

Rural and Urban Households Choice of Energy Use in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects

Foluso O.C Osunkwo¹, Rose D Onwusogbulu², and Kalu E Uma³

¹ (Abia State University Uturu, Abia State)

²(Federal Polytechnic, Okoh, Anambara State)

³ (Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu Alike Ikwo, Ebonyi State)

Abstract: *The expository study centres on the choice of rural and urban households' energy use in Nigeria. This involved a review of related works and a look at some descriptive information on the matter. It was realized that many factors such as income level, education, nearness to sources of energy supply, location of residence, ownership of residence, energy price, family size among others play a remarkable role in the choice of cooking energy. However, from the review we hereby articulate that the dominant energy use in Nigeria is unclean energy and apart from all the revealed factors which determine the choice of energy use in Nigeria and possible energy combination, the actions and roles of the government is the major determinant of energy use. This is on the basis that the poverty status of the country hinges on the government policies application and non-implementation of policies which have positioned the country among the poorest economies of the world. The inability to provide adequate and efficient infrastructure/capital overheads, lack of industries and uncontrolled corruption impose a constraint to availability of sufficient environment for efficient resources use. These give rise to low output/income generation, enabling the populace to wallow in abject poverty and unable to opt for the use of decent goods like cooking energy, adequate food and other essentials of living. This implies government inability to revamp the economy puts the inhabitant on the path of making choices of consumption on the ground that when the desired are not available, the available becomes desirable.*

Key words: *Choice, energy, households, low-income, problems, prospects*

I. INTRODUCTION

Nigeria is one of the most populous countries in Africa with a population of over 190 million (World Bank, 2018). The country is blessed with varieties of natural resources but has been confronted with serious problems of resources management due to poor leadership. Egbas (2020) points out that the 2018 World Poverty Clock estimated the number of Nigerian living in extreme poverty to be 90.8million, thereby classifying Nigeria as the world poverty capital. This is because over 86.9 million Nigerians are living below \$1.90 (₦684) a day. This is an unfortunate situation in a country blessed with abundant varieties of natural resources. As a third world country, it is characterized by dualism, low income, poor infrastructure, high infant mortality, energy poverty, rural and urban settlements and underdevelopment among others. Energy consumption varies between the rural and the urban. In spite of all efforts to improve energy supply globally, energy poverty has remained a great problem of the world community (Kammen et al, 20; Kuik et al, 2011). As one of the poorest countries of the world, the poor's choice of energy consumption is at variance with the rich. The large chunk of aggregate energy consumption in Nigeria which is about 65% is utilized by the household (Bisu, et 2016). About 91% of total domestic energy consumption is mainly for cooking and about 86% of the household in Nigeria rely solely on solid fuel as the main source of energy for cooking (Oyedepo, 2012). Many households in Nigeria are known to use both inferior and superior energy in cooking which includes: dung/waste from farm wastes, fuelwood which is associated with deforestation, charcoal, kerosene, liquified petroleum gas and electricity. There is a mixed consumption of both unclean and clean energy in both the rural and urban areas due to the pattern of life and the existence of peasant farmers (low-income category), average income earners and the few rich. Heltberg (2005) pointed out that income is an important factor but not the only factor influencing the household choice of energy use. Other factors, such as residential place (location), education level, level of development, availability, price among others play a role in the choice of cooking gas (Bisu,2016; Toole, 2015).

However, Ogwumike et al (2014) posit that the increasing use of inferior fuel (biomass) far outweigh the consumption of superior (higher) fuel in Nigeria. This is because, in 1980 and 2004, firewood consumption rose from 47.6% to 70.8% whereas kerosene and electricity consumption declined from 49% to 26.6%. The preference for liquified petroleum gas (LPG) has remained relatively low at 1.1% over the years. This is because of the high poverty level in Nigeria and man being rational and irrational will opt for what is available and affordable with the intention to achieve desired goals; not minding the adverse effect of the outcome about the choice.

The dominant use of solid fuel for cooking is associated with air pollution which poses a health hazard to the populace and the environment. The emission of carbon dioxide is dangerous to man, birds and animals.

Rahut et al (2019) asserted that decent and clean fuel for cooking is necessary for safeguarding good health for all and sundry, and so improves better living, and welfare in the underdeveloped countries. But a large chunk of the rural people in the less developed countries prefer the use of solid fuel as an energy source for cooking. This choice is very harmful to the environment and the health of the living organisms, especially man. The development includes positive changes in energy use that is capable of elimination of pollution and avoidance of myriad health challenges from pollution. The recent United Nations focus on Sustainable Development Goal is linked to quality energy use by a household with the view to improve life and living standard. But it is a belief by Sevakkumaran and Silveira (2018) that Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) number 7 which is targeted at provision of affordable and accessible electricity by 2030 is hoped to help developing countries to achieve sustainable development. However, this is if and only if the developing nation seriously prioritized, aspire, and focus on improving the power sector for such goal attainment. The outcome of unclean energy use such as air pollution is linked with over four million premature deaths annually, coupled with a large hour of use in fetching firewood for cooking by the household which could be used for more productive engagements (Bisu et al, 2016; WHO, 2010)

