

## **ERADICATING OR AGGRAVATING POVERTY? AN EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL POVERTY ERADICATION PROGRAMME (NAPEP) IN ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA, 2001-2007**

**Victor Chidubem Iwuoha**

Department of Political Science,  
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

**Kelechukwu Charles Obi**

Department of Political Science,  
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

### **Abstract**

In Nigeria, people are no longer suffering and smiling, as Fela sang, but, suffering and dying. Hence, the growing incidences of poverty and concomitant problems in Nigeria are, indeed, critical issues of concern and contention. The bulk of the matter hinges upon finding apt solutions and strategies to open up and unburden human beings from abject poverty. Thus, numerous ways are sought, to rapidly and timely enhance human capacity. The National Poverty Alleviation Programme (NAPEP) is yet another effort, by the Federal Government, in this direction. Accordingly, NAPEP has had its generous footage in Enugu State of Nigeria, in the course of its confident voyage across the country. This paper is, therefore, a genuine effort to evaluate the implementation of NAPEP programmes in Enugu State and its overall outcome and impact on human capacity enhancement. The descriptive survey method of data collection is adopted. In this way, we obtained our primary data through the distribution of questionnaire, which was designed for selected beneficiaries of NAPEP programmes in the three major zones in Enugu State. In addition, our method of data analysis was based on the use of simple frequency and percentages. We argue, principally, that the implementation of NAPEP programmes, including the Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES), has not tangibly reflected upon high feasibility of human capacity enhancement in Enugu State. We conclude that there is urgent need for different levels of governments in Nigeria to exhibit more political will and commitment in the fight against poverty and its attendant problems in the country.

**Keywords: Poverty, NAPEP, Human Capacity Enhancement, Youth Empowerment Scheme, Social Welfare.**

### **Introduction**

Over several decades, poverty and its associated problems has remained one of the most defining as well as enduring features of most African states, especially Nigeria. Thus, according to UNDP Human Development Report in Nigeria (2003), the poverty incidence in the country is more preponderant as it remains unabated in rural areas, where poverty alleviation supportive programmes are in short supply and most times non-existent. Besides, and considering the abundant natural resources that Nigeria is blessed with, the ugly poverty situation in the country

has in the recent times, become more worrisome. Furthermore, this has in turn, presented Nigeria as a contradictory state (Ikejiani-Clark and Ezech, 2008; Nwanolue and Iwuoha, 2012). In a bid to redress the foregoing poverty situation, successive Nigerian governments (colonial, civilian and military) had indeed, initiated and executed a number of poverty alleviation programmes, of which among the latest is the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP). As a member of the United Nations and a signatory to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), Nigeria is a part of the world league of poverty-fighters through capacity building, capacity acquisition and enhancement. NAPEP was therefore established in 2001 in exhibition of the country's commitment and zeal towards poverty reduction by Obasanjo civilian administration.

In addition, in recognition of several factors which had crippled the past policy efforts at poverty alleviation in Nigeria such as inadequate involvement of stakeholders, poor management and implementation arrangements among others, NAPEP was equally created and made to incorporate all the stakeholders namely, the federal, state, local government, civil society research institutions, organized private sectors and concerned individuals (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007). The overall objectives of the programme were to eradicate extreme poverty in Nigeria through monitoring and coordination of all poverty eradication efforts. Furthermore, these tasks were to be actualized through the established National Poverty Eradication Council (NAPEC) (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007).

There is a wide range of NAPEP programmes proposed in the blue print to be implemented in Enugu state, especially several components of the Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES), which is aimed at providing job training opportunities to graduates and school leavers. There are also the mandatory attachment programme and the capacity acquisition programme (Francis and Nweze, 2003). The capacity acquisition programme was meant for holders of First-Leaving Certificate and Secondary School leavers. Participants were trained for three months in trades such as tailoring, plumbing or hairdressing, receiving a monthly stipend of ₦3,500, after which they were settled with employment and offered trade equipment at the subsidized price. Furthermore, the mandatory attachment programme was for unemployed graduates of universities and polytechnics, and holders of the Nigerian certificate of education (NCE). Trainees were attached to employers for two years in order to acquire relevant job skills. Participants were equally to receive a monthly stipend of ₦10, 000 for the duration of their attachment (Francis and Nweze, 2003). The DFID Report (2008:16) indicates that Enugu state is the second poorest of the five states of South-Eastern Nigeria. This study therefore, is principally aimed at evaluation of the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in Enugu State, 2001-2007.

Therefore, this paper is poised to evaluate the implementation of NAPEP programmes in Enugu State and its contributions to human capacity enhancement.

### **Conceptual and Theoretical Issues on Poverty**

There is no universally accepted definition of poverty. At same time, there is always the difficulty in deciding where to draw the line between the 'poor' and 'non-poor'. According to World Bank Report (2002), poverty is the inability to obtain a minimum standard of living. The report constructed some indices based on a minimum level of consumption in order to show the practical aspect of poverty. These include, lack of access to resources, lack of shelter, poor access to water and sanitation, vulnerability to shocks, violence and crime, political discrimination and marginalization. Similarly, the United Nations Human Development (UNHD, 2002) has introduced the use of such other indices such as life expectancy, infant mortality rate, primary school enrolment ratio and number of persons per physician to measure poverty in a country. Aluko (1993) refers to poverty as a lack of command over basic consumption needs.

