



Assessment of the Impact of National Poverty Eradication Programme on Rural Households in Kano State, Nigeria

Abdullahi M. Adamu¹, AminaAbubakar Isma'il²

^{1&2}Department of Economics, Bayero University, Kano-Nigeria

Abstract

This study assessed the impacts of National poverty Eradication programme (NAPEP) on rural households in Kano state, Nigeria. Cross sectional data was utilized for the study. Questionnaires were administered to 720 respondents selected based on multi stage sampling techniques on 12 selected rural local government areas. Descriptive statistics, logit model and ordered logit were employed to ascertain the impact of poverty alleviation on rural households in Kano state. The results indicate that: with regards to socioeconomic characteristics, majority of the respondents were male with most of them being married with mean age of 38.25years, with significant number of them formally educated to atleast secondary school level of education. Variables such as gender, age, level of education, occupation and dependents were important determinants of the programme awareness. Also, the variables age, level of education, unemployment and NAPEP awareness were important in determining the impact of the programme in the study area. The results also, show that politics, implementation, sectorial biased, and funding were the problems that hindered the success of the programme in Kano state. The results also indicate that provision of education; soft loans, social amenities and subsidy to agricultural inputs are important tools for fighting poverty in the study area. The study concludes that NAPEP has not impacted very much on rural poverty in the study area. The study therefore recommends among others that more awareness of the programme, sensitized politics should be improved in implementation of the programme and government should increase investment in education in order to curtail the menace of poverty in the study area and the country at large.

Keywords: NAPEP, Ordered logit/probit, Kano State

JEL Codes: E26, E27

Introduction

Despite the implementation of several ambitious programmes and projects which had been adopted in the past to check the increasing rate of poverty in Nigeria, most of these projects failed to achieve their

specified objectives and targets. The collapse of DFRRRI and Better Life for Rural Women among others, stand as unique examples. This is largely because many of the programmes were not well designed, formulated or implemented in a

co-ordinate manner (Kayode, 2012). Most of them relied solely on government subventions for their operations resulting in financial problems during periods of declined revenues and other bureaucratic delays. Dakye and Mundi (2013), affirmed that widespread corruption and mismanagement of the programme by the coordinators aggravate the level of poverty in the country. Furthermore, with the coming of Obasanjo's government, Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP) was established in 1999 in order to address the issue of poverty in the country. By 2001, National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) was established to replace PAP. Available evidence has shown that the programme has not been up to expectation. Some international poverty alleviation programmes have failed owing largely to inadequate finance particularly in the area of counterpart funding. Similarly, lack of commitment on the part of the executors of the various programmes has constituted a number of problems. Also, some aspect of public spending, even though concealed with good intention, have not been adequately targeted and judiciously directed at fighting poverty (Egware, 1997, Ogwuminke and Akinnibosum, 2013). Therefore, the paper seek to assessed the impact of National Poverty Eradication programmed on rural household in Kano State.

Literature Review

Shawulu, et al (2008) conducted a study on the appraisal of the impact of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in Jalingo Local Government Area of Taraba States Nigeria, with view to measure the success or failure of the programme since 1999 to date. They employed stratified and random sampling techniques, 100 respondents were selected from different scheme of NAPEP. A Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was also used to assess expert opinions on the

impact of the programme. Questionnaires were used to elucidate needed information from all groups of respondent. The simple percentages score and student t-test were used analysis. The results shows that most beneficiaries of the programme fall within the age bracket of 15-30 years, while 40.4% of the non-beneficiaries had no access to any formal education. Analysis of dependency ratio also shows that 32.1% of the non-beneficiaries had between 7-9 dependents while 42.5% of the benefiting respondents had between 4-6 dependents. A greater percentage (71.4%) attested to the fact that benefiting from programme has a political angle to it. The t-test result reveals that there is strong positive relationship between income of beneficiaries before and after enrollment in the programme. The research concludes that the programme needs to be re-designed in order to address some critical poverty issues.

