

IMPACT OF N-TEACH SOCIAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME ON POVERTY ALLEVIATION IN GWAGWALADA AREA COUNCIL, FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY, ABUJA.

BY

Oyewole Olonade

woleolonade@gmail.com

&

Maiye B. Olusegun Ph.D

olusegun.maiye@uniabuja.edu.ng

Department of Political Science and International Relations,

University of Abuja,

Abstract

Governments at all levels in Nigeria have initiated and implemented various policies and programmes to tackle the menace of rural poverty among the poorest of the poor. However, despite the concerted efforts to address the menace and reverse the trends of poverty through poverty reduction strategies, the situation has not only remained intractable but continued to worsen. The study assessed the impact of the N-Teach social investment programme on poverty alleviation in the Gwagwalada Area Council of the Federal Capital Territory. A survey design method was used for this study. A sample of 385 respondents was drawn. Relevant data for this study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The system theory provided the analytical framework. It was discovered that, though the government intended to alleviate rural poverty through the N-Teach programme, the objectives were far from being realised. The manifestation of corruption in the implementation of poverty eradication programmes includes diversion of resources and public funds to private uses. Based on the findings, the study recommends that an effective mechanism be put in place to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the N-Teach program, with a view to determining the program's performance level. It should also be designed to identify defaulting beneficiaries and to provide enforcement strategies that ensure all stakeholders discharge their responsibilities accordingly.

Keywords: Social investment, Poverty, Poverty alleviation, N-Teach programme

Introduction

In the global fight against poverty, countries have launched a series of programmes to reduce poverty. Eradication of poverty is the number one goal on the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted by all United Nations member states in 2015, lending credence to poverty reduction programmes worldwide. Over the years, governments at all levels in Nigeria have initiated and implemented various policies and programmes to tackle the menace of poverty.

However, despite the concerted effort to address the situation and reverse the trend of poverty through poverty reduction strategies, the situation has not only remained intractable but continued to worsen. This is evident in an increase in low social indicators such as inadequate health facilities, inadequate housing, poor feeding, high levels of unemployment and underemployment, etc., which has collapsed the middle class, thereby increasing the number of people living in poverty. This situation, therefore, brought to the open the frustrating problem of poverty, with real per capita income, expenditure, and consumption dropping precipitously, and the severity of poverty continued to worsen.

Poverty, as defined by Taiwo and Agwu (2016), is a condition in which people live below a specified minimum income level and are unable to provide the necessities of life required for an acceptable standard of living. Poverty eradication for all people everywhere by 2030 is the first of the Sustainable Development Goals set by the United Nations in 2015. To achieve this globally, 90 people were expected to leave poverty every minute; in Africa, 57; and in Nigeria, 12 (Ogbu, 2018).

Over the years, the Nigerian government has established various programs to address poverty. These include the first, second, third, and fourth national Development plans (1962 – 1985), the three-year rolling plans (1990 – 1992), the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS 2003 – 2007), and the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP 2001 – 2015). In all of these programmes, a massive amount of money was expended, yet there has been no significant reduction in poverty; rather, the trend is on the increase.

Several programmes have been carried out in Nigeria with the aims of improving the economic status and reduce or eradicate poverty in the country, such programmes include: Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) 1986, Better Life Programme (BLP) 1987, National Directorate of Employment (NDE) 1986, People Banks of Nigeria (PBN) 1990, Family Support Programme (FSP) and Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP) 1993, National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA) 1993, Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP) 2000, National.

Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) 2001, Small and Medium Enterprises Development Agency of Nigeria (SMEDAN) 2003, Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SureP) (Lamidi, 2021). In 2016, the National Social Investment Programme was established to tackle poverty and hunger in the country. The programmes under the scheme are N-Power, Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT), Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP), and Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (HGFSF), which focus on ensuring a more equitable distribution of resources to vulnerable populations, including children, youth, and women (Aliogo, 2022). This is in line with Adam (2018) who opined that in June 2016, the World Bank Group approved a \$500 million International Development Association credit to support the establishment of programs targeted at economic development in Nigeria while the Nigerian government provided an additional \$1.3 billion from its budget to create the social safety net programmes which came to be known as National Social Investment Programme.

