PUBLIC PERCEPTION AND POVERTY REDUCTION
IN BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA

BY
PETER FIDERIKUMO
BREDINO SAMSON

Abstract

The study analyzed the perception of residents of Bayelsa State on the condition of poverty, and the impact of poverty alleviation programme. It made use of primary data which was sourced by means of questionnaire administered to a random sample of 400 indigenous adults drawn from 40 communities across Bayelsa State. The data was measured on the basis of the modified four points Likert scale and analyzed using percentage, mean and Chi square. The results showed that poverty in Bayelsa State is substantial, widespread and far-reaching; it is both urban and rural phenomenon. Lack of clean and safe water and unemployment topped the problem of the poor. The worse effect of poverty is the vulnerability of the poor to diseases due to lack of safe drinking water and poor access to medical care. Lack of access to credit facility and lack of skilled manpower topped the list of causal factors. The study concluded that notwithstanding the plethora of poverty alleviation programmes, standard of living is low in Bayelsa State. It recommended amongst others the need to redesign and harmonise the various poverty intervention programmes for a coordinated attack and effective monitoring. Anti-poverty programmes should be targeted at enhancing the productive capacity of the poor. Finally, the need for urgent intervention in the supply of clean and safe water to all communities especially the rural ones.

Introduction

Nigerians are becoming poorer (Tamuno, 2013). According to Ukwu (2002), Nigeria is confronted not just with pockets of poverty – disadvantaged or marginalized areas, groups and individuals – but with mass poverty, a situation in which most of the people live a very substandard existence. In the same vein, National Bureau of Statistics (2012) reported that poverty has risen in Nigeria, with almost 100 million people living on less than a $1 a day, despite economic growth. It further stated that 60.9 per cent of Nigerians in 2010 lived in "absolute poverty"; an increase from 54.7 per cent in 2004. The growing rate of unemployment and underemployment has exacerbated the condition of the economy.

Successive governments in Nigeria have initiated a plethora of poverty alleviation programmes, policies, projects and agencies to tackle poverty with claims of winning the war. Government agencies are quick to make reference to the huge expenditure without corresponding verifiable results. However, it is argued that there has been greater number of poverty interventions than there are actual results to show for the huge expenditure. The interventions have failed to significantly reduced poverty (Nwosu, 2002). An apparent limitation of anti-poverty programmes is the dearth of accurate data for planning. The consequence is that the condition of the absolute poor is glossed over (Nwosu, 2002). Poverty interventions in Nigeria have largely taken the forms of credit programme; training and skill development; linking up the rural areas, health programme, etc. The programmes are generic in approach with little or no consideration for the socio-economic peculiarities of people.

According to Ukwu (2002), the level and structure of poverty varies with the social and economic conditions of the people in question. So if we are to deal decisively with poverty, we should start by understanding the situation, perceptions and feelings of the poor. This state of affairs makes it necessary to investigate what has been happening. Thus, the objective of the study is to analyze the perception of the people of Bayelsa on poverty and impact of poverty alleviation programmes.

Research Questions

i   What is the extent of poverty in Bayelsa State?
ii   What are the effects of poverty in Bayelsa State?
iii   What are the determinants of poverty in Bayelsa State?
iv   What is the impact of poverty alleviation programme (PAP) in Bayelsa State?

Hypothesis
The preponderance of poverty alleviation programmes (PAP) has resulted in improved standard of living in Bayelsa State.

Theoretical Literature
Concept of Poverty
A universally acceptable definition of poverty is difficult due its complexity and multidimensional nature (Oladeji, 2014). Poverty connotes economic and non-economic deprivation. However, Rowntree (1901) cited in Griffiths and Wall (1999) observed that poverty is having insufficient income to obtain the minimum means necessary for survival, namely basic food, housing and clothing. Similarly, Encyclopædia Britannica, (2012) stated that poverty is the state of one who lacks a usual or socially acceptable amount of money or material possessions. Poverty is said to exist when people lack the means to satisfy their basic needs. Relating poverty to the inability to meet "basic necessities of life" or basic human needs, the World Employment Conference of 1976, and confirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations as cited in Nwosu (2002) stated that basic human needs are mainly the "biophysical requirements for maintaining survival, namely the amount of food, clean water, adequate shelter, access to health services, educational opportunity, et cetera, to which every person is entitled by virtue of being born."

