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Abstract
This study analysed the monitoring and evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes in the Southern Senatorial District of Cross River State, Nigeria. The study considered different levels of care/support and tested for locational variations in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes. A descriptive survey design was utilised. This study covered 596 public health employees (doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and laboratory employees) in the study area. Using the proportional stratified random sampling procedure, a sample of 239 respondents was chosen. Data was collected using a questionnaire constructed by the researchers and validated by specialists. Data gathered were analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Results indicated that HIV/AIDS programmes had been successfully monitored/evaluated to a high extent. High success rates in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes are attributable to high rates of care/support provided to people living with HIV/AIDS. There was a significant variation in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes based on the location of health facilities, with higher rates recorded for urban areas. Based on the findings, it was concluded that the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes in the Southern Senatorial District of Cross River State had recorded a significant level of success. The study recommended, among others, that there should be even distribution of medical facilities, resources and personnel to both urban and rural areas to promote equity and access to materials needed to contain or mitigate the spread of the pandemic across all locations.

Introduction

The HIV/AIDS pandemic is among the deadliest and long-standing pandemics in the history of man. The virus has claimed many lives and will continue until a breakthrough is made in providing a more permanent solution. According to available data by the World Health Organisation (hereafter, WHO), 37,700,000 people live with HIV at the close of 2020. Of this value, 1,500,000 were newly infected in 2020, whereas as high as 680,000 people died in the same year of HIV-related causes. WHO also documented that 73% of the people living with HIV/AIDS received Antiretroviral therapy (WHO, 2020). The outburst of Covid-19 in the early months of 2020 shifted people’s attention from HIV/AIDS, making it appear like a forgotten story (Owan, Akah, et al. 2021). While we are battling to fit into the new normal occasioned by the Covid-19 pandemic (Owan, Asuquo, et al. 2021; Aslam, Sonkar, and Owan 2021), it is pertinent that we also consider regulating the spread of the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

Due to the magnitude of the HIV/AIDS pandemic and the relevance of transmission prevention efforts, HIV prevention projects prioritise complete and timely evaluations (Katz et al., 2013; Phillips et al., 2021; Taylor, 2018). HIV prevention programmes affect risk behaviour if conducted with sufficient resources, intensity, and cultural competence (Pantalone et al. 2020; Sun et al. 2019; Ward et al. 2020). Successful project monitoring and assessment are usually one of the pillars of effective project performance (Bahadorestanl et al., 2020; Ma et al., 2020; Odigwe et al., 2020). Since it offers a reliable method, exhibits stakeholders’ transparency, and supports strategic planning for upcoming projects (Owan and Agunwa 2019).

However, we cannot state clearly the extent to which the HIV/AIDS pandemic has permeated an area or region except through effective monitoring, tracking and evaluation. An essential component of a sound monitoring system is the integrated interpretation of data from multiple sources. Monitoring allows programme managers to understand what has been done, identify areas that deserve further attention, and highlight concerns that may improve responses. Evaluation is a collection of measures to determine the quality or value of a given programme, intervention, or project. Essential evaluation practices include an assessment of the contents, scope of coverage, quality, and completeness of the programme. If the evaluation of the process discloses that the programme did not take place or reach its target audience, then a review is valuable. However, the evaluation process can show whether the program is being executed as expected. An appraisal of short-term outcomes (known as the evaluation of results) should be carried out if the execution is not according to plan.

In Cross River State, little appears to have been done to monitor and evaluate existing HIV/AIDS programmes implemented by the government or donor agencies. The monitoring and evaluation of the programmes tend to be a daunting exercise due to numerous challenges. Some of these challenges have been discovered to include inadequate funding, poor monitoring and evaluation goals, the problem of stigmatisation and others (Cavazos-Rehg et al. 2021; Kissi et al. 2019; Y. Wang, Kiwuwa-Muyingo, and Kadengye 2021; Schiaroli et al. 2020). These issues have led to the argument that HIV/AIDs programmes are not being monitored and evaluated adequately (Al Awaidy & Sharanya, 2019; Arias Garcia et al., 2020; WHO, 2020). Although these programmes play an essential role in the battle against HIV/AIDS, it is unclear how successful they are monitored and evaluated by stakeholders. It is also unclear how each specific challenge has limited the efficacy in monitoring and evaluating HIV/AIDS prevention programmes in developing countries. Thus, the current study sought to determine how the evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes has been successful in the Southern Senatorial District of Cross River State. The study also analysed the influence of care/support and location on the district’s monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes.