However, studies by scholars such as (Ingale et al, 2013; Oguntoke et al, 2013; Olopade et al, 2013; Fullerton et al, 2008; Kim et al, 2011) among others have shown the great relationship between the use of solid fuel and health challenges in human beings such as pneumonia, tuberculosis, dizziness, eye irritation, cataracts, sneezing, continuous headaches, worsening of menstrual health and anaemias. The ill-health due to man-made air contamination has consumed a large proportion of households and societal income in the course of tackling health challenges. Energy consumption in Nigeria is relatively poor due to poverty, especially in the rural areas. In spite of all the allocated resources in electricity power supply in Nigeria, the power supply has remained a serious obstacle to production, income generation and better life. This situation has compelled many rural dwellers to migrate to urban areas that is considered relatively better, in search of jobs. This has lessened rural productivity raised urban unemployment and congestion. Bouzarovski and Petrova (2015) posit that the level of poverty associated with energy in developing nations is initiated by low level of electrification and lack of other forms of energy due to economic debilities, ineffective and inefficient institutions. Energy supply is very essential because of its use in varieties of things. Productive gadgets and households' appliances require a power supply. The low productivity in Nigeria is related to the low power supply. In their study, Njiru and Letema (2018) pointed out that energy poverty has adverse effects on physical health, societal welfare and the capability to flourish.

National Population (2018) stated that over half of Nigerian households have electricity: urban 83% while rural 39%. But the electricity supply is highly irregular, especially in rural areas. This has compelled many Nigerians to opt for self-power generation which is not affordable by all. It makes the business very expensive to establish, increases production cost, and prices of outputs. Besides, the price of liquid fuel such as kerosene, petrol and gas are high. Kerosene, mostly consumed by the poor is the costliest in Nigeria when compared with other energy types. As at today, the price of petrol per litre is ₦143.80, gas, ₦ 180 per litre while kerosene is ₦ 220 per litre. This situation has compelled the poor to opt for biomass energy in spite of the health hazards they constitute. Adusei (2012) posits that two out of three households in Africa are underprovided with access to appropriate, effective and dependable energy source needed for socio-economic activities. So, a large proportion of the populace is compelled to depend on energy sources such as charcoal, firewood, dungs, candles and kerosene.

The report of African Development Bank (2014) pointed out that over-all electricity access and per capita consumption for Nigeria are respectively 48% and 149kWh; while Cote d'Ivoire has 59.5% and 212kWh/person; Ghana has 72% and 344kWh/person; Senegal 56% and 186kWh/person. Disgustingly, Nigeria who claims to be the giant of Africa is the least among the few countries. The insufficiency of energy is more conspicuous in the rural area given the very low access rate. The impact of energy is tremendous because of its use in virtually every facet of society. Tagoe (2010) posits that energy is a focal issue because of its role with respect to global security, human security, climate change, environmental security, food security, poverty reduction, job creation, health, education and attainment of national development. These are critical for survival and sustenance of an economy.

Given the energy situation in Nigeria, in this study, it is our intention to investigate the problems and prospects of energy consumption with the motive of proffering lasting solutions. Therefore, the paper is streamlined thus: section one is energy consumption theory and literature review; Section two focuses on descriptive presentation of energy issues in Nigeria; section three is problems and prospects of choice of energy use in Nigeria while the last section is conclusion.

II. ENERGY CONSUMPTION THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Scholars have come up with different theories of energy consumption. Energy ladder is one of the early theories which posits that an increase in income gives rise to change from unclean energy consumption to clean energy use. For instance, Toole (2015); Kroon et al (2013), pointed out that energy ladder is built on the foundation of the ranked relationship between the choice of decent energy use for cooking with an increase in economic status. This presupposes that the increase in income of a household usually leads to the choice of superior goods to inferior ones. This is on the conception that the consumer obeys the law of economic rationality and utility maximization in consideration of consumer's financial muscle. High income is seen as positively related to the

choice of decent energy consumption as giving more satisfactory in comparison with unclean energy. The energy ladder has been classified in different ways and one aspect is stated thus: dung/waste, fuelwood, charcoal, kerosene, liquefied petroleum gas and electricity. The solid energy (dung/waste, fuelwood and charcoal) are seen as inferior and associated with the pollution which is a source of health challenges while kerosene, liquefied petroleum gas and electricity are superior or decent energy.

Energy transition is a follow up to the energy ladder. It implies the tendency of households' reliance on biomass fuels such as wood and dung due to low income. But when income begins to rise, there is a transition or shifting from biomass energy consumption to cleaner and more costly fuels such as liquefied petroleum gas and electricity (Nansairo et al, 2011; Mekonnen et al, 2009). In their view, Kroon et al (2013) see this transition in phases, phase one is at the time when a household achieve a socio-economic status which gives rise to disregard of the use of inefficient and low quality fuels such as dungs, and firewood; the second phase is a transition to kerosene and coal which is superior to the solid energy while the third phase is the climax of transition to liquefied petroleum gas and electricity and considered more decent and clean energy.

