

## **Evaluation of the Effects of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) on the Wellbeing of Rural Dwellers in Niger State**

Adamu Isah

Department of Public Administration  
Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai  
Email: [isahadamuamir@yahoo.com](mailto:isahadamuamir@yahoo.com)

### **Abstract**

*This paper is a genuine effort to evaluate the effects of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) on the wellbeing of the rural dwellers in Niger State. It focuses on rural infrastructures and rural economic development. Data for the study were generated from both primary and secondary sources using the instruments of questionnaire interview and observation. A sample of 150 respondents was selected from the target population in Lavun, Shiroro and Agwara Local Government using simple random sampling techniques. The study revealed that NAPEP has not developed rural infrastructures, has not economically benefited the rural populace and its activities and interventions excluded the rural poor and concluded that NAPEP has not enhanced the wellbeing of the rural dwellers it was therefore recommended that the rural poor should be involved in the activates of NAPEP; Agencies and ministries with poverty alleviation objective should collaborate with NAPEP in providing rural infrastructures. Also, credit facilities should be given to the rural populace to enhance their economic wellbeing.*

**Keywords:** NAPEP, Poverty, Rural Infrastructure, Rural Economic Development, Wellbeing.

**JEL Classification:** I32

### **1. Introduction**

Poverty stirs a lot of misgiving and has a devastating influence on its victims by reducing their social and psychological prestige. Indeed the wave of poverty, economic backwardness; dearth of infrastructure, health problems, unemployment; and natural disaster in rural and urban areas have aggravated the problems of rural dwellers around the world. Consequently, one of the major issues in development is how to tackle rural poverty. Rural areas present problems that are paradoxical of its natural resource endowment. The inhabitants tend to live at the margin of existence and opportunities as most rural communities lack portable water, electricity, healthcare, educational and recreational facilities and motor able roads.

Attempts to put rural areas on the course of development in Nigeria over the past decades have not yielded much impact. Conditions have continued to worsen and poverty has become a major issue in the rural areas inspite of their potentials in agricultural productivity. A common thread that runs through the various perceptions of “poverty” connotes material and non-material deprivation and lack of control over resources to meet essential needs. If the incidence of poverty runs counter to the development aspiration, its alleviation or eradication becomes a worth-while endeavor in any socio-economic system irrespective of ideology and structural/organizational nomenclature (Sadiya, 2013). Poverty alleviation has become a prime focus of economic policy, policy research, and analysis and development management. The need becomes particularly compelling in developing countries where poverty is most dehumanizing (Obadan et al., 2003).

A number of government programmes have been put in place to improve basic services. Such programme includes Better Life for Rural Women, Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructures; Operation Feed the Nation; Family Support Programme; Family Economic and Vicegerent Programme, Poverty Allivation Programme to mention just a few. All these programmes put together are meant to provide a catalytic impetus for the take-off and subsequent advancement of the rural areas towards: Linking item to national economic system increasing rural household income and providing basic socio-economic and physical infrastructure thereby contributing to the wellbeing of the rural dwellers

In looking at poverty in Nigeria, according to the Federal Office of Statistics, incidence of poverty in Nigeria in 1960 was about 15 percent but between 1980 and 1985 and between 1992 and 1996, it increased sharply. In 1980 it had grown to 28 percent and by 1985 the extent of poverty was about 46 percent although it dropped to 43 percent in 1992. However by 1996, poverty incidence in the country was 66 percent or 76.6 million Nigerians out of a population of 110 million. Again, in 2004 it fluctuate to 54.4% and by 2012 it was 72.6% (Mohammed, 2014)

These alarming indicators prompted the Obasanjo administration to review the existing poverty alleviation schemes with a view to harmonizing them and improving on them. To facilitate this need, all poverty eradication institutions and programmes were streamlined and rationalized and a comprehensive structure for coordinating and monitoring the activities of the core poverty eradication ministries and agencies was established. This structure as approved by the Federal Executive Council (FEC) is the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP). The justification for this study emanate from the fact that inspite of the existence of poverty alleviation programmes instituted by various governments in Nigeria NAPEP inclusive, poverty incidence is still high hence the paper investigates and assesses the effect of NAPEP on the wellbeing of the rural dwellers of Niger State.

