**CHAPTER FOUR**

**RESULTS**

4.0

**4.1 RESPONDENTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE STUDY**

A total of 242 out of the 276 administered questionnaires were retrieved and analyzed giving a response rate of 87%.

**4.2 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS**

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Socio-demographic Characteristics** | **Frequency (%)** |
| **Age (years)**  20-29  30-39  40-49  50-59  60-69  70-79  Not Given  Total  Mean + SD  **Sex**  Male  Female  Total  **Marital Status**  Married  Single  Separated  Divorced  Widowed  Total  **Religion**  Islam  Christianity  Others  Total | 45 (18.6)  74 (30.6)  46 (19.0)  24 (9.9)  29 (12.0)  11 (4.5)  13 (5.4)  242 (100)  42.1 + 14.5  153 (63.2)  89 (36.5)  242 (100)  136 (56.2)  75 (31.0)  12 (5.0)  2 (0.8)  17 (7.0)   1. (100)   65 (26.9)  176 (72.7)  1 (0.4)  242 (100) |

Table 1 continued: Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Socio-demographic Characteristics** | **Frequency (%)** |
| **Ethnicity**  Hausa  Igbo  Yoruba  Others  Total  **Educational Status**  No formal education  Primary education  Secondary education  Tertiary education  Total  **Employment Status**  Govt. Institution  Private Institution  Self employed  Unemployed  Student  Total  **Average income per month (#)**  0-50,000  51,000-100,000  101,000 – 150,000  151,000 – 200,000  201,000 – 250,000  251,000 – 300,000  301,000 – 350,000  501,000 – 550,000  Not Given  Total  Mean + SD  **Type of dwelling place**  Flats  A room  Self contained  Duplex  Others  Total  **Household Size**  1-3  4-6  7-9  10-12  Total | 24 (9.9)  62 (25.6)  103 (42.6)  53 (21.9)  242 (100)  14 (5.8)  11 (4.5)  44 (18.2)  173 (71.5  242 (100)  52 (21.5)  6 (27.3)  83 (34.3)  21 (8.7)  20 (8.3)  242 (100)  70 (28.9)  65 (26.9)  21 (8.7)  6 (2.5)  3 (1.2)  3 (1.2)  1 (0.4)  1 (0.4)  72 (29.8)  242 (100)  81.0 + 23.5  150 (62.0)  18 (7.4)  26 (10.7)  25 (10.3)  23 (9.5)  242 (100)  76 (31.4)  125 (51.7)  37 (15.3)  4 (1.7)  242 (100) |

Table 1 above shows that the ages of the respondents ranged between 20 to 79 years with the highest number of respondents within the age group of 30-39 (30.6%). The mean age was 42.1 + 14.5. Majority (63.2%) of the respondents were males, married (56.2%). Christians, (72.7%) and Yoruba (42.6%). Most (71.5%) of the respondents had tertiary educational level while about 34.3% were self-employed. Majority (62.0%) of the respondents live in flats, 10.7%, 10.3% and 7.4% lived in self-contained, duplexes and a room apartment respectively. Majority (51,7%) of the respondents has family members of between 4 – 6 people and the average income per month was about 50,000 naira.

**4.3 KNOWLEDGE OF DOMESTIC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

**Table 2: Respondents’ knowledge of improper disposal of domestic solid wastes management.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Knowledge of domestic solid waste management** | **Correct Response**  **Frequency (%)**  **(n = 242)** |
| **Consequence of Improper disposal of wastes**  Air Pollution  Contamination of food  Contamination of water supply  Breeding of mosquitoes and flies  Bad odour  Illness among people  **Proper, safe and hygienic methods for storage and disposal of wastes**  Storage of house wastes in dustbin  Storage of wastes in covered waste bin in the kitchen overnight  Dumping of wastes in open sites around the house  Burning of wastes within the house premise  **Types of diseases as a result of improper waste management**  Malaria  Hypertension  Cholera  Diabetes Mellituse  Diarrhea  Typhoid Fever  Food Poisoning  Chest infections  Gonorrhea | 229 (94.6)  213 (88.0)  199 (82.2)  231 (95.5)  239 (98.8)  206 (85.1)  231 (95.5)  188 (77.7)    211 (87.2)  156 (64.5)  199 (82.2)  157 (64.9)  227 (93.8)  124 (51.2)  212 (87.6)  187 (77.3)  202 (83.5)  182 (75.2)  161 (66.5) |

Table 2 above shows that majority of the respondents had a good knowledge of the effects of domestic solid waste management on health. Many, 85.1% knew that improper disposal of waste can cause illness among the household management while 95.5% of the respondents knew that improper disposal of waste can lead to breeding of mosquitoes and flies.

Also, majority (95.5%) knew that domestic wastes should be stored in dustbins and 82.2% and 87.6% were aware that improper waste management could result in malaria and diarrhea respectively.

Table 3: Grading of respondents’ knowledge of domestic solid waste management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grading of knowledge | Frequency (%) |
| Grade  Good  Poor  Total  Score  Mean knowledge Score (%) | 236 (97.5)  6 (2.5)  242 (100)  81.7 + 14.6 |

Table 3 above shows that majority 97.5% of the respondents had good knowledge of domestic solid waste management while only 2.5% had poor knowledge.

