



APPRAISAL OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL POVERTY ERADICATION PROGRAMME (NAPEP) IN TARABA STATE

***ADAMU BASHIR; AND **R.N. KADALA**

**Department of Public Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Mubi, Adamawa State- Nigeria. **Department of Cooperatives Economics and Management, Federal Polytechnic, Mubi, Adamawa State, Nigeria.*

Abstract

Poverty is a 'curse' and a big obstacle to development. On this understanding, subsequent governments in Nigeria at different time and level came up with different programmes/policies directed at eradication of the menace of poverty in the country. This study appraised the implementation of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in Taraba state, particularly in Sardauna, Wukari and Jalingo local government areas; the study specifically examined the extent to which NAPEP implementation improved on the socio-economic well-being of people and the challenges faced in the programme implementation. The data were mainly sourced through questionnaire from a sample of 300 respondents. However, out of the 300 questionnaires administered, 260 were returned. Both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were used in analysing the data collected. Based on the analysis, it was found among others that NAPEP implementation in the study areas has encouraged skill acquisition, and self-reliance and have to an extent enhance the socio-economic well-being of the people. The implementation of NAPEP was characterized by large scale fraud and corruption, political interference, failure to focus on the target audience and poor programme execution. In-line with the findings, we recommend that the government through legislation strengthen the powers of the anti-corruption agencies in the country,

Keywords: Implementation, NAPEP, Programme, Taraba State, Nigeria

Introduction

Poverty is a complex human phenomenon associated with unacceptable low standard of living. It has multiple dimensions, manifestations and causes (World Bank, 2000). Poverty afflicts people in various depths and levels, at

different times and phases of existence (Ade, 2012). Poverty scenario is viewed as a serious threat to humanity and indeed a great challenge to policy makers all over the world. The manifestation of poverty is bedevilled with high level of social insecurity, violence and unrest among others. Poverty is one of the oldest phenomena and yet unresolved social problem. It has serious manifestations of human deprivation and is inextricably linked to dehumanization (Akerele and Adewuyi, 2011).

Poverty is a concept that is perceived differently by different scholars. According to Rahila and Abbas (2009), Poverty is a function of insufficient income level for securing basic goods and services. However; development analysts see poverty in a broader term. To them, poverty is the inability to meet the basic needs such as Physical (Food, healthcare, education and shelter) and non-physical (participation, identity and influence) which are required for a meaningful life (Okumadewa, 2005).

Meanwhile, Ogege (2011) has attempted a more universal definition of poverty. That Poverty is categorized into "absolute and relative". *Absolute* is the condition where an individual or group of people are unable to satisfy their basic requirements for human survival, the propensity to serve is zero and lives are short and brutish. To Grep (2012) Absolute poverty is a situation of insufficient or total lack of basic necessities and facilities like food, housing, medical care, education, social and environmental services, consumer goods, recreational opportunities, neighbourhood amenities and transport facilities. This simply refers to as minimum requirement for a healthy, efficient and quality living. While *Relative poverty* on the other hand, is poverty that exists when people though may be able to afford the basic necessities of life but are still unable to maintain an average standard of living. On the whole, the poverty from the foregone definitions, as a state where an individual or group of people are not able to cater adequately for their basic needs; they are unable to meet their social and economic obligations.

In Nigeria, evidence shows that the incidence of poverty has continued to increase over the years. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS 2004, 2007, 2010), the national poverty rate increased from 28.1% in 1980 to 39% in 1983 from 46% in 1986 to 49% in 1993 and from 65.6% in 1996 to 67.2% in 2005, from 69.8% in 2006 to 70.6% in 2007 and also 69.0% in 2010. The above record of poverty incidence reveals an increase between the periods 1980 and 1985 and between 1992 and 1995 and also between 2006

