

IMPACT OF FARMERS EMPOWERMENT PROGRAMME (FEP) ON POVERTY REDUCTION IN DAURA LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF KATSINA STATE

HARUNA YERIMA – PhD
Harunayerima@yahoo.com
Department of Public Administration
Faculty of Administration
Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria

ABSTRACT

Farmers Empowerment Programme (FEP) is one of the programmes under National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP). The programme is aimed at wealth creation, employment generation and poverty eradication within the farming communities in the rural sector. This paper assesses the impact of FEP on poverty alleviation among farmers in Daura Local government Area of Katsina state. Data used for the study came from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data were gathered through the instrument of questionnaire administered to 40 units of the respondents from the beneficiaries that constitute our population size. Interview was also conducted to complement the data from the questionnaire. Secondary data used were from published materials. Data were analyzed using Pearson chi square test. The study found that the programme recorded low success as a result of inadequate funding, incredible criteria that reigned in selecting beneficiaries to the programme and low level of commitment among the beneficiaries. The study recommends that fund should be made available and adequate to the government poverty intervention programmes; credibility should be ensured in selecting beneficiaries; and government should ensure that farmers get ease access to farm inputs for effective farming practices.

Keywords: Poverty, impact, farmers, programme, beneficiaries ~~and~~ funding

Introduction

Nigeria is one of the countries of the world endowed with rich land and natural resources. It occupies the World's thirteenth largest producer of petroleum and sixth largest in the organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) as at 2002. At the beginning of 2006, the country was rated as eighth highest producer of petroleum in the world, producing 2.1 million barrels of petroleum per day at an average price of US\$ 50-60 per barrel (BBC World news, 16th January, 2006). The country has an estimated proven reserve of 32 million barrels – sufficient for 37 years at the then prevailing rate of production. Its gas reserve when fully exploited would place it in the world's top ten gas producers as the estimated gas reserves were 174 million cubic feet and would last for 110 years at the then prevailing rate of production (IMF, 2002).

However, despite the abundant resources endowed to the country and the huge

amount of revenue generated from the export of petroleum products, the country is still regarded as one of the World's countries with the highest level of poverty (UNDP, 2008). Statistical data available indicate that by 1960, the poverty level in Nigeria covered about 15% of the populace and increased 28.1% in 1980. As at 1985, about 46.3% of the populace lived below the poverty line. This percentage however jumped to about 66% in 1996 and to about 70% in 2000 (UNDP, 2008).. The report of the National Planning Commission indicates that the poverty level has reduced to about 54.4% in 2004 (NBS, 2006). This percentage is still above the average of 41.1% of the poverty rate in Sub – Saharan Africa in that year. Even in terms of the annual percentage of growth in GDP, the country only recorded 2.4% from 1990 – 2000. This could be regarded as very poor compared to other countries like Ghana (4.3%) and Egypt (4.6%)(IMF, 2002).

In terms of the Human Development Index (HDI) the country only recorded 0.416; this placed her among the 25 poorest countries in the world by the United Nations (NAPEP, 2001). In 2005 however, the World Bank placed the country as the second poorest nation in the world (The Guardian, 17th September 2005). This trend continued as the country was rated as the 158th out of 177 countries in terms of human development with index expressed as 0.470 in 2007. The country's HDI value for 2018 is 0.534. This puts the country in the low human development category—positioning it at 158 out of 189 countries and territories (Elumilode etal 2006; NAPEP 2001; UNDP 2008; UNDP 2019).

In a bid to address the issue of poverty in the country, the democratic government that came into power in 1999 introduced the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) as the highest poverty alleviation machinery in the country. This programme has many schemes under it that are geared towards achieving government's efforts of poverty reduction among the populace. One of such schemes is Farmers Empowerment Programme (FEP). This programme is a capacity enhancement programme that targets poor rural farmers. It focuses on wealth creation, employment generation and poverty eradication within the farming communities in the rural sector. In this programme, financial and technical supports are provided by the NAPEP to cooperatives of rural farm families to boost farm productivity and output (NAPEP, 2001). Each of the 774 Local governments of the Nigerian 36 states participated in such programme including Daura Local Government of katsina State. Therefore, this work is carried out to examine how the FEP worked in Daura Local Government of Katsina State.