Care and support include various nutritional, health, psychological, economic, physical, and legal services offered to infected persons. These programmes are essential to the well-being of orphans and other vulnerable youths who are HIV positive. Care and support are
essential regardless of access to antiretroviral drugs, from diagnosis to HIV-related illnesses (UNAIDS, 2016). A study found that a $5 family food voucher increased consent by 29 percentage points for home-based HIV testing (Lucie D Cluver et al. 2014). People with food vouchers were tested for HIV and agreed to do so a year later than people without a coupon, suggesting the long-lasting benefits of food incentives to boost HIV counselling and test rates (Tanser et al. 2021). Also, it was revealed that combining care with at least two daily meals (“cash plus care”) reduced non-compliance to 18 per cent (Palazuelos, Farmer, and Mukherjee 2018; Hosek and Pettifor 2019). Therefore, WHO (2016), in a global health sector report (covering 2016 to 2021), indicated that complete support and assistance include the provision of compliance support, counselling and testing, legal, socio-economic aid, mental and emotional help, contraception and health services, pre-exposure prophylaxis and antiretroviral medication.

Bekke, Beyrer and Quinn (2012) characterised a successful HIV programme as one that avoids or lowers HIV-related risk behaviours or favourably influences their effectiveness, or both, in the most cost-effective or cost-beneficial manner given a level of resource investment. It was further emphasised by Bekke et al. that HIV prevention programmes must be assessed to determine whether the intended objectives (behavioural or health) are met. Otherwise, the outcome objectives should be rechecked for clarity and mid-course modifications made for objectives to be met (Awofala and Ogundele 2018). However, due to limited resources, not every HIV prevention programme can be subjected to scientifically rigorous outcome evaluation (Katz et al. 2013; Jones, Sullivan, and Curran 2019). Other challenges that affect the evaluation of HIV prevention programmes include stigma, the fluctuating incidence of HIV cases, resistance to antiretroviral therapy, gender discrimination, difficulty in collecting sensitive data, and racial discrimination (Agudelo-Rojas et al. 2019; Ansari and Pandey, 2018; Cardoso et al. 2021; Feyissa et al. 2019; Greenwood et al. 2022; Logie et al. 2018). Nevertheless, it can be argued that a programme, once started, can and should be evaluated for decision-making and improvement. Along these lines, HIV/AIDS prevention programmes have been evaluated in different parts of the world (Adejimi et al. 2018; Garcia et al. 2022; Joshua et al. 2020; Marshall et al. 2022; Mustanski et al. 2020; Ndungu, Gakuu, and Kidombo 2019; Rohrbach et al. 2019).

Studies evaluating the prevention programmes of HIV/AIDS tend to reveal a high degree of success (Bennett et al. 2015; Parham et al. 2015; Malama et al. 2020; Sypsa et al. 2017; Operario et al. 2017). For instance, it was found that the execution of the minimal preventive package for intervention in HIV/AIDS prevention programmes had significant success in decreasing the prevalence rate (Adejimi et al. 2018). Other studies have reported that HIV incidents dropped after implementing different prevention programmes (Girum et al. 2018; Hanum et al. 2021). A more recent study discovered that HIV prevalence was 5.35%, and there is a significant difference when comparing the rates of new HIV infections among 1028 feverish individuals and blood donors (Olusola, Olaleye, and Odaibo 2021). Other recent studies have documented that even though there is no cure or HIV vaccine now, technological developments (in areas such as HIV testing, rapid and sustained treatment, pre-exposure prophylaxis and robust syringe service programs) have the potential to significantly reduce the number of new HIV infections (Bosh et al. 2021; Chesson et al. 2021; Giguère et al. 2021; Rendina et al. 2021; Romero et al. 2021). Reducing HIV transmission, morbidity, and mortality might be sped up, and inequities could be narrowed by stepping up efforts to execute these methods fairly and equally. However, due to social distancing regulation occasioned by the Covid-19 pandemic, it has been forecasted that the chances of HIV and STI increasing are lower if a more extended period of sexual distancing is maintained (Jewell, Smith, and Hallett 2020; Stephenson et al. 2021; Ponticiello et al. 2020; Zapata et al. 2021; Jenness et al. 2021).
On the other hand, Taylor (2018) noted a rising frequency of sexually transmitted illnesses, especially HIV/AIDS, among adolescents in Sub-Saharan Africa, demonstrating that the continent’s previous attempts to combat the pandemic have been insufficient. Results from many recent studies also tend to reveal a high rate of prevalence of HIV among individuals with antiretroviral therapy in the US (Kalichman, Eaton, and Kalichman 2021) and several Asian countries such as Tanzania (Mosha et al. 2022), China (Jing et al. 2022), Thailand (Thitipatarakorn et al. 2022). According to UNAIDS (2016), various reasons can hinder people from starting and staying on antiretroviral medication. According to studies in Sub-Saharan Africa, transport and opportunity expenses are vital determinants influencing whether persons eligible for HIV treatment begin antiretroviral medication (Amosse et al. 2021; Chamie et al. 2021; Kadia et al. 2021; Abdulai et al. 2022; Tweya et al. 2020).

