

Volume: 3, Issue: 3 Page: 14 - 28 2022

## International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

# Family income and access to health care services among residents of Sagamu local Government area of Ogun State, Nigeria

**Author(s),** ENAHOLO Kikelomo Isimot (RN, RM, RPON, BNSc), OKAFOR, Ngozi Anthonia (RN, RM, RPHN, PhD, Assoc. Prof.),

#### **Abstract:**

Access to health care services means having the timely use of personal health services to achieve the best health outcomes. However, accessibility, affordability and quality make up the golden triangle of ideal healthcare. Hence, the goal of this study is to ascertain the relationship between family income and health-care access in Sagamu local government area of Ogun State, Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive cross-sectional quantitative research design. The target population consisted of family heads (household heads) in Sagamu LGA. A multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select 316 respondents. The instrument for data collection was a self-structured questionnaire which was divided into three sections (sections A-C). The instrument was subjected to face and content validity. The data for this study were collected primarily by the researchers. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the data collected. The findings revealed that the geographical accessibility of health care services was poor due to reasons which include poor road network and bad transportation system while financial accessibility was also poor as most respondents could not afford the health care financing. Results for test of hypotheses showed that family income has a significant relationship with proximity to health care services (r= 0.347, p= 0.000), and availability of funds to care for health needs (r= 0.559, p= 0.000). The study concluded that the relationship between family income and geographical and financial accessibility were correlated.

IJMNHS

Accepted 21 April 2022 Published 30 June 2022 DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6783425

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Email: editor.ijmnhs@gmail.com editor@ijmnhs.com Website: ijmnhs.com



It was recommended among others that the government should ensure the payment of subsidized charges by low income earners, to enable those with low income (the poor) access available health care services.

Keywords: Family Income, Access, Health Care Services,

(R)

Medicine, Milania y Health Solling

#### **About Author**

### Author(s):

#### **ENAHOLO Kikelomo Isimot (RN, RM, RPON, BNSc)**

Department of Public/Community Health Nursing, School of Nursing Science, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria.

#### And

#### OKAFOR, Ngozi Anthonia (RN, RM, RPHN, PhD, Assoc. Prof.)

Department of Public/Community Health Nursing, School of Nursing Science, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria.

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Medicine, Manager and Medicine, Manager and

#### Introduction

Family income reflects people's ability to maintain reasonable financial alertness; and having some finances to manage is better to deal with health risks than not having much (Allmark, et al, 2019). In recent time, statistics have shown that low-income households are bedeviling not only with physical accessibility and acceptability of healthcare services but the affordability of healthcare services. According to the World Health Organization (2021), 210 million people globally suffer financial catastrophe from out- of-pocket expenditure on healthcare services every year, while 160 million are below the poverty line. Similarly, Scofield (2020) noted that not less than 12% of the global population spends at least 10% of their family budget on health. Correspondingly, in Nigeria, the poverty line due to out-of-pocket healthcare expenditure rose from 6.61% in 2010 to 8.66% and 9.52% in 2020 and 2021 respectively. While the number of maternal death resulting from the inability to respond or afford health services per 1000 adults continue to rise from 64,000 in 2010 to 69,000 in 2018 (World Bank, 2019).

Universal health care has long been regarded as a basis of long-term growth and international stability (United Nation 2012). As a result, health-related facilities should be widely accessible, acceptable, appropriate, and of good quality (Campbell et al., 2013). The economic development of any country is closely related to the health status of its population. As such, an efficient and equitable health care system that responds to the need of its people is an important instrument that can break the vicious circle of poverty and ill health. Health systems deliver preventive and curative health services which make large impacts on peoples' health. However, access to these services can lead to families spending substantial proportions of their available income. This has pushed some households into poverty. Because of these negative impacts some households forgo healthcare services and suffer ill health. The health sector in any country has been recognized as the primary engine of growth and development. The major factors that affect the overall contribution of the health system to economic growth and development in Nigeria include inter alia; lack of consumer awareness and participation, inadequate laboratory facilities, lack of basic infrastructure and equipment, poor human resource management, poor remuneration and motivation, lack of fair and sustainable health care financing, and high out-of-pocket expenditure on health. All these militate against access to health care services by the population.