and 2007. The result also shows an appreciable decrease in poverty rates between 1985 and 1992 and between 1990 and 2004 and also 2010. However, even with the drop in the poverty rates, the population of those living in poverty in the country has maintain a steady increase from 17.1million in1980 to 34.7million in 1985, from 39.2million in 1992 to 67.1million in 1996 and from 68.7 million in 2004 to 112.47 million in 2010. In view of this scenario, Nigerian government at all levels, at different time and phase came up with different forms of poverty reduction strategies meant to reduce the level of poverty, give hope and succour to the poor and or move toward some sort of wealth creation. Such of these programmes includes Directorate of Food Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFPRI), Nigerian Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA), Family Support Programme (FSP), National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) and the Seven Point Agenda. These strategies are diverse spanning all sector of the economy. Some are incorporated into various development plans of the country, while others are policies and programmes of successive government (Olatoye, 2012).With all these efforts, the poverty situation in the country is still intolerable with life expectancy and mortality rising to 77 out of every 1000 and 700 per 100,000 respectively due to inadequate or non-functional basic health care and social infrastructure (Ade, 2012). The county's growth has been stunted with ever growing arm of poor and unemployed people. This therefore, called for a conscious and pragmatic initiative to be adopted so as to address the problem of poverty and other related dehumanizing conditions pervading Nigeria. In line with this notion, in 2001, the Nigerian government came up with National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) which consists of all relevant programmes and projects that are aimed at eradicating absolute poverty among the people of Nigeria. Going by the programme outline of activities, efforts are now being re-directed towards partnership and collaborations with other agencies of government to source and allocate resources for productive engagements in the country particularly to the rural based activities. This was in recognition of the fact that over 70% of the Nigerian population resides in the rural areas practising agriculture and its related activities (Rahila and Abbas, 2009). The need therefore, becomes obvious to put this area into the right path of development through improve productivity. NAPEP was identified as an alternative strategy that could be used to coordinate other poverty reduction

measures towards achieving the developmental aspiration of the nation (Obadan, 2003).

On the basis of the above, this study seeks to appraise the level of implementation of the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in Taraba State. The study specifically aimed at achieving the following objectives:

- i. Examine whether NAPEP implementation has improved the socio-economic well-being of people in Taraba State
- ii. Evaluate the major challenges of NAPEP implementation in Taraba State.

Hypothesis Statement

H₀₁: The National Poverty Eradication Programme did not significantly enhance the socio-economic wellbeing of people in Taraba State.

Research Methodology

The Study relies on secondary and primary data. The secondary data were obtained from textbooks, journals, and other related publications while the primary data were collected through questionnaire and oral interview. The interview was conducted to augment information collected through questionnaire.

Multi-stage purposive sampling technique was employed to draw a sample size of 300 respondents for the study. The stages include purposive sampling of three (3) local government areas in Taraba state. This involved first, the purposive selection of one (1) local government from each of the three (3) senatorial districts of the state, secondly, in each of the three (3) local governments, five (5) council wards were randomly selected which gives a total of fifteen (15) council wards, thirdly, twenty (20) persons were randomly selected in the fifteen (15) wards of the three (3) local government areas. This summed up to one hundred (100) respondents for each local government area, and three hundred (300) respondents for the three local government areas.

Both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were used to analyse the data collected. Simple percentage was the descriptive tool used while chi-square was the inferential tool employed to test the hypothesis statement. The chi-square was computed using the following formula:

$$\chi^2 = \sum (o-e)^2/e. \text{-----}1$$

Where: O = Observed frequency, e=expected frequency. \sum = summation term
The test was conducted using degree of freedom (df) = (r-1) (c-1) and 5% (0.05) significant level (α). The rejection or acceptance of the hypothesis was guided by the significance of the test. That is when the $\chi^2_{\text{calculated}}$ is greater than χ^2_{table} , the null hypothesis (Ho's) were rejected or otherwise.

Data Analysis and Discussion of Findings

The data used for the study were gathered from 260 respondents who duly completed and returned their questionnaire out of the 300 questionnaires that were administered in the three (3) local government areas selected.

