Research Report No. 72

INDICES OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATIONS 2005

SOCIAL POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

Research Report No.72

INDICES OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATIONS 2005

By

Haroon Jamal
Amir Jahan Khan

July, 2007

INDICES OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATIONS 2005

SUMMARY

The objective of this research is to update district-wise Indices of Multiple Deprivations 1998, using the latest available data of the Pakistan Social and Living Standards Measurement Survey 2005 (PSLM, 2005). The period from 1998 to 2005, offers an opportunity to evaluate performance of the present government in terms of policies adopted for poverty reduction and in bringing down regional, social and economic inequalities. This exercise is also helpful for provincial governments in designing financial awards for districts with the objective of geographical targeted intervention by giving due shares for backwardness or deprivation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Geographical targeting is appealing because it is comparatively simpler to administer. Different parts of the country – regions, provinces, divisions or districts are ranked by some measure of deprivation. This measure could be income-based poverty, or more commonly, an indicator of education, health and access to other basic services or living standards. Resources are then allocated in an inverse proportion to average welfare so that the poor regions receive higher per capita transfers in comparison to the rich ones. Alternatively, relatively rich areas can be excluded from the special programs altogether.

The first national and regional database of district multiple deprivation indices was provided by Jamal et al (2003). These indices were based on data from the Population Housing Census 1998. Recently, the Federal Bureau of Statistics (FBS), Government of Pakistan (GoP) released a new district-wise dataset for 2005. The FBS conducted a nationwide Pakistan Social and Living-Standards Measurement Survey (PSLM) in 2004-05. Its design is based on the Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaire (CWIQ) survey instrument, which essentially collects simple welfare indicators and indicators of access as well as use of and satisfaction with public services. PSLM survey provides district level welfare indicators with a sample size of about 76,500 households. The PSLM data is statistically comparable with the Census data, with some margin of sampling error.

The new dataset provides an opportunity to update 1998 Indices of Multiple Deprivations (IMD). It is the purpose of this research to replicate the exercise adopted by Jamal et al in (2003), for constructing new indices for 2005. The updated indices may be used as a criterion in the provincial financial awards, while the comparison of indices for both periods will indicate the extent and direction of changes in districts position during the period. The updated indices will also be helpful for identifying areas of need, making decisions on regional priorities and targeting interventions and resources for addressing regional inequality.

Section 2, provides a brief description of variables or indictors used in the construction of IMD, while section 3 presents methodology for combining the selected indicators. These two sections are reproduced from Jamal et al (2003), with some modifications. These sections also highlight inconsistency and data limitations in two datasets. The major findings are

discussed in section 4, whereas district-wise inter-temporal changes in overall IMD are furnished in the Appendix. Concluding remarks are given in section 5.

2. THE COVERAGE

These indices are based on the premise that multiple deprivations are made up of separate dimensions or 'sectors' of deprivations. These sectors reflect different aspects of deprivations. Each sector is made up of a number of indicators, which cover aspects of this deprivation as comprehensively as possible. However, the selection of indicators is based purely on district-wise data availability in both datasets. The selected sectors and indicators in constructing indices of multiple deprivations are described below, while a schematic view of indicators is furnished in Table 1. All sectoral indices and the IMD are also constructed separately for urban and rural areas[1].

TABLE 1
VARIABLES USED TO REPRESENT SECTORAL DEPRIVATIONS

Education
Illiteracy Rate (10 years and above) – Female
Illiteracy Rate (10 years and above) – Male
Out of School Children (5-9 Years) – Female
Out of School Children (5-9 Years) – Male
Housing Quality and Congestion
Percentage of Non-Owner Households
Percentage of Homeless Population***
Inadequate Material Used in Roof
Inadequate Material Used in Wall
Households with no Bathroom Facility***
Household with no Kitchen Facility***
Households with no Latrine Facility
Housing Units with One Room
Persons Per Room
Residential Housing Services
Un-electrified Households
Households not using Cooking Gas
Households with no Inside Piped Water Connection
Households with no Telephone (landline) Connection**
Employment
Unemployment Rate [15-65 years].
Employed Labor Force in Non-Manufacturing Sectors

*** These indictors are not available in PSLM survey 2005.
** This indicator is not available in the Census 1998
Source: Pakistan Population and Housing Census (1998) and PSLM Survey 2005

[1] Detailed district-wise urban, rural and sectoral indices are not reported in the paper, however these may be provided on request.