Health care financing is the gathering of funds from public and private sources, including donor agencies, to pay for health care providers' services. The way a health system is funded has an impact on how well it performs, functions, and achieves its objectives. Costs of health care services and disposable incomes of households have significant implications for population health. The extent to which public health services are designed to promote health, prevent disease, and provide high-quality treatment, rehabilitation, and palliative care sufficient to be effective while ensuring that the services provided will not put the user in financial hardship is defined as the extent to which public healthcare services are designed to promote health, prevent disease, and provide sufficient high-quality treatment, rehabilitation, and palliative care while ensuring that the services provided will not put the user in financial hardship (Morgan & Churchill, 2018). However, due to widespread poverty, unemployment, inflation, and other macroeconomic difficulties, low-income individuals in Nigeria continue to

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Email: editor.ijmnhs@gmail.com editor@ijmnhs.com Website: ijmnhs.com

Medicine. Nurgerial standard s

have difficulty accessing healthcare services. Health care financing is particularly hard hit, particularly in Nigeria, where out-of-pocket spending accounts for more than 70% of total private health expenditure, sapping the little progress the health system has made. As a result, most poor-stricken households' out-of-pocket spending has increased as a result of the high disease burden, trapping them in a vicious cycle of poverty and illness.

Out-of-pocket health expenses, according to World Health Statistics (2020), can put people in a financial bind by forcing them to choose between health and other requirements. Out-of-pocket health spending has been termed as catastrophic in many studies when it exceeds a specific threshold of a household's consumption or income (Wagstaff, et al., 2020). Out-of-pocket payments put a strain on family income, hence the goal of this study is to see how family income affects access to health care services. The frequency of catastrophic health spending is the most extensively used indicator to quantify financial hardship connected with out-of-pocket payments for households (Gyasi et al, 2019).

There is a direct link between the distance patients travel to get health care services and the reduction of disease and suffering in a country in public health facility (AlHW 2011). Patients are more likely to use health facilities that are close to them rather than those that are farther away (Mizen et al., 2015). One of the most important drivers of health-care utilization is the distance between patients and centers (Stock 1983). Patients travel a longer distance in third-world countries than they do in develop countries (Gyasi et al., 2019). Quality healthcare service has been defined in four aspects of access (Levesque et al., 2013), reflecting the balance between the qualities and expectations of providers and clients: (1) geographic accessibility – the physical distance or travel time to the potential user; (2) availability – having the appropriate type of care for those who require it; and (3) financial accessibility – users' willingness and ability to pay for services. Identifying varying levels of spatial accessibility to healthcare services in a given area allows decision makers to assess the effects of new facilities opening, closing, moving, or adjusting the services provided by current ones (Delamater et al., 2012).

Consequently, spending on health is not only consumption expenditure, but a productive investment both at individual and national levels. A healthy population is potentially a more productive population. This reasoning justifies national resource deployment to health funding and the increased campaign to use organized health system. It is assumed that increased access and use of health services will improve the health status of the population. The correlation between family income and access to health services can be argued through the proper utilization of financial services. Agrigoroaei, et al (2017) and Aguila, et al (2016) opined that ability to maintain reasonable financial competence such as having access to a bank and account ownership, involvement in microfinance credit union, having a mobile money account and access to credit through loans from financial institutions and non-financial systems are significant determinant of healthcare.

The problem is that family income that is inadequate may lead to low access to health care services. Also most families cannot access health care services because it is out reach. The idea is that third party payment through health insurance scheme should be universally made available for all families. This will help determine the effects of family income on access to health care services.

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Email: editor.ijmnhs@gmail.com editor@ijmnhs.com Website: ijmnhs.com

du Mangara de Per

Nigerians, especially the residents of Sagamu local government area of Ogun State maintain a very strong household relationship. This is evident in the culture and attributes of the people of Ogun State. The household family members are a decisive agent in determining the healthcare service financing of the household (Ogunsakin & Fawehinmi, 2017). Family income plays a very important role in household spending on health. Inadequacy in healthcare service financing among households has been documented as a major factor promoting high morbidity and mortality among members of the family. The main objective of this study was to determine the effect of family income on access to health care service among residents of Sagamu local government area of Ogun State, Nigeria. The specific objectives were to:

- 1. determine the effect of family income on geographic accessibility of health services among residents in Sagamu local Government in Ogun State Nigeria; and
- 2. determine the effect of family income on financial accessibility of health services among residents in Sagamu local Government in Ogun State Nigeria.

#### **Research Hypotheses**

**Ho1:** There is no significant relationship between family income and geographical accessibility to healthcare services among residents of Sagamu local government of Ogun State

**Ho2:** There is no significant relationship between family income and financial accessibility to health care services among residents of Sagamu local government area of Ogun state.

#### Methodology

The study adopted a quantitative design using a descriptive cross-sectional approach. This study was carried out among residents of Sagamu local government area of Ogun state. Approximately, 35,760 households are residents of Sagamu local government area of Ogun State. The target population was family members resident in Sagamu local government of Ogun State. To determine the sample size, the indices used to determine sample size in a study done to investigate Out-of-pocket payment for health care services and implication for household by Adesina (2020) was adopted in this study since both studies have significant similarities. 0.25 was used as proportion of residents positive for health care that will require payment, power of 80% (0.8), confidence interval of 95% and 0.05 as the absolute sampling errors that can be tolerated.

