



**EFFICACY OF A COMMUNITY-DIRECTED SOCIO-ECONOMIC INTERVENTION  
FOR POVERTY REDUCTION TO ENHANCE ECONOMIC PROSPERITY FOR  
HOUSEHOLDS IN SOME HARD-TO REACH RURAL COMMUNITIES IN ANAMBRA  
STATE**

**Emmanuel Ikechukwu Okoye, Ph.D**

Department of Accountancy, Faculty of Management,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Anambra State, Nigeria.  
Email: eik.okoye@unizik.edu.ng

**Obiajulu A.Ugochukwu Nnedum, PhD**

Deputy Director of Research and Grants, Unizik Business School,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Anambra State, Nigeria.  
Email: oau.nnedum@unizik.edu.ng

**Abstract**

*Poverty remains a pervasive challenge in many regions, including Anambra State, Nigeria. In response to this issue, community-directed socio-economic interventions have gained traction as a means to empower communities and uplift households from poverty. This investigation delves into the evaluation of such interventions in Anambra State, aiming to assess their efficacy in reducing poverty and enhancing economic prosperity for households. Drawing from empirical research and community case studies, this paper provides insights into the effectiveness of community-directed interventions, identifies key success factors, and offers recommendations for sustainable poverty reduction strategies in rural areas.*

**Keywords:** Poverty Reduction, Community- directed intervention, economic prosperity of households,

**1. Introduction**

Poverty remains a critical and persistent issue in Anambra State, Nigeria, affecting a significant portion of the population and hindering the region's overall development. In response to this challenge, community-directed socio-economic interventions have been introduced with the aim of reducing poverty and enhancing economic prosperity at the household level. Community-directed socio-economic interventions refer to development programs and initiatives that empower local communities to plan,

implement, and manage projects aimed at improving their economic well-being. However, the effectiveness of these interventions in achieving their intended goals is a subject of concern. This investigation outlines the key issues and challenges related to evaluating the efficacy of community-directed socio-economic interventions for poverty reduction in Anambra State. Community-directed socio-economic interventions are designed to empower local communities to actively participate in their own development and



reduce poverty while enhancing economic prosperity for households. The issue of poverty and economic inequality is a global challenge, affecting many developing countries, including Nigeria. In response to this challenge, various socio-economic interventions have been implemented to reduce poverty and promote economic prosperity in different regions of the country. These interventions are community-directed, meaning they are designed and implemented by the community members themselves, with the support of external organizations.

### **1.1 Background**

Nigeria is one of the most populous countries in Africa, with a population of over 200 million people. However, poverty remains a significant challenge, particularly in rural areas where the majority of the population lives. Despite numerous poverty reduction interventions implemented by the government and non-governmental organizations, poverty rates in Anambra state remain high, with over 60% of the population living below the poverty line. This situation is further compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has had a devastating impact on the economy, particularly on small-scale businesses and vulnerable households. Anambra State, like many regions in Nigeria, faces the persistent challenge of poverty. Poverty affects not only individual households but also the broader community and regional development. Several community-directed socio-economic interventions have been employed to address this issue by empowering communities to take charge of their development and uplift their economic status. Key concepts of interests that are essential to national development in Nigeria are poverty, socio-economic interventions, community-directed

interventions, community participation, empowerment, ownership, sustainable development, and economic prosperity. Poverty refers to a lack of basic necessities such as food, shelter, and clothing, while socio-economic interventions refer to programs and policies aimed at promoting economic and social well-being, while community-directed interventions are interventions designed and implemented by community members themselves. Community participation, empowerment, and ownership are fundamental principles of community-directed interventions, aimed at promoting sustainable development and enhancing economic prosperity.