There is an inadequate level of consumption such as rise to insufficient food, clothing and shelter. He further notes that the conventional notion depicts poverty as a condition in which people are below a specific minimum income level and are unable to provide or satisfy the basic necessities of life needed for an acceptable standard of living. This explanation however has, failed to provide the graphic picture of those who are poor, how to change their conditions and what to do. Providing more insight, Shaffer (2001), avers that the concept poverty, has undergone four changes over the past decade. First, there has been a shift from a physiological model of deprivation to a social model of deprivation. The social model is about incorporating issues of political and economic rights and social justice into the anti-poverty programmatic framework. Second, there has been renewed emphasis placed on the concept of vulnerability and its relationship to poverty. Fourth, the idea that poverty should be conceptualized as the violation of basic human rights has been painstakingly argued by UN system agencies.

In his analysis, Hettne (2002) classified poverty into five types. First, absolute poverty that occurs when human beings live in a state of deprivation due to meager income or lack of access to basic human needs which include food, safe water, sanitation, health, shelter, education and information. Second, relative poverty that defines poverty from a comparative point of view (i.e. poverty is not absolute but relative). Relative refers to the position of household or individual compared. It is measured in three ways: through the low income family statistics, through income and through disposable income. Third, chronic/structural means that poverty is persistent or long term. Its cases are more permanent and depend on a host of factors such as limited productive resources, lack of skill for gainful employment, vocational disadvantage or endemic socio-political and cultural factors. Fourth, conjectural transitory which means poverty is temporary or short-term and cause mainly by factors such as natural or man-made disasters – wars and environmental degradation or structural changes induced by policy reforms which result in loss of employment, loss in value of real income assets, etc. Fifth, spatial/location that means depending on geographical or regional spread and incidence. It involves urban squalor/poverty typified by the existence of ghettos slums and charities in metropolitan cities and characterized by environmental degradation, inadequate welfare services and social deprivations, low per capita income, over-crowded accommodation, engagement in informal business, rural poverty characterized by poor conditions of living. Indeed, the UNDP had summarized these conceptions of poverty and described the extent of poverty around the world as pervasive. Today, more than one billion people – one person in five live in abject poverty (The Human Development Magazine, March 2003).

Obviously, poverty is a state where an individual is neither able to cater adequately for his/her basic needs of food, clothing and shelter, nor meet social and economic obligations as a result of lack of gainful employment, skills, assets and self-esteem (Adebayo et al, 2006:8). In other words, poverty implies an observable disadvantage in relation to the local community or the wider society or nation to which a deprived individual, family, household or group belongs. In recent times, scholars have pointed out that there are reinforcing vicious circles that sustain and keep families, regions and countries poor and unable to contribute to national growth (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007). In Nigeria, poverty has been on the increase; the situation has worsened since the late 1990s and can best be described as ‘inflammable’ (Ukpere and Ugoh, 2009).

To be sure, the incidence of poverty in Nigeria shows that rural areas are the most affected (UNDP, 2003). Several reasons account for this; the large concentration of the populace in the rural areas, many years of neglect of the rural areas in terms of infrastructural development, and lack of adequate information on poverty alleviation programmes of the government. The CBN/World Bank (1999) study on poverty assessment and alleviation in

Nigeria, attested to the fact that the living and environmental conditions of those living in the rural areas have worsened. Urban poverty is also on the increase in the country. This has been attributed to the under provision of facilities and amenities which are inadequate to match the growing demand of the urban populace as well as the rural-urban migration that has caused serious pressure on the existing infrastructural facilities (Oyesanmi et al, 2008). Aware of the grave consequences of poverty and prior to the establishment of NAPEP by Obasanjo civilian regime in 2001, various governments (civilian and military) had made noticeable efforts towards poverty alleviation through skills acquisition, micro-credit and capacity enhancement. The Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) in 1976, and later, the Green Revolution (GR) in 1980, were principally aimed at making Nigeria a self-sufficient state in terms of food and agriculture. In the 1980s, some farmers and allied product dealers were encouraged by granting them soft loans and agricultural implements to enable them increase their production and productivity. Again, the establishment of the People's Bank of Nigeria (PBN), Community Development Bank (CDB), Nigerian Agricultural, Co-operative and Rural Development Bank, Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP), among others, was all governments' policy efforts aimed at poverty reduction and capacity enhancement (Obi and Iwuoha, 2009). More still, these agencies encouraged individuals and cooperative societies by granting them micro-credit loans in tandem with the government staunch belief that micro credit was one of the most important economic tools and very vital in economic development. (UNDP, 1997).

As a result of failure of the foregoing economic policy framework to significantly reduce the poverty index in Nigeria, and in compliance with the MDGs directives, the Obasanjo civilian regime established NAPEP in 2001. NAPEP was to involve all stakeholders in poverty eradication in Nigeria namely the federal, state and local governments, civil society organizations, research institutions, the organized private sector, women groups, and concerned individuals (Okoye and Onyeukwu, 2007). Besides, the stakeholders recognized that certain fundamental reasons were responsible for the inadequacy of anti-poverty measures over years; these include the absence of a policy framework, inadequate involvement of stakeholders, poor implementation arrangements and lack of proper coordination (Okoye and Onyeukwu, 2007). All of these seem to have received attention in designing NAPEP and to make it different from all past efforts. As a federal government sponsored project, NAPEP was to be subsequently launched in various states of the federation including Enugu State. As a result, Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES) that aimed at capacity enhancement through provision of job training opportunities to graduates and school leavers was implemented in Enugu State amidst other numerous programmes of the NAPEP (Francis and Nweze, 2003). Though the scheme, had been establishment in 2001, it recorded various degrees of achievements in training the unemployed, the growing incidence of poverty in Nigeria including especially Enugu State, where the recent report (NBS, 2007) indicates 31.12% increase has generated a quantum debate among scholars concerning the effectiveness of NAPEP as a scheme for poverty eradication through capacity enhancement.

