

**MODERATING ROLE OF GOOD GOVERNANCE ON THE  
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERVENTION PROGRAMS,  
POLICY PARTICIPATION AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION: A  
PLS APPROACH**

**By**

**Abu Idris**

Department of Public Administration  
Faculty of Management and Social Science  
Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State

**Abstract**

Poverty is one of the greatest threats to global peace and a topical topic of discussion in the development agenda. In an effort to break the cycle of poverty, governments at different levels introduced various intervention schemes to combat the scourge. This paper adopts quantitative technique using Partial Least Square (PLS) to examine the moderating effects of good governance on two intervention programs (IPs), participation of target beneficiaries in policy formulation and implementation and poverty alleviation. The findings highlight that National Fadama Development Project III is significantly related to poverty alleviation and most beneficial to the target beneficiaries. However, the relationship between Niger State Commercial Agricultural Credit Scheme and poverty alleviation was insignificant. Correspondingly, the introduction of good governance in the study will strengthen the affiliation between IPs and poverty reduction if there is effective participation of recipients of IPs in policies, periodic accountability of stakeholders and application of rule of law. The study shows that manifold intervention programs are linked with compound challenges, hence, the study recommends for the synchronization of the couple programs to curb the waste of scarce resource and accord it a required devotion. Good governance is the key to poverty alleviation, therefore, government should engender coherent vision and concrete commitment administratively, politically and professionally to realize it. Specifically, the study calls for the transformation and reinforcement of the judicial institutions to combat corruption and lead a crusade for the reinstatement of the good virtues entrenched in the public service to enhance a hitch free application of rule of law as a stepping stone to expedite economic development and poverty alleviation in Niger state.

**Keywords:** Good governance, intervention programs, policy participation, poverty alleviation

### **1.0 Introduction**

Poverty is as old as history of mankind and it has affects several aspects of human conditions physically, morally and psychologically. It is menace that has zero consideration for age, race, religion, ethnicity or nationality. Poverty has rendered many miserable, helpless, powerless, voiceless and visionless. Poverty is one of the greatest threats to global peace and a topical topic in the development agenda (Roy, Cawood, Hordijk, & Hulme, 2016) to human development and the uppermost topic of deliberation in the development agenda of most nations. Poverty is a universal phenomenon (Ravallion, 2016) across countries of the world and a basic antithesis to human dignity. As a universal phenomenon, poverty affects approximately four billion people across the globe and more devastating in the developing world of Africa, Asia and Latin America (Greig, Hulme, & Turner, 2007). Out of the three continents, Africa remains the poorest (Tupy, 2016) most technologically regressive, most indebted, most crisis ridden, most politically unbalanced, most marginalized in the world. Poverty threat on the rural population was a driven force for the United Nations proclamations to fight the scourge across the globe, consequently, the Federal Government of Nigeria among comity of nations was inspired to direct significant resources into various institutions particularly Agricultural Intervention

Programs (AIPs) to bridge the gap between economic growth and prosperity of the citizens. Famous among them are the National Agricultural and Cooperative Bank (NACB), Operation Feed the Nation (OFN), Agricultural Development Project (ADP), Directorate of Food, Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI), National Directorate of Employment (NDE), Better Life Program (BLP), Micro Finance Bank, Bank of Agriculture, National Poverty Eradication Program (NAPEP) among others (Dugguh, 2014; Ogwumike, 2002). The effectiveness of the schemes in combating poverty remains a recurring questions (Ighodalo, 2012).

Researchers argue that persistence poverty is less in the lack of funds for its alleviation than in the failures of governance (Baker, 2013; Cain, 2016). In the same vein, (Devas, 2012; Grindle, 2011; Hulme & Shepherd, 2003; McFerson, 2013; Moore, 2001; Ogun, 2010; Sobhan, 1998) concurred that poverty has direct linkage with bad governance further affirmed that the incidence of poverty in developing countries of the world is related with bad governance and not dearth of financial resources as claimed by some scholars. The failures range from narrow-minded developmental vision, poor commitment and lack of political determination to translating the vision into attainable policies and programs.

In observing the challenges of poverty annihilation and hunger, governance is

identified as the missing link. For instance, Kofi Anan in 1998 conceived good governance as the most essential factor required by every government to eradicate poverty and promote development (UN, 1998). Good governance entails improvement of all aspects of the society- the institutional rules, the intra and interrelation between the economic and political system (Aryeetey, Devarajan, Kanbur, & Kasekende, 2012; Bezold, Juech, Michelson, & Lyakurwa, 2009; Gul, Sajid, Afzal, Khan, & Mughal, 2012; Lusk, 2010; Murega, 2014). Consequently, Azam & Emirullah upheld that good governance expedite sustainable development vis-a-vis poverty eradication especially in the developing world of Asia, Latin America Africa where Nigeria belongs. Accordingly, good governance is perceived as a major precondition for poverty alleviation and sustainable economic development (Anyang, 2001; Bolton, 2000; Craig & Porter, 2006b; Dingwerth & Pattberg, 2006; Frenk & Moon, 2013; Lyakurwa, 2009). In spite of the foregoing assumptions, there is paucity of empirical research that align good governance with intervention policies and programs, level of participation of target beneficiaries in policy formulation and implementation to determine the level of poverty in Nigeria. It has manifested in various studies that results on Intervention Programs (IPs) and poverty alleviation in Niger state rural areas were inconclusive and equivocal (Sanusi, 2015), thus requires the introduction of moderating variable

