

# **NATIONAL POVERTY ERADICATION PROGRAMME (NAPEP) AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION IN RURAL NIGERIA: A CASE STUDY OF GIWA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KADUNA STATE**

*Yakubu, Rahila*

*Abbass I. M.*

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, Ahmadu Bello University,  
Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria

---

## **Abstract**

The study aims at analyzing the framework of NAPEP in order to ascertain the impact of the programme on the people of Giwa local government area of Kaduna State as it affects the wellbeing of the people in improving their standard of living vis-à-vis poverty eradication. Purposeful and simple random sampling technique was used to sample 220 respondents in the study area. Data was collected from the respondents using the interview schedule and a total of 179 questionnaires were used for the analysis. The principal results of the study reveal the failure of poverty alleviation programmes with special reference to NAPEP in Giwa local government area. Hence this study therefore recommends that NAPEP as an agency of the government with the sole aim of coordinating all poverty alleviation efforts in the country should work in harmony with other ministries and agencies that are stakeholders in the fight against poverty; the provision of credit facilities and skills training should be one of the central focus in poverty eradication and Government should adopt a holistic approach to poverty alleviation in the country.

---

**Keywords:** Rural, Poverty, Alleviation

## **1.0 Introduction:**

One of the major issues in development is how to tackle rural poverty. The constraints to developing rural areas as well as the problems of this critical sector have come to loom very large. Rural areas present problems that are paradoxical of its natural resource endowment. Rural communities are marginalized in terms of most basic elements of

development. The inhabitants tend to live at the margin of existence and opportunities as most rural communities lack portable water, electricity, health care, educational and recreational facilities and motorable 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. 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. Poverty alleviation has become a prime focus of economic policy, policy research, analysis and development management. The need becomes particularly compelling in developing countries where poverty is most dehumanizing (Obadan et al., 2003).

Therefore a major concern to governments, multilateral institutions and policy makers in different countries is to identify appropriate strategy for poverty alleviation in the rural areas so as to bring about rural development.

## **2.0 Fundamentals of Poverty Alleviation:**

The underlying principle of poverty alleviation could be seen in the various conceptions of poverty in literatures. Poverty is the oldest and yet unresolved social problem. Historically, the problem of poverty dates back to the formation of human society. These early societies were either stratified between the slaves and the slave owners, feudal Lords and serfs, or the capitalists and the working class. These different forms of social division are simply translated into division between the ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’ or ‘rich’ and ‘poor’. The rich are of course the better opportune, privileged, educated and sheltered, the healthier and secured social groups, while the poor are the complete opposite – deprived, depressed and diseased.

Therefore poverty is a multi-dimensional issue that affects many aspects of human condition ranging from physical to moral and psychological (Ogwumike, 2002). As a result, different forms of conceiving poverty have emerged over the years. Some analysts have regarded poverty as a function of insufficient income levels for securing basic goods and services. Poverty has also been viewed as inability of individuals to subsist and to produce for themselves as well as inability to meet basic nutritional needs.

Studies by Musgrave and Ferber (1976) have used the levels of consumption and expenditures to qualify the poor, while some like Singer (1975) view poverty in part, as a function of education and/or health! Life expectancy at birth, child mortality etc. Other development analysts see poverty in very broad terms such as being unable to meet “Basic needs”, physical (Food, healthcare, education, shelter, etc) and non-physical (participation, identity, etc) requirement for a “meaningful life” (Streeten, 1979; Blackwood and Lynch 1994 cited in Okunmedewa et al 2005, Pg 6).

It is generally agreed that poverty means lack of basic needs and services such as food, clothing, bedding, shelter, basic healthcare and education. This is otherwise referred to as lack of minimum standard of living. Also, poverty is seen to be powerlessness, indicating lack of ability to express ones view locally and nationally. Haralambos (1980) defined poverty in ‘absolute’, ‘relative’ and ‘subjective’ terms. In absolute term, the definition of poverty is concerned with drawing a ‘poverty line’ below which poverty begins and above which poverty ends. This simply refers to minimum requirement for a healthy, efficient and quality living.

