and Oromiya than other regions. Thirty percent of Afar boys and 15 percent of Afar girls have tried chat; in Oromiya, 23 percent of boys and 5 percent of girls have tried chat. There do not seem to be significant urban–rural differentials in use of chat, though it is slightly more common in urban areas than rural areas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7.3  Chat: Percentage of respondents aged 15–24 who ever chewed chat, chewed in the last month, and frequency of chat consumption, by sex and selected characteristics</th>
<th>Males (n=3,193)</th>
<th>Females (n=3,572)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever chewed chat (All respondents)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary &amp; higher</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewed chat in the last month (all)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewed chat in the last month (ever users)</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers oneself addicted to chat (all)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers oneself addicted to chat (ever users)</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of days chat is typically chewed in week*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 days</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 days</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–7 days</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where chat is typically chewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At friend’s home</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chat shop</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money spent in the last week on chat (Birr)</td>
<td>16 Birr</td>
<td>11 Birr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Among respondents who have tried chat.
Habitual use of chat seems to be more common among those who have tried it compared to habitual use of alcohol. Among male chat users, 16 percent consume chat six or seven times a week. Overall, 10 of male youth have chewed chat in the last month and 3 percent consider themselves addicted.

Chat is most frequently consumed at one’s home, especially among female chat consumers. In addition, 29 percent of boys and 6 percent of girls reported that they chew chat at work. Ten percent of boys reported chewing in chat shops, while no girl reported that practice. Among young people with living parents, 32 percent of boys and 34 percent of girls report that their parents do not know about their chat use. However, fully 66 percent of chat users report that at least one of their parents is aware of their use (not shown).

Seven percent of male alcohol consumers and 3 percent of females report that they usually chew chat during alcohol consumption. Respondents consuming both alcohol and chat simultaneously are mainly found in urban areas (12 percent of urban males and 5 percent of urban females; compared to 2 percent of rural males and 1 percent of rural females) (not shown).

Like a car doesn’t move without petrol, some people can’t move without chat.
Male, age 19, Addis Ababa

I know that it’s not good, but my mother sells chat. I talked to my father a lot about his chat chewing. He used to start chewing in the morning.
Male, age 18, Afar
8.1 FEMALE GENITAL MUTILATION/CUTTING

Fifty-eight percent of females in the sample are circumcised and 13 percent do not know their circumcision status. Female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C) is more common in the older age groups, compared to younger age groups, suggesting that it is a practice that may be declining; among girls aged 21–24, 66 percent are circumcised compared to 56 percent of girls aged 15–17. Large proportions of girls are circumcised in Afar (90 percent), Oromiya (77 percent), and SNNPR (75 percent). Among girls in Afar, 33 percent report being infibulated, the most severe form of FGM/C. Girls with no education are more likely to be circumcised (66 percent) compared to girls with higher levels of education (52 percent). Likewise, girls with no education are more likely to be infibulated (6 percent) compared to girls with at least 7 years of education (<1 percent).

### TABLE 8.1: Female genital mutilation/cutting: Percentage of females aged 12–24 who are circumcised, by type of circumcision and selected characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percent circumcised (n=4,789)</th>
<th>Among circumcised girls*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitoridectomy</td>
<td>Excision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total number of girls in the sample corresponding to each characteristics category.

### Circumstances of FGM/C

Table 8.2 shows the age at which girls were circumcised, the decisionmaker related to the circumcision, and the location of the circumcision. The table includes data for all girls who are circumcised in the seven regions as well as for Afar girls, specifically, given the high prevalence of the practice in that region. Given the young age at which many girls are circumcised, many respondents did not know the circumstances of their circumcision.

Mothers were the most common decisionmakers related to FGM/C (76 percent), followed by fathers (57 percent). Other female relatives reportedly played a relatively minor part in the decision, with only 5 percent of girls reporting that their grandmother or aunt took part in the decision. Four percent of respondents...
reported they took part in the decision to be circumcised. Most circumcisions were performed by the traditional circumciser (61 percent). However, traditional birth attendants and relatives also performed some procedures (6 percent each). Over half of the circumcised girls said that they were the only recipient of the procedure at the time, whereas 37 percent reported having FGM/C as part of a group of girls.

Afar girls were more likely to be circumcised during infancy, below the age of 1, compared to the general population of Ethiopian girls. Afar girls reported relatively more involvement of their mothers and fathers than girls from other regions; 88 percent of girls reported their mother was involved in the decision and 70 reported their father was involved.

| TABLE 8.2: Female genital mutilation/cutting: Age at FGM/C, decisionmaker, and profile of circumciser |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Characteristic                  | All circumcised girls (n=2,895) | Circumcised girls, Afar (n=628) |
| Age at circumcision             |                                  |                                 |
| Less than 1 year                | 49.6                             | 81.2                             |
| 1–5 years                       | 17.3                             | 7.7                              |
| 6–10 years                      | 24.9                             | 6.1                              |
| Over age 10                     | 8.2                              | 5.0                              |
| Who decided upon circumcision*  |                                  |                                 |
| Mother                          | 76.3                             | 88.2                             |
| Father                          | 57.0                             | 70.1                             |
| Grandmother/aunt                | 5.1                              | 3.1                              |
| Respondent                      | 3.6                              | 0.3                              |
| Other                           | 2.4                              | 0.8                              |
| Don’t know                      | 16.2                             | 8.7                              |
| Profile of circumciser          |                                  |                                 |
| Traditional circumciser         | 60.8                             | 56.9                             |
| Traditional birth attendant     | 5.6                              | 9.9                              |
| Relative                        | 5.5                              | 1.9                              |
| Other                           | 2.5                              | 0.2                              |
| Don’t know                      | 25.6                             | 31.1                             |
| Context of circumcision         |                                  |                                 |
| Alone                           | 55.0                             | 66.3                             |
| In a group                      | 37.3                             | 22.7                             |
| Don’t know                      | 7.7                              | 11.0                             |
| Location of circumcision        |                                  |                                 |
| Home                            | 67.6                             | 61.7                             |
| Another home or home of circumciser | 10.0                         | 8.7                              |
| Other (e.g., bush, health facility) | 3.1                          | 12.3                             |
| Don’t know                      | 19.3                             | 17.3                             |

* Percentages may sum to over 100, as more than one response is possible.
Experience of FGM/C
Five percent of circumcised girls report that they have experienced problems as a result of their circumcision (data not shown). Among girls who are infibulated, 22 percent report problems. Among girls reporting associated problems, the most common were pain during urination (59 percent), pain during healing (41 percent) and difficulty during childbirth (20 percent). Forty-four percent of circumcised girls wish they had not been circumcised with the most common reasons cited being medical complications (53 percent), the procedure being illegal (16 percent), belief that the tradition had lost its significance (11 percent), and because of the associated pain (10 percent).

Attitudes about FGM/C
Among circumcised girls, 42 percent support that they were circumcised while 59 percent oppose that they were circumcised (Table 8.3). Circumcised girls in Afar are more likely to support the practice (57 percent) compared to the general population of circumcised girls.

Among girls supporting the practice, the most common reason cited was custom and tradition (81 percent). Whereas a considerable number of Afar girls mentioned religion (44 percent) as the rationale for the practice, few mentioned marriage prospects (3 percent). Among the general population of circumcised girls, only 14 percent mentioned religion and 19 percent mentioned marriage prospects. Opposition to the practice was mainly based on medical complications (49-50 percent of girls) and the perception that it had lost its significance (44 percent of Afar girls; 38 percent of general population of girls). While relatively few Afar girls mentioned that the practice was illegal (19 percent), 44 percent of the general population of girls mentioned that FGM/C is illegal in citing motivations for opposition.

Table 8.3 shows attitudes related to FGM/C by urban–rural residence and within Afar region, specifically. Only about 1 in 10 urban young people believe their community or religion expects circumcision and that a girl should be circumcised before marriage. About one third of rural young people hold these views, with relatively little difference in opinion between males and females. In Afar, however, 59 percent of boys and 40 percent of girls believe their community expects circumcision and 66 percent of boys and 51 percent of girls believe it is an expectation of their religion.
There is good culture and there is also bad culture and FGM is one of the bad cultures.  

Male, age 18, Beneshangul Gumuz

I once convinced my parents that there is no need to circumcise my little sister, but they told me that they couldn’t handle the pressure from the neighbors... The old people in the neighborhood accused my parents of disrespecting their culture.  

Female, age 19, Addis Ababa
8.2 MALE CIRCUMCISION

Ninety-one percent of boys are circumcised. Over 90 percent of boys are circumcised in all regions except SNNPR, where 70 percent of boys are circumcised. That fewer boys are circumcised in SNNPR could be a reflection of later age at circumcision, rather than not ultimately being circumcised. Mean age at circumcision in SNNPR was 10 years, compared to 1 year in Amhara, 2 years in Addis Ababa, and 3 years in Afar and Oromiya (not shown).

Few respondents were aware of the protective effective of male circumcision in relation to HIV transmission. Only 18 percent of boys and 10 percent of girls knew that a circumcised boy/man has a smaller chance of acquiring HIV infection compared to an uncircumcised boy/man. Twenty-three percent of respondents thought a circumcised man was at greater risk; 22 percent thought the risk was equal between the two groups, and 41 percent did not know (data not shown).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8.6 Male circumcision: Percentage of males who are circumcised, by selected characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All boys</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at circumcision</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational attainment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER NINE: SEXUAL ACTIVITY

Sixteen percent of boys and 36 percent of girls are sexually experienced (Table 9.1). As expected, the percent of young people who have sexual experience increases with age. Few never married young people are sexually experienced. Nine percent of never married males and 5 percent of never married females are sexually experienced. That some ever married respondents do not have sexual experience is probably related to early marriages that were not consummated.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 9.1  Sexual activity: Percentage of respondents who are sexually experienced, by sex and selected characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=4,682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Earlier studies of Ethiopian adolescents suggest that sexual activity may be delayed for some period following the marriage, especially within child marriage. See, for example, Erulkar AS, Melkib T, Simie N, Gulemen T. 2004. “The experience of adolescence in rural Amhara region Ethiopia.” Accra: Population Council.
9.1 CONTEXT OF SEXUAL INITIATION

The vast majority of girls first had sex with their spouse (89 percent), while boys’ first sex was with spouses (43 percent), girlfriends (29 percent), or other friends (23 percent) (Table 9.2). Girls were significantly younger than their first sexual partners (mean 6.9 years), while boys were slightly older (mean 1.5 years). Fifty-six percent of girls were at least 6 years younger than their first sexual partner and 15 percent were more than 10 years younger than their first partner.