(Baron & Kenny, 1986) to effectively assess the impact of IPs on poverty alleviation (Sanusi, 2015) . This study is to provide new empirical evidence of the relationship between two intervention programs, participation of the intended beneficiaries under the umbrella of prevailing level of poverty and good governance. In recent scenario, it is unfeasible for the poor communities to participate in usual functioning of the society as a result of weak social bonding that limit the exchange of information concerning employment, human rights, political rights, routine activities and female contribution in common dealings. In the light of above, this study intends to address the following research questions.

1. To what extent does Agricultural Intervention Programs influence poverty alleviation in the rural areas of Niger State?
2. To what extent does participation of target beneficiaries in policy formulation and implementation impact on poverty alleviation in the rural areas of Niger State?
3. Does the practice of good governance moderate the relationship between AIPs, participation in policy process and poverty alleviation in the rural areas of Niger state?

In the same vein, the study intends to achieve the following objectives:

1. To examine the impact of Agricultural Intervention Programs (AIPs) on poverty alleviation in the rural areas of Niger State.

2. To determine the impact of participation of target beneficiaries in policy implementation on poverty alleviation in the rural areas of Niger State.
3. To assess the moderating effect of good governance on AIPs, participation of beneficiaries on policy towards poverty alleviation in the rural areas.

## **2.0 Methodology**

This study adopts quantitative instrument to pull together a cross sectional data from 18 rural areas of Niger state to examine the relationship between good governance, National Fadama Development Project III (NFDPIII) and Niger State Commercial Agricultural Credit Scheme (NSCACS) on poverty alleviation. 440 structured questionnaires were administered on the target beneficiaries and 347 were valid for analysis. The study adopts probability sampling technique which tolerate each item of the population and corresponding chance to be chosen as a sample so as to limit high rate of bias (Sekaran & Bougie, 2014). The study adopts multi-stage sampling method, where Niger state was clustered into three senatorial zones. Partial Least Square (PLS) software was used to run the data as it provide better prediction capacity and best option for data collected from social setting like rural areas which might not be absolutely normal (Hwang, Malhotra, Kim, Tomiuk, & Hong, 2010). Also, measurement of this study was adapted from the studies of (Ilemona, Akoji, & Matthew, 2014; Orji, 2005) with minor

contextual modification that twinset the study area vis-a-vis to measure the independent and dependent variables using 5 likert scale.

## **3.0 Literature Review**

### **3.1 Intervention Program**

Intervention schemes play considerable roles in moderating poverty and supporting socio-economic development (Bank, 1997). However, the schemes were criticized for their duplicative functions which consume huge fractions of government funds at the detriment of the real beneficiaries. For instance, in reviewing poverty alleviation programs in Latin America and the Caribbean, high administrative expenses dejected the concerned governments to sustain the programs and consequently they were abandoned (Caldés, Coady, & Maluccio, 2006). Related study advocate that investment on poverty programs is in opposite direction with poverty reduction (Kalu & James, 2012; Mehmood & Sadiq, 2010). The values of poverty intervention programs have persistently trim down as a result of its replications (Arogundade, Adebisi, & Ogunro, 2011; Caldés et al., 2006). This inspires the present study to examine National Fadama Development Project III (NFDPIII) and Niger State Commercial Agricultural Credit Scheme (NSCACS) with a view to determine their achievements and the foremost beneficial to *rural areas*. According to Simonyan, Olukosi, Omolehin, and Atala (2012), the

first segment of the program recorded huge success as mainstream of the farmers in participating states like Niger, Enugu, Kogi, Oyo etc. increases their production capacity, annual income and consequently improved standard of living. The Fadama projects were owned and managed by the participating communities to ensure sustainability (Ezeokeke, Anyanwu, & Okoro, 2012). Results of a study reveals a significant net farm income among beneficiaries of Fadama in Akwa Ibom state (Kainga, Nnadi, Morgan, & Akpas, 2016). A similar result on the intervention program positioned beneficiaries of Fadama III program higher against the non-beneficiaries with poverty gap indices of 0.36 and 0.45 representing 9% (Adenuga, Omotesho, Babatunde, Popoola, & Opeyemi, 2015). Consequently, this study hypothesized that Fadama III program is positively related to poverty alleviation as presumed by the previous research (Agbarevo & Age, 2013; Ike, 2012; Ugwumba & Okechukwu, 2014).