Relative poverty on the other hand, is measured by what members of society considered desirable and acceptable standards of living within the context of their situations, circumstances, environment and culture. While Subjective poverty on the other hand refers to individuals’ or groups’ subjective feelings of being poor. Here poverty is not measured by the level of income or living standards but by individual’s intrinsic feeling of contentment and sense of fulfillment or otherwise in life.

Other conceptions of poverty include moral poverty, which is measured by the normative way of life defined by society. Moral poverty manifests itself in such behavior and practices as same sex marriage, sex changes and gender crossing, incest, abortion, single parenthood, drug culture, child abuse and exploitation and other practices universally conceived as morally inadequate and questionable. (Mustapha et al 2008, Pg 3).

The term ‘Poverty alleviation’ represents the attempt to reduce the incidence of poverty in the country. Attempts at tackling the problem of poverty in Nigeria have been going on for a long time. The government have made several attempts to address the problem of poverty which have often been focused on rural communities given the fact that majority of Nigerians reside in the rural areas. The major efforts made in the pre-independence and the early days of independent Nigeria according to Omale and Molem (2003) were in the area of farm settlement schemes. The aim of these farm settlement schemes was to bring scattered small communities together so that they could take advantage of economies of scale in farm

inputs, agro services, marketing, etc. these schemes recorded little or no achievement because those affected were not involved at the planning stage.

Since then a number of government programmes have been put in place to improve basic services, infrastructure and housing facilities for the rural population, extending access to credit farm inputs, and creating employment. Such programmes included specific multi-sector programmes (water and sanitation, environment etc) as well as sector-specific programmes in agriculture, health, education, transport, housing, finance, industry/manufacturing and nutrition. 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 them to national and international economic systems;
- ❖ Increasing rural household income;
- ❖ Providing basic socio-economic and physical infrastructure;
- ❖ Efficient resource allocation to shift attention and interest of the private sector towards investment in rural areas to enhance rural development; and
- ❖ Enhancing rural welfare.

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.

The UN human poverty index in 1999 which credited Nigeria with 41.6 percent captured the phenomenon more succinctly as the figure placed the nation as amongst the 25 poorest nations in the world. Today, it is estimated that two thirds of the country's 120 million people or 80 million are said to be poor and this is in spite of the fact that since independence Nigeria is said to have realized \$300 billion in oil and gas revenues and development aid (Poverty alleviation in Nigeria: A perspective).

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).

This study therefore appraises the National Poverty Eradication Programme with the view to assessing the prospects of the programme for the improvement of rural Nigeria with specific reference to Giwa local government area. The study hypothesized that rural development would be effectively and meaningfully realized if appropriate and sustainable infrastructure is provided in rural communities.

### **3.0 Materials and Methods**

This study was carried out in Giwa local government area of Kaduna State. Giwa local government area located in the plain of the northern part of Kaduna State was created on 15<sup>th</sup> September, 1991 from the defunct Igabi local government area of Kaduna State. Giwa local government area is a rural area with close proximity to Zaria local government area. The rural residents in the area constitute the population for the study. Purposeful and Simple random sampling technique was used to select the population for the study. A total of 179 respondents from the eleven (11) districts in Giwa local government area were sampled for the study. Interview schedule was used in collecting data from the respondents. Some socio-economic characteristics of the respondents were identified such as those that were civil servants, farmers, students, etc. Ages and formal educational qualifications of respondents were measured while gender, marital status were also measured at ordinal level. The basic infrastructure in the communities in Giwa local government area and the impact of the available infrastructure on the socio-economic condition of Giwa local government area was also measured at nominal level. While the training and educational empowerment programmes of NAPEP in Giwa local government area and the impact of Poverty alleviation programmes in Giwa local government area were also measured at nominal level.

### **4.0 Results and Discussion**

**4.1 Socio-Economic Characteristics Of The Respondents:** the result of this study reveal that a majority (40.2%) of the respondents had their ages between 28-37 years (table 1). A majority (64.8)of the respondents were married, 30.7% were single and 4.5% were divorced. This shows that there are predominantly more married people in the communities than those who are not married or divorced. About 39.7% of the respondents had received OND/NCE education and 22.9% had Degree/HND and 14.5% had received only primary/secondary education. Yet 22.9% had received no form of formal education. It may be concluded that of the people who had received formal education, 31.8% were civil servants and 7.8% are still

students. An overwhelming 38.0% of the respondents were farmers while 18.4% were self-employed and 3.9% are unemployed.

