**CHAPTER FIVE**

**ESTIMATION, RESULT & INTERPRETATION**

**5.1 Introduction**

This chapter contains a detailed analysis of collected primary data through a constructed questionnaire in accordance with the research objectives set for this study. All analyses are in line with the earlier highlighted objectives contained in the first chapter of this study.

Descriptive and inferential statistics of sections of the questionnaires which pertain to the impact of poverty alleviation programmes in the selected local government are presented and explained. Statistical Package for Social Sciences’ (SPSS) was used to test research hypotheses.

**5.2 Presentation of Results**

**5.2.1 Response Rate**

A total number of two hundred questionnaires were sent out however One hundred and ninety-five questionnaires were returned yielding a response rate of 97.5 per cent. All the 195 questionnaires were fully and correctly completed.

**5.3 Socio Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents**

The socio demographic characteristic attributes of the respondents that were examined includes age, sex, marital status, level of education, religion, local government area, Household size, type of family and occupation.

**5.3.1 Age**

In general, our sample size was dominated by respondents who fell within the age bracket of 30-39 with 51 (26.2%) responses, followed by respondents who fell in the age bracket of 20-29 with 49 (25.1%) responses. 22.6% of the respondents have their ages fall within the age range 40-49, while 20 respondents (10.3) are within the age range of 50-59. Respondents ‘under 20’ comprised of 9.7% of our sample size, that is, 19 out of 195 and the least number of respondents were ’60 and above’ accounting for 12 (6.2%). It can be deduced from the data that majority of the respondents who took part in the survey falls within the active working \class age of the population.

**5.3.2 Gender**

In general, more female respondents took part in the survey than their male counterparts. 109 (55.9%) of the respondents were female while the remaining 86 (44.1%) of the respondents were male.

**5.3.3 Marital Status**

Th result revealed that 61 (31.3%) of the respondents are single, 107 (54.9%) of the respondents indicated that they were married, 5 (2.6%) of the respondents are divorced, 15 (7.7%) of the respondents are widowed and the remaining 7 (3.6%) of the respondents are separated.

**5.3.4 Level of Education**

In this study, it is revealed that most of the respondents had attained a certain level of education. Majority of the respondents are secondary school leavers, about 83 (42.6%) of the respondents fall into this category; 30 (15.4%) of the respondents are primary six leavers; 22 (11.3%) of the respondents have their Bachelors’ Degree; 16 (8.2%) of the respondents have their Ordinary National Diploma (OND); 13 (6.7%) of the respondents have their Masters’ Degree (MSc); 10 (5.1%) of the respondents had their Honourary National Diploma (HND); 9 (4.6%) of the respondents Did not go to School; 7 (3.6%) of the respondents have National Certificate in Education (NCE); 3 (1.5%) of the respondents have PHD and the remaining 2 (1%) have other forms of education. This shows that most people in these local government areas have attained a form of education.

**5.3.5 Religion**

The result revealed that majority of the respondents are christians, 118 (60.5%) are christians, 74 (37.9%) of the respondents practiced Islam, 2 (1%) of the respondents practiced African traditional religion and the remaining 1 (0.5%) of the respondents had another religion aside the above mentioned religion they did not state.

**5.3.6 Local Government Area**

This study covered four local government areas; Ibadan North, Ibadan North West, Ibadan South West and Akinyele local government area of Ibadan. 50 (25.6%) of respondent that partook in the survey were from Ibadan North and Ibadan South West while 48 (24.6%) and 47 (24.1%) of the respondents were from Ibadan North West and Akinyele respectively.

**5.3.7 Household Size**

The study revealed that majority of the respondent have an household size with 5 to 8 members. 103 (52.8%) out of the 195 respondents fall within this category; 78 (40%) of the respondents have family with household size of 1-4 members, 9 (4.6%) of the respondents have a household with members between 9-12 and 2.6 percent of the respondents have a family with household size having 13 members and above.