Statistics indicate that bank loan to agriculture sector through NSCACS shoot-up from 1.7% to 2.1% from 2009 to 2011. On the contrary, bank credit to agriculture stagnated at 1.4% from 2008 to 2011, (Obaidullah, 2008; Odufote, 2012) as accessing fund improves from N43.332 billion to N96.811 billion in 2010 and afterward to N151.016 billion in 2011 respectively. A different study conducted on agriculture credit reveals that agricultural

credit program by purpose has led to a significant positive growth in agricultural productivity in Nigeria (Agbo 2013; Agunuwa, Inaya, & Proso, 2015; Polycarp & Odufote, 2012). Yet, Obasi (2015), argue that the loan granted to borrowers improved national output by 20.33%, and also impacted significantly on the income of borrowers. In the light of the foregoing, it could be figure out that CACS was architect to increase recorded in bank credit to the agricultural sector. This was further confirmed by a strong positive correlation of 0.89 (Polycarp & Odufote, 2012). Bearing in mind the position of dominance studies, we advanced the hypothesis thus: Commercial Agriculture Credit Scheme is positively related to poverty alleviation.

### **3.2 Participation in policy formulation and implementation**

The misgivings of conventional development concepts in the late 1960s and their failure to address the mystery of poverty across the globe facilitates the dependable search for an alternating theoretical analyses and a paradigm shift from economic growth to social development. Within the neighborhood of 1970s and 1980s, participatory approaches were symbolically professed as a “child of necessity” to development practice and progressively sustained as people-centered development, state society synergies, participatory democracy and grassroots development (Maiava, 1995; Potts, Awuzie, McDermott, & Stephenson, 2015; Rahman, 1993).

Participatory approaches to poverty study identifies the specific group of people with knowledge of poverty to put forward their realities (Lewis, 2008). The opinions in favor of participatory approaches in poverty study underscore the value of improving the quality of research and its potency on the weak in the society. Thus, the kernel of participatory concept is a turn from intra-subjective experiences to participatory events in our understanding of transpersonal and spiritual phenomena (Ferrer, 2002). By implication, people-centered development discourse stresses that people should be the planners of their own future (Al Attar, 2015; Burkey, 1993; Mandal & Jirli, 2016; Oakley, 1991) concentrating on the role of social capital, competences, liberty and the skill of common people to cope with development strategies (Dreze & Sen, 1999; Sen, 1999). In this context, participatory development enable the deprived people to influence, implement and control activities which are indispensable to their growth through interaction with agencies, officials and technical consultants among others (Burkey, 1993; Chambers, 2002). Participatory approaches in the 80s acknowledged the significance of generating indigenous knowledge and investing on beneficiaries of development efforts to participate in all stages of the process (Brownhill, Moturi, & Hickey, 2016; Hickey & Mohan, 2004, 2005). Participation in decision making offers opportunities for cross-fertilization of idea

(Tschirhart et al., 2016) and enable the citizen acquires skills to challenge or sway the government when needed; and equally, government persuades its citizens, builds trust and tranquil anxiety or antagonism to strike a balance vis-à-vis give room for harmonious relationship with the citizens towards societal development .

The participation of the downtrodden in intervention programs summarizes the philosophy of bottom-up approach. acknowledged that, bottom-up approach mainly focuses on the target groups and service deliverers and it is a condition that policy formulation allows the contribution of the beneficiaries. For instance, a study reveals that farmers' participation in agricultural projects has a direct bearing on technology awareness, adoption, livelihoods, environment, and nutrition vis-a-vis poverty reduction (Etwire et al., 2013). A farming institute that adopts the top-bottom strategy with little input and commitment of farmers have been recognized as an unsustainable and weak trajectory to farmers' active participation in policy formulation and implementation and subsequently explains the low yield and productivity in Ethiopian agriculture (Etwire et al., 2013). In the same vein, pointed out that the adoption of top-bottom approach in the formulation and implementation of poverty alleviation program exacerbated the situation in Nigeria, because the target beneficiaries who mostly reside in the rural areas were

marginalized as a result of the fact that the activities or programs that alleviate poverty only focused on the state and local government headquarters. Considering the roles of participation of the target beneficiaries and result of previous empirical studies, we hypothesized that participation of target beneficiaries in policy formulation and implementation is positively related to poverty alleviation in Niger State rural areas.

### **3.3 Good governance**

Good governance predetermines human development in its entirety. This is realizable through poverty reduction in the sphere of creative employment, integration of the taxpayers, principally the poor people in the social activities and policies that directly affect their felt-needs. uphold that it is the worthiness of governance that smooth the progress of sustainable development as well as poverty eradication in the emerging world of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Considering the significance of good governance, Africa Union (AU) advocates the New Partnership for Africa Development (NEPAD) which proclaims better governance as an fundamental requirement for the development of the African continent (Anyang, 2001). In a proclamation, opined that good governance promote resilient, pro-poor growth, by allusion, it trim down poverty, promote peace, heartens political participation vis-a-

vis social empowerment and development of any nation.