**4.4 ATTITUDE TOWARDS DOMESTIC SOLID WASTES MANAGEMENT**

**Table 4: Respondents’ attitude towards domestic solid waste management**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attitude towards domestic solid waste management** | **Correct responses**  **Frequency (%)**  **(n = 242)** |
| Waste bin should not overflow with wastes | 214 (88.4) |
| Each household should have a dustbin with a cover | 173 (71.5) |
| Households without a dustbin with cover should be penalized | 70 (28.9) |
| Willing to pay for collection and disposal of domestic wastes | 202 (83.5) |
| Responsible for transporting waste to a sanitary dumpsite in the absence of waste collection agency | 140 (57.9) |

Table 4 shows that attitude of respondents towards domestic solid waste management was generally good. Majority, 83.5% were willing to pay for collection and disposal of their domestic wastes while 71.5% agreed that each household must have a dustbin with cover. However, only 28.9% agreed that households without a dustbin with cover should be penalized.

**Table 5: Grading of respondents’ attitude towards domestic solid waste management**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grading of attitude** | **Frequency (%)** |
| Grade |  |
| Positive | 183 (75.6) |
| Negative | 59 (24.4) |
| Total | 242 (100) |
| Score |  |
| Mean Attitude Score (%) | 66.0 + 23.8 |

Table 5 above shows that majority, 75.6% of the respondents had positive attitude towards household solid waste management.

**4.5 DOMESTIC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES**

**4.5.1 Reported practices of domestic solid waste management**

**Table 6: respondents’ reported practices of domestic solid waste management**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reported practices of domestic solid wastes management** | **Frequency (%)**  **(n=242)** |
| **Method of storage of domestic solid wastes**  In covered plastic/metal bin  In uncovered plastic/metal bin  In polythene bags  In a carton  **Method of disposal of domestic solid waste**  Separate wastes before discarding  Burning in dug pits around the house  Dumping on an authorized dumpsite  Open dumping on streets  Dumping in gutters  Storing in containers for collection by waste management agencies. | 128 (52.9)  35 (14.5)  72 (29.8)  4 (1.7)  48 (19.8)  182 (75.2)  102 (42.1)  234 (96.7)  178 (73.6)  238 (98.3)  187 (77.3) |

Table 6 shows that the reported practice of respondents on waste disposal was generally good. Majority, 52.9% of respondents store their wastes in covered bins, 14.5% store theirs in uncovered bins while 29.8% and 1.7% store their wastes in polythene bags and cartons respectively. Majority 77.3% store their waste in containers for collection by waste management agencies, 98.3% do not dump their wastes in gutters and 96.7% do not practice open site burning of wastes. However, only 42.1% dump their wastes on authorized sites and a relatively low (19.8%) proportion of respondents separate their wastes before discarding.

Table 7: Grading of respondents’ reported practices of domestic solid waste management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grading of reported practices | Frequency (%) |
| Grade  Good  Poor  Total  Score  Mean Reported Practice Score (%) | 188 (77.7)  54 (22.3)  242 (100)  66.1 + 19.7 |

Table 7 above shows that majority, 77.7% of the respondents had good reported practice of domestic solid waste management.

**4.5.2: OBSERVED PRACTICES OF DOMESTIC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

**Table 8: Respondents’ observed practices of domestic solid waste management**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Observed practices of domestic solid wastes management** | **Correct practices**  **Frequency (%)**  **(n= 242)** |
| Availability of waste bin in the kitchen  Waste bin in the kitchen has cover  Waste bin is present within the house premises or compound  Burning of wastes within the house premises | 147 (60.7)  84 (34.7)  206 (85.1)  167 (69.0) |

Table 8 shows that 60.7% of respondents had waste bins in their kitchen and only 34% of these waste bins had covers. Majority (85.1%) had waste bins in their compounds and it was also observed that 69% of respondents did not practice burning of wastes within the house premises.

**Table 9: Grading of respondents’ observed practice**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grading of observed practices** | **Frequency (%)** |
| Grade  Good  Poor  Total  Score  Mean Observed Practice Score (%) | 202 (83.5)  40 (16.5)  242 (100)  62.4+ 25.1 |

Table 9 above shows that majority, 83.3% of the respondents had good observed practice of domestic solid waste management.

**4.6 FACTORS AFFECTING KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE, REPORTED PRACTICES AND OBSERVED PRACTICES OF DOMESTIC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

**Table 10: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and level of knowledge of domestic solid waste management.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Age group (years)** | **Good** | **Poor** | **Total** |  |
| 20-29 | 45 (100) | 0(0.0) | 45 (100) |  |
| 30-39 | 73 (98.6) | 1(16.7) | 74 (100) |  |
| 40-49 | 45 (97.8) | 1(16.7) | 76 (100) |  |
| 50-59 | 21(87.5) | 3(50.0) | 24(100) | P=0.057 |
| 60-69 | 28(96.6) | 1(16.7) | 29 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 70-79 | 11(100) | 0(0.0) | 11(100) |  |
| Not Given | 13(100) | 0(0.0) | 13(100) |  |
| Total | 236(97.5) | 6(2.5) | 242(100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 41.9+ 14.6 | 51.5 + 8.2 |  |  |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 152(99.3) | 1.(0.7) | 153(100) | P=0.026 |
| Female | 84(94.4) | 5(5.6) | 89(100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 236 (97.5) | 6(2.5) | 242(100) |  |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 130 (95.6) | 6(4.4) | 136(100) |  |
| Single | 75(100) | 0(0.0) | 75(100) |  |
| Separated | 12(100) | 0(0.0) | 12(100) | P=0.325 |
| Divorced | 2(100) | 0(0.0) | 2(100) | (fisher exact) |
| Widowed | 17(100) | 0(0.0) | 17(100) |  |
| Total | 236(97.5) | 6(2.5) | 242(100) |  |