A mapping analysis conducted in the rural northern section of South Africa’s KwaZulu-Natal region indicated that clinic travel time is the most critical factor influencing health services utilisation (Kim et al. 2021). Furthermore, studies on location have also documented the presence of a divide in access to medical facilities between rural and urban inhabitants (Amiri et al. 2021; Laksono, Wulandari, and Soedirham 2019; Laksono, Rukmini, and Wulandari 2020; X. Wang et al. 2018). This makes it difficult for rural dwellers to travel long distances to access health facilities in urban areas (Myers 2019; Pereira et al. 2021; Strowd et al. 2021). This implies that urban-rural inequality in access to medical care is pervasive due to similarities in evidence from studies in different parts of the world. To reduce this, research has shown a need to address the factors that have led to regional differences in HIV prevalence and prevention (Blanco et al. 2020; Lu et al. 2021; Shadmi et al. 2020; Sullivan et al. 2021). This gave the impetus to consider care/support as one of the factors that can play a role in HIV intervention and response to medication.

This research was based on the programme assessment’s Context-Input-Process-Product (CIPP) framework (Stufflebeam, 1971). The CIPP model comprises four complimentary components that enable evaluators to consider critical but often neglected programme features. The context, input, process, and product assessment phases are all included in this. The context assessment offers a broad picture of the relationship between the programme and evaluation strategies (Mertens & Wilson, 2012). This aids in decision-making by allowing the evaluator to determine a community’s needs, assets, and resources to provide good programming (Fitzpatrick, Sanders and Worthen, 2012). Its goal is to evaluate the programme’s strategy, merit, work plan, response to client requirements and comparable alternative strategies.

Process evaluation assesses the quality of a programme’s implementation. The evaluator monitors, documents, and evaluates program actions throughout this stage (Fitzpatrick, Sanders and Worthen, 2011; Mertens & Wilson, 2012). The goal is to offer feedback on how planned activities are carried out. This understanding can aid staff in modifying and improving the programme plan and the degree to which participants fulfill their tasks (Stufflebeam 2003). Product assessment evaluates the programme’s impacts on its target audience, considering both planned and unintentional results. Stakeholders and relevant specialists are examined at this stage, focusing on outcomes that affect the group, subgroups, and individuals. Using various methodological strategies, all outcomes are recorded and aid in verifying assessment results (Mertens and Wilson, 2012; Stufflebeam, 2003).

The application of the CIPP theory to the current research is to successfully monitor and evaluate HIV/AIDS prevention programmes and the environment in which such programmes are implemented. The required inputs, including people and material resources that must be provided to drive the HIV/AIDS prevention programmes, must be considered. The procedures must be clearly defined and reviewed for consistency, including the activities completed by various groups in the programme. The product (the total efficacy of the
HIV/AIDS programme) must also be evaluated subjectively or statistically in terms of health, social, and economic effects. A CIPP context assessment study identifies programme objectives by examining programme-related needs, issues, assets, and opportunities. The context and process evaluation results provide a good starting point for analysing future outcomes (products). A vital context and process evaluation may help a programme’s planning or leadership team boost its proposal when submitting a request for external financing. A context evaluation is more comprehensive than a traditional ‘needs assessment’ since it includes questions about possible obstructions and assets, but it does contain that critical part. For all of these to function, there must be clearly defined objectives, enough financing, and increased awareness of the advantages of enhanced data collecting. If any or all of these elements are absent, the monitoring and evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes will be flawed.