Binta (2006) conducted a study to assess the performance of the NAPEP programme and its impact on alleviation of poverty, with a special focus on FCT, Abuja. Data were collected through NAPEP bulletins progress reports and questionnaires administered on the staff and beneficiaries of NAPEP programme in FCT Abuja. The study found out that the programme is bedeviled by some problems, which are militating against its success. These includes poor monitoring of the programme irregular payment of beneficiaries and training of officers, lack of commitment on the part of both participant and the organizers, non-involvement of Non-Government Organizations (NGO's) bureaucratic bottlenecks, among others. The study found out that in spite of the level of employment opportunities generated by NAPEP, it has not enhanced the level of productivity and economic wellbeing of the beneficiaries. The study, therefore, recommend that the National Poverty

Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in FCT, Abuja and Nigeria at large should be properly funded and this fund should be made available in good time. Also, government should involve the poor, who are the stakeholders from the planning to the implementing stages of the programmes among others.

Ntunde & Oteh (2011) conducted a study to evaluate the impact of Poverty Eradication Programmes in Nigeria. It tries to assess their effectiveness in helping to improve the lives of the poor. Primary data were collected from adult male and female residents in Enugu state. The analysis showed that most of the poverty reduction effort had no significant impact on the lives of the poor. Even those that were recorded effective had negligible impact on the populace to have reduced poverty. The study enumerates among others inadequate funding, mismanagement of resources and inadequate infrastructure as problems stifling most poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria. The study recommends in addition to establishing these poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria, should strive to move away from import dependent economy to an export oriented one. The study however lacks generality and inferential statistical techniques- thus limited in methodology and lacks generality.

Luka (2012) conducted a study to assess poverty eradication and youth empowerment with special focus on Bomo village. The study aims at finding the impact of NAPEP on Poverty Eradication and Youth Empowerment. Data was collected through interviews and questionnaire administered on the staff and inhabitants of Bomo village. The study found out that the programme was bedeviled by some problems which are militating against its success. This includes poor and inadequate funding of the programme, irregular payment of

beneficiaries, bureaucratic bottleneck, poor monitoring of the programme, high level of corruption, and lack of commitment on both the participant and the organizers of the programme. In addition, to all these problems, the study found out that NAPEP has made very little impact in Bomo Village thus insignificant to create change. However, the study lacks generality and limited in methodology.

Olayemi (2011) examined the impact of government poverty reduction programmes on the multidimensional poverty of rural Nigeria by using the 2006 core welfare indicator survey (CWIS) data. She employed fuzzy set approach to compute the multidimensional poverty index of rural Nigeria. She also used Tobit regression to examine the impact of poverty alleviation programmes on multidimensional poverty index of rural Nigeria. The result shows that the multidimensional poverty index for rural Nigeria is 0.3796 and also reflected that some development programmes had negative impact on multidimensional poverty index of rural Nigeria. The study recommended that provision of health centre or rehabilitation of the existing one is important in reducing multi-dimensional poverty of the rural dwellers among others.

Yakubu & Abbas (2012) conducted a study on National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) and Poverty Alleviation in Rural Nigeria. The study aims at analyzing the framework of NAPEP in order to ascertain the impact of the programme on the people of Giwa local government area of Kaduna state. Purposeful and simple random sampling technique was used to sample 220 respondents in the study area. Data was collected from the respondents using interview schedule and a total of 179 questionnaires were used for the analysis. The results revealed the failure of poverty

alleviation programmes with special reference to NAPEP in Giwa Local Government. Hence, they recommends that NAPEP as an agency of the government with sole aim of coordinating all poverty alleviation efforts in the country should work in harmony with other ministries and agencies that are stakeholders in the fight against poverty, provision of credit facilities and skills training should be one of the central focus in poverty eradication and government should adopt a holistic approach to poverty alleviation in the country.

Muhammed et al (2017) conducted study titled an assessment of poverty alleviation in Kaduna state which was intended to assess the impact, implementation and evaluating the effectiveness of NAPEP in relation to the policy and strategy formulation, coordination, monitoring, control, funding and utilization of human and material resources. The study utilized the survey research and questionnaire administered on 240 respondents interviewed primarily and secondary sources of data collected and analyzed. It was found that NAPEP has not alleviated the rate of poverty in Kaduna state and the reason adduced includes: underfunding of the programme, nonchalant attitude of political and public office holders, shortage of manpower and corruption which is a general phenomenon in Nigeria. Based on above findings the study recommends that NAPEP and other stakeholders should develop a multi-dimensional approach towards poverty alleviation programme, and efforts should be made by government to increase funding and fight corruption.