Table 10 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and level of knowledge of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Religion** | **Good** | **Poor** | **Total** |  |
| Islam | 61 (93.8) | 4 (6.2) | 65 (100) |  |
| Christianity | 174 (98.9) | 2(1.1) | 176(100) | P=0.070 |
| Others | 1 (100) | 0(0.0) | 1(100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 236 (97.5) | 6(2.5) | 242(100) |  |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | |
| Hausa | 20 (83.8) | 4(16.7) | 24(100) |  |
| Igbo | 61(98.4) | 1(1.6) | 62(100) | P=0.002 |
| Yoruba | 102(99.0) | 1(1.0) | 103(100) | (fisher exact) |
| Others | 53(100) | 0(0.0) | 53(100) |  |
| Total | 236(97.5) | 6(2.5) | 242(100) |  |
| **Educational Status** |  |  |  |  |
| Informal | 11(78.6) | 3(21.4) | 14(100) |  |
| Primary | 9(81.8) | 2(18.2) | 11(100) |  |
| Secondary | 43(97.7) | 1(2.3) | 44(100) | P=<0.001 |
| Tertiary | 173(100) | 0(0.0) | 173(100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 236(97.5) | 6(2.5) | 242(100) |  |

Table 10 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and level of knowledge of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Employment Status** | **Good** | **Poor** | **Total** |  |
| Government | 51 (98.1) | 1 (1.9) | 52 (100) |  |
| Private | 66 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 66 (100) |  |
| Self employed | 80 (96.4) | 3 (3.6) | 83 (100) | P=0.116 |
| Unemployed | 19 (90.5) | 2 (9.5) | 21 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Student | 29 (100) | 0(0.0) | 29 (100) |  |
| Total | 236 (7.5) | 6 (2.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Average Income (#)** | | | | |
| 0-50,000 | 67 (95.7) | 3 (4.3) | 70 (100) |  |
| 51,000-100,000 | 64 (98.5) | 1 (1.5) | 65 (100) |  |
| 101,000-150,000 | 21 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 21 (100) |  |
| 151,000-200,000 | 6 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 6 (100) | P=0.915 |
| 201,000-250,000 | 5 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 5 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 251,000-300,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| 301,000-350,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| 501,000-550,000 | 1 (100) | 0(0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| Not Given | 70 (97.2) | 2 (2.8) | 72 (100) |  |
| Total | 236 (97.5) | 6 (2.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 81933.7 + 67677.2 | | 43250.0 + 19720.1 |  |

Table 10 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and level of knowledge of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Dwelling Place** | **Good** | **Poor** | **Total** |  |
| Flats | 146 (97.3) | 4 (2.7) | 150 (100) |  |
| A room | 18 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 18 (100) |  |
| Self-Contained | 26 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 26 (100) | P=0.682 |
| Duplex | 24 (96.0) | 1 (4.0) | 25 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Others | 22 (95.7) | 1 (4.03) | 23 (100) |  |
| Total | 236 (97.5) | 6 (2.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| Household Size |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 10 above shows that there was a statistically significant association between the respondents’ education level and level of knowledge of domestic solid waste management in which a higher proportion (100%) of respondents with tertiary education had good knowledge (p= < 0.001).

Also, there was a statistically significant association between the sex of respondents and level of knowledge as a higher proportion of male respondents (99.3%) had good knowledge compared to female respondents (94.4%).

There was also a statistically significant association between the ethnicity and household size of respondents and level of knowledge where higher proportions; Yorubas (99%) and respondents with household size of 4-6 members (99.2%) had good knowledge of household solid waste management.