### TABLE 9.2 Sexual activity: Context of first sex and profile of first partner, by sex and selected characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile of first partner</th>
<th>Males (n=867)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,789)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend or other student</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age difference with first partner</th>
<th>Males (n=867)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,789)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years younger than partner</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years younger</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years younger</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years older</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years older</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years older</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean age difference with partner | 1.5 years | −6.9 years |

The majority of boys wanted to initiate sex at the time they did (97 percent) (Table 9.3). However, only three quarters of girls (73 percent) wanted their first sex and 22 percent did not want to have sex at the time they did.

Respondents were read a list of circumstances or motivations for sex and asked if the circumstance pertained to their first sexual experience. The most common reason for boys’ first sex was curiosity; 51 percent of boys first had sex because they wanted to know what it felt like. Forty-three percent had sex to show their partner love and 32 percent had sex out of feelings of obligation as a husband or boyfriend. The most common reasons cited by girls were out of obligation as a partner (50 percent) and to show love (34 percent).

Peer pressure was not a significant factor in first sex. Only 13 percent of boys and 7 percent of girls reported pressure from peers. In contrast, many young men suspected their friends were having sex (26 percent) and cited this as a motivating factor for sex; 17 percent of girls thought their female friends were doing it and cited this as a motivation.

A considerable proportion of young women described coercive circumstances surrounding their sexual initiation. Seventeen percent of girls said their partner insisted and would not take “no” for an answer and 14 percent said that physical force, or rape, was used. Eleven percent reported receiving threats and 6 percent were hit or beaten during their first experience of sex. Overall, one third of girls experienced at least one circumstance that is considered coercive during their first sexual experience.
**TABLE 9.3  Sexual activity: Motivation for and “wantedness” of first sex, by sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=867)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,789)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Wantedness” of first sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to have sex</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was undecided</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want to have sex</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation for first sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noncoercive motivations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To show love</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity/wanted to see what sex is like</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obliged as a spouse/partner</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought friends were doing it</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured by friends/peer pressure</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coercive motivations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner insisted/would not take “no” for an answer</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical force/rape</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner threatened</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given money or gifts</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner hit or beat</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At least one coercive condition</strong></td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Motivations may sum to over 100, as more than one circumstance was possible.*

9.2  **SEXUAL FREQUENCY & LIFETIME PARTNERS**

The frequency of sex varied with respondents’ marital status (Table 9.4). Respondents who were currently married had much more frequent sex than unmarried respondents. Unmarried sexually experienced young people had had sex an average of two times among boys, and five times among girls, in the last three months. Married adolescents had an average of over 20 encounters in the previous three months. Unmarried sexually experienced young people were not necessarily sexually active. Sixty-one percent of sexually experienced boys and 76 percent of sexually experienced girls had not had sex in the previous three months. The vast majority of sexually experienced young people had had only one or two lifetime sexual partners.

Young people were read a list of profiles of people and asked if they had ever had sex with such a person. Less than one percent of both boys and girls reported having sex with a teacher or with an employer. Three percent of sexually experienced boys reported that they had had sex with a sex worker. Six percent of sexually experienced boys and 2 percent of girls reported that they had had sex with someone who was married to someone else. At the same time, it is likely that these circumstances were underreported, due to the sensitivity in admitting some of these experiences (not shown).
**TABLE 9.4  Sexual activity: Frequency of sex and number of partners among sexually experienced respondents, by sex and current marital status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males Unmarried (n=526)</th>
<th>Males Married (n=340)</th>
<th>Females Unmarried (n=318)</th>
<th>Females Married (n=1,468)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of sex in the last three months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not have sex</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10 times</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 times</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 times</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 times</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean number of sex acts in last three months</strong></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of lifetime partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean number of lifetime partners</strong></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_They [boys] only want to have sex. I tell my friends that they shouldn’t trust men... I tell them that [gifts from men] don’t mean anything and they can buy these things for themselves if they work hard... Most of them are fooled by what they get.... jewelry and money._

_Female, age 18, SNNPR_

_There is business and there is true love. True love does not include money and has love as a base. ‘Business love’ means doing business with the man or the woman. If the girl into ‘business love,’ then she goes out with the man for money._

_Male, age 22, Amhara_

_Usually boys tended to show domination over girls. For instance, if a boy asks a girl to become his girl friend and she refuses he might force her to be with him or he might hit her._

_Female, age 24, SNNPR_
10.1 ATTITUDES TOWARD MARRIAGE

Respondents were asked what they consider to be the ideal age for boys and girls in their community to marry (Table 10.1). The ideal marriage age for girls was considerably younger than for boys. Overall, girls’ ideal age at marriage was 17.9, while boys was 22.0. Roughly 40 percent of respondents named an ideal marriage age for girls below the legal age of 18. Conversely, only about 5 percent of respondents named an ideal marriage age for boys below the age of 18.

**TABLE 10.1 Marriage: Ideal age for marriage of boys and girls, by sex and type of place of residence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal age for marriage</th>
<th>Males (n=4,682)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,794)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boys’ ideal marriage age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal marriage age for boys (mean)</strong></td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girls’ ideal marriage age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 15</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideal marriage age for girls (mean)</strong></td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.2 PREVALENCE & CONTEXT OF MARRIAGE DURING YOUNG ADULTHOOD

The majority of boys had never been married (91 percent), whereas 66 percent of girls had never been married and 34 percent of girls were ever-married (Table 10.2). Among respondents below the age of 18, less than 1 percent of boys were ever-married compared to 7 percent of girls. Five percent of girls were already divorced. Rural girls were more likely to be married than urban girls; 41 percent of rural girls were ever married compared to 23 percent of urban girls. Girls with no education had the highest rates of marriage. Seventy-two percent of girls with no education had ever been married compared to 22 percent of girls with 9 or more years of education. A considerable number of young women were already divorced or widowed, especially in regions such as Amhara (8 percent) and Afar (8 percent).
Table 10.2: Marriage: Percent distribution of young people’s current marital status, by sex and selected characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males (n=4,628)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Females (n=4,732)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>Div/Sep / Wid</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>Div/Sep / Wid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents &lt;18 yrs</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.3 shows the percentage of respondents who are married during adolescence, before age 15 and 18, among those aged 18 and above. Relatively few boys are married during their adolescence with 2 percent married by age 15 and 9 percent married by age 18. In contrast, nearly half of the girls in the sample (47 percent) were married by their eighteenth birthday and 18 percent were married by their fifteenth birthday. Girls with low levels of education and those residing in rural areas were more likely to be married early. Among girls who had never been to school, 35 percent were married by age 15 and 78 percent were married by age 18. Among rural girls, 26 percent are married by age 15 and 63 percent married by age 18.
TABLE 10.3: Marriage: Percentage of respondents married by age 15 and by age 18, among those aged 18 and above, by sex and selected characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=2,122)</th>
<th>Females (n=2,475)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married by age 15</td>
<td>Married by age 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of place of residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most marriages of young people were arranged (65 percent of boys and 70 percent of girls), with marriages to rural young people more likely to be by arrangement (71 percent of boys and 81 percent of girls). Arranged marriage is very common in regions such as Amhara and Tigray where over 85 percent of marriages are arranged. Partnerships chosen by the bride and groom are most common in Addis Ababa (75 percent of girls) and SNNPR (66 percent of girls). In addition, 13 percent of girls in SNNPR report that their marriage was a result of abduction. Only 2 percent of marriages are polygamous, though 5 percent of boys anticipate marrying another wife in the future (not shown).

Age at marriage was examined among married young people in the sample. Note that the age at marriage is not representative of all young people as analysis includes only those married during their adolescent and young adult years. As such, estimates of age at marriage are lower than the general population and only represent the population of married adolescents, who married relatively earlier than the entire population. Among married adolescents, girls get married at considerably younger ages than boys (mean 18 for boys; 15 for girls). Among married girls in the sample, 34 percent married before the age of 15, compared to 16 percent of boys.
Married adolescent girls are generally younger than their husbands, with a mean spousal age difference between girls and their husbands of 7 years. Fifteen percent of married girls were more than 10 years younger than their spouse. Most married boys were married to girls only slightly younger than them. Eighty percent of married boys had wives who were the same age or 1 to 5 years younger than them.

A considerable proportion of married adolescents did not want to get married at the time they did. Nineteen percent of married boys and 31 percent of married girls did not want to get married when they did; an additional 10 percent of young people were undecided. Rural girls were most likely to experience an unwanted marriage, with 48 percent of rural girls not wanting to get married or being undecided. Five percent of married boys and 10 percent of married girls reported that they were required to leave school at the time of marriage.

### TABLE 10.4: Marriage: Percent distribution of marriages that are arranged, chosen, the result of abduction, by sex and selected characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male (n=412)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female (n=1,702)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arranged</td>
<td>Chosen</td>
<td>Abducted</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox Christian</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10.5: Marriage: Timing and context of marriage among married adolescents, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at marriage*</th>
<th>Males (n=412)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,702)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–14 years</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17 years</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–19 years</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+ years</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean age at marriage (years)</strong></td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age difference with spouse</th>
<th>Males (n=412)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,702)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years younger than partner</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years younger</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 years younger</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same age</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 years older</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years older</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years older</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean age difference with spouse</strong></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consented/agreed to marriage (yes)</th>
<th>Males (n=412)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,702)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Wantedness&quot; of marriage at that time</th>
<th>Males (n=412)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,702)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to get married</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was undecided</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want to get married</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was attending school at time of marriage</th>
<th>Males (n=412)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,702)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was made to leave school at marriage**</th>
<th>Males (n=412)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,702)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimate is not representative of entire population of young people as it only includes those in the sample who are married.

**Among all married youth.

### 10.3 Marital Relationships

**Sexual relationships**

The majority of married adolescents (93 percent), particularly rural youth (98 percent), first had sex with their spouse following the marriage. Only 7 percent of married adolescents had sex with their spouse before the marriage. Urban young people were more likely to have sex with their spouse before marriage: 20 percent of married boys and 19 percent of married girls.

Virtually all married boys wanted to have first sex with their wives and did so willingly. As a significant proportion of girls were married without their desire or consent, many girls experienced unwanted sex with their husbands and forced marital intercourse. Twenty-two percent of married girls did not want their first sex with their husbands and 18 percent reported that their marital sexual initiation was forced. Because some girls married at very early ages, many married girls first had sex with their spouse before menarche: 32 percent.
### Table 10.6 Marriage: Context of marital sexual initiation among married adolescents, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=412)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,702)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing of first sex with spouse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before marriage</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After marriage</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Wantedness” of first marital intercourse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to have sex</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was undecided</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want to have sex</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had first marital intercourse willingly or by force</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingly</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By force</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experienced menarche by first marital intercourse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Husband–wife communication**

There were significant differences in the extent of discussion between urban and rural couples. On all topics mentioned, urban couples were more likely to have discussed the topic compared to rural couples. Less than half of the rural married couples had discussed any of the topics mentioned, including faithfulness, HIV/AIDS, the number of children to have, and domestic duties. Only 28 percent of rural married girls and 36 percent of rural males reported that they had discussed antenatal and postnatal services with their spouses. In contrast, a majority of married young people in urban areas had discussed fidelity and HIV/AIDS.