Deprivation in the education sector is represented by current and future levels of deprivation. Two measures, adult illiteracy and children out of school, are included in this sector. UNDP incorporates the inverse of these two measures to construct the Human Development Index (HDI). Literacy is defined as the "ability of a person to read a news paper or write a simple letter in any language." Illiteracy is measured in terms of ratio and computed as a percentage of illiterate persons among the population aged 10 years and above[2]. Children between the ages of 5 to 9, who are not attending school, are taken to compute out-of-school children at the primary level. The gender disparity is incorporated taking these measures separately for male and female population.

The most widely used indicator of health deprivation is the Infant Mortality Rate (IMR). It is computed on the basis of average of three years of death of children before they complete one year. Although the 1998 Census provides information necessary to compute IMR, but these are only for one year. Therefore, a comparable district-wise IMR could not be computed from the Census information. Further, no information is available in the PSLM 2005. Another important health output indicator is life expectancy or deprivation in longevity, which is measured as the percentage of people not expected to survive till age 40. The Census as well as PSLM 2005, provides no information on this health related aspect, therefore, no indicator of health deprivation is included in the analysis due to absence of required information.

The sector related to housing quality identifies people living in unsatisfactory and inadequate housing structures. It is represented by a series of indicators. The house structure is treated as inadequate if un-baked bricks, earth bound materials, wood or bamboo are used in the construction of a wall or the roof. Two indicators are used to measure housing congestion: percentage of households with one room and number of persons per room. Percentage of households which are lacking essential facilities such as kitchen, bathroom and toilet are included in the deprivation index. Non-ownership of house and, in the extreme case, homelessness, is also added to the deprivation list. However, kitchen and bathroom facility and homelessness are not included for the 2005 IMD due to non-availability of related information in PSLM 2005.

[2] Adult literacy rate is often taken as the ratio of literate persons to the population 15 years and above. Due to the data limitation in Census 1998, literacy rate is defined as the ratio of literate persons to the population 10 years and above for both periods.

Access to basic utilities is an important aspect of everyday lives of people. Deprivation for this sector includes households with no electricity, households using wood or kerosene oil as cooking fuel, and households with no inside water availability. Further, households with no landline telephone connection are included only for the 2005 IMD, as this information is not available in Census 1998.

'Employment deprived' are defined as those not working but looking for work and those that are laid off. Due to definitional inconsistency regarding unemployment rate in the Census and the PSLM, the Census figure is used for both periods. To capture the disguised employment, a proxy is used which considers the proportion of labor force in the non-manufacturing sector.

3. METHODOLOGY FOR COMBINING INDICATORS

At stage 1, indicators in each sector are combined to create Sectoral Indices. Except person per room, all the fore mentioned indicators are simple rates (percentage of the population affected by the type of deprivation) and may easily be combined. Person per room is standardized with the minimum and maximum. Instead of assigning equal weight to each indicator in a particular sector, Principal Component Technique of Factor Analysis is used to generate weights. This statistical procedure assigns the greatest weight to those variables which have the greatest variance (or dispersion). Therefore, indicators with the lowest level of inequality will have the lowest weight. After assigning these weights, four sectoral indices are computed in order to compare deprivation levels across districts and provinces.

Once the four sectoral indices have been calculated, an overall IMD is derived. Having considered various options, it is decided to employ the criteria used by UNDP in deriving its Human Poverty Index (HPI). The following formula is used to derive IMD.

$$IMD = [\ 1/4 * \{\ (E)^{\alpha} + (HQ)^{\alpha} + (HS)^{\alpha} + (L)^{\alpha}\ \}\ ]^{1/\alpha}$$

Where;

IMD	=	Index of Multiple Deprivation
E	=	Index of Education Deprivation
HQ	=	Index of Deprivation in Housing Quality
HS	=	Index of Deprivation in Housing Services
L	=	Index of Deprivation in Employment
α	=	3

The value of α has an important impact on the value of the index. If α=1, the IMD is the average of its four sectors. As α rises, greater weight is assigned to the sector in which there is most deprivation. Following UNDP, the value of α is set at 3 to give additional but not overwhelming weight to the area of greater deprivation. This gives an elasticity of substitution of 1/3 between any two indices and places weight on those dimensions in which deprivation is higher. The technical detail is provided in the UNDP Human Development Report (1997). IMD is a dimensionless index scaled to vary from a minimum of zero to a maximum of 100; zero representing no deprivation and 100 representing the maximum degree of deprivation in terms of sectors and indictors chosen for the analysis.

4. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Inter-temporal (1998 and 2005), multiple deprivation level of districts are furnished in the Appendix. This section summarizes the major findings of the study. According to Table 2, IMD 2005 is showing a decline of 8 percentage points (1.4 percent per annum) during 1998-2005. Per annum declining rate is the lowest in Balochistan, while the rate of decline in Punjab province is also lower than Sindh and NWFP provinces. As expected, in terms of level of deprivation during 2005, Punjab possesses the lowest, while Balochistan has the highest magnitude of IMD.

TABLE 2
AVERAGE VALUES OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATIONS INDICES
[Inter-Temporal Changes]

	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	**Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998**	**Annual Rate of Change [%]**
Overall	**58.45**	**64.51**	**-1.42**
Punjab	52.53	58.41	-1.47
Sindh	54.95	62.03	-1.75
NWFP	58.43	66.17	-1.75
Balochistan	69.19	73.15	-.78

TABLE 3
SHARES IN MULTIPLE DEPRIVATIONS
[% of Provincial Population Residing in]

	1998	2005
High Deprived Areas		
Punjab	25	28
Sindh	31	35
NWFP	51	35
Balochistan	88	91
Medium Deprived Areas		
Punjab	38	33
Sindh	27	29
NWFP	38	54
Balochistan	1	-
Low Deprived Areas		
Punjab	37	39
Sindh	42	36
NWFP	11	11
Balochistan	11	9

Classifying the districts in terms of high, medium, and low deprivation on the basis of one-third national population in each of the categories provides a useful basis of analysis. High deprivation refers to the one-third national population residing in the highest deprived areas (highest magnitudes of the IMD). Table 3 provides distribution of national population by high, medium and low deprivation levels across provinces and time. Balochistan emerges as the most deprived province with over 91 percent of population residing in high deprived districts during 2005. Regrettably, the relative deprivation level is also increasing over time in the province, as the table shows that 88 percent of the population was residing in high deprived districts during 1998. In fact, barring NWFP, the percentage of population residing in high deprived areas is increasing in all three provinces. NWFP depicts an interesting phenomenon. About 16 percent population has shifted from high to medium deprived areas, while there is no change in population proportion residing in low deprived districts. Punjab is

also showing an upward trend (2 percentage points) in low deprived category, while Sindh and Balochistan show a declining trend of about 6 and 2 percentage points, respectively, indicating alarming signals in terms of increasing regional inequality.

Districts of Punjab province which are showing noticeable declining annual rates in IMD include Rajanpur, D. G. Khan, Bhakkar, Chakwal, Sheikhupura, Gujranwala and Lahore (Table A – 1, Appendix). In Sindh, high declining rates are observed in districts Tharparker, Badin, Mirpurkhas, Ghotki, Shikarpur, Sukkur and Karachi (Table A – 2, Appendix). Districts Kohistan, Batagram, Shangla, D. I. Khan, Lower Dir, Bannu, and Swabi in NWFP recorded relatively higher declining rate in IMD during 1998-2005 (Table A – 3, Appendix). Regrettably, the annual declining rate of more than 2 percent is not evident in any district of Balochistan (Table A – 4, Appendix).

Table 4 and Table 5, report the 10 lowest and the highest deprived districts, respectively. Besides provincial capitals, districts Gujranwala, Sialkot, Rawalpindi, Gujrat, Faisalabad and Sukkur come out in the category of the 10 lowest deprived districts. Baring Sukkur and the provincial capitals, all districts belong to Punjab. Conversely and as expected, all 10 of the most deprived districts belong to Balochistan province. District Musa Khel is the highest deprived district of Pakistan indicating a score of 83 percent.