**5.3.8 Types of Family**

The result revealed that more of the respondent were from a monogamy kind of family. 160 (82.1%) of the 195 respondents revealed to have a monogamy kind of family while 32 (16.4%) of the respondents are from a polygamous family. 3 (1.5%) of the respondents chose other kind of family.

**5.3.9 Occupation**

The study reveals that 12 (6.2%) of the respondent are civil servant, 66 (3.8%) of the respondents are traders, 6 (3.1%) of the respondents are farmers, 19 (9.75%) of the respondents had menial jobs, 62 (31.8%) of the respondents are self-employed, 9 (4.6%) of the respondents had a professional Job and the remaining 21 (10.8 %) had some other form of work they engage in. The result revealed that very few of the respondents relied on the government for jobs as majority of them are self-employed and traders.

**Table 5.1: Socio Demographic Attributes of the Respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| **Age** |  |  |
| Under 20 | 19 | 9.7 |
| 20-29 | 49 | 25.1 |
| 30-39 | 51 | 26.2 |
| 40-49 | 44 | 22.6 |
| 50-59 | 20 | 10.3 |
| 60 and above | 12 | 6.2 |
| **Gender** |   |  |
| Female | 109 | 55.9 |
| Male | 86 | 44.1 |
| **Marital Status** |  |  |
| Single | 61 | 31.3 |
| Married | 107 | 54.9 |
| Divorced | 5 | 2.6 |
| Widowed | 15 | 7.7 |
| Separated | 7 | 3.6 |
| **Level of Education** |  |  |
| Did not go to school | 9 | 4.6 |
| Primary Six | 30 | 15.4 |
| SSCE | 83 | 42.6 |
| OND | 16 | 8.2 |
| HND | 10 | 5.1 |
| BSc | 22 | 11.3 |
| MSc | 13 | 6. |
| PhD | 3 | 1.5 |
| NCE | 7 | 3.6 |
| Others | 2 | 1.0 |
| **Religion** |  |  |
| Christianity | 118 | 60.5 |
| Islam | 74 | 37.9 |
| Traditional | 2 | 1.0 |
| Other | 1 | 0.5 |
| **Local Government Area** |  |  |
| Ibadan North | 50 | 25.6 |
| Ibadan North West | 48 | 24.6 |
| Ibadan South West | 50 | 25.6 |
| Akinyele | 47 | 24.1 |
| **Household Size** |  |  |
| 1-4 | 78 | 40 |
| 5-8 | 103 | 52.8 |
| 9-12 | 9 | 4.6 |
| 13 and Above | 5 | 2.6 |
| **Type of Family** |  |  |
| Monogamy | 160 | 82.1 |
| Polygamy | 32 | 16.4 |
| Others | 3 | 1.5 |
| **Occupation**  |  |  |
| Civil Servant | 12 | 6.2 |
| Trader | 66 | 33.8 |
| Farmer | 6 | 3.1 |
| Menial Jobs | 19 | 9.7 |
| Self-Employment | 62 | 31.8 |
| Professional Jobs | 9 | 4.6 |
| Others  | 21 | 10.8 |

Field report, 2019

**5.4 Incidence of Poverty**

The second objective of the study is to examine the incidence of poverty in the chosen local government. One of the variables used to measure this is the average monthly income. The result showing the distribution is presented in Table 5.2 below.

**Table 5.2: Table showing distribution of the monthly income of Respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Average Monthly Income |  |  |
| Below 5000 | 20 | 10.3 |
| 5000-10000 | 48 | 24.6 |
| 10001-30000 | 60 | 30.8 |
| 30001-70000 | 41 | 21.0 |
| 70001 and above | 26 | 13.3 |

**Field Report, 2019**

The study revealed that the average monthly income of the respondents falls between 10001-30000 Naira monthly. The minimum monthly salary a respondent attest to owning is below 5000 Naira while the maximum monthly salary a respondent agreed to be receiving is greater than 70000 Naira. In general, 20 (10.3%) of the respondents stated that they make below 5000 every month, 48 (24.6%) of the respondents stated that they make between 5000 and 10000 naira every month, 60 (30.8%) of the respondents stated they make between 10001 and 30000 every month, 41 (21%) of the respondents makes between 30001-70000 monthly and 26 (13.3%) of the respondents make above 70000.