**Table 1: Distribution of respondents by their socio-economic characteristics**

**Age distribution of Respondents**

<i>Age</i>	<i>No of Respondents</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
18-27	34	19.0
28-37	72	40.2
38-47	60	33.5
48 and above	13	7.3
TOTAL	179	100%

**Source: Questionnaire 2009**

**Marital Status of Respondents**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>No of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
Married	116	64.8
Single	55	30.7
Divorced	8	4.5
Total	179	100%

**Source: Questionnaire 2009**

**Educational Qualification of Respondents**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>No of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
Degree/ HND	41	22.9
OND/NCE	71	39.7
SEC/PRI	26	14.5
No formal education	41	22.9
TOTAL	179	100%

**Source: Questionnaire 2009**

**Occupation of Respondents**

<i>Variables</i>	<i>No of respondents</i>	<i>Percentage (%)</i>
Civil Servant	57	31.8
Farmer	68	38.0
Student	14	7.8
Self-Employed	33	18.4

Unemployed	7	3.9
TOTAL	179	100%

Source: Questionnaire 2009

#### 4.2 Basic Infrastructure In Giwa Local Government Area:

Table 2: Basic Infrastructure in Giwa Local Government Area

<i>What are the basic infrastructure in your Community</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (%)</i>	<i>Valid (%)</i>	<i>Cumulative Percent</i>
Schools	Yes	125	74.0	74.0	74.0
	No	44	26.0	26.0	26.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Dispensaries	Yes	101	59.8	59.8	59.8
	No	68	40.2	40.2	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Electricity	Yes	59	34.9	34.9	34.9
	No	110	65.1	65.1	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Pipe-borne water	Yes	20	11.8	11.8	11.8
	No	149	88.2	88.2	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Accessible roads	Yes	34	20.1	20.1	20.1
	No	135	79.9	79.9	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Boreholes	Yes	62	36.7	36.7	36.7
	No	107	63.3	63.3	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
Wells	Yes	136	80.5	80.5	80.5
	No	33	19.5	19.5	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Source: Questionnaire 2009

The results of the study show that 74% of the respondents agreed to the fact that there are schools provided in the communities while 26.0% said they don't have schools in their own communities. Here the researcher discovered that there is a total of only twelve (12) government schools in Giwa local government area. On the issue of health facilities, 59.8% of the population agreed that they have adequate healthcare provision while 40.3% disagreed. The above responses go a long way to explain that there is a privileged few in the local

government area who in the midst of the low standard of healthcare services provided have the means of seeking healthcare services from the bigger hospitals located in the urban areas whereas there is a good number of the population who are located in the hinterlands and such people even though there are dispensaries there, there are no competent doctors or health officers to attend to them and in most cases they experience a higher mortality rate.

Consequently, majority of the respondent in the study area indicated by 65.1% said that they do not have electricity in their localities while 34.9% agreed that they have electricity supply. On the issue of their source of water supply, 11.8% of the population under study said that they have access to pipe-borne in the local government area while 88.2% were of the contrary opinion. In the same vein 63.3% attested to the fact that they have access to boreholes and 36.7% said that they do not have access to boreholes. It was however discovered that an overwhelming majority of the population in the local government area have access to wells which is represented by 80.5% of the population and a minority population of 19.5% do not have access to wells.

An efficient transport system is very important for economic development. In many developing countries, Nigeria inclusive, a significant portion of the roads including the main road network, is in poor condition. This have affected the rural dwellers greatly because they could not transport their farm produce to where they are needed. A majority of the population represented by 79.9% do not have access to accessible roads while only 20.1% said they have accessible roads. In a situation whereby 80% of the population in Giwa local government area are farmers, it becomes difficult for them to reach the markets. Giwa local government area has a large grain market which converges every Thursday, the provision of basic infrastructure like roads will enhance the movement of their goods. Limited accessibility has also cut off small scale farmers from sources of inputs, equipments and new technology.