The problem investigated in the study revolves around the fact that in spite of the existence of all the institutional mechanisms and funds availability; does NAPEP

improve the wellbeing of the rural dwellers in Niger State? This raised pertinent questions as to what extent does the infrastructure component of NAPEP improved wellbeing of the rural dwellers. And also to what extent does the economic activities component of NAPEP also improved the wellbeing of the rural dwellers as well as what factors inhibit the success of NAPEP in enhancing the wellbeing of the rural dwellers.

Centrally, the objectives of the study are to examine the effects of NAPEP's activities on the wellbeing of the rural dwellers. However; the specific objectives of the study include: to determine the extent to which infrastructure component of NAPEP improved the wellbeing of the rural dwellers, to find out the extent to which economic activities of NAPEP improve the wellbeing of the rural dwellers and examine the factors inhibiting the success of NAPEP in enhancing the wellbeing of the rural dwellers. Although various researches were conducted on the impact of NAPEP such as Asaju (2011), Muhammad (2009) Isah (2008) and Lawal (2013). This study is unique for its emphasis on rural dwellers. The study is significant to policy makers' development partners, researchers and the public. It also covers the time frame 2004-2014 and limited to Lavun, Shiroro and Agwara local government areas of Niger State. It also covered infrastructure and economic component of NAPEP. This paper is divided into four sections, section one is the introduction, section two contains conceptual and theoretical framework, section three contains discussions of result and findings while section four concludes the paper with policy recommendation.

## **2. Literature Review**

Theoretical framework of the study is derived from the work of Rensts Likert, (1972) Linking – pin-model which to a large extent depicts representation and participation in an organization. The model is based on the principle of supportive relationship whereby it is assumed that every thought and action by any member of the organization is done with a view that it is meant for the benefit of the whole organization or system. According to Rensis Linkert Liking pin-model, party's patroy decision making procedure in planning and implementing activities or programme in a society promotes coordination. He is of the view that the government structure would consist of linking pin model of people in groups and not of individuals. Vertical and horizontal relationship is assured to be the order of relationship, which will invariably promote blending or mashing of activities of the organization into a harmonious whole.

Furthermore, according to this model the national coordinating body of NAPEP links-up vertically with the other federal ministries and agencies; hereby the state government on the other hand links-up with the people at local government level. This is to promote overlapping relationship between the national implementing body, federal ministries, state governments, local governments, and the people at the local level. Linking-pin theory is relevant to, this research as the theoretical framework for the fact that effective administration of NAPEP requires inter-twine correlation ship

among the implementation officers, the staff, various institutions of NAPEP and other relevant public and private organizations that complement the programme.

Poverty connotes many things i.e. lack of material well-being, insecurity, low self-confidence, psychological distress, unpredictability, lack of freedom of choice and action and inability to believe in one self (Narayan 2000). Poverty can either be absolute or relative or both (Sanyal, 1991; Schubert, 1994). Poverty is said to be absolute when people fall below the level of income that is necessary for bare subsistence, while relative poverty relates to the living standards that prevail elsewhere in the community in which they live.

Poverty measurements attempt to identify those who are poor. The most frequently used measurements are (i) the head count poverty index given by the percentage of the population that live in the household with a per capital, consumption below the poverty line (ii) poverty gap index which reflects how far the average poor persons income diverge from the poverty line, and (iii) the squared poverty gap which shows the means of the squared proportion rate squared poverty gap which reflects the severity of poverty (see Grouter and Braithwaite 1998).

The UNDP has recently advocated the use of Human Development Index (HDI) and Capacity Poverty Measure (CPM). Human Development Index entails the combination of three elements in the measures of poverty. This includes life expectancy at birth (Longevity); educational attainment; and improvement in standard of living, proxy by per capita income. Whereas, capacity poverty measure focuses on the percentage of the people who lack basic or minimally essential human abilities needed to jump start one form income poverty to a sustainable human development.

There are factors that cause poverty. These factors include structural causes such as limited resources, location disadvantage, lack of skills and other factors that are inherent in the social and political set-up (Yahie 1993). Other factors are transitional factors that are mainly due to structural adjustment reforms and changes in domestic economic policies that may result in price changes, unemployment and so on. In addition, transition poverty can be caused by environmental degradation, natural calamities such as drought, flood and man-made disasters such as wars.