Table 11: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and level of attitude towards domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Age group (years)** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| 20-29 | 32 (71.1) | 13 (28.9) | 45 (100) |  |
| 30-39 | 59 (79.7) | 15 (20.3) | 74 (100) |  |
| 40-49 | 35 (76.1) | 11 (23.9) | 46 (100) |  |
| 50-59 | 19 (79.2) | 5 (20.8) | 24 (100) | P=0.141 |
| 60-69 | 24 (82.8) | 5 (17.2) | 29 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 70-79 | 9 (81.8) | 2 (18.2) | 11 (100) |  |
| Not Given | 5 (38.5) | 8 (61.5) | 13 (100) |  |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 42.4 + 14.6 | 41.1 + 14.2 |  |  |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 117 (76.5) | 36 (23.5) | 153 (100) | X2=0.062 |
| Female | 66 (74.2) | 23 (25.8) | 89 (100) | df=1 |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) | P=0.803 |
| Marital Status |  |  |  |  |
| Married | 113 (83.1) | 23 (16.9) | 136 (100) |  |
| Single | 52 (69.3) | 23 (30.7) | 75 (100) |  |
| Separated | 6 (50.0) | 6 (50.0) | 12 (100) | P=0.009 |
| Divorced | 1 (50.0) | 1 (50.0) | 2 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Widowed | 11 (64.7) | 6 (35.3) | 17 (100) |  |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 11 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and level of attitude of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Religion** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| Islam | 49 (75.4) | 16 (24.6) | 65 (100) |  |
| Christianity | 134 (76.1) | 42 (23.9) | 176 (100) | P=0.341 |
| Others | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) | 1 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | |
| Hausa | 17 (70.8) | 7 (29.2) | 24 (100) |  |
| Igbo | 53 (85.5) | 9 (14.5) | 62 (100) | X2=5.31 |
| Yoruba | 77 (74.8) | 26 (25.2) | 103 (100) | df=3 |
| Others | 36 (67.9) | 17 (32.1) | 53 (100) | P=0.147 |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) |  |
| Educational Status |  |  |  |  |
| Informal | 4 (28.6) | 10 (71.4) | 14 (100) |  |
| Primary | 9 (81.8) | 2 (18.2) | 11 (100) |  |
| Secondary | 32 (72.7) | 12 (27.3) | 44 (100) | P=0.001 |
| Tertiary | 138 (79.8) | 35 (20.2) | 173 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.2) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 11 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and level of attitude of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Employment Status** | **Good** | **Poor** | **Total** |  |
| Government | 40 (76.9) | 12 (23.1) | 52 (100) |  |
| Private | 52 (78.8) | 14 (21.2) | 66 (100) |  |
| Self employed | 63 (75.9) | 20 (24.1) | 83 (100) | P=0.638 |
| Unemployed | 13 (61.9) | 8 (38.1) | 21 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Student | 15 (75.0) | 5 (25.0) | 20 (100) |  |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Average Income (#)** | | | | |
| 0-50,000 | 47 (67.1) | 23 (32.9) | 70 (100) |  |
| 51,000 – 100,000 | 47 (72.3) | 18 (27.8) | 65 (100) |  |
| 101,000 – 150,000 | 17 (81.0) | 4 (19.0) | 21 (100) |  |
| 151,000 – 200,000 | 5 (83.3) | 1 (16.7) | 6 (100) | P=0.247 |
| 201,000-250,000 | 5 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 5 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 251,000 – 300,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| 301,000 – 350,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| 501,000 – 550,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| Not Given | 59 (81.9) | 13 (18.1) | 72 (100) |  |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 89177.4 + 73754.5 | | 59043.5 + 37473.5 |  |

Table 11 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and level of attitude of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Dwelling Place** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| Flats | 20 (80.0) | 5 (20.0) | 25 (100) |  |
| A room | 112 (74.7) | 38 (25.3) | 150 (100) |  |
| Self-Contained | 22 (84.6) | 4 (15.4) | 26 (100) | P=0.012 |
| Duplex | 8 (44.4) | 10 (55.6) | 18 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Others | 21 (91.3) | 2 (8.7) | 23 (100) |  |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Household Size** | | | | |
| 1-3 | 50 (65.8) | 26 (34.2) | 76 (100) |  |
| 4-6 | 102 (81.6) | 23 (18.4) | 125 (100) |  |
| 7-9 | 27 (73.0) | 10 (27.0) | 37 (100) | P=0.053 |
| 10-12 | 4 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 4 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 183 (75.6) | 59 (24.4) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 11 shows that there was a statistically significant association between the respondents’ educational level and attitude towards domestic solid waste management in which a higher proportion (79.8%) of respondents with tertiary educational level showed positive attitude towards domestic solid waste management (p=<0.001).

There was also a statistically significant association between the marital status and dwelling place of respondents and attitude towards domestic solid waste management where higher proportions of respondents who were married (83.1%) and respondents that lived in self-contained house (84.6%) showed positive attitude towards domestic solid waste management.