Using the formula  $n = \frac{z^2 \times pq}{d^2}$ 

#### Where

n = the desired sample size,

z = the standard normal deviation at 95% confidence interval =1.95

p = the proportion in the target population estimated to have a particular characteristics = 0.25

q = 1.0 - p = 0.75

d = degree of accuracy desired, usually set at 0.05

Therefore

 $n = 1.962 \times 0.25 \times 0.75 = 0.7203 = 288.12$ 

0.0025

n = 288

6

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Published By



To make up for non-response/attrition rates, 10% of the sample size was calculated and added. 10% of 288=28, therefore, 28+288=316

A multi-stage sampling procedure was used for this study.

Stage 1: All the fifteen wards in Sagamu local government area were considered at this stage. Ten wards were selected by stratified random sampling so that wards in both rural and urban areas are represented.

Stage 2: All the streets in the selected wards were listed out and numbered. There was an average of 14 streets per ward. Each street had an average of 16 houses on it. Two (2) streets were selected by simple random sampling through balloting from the list of streets in each of the ward for this study.

Stage 3: The streets were considered one after another, starting from the first selected street, to the last. All the houses on the selected streets were considered, starting from the first to the last. In houses with more than one household, and therefore more than one household/family member, only one of the household/family member was recruited. A household/family member was picked by simple random sampling method per house, until the required number of household members was attained.

For the purpose of this study, data collection was done using a structured self-administered questionnaire which contained 3 sections. Section A sought for Socio demographic characteristics of the respondents. Section B consisted of items on Proximity of Health care Services. This was measured with Yes or No while Section C consisted of items on Availability of fund to Access Health care Services. This was measured by Yes or No. The instrument was subjected to face and content validity. The items in the questionnaire were presented to experts in tests and measurement, and nursing science for reviewing, correction and appraisal after which necessary corrections were made. Reliability of instrument was carried out using 10% of the respondent (10% of 316 = 31), these copies of the questionnaire were shared amongst 31 participants in Odogbolu Town. The data collected were analysed using the Cronbach's alpha statistics and the reliability index gotten was 0.747

A letter of introduction was presented to the Chairman, Sagamu Local Government Area. After acceptance, copies of the questionnaire were distributed among the residents of Sagamu LGA. The copies of the questionnaire were shared for a period of two weeks. After which each questionnaire was numbered and taken for analysis. Data obtained were processed and analyzed using the latest version of statistical package for social sciences (version 27). Frequency tables were made and data were presented on it. Research questions were answered using descriptive statistics of mean standard deviation and percentages while hypotheses were tested using inferential statistics of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation test at 0.05 level of significance.

#### Results

Table 1: Distribution of respondents by socio-demographic characteristics N= 316

Socio-demographic characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
26-33yrs	31	9.8
34-40yrs	80	25.3
41-48yrs	119	37.7