NAPEP and Socio-Economic Wellbeing

In this part, data on the impact of NAPEP on socio-economic wellbeing of people was analyze and the information is presented in tables 1-4 below

Table 1: Distribution of the Respondents on whether NAPEP Provides Social Facilities

<i>Options</i>	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Strongly Agreed</i>	110	42.3
<i>Agreed</i>	82	31.5
<i>Strongly Disagreed</i>	24	9.2
<i>Disagreed</i>	29	11.1
<i>Undecided</i>	15	5.8
<i>Total</i>	260	100

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Table 1 above shows that 110(42.3%) of the respondents strongly agreed that NAPEP helped in the provision of facilities relating to the improvement of socio-economic wellbeing of people, 82(31.5%) agreed. However, 24(9.2%) strongly disagreed that NAPEP provides facilities that are capable of improving people quality of life, 29(11.1%) disagreed while 15(5.8%) were undecided.

On the whole, it can be concluded the NAPEP implementation has sufficiently help in providing socio-economic facilities in Taraba state. This was informed by a total of 192(73.9%) of the respondents.

Table 2: Distribution of the Respondents on Self-Reliance

<i>Options</i>	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Strongly Agreed</i>	102	39.2
<i>Agreed</i>	64	24.6
<i>Strongly Disagreed</i>	57	21.9
<i>Disagreed</i>	22	8.5
<i>Undecided</i>	15	5.8
Total	260	100

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Table 2 above revealed that out of 260 respondents, 102(39.2%) strongly agreed that NAPEP implementation helped people to be self-reliant, 64(24.6%) agreed, 57(21.9%) strongly disagreed, 22(8.5%) disagreed while 15(5.8%) were undecided. The result indicates that 166(63.8%) of the respondents agreed that NAPEP implementation in the study area, assisted people to be self-reliant.

Table 3: Distribution of the Respondents on the level of income of People

<i>Options</i>	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Strongly agreed</i>	121	46.5
<i>Agreed</i>	62	23.9
<i>Strongly Disagreed</i>	21	8.1
<i>Disagreed</i>	24	9.2
<i>Undecided</i>	32	12.3
Total	260	100

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Table 3 above shows that out of the 260 respondents, 121(46.5%) strongly agreed that NAPEP activities has improved the income level of people in the study area, 62(23.9%) agreed, 21(8.1%) strongly disagreed that NAPEP activities improved the level of income of people, 24(9.2%) disagreed while 32(12.3%) were undecided.

This implies that the implementation of NAPEP in Taraba state has improved the income level of people. This was revealed by the views of more than half (1/2); 183(70.4%) of the respondents.

Table 4: Distribution of the Respondents on Access to Good Healthcare and other Poverty driven facilities

<i>Options</i>	Frequency	Percentage
<i>Strongly Agreed</i>	21	8.1
<i>Agreed</i>	49	18.8
<i>Strongly Disagreed</i>	76	29.2
<i>Disagreed</i>	99	38.1
<i>Undecided</i>	15	5.8
Total	260	100

Source: Field Survey, 2019

Table 4 above revealed that out of the 260 respondents, 21(8.1%) strongly agreed that NAPEP helped people to enjoy good healthcare facilities, electricity, transportation and other poverty driven social facilities in the study area., 49(18.8%) agreed, while 76(29.2%) strongly disagreed that NAPEP helped people access to the poverty driven facilities in the study area, 99(38.1%) agreed and 15(5.8%) were undecided. The result shows that 175(67.3%) of the respondents indicates that NAPEP did not helped people have access to poverty driven related facilities such as healthcare. Communications, electricity, informal education (literacy classes) among others which are also referred to as core evils of poverty

Major Challenges of NAPEP in the Study Area

Data on the major challenges of NAPEP implementation in the study area are examined in this part of the report and is presented in table 5 below