Statement of the Problem

At the inception of the Civilian administration in 1999 in Nigeria, the poverty rate in the country covered about 70% of the entire populace. The government made effort to curtail such growing rate of poverty in the country through the introduction of the NAPEP as the government's poverty reduction intervention in the country with number of programmes and schemes under it. Katsina state is one of the Nigerian states whose inhabitants are mostly farmers that lived in rural areas and whose poverty rate was

among the worst in the country with 77.1% and 71.1% of the populace living below the poverty line in 1996 and 2004 respectively (NBS, 2005). This made the state among others to commit greatly towards implementing the NAPEP programme particularly the FEP that directly focuses on wealth creation, poverty reduction and financial and technical supports to rural farmers. This programme was implemented in all the 34 local Governments Areas of the state including Daura Local government.

However, researchers like Asaju (2011) conducted research on NAPEP with focus on the operational structure of the programme and implementation strategies of its various schemes as well as the appropriateness of the programme to poverty alleviation. Nnamdi (2010) also conducted a study on the impact of NAPEP on rural populace. The variables focused by the research were the issues of contribution to agriculture, employment provisions, micro finance and social amenities provisions by NAPEP to the benefitting communities. Other scholars like Mahamadu (2008) studied the role of NAPEP on the development of the society with focus on its contribution to only Women and the factors that affect the success of the programme. But, no study conducted with focus on funding, selection criteria and commitment of the beneficiaries which this study attempts to address. Therefore, our focus now is that has the FEP of the NAPEP programme really alleviate poverty among farmers in Daura Local government Area of Katsina state. This is the issue which this work intends to address. Addressing this issue however requires answers to the following questions:

1. How adequate was the funding to the programme?
2. How credible was the criteria adopted in selecting the beneficiaries to the programme?
3. How committed were the beneficiaries to this programme?
4. What factors constitute barrier to the success of such programme in the study area?

Objectives of the Study

The central objective of this work is to examine whether the FEP of the NAPEP has actually contributed to alleviated poverty among farmers in Daura Local Government of Katsina state. In achieving this, the following objectives need also to be achieved.

1. To determine the adequacy of funding to the Programme.
2. To assess the credibility of Criteria adopted in selecting the beneficiaries to the programme.
3. To look at the level of commitment of the beneficiaries to the programme and how that affect success of the programme.
4. To appraise the factors that constitute barrier to the success of the programme.

Statement of Hypothesis

The hypothesis tested by the study states that:

H₀ There is no significant relationship between poverty reduction and FEP contribution to farmers in Daura Local Government Area of Katsina state.

H₁ There is significant relationship between poverty reduction and FEP contribution to farmers in Daura Local Government Area of Katsina state.

Scope of the study

This study captures the role played by the National poverty Alleviation Programme (NAPEP) on poverty reduction among farmers in Daura Local government of Katsina state with focus only on Farmers Empowerment programme (FEP). The choice of FEP is due to the fact that it is the programme that concentrates on alleviating poverty among rural farmers. The period of study covers period between 2005-2018.

Significance of the Study

Studies have been conducted on the issue of poverty especially as it affects socio economic development of the country. However, from the records available to the researcher, nothing or very little is done on the issue of farmers Empowerment Programme (FEP) which is part of the NAPEP programmes as it impacts on poverty reduction among farmers, especially the rural farmers. This study will therefore bridge the gap of knowledge by digging deep into the impact which the FEP of the NAPEP has on poverty reduction among rural farmers.

However, the study will be very significant to policy makers in designing poverty alleviation programmes in the country. The study will also expose the numerous problems that face the success of any poverty alleviation programme of the government.

Review of Related Literature

Poverty is multi dimensional and multi faceted in nature, defined differently using different criteria. It refers to lack of command over basic consumption needs, which mean, in other words, that there is an inadequate level of consumption giving rise to insufficient food, clothing and/ or shelter, and moreover the lack of certain capacities, such as being able to participate with dignity in society (Aloku 1975).