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Published By



Total      316      100.0        Sex      65.5        Male      207      65.5        Female      109      34.5        Total      316      100.0        Main Occupation      67      21.2        Civil Servant      67      21.2        Artisan      78      24.7        Trader      94      29.7        Unemployed      4      1.3        Others      73      23.1        Total      316      100.0        Married Status      8      1.2        Never Married      13      4.1        Married      228      72.2        Non-married Partner      27      8.5        Divorced      12      3.8        Separated      23      7.3        Widowed      13      4.1        Total      316      100.0        Family type      8      100.0        Monogamous      233      73.7        Polygamous      43      13.6        Cohabiting      <	48yrs and above	86	27.2
Male  207  65.5    Female  109  34.5    Total  316  100.0    Main Occupation	Total	316	100.0
Female      109      34.5        Total      316      100.0        Main Occupation      Civil Servant      67      21.2        Artisan      78      24.7        Trader      94      29.7        Unemployed      4      1.3        Others      73      23.1        Total      316      100.0        Married Status      8      7.2        Never Married      13      4.1        Married Partner      27      8.5        Divorced      12      3.8        Separated      23      7.3        Widowed      13      4.1        Total      316      100.0        Family type      8      7.3        Monogamous      233      73.7        Polygamous      43      13.6        Cohabiting      40      12.7        Total      316      100.0        Family size      8      1.2        Less than 4      134      42.4        Greater than 4      182      57.6	Sex		
Total      316      100.0        Main Occupation      67      21.2        Civil Servant      78      24.7        Artisan      78      24.7        Trader      94      29.7        Unemployed      4      1.3        Others      73      23.1        Total      316      100.0        Married      13      4.1        Married Partner      27      8.5        Divorced      12      3.8        Separated      23      7.3        Widowed      13      4.1        Total      316      100.0        Family type      316      100.0        Monogamous      233      73.7        Polygamous      43      13.6        Cohabiting      40      12.7        Total      316      100.0        Family size      2      2        Less than 4      182      57.6        Total      316      100.0        Educational Background      2      0.6	Male	207	65.5
Total      316      100.0        Main Occupation      67      21.2        Civil Servant      78      24.7        Artisan      78      24.7        Trader      94      29.7        Unemployed      4      1.3        Others      73      23.1        Total      316      100.0        Married      13      4.1        Married Partner      27      8.5        Divorced      12      3.8        Separated      23      7.3        Widowed      13      4.1        Total      316      100.0        Family type      316      100.0        Monogamous      233      73.7        Polygamous      43      13.6        Cohabiting      40      12.7        Total      316      100.0        Family size      2      2        Less than 4      182      57.6        Total      316      100.0        Educational Background      2      0.6	Female	109	34.5
Main Occupation  67  21.2    Artisan  78  24.7    Trader  94  29.7    Unemployed  4  1.3    Others  73  23.1    Total  316  100.0    Marital Status  13  4.1    Never Married  13  4.1    Married Partner  27  8.5    Divorced  12  3.8    Separated  23  7.3    Widowed  13  4.1    Total  316  100.0    Family type  43  13.6    Monogamous  233  73.7    Polygamous  43  13.6    Cohabiting  40  12.7    Total  316  100.0    Family size  182  57.6    Less than 4  182  57.6    Total  316  100.0    Educational Background  2  0.6    No formal education  2  0.6    Primary  36  11.4    Secondary  140  44.3    Tertiary  -  -    Graduate  138  43.7    Total  316  100.0		316	100.0
Civil Servant    67    21.2      Artisan    78    24.7      Trader    94    29.7      Unemployed    4    1.3      Others    73    23.1      Total    316    100.0      Marital Status    13    4.1      Never Married    13    4.1      Married    228    72.2      Non-married Partner    27    8.5      Divorced    12    3.8      Separated    23    7.3      Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type    5      Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    2      Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    2    0.6      No formal education    2    0.6	Main Occupation		
Trader    94    29.7      Unemployed    4    1.3      Others    73    23.1      Total    316    100.0      Marital Status    13    4.1      Never Married    13    4.1      Married    228    72.2      Non-married Partner    27    8.5      Divorced    12    3.8      Separated    23    7.3      Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type    316    100.0      Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    233    73.7      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    2    2      Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    132    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    2    0.6      No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary		67	21.2
Unemployed  4  1.3    Others  73  23.1    Total  316  100.0    Marital Status  1    Never Married  13  4.1    Married  228  72.2    Non-married Partner  27  8.5    Divorced  12  3.8    Separated  23  7.3    Widowed  13  4.1    Total  316  100.0    Family type  233  73.7    Monogamous  233  73.7    Polygamous  43  13.6    Cohabiting  40  12.7    Total  316  100.0    Family size    Less than 4  134  42.4    Greater than 4  182  57.6    Total  316  100.0    Educational Background  2  0.6    No formal education  2  0.6    Primary  36  11.4    Secondary  140  44.3    Tertiary  -  -    Graduate  138  43.7    Total  316  100.0    Household monthly income  1  1    Less than N30,000  <	Artisan	78	24.7
Others  73  23.1    Total  316  100.0    Marital Status  13  4.1    Never Married  13  4.1    Married  228  72.2    Non-married Partner  27  8.5    Divorced  12  3.8    Separated  23  7.3    Widowed  13  4.1    Total  316  100.0    Family type  43  13.6    Monogamous  233  73.7    Polygamous  43  13.6    Cohabiting  40  12.7    Total  316  100.0    Family size  134  42.4    Less than 4  134  42.4    Greater than 4  182  57.6    Total  316  100.0    Educational Background  2  0.6    No formal education  2  0.6    Primary  36  11.4    Secondary  140  44.3    Tertiary  -  -    Graduate  138  43.7    Total  316  100.0    Household monthly income  1  1    Less than N30,000  57	Trader	94	29.7
Others  73  23.1    Total  316  100.0    Marital Status  13  4.1    Never Married  13  4.1    Married  228  72.2    Non-married Partner  27  8.5    Divorced  12  3.8    Separated  23  7.3    Widowed  13  4.1    Total  316  100.0    Family type  43  13.6    Monogamous  233  73.7    Polygamous  43  13.6    Cohabiting  40  12.7    Total  316  100.0    Family size  134  42.4    Less than 4  134  42.4    Greater than 4  182  57.6    Total  316  100.0    Educational Background  2  0.6    No formal education  2  0.6    Primary  36  11.4    Secondary  140  44.3    Tertiary  -  -    Graduate  138  43.7    Total  316  100.0    Household monthly income  1  1    Less than N30,000  57	Unemployed	4	1.3
Total      316      100.0        Marital Status      Never Married      13      4.1        Married      228      72.2        Non-married Partner      27      8.5        Divorced      12      3.8        Separated      23      7.3        Widowed      13      4.1        Total      316      100.0        Family type      316      100.0        Monogamous      233      73.7        Polygamous      43      13.6        Cohabiting      40      12.7        Total      316      100.0        Family size      2      57.6        Less than 4      182      57.6        Total      316      100.0        Educational Background      2      0.6        Primary      36      11.4        Secondary      140      44.3        Tertiary      -      -        Graduate      138      43.7        Total      316      100.0        Household monthly income      1		73	23.1
Never Married    13    4.1      Married    228    72.2      Non-married Partner    27    8.5      Divorced    12    3.8      Separated    23    7.3      Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type    316    100.0      Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    -    -      Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    1    1      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50	Total		100.0
Married    228    72.2      Non-married Partner    27    8.5      Divorced    12    3.8      Separated    23    7.3      Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type	Marital Status		
Married    228    72.2      Non-married Partner    27    8.5      Divorced    12    3.8      Separated    23    7.3      Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type	Never Married	13	4.1
Divorced    12    3.8      Separated    23    7.3      Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type    Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    2    0.6      No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    1    1      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1			
Separated    23    7.3      Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type    Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    2    0.6      No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    Eess than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Non-married Partner	27	8.5
Separated    23    7.3      Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type    Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    2    0.6      No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    Eess than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Divorced	12	3.8
Widowed    13    4.1      Total    316    100.0      Family type	Separated	23	7.3
Total    316    100.0      Family type        Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	•	13	4.1
Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    6    1.9      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Total		100.0
Monogamous    233    73.7      Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    6    1.9      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Family type		
Polygamous    43    13.6      Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1		233	73.7
Cohabiting    40    12.7      Total    316    100.0      Family size    Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1		43	13.6
Total    316    100.0      Family size		40	12.7
Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background        No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income       Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1		316	100.0
Less than 4    134    42.4      Greater than 4    182    57.6      Total    316    100.0      Educational Background        No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income       Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Family size		
Total    316    100.0      Educational Background    Colspan="2">C		134	42.4
Educational Background    2    0.6      No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    5    1.9      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Greater than 4	182	57.6
No formal education    2    0.6      Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    -    -      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Total	316	100.0
Primary    36    11.4      Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    -    -      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Educational Background		
Secondary    140    44.3      Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income    -    -      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	No formal education	2	0.6
Tertiary    -    -      Graduate    138    43.7      Total    316    100.0      Household monthly income      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Primary	36	11.4
Graduate13843.7Total316100.0Household monthly income50.0061.9Less than N30,00061.9N31,000 - N50,0005718.0N51,000 - N100,00019361.1	Secondary	140	44.3
Total316100.0Household monthly income		-	-
Household monthly income      Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Graduate	138	43.7
Less than N30,000    6    1.9      N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Total	316	100.0
N31,000 - N50,000    57    18.0      N51,000 - N100,000    193    61.1	Household monthly income		
N51,000 - N100,000 193 61.1	Less than N30,000	6	1.9
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	N31,000 - N50,000	57	18.0
0 1 . 374.00.000	N51,000 - N100,000	193	61.1
Greater than N100,000   60   19.0	Greater than N100,000	60	19.0
Total 316 100.0	Total	316	100.0