It was also asserted that economic progress is not the only determinant of household energy consumption behaviour since some other factors play a role in enabling households to take a decision on energy use. Such factors include environmental pressure, technological progress, availability of resources, people's choice, urbanisation and living standard (Erdmann and Haigh, 2013; Nansairo, 2011). However, Mekonnen et al (2009) and Toole (2015) pointed out other factors that influence fuel-switching behaviour of households that are not captured by energy ladder the hypothesis which includes: changes in price, taste, preference, supply reliability, cooking and consumption habits, availability of technology, education, culture and household composition among others. It has been stressed by scholars such as Jain et al (2014); Yadama (2013) and Lucon et al (2004) that the level of rural income impact significantly on the choice of consumption of liquid petroleum gas (LPG). It is believed that household switched to other cleaner energy use as income increases. But studies by Pal and Das (2019) contradicts this given that household features such as socioeconomic situation, size of household and social status plays a major role in determining the choice of fuel for cooking.

Fuel stacking or multiple fuel models has a different dimension in energy consumption by households. In this concept, increase in income does not lead to an absolute switch to different types of energy, instead, a mix of energy are in use which could be more of liquefied petroleum gas and less of firewood (Kroon, 2013; Mekonnen et al 2009). This implies the reliance on multiple consumptions of energy that is the combination of superior and inferior energies as situation demands (Toole, 2015; Nansairo et al, 2011). Studies by Heltherg (2004 and 2005); Gundimeda and Kohlin (2008) have shown that fuel switching commonly happens faster in an urban area than the rural. Leach (1992) pointed out that the lower rate of fuel switching in a rural area is due to the non-availability of relevant infrastructure for modern fuels consumption. Besides, is low-income level, the pattern of the old-style way of life and value of time different from what is obtainable in the urban areas; and closeness to enough existence of collectable fuels cum the role of women in the decision on the appropriate fuel to be used in the house. However, Barnes et al (2005) posit that the degree of availability of biomass has a strong impact on the desire for fuel switching in the urban place. For instance, in Nigeria during ceremonies, the rich combines clean energy with firewood. However, the dominant energy use in Nigeria is biomass or solid energy due to poverty, affordability and nearness to the source.

In their study of fuel choices in urban Indian household Farsi and Filippini (2007) focused on firewood, kerosene and liquid petroleum gas (LPG). The finding revealed that deficiency of adequate income is among the major factors that impede households from consuming cleaner fuels coupled with the requirement for acquisition of expensive cooking equipment. The household showed high resistant to the use of LPG because of its high price. Other finding showed that factors such as socio-demographic (education, sex of head of the household have considerable influence on the choice of cooking fuel consumption. In their study of the factors that impact on the choice of cooking fuel Bhubaneswar, Odisha, India Pal and Das (2019) revealed that apart from income and socio-economic status, some other households' features such as family number, nature of the house and house size influence considerably on the choice of cooking fuel. This implies that both external and household-specific circumstances plays an important role in the choice of cooking gas.

In their study of urban cooking choice in Bauchi, Nigeria, Bisu et al (2016) found out that biomass is heavily in use but a little improvement in the use of liquified petroleum gas. Electricity and solar energy are not primary cooking energy in Bauchi. Multiple fuel use was also realized which supported the fuel stacking hypothesis as opposed to energy ladder theory. The study also revealed that variation in household size, residential ownership status, changes in season, level of income and education, location of residence, availability and affordability are among the factors that influence the choice of households cooking energy.

In their focus on the role of family structures in the determination of cooking fuel decision-making, Hou et al (2019) pointed out that solid fuel use for cooking in rural China is associated with air pollution and other environmental and health problems. The survey study of ten villages revealed that the number of family household dining together, the number of school-age children and family members below age 6 and above 60 years have a significant impact on the household's choice of cooking fuel.

In the study of how rural households make choices given available energy alternatives, Moeen et al (2016) revealed that due to limited access to modern energy sources, household rely strongly on traditional sources of energy, mainly animal and plant residue such as firewood, crop residue and animal waste. The authors believe that conversion of the traditional energy sources into a modern type like biogas, employment of efficient energy appliances among others would have a desirable positive impact on the entire environment and sustainable economic progress in Pakistan.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that many factors influence the choice of energy consumption in both the rural and urban areas of different countries owing to the level of development and the pattern of the management of resources. The poverty level in Nigeria and the desire for sustainable development necessitates repositioning things to improve energy availability, accessibility and affordability. But this depends on the desire and aspiration of the leaders of the country. Avoidance of selfishness and corruption among leaders and a focus on a positive change with the motive of repositioning the economy and improving living standard will go a long way to make a remarkable change.

III. DESCRIPTIVE PRESENTATION OF ENERGY ISSUES IN NIGERIA

Many scholars have descriptively expressed energy situation in Nigeria. This truly reflects the extent of energy provision which depicts government roles in this regard. The status of the country centres on what the government is doing. The poverty position of the country has its base on activities of the leaders who have managed the economy's resources.