In explaining the incidence of poverty among respondents, we made three categories from the data obtained, the low income earners which comprise of those whose monthly income is 10000 and below; the average earners whose income is between 10001-30000 and the high income earners that makes above 30000 every month.

Over 64% of the respondents earn income less than 30,000 naira per month which is less than the minimum wage rate of the federal government. Income is a determinant of household expenditure since it serves as the budget constraint of the amount that can be spent within a period and there is also a relationship between income and poverty level of a household.

Based on local government area, the information provided in table 3 reveals that the incidence of poverty is quite low in Ibadan North local government area – 22% of the respondents fall into this category however it is higher in the other local governments (Ibadan North West, Ibadan South West and Akinyele) - accounting for 35.4%, 40% and 42.5% respectively.

**Table 5.3: Cross tab showing income earnings of respondents across the local government areas**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Below 5000N (%) | 5000-10000N (%) | 10001-30000N (%) | 30001-70000N (%) | 70001 and AboveN (%) |
| Ibadan North | 3(6) | 8(16) | 13(26) | 14(28) | 12(24) |
| Ibadan North West | 4(8.3) | 13(27.1) | 14(29.2) | 7(14.6) | 10(20.8) |
| Ibadan South West | 2(4) | 18(36) | 18(36) | 11(22) | 1(2) |
| Akinyele | 11(23.4) | 9(19.1) | 15(31.9) | 9(19.1) | 3(6.4) |

**Field Survey, 2019**

**5.4.1 Socio Economic Condition**

In examining the incidence of poverty, the study used the subjective opinion of respondents as regards their preset socio economic conditions such as the inability to meet the basic needs of life, lack of money and employment and the inability to train children and own a business. The result reveals that majority of the respondent claim they do not have money and they are unemployed - more than half of the respondents fall into this category; 25.1% of the respondents state their inability to meet basic life needs; 16.4% of the respondent claim to be unable to train children in school and own a business. Only 2.6% of the respondent stated that they are not affected by any of this challenge. In general, these are high pointers to the incident of poverty in the study area.

**Table 5.4: Socio economic conditions of the respondents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Lack of Money and Employment  | 109 | 55.9 |
| Inability to meet the basic needs of life | 49 | 25.1 |
| Inability to train children in school and own a business | 32 | 16.4 |
| None | 5 | 2.6 |

**Field Report, 2019**

Based on individual local government area, the information provided in table 5.5 reveals that the incidence of poverty is highest in Ibadan South West local government area and Akinyele - socio economic conditions of respondents in these study areas proved 100 percent that the incidence of poverty is highest. Ibadan North West Local governments and Ibadan North local government have 97.9 percent and 92 percent respectively.

**Table 5.5: Cross Tab showing the Socioeconomic condition of the respondents across the local government areas surveyed.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Inability to meet the basic need of life****N(%)** | **Lack of Money and employment****N(%)**  | **Inability to train children in school and own Business****N(%)** | **None****N(%)** |
| Ibadan North | 16(32) | 22(44) | 8(16) | 4(8) |
| Ibadan North West | 16(33.3) | 28(58.3) | 3(6.2) | 1(2.1) |
| Ibadan South west | 12(24) | 26(52) | 12(24) | 0(0) |
| Akinyele | 5(10) | 33(70.2) | 9(19.1) | 0(0) |

**Field Survey, 2019**

**5.4.2 Access to Health care**

Access to health care is also a variable used in measuring the incident of poverty. Responses revealed that majority of the respondents make use of Government hospitals - 53.3% of the respondents makes use of this facility; 28.7% of the respondents makes use of private hospitals; 16.9% of the respondents makes use of the chemist/pharmacist; 15.9% makes use of the respondents reported using herbal medicines and the remaining 4.6% of the respondents claim they do not make use of any of the health care options presented.