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Published By

 ${\bf Email: editor.ijmnhs@gmail.com \quad editor@ijmnhs.com \quad Website: ijmnhs.com}$ 



#### Source: Field Survey, 2022

Table 1 presents the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents in Sagamu Local Government Area of Ogun State. With respect to age, 31(9.8%) were between the age 26-33 years, 80(25.3%) were within 34-40 years, 119(37.7%) were within 41-48 years while 86(27.2%) respondents were above 48 years. Furthermore, a total of 207(65.5%) respondents were male, while the remaining, which accounts for 48(15.8%), were female. The occupation of respondents was also analyzed. A total of 67(21.2%) were civil servants, 78(24.7%) were artisans, 94(29.7%) were traders, 4(1.3%) were unemployed while others were 73(23.1%). On marital status, 13(4.1%) respondents were never married, 228(72.2%) were married, 27(8.5%) were non-married partner, 12(3.8%) were divorced, 23(7.3%) were separated while 13(4.1%) were widowed. Upon analyzing family type, 233(73.7%) were monogamous, 43(13.6%) were polygamous while 40(12.7%) were cohabiting. Results on family size showed that 134(42.4%) respondents have were less than 4 members in the family while 182(57.6%) were have a family size greater than 4. On educational background, 2(0.6%) respondents had no formal education, 36(11.4%) respondents had primary education, 140(44.3%) respondents had secondary education, while others, 118(38.8%) were graduates. Results on monthly income showed that 6(1.9%) respondents earn below N30,000 monthly, 57(18.0%) respondents earn between N20,000 to N50,000 monthly, 193(61.1%) of them earn between N51,000 to N100,000 per month while 60(19.0%) respondents earn above N100,000 every month.