Similarly, observed that good governance is missing link that impinge on the effective combat of poverty in Africa (Nigeria and Niger State inclusive). Therefore, to address the problem of poverty in Africa, the author suggested on the need to embrace democratic values, accord priority to security, emphasis on economic development, zero tolerance to corruption, just to mention but a few. This claim was further substantiated by (Craig & Porter, 2006a). The concept of governance goes beyond the official apparatus of government, it refers to the entirety of ways in which humanity or the general society organizes and jointly manages its affairs. Global governance is an annex of this notion of the world as a whole. Equally, it involves formal decision-making processes of any nation or numerous processes that form the way we jointly address issues of concern that have global implication, such as financial stability or instability, environmental sustainability, peacekeeping and security, human rights, trafficking and many more (Bolton, 2000; Dingwerth & Pattberg, 2006; Frenk & Moon, 2013; Thomas, 2000). Similarly, disclosed that the right to make choice on the economic policy and agenda which each country intends to pursue without foreign intervention or imposition of market ideology that could facilitate poverty reduction is feasible through effective

governance. In addition to the direct relationship that exist between good governance intervention programs and poverty alleviation, the study also proposed that good governance will moderate the relationship between intervention programs and poverty alleviation such that there is high degree of participation of target beneficiaries in policy formulation and implementation, accountability and application of rule of law.

**4.0 Result and Discussion**

*Measurement model*

Tables 1 and 2 show the discriminant validity and result of composite reliability coefficients of the variables, each latent variable has .861 as the least and .954 as the highest. This mean that each exceeds the acceptable threshold of .70 suggesting tolerable internal consistency reliability of the measures adopted in this study (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). Yet, it is important to note that the analysis of the outer model led to the deletion of 18

indicators out of 75. Nevertheless, none of the variables was removed as they have adequate number of indicators per each variable (Hair, Sarstedt, Pieper, & Ringle, 2012). The indicators removed are: Fadama III (FDM10, FDM11, FDM12, and FDM16); CAS (CAS01, CAS09, CAS10, and CAS11); PAR (PAR01, PAR04, PAR02, PAR06, PAR07 and PAR11); GOV (GOV05 and GOV10); PAL (PAL08 and PAL13).

Note: Values in bold across diagonal in Table 2 below are the square root of AVE, while of diagonal values are the correlations between variables. CAS represent Niger state Commercial Agricultural Credit Scheme, FDM= National Fadama Development Project III, PAL=Poverty Alleviation, PAR=Participation, PEP=National Poverty Eradication Program and GOV= Good governance

**Table 1** Latent Variable Correlation

Variables	CAS	FDM	GOV	PAL	PAR
CAS	<b>0.872</b>				
FDM	0.172	<b>0.711</b>			
GOV	0.508	0.319	<b>0.731</b>		
PAL	0.465	0.3	0.624	<b>0.76</b>	
PAR	0.475	0.092	0.457	0.433	<b>0.745</b>



**Table 2** Item loadings AVE and reliabilities

<b>Code</b>	<b>Loadings</b>	<b>AVE</b>	<b>Composite Reliability</b>	<b>Cronbach Alpha</b>
CAS02	.874	.761	.957	.947
CAS03	.828			
CAS04	.921			
CAS05	.943			
CAS06	.908			
CAS07	.867			
CAS08	.753			
FDM01	.786	.506	.929	.922
FDM02	.775			
FDM03	.758			
FDM04	.800			
FDM05	.719			
FDM06	.741			
FDM07	.809			
FDM08	.620			
FDM09	.613			
FDM13	.746			
FDM14	.635			
FDM15	.563			
FDM17	.619			
GOV01	.750	.535	.901	.873
GOV02	.830			
GOV03	.596			
GOV04	.808			
GOV06	.640			
GOV07	.685			
GOV08	.783			
GOV09	.723			

**Table 2 Contd.** Item loadings AVE and reliabilities

<b>Code</b>	<b>Loadings</b>	<b>AVE</b>	<b>Composite Reliability</b>	<b>Cronbach Alpha</b>
PAL01	.784	.577	.953	.947
PAL02	.706			
PAL03	.764			
PAL04	.788			
PAL05	.787			
PAL06	.746			
PAL07	.721			
PAL09	.663			
PAL10	.717			
PAL11	.848			
PAL12	.861			
PAL14	.769			
PAL15	.750			
PAL16	.794			
PAL17	.672			
PAR03	.808			
PAR05	.728			
PAR08	.717			
PAR09	.691			
PAR10	.774			

Source:  
Computation

*Structural Model Results (PLS Path with moderator)*

Hair et al (2013) conceived that there are four major criteria for evaluating the structural model in PLS SEM. These are:

significance of the path coefficients, coefficient determination ( $R^2$ ), the effect size ( $f^2$ ), and predictive relevance ( $Q^2$ ). The default results for the assessment of the significance of path coefficients are obtainable in Table 3 below.