The programme was initiated to ensure a more equitable distribution of resources to the vulnerable population, to address poverty and boost economic Development. The N-power program was initiated to provide young Nigerians with job training, education, and a monthly stipend of 30,000 naira. The Conditional Cash Transfer programme provides targeted cash transfers to the most vulnerable households with the long-term goal of lifting millions out of

poverty. The beneficiaries of the programme are drawn from the National Social Register (NSR), comprising the State Social Registers (SRs) of poor and vulnerable households. Furthermore, the Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP) is a micro-lending investment program targeting small businesses with a focus on young people and women. The program provides loans to its beneficiaries, helping reduce the start-up cost of business ventures in Nigeria. The Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (HGSF) is a program in which the government seeks to increase school enrollment by providing meals to students, particularly those in poor regions of the country. The program works in conjunction with local farms to sustain the economy and provide affordable meals to pupils.

N-Teach is one of the components of the National Social Investment Programme, aimed at enhancing educational delivery while empowering unemployed youths through temporary employment and skills Development. Despite these poverty alleviation programmes, poverty remains high among youths in the Gwagwalada Area Council. The Purpose of this study, therefore, is to appraise the N-Power Teach programme on poverty alleviation in Gwagwalada Area Council, FCT Abuja. The following questions are considered pertinent for this study. To what extent has N-Power Teach improved beneficiaries' skills to take up teaching jobs after they exit the programme? To what extent has N-Power Teach reduced youth unemployment in the Gwagwalada Area Council? What are the challenges of N-Power Teach in alleviating poverty in the Gwagwalada Area Council? What are the strategies for the successful implementation of the N-power teach programme in the Gwagwalada Area Council?

Objectives of the Study

The following are the objectives of the study:

- a. Examine the extent to which N-power Teach has improved the skills of the beneficiaries to take up teaching jobs after they exit the programme.
- b. Examine the extent to which N-Teach has reduced unemployment among the youth in the Gwagwalada Area Council.
- c. Identify the challenges of N-Power Teach in alleviating poverty in the Gwagwalada Area Council.

Conceptual Clarification

Concept of Social Investment

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) coined the term "social investment" as a framework for social policy reform. This was with a view to maximising the return to social expenditure in the form of social cohesion and active participation in society and the labour market (Frazer & Sabato, 2015).

The European Commission, from its own perspective, defines social investments as the set of policies and instruments that promote investment in human capital and enhance people's capacity to participate fully in social and economic life, including the labour market (Frazer & Sabato, 2015). From a different perspective, Wells (2012) presents two broad meanings of social investment. Drawing from (Giddens, 1998), he defines social investment as the promotion of a "social investment state", with a guideline for investment in human capital wherever possible, rather than direct provision of economic maintenance. The second

definition emphasises the provision of funding (such as loans) or social benefits. The differences in the definitions of authors notwithstanding, the common focus is on investment in human capital and on enhancing people's capacities, especially those of vulnerable groups in society. The driving force for social investment is therefore to enhance people's capacity to participate in social and economic life. Assisting the most vulnerable and disadvantaged through policies and programmes is a recurring theme in the social investment literature.

Lamidi and Igbokwe (2021) define a social investment programme as one that aims to uplift the economic lives of people across the strata of society. It is rooted in designed policies that strengthen individual capacities and skills, with a view to engaging them in full employment, social life, and work. Lamidi stressed that the key areas of social investment programmes are agriculture, youth training, education, health-related services, and job search assistance. He further stated that the social investment programme is an intrinsic solution to addressing the root causes of delinquency and anti-social behaviour, such as poverty, illiteracy, the collapse of the middle class, conduct disorder, among others.

Poor attitudinal discharge towards societal norms, such as violent acts, public fights, law-breaking, physical assaults, and non-compliance with safety rules and regulations, if associated with a person, is termed anti-social order, which is an antonym of social investment (Kazeem, 2021). Social investment is a set of policies and programmes aimed at mitigating social and economic risks and vulnerabilities while reducing extreme poverty and inequality.

Poverty

There is no universal definition of poverty because it affects many aspects of human life. Some scholars define the concept from cultural perspectives, while others prefer political, economic or statistical definitions (Jobbin & Osu, 2014). A typical example of a statistical definition is that of (United Nations and World Bank, 1998): "a denial of choices and opportunities, a violation of human dignity. It means a lack of basic capacity to participate effectively in society. It means not having enough to feed and clothe a family, not having an organisation or clinic to go to, not having the land on which to grow one's food or a job to earn one's living, and not having access to credit. It means insecurity, powerlessness, and exclusion of individuals, households and communities. It means susceptibility to violence, and it often implies living in marginal or fragile environments, without access to clean water or sanitation.