### Table 10.7 Marriage: Communication and decisionmaking within marriage, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=412)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,702)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed being faithful</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed HIV and AIDS</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed number of children to have</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed sharing domestic duties</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed MCH services</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.1 FAMILY PLANNING KNOWLEDGE & ATTITUDES

Table 11.1 shows the percentage of respondents who have heard of family planning methods, among all respondents, currently married young people, and unmarried sexually active youth. Nearly all respondents knew of at least one family planning method (95 percent), with most young people knowing about injectables, pills, and condoms.

Sexually active unmarried youth appeared to be more aware of a range of methods compared to married youth. For example, 92 percent of sexually active unmarried boys and 63 percent of unmarried girls were aware of condoms, compared to 60 percent of married boys and 41 percent of married girls; 55 percent of unmarried sexually active boys and 50 percent of unmarried girls were aware of implants, compared to 35 percent of married boys and 39 percent of married girls. The greater knowledge of family planning among sexually active unmarried youth could be associated with the fact that these respondents are more likely to reside in urban areas and have higher levels of education than the married youth. In addition, unmarried youth may be more motivated to seek out information on family planning methods, as they presumably have a greater desire to prevent pregnancy than married youth.

TABLE 11.1 Family planning knowledge: Percentage of female and male respondents aged 15–24 knowing family planning methods, by marital status, sexual experience, and method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females (n=3,578)</th>
<th>Males (n=3,195)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All females</td>
<td>Currently married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any method</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any modern method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable/Depo</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pill</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male condom</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadelle/implant</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe days</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCD</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female condom</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasectomy/tubal ligation</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency contraception</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural contraception</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foam/cream/jelly</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents</td>
<td>3578</td>
<td>1454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.2 USE OF FAMILY PLANNING

Forty-six percent of sexually experienced females and 48 percent of sexually experienced males aged 15–24 have ever used family planning. A greater proportion of unmarried sexually active youth have used a method compared to married youth. Method choice differs between the two groups. The most common method among currently married females is injectables (35 percent), followed by pills (13 percent). Unmarried sexually active girls have lower levels of injectable use (21 percent), compared to their married counterparts, and equivalent levels of pill use (15 percent). However, unmarried girls are more likely to use condoms than married girls (19 percent among unmarried versus 4 percent among married) and more likely to use safe days (4 percent among unmarried; <1 percent among married). Likewise, sexually active unmarried males are significantly more likely to have ever used condoms (49 percent) than married males (3 percent).

Thirty-five percent of sexually experienced females and 44 percent of sexually experienced males are currently using a method. Family planning use is significantly higher in urban areas than rural areas (55 percent of urban males; 41 percent of urban females; 17 percent of rural males; 26 percent of rural females) (not shown). Seven percent of married girls and 9 percent of married males reported that their spouse/partner does not know about their family planning use. Among unmarried sexually active youth, 10 percent of females said their family planning use is not known to their partner, compared with 3 percent of males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Females (n=1,786)</th>
<th>Males (n=859)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>Sexually active unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>Sexually active unmarried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever used any method</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently using any method</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method(s) ever used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injectable/Depo</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pill</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male condom</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe days</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCD</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasectomy/tubal ligation</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jadelle/implant</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female condom</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency contraception</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural contraception</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/partner knows about family planning use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among sexually active respondents who were not using family planning, 24 percent of females and 25 percent of males would have liked to use it (not shown). Main reasons for non-use were partner refusal (26 percent of females and 23 percent of males), experience or fear of side effects (23 percent of females and 19 percent of males), religion (10 percent of females and 13 percent of males), not knowing enough about family planning (10 percent of females and males), and the source of methods being too far (7 percent of females and 10 percent of males) (not shown).
11.3 CONDOMS

Among young people who were aware of condoms\textsuperscript{14}, accurate knowledge about condoms was relatively high (Table 11.3). Seventy-nine percent of males and 84 percent of females knew that condoms are effective in preventing HIV; 95 percent of young people knew that they cannot be reused. However, a considerable number of young people held negative attitudes toward condoms. One third of young people felt that moral people do not use condoms, 48 percent of young people felt that condoms should not be used within marriage; roughly half felt that condoms are used by promiscuous people.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Condoms: Percentage of young people with correct information about condoms and accepting attitudes toward condoms, by sex and type of place of residence.}
\begin{tabular}{lccc}
\hline

 & Males (n=2,665) & Females (n=2,303) & \\
 & Urban & Rural & All & Urban & Rural & All & \\
\hline
Correct information & & & & \\
Disagree with "Condoms prevent pregnancy but not HIV" & 94.2 & 88.6 & 92.1 & 89.0 & 83.9 & 86.7 & \\
Disagree with "Condoms can be reused" & 97.7 & 93.1 & 95.3 & 97.5 & 92.8 & 95.5 & \\
Disagree with "Condoms are not effective in preventing HIV" & 83.3 & 75.3 & 79.0 & 84.5 & 83.3 & 84.0 & \\
Attitudes toward condoms & & & & \\
Disagree with "It is a man's responsibility to provide the condom" & 72.1 & 54.3 & 62.6 & 80.5 & 52.3 & 68.1 & \\
Disagree with "Moral people do not use condoms" & 76.5 & 61.4 & 68.5 & 75.4 & 59.2 & 67.9 & \\
Disagree with "Condoms should not be used within marriage" & 65.8 & 40.7 & 51.9 & 59.2 & 43.5 & 51.8 & \\
Disagree with "People who use condoms are promiscuous" & 62.7 & 35.2 & 47.8 & 63.3 & 40.2 & 52.6 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\*Among young people who know about condoms; others removed from analysis.

Three percent of sexually active females and 27 percent of sexually active males used a condom during their last sexual encounter (Table 11.4). Compared to those who were married, considerably more unmarried young people had used a condom (12 percent of unmarried females; 45 percent of unmarried males). Females relied on their partners for the condoms, with 48 percent getting condoms from their partners, followed by 20 percent obtaining condoms from a clinic and 17 percent obtaining from kiosks. Male users obtained condoms primarily from kiosks (45 percent), chemists (32 percent), and street vendors (30 percent).

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Condoms: Percentage of sexually active female and male respondents who used a condom at last sex, partner profile and source of condoms, by sex and marital status.}
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline

 & Females (n=1,786) & & \\
Characteristic & Currently married & Sexually active unmarried & All sexually active & \\
 & & & & \\
 & Males (n=859) & & \\
 & Currently married & Sexually active unmarried & All sexually active & \\
\hline
Used a condom at last sex & 1.0 & 12.1 & 3.1 & 1.7 & 45.4 & 26.8 & \\
Source of condoms* & & & & \\
Kiosk & 9.9 & 22.2 & 16.7 & 65.9 & 44.6 & 45.5 & \\
Chemist & 13.1 & 12.1 & 12.6 & 30.5 & 32.2 & 32.1 & \\
Street vendor & 5.1 & 16.2 & 11.3 & 19.7 & 30.6 & 30.1 & \\
Clinic & 16.5 & 23.5 & 20.4 & 24.6 & 22.9 & 23.0 & \\
Bar / nightclub & 2.6 & 4.1 & 3.4 & 0.0 & 6.0 & 5.8 & \\
Peer educator & 0.0 & 5.8 & 3.2 & 0.0 & 1.2 & 1.1 & \\
Partner & 56.0 & 42.1 & 48.4 & 0.0 & 0.4 & 0.4 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\*Sources may sum to over 100, as more than one source was possible

\textsuperscript{14}A considerable percentage of young people had never heard of condoms or had no exposure to them. These respondents were removed from analysis and only young people with knowledge of condoms were included.
Attitudes about pregnancy and childbirth

All young people were read a series of statements related to attitudes and perceptions of pregnancy and childbirth (Table 11.5). Attitudes varied between young people in urban and rural areas, especially in relation to the location of childbirth. A considerable proportion of young people felt that women should give birth to sufficient numbers of children in case some die in infancy (84 percent of boys and 74 percent of girls). Sixty-one percent of young people felt that death to a woman during childbirth is God’s will, with nothing that could have been done to prevent it. A considerable proportion of young people—especially rural young people—felt that most women prefer to deliver at home and the community expects it.

### TABLE 11.5 Parenthood: Percent distribution of attitudes related to childbirth and maternal mortality among young people, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage agreeing with the statement</th>
<th>Males (n=3,195)</th>
<th>Females (n=3,572)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should have enough children to be taken care of in old age, in case some die</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a woman dies in childbirth, there is nothing that could have been done; it is God’s will</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most women in your community prefer to deliver at home</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your community expects women to deliver at home</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young women were asked whether they had discussed antenatal care and place of delivery with their spouses/partners, and if the spouse or family could help them in pregnancy or in a pregnancy-related emergency (Table 11.6). Few couples have discussed antenatal care or where to deliver, especially rural couples (less than 40 percent of rural girls). Only about half of the respondents said that their spouse helps them with domestic work or childcare during pregnancy. Fifty-eight percent of girls said their family would have enough money to take them to a clinic in case of an emergency during childbirth.

### TABLE 11.6 Parenthood: Percent distribution of spousal discussion and support on matters related to childbirth among young women with partners, by type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage agreeing with the statement</th>
<th>Females (n=1,763)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You and your spouse have discussed medical care during pregnancy</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You and your spouse have discussed where you should deliver</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical services for pregnancy are too far away for you to access them</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your spouse helps you care for children when you are pregnant</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your spouse helps you with work when you are pregnant</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had an emergency during childbirth, your family would have enough money to take you to the clinic</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had an emergency during childbirth, your family would take you to the clinic</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-one percent of young women had given birth to a child and 6 percent of young men had fathered a child (Table 11.7). Rural young people were more likely to be parents, especially rural girls; 39 percent of rural girls have ever given birth, compared to 21 percent of urban girls and 8 percent of rural boys. Very few never-married respondents were parents, whereas 40 percent of ever-married boys and 66 percent of ever-married girls had had children. Young people with no education were more likely to have children; 57 percent of girls with no education had a child compared to 13 percent of girls with 9 or more years of education.
Not all pregnancies were wanted at the time. Whereas 95 percent of fathers wanted the pregnancy at the time, 83 percent of girls wanted their first pregnancies at that time (77 percent of urban girls and 85 percent of rural girls). Twelve percent of girls would have preferred that the pregnancy occur later and 6 percent did not want the pregnancy at all (data not shown).