Based on the CIPP framework, the current study assessed the degree to which the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes has been successful. The study also assessed care/support and location and their respective contributions to the monitoring/evaluating HIV and AIDs prevention programmes in Cross River State. Along these lines, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested.

i. The level of success in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes is not significantly high.

ii. There is no significant difference in monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes based on the level of care/support provided.

iii. There is no significant difference in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes based on the location of health facilities.

Methodology

Research method and design

The quantitative research method was adopted for the study focused on the descriptive survey research design. Descriptive survey research design is “suitable for studies seeking to describe observed phenomena occurring in the population using the observations from the sample” (Owan & Robert, 2019; p.5). Therefore, this study aims to use appropriate tools to collect primary data from respondents.

Population and sample

The study’s population included all public health employees (doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and laboratory personnel) in the Southern Senatorial District of Cross River State. According to the Cross River State Ministry of Health [CRSMH] (2021), 596 health care service professionals are in the district. These include 31 medical doctors, 453 nurses, 54 pharmacists, and 58 laboratory staff. Taro Yamane’s method determined the research sample size (Yamane, 1973). The formula is used in determining the sample size of a study when the population size is already known. The formula was used to yield a representative sample that will ensure that the population parameters (characteristics of the population) are possessed by the sample statistic (characteristics of the sample). Taro Yamane’s formula is given as:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N (e)^2} \]

Where:

- \( n \) = the sample size to be determined
- \( N \) = the population size (which in this study is known as 596 healthcare practitioners)
- \( e \) = the acceptable sampling error (At 95% confidence level, \( e = 0.05 \))

Substituting values into the formula, we have that:
\[ n = \frac{596}{1 + 596(0.05)^2} \]
\[ n = \frac{596}{1 + 596(0.0025)} \]
\[ n = \frac{596}{1 + 1.49} \]
\[ n = \frac{596}{2.49} \]
\[ \therefore n = 239.357 \approx 239 \]

This means that a sample of 239 respondents will be large enough for the population of 596 public health workers in the Southern Senatorial District to be adequately represented in this study. However, in selecting the actual sample of the study, the proportionate stratified random sampling technique was adopted. The study population was stratified according to the cadre of public health workers (e.g., doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and laboratory staff) in the Southern Senatorial District. In each stratum, 40.10% of the population was computed. This was done so that healthcare practitioners represented the sample in the same proportion as the population. Upon computation and selection, 239 respondents (public health care workers) were selected.

**Instrumentation – validity and reliability**

A questionnaire named “Care/Support, Location, and Monitoring/Evaluation of HIV/AIDS Prevention Programmes Questionnaire” (CSLMEHAPPQ) was used to gather data. The researchers created the questionnaire and sub-divided it into two portions. Section A was meant to collect demographic information from respondents, such as gender, age, experience, employment, and the location of their health facility. Section B was designed with 12 items on a four-point Likert scale to assess care/support and the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes. Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD) were the answer possibilities. Six specialists (three public health experts and three psychometrists) from the University of Calabar, Calabar, assessed the face and content validity instrument. These specialists ensured that the items covered the main topics in each subsection. They also ensured that the statements and placements of items were generally clear. Items deemed irrelevant were changed or removed, and recommendations for improvement were offered. The instrument’s scale content validity index (SCV-I UA) was .913, with individual item content validity indices ranging from .82 to .95. The Cronbach Alpha method was used to assess the instrument’s reliability, and a coefficient of .862 indicated that the instrument was internally consistent.

**Data collection and analysis procedures**

Primary data were obtained in this study by administering copies of the instrument. The researchers made physical contact with the selected respondents based on a scheduled date allocated for each category of the respondents. Before administering the instrument, the researchers got written informed consent from the targeted participants. Fortunately, the 239 respondents all voluntarily consented to participate in the study after the researchers had explained the purpose and implications of participating in the study. During the administration, the researchers explained the significance of the exercise and why they (respondents) should provide honest replies to the items. The respondents were also told that personal information would be used just for the study and not shared with anybody. The respondents were also aware that after deanonynisation and aggregation of responses, the result would be published in a peer-reviewed journal. After the data collection process, all copies of the instruments were obtained without loss from respondents. Thus, a return rate of 100 per cent was achieved. The serial numbers previously issued for simple identification were considered while scoring the questionnaires. The Likert scale was scored differently for positively and negatively phrased
questions. All responses were coded on a person-by-item matrix using a computer spreadsheet application following the scoring. Variables were coded differently depending on the data gathered and the measurement scale.