The main factors that cause poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa include: inadequate access to employment opportunities, inadequate physical assets, such as land and capital and minimal access to credit by the poor (See Obadan 1997, World Bank 1996). Other causes include inadequate access to markets where the poor can sell their goods and services; low endowment of human capital; inadequate access to assistance for those living at the margin, and those victimized by transitory poverty and lack of participation, that is to draw the poor into design of development programmes that affect their lives.

Urbanization is also identified as one of the causes of poverty. Poverty in most urban cities can be linked to the inner urban decay caused by prevalence of poor urban

public facilities as most infrastructure assets have been allowed to run down through lack of maintenance and investment. Consequence of poverty can be deep and widespread; Hauff and Kruse (1994) highlighted three major consequences, which include consequences for the people affected leading to physical and psychological misery. Then, there is consequences for the national economics of countries affected which arise from the formation of slums in cities, and finally Consequences for the political and social development of the countries affected leading to mass poverty.

Social development is concerned with the transformation of society in its totality, making human the focus of the development effort and seeking to develop its potentialities in a total sense. More specifically, it aims ultimately at the maximum improvement of the material, cultural, social and political aspects. Social development embraces programmes and activities, which enhance the capacities of members of society to fulfill existing and changing social Soles expectations and accomplish their various personal goals. It entails the democratization of the development process and the orientation of development effort to the needs and interest of the masses. It ensures equitable sharing in the benefits and burdens of development, the recovery of self-confidence and delineation (ACARTSD, 1980).

More concretely, social development involves comprehensive human resources development; raising living standards and quality of life, improving health and human welfare, ensuring social justice and equality, and providing adequate social security for all segments of the population (ECA, 1985). Unfortunately, Africa lacks behind in terms of social development. Families and individuals in absolute poverty are found in Sub-Sahara Africa and the greatest concentration are in the least developed countries of Africa. Economic development on the other hand entails economic improvement; it includes advancing technology to increase the productivity of labour. It involves the complete modernization of peasant society into an industrial one. Social and economic development is therefore a multidimensional process involving changes in structures, attitudes and institutions as well as the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and the eradication of absolute poverty. It is change and advancement. It implies progress and economic advancement. It involves raising people's income and consumptions levels through relevant economic growth process (Tadoro, 1977; Mohammed, 1991).

In addition, in recognition of several factors which had crippled the past policy efforts at poverty alleviation in Nigeria such as inadequate involvement of stakeholders, poor management and implementation arrangements among others, NAPEP was equally created and made to incorporate all the stakeholders namely, the federal, state, local government, civil society research institutions, organized private sectors and concerned individuals (Okoye and Onykwu, 2007). The overall objectives of the programme were to eradicate extreme poverty in Nigeria through monitoring and coordination of all poverty eradication efforts. Furthermore, these tasks were to be

actualized through the established National Poverty Eradication Council (NAPEC) (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007).

The mandate of NAPEP is to monitor and coordinate all poverty eradication efforts in order to harmonize and ensure better delivery, maximum impact and effective utilization of available resources (Okoye and Onyukwu 2007). In order to ensure effective poverty eradication, the government arranged NAPEP into four schemes. These include Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES) which deals with capacity acquisition, mandatory attachment, productivity improvement, credit delivery, technology development and enterprise promotion. There is also Rural Infrastructure Development Scheme (RIDS), which entails that the equality has to do with the provision of portable and irrigation water transport (rural and urban), rural energy and power supply.

Others include Social Welfare Services Scheme (SOWESS) which deals with intervention in special education, primary health care services, establishment and maintenance of recreational centers, public awareness facilities, youth and student hostels, development, environmental protection facilities, food security, provision of agricultural input, provision of micro and macro credits delivery, rural telecommunication facilities, provision of mass transit and maintenance culture. The last is National Resources Development and Conservation Scheme (NRDCS) which also deals with the harnessing of agriculture, water, solid minerals resources, conservation of land and space particularly for the convenient and effective utilization by small scale operators and the immediate community (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007).