**TABLE 11.7 Parenthood: Percentage of young people who have ever given birth to or fathered a child, by sex, type of place of residence and background characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=3,190)</th>
<th>Females (n=3,564)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever married</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.8 shows the percentage of young people or their female partners who received at least one antenatal care visit during their first pregnancy, as well as reasons for not receiving care. Only 47 percent of girls reported receiving at least one antenatal care visit and 37 percent of boys reported that their partners received care. That fewer boys reported their partners’ receiving care than girls may be a reflection of boys’ not knowing about the care received by their partners. Considerably more urban girls received antenatal care (76 percent) compared to rural girls (36 percent). Only 57 percent of girls reported they were accompanied to the health service by their partners. However, 77 percent of girls reported that their partners helped to pay for the medical care.

Among those who did not receive antenatal care, the most common reason cited for not getting care was the perception that there was no problem during the pregnancy and that care was not needed (55 percent of boys; 40 percent of girls). After that, perceptions that antenatal care is not practiced in the community were cited by 21 percent of boys and 22 percent of girls. A considerable proportion of young people did not know where to get services or reported that the services are too far (17 percent of boys; 29 percent of girls). It is noteworthy that few respondents reported cost or partner refusal as barriers to antenatal care.
TABLE 11.8 Parenthood: Percentage of young people/female partners who received antenatal care and reasons for not receiving antenatal care, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=177)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received antenatal care/partner received antenatal care (at least one visit)</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male partner accompanied spouse to antenatal care</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male partner helped pay for antenatal care</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for not receiving antenatal care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problem during pregnancy/not needed</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not done in the community</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services too far</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know where to get services</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services too costly</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner refused</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.9 shows the location of the first birth. Consistent with other studies, most births took place in the home, either the marital home, natal home, or the home of another relative. Eighty percent of girls reported that their first birth took place at home, with 92 percent of rural girls and 51 percent of urban girls reporting the first birth at home. Twenty percent of first births took place in a clinic or hospital, with most of these births among urban girls (49 percent of urban girls; 8 percent of rural girls). Most first births were attended by one’s mother, mother-in-law, aunt or sister (48 percent of girls). Twenty-five percent of first births were attended by a traditional birth attendant and 20 percent were attended by a health professional.

TABLE 11.9 Parenthood: Place of first birth and assistance during childbirth, by sex, type of place of residence, and background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=177)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of first birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic/health facility other than hospital</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest/field/desert</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance during delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother/mother-in-law/other relative</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional birth attendant</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor/nurse/health officer</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health extension worker/Community-based reproductive health agent</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One percent of girls report that they have had a pregnancy that ended in miscarriage, stillbirth, or abortion. Less than one percent of girls admit that they had done something to make a pregnancy end. However, 4 percent of girls report that their best friend has induced an abortion (5 percent of urban girls; 2 percent of rural girls), which may suggest some underreporting of induced abortion (data not shown).
12.1 HIV & AIDS KNOWLEDGE

Over 90 percent of both males and females had heard of AIDS (91 percent of males and 92 percent of females) (Table 12.1). Awareness levels increased with age; among young people over the age of 20, 98 percent of boys and 95 percent of girls had heard of AIDS. Knowledge levels were highest in Addis Ababa (99 percent), SNNPR (94 percent) and Tigray (93 percent). Lowest levels of awareness of HIV/AIDS were in Afar (84 percent). Awareness levels were lower among young people with no education (80 percent), compared to those with higher levels of education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Characteristics</th>
<th>Males (n=4,661)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,763)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Married</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated/widowed</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary 5</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of respondents knew that HIV can be transmitted through sexual intercourse (95 percent of males and 92 percent of females). After intercourse, the modes of transmission mentioned by respondents were injections with unsterilized needles (72 percent of males and 59 percent of females), and circumcision with unsterilized tools (49 percent of males and 34 percent of females). Mother-to-child transmission was mentioned less often; only 21 percent of respondents mentioned transmission through breast milk and 13 percent mentioned transmission during childbirth. Only 2 percent of young people do not know any mode of HIV transmission.

Table 12.2 shows the extent of misconceptions about HIV and AIDS among youth as well as levels of knowledge. The most widely held misconception—commonly held in Ethiopia—was that most people contract HIV from accidents with sharp objects (54 percent of boys and 58 percent of girls). As well, a considerable proportion of young people believed that one can contract HIV from eating utensils (51 percent). Relatively few young people believed one could get HIV from mosquito bites or that there was a cure for AIDS.

Only about 60 percent of young people knew that having another sexually transmitted infection increased ones chances of getting HIV. Likewise, only about 60 percent of young people knew about anti-retroviral therapy (ART). Knowledge of ART was considerably higher among urban young people compared to rural young people. While only 49 percent of rural youth knew about ART, 76 percent of urban youth knew about it, perhaps reflecting differential exposure and access to the therapy.

I heard about a girl being abused by a teacher and I also heard the teacher was HIV positive. When this girl heard about the teacher’s situation, she fainted.

Male, age 20, Afar

Everybody should talk openly about HIV and teach the people. People should talk openly without fear.

Male, age 24, Addis Ababa
TABLE 12.3 HIV and AIDS: Misconceptions and knowledge about HIV and AIDS, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misconceptions</th>
<th>Males (n=4,346)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,364)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people contract HIV from accidents with sharp objects</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One can get HIV from sharing eating utensils such as knives and forks</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One can get HIV from mosquito bites</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is now a cure for AIDS</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Males (n=4,346)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,364)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having an STI can increase one’s chances of getting HIV</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is now a medical treatment for PLWHA to improve their quality of life (ART)</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A healthy-looking person can be infected with HIV</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comprehensive knowledge about AIDS* | 41.8 | 23.6 | 31.0 | 42.3 | 21.3 | 30.4 |

* Respondent knows that HIV is transmitted through sexual intercourse, that a healthy looking person can have the AIDS virus, and rejects two common misperceptions: that one can get HIV from mosquito bites and utensils.

12.2 STIGMA & DISCRIMINATION

Four out of five respondents disagreed with the statement that “an HIV positive child should not go to school with healthy children.” Most respondents reported that they are willing to share food with a person with AIDS and were also willing to care for a person with AIDS. More males than females expressed willingness to share food with an HIV positive person or care for the person with AIDS. Only a minority of respondents (28 percent) felt that an HIV positive teacher should be allowed to continue teaching. Stigma against people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA) was higher in rural areas than urban areas. Urban respondents were considerably more likely to be willing to share food with PLWHA or care for them, compared to respondents from rural areas.

TABLE 12.4 HIV and AIDS: Accepting attitudes toward those living with HIV and AIDS, by sex and type of place of residence (percent agreeing or disagreeing with the statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=4,346)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,364)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree with: “A child who is HIV+ should not go to school with healthy children”</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with: “You would be willing to share food with a person with AIDS”</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with: “You would be willing to take care of a person with AIDS”</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with: “If a person is HIV+, he/she should be allowed to keep it private and not be forced to tell his/her community”</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with: “An HIV+ teacher should be allowed to continue teaching”</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12.3 COUNSELING & TESTING FOR HIV

Twenty-eight percent of males and 36 percent of females have received counseling and testing for HIV. A greater number of urban young people have been tested (34 percent of boys and 49 percent of girls) compared to rural young people (23 percent of boys and 26 percent of girls). Compared to other regions, considerable proportions of young people have been tested in SNNPR, Oromiya, Tigray, Beneshangul Gumuz and Addis Ababa. Two percent of young people report that they have been turned away from a facility when they attempted to get counseling and testing.

### TABLE 12.5. HIV and AIDS: Percentage of youth aged 15–24 who have ever been counseled or received testing for HIV, by sex and selected characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background characteristics</th>
<th>Males (n=3,050)</th>
<th>Females (n=3,283)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–17</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–20</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–24</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated/widowed</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational attainment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked the reasons for testing, most young people cited curiosity or wanting to know their status (91 percent of males; 73 percent of females) (Table 12.6). Females frequently cited testing before marriage (18 percent) or within the context of pregnancy (14 percent). A considerable proportion of young people were advised to take the test from healthcare workers or friends (9 percent).

Respondents received tests through a variety of locations including: government health centers (32 percent), government hospitals (21 percent), schools (13 percent), private clinics/NGO facilities (15 percent), mobile services (9 percent), and government health posts (8 percent). Ninety-seven percent of urban respondents and 93 percent of rural respondents received their results. A considerable proportion of those who tested did not tell anyone their result (21 percent of males; 26 percent of females) (data not shown).

| TABLE 12.6 HIV and AIDS: Main reasons* for having counseling and testing for HIV, by sex |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|
|                                               | Males (n=894) | Females (n=1,189) |
| Curiosity/want to know status                 | 91.0          | 72.5               |
| Before marriage                               | 8.1           | 18.3               |
| Part of pregnancy/antenatal care              | 0.0           | 13.5               |
| Advised by healthcare worker or friend        | 10.6          | 8.5                |
| Was sick                                      | 1.9           | 4.7                |
| Going abroad                                  | 0.2           | 1.8                |
| Received testing at school                    | 1.8           | 1.5                |
| Suspected spouse/partner                      | 0.7           | 0.7                |
| Other                                         | 2.0           | 3.2                |

* Percentages may sum to over 100 as more than one reason is possible.

Young people who had never received counseling and testing were asked the main reason that they have never tested (Table 12.7). Among sexually experienced youth, the main reason for not testing was having one partner that they trust (43 percent), followed by the perception that they are not at risk (36 percent). A considerable proportion of young people felt that, because they did not feel sick, they did not need to get the test (7 percent).

| TABLE 12.7 HIV and AIDS: Main reason for not receiving counseling and testing for HIV, among sexually experienced youth, by sex |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
|                                                                                                                           | Males (n=2,120) | Females (n=2,057) |
| Have one partner I trust                                                                                                  | 33.1          | 47.2               |
| Not at risk                                                                                                              | 42.8          | 33.6               |
| Don’t feel sick                                                                                                          | 4.8           | 8.2                |
| Don’t know where to get the test                                                                                         | 3.2           | 7.2                |
| Never thought of it                                                                                                      | 3.0           | 1.1                |
| No service in vicinity                                                                                                   | 1.3           | 1.0                |
| No sex/no current partner                                                                                                 | 1.3           | 0.3                |
| Use condom consistently                                                                                                  | 5.2           | 0.1                |
| Other*                                                                                                                    | 5.3           | 1.3                |

* Includes against religion, too young, afraid, cannot afford.