### **Aims and Objectives of NAPEP**

As earlier noted, the rationale behind the conception and eventual establishment of the NAPEP stemmed from the failures of the successive colonial and post-colonial poverty alleviation programmes to achieve the set targets. The NAPEP was therefore, established in 2001, by the Obasanjo civilian Administration, as a corrective likewise alternative poverty alleviation programme, which was aimed essentially at enhancing the living conditions of the Nigerian populace, including especially the poor and unemployed as could be seen in both the urban and rural areas in Nigeria. Furthermore, NAPEP was equally aimed at addressing the

aspects of absolute poverty in the country and to eradicate them. The stakeholders recognized that certain fundamental reasons were responsible for the inadequacy of anti-poverty measures over the years, which include inadequate involvement of stakeholders, poor management and implementation arrangements and lack of proper coordination. All these seemed to have received attention in designing NAPEP and to make it different from all past efforts. The mandate is to monitor and coordinate all poverty eradication efforts in order to harmonize and ensure better delivery, maximum impact and effective utilization of available resources (Okoye and Onyukwu 2007). In order to ensure effective poverty eradication, the government arranged NAPEP into four schemes. These are:

- (a) **Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES)** – This deals with capacity acquisition, mandatory attachment, productivity improvement, credit delivery, technology development and enterprise promotion.
- (b) **Rural Infrastructure Development Scheme (RDS)** – This equally has to do with the provision of portable and irrigation water, transport (rural and urban), rural energy and power supply.
- (c) **Social Welfare Services Scheme (SOWESS)** – This deals with intervention in special education, primary health care services, establishment and maintenance of recreational centers, public awareness facilities, youth and student hostels, development, environmental protection facilities, food security, provision of agricultural input, provision of micro and macro credits delivery, rural telecommunication facilities, provision of mass transit and maintenance culture.
- (d) **National Resources Development and Conservation Scheme (NRDCS)** – This deals with the harnessing of agriculture, water, solid minerals resources, conservation of land and space particularly for the convenient and effective utilization by small scale operators and the immediate community (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007:28).

Apart from the above, NAPEP also has an organizational structure. At the top of the scheme is the National Poverty Eradication Council (NAPEC). It coordinates all poverty reduction related activities and also ensures that the activities involved are centrally planned and coordinated in ways that make them complement one another. In terms of institutional structure, NAPEP data and information flow upwards from the local government level to the state coordinating committees and up to national coordination committee. In essence, information flow is from the bottom-up, with each subsequent level reviewing, refining and standardizing data as well as completing assessment reports. NAPEP performs two major functions. It plays the role of monitoring and that of evaluation. In terms of monitoring, it monitors all the relevant initiatives periodically to confirm project location, project implementation, project delivery, functionality of facilities provided, assess impacts on livelihood of communities, and ensure equitable distribution and review of the actual poverty status or situation of the communities in Nigeria. Indices of monitoring are evaluated from broad performance blocks such as quality, project objective and target achievement, scheduled completion and financial prudence (Okoye and Onyukwu, 2007; Nwanolue and Iwuoha, 2012).

More still, despite the activities of the NAPEP, there are yet in existence, several poverty alleviation and national development programmes both at the national, state and local government levels. For instance the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), which was later to be established as a fellow-up to the NAPEP is aimed at poverty reduction through public sector reforms, privatization, liberalization, governance, transparency and anti-corruption, service delivery, budget expenditure reforms. In addition, it was equally aimed at provision of health facilities, education, environmental transformation, housing development, safety nets gender and geo-political balance and pension reform (NEEDS Document, 2006). The United Nations (UN) equally, has its rural assisted development

programmes scattered all over the country. Furthermore, most states of the federation have established one form of directorate for rural development or other rural-based projects such as the Rivers State “School-To-Land” programme, “Integrated Rural Development” of Bauchi State, the “Imo Initiative of Imo State and Taraba State “Human Development Policy (Okitikpi, 2006).

### **Establishment of NAPEP in Enugu State**

Enugu state has been the administrative capital of the Eastern Region since before independence. However, the boundaries of Enugu state were established in their present form in 1996 following the creation of the state. It lies in the West African tropical rain forest region between latitudes  $5^{\circ}55'$  and  $7^{\circ}10'$  North and longitudes  $6^{\circ}50'$  and  $7^{\circ}10'$  East. It is bounded in the east by Ebonyi and Abia states, in the west by Anambra state, in the north Kogi and Benue states and in the South by Ebonyi state (Ukwu et al, 1998). The population was 3.1 million in 1991, and was 3.2 million in 2006. Furthermore, with a surface area of 7,756 square kilometers, Enugu state has a population density of 273 persons per square kilometer (NBS, 2008). In addition, the state has seventeen local government areas. The three local government areas of Enugu Municipality (Enugu South, Enugu North and Enugu East) together account for 22 percent of the population, and Nsukka, a rapidly growing university town, a further 10 percent of total population (Enugu State Document, 1999). Apart from these conurbations, the other 13 local government areas, home to two-thirds of the population, are mainly rural, though their population densities vary widely between 61 people per square kilometer for Uzo-Uwani in the west of the state and 930 people per square kilometre in the case of Igbo-Eze in the north. Small scale agriculture remains the main economic activity for most of the population (Enugu State Document, 1999).