TABLE 4
THE TEN LOWEST DEPRIVED DISTRICTS OF PAKISTAN
[According to IMD 2005]

	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	**Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998**	**Annual Rate of Change [%]**
Karachi	20.9	24.6	-2.3
Lahore	29.2	34.3	-2.3
Gujranwala	38.5	45.1	-2.2
Sialkot	40.9	40.3	.2
Rawalpindi	41.4	41.0	.1
Gujrat	42.7	46.5	-1.2
Faisalabad	44.2	45.6	-.4
Peshawar	44.2	50.8	-2.0
Sukkur	44.5	58.0	-3.7
Quetta	46.0	46.0	.0

TABLE 5 THE TEN HIGHEST DEPRIVED DISTRICTS OF PAKISTAN *[According to IMD 2005]*			
	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	**Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998**	**Annual Rate of Change [%]**
Kohistan	71.7	83.0	-2.1
Khuzdar	72.8	79.0	-1.1
Qilla abdullah	73.9	76.1	-.4
Jhal Magsi	74.7	79.2	-.8
Panjgur	75.6	79.2	-.7
Qillah Saifullah	76.8	76.2	.1
Zhob	77.1	79.3	-.4
Kharan	77.6	82.9	-.9
Awaran	79.8	80.4	-.1
Musakhel	82.8	89.1	-1.0

Table 6 assembles those districts in which the magnitude of IMD has increased during 1998-2005, reflecting the enhancement in the level of deprivation measured through the chosen indicators. Districts Rawalpindi and Sialkot of Punjab, Larkana of Sindh and Ziarat and Qilla Saifullah of Balochistan have appeared in this group. The highest increase (about 3 percentage points) in IMD is evident for Ziarat district.

TABLE 6 INDEX OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATIONS *Districts Showing Positive Change in IMD*			
	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	**Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998**	**Positive Change in IMD**
Punjab			
Rawalpindi	41.4	41.0	.3
Sialkot	40.9	40.3	.5
Sindh			
Larkana	61.2	59.9	1.3
Balochistan			
Ziarat	61.2	59.9	1.3
Qilla Saifullah	62.5	59.8	2.7

TABLE 7
INDEX OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATIONS
MAJOR SHIFTING IN PROVINCIAL RANK ORDER
[Change in Rank Order – More than +/- 3]

		IMD Rank 2005	IMD Rank 1998	Shift in Rank Order
Punjab	Chakwal	8.0	14.0	6.0
	Bhakkar	21.0	29.0	8.0
	Vehari	26.0	21.0	-5.0
	Lodhran	34.0	30.0	-4.0
	Bahawalnagar	20.0	24.0	4.0
Sindh	Ghotki	6.0	12.0	6.0
	Shikarpur	4.0	9.0	5.0
	Larkana	13.0	4.0	-9.0
	Dadu	14.0	8.0	-6.0
	Mirpur Khas	7.0	11.0	4.0
NWFP	Lower Dir	8.0	15.0	7.0
	Chitral	22.0	18.0	-4.0
	Karak	17.0	12.0	-5.0
	D.I.Khan	10.0	16.0	6.0
Balochistan	Chaghi	15.0	11.0	-4.0
	Ketch/Turbat	13.0	6.0	-7.0
	Qilla Saifullah	20.0	15.0	-5.0
	Nasirabad	10.0	16.0	6.0
	Jafarabad	3.0	9.0	6.0

The major change in relative position of districts in terms of provincial rank order is displayed in Table 7. It shows those districts which have shifted plus or minus 3 in rank order during the period 1998-2005. District Chakwal, Bhakkar and Bahawalnagar of Punjab, shifted up while districts Vehari and Lodhran moved down in provincial ranking. Major downward shifting (9 and 6 points) in rank order is evident for Larkana and Dadu districts of Sindh, while Ghotki, Shikarpur and Mirpurkhas moved up. In NWFP, Lower Dir and D. I. Khan are gainers, while Chitral and Karak are loser districts. Correspondingly, district Chaghi, Ketch and Qilla Saifullah moved down in provincial ranking of Balochistan, whereas Nasirabad and Jafarabad moved 6 positions up.