United Nations (1995) defines absolute poverty as a condition characterized by severe deprivation of basic human needs including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities health, shelter, education information. It depends not only on income but also access to services. This view widens the scope of absolute poverty to include absence of goods and services necessary for human survival. Poverty has been defined as the inability to attain a minimum standard of living (World Bank Report, 1990). The report constructed two indices based on a minimum level of consumption in order to show the practical aspect of the concept. While the first index was a country specific poverty line, the second was global, allowing cross-country comparisons (Walton, 1990).

Poverty is also described as *watching your child dying because you don't have the money to take her to the hospital... not even a penny to buy food for yourself. it is when a man wakes up in the morning ... and realizes that he has to start a fight for him to be*

able to get out of the house. Poverty is spending the daytime hawking on the street and missing school in the process (Magnus, 2007).

Ramon, (2002) defines Poverty as a phenomenon which makes a substantial number of people uncomfortable, absence of opportunities, accompanied by high levels of undernourishment, hunger, illiteracy, lack of education, physical and mental ailment, emotional and social instability, unhappiness sorrow and hopelessness of future.

Poverty has also been conceptualized in both the “relative” and “absolute” sense. This is generally based on whether relative or absolute standards are adopted in the determination of the minimum income required to meet basic life's necessities. The relative conceptualization of poverty is largely income-based or ultimately so. Accordingly, poverty depicts a situation in which a given material means of sustenance within a given society is hardly enough for subsistence in that society (Townsend, 1962). What is most important to deduce from these different definitions is that, poverty must be conceived, defined and measured in absolute quantitative ways that are relevant and valid for analysis and policy making in that given time and space. Odumosu (1999) has identified three (3) broad concepts or dimensions of poverty. These are: Poverty as subsistence, Poverty as inequality, and externality concept of poverty.

Subsistence: It concerned with the minimum of provision needed to maintain health and working capacity. The subsistence definition described poverty objectively as lack of income needs to acquire the minimum necessity of life. Those who lack the necessities to sustain life are described as poor. However, there are difficulties in determining what constitutes “minimum” which should be the dividing line separating the poor from the non poor.

Inequality: Is concerned with the relative position of income groups to each other. Poverty cannot be understood in isolating the poor and treating them as special group. Society is seen as a series of stratified income layers and poverty is concerned with how the bottom layers fare in relation to the society as a whole. Inequality is determined by studying the living standard of the rich in relation to the poor.

The externality concept of poverty: Is concerned with the social consequences of poverty for the rest of the society rather than in terms of the need of the poor. According to this concept, people must not be allowed to become so poor that they offend or are hurtful to the society.

Atkinson (1983) contributing to the inequality concept of poverty gives the general meaning of inequality to refer to “case where income and wealth are simply different”. He argued that in order to assess the implication of the differences in income, it is necessary to establish first, that people involved are comparable in other relevant respect. As extracted from Mato (2008), the prevalence of both relative and absolute poverty is duly recognized and even mentioned in various National Developments Plans (1975, 1980). Concern for poverty scourge received a further

boost during the 1975 Annual Conference of the Nigerian Economic Society (NES) and during the 1997 Annual Conference of the same NES. The 1975 NES conference was devoted entirely to sensitizing the nation to the poverty menace view that poverty existed when incomes or disposable resources were inadequate to support a minimum standard of decent living. Some of the components of living were specified in the individual papers and more importantly the urban poverty was well enlightened. While the 1997 Annual Conference was devoted to impact of Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) on poverty in Nigeria and different methods of alleviating poverty in Nigeria. It was agreed that majority of those who are poor are not producers themselves. This group of people forms part of dependent population because they have no direct earnings of the type typically evaluated in distribution studies. And partly there is no guarantee that an increased income would be spent on essential services. Therefore, it was agreed upon that improvement is basic needs such as medical, housing, education, regular access to nutritional food and so on remains the best option. Dudley (1975) sees poverty largely in the light of the need for personal growth in Nigeria. According to him, the basic needs, which any society should provide for its members should include such things as food, clothing, shelter, education, health, work and mobility. Dudley provided some basic indicators of the state basic services especially in relation to the poor in Nigeria. Most of the discussion was at a national aggregate level. Other than showing the general adverse situation in the rural and urban areas, inequality, potable water supply, he also refers to issues of nutrition, for instance, it was stated that 30 percent of the households in Oyo State are malnourished. He also stated that in Lagos State more than 72 percent of the households live in one-room houses.

