

CONSTRUCTION OF A SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS SCALE FOR RURAL DWELLERS IN NORTHERN NIGERIA

M. A. Adegboye^{1*}, O. B. Oyesola² and E. O. Olumodeji³

¹Federal College of Land Resources Technology Kuru, Plateau State, Nigeria

²Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Nigeria

³Department of Sociology, University of Jos, Nigeria

*Tel.: +2348033938691

E-mail: maadegboye@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Actual assessment of the socio-economic status (SES) is best carried out through a well constructed SES scale in line with the dynamic nature of SES indicators in every community. Therefore, this study was carried out to construct a standardised SES scale for rural dwellers in northern Nigeria. A multi-stage sampling technique was used for this study. Simple random sampling technique was used to select a state from each of the 3 geo-political zones of northern Nigeria. Random sampling technique was used to select 30% of the Local Government Areas (LGAs) in each selected state; producing 3 from 11 LGAs in Gombe, 7 from 23 in Kaduna and 5 from 16 in Kwara states. Purposive sampling technique was used to select 2 villages from each LGA to ensure that the selected villages did not fall to one side of any LGA. Then, random sampling technique was used to select 13 household heads from each of the villages given a total of 390 respondents. Interview schedule was used to collect data for the study. Sigma scoring method was used to measure the variables while Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) and t-test were used for data analysis. Only 28 of the items collated were discovered valid, to be standardised into SES scale, when item analysis was conducted with $r \geq 0.30$ considered good for assessing SES of the rural dwellers in the northern Nigeria. There was a significant difference between high and low socio-economic status rural dwellers ($t = 2.33$, $p = 0.03$); indicating that the scale was valid. Similarly, high correlation ($r = 0.69$; $p = 0.02$) of the split-half score of the respondents for the reliability test shows that the scale was reliable. Therefore, the scale is recommended for the researchers in rural sociology, rural development agencies and policy makers towards better life for rural dwellers in the study area.

Keywords: Socio-economic status scale, standard score, rural dwellers' socio-economic status, rural dwellers in northern Nigeria

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Every individual within a community occupies a social and economic position in relation to others. This position could be high or low depending on the possession or non-possession of certain socio-economic indicators adjudged as important in that society [1]. Such social and economic position or

Comment [M1]: to have

Comment [M2]: were not from the same

27 ranking in the society is known as socio-economic status (SES). [2] and [3] defined socio-economic status
28 as the position an individual occupies with respect to the amount of cultural possession, effective income,
29 material possession, prestige and social participation. According to [4], socio-economic status is the
30 position that an individual or family occupies with reference to the prevailing average standards of cultural
31 possession, effective income, material possessions and participation in the group activities of the
32 community.

33 Socio-economic status is typically broken into three categories, high SES, middle SES, and low SES
34 describing the three areas into which a family or an individual may fall. According to [5], families with high
35 socio-economic status often have more success in preparing their young children for school because they
36 typically have access to a wide range of resources to promote and support young children's development.
37 However, families with low socio-economic status often lack the financial, social, and educational
38 supports that characterize families with high socio-economic status. When placing a family or individual
39 into one of the three SES categories any or all of the three variables (income, education, and occupation)
40 can be assessed. A fourth variable, wealth, may also be examined when determining socio-economic
41 status. Additionally, income, occupation and education have shown to be strong predictors of a range of
42 physical and mental health problems, ranging from respiratory viruses, arthritis, coronary disease, and
43 schizophrenia [6]; [7] and [8]. Hence, the main factors considered in the issue of SES are income,
44 educational attainment, occupation and wealth.

45 According to [9] the socio-economic status scale provides an instrument for actual assessment of the
46 socio-economic status of rural dwellers. If the actual socio-economic status can be known certain
47 characteristics and behavioural tendencies of the rural dwellers could be inferred. Availability of the scale
48 of measurement gives an empirical basis for ascribing socio-economic status position to individuals
49 instead of mere arbitrary description. The construction of socio-economic status scale would stimulate
50 more studies in the area of socio-economic status scaling [9]. Similarly, there is no doubt that availability
51 of the SES scale will be very useful in evaluating the impact of intervention programmes in rural areas.