According to Avallion (2003:47), poverty is defined as any income below US\$1.25 a day for the poorest countries and US\$2 a day for poor developing countries. This study focuses on the conventional definition of poverty by Taiwo & Agwu (2016), who defined it as a condition in which people live below a specified minimum income level and are unable to provide the necessities of life needed for an acceptable standard of living. Therefore, poverty can be viewed as a situation in which individuals or communities lack the necessities of life, such as an adequate health system, decent shelter, and adequate food. It is the inability of individual (s) to meet or provide for their needs as needed.

Poverty Alleviation

The eradication of extreme poverty for all people everywhere by 2030 is the first of the Sustainable Development Goals set by the United Nations in 2015. Poverty alleviation refers to strategies and interventions that aim to improve people's overall well-being. According to Todaro and Smith (2020), poverty alleviation refers to a range of policy interventions and Development strategies designed to reduce the incidence, depth, and severity of poverty by

improving individuals' access to resources, opportunities, and social services. (Sen, 1999) posited that poverty alleviation is a systematic effort by governments, organisations, and communities to raise the living standards of people experiencing poverty by enhancing income, human capital, and social protection.

Poverty alleviation is the process of reducing economic deprivation through targeted programs that address structural inequalities and expand people's capabilities to live productive and fulfilling lives. (World Bank, 2018). Poverty alleviation is the totality of governmental actions and programmes aimed at reducing abject poverty among the people of a particular country. It must be deliberate, intentional, and driven to achieve the stated goal of reducing poverty.

Fundamentally, poverty is a denial of choices and opportunities, a violation of human dignity. It means a lack of basic capacity to participate effectively in society. It means not having enough to feed and clothe a family, not having a school or clinic to go to, not having the land on which to grow one's food or a job to earn one's living, and not having access to credit. It means insecurity, powerlessness, and the exclusion of individuals, households, and communities. (United Nations, 2019)

To address poverty in Nigeria, governments established various programmes. These include the first, second, third and fourth national Development plans (1962 – 1985), the three-year rolling plans (1990 -1992), Vision 2010 (1996 -1996), the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) 2003 – 2007; National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) (2001 – 2015). In all these, vast sums of money were sunk into the programme. However, no significant reduction in the poverty rate has been recorded; instead, the trend is increasing. Numerous studies have examined the causes of poverty (Olowa, 2012; Ucha, 2010; UNICEF, 1971; Taiwo & Agwu, 2016). Research findings indicate that the leading causes of poverty in Nigeria are low economic growth and social Development, unemployment, underutilisation of resources, absence of economic diversification, inadequate investment, and poor governance.

Overview of N-Power Programme

Skills and knowledge are the driving forces of economic growth and social Development of any great nation. Despite the current high unemployment rate, harnessing Nigeria's young population through targeted skill Development efforts offers an opportunity to achieve inclusion and productivity. Large-scale skill Development is the main policy thrust of the N-Power Programme (Obadan, 2017).

N-Power is a youth empowerment scheme sponsored by the Federal Government of Nigeria. NPower addresses the challenge of youth unemployment by providing a structure for large-scale, relevant work skills acquisition and Development while linking its core and outcomes to improving inadequate public services and stimulating the broader economy (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019). NPower seeks to provide a platform that enables most Nigerians to access skills acquisition and Development. N-Power is designed for Nigerian citizens aged 18 to 35. The programmes under N-Power will ensure that each participant learns and practices most of what is necessary to find or create work (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019). The programme was set up by the late President of Nigeria, Muhammadu Buhari, on 8 June 2016, to provide a structure for large-scale, relevant skills acquisition, addressing issues of youth unemployment, and increasing Development.

Categories of N-Power Programmes

The N-Power programmes are broadly categorised into two categories: N-Power Graduate.

Categories and N-Power Non-Graduate Categories (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019). Therefore, the NTeach programme falls under the N-Power Graduate category.