Furthermore, ethnically speaking, the majority of the inhabitants of Enugu state are Northern Igbo, though both in-and out – migration are substantial. The traditional society organization in the state conforms to the typical Igbo segmentary structure. Igbo society has been characterized as open, with authority and leadership going to those who achieved economic success (DFID, 2003). However, as Ukwu et al (1998) point out, in the emerging economic class structure, patron-client relationships between the elite and their poor relations have to some extent eroded the segmentary principle of equivalence. As such, despite the huge potentials available to Enugu state for tackling poverty in the state and enhance the living conditions of the growing number of her poor people, the state, as it could be obtained in some other states of the Nigerian federation has largely remained undeveloped, with endemic poverty taken its toll on the generality of the populace. This indeed, becomes more worrisome when the activities of the numerous poverty alleviation programmes (both past and present) in the state are taken into consideration. But, suffice the foregoing to say that the inception of democratic governance in 1999 in the country, among other things, brought to the fore, the need for more assertive effort towards poverty alleviation in Nigeria including especially Enugu State. This could be substantiated when the mandate given to NAPEP as contained in its blueprint is taken into consideration. Thus, according to NAPEP’s blueprint:

...provides strategies for the eradication of absolute poverty in Nigeria, through the streamlining and rationalization of existing poverty alleviation institutions and coordinate implementation and monitoring of relevant schemes and programmes at all levels of government (NAPEP, 2001:3)

Arising from this mandate, the National Poverty Eradication Council (NAPEC) was established by the Federal Executive Council in January 2001 in order to:

Coordinate the poverty reduction related activities of all the relevant Ministries, Parastatals and agencies. NAPEP is mandated to ensure that the wide range of activities are centrally planned, coordinated and complemented one another so that the objectives of policy continuity and sustainability are achieved (NAPEP, 2001:5).

Against this background, and as a federal government sponsored poverty alleviation programme, NAPEP was to be subsequently launched and established in various states of Nigeria, including Enugu State. Of the wide range of NAPEP programmes proposed in their blueprint, the only activities being implemented in Enugu state are several components of the Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES), which aim to provide job training opportunities to graduates and school leavers. These are the Mandatory Attachment Programme and the Capacity Acquisition Programme (DFID, 2003:27). Others include:

- **The Mandatory Attachment Programme (MAP)** – This is for the unemployed graduates of Universities and Polytechnic, and holders of the Nigerian Certificate of Education (NCE). Trainees are attached to employers for two years in order to acquire relevant job skills. Participants are supposed to receive a monthly stipend of ₦10, 000 naira for the duration of their attachment.

- **The Capacity Acquisition Programme (CAP)** – targets holders of First School-leaving Certificates and Secondary School leavers. Participants are trained for three months in trades such as tailoring, carpentry, plumbing or hairdressing, receiving a monthly stipend of 3,500 naira, after which they are settled in employment and offered trade equipment at a subsidized price (DFID, 2003:27). Furthermore, at the state level, there are in existence, various poverty alleviation initiatives aimed at liberating the people from the morass of poverty. Indeed, poverty and its alleviation had remained an issue of serious concern to the former governor of the state, Dr. Chimaroke Nnamani. This could be observed in his speech during the events that marked the 2003 International Day for the Eradication of Poverty (IDEP) in October 17, 2003. Thus, according to him:

In recent times, the incidences of poverty, as well as the process of deprivation, some of which arose from intermittent failure of economic programmes or deviation from development policies made it imperative to take more than a causal interest in the affairs of such fellow citizens who, not by an shortcoming in their individual creation but a loophole in the system, lack in what it takes to be happy members of the society (see ebenano@ebeano.org, for details).

Consequent upon this, the main state-level programme with a particular focus on poverty was established. This is Community Development Coordinating Council (CDCC). As such, a Permanent Secretary (Special Duties) was appointed in the office of the Secretary to the State Government (SSG) to coordinate state poverty programmes, and to liaise with federal initiatives. In addition, the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), that was later to be established in 2004, has its state version in all the states of the federation including Enugu State. This is in addition to the World Bank sponsored poverty alleviation project in the state, the Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP).

### **NAPEP Programmes and Contribution to Human Capacity Enhancement in Enugu State Data Relevant to the Hypothesis**

In our investigation on whether the implementation of NAPEP programmes in Enugu state has actually contributed to human capacity enhancement, we administered questionnaires to the beneficiaries of the programmes. To this end, ninety two (92) questionnaires were distributed

to both male and female beneficiaries, but only eighty (80) copies were returned. These were analyzed appropriately.

## SECTION A

### PERSONAL DATA

**Table 1: Distribution on Sex**

Options	Frequency	Percentages
Male	50	62.5
Female	30	37.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012

(Frequency represents respondents all through the tables).

Fifty (50) respondents representing 62.5% were male, while 30 respondents making 37.5% of the respondents were female. The next table shows the educational qualification of the respondents.

**Table 2: Distribution on Educational Qualification**

Options	Frequency	Percentages
Primary	0	0
Secondary	20	25
OND/NCE	30	37.5
HND/B.Sc	20	25
Masters	10	12.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012.

Table 2 above shows that none of the respondents had below secondary school certificate. 20 respondents representing 25% were secondary school leavers. 30 representing 37.5% had their OND or NCE certificate, 20 representing 25% had B.Sc. or HND certificate, while only 12.5% made up of 10 respondents had their masters' degree.

## SECTION B

### Data Relevant to the Hypothesis

**Hypothesis 1:** Does implementation of NAPEP programme in Enugu state contribute to human capacity enhancement?

**Question 1:** Are you aware of NAPEP and its programme in Enugu state?

**Table 3: Distribution on the Response**

S/N	Options	Frequency	Percentages
1	Yes	80	100
2	No	0	0
3	Undecided	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012

Table 3 above shows that 100% that represents 80 respondents indicated being aware of the existence of the NAPEP and its programmes in their various zones in Enugu state. However, none of the respondents indicated otherwise nor remained undecided. This shows that NAPEP and its programmes are in existence in Enugu state and its environs.