Results

Monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes

The first objective of this study was to determine the extent monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes has been successful. We hypothesised that success in monitoring/evaluating HIV/AIDs prevention programmes is not significantly high. Since there is only one continuous variable in this hypothesis that does not depend on any other variable, the one-sample t-test analysis was performed. The respondents’ observed (calculated) mean for this variable was compared to the expected (population) mean to test this hypothesis. The population mean was statistically determined to be 15.00. As shown in Table 1, the investigation found that the observed mean score for monitoring/evaluating HIV/AIDs prevention programmes was 17.06. With a mean difference of 2.06, this number is greater than the actual population mean of 15.00. A glance at the p-value reveals .00, smaller than the .05 alpha threshold at 238 degrees of freedom. Based on this result, the null hypothesis was rejected, while the alternative hypothesis, which states that “the extent to which the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes has been successful is significantly high”, was retained. This implies that the rate at which the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes has been successful is significantly higher than the expected average in the Southern Senatorial District of Cross River State.

Table 1: One sample t-test results showing the extent monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes has been successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean d</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prevention programmes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 238; 95% CI of the mean difference (1.24; 2.88)

To validate the test of this hypothesis, a post-hoc power test (Cohen, 1988) was performed using the G*Power program (Erdfelder et al. 2009; Mayr et al. 2007; Faul et al. 2007). An effect size (d = 0.32), with a statistical power of .999, was obtained at the .05 alpha level. This implies that our one-sample t-test analysis was 99.9% accurate in rejecting the null hypothesis; hence, the chances of having committed a type I error are almost non-existent (see Figure 1).
Care/support and the monitoring/evaluation of the HIV/AIDs programme

The study’s second objective was to estimate the influence of care/support on the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes. We hypothesised that there is no significant difference in monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes based on the level of care/support provided in the Southern Senatorial District. Using responses to the survey, we classified the level of care/support into three ordinal levels - high, moderate, and low levels. The dependent variable – monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes was continuous. The one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was adopted in testing the hypothesis at the .05 level of significance. Table 2 shows that 116, 80 and 43 respondents perceived that the level of care/support provided to HIV/AIDs patients is high, average, and low, respectively. The monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes was higher in areas with a level of care/support than areas where care/support is moderate and low, respectively. The analysis of variance revealed a significant difference in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS programme among three groups with varying levels of care/support ($F_{[2, 236]} = 23.07, p = .00 < .05\alpha$). The null hypothesis was rejected based on this evidence, whereas the alternative hypothesis was accepted. This means there is a considerable variation in the monitoring/evaluation of the HIV/AIDS programme based on the level of care/support provided.

Table 2: One-way analysis of variance result of the influence of care/support on the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of care/support</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>(17.78, 20.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>(15.87, 18.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>(10.27, 13.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>(16.24, 17.88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1611.87</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>805.94</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8243.31</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>34.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9855.18</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Central and non-central distributions of the one-sample t-test analysis in Table 1
A post hoc power analysis for the ANOVA test results in Table 2 was performed. At the .05 alpha level, the analysis result yielded a power $(1 - \beta \text{ err})$ value of .993. This suggests a 99.3% probability that the null hypothesis will be rejected (See Figure 2). Due to the significant difference obtained in the omnibus result of the one-way ANOVA, the Tukey HSD test of multiple pairwise comparisons was performed. The Tukey HSD test revealed that although the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes was higher where there was a high rate of care/support, the mean difference (1.74, $p = .11$) was not statistically significant compared with areas having a moderate level of care/support. However, there is a significant mean difference between the high and low categories of care/support (7.16, $p = .00$) in the monitoring/evaluating HIV/AIDs prevention programmes (in favour of the high category). Furthermore, there is a significant mean difference between the average and low category of care/support (5.42, $p = .00$) in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes. Therefore, the F-value was significant due to the differences between high vs low and average vs low levels of care/support (See Fig. 3).