Table 1: Households Reliance on Firewood for Cooking by Nigeria Regions 2011(%) and 2005 Poverty Status

S/N	Zones	Firewood Consumption (%)	Poverty Status (%)
1	North East	93.7	81.0
2	North Central	74.0	80.0
3	North West	91.8	71.9
4	South East	66.0	77.6
5	South South	58.7	74.8
6	South West	37.2	71.5

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2011). Annual Abstract of Statistics & NBS (2005). Poverty Profile for Nigeria

The above depicts that a large proportion of the Nigerian population uses firewood as a major source of energy for cooking. The North East region leads in the percentage of firewood consumption, followed by North West and North Central whereas, in South zones, South East use of firewood exceeds that of South-South and the South-West. This situation reflects the poverty status of the regions. Besides, the existence of the rich, average income earners and educated people seem higher in the South region than the North region. Hence, the choice of energy consumption is influenced by income, education and other factors.

Table 2: The Mean Biomass and Kerosene Consumption by Regions

Zone	Biomass (Mean)	Kerosene(Mean)
North East	93.7000	3.9833
North Central	91.7714	5.8000
North West	77.2167	18.2833
South East	37.2167	54.4833
South South	74.7200	23.0600
South West	58.7333	37.8333

Source: Sa'ad and Bugaje (2016)

The table 2 buttresses the fact that the south region of the country consumes more kerosene for cooking than the North. Kerosene in Nigeria is the most expensive of all the liquid fuel. The frequent and main use of kerosene involves the acquisition of stove unlike the use of firewood. Consequently, the relatively well-to-do region can afford to opt for the use of stove and kerosene as a source of energy for cooking than other regions. This implies that energy use is influenced by income. The relative rich region may have a more modern building that requires decent energy use than those dominantly occupy traditional buildings.

Table 3: Electricity Production and Consumption in Nigeria, 2002-2013

Year	Total Elect. Net Generation in Billion Kilowatts hours	Total Net Consumption in Billion Kilowatts hour	Total Consumption Petrol in Thousand barrel per day	Consumption Liquefied Petroleum Gas in Thousand barrel per day	Consumption Kerosene in Thousand barrel per day
2002	20.7	14.3	303.9	3.3	33.2
2003	19.3	12.6	288.5	0.9	23.6
2004	23.2	15.7	277.1	0.7	19.9
2005	22.5	16.9	311.6	1.3	28.1
2006	22.0	14.9	284.5	0.8	36.5
2007	21.9	19.3	232.2	0.0	36.6
2008	20.1	18.1	263.0	1.3	16.9
2009	18.8	17.7	252.9	0.8	12.2
2010	24.9	20.4	283.1	0.8	44.4
2011	25.7	23.1	287.4	-	-
2012	27.3	-	300.0	-	-
2013	-	-	302.0	-	-

Source: International Energy Statistics (2015)

From table 3 above, Electricity generation and consumption in Nigeria are low in consideration of the population. This made it impossible to sustain households and businesses. Manufacturers, hotels, butchers, food producers, do not find it easy with the low power supply. Hence, many opted for self-generation of electricity which is a source of pollution. It also leads to the high cost of production and high prices of goods/services; thereby impacting adversely on the consumers' real income. This situation has an effect on inflation, a macroeconomic problem that has been devastating in Nigeria over the years. Besides, the situation of low electricity generation has contributed to high unemployment in Nigeria. Some artisan, hairdressers/barbing salon, welders, and others have resorted to transporting business such as tricycle/motorcycle business leaving the productive business due to poor electricity supply. The disgusting aspect is that the electricity supply is not always available because of low supply. The rural areas are mostly affected, thereby retarding production in the area. Petrol consumption is relatively high when compared with kerosene and liquefied petroleum gas. But mostly consumed by the poor is the most expensive in Nigeria. Consumption of liquefied petroleum gas involves the acquisition of gadgets such as cylinder and gas cooker which may not easily be affordable by the poor who are in majority in Nigeria.

Table 4 Access to Electricity Rural 1991-2018

Year	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	2000	2005	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Access To Elect	13.6	14.4	15.1	15.9	16.7	17.5	18.3	19.1	20.9	23.6	23.5	31.0	27.8	31.6	29.0	25.9	34.0	22.7	31.0

Source: International Energy Statistics (2015)

Table 4 shows that many Nigerian cannot access electricity where it is available. This is because the national grid has not covered every place and the extent of availability is not sufficient. There is a high degree of irregular supply in the area in which electricity exist. This situation of the low level of electric supply has resulted in a high degree of rural-urban movement, which has given rise to urban congestion/overcrowding that do put pressure on insufficiently available infrastructure in urban places. It has created an imbalance in production as young able-bodied men and women opted for urban areas, thereby lessening agricultural production and creating food shortage. The fiscal and monetary policies incentives of the government regarding investment in the rural area is thwarted by a low supply of electricity and its inaccessibility.