Apart from the above, NAPEP also has an organizational structure. At the top of the scheme is the National Poverty Eradication Council (NAPEC). It coordinates all poverty all poverty reduction related activities and also ensures that the activities involved are centrally planned and coordinated in ways that make them complement one another. In terms of institutional structure, NAPEP data and information flow upwards from the local government level to the state coordinating committee and up to national coordination committee. (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007; Nwanolue and Iwuoha, 2012).

### **3. Methodology**

The study adopted the survey research design as well as generation of data from both primary and secondary sources. Three methods of data collection was utilized namely observation, interview and questionnaire. The target population for the study consists of NAPEP beneficiaries and members of the local government monitoring committee from the three selected local governments. The total population is seven hundred and fifty (750), a sample parameter of 20% was used to determine the sample of one hundred and fifty (150) using purposeful and simple random sampling techniques. Data was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequently tables, simple percentages were the descriptive tools while the Chi-square statistics was the inferential tool employed.

#### 4. Data Presentation, Discussion of Results and Findings

##### 4.1 Administration of Instrument/Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

A total of one hundred and fifty (150) questionnaires were administered to the respondents, out of which one hundred and twenty (120) questionnaires were returned given a rate of returns of 80%. Out of the one hundred and twenty questionnaires returned; only one hundred (100) questionnaires were duly completed given a validity rate of 67%. The analysis of data is based on 100 respondents.

The demographic data of respondents were presented on table 4.1 below:

Table 4.1 Demographic profile of Respondents

S/No	Variables	No. of Respondents	Percentage
1	Gender		
	Male	60	60%
	Female	40	40%
	Total	100	100%
2	Age		
	Less than 21 years	10	10%
	21-30years	30	30%
	31-40 years	40	40%
	41-50years	15	15%
	Total	100	100%
3	Marital Status		
	Single	35	35%
	Married	50	50%
	Divorced	10	10%
	Separated	5	5%
	Total	100	100%
	Highest Educational		
	FSLC	20	20%

---

S/No	Variables	No. of Respondents	Percentage
	SSCE	35	35%
	NCE/OND	30	30%
	University Agree	15	15%
	Total	100	100%

---

*Source: Survey Research 2017*

From table 4.1 above, 60 respondents representing 60% are male, 40 are female representing 40% also, majority of respondents about 70 representing 70% are within the age 21-40years also, 50respondents representing 50% are married and 35 are singled 20 representing 35%, 20 respondents representing 20% have primary education, 35 respondents representing 35% have secondary education, 45 respondents representing 35% have post-secondary education. The analysis above indicate that the respondents cut across all sexes, are within active years and are enlightened to understood the importance of government programmes.

#### *4.2 Index of Poverty in Niger State*

It is expected that NAPEP intervention will improve the wellbeing of the rural dwellers in Niger State by reducing poverty. Data obtained from National Bureau of Statistics indicated that in 1996 when NAPEP was not established the incidence of poverty is 52.9. it is expected that when NAPEP was established in 2001 it is expected that poverty incidence should below, but observation shows that in 2002, the incidence of poverty in Niger State is 34.0, in 2004 it was increased to 63.90, 2006, the incidence is 61.4, in 2008 it was 29.9. in 2010 and 2012, the incidence of poverty in Niger State stood at 52.9 and 63.90 respectively. This analysis means that poverty level before and after NAPEP establishment has no improvement, rather it even deteriorated meaning that the wellbeing of the rural dwellers was not addressed.

#### *4.3 NAPEP and Wellbeing of the Rural Dwellers*

Four issues were discussed below to evaluate the relationship between NAPEP and wellbeing of the rural dwellers in Niger State. This includes, NAPEP interventions/activities rural infrastructures, economic empowerment, success factors and solutions.

##### *4.3.1 NAPEP activities/interventions*

From above table, 50 respondents representing 50% attested that NAPEP activities and programme are not well known to the rural people, 60 respondents representing 60% further reconfirmed that the rural people are not involved. Also 70 respondents representing 70% claimed that the youth empowerment interventions did not address the problem of the rural people and also 68% opined that rural infrastructure development intervention has not infected positively on the rural area. On the whole,



as high as 80 respondents representing 80% believed that NAPEP activities and interventions has not actually alleviate poverty in the rural areas.