![Figure 2: Plot of generic F-test showing power as a function of non-centrality parameters](image-url)
The third objective of this study was to determine whether there is a difference in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes between urban and rural locations. We hypothesised that there is no significant difference in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes between urban and rural locations of health facilities. An independent t-test analysis was performed to compare the means of monitoring/evaluating HIV/AIDS prevention programmes between urban and rural locations. Table 3 demonstrates that the monitoring/evaluation of the HIV/AIDS programme is more remarkable in urban (Mean =18.55) than rural (Mean =15.19) rural areas, with a mean difference of 3.36. Table 3 further shows that the p-value of .00 is smaller than the .05 alpha level at 237 degrees of freedom. Based on this finding, the null hypothesis was rejected, but the alternative hypothesis, which argues that there is a significant difference in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS programmes between urban and rural areas, was accepted. This is further illustrated in Fig. 4 for easy understanding/clarity.

Table 3: Independent t-test results summary showing the disparity between urban and rural locations in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 237; mean difference = 3.36; 95% CI of mean difference = 1.76, 4.96
Figure 4: Simple bar chart showing the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes in urban and rural locations.

Discussion of findings

This study analysed the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes, considering care/support and location. Our result highlighted a high extent of success in the monitoring/evaluating HIV/AIDS prevention programmes in the southern senatorial district of Cross River State. This finding is attributed to the high success rate in estimating the risk of transmission per contact using available resources (such as data, facilities, and expertise) in evaluating the duration of infection from people with HIV/AIDS. The healthcare facilities also demonstrated the capacity to determine the quality of people with HIV/AIDS using available facilities, the management of data and reports on the rate of mother-to-child transmission using databases, and the possibility of collecting quantitative or qualitative data about HIV-related situations from health centres. Therefore, if all of these services and activities are possible to a high extent at the moment, it is no surprise that this study’s findings appeared this way. This result is consistent with other studies that have documented a decrease in the incidents of HIV/AIDS due to technological advancements, among other factors (Adejimi et al. 2018; Hanum et al. 2021; Olusola, Olaleye, and Odaibo 2021; Bosh et al. 2021; Jenness et al. 2021). The conclusion also confirms the findings of another research, which found that, while there are still some problems, significant progress has been achieved toward ending the HIV/AIDS pandemic due to advances in HIV prevention and treatment (Jones, Sullivan, and Curran 2019).

As evidence of the documented success rate, it was earlier reported that the yearly number of AIDS fatalities decreased due to a significant increase in access to HIV treatment in recent years (Katz et al. 2013).

Nationally, 67% of those living with HIV are aware of their status, 88% are undergoing treatment, and 86% have viral suppression. As a result, AIDS-related deaths among adults of all ages and children decreased by 77% and 79%, respectively (Girum, Wasie, and Worku 2018). Girum and colleagues further revealed that by 2020, 79% of people living with HIV would be aware of their HIV status, with 96–99% of HIV-infected people receiving ART and more than 86% having viral suppression. This finding explains why this study’s monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes suggested a high extent. The findings, however, contradict other studies that documented that the rising frequency of sexually transmitted illnesses, especially HIV/AIDS, demonstrates that previous attempts to combat the pandemic have been insufficient, even with antiretroviral therapy (Kalichman,
Eaton, and Kalichman 2021; Mosha et al. 2022; Jing et al. 2022; Thitipatarakorn et al. 2022). The disparity in results might be related to variations in the factors included in the investigations. Besides, contextual factors in the areas where the studies were conducted might be another reason. Nevertheless, the result of the present study aligns with the CIPP framework of programme evaluation that emphasises that contextual factors be considered during evaluations.

This study established that care/support significantly influences the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes. This finding indicates that high success rates in monitoring/evaluation may be attributed to high levels of care/support provided to people living with HIV/AIDS. This result may be due to the favourable climate surrounding patients shown love, care and support. Thus, such infected individuals may be readily willing to participate in self-report surveys administered by the monitoring and evaluation teams. Furthermore, caregivers may understand the psychology and sociology of people living with AIDS, enabling them to provide useful information to researchers, public health scientists, and monitoring/evaluation teams to reach meaningful conclusions for decision-making purposes. This result is consistent with the evidence of UNAIDS that the identification of HIV-related diseases requires care and aid services, regardless of the capacity to have access to antiretroviral medicine (UNAIDS, 2016). This result is consistent with Cluver et al. (2014) findings that a $5 family food voucher boosted consent to home-based HIV testing by 29 percentage points.