Thus, poverty tends to encompass a range of non-material conditions such as lack of rights, insecurity, powerlessness and indignity. Hence, according to Tamuno (2013), poverty has three basic typologies viz: physiological deprivation; sociological deprivation; human freedom deprivation.

There are many variants to poverty due to its complexity and multidimensional nature. However, the two major typology of poverty concept are generally recognized: absolute and relative poverty (Griffiths & Wall, 1999). Sachs (2005) identified a third type termed moderate poverty. Encyclopædia Britannica (2012) added cyclical poverty, collective poverty, concentralized collective poverty, and case poverty.

Todaro & Smith (2011) defined absolute poverty also called extreme poverty or destitution as a situation of being unable to meet the minimum levels of income, food, clothing, healthcare, shelter, and other essentials in order to ensure continued survival. In the view of Sachs (2005), relative poverty is generally construed as a household income level below a given proportion of average national income. However, it is not relative poverty but absolute poverty that is more important in assessing economies.

People are said to be poor if their incomes fall below a certain threshold known as the poverty line. Poverty line is the level of income below which a person or a family is considered poor. The poverty line is defined in absolute terms expressed in constant dollars (e.g. $1 per day), used as a basis for estimating the proportion of a country's population that exists at bare level of subsistence. The poverty rate equals the number of people whose incomes fall below the poverty threshold divided by the number of people counted in the census.

According to Oladeji (2014), there are mounting evidences corroborating the fact that where poverty is widespread, the vulnerability of child mortality, problem of maternal health care, HIV & AIDS, malaria and other diseases are necessarily commonplace. Poverty is self-perpetuating in forms known as vicious circle of poverty. For instance, the poor is vulnerable to disease. Illness prevents people from working, affects their productivity and consequently impoverishes them or undermines their capacity to make appreciable income for better living standard. In addition, poverty manifest in low or insufficient income. Low income results in low saving or no saving, which leads to low investment or no investment, which in turn results in low production, and then ultimately back to low income. Except, drastic measures is taken or a strong external force acts to break the vicious circle it will simply continue as in a circle (Jhingan, 2010).

Causes of Poverty in Nigeria

There are many causes of poverty; some generic in nature and others particular to the community concern. The cause of poverty can be a combination of economic, environmental, and socio-political factors (Obadan, 2003). Poverty can be the result of insufficient economic growth and unequal income distribution; adverse macroeconomic shocks, low human resource development; insufficient capital formation or insufficient social overhead capital; environmental degradation or pollution; overpopulation, bad governance and weak institutions; over-dependency on developed nations. Other factors are deficiencies in the labour market resulting in limited job growth, low productivity and low wages in the formal sector, minimal access to the means of supporting rural development in poor regions, inadequate access to markets where the poor can sell goods, and those victimized by transitory poverty; lack of participation in poverty alleviation programmes; retrenchment of workers, a fall in the real value of safety nets, and changes in family structures (Obadan, 1997; Ukwu, 2002; Olowa, 2012).

Poverty Reduction Strategies

There are five major strategies or approaches to poverty reduction namely: economic growth; appropriate technology aid; rural development approach; basic needs approach; target approach; and welfare programme (Tamuno, 2013).

In the view of Ajayi (2002), economic growth is the sine qua non for sustained progress on poverty reduction. Economic growth refers to the increase in real GDP over time. Economic growth directly affects economic well-being. It does not only increase the standard of living for many individuals in the labour force, but also allows society to care better for those who are unable to work (Case & Fair, 1999, Mankiw, 2007). The argumentfor economic growthas apreconditionforpovertyreduction isbecauseitincreasesmeanincomesandthenarrowing of incomedistribution (Olowa, 2012). However, the point should be made that whether economic growth results in poverty reduction depends on what it is made up of. Real GNP must grow more rapidly than population. It should be inclusive of the citizenry, and more investment spending should be geared towards things which improve efficiency or the production capacity of majority of the people. Lavish spending on prestige schemes like new presidential palaces or new government offices, highway to the governor's village, etc has little to increase national output or reduce poverty. But most people would be better off if growth took the form of production in more basic foodstuffs and low-cost housing (Olayide & Donaldson, 1977).