Table 5: Major Challenges of NAPEP

<i>S/N</i>	Challenges	Frequency	Percentage	Ranking
<i>i.</i>	Large Scale Fraud and Corruption	252	96.9	1 st
<i>ii.</i>	Poor programme Execution	216	83.1	5 th
<i>iii.</i>	Inadequate funding	189	72.7	6 th
<i>iv.</i>	Poor targeting Mechanism	100	38.5	7 th
<i>v.</i>	Failure to Focus on the Poor	247	95	3 rd
<i>vi.</i>	Political/Policy interference	250	96.2	2 nd
<i>vii.</i>	Difficulties in accessing Facilities/serv.	244	93.8	4 th
		1,498*		

Source: Field Survey, 2014

*=Respondents were allowed to tick more than one (1) option

The analysis in table 5 above revealed the following as the major challenges of NAPEP based on ranking in the study area; Large scale fraud and corruption 252(96.9)^{1st}, Political/policy interference 250(96.2%)^{2nd}, failure to focus on the target audience (poor) 247(95%)^{3rd}, difficulty to access the facilities/services of the programme 244(93.8%)^{4th} and poor programme execution 216(83.1%)^{5th} among others. This result shows that the challenges of NAPEP in the study area are not far from that of the other poverty programmes earlier existed in the country.

Test of Hypothesis

In testing the stated hypothesis Ho₁, “The National Poverty Eradication Programme did not significantly enhance the socio-economic wellbeing of people in Taraba State”, Chi-square statistics was used and the result is represented in table 5

Table 6: Estimation of Chi-Square (χ^2) value for Ho₁

O	E	(o - e)	(o - e) ²	(o - e) ² /e
10	26.8	-16.8	282.2	10.5
82	101	-19	361	3.6
24	39.6	-15.6	243.4	6.2
129	78.6	50.4	2540.2	32.2
15	14	1	1	0.1
25	26.8	-1.8	3.2	0.1
152	101	52	27	0.3
24	39.6	-15.6	243.4	6.2
46	78.6	-32.6	1062.8	13.5
12	14	-2	4	0.3
46	26.8	19.2	368.6	13.8
124	101	23	525	5.2
33	39.6	-6.4	43.6	1.1
40	78.6	-38.6	1490	1.9
17	14	3	9	0.6
22	26.8	-4.8	23	0.9

64	101	37	136.9	13.6
61	39.6	21.4	458	11.6
98	78.6	19.4	376.4	4.8
15	14	1	1	0,1
31	26.8	4.2	17.6	0.7
82	101	19	361	3.6
56	39.6	16.4	269	6.8
80	78.6	1.4	2	0.03
11	14	-3	9	0.6
				$\Sigma(o-e)^2/e = 155.5$

Source: Researcher Computation

Therefore, $(H_{01}) \chi^2_{\text{calculated}} = 155.5$

The χ^2_{Table} is obtained using $df = (r - 1) (c - 1)$ and Significant level ($\alpha 0.05$)

Where: $c = 5, r = 5$

$$(5 - 1) (5 - 1)$$

$$4 * 4 = 16$$

Table value of $\chi^2_{16, 0.05} = 26.296$

$(H_{01}) \chi^2_{\text{Table}} = 26.296$

Decision H_{01} : The result above revealed that $\chi^2_{\text{calculated}} (155.5)$ is greater than the $\chi^2_{0.05, 16} (26.296)$ on this note, the null hypothesis (H_{01}) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H_{11}) was accepted that the implementation of NAPEP has enhanced the socio-economic wellbeing of people in Taraba State.

Findings of the Study

Based on the analysis, the following findings were made:

1. That NAPEP implemented in the study area have encourages, skill acquisition and self-reliance.
2. That NAPEP implementation has also improved the income level of its beneficiaries in the study area
3. That NAPEP implementation did not helped people have access to poverty driven related facilities such as good healthcare. Proper Communications network, electricity, informal education (literacy classes) among others which are also referred to as core evils of poverty
4. That the implementation of NAPEP in Taraba State, was characterized by large scale fraud and corruption, political/policy interference, failure to focus on the poor, poor programme execution among others.