**Table 5.6: Response on Assess to Health care**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Government Hospital | 104 | 53.3 |
| Private Hospitals | 56 | 28.7 |
| Pharmacy/ chemist | 33 | 16.9 |
| Herbal medicine | 31 | 15.9 |
| None | 9 | 4.6 |

**Field Report, 2019**

**5.5 Assessing the Respondent knowledge on Poverty as a concept**

As revealed in the table 5.10 below, majority of the respondents have a clear understanding of the concept of poverty. World Health Organization considers any fellow that lives on less than $2 (₦720) per day as a poor fellow. Responses from majority of the respondent corresponds with this assessment. Most of the respondents strongly agreed that people living on less than ₦720 per day are considered very poor. 62.1 percent of the respondent attested to these statements; 15.9 percent of the respondents agreed to the statement; 9.7 percent of the respondents were undecided; 8.7 percent of the respondents disagreed with the statement while the remaining 3.6 percent strongly disagreed with the statement. In general, approximately 78 percent of the respondent agreed to the statement which proves to a greater extent that respondents have knowledge about poverty as a concept.

**Table 5.7: Assessing Respondents knowledge on Poverty as a concept**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly AgreedN(%) | AgreedN(%) | UndecidedN(%) | DisagreedN(%) | Strongly DisagreedN(%) |
| People living below ₦720 per day can be said to be poor | 121(62.1) | 31(15.9) | 19(9.7) | 17(8.7) | 7(3.6) |

**Field Report, 2019**

When asked to confirm the definition of poverty, 76.9 strongly agreed that poverty is a situation when the resources of individuals or family are in adequate to provide a socially acceptable standard of living. 17.9 percent of the respondents agreed with the statement, 2.1 percent of the respondents were undecided while the remaining 3.1 percent of the respondent strongly disagreed. In general, 94.8 percent of the respondents through the definition of poverty have a proper understanding of the concept of poverty.

**Table 5.8: Assessing Respondents knowledge on Poverty as a concept through definition**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly AgreedN(%) | AgreedN(%) | UndecidedN(%) | Strongly DisagreedN(%) |
| Poverty is a situation when the resources of individual or family are inadequate to provide a socially acceptable standard of living. | 150(76.9) | 35(17.9) | 4(2.1) | 6(3.1) |

**Field Survey, 2019**

The result in table 5.8 shows respondents opinions on associated challenges that may surface as a result of an individual being poor. 90.8 percent of the respondents reveals that poverty is associated with poor feeding; 86.7 percent of the respondents agreed that poverty is associated with inadequate health care; 82.6 percent of the respondent revealed that poverty is associated with inadequate health care; 77.4 percent of the respondent reveals that poverty is associated with high infant mortality rate; 76.9 percent of the respondents agreed that poverty is associated with poor housing facility; 76.4 percent of the respondents agreed that poverty is associated with low life expectancy rate; 68.7 percent of the respondents agreed that poverty is associated with poor water facility and finally, 68.2 percent of the respondents reveals that poverty is associated with the lack of active participation in decision making process. The responses show that respondent have a better understanding of the concept of poverty.