Table 3 *Direct relationship among the variables without moderator* Hypotheses test

Hypotheses	Relationships	Beta value ( $\beta$ )	Standard Error	T value	P value	Decision
H1	FDM -> PAL	.039	.024	1.614	0.05*	Supported
H2	CAS -> PAL	.015	.036	.418	0.34	Not Supported
H3	PAR -> PAL	.076	.039	1.963	* 0.03*	Supported

Source: Computation

In line with the reviewed literature and developed hypothesis, the result of hypothesis 1 indicate that National Fadama Development Project III is positively related to poverty alleviation in Niger State rural areas. Thus, the result in Table 3 revealed a significant positive relationship between Fadama III program and the phenomenon under study (poverty). Thus:  $\beta = .039$ ,  $t = 1.614$ ,  $p = 0.05$  thereby supporting Hypothesis 1. In the same vein, hypothesis 2 predicted that Niger State Commercial Agricultural Credit Scheme is positively related to poverty alleviation in the rural areas of Niger State. Result in Table 3 did not support the prediction, because the t-value is below the

recommended threshold (1.282) and the probability value above the cut-off point(0.34)(R. A. Fisher & Yates, 1974) ( $\beta = .015$ ,  $t = .418$  and  $p = 0.34$ ), thereby conflicting the postulation of Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that participation of target beneficiaries in policy formulation and implementation is positively related to poverty alleviation in Niger State rural areas. The above prediction coincides with the result in Table 3, indicating a significant positive relationship between participation of beneficiaries in policies and poverty reduction in the rural areas. Therefore,  $\beta = .076$ ,  $t = 1.963$ ,  $p < 0.05$  portraying a strong support for hypothesis 3 of this study.

Table 4 *Indirect relationship*

Hypotheses	Indirect Relationships	Beta value	Standard Error	T value	P value	Decision
H4	FDM * GOV -> PAL	.085	.034	2.487	.01***	Supported
H5	CAS * GOV -> PAL	-.146	.049	2.986	.00***	Supported
H6	PAR * GOV -> PAL	.059	.043	1.368	.09*	Supported

To determine the moderating effect of this study, we adopt a product indicator method using PLS to classify and estimate the influence of the moderating effect (good governance) on the 2 intervention programs as well as participation of target beneficiaries on poverty alleviation. Consequently, H4 predicted that: Good Governance moderate the relationship between National Fadama Development Project III and poverty alleviation in the rural areas, such that there is high degree of participation of beneficiaries in policy, accountability and application of rule of law. The result tells that good governance moderates a positive exists between Fadama III program and poverty alleviation ( $\beta=0.85$ ;  $t =2.847$ ;  $p = 0.01$ ), thereby supporting H4.

Again, H5 proposed that: Good Governance moderate the relationship between Niger State Commercial Agricultural Credit Scheme and poverty alleviation in the rural areas of Niger State, such that there is high degree of accountability and application of rule of law. The result further shown that governance dampen the positive relationship between Niger state Commercial Agricultural Scheme and poverty alleviation, yet, the result of probability value (p-value) is significant and therefore supporting the non-directional H5 with: ( $\beta= -1.46$ ;  $t=2.986$ ;  $p = .00$ ).

H6 predicts that Good Governance

moderates the relationship between participation in policy formulation and implementation and poverty alleviation in the rural areas of Niger State such that recipients' views are accepted and implemented. The moderating effect further illustrates that good governance moderate the positive relationship between participation of target beneficiaries and poverty alleviation. So: ( $\beta = 0.59$ ;  $t = 1.369$ ;  $p = 0.09$ ), hence, H6 also established and accepted at 10 percent level of significance.

Effect size ( $f^2$ ) was computed to determine the degree to which individual exogenous latent variable contribute to the study and to assess whether the omitted exogenous variable has a significant impact on the endogenous variables (Hair *et al.*, 2013). The  $R^2$  for the core effect model was 0.693 and after the introduction of the interaction effect model the  $R^2$  shoot-up to 0.708. Therefore, the  $R^2$  improved by 0.015 parallels to 1.5 percent additional variance. The effect sizes ( $f^2$ ) of participation of target beneficiaries on intervention programs, National Fadama Development project III and Niger State Commercial Agriculture Credit Scheme are 0.016, 0.003 and 0.000 which are small effect for the former and no effect for the later respectively. Interestingly, the effect-size ( $f^2$ ) of good governance as the moderator is 0.834 which higher and consider larger.