Appropriate or intermediate technology is technology designed to be suitable to the needs and resources of a particular group of people. According to many economists, the problem of poverty in developing countries can only be solved if government introduced an intermediate technology (Olayide & Donaldson, 1977). This involves paying more attention than in the past to encouraging small-scale enterprises. Agro-industries (those which process agricultural products) can be located near to where the crops are grown. This Appropriate technology relies on local skills and resources that fit into the local situation economically and culturally, and that do not harm the environment. A wider approach takes into account the processes of the development of technologies—the skills and knowledge that go into them.

Rural development approach views the rural sector as a unique sector in terms of poverty reduction.Thisisbecausemajorityofthepoorindevelopingcountrieslivein this sector. The approach aims at the provision of basic necessities of life such as food, shelter, safe drinking water, education, healthcare, employment and in come generating opportunities to rural dwellers in general and the poorin particular. Linkingtheruralareaviaroadconstruction/rehabilitationisimportantinreducingrural povertybecauseitcouldenhancetheireconomicactivity.Provisionofhealthcentreorrehabilitationoftheexisti ngone is important in reducing multidimensional poverty of the rural dweller. Construction of school or rehabilitation of the existing one, also impact positively on multidimensional poverty of the rural dweller. Rural electrification has been identified as one of the factor that reduced the multidimensional poverty of the rural dweller (Daramola, 2012).

The Basic Needs Approachcallsfortheprovisionofbasicneedssuchasfood,shelter,water,sanitation, healthcare, basic education and transportation. Ogwumike (2001) as cited in Daramola (2012) argued that unless thereispropertargeting,thisapproachmaynotdirectlyimpactonthepoorbecauseof their inherent disadvantage in terms of political power and the ability to influence the choice and location of government programmes and projects. Target approach favours the directing of poverty alleviation programme to specific grows up within the society. This approach includes such programmes as social safety nets, micro credits and school meal program.

Welfare programmes aimed at helping people unable to support themselves fully or earn a living. Welfare recipients include elderly people, people with mental or physical disabilities, and those needing help to support dependent children. Generally, programmes to assist the poor are classified into two broad types: cash assistance and in-kind transfers. In the cash assistance, eligible persons are provided with cash payments needed to purchase food, shelter, clothing, and other basic needs. Whereas, in-kind transfer programmes are geared to improve the standard of living of the poor through such means as medical and housing assistances. However, according to Case and Fair (1999), many people believe that welfare encourages its recipients to become dependent on government support and remain unemployed. As a result, the programmes have always aroused heated public debate.

Empirical Literature
Olowa (2012) in a study on the concept, measurement and causes of poverty in Nigeria identified inadequate economic growth as the main cause of poverty in Nigeria. It linked the lack of economic growth to a very narrow and weak economic base; depending mostly on exportation of petroleum crude oil as a major source of income. The current high and growing unemployment has also exacerbated the level of poverty in Nigeria.

Arogundade et al (2011) in a study on poverty alleviation programme in Nigeria employed archaeological survey and observed that governments in power often seek to introduce their own policy and in the process any other policy inherited from successors are gradually either abandoned or rendered impotent. As such, it recommended that all government policies aimed at poverty alleviation be harmonized under the same umbrella and each unit be made accountable and responsible for their actions.

In a similar study by Oyekale (2011) on the impact of poverty reduction programmes on multidimensional poverty in rural Nigeria used the 2006 Core welfare indicator survey data and employed Fuzzy set approach to compute the multidimensional poverty index and Top Tobit regression to examine the impact. The results showed an index for rural Nigeria of 0.3796. This indicates that some development programmes had negative impact on multidimensional poverty index of rural development.

Furthermore, Daramola (2012) in a paper on public private partnership and poverty alleviation in Nigeria concluded that effective poverty reduction in Nigeria requires adoption of strategies that are holistic in approach and involve the government (all tiers), the private sector and civil society. Each party to the partnership would bring its strength to the table while outsourcing services in the areas of its weakness. Thus together, areas of strength of different partners could be combined to tackle poverty more effectively.

Study Method
The study was carried out to elicit public perception from residents of Bayelsa State on the extent, effects, determinants of poverty, and the impact of poverty alleviation programmes (PAPs). Thus, it adopted survey research design in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data. The nature of data was primary and was sourced from the local adult population drawn from the eight local government

areas of Bayelsa State. The instrument employed was a combination of structured and semi-structured questionnaire, semi-structured interviews, field notes, and recordings of responses. Face validity method was used to ensure the instrument was valid for the study.