**Question 2:** If your answer in question (1) is 'Yes', are you a beneficiary of the programmes?

**Table 4: Distribution on the Response**

S/N	Options	Frequency	Percentages
1	Yes	70	87.5
2	No	0	0
3	Undecided	10	12.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012

In table 4 above, 87.5% representing 70 respondents indicated that they were beneficiaries for the NAPEP's programmes in the state, while no respondent indicated otherwise. However, 12.5% representing 10 respondents remained undecided. This shows that people from different zones in Enugu State benefited from NAPEP and its programmes.

**Question 3:** Which of the programmes of the NAPEP did you benefit from?

**Table 5: Distribution on the Response**

S/N	Options	Frequency	Percentages
1	MAP	40	50
2	CAP	30	37.5
3	Undecided	10	12.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012

Table 5 above shows that 50% representing 40 respondents indicated that they were trained in MAP, while 37.5% representing 30 respondents indicated that they were trained in CAP. However, 12.5% representing 10 respondents remained undecided. This shows that beneficiaries of NAPEP in various zones in Enugu state were trained in different programmes.

**Question 4:** How often did you receive your monthly stipend and supportive equipments?

**Table 6: Distribution on the Response**

S/N	Options	Frequency	Percentages
1	Very often	22	34.1
2	Not often	56	63.6
3	Undecided	2	2.3
	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012

Table 6 above shows that 34.1% representing 22 respondents indicated that their monthly stipends and supportive equipments were very often supplied, while 63.6% representing 56 respondents indicated otherwise. 2.3% representing 2 respondents remained undecided. Using our simple percentage measurement, the table shows that the monthly stipends and supportive equipments of the beneficiaries are not often supplied.

**Question 5:** Do you think that the NAPEP scheme has empowered you economically?

**Table 7: Distribution on the Response**

S/N	Options	Frequency	Percentages
1	Yes	10	12.5
2	No	70	87.5
3	Undecided	0	0

	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>
--	--------------	-----------	------------

Source: Research Data, 2012

In table 7 above, 12.5% representing 10 respondents indicated that the NAPEP scheme has empowered them economically, while 87.5% representing 70 respondents indicated that the NAPEP scheme has not empowered them economically. However no respondent remained undecided on the matter. This shows that the NAPEP scheme has not empowered the beneficiaries from the various zones in Enugu state.

**Question 6:** If your answer to question (5) above is 'No', what do you think is the problem with the scheme?

**Table 8: Distribution on the Response**

S/N	Options	Frequency	Percentages
1	Poor funding	40	50
2	Official corruption	30	37.5
3	Undecided	10	12.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012

Table 8 above shows that 50% representing 40 respondents indicated that poor funding of NAPEP programmes militates against their success in the state, while 37.5% representing 30 respondents indicated official corruption as militating factor against NAPEP programmes in Enugu state. However, 12.5% representing 10 respondents indicated that there could be other militating factors against NAPEP programme other than the ones listed out.

**Question 7:** Do you agree that NAPEP has generally achieved its targets of human capacity enhancement in your zone?

**Table 9: Distribution on the Response**

S/N	Options	Frequency	Percentages
1	Yes	10	12.5
2	No	70	87.5
3	Undecided	0	0
	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012

Table 9 above shows that 12.5 representing 10 respondents indicated that NAPEP has generally achieve its targets of human capacity enhancement in different zones in Enugu state while 87.5% representing 70 respondents indicated otherwise. No respondent remained undecided on the issue. This shows that NAPEP has not generally achieve its target of human capacity enhancement in Enugu state.

## SECTION C

### TEST OF HYPOTHESIS

**Hypothesis:** The Implementation of NAPEP programmes in Enugu state does not contribute to human capacity enhancement

The hypothesis was drawn from our research question. However, our effort to validate it led us to the summary on the table below, arising from our analysis on the previous tables.

**Table 10: Summary of distribution on whether NAPEP programmes in Enugu state contribute to human capacity enhancement.**

S/N	Options	Frequency	Percentages
1	Poor funding	20	25
2	Wrong targeting	10	12.5
3	Official corruption	50	62.5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: Research Data, 2012

From the above table, 25% made up of 20 respondents indicated that poor funding constitute a militating factor against NAPEP and its programmes in Enugu state, while 12.5% representing 10 respondents indicated wrong targeting of programmes. However, 62.5% made up of 50 respondents indicated official corruption. With little doubt, poor budgetary allocations to NAPEP and its programmes in various states of the federation including Enugu state, has contributed to the poor performance of the scheme since establishment in 2001. This is indeed, compounded by the mismanagement of the available funds by the officials of the NAPEP both at the federal and state levels. For instance according to Daily Champion, (Wednesday February 18, 2009:7) report, the National coordinator of the programme and special Assistant to the president, Dr. Magnus Kpakol, confirmed the fact that NAPEP has received 11.8 billion as budgetary allocation, 4 billion for the procurement of Keke-NAPEP, 10 billion from State Governments and commercial banks for multi-partnership programme and 8.2 billion from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), totaling 34 billion. But, in a motion titled “Dismal performance of the National Poverty Eradication Programme” Senator Kure observed that poverty have continued to be on the increase with about 70% of the Nation’s population including Enugu state currently living in below poverty level. He asserts further that since its establishment in 2001, the agency has not efficiently impacted on the lives of Nigerians. (See Daily Champion, Wednesday February 18, 2009:7). Perhaps, official corruption and poor targeting as were indicated by our respondent constitute reinforcing factors to the foregoing abysmal performances of the NAPEP. Thus, according to World Bank (2002:12) Report:

The problem of non-release of funds conspires with several others to make government programmes ineffective. An emphasis on physical achievements, and the contracting system, has led to a conception of development as one of creating new infrastructure, rather than of managing existing assets to produce effective services for the poor.