Table 5 *Effect size*

Endogenous Variable	Exogenous Variable	R Squared Included	R Squared Excluded	$f^2$	Effect Size
PAL	PAR	.693	.688	.016	small
	FDM	.693	.692	.003	None
	CAS	.693	.693	.000	None
	GOV	.693	.437	.834	Large

**Source:** Computation

This study offers empirical proof on the significant contribution of good governance as a moderator between Intervention Programs (IPs), participation in policy and Poverty reduction in the rural areas. The three hypotheses were significant and supportive suggesting that the practice of good governance will ease poverty alleviation through the intervention programs and joint contribution of the target beneficiaries in the formulation and implementation processes. The result is consistent with our supposition that poverty will be alleviated only if good governance; which entails high degree of policy participation (bottom-top approach), accountability and application of rule of law among government representatives is practiced.

### 5. Conclusion and Policy Recommendation .

Basically, this study examines the direct

effect of National Fadama Development Project III and Niger State Commercial Agriculture Credit Scheme on poverty alleviation. It equally examines the moderating role of good governance on the relationship between the two intervention programs, policy participation and poverty alleviation. The result established a significant relationship between Fadama III program and poverty alleviation and insignificant relationship between NSCACS and poverty alleviation. Similarly, the introduction of good governance in the study will strengthen the relationship between IPs and poverty reduction if recipients of IPs effectively participate in policies that affect them, periodic accountability of the stakeholders and application of rule of law. The study shows that manifold intervention programs are linked with compound challenges. Thus, it recommends for the synchronization of the multiple programs to curb the waste of

scarce resource and accord it a required devotion. In order to eliminate poverty, good governance is the key, denotatively, government should design and engender coherent vision to alleviate poverty and concrete commitment administratively, politically and professionally to realize it. Specifically, the study calls for structural transformation and reinforcement of the judicial institutions to combat corruption and lead a crusade for the reinstatement of the good virtues entrenched in the public service to enhance a hitch free application of rule of law as a stepping stone to facilitate economic development and poverty alleviation in Niger state.

#### **Reference**

- Adejumobi, S. (2006). *Governance and poverty reduction in Africa: A critique of the poverty reduction strategy Policy and Welfare Regimes in Comparative Perspectives*.
- Akpan, S. B., & Udoh, E. J. (2016). Farmers' decision to participate in government agricultural programmes in a volatile political environment: a case study of farmers in the South-South region of Nigeria. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 53(5).
- Al Attar, Z. H. (2015). A Case Study of IRADA: Its Impact on the Development and Enhancing the Legitimacy of Home-Based Businesses in Key Poverty Areas in Jordan.
- Ameyaw, D., Kwame, & Nyigmah, B., Justice. (2009). Localising and sustaining poverty reduction: experiences from Ghana. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 20(5), 490-505.
- Aminu, I., & Onimisi, T. (2014). Policy Implementation and The Challenges of Poverty Alleviation in Nigeria. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 3(4), 295.
- Anyang, N. P. (2001). *Governance and poverty reduction in Africa*: African Development Bank.
- Arogundade, K., Adebisi, S., & Ogunro, V. (2011). Poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria: A call for policy harmonisation. *European journal of Globalization and Development research*, 1(1), 42-52.
- Aryeetey, E., Devarajan, S., Kanbur, R., & Kasekende, L. (2012). *The Oxford companion to the economics of Africa*: Oxford University Press.
- Azam, M., & Emirullah, C. (2014). The role of governance in economic development: Evidence from some selected countries in Asia and the Pacific. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 41(12), 1265-1278.
- Baker, A. (2013). *Shaping the Developing World: The West, the South, and the Natural World: The West, the South, and the Natural World*: CQ Press.
- Bank, W. (1997). *World development report*. Retrieved from Washington: Bawole, J., Nyigmah, & Hossain, F. Marriage of the Unwilling? The Paradox of Local Government and NGO Relations in Ghana. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 1-23.