Table 5: Access to Electricity Selected Countries, 2018

Country	Electricity Consumption
Nigeria	31.0
Cote d' Ivoire	32.9
Eritrea	34.6
Ethiopia	32.7
Gambia	35.5
Gabon	62.5
Ghana	67.3
Kenya	71.7

Source: International Energy Statistics (2015)

Nigeria claims to be the giant of Africa but unable to do things to authenticate the claim. Low electricity consumption due to lack of it contributes to the poverty level in the country. Ghana's population is about three-quarter of the Nigerian population but Ghana consumes more than doubled percentage of electricity relative to what Nigerians consume. Low level of production, high unemployment rate, the high tendency for migration and seeking of asylum to other European countries by Nigerians hinge on lack of required infrastructure such as electricity. Many Nigerians consciously established their industries and factories outside Nigeria due to lack of enough power supply and required environments.

Table 6 Primary Energy Consumption in Nigeria 2009-2017

Year	Value (Quadrillion Btu)	% Change
2009	0.67	-37.27
2010	0.83	24.47
2011	1.18	42.27
2012	1.18	-0.22
2013	1.52	28.60
2014	1.66	9.19
2015	1.57	-5.48
2016	1.58	0.77
2017	1.54	-2.45

Sources: Knoema.Com (2020). <https://knoema.com/atlas/Nigeria/Primary-energy-consumption>

Primary energy consumption includes a wide range of energy in use by various type of consumers. It includes energy converted from natural sources and a host of others such as wood and wood-derived fuels consumption; biomass waste consumption; fuel ethanol and biodiesel consumption and so on (Knoema.Com, 2020). Table 6 shows that primary energy consumption is low and the rate of change is unstable over the years. However, studies have shown that the dominant energy consumption by household is solid energy such as firewood, charcoal, farm and animal wastes. Decent energy is not popular in use rather by a few average and above-average income group.

IV. PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF CHOICE OF ENERGY USE IN NIGERIA

The level of poverty in Nigeria is so high which influences the occurrences and choices of doing things. The persistent situation of inadequate environment and disempowerment of the people in all ramifications have repositioned employment and income generation which in turn impacts on consumption of goods and energy utilization. The impediments of revamping Nigeria economy or extricating herself from poor living status hinges on a lot of things which bothers on resources management, efficient execution of fiscal and monetary policy and rampant corruption. In addition, the ugly attitude of Nigerians is a thing of worry. For instance, Uma and Eboh (2013) posit that a less developed economy such as Nigeria requires prudent management of bestowed resources and supposed to eschew all type of misappropriation of resources and create a relevant environment for economic activities. However, the country has chosen greed, bribery, kick-backs as a way of life which have denied many Nigerians the means of sustainability. Consequently, many Nigerians aspire for one position and ready to do anything to usurp power in order to consciously be in a position to appropriate public resources for personal use. As a result, the national resources are syphoned by the few leaders at the expense of the masses. Hence, in his reference to Omojuwa exposition, Ozoh (2012) pointed out that Nigeria is what it is due to the fact that we are so selfish, myopic in perspective, parochial and grab-your-own mentality; a fanatical group of people who are fond of making noise when not in a position to steal public fund, who steal when given an opportunity to do greater good. The adverse effect associated with such an attitude is the inability to do any meaningful thing to better the life the people. So, the masses wallow in abject poverty in a country blessed with a myriad of natural resources.

Egbu (2012) notes that there exist numerous institutional weaknesses in Nigeria such as political, legislative, judicial, economic, social and bureaucratic bottle-neck. All these have played a remarkable role in putting the economy in a state of melancholy and lack of growth. The skewed share of national income exonerated the majority of the people from a better life. So, lower-income cum poor living condition is associated with a disregard for cleaner cooking energy. This is because everybody loves and desires decency and when the desirable is not available, the available becomes desirable.

The International Corruption Perception Index showed that Nigeria moved from 144th position to 146th out of 180 economies surveyed, and it showed that Nigeria scored 26 which is far below the global average of 43 and the 2019 average score of 32 for the sub-Saharan African region. This implies that in the sub-Saharan region and West Africa Nigeria is rated so high in corruption (Transparency International, 2019); Akinpel, 2020). It was further pointed out by Uma and Eboh (2013) asserted that the degree of corruption is so alarming and it has stifled industrialisation and infrastructural development. The development aspired by the country requires short, medium and long-term industrialisation strategies. But dishearteningly, allocated and budgeted resources are not fully employed due to diversion from targeted and corruption practices. This type of action retards production, weaken

efficient resources use, stifle development and growth which have helped to perpetuate the vicious cycle of poverty in the country. Obayelu (2007) stressed the relevance of infrastructure for economic progress which is lacking due to resources diversion and mismanagement. Therefore, the ugly and poor situation of electricity, transportation and communication are an obstacle to business operation in Nigeria. The ugly trend is shown in lack of power supply and activities such as income generation involving decent energy use. Besides, most things consumed by the poor are the costliest. Kerosene often used by the poor are the most expensive when compared with petrol and gas. Given the man-made poverty in Nigeria, a large chunk of Nigerian people is handicapped in choosing energy use devoid of environmental degradation, which has played an enormous role in regular air pollution and which is known to perpetuate health challenges to numerous inhabitants of the country.