Tersoo (2013) conducted a study on Assessment of National Poverty Eradication Programme on Wealth creation in Benue State. The study used exploratory survey for the collection of data through structured questionnaire

administered on one hundred and nine (109) respondents selected from beneficiaries and key officials of NAPEP in six local government areas of Benue State. The study adopted descriptive statistics to analyze the data collected. The findings of the study suggest that the strategies employed by NAPEP have not made significant impact in improving the lives of beneficiaries in study area. The results also show that there were structural defects in implementation strategies adopted by NAPEP. The study, therefore, recommends that poverty reduction strategies should be constructively structured to effectively target the poor who are the actual beneficiaries among other things. This study however, is limited to one state and constraint in methodology employed which is not a robust one.

In their study on the impact of anti-poverty programme on development of rural areas of Nigeria, Dakyes & Mundi (2013) used a sample size of 500. The respondents were selected using systematic sampling technique. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The results showed that NAPEP has little positive impact on the well-being of the labour force due to alleged high rate of corruption among leaders and leakage of benefits to un-intended beneficiaries. In addition the results showed that poverty has serious setback on the development of the study area and by extension rural areas of Nigeria. However, the study is limited only to one local government in a state (Mungu Local Government, Plateau State). Therefore, it lacks generalization and methodology used was not a robust one.

Magnus & Sunday (2012) conducted a study on the role of infrastructure on poverty reduction in the rural areas of Edo state, Nigeria. The objective of their study was to identify the types of distribution

and impacts of those facilities on the lives of the people. Data used were obtained from the field survey through questionnaires interview and personal observation and also secondary sources including published and unpublished materials. The study emphasized the use of descriptive statistic which includes use of tables, proportions and percentages. The study revealed that few infrastructural facilities were located in the study area which was however not equitably distributed. The study also showed that these facilities had impacts in the lives of the people of the study area. .

Aliero *et al* (2012) carried out a study on the impact of IFAD poverty intervention programme on rural poverty reduction in Sokoto state. The study sourced data from primary source using questionnaire to collect a cross sectional data from area where IFAD intervention programmes were found in the study areas. The logit regression model was used to established the relationship between the likelihood of being poor and access to IFAD programme and projects and the various factors (predictor variables) affecting the household poverty status. The results indicate that educational attainment can reduce the prevalence of poverty and chances of being poor. The study further indicates that the relationship between gender and rural poverty is positively insignificant. This study is however limited in its scope because it is only concern with the local government in one state therefore, there is the need for further research/study in other states of the country.

Gap Identified From Literature

It is obvious while reviewing the literature there are some specific gaps that need to be filled or bridge in relation to this study. Most of the studies reviewed in the work concentrate on using descriptive statistics but this study employs both descriptive

and inferential statistics that is making the study more robust. Another gap identified is that most of the studies reviewed were conducted elsewhere; therefore, this study bridges the gap by conducting a study in Kano state. Also, most of the literatures were concerned with issue of poverty generally but this work gives more attention to rural poverty. Finally, the scope of the most studies reviewed shows narrow scope but this study used a wider scope.

Theoretical Framework

Most studies on poverty and its alleviation through increased output and enhanced income that existed in the past, have over the years been down played for more critical basic needs. This approach emerges based on the recommendation of World Employment Conference of international Labour organizations in 1976, which was further articulated and popularized by the World Bank. The basic needs were introduced because the World Bank argued that the only way to eliminate absolute poverty on a permanent basis is to increase the productivity of the poor.

There are two objectives of the basic need approach. The World Bank and other organizations realize the provision of basic goods and services as a precondition for increasing the productivity and income of the poor, enabling them to contribute more objectively to national development. Others argue that the objective is to ensure the access of the poor to bundles of essential goods and services for its own sake, (for the poor to live a meaningful life) and as basic human rights.