Table 4.3 Respondent opinion on NAPEP programme Intervention and activities for wellbeing of rural dwellers

S/NO	NAPEP Interventions/Activities	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	NAPEP activities and interventions is well known in your rural areas	10 (10%)	20 (20%)	-	20 (20%)	50 (50%)
2	NAPEP intervention programmes and activities actually involved the rural poor	2 (2%)	8 (8%)	2 (2%)	28 (28%)	60 (60%)
3	NAPEP youth empowerment interventions address the problem of rural people.					
4	NAPEP rural infrastructure development interventions impacted positively on the rural areas.	12 (12%)	8 (8%)	2 (2%)	10 (10%)	68 (68%)
5	NAPEP activities and interventions actually alleviate rural poverty	5 (5%)	2 (2%)	-	13 (13%)	80 (80%)

Source: Survey Research 2017

The results in the below table indicate that majority of the respondents are of the opinion that NAPEP has not provided and developed rural infrastructures in the rural areas for their wellbeing. 60 respondents representing (60%) claimed schools were not

Table 4.4 Infrastructure provisions and wellbeing of the rural dwellers

S/No	NAPEP Interventions/Activities	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	Schools	20 (20%)	10- (10%)	2 (2%)	8 (8%)	60 (60%)
2	Hospitals/Dispensaries	10 (10%)	15 (15%)	-	5 (5%)	70 (70%)
3	Electricity Supply	5 (5%)	6 (6%)	2 (2%)	37 (37%)	50 (50%)
4	Pipe home water/Boreholes	20 (20%)	10 (10%)	5 (5%)	25 (25%)	40 (40%)
5	Accessible Roads	15 (15%)	23 (23%)	2 (2%)	15 (15%)	45 (45%)

Source: Survey Research 2017

provided and developed; 70 respondents representing (70%) claimed on hospitals/dispensary 50 respondents representing 50% lay emphasis on electricity supply, 40 respondents representing (40%) on pipe home water and boreholes, while 45 respondents representing 45% lay their claims on absence of accessible roads.

#### 4.3.2 Economic Empowerment and Wellbeing of the Rural Dwellers

Table 4.5 Respondents opinion on effects of NAPEP on economic development for Wellbeing of the rural dwellers

S/No	NAPEP has provided the following benefits for rural economic development towards rural poverty alleviation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
1	Establishment of poultry farms	2 (2%)	4 (4%)	- -	34 (34%)	60 (60%)
2	Created jobs for the unemployed rural dwellers	10 (10%)	8 (8%)	1 (1%)	2 92%	78 (78%)
3	Provided training on skill acquisition	24 (24%)	16 (16%)	- -	10 (10%)	50 (50%)
4	Provided credit facilities to start up small business	8 8%)	4 (4%)	- -	18 (18%)	70 (70%)
5	Make the rural people self-reliant	6 (6%)	4 (4%)	2 (2%)	8 (8%)	80 (80%)

Source: Survey Research 2017

From the above table, majority of the respondents testified that NAPEP has not provided any economic benefit to the rural people for their wellbeing. Here; 60 respondents representing 60% claimed NAPEP has not established poultry farms, 78 respondents representing 78% said NAPEP has not created jobs for the unemployed, 50 respondents represent 50% claimed no training was provided on skill acquisition. 70 respondents representing 70% opined that credit facilities are not given to start up small business and as high as 80 respondents representing 80% opined that NAPEP has not made the rural people self-reliant.

Table 4.6 Factors Inhibiting NAPEP success

S/No	Factors Inhibiting NAPEP Success
1	Inadequate funding
2	Political interference
3	Poor monitoring
4	Corruption
5	Poor selection criteria
6	Inadequate facilities

Source: Survey Research 2017

One of the main factors opined by majority of the respondents was the issue of funding. They argued that NAPEP has insufficient fund to effectively carry out its mandates of poverty reduction among the targeted population. However significant number of the respondents also identified another factor which they expressed as poor monitoring of activities as one of the factor inhibiting NAPPE's success. Another factors mentioned by the respondents was the issue of hijacking of the programme meant for the poor by the elites. This was mostly expressed as Political Interference in the management of NAPEP by the government functionaries and some politicians also constituted a barrier to the programmes implementation.