Table 8 shows a list of 'progressive' districts which showed a decline in deprivation by dropping more than 10 points of IMD during the period of analysis. Bhakkar, D. G. Khan from Punjab; Sukkur, Ghotki, Shikarpur and Badin from Sindh; and seven districts (Upper Dir, Lower Dir, Shangla, D. I. Khan, Batagram, Kohistan and Swabi) of NWFP appeared in this grouping. District Shangla of NWFP recorded the highest decline in IMD (14 points).

TABLE 8
INDEX OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION
DISTRICTS SHOWING DECLINE IN IMD MORE THAN 10 POINTS

		Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998	Decline In IMD
Punjab	Bhakkar	56.5	67.9	-11.4
	D.G.Khan	59.6	70.6	-11.0
	Rajanpur	61.8	74.8	-12.9
Sindh	Sukkur	44.5	58.0	-13.5
	Ghotki	55.6	67.7	-12.1
	Shikarpur	52.7	64.2	-11.5
	Badin	61.1	71.6	-10.5
	Tharparkar	64.0	75.4	-11.4
NWFP	Upper Dir	64.6	74.6	-10.0
	Lower Dir	54.4	66.9	-12.5
	Shangla	64.5	78.6	-14.1
	D.I.Khan	56.8	68.1	-11.3
	Batagram	67.9	78.0	-10.1
	Kohistan	71.7	83.0	-11.3
	Swabi	52.9	64.1	-11.2

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Geographical targeting may be a viable way to allocate resources for poverty alleviation in developing countries. Efficiency can be increased and leakages to the non-poor substantially reduced by targeting needy areas. The exercise of identifying clusters of backwardness and deprivation facilitates in making decisions on regional and sectoral priorities, in targeting public interventions through special poverty alleviation programs, in understanding the relationship between poverty and its causes and in assisting federal and provincial governments in determining financial awards.

This study provides an opportunity to understand the patterns and trends in regional development and regional inequalities by updating the Multiple Deprivation Indices of 1998. These indices are based on the combined district-wise indicators of education, housing quality, housing services and employment sectors and thus can be used to make inter-district, intra-province and inter-province comparisons of populations that are deprived, with respect to the indicators chosen for this analysis.

Maximum possible deprivation indicators have been derived both from the Population and Housing Census 1998 and PSLM 2005. The survey provides district level welfare indicators with a sample size of about 76,500 households and is thus statistically comparable with the Census data with some margin of sampling error. UNDP methodology for constructing the Human Poverty Index is used in developing the multiple deprivation indices.

Overall, average IMD of 2005 is showing a decline of 8 percentage points (1.4 percent per annum) during 1998-2005. Per annum declining rate is the lowest in Balochistan, while the rate of decline in Punjab is also lower than Sindh and NWFP provinces. As expected, in terms of level of deprivation during 2005, Punjab possesses the lowest, while Balochistan has the highest magnitude of IMD.

REFERENCES

Jamal, et al (2003). "Mapping the Spatial Deprivation of Pakistan," Pakistan Development Review, 42(2).

UNDP, (1997). Human Development Report 1997, Oxford University Press, New York

APPENDIX

TABLE – A1
INDICES OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION – PUNJAB PROVINCE
[Sorted by IMD 2005]

	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998	Annual Rate of Change [%]
Lodhran	64.9	68.9	-.9
Muzaffargarh	64.2	70.8	-1.4
Rajanpur	61.8	74.8	-2.7
Leiah	60.1	69.1	-2.0
D.G.Khan	59.6	70.6	-2.4
Pakpattan	59.5	66.0	-1.5
Bahawalpur	58.4	65.3	-1.6
R. Y. Khan	58.4	66.0	-1.7
Jhang	58.1	64.6	-1.5
Vehari	58.1	62.1	-.9
Khanewal	58.0	64.0	-1.4
Okara	57.5	62.0	-1.1
Khushab	57.1	61.5	-1.1
Bhakkar	56.5	67.9	-2.6
Bahawalnagar	56.2	64.1	-1.9
Mianwali	54.8	62.3	-1.8
Sargodha	53.6	59.3	-1.4
Sahiwal	53.5	61.3	-1.9
Hafiza Abad	52.9	58.1	-1.3
Multan	51.9	56.8	-1.3
Narowal	51.8	54.9	-.8
Kasur	51.8	58.3	-1.7
Mandi Bahauddin	50.9	55.6	-1.3
T.T.Singh	50.0	52.8	-.8
Attock	48.0	53.7	-1.6
Jhelum	47.7	51.3	-1.1
Chakwal	47.2	56.9	-2.6
Sheikhupura	46.6	53.8	-2.0
Faisalabad	44.2	45.6	-.4
Gujrat	42.7	46.5	-1.2
Rawalpindi	41.4	41.0	.1
Sialkot	40.9	40.3	.2
Gujranwala	38.5	45.1	-2.2
Lahore	29.2	34.3	-2.3