Discussion of the Findings

On a whole, the study shows that NAPEP has improved the economic wellbeing of people. Its implementation encourages skills acquisition, self-reliance and hence improves on income level of participation. This to an extent reduces the probability of being poor among the beneficiary group in Taraba State.

The study further discovered that though NAPEP implementation in Taraba State recorded some achievement, its activities were said to have been characterized by the following challenges among other; large scale fraud and corruption, political/policy interference, failure of the programme to focus on the target audience (Poor/less privilege), difficulty in accessing the programme facilities and poor execution. This implies that NAPEP just as the other poverty related programmes that existed earlier faces the same range of challenges in the study area.

Conclusion

Based on the descriptive analysis, the rejection of the null hypotheses and the acceptance of the alternative hypotheses, it was concluded that the implementation of NAPEP in Taraba State, have to an extent met up with the goals of the programme in areas of job creation, improve socio-economic wellbeing and poverty eradication. And hence has the potentials for further performance particularly in the areas where the study was conducted, Taraba State and the country at large.

Recommendations

Emergent from the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made to further strengthen the effort and boost the activities of NAPEP in Taraba State:

1. Government through proper legislation process, come up with a rule that will handle cases of frauds and corruption particularly in public offices,
2. NAPEP schemes responsible in providing healthcare facilities, communication network, electricity to the rural dweller and informal education should double their effort in executing their responsibilities.
3. High-powered group be supported and or sponsor to embark on sensitization/orientation specifically among the politician who turned

the programme to be a medium for settling their supporters living those that are supposed to be beneficiaries. This will in no small way arrest the problem of political/policy interference and focus on the poor.

4. The government on its part should improve its budgetary allocation to NAPEP having considered the programme's role in the transformation intent and the development path.

Reference

- Ade, U. T. (2012). "Poverty Alleviation Programme in Nigeria; Issues on NAPEP as the way forward". *Journal of Research in Management, Economics and Commerce*, 2(4): 225-237
- Akerele, D and Adewuyi, S.A. (2011). "Analysis of poverty profile and socio-economic determinants of welfare among urban households of Ekiti State, Nigeria" *Current Research Journal of Social Sciences*.3 (1) Retrieved from maxwellsci.com/print/crjss/v3-1-7
- Grep, A. (2012). "Implication of Government Poverty Eradication Measures on Poverty Rate in Nigeria" *Journal of Management and Social Science*, 3(2) :112-124
- NBS (2004). "Poverty profile for Nigeria" *National Bureau of Statistics publication. Abuja, Nigeria*
- NBS (2007). "Poverty profile for Nigeria" *National Bureau of Statistics publication. Abuja, Nigeria*
- NBS (2010). "Poverty Profile for Nigeria" *National Bureau of Statistics publication. Abuja, Nigeria*
- Obadan, U. (2003). "Poverty, its Remedies in Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria" *the Nigerian Economic Society Publication, Ibadan*
- Ogege, S.O. (2011). "Evolving poverty profile and Millennium Development Goals in Nigeria". Retrieved from <http://www.ajol.info/journals/jorind>
- Okumadewa, F. (2005). "International Agency Response to Poverty Situation in Nigeria" in *CBN Bullion*, 22(4):58
- Olowa, O.W. (2012). "Concepts, Measurement and Causes of Poverty: Nigeria in Perspective" *American Journal of Economics*, 2(1), 25-29

Rahila, Y. and Abbas, I. M (2009). "National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) and Poverty Alleviation in Rural Nigeria" A Case study of Giwa Local Government Area of Kaduna State, *European Scientific Journal*, 8(18):90-102

World Bank (2000). "Attacking Poverty" *World Development Report 2000/2001*, New York, Oxford University Press