Marital counseling, testing, and risk
Married young people were asked if they had had counseling and testing for HIV within their marriage, and whether the results were shared with their spouse (Table 12.8). For the most part, either both partners had tested or both partners had not tested. In less than 10 percent of couples had one partner tested but the other had not. Married couples in urban areas were significantly more likely to have been tested compared to those in rural areas; 53 percent of married females in urban areas report that both partners have been tested compared
to 18 percent of married girls in rural areas. A large percentage of couples had tested together (84 percent of males and 78 percent of females), reflecting feasibility and popularity of couples’ testing for HIV. However, husbands were considerably more likely to know the results of their wives, than wives were to know the results of their husbands. This was particularly true among rural couples. Whereas 94 percent of rural married men report that they know their wives’ result, only 86 percent of rural women know their husbands’ result. Likewise, 83 percent of rural men report that their wives know their result.

TABLE 12.8 HIV and AIDS: Percent distribution of married adolescents who have had marital counseling and testing, context of testing, and perception of marital risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=410)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,680)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital partners have tested for HIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither have tested</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent only has tested</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse of respondent has tested</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both husband and wife have tested</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context of testing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a couple</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent knows spouse’s result</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse knows respondent’s result</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feels scared that spouse will give respondent HIV</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspects spouse of being unfaithful*</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Those responding “yes” and “don’t know” to the question: “Have you ever suspected your spouse of being unfaithful?”

Married females are considerably more likely than males to fear their spouses giving them HIV, and to suspect infidelity by their husbands. Seven percent of married females are scared that their husbands will give them HIV (9 percent of urban females; 6 percent of rural females). Likewise, 14 percent of married girls suspect their spouse of being unfaithful, compared to 5 percent of married boys.
CHAPTER THIRTEEN: SEXUAL & GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

13.1 ATTITUDES TOWARD GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

Table 13.1 shows young people’s attitudes toward gender-based violence (GBV) and the acceptability of wife beating. Just over half of both males and females believe that a wife should not be able to refuse her husband sex and that it is a man’s right to have sex with his wife whenever he wants. The belief is more widely held among rural young people than urban young people. Only about one in ten young people believe that beating is a reflection of marital love.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13.1 Gender-based violence: Percent distribution of respondents aged 15–24 holding conservative views related to gender relations and violence, by sex and type of place of residence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males (n=3,988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with “A wife should not be able to refuse her husband sex”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with “It’s a man’s right to have sex with his wife whenever he wants.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with “If a man doesn’t beat his wife, it means he doesn’t love her.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe beating a woman is justified in the following instances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If she burns the food</td>
<td>6.8 19.6 14.3</td>
<td>10.4 33.4 23.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If she argues with her husband</td>
<td>13.5 25.8 20.8</td>
<td>17.4 41.7 31.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If she goes to the neighbors without telling him</td>
<td>10.0 24.1 18.3</td>
<td>13.2 33.3 24.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If she refuses to have sex with him</td>
<td>9.5 19.7 15.5</td>
<td>14.8 36.2 29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If she neglects the children</td>
<td>18.9 29.7 25.3</td>
<td>19.8 36.9 29.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one circumstance mentioned above</td>
<td>28.9 51.6 42.2</td>
<td>32.5 65.0 50.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were read a series of statements regarding possible actions of a wife—including burning the food, arguing with her husband, and refusing to have sex with him—and asked if her beating was justified in each instance mentioned. Rural young people were significantly more likely than urban young people to consider beating justified. For example, 26 percent of rural males and 42 percent of rural females felt a wife’s beating was justified if she argued with her husband; 24 percent of rural males and 33 percent of rural females felt he was justified to beat her if she went to the neighbors without telling him. Overall, rural females were the most likely to consider beating justified. Sixty-five percent of rural females believed a beating was justified for at least one of the circumstances mentioned; 52 percent of rural males felt that beating was warranted in at least one of the circumstances.

13.2 FORCED SEX/RAPE

Table 13.2 shows the percent of young people who report that they have ever been forced to have sex, either during their first sexual encounter or subsequent encounters. Fifteen percent of girls report having ever been forced to have sex (16 percent of rural girls; 12 percent of urban girls). Two percent of boys reported having experienced forced sex. Reactions of female victims in urban areas differed significantly from those in rural areas. Thirty-eight percent of urban victims blame themselves for what happened to them, compared to 14 percent of rural victims. Urban victims were significantly more likely to tell someone and seek assistance; 25
percent of urban girls told someone about the experience compared to 6 percent of rural girls. Fifteen percent of urban girls sought medical care and 22 percent sought legal assistance, compared to only 7 percent of rural girls seeking medical care and <1 percent of rural girls seeking legal assistance.

TABLE 13.2 Gender-based violence: Percent distribution of sexually experienced respondents having ever experienced forced sex/rape, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males (n=821)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,757)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever experienced forced sex/rape</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actions taken following forced sex/rape*

| Blame yourself for what happened | - | - | - | 37.8 | 13.9 | 18.5 |
| Told someone about it | - | - | - | 25.4 | 5.8 | 10.5 |
| Sought medical assistance | - | - | - | 14.6 | 6.7 | 8.1 |
| Sought legal assistance | - | - | - | 21.7 | 0.7 | 4.7 |
| Sought psychological support/counseling | - | - | - | 3.6 | 4.5 | 4.3 |

* Among respondents reporting rape; boys excluded due to too few cases.

13.3 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Married young people were asked about experiences of domestic violence, using a specialized module developed by the DHS. Young people were read a series of violent acts and asked if their current or most recent spouse/partner had ever done this to them (Table 13.3). Wives were much more likely to experience violence at the hands of their partners, compared to husbands. The most common violent acts experienced by young women were being slapped (7 percent), being insulted (6 percent), being humiliated (5 percent), and being pushed or having something thrown at you (5 percent). Urban females were more likely to report being victims of violent acts from their husband including 10 percent reporting having been slapped and 8 percent having been pushed or having something thrown at them.

Overall, 17 percent of urban females had experienced at least one form of violence from their husbands as well as 11 percent of rural females. Considering acts of physical violence only (excluding insults and humiliation), 13 percent of urban females and 9 percent of rural females had experienced physical violence at the hands of their husbands. Six percent of men had experienced physical violence from their wives with more rural men reporting physical violence from their wives.

I used to beat the girls and do bad things to them...this happened because I used to have a bad opinion about females in general.

*Male, age 20, Afar

We know girls and boys are equal, but we tease them anyway...We tell them that a females should be beaten up once a week, whether or not they do something wrong.

*Male, age 20, Amhara
TABLE 13.3 Domestic violence: Percent distribution of married adolescents who have experienced domestic violence from their spouse/partner, by type of violence, sex and type of place or residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of domestic violence</th>
<th>Males (n=351)</th>
<th>Females (n=1,407)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapped you</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulted to make you feel bad about yourself</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humiliated in front of others</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushed you or threw something at you</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punched with fist</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked or beat up</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twisted arm or pulled hair</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced sex when you didn’t want it</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threaten to hurt/harm someone close to you</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choked or burned you</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one violent act (physical &amp; emotional)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one violent act (physical only)*</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been hit, slapped, beaten in last 3 months</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think they deserved last beating**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse had been drinking/doing drugs during last beating**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Told someone about the beating**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include humiliation, insults, and threats. **Among those who were beaten in the last three months.

Among young women who experienced recent beating, 15 percent felt they deserved it. In particular, rural women were more likely feel deserving of violence (22 percent of rural women; 4 percent of urban women). In many instances, the beating was in the context of drinking (12 percent). Urban women were more likely to confide in someone about the beating (38 percent) than rural women (21 percent).

My father was very aggressive. He used to beat us harshly. He also hit my mother... He used to beat us for any reason. My father used to work in another region. Once, when I was a child, he had arrived home one day and my mother was still at the market... As soon as my mother got home, she brought him something to eat and some water so that he could wash his hands. Instead, he splashed the water on her face and started beating her with a stick... My mother lost unconsciousness... Everybody had feared that she was going to die. This was how some husbands beat their wives.

Female, age 24, SNNP
13.4 INFORMATION ON GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE

Only one quarter of boys and 21 percent of girls have heard a message about gender-based violence in the previous year. Urban young people were significantly more likely to have heard a message compared to rural young people; 42 percent of urban boys and 36 percent of urban girls have heard a message related to GBV, compared to 13 percent of rural boys and 9 percent of rural girls. The most common sources of information on GBV were radio, television, newspaper, and teachers. Among rural young people, teachers, health workers, and community meetings were more important sources of information on GBV, compared to young people in urban areas.

### TABLE 13.4 Gender-based violence: Percent distribution of young people who have heard a message/received information on gender-based violence in the last year and sources of information, by sex and type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of information</th>
<th>Males (n=3,188)</th>
<th>Females (n=3,561)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard message/received info on GBV in the last year</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health worker</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboard</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community meeting</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlet</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kebele official</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Fourteen: Access & Utilization Of Services

14.1 Perceptions of Youth-Friendly Services

Respondents were asked to imagine that they needed reproductive health services such as family planning, pregnancy-related services, or services related to HIV and AIDS. They were read a list of service characteristics that are often associated with “youth friendliness” and asked to rate the importance of the characteristic in the context of health services. Table 14.1 shows the percent of young people rating service characteristics as “very important” to them. Both males and females rated the friendliness of the staff and provider as the most important characteristic of a service, followed by low-cost or free services, proximity to one’s place of residence, and short waiting times. Having providers that are the same sex as the client, or having young people involved at the service site were the least important to respondents.

Table 14.1 Youth-friendly services: Percentage of respondents considering characteristic as “very important” to them in choosing a health facility, by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service characteristic</th>
<th>Males (n=4,641)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,743)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly staff</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-cost or free service</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near to place of residence</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short waiting time</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider keeps information confidential</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider is not rushed</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenient hours</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider is the same sex</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth are involved in running the facility</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14.2 Utilization of Services & Barriers to Utilization

Table 14.2 shows the percent of young people who have utilized or been exposed to various services and facilities in the last year. Exposure to religious institutions was highest, with over 80 percent of young people having visited a religious institution in the last year. The next most common institutions visited were hospitals (20 percent), private clinics (19 percent), health extension workers (13 percent), and health centers/health posts (12 percent each). Specialized youth programs such as peer education, youth clubs, and youth centers were accessed to a far lesser extent than religious or health institutions.