Basic needs may be interpreted in terms of minimum specified quantities of such things as food, clothing, shelter, water and sanitation necessary to prevent ill health, under nourishment etc. This interpretation is in line with neoclassical paradigm,

which assumes that consumers are better judges of their basic needs. Third interpretation believes that consumers are not rational economic agent; this suggests a more interventionist interpretation where public authorities decide not only the design of public services such as water supply, sanitation and education but also guide private consumption in the light of public consideration. The fourth interpretation emphasizes the non-economic, non-material aspects of human autonomy and embrace individual and group participation in the design, formulation and implementation of projects and in some case political mobilization. This interpretation emphasizes on basic human needs. It is imperative to distinguish between basic needs and basic human needs. Basic human needs in addition emphasize on participation and contains some political and non-economic goals and perception.

Methodology

The Study Area

Kano state is the Centre of Commerce, an economic nerve centre of northern Nigeria with most politically active and sophisticated peoples in the northern part of the country. Created along with eleven other states, Kano formally came to being on April 1, 1968. The state is arguably the most homogeneous in the Nigerian Federation with a population of over 12 million people (K-SEEDs, 2005). Kano state is located 12°37'N, 9°29'E, 9°33' and 7°43' W. It is bordered on the east by Jigawa state to the south by Kaduna state, to the west by Katsina.

The inhabitants of the state are mainly Hausa/Fulani while other tribe and ethnic groups are of minority. As a result, Kano is regarded as composition state life expectancy in Kano state is 51years for male and 52.2 years for females. The infant mortality rate is 110 per 1000, live

birth and maternal mortality rate, on the other hand, is 1700 per 100,000 (K-SEEDS, 2005).

Kano state has agriculture as its rural population activities, involving at least 75% of the rural population. Before the oil Boom of 1970s, Kano state was the main producer of groundnuts (producing at least 50% of the country's total output).

Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The sample size of this study is determined based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970). The appropriate sample size provided by Krejcie and Morgan (1970) is 384 sample size. However, for this study a total of 720 sample was utilized which is almost a double of the sample size as curtailed in the table of Krejcie and Morgan (1970). This is because of the estimation of response rate of 50% which was suggested by scholars and was equally used by many previous studies.

A sample of twelve (12) rural local governments out of the thirty six (36) rural local governments were selected, hence, the total of seven hundred and twenty sample questionnaires were evenly distributed.

In acquiring an appropriate sample size, a multi-stage random sampling technique was employed in order to maximize the benefit of random sampling method. The first stage involves a systematic random sampling of twelve (12) local government areas. Second stage is the random selection of six political wards from each of the twelve (12) local government areas selected making a total of seventy two (72) political wards. The last stage is the random selection of ten (10) households from each of the selected wards making a total of seven hundred and twenty (720) respondents.

Model Specification

In order to determine the impact of NAPEP programme on the rural household as poverty determinants in Kano state, the study employed the used of ordered logit and ordered probit model.

The reason for using these models is attributed to the nature of the dependent variable which is in form of category, in this case the dependent variable in Lakert scale therefore in category.

The model is expressed as: $Y_i^\alpha = X_i\beta + \mu_i$

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_5X_5 + \beta_6X_6 + \beta_7X_7 + \beta_9X_9 + \mu_i$$

$$NIA = \beta_0 + B_1GEN + B_2AGE + B_3MST + B_3HHH + B_6OCC + B_7DPD + \beta_8INC. + \beta_9NAPA$$

Where;

NIA is ordered dependent variables at it represent the NAPEP impact assessment on rural households.

NIA = 1 If a household is not satisfied about NAPEP 1

NIA = 2 if a household is satisfied with NAPEP

NIA = 3 if a household is neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

NIA = 4 if a household is highly dissatisfied

X_i represents the set of explanatory variables. While some are continuous include others categorical.

Gender = X_1 - Gender of respondent (1 male, 0 = otherwise)

Age = X_2 - Age of the respondent which was measured on interval scale since most people do not like to reveal their real age.