Table 12: Association between socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and their reported practices of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Age group (years)** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| 20-29 | 37 (79.7) | 8 (20.3) | 45 (100) |  |
| 30-39 | 62 (84.4) | 12 (15.6) | 74 (100) |  |
| 40-49 | 37 (81.4) | 9 (18.6) | 46 (100) |  |
| 50-59 | 17 (79.6) | 7 (20.4) | 24 (100) | P=0.175 |
| 60-69 | 18 (76.7) | 11 (23.3) | 29 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 70-79 | 10 (89.1) | 1 (10.9) | 11 (100) |  |
| Not Given | 7 (52.5) | 6 (47.5) | 13 (100) |  |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 41.2 + 14.3 | 45.4 + 15.1 |  |  |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 119 (81.3) | 34 (18.7) | 153 (100) | X2=0.0020 |
| Female | 69 (82.7) | 20 (17.3) | 89 (100) | dt = 1 |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) | P = 0.964 |
| **Marital Status** | | | | |
| Married | 110 (84.5) | 26 (15.5) | 136 (100) |  |
| Single | 59 (81.7) | 16 (18.3) | 75 (100) |  |
| Separated | 7 (59.2) | 5 (40.8) | 12 (100) | P = 0.144 |
| Divorced | 1 (50.0) | 1 (50.0) | 2 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Widowed | 11 (76.9) | 6 (23.1) | 17 (100) |  |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 12 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and their reported practices of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Religion** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| Islam | 46 (75.6) | 19 (24.8) | 65 (100) |  |
| Christianity | 141 (75.0) | 35 (25.0) | 176 (100) |  |
| Others | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | |
| Hausa | 15 (83.9) | 9 (16.1) | 24 (100) |  |
| Igbo | 50 (86.6) | 12 (13.4) | 62 (100) | X2 = 3.635 |
| Yoruba | 81 (83.1) | 22 (16.9) | 103 (100) | df = 3 |
| Others | 42 (80.2) | 11 (19.8) | 53 (100) | P = 0.304 |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Educational Status** | | | | |
| Informal | 1 (4.7) | 13 (95.3) | 14 (100) |  |
| Primary | 8 (86.3) | 3 (13.7) | 11 (100) |  |
| Secondary | 28 (74.9) | 16 (25.1) | 44 (100) | P = < 0.001 |
| Tertiary | 151 (85.6) | 22 (14.4) | 173 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 12 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristics of respondents and their reported practices of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Employment Status** | **Good** | **Poor** | **Total** |  |
| Government | 46 (88.2) | 6 (11.8) | 52 (100) |  |
| Private | 55 (79.3) | 11 (20.7) | 66 (100) |  |
| Self employed | 59 (81.4) | 24 (18.6) | 83 (100) | P = 0.006 |
| Unemployed | 11 (53.6) | 10 (46.4) | 21 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Student | 17 (91.2) | 3 (8.8) | 20 (100) |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |
| **Average Income (#)** | | | | |
| 0-50,000 | 49 (77.8) | 21 (22.2) | 70 (100) |  |
| 51,000 – 100,000 | 48 (81.1) | 17 (18.9) | 65 (100) |  |
| 101,000 – 150,000 | 17 (82.0) | 4 (18.0) | 21 (100) |  |
| 151,000 – 200,000 | 3 (50.0) | 3 (50.0) | 6 (100) |  |
| 201,000-250,000 | 4 (83.3) | 1 (16.7) | 5 (100) | P = 0.052 |
| 251,000 – 300,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 301,000 – 350,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| 501,000 – 550,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| Not Given | 63 (88.2) | 9 (11.8) | 72 (100) |  |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 99338.7 + 83173.5 | | 60652.3 + 21327.1 |  |

Table 12 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and their reported practices of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Dwelling Place** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| Flats | 120 (86.8) | 30 (13.2) | 150 (100) |  |
| A room | 9 (50.0) | 9 (50.0) | 18 (100) |  |
| Self-Contained | 22 (88.7) | 4 (11.3) | 26 (100) | P=< 0.001 |
| Duplex | 18 (79.6) | 7 (20.4) | 25 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Others | 19 (90.2) | 4 (9.8) | 23 (100) |  |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Household Size** | | | | |
| 1-3 | 54 (74.9) | 22 (25.1) | 76 (100) |  |
| 4-6 | 107 (86.5) | 18 (13.5) | 125 (100) |  |
| 7-9 | 23 (72.8) | 14 (27.2) | 37 (100) | P=0.006 |
| 10-12 | 4 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 4 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 188 (77.7) | 54 (22.3) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 12 shows that there was a statistically significant association between the respondents’ educational level and their reported practices as a higher proportion (85.6%) of respondents with primary educational level had good reported practices of domestic solid waste management (p=0.0001). Also, there was a statistically significant association between the respondents’ employment status and their reported practices as a higher proportion (91.2%) of respondents that were students had good reported practices of domestic solid waste management (p=0.006). there was also a statistically significant association between the dwelling place and household size of respondents and their reported practices where higher proportions of respondents who lived in flats (86.8%) and respondents with household size of 10-12 members (100%) had good reported practices of domestic solid waste management.