Sample and Data Collection
Copies of questionnaire were administered to a random sample of 400 adults drawn from 40 communities across the eight local government areas of Bayelsa State on the basis of stratified sampling technique. Out of which, 380 copies of the questionnaire representing 95 percent were retrieved.

Table 1: Awareness of Poverty Alleviation Programmes (PAP)

Response	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total (%)
Programme awareness	285 (75)	95 (25)	380 (100)

Table 1 showed that that out of the 285 questionnaires were retrieved out of 380 representing 75 percent of respondents who showed some level of awareness of poverty alleviation programmes. Therefore, the analysis of the research questions was based on 285 respondents.

Method of Data Analysis
The data was measured on the basis of the modified 4 points Likert scale namely strongly agreed (SA) = 4, agree (A) = 3, disagree (D) = 2, strongly disagreed (SD) =1, and criterion mean = 2.5. If the mean is greater than or equals to the criterion mean we accept the proposition and when it is less it is rejected. The analysis employed percentages, mean and chi square.

Results and Discussion
The analyses based on the research questions are presented here.
Research Question 1: Nature and Extent of Poverty in Bayelsa State
In order to gain insight into the people's perception of their economic condition, the respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they could not afford a number of key needs, that is, to identify from the list of possible problems those they considered serious.
The items listed below have been ranked in a descending order of lack (by their mean).

Table 2

Problem	Mean	Decision	Sum of SA & A in %	Sum of D & SD in %
1. Safe water for domestic use	3.44	Accept	89%	11%
2. Job opportunities	3.39	Accept	89%	11%
3. Health services	3.12	Accept	82%	18%
4. Literacy	3.11	Accept	83%	17%
5. Good food	2.94	Accept	78%	22%
6. Toilet facilities and sanitation	2.89	Accept	83%	17%
7. Hospitable dwelling or adequate shelter	2.83	Accept	72%	28%
8. Meet the expenses of children in secondary school	2.78	Accept	56%	44%
9. Meet the expenses of children in primary school	2.61	Accept	50%	50%
10. Transportation	2.26	Reject	37%	63%
Overall Mean	**2.94**	**Accept**	**71.9%**	**28.1%**

Source: Author's computation from survey (2014)

The overall mean of 2.94 and the associated percentage acceptance of 71.9 are strong indications that 9 out of 10 problem areas identified in Bayelsa State are major difficulties faced by the poor. The table also showed that lack of access to safe water for domestic use which has mean of 3.44 topped the list of problems suffered by the people especially the rural dwellers. This view is shared by 89 percent of respondents. Followed closely in order of severity are unemployment and underemployment with mean of 3.39; lack of access to health with mean of 3.12; low literacy level with mean of 3.11; lack of access

to good food with mean of 2.94, etc. However, 63 percent of respondents rejected the proposition that accessing community is a problem by the mean score of 2.26. This simply means that accessing communities in Bayelsa State is not a problem to the poor. The implication of the overall result is that poverty is widespread and pervasive in the rural area as well as in the urban area. This position is corroborated by National Bureau of Statistics' report that at the end of 2012 Bayelsa State had an absolute poverty of 47 percent and 57.9 percent of relatively poor. The poor depends on river and well for their major sources of water, live in squalor, are malnourished, and die from routine infection or diseases, and lack work opportunities. This condition of the poor masses is contrasted with a tiny minority that is able to enjoy affluence. This view is expressed by Daramola (2012) when he pointed out that the problem of poverty in Bayelsa State is intensified by the apparent co-existence of wealth and poverty. Income inequality is very high in the State. The condition of the poor is reinforced by the fact that Bayelsa State is a mono-sector economy; the state government is the only major employer of labour. Any programme aimed at improving the lot of the poor must address these problems.