52 **1.2 Problem of the study**

53 [10] worked on construction and standardization of a scale to measure socio-economic status of
54 Heads of rural households (Gandu) in Funtua zone of Kaduna state. This was published and has been a
55 useful tool for that part of northern Nigeria since then. However, the indicators of SES change with time in
56 every community because of the dynamics of human existence [11] and [4]. Most of the indicators used in
57 the past are no longer valid for assessing the socio-economic status of rural dwellers. Similarly, some
58 items such as cell phone and video player that were not seen as SES indicators before are now useful
59 indicator of SES for rural dwellers as a result of changes in social amenities in many rural areas. Hence, it
60 becomes necessary to develop a scale that will serve the need of the moment. Consequently, this study
61 was designed to construct a socio-economic status scale for rural dwellers in northern Nigeria, which will
62 serve as an instrument for actual assessment of the socio-economic status of rural dwellers. The scale
63 will also give an empirical basis for ascribing socio-economic status position to individuals instead of mere
64 arbitrary description. Similarly, it will be a good instrument for evaluating the impact of intervention
65 programmes in rural areas.

66 **2.0 METHODOLOGY**

67 **2.1 Area of the study**

68 The research was carried out in the northern Nigeria. This comprises states in North-Central
69 (Benue, Kogi, Kwara, Nasarawa, Niger, Plateau, and Federal Capital Territory); North-East (Adamawa,
70 Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe) and North-West (Jigawa, Kaduna, Kano, Katsina, Kebbi,
71 Sokoto and Zamfara).

72 Most of the cities and towns in northern Nigeria are predominantly occupied by Hausa-Fulani except
73 the north central region. Amongst these main cities are Kano, Zaria, Katsina, Abuja, Bauchi, Birnin Kebbi,
74 Damaturu, Dutse, Gombe, Gusau, Jalingo, Jebba, Jos, Kaduna, Lafia, Maiduguri, Makurdi, Sokoto,
75 Suleja and Lokoja. There are many indigenous tribes of northern Nigeria. The major ones are the Hausa,
76 Fulani, Kunuri, Tiv, Jukun, Ebira, Nupe, Berom, and Igala. As a result of economic activities, many other
77 tribes from the west, south and eastern part of the country now reside in different cities, towns and
78 villages of northern Nigeria.

79 Major occupation of the people in the area is farming. As a result of the wide range of climate and
80 vegetation of the area, different kinds of arable crops (such as maize, millet, rice, sorghum, beans,
81 soyabeans, yam, cassava, cocoyam, irish potato and sweet potato) and tree crops (such as citrus,
82 mango, pears and cashew) are grown. There are other sources of income in the area such as trading,
83 crafts and civil service work.




Figure 1: Map of Nigeria showing location of the study

84 2.2 Sampling technique and sampling size

85 A multi-stage sampling technique was used for this study. Simple random sampling technique was
86 used to select a state from each of the 3 geo-political zones of northern Nigeria (North-East, North West
87 and North Central) producing Gombe, Kaduna and Kwara states. Also, a random sampling technique was
88 used to select 30% of the Local Government Areas (LGAs) in each state. Hence, 3 of the 11 LGAs in
89 Gombe, 7 of the 23 in Kaduna and 5 of 16 in Kwara states were selected to have a total of 15 LGAs.
90 Purposive sampling technique was used to select 2 villages from each LGA to ensure that the selected
91 villages did not fall to one side of any LGA. Then, random sampling technique was used to select 13
92 household heads from each of the villages given a total of 390 respondents.

Comment [M3]: were not from the same

Comment [M4]: the

93 2.3 Developing and pre-testing the experimental schedule

94 A preliminary research survey was conducted to collate items that enhance individual's socio-
95 economic status in the rural areas. This was done through information from literature, personal survey
96 and observation, discussion with experts in rural sociology and community development, and interaction
97 with some rural dwellers in different zones of northern Nigeria to identify items that could enhance the
98 socio-economic status of rural dwellers in the area. Up to 184 items were collated and subjected to initial
99 pruning using the criteria of [12] of including only items that are objectively observable, suitable for the
100 area, scorable and being good indicators of socio-economic status. Items which were non-specific,
101 redundant, vague and repetitive were rejected; reducing the items to 91.