Table 13: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and their observed practices of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Age group (years)** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| 20-29 | 36 (80.0) | 9 (20.0) | 45 (100) |  |
| 30-39 | 65 (87.8) | 9 (12.2) | 74 (100) |  |
| 40-49 | 37 (80.4) | 9 (19.6) | 46 (100) |  |
| 50-59 | 19 (79.2) | 5 (20.8) | 24 (100) | P=0.638 |
| 60-69 | 26 (89.7) | 3 (10.3) | 29 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 70-79 | 10 (90.9) | 1 (9.1) | 11 (100) |  |
| Not Given | 9 (69.2) | 4 (30.8) | 13 (100) |  |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 42.4 + 14.6 | 41.4 + 14.2 |  |  |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 123 (80.4) | 30 (19.6) | 153 (100) | p=0.107 |
| Female | 79 (88.8) | 10 (11.2) | 89 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Marital Status** | | | | |
| Married | 116 (85.3) | 20 (14.7) | 136 (100) |  |
| Single | 62 (82.7) | 13 (17.3) | 75 (100) |  |
| Separated | 7 (58.3) | 5 (41.7) | 12 (100 | P = 0.211 |
| Divorced | 2 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 2 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Widowed | 15 (88.2) | 2 (11.8) | 17 (100) |  |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40(16.5) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 13 continue: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and their observed practices of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Religion** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| Islam | 57 (87.7) | 8 (12.3) | 65 (100) |  |
| Christianity | 141 (81.8) | 35 (18.2) | 171 (100) | p= 0.443 |
| Others | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | |
| Hausa | 20 (83.3) | 4 (16.7) | 24 (100) |  |
| Igbo | 53 (85.5) | 9 (14.5) | 62 (100) | p= 0.942 |
| Yoruba | 86 (83.5) | 17 (16.5) | 103 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Others | 43 (81.1) | 10 (18.9) | 53 (100) |  |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Educational Status** | | | | |
| Informal | 8 (57.1) | 6 (42.9) | 14 (100) |  |
| Primary | 11 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 11 (100) |  |
| Secondary | 32 (72.7) | 12 (27.3) | 44 (100) | p = 0.003 |
| Tertiary | 151 (87.3) | 22 (12.7) | 173 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 13 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and their observed practices of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Employment Status** | **Good** | **Poor** | **Total** |  |
| Government | 44 (84.6) | 8 (15.4) | 52 (100) |  |
| Private | 59 (89.4) | 7 (10.6) | 66 (100) |  |
| Self employed | 68 (81.9) | 15 (18.1) | 83 (100) | P = 0.388 |
| Unemployed | 16 (76.2) | 5 (23.8) | 21 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Student | 15 (76.2) | 5 (23.8) | 21 (100) |  |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Average Income (#)** | | | | |
| 0-50,000 | 56 (80.0) | 14 (20.0) | 70 (100) |  |
| 51,000 – 100,000 | 56 (86.2) | 9 (13.8) | 65 (100) |  |
| 101,000 – 150,000 | 17 (81.0) | 4 (19.0) | 21 (100) |  |
| 151,000 – 200,000 | 6 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 0 (100) | p= 0.924 |
| 201,000-250,000 | 5 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 5 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 251,000 – 300,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| 301,000 – 350,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| 501,000 – 550,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| Not Given | 60 (29.7) | 12 (18.6) | 72 (100) |  |
| Total | 202 (81.4) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 84281.7 + 69922.0 | | 64500.0 + 48774.2 |  |

Table 13 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristic of respondents and their observed practices of domestic solid waste management.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Dwelling Place** | **Positive** | **Negative** | **Total** |  |
| Flats | 127 (84.7) | 23 (15.3) | 150 (100) |  |
| A room | 13 (72.2) | 5 (27.8) | 18 (100) |  |
| Self-Contained | 23 (88.5) | 3 (11.5) | 26 (100) | P= 0.342 |
| Duplex | 19 (76.0) | 6 (24.0) | 25 (100 | (fisher exact) |
| Others | 20 (87.0) | 3 (13.0) | 23 (100) |  |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Household Size** | | | | |
| 1-3 | 60 (78.9) | 16 (21.1) | 76 (100) |  |
| 4-6 | 107 (85.6) | 18 (14.4) | 125 (100) |  |
| 7-9 | 32 (86.5) | 5 (13.5) | 37 (100) | P=0.475 |
| 10-12 | 3 (75.0) | 1 (25.0) | 4 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 202 (83.5) | 40 (16.5) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 13 above shows that there was a statistically significant association between the respondents’ educational level and their observed practices of domestic solid waste management in which a higher proportion (100%) of respondents with primary education had good observed practices (p=0.003).

However, there was no statistically significant relationship between the other socio-demographic factors and respondents’ observed practices domestic solid waste management.

**4.7: QUANTITY OF DOMESTIC SOLID WASTES GENERATED**

**Table 14: Quantity of waste generated per household per day**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Weight (kg) | Frequency (%) |
| 0.10-0.49 | 73 (30.2) |
| 0.50-0.89 | 127 (52.4) |
| 0.90 – 1.29 | 22 (9.1) |
| 1.30-1.69 | 16 (4.2) |
| 1.70-2.09 | 3 (1.2) |
| 2.10-2.49 | 14 (0.4) |
| Total | 242 (100) |
| Mean + SD | 0.67 + 0.36 |

Table 14 above showed that the mean weight of waste generated per household per day was 0.67 + 0.36kg and the modal group was 0.50-0.89kg.