Furthermore, the Report maintains by citing an example from Nigerian context where the government would always prefer building new social infrastructures such as health clinics, and school while the existing ones lie unutilized because they lack the basic equipments. This tendency according to the report is reinforced by the dual capital/recurrent division of the budget process such that development tends to be equated with capital projects. Perhaps, the compensation of political supporters and loyalists was at the root of establishment of the NAPEP instead of refurbishing the existing poverty alleviation programmes aimed at human capacity enhancement by the means of skills acquisition namely National Directorate of Employment (NDE) among others. Thus, according to DFID (2003) report on Assessment of Policies and Institution Addressing Poverty Reduction in Enugu State.

The limited success of the NAPEP programmes is widely recognized and can be traced to the highly politicized nature of candidate selection. Indeed, the embeddedness of the YES scheme in the nexus of party political patronage was openly acknowledged in the distribution of MAP and

CAP application forms through Senators, Members of the House of Assembly and local government office holders. (See DFID, 2003:27).

According to the report, the foregoing backdrop on the activities of the NAPEP inevitably meant that the criteria for the selection of beneficiaries were unlikely to be ones that would promote the sustainability of the programme, while those in a position to genuinely benefit from the programmes were overlooked. The immediate consequences of the limited success of the NAPEP's human capacity enhancement programmes and indeed, that of the Enugu state and other non-governmental and international agencies in state could surface at this very point. The table below summarizes the core welfare indicators in Enugu state, 2003-2006.

**Table 11: Core Welfare Indicators in Enugu State 2003-2006**

Enugu Core Welfare Indicators (2006)									
	Total	Margin of error	Rural	Rural poor	Urban	Urban poor	Senatorial Districts		
							East	North	West
<b>Household characteristics</b>									
Dependency ratio	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.8
<b>Household welfare</b>									
Household economic situation compared to one year ago									
Worse now	42.6	1.9	45.0	53.9	38.6	44.7	37.8	48.2	43.0
Better now	29.3	1.8	24.8	14.0	37.2	20.7	35.1	21.4	30.5
Neighborhood crime/security situation compared to one year ago									
Worse now	25.6	2.3	21.3	20.0	33.1	36.1	29.4	18.4	28.9
Better now	33.1	1.9	33.6	31.8	32.1	25.5	28.1	41.5	30.2
Difficulty satisfying household needs									
Food	16.5	1.6	17.5	22.1	14.9	21.4	12.6	25.4	11.4
Households self classified as poor									
All households	70.7	2.1	77.5	93.7	59.0	89.9	59.2	83.7	71.9
Male headed households	68.4	2.3	76.0	92.5	57.0	88.5	56.9	82.0	70.7
Female headed households	78.8	2.8	81.8	96.2	70.2	94.4	71.4	89.3	74.6
Household infrastructure									
Secure housing tenure	74.8	2.4	70.1	64.5	83.1	71.9	85.5	48.0	92.0
Access to water	57.4	3.3	48.4	28.5	73.0	44.5	72.2	35.5	62.4
Safe water source	28.9	3.3	26.4	17.3	33.2	13.2	34.9	31.3	17.1
Safe sanitation	46.3	3.8	29.5	12.6	75.6	28.3	63.7	37.8	31.0
Improved waste disposal	9.4	2.2	0.4	0.0	25.2	3.9	23.5	0.0	0.0
Has electricity	50.3	4.2	37.6	19.1	72.6	34.7	74.8	37.7	29.7
Ownership of IT/Telecommunications Equipment									
Personal computer	2.0	0.7	0.2	0.0	5.2	0.0	4.8	0.3	0.0
Mobile phone	32.4	3.3	16.3	1.5	60.0	8.5	60.5	9.2	19.0
<b>Employment</b>									
Employment Status in last 7 days									
Unemployed (age 15-24)	31.8	4.2	31.1	25.0	33.8	22.2	34.6	33.3	22.4
Male	37.5	5.5	36.7	21.4	39.2	45.0	40.7	34.7	35.2
Female	26.5	5.1	26.9	26.9	24.9	10.2	28.2	32.0	14.6
Unemployed (age 15 and above)	9.6	1.2	7.0	5.0	14.5	5.7	14.4	7.2	5.4
Male	10.5	1.5	7.7	3.6	15.2	9.3	13.9	8.4	7.2
Female	8.8	1.2	6.5	5.9	13.7	3.0	14.9	6.2	3.9
Underemployed (age 15 and above)	28.5	2.5	31.5	41.5	22.3	22.4	21.3	44.6	15.6
Male	32.6	3.1	36.3	52.8	26.1	27.0	24.8	49.2	21.5
Female	24.8	2.3	27.7	33.5	18.4	19.1	17.7	40.9	11.3
<b>Education</b>									
Adult literacy rate-any language									
Total	75.6	1.8	66.1	59.0	87.8	66.8	63.6	74.9	62.5
Male	83.1	1.6	77.2	69.6	91.4	72.5	87.7	84.1	71.4
Female	68.9	1.9	60.6	51.3	84.0	61.1	79.4	66.6	55.7
Youth literacy rate-any language (age 15-24)									
Total	96.2	0.8	95.6	91.0	97.1	93.0	97.0	97.2	92.2
Male	96.9	1.2	96.5	94.2	97.3	87.9	98.4	98.2	89.5
Female	95.5	1.2	94.8	88.8	96.8	97.9	95.6	96.3	94.1
Primary school									
Access to School	62.7	3.7	52.0	21.7	81.7	55.3	66.3	54.2	69.6
Primary Net Enrollment	79.9	2.0	77.1	66.6	84.9	76.3	80.0	78.5	81.7
Male	84.0	2.2	80.1	71.7	91.5	82.0	85.2	80.7	87.2
Female	76.1	2.8	74.2	61.2	79.2	71.3	75.8	76.3	76.2
Satisfaction	60.5	2.9	59.9	47.1	61.7	54.9	61.8	57.3	63.7
Primary completion rate	19.9	1.6	18.7	17.5	22.1	28.6	22.6	19.6	16.3
Secondary school									
Access to School	32.6	3.3	23.3	6.5	49.3	28.9	36.4	27.1	36.9
Secondary Net Enrollment	60.6	2.4	57.5	48.0	66.1	52.0	66.2	56.4	58.9
Male	60.0	3.2	56.2	47.0	67.4	51.0	67.3	57.3	52.5
Female	61.1	2.6	58.8	49.1	64.8	53.0	65.0	55.4	64.9
Satisfaction	46.1	3.2	44.3	36.2	49.3	53.0	52.9	36.4	55.2
Secondary completion rate	37.1	5.1	23.3	14.6	61.7	21.6	59.0	24.0	24.4
Medical services									
Health access	39.2	3.4	25.9	10.5	61.8	26.5	55.1	25.6	32.5
Need	16.9	1.0	16.6	15.1	17.5	20.7	15.7	16.5	19.9
Use	18.4	1.0	17.8	15.4	19.4	20.8	18.7	16.7	20.5
Satisfaction	72.0	2.4	69.8	70.5	75.3	65.4	77.8	68.7	66.8
<b>Child welfare and health</b>									
Children under 5									
Birth registration	46.1	4.3	33.6	13.8	68.6	32.9	62.1	28.7	41.3
Male	46.9	5.0	35.5	14.9	68.7	26.2	67.3	29.2	42.0
Female	45.2	4.5	31.6	12.3	68.5	41.9	57.8	28.1	40.5
Fully vaccinated	70.7	3.5	68.6	58.6	74.4	64.1	74.1	74.3	59.3
Not vaccinated	10.1	2.9	13.3	26.2	4.8	17.6	10.1	11.2	8.7
Gender									
Female Circumcision	44.2	2.5	45.8	38.8	41.4	50.9	44.1	31.5	63.3
Access to credit facility	8.7	1.1	7.6	3.1	10.6	6.3	10.6	6.9	8.2
Male	10.6	1.4	8.6	2.2	13.5	7.0	13.5	6.4	12.2
Female	7.0	0.9	6.8	3.6	7.5	5.6	7.7	7.4	5.2

