What were the key service delivery, funding and planning issues? Which groups were thought to be the most excluded?

This page shows selected analysis on the main issues perceived to be affecting different groups in the State and identifies some characteristic trends of these groups.

Characteristics trends

- Non-indigenes were thought to be the most excluded (see fig. 7) with less than 40% of people indicating them to be included in decision-making.
- Planning, public spending, and service delivery priorities were different for different groups of people (see figures 8 and 9).
- Separate analysis showed that those surveyed thought TV was the most reliable source of information, followed by radio.
- Only 3% of those surveyed thought government events were reliable sources of information.
- Those with post-secondary education, those in employment or government workers felt the civil service was working hardest to solve the problems in the State.
- Young people and the unemployed were the least likely to believe the civil service was working to solve the problems in the State.

8. What were the top planning and public spending priorities of those surveyed?

9. What were the service delivery priorities of different groups?

7. Which groups were the most included?

Possible areas for discussion?

- Are there other things government could do to monitor and evaluate the needs or priorities of specific groups?
- How could people management and leadership skills be improved to support the implementation of reform programmes? What about senior leadership academies for key managers?

About this factsheet

In 2010 a survey of citizens’ perceptions was conducted in Lagos, Enugu, Kaduna, Kano and Jigawa by NOI Polls. 500 people were interviewed in each State and asked how they thought government service delivery, governance, voice and accountability. Surveys usefully reveal public opinion on important economic or social issues, government policy changes, reforms or legislative actions and increase accountability. These opinions can then be used to inform decision-making.

For more information

Tel: +234 (0) 8033 885779 / +234 (0) 7055 005055
Website: www.noi-polls.net

Enugu State

Perceptions of Service Delivery & Governance

Who responded to the survey? How well was the government performing?

This page shows selected analysis on the people who responded to the survey and gives a general summary of how well they thought government was delivering the following key services: 1) maintaining roads, 2) keeping communities safe, 3) providing clean water, 4) providing primary school education for each child, and 5) access to medical care.

Survey population fast facts

- 88% of those surveyed had some form of income. 27% earned less than 9,000 naira a month.
- 96% of those surveyed had finished primary education. More women than men had completed post secondary education.
- 65% of those surveyed were employed or self-employed.
- 97% were Christian.
- 43% lived in semi-urban areas, 34% in rural areas and 23% in urban areas.

Possible areas for discussion?

- Does government want to introduce its own opinion surveys to collect information about what its citizens’ think? Could this be used to guide planning, make decisions, increase accountability or measure how well government is delivering key services?
- Should Service Charters for Ministries, Departments or Agencies (MDAs) be introduced in more sectors? Would this help make sure better services are delivered?

Service delivery trends

- Most people surveyed thought the government was doing well at maintaining roads, making sure communities were safe, providing access to primary education and providing access to medical care (see Figure 1).
- Those surveyed thought the government was not doing as well at providing access to clean water. Separate analysis showed it was a particularly important issue for people in semi-urban and rural areas.
- People thought delivery of these key services had improved generally, but 43% thought access to water had become worse in the 12 months leading up to the survey.
- Only 45% of those surveyed thought the civil service was working to solve the problems of citizens (see Figure 2).
- Other analysis showed that those with no income or those on low income were least likely to think that the civil service was working to solve the problems of citizens in the State.

1. How well was government handling service delivery in key areas?

2. Was the civil service working to solve the problems of citizens?

The opinions expressed in this leaflet are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department for International Development.
How well were public services being funded? How accountable was government?

This page shows what people thought about public service funding and how accountable they thought government was to the State House of Assembly or the law.

Funding trends
- Less than 50% of those surveyed thought government was doing well at deciding how to fund public services or providing funding (see Figure 3).
- Less than 35% thought government was doing well at providing information to the public about budget spending.
- Other analysis showed that overall men were happier with public service spending than women.
- Those in rural areas were more unhappy about public spending decisions than those living in urban areas.
- Generally, 51% of those surveyed thought that public spending decisions had become better in the 12 months leading up to the survey.
- However, more than 35% of those surveyed thought the government had become worse at actually providing funding to meet the priority needs of the general public.

Accountability trends
- On average, 43% of those surveyed thought the government was accountable to the State House of Assembly or the law. 37% thought the government was not accountable.
- Surprisingly non-indigenes were more likely to think the government was accountable than indigenes (see Figure 4).
- Separate analysis showed that those in employment were also more likely to think that the government was accountable.
- There was a link between knowledge and accountability i.e. those who knew something about government were more likely to think it was accountable than those who knew nothing about government.
- More generally, there appeared to be a desire from the public to get more information from government about its activities. For example, only 28% of those surveyed thought there was enough information on health policies available.

3. How well was government managing public service spending?

Possible areas for discussion?
- Can public spending needs and priorities be made more clearly defined? Who should be defining these?
- Could ways of communicating with the public be approached more strategically, depending on the issue to be communicated and the target audience?

Voice trends
- Generally, the further away people were from their homes of residence the less comfortable they felt expressing their opinions (see Figure 6).
- Non-indigenes showed this same trend but were generally more comfortable than indigenes expressing their opinions.
- Those living in urban areas also felt more able to freely express their opinions than those living in rural areas.
- Other analysis also showed that non-indigenes felt significantly less included in decision-making on big issues than women, young people or those over 55.
- Generally, the main reasons people felt uncomfortable expressing themselves were: 1) a lack of confidence, or 2) a fear of upsetting others.
- Women felt unable to express themselves in local government offices for fear of intimidation. Those living in urban areas also felt afraid of intimidation at work and at public meetings.
- The most common reason those over 55 felt unable to express themselves was a lack of knowledge.

Was government responsive? Were people able to give their opinions?

This page shows select analysis on the responsiveness of government. It also shows how included or excluded specific groups felt in decision-making on big issues and how comfortable they felt expressing their satisfaction/dissatisfaction with government services.

Responsiveness trends
- On a scale of 0 (worst) to 100 (best), those surveyed gave an overall score of 56 for how well they thought government was doing at deciding how to improve public services. This was an improvement on the previous year (see Figure 5).
- Those surveyed thought government was not doing as well as it had done in previous years at seeking feedback on government plans. The exception was those over 55 who thought government was doing better at this than before.
- Those over 55 and those living in semi-urban areas thought the government was doing better than it had done previously at putting plans into action.

5. How responsive was government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15-34</td>
<td>35-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding how best to improve public services.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking the general public what they think of State Government plans to improve public services.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting plans into action and improving public services as a result.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information to the general public about the progress made in putting plans into action.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Compared to 12 months before:
- Improving
- Declining
- Staying the same.

Possible areas for discussion?
- Could ways be developed to collect feedback on government plans during the planning process? Can more regular updates be given on progress?
- How might this influence the Medium Term Sector Strategy (MTSS) process?

4. Was government accountable to the State House of Assembly and the law?

6. What proportion of people felt able to express themselves freely in different places?