However, a good number of the respondents have the view that corrupt practices among the key stakeholders in the management of the programme served as another factor. Also poor criteria in the selection of beneficiaries also serve as a factor inhibiting the implementation of the programme. The facilities needed for effective undertaking of some businesses were grossly inadequate in the selected rural areas. This was expressed by a good number of the respondents as an issue constituting barrier to poverty alleviation in the study areas.

#### *4.4 Respondents' Views on Solutions to the Factors Inhibiting NAPEP's Success on Rural Poverty Alleviation*

Respondents were also asked to proffer suggestions on how to overcome the poverty alleviation barriers in their local governments. The responses generated show that very high percentage of the respondents argued that funding should be improved or in other words, the government should increase allocation given to the programme. Other donor agencies and counterparts in funding should also be encouraged by the NAPEP officials through judicious and transparent management of the fund.

However, some of the respondents mentioned that there should be effective monitoring of how NAPEP operations are being conducted. Activities of some elites, especially the political elites who showed interest on the programme should be checked in order to ensure that they block the room for them to hijack the programme. Another solution offered by the respondents was that undue political interference in the activities of the body should be avoided by the government. The agency should be allowed to function based on its guidelines without interference by the powerful executive. Strong punishments should also be imposed on anybody found with any corrupt practices as well as accountability should be ensured in the sue of the resources meant for the pgoramme. This would minimize the room for corrupt practices as suggested by some of the respondents. Other solutions offered by the respondents were that credibility and transparency should be ensured in selecting beneficiaries to the programme and adequate infrastructures that were necessary for any effective business undertaking in the rural areas should be provided by the government.

#### 4.5 Testing of Hypothesis

Ho: There is no significant relationship between NAPEP's activities and wellbeing of the rural dwellers. From the above, the dependent variable is wellbeing of the rural dwellers while the independent variable is NAPEP's activities. Here, the response of residents was cross tabulated using the SPSS package for chi-square test. The output is provided below:

Table 4.7: Test of Association

	Chi-Square Tests		
	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	231.4	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	403.141	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	186.42	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	100		

Source: Survey Research, 2017

From the computer output above, hypothesis testing procedures are presented below; Calculated value: which is Pearson Chi-square from the table above is equal to 231.426

Degree of freedom (df) =16

Level of significance ( $\alpha$ ) =0.05

Critical or tabulated value at 16 \*DF) and 0.05 ( $\alpha$ ) value is equal to 26.296.

#### 4.6 Decision Rule

Accept null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) against the alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) If  $X^2$  calculated value is less than  $X^2$  critical (tabulated) value. Reject null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) in favour of alternate hypotheses if otherwise.

From the above, the calculated value is greater than critical value as such; we reject the  $H_0$  and conclude there is a significant relationship between NAPEP activities and rural electric development for poverty alleviation. This means that the more NAPEP programmes and intervention is high the better for rural economic development for the wellbeing of the rural dwellers.

#### 4.7 Findings of the Study

Based on the presentation, analysis and results discussed above, the following are the major findings of this study:-

- (i) It was revealed by the study that NAPEP activities and interventions in Niger State has excluded the poor persons in the rural areas.
- (ii) It was also found out that rural infrastructures in Niger State has long been neglected. As a result, the rural populace has limited access to services such

as schools, health centres, access to safe drinking water. All these perpetuate rural poverty.

- (iii) It was also revealed in the study that NAPEP has not benefited the rural areas economically in terms of creating jobs, providing micro credit facilities and provision of training on skills acquisition.
- (iv) The study also revealed inadequate funding, corruption, political interference; ineffective monitoring as some of the factors inhibiting the success of NAPEP in alleviating rural poverty in Niger State.
- (v)

### **5. Conclusions**

This research was principally aimed at evaluating the effect of National Poverty Eradication Programme NAPEP on the wellbeing of rural dwellers, focusing on Niger State. It was argued that NAPEP's activities and interventions have not contributed to the wellbeing of rural dwellers in terms of its programme. In fact, considering the high poverty incidence in Niger State before and after NAPEP's creation, it is easy to conclude that, NAPEP as the agency of the government with the sole aim of coordinating all poverty alleviation efforts has failed. Hence the study recommends the following:-

- i. The rural community should be involved in the design and formulation and decision making in the type of intervention NAPEP should do in the rural areas.
- ii. On infrastructures, various ministries and agencies whose activities are poverty alleviation related should collaborate with NAPEP to develop the rural areas.
- iii. NAPEP should provide enough credit facilities that will enhance the economic empowerment of the rural areas.
- iv. NAPEP should create jobs, train the rural people on the business skills for setting up cottage industries limited can make them self-reliant and thus alleviate poverty.