TABLE – A2
INDICES OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION – SINDH PROVINCE
[Sorted by IMD 2005]

	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998	Annual Rate of Change [%]
Thatta	65.3	72.7	-1.5
Tharparkar	64.0	75.4	-2.3
Dadu	62.5	63.1	-.1
Larkana	61.2	59.9	.3
Badin	61.1	71.6	-2.2
Jacobabad	60.1	68.2	-1.8
Sanghar	59.7	64.6	-1.1
Khairpur	57.4	62.6	-1.2
Nawab Shah	57.2	60.4	-.8
Mirpur Khas	56.3	65.8	-2.2
Ghotki	55.6	67.7	-2.8
Noshero Feroz	53.5	60.4	-1.7
Shikarpur	52.7	64.2	-2.8
Hyderabad	47.2	53.2	-1.7
Sukkur	44.5	58.0	-3.7
Karachi	20.9	24.6	-2.3

TABLE – A3
INDICES OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION – NWFP PROVINCE
[Sorted by IMD 2005]

	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998	Annual Rate of Change [%]
Kohistan	71.7	83.0	-2.1
Batagram	67.9	78.0	-2.0
Chitral	64.8	69.0	-.9
Upper Dir	64.6	74.6	-2.0
Shangla	64.5	78.6	-2.8
Buner	63.6	69.2	-1.2
Tank	63.2	68.5	-1.1
Karak	63.1	65.7	-.6
Hangu	61.1	69.0	-1.7
Mansehra	60.2	66.1	-1.3
Charsadda	58.8	65.7	-1.6
Malakand	58.2	64.3	-1.4
Swat	57.6	66.3	-2.0
Lakki Marwat	57.1	63.5	-1.5
D.I.Khan	56.8	68.1	-2.6
Kohat	54.9	62.1	-1.8
Lower Dir	54.4	66.9	-2.9
Mardan	53.8	61.4	-1.9
Nowshera	52.9	58.8	-1.5
Bannu	52.9	62.4	-2.3
Swabi	52.9	64.1	-2.7
Abottabad	51.7	57.5	-1.5
Haripur	51.6	54.5	-.8
Peshawar	44.2	50.8	-2.0

TABLE – A4
INDICES OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION – BALOCHISTAN PROVINCE
[Sorted by IMD 2005]

	Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005	Index of Multiple Deprivation 1998	Annual Rate of Change [%]
Musa Khel	82.8	89.1	-1.0
Awaran	79.8	80.4	-.1
Kharan	77.6	82.9	-.9
Zhob	77.1	79.3	-.4
Qilla Saifullah	76.8	76.2	.1
Panjgur	75.6	79.2	-.7
Jhal Magsi	74.7	79.2	-.8
Qilla Abdullah	73.9	76.1	-.4
Khuzdar	72.8	79.0	-1.1
Chaghi	70.1	72.8	-.5
Barkhan	69.3	76.7	-1.4
Ketch/Turbat	68.7	69.5	-.2
Bolan	68.3	75.0	-1.3
Mastung	68.1	73.5	-1.1
Nasirabad	67.8	76.7	-1.7
Lasbela	67.7	71.6	-.8
Loralai	66.2	70.8	-.9
Gwadar	65.4	67.8	-.5
Sibbi	63.6	67.2	-.8
Kalat	63.2	70.5	-1.6
Ziarat	62.5	59.8	.6
Jafarabad	61.9	71.4	-2.0
Pishin	60.6	65.1	-1.0
Quetta	46.0	46.0	.0