**4.3 Impact Of Available Infrastructure And Socio-Economic Condition Of Giwa Communities:**

**Table 3: Impact of Available Infrastructure on the Socio-Economic Condition of Giwa Community**

<i>Has the provision of infrastructure improved the socio-economic condition of the community?</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (%)</i>	<i>Valid percent</i>	<i>Cumulative percent</i>

Yes	48	28.4	28.4	28.4
No	121	71.6	71.6	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Source: Questionnaire 2009.**

The result of the study in the above table shows that the available infrastructure in Giwa local government area has not improved the socio-economic condition of the community. A majority of 71.6% of the population attested to the fact that the infrastructure that has so far been provided in Giwa local government area has not improved the socio-economic condition of the community members. A close look at the kind of infrastructure available in the local government area indicated that they are far below standard such that the main purpose of providing them which is to improve the living condition of the people is defeated.

#### ***4.4 The Impact Of National Poverty Eradication Programme In Giwa Local Government Area***

The results of the study in table 4 reveal that only a total of 11.2% of the population have received training from NAPEP while a majority of 88.8% have not received any training from NAPEP. The training was basically on practical farm training while a few others who had some basic educational level received training in computer usage. Amongst those that received the trainings, 8.3% of the respondents attested to the fact that the training they received enabled them to embark on self-help projects, 1.8% said it enabled them become aware of their rights as individuals while 5.9% said it empowered them to be able to make meaningful contributions to their communities.

**Table 4: Training and Educational Empowerment Programmes of NAPEP in Giwa LGA:**

<i>Do you receive any training from NAPEP?</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (%)</i>	<i>Valid percent</i>	<i>Cumulative percent</i>
Yes	19	11.2	11.2	11.2
No	150	88.8	88.8	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<i>What have these training(s) enabled you do in your</i>				

<i>community?</i>					
<b>Embark on self-help projects</b>	Yes	14	8.3	8.3	8.3
	No	155	91.7	91.7	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Aware of your rights</b>	Yes	3	1.8	1.8	1.8
	No	166	98.2	98.2	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Empower your community</b>	Yes	10	5.9	5.9	5.9
	No	159	94.1	94.1	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

Survey: Questionnaire 2009.

#### *NAPEP credit facility programme in Giwa LGA:*

The results in the table 4 indicates that only 17.2% of the population under study had the privilege of enjoying credit facility from NAPEP while 82.8% did not benefit any credit facility from NAPEP since the inception of the programme. This credit facility was given under the Capacity Acquisition Programme (CAP 2004 Phase I and III) and the Multi-Partner Micro finance 2008. Under the CAP (Phase I) 2004, the sum of four hundred and fifty thousand naira (N450,000.00) was given to seven (7) individuals of which each benefitted the sum of N65,000.00 each. Under the CAP (Phase III) 2004, three (3) Community based Organizations (CBOs) were given N100,000.00 each these CBOs constitute 3 members each as such each member benefitted the sum of thirty three thousand, three hundred and thirty three kobo (N33,333.33) respectively.

**Table 5: NAPEP'S Credit Facility Programmes in Giwa LGA**

<i>Have you ever received any credit from NAPEP?</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Perce nt (%)</i>	<i>Valid percent</i>	<i>Cumulati ve percent</i>
Yes	29	17.2	17.2	17.2
No	140	82.8	82.8	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<i>What did you use the credit for?</i>				

<b>Purchase of irrigation pumps</b>	Yes	10	5.9	5.9	5.9
	No	159	94.1	94.1	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Sewing machines</b>	Yes	8	4.7	4.7	4.7
	No	161	95.3	95.3	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Knitting machines</b>	Yes	5	3.0	3.0	3.0
	No	164	97.0	97.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Grinding machines</b>	Yes	6	3.6	3.6	3.6
	No	163	96.4	96.4	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Motor cycles</b>	Yes	0	0	0	
	No	160	100.0	100.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Questionnaire 2009.

The failure of formal financial system to provide requisite services to the small and micro enterprises, and the fact that the poor in Nigeria are mainly engaged in this informal sector continues to provide a strong basis for micro finance and invariably micro credit as a viable strategy for income expansion and poverty reduction

#### **4.5 The Impact Of Poverty Alleviation Programmes On Giwa Lga:**

The study reveals in the table 6 that a majority (56.2%) of the population under study were of the view that poverty alleviation programmes in the country have had little or no impact on the people in view of the huge human and material resources deployed to poverty reduction.