#### **Objective 1: PROXIMITY TO HEALTH CARE SERVICES**

Table 2: Proximity to Health Care Services

N = 316

Table 2: Froximity to nearth care services			N- 310		
S/N	Statements	Yes	No	Mean	SD
1	Health care facility is quite a distance	285(90.2%	31(9.8%)	0.90	0.298
	from where we live.	)			
2	Health care facility is quite a distance	197(62.3%	119(37.7%	0.62	0.485
	from where we work.	)	)		
3	Road network to access health facility we	214(67.7%	102(32.3%	0.68	0.468
	use is not good.	)	)		
4	There is no good transportation system to	273(86.4%	43(13.6%)	0.86	0.343
	access our health facility	)			
5	It takes a long time to reach the closest	198(62.7%	118(37.3%	0.63	0.484
	health facility from our home	)	)		
6	There is no government primary health	214(67.7%	102(32.3%	0.68	0.468
	centres in our community	)	)		
Ave				0.73	0.424
rag					
e					

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Table 2 presents descriptive statistics respondents' responses to questions related to effect of family income on proximity to health care services. This result shows that a total of 285(90.2%) respondents answered that the health care facilities are located far away from their residents while just 31(9.8%) respondents said health care facilities are located nearer

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Published By

of Medicine. Murating Health Scale

to where they live. This indicates that almost all respondents have health care facilities situated away from the various residences (mean= 0.90, standard deviation= 0.298).

Also, 197(62.3%) respondents noted that health care facilities are located far from their places of work while the rest, 119(37.7%) answered otherwise. This shows that over half of the respondents have health care facility situated away from their place of work (Mean= 0.62, standard deviation= 0.485). 214(67.7%) respondents said there is bad road network to access health care facility while 102(32.3%) said there is a good road network linking their various residences to the health care facility (mean= 0.68, standard deviation= 0.468). From the fourth question, 273(86.4%) people said there is no good transportation system to access the health care facilities in Sagamu while 43(13.6%) people said otherwise (mean= 0.86, standard deviation= 0.343).

From the next question, 198(62.7%) people said it takes longer time to reach the closest health facility while 118(37.3%) people answered it takes shorter period for them to access the closest health care facility (mean=0.63, standard deviation=0.484). From the last question asked concerning the presence of a government primary health centre in their community, a total of 214(67.7%) respondents answered there are no government primary health centre in their community while the remaining people answered otherwise. This means that only about 32% of the respondents have a government primary health facility in their community (mean= 0.68, standard deviation= 0.468).

The average mean score of responses of respondents for this section is 0.73 while the average standard deviation is 0.424. This indicates that most of the respondents answered in affirmation to each of the questions, meaning there are challenges in the proximity to health care facility in Sagamu Local Government Area.

**Objective 2: AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS TO ACCESS HEALTH CARE SERVICES** 

Table 3: Availability of Fund to Access Health Care Services N=316

S/N	Statements	Yes	No	Mea	SD
				n	
1	My income is sufficient to take care of	40(12.7%)	276(87.3	0.13	0.33
	myself and my family members health		%)		3
	needs				
2	We take loan to visit the hospital for health	1(0.3%)	315(99.7)	0.00	0.05
	care				6
3	We pay out of pocket for health care	286(90.5	30(9.5%)	0.91	0.29
	services expenses	%)			4
4	I have health insurance policy to take care	30(9.5%)	286(90.5	0.09	0.29
	of my family members health care needs		%)		4
5	My family get some free health care	1(0.3%)	315(99.7	0.00	0.05
	services from government and NGOs/		%)		6
Ave				0.23	0.20
rag					7
e					

Source: Field Survey, 2022

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)



Table 3 indicates the descriptive statistics of respondents' responses to questions relating to the availability of funds to access health care facilities in Sagamu. This result of this survey indicates that only 40(12.7%) respondents have sufficient income to take care of the health needs of themselves and their family members. 276(87.3%) respondents answered their income isn't. This is evident as shown by the mean score of 0.13 and standard deviation of 0.333. Almost all respondents are unable to access loan in other to visit the hospital for health care has only just 1(0.3%) of them can take loan while the remaining 315(99.7%) people cannot take loan (mean= 0.00, standard deviation= 0.056). Only 30(9.5%) respondents have health insurance policy to take care of family members health care needs while 286(90.5%) respondents do not have an insurance policy (mean= 0.09, standard deviation= 0.294). As shown by the results from the analysis, 286(90.5%) respondents pay out of pocket for health care services expenses while just 30(9.5%) respondents do not (mean=0.91, standard deviation= 0.294). Lastly, 315(99.7%) respondents said they do not get free health care services from the government and NGOs as only just one respondent receives free health care services (mean=0.00, standard deviation= 0.056).