Research Question 2: Effects of Poverty in Bayelsa State
In the questionnaire, an attempt was made to identify and rank the major effect of poverty faced by the people.
A summary of the responses is presented below in a descending order of severity (by their mean).
Table 3

Effects	Mean	Decision	Sum of SA & A in %	Sum of D & SD in %
1. Health problems / disease	3.42	Accept	95%	5%
2. Domestic violence	3.11	Accept	84%	16%
3. High maternal mortality	3.00	Accept	68%	32%
4. High infant mortality	3.00	Accept	63%	37%
5. Low life expectancy	2.95	Accept	79%	21%
6. Drug abuse / dependence	2.89	Accept	79%	21%
7. Criminality	2.78	Accept	72%	28%
8. Depression	2.74	Accept	68%	32%
OVERALL MEAN	2.99	ACCEPT	76%	24%

Source: Author's computation from survey (2014)
From the table, there is a strong agreement among respondents on the effects of poverty with an overall mean of 2.99 representing 76 percent of respondents' view. The worst effect is experienced in ill health and diseases which has a mean score of 3.42. Followed in order of severity are domestic violence with mean of 3.11, high maternal maternity or infant mortality with mean of 3.00, low life expectancy with mean of 2.89, criminality with mean of 2.77, etc. Note that earlier on, we identified shortage of safe water as the most serious problem of the poor. Thus, there appears to be a causal correlation between shortage of safe water supply and the proliferation of diseases or health problems. Therefore, provision of quality water is indispensable feature for preventing diseases and improving quality of life. In addition to deprivation, respondents stressed that the poor is dehumanized, alienated and powerless.

Research Question 3: Determinants of Poverty in Bayelsa State
In the questionnaire, an attempt was made to identify and rank the major determinants of poverty experienced by the people.
A summary of the responses is presented below in a descending order of magnitude (by their mean).

Causal Factors	Mean	Decision	Sum of SA & A in %	Sum of D & SD in %
1. Credit facility	3.41	Accept	94%	6%
2. Skilled manpower	3.39	Accept	89%	11%
3. Entrepreneurship/ self-employment	3.33	Accept	83%	17%
4. Job opportunities	3.11	Accept	79%	21%
5. Environmental degradation / pollution	3.11	Accept	72%	28%

6.	Low need for achievement	3.05	Accept	79%	21%
7.	Rapid population growth	2.95	Accept	68%	32%
8.	Participation in poverty alleviation programmes	2.61	Accept	56%	44%
9.	Inter-community war or conflict	2.11	Reject	28%	72%
	Overall Mean	**3.01**	**Accept**	**72%**	**28%**

Table 4

Source: Author's computation from survey (2014)

The table reveals a consensus on the causes of poverty which is an indication of common historical and geographical background. The overall mean of 3.01 is representative of 72 percent of the responses. It means that 8 out of the 9 determinants identified in Bayelsa State are major causal factors of poverty. The lack of access to credit facility with mean of 3.41 topped the list of determinants of poverty. This is closely followed in the order of magnitude by lack of skilled manpower with mean of 3.39; low desire for entrepreneurship or self-employment with mean of 3.33; unemployment opportunities with mean of 3.11; environmental degradation with mean of 3.11; low need for achievement with mean of 3.05, etc. However, the respondents rejected inter-community war or conflict as a cause of poverty in Bayelsa State. It means that inter-communal war or conflict is not a causal factor of poverty in Bayelsa State. Inability to access credit facilities and lack of skilled manpower are crucial problems requiring urgent attention. Not until 2015 that the State government established a microfinance bank. Many workers are unemployed because they do not have any useful skills to offer. There is a shortage of indigenes that have been trained in trades such as electricians, mechanics, bricklayers, and metal-works. At higher level, there is a lack of qualified engineers of all kinds (to construct roads and docks, to build and run factories, to keep the communication system and electricity supplies working). And there are not enough experienced entrepreneurs, surveyors, town planners or agricultural and veterinary experts. Many young people looking for a job have had hardly any education or training at all. And some of them have skills that not in demand. Olayide & Donaldson (1977) attributed the fault partly of the education system. Not enough attention has been paid to the need for technical education and middle manpower. Instead, the schools give a general education which fits their successful students for 'white-collar' jobs: the students think that work in an office or with the government is preferable to dirtying their hands in agriculture or manufacturing industry. The State's skill acquisition programme is non-functional. According to Ajayi (2002), a necessary condition for sustained growth and poverty reduction is investment in quality education and training particularly in technical education. The low need for achievement is indicative of the need for value reorientation and change of attitude to work, and a break from the retrogressive customs of the past. Any programme aimed at poverty reduction in the State must take cognizance of the causations.

Research Question 4: Extent of Impact of Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Bayelsa

In the questionnaire, an attempt was made to identify and rank the major impact of poverty alleviation. A summary of the responses is presented below in a descending order of magnitude (by their mean).