### **References**

- Abasiokong, E. (1982). *Integrated Rural Development in the third world*. Exposition press, smithtown, New York.
- Adewoye, S.O. (2004). *Basic Statistics for Engineering, Economic and Management*, printed and Bound by: Olukayode Ojo Comm. Ent. 44 St. Finbarrs College Road, Akoka Lagos, Nigeria
- Asugbo O.A. (2009). *Unlocking the Potential of Rural Nigeria*.
- Bolanle O. (2006). *Sustaining the Development of the Rural Areas in Nigeria*. *The Social Sciences* 1 (1); 82-84.
- Bullion (2003) "An Appraisal of Federal Government National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP)" (BN Research Department).

- Coudouele, A., Hentschel, J. & Wodon O. (2001) Well-being Measurement Analysis. World Bank Poverty Reduction Strategy Source Book. The World Bank, Washington D.C. pp. 2
- Grootaert, C. & Braithwait, J. (1998). Poverty Correlates and indicator Based Targeting in Eastern Europe and Former soviet union, World Bank Policy Research Working paper. No 1942.
- Isiugo-Abanihe C. (1999). Analyzing Quantitative Data. Capacity Building Workshop. Centre for Economic and Allied Research, University of Ibadan.
- Muhammad, I. (2014). Poverty incidence in Nigeria myth or reality” a discussion paper in an interacting session organized by Mellienieum Development Goal (MDGs) for desk officers in poverty programme held at Zaranda Hotel Bauchi on 13<sup>th</sup> January, 2014.
- Narayan, D. (2000). Poverty is Powerlessness and Voiceless, IMF Finance and Development Vol. 37, No. 4 18-21.
- Obadan, M. (1997). Analytical Framework for Poverty Reduction: Issues for Economic Growth Versus other strategies. In proceeding of the Nigeria Economic Society Annual Conference on Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria 1997. Ibadan: NES: 121-140.
- Obadan, M. I. (2003). Integrating Poverty Alleviation Strategies Plans and Programmes in Nigeria, National Centre for Economic Management and Administration Ibadan. Pp 5-29.
- Ogaboh-Agba, A.M. (2014). The role Non-Governmental (NOGs) and poverty Alleviation Programme of Rural Transformation. *International of Development Studies*, 2(1)1-16
- Ogwumike, O. F. (1991). A basic needs approach to the measurement of poverty in Nigeria, *Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social studies* 33 (92): 105-120.
- Ravallion & Huppi (1991). Sectoral Analysis of Poverty in Coudouele. Ibid.
- Ravallion, M. and B. Bidani (1994) How robust is a poverty profile? *World Bank Economic Review*, 8(1): 75-120
- Sadiya, Z. A. (2013). poverty alleviation and development in Nigeria. Paper presented at a workshop organized by Democracy Watch International at Abdulsalam Youth center Minna on 14<sup>th</sup> December, 2013.
- Sanyal, B. (1991). Organising the Self Employed: The Poverty of the urban Informal Sector. *International Labour Review* 30(1); 39-56
- Schubert, R. (1994). Poverty in Developing Countries: Its Definition. *Extent and Implication. Economic*; 49 (5); 17-40.
- Sundrum, R.M. (1990). Income Distribution in LDCs. Routlge pp 36-42.
- The World Bank (2005). World development indicator
- Von Hauff, M. and Kruse, B., (1994). Conceptual Bases for a Consistent Poverty-Oriented Policy. *Economics*. 49(50): 41-55.
- World Bank (1996). Nigeria: Poverty in the midst of plenty; the Challenges of Growth with Inclusion.

Yahie, (1993). the Design and Management of Poverty Alleviation Projects in Africa; Evolving Guidelines Based on Experience. World Bank ED Human Resources Division.