All correspondence about the survey including definitions of terms and concepts should be addressed to:  
The Director-General, National Bureau of Statistics, Plot 762 Independence Avenue, Central Business District, Abuja

CWIQ – Enugu State Report

Table 11 above shows a serious and progressive decline in the core welfare indicators in Enugu state. For instance, about 42.6 percent of the households in the state reported worse economic situation in 2006 in comparison with past years. Sector-wise, the situation showed a higher percentage of households in the rural areas reporting worse economic situation (45.0%) than those in the urban areas (38.65%). North senatorial district has the higher worse situation (42.2%), while east recorded the lowest (37.8%) (NBS, 2006:1). Similarly, almost eight in every ten households in the state classified themselves as poor and majority of households were headed by females (78.8%) classified themselves poorer than those in the urban sector (59.0%). The females (78.8%). Sector-wise, more households in the rural areas (77.5%) classified themselves poorer than those in the urban sector (59.0%). The female-headed households in rural and urban sectors as well as at the senatorial districts were identified poorer than the male-headed ones (NBS, 2006:1). More still, neighborhood crime/security situation in the state coupled with access to the basic social services have been on serious decline. Table 12 below is a summary of the DFID report on the rural livelihood in Enugu State, 2007

**Table 12: Summary of the DFID Reports on the rural livelihoods in Enugu State, 2007**

<b>Asset</b>	<b>Findings</b>
Social	<p>Strong cultural principles of communalism and interdependence.</p> <p>Community-based organizations provide support at different levels of social organization.</p> <p>Lack of property rights especially for women, affecting production choices and asset accumulation.</p> <p>Poorest perceived to be living in social isolation.</p>
Political	<p>Poor people not well organized</p> <p>Urban and rural elite dominates CBOs inadequate financial and human capacity.</p> <p>State seen as bad manager</p> <p>Self-interest, corruption and fraud seen as main bottlenecks for good implementation of programmes and projects.</p> <p>Top-bottom approach at all levels in government; imposing projects at community level has led to non-acceptance.</p>
Human	<p>Low levels of skills and knowledge opportunities to develop capacity seriously curtailed by economic instability.</p> <p>Children, especially girls, are being withdrawn from school to increase labour pool in household. Male youths drop out to look for jobs with a higher prestige in urban centres.</p> <p>Low health levels (higher infant mortality) compounded by the rising incidence of HIV/AIDS particularly in the rural areas.</p> <p>Women carry the main burden of agriculture and young women are the main source of unpaid labour in the household and for farm.</p>
Financial	<p>Very few options for raising capital-reliance on middlemen, money lenders or informal networks for credit.</p> <p>Existing credit programmes poorly targeted and managed. Repayment rates are low.</p>