102 The schedule was pre-tested with 30 heads of rural households sampled from the three senatorial
103 zones of Bauchi state. The distribution was 10 households from a local government area of each
104 senatorial zone. The heads of households were selected as most of the information required pertains to
105 them. Through the result of the pre-test, necessary modification and rearrangement of the items were
106 made. These processes gave rise to the final draft of the schedule containing 47 items used for the study.

107 2.4 Conducting item analysis (to determine valid ones)

108 The purpose of conducting item analysis is to identify items that are valid for predicting socio-
109 economic status. According to [4], the three common methods in use for item validation were correlation

of scores of test items with those of an external criterion, the use of factor analysis and correlation of scores of test items of the whole item (i.e. internal criterion). The third method, correlation of scores of test items of the whole item (i.e. internal criterion) was used in this study. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine items that are valid for measuring SES. A high correlation, that is, when it is statistically significant indicates that the item is valid for measuring SES. Adopting the [13] discriminating index evaluation method, items with $r = 0.30$ and above were considered valid in this study because of the wide coverage of the study.

Table 1: Evaluation of discrimination index after item analysis

Index of discrimination	Item evaluation
0.40 and above	Very good items, accept
0.30 to 0.39	Reasonably good but subject to possible improvement
0.20 to 0.29	Marginal items that need being subjected to improvement
Below 0.19	Poor items to be rejected or improved by reversion

Source: Ebel, R. L. (1972)

2.5 Determination of standard scores for valid socio-economic status indicators

The standard score of an item in the list of valid socio-economic status indicators is the value attached to the item showing its importance in determination of people's socio-economic status. Sigma scoring method was used for assigning weights to valid items as applied by [4]. Weights were assigned to items in reverse relation to their frequency of possession in the population. Those valid items that occur rarely in the population are more important and were given highest scores.

2.6 Standardisation of the developed scale

Standardisation of a scale is necessary to ensure its appropriateness for what it is meant to measure. Standardised scale is one which is satisfactorily valid and reliable [12]. Hence, the process of standardisation involves taking the scale through validity and reliability tests. According to [14], the process involves the field testing of a scale or test for the purpose of collecting data for measuring validity and reliability to have normative standards to be used in interpreting scores. [4] affirmed that the process

131 involves field testing a scale on a representative sample of the population for which the test is designed,
 132 referred to as the test's norm group. The scores of the people in the norm group becomes the standard to
 133 which the results of subsequent administrations of the test are compared once the test is certified valid
 134 and reliable.

135 **3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

136 **3.1 Result of item analysis**

137 Based on [12] discriminating index evaluation method that items with $r = 0.30$ were reasonably good,
 138 28 of the 47 items having $r = 0.30$ and above were discovered to be valid to be standardised into socio-
 139 economic status scale (Table 2).

140 **Table 2: Correlation coefficient of items selected for the socio-economic scale**

S/N	Item	Correlation coefficient (r)	Significance (p)
1	Total numbers of children	0.70	0.00
2	Children in primary school	0.50	0.00
3	Children in secondary school	0.50	0.00
4	Children in the higher institution	0.43	0.00
5	Deep well	0.33	0.00
6	Pit toilet (latrine)	0.34	0.00
7	Plot of land for building	0.41	0.00
8	Farmland (in hectare)	0.63	0.00
9	Poultry birds/fowls	0.57	0.00
10	Goat	0.59	0.00
11	Sheep	0.51	0.00
12	Cattle	0.42	0.00
13	Grain rhombus/ store	0.43	0.00
14	Bicycle	0.45	0.00
15	Motorcycle	0.45	0.00