**Table 5.9: Resultant Effect of Poverty**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Associated Variables** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Poor Feeding | 177 | 90.8 |
| Low Educational opportunities | 169 | 86.7 |
| Inadequate Health Care | 161 | 82.6 |
| High Infant Mortality rate | 151 | 77.4 |
| Poor Housing Facilities | 150 | 76.9 |
| Low life Expectancy | 149 | 76.4 |
| Poor water facility | 134 | 68.7 |
| Lack of active participation in Decision making process | 133 | 68.2 |

**Field Report, 2019**

**Multiple responses**

**5.6 Awareness of Poverty Alleviation Programme(s) in Oyo state.**

The result revealed that respondents were aware of different Poverty alleviation programme(s) available in the states. 52.3% of the respondent attested to hearing about different Poverty Alleviation Programme(s) in the state while the remaining 47.7% claim to be unaware of any of the poverty alleviation programme(s) in the state.

**Table 5.10: Awareness of respondents on Poverty Alleviation Programme(s)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Yes | 102 | 52.3 |
| No | 93 | 47.7 |

**Field Report, 2019**

**5.7 Benefit derived from the Poverty Alleviation Programme(s) in Oyo State**

The result presented in table 5.8 provides subjective responses on whether respondents have benefited from any of the poverty alleviation programme(s) in Oyo state. The result obtained reveals that 14.9% of the respondent agreed to benefiting from the poverty alleviation programme(s) while the remaining 85.1% of the respondent have not benefited from the programme(s).

**Table 5.11: Ever benefited from any of the Poverty Alleviation Programme(s) in the state**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| No | 165 | 84.6 |
| Yes | 30 | 15.4 |

 **Field Report, 2019**

**5.8 Ways Poverty Alleviation Programme(s) has been beneficial**

The 15.4 percent of the respondents who attested to benefiting from the Poverty Alleviation Programme(s) were further probed to know exactly how the programme(s) has been beneficial to them. 7.2 percent of the respondents claimed they acquired new skills as a result of the program, 1.5 and 3.1 percent of the respondents claim they were beneficiary of an agricultural loans and a soft loan while the remaining 3.6 percent claim that they benefited from the program through the free education programme(s) the enjoyed.

**Table 5.12: Way through which respondents benefited from the Poverty Alleviation programme(s)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** |
| Skill Acquisition | 14 | 7.2 |
| Education (Free) | 7 | 3.6 |
| Soft Loan | 6 | 3.1 |
| Agricultural Loan | 3 | 1.5 |

**Field Survey, 2019**

**5.9 Effect of Poverty alleviation on Poverty**

The study further examined respondent perceptions on the effect of poverty alleviation programme(s) on Poverty. This was obtained from the subjective responses of the participants as regard the noticeable impact they experienced due to the poverty alleviation program and their perception of the others. Respondents perception on whether PAPs has improved their life is presented in table 5.13 below:

**Table 5.13: Perception on whether PAPs has improved their life**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly AgreedN(%) | AgreedN(%) | UndecidedN(%) | DisagreedN(%) | Strongly DisagreedN(%) |
| PAPs has improved my Life | 21(10.8) | 4(2.1) | 32(16.4) | 40(20.5) | 98(50.3) |

**Field Report, 2019**

 When asked whether the programme improved their life. 50.3 percent of the respondents strongly disagree with the statement, 20.5 percent of the respondents disagreed that the PAPs has not improved their life, 16.4 percent of the respondents were undecided about whether the program has improved their life or not; 2.1 percent of the respondents agreed that PAPs improved their life and 10.8 percent strongly agreed that PAPs improved their life. The result revealed that more respondents opined that PAPs programme does not improve their life which is supported by the fact that majority have not benefited from the programme(s).

On whether PAPs improve the life of people in Oyo state, the result revealed that 14.9 percent of the respondent(s) strongly agreed that PAPs has improve the life of respondents in Oyo state; 14.4 percent of the respondents agreed that PAPs has improved the lives of people in Oyo state; 42.6 percent of the respondents were undecided about PAPs improving the lives of residents in Oyo state; 11.3 percent of the respondents disagrees that PAPs programme do not impact the lives of Oyo residents and 16.9 percent of the respondents strongly disagrees that PAPs improves the lives of residents in Oyo.