Utilization of services may be related to travel time to and from the service (Table 14.3). Based on travel time to and from the service or facility, religious institutions seem to be the most accessible, with rural respondents spending an average of 54 minutes traveling to and from a service. Community conversations which are typically held in the community itself were also located close to respondents, with rural respondents taking, on average, 62 minutes to travel to and from the activity. Health centers, private clinics and hospitals required over two hours in travel time for rural respondents.
TABLE 14.2 Service utilization and barriers: Exposure to health institutions, youth programs, community conversations, and religious institutions in the last year, by sex and type of place of residence

| Type of institution/individual | Males (n=4,652) | | | Females (n=4,750) | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                               | Urban | Rural | All  | Urban | Rural | All  |
| Church or mosque              | 96.5  | 84.2  | 88.8 | 92.3  | 77.4  | 83.4 |
| Hospital                      | 38.8  | 7.2   | 19.0 | 36.4  | 10.1  | 20.8 |
| Private clinic                | 33.8  | 11.9  | 20.1 | 31.1  | 7.3   | 16.9 |
| Health extension workers      | 6.0   | 16.2  | 12.4 | 6.2   | 18.5  | 13.6 |
| Health center                 | 17.4  | 7.3   | 11.1 | 19.4  | 9.1   | 13.3 |
| Health post                   | 10.2  | 13.6  | 12.3 | 8.7   | 16.0  | 13.0 |
| “Community conversation”      | 13.6  | 11.8  | 12.5 | 8.6   | 8.2   | 8.4 |
| Peer educator                 | 8.1   | 4.1   | 5.6  | 11.2  | 4.9   | 7.4 |
| Youth club                    | 10.6  | 2.8   | 5.7  | 9.9   | 3.7   | 6.2 |
| Youth center                  | 15.1  | 3.7   | 8.0  | 7.2   | 1.6   | 3.8 |

TABLE 14.3 Service utilization and barriers: Mean travel time in minutes by users to and from institutions (two-way), by type of place of residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution/individual</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church or mosque</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Community conversation”</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth center</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth club</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health post</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health center</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private clinic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14.3 YOUTH CENTERS

Eleven percent of boys and 6 percent of girls have ever been to a youth center (Table 14.4). Considerably more urban young people have been to youth centers compared to rural young people. When asked the main reason for not visiting youth centers, the most common reasons were not knowing enough about the centers, what is offered, or where they are (40 percent of boys; 55 percent of girls), followed by not having a youth center in their vicinity (33 percent of boys; 38 percent of girls). Rural young people were more likely not to have a youth center in their vicinity, reported by 63 percent of rural boys and 47 percent of rural girls. Five percent of girls reported their parents or spouse does not approve of the centers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males (n=4,652)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,750)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been to a youth center</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never been to youth center</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main reason(s) for not going to youth center*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not know about youth centers/what’s offered/where located</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No service in vicinity</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No need for services</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time to go</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/spouse disapprove</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No money for services/transport to services</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages may sum to over 100 percent as more than one reason possible.
**Other includes considers oneself too young or too old, does not want to, sickness/disability.

Twenty-four youth centers were included in the study over six regions. The research team registered details of each of the youth center visitors during the five days of data collection. On average, each youth center had 56 visitors per day, ranging from 9 to 109 visitors per day (Table 14.5).

The vast majority of youth center visitors are male (83 percent). Other than Aksume Youth Center in Tigray region, all youth centers were dominated by male clients, with some having as many as 99 percent of their clients being male. Likewise, the vast majority of clients were in school (83 percent), with the exception of Aksume Youth Center. The age distribution of clients at the centers varied. Overall, 15 percent were younger adolescents, below the age of 15, and 6 percent were overage, aged 25 and above. Fifty-nine percent of youth center clients were in the age group 15–19.
**TABLE 14.5 Youth centers: Volume and demographic profile of youth center visitors, by youth center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ave. visitors/day</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>School status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Male</td>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>&lt;15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All youth center visitors</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksume YC</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGAE YC</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayachew YC</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mekele YC</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awash Dahgudina YC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elewuha Kebele 1 YC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haile Ela</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semar YC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andinet YC</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azezo YC</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahir Dar FGAE</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debre Markos Red Cross</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abudu Bouro YC</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nekemte Town YC</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofen Arejo YC</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woliso FGAE</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beza YC</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biruh Tesfa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodet Millennium YC</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debub Kilil YC</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ketema subcity YC</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alem Bank Millenn. YC</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGAE</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolfe Koranyo YC</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Attendance register at youth centers.

Most young people found out about the youth center from friends (67 percent) followed by simply seeing the facility in their neighborhood (22 percent) (Table 14.6). Most clients at the youth centers seem to live in the vicinity of the youth centers as their travel time to the facilities is low. Twenty-eight percent of young people take less than 10 minutes to travel to the youth center and two thirds (67 percent) have to travel less than 20 minutes from their home to reach the center. The vast majority of youth center clients travel by foot to the centers (95 percent).
### TABLE 14.6  Youth centers: Access to the youth centers and frequency of visits, by sex of youth center clients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How heard about the center</th>
<th>Males (n=1,466)</th>
<th>Females (n=235)</th>
<th>All (n=1,701)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw facility in neighborhood</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives (parents, siblings, aunts, uncles)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth center staff</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Time to travel to center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to travel to center</th>
<th>Males (n=1,466)</th>
<th>Females (n=235)</th>
<th>All (n=1,701)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 minutes</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19 minutes</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29 minutes</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ minutes</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Travel to center by foot

- Males: 96.0%  
- Females: 91.1%  
- All: 95.3%

#### Number of visits in the last month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Males (n=1,466)</th>
<th>Females (n=235)</th>
<th>All (n=1,701)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19 visits</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29 visits</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ visits</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mean number of visits in last month

- Males: 13.5 visits  
- Females: 11.5 visits  
- All: 13.2 visits

#### Needs permission before going to the center

- Males: 37.6%  
- Females: 61.7%  
- All: 40.9%

*Other includes kebele officials, radio, TV, teachers.  **Responses sum to over 100 as more than one reason possible.

Most youth center clients were frequent visitors to the centers; nearly 60 percent visited the centers at least 10 times a month, or one in three days. The average number of monthly visits was 14 visits by male clients and 12 visits by female clients. Most female clients of youth centers need permission before going to the youth centers (62 percent); most male clients of the youth centers do not need permission (62 percent).

When asked how youth center clients had used the center in the last month, the vast majority reported for recreational purposes (78 percent) (Table 14.7). Patterns of youth center utilization were different for boys compared to girls. Boys were considerably more likely to report using the center for recreation than girls (84 percent of boys; 41 percent of girls). After recreation, use of the library was a popular reason for going to the center (50 percent), mentioned by similar proportions of girls and boys. Girls were more likely than boys to report going to the center for personal development or services. For example, more girls reported visiting the center for skills training (14 percent of girls; 2 percent of boys), or for healthcare and family planning (8 percent of girls; 1 percent of boys).
TABLE 14.7 Youth centers: Patterns of youth center utilization among youth center clients, by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for coming to the center in the last month</th>
<th>Males (n=1,466)</th>
<th>Females (n=235)</th>
<th>All (n=1,701)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/to meet friends</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the library</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend a program (music, drama, etc.)</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See staff, peer educators, get counseling</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer use, internet access</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare, family planning</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ever received RH or other healthcare (over all visits to youth center)**

| Ever taken condoms                               | 6.6             | 1.3             | 5.8          |
| Ever received family planning                    | 0.1             | 6.0             | 0.9          |
| Ever seen health provider                        | 3.1             | 7.3             | 3.7          |
| Ever been counselor                              | 8.4             | 7.1             | 8.2          |
| Ever discussed with a peer educator              | 9.1             | 7.4             | 8.8          |

**Experiences at the youth center**

| Made new friends at the center                   | 48.8            | 35.7            | 47.0         |
| Ever teased by clients of the opposite sex at center | 3.6             | 9.0             | 4.5          |
| Ever teased by clients of the same sex at the center | 8.3             | 4.7             | 7.8          |

Considering all the clients’ visits to the center, few received condoms, healthcare or family planning, or discussed issues with a counselor. Only 8 percent of youth center clients had ever discussed issues with a counselor or peer educator; 4 percent of clients saw a healthcare provider and 6 percent obtained condoms at the centers.

Nearly half of the youth center clients report that they made new friends at the center (49 percent of boys; 36 percent of girls). Nine percent of girls report that they have been teased by boys at the center; 8 percent of boys report that they have been teased by other boys.
Chapter Fifteen: Young People in Special Circumstances

The general youth questionnaire asked about young people with disabilities. In addition, special surveys were undertaken among commercial sex workers, street youth, pastoral youth, and university students, who may not be easily sampled in household-based surveys.

15.1 Disabled Young People

Two percent of young people reported themselves as disabled (2 percent of boys; 1 percent of girls) (Table 15.1). A slightly greater proportion of the urban population was disabled and the prevalence of disabilities seemed to increase with age, probably reflecting disabilities that are acquired through accident or illness.

TABLE 15.1. Disabled young people: Percentage of youth reporting themselves as disabled, by sex and selected characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background characteristics</th>
<th>Males (n=4,687)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,794)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated/widowed</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afar</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amhara</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneshangul Gumuz</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPR</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ababa</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.2 shows the nature of young people’s disability as reported by respondents themselves. Most disabled young people described themselves as having a motor or limb disability as a result of polio, amputation, or another problem (39 percent). Thirty-seven percent of disabled young people reported themselves as blind or partially blind and 7 percent were deaf or hard of hearing. The majority of disabled young people acquired the disability (90 percent) rather than being born with it (10 percent).
TABLE 15.2. Disabled young people: Nature of disability and timing of disability, by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of disability (self reported)</th>
<th>Males (n=78)</th>
<th>Females (n=56)</th>
<th>All (n=134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor disability/lame/amputee/polio</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind/partially blind</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf/hard of hearing</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning disability</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing of disability</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Born with disability</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired disability</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young people were asked a series of agree–disagree statements related to their experience as disabled young people (Table 15.3). Nearly half of disabled young people report that they did not go to school because of their disability (44 percent of boys; 53 percent of girls) and 33 percent report that their disability contributed to their dropping out of school. Forty-one percent report that they have been teased or harassed and 31 percent do not make friends easily. Sixty percent of disabled young people report that their families are supportive and 24 percent have a role model who is disabled.