16	Transistor radio	0.36	0.00
17	Cassette player	0.30	0.00
18	VCD player/video player	0.38	0.00
19	Television	0.30	0.00
20	Ceiling/standing/table fan	0.39	0.00
21	Cushioned/executive chair	0.32	0.00
22	Wrist watch	0.42	0.00
23	Umbrella	0.33	0.00
24	Standing mirror	0.30	0.00
25	Breakable plates	0.36	0.00
26	Cell phone	0.37	0.00
27	Relative living under same roof	0.46	0.00
28	Chieftaincy/religious title	0.30	0.00


Source: Field survey (2011)

3.2 Assignment of weights to valid items

Weights were assigned to valid items as shown in Tables 3 and 4. Table 3 shows a non-graduated item where a respondent obtained a score of 4 for non-possession of cell phone and 7 for possession of cell phone. However, number possessed was considered in graduated items. Hence, a respondent obtained a score of 0 for having no child, 1 for having 1 child but 2 for 2 or 3 children (Table 4).

Table 3: Assignment of weights to non-graduated items (e.g. possession of a cell phone)

Possession of the item	F	CF	CFM	CPM	Z	Standard score	Standard score rounded
Non-possession	82.9	82.9	41.45	0.415	-0.22	3.56	4
Possession	17.1	100	91.45	0.915	1.37	6.74	7



Normal distribution curve for possession and non-possession of valid items

F = Frequency (percentage of those who agreed to each response category)

CF = Cumulative frequency

CFM = Cumulative frequency to mid-point i.e. $\frac{x+y}{2}$ where x and y are the 2 extreme points

i.e. Non-possession (NP) = $\frac{0+82.9}{2} = 41.45$

Possession (P) = $\frac{82.9+100}{2} = 91.45$

CPM = Cumulative proportion to mid-point (CPM) = $\frac{CFM}{N} = \frac{CFM}{100}$

Z = Sigma score

Standard score = $(Z+2) \times 2$

$(Z+2) \times 2$ = a constant used in transforming the Z values to standard scores. The Z value is added to 2 and then multiplied by 2 to get the standard score.

Standard score rounded: This column contains standard scores approximated to whole numbers.

Table 4: Assignment of weights for graduated items (total number children)

No of possession	F	CF	CFM	CPM	Z	Standard score	Standard score rounded
0	15	15	7.5	0.019	-2.075	-0.2	0
1	11	26	20.5	0.053	-1.616	0.8	1
2	35	61	43.5	0.112	-1.270	1.5	2

3	48	109	85	0.218	-0.779	2.4	2
4	76	185	147	0.377	-0.313	3.4	3
5	49	234	209.5	0.537	0.093	4.2	4
6	37	271	252.5	0.647	0.377	4.8	5
7	21	292	281.5	0.722	0.586	5.2	5
8	34	326	309	0.792	0.813	5.6	6
9	09	335	330.5	0.847	1.024	6.0	6
10	12	347	341	0.874	1.146	6.3	6
>10	43	390	368.5	0.945	1.598	7.2	7

162 **F** = Frequency (number of respondents who chose a particular response category)

163 **CF** = Cumulative frequency. The frequency of the first response category was used as its cumulative

164 frequency. The process was continued by adding the frequency of the least response category to the

165 next to get cumulative frequency of the second response category. The cumulative frequency of the

166 second response category was then added to the frequency of the third response category. The

167 process was continued in that manner until the cumulative frequency of the highest response

168 category was obtained.

169 **CFM** = Cumulative frequency to mid-point. The cumulative frequency of the least response category

170 was divided by 2 to get the cumulative frequency to mid-point for first response category. The

171 cumulative frequency of the least and next response categories were added together and divided by

172 2 to get the cumulative frequency to mid-point for the second response category. The cumulative

173 frequency of the second and third categories were added and divided by 2 to get the cumulative

174 frequency to mid-point for the third response category. The process continued in that manner until the

175 highest response category was obtained.

176 **CPM** = Cumulative proportion to mid-point. This is obtained by dividing the cumulative frequency to

177 mid-point of each response category by the total number of the respondents which in this case is

178 three hundred and ninety (390)

Z = Sigma score. It is obtained by checking the *Z* value that corresponds to the cumulative proportion to mid-point from the table of normal deviates.