Marital Status = X_2 - Marital status of the respondents (1 = married 0 = otherwise)

Schooling = X_4 - Education of respondent Household had = X_5 - Head of household in term of financial responsibility.

Occupation = X_6 - Occupation of the respondent

Respondents = X_7 - Number of dependent of the respondents

Income threshold = X_8 - Income threshold of the respondents

NAPEP awareness = X_9 - if the respondents is aware of the NAPEP program

β_0 is the intercept parameter

μ_i is the random term which captured the impact of other variables not included in the model

For the ordered logit, μ_i is logistically distributed i.e. the error term in the model is assumed to have a logistic distribution. While for the ordered probit model, μ_i is standard and normally distributed.

That is, μ_i is assumed to follow both a normal and logistic distribution for the Oprobit and Ologit respectively.

Model 3

In attempts to find out the determinants of rural poverty as has been reviewed in literature found by many researchers such as Oni. *et al* (2008), Olorunsanya *et al* (2011), Yelwaet *et al* (2013), Sharif (2009), Igbalajobiet *et al* (2013), Olawuyi and Adetunji (2013) adopted the use of ordinary least square multiple regression model as well as logit and probit model to determine the factors responsible for rural poverty. However, this study employed the used of ordered logit and probit the models, since the dependent variable is ordered in form of category.

The model is specifying as follow:

$$Y = Y_i^\alpha = X_i\beta + \mu_i \dots\dots\dots 1$$

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_5X_5 + \beta_6X_6 + \beta_7X_7 + \beta_9X_9 + \mu_i \dots\dots\dots 2$$

The above can be expressed as;

$$SPV = \beta_0 + \beta_1AGE + \beta_2GEN + \beta_3MST + \beta_4HSZ + \beta_5SCH + \beta_6LOH + B_7OCP + B_8FEX + \beta_9LOW + B_9LIO + \beta_{10}DEP +$$

$$\beta_{11}FSZ + \beta_{12}TRA + \beta_{13}TRM + \beta_{14}SSEV + \beta_{15}HTN + \beta_{16}FME + e_i \dots \dots \dots 3$$

- Where
- AGE = X₁ – Age of respondents
 - GEN = X₂ – Gender of respondent
 - MST = X₃ – Marital status of respondent
 - HSZ = X₄ – Household size
 - SCH = X₅ – Education of respondent
 - LOH = X₆ – Loan history
 - OCP = X₇ – Occupation
 - FEX = X₈ – Food expenditure
 - LOW = X₉ – Land ownership
 - DEP = X₁₀ – number of dependents
 - FSZ = X₁₁ – Farm size
 - TRA = X₁₂ – Transport access
 - TRM = X₁₃ – Transport mode
 - SSEV = X₁₄ – Social services
 - HTN = X₁₅ – HOUSING TENURE
 - FME = X₁₆ – Farming experience

Results

OLogit and Oprobit of Impact of NAPEP Programme

The estimation was performed in two ways: first, where the respondents are aware of the program (NAPEP) and secondly, where the data is not restricted by whether the respondents are aware of the programme or not.

Case I: Where the respondents are aware of the programme.

In this the total number of observations are 297 respondents.

The estimated result of the ordered logit indicate that being an unemployed respondents increases the log odd of dissatisfaction with NAPEP programme higher by about 1.03 unit compared to a farmer. This revealed that if a respondent is unemployed is likely to be highly dissatisfied with NAPEP programme compared to farmer. In other words, the program has impact to those respondents

who were already in any employment like (farming). This shows that the NAPEP program has no impact on capacity building and unemployment.

Similarly the result of the marginal effect of occupation coefficient indicates that there is a negative and significant relationship between NAPEP overall impacts of rural poverty by about - 12.1% compared to that of employed respondents like farmer. This further revealed that, the probability of dissatisfaction with NAPEP Program of unemployed respondents is higher by about 12.1% compared to that of farmer. The finding, of this result shows that NAPEP programme has not impacted much on the poverty of the respondents, in the study area. This result is in line with works of Abbas (2016), Yakubu and Abbas (2014), Iwuoha and Obi (2012), which revealed that NAPEP programme has not impacted on the poverty of the rural populace.