The persistence of poverty in Anambra state is a multifaceted problem that has its roots in a range of social, economic, and political factors. One of the key challenges is the lack of access to financial resources, which limits households' ability to invest in productive activities and generate income. Moreover, the lack of access to education and training opportunities limits individuals' capacity to engage in formal employment and entrepreneurship opportunities. The absence of support for small-scale businesses, coupled with weak infrastructure and market linkages, also constrains economic growth and development in the state. To address these challenges, an evaluation of a community-directed socio-economic intervention is proposed, which aims to assess efficacy of prior projects to empower households and communities through capacity building, access to micro-credit, and entrepreneurship training. The intervention will be implemented in selected rural communities in Anambra state, where poverty rates are particularly high, and will be designed to engage households and communities in the design and implementation of poverty



reduction programs. The problem that this research seeks to address is the persistent and widespread poverty in Anambra state, and the lack of effective poverty reduction interventions that take into account the socio-economic context of the communities. The study will aim to fill this gap by evaluating the effectiveness of a community-directed approach to poverty reduction that engages households and communities in the design and implementation of the intervention.

## 1.2 Statement of Problem

### *Limited Understanding of Intervention*

**Impact:** One of the central problems in assessing the efficacy of community-directed socio-economic interventions in Anambra State is the limited understanding of their impact. There is a lack of comprehensive and systematic studies that examine the extent to which these interventions have contributed to poverty reduction and economic prosperity for households in the region. This knowledge gap hampers evidence-based decision-making and inhibits the refinement of intervention strategies.

### *Varied Implementation and Outcomes:*

Community-directed interventions are often tailored to the specific needs and contexts of different communities within Anambra State. Consequently, the interventions and their outcomes can vary significantly from one community to another. This variability complicates the evaluation process, making it challenging to draw general conclusions about the overall effectiveness of these interventions in addressing poverty and enhancing economic prosperity across the state.

**Sustainability Concerns:** The sustainability of community-directed socio-economic interventions is another pressing issue. While some interventions may achieve short-term successes, questions persist about their long-term viability and impact. Ensuring that the positive effects of these interventions persist and lead to lasting economic prosperity for households is a critical challenge that requires investigation.

### *Limited Data and Monitoring Mechanisms:*

Data collection and monitoring mechanisms for assessing the outcomes of these interventions are often inadequate. Many communities lack baseline data, making it difficult to measure changes in poverty levels and economic prosperity accurately. Additionally, the absence of robust monitoring systems can hinder the identification of areas requiring intervention adjustments.

**Inclusivity and Equity:** Another problem relates to the inclusivity and equity of these interventions. There may be disparities in access to and benefits from community-directed programs, raising questions about whether the most vulnerable and marginalized households are adequately reached and supported.

**External Factors and Shocks:** Evaluating the efficacy of community-directed interventions should also consider external factors and economic shocks that may influence poverty dynamics. These factors, including regional economic trends and global economic fluctuations, can impact the effectiveness of poverty reduction strategies.



## Theory

Several theories underpin these interventions, guiding their implementation and assessment. In this context, we explore three prominent theories that inform the design and effectiveness of community-directed socio-economic interventions: Community-Based Development Theory, Social Capital Theory, and Capability Theory.

### 1. Community-Based Development Theory:

Community-Based Development (CBD) Theory emphasizes the active engagement of local communities in identifying their development priorities, designing interventions, and taking collective action. It assumes that communities possess valuable knowledge about their own needs and can contribute to sustainable development when adequately supported (Laverack, 2001). In the context of community-directed interventions for poverty reduction, CBD theory underscores the importance of community participation in decision-making, resource allocation, and project implementation. By involving communities in the identification of poverty-related issues and the formulation of strategies, these interventions aim to foster a sense of ownership and responsibility among community members, ultimately leading to enhanced economic prosperity (Chambers, 1997).

### 2. Social Capital Theory

Social Capital Theory focuses on the value of social networks, relationships, and trust within communities. It suggests that strong social bonds and connections can lead to increased access to resources, information,

and support, ultimately improving the economic well-being of individuals and communities (Putnam, 2000). Community-directed interventions often leverage social capital by strengthening community ties and encouraging collective action. The theory suggests that fostering trust and cooperation among community members can enhance their ability to mobilize resources, share knowledge, and access opportunities for economic prosperity. These interventions aim to build social capital as a means to alleviate poverty and promote economic growth (Narayan & Pritchett, 1999).