The average mean score of responses of respondents for this section is 0.23 while the average standard deviation is 0.207. This indicates that most of the respondents answered negative on average to the question in this section.

#### Test of Hypotheses

**Research Hypothesis 1 (Ho1)**: There is no significant relationship between family income and geographical accessibility to healthcare services among residents of Sagamu local government of Ogun State.

Table 4: Pearson Correlation between family income and geographical accessibility to healthcare services

		HOUSEHOLD MONTHLY INCOME	Geographical Accessibility
HOUSEHOLD MONTHLY	Pearson Correlation	1	.347**
INCOME	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	316	316
Geographical Accessibility	Pearson Correlation	.347**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	316	316

Source: Field Survey, 2022

The results in Table 4 revealed that there was significant relationship between family income and geographical accessibility to healthcare services among residents of Sagamu local government of Ogun State (r = 0.347, p < 0.05). This implies that family income and geographical accessibility to healthcare services are related. Therefore, the hypothesis stating no significant relationship between family income and geographical accessibility to healthcare services among residents of Sagamu LGA is hereby rejected.

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)



**Research Hypothesis 2 (Ho2)**: There is no significant relationship between family income and financial accessibility to health care services among residents of Sagamu local government area of Ogun state.

Table 5: Pearson Correlation between family income and financial accessibility to health care services

		HOUSEHOLD MONTHLY INCOME	Financial Accessibility
HOUSEHOLD MONTHLY INCOME	Pearson Correlation	1	.559**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	316	316
Financial Accessibility	Pearson Correlation	.559**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	316	316

Source: Field Survey, 2022

The results in Table 5 revealed that there was significant relationship between family income and financial accessibility to health care services among residents of Sagamu local government of Ogun State (r = 0.559, p < 0.05). This implies that family income and financial accessibility to health care services are related. Therefore, the hypothesis stating no significant relationship between family income and financial accessibility to health care services among residents of Sagamu LGA is hereby rejected.

#### **Discussion of Findings**

Various findings have been highlighted in this result. First, the finding revealed that the geographical accessibility of health care services in Sagamu Local Government Area is poor due to reasons which include poor road network (mean= 0.68) and bad transportation system (mean= 0.82). Responses on availability of funds to finance health care services were mostly negative. Lack of health care insurance and access to free health care services as shown by low mean score of 0.09 and 0.00 respectively are amongst other factors leading to poor financial access to healthcare services.

The result on test of hypotheses revealed that there was significant relationship between family income and proximity to health care services among residents of Sagamu LGA (r = 0.347, p < 0.05). According to the research done by **Ossi kotavaara et al. (2021)** on the geographical accessibility to primary health care in Finland, the result shows that the Finnish population reaches primary health services well, also by public transport, which is most beneficial in urban fringes, where health services are not immediately available. However, accessibility of services may be limited for some segments of the population, such as carless households located in remote areas, and teenagers who access health services independently. Distinct regional differences exist in accessibility, particularly in rural areas. There are relationships between these two entities as rural areas are mostly linked with lowly earning families.

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Published By



The result also revealed that there was significant relationship between family income and availability of funds for healthcare needs among residents of Sagamu LGA (r = 0.559, p < 0.05). The finding of **Akawu and Charles (2018)** is in consonant with the present finding as they found relationship between family income and access to health care services. They discovered that the increase in poverty rate in the state and by extension across Nigeria has been coupled with a corresponding increase in the incidence of diminishing health status.

#### Conclusion

Sequel to the findings of this study, it is concluded that the geographical accessibility of health care services in Sagamu Local Government Area is poor due to reasons which include poor road network and bad transportation system. Availability of funds to care for health needs was also poor as most respondents couldn't afford the health care financing. No loan options and lack of free health care services for residents to explore. Responses on availability of funds to finance health care services were mostly negative. Lack of health care insurance and access to free health care services are amongst other factors. Conclusively, the relationship between family income and geographical and financial accessibility are correlated.

#### Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made;

- 1. The government should formulate and implement policies that will subsidize health care services and also provide a good road network linking the community to health care centres.
- 2. The government should ensure the payment of subsidized charges by low income earners, to enable those with low income (the poor) access available health care services.
- 3. There is need for health workers to create awareness among residents on health insurance and the need to enroll in the scheme.
- 4. National Health Insurance Scheme should be made available and accessible for all especially the low income earners.