Case II: where the model is estimated without considering whether the respondents is aware or not about the programme (NAPEP).

The variable (schooling) represents the education attainment of the respondents such as non-formal, primary, secondary, tertiary and none. Based on the result, the estimated coefficient indicate that a respondent that was able to obtain education up to primary school have lower log odd of being dissatisfying with the impact of NAPEP programme compared to non-formal education by about 0.75 units at 1% level of significant. This implies that if a respondent has obtained education up to primary school the chances of being satisfied with NAPEP programme in reducing poverty is minimum.

Table 4.6: Estimated Ologit and Oprobit on the Overall Impact Assessment of the NAPEP Programme

VARIABLE	(1) ologit1	(2) margins1	(3) ologit2	(4) margins2	(5) oprobit1	(6) Margins3	(7) oprobit2	(8) Margins4
Gender	-0.345 (0.337)	0.0502 (0.0492)	-0.0584 (0.202)	0.00886 (0.0307)	-0.185 (0.192)	0.0475 (0.0494)	-0.0306 (0.120)	0.00830 (0.0325)
Age	0.0139 (0.0126)	-0.00202 (0.00184)	0.0132* (0.00758)	-0.00200* (0.00115)	0.00846 (0.00732)	-0.00218 (0.00188)	0.00775* (0.00445)	-0.00210* (0.00121)
marital_status	-0.162 (0.264)	0.0236 (0.0384)	0.0804 (0.168)	-0.0122 (0.0255)	-0.103 (0.141)	0.0266 (0.0362)	0.0457 (0.0976)	-0.0124 (0.0265)
2.primary	-0.455 (0.469)	0.0659 (0.0701)	-0.749*** (0.273)	0.114** (0.0457)	-0.212 (0.266)	0.0542 (0.0685)	-0.401** (0.160)	0.110** (0.0469)
3.secondary	-0.287 (0.392)	0.0394 (0.0519)	-0.493** (0.224)	0.0694** (0.0316)	-0.161 (0.229)	0.0400 (0.0553)	-0.249* (0.132)	0.0644* (0.0341)
4.tertiary	-0.262 (0.410)	0.0358 (0.0539)	-0.599** (0.256)	0.0870** (0.0380)	-0.127 (0.237)	0.0312 (0.0567)	-0.329** (0.154)	0.0877** (0.0421)
5.none	0.201 (0.569)	-0.0235 (0.0648)	-0.180 (0.224)	0.0229 (0.0289)	0.180 (0.331)	-0.0379 (0.0675)	-0.0811 (0.129)	0.0194 (0.0311)
household_head	-0.0511 (0.523)	0.00743 (0.0761)	-0.137 (0.285)	0.0207 (0.0432)	-0.0747 (0.292)	0.0192 (0.0750)	-0.0597 (0.169)	0.0162 (0.0457)
2.civil servant	0.0365 (0.342)	-0.00586 (0.0551)	-0.188 (0.227)	0.0296 (0.0361)	-0.00313 (0.196)	0.000889 (0.0556)	-0.129 (0.137)	0.0365 (0.0393)
3.trader	0.297 (0.391)	-0.0441 (0.0574)	-0.237 (0.219)	0.0377 (0.0356)	0.237 (0.219)	-0.0609 (0.0554)	-0.121 (0.128)	0.0341 (0.0366)
4.others	-0.119 (0.637)	0.0199 (0.109)	-0.0730 (0.443)	0.0111 (0.0688)	-0.0527 (0.395)	0.0153 (0.116)	-0.0346 (0.261)	0.00948 (0.0722)
5.not employed	1.029** (0.463)	-0.121** (0.0535)	0.331 (0.244)	-0.0449 (0.0324)	0.640** (0.259)	-0.134** (0.0528)	0.222 (0.144)	-0.0545 (0.0345)
Dependents	0.00184 (0.0279)	-0.000267 (0.00407)	-0.0124 (0.0177)	0.00188 (0.00269)	0.000444 (0.0157)	-0.000114 (0.00404)	-0.00745 (0.0103)	0.00202 (0.00280)
income_threshold	-1.77e-06 (2.30e-06)	2.57e-07 (3.35e-07)	-3.61e-07 (1.87e-06)	5.47e-08 (2.83e-07)	-8.80e-07 (1.35e-06)	2.26e-07 (3.48e-07)	-1.00e-07 (1.11e-06)	2.72e-08 (3.01e-07)
o.napep_awareness	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
napep_awareness			-0.541*** (0.161)	0.0820*** (0.0242)			-0.275*** (0.0953)	0.0746*** (0.0257)
Constant cut1	-1.629** (0.732)		-1.824*** (0.427)		-0.970** (0.421)		-0.990*** (0.251)	
Constant cut2	0.158 (0.727)		-0.752* (0.423)		0.112 (0.419)		-0.357 (0.250)	
Constant cut3	1.693** (0.734)		0.474 (0.420)		1.028** (0.420)		0.384 (0.248)	
Constant cut4	3.097*** (0.769)		1.702*** (0.426)		1.762*** (0.432)		1.089*** (0.250)	
Observations	297	297	684	684	297	297	684	684

