### Separating myth from reality: Do location and gender matter for mobile ownership?

#### Ranmalee Gamage



Canada

This work was carried out with the aid of a grant from the International Development Research Centre, Canada and UKaid from the Department for International Development, UK.





### Understanding emerging Asian BOP's use of ICTs (mostly phones) via Teleuse@BOP studies

- Multi-country studies conducted in 2005, 2006, 2008, 2011
  - Bangladesh, Pakistan , India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia (Java), Philippines, Thailand
  - Quantitative (representative survey) and qualitative research conducted
- Target group: BOP teleusers aged 15-60
  - BOP defined as Socio-Economic Classification (SEC) groups D and E
  - Teleusers defined as having used any phone in previous three months
  - Representative of gender and also at urban and rural levels for the BOP
- Different methodology and target group (USD1.25/day group) in Java



#### Sample size of Teleuse@BOP4 (2011)

Country	Urban		Ru	Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
Bangladesh	267	264	739	780	2050
Pakistan	291	408	487	648	1834
India	269	328	1145	1433	3175
Sri Lanka	84	92	400	624	1200
Thailand	177	170	215	238	800
Indonesia (Java Only)	155	115	416	403	1088
Total	1243	1377	3402	4126	10147



A preliminary glance, suggests the ownership higher amongst men in urban and rural areas, except Thailand





### The model

- Model based on de Silva, Ratnadiwakara, & Zainudeen (2011) with some adjustments:
  - Variables used: close contacts who own mobile phones (1-5), perceived economic benefits, perceived social benefits, perceived emergency benefits, availability of fixed phone, electricity in the house, gender, location (urban or rural), age, household income, education (primary, secondary, tertiary) and availability of television, radio and fixed phone in the house
  - Separate regressions for individual countries instead of using a country variable



### What did we find out?

- It doesn't seem to matter if the location is urban or rural.
- There is a gender effect, but..
- This could potentially be addressed by concentrating on other factors such as education



# Study results: Most prominent explanatory variables

Change in Odds

PK IN LK TH BD Java Location (1= rural, 0=urban) -0.669 -0.019 -0.167 -0.024 -0.053 0.429 Gender (1=female; 0= male) -0.787 -0.854 -0.795 -0.17 1.472 -0.789 -0.023 0.024 -0.005 -0.014 -0.002 Age -0.068 **Household income** 0.747 -0.263 0.541 0.816 0.451 0.156 **Primary education** 0.467 3.804 0.261 -0.017 -0.06 1.006

Values in white are significant at the 95% confidence interval.



### Location doesn't seem to matter



#### Mobile ownership amongst BOP teleusers



RNEasia

## Being a woman significantly reduces the odds of mobile ownership....

Model results

	BD	РК	IN	LK	тн	Java
Gender (1=female; 0= male)	-0.787	-0.854	-0.795	-0.17	1.472	-0.789

Mobile ownership amongst BOP teleusers



### .... but, the divide may be reduced by concentrating on other factors e.g. education in Pakistan

Change in Odds						
	BD	РК	IN	LK	TH	Java
Location (1= rural, 0=urban)	-0.019	-0.167	-0.024	-0.053	0.429	-0.669
Gender (1=female; 0= male)	-0.787	-0.854	-0.795	-0.17	1.472	-0.789
Age	-0.023	0.024	-0.005	-0.014	-0.002	-0.068
Household income	0.747	-0.263	0.541	0.816	0.451	0.156
Primary education	0.467	3.804	0.261	-0.017	-0.06	1.006

- When we use a gender and location disaggregated sample it reveals the following:
  - The odds of mobile ownership amongst rural men increase by 246% if they have primary education
  - But the odds of mobile ownership amongst rural women increase by 1157% if they have primary education



### In summary

- Mobile ownership is not significantly affected by urban or rural locations
- There is a gender effect to mobile ownership, but..
- This could potentially be addressed by concentrating on other factors such as education
  - Accounting for varying effects of other mediating and determining factors on gender-wise and location-wise mobile adoption is needed before refining policies for encouraging mobile adoption.