	Thrift and loan organizations widespread but impact limited by low capacity and financial base.
Physical	<p>Lack of basic infrastructure a major concern throughout Enugu. Most of the rural population has no access to good roads; feeder roads often impassable during the rains.</p> <p>Grossly deficient potable water supplies with approximately 53% of the rural population with no access to safe water supplies in some regions up to 88%.</p> <p>Poor coverage of schools, clinics and other amenities. Drastic decline in primary and secondary school enrolment (by 59% and 49% in five years).</p> <p>Inadequate energy supply with 72% of all households having access to electricity.</p> <p>Irrigation systems weakly developed.</p>
Natural	<p>Uneven distribution of fertile and unfertile land; in some parts of the country side under-utilization due to low profitability (labour expensive, low financial liquidity, marketing, marketing possibilities uncertain).</p> <p>Access to fertile productive land increasing concern in some LGAs.</p> <p>Inheritance patterns have led to fragmentation of holdings and declining yields.</p> <p>Evidence of increase in inequality/conflicts over land and access to resources.</p> <p>Wide-spread resources degradation leads to decreasing soil fertility, low yields and increased requirement of labour input.</p> <p>Labour shortage acts as disincentive to adopt, improved, labour-intensive cultivation practices.</p>

Source: DFID, (2007:14)

With little doubt, the empirical indicators in table 11 and 12 coupled with results emanating from the questionnaires we administered to the randomly selected beneficiaries of the NAPEP programmes in Enugu state are clear manifestation of weakness in the side of the programmes that have their targets in human capacity enhancement among others in the state. On the strength of this therefore, we validate our hypothesis, emphasizing that the implementation of NAPEP programmes in Enugu state does not contribute to human capacity enhancement.

### Conclusion

This research was principally aimed at evaluation of the human capacity enhancement in Nigeria, using NAPEP and its activities in Enugu state as a case study. We argued that NAPEP and its activities have not contributed to human capacity enhancement through its major programme (YES) in Enugu state. Among the major problems that had contributed to the backdrop performances of NAPEP in the state include poor funding, share politicization of the programmes that had led to official corruption and wrong targeting. More still, this phenomenon is indeed, compounded by policy interference in the form of multiplicity of poverty alleviation programmes in the state with its negative effects on the activities of NAPEP. Contradictions which had led to unnecessary rivalries have become the order of the day. Besides, the competition for the available resources for funding of the multiple poverty alleviation programmes in the state has stifled the financial valve of NAPEP. As such the statutory billings of NAPEP have not been met in Enugu state, leading to increased incidence of poverty and joblessness in the state.

## References

- Aluko, S. (1993) *Poverty: Its Remedies in Nigeria*. Ibadan: The Nigerian Economic Society.
- Francis, P. and Nweze, N. (2003) 'A Review of Poverty Data, and Assessment of Policies and Institution Addressing Poverty Reduction in Enugu state', A DFID Consultant Report, 2003.
- Hettne, B. (2002) "Poverty and Poverty Reduction". Retrieved on 03/10/11 from <http://www.archives/articles.com>
- Ikejiani-Clark and Ezech, C. (2008) "The State; Multipartyism and Democratization in Nigeria", 1999-2007, in *Journal of Political Economy*, vol -2 Nos. 1&2.
- Nwanolue, B.O.G. and Iwuoha, V.C. (2012) "The Nigerian Civil Service and Promotion of Sustainable Human Development: A Critical Analysis", *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, Vol. 1 (9).
- Nwanolue, B.O.G. and Iwuoha, V.C. (2012) "From Monopolism to Competitionism: A Market Analysis of the Performance of the Nigerian Postal Service, 1985-2011", *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 4 (7).
- Nwanolue, B.O.G. and Iwuoha, V.C. (2012) "The Perspectives and Structural Contradictions of the Nigerian Postal Service: A Neoliberal Approach", *Journal of Management and Corporate Governance*, Vol. 4 (1).
- Obi, E.A. and Iwuoha, V.C. (2009) "Restructuring the Dialectics of Fiscal Federalism in the Nigerian Democratic Experience", *ESUT Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 3 (3).
- Okitikpi, C. (1996) "My Mission in Lagos". Newswatch, March 6.
- Okoye, U.C. and Onyukwu E.O. (2007) "Sustainable Poverty Reduction Effort through Inter-Agency Collaboration in Nigeria", in K. Omeje ed, *State-Society Relations in Nigeria Democratic Consolidation, Conflicts and Reforms*. London: Adores Abbey Publication.
- Oyasammi, O. et al (2008) "Evaluation of the Concept, Implementation and Impact of Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Nigeria" in *Centre for Gender and Social Policy Studies*. Ile Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press.
- Shaefer, B.D. (2001) "Multilateral Economic Development in Sub-Saharan Africa". Retrieved on 03/10/11 from <http://www.heritage.org>
- Ukpere, W.I. and Ugo, V.C. (2009) "Appraising Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Nigeria". Retrieved from <http://www.dk.cpu.ac.za/bus-paper/13> on 03/10/11
- Ukwu, I.U. et al (1998) 'Enugu State Poverty Report'. Institute for Development Studies, University of Nigeria Enugu Campus. Report prepared for United Nations Development Programme.
- Ugwuanyi (2012) "Human Capacity Enhancement in Nigeria: An Evaluation of the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in Enugu State, 2001-2007" (unpublished)
- Enugu State Document, 1999
- DFID Report on Enugu, 2007
- Human Development Magazine, March 11, 2003
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) 2007
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) 2008
- NAPEP Document 2001
- NEEDS Document, 2006
- World Bank Institute Report, 2002
- UNHD Report on Nigeria, 2002.
- UNDP Human Development Report in Nigeria, 2003
- UNDP Report on Nigeria, 1997
- CBN/World Bank Report in Enugu State, 1999