N-Power Graduate Category: The N-Power Graduate category, also known as the N-Power Volunteer Corps, is a post-tertiary engagement initiative for Nigerians aged 18 to 35. It is a paid volunteering programme lasting 2 years. The graduates will undertake their primary tasks in identified public services within their proximate communities (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019). All N-Power Volunteers are entitled to computing devices that will contain information necessary for their specific engagement, as well as information for their continuous training and Development. N-Power volunteers will provide teaching, instructional, and advisory services in 4 key areas (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019).

N-Power Agro: N-Power Agro Volunteers will provide advisory services to farmers nationwide. They will disseminate the knowledge that has been aggregated by the Federal Ministry of

Agriculture and Rural Development in the area of extension services (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019). **N-Power Health:** N-Power Health Volunteers will help improve and promote healthcare in their communities for vulnerable members of society, including pregnant women and children, as well as families and individuals (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019).

N-Power Teach: N-Power Teach Volunteers will help improve basic education delivery in Nigeria. N-Power Teach Volunteers will be deployed as teaching assistants in public primary and secondary schools across Nigeria (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019).

N-Power Tax: N-Power volunteers will be selected to serve as Community Tax Liaison Officers in their states of residence, working with the state's tax authorities. The N-Power community tax liaison officers will have responsibilities including answering online inquiries, managing customer relations, and raising awareness of tax compliance (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019).

N-Power Non-Graduate Categories: The N-Power Non-Graduate category is designed to train and empower non-graduates with skills they can use to better themselves and the economy as a whole. The programme offers training and certification to all successful candidates (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019). The N-Power Non-Graduate category provides training and certifications in 2 key areas, which include:

N-Power Knowledge: The N-Power Knowledge programme is the Federal Government's first step towards diversifying into a knowledge economy. This programme will work alongside the planned eight innovation hubs across the country to provide incubation and acceleration of the technology and creative industries. The programme is a 'Training to Jobs' initiative, essentially ensuring that participants can get engaged in the marketplace in an outsourcing capacity, as freelancers, as employees, and as entrepreneurs (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019).

N-Power Build: N-Power Build is an accelerated training and certification (Skills to Job) programme that will engage and train 75,000 young unemployed Nigerians to build a new crop

of skilled, highly competent technicians, artisans, and service professionals (Akujuru & Enyioko, 2019).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework adopted for this study is System Theory. The "system" concept is used by Talcott Parsons (1951), Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1950), David Easton (1965), and Katz and Kahn (1969) to denote an analytical scheme for uncovering complexity. A system is any whole that functions as a result of the interrelatedness of its parts. It is the concept that refers to the complexities of inter-dependencies between parts, components, and processes that involve discernible regulation of relationships, as well as to a similar type of inter-dependencies with its surroundings (Easton, 1965).

According to Henry (2002:56), systems theory is a model of the public policy-making process. He further views a system as an entity in which everything relates to everything else. To put it another way, systems comprise components that work together for the sake of the whole, and the system approach is merely a way of thinking about these components and their relationships (Henry, 2002).

The theory, therefore, is relevant to this study, as it implies that the government serves as the processing unit that takes in demands, processes them, and outputs authoritative decisions and policy initiatives for poverty reduction. The theory shows how the government responds to people's plight by providing the necessities of life. It highlights how the demands of the people are presented to the government, the government's responses to those demands, and the outcome: a programme that enhances the people's well-being.

Methodology

A survey research design was used in this study. The research design was chosen because the study involves collecting original data to describe a large population that cannot be examined in person. It also involves gathering and evaluating data from a representative sample of the total population. The study sample comprises approximately 385 respondents from the total population of 10,000 beneficiaries of the N-Power Teach programme in Gwagwalada Area Council (NSIP office, 2024). In drawing this sample, the stratified sampling technique was used to ensure that all beneficiaries were included, thereby increasing the validity of the findings. The simple random sampling technique was also used to ensure that every member of the population had an equal chance of being included in the sample. This was justified using Taro Yamane's (1973) formula for sample size determination, with a significance level of 0.0025.

