Community Characteristics from the Nigeria General Household Survey – Panel

In 2010, the National Bureau of Statistics in collaboration with the World Bank, implemented the General Household Survey (GHS), which included a panel component focusing on agriculture and household welfare. The GHS-Panel survey was conducted on a sample of 5,000 households and is nationally representative. The survey was implemented in two visits to households: visit 1 ran from August to October 2010 and visit 2 ran from February to April 2011. As part of the GHS-Panel, community-level information was collected from a group of key informants, from which several key findings are presented below.

Introduction
The GHS-Panel community questionnaire surveyed approximately 500 communities across Nigeria. In the first visit, community respondents provided information on the prices for common food items, agricultural labor, and land prices and credit. In the second visit, community respondents answered questions concerning infrastructure and transportation, local organizations, changes over time within the community, key events, resource management, as well as questions on community needs, actions, and achievements.

Education
The community data from the GHS-Panel survey asked detailed information about the presence of nursery, primary, and secondary schools within each community. As might be expected, urban communities enjoyed a greater level of access to schooling at both the primary and secondary level, with the difference between urban and rural access becoming more apparent at the secondary level. 98% of urban communities reported having a primary school within less than 5km from the center of the community, as compared with 79% of rural communities. Furthermore, only 61% of rural communities reported having a secondary school within 5km of the center of the community, in comparison to 84% of urban communities.

Health
The urban/rural divide also extends into the health sector, where 80% of urban communities have health centers within 5km of the center of their community, in contrast to 57% of rural communities. Hospitals provide more services than health centers, and are therefore less likely to be widely accessible, and most likely to be located within urban centers. The GHS-Panel finds this to be the case, in that 68% of urban communities have access to a public hospital within 5km of the center of their community. As would be expected, rural dwellers need to travel further in order to access a public hospital; the percentage of hospitals within 5km of the center
of a given community is found to be a little less than 25%.

% of health care providers within 5km of community

Comparing across the availability of various types of health infrastructure, health centers emerge as the primary health care provider for people living in rural communities, whereas urban dwellers are able to choose from a wider variety of options, with high levels of access to private clinics and private doctors as well as midwives.

Local Organizations
The GHS-Panel provides detailed information on the types of organizations existing in each community. Among other information, the GHS-Panel contains data on the number of different types of organizations, the frequency of organization meetings, the number of members of each organization, and the gender balance of the members.

Key local organizations on which information was requested included Village Development Committees, agricultural cooperatives, savings and credit cooperatives, business associations, women’s groups, parent-teacher associations, as well as groups centered around interests such as health, culture, education, youth, and politics.

From the chart above, we can see that political organizations are the most commonly found organizations in any given community, followed by parent-teacher associations, youth groups, and village development committees.

Key Events
The GHS-Panel contains information on all important events that occurred in its surveyed communities within the five years prior to the administration of the survey. The events ranged from negative events such as droughts, floods, and epidemic diseases, to positive events such as new roads, new schools, or the advent of electricity.

In total, communities reported almost 2,000 important events of note, of which 1,142 were negative and 842 were positive. The negative event that was most frequently reported by the surveyed communities was a sharp change in prices, which underlines the significant impact of the price of goods on livelihood and welfare. The other more common negative events were forms of natural disasters, specifically floods and crop diseases/pests.

The most frequently reported positive event was improved transportation services, which was reported by more than 140 communities in the GHS-Panel. New roads and new schools were also frequently reported, which seems to point to a general level of improved infrastructure across Nigerian communities.

Approximately one quarter of all events listed were reported to have affected every member of the community. Of these, the survey found that positive and negative events were evenly split, with 263 positive events and 262 events that affected the entire community over the 5-year reporting period.

This brief is based on data collected by the National Bureau of Statistics as part of the Living Standards Measurement Study – Integrated Surveys on Agriculture (LSMS-ISA) project. The full dataset is available for download at NADA via www.nigerianstat.gov.ng.
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