#### References

- Agrigoroaei, S., Lee-Attardo, A., & Lachman, M. E. (2017). Stress and subjective age: Those with greater financial stress look older. *Research on Aging*, 39(10), 1075–1099
- Aguila, E., Angrisani, M., & Blanco, L. R. (2016). Ownership of a bank account and health of older Hispanics. *Economics Letters*, 144, 41–44
- AIHW. Access to health and services for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Cat. no. IHW 46. Canberra: AIHW; 2011. Accessed 6 March 2016.
- Allmark, P., Baxter, S., Goyder, E., Guillaume, L., & Crofton-Martin, G. (2019). Assessing the health benefits of advice services: Using research evidence and logic model methods to explore complex pathways. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 21(1), 59–68.
- Campbell J, Buchan J, Cometto G, David B, Dussault G, Fogstad H, Fronteira I, Lozano R, Nyonator F, Pablos-Méndez A, Quain EE, Starrs A, Tangcharoensathien V. (2013). Human resources for health and universal health coverage: fostering equity and effective coverage. *Bull World Health Organ.*, 91(11), 853–863.

International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences (IJMNHS) ® (IJMNHS.COM)

Email: editor.ijmnhs@gmail.com editor@ijmnhs.com Website: ijmnhs.com

A Modicine, Modi

- Delamater, P.L., Messina, J.P., Shortridge, A.M., & Grady, S.C (2012) Measuring geographic access to health care: raster and network-based methods. *Int J Health Geogr.* 11(1):15-21
- Gyasi, R. M., Adam, A. M. & Phillips, D. R. (2019). Financial Inclusion, Health-Seeking Behavior, and Health Outcomes Among Older Adults in Ghana. *Research on Aging*, 20(10); 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1177/0164027519846604
- Levesque J.F., Harris, M.F., & Russell, G (2013) Patient-centred access to health care: conceptualising access at the interface of health systems and populations. Int J Equity Health. 12(1):18-24.
- Mizen A, Fry R, Grinnell D, Rodgers SE. (2015). Quantifying the Error Associated with Alternative GIS-based Techniques to Measure Access to Health Care Services. *AIMS Public Heal.* 2(4), 746–761.
- Morgan, L. & Churchill, C. (2018). *Financial inclusion and health: how the financial services industry is responding to health risks.* Switzerland: International Labour Organization
- Ogunsakin, S. & Fawehinmi, F.O. (2017). Financial inclusion as an effective policy tool of poverty alleviation: A Case of Ekiti State. *OSR Journal of Economics and Finance (IOSRJEF)*, 8(4-2), 01-10. https://doi.org/10.9790/5933-080402011
- Scofield, R. (2020). The link between financial inclusion, energy, and health. Retrieved from https://www.rupertscofield.com/the-link-between-financial-inclusion-energy-andhealth/
- Stock R. (1983) Distance and the utilization of health facilities in rural Nigeria. Soc Sci Med, 17(9):563–570.
- Wagstaff A, Claeson M, Hecht RM, Gottret P, Fang Q (2020). Millennium Development Goals for Health: What Will It Take to Accelerate Progress? In: Jamison DT, Breman JB, Measham AR, Alleyne G, Claeson M, Evans DB, Jha P, Mills A, Musgrove P. (eds.) Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries, 2nd ed. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (2019, 3rd April). Poverty Overview. Retrieved May 10, 2019, from https://www.worldbank.org/topic/povert/overview
- WHO (World Health Organization).(2021). Health impact assessment (HIA), determinants of health. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/hia/evidence/doh/en.
- United Nations (2012). General Assembly Sixty Seventh Session A/67/L.36. United Nations, 12-63051:1-6

d Medicine, Natificate Health Style

#### Cite this article:

Author(s), ENAHOLO Kikelomo Isimot (RN, RM, RPON, BNSc), OKAFOR, Ngozi Anthonia (RN, RM, RPHN, PhD, Assoc. Prof.), (2022). "Family income and access to health care services among residents of Sagamu local Government area of Ogun State, Nigeria", Name of the Journal: International Journal of Medicine, Nursing & Health Sciences, (IJMNHS.COM), P, 14 – 28. DOI: <a href="www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6783425">www.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6783425</a>, Issue: 3, Vol.: 3, Article: 2, Month: June, Year: 2022. Retrieved from <a href="https://www.ijmnhs.com/all-issues/">https://www.ijmnhs.com/all-issues/</a>

#### **Published By**



#### **AND**

ThoughtWares Consulting & Multi Services International (<u>TWCMSI</u>)