### 3. Capability Theory

The Capability approach, developed by Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum (1999), focuses on individuals' freedom and capability to lead lives they value. It emphasizes the importance of expanding people's capabilities through access to education, healthcare, economic opportunities, and social support (Sen, 1999). In the context of community-directed socio-economic interventions, the Capability approach highlights the significance of enhancing individuals' and households' capabilities. By addressing the multidimensional aspects of poverty, including access to education, healthcare, and economic resources, these interventions aim to empower individuals and households to improve their economic well-being and escape the cycle of poverty (Alkire, 2002).

**Theoretical Framework:** These interventions are often based on principles of community participation, empowerment, and self-reliance. The theory of community empowerment and participatory



development underpins such initiatives (Chambers, 1997).

### **Objectives**

This investigation aims to evaluate the efficacy of community-directed socio-economic interventions for poverty reduction in Anambra State, focusing on their impact on household economic prosperity. Specifically, it seeks to:

Assess the effectiveness of community-directed interventions in enhance economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty. Identify key success factors that contribute to the sustainability and impact of these interventions.

### **Hypotheses**

This study evaluates the efficacy of community-directed socio-economic interventions for poverty reduction in Anambra State, focusing on their impact on household economic prosperity. Specifically, it hypothesises that:

H1: Effectiveness of community-directed interventions will significantly enhance economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty.

H2: Gender differences will impact community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty

H3: Experience of previous socio-economic intervention will impact community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness to enhance economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty.

H4: Are there identifiable key success factors that contribute to the sustainability and impact of these interventions.

### **Method**

#### **Population and sampling techniques**

The population for the study covers all the rural communities that access community-based intervention in the last ten years in Anambra, East of Nigeria. Therefore, list of number of communities was obtained from commissioner of culture and chieftaincy matters, Anambra state. Study population comprised of household heads in rural communities and urban slumps in Anambra State. The community-based households' stakeholders were household heads from three senatorial districts in the State, which involves the randomly selected 12 Local Government Areas and 36 communities in the State. Study Sites were randomly select 36 communities from 12 local government areas out of 21 Local Government Areas in Anambra. Sample size were 3600 household heads as respondents that were selected using proportionate allocation to accommodate all the households head in sampled community. This helps in determining the sample size. Many sampling techniques were implemented for data collection. Sampling





technique shall be multistage. Multi stage stratified sampling technique were adopted in this study. Sequential ordering of qualitative sampling followed by quantitative sampling were the adopted model of mixed method research. Exclusion criteria was that all community stakeholders-based household heads below 16 years of age were excluded. Inclusion criteria was that all community stakeholders' households 16 years of age and above were accommodated. First, systemic random sampling was used to select the rural communities that were used in the study. Second, purposive random sampling was applied and used to purportedly select 36 rural communities particularly hard-to-reach rural communities. In the third stage, the rural dwellers and household heads that participated in the study were selected using a simple random sampling through the community-based stakeholders such as the President General and Traditional rulers.

### **Sample /Procedure**

Cochran formula for determine sampling size was used to calculate the sample size for the study. The parameter used was an effect size of 0.15 and power of 0.95 (Faul et al., 2007),

so the calculated sample size was 3600. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional Ethical Review Board (IBR) of human Health and Scientific Research of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Research instruments, we develop sets of qualitative semi- structured in-dept interview (IDI) guide, Focused group discussion (FGD) guide, and other sets of valid, reliable and standardized quantitative test. Data Collection Procedure was done in two sequential phases. The qualitative data were collected from the target community-based household stakeholders within a period of three (3) months using digital audio recorder, interview guide and focused group discussion guide in the first sequential phase. The quantitative data were collected from the target community-based household stakeholders within a period of three (3) months using android tablet having digital GPS monitor with online enabler and valid, reliable and standardized questionnaire



within the second sequential phase. All the data collected were stored electronically for easy of storage and data management for a total period of six (6) months.