Table 5

Programmes	Mean	Decision	SUM of SA & A in %	SUM of D & SD in %
1. Provision of safe water for domestic use	2.42	Reject	42%	58%
2. Employment generation	2.33	Reject	33%	67%
3. Skill acquisition / training	2.25	Reject	50%	50%
4. Improved health care/ free health	2.23	Reject	46%	54%

5. Transportation		2.17	Reject	42%	58%
6. Road		2.17	Reject	42%	58%
7. Electricity		2.08	Reject	46%	54%
8. Credit facility		2.08	Reject	25%	75%
9. Cash assistance		2.08	Reject	25%	75%
10. cottage industry		2.00	Reject	33%	67%
11. Public toilets / sanitation		2.00	Reject	25%	75%
12. Housing assistance		1.92	Reject	25%	75%
13. Distribution of farming or fishing implements		1.92	Reject	25%	75%
14. Food assistance		1.82	Reject	18%	82%
OVERALL MEAN		**2.00**	**REJECT**	**34%**	**66%**

Source: Author's computation from survey (2014)

The overall mean of 2.00 which represents 66 percent of respondents view revealed that the impact of poverty alleviation programmes is below average. Table 5 also showed that the impact in all the 14 areas is low. The worse impact was indicated in the areas of food assistance to the absolute poor with mean score of 1.82. It was closely followed in the order of severity by lack of distribution of farming or fishing implements with mean of 1.92; lack of housing assistance with mean of 1.92; public toilets / sanitation and cottage industry each with mean of 2.00; credit facility with mean of 2.08, etc. Poverty alleviation programmes have been of minimal impact on poverty reduction in Bayelsa State because of its many limitations. Principal among such limitations are politization of programme, inappropriate project design, lack of sustainability or commitment, corruption and incompetence. In agreement with Okowa (2005), every well-conceived programme or policy will amount to disappointing result as long as corruption continues to be a major problem of our socio-economic political system.

Test of Hypothesis

We employed the chi-square test χ^2 to test our hypothesis: the preponderance of poverty alleviation programmes (PAP) has significantly reduced poverty in Bayelsa State. We relied on responses to four performance assessment criteria to evaluate the impact of poverty alleviation programmes in Bayelsa State.

Table 6

S /N	Performance Criteria	Agree(%)	Disagree (%)	Total
1	Your community is benefitting from a poverty alleviation programme.	75 (26.18)	210 (73.82)	285
2	Poverty alleviation programme is targeted at assisting the disabled, elderly, the absolute poor with dependent children.	40 (14.18)	245 (85.82)	285
3	Poverty alleviation has contributed to improved living condition or income of poor families.	63 (22.18)	222 (77.82)	285
4	Poverty alleviation programme has significantly contributed to poverty reduction in Bayelsa State.	46 (16)	239 (84)	285
	MEAN	**56 (19.65)**	**229 (80.35)**	**285**

Source: Author's computation from survey (2014)

Table 7: Result of the Test Statistic

Level of Significance (α)	Degree of Freedom (df)	χ^2 calculated value	χ^2 critical (table) value
5% (0.05)	3	17.04	7.8

The result of the test of hypothesis in Table 7 shows that the calculated χ^2 value is 17.04, while the critical or table value is 7.8 at 5% level of significance and degree of freedom of 3. Since the calculated χ^2 value is greater than the critical χ^2 value, we reject the hypothesis. The result of the test suggests a

statistically significant difference between the observed or empirical distribution from the expected distribution. Specifically, the result shows that notwithstanding preponderance of poverty alleviation programmes, poverty is not significantly reduced in Bayelsa State. In other words, poverty alleviation programmes (PAP) has not made significant impact on the income and living condition of the masses. To a great extent, the interventions failed to reach the absolute poor and the marginalized. Most communities do not have the presence of a functional poverty alleviation programme. Most PAP's projects are substandard in nature therefore do not stand the test of time. Most PAP's interventions are awarded to communities on the basis of nepotism therefore some of the most deserving communities are left out. Evidences abound of poor implementation of PAP's projects, abandoned projects, and lack of project monitoring in most communities. According to National Bureau of Statistics (2013) at the end of 2012, Bayelsa State had an absolute poverty rate of 47 percent and a 57.9 percent relative poverty. The situation is presently exacerbated by the state of economic recession and months of unpaid salaries of civil servants.