Table 15: Association between socio-demographic characteristic and quantity of waste generated per household per day.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Age group (years)** | **< 0.67** | **> 0.67** | **Total** |  |
| 20-29 | 28 (68.3) | 14 (31.7) | 42 (100) |  |
| 30-39 | 52 (65.3) | 26 (34.7) | 78 (100) |  |
| 40-49 | 27 (60.0) | 18 (40.0) | 45 (100) |  |
| 50-59 | 18 (75.0) | 6 (25.0) | 24 (100) |  |
| 60-69 | 19 (64.3) | 10 (35.7) | 29 (100) | p= 0.873 |
| 70-79 | 9 (81.8) | 2 (18.2) | 11 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Not Given | 8 (61.5) | 5 (38.5) | 13 (100) |  |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 42.8 + 15.1 | 41.4 + 13.6 |  |  |
| **Sex** | | | | |
| Male | 99 (66.1) | 55 (33.9) | 154 (100) | X2 = 0.70 |
| Female | 62 (70.5) | 26 (29.5) | 88 (100) | df = 1 |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) | p=0.401 |
| **Marital Status** | | | | |
| Married | 97 (72.2) | 41 (27.8) | 138 (100) |  |
| Single | 44 (60.3) | 29 (39.7) | 73 (100) |  |
| Separated | 6 (50.0) | 6 (50.0) | 12 (100) | P = 0.265 |
| Divorced | 1 (50.0) | 1 (50.0) | 2 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Widowed | 13 (76.5) | 4 (23.5) | 17 (100) |  |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 15 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristics and quantity of waste generated per household per day.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Religion** | **< 0.67** | **> 0.67** | **Total** |  |
| Islam | 39 (63.9) | 22 (36.1) | 61 (100) |  |
| Christianity | 121 (66.3) | 59 (33.7) | 180 (100) | p= 0.77 |
| Others | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Ethnicity** | | | | |
| Hausa | 10 (45.5) | 12 (54.5) | 22 (100) |  |
| Igbo | 41 (66.1) | 21 (33.9) | 62 (100) | X2 = 7.86 |
| Yoruba | 80 (76.5) | 27 (23.5) | 107 (100) | p=0.045 |
| Others | 30 (58.5) | 21 (41.2) | 51 (100) |  |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Educational Status** | | | | |
| Informal | 6 (46.2) | 7 (53.8) | 13 (100) |  |
| Primary | 8 (72.7) | 3 (27.3) | 11 (100) |  |
| Secondary | 30 (69.8) | 13 (30.2) | 43 (100) | p = 0.441 |
| Tertiary | 117 (68.9) | 58 (31.1) | 175 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 15 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristics and quantity of waste generated per household per day.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Employment Status** | **< 0.67** | **> 0.67** | **Total** |  |
| Government | 32 (62.7) | 19 (37.3) | 51 (100) |  |
| Private | 45 (70.3) | 19 (29.7) | 64 (100) | X2 = 1.62 |
| Self employed | 56 (65.2) | 31 (34.8) | 87 (100) | df=4 |
| Unemployed | 15 (71.4) | 6 (28.6) | 21 (100) | p=0.813 |
| Student | 13 (68.4) | 6 (31.6) | 19 (100) |  |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Average Income (#)** | | | | |
| 0-50,000 | 61 (87.1) | 9 (12.9) | 70 (100) |  |
| 51,000 – 100,000 | 39 (60.0) | 26 (40.0) | 65 (100) |  |
| 101,000 – 150,000 | 12 (57.1) | 9 (11.1) | 21 (100) | p=< 0.001 |
| 151,000 – 200,000 | 4 (66.7) | 2 (33.3) | 6 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| 201,000-250,000 | 2 (33.4) | 3 (66.7) | 5 (100) |  |
| 251,000 – 300,000 | 1 (100) | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) |  |
| 301,000 – 350,000 | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) | 1 (100) |  |
| 501,000 – 550,000 | 0 (0.0) | 1 (100) | 1 (100) |  |
| Not Given | 42 (57.7) | 30 (42.3) | 72 (100) |  |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |
| Mean + SD | 77294.6 + 69147.4 | | 90672.7 + 63945.6 |  |

Table 15 continued: Association between socio-demographic characteristics and quantity of waste generated per household per day.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio demographic Level of knowledge Statistics**  **Characteristics Frequency (%)** | | | | |
| **Dwelling Place** | **< 0.67** | **> 0.67** | **Total** |  |
| Flats | 105 (71.5) | 46 (28.5) | 151 (100) |  |
| A room | 12 (66.7) | 6 (33.3) | 18 (100) | X2=4.44 |
| Self-Contained | 19 (73.1) | 7 (26.9) | 26 (100) | df = 4 |
| Duplex | 13 (52.0) | 12 (48.0) | 25 (100) | p = 0.355 |
| Others | 12 (54.5) | 10 (45.5) | 22 (100) |  |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |
| **Household Size** | | | | |
| 1-3 | 58 (76.3) | 18 (23.7) | 76 (100) |  |
| 4-6 | 83 (66.4) | 42 (33.6) | 125 (100) |  |
| 7-9 | 19 (51.4) | 18 (48.6) | 37 (100) | P=0.014 |
| 10-12 | 1 (25.0) | 3 (75.0) | 4 (100) | (fisher exact) |
| Total | 161 (65.8) | 81 (34.2) | 242 (100) |  |

Table 15 above shows that there was a statistically significant association between household size of respondents and the quantity of wastes generated per household per day as a higher proportion (73.6%) of respondents with household size of 1-3 members generated quantity of waste < 0.67 per day (p=0.014).

However, there was no statistically significant relationship between respondents’ age (p=0.88), sex (p=0.40), religion (p=0.76), marital status (p=0.27), education (p=0.44), employment status (p=0.81), dwelling place (p=0.35) and the quantity of wastes generated per household.

**APPENDIX**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

**DETERMINANTS OF DOMESTIC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AMONG RESIDENTS OF AN URBAN COMMUNITY IN LAGOS STATE.**

Dear Sir/Ma,

My name is Alabi Babatunde M, a postgraduate student of Public Health of the Department of Community Health and Primary Care, College of Medicine, University of Lagos, Idi-Araba. Lagos State.