Suffices it to also point out that minimum wage rate exists but it is not enforced in Nigeria. There is a high degree of income inequality among workers and private employees. A junior staff of federal establishment earns higher than a senior civil servant in some states. People with the same qualifications working in different sectors do not earn the same income level due to income inequality and lack of enforcement of the minimum wage rate. Workers in the local, state and federal governments with an exact same qualification are not remunerated equally. Some private businesses pay workers about three thousand naira (₦3000) per month, and so there is a high degree of variation in the choice of goods and services among lower and higher-income earners

Education which is seen as a veritable key for escaping poverty is not adequately attended to in Nigeria. The inability of the leaders to fund public schools to encourage the poor masses' education is highly demoralising. The private school owned by a good number of the leaders and faith-based organisations are not affordable by the poor Nigerians. This has denied adequate education on the part of those desirous for enlightenment as a way to escape poverty. A corollary to this is an increased crime rate. Besides, the lack of employment has an impact on income generation. There are no job opportunities for those who wish to work. So, insecurity and instability have not allowed a favourable environment to attract more foreign investors who can create jobs in the country.

So, numerous issues are attributed to the poor living standard in Nigeria. The problem of choice of decent energy use and improved living standard hinged and impeded by poor leadership, inefficient resources management, a poor environment for economic activity, lack of job opportunity, income inequality, low access to education, very low income, the existence of rural and urban areas with different mentality and ideology, corruption among others.

Prospects

In life, every problem has its corresponding solution and need to be identified and applied for, for the desired change. The problems of inability to use decent energy and repositioning of living standard in Nigeria is resolvable if and only if there is a positive change in resource management in Nigeria that is capable of empowering the masses. This presupposes actions, activities, establishments of better ways of doing things and practical revamping of the economy. It really requires reviving the environment, eliminating insecurity, avoiding frequent crisis and having sincere and honest leaders who have the interest of the masses at heart. It involves creating avenues for employment of numerous idle resources which will raise output and income. It necessitates remodelling education system through adequate funding of school and ensuring quality education devoid of a double standard. It also calls for a reorientation of the masses to change their attitude toward making the country great that is eschew all manner of crisis which retard income generation but this rests solely on the activities of the leaders. Leaders with integrity give rise to a society with decent quality. The leaders need to provide infrastructure, improve energy sources by ensuring the availability and accessibility of all necessities of life.

To all intents and purposes, besides all the determinants of the choice of energy use in Nigeria, the greatest is the role of the government. If the government should live up to its responsibility of provision of infrastructure/capital overheads (water supply, good road network, efficient land, air and water transportation, electricity etc), create jobs, control resources diversion, eradicate corruption, enforce minimum wages, revamp rural areas through massive development, encourage production and consumption, eliminate income inequality, harmonise wages and salaries such that people of the same qualification anywhere earn equal income, adequate distribution of national resources, attract foreign investment/industrialise the country as a way of creating job opportunities, it will place the economy on the path of efficient and effective economic activity, development and growth that is capable of ensuring adequate resources utilization, production and income generation which is essential in decent and better living. Hence, a better choice of clean fuel for cooking and other basic needs which invariably improve living standard in all ramifications.

V. CONCLUSION

The paper has shown the intention of the people to improve living standard and better energy consumption but affected by leadership style with respect to poor provisions of infrastructure and essentials of living, giving rise to a lack of enough environment required to generate income needed to improve living standard. This situation is reflected in the choice of energy use in Nigeria over the years. And apart from other factors influencing the choice of energy use, the major key factor militating clean energy use and inadequate food consumption hinges on the government who failed to repositions the economy and its environment to support

smooth economic operation needed to ensure the employment of resources for the needed output/income generation. Consequently, the low investment gives rise to low production which in turn results in low output and low income. This implies a high poverty rate in the country in spite of abundant of natural resources provided by the owner of life.

So, lower-income bars a good proportion of the people from opting for a decent choice of goods and services. It is the conviction of the authors that the required change for better living and using decent goods and services necessitate an unalloyed and practical turnaround of the government with respect to provisions of needed capital overheads, controlling instability, eliminating corruption and creating a conducive environment. This is expected to increase and encourage income growth which empowers people to choose better energy and desist from polluting the environment due to heavy reliance on unclean energy use.