Conclusion
a) Poverty is substantial, widespread and far-reaching problem in both rural and urban areas in Bayelsa State. The three topmost problems of the poor are lack of clean and safe water, unemployment and underemployment, and lack of access to health care.
b) The effect of poverty is most visible in health problems/ diseases, domestic violence, high maternal and infant mortality.
c) The determinants of poverty are lack of access to credit facility, lack of skilled manpower, low desire for entrepreneurship / self-employment, and environmental degradation / pollution.
d) The preponderance of poverty alleviation programmes has not resulted in improved standard of living in Bayelsa State.

Recommendation
a. Government should ensure sustainable supply of clean and safe water to all communities and improved access to health care services.
b. Government should enhance productive capacity through provision of improved seedlings, fertilizer, fishing, farming implement and resuscitation of vocational schools to intensify both entrepreneurship and technical training among the youths.
c. Government should facilitate access to credit through adequate funding of the State micro-finance bank.
d. Government should set up a competent team representative of the various parts of Bayelsa State to redesign, harmonise, coordinate, execute, and monitor the various poverty intervention programmes.

References
Ajayi, S.I. (2002). The 2002 Federal Government Budget: Some Remark. *NCEMA Policy Analysis Series*. Vol. 8, No.1.
Arogundade, K. K., Adebisi, S. O. & Ogunro, V. O. (2011). Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Nigeria: A Call for Policy Harmonization. European Journal of Globalization and Development Research, Vol. 1 No. 1
Case, K. E., & Fair, R. C. (1999). *Principles of Economics*. New   Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

CBN (1999). Poverty Alleviation and Assessment in Nigeria. *Billion* October / December

Daramola, A. G. (2012) Public Private Partnership and Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria, Keynote Address Presented at PIND's *Niger Delta Development Forum* – Supporting Poverty Reduction through Partnership, Port Harcourt.

Encyclopaedia Britamica (2012). *Encyclopaedia Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite.* Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Griffiths, A., & Stuart W. (1999). *Applied Economics.* Harlow: Person Education Ltd.

Jhingan, M. L. (2010). The Economics of Development and planning. Delhi 119091 Vinda Publications (P) Ltd.

Mankiw, N. G. (2009). *Principles of Economics.* Mason: South-Western Cengage Learning.

National Bureau of Statistics (2012). *The Nigeria Poverty Profiles 2010 Report.*

National Bureau of Statistics (2014). *The Nigeria Poverty Profiles 2012 Report.*

Nwosu, E. J. (2002). *The Challenge of Poverty in Africa.* Owerri: Skillmark Media Ltd.

Obadan, M. I. (2003). Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: The Way Forward. CBN Economic and Financial Review, Vol. 39, No. 4.

Odigwe, W. D. (2002). Poverty Alleviation: The Nigerian Experience and the Way Forward. *Management in Nigeria, Journal of NIM,* Vol. 38 No. 3: pp 14 – 22

Okowa, W. J. (2005). *Oil,"Babylonian" "Matthewnomics" and Nigerian Development Policy:* University of Port Harcourt, Inaugural Lecture Series No. 40

Oladeji, S.I.(2012). *Lecturer Note on Definition of Measurement of Poverty.* Department of Economics, Obafemi Awolawo University Ile-ife

Olayide, S. O. & Donaldson P (1977). *Certificate Economics for West Africa.* Ibadan: Oxford University Press.

Olowa, O.W. (2012). "Concept Measurement Causes of Poverty: Nigeria in Perspective". American journal of Economics 2(1): 25-36.

Oyekale, T. O. (2011). Impact of Poverty Reduction Programs on Multinational Poverty in Rural Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* Vol. 13, No. 6.

Sachs, J. D. (2005). *The End of Poverty*. London: Penguin Books.

Tamuno, S. O. (2013). *A Collection of Selected Works on Development Issues in Nigeria.* Port Harcourt: Havey Publications Coy.

Todaro, M.P. & Smith, S.C. (2011). *Economic Development.* Harlow: Pearson.

Ukwu, U. I. (2002). Towards Effective Poverty Eradication Strategies. *NCEMA Policies Analysis Series*, Vol. 8, No. 1.

Effects of Foreign Direct Investment on the Economy of Nigeria: A Disaggregation of the Real Sector Investigation