**Table 6: The Impact of Poverty Alleviation Programmes on Giwa LGA**

<i>Have Poverty Alleviation Programmes in the Country yielded much impact in view of the Human and Material</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent (%)</i>	<i>Valid percent</i>	<i>Cumulative percent</i>

---

**resources deployed to it.**

Yes	74	43.8	48.8	43.8
No	95	56.2	56.2	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**What has been the****economic benefit of****NAPEP on the****community as a whole?**

<b>Improving the quality of life</b>	Yes	48	28.4	28.4	28.4
	No	121	71.6	71.6	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Skill acquisition</b>	Yes	32	19.0	19.0	19.0
	No	137	81.0	81.0	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Increase awareness</b>	Yes	40	23.7	23.7	23.7
	No	129	76.3	76.3	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	
<b>Self-reliance</b>	Yes	43	25.4	25.4	25.4
	No	126	74.6	74.6	100.0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

---

**Source: Questionnaire form, 2009.**

On the economic benefit of NAPEP on the community as a whole, 28.4% of the population under study were of the view that NAPEP has improved the quality of their lives while 19.0% were of the view that NAPEP has benefitted Giwa LGA through various skill acquisition. 23.7% attested to the fact that NAPEP has contributed in increasing awareness in the local government area and 25.4% agreed that NAPEP has helped the community in being self-reliant. As such, majority of the population said that there are no mobilization about NAPEP programmes in their localities and as such they do not have access or privilege to benefit from any of their programmes.

#### **4.6 Conclusion:**

In view of the results of this study, it is evident that rural infrastructure in Nigeria has long been neglected, while investments in health, education, water supply have largely been focused in the cities. As a result, the rural population has extremely limited access to services such as schools and health centres and about half of the population lack access to safe drinking water. Limited education and poor health perpetuate the poverty cycle. Agriculture which is often the dominant, and sometimes exclusively economic activity of the rural sector has suffered setbacks due to limited financial resources and these have stalled development from being a reality in the rural areas.

The result of this study indicates the failure of poverty alleviation programmes with special reference to National Poverty Eradication Programme in Giwa local government area. Hence this study recommends amongst other things that NAPEP as an agency of the government with sole aim of coordinating all poverty alleviation efforts in the country should work in harmony with other government ministries and agencies that are stakeholders in the fight against poverty; the provision of credit facilities and skill training should be one of the central focus in poverty eradication and government should adopt a holistic approach to poverty eradication in the country.

**References:**

Abasiokong, E.M. (1982): *Integrated Rural Development in the Third World*. Exposition Press, Smithtown, New York.

Ali G.; “Alleviating Poverty in Northern Nigeria” Paper Presented at the Annual Convention of Zumunta Association, USA Minneapolis July 28-29, 2006.

Anonymous; “Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria”, A Perspective.

Asuquo A. (2009) : Unlocking the potential of Rural Nigeria

Bolanle O. (et al) 2006: Sustaining the development of the Rural areas in Nigeria. *The Social Sciences* 1(1): 82-84

Maduagwu A. (2000) : Alleviating Poverty in Nigeria

“Meeting Everyone’s Needs”(2004) : National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy, Nigerian National Planning Commission, Abuja

Mustapha C.D. (2008). *Poverty in Nigeria: causes, Manifestations and Alleviation Strategies*. Adonis and Abbey Publishers Ltd, London

Obadan M.I. et al (2003). *Integrating Poverty Alleviation Strategies into Plans and Programmes in Nigeria*. National Centre for Economic Management and Administration, Ibadan. Pg 5-29

Obadan M. I.: Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: The way forward. *CBN Economic And Financial Review, Vol. 39 No.4*

Ogumike F. O. : An appraisal of Poverty Reduction Strategies in Nigeria. University of Ibadan, Nigeria

Okunmedewa F. et al (2005); “Human Capital, Institutions and Poverty in Rural Nigeria” Research Report Submitted to the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC), Nairobi. Pg1-62

Olayiwola L. M. (et al)(2005) : Rural Infrastructural Development in Nigeria: Between 1960 and 1990

Selected speeches and presentations of the National Coordinator, NAPEP, 2006