The community households' heads were gathered in the town halls, markets square and community centers through the community-based stakeholders such as the President General and Traditional rulers. They (participants) were contacted and the aim of the study was explained to them. Out of the 4000 leaflets of questionnaire floated, 3000 responses were received at the end, giving a response return rate of (75%). After scrutinizing all the responses, 500 responses were discarded due to incomplete information, and the remaining 2500 were used, giving a valid response rate of (83.33%). The final households heads (N = 2500) comprised 1980 women (79.2%) and 520 men (20.8%) of community dwellers in hard- to- reach rural communities in Anambra, East of Nigeria served as data for

the study. For their age distribution, 40.8% of them (n = 1020) were of age between 18 to 30 years, 42.4% (n = 1060) fall between 31 to 40 years, whereas 18.4% (n = 460) were between 41 to 50 years. Their educational qualifications were as flows; 42.8% (n = 1070) attended maximum of high school, 41.2% (n = 1030) were B.Sc holders, 9.6% (n = 240) had a master degree, while 2.4% (n = 60) were Ph.D holders. In terms of their beneficiary experience of community-based intervention, 76% (n = 1900) had no experience in the last 10 years, and 24% (n = 600) had experience in the last 10 years.

### **Measures**

Existing measures with established validity and reliability were used to assess the two main variables of this study; one independent (community-directed interventions effectiveness) and one dependent variable (economic prosperity of households). These two variables were measured on 5-point likert-scale (1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree).

**Community- directed intervention effectiveness scale:**

The Community -directed intervention effectiveness scale (Nnedum 2023) was adopted. In this study, 12-items of Community -directed intervention effectiveness facet that is specifically relevant to the current study was culled from the Nnedum (2023) original Community -directed intervention effectiveness scale. Some of the selected items were reworded where necessary to make it compatible with the peculiar interventions for target respondents (Nnedum 2023). The Cronbach reliability analysis of Community -directed intervention effectiveness scale based on the data is .92. This high alpha score shows that overall Community -directed intervention effectiveness items have good fit to the population and highly reliable in the context of this study (Nnedum 2023). The total overall average scores of the scale items were used to assess Community -directed intervention effectiveness. Higher scores reflect high Community -directed intervention effectiveness and low score reflect low Community -directed intervention effectiveness (Nnedum 2023). In the current study, Community -directed intervention

effectiveness scale produced Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient score of 0.93 in the household sample

**Economic Prosperity of households that reduces poverty scale**

Economic prosperity of household that reduces poverty was measured using adapted version of Socio-economic index of poverty (SEIP) measure (Nnedum, 2005,2006). The community dwellers were required to respond to items on the socio-economic index of poverty questionnaires. The socio-economic index of poverty (SEIP) was developed in Nigeria (Nnedum 2005. 2006) to assess poverty status, household poverty, and poor standard of living (Nnedum 2006). The socio-economic index of poverty measures the extent to which an individual feels social and environmental hardship (Nnedum 2006); it assesses the standard of living (Nnedum, 2005) as well household poverty of the individual as a viable and stable index of household poverty (Nnedum 2006) in rural communities and urban slumps. To assess the poverty status of the rural dwellers, this investigator required household heads in rural communities to respond to the 20- items of socio-economic index of poverty questionnaire, that was





designed to assess two components of poverty index in particular and the overall poverty in general (Nnedum & Ezeokana, 2007; Ezeokana, Nnedum & Madu, 2009a; 2009b) The two sub-scales are the household and standard of living dimensions. The household poverty subscale, measured by the following questions: feeding habit, sources of water and size of the household, is assessed using item 1, 2 and 3 anchored on a five-point scale. The minimum possible score on this subscale is 3 and the maximum score is 15. Also, Nnedum (2005) stated that a total score of 1 to 7 indicate poor household income profile (low poverty index) while a score of 7.1 and above indicate abject poor household income profile (High Poverty Index). The standard of living subscale, measured by the form as well as the use of household facilities (toilet, water, cooking utensils and waste management) is measured by items 4 – 12 anchored on “Yes or No” response scheme, only one choice is possible. The details of the household facilities indicate that toilet facility was measured by item 4,6,8,10 and 12; power energy facility by item 5, 7, 9, and 11; water facility by item 2, cooking facility by item 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20; waste management facility by item 14. Nnedum (2006) state that the minimum possible score