TABLE 15.3. Disabled young people: Self-reported experience of disability, by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantage and lack of participation</th>
<th>Males (n=78)</th>
<th>Females (n=56)</th>
<th>All (n=134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not go to school because of disability</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been teased or harassed because of disability</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped out of school because of disability</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel they do not make friends easily because of disability</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group membership and social support</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family is supportive and understanding of disability</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a role model who is disabled</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belong to a group for disabled people</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disabled young people were less likely to have ever been to school and to be in school at the time of the survey, compared to young people who were not disabled (Table 15.4). Disabled girls, in particular, were less likely to be in school; 23 percent of disabled girls were in school compared to 48 percent of non-disabled girls and 55 percent of nondisabled boys. Disabled girls were more likely to report having no friends (25 percent) compared to other categories of young people. Disabled males experienced more physical violence than their nondisabled counterparts; 6 percent of disabled boys had been beaten in the last three months, compared to 2 percent of nondisabled boys. Among young people who were sexually experienced a significant percent of disabled girls had experienced forced sex (33 percent).
### TABLE 15.4 Disabled young people: Percent distribution of disabled and nondisabled young people in school, having no friends, and experiencing violence, by sex and disability status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=4,687)</th>
<th>Females (n=4,794)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nondisabled</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been to school</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in school</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendships and participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports having no friends</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been hit or beaten in the last three months</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has been forced to have sex (among sexually experienced)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15.2 COMMERCIAL SEX WORKERS

In all, 210 commercial sex workers (CSW) were purposely sampled in urban areas of the seven study regions. In each region, 30 CSWs were interviewed. Table 15.5 compares the background characteristics of girls in commercial sex work with the general population of urban girls. Girls in CSW were slightly less likely to have ever been to school than other urban girls (76 percent of CSWs had ever been to school compared to 86 percent of the general population of urban girls). Four percent of CSWs were currently enrolled in school. CSWs were significantly more likely to be migrant to the area (82 percent) compared to the general population (52 percent). While 24 percent of urban girls were married and 5 percent were divorced or separated, among CSWs in the sample, not one girl was currently married but 15 percent were divorced. A significant proportion of CSWs were double orphans (24 percent) or single orphans (29 percent), compared to the general population of girls (7 percent double orphans; 25 percent single orphans).
### Table 15.5 Commercial sex workers: Percent distribution of general population of urban girls 15–24 and commercial sex workers, by background characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban females, general population (n=1,460)</th>
<th>Urban females in commercial sex work (n=210)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been to school</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in school</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years educational attainment</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migrant to the area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced or widowed</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orphanhood status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double orphan</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single orphan</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents living</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friendships and participation</strong></td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15.6 shows the sexual experience of CSWs versus the general population of urban girls. Mean age at first sex was slightly younger for commercial sex workers (16.5 years) compared to the general population (17.2 years). However, commercial sex workers were considerably more likely to have experienced coerced first sex (38 percent) compared to other urban girls (11 percent). Only 5 percent of CSWs reported that their first sexual partner was a paying client. Sixty-one percent reported that their first sexual partner was a boyfriend and 11 percent first had sex with a spouse. However, a large percentage (12 percent) reported that their first sex was with a complete stranger, which may be indicative of rape (data on rates not shown). Ninety-nine percent of CSWs report that they used condoms during their last intercourse and 75 percent have undergone voluntary counseling and testing (VCT).

Previous to sex work, many CSWs worked as waitresses or barmaids (29 percent), domestic workers (16 percent), renting beds (3 percent), or in petty trade (2 percent). On average, CSWs reported that they worked an average of 42 hours in the last week and earned an average of 1027 Birr (US $79) in the previous month (not shown).
TABLE 15.6  Commercial sex workers: Percent distribution of general population of urban girls 15–24 and commercial sex workers, by patterns of sexual behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban females, general population (n=1,460)</th>
<th>Urban females in commercial sex work (n=210)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexually experienced (yes)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first sex*</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First sex was coerced (yes)*</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sex partners in last three months (mean)*</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a condom at last sex*</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had symptoms of a sexually transmitted infection*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever had VCT</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Among sexually experienced females

15.3 STREET BOYS

Thirty street children were interviewed in urban areas of each of the seven regions, totaling 210 street children interviewed. Only 28 of these respondents were female, and street girls’ experiences likely differ significantly from those of males. As there were too few female respondents to analyze, they were removed from analysis. Therefore, results are based on interviews with 182 street boys in seven regions.

Street boys in the sample averaged 16.8 years of age, with 29 percent being in the younger age group, 12–14. Eighty-two percent had been to school and 18 percent reported that they were currently in school, all of them in government-run schools. A significant proportion were migrant to the area (78 percent). A considerable proportion of street boys interviewed were orphans. Forty-seven percent reported that they are double orphans and 26 percent were single orphans. Only 26 percent had two surviving parents.

Seventy-two percent of street boys had ever worked for pay (data not shown). On average, working street boys started working at age 13. The most common types of work were daily laborer (23 percent), shoeshine (19 percent), construction work (14 percent), farmer/herder (10 percent), and car wash (7 percent). Working street boys worked an average of 38 hours in the previous week and earned an average of 190 Birr (US $14.60) in the previous month.

Twenty-six percent of street boys report that they have had sexual intercourse (data not shown). Among sexually experienced street boys, the majority first had sex with a commercial sex worker (39 percent), followed by a friend/social acquaintance (26 percent) or a girlfriend (26 percent). Most street boys first had sex out of curiosity (46 percent), because they thought their friends were doing it (38 percent) or out of peer pressure (29 percent). Forty-four percent report that they used a condom during their first intercourse.

Among those reporting their first sex was with a CSW, 61 percent said that a condom was used. On average, sexually active street boys have had 2.8 lifetime partners and 1 partner in the last three months. Ninety-one percent of boys used a condom during their last intercourse. Thirty-six percent have had VCT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban street boys (n=182)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever been to school</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in school</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean years educational attainment</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migrant to the area</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced or widowed</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orphanhood status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double orphan</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single orphan</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents living</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15.4 UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

A total of 355 university students were interviewed at six universities: Adama, Dilla, Gondar, Hawassa, Nekemt, and Semera. Nearly equal numbers of males and females were interviewed (178 males; 177 females). On average, young people in the sample were 20 years of age. The vast majority were migrant to the area, presumably moving to attend the university, and most had never been married (Table 15.8). Compared to the general population of young people and to other categories of youth such as street boys or commercial sex workers, university students were considerably more likely to have two living parents, 75 percent of boys and 79 percent of girls.

### TABLE 15.8 University students: Percent distribution of university students, by background characteristics and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Males (n=178)</th>
<th>Females (n=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant to the area</th>
<th>Males (n=178)</th>
<th>Females (n=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Males (n=178)</th>
<th>Females (n=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced or widowed</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orphanhood status</th>
<th>Males (n=178)</th>
<th>Females (n=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double orphan</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single orphan</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents living</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the university students interviewed, 30 percent of boys and 9 percent of girls were sexually experienced (Table 15.9). Among sexually experienced females, first partners were either spouses/fiancés or boyfriends. Among boys, first sexual partners were mainly acquaintances or fellow students (53 percent), girlfriends (30 percent), or spouses/fiancées (11 percent). Only a minority of sexually experienced university students were sexually active in the last three months (25 percent of boys and 50 percent of girls). Only a minority of sexually experienced boys had multiple partnerships. Fifteen percent of boys reported having four or more lifetime partners.

While ever use of condoms was relatively high (64 percent of boys and 40 percent of girls), condom use during first sex was modest (28 percent of boys; 19 percent of girls). Only one boy reported having had burning pain during urination and discharge; three girls reported having burning during urination (not shown). Sixty-two percent of males and 66 percent of females have had VCT.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=178)</th>
<th>Females (n=177)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ever had sex</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profile of first sex partner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyfriend/girlfriend</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance/fellow student</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/fiancé</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had sex in the last three months</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of lifetime partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condom use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a condom at first sex</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a condom at last sex</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever used a condom</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever had VCT</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other includes relative and CSW.
Pastoral youth were interviewed in Afar region, 119 in all. This population was characterized by low levels of schooling, particularly among girls. Only 11 percent of pastoralist girls had ever been to school compared to 65 percent of pastoralist boys (Table 15.10). At the time of survey, 5 percent of girls were attending school, compared to 47 percent of boys. A considerable proportion of girls had ever been married (61 percent), compared to 9 percent of boys.

Ninety-three percent of girls interviewed said that they were circumcised and 4 percent did not know (not shown). Among circumcised girls, 53 percent reported being infibulated, 36 percent reported excision, 1 percent had clitoridectomy, and 10 percent did not know the type of FGM/C they had. Thirty-two percent of girls were circumcised in infancy and the average age at circumcision was 5 years. A considerable number of girls (69 percent) opposed their own circumcision, though none reported that anyone else opposed it, to their knowledge.

### TABLE 15.10 Pastoral youth: Percent distribution of pastoral youth, by background characteristics and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (n=43)</th>
<th>Females (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12–14</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15–19</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–24</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ever been to school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currently in school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced or widowed</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orphanhood status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double orphan</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single orphan</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents living</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Sixteen: Implications for Youth Programs

The survey findings underscore the differing experiences of boys and girls as well as the varying conditions in urban and rural areas of Ethiopia. The divergent experiences and conditions imply that tailored strategies are needed to reach rural boys, rural girls, urban boys, and urban girls. In addition, young people in special circumstances, such as disabled youth, street youth, and young women in commercial sex work, exhibit widely varying experiences.

Myth: Most young people live in two-parent households.
Reality: Many young people do not live with parents at all, especially girls.
Recommendation: Develop programs to support young people living outside of traditional family settings.

Many youth programs assume that young people live with their parents, and strategies of youth programs include increasing parent–child communication. However, one out of five young people under age 18 had lost at least one parent and 3 percent of those under age 18 were double orphans. Many programs in Ethiopia do work to support orphans, especially those working within the context of the HIV epidemic. At the same time, among all children under 18, 15 percent of boys and 25 percent of girls were living with neither parent, though many had surviving parents. Some of these young people may be married, or may have migrated for jobs, education, or to escape early marriage or other hardships. Living away from parents is likely an indication of increased vulnerability including poverty, limited education and social support, and lack of a caring adult in one’s life. Few programs address the significant proportions of young people—particularly urban girls—living away from their parents, who, as a group, warrant additional programmatic attention.

Myth: All young people have friends and peers.
Reality: Many young people, especially girls, have no social networks or peer support.
Recommendation: Programs should seek to increase girls’ social networks and safety nets.