VI. REFERENCES

1. Adusei, L.A (2018). *Energy Poverty: Exploring Households Energy Constraints and Coping Strategies. Case Study of Sekondi-Takoradi, Ghana*, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, <http://stud.epsilon.slu.se>
2. African Development Bank Group (AFDB) (2014) *West Africa monitor quarterly*, 3, 14–15 Akinpel, Y (2020). *Explainer: How Transparency International assessed Nigeria's corruption level*, available: <https://www.premiumtimesng.com/news/headlines/374623-explainer-how-transparency-international-assessed-nigerias-corruption-level.html>
3. Barnes, D.F., Krutilla, K. and Hyde, W. (2005) *The Urban Household Energy Transition: Energy, Poverty, and the Environment in the Developing World*. World Bank, Washington DC.
4. Bisu, D. Y, Kuhez, A and Lortyer, H. A (2016). *Urban Household Cooking Energy Choice: An Example of Bauchi Metropolis, Nigeria*, *Energy, Sustainability and Society*, 6(15): 1-12
5. Bouzarovski, S and Petrova, S (2015). *A global perspective on domestic energy deprivation: Overcoming the energy poverty–fuel poverty binary*, *Energy Research and Social Science*, 10, 31–40, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2015.06.007>.
6. Cader, C, Blechinger, P and Bertheau, P (2016). *Electrification planning with focus on hybrid mini-grids – A comprehensive modelling approach for the Global South*, *Energy Procedia*, 99, 269–276,
7. Farsi, M and Filippini, M (2007). *Fuel Choices in Urban Indian Households*, *Environment And Development Economics* 12: 757-774 Cambridge University Press Doi:10.1017/S1355770X07003932
8. Egbu, C. (2012). *'Corruption in Nigeria: Is James Ibori's Case a Drop in The Ocean, a Reminder of The Sad State of Affairs in The Country, or Are there Some Lessons to be Learned?'* Available at: <http://saharareporters.com/press-release/corruption-nigeria-james-ibori%E2%80%99scase-drop-ocean-reminder-sad-state-affairs-country-or>
9. Fullerton, D.G, Bruce, S. B, Gordon, S.B (2008). *Indoor air pollution from biomass fuels smoke is a major health concern in the developing world*, *Trans. R. Soc. Trop. Medicine* 102, 843-851
10. Erdmann, T. and Haigh, M. (2013). *The Energy Ladder: A Model for Projecting Energy Demand*. Available at: <http://www.biee.org/wp-content/uploads/Erdmann-The-Energy-Ladder-v2.pdf>
11. Egbas, J, (2020). *87 Per cent of Poor People in Nigeria are from the North*, available <https://www.pulse.ng/news/local/87-percent-of-poor-people-in-nigeria-are-from-the-north-world-bank/ccj8m1f>
12. Gundimeda, H. and Kohlin, G. (2008) *Fuel Demand Elasticities for Energy and Environmental Policies: Indian Sample Survey Evidence*. *Energy Economics*, 30, 517-546. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2006.10.014>
13. Heltberg, R. (2004) *Fuel Switching: Evidence from Eight Developing Countries*. *Energy Economics*, 26, 869-887
14. Heltberg, R (2005). *Factors determining household fuel choice in Guatemala*, *Journal of Environment & Development Economics*, 10, 337-361, Cambridge University Press <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X04001858>
15. Hou, B, Liao, H & Wang, J, Wang, F and Zhang, H (2019) *Cooking fuel decision-making and family structure: a field study in China*, *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 26:24050–2406, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-019-05216-9>
16. International Energy Agency (2017). *World Energy Outlook*, IEA, www.iea.org/75739 Paris Cedex 15 France
17. International Energy Statistics (2015) *Access to Electricity*, available, <http://nso.nigeria.opendataforafrica.org/avgduk/nigeria-energy-profile>
18. Ingale, L.T, Dube, K.J, Sarode, D.B, Attarde, S.B, Ingle, S.T (2013). *Monitoring and respiratory health assessment of the population exposed to cooking in rural area of Jalgoan District, India*, *Asia Pac Journal of Public Health* 25, 463-475
19. Jain, A., Agrawal, S. and Ganesan, K. (2014) *Rationalizing Subsidies, Reaching the Underserved*. Council of Energy, Environment and Water, New Delhi.
20. Kim, K.H, Jahan, S.A, Kabir, E, (2011). *A Review Diseases Associated with Household Air Pollution due to the Use of Biomass Fuel*. *J. Hazard Mater.* 192, 425-431
21. Kammen, D.M, Alstone, P, and Gershenson, D (2014). *Energy for Sustainable and Equitable Development*, <http://www.casinapoioiv.va/content/dam/academia/pdf/es41/es4/-Kammen.pdf>.
22. Knoema.Com(2020). *Primary Energy Consumption*, available, <https://knoema.com/atlas/Nigeria/Primary-energy-consumption>
23. Kuik, O.J, Lima, M.B and Gupta, J (2011). *"Energy security in a developing world*, *WIREs Climate Change*, 2, 627–634,
24. Kroon, B.V.D, Brouwer, R. and Van Beukering, P.J.H. (2013). *The Energy Ladder: Theoretical Myth or Empirical Truth? Results from a Meta-analysis*. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 20:504-513. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032112006594>
25. Leach, G. (1992) *The Energy Transitions*. *Energy Policy*, 20, 116-123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-4215\(92\)90105-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/0301-4215(92)90105-B)
26. Lucon, O., Coelho, S.T. and Goldemberg, J. (2004) *LPG in Brazil: Lessons and Challenges*. *Energy for Sustainable Development*, 8, 82-90. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0973-0826\(08\)60470-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0973-0826(08)60470-6)
27. Moeen, M. S, Sheikh, A.T, Saleem, M.S.S and Rashid, S (2016) *Factors Influencing Choice of Energy Sources in Rural Pakistan*, *The Pakistan Development Review* 55 (4): 905–920
28. National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2011). *Annual Abstract of Statistics*, Abuja, NBS.
29. National Bureau of Statistics (2005). *Poverty Profile for Nigeria*, Abuja, NBS.
30. Njiru, C. W and Letema, S.C (2018). *Energy Poverty and Its Implication on Standard of Living in Kirinyaga, Kenya*, *Journal of Energy* <https://doi.org/10.1155/2018/3196567>
31. National Population Commission (2018). *Nigeria Demographic and Health Survey, NPC*, Abuja