According to the World Bank Poverty Task Force as quoted from Mato (2008), Poverty is caused by inadequate access to employment opportunities; inadequate physical assets, such as land and capital, and minimal access by the poor to credit even on a small scale; inadequate access to the means of supporting rural development in poor regions; inadequate access to markets where the poor can sell goods and services; Low endowment of human capital; Destruction of natural resources, leading to environmental degradation and reduced productivity; Inadequate access to assistance for those living at the margin and those victimized by transitory poverty and Lack of inclusive participation; which is the failure to include the poor in the process of designing development programmes.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework adopted for this work is the Benefit – Cost analysis Model developed by Schalock and Butterworth (2000) the framework is based on the assumption that public policy is based on two fundamental principles: equity and efficiency. Equitable programs contribute to balancing the needs and desires of the various groups in society; whereas efficient programs are those that serve to increase the net value of goods and services available to society. Benefit-cost analysis is a tool developed to determine whether a program produces effects that justify the costs incurred to operate the program. The benefit-cost model requires the understanding

of the concept of an analytical perspective; moving beyond viewing benefit-cost analysis as a simple ratio of benefits to costs; including both monetized and non-monetized benefits in the analysis; and consideration of what is a benefit and what is a cost, and to whom. Thus, potential users of the proposed model are encouraged to take a broader perspective on the benefits and costs of a program, intervention, or service, rather than reducing the analysis to a simple ratio of benefits to costs. The purpose of benefit-cost analysis is to determine whether a program's benefits outweigh its costs. The primary issue addressed by a benefit-cost analysis is whether the impacts of a program, intervention, or service are big enough to justify the costs needed to produce them. Benefit-cost analysis depends upon the availability of cost estimates, benefits to program participants, and impact statements, which are the statistically significant mean differences of costs and benefits between the programs, interventions, or services being compared.

Methodology

Data used for this paper were from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data were generated from the beneficiaries of the FEP Scheme of the NAPEP programme in the study area and the staff of NAPEP in Daura Local Government. The instruments used were the questionnaire, interview and observation. The secondary data were gathered from publications of the NAPEP, Newspapers, magazines, journals, books and other published materials. However, 40 units of beneficiaries out of total of 150 beneficiaries were selected to serve as the sample. The number is representative enough for the population. Simple random sampling was used in the selection because the population is homogenous. Also, all the 2 staff of NAPEP were selected as sample size for the other population. Data from the questionnaire were presented using tables and analyzed using Chi square statistical tool of analysis. Discussions and comments were provided where necessary especially on the data from the secondary source and the interview.

Results, Discussions and Findings

As stated earlier, the data we used for this paper were gathered from both primary and secondary sources. However, out of the 40 units of questionnaires administered to the sample of the beneficiaries of the FEP in the study area, only 37 units were correctly filled and returned. The analysis of the data from such method will be based on such number. Data were also got from interview method to complement the one generated from the questionnaire.

Adequacy of Knowledge and Understanding of FEP

FEP of the NAPEP targets rural farmers. In order to assess whether these farmers actually were aware of the existence of such programme, we asked them to indicate the adequacy of their knowledge and understanding of the Programme. The responses generated are tabulated below:

Table 5.1: Responses on Adequacy of Knowledge and Understanding of FEP**Table 5.2 Responses on Adequacy of Funding to the Programme.**

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Very adequate	1	2.7
Adequate	5	13.5
Inadequate	18	48.6
Very inadequate	13	35.1
Total	37	100

Source: Researcher's survey, 2018

The Table above shows respondents views as regard to the level of funding of the NAPEP programme. It can be seen that, 2.7% of the total respondents rated the level of funding to be very adequate while 13.5% were on the stand that such funding was adequate. However, 48.6% of the respondents expressed that funding to this programme by government could be rated as inadequate. The remaining 35.1% were on the stand that the funding was very inadequate. This implies that, the fund given to the programme was inadequate.

However, the interview conducted to some of the beneficiaries shows that although the policy intends to cover wide range of farmers with significant capital as input to boost farming activities, what actually went to their hand was grossly inadequate to meet their farming needs.

Credibility of the Criteria Adopted in the selection of the Beneficiaries

To determine the credibility of the criteria that transpired in the selection of the beneficiaries, we ask the respondents to state whether the criteria applied in their selection was credible. The responses we got are tabulated below:

Table 5.3 Responses on Credibility of the Criteria Adopted in the selection of the Beneficiaries

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Very Credible	4	10.8
Credible	5	13.5
Incredible	19	51.4
Very incredible	9	24.3
Total	37	100

Source: Researcher's survey, 2018

The data presented above shows the respondents views on the criteria adopted by the NAPEP officials in selecting the beneficiaries. Based on the data received, 10.8% of the respondents expressed that the criteria adopted in selecting beneficiaries of the programme were very credible. Those that rated the criteria to be credible were

13.5% of the total respondents. Also, 51.4% of the respondents believed that the criteria were incredible. The remaining 24.3% expressed that such criteria were very incredible. The data thus show that incredibility reigned during the beneficiaries' selection. The result generated from interview to the beneficiaries of the programme shows that the actual farmers that the programme targets did not actually benefit partly due to the criterion of belonging to a cooperative society and that majority of the farmers were not members of any cooperative society. Even some of those that happened to be members were not selected based on merit or need but rather based on political background consideration. This view was however contradicted by the NAPEP staff interviewed as they claimed to ensure credibility of the process.

Beneficiaries' Level of Commitment to the Programme

It is also believed that the success of a particular government programme is informed by the level of commitment shown by those who benefits from the programme among others. In view of this, we required the respondents to express their view as regard to the level of commitment on the part of the beneficiaries. The responses we get are shown in the table below:

Table 5.4 Responses on Beneficiaries' Level of Commitment to the Programme

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Very High	5	13.5
High	10	27.0
Low	16	45.2
Very low	6	16.2
Total	37	100

Source: Researcher's survey, 2018

The table above shows how respondents expressed their views as regard to the level of commitment shown by the beneficiaries in general to the programme. From the responses, 13.5% of the respondents agreed that the level of commitment was very high while 27.0% rated it as high. Those that rated the commitment level as low constituted of 45.2% of the total respondents. The remaining 16.2% argued that the level of commitment was very low. This indicates that the commitment needed on the part of the beneficiaries was discouraging.

FEP and the level of Assistance to Agricultural Practices

Respondents were further required to indicate the level at which FEP has assisted them in their farming practices. This is of course a critical issue in assessing the success or contribution of the programme. The responses generated are tabulated below:

Table 5.5 Responses on the Level of Assistance to Agricultural Practices

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Very High	7	18.9
High	10	27.0
Low	13	35.1
Very low	7	18.9
Total	37	100

Source: Researcher's survey, 2018

The table above represents views of the respondents in respect of the rate at which the programme assisted the farmers in agricultural practices. The responses show that 18.9% indicated that the level at which the programme has assisted them was very high. Those that rated it as high constituted for about 27.0% of the entire responses. However, 35.1% argued that such level could be rated as low while the remaining 18.9% expressed very low as their response. Although the difference between those that agreed and those that did not is not significant, we can still see that the programme has not really assisted the farmers in improving their agricultural practices.

FEP and the level of Improvement in Living Condition

Improvement in the condition of an individual indicates improvement on the poverty level of the individual concerned. Against this, we asked the respondents to indicate the rate at which the programme under study has assisted in improving their living condition. The responses generated from this are tabulated below:

Table 5.6 Responses on the Level of Improvement in Living Condition

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Very High	3	8.1
High	8	21.6
Low	19	51.4
Very low	7	18.9
Total	37	100

Source: Researcher's survey, 2018

The table above shows that 8.1% of the respondents believed that the programme has improved their lives at a very high rate. However those that rated it to have been high and low were 21.6% and 51.4% respectively. The remaining 18.9% of the respondents argued that the programme's contribution to improving living standard was very low. Thus, from the general responses, we shall see that the programme has not really improved the condition of living of the farmers.

Factors responsible for Low Success of the Programme

Respondents from both staff and beneficiaries groups were interviewed on the factors that they regarded as barrier to the success of the programme. One of the factors was low literacy level among the farmers. In fact, some of the farmers were not having

adequate knowledge on the existence of the FEP. This factor accounted for their non concern on the loan facility given to them which attracts low interest rate. However, we were made to understand by the NAPEP officials that only 5 cooperatives were formed in the area and that loans were given to them, but they later realized that all the cooperatives were formed and ran by a single individual. A reason gave by the staff interviewed was that the low level of literacy among the farmers accounted for such situation. This indeed serves as a barrier to the success of the programme. Another barrier to the success of the programme was also politicization of the programme. This factor was given as a problem by about 60% of those interviewed from the beneficiaries' sample. Most of those that benefited from the scheme were selected based on political background. This view was however contradicted by the 2 NAPEP staff interviewed. However, about 55% of the farmers interviewed clearly expressed that the programme has failed to educate them on the new farming techniques that improves agricultural practices. In addition to this, the farm inputs used such as fertilizer were in a very short supply and the programme has not done much in their provisions. However, the issue of fertilizer was stated to have been provided adequately by the local government through the state government as stated by the NAPEP officials interviewed.

Test of Hypothesis

As earlier stated the hypothesis tested by the study is:

H₀. There is no significant relationship between poverty reduction and FEP contribution to farmers in Daura Local Government Area of Katsina state.

Our independent variable here is FEP Contribution to farmers while the dependent variable is Poverty reduction. However, the results generated from the analysis using the Chi square test is as follows:

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	66.155 ^a	9	.000
Likelihood Ratio	65.193	9	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	29.104	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	37		

a. 14 cells (87.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .57.

From the chi square output above, we shall see that our calculated value is 66.155. The critical value at 0.05% level of significance and 9 degree of freedom from the chi square table is 16.91. In comparing the two, we shall see that the calculated value is greater than the critical value. Thus we reject our null hypothesis and accept the alternate one. The decision is guided by the decision rule which state that if the calculated value is greater than the critical value we reject and if less than we accept. The result of the interview from the analysis above also confirms this stand.

Therefore we shall conclude that there is significant relationship between poverty reduction and FEP contribution to agricultural activities in Daura Local government Area of Katsina State. However, this study was able to arrive at the following findings: Firstly, it was revealed although significant number of farmers has knowledge and understanding of the programme, the fund needed for the success of the programme was grossly inadequate to meet the farmers farming needs. Also, it was found that the criteria that reigned in the selection of the beneficiaries to the programme was incredible as some of the beneficiaries were selected not based on merit or need but rather based on their political backgrounds. In addition to this, the criterion of belonging to cooperative society before being a beneficiary left many of the rural poor farmers which the programme targeted as non beneficiaries because they are not members of any cooperative.

The study also revealed that, the beneficiaries to the programme were not fully committed to the programme. The reason to this was the nature of some of the selected beneficiaries to the programme because they were selected based on their political affiliations. It was also revealed that the programme has not really assisted the farmers in boosting their agricultural practices. In addition, the living condition of the affected farmers has not significantly improved as an impact of the programmed. However, the study further revealed that the programme's success was affected by certain barriers such as low literacy rate among farmers, lack of adequate knowledge on the existence of the programme by some farmers, politicization of beneficiaries' selection and inadequate provision of the necessary inputs among others.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Poverty as one of the greatest challenges to the global development remains one of the central issues of discussion when it comes to human development. Its alleviation in Nigeria in general and in Daura Local government Area of katsina state in particular requires careful strategies that focus on the core poor who are mostly farmers that reside in rural areas. Thus, we conclude that poverty level in Nigeria would continue to increase as long as emphasis towards boosting agricultural practices in all dimensions is not given attention. Therefore, poverty reduction among farmers is central to the fight against poverty in the country and can only be achieved if those issues that lead to effective farming practices are adequately taken care of by the authorities concerned. The study also offers the following recommendations: In the first place, the government should supply adequate capital in its fight against poverty in the country especially to those programmes that centered on agriculture. Because, most of those affected by the country are in rural areas and agriculture is their main occupation. Thus improving, facilitating or assisting on such means of lively hood with the required capital implies reduced poverty in the society concerned. Also, credibility should be ensured in selecting beneficiaries to the programme and any other programme that targets poverty reduction in the country. Attention or emphasis should not be placed on criteria such as political affiliation, family background or other primordial factors. The government through its policies should ensure that farmers, especially those in

rural areas get ease access to loans to boost their agricultural productivity and strengthen its efforts on farm inputs supply at cheap prices to farmers. Credibility and fairness should also be ensured in the distribution of such facilities to the beneficiaries. People, especially the target group of any poverty alleviation programme should be enlighten more on the benefits of such programme and motivated to show absolute commitment to it. Because without beneficiaries' commitment a particular effort will end up in vain. Some of the major limitations to this paper are the inaccessibility of some vital documents from the NAPEP office and the inability of the researchers to locate some of the beneficiaries to the programme. Time constraint is another limitation to the research. The study also recommends that further studies should be conducted particularly on the issues below:.

A comparative study of the strategies for poverty alleviation in Katsina and other dates in Nigeria.

- b. The Impact of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) on the socio-economic development of urban communities.
- c. Challenges to successful implementation of poverty Reduction Strategies in Nigeria.

References

Asaju, K. (2011). Poverty Reduction Programmes In Nigeria; An Assessment Of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP). An unpublished Ph. D Dissertation, Postgraduate School, A. B. U. Zaria.

BBC World News (2006). Oil Prices Climb on Nigeria, Iran Supply Fears. January 16.

Elumilade D. O. and Asaolu T.O. (2006). *Appraising the Institutional Framework for Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Nigeria*. International Journal of Finance and Economics. Issue 3, 2006.

Igbuzor, O. (2006a). The Millennium Development Goals : can Nigeria Meet the Goals in 2015? *A paper presented at a symposium on Millennium Development Goals and Nigeria: Issues, Challenges and Prospects organized by Chartered Institute of Accountants of Nigeria on 27th July, 2006 at Sheraton Hotels and Towers, Abuja.*

Igbuzor, O. (2006b) Review of the Nigeria Millennium Development Goals- 2005 Report. A Review Presented at the MDG/GCAP Nigeria Planning Meeting held in Abuja on 9th March, 2006.

IMF (2002). Selected Issues and Statistical Appendix to IMF article 4. December 2002.

Isah, M. A. (2008). Social Policy and Poverty Alleviation in Gombe State. An unpublished Ph. D Dissertation, Postgraduate School, A. B. U. Zaria.

- Magaji, A. B. (2008). Millennium Development Goals: the Nigerian Situation. Daily Triumph Newspaper: Thursday, April 28 2008.
- Magnus L. K. (2007). *Global Perspectives of Poverty: The Nigerian Experience*. Seminar paper, University of Ilorin. February 2007.
- Magnus L. K. (2007). *Global Perspectives of Poverty: The Nigerian Experience*. Seminar paper, University of Ilorin. February 2007.
- Mahamadu A. (2008). An assessment of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) on Women in Zaria Local Government (1999 - 2007).". An Unpublished M. ScThesis, Postgraduate School, A. B. U. Zaria.
- Mato Kabir (2008). Poverty In Nigeria: The Dimension In Northern Nigeria. A Discussion Paper Presented at a Seminar Organised by Niger State Community, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria on Saturday 13th December, 2008. Assembly Hall ABU Main Campus, Samaru Zaria
- NAPEP (2007). *NAPEP Today*. A publication of NAPEP.
- NAPEP, (2001). *Blueprint for the schemes*. Revised edition.
- NBS, (2005) National Bureau of Statistics Publication
- The Guardian, (2005). *World Bank Rates Nigeria the Second poorest Nation*. September 17.
- The Guardian, (2005). *World Bank Rates Nigeria the Second poorest Nation*. September 17.
- The World Bank (1990). *Poverty in Latin America: The Impact of Depression*. Washington D.C
- Townsend, P. (1962), "*The Meaning of Poverty*" The British Journal of Sociology Vol. Xii No. 1 pp. 210 – 270
- UNDP (2008). 2007/2008 Human Development Report.
- UNDP (2019). 2018/2019 Human Development Report.
- Walton, M. (1990), *Combating Poverty: Experience and Prospect*. Finance and Development 27(3).