on this subscale is 0 and the maximum score is 17; a score of 0 – 8 indicate poor standard of living (low poverty index) while a score of 8.1 and above indicate abject poor standard of living (High poverty index). The minimum possible score for overall socio-economic index of poverty scale is 03 and the maximum score is 32. Also, an overall maximum score of 15 or less indicate low poverty level while score of 15.1 and above indicate high poverty level and the greater the score, the more the level of poverty index. The reliability coefficient reported by Nnedum (2006) are split half = .72 and Eight weeks interval test- retest = .88 and alpha  $\mu$  = .78. In addition, Nnedum (2006) obtained a concurrent validity coefficient of .86 by correlating SEIP with the economy scale (Verga 1997). Based on the scoring from the manual (Nnedum 2006) a score of 15 indicate low poverty level and any score above 15.1 indicates a high poverty level on the socio-economic index of poverty main scale. In the current study, economic prosperity of household that reduces poverty (EPHRP) that was measured using adapted version of SEIP yielded a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient score of 0. 89 in the household sample.



## RESULT

Table 1: Mean, Standard deviation, Zero-Order Correlation, and Cronbach Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) reliability Results

Variables:	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
1-Gender	.63	.51	1					
2-Age	1.69	.68	.45***	1				
3-Edu Qual	2.01	.59	.02	.50***	1			
4-Inter experience	.60	.49	.36**	.58***	.37*	1		
5- Co-Intervention	3.70	.74	-.14	.01	.04	.13	(.93)	
6-Econ prosperity	3.41	.91	-.28*	.05	-.02	.10	.78***	(.89)

Key:  $N = 150$ , \* =  $p < .05$ , \*\* =  $p < .01$ , \*\*\* =  $p < .001$ .

As presented in table 1, cronbach's alphas ( $\alpha$ ) reliability of the scales are reported in parenthesis along the diagonal. The cronbach alpha reliability analysis result showed that the two variable scales are within the acceptable limit ( $< .70$ ) indicating that community -directed intervention effectiveness ( $\alpha = .93$ ) and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty ( $\alpha = .89$ ) scales are highly reliable assessing the rural community dwellers in hard-to-reach rural communities in Anambra State. According to the correlation result (table 1), gender was significantly and negatively correlated only with economic prosperity for households that reduce poverty ( $r = -.28$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Apart from this, no other demographic variable was able to correlate with any of the

two variables of interest. However, there was a strong positive correlation between Community -directed intervention effectiveness and enhanced economic prosperity of households that reduce poverty ( $r = .78$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

### Test of hypotheses.

The hypotheses of this study states that:

H1: Community-directed socio-economic interventions effectiveness will significantly enhance economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty among rural dwellers.

H2: Gender will effect community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty

H3: Community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty



will have bearing on previous experience of interventions in the community

H4: There are identifiable key success factors that contribute to the sustainability and impact of these interventions.

Table 2: Testing for the relationship between community-directed socio-economic interventions effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty, controlling for the effect of the demographic variables using regression analysis

variables	Model 1 ( $\beta$ )	Model 2 ( $\beta$ )	Model 3 ( $\beta$ )	Model 4 ( $\beta$ )
Gender	-.23**	-.10	.07	-.10
Age	-.02	-.07	-.07	-.07
Edu qual	.11	.06	.06	.06
Inter experience(IE)	.14	.11	.12	-.03
Com Intervention (CDI)		.78***	.82***	.74***
CDI X gender			-.15	
CDI X IE				.12
R <sup>2</sup>	.066	.505	.507	.507
R <sup>2</sup> change	.066	.439	.001	.001
F-change	F(4,145) = 2.58*	F(1,144) = 127.80***	F(1,143) = .42	F(1,143) = .39
F - value	F(4,145) = 2.58*	F(5,144) = 29.42***	(6,143) = 24.49***	F(5,143) = 24.48***

Table two contained the regression result that tested the quantitative hypotheses. Model 1 showed that overall demographic variables accounted for 6.6% of the variance in economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty outcome ( $R^2 = .066$ ), that has an insignificant effect. Regression result in model 2 showed that community -directed

socio-economic intervention effectiveness strongly and positively related to economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty ( $\beta = .78$ ) at  $p < .001$ , after controlling for gender, age, educational qualification and intervention experience; that explained 50.5% of the variance in economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty outcome



( $R^2 = .505$ ), which was a high significant variance,  $F(5,144) = 29.42$ ,  $p < .001$ . Thus, the hypothesis 1, that community -directed socio-economic interventions effectiveness would be significantly related to economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty among dwellers in rural communities in Anambra State was accepted. The result demonstrated that the more effectiveness of socio-economic intervention delivery, the more they experience economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty, that in turn, enhances the economic prosperity of the rural communities. Further analysis was done to check the conditional effect of the relationship between community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty based on gender differences (H2) and previous intervention experience. Hence, an interaction of community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and gender (CDI X Gender) and community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and intervention experience (CDI X IE) were regressed in model 3 and 4 respectively. Applying a moderated regression analyses, result showed no significant interaction effect of gender ( $\beta = -.15$ ) and intervention experience ( $\beta = .12$ ) in

community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty linkage, as each of the interaction model contributed just 1% ( $R^2 = .001$ ) additional variance in the relationship between community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty, which was found not to be significant;  $F(1,143) = .42$ , and  $.39$  for gender (H2) and previous intervention experience (H3) respectively. Therefore hypotheses 2 and 3 were rejected. Consequently, these results demonstrate that once community -directed socio-economic intervention are effective, that tend to increase the economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty in families or in the community irrespective of their gender and previous intervention experience. Therefore, community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness matter so much in influencing economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty across all kind of rural households' heads dwellers in hard- to- reach rural communities in Anambra State.

**H4:** There are identifiable key success factors that contribute to the sustainability



and impact of these socio-economic interventions to reduce poverty.

*Qualitatively data results:* In this study, focus group discussion of a case study of Nibo community were analyzed that indicated that community-directed interventions like school feeding program of Governor Obiano have shown promise in reducing poverty among female rural dwellers of child-bearing age in Anambra State. The finding is consistent with previous facts that improved access to education, healthcare, and income-generating activities contribute to poverty reduction (Adeleke et al., 2020) in sub Saharan Africa.

Further explication of qualitative data identified five key success factors that contributes to the efficacy of community-directed school feeding interventions in Anambra State. The key factors include:

- Community Engagement and Ownership
- Capacity Building and Skill Development
- Sustainable Livelihood Diversification
- Gender Inclusivity
- Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanisms

## **Discussion**

Community-directed socio-economic interventions are increasing in dimensions in Nigeria, contributing to economy and well-being of its citizens. The hypothesis one of this study that stated that community-directed socio-economic interventions effectiveness will significantly enhance economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty among rural dwellers was accepted. The study has shown that efforts to enhance economic prosperity of households will help to reduce households' poverty in rural communities, that in turn, will improve the psychological wellbeing of rural dwellers. The needs to identify factors to increase economic prosperity of households in rural communities are of paramount. The study aimed to examine the relationship between community-directed socio-economic interventions effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty among rural dwellers in Anambra State, Nigeria. The result showed that the more rural poor dwellers' household poverty is reduced, the more they tend to experience enhanced economic prosperity. This result aligned with the previous studies (Adeleke et al., 2020). In furtherance to understand the boundary condition of the extant relationship



between community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness and economic prosperity of households that reduces poverty, the current study checked if gender (H2) of rural dwellers and previous intervention experience (H3) can moderate the outcomes . However, the result showed that the relationship did not differ between male and female on one hand and did not also differ based on level of participants experience of previous intervention initiatives on the other hand. This implies that community -directed socio-economic intervention effectiveness matters a lot in influencing economic prosperity of households that reduces household poverty to the individual and enhance their psychological wellbeing, specifically in hard-to-reach rural communities in Anambra State of Nigeria.

#### **4. Recommendations for Sustainable Poverty Reduction**

Based on the evaluation, the following recommendations are proposed for enhancing the effectiveness and sustainability of community-directed socio-economic intervention to enhance prosperity of households' heads for poverty reduction efforts in Anambra State. Governments, State and Federal Governments and Multinational organizations and

International Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) Should:

- Strengthen community leadership engagement and participation in decision-making processes on community-directed intervention initiatives.
- Focus on technological -driven skill development and entrepreneurship training for young adults in the households to create sustainable income-generating opportunities to enhance household income base.
- Diversify livelihood options for savaged rural dweller in hard-to-reach rural communities to reduce vulnerability to economic shocks.
- Promote gender equality and inclusivity in all intervention programs.
- Establish robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to track progress and ensure accountability.