- Bezold, C., Juech, C., Michelson, E., & Lyakurwa, W. (2009). Prospects for economic governance: resilient pro-poor growth. *foresight*, 11(4), 66-81.
- Bolton, J. R. (2000). Should we take global governance seriously. *Chi. J. Int'l. L.*, 1, 205.
- Brownhill, L., Moturi, T., & Hickey, G. M. (2016). 9 Accountability and citizen participation in devolved agricultural policy-making. *Food Security, Gender and Resilience: Improving Smallholder and Subsistence Farming*, 140.
- Burkey, S. (1993). *People first: a guide to self-reliant participatory rural development*: Zed Books Ltd.
- Cain, G. (2016). Bad Governance in Zimbabwe and Its Negative Consequences. *The Downtown Review*, 2(1), 7.
- Caldés, N., Coady, D., & Maluccio, J. A. (2006). The cost of poverty alleviation transfer programs: a comparative analysis of three programs in Latin America. *World development*, 34(5), 818-837.
- Cerna, L. (2013). The Nature of Policy Change and Implementation: A Review of Different Theoretical Approaches: OECD/CERI paper.
- Chambers, R. (2002). *Relaxed and Participatory Appraisal: notes on practical approaches and methods for participants in PRA/PLA-related familiarisation workshops*: Participation Group, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.
- Craig, D., & Porter, D. (2006a). *Development beyond neoliberalism: Governance, poverty reduction and political economy*: Cambridge Univ Press.
- Craig, D., & Porter, D. (2006b). *Development beyond neoliberalism?: Governance, poverty reduction and political economy*: Cambridge Univ Press.
- Devas, N. (2012). *Urban governance voice and poverty in the developing world*: Routledge.
- Dingwerth, K., & Pattberg, P. (2006). Global governance as a perspective on world politics. *Global governance: a review of multilateralism and international organizations*, 12(2), 185-203.
- Domfeh, K., Ameyaw, Ahenkan, A., & Bawole, J., Nyigmah. (2012). Is sustainable development achievable in Ghana? An analysis of Ghana's development policy achievements and challenges. *International Journal of Environment and Sustainable Development*, 11(3), 304-317.
- Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (1999). *India: Economic development and social opportunity*. OUP Catalogue.
- Dugguh, S. I. (2014). Entrepreneurship and small business: Strategic approach to alleviating poverty and corruption in Nigeria. *Journal on Business Review (JBR)*, 3(1).

- Etwire, P. M., Dogbe, W., Wiredu, A. N., Martey, E., Etwire, E., Owusu, R. K., & Wahaga, E. (2013). Factors influencing farmer's participation in agricultural projects: the case of the agricultural value chain mentorship project in the Northern Region of Ghana. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 4(10), 36-43.
- Ferrer, J. N. (2002). *Revisioning transpersonal theory: A participatory vision of human spirituality*: Suny Press. Forae, O., & Benedict, A. O. (2011). An Appraisal of Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Nigeria. *JORIND*, 9(1), 296-304.
- Francis, P., & James, R. (2003). Balancing rural poverty reduction and citizen participation: The contradictions of Uganda's decentralization program. *World Development*, 31(2), 325-337.
- Frenk, J., & Moon, S. (2013). Governance challenges in global health. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 368(10), 936-942.
- Greig, A., Hulme, D., & Turner, M. (2007). *Challenging global inequality: development theory and practice in the 21st century*: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Grindle, M. (2011). Good enough governance revisited. *Development Policy Review*, 29(s1), s199-s221.
- Gul, S., Sajid, M., Afzal, F., Khan, M. B., & Mughal, S. (2012). Factors Influencing Foreign Direct Investment. *Economics & Finance Review*, 2(2).
- Hickey, S., & Mohan, G. (2004). 10 I Relocating participation within a radical politics of development: insights from political action and practice. *Participation--From Tyranny to Transformation?: Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development*, 159.
- Hickey, S., & Mohan, G. (2005). Relocating participation within a radical politics of development. *Development and change*, 36(2), 237-262.
- Hulme, D., & Shepherd, A. (2003). Conceptualizing chronic poverty. *World development*, 31(3), 403-423.
- Hwang, H., Malhotra, N. K., Kim, Y., Tomiuk, M. A., & Hong, S. (2010). A comparative study on parameter recovery of three approaches to structural equation modeling. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 47(4), 699-712.
- Idris, M., Nasiru, Rafee, M., M., & Johar, F. (2011). Drought and desertification management in arid and semi-arid zones of Northern Nigeria. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, 22(5), 595-611.
- Ighodalo, A. (2012). Poverty and Sustainable Socio-Economic Development in Africa: The Nigeria Experience. *European Scientific Journal*, 8(26).
- Ilemona, A., Akoji, O., & Matthew, A. (2014). Alleviating Poverty through the Use of Entrepreneurship Skill Acquisition in Kogi State, Nigeria. *Aceh International Journal of Social Science*, 2(1), 1 - 10.