Note Standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Author's estimates usingstata 13.0 (2017).

Similarly, the result further shows that respondents with level of education up to secondary school have lower log odd of being dissatisfied with NAPEP programme by about 0.49 units compared to those respondent in the category of primary education at 5% level of significant. This implies that if respondents attended school up to secondary level the satisfaction of NAPEP programme is lower when compare with those who attended primary school only. Also, the results further revealed that a respondent with education up to tertiary level has a lower log odd of being dissatisfied with NAPEP programme by about 0.59 units compare to those respondents who possess secondary education at 5% significant level. This shows that those who secured education up to tertiary level have higher chance of getting employment than those in the other categories of education, therefore, are not easily stricken by poverty. This further shows that the level of education obtained by respondents is inversely related to the impact of NAPEP programme on rural poverty in the study area.

The result of the estimate of marginal effect of this variable (education) is found to be statistically significant at 5% level for categories of this variable. The discrete effect of education indicates that a respondent who attended school level up to primary has higher probability of being impacted by NAPEP programme by about 11.4% when compared to those respondents who are in category of non-formal education. Similarly, the marginal effect of respondents with secondary education has lower probability of being dissatisfied with NAPEP programme by about 6.9% when compared with those respondents with non-formal education. Likewise, the marginal effect of respondents with tertiary education has a higher probability of being dissatisfied with NAPEP programme by about 8.7%

when compared with the respondents with secondary education. This shows that the higher the level of education the lower the impact of NAPEP programme, this is attributed to the important role education play in fighting poverty. This finding is in line with study of Adama and Kenneth (2015).

On NAPEP awareness, the estimate coefficient of this variable indicates that the respondents that are aware of NAPEP have lower log odd of being dissatisfied with impact of the program by about 0.54 units compare to otherwise. This implies that even if a respondent was aware of NAPEP, the impact of the programme is minimal. This further shows that, the programme has failed to address the menace of poverty in the study area and indicates the failure of NAPEP programme in achieving its function of eradicating poverty. This study corroborate with work of Abbas (2016), Iwuoha and Obi (2012), Yakubu and Abbas (2014) which revealed that NAPEP program has not impacted on the poverty of the rural populace.

The estimated of the discrete effect of this variable indicates that the respondents that were able to be aware of the NAPEP programme have lower probability of being impacted by about 8.2% compared to otherwise. This further indicates that being aware of the NAPEP programme does not implied increasing the probability of the impact of the programme on the rural poverty in the study area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Poverty has always been a major socioeconomic problem in many societies. This study investigated the determinant of rural poverty in Kano state and the role of NAPEP in combating this socioeconomic menace. Moreover the study identified the socioeconomic characteristics of rural households in Kano state, which may directly or indirectly impact on their living

standard. From the analysis of results the study concluded that, most of the rural poor are not even aware of NAPEP program for the simple reason that the program does not benefit them in a known way. By extension therefore, the programme does not significantly improve their living conditions.