#### **5. Conclusion**

Community-directed socio-economic interventions have the potential to significantly reduce poverty and enhance economic prosperity for households in Anambra State. However, their success relies on community engagement, capacity building, and sustainable livelihood strategies. By harnessing these interventions' strengths and addressing their challenges, Anambra State can work towards a future with reduced poverty and improved economic well-being for all its rural dwellers residents in hard-to-reach communities. Assessing the efficacy of community-





directed socio-economic interventions for poverty reduction and enhanced economic prosperity in Anambra State is a complex challenge. The limited understanding of intervention impact, the variability in implementation and outcomes, sustainability concerns, data limitations, issues of inclusivity and equity, and the influence of external factors all contributed to the complexity of this evaluation. Addressing these challenges is essential to provide a comprehensive assessment of the interventions' effectiveness and inform evidence-based policies for poverty reduction in Anambra State. Community-directed socio-economic interventions for poverty reduction and enhanced economic prosperity draw upon several key theories. Germane to this study, community-based development theory underscores community participation and ownership, social capital theory emphasizes the value of social networks and trust, and the capability theory highlights the importance of expanding individuals' capabilities. By integrating these theories into future design and implementation, these interventions can sustainably empower communities and households in their journey toward poverty reduction and improved economic prosperity. Understanding and applying these theories effectively can enhance the impact and sustainability of such interventions, ultimately leading to better outcomes for communities in need in Nigeria.

### **Funding**

We would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by TetFund Institutional Based Research grant serial number 12 of year 2021-2023 referenced number

(TETF/DR&D/CE/UNVAWKA/IBR/2022/VOL.1) to the lead researcher, Emmanuel Ikechukwu Okoye, for the preparation of this research report.

### **Acknowledgement**

The authors acknowledge the contributions of all the poor people living in rural communities at Nibo and those poor households bearing the burden of poverty in hard-to reach Nibo villages, who volunteered to participate in the study and volunteered to participate in the interview and responded to the questionnaires distributed to them, having honestly responded to its content. We acknowledge the Eke-Nibo market Union for their assistance and the President General of Nibo community for his cooperation during the field research trip

### **References**

- Adeleke, R. A., Ogbuagu, M. N., & Odibo, N. D. (2020). Community-Based Interventions and Poverty Reduction: A Case Study of Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Community Development and Management Studies*, 4(1), 39-53.
- Alkire, S. (2002). *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. ITDG Publishing.
- Ezeokana OJ, Nnedum OAU (2007). Influence of Economic hardship on social interaction and disclosure help seeking behaviour. *African Psychologist: An*



*International journal of Psychology and Allied Professions*, 2(1): 19 -26.

Ezeokana, J.O; Nnedum, O.A.U. & Madu, S.N. (2009). Effect of Economic Hardship on Anti rithroviral Therapy among patients with HIV/AIDS. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 18 (2) , 137-142

Ezeokana, J.O; Nnedum, O.A.U. & Madu, S.N. (2009a). Perversiviness of Poverty among People Living with HIV/AIDS in South Eastern Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*. 25 (3)

Laverack, G. (2001). An identification and interpretation of the organizational aspects of community empowerment. *Community Development Journal*, 36(2), 134-145.

Narayan, D., & Pritchett, L. (1999). Cents and Sociability: Household Income and Social Capital in Rural Tanzania. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 47(4), 871-897.

Nnedum OAU (2005). Standardization of the Socio- economic index of poverty (SEIP). *African Psychologist: An international Journal of Psychology and Allied Professions*, 1(1): 11-21.

Nnedum OAU (2006). Evaluation of HIV-AIDS Prevention– Reduction Related Services of Anambra State Action Committee on HIV-AIDS (ANSACA) in Nigeria. *Review of Behavioural Perspectives*, 2(3): 24-32.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Oxford University Press.