- Irvin, R. A., & Stansbury, J. (2004). Citizen participation in decision making: is it worth the effort? *Public administration review*, 64(1), 55-65.
- Jami, A. A., & Walsh, P. R. (2014). The role of public participation in identifying stakeholder synergies in wind power project development: The case study of Ontario, Canada. *Renewable Energy*, 68, 194-202.
- Kalu, I. E., & James, O. N. E. (2012). Government expenditure and economic growth in Nigeria, 1980-2011. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 4(6).
- King, C. S., et al. (1998). The question of participation: Toward authentic public participation in public administration. *Public administration review*, 317-326.
- Lewis, J. (2008). *Children, changing families and welfare states*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Lusk, M. (2010). International social development and counter-development. *Journal of Comparative Social Welfare*, 26(2-3), 165-176.
- Lyakurwa, W. (2009). Prospects for economic governance: resilient pro-poor growth. *foresight*, 11(4), 66-81.
- Maiava, S. (1995). *People's self-development: Perspectives on participatory action research: A journey through experience*: Anisur Rahman, 234 pp., 1993, Zed Books, London, New Jersey, University Press Limited, Dhaka, £ 12.95 pbk, £ 32.95 hbk: Pergamon.
- Mandal, P. K., & Jirli, K. B. (2016). Role of Information and Communication Technologies in Rural Development. *Journal of Global Communication*, 9(conf), 147-151.
- McFerson, H. M. (2013). Poverty among women in Sub-Saharan Africa: A review of selected issues. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 11(4), 50-72.
- Mehmood, R., & Sadiq, S. (2010). The relationship between government expenditure and poverty: a cointegration analysis. *Romanian Journal of Fiscal Policy (RJFP)*, 1(1), 29-37.
- Moore, M. (2001). Political Underdevelopment: What causes 'bad governance'. *Public Management Review*, 3(3), 385-418.
- Murega, T. G. (2014). *Demand elasticities of mobile telecommunication services in Kenya*. University of Nairobi.
- Nielsen, e. a. (2008). Taxes and decision rights in multinationals. *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 10(2), 245-258.
- O'Toole, L. J. (2000). Research on policy implementation: Assessment and prospects. *Journal of public administration research and theory*, 10(2), 263-288.
- Oakley, P. (1991). *Projects with people: The practice of participation in rural development*: International Labour Organization.
- Obadan, M. I. (2001). Poverty reduction in Nigeria: The way forward. *CBN Economic and Financial Review*, 39(4), 159-188.

- Ogun, T. (2010). *Infrastructure and poverty reduction: implications for urban development in Nigeria*. Paper presented at the Urban Forum.
- Ogwumike, F. O. (2002). An appraisal of poverty reduction strategies in Nigeria. *CBN Economic and Financial Review*, 39(4), 1-17.
- Onyach-Olaa, M., & Porter, D. (2000). Local government performance and decentralisation in Uganda: Implications for central governments and donors. *Projet de document, photocopie*.
- Orji, J. I. (2005). *An Assessment of Impact of Poverty Reduction Programmes in Nigeria as a Development Strategy, 1970-2005*. Patel, S., & Mitlin, D. (2002). Sharing experiences and changing lives. *Community Development Journal*, 37(2), 125-136.
- Penderis, S. (2012). Theorizing participation: from tyranny to emancipation. *Journal of African & Asian Local Government Studies*, 1(3).
- Potts, M., Awuzie, B., McDermott, P., & Stephenson, A. (2015). Engendering Change within a Water Infrastructure Client Organisation: A Participatory Action Research Approach. *Journal of Engineering, Project, and Production Management*, 5(2), 71.
- Rahman, M. A. (1993). *People's self development*: Zed Books London.
- Ravallion, M. (2016). Toward better global poverty measures. *The Journal of Economic Inequality*, 14(2), 227-248.
- Roy Kartik, C., & Tisdell, C., Allan. (1998). Good governance in sustainable development: the impact of institutions. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 25(6/7/8), 1310-1325.
- Roy, M., Cawood, S., Hordijk, M., & Hulme, D. (2016). *Urban Poverty and Climate Change: Life in the Slums of Asia, Africa and Latin America*: Routledge.
- Scheingold, S. A. (2010). *The politics of rights: Lawyers, public policy, and political change*: University of Michigan Press.
- Schofield, J. (2001). Time for a revival? Public policy implementation: a review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *International journal of management reviews*, 3(3), 245-263.
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2014). *Research methodology for business*: New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Selebalo, Q. C. (2001). *Land Reform and Poverty Alleviation: Lesotho's experiences during the last two decades*. Paper presented at the Regional Conference for Land Reform and Poverty Alleviation in Southern Africa.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Freedom as development*: Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Siphuma, Z. R. (2009). *An assessment of the role of public participation in IDP: The Thulamela Municipality*. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

- Sobhan, R. (1998). How bad governance impedes poverty alleviation in Bangladesh. Thelma, M. N. (2015). Desertification in northern Nigeria: Causes and implications for national food security. Thomas, W. (2000). Governance, good governance and global governance: conceptual and actual challenges. *Third world quarterly*, 21(5), 795-814.
- Tschirhart, C., Mistry, J., Berardi, A., Bignante, E., Simpson, M., Haynes, L., . . . Robertson, B. (2016). Learning from one another: evaluating the impact of horizontal knowledge exchange for environmental management and governance. *Ecology and Society*, 21(2).
- Tupy, M. L. (2016). Trade liberalization and poverty reduction in sub-Saharan Africa. *Policy Analysis*, 557. UN. (1998). *UN Annual Report*. Retrieved from New York: