

Analysis of the Relevance of Baseline Survey in the Selection of Beneficiaries: The Case of Community and Social Development Agency Adamawa State, Nigeria

*Girei, A. A. and **D.Y. Giroh

*.Adamawa State Community and Social Development Agency, P.M.B 2110, Yola, Nigeria

** Rubber Research Institute of Nigeria, PMB 1049, Benin City, Nigeria

agirejo@yahoo.com, girohydengle@yahoo.com

Abstract: A baseline survey was conducted in nine selected Local Government Areas of Adamawa State to ascertain the present state of socio-economic status of participating communities to ensure that at the end of the project, proper and acceptable impact assessment studies could be carried-out in the State. Data were collected from 900 respondents using random sampling technique and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Results from survey revealed that majority of the respondents (71.11%) are in the prime of age of 20 to 49 years, 76.67% had one form of formal education or the other, farming provides primary and secondary occupation with 60.67 % and 39.33 % respectively. Income from secondary source was 55.78%. Also, 73.89% of the respondents live in their own family houses, water supply source was mainly by well (63.89%), 69.33% of the respondents used pit toilets and waste disposal was by vacant plots. Recommendations for project intervention were made.

[Girei, A.A, Giroh, D.Y. Analysis of the Relevance of Baseline Survey in the Selection of Beneficiaries: The Case of Community and Social Development Agency Adamawa State, Nigeria. World Rural Observations 2011;3(3):33-39]; ISSN: 1944-6543 (Print); ISSN: 1944-6551 (Online). <http://www.sciencepub.net/rural>.

Keywords: Survey, baseline, rural communities, Adamawa, descriptive statistics

1. Introduction

A baseline survey is designed to establish initial condition against which the effects of a finished project can be compared. This involves collection and collation of baseline information on desired samples. To enable proper documentation of the project impact, there is need for baseline study. This baseline is to assist in providing opportunities for intervention by the project and also to provide a basis for impact based comparison of pre and post project situation. Data from the baseline study also fit directly into the programmatic decision-making process so as to ensure that interventions target the specific supply and demand needs of the local context.

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is a scale up of the pilot Community-based Poverty Reduction Project (CPRP) and Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP). CSDP is therefore an intervention building on the CPRP and LEEMP structures to effectively target socioeconomic and water resources management, infrastructural projects at the community level as well as improve Local Government Area (LGA) responsibility to service delivery.

Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is generally a new intervention that would effectively target social and environmental infrastructure at the community level as well as

improve local government area (LGA) responsibility to service delivery.

The overall goal of the CSDP is to improve access to services for human development. In order to achieve this goal, the project development objective (PDO) is to support empowerment of communities and LGAs for sustainable increase access of poor people to improved social and natural resource infrastructure. The overall goal of the CSDP is to improve access to services for human development. To achieve this goal, the Project Development Objective (PDO) is to support empowerment of communities and LGAs for sustainable increase access of poor people to improved social and natural resource infrastructure.

According to World Bank (2008), the objective of the Community and Social Development Project for Nigeria is to sustainably increase access of poor people to social and natural resource infrastructure services. The project is made up of three components:

The first component is the Federal level-coordination and programme support. At the federal level, this component will be supervised by the Federal Ministry of Finance, while the direct responsibility for implementation will rest with the existing Federal Project Support Unit (FPSU). The FPSU will be responsible for providing technical backstopping to state agencies on procurement, financial management, gender, environment, and local government capacity issues. The unit will

organize the appropriate technical assistance based on requests from state agencies or needs identified by the monitoring and evaluation system.

The second component is the Local Government Authority (LGA)/sectoral ministries capacity and partnership building. This component will be implemented by the state agency in all participating states and will provide funding for capacity building, skills training and hardware types of investments. The objective of this component is to establish and strengthen a partnership between LGA and communities.

Finally, the third component is the community-driven investment. State agencies will manage this component. Funding will be provided for Community Development Plans (CDPs) of selected communities, based on specific criteria, including broad based community participation in plans formulation, micro-project identification and preparation, and a matching contribution from communities.

The overall goal of the CSDP is to improve access to services for human development. To achieve this goal, the Project Development Objective (PDO) is to support empowerment of communities and LGAs for sustainable increase access of poor people to improved social and natural resource infrastructure.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of the study is on the relevance of baseline survey prior to the selection of beneficiaries for intervention of Community and Social Development Agency in Adamawa State.

The specific objectives were to:

- i. describe the socio-economic characteristics of respondents
- ii. determine housing characteristics
- iii. identify sources of water use by respondents and
- iv. examine means sanitation and methods of waste disposal.

2. Methodology

2.1 The Study Area : Adamawa State is located on latitude 7° and 11° N of the equator and longitude 11° and 14° E of Greenwich Meridian. The State shares boundary with Taraba State to the south and west, Gombe State to its Northwest and Borno to the North. The state has an international boundary with the Cameroun Republic along its eastern end (Adebayo, 1999). The State has a land area of about 38,741 square kilometers. The total population of Adamawa State is 3,168,101 people (National Population Commission, NPC 2006).

2.2 Sampling techniques, data collection and analysis: The baseline survey was conducted in ninety (90) selected communities from nine LGAs of Adamawa State. The LGAs are Madagali, Mubi North and Mubi South in the North Senatorial District; Gombi, Girei and Fufore in the Central Senatorial District; and Demsa, Guyuk and Mayo Belwa in the South Senatorial District.

Two methods of data collection were adopted. These were focus group discussion (FGD) and cross-sectional survey (CSS). The FGD was used to obtain village level information while the CSS was used to obtain information from randomly selected individuals from the communities. Information was obtained by means of well structured questionnaires supplemented with oral interviews on 900 respondents.

Data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as percentage, means and tables.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Socioeconomic Status of the Respondents:

Socioeconomic status (SES) is an economic and sociological combination of total measure of a person's work experience and of an individual's or family's economic and social position relative to others, based on income, education and occupation. The household income, education and occupation were examined as well as other characteristics such as age of the household members. The age distribution of the respondents is shown in Table 1. From the table, 11.33% of the respondents were between the ages of 10 and 29 years. The age category with the highest number of respondents was the 40-49 years category (31.7%) while the age 30 – 39 years was the next highest. Majority of the respondents (71.11%) are in the prime of age and their productivity is expected to be high. The result is in line with the studies conducted by Abolagba *et al.*, (2003) who observed that young and active population are productive.

The educational qualification of the household heads (income earners) is presented in Table 2. This table shows that the majority (about 34.11%) of the respondents attained the basic primary education. Those with higher level of education were 42.55 percent of the sampled population. The universal basic education policy stipulates that basic education which runs from primary one to junior secondary school is compulsory for all. As shown in the table, only about 13.56 percent of the respondents attained the junior secondary education.

Socioeconomic status strongly influences the varying perspectives of people on the value and

attainability of higher education. The probability of students attending schools of higher education is more likely in students from higher socio-economic backgrounds. Education can increase opportunities for income and job security. One's level of education can also be an indicator of socioeconomic status (Meskel 2000). Socioeconomic status is based on

income, but too often is connected to race as well. Individuals with lower incomes and less education have higher death rates than those with better educated, wealthier people and the differences between these groups are increasing.

Table 1: Age Distribution of Respondents

Age category (yrs)	No. of respondents	Percentage
10 - 19	17	1.89
20 - 29	85	9.44
30 - 39	252	28.00
40 - 49	286	31.78
50 - 59	144	16.00
>60	116	12.89
Total	900	100

Source: Baseline survey, 2010.

Table 2: Educational attainment of household's income earners

Level of Education	No.	Percentage
None	210	23.33
Primary school	307	34.11
JSS	122	13.56
SS	163	18.11
OND	76	8.44
HND/Degree	22	2.44
Total	900	100.0

Source: Baseline survey, 2010.

The primary and secondary occupations of the respondents were surveyed and presented in Table 3. The primary occupations included farming, civil service, trading and business among others. About 60.67 percent of the respondents are mainly farmers and is in line with previous studies which show that agriculture is the major employer of labour especially in the rural areas of Nigeria (Maurice *et al.*, 2005). Also, about 17 percent are civil servants. The respondents that are employees in private companies are only about 1 percent of the population. The table shows that about 18.45 percent of the respondents are into paid employment as primary occupation. This implies that majority of the respondents are independently employed in the private sector.

Occupational prestige as one component of socio-economic status (SES) encompasses both income and educational attainments. Occupational status reflects the educational attainment required to obtain the job and income levels that vary with different jobs and within ranks of occupations. Additionally, it shows achievement in skills required for the job. Occupational status measures social position by describing job characteristics, decision making ability and control, and psychological demands on the job. Occupation is the most difficult

factor to measure because so many exist, and there are so many competing scales. Many scales rank occupations based on the level of skill involved, from unskilled to skilled manual labor to professional, or use a combined measure using the education level needed and income involved.

Table 3, about 39.33 percent of the respondents had farming as their secondary occupation. This is followed by trading. Those in paid employment are about 6.22 percent of the respondents. The result shows that majority of the respondents have farming as both their primary and secondary occupations. This occupational distribution of the respondents reveals that farming is the most important activity in most of the communities that were surveyed.

The implication of this situation is that there is need for increased investment in the development of the agricultural sector in order to make for increased sustainability and growth in that sector. Not many of the people are technicians, businessmen and employees of private companies. It is clear that the agricultural sector is the highest employer of labour in these communities. This fact underscores the dire need for rural community development in the state.

Table 3: Primary occupation of the Respondents

Type of occupation	Primary occupation		Secondary occupation	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Farming	546	60.67	354	39.33
Fishing	9	1.00	38	4.22
Trading	73	8.11	181	20.11
Civil service	152	16.89	55	6.11
Technician/artisan	22	2.44	81	9.00
Business/contractor	61	6.78	63	7.00
Employee in a private company	5	0.56	10	1.11
Others	23	2.56	94	10.44
Total	900	100.0	900	100.0

Source: Baseline survey, 2010.

Table 4: Monthly income from primary and secondary occupations

Income range (Naira)	income from primary occupation		income from secondary occupation	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
<1000	80	8.89	142	15.78
1, 000-10, 000	470	52.22	502	55.78
11, 000-20, 000	226	25.11	162	18.00
21, 000-30, 000	56	6.22	51	5.67
31, 000-40, 000	27	3.0	6	0.67
41, 000-50, 000	18	2.0	11	1.22
51, 000-60, 000	5	0.56	8	0.89
61, 000-70, 000	5	0.56	5	0.56
>70, 000	13	1.44	13	1.44
Total	900	100.0	900	100.0

Source: Baseline survey, 2010.

Table 5: Major sources of water available to the households in the communities

Water source	Frequency	Percentage
Water sellers	11	1.22
Well	575	63.89
Boreholes	134	14.89
Public tap	59	6.56
Streams/rivers	121	13.44
Total	900	100.0

Source: Baseline survey, 2010.

Table 6: Ownership of house by the Respondents

Type of ownership	Frequency	Percentage
Rented	24	2.67
Family house	665	73.89
Owner occupier house	213	23.67
Others	6	0.67
Total	900	100.0

Source: Baseline survey, 2010.

Table 7: Toilet facilities in households

Type of facility	Frequency	Percentage
Water cistern	14	1.56
Pit toilet	624	69.33
Bucket type	11	1.22
Shallow pit	36	4.0
Bush	214	23.78
Others	1	0.11
Total	900	100.0

Source: Baseline survey, 2010.

Table 4 shows the monthly income of the respondents from primary occupation and secondary occupation respectively. The income has been categorized and the frequency counts and percentages are shown on the table. The majority of the respondents earn about 10, 000 naira monthly from both the primary and secondary occupations. Those that earn above 20, 000 naira are about 13.78 percent for primary occupation and about 10.45 percent from secondary occupation respectively; while the remaining earned less than 20, 000 naira per month. This shows that the respondents were predominantly low income earners. United Nation Development Report (2000) observed low income among developing countries of the World and characterized by high proportion living below one dollar per day. In view of the fact that most of the respondents are farmers their monthly incomes as shown on Tables 3 and 4 reveal that these people are mainly subsistence farmers who produce principally for family consumption.

Table 5 shows the major sources of water available to the peoples. They include water sellers who obtained their water from other sources like streams, wells, rivers boreholes, public taps and streams/rivers. Sources of water from water hawkers may be from polluted sources and could predispose respondents to water borne diseases with a reduction in the productivity and life span of the rural dwellers (WHO,2000, WHO /UNICEF, 2000). The table shows that about 64 percent of the households have wells as their major source of water for both drinking and other domestic purposes. This is the situation in all the rural communities that were surveyed. Well is also very popular in some of the semi-urban settlements that were surveyed. The next most used sources of water were boreholes and streams/rivers in that order. Public taps was not a very popular source of water. Only about 1 percent of the households utilized the services of water sellers regularly.

Table 8: Methods of waste disposal by households

Method	Frequency	Percentage
Public waste system	135	15.0
Private waste system	91	10.11
Throw in vacant plot	424	47.11
Throw in rivers/streams/drainage/roadside	159	17.67
Others	91	10.11
Total	900	100.0

Source: Baseline survey, 2010.

This could be a reflection of the economic status of the households. This is further corroborated by David (2000) and Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS) report (2003) that rural dwellers in Nigeria have low access to safe drinking water. Manyanhaire and Taneal (2009) also found out in their studies in rural communities in Zimbabwe that streams provided most sources of drinking water and villagers trekked long distances to source for drinking water.

Table 6 shows the distribution of the respondents according to ownership of house. About 73.89 percent of the respondents live in their own family houses. The houses are mainly constructed with mud and have thatched roofs. They are poorly ventilated in most cases since they have very small windows. The floors of the houses are rarely cemented. Also it can be seen that about 23.67 percent live in owner occupier houses. Renting of accommodation is not popular among the

respondents across the communities. Rather than expending money on paying rent, the respondents would rather put such funds, where available, to some other uses.

In Table 7 it can be seen that the toilet facilities used by the respondents included pit toilet, water cistern and bucket type latrines. About 69.33 percent of the households use pit toilets while 4 percent use shallow pit toilets. The use of bush was the next popular way of disposal of human waste in the communities that were surveyed with about 23.7 percent.

This has implication on the state of sanitation and personal hygiene in these communities. This situation can pose a veritable source of risk to the health and wellbeing of the people. Ogu (1994) noted in his study that rural housing in many Nigerian rural areas is characterized by low quality and internal facilities. Low quality of facilities was found to be an indicator of poverty in many rural communities in Nigeria (NDHS, 2003).

3.2 Sanitation and waste management system in the communities: Sanitation is the hygienic means of promoting health through prevention of human contact with the hazards of wastes. Hazards can be physical, microbiological, biological or chemical agents of disease. Wastes that can cause health problems are human and animal faeces, solid wastes, domestic waste water (sewage, sullage, grey water), industrial wastes, and agricultural wastes. Hygienic means of prevention can be by using engineering solutions (e.g. sewerage and wastewater treatment), simple technologies (e.g. latrines, septic tanks), or even by personal hygiene practices (e.g. simple hand washing with soap).

Basic sanitation- refers to the management of human feces at the household level. This terminology is the indicator used to describe the target of the Millennium Development Goals on sanitation. Many of the houses did not have proper system for human waste disposal and management. On-site sanitation - the collection and treatment of waste is done where it is deposited. Examples are the use of pit latrines, septic tanks. Food sanitation - refers to the hygienic measures for ensuring food safety. Environmental sanitation- the control of environmental factors that form links in disease transmission. Subsets of this category are solid waste management, water and wastewater treatment, industrial waste treatment and noise and pollution control. On the other hand waste management is the collection, transport, processing, recycling or disposal, and monitoring of waste materials. The term usually relates to materials produced by human activity, and is generally undertaken to reduce their effect on health, the environment or aesthetics. Waste management is also

carried out to recover resources from it. Waste management can involve solid, liquid, gaseous or radioactive substances, with different methods and fields of expertise for each. Waste management practices differ for developed and developing nations, for urban and rural areas, and for residential and industrial producers. Management for non-hazardous residential and institutional waste in metropolitan areas is usually the responsibility of local government authorities, while management for non-hazardous commercial and industrial waste is usually the responsibility of the generator. Table 8 shows the methods of waste disposal used by the people in the surveyed communities. In most cases the people throw waste into vacant plots, rivers/streams/drainage systems. About 47.1 percent of the respondents throw waste into vacant plots (undeveloped plots of land within their neighbourhood). Agunwamba (1998) and David (2000) observed that the throwing of solid waste into rivers and streams and drainages can prove to be hazardous to the environment and to humans who use these streams and rivers as sources of drinking water and other domestic purposes. There are no on-site sanitation facilities in the communities. There is need for enhancement in the environmental sanitation.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation: In conclusion, it is evident that the sampled communities in the nine LGAs of Adamawa State selected for the baseline survey are involved in both farming (crop and livestock) and non-farming activities which constitute their main source of livelihood. More importantly, the sampled communities are deficient in infrastructural facilities both in terms of available numbers and adequacy of the existing ones. Similarly, continued exploitation of the fragile natural resources and poor infrastructural facilities would further reduce agricultural productivity and increase uncertainties and vulnerability of the rural dwellers to food insecurity and extreme poverty.

Therefore, it is recommended that CSDP initiative is necessary by bringing sustainable existing interventions that would address the priority issues in respect of general infrastructural development and farming and non-farming interventions in all the participating communities. Focus should be tailored in areas such as: (1) provision of infrastructural facilities, renovation of health centers and supply of necessary facilities, skill acquisition centers, etc (2) empowerment of the rural poor in all the participating communities to enhance their capacity to generate income through small-scale activities, (3) strengthening of linkages between relevant institutions within the participating communities most especially trade associations and

cooperative societies, and (4) full integration of women into the development process is an important precondition for the sustainability and success of CSDP development efforts.

Correspondence to:

Girei A. Abdulhameed

Adamawa State Community and Social Development Agency, P.M.B 2110, Yola, Nigeria

agirejo@yahoo.com

References

1. Adamawa State Community and Social Development Agency 2010 Baseline Survey Report.
2. Adebayo A.A (1999): Introduction” in Adamawa State in Maps , Adebayo A.A. and Tukur A.L.(eds.) Paraclete Publishers. Nigeria.
3. National Population Commission Abuja 2006 National Census.
4. Abolagba, E. O, Aigbekaen, E.O and Omokhafa, K.O. (2003): Farm Gate Marketing of Natural Rubber in the South East Rubber Growing zone of Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*, 6:40-48.
5. Meskel, Z.W. (2000): Study on Functional Literacy Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development in Ethiopia. CTA. Pp 16 – 17.
6. Maurice, D.C. Amaza, P.S. and Tella, M.O. (2005): Analysis of Technical Inefficiency in Rice-based Cropping Patterns among Dry Season Farmers in Adamawa State, Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Tropical Agriculture*, 7 (1): 113 – 127.
7. United Nations Development Report. 2000. *Overcoming Human Poverty: UNDP Poverty Report 2000*. New York: United Nations Publications.
8. World Health Organization (2000): *Water Supply and Sanitation Assessment Report*, Geneva. www.who.int/watersanitation-health/globalassessment/globalTOChtm.
9. WHO/UNICEF/ WSSCC (2000): *Water Sanitation Coverage by Region*
10. David, H. (2000): *Federal Republic of Nigeria Water Supply and Sanitation Interim Strategy Note*, 33p.
11. *Nigeria Demographic and Housing Survey (2003) Household Population and Housing Characteristics*. Pp 11- 21.
12. Manyanhaire, I.O and Taneal, K (2009): Access to Safe drinking Water by rural communities in Mundenda village in Mutasa District of Manicaland Providence. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 11 (1): 125 – 130.
13. Ogu, V.I. (1994): *Rural Housing Quality in Nigeria: A case Study from Imo*. *Habitat International*, 18(3): 53 -65.
14. Agunwamba, J.C (1998): *Solid Waste Management in Nigeria: Problems and Issues* *Environmental Management*, 22(6): 849-856.

5/19/2011