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INTRODUCTION
Our vision is to create a safer, more secure world where violent extremist groups can no longer exploit the conditions of extreme poverty.
Guiding Research Question

• **Nuru’s Mission:** Eradicate extreme poverty in fragile rural areas to build communities resilient to violent extremism

• **Research Question:** How does Nuru Nigeria build community and household resilience to shocks and stressors as measured by an aggregate index and dimensions of resilience capacities in a LGA in northern Adamawa State over 4 years (2019-2023)?
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The Resilience Capacities Index is an aggregate score of three resilience capacities - absorptive, adaptive, and transformative - and their composite indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absorptive Capacity Index</th>
<th>Adaptive Capacity Index</th>
<th>Transformative Capacity Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Availability of informal safety nets</td>
<td>● Bridging social capital</td>
<td>● Availability of/access to formal safety nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Bonding social capital</td>
<td>● Education/training</td>
<td>● Bridging social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Access to cash savings</td>
<td>● Livelihood diversification</td>
<td>● Social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Asset ownership</td>
<td>● Asset ownership</td>
<td>● Gender equitable decision-making index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Shock preparedness and mitigation</td>
<td>● Availability of financial resources</td>
<td>● Local government responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Availability of/access to insurance</td>
<td>● Aspirations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Availability of/access to humanitarian assistance</td>
<td>● Locus of control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Confidence to adapt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Design

• 2019-2023 (4 years)
• One Local Government Area (LGA) in northern Adamawa State
• Intervention & Comparison
  – 500 HHs in two intervention wards
  – 1,000 HHs in two comparison wards
# Evaluation Dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Dimensions</th>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Survey Tools</th>
<th>Thought Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience to Vulnerabilities</td>
<td>Does Nuru programming build community and HH resilience?</td>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of community cohesion</td>
<td>Does Nuru’s programming impact social cohesion?</td>
<td>VRAI</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrent Monitoring Survey</td>
<td>To what extent do communities/households have the capacities to cope with irregular/unanticipated shocks?</td>
<td>USAID/TANGO</td>
<td>USAID/TANGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Does Nuru programming contribute to equitable decision-making in HHs?</td>
<td>Mercy Corp’s BRIDGE</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nuru’s Work in Global Context

- Nuru’s niche as framed within the Taskforce on Extremism in Fragile States

[Diagram of Objectives of a Preventive Strategy]

Secondary & long-term

Primary & medium-term impact

Nuru does not address this

Study Timeline & Deliverables

Baseline
- Resilience Report
- Impact Report

2020
Short-term Program Impact

Midpoint
- Resilience Report
- Impact Report

2021
Short-term Program Impact

Endpoint
- Resilience
- Impact
- Policy Briefs

2022

2023

This information is confidential and not intended for public distribution.
METHODOLOGY
Ray Marshall Center (RMC)

- Heath Prince, PhD
- Ashweeta Patnaik, MPH
Methods

- Panel
- Randomization
- Oversampling
- Propensity score matching
- Quantitative & qualitative
- Difference-in-difference
Sample Design

- Cluster sample
- Propensity Score Matching
## Data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th># of Research Assistants</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>June – August 2019</td>
<td>• 33 Research Assistants</td>
<td>• 509 Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 1,360 Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>July – August 2019</td>
<td>• 33 Research Assistants</td>
<td>• 8 Female FDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4 Transcribers</td>
<td>• 4 Male FDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 26 KIIIs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRELIMINARY FINDINGS
Demographics (All HH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count of respondents</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of respondent</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average household size</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of children in household</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% female respondents
- Comparison: 10%
- Intervention: 15%

% respondents practicing Islam
- Comparison: 10%
- Intervention: 15%

% respondents who are married
- Comparison: 72%
- Intervention: 80%

% respondents with no education
- Comparison: 36%
- Intervention: 32%

% HH with disabled HH member
- Comparison: 13%
- Intervention: 18%

% HH without a major source of livelihood in past 6 months
- Comparison: 49%
- Intervention: 37%

% HH where the woman decides jointly with her husband how hh income is used
- Comparison: 70%
- Intervention: 71%

% HH with tin roofing sheets
- Comparison: 93%
- Intervention: 91%

% HH with two or more separate rooms just for sleeping
- Comparison: 84%
- Intervention: 81%
## Livelihoods (Nuru HH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own farming or crop production and sales</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own livestock production or fattening and sales</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural wage labor (WITHIN THE VILLAGE)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural wage labor (OUTSIDE THE VILLAGE)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agricultural wage labor (WITHIN THE VILLAGE)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-agricultural wage labor (OUTSIDE THE VILLAGE)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried work</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of wild-bush products</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey production and sales</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty trade (selling other products.)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty trade (selling own products)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other self-employment or own business (agricultural)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other self-employment or own business (non-ag)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental of land, house, rooms</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country remittances</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts or inheritance</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety net food or cash assistance</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shock Exposure (Nuru HH)

**Climate Shocks**
- Excessive rains (flooding): 49%
- Variable rain (drought): 21%
- Hail: 24%
- Landslides-erosion: 31%

**Biological Shocks**
- Crop disease: 64%
- Crop pests: 72%
- Weeds: 53%
- Livestock disease: 65%
- Human disease outbreaks: 45%
- Theft or destruction of assets: 28%
- Theft of livestock: 31%
- Trauma associated with insurgency: 61%
- Destruction of local market: 20%

**Economic Shocks**
- Increasing food prices: 36%
- Unavailable food in market: 17%
- Increased prices of inputs: 38%
- Decreased prices for products: 53%
- Loss of land: 44%
- Unemployment for youths: 76%
- Death of household member: 42%
- Severe illness or accident of HH member: 50%
Coping With Shocks (Nuru HH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use cash savings</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use in-kind savings</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use remittances</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take out a loan within the community</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an unconditional gift from within community</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive emergency food aid</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive emergency cash transfer</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take out a loan outside of the community</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use an unconditional gift from outside of the community</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell any protective asset</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell any productive asset</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ability to Recover (Nuru HH)

To what extent do you believe you will be able to meet your basic needs (food, water, shelter etc) in the next year?

41% 21% 35%

Worse Same Better

To what extent has your ability to meet basic food needs (food, water, shelter etc) returned to the level it was before all the shocks and stressors you experienced?

47% 22% 29%

Worse Same Better
DISCUSSION
Implementation Challenges

• Incomplete, missing, declined to answer responses due to:
  – Length of the Household Survey
  – Technical challenges
  – Sensitive questions, ie: firearms and assets

• Data collection was late

• Technical challenges:
  – Phones
  – Splitting up the survey
Course Corrections

• Adjust calculations based on missing data:
  • Government support
  • Decision making in the HH
• New phones
• Begin data collection ahead of rainy season
QUESTIONS?