Standard score = $(Z+2) \times 2$

$(Z+2) \times 2$ = a constant used in transforming the *Z* values to standard scores. The *Z* value is added to 2 and then multiplied by 2 to get the standard score.

Standard score rounded: This column contains standard scores approximated to whole numbers.

3.3 Developed socio-economic scale

Table 5 shows the developed socio-economic scale comprising the 28 valid items. The scale has both graduated (number possessed mentioned) and non-graduated (possessed or not possessed) items earlier processed to the level of standard score rounded up to the nearest whole number. The table reveals item's number possessed under response categories and corresponding value (weighted score) of each number possessed under standard score. The result shows that some items had weighted score of greater than zero for non-possession; indicating how important they were. This observation is in line with that of [4] and [1] who also recorded greater than zero for non-possession of some items. Score of non-possession of children in higher institution was greater (3) than non-possession of children in secondary school (2) indicating more importance of having children in tertiary institution than having children in secondary school. Only the total number of children and chieftaincy/religious title had '0' as weighted score for non-possession of all the 28 valid items; showing their less importance compared to other items. Different possession number of an item with the same weighted score is an indication that there is no difference between those number possessed.

Table 5: Socio-economic status scale for the rural dwellers in northern Nigeria

S/No	Valid indicators	Response categories	Standard scores
1.	Total number of children	None	0
		1	1
		2	2
		3	2
		4	3
		5	4
		6	5
		7	5
		8	6

		9 10 >10	6 6 7
2.	Children in primary school	None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	2 3 4 5 7 8 8 9 10
3.	Children in secondary school	None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 10 10
4.	Children in higher institution	None 1 2 3 4 5 6	3 6 6 7 8 9 10
5.	Deep water well	No Yes	3 6
6.	Pit toilet	No Yes	3 5
7.	Plot of land for building (hectare)	None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 >10	3 4 5 7 7 8 8 8 8 8 8 9
8.	Plot of land for farming	None 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2 3 4 5 5 6 6 6 7 7

		10	7
		>10	8
9.	Poultry birds/fowls	None	2
		1	3
		2	3
		3	4
		4	4
		5	4
		6	5
		7	5
		8	5
		9	5
		10	5
		>10	6
10.	Goats	None	2
		1	3
		2	3
		3	4
		4	5
		5	6
		6	6
		7	6
		8	6
		9	7
		10	7
		>10	8
11.	Sheep	None	3
		1	4
		2	5
		3	5
		4	6
		5	6
		6	6
		7	7
		8	7
		9	7
		10	7
		>10	8
12.	Cattle	None	3
		1	5
		2	6
		3	7
		4	7
		5	8
		6	8
		7	8
		8	8
		9	9
		10	9
		>10	9
13.	Grain rhombus/store	No	3
		Yes	6
14.	Bicycle	No	3
		Yes	6
15.	Motor cycle	No	3

		Yes	6
16.	Transistor radio	No	3
		Yes	5
17.	Cassette player	No	3
		Yes	5
18.	VCD player/VHS video player	No	3
		Yes	6
19.	Television	No	3
		Yes	5
20.	Ceiling, standing or table fan	No	3
		Yes	6
21.	Cushion/executive chair	No	3
		Yes	5
22.	Wrist watch	No	3
		Yes	5
23.	Umbrella	No	2
		Yes	5
24.	Standing mirror	No	3
		Yes	6
25.	Breakable plates	No	3
		Yes	5
26.	Cell phone	No	2
		Yes	5
27.	Relative living under same roof	None	3
		1	5
		2	6
		3	7
		4	7
		5	8
		6	8
		7	8
		8	9
		9	9
		10	9
		>10	10
28.	Chieftaincy/religious title	No	0
		Yes	4

Source: Field survey (2011)

3.4 Validity and reliability test of the scale

3.4.1 Validity test of the scale

Norm group method was used to determine the concurrent validity of the scale. This involved the sampling of 30 people of high socio-economic status and 30 people of low socio-economic status as identified by members of the community. There was a significant difference between those considered to be of high SES and those considered to be of low SES in the rural community ($t = 2.33$, $p = 0.03$). The significance obtained is an indication that the scale was valid.