Programs such as peer education are designed with the assumption that young people have friends, peers, and social networks. A considerable number of young people—especially girls—report having no friends or other mechanisms of social support such as an alternative place to stay or someone from whom to borrow money. There is an emerging body of evidence suggesting that social connections and “social capital” may have a protective effect for young people. Programs should target the most marginalized youth and explicitly address their isolation and lack of participation. Strategies may include social mobilization and group formation, with the explicit objective of increasing social networks and safety nets, especially for urban girls and married girls.

Myth: These days, young people receive information on puberty in school or from parents, aunts, uncles, and other family members.
Reality: Only one quarter of young people reported receiving family life education in school and a relatively small proportion of young people knew about puberty before it happened to them.
Recommendation: Increase programmatic attention to menarche and spermarche.

Few young people were given any information before they had their first menstruation or wet dreams. In particular, very few boys were given information by anyone other than friends. Reproductive health programs should increase information given to girls and boys about menstruation and wet dreams, and encourage parents, teachers, and extended family members to discuss the experience with their children. About 1 in 6 girls missed school in the last year, with absenteeism associated with how effectively girls manage their menstruation. Programs should expand information and material support to girls on menstruation management.
**Myth:** Boys and young men do not need specialized life skills and reproductive health education.
**Reality:** Boys experience special challenges during their early years and require special programmatic content.
**Recommendation:** Expand programs addressing the special needs of boys including RH information and attention to violence.

Young men in the study were more likely than girls to experience corporal punishment from their parents or teachers, and teasing from other boys. Boys reported less communication with their parents on reproductive health topics and received information on puberty primarily from their peers. Additional efforts are needed to address the violence experienced by boys early on and teach them not to be violent in their later lives, with their wives, children and other men. Dedicated communication with boys on reproductive health topics and non-violence is needed in a safe space where boys can discuss their concerns and not feel pressure to prove their manhood.

**Myth:** Young people lacking skills is the main barrier to positive livelihoods.
**Reality:** Skills training is insufficient to support the transition to positive livelihoods.
**Recommendation:** Livelihoods programs should go beyond skills training to job placement and apprenticeship.

Few young people had received skills training. However, among those who had, two thirds had not put the skills to use, citing lack of ability to find a job. Livelihoods programs need to go beyond skills training to include job placement and apprenticeship, allowing young people to transition more easily into paid work in their chosen profession.

**Myth:** Most young people in Ethiopia have premarital sex.
**Reality:** The majority of Ethiopian young people experience sex within marriage, especially girls and young people in rural areas.
**Recommendation:** Programs should address early marriage of girls as a main driver of early sexual initiation and first birth.

A substantial number of programs in Ethiopia focus on premarital sexual activity, ignoring the fact that most young people in Ethiopia have first sex within the context of marriage. As such, the timing of marriage is the most influential predictor of the timing of sexual initiation. Delaying marriage would have the effect of delaying first sex, especially for girls, and related reproductive risks such as HIV and AIDS, early first birth, and fistula. Additional programs are needed to address early marriage, not only in rural areas, but in urban areas as well.

**Myth:** Peer pressure is a major factor in young people initiating sex.
**Reality:** Young men tend to initiate sex out of curiosity or love; young women have sex because they feel obligated, feel love, or are coerced.
**Recommendation:** Increase attention to addressing feelings of obligation and non-consensual sex within programs.

Among girls, peer pressure was not as important a factor in sexual initiation as was non-consensual sex. Yet few programs for young people include content on non-consensual or coercive sex. Girls, in particular those in rural areas, tend not to tell anyone about the experience of forced sex and do not seek medical, psychological, or legal assistance. Programs should equip girls to avoid situations where they may experience undue pressure or forced sex. Programs should include messages to boys about sexual rights and what constitutes violations of those rights against girls and women. Both boys and girls need additional skills to adequately communicate their views and negotiate with partners.

**Myth:** Marriage is a safety zone from HIV infection.
**Reality:** Many people contract HIV from their spouses and a number of married girls perceive their husbands as putting them at risk.
**Recommendation:** Increase attention to marital transmission of HIV/AIDS and use of condoms within marriage.

Sexual frequency was much higher among married adolescents than among unmarried, sexually experienced youth. Moreover, use of condoms was virtually nonexistent within marital unions and many young people feel that it is a woman's obligation to have sex with her husband whenever he wants it. At the same time, many young married women suspected that their spouse had been unfaithful and worried about contracting HIV within their marital relationships. Yet, few HIV programs address marital transmission of HIV or use of condoms within
marital relationships. Condom use is needlessly stigmatized within marriage and yet HIV programs do not address the stigma. Additional programmatic attention to marital transmission of HIV is warranted.

**Myth:** Youth-friendly facilities require high-cost inputs such as special corners for youth or special days and times for young people.

**Reality:** The quality that young people valued most highly in clinical facilities was the friendliness of the staff and low cost of services.

**Recommendation:** Retrain providers in existing facilities to provide services to young people in a nonjudgmental and friendly environment.

The greatest proportion of young people considered friendly staff and low-cost services as the main qualities they looked for in a reproductive health facility. Having young people involved in running the facility was the least important aspect of the service. Existing clinical services can improve their “youth friendliness” by simple, low-cost methods such as training providers to be friendly and nonjudgmental. High-cost strategies such as having peer educators available at the facility do not seem to be of significant importance to young people.

**Myth:** Youth centers reach a range of young people of both sexes.

**Reality:** Youth centers reach mainly boys and young men and mainly in-school populations.

**Recommendation:** Reorient youth centers to engage in specific targeting of young people in specific circumstances.

Only a minority of young people had been to a youth center and twice as many boys had been to one compared to girls. The vast majority of youth center visitors were boys; and these were mainly boys who lived in the vicinity of the centers and came numerous times in a month. For the most part, they came for recreation, sports, television, and to meet their friends. Few girls attended and, in fact, in environments dominated by boys, such spaces could be intimidating for girls. Youth centers should redirect efforts. Centers could take advantage of the boys attending and offer intensified RH education and communication to boys, including programmatic content on nonviolence and supporting girls and women. As well, centers can set up sex-specific programs, so that spaces are not so intimidating for girls and more acceptable to their parents.

**Myth:** Additional infrastructure such as youth centers is needed to reach out-of-school youth.

**Reality:** Existing institutions in the community, such as religious institutions, reach a significant proportion of young people.

**Recommendation:** Design additional strategies to reach young people through religious institutions.

Over 80 percent of young people had visited a religious institution in the previous year. In addition, among both urban and rural youth, religious institutions seemed to be relatively accessible with the shortest travel time reported for distance to a church or mosque. Additional efforts to engage religious institutions in youth education and development should be explored in order to capitalize on the current reach of these institutions in Ethiopia.
# Appendix A: Sample Information

## Table A1: Study districts/woredas and sample per site, by region and type of respondent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region &amp; district/woreda</th>
<th>Number of enumeration areas (EAs)</th>
<th>Experiment or Control</th>
<th>Adolescent Boys 12–24</th>
<th>Adolescent Girls 12–24</th>
<th>Parents of adolescents 12–24</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tigray</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naeder Adet</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samre Saharti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulo Mehada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kola Temben</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Afar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubti</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awash Fentale</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argoba Liyu/Gach</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afambo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mile</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amhara</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonder</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enarj Enawga</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekela</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machakel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambasel</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oromiya</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekorou</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sululta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adama</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nekemtie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiro Afeta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lome</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beneshangul Gumuz</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosha</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherkole</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SNNPR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodo Zuria</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawasa Zuria</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addis Ababa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolfe Keraniyo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addis Ketema</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulele</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2880</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12,600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B: DATA COLLECTION STAFF

### SURVEY COORDINATOR LEMI NEGERI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinators</th>
<th>Supervisors</th>
<th>Interviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alemayehu Tesfay</td>
<td>Abebe Sahilu</td>
<td>Abdulkadir Kassa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asfaw Getahun</td>
<td>Abelelom Kahasay</td>
<td>Abdulkir Benur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assefa Negera</td>
<td>Abreham Wubshet</td>
<td>Abeba Belay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayisa Jebeessa</td>
<td>Amanuel Angolo</td>
<td>Abebe Ayalew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berhanu W/Gebrail</td>
<td>Aster Eyob</td>
<td>Abebech Tsegaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berhanu Arba</td>
<td>Avel Jemal</td>
<td>Abel G/Eziabher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desalegn Doja</td>
<td>Ayalech Habte</td>
<td>Aberash Girmay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ayub Temam</td>
<td>Aberash Halefom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birhanu Dermeke</td>
<td>Aberham Afeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eneyew Temesgen</td>
<td>Abirot Saketa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Esayas Fekadeselase</td>
<td>Abreahet Tekle Geworgis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addane Shibesh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adanech Chemeda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addis Tsegaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addise Zegaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adugna Kenaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Africawit Aweł</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agegnehu G/Selase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agegnehush Asires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alemayehu Abebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alemayehu Deme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alemtesthay Tadesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alemtesthay Wana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mulugeta Asea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheko Guru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheko G/Mariam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sori Dadi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taye Alemayehu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tefera Atalay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tesfaye Azimera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zerihun Befekadu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temeugen Enyew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temeugen Negatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teshale Hirphas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teshome Tadesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tewodros Lulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsegaye Alemu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsegaye Kejela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsegeberhan G/Hiwot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsige Yohannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yasabu Shiferaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zer’u Berhane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mulunesh Mengstu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negashe Negussa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raheel Haiwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rahel Yaregal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ribka Yimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sahilatu Made Birhan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samson Abdisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seble Haiwu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seid Mohammed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selamawit Jemal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Semhar Tesfatsion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senait Degefa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senait Tadesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sewunet Tadesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shewawezuw Berhanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shewit G/Tadiku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shibere Yadeta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shiwaye Negewo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simegn Siyum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Simegnaw Maru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sisay Tsegaye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon Gidey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Standard Errors

#### TABLE A2: Adolescent boys: Table of standard errors (based on unweighted data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>CV (%)</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>Design effect</th>
<th>Number of observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of place of residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ever been to school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>3,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>37.77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–8 yrs</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.905</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main water source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased bottle</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap in compound, private</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap in compound, shared</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tap</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap inside</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River, ponds</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>37.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of friends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.908</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>4,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 friends</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ever heard of HIV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>4,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10 Times</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 Times</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 Times</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>CV (%)</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Design Effect</td>
<td>Number of observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of place of residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>0.637</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ever been to school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>40.76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–8 yrs</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.648</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>3,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main water source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap inside dwelling</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>8.62</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap in compound, private</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap in compound, shared</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tap</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected well</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprotected well</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River, ponds</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased bottle</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>28.85</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of friends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>3,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–5 friends</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ever heard of HIV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.893</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>16.79</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency of sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–10 Times</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–20 Times</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30 Times</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1,679</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>