Another research indicated that those with feeding incentives had higher HIV testing and compliance rates a year later than people without a voucher, which confirmed the long-term effects of the Food Incentive on the increase of HIV counselling and testing rates (Tanser et al. 2021). Another study proved that attending and parental supervision of an HIV support group would reduce non-adherence (from 54% to 27%), viral load and opportunistic infections in young people living with HIV (L D Cluver et al. 2016). Another study also reported that the combination of care and delivery of at least two meals a day (known as ‘cash plus treatment’) decreased non-compliance by 18% (Girma, Assegid, and Gezahen 2021). Therefore, WHO guidelines issued in 2016 call for a complete support and care package that include commitment aid, counselling and testing, legal, social, and financial help, emotional and psychological support and access to contraception and health services (WHO, 2016).

Through the third finding, this study uncovered that location played a substantial role in the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDS prevention programmes in favour of urban areas. This result might be explained by the disparity in the distribution of health staff, facilities, and services between urban and rural locations. It is more likely that there is a higher concentration of health facilities, resources, and services in urban than rural areas. This evidence provides support to the urban-rural gap in access to medical services widely documented in other studies (Kim et al. 2021; Amiri et al. 2021; Laksono, Wulandari, and Soedirham 2019; Laksono, Rukmini, and Wulandari 2020; X. Wang et al. 2018; Myers 2019; Pereira et al. 2021; Strowd et al. 2021). This explains why monitoring/evaluating HIV/AIDS prevention programmes will be easier in urban areas (with quality resources) than in rural areas (with inadequate or poor-quality infrastructure and resources). This agrees with another study that the HIV/AIDS outbreak is moving to places where the populations are scattered, and the health services are restricted by the socio-economic, geographical, and cultural factors and an evolved epidemic of injection medicine (Schafer et al. 2017).

Other studies in Sub-Saharan Africa have also discovered that transport and opportunity expenses are vital determinants for persons eligible for HIV treatment to begin antiretroviral medication (Tweya et al. 2020; Ahmed et al. 2018; Bruser et al. 2021; Frijters et al. 2020; Nuwagira et al. 2021). This study has further highlighted the importance of the CIPP theory that essential inputs and processes are required to produce desired output (Stufflebeam, 1971). Thus, to reduce regional disparities in HIV prevalence, factors that led to regional differences...
have been addressed (Blanco et al. 2020; Lu et al. 2021; Shadmi et al. 2020; Sullivan et al. 2021). By implication, effective monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes in rural and urban areas require a level playing ground.

Conclusion
Predicated on the results of this study, it was concluded that the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes in the Southern Senatorial District of Cross River State had recorded a significant level of success. There is a disparity between urban and rural areas in the district’s monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes. However, care/support proved to be an essential factor influencing the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes. This conclusion implies that public health workers have a role in promoting how these challenges can be mitigated within their jurisdiction for effective and quality service delivery. Theoretically, this study validates the CIPP model of evaluation that contexts, inputs and processes are significant in determining the success of any programme evaluation. Therefore, healthcare practitioners, policymakers, actors, and surveillance teams must consider these critical elements in the design and implementation of monitoring frameworks. The study has also contributed to the literature on HIV/AIDs, especially in tracking and surveillance.

Recommendations
i. Private philanthropists, foreign donor agencies, government and non-governmental organisations should provide funds to all HIV/AIDs control centres, public health facilities and situation centres for the monitoring/evaluation of HIV/AIDs prevention programmes in the Southern senatorial district of Cross River State.

ii. Parents and guardians should also ensure that non-infected siblings display the right attitudes (such as love, care, and support) towards affected relatives. People living with HIV/AIDs should not be relegated or seen as the worst set of people in rural and urban areas; the government should persistently supply antiretroviral drugs to public health facilities to grant internal support to the immune system of people living with HIV/AIDs at all times.

iii. Medical facilities, resources, and personnel should be distributed to urban and rural areas to promote equity and access to materials needed to contain or mitigate the pandemic spread across all locations. This will make the fight against HIV/AIDs holistic instead of concentrating only on urban areas. The Federal and State government should provide social amenities such as motorable roads to all rural communities for easy access by external monitoring and evaluation teams.
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