208 3.4.2 Reliability test of the scale

209 Split-half method of reliability was used to ensure internal consistency of the scale. The items on the
210 scale were divided into odds and even numbered items; each group treated as a whole. Scores of the two
211 sets of the items obtained from 30 respondents were computed and correlated. A correlation coefficient of
212 $r = 0.69$ was obtained which was high enough to adjudge the scale as reliable.

213 4.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

214 Only 28 of the socio-economic status indicators collated were discovered valid when item analysis
215 was conducted. Consequently, they were standardised into the socio-economic status scale of the rural
216 dwellers in the northern Nigeria. There was a significant difference between high and low socio-economic
217 status rural dwellers; indicating that the scale was valid. Similarly, high correlation of the split-half score of
218 the respondents for the validity test shows that the scale was reliable. Therefore, the scale is
219 recommended for the researchers in rural sociology, rural development agencies and policy makers
220 towards better life for rural dwellers in the study area.

222 5.0 AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

223 Author 1 designed the study performed the statistical analysis, managed the analyses of the study, wrote
224 the first draft of the manuscript and produced the final draft of the manuscript. Author 2 designed the
225 study with author 1 and vetted the draft of the manuscript. Author 3 vetted the draft to get better output for
226 the final draft. All the authors read and approved the final manuscript.

228 REFERENCES

- 229 1. Owigho, BO. Construction of a Socio-economic Status Scale for Heads of Rural Farm Families in the
230 North Agricultural Zone of Delta State, Nigeria. *J Hum Ecol*, 2011; 33(2): 113-118
231 2. Tubbs, SL. *A system approach to small group interaction*. Random House, New York. 1988
232 3. Onwueme, MS. and Ugbor, O. *Education and Society: The Sociology of Education*. Nigerian Research
233 Association, University of Benin, Benin-City. 1994

- 234 4. Akinbile, LA. Standardization of socio-economic status (SES) scale for farm families in South West
235 Nigeria. *Journal of Social Science* 2007; 14(3): 221-227
- 236 5. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL). Socio-economic Status 2010. Accessed
237 June 2010. Available: <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/students/earlycld/ea7lk5.htm>.
- 238 6. Marmot, M. *The Status Syndrome: How Social Standing Affects Our Health and Longevity*. New York:
239 Owl Books. 2004
- 240 7. Werner, S., Malaspina, D. and Rabinowitz, J. Socio-economic Status at Birth is Associated with Risk of
241 Schizophrenia: Population-Based Multilevel Study. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*. 18 April 2007.
- 242 8. Goode, E. *For Good Health, it Helps to be Rich and Important*. New York Times 2008 Accessed June
243 2010. Available:
244 [http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9806E5DA1230F932A35755C0A96F958260&sec=&spon](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9806E5DA1230F932A35755C0A96F958260&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=1)
245 [=&pagewanted=1](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9806E5DA1230F932A35755C0A96F958260&sec=&spon=&pagewanted=1)
- 246 9. Owigbo, BO. *Construction and standardisation of a socio-economic status scale for farm families in*
247 *Delta state, Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural
248 Development, University of Ibadan. 2000
- 249 10. Akinola, CA. and Patel, AU. Construction and standardization of a scale to measure socio-economic
250 status of heads of rural household (Gandu) in Funtua zone of Kaduna state *Journal of rural development*
251 1987; 10:85-94
- 252 11. Sender, J. and Smith, S. *Poverty, class and gender in rural Africa: A Tanzanian case study*. London,
253 Routledge and Kegan publishers. 1990
- 254 12. Patel AU. and Anthonio, QBO. Construction and standardisation of a scale to measure socio-
255 economic status of rural farm families in Western Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Economic and social*
256 *studies*. 1974; 16: 99 – 113.
- 257 13. Ebel, RL. *Essentials of educational measurement*. Prentice hall, London. 1972
- 258 14. Cangelosi JA. *Designing tests for evaluating student's achievement*. New York, Longman 1990.