Below is a table showing the total population and the number of respondents sampled from each ward

Table 1: Population and Sample size

S/No	Wards	Targeted Population	Sample Respondents
1.	Gwagwalada Central Ward	1,500	53
2.	Kutunku Ward	1,250	45

3.	Quarters Ward	1,000	40
4.	Ibwa Ward	900	36
5.	Dobi Ward	950	32
6.	Paiko Ward	700	31
7.	Tungan-maje Ward	800	36
8.	Zuba Ward	1,100	38
9.	Ikwa Ward	850	38
10.	Gwako Ward	950	36
	Total	10,000	385

Source: NSIP OFFICE, 2024

The primary data for this study were collected through questionnaires administered to respondents. The advantage of primary data sources is that they provide the information required for this study. The secondary data for this study were collected from textbooks, journals, articles, government agency publications, gazette materials, newspapers, and internet sources. Secondary data were considered because they complemented the information obtained from the primary source.

Analysis and Discussion of Findings

This evaluates the questions raised in the introduction to validate or refute the assumptions. Table 1 Research Question 1: To what extent has N-power teach improved the skills of the beneficiaries to take up teaching jobs after they exit the programme?

S/No	Options	SA (5)	A (4)	DA (3)	SD (2)	UD (1)	Total Score	Mean	Decision
1.	The quality of the training sessions provided by N-power teach is excellent	140 (700)	123 (492)	30 (90)	22 (44)	35 (35)	350 (1361)	3.9	Accepted
2.	The N-power teach beneficiaries have confidence in taking up a teaching job after exiting the program	137 (685)	155 (620)	20 (60)	17 (34)	21 (21)	350 (1420)	4.1	Accepted
3.	The program provided adequate knowledge to its beneficiaries	20 (100)	22 (88)	30 (90)	123 (246)	155 (155)	350 (679)	1.94	Rejected

4.	It creates job opportunities and economic growth for the youths	123 (615)	140 (560)	26 (78)	26 (52)	35 (35)	350 (1340)	3.8	Accepted
5.	The programme is fully adequate	35 (175)	30 (120)	130 (390)	140 (280)	15 (15)	350 (980)	2.8	Rejected
	Sectional Mean							3.3	Accepted

Source: Field Survey, 2024

From the table above, the respondents share their views on the extent to which N-PowTeach has improved the beneficiaries' skills to take up teaching jobs after they exit the programme. As shown, a mean of 3.9 indicates that the quality of the training sessions provided by N-power teach is excellent. In contrast, a mean of 4.1 indicates that N-power teach beneficiaries have confidence in taking up a teaching job after exiting the program. On the other hand, a mean score of 1.94 indicates that the program did not provide adequate knowledge to its beneficiaries, and a mean score of 3.8 indicates that it creates job opportunities and economic growth for the youths; on the contrary, 2.8 shows that respondents disagreed that the programme is fully adequate in the Gwagwalada Area Council. These responses imply that the N-power programme affects unemployed youths. The sectional mean score of 3.3 indicates that all options jeopardise the programme.

Table 2 Research Question 2: To what extent has N-power Teach reduced unemployment among the youth in Gwagwalada Area Council?

S/No	Options	SA (5)	A (4)	DA (3)	SD (2)	UD (1)	Total Score	Mean	Decision
1.	N-power teach has significantly contributed to reducing youth unemployment in the Gwagwalada Area Council	105 (525)	135 (540)	65 (195)	20 (40)	25 (25)	350 (1337)	3.9	Accepted
2.	Many youths in the Gwagwalada Area Council are unemployed before joining the N-power teach	120 (600)	143 (572)	27 (81)	24 (48)	36 (36)	350 (1622)	3.8	Accepted
3.	The programme provided its beneficiaries with adequate job experience to secure other employment opportunities	145 (725)	130 (520)	20 (90)	25 (50)	20 (20)	350 (1405)	4.0	Accepted
4.	It creates job opportunities and economic growth for the youths	155 (775)	137 (548)	20 (60)	27 (54)	11 (11)	350 (1478)	4.1	Accepted

5.	The programme is fully adequate	15 (75)	30 (120)	50 (150)	150 (300)	105 (105)	350 (750)	2.1	Rejected
	Sectional Mean							3.6	Accepted

Source: Field Survey, 2024

From the table above, the respondents bare their minds on the extent to which N-Power Teach has reduced unemployment among the youth in the Gwagwalada Area Council. As shown, a mean of 3.9 points indicates that N-power teach has contributed to reducing youth unemployment in Gwagwalada Area Council. In contrast, 3.8 shows that many youths in Gwagwaladthe Area Council were unemployed before joining N-power. The N-Power Teach program, on the other hand, has a mean score of 4.0, indicating that the programme provided its beneficiaries with adequate job experience to secure other employment opportunities, and 4.1 that it creates job opportunities and economic growth for the youths. On the contrary, 2.1 shows that respondents disagreed that the programme is fully adequate in the Gwagwalada Area Council. The sectional mean score of 3.6 shows that all the options affect the programme

Table 3 Research Question 3: What are the challenges of N-power teaching in alleviating poverty in Gwagwalada Area Council?

S/No	Options	SA (5)	A (4)	DA (3)	SD (2)	UD (1)	Total Score	Mean	Decision
1.	Lack of adequate awareness of the programme by the rural people	90 (450)	150 (600)	50 (150)	30 (60)	30 (30)	350 (1290)	3.7	Accepted
2.	Delayed in stipend payments	105 (525)	135 (540)	65 (195)	20 (40)	25 (25)	350 (1325)	3.8	Accepted
3.	Inadequate training and support	145 (725)	130 (520)	30 (90)	25 (50)	20 (20)	350 (1405)	4.0	Accepted
4.	Lack of post-programme transition plans	120 (600)	143 (572)	27 (81)	24 (48)	36 (36)	350 (1337)	3.8	Accepted
5.	Gender specific challenges	155 (775)	137 (548)	20 (60)	17 (34)	21 (21)	350 (1438)	4.1	Accepted
	Sectional Mean							3.9	Accepted

Source: Field Survey, 2024

The table above presents respondents' opinions on the challenges faced by the N-Power Teach programme in the Gwagwalada Area Council. As shown in the table, mean scores of 3.7, 3.8, and 4.0 indicate acceptance of the fact that the Lack of adequate awareness of the programme among the rural people of Gwagwalada Area Council has resulted in delayed stipend payments. On the other hand, a mean of 3.8 indicates inadequate training and support. In contrast, a mean of 4.1 suggests that a Lack of post-programme transition plans and gender-specific challenges

are part of the challenges. The sectional mean score of 3.9 indicates that the above options are among the difficulties of the N-power teach programme in Gwagwalada Area Council.

Table 4: Research Question 4: What are the strategies for the successful implementation of the Npower Teach Programme in the Gwagwalada Area Council?

S/No	Options	SA (5)	A (4)	DA (3)	SD (2)	UD (1)	Total Score	Mean	Decision
1.	Adequate and proper awareness of the programme	150 (750)	50 (200)	100 (300)	25 (50)	25 (25)	350 (1325)	3.8	Accepted
2.	Accountability and transparency	137 (685)	155 (620)	27 (81)	20 (40)	11 (11)	350 (1437)	4.1	Accepted
3.	Improve management and information skills	130 (650)	145 (580)	30 (90)	5 (10)	40 (40)	350 (1370)	3.9	Accepted
4.	Sufficient funding of the programme	105 (525)	140 (560)	60 (180)	25 (50)	20 (20)	350 (1315)	3.8	Accepted
5.	Political Stability	95 (475)	145 (580)	45 (135)	35 (70)	30 (30)	350 (1290)	3.7	Accepted
	Sectional Mean							3.9	Accepted

Source: Field Survey, 2024

From the table above, the respondent shared their opinion on possible solutions for the successful implementation of the N-Power programme in the Gwagwalada Area Council. As shown, a mean of 3.8 points indicates improved awareness, while a mean of 4.1 indicates accountability and transparency. On the other hand, a mean of 3.9, 3.8, and 3.7 accepted that improved management skills, sufficient funding, and political stability are among the solutions to the successful implementation of a social investment programme. The sectional mean score of 3.9 implies that the respondents agreed with the options.

Discussion of Findings

Based on data collection and analysis, this study identified several findings, which are discussed in this section. The study revealed a significant relationship between N-Power Teach and beneficiaries' income in poverty alleviation in the Gwagwalada Area Council. This finding is supported by respondents' agreement that the N-Power Teach programme improved their financial capability. This finding is not disputable, as the mandate of the Npower Teach Programme is to alleviate poverty in the country. The study also found that N-Power Teach has improved the beneficiaries' skills to take up teaching jobs after they exit the programme. This finding is supported by the fact that the respondents accepted that the quality of the training sessions provided by N-power teach is excellent, the N-power teach beneficiaries have confidence in taking up a teaching job after exiting the program, the program offered adequate

knowledge to its beneficiaries, and it creates job opportunities and economic growth for the youths.