It is also concluded that politization of NAPEP, ineffective implementation and poor funding are the major reasons for its poor performance. Moreover the impact NAPEP manifests mostly in male civil servants who have attained a considerable level of education at young age. Additionally, the study concluded that default on loan; unemployment and poor access to transportation facilities exacerbate the level of poverty in the rural areas of Kano state. However, provision of jobs, goods transportation facilities particularly roads and reviewing the land ownership system in the areas would help in reducing the level of poverty in the areas, particularly that most of the dwellers are farmers.

Given the findings of this study, the following recommendations can be suggested:

1. Since majority of the respondents were not aware of the programme concerned stakeholders should amplify the awareness campaign on the program through radio, pictures and drama using the local language.
2. Both the male and female genders should be involved in the decision making process on the programme policy formulation.
3. The government and private organizations as wells as NGOs should increase their efforts of access to free education to both males and females in order to increase the programme awareness.
4. The government should increase investment in the programme and follow it up with a stringent supervision and monitoring to ensure its effectiveness.
5. The program should extend to creating good road networks for cars, tricycle and motorcycle loans should be made available to the rural dwellers in order to reduce their poverty.

Therefore, implementation of the above mentioned recommendations will undoubtedly go a long way in improving the standard of living of the rural populace and consequently reduce the incidence of poverty to a very low level in Kano State, Nigeria.

References

- Aliero, H. M. et'al (2012) Impact of IFAD Poverty Intervention Programme on Rural Poverty Reduction in Selected LGAs of Sokoto. JORIND 10(2) June.
- Binta, F.M. (2006) Assessment of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP). A Case of FCT. Abuja (1999-2004). Unpublished MPA Thesis Submitted to the Department of Public Administration. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria.
- Kayode, S. K. (2012) "Do Microenterprises reduce poverty in Rural Nigeria?" Journal of Agricultural and Bioloogical science vol.7, No.6 June, 2012.(PP 421-429).
- Magnus, O. O. and Sunday, O. A. (2012)The Role of Public Infrastructure in Poverty Reduction in the Rural Areas of Edo State, Nigeria. Journal of Research on Humanities and Social Science vol. 2, No.7 pp. 109-120.
- Dakyes, S.P. and Mundi, R. (2013) Impact of antipoverty programme on Development of Rural areas of Nigeria. Ethiopian Journal of Environmental studies and management Vol 6 No.1, 2013.

- Luka, P. (2012) Poverty Alleviation Programme and Youth Empowerment in Nigeria: A Case of National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP in Borno Village of Sabon Gari Local Government Area Kaduna State 2004-2009. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis Submitted to Department of Political Science, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria.
- Ogwumike, F.O. and Akinnibosun (2013) Determinants of poverty among farming households in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of social sciences* Vol 4 No.2 published by MCSER-CEMAS Sapienza university of Rome
- Olayemi, T.O. (2011) Impact of Poverty Reduction Programs on Multidimensional Poverty in Rural Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* vol.13,No.6pp 1-11.
- Muhammad I. A. et al (2017) Assessment of Poverty Alleviation Programme in Nigeria; A Case Study of Kaduna State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Science, Technology and Management* Vol. No. 6, Issue No. 2 February, 2017.
- Ntunde, F.O and Oteh, C.O. (2011) Theory Stock of Poverty Reduction Efforts in Nigeria. *Canadian Social Science* Vol. 7, No. 6, pp. 96-102.
- Egware, L. (1997) Poverty and Poverty Alleviation: Nigerians Experience in poverty alleviation, NES Conference, 1997.
- Shawulu, H.M. et al (2008) Appraisal of the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in Jalingo Local Government Area, Taraba State, Nigeria. *The Social Sciences (Madwell Journals)*, Vol. 3. No.4:pp 291-296
- Yakubu, R. and Abbas I.M. (2012) National Poverty Eradication and Poverty Alleviation in Rural Nigeria. A Case of Giwa Local Government Area of Kaduna State. *European Scientific Journal* Vol. 8, No. 18.
- K-SEEDS (2005) Policy framework and project implementation. Published by Kano state government.