32. Nansairo, A. Patanothai, A. Rambo, A.T. & Simaraks, S. (2011). *Climbing the Energy Ladder or Diversifying Energy Sources? The Continuing Importance of Household Use of Biomass Energy in Urbanizing Communities in Northeast Thailand*. *Biomass and Energy* 35(10): 4180-4188. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0961953411003886>
33. Mekonnen, A. Gebreegziabher, Z. Kassie, M. and Köln, G. (2009). *Income Alone Doesn't Determine Adoption and Choice of Fuel Types: Evidence from Households in Tigray and Major Cities in Ethiopia*. Available at: <https://docs.google.com/viewer?url=http://www.efdnitiative.org/sites/default/files/urban20fuel20choice20brief.pdf>
34. Obayelu, A. E. (2007). *Effects of Corruption and Economic Reforms on Economic Growth and Development: Lessons from Nigeria*. Paper submitted for African Economic Conference.
35. Oguntoke, O. Adebulehin, H.J, Annegarn, H.J (2013) *Biomass, Energy utilization, air quality and the health of rural women and children in Ido L.G.A, South-Western Nigeria*, *Indoor Built Environ.* 22, 528-534
36. Olopade, O, Ana, G.R, Arinola, G.O, Wiskel, A.G, Falusi, D.Z, Huo, O.I, Olopade, C.O (2013). *Effect of Stove Intervention on Household air pollution and respiratory health of women and children in rural Nigeria*, *Air Quality, Atmosphere and health* 6, 553-561
37. Oyedepo O (2012) *Energy and sustainable development in Nigeria: the way forward*. *Energy Sustain Soc* 2:15
38. Ogwumike F. O, Ozughalu UM, Abiona G.A (2014) *Household energy use and determinants: evidence from Nigeria*. *Int J Energy Econ Policy* 4(2):248–262
39. Ozoh, F. O. (2012). *'Constituents Welfare and Public Expenditure Immiseration in Nigeria: A Graphical Survey'*, *The Nigerian Electoral Journal*, 5(2).
40. Pal, S. and Das, S. (2019) *Is the Socio-Economic Status of the Households below Poverty Line a Key Indicator towards the Choice of Cooking Fuel as LPG? Theoretical Economics Letters*, 9, 2126-2138. <https://doi.org/10.4236/tel.2019.96134>
41. Rahut, D.B, Ali, A, Mottaleb, K.A and Aryal, J.P (2019). *Wealth, Education and Cooking-fuel among Rural Households in Pakistan*, *Energy Strategy Reviews* 24, 236-243.
42. Sa'ad, A, Bugaje, I.M (2016). *Biomass Consumption in Nigeria: Trends and Policy Issues*, *Journal of Agriculture and Sustainability* 9(2), 127-157
43. Selvakkumaran, S and Silveira, S (2018). *Exploring Synergies between the Intended Nationally Determined Contributions and Electrification Goals of Ethiopia, Kenya and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)*, " *Climate and Development*,
44. Tagoe, H. A. (2010). *The Double-Edged Sword: Financial Source of Household Healthcare Expenditure in Ghana*. *Regional Institute for Population*. Working Paper No. 10-04.
45. Toole, R. (2015). *The Energy Ladder: A Valid Model for Household Fuel Transition in Sub-Saharan Africa?* Available at: <https://sites.tufts.edu/MaryDavis/files/2015/06/ThesisFinal.pdf>
46. *Trading Economics.Com* (2016) *Nigeria-Total Primary Energy*, available <https://tradingeconomics.com/nigeria/modern-biomass-consumption-tj-wb-data.html>
47. *Transparency International* (2019). *Our Work in Nigeria*, <https://www.transparency.org/en/countries/nigeria>
48. Uma, K.E, Eboh, F.E (2013). *Corruption, Economic Development and Emerging Markets: Evidence from Nigeria*, *Asian Journal of Management Sciences and Education*, 2(3); 56-67.
49. WHO (2010) *Household Air Pollution and Health. USA: Fact Sheet No 292.*, Available at <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs292/en/>
50. *World Bank* (2018). *Population, Total Nigeria* retrieved on May 12, 2020 from <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL?locations=NG>
51. Yadama, G.N. (2013) *Fires, Fuel, and the Fate of 3 Billion: The State of the Energy Impoverished*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.