**Table 5.14: Perception on whether PAPs has improved people’s life**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly AgreedN(%) | AgreedN(%) | UndecidedN(%) | DisagreedN(%) | Strongly DisagreedN(%) |
| PAPs has improved the lives of people in Oyo state. | 29(14.9) | 28(14.4) | 83(42.6) | 22(11.3) | 33(16.9) |

**Field Report, 2019**

**5.10. Subjective opinions on Government effort in alleviating Poverty**

On examining the fifth objective, respondents were asked to examine the government effort in alleviating poverty. The result were presented in table 15 and 16 respectively.

**Table 5.15: Ratings on Government performance towards poverty alleviation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ExcellentN(%) | V. GoodN(%) | GoodN(%) | FairN(%) | PoorN(%) | V. PoorN(%) |
| Rating Government efforts in alleviating poverty | 14(7.2) | 14(7.2) | 29(14.9) | 57(29.2) | 40(20.5) | 4121.0 |

**Field Report, 2019**

Results in table 5.15 reveals that 7.2 percent of the respondents rated the government effort in alleviating poverty as excellent and very good respectively; 14.9 percent of the respondents rated government effort as good; 29.2 percent of the respondents rated the government efforts as fair; 20.5 percent of the respondents rated government efforts in alleviating poverty as poor while the remaining 21 percent of the respondents rated government effort as very poor. Majority of the respondent do not perceive the government is putting in more effort in alleviating poverty in Oyo state.

**Table 5.16: Perception on Government contribution to PAPs**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Strongly AgreedN(%) | AgreedN(%) | UndecidedN(%) | DisagreedN(%) | Strongly DisagreedN(%) |
| Government has immensely contributed to PAPs | 16(8.2) | 30(15.4) | 48(24.6) | 39(20.0) | 62(31.8) |

**Field Report, 2019**

The result presented in table 16 reveals that 8.2 percent of the respondents strongly agreed that the state government is immensely contributing to the poverty alleviation; 15.4 percent of the respondents agree that state is contributing to poverty alleviation; 24.6 percent of the respondents are undecided about government contribution to Poverty alleviation; 20 percent of the respondents disagrees that government contributes immensely to poverty alleviation and the remaining 31.8 percent of the respondents strongly disagrees with that the state government contributes immensely to poverty alleviation in the stage. Majority of the respondents - more than 50 percent of the respondents do not agree that the governments contribution is immense to the poverty alleviation in the state.

**5.11 Probit Regression Analysis**

**Table 5.17: Display of Regression Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Coefficients**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **B** | **Std. Error** | **Z** | **Sig** |
| (Constant) | -2.179 | 1.327 | -1.642 | 0.101 |
| Age | 1.803 | 1.286 | 1.402 | 0.161 |
| Sex | 1.882 | 1.394 | 1.351 | 0.177 |
| Marital Status | -2.689 | 1.767 | -1.521 | 0.128 |
| Level of Education | 6.348 | 2.619 | 2.423 | 0.015 |
| Household Size | -1.668 | 1.682 | -0.992 | 0.321 |
| Poverty Intervention | -0.316 | 0.707 | -0.447 | 0.655 |

 |
| The poverty level of respondents will be estimated as -2.179 given all explanatory variables are held constant. The probit regression results reveals that an increase in the age of respondents was more likely to result in the respondent been poor, A unit increase in the age (1%) will add 1.803 to the poverty level, given all other explanatory variables are held constant. The result also revealed that males were more likely to be poor than females (estimates equals 1.882) and this was also found to be not significant (P value is 0.177). Married people were observed to be less poor than single (Estimate equals -2.689) and this was also not significant as p value equals 0.128. More educated people were more likely to be poor than less educated fellow (estimate equals 6.348) and this was significant at a 0.001 level. Benefiting from poverty alleviation limits the likelihood of getting participant getting poor (estimate equals -0.316) and was also observed not to be significant (p value is 0.655). |
|  |