Furthermore, the study's findings showed challenges affecting the smooth running and operation of the N-power teach programme for poverty alleviation, including inadequate awareness of poverty alleviation programmes among rural dwellers, corruption, poor management and accountability, insufficient funding, and political instability. Also, the study identified strategies to improve and overcome the programme's challenges in poverty alleviation in the Gwagwalada Area Council. The study shows that adequate and proper awareness, transparency, effective management and accountability, sufficient funding for the N-power programme, and political stability are some of the ways to address the challenges affecting the smooth running and implementation of the programme in the study area. Also, there is a need for strong collaboration among relevant agencies to tackle the menace of bribery and corruption in the programme's implementation.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Despite various attempts by successive governments to eradicate extreme poverty in Nigeria, the scourge has persisted due mainly to poor implementation. In other words, Nigeria is not short of noble and achievable poverty eradication programmes, but it needs transparent and accountable public officers who will implement them effectively. The study confirmed that the programme's most noticeable effect on beneficiaries was an improvement in their income levels, but this was insufficient to guarantee them an internationally accepted minimum standard of living.

The study concludes that the N-Power Teach programme has temporarily improved teaching standards in the Gwagwalada Area Council and beneficiaries' incomes. The capacity of the N-Power Teach programme to reduce poverty sustainably is considered adequate to address it. The laid-down operational procedure is also considered sufficient. However, numerous impediments to the effective implementation of the programme have been identified, and recommendations to overcome them have been proffered. Consequently, if these recommendations are meticulously implemented, the N-Power Teach programme can reduce or alleviate poverty in the Gwagwalada Area Council and across Nigeria.

The following recommendations are made:

- i. An effective mechanism should be put in place to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the N-teach programme, with a view to assessing its performance. It should also be designed to identify defaulting beneficiaries and to provide enforcement strategies that ensure all stakeholders discharge their responsibilities accordingly. Any such implementation mechanism should be designed to involve all stakeholders in the exercise, ensuring proper monitoring and evaluation.
- ii. The N-teach Programme beneficiaries should be widened. There are millions of Nigerians living below the poverty line; the net of beneficiaries needs to be widened to reflect the magnitude of the problem of poverty in the country.
- iii. There should be adequate funding of the programme, and budgetary allocation to the N-teach programme should be placed on the first line, as this will make early release of funds possible and promote the smoothness of the programme. Early payment of beneficiaries' allowances will encourage them to discharge their duties diligently.

References

- Achimugu, H., Abubakar, Y., Agbani, J., Orokpo, J.O. (2012). Rethinking poverty reduction and sustainable Development in Nigeria: An advocacy for the bottom-up paradigm. *Canadian Social Science* 8(6)
- Adepegba, A. (2019). The number of poor Nigerians rose from 86 to 98 million in 10 years, according to the UNDP. Retrieved 10 October 2019, from Punch: <https://punch/mgxn/poor-nigerians-rose-from-86-to-98million-in-10years-undp/>
- Aderonmu, J.A. (2017). Poverty eradication in rural Nigeria: The role of local government. A paper presented at a conference on "Empowerment of Rural People. Organised by Charity Centre for Advancement and Rural Empowerment, Abuja, in Jos, 6-8 December
- Adetiloye, D. (2018). N-power social investment programme by the Federal Government of Nigeria. Retrieved 10 October 2019, from Adetiloye Business Hub: <https://dayoadetiloye.com/n-power-social-investment-programme-federalgovernment-nigeria/>
- Adoba, I. (2005). Nigeria: Better Life Programme: A success – Mrs Babangida. This Day Newspapers. Available at www.allafrica.com/stories. Accessed 21 October, 2018 via Google.com
- Ahmad, Z. (2016). Federal Government releases N65bn for Social Investment Programme. Retrieved 23 March 2020, <https://punchng.com/fg-releases-n65bn-social-investmentprogramme/>
- Akunjuru, C.A. & Enyioko, N.C. (2019). The impact of N-power programmes on poverty reduction in Nigeria: A Study of River State in *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration* 2017, No. 3
- Aliogo, U.(2022). Implications of Rejecting Gender Equality Bills. Thisdaylive.www.thisdaylive.com
- Babatunde, A. (2019). 5 Million Nigerians have not been lifted out of poverty. Retrieved from Dubawa, 28 March 2020. From <https://dubawa.org/5-million-nigerians-have-notbeen-lifted-out-of-poverty/>
- Bennel, P. (2017). Improving youth livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Review of and Programmes with particular emphasis on the link between sexual behaviour and economic well-being. Report to the Inter-Poverty Reduction in River State Centre (IDRC)
- Bouget, D., Frazer, H., Marlier, F., Sabato, S., Vanhersake, B. (2015). Social Investment in Europe: A Study of National Policies, Belgium, European Commission
- Daskyes, G. & Plagshak, S. (2018). Impact of National Social Investment Programme on Poverty and Youth Unemployment in Plateau State, 2016 – 2019

- Easton, D. (1965). *A System Analysis of Political Life*, New York
- Egware, L. (2017). *Poverty and poverty reduction: Nigeria's Experience*. In *poverty in Nigeria. The Nigerian Economic Society: Ibadan*
- Federal Ministry of Youth Development (2019). *National Youth Policy*. Abuja: Government Press, Frazer, H., & Sabato, S. (2015). *Social Investment in Europe, a Study of National Policies*. PostPrint Hal.
- Giddens, A. (1998). *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge. Polity Press
- Henry, N (1995). *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. India: Asoke Ghost Prentice Hall Ltd.
- International Labour Organisation (2020). *Poverty Alleviation through Social and Economic Transformation. A Paper prepared for the Employment Working Group under the 2020 Russian Presidency of the Bricks*.
- Jebbin, M.F. & Osu, A.K. (2014). *Why have efforts to end poverty failed in Nigeria? Developing Country Studies 4(19)*
- Kanayo O. & Nhombifuthi, M. (2022). *Does Social Investment Influence Poverty and Economic Growth in South Africa: A Co-Integration Analysis? Journal of Economics MDPI*
- Kazeem, O.L. (2021). *Social Investment Programmes in Nigeria: Impact and Challenges. AJSW, Volume 11*.
- Lamidi, K. & Igbokwe, P.I. (2021). *Social Investment programmes in Nigeria: Impact and Challenges. African Journal of Social Work, 11(1), 1-11*
- Ludwig, V.B (1950). *The History and Status of General Systems Theory. The Academy of Management Journal*
- Margima, A. (2002). *The impact of poverty alleviation strategies on people in Maiduguri metropolis: unpublished M.Sc thesis, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria*.
- National Bureau of Statistics (2019). *Poverty Level in Nigeria*. Abuja: NBS Publication
- National Social Investment Programme: The State House, Abuja (2019) Report.
- National Social Investment Programme. (2024). Gwagwalada Area Office.
- NBS (2017). *National Bureau of Statistics Annual Abstract of Statistics Vol. 1 Federal Government of Nigeria*
- Obadan, M. I. (1996). *Poverty in Nigeria: Characteristics, Alleviation Strategies and Programmes, NCEMA Analysis Series, 2 (2), 2–3*.
- Obadan, M. (2003). "Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: The way forward", in Obadan, M. A.A Fajingbesi, and E.O Uga, eds. 'Integrating Poverty Alleviation Strategies into plans and programmes in Nigeria', NACEMA/World Bank, Pp 243–266.

- Obadan, M.O. (2017). Analytical Framework for Poverty Reduction: Issue of Economic Growth versus other Strategies Proceedings of the Nigerian Economic Society's Annual Conference, 1-18.
- Ogbu, O. (2018). Why are they so poor? An Inaugural Lecture of the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, University of Nigeria Press.
- Olaf Van Vliet, Chen Wang, (2015). Social Investment and Poverty Reduction: A Comparative Analysis Across Fifteen European Countries. *Journal of Social Policy*, Vol. 44, Issue (3), Published online by Cambridge University Press.
- Olowa, O.W. (2015). Concept, measurement, and causes of poverty: Nigeria in Perspective. *American Journal of Economics* Vol. 2, Issue (1)