I am carrying out a research study on Determinants of Domestic Solid Waste Management Practices Among Residents of An Urban Community In Lagos State in partial fulfilment of my postgraduate programme.

I will be grateful if this questionnaire is correctly and adequately filled.

Confidentiality and anonymity are fully guaranteed.

Thank you.

**SECTION A: SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS**

Age as at last birthday (years), please specify …………………………………………….

1. **Sex**

Male

Female

1. **Marital Status**
2. Married
3. Single
4. Separated
5. Divorced
6. Widowed
7. **Religion:**
8. Islam
9. Christianity
10. Others
11. **Ethnicity**
12. Hausa
13. Igbo
14. Yoruba
15. Others
16. **Educational Status:**
17. No formal education
18. Primary
19. Secondary
20. Tertiary
21. **Employment Status:**
22. Government Institution
23. Private Institution
24. Self employed
25. Unemployed
26. Student
27. Average income per month …………………………………………….(please specify)

Type of dwelling place

1. Flats
2. A room
3. Self contained
4. Duplex
5. Others ………………………………………………. (specify)
6. Household size (number of people living in the house) ……………….. (please specify)

**SECTION B: KNOWLEDGE OF HOUSEHOLD SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

(8-13) Improper disposal of wastes could result in

1. Air pollution
2. Yes
3. No
4. I don’t know
5. Contamination of food
6. Yes
7. No
8. I don’t know
9. Contamination of water supply
10. Yes
11. No
12. I don’t know
13. Breeding of mosquitoes and flies
14. Yes
15. No
16. I don’t know
17. Bad odour
18. Yes
19. No
20. No I don’t know
21. Illness among household members
22. Yes
23. No
24. I don’t know

(14-17) Which of the following are proper, safe and hygienic method(s) of storage and disposal of waste in the home?

1. Storage of house wastes in the dustbin
2. Yes
3. No
4. I don’t know
5. Storage of wastes in uncovered waste bin in the kitchen over night
6. Yes
7. No
8. I don’t know
9. Dumping of waste in open sites around the house
10. Yes
11. No
12. I don’t know
13. Burning of waste within the premises of the house
14. Yes
15. No
16. I don’t know

(18-27) Which of the following could occur as a result of improper disposal of waste?

1. Malaria
2. Yes
3. No
4. I don’t know
5. Hypertension
6. Yes
7. No
8. I don’t know
9. Cholera
10. Yes
11. No
12. I don’t know
13. Diabetes Mellitus
14. Yes
15. No
16. I don’t know
17. Diarrhea
18. Yes
19. No
20. I don’t know
21. Typhoid Fever
22. Yes
23. No
24. No I don’t know
25. Food Poisoning
26. Yes
27. No
28. I don’t know
29. Chest infections
30. Yes
31. No
32. I don’t know
33. Gonorrhea
34. Yes
35. No
36. I don’t know

**SECTION C: ATTITUDE TOWARDS HOUSEHOLD SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

1. Do you feel comfortable seeing your waste bin overflow with waste?
2. Yes
3. No
4. I don’t know
5. Will you recommend that each household must have a dustbin with cover for storage of refuse?
6. Yes
7. No
8. I don’t know
9. Will you recommend that any household without a dustbin with a cover should be penalized?
10. Yes
11. No
12. I don’t know
13. Are you willing to pay for the collection and disposal of your domestic wastes?
14. Yes
15. No
16. I don’t know
17. Do you think you have a responsibility to transport your wastes to a sanitary dumpsite if the waste collection agency responsible for it does not come for collection.
18. Yes
19. No
20. I don’t know

**SECTION D: PRACTICES IN DOMESTIC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

1. How do you store your refuse in the house?
2. In covered plastic/metal bin
3. In uncovered plastic/metal bin
4. In polythene bags
5. In a carton
6. Others (please specify) ……………………………………………………
7. Do you separate your wastes before discarding them?
8. Yes
9. No
10. How do you discard the waste generated in your household
11. Hand it over to LAWMA waste collectors
12. Dump it on the open site on the street
13. Burn it
14. Others, specify ………………………………………………………………………………..

(35- 41) Which of the following do you do to the wastes generated from your house?

1. Burning the dug pits around the house
2. Yes
3. No
4. Dumping on an authorized dump site
5. Yes
6. No
7. Open dumping on the streets
8. Yes
9. No
10. Burning on an open site
11. Yes
12. No
13. Dumping in gutters when rain falls
14. Yes
15. No
16. Storing in containers for collection by waste management authority
17. Yes
18. No

**SECTION E: OBSERVER’S CHECKLIST FOR DOMESTIC SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT**

Serial Number …………………………………………..

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **OBSERVATION** | **YES** | **NO** |
| 41 | Availability of refuse bin in the kitchen |  |  |
| 42. | Refuse bin in the kitchen has cover |  |  |
| 43. | Plastic/steel refuse bin in the kitchen has hole(s) on the body |  |  |
| 44. | Availability of refuse bin within the premises, compound or in from of the house |  |  |
| 45. | Availability of a public waste bin within the location of the house |  |  |
| 46. | Presence of an open dumpsite in the neighborhood |  |  |
| 47 | Burning of wastes is being practiced  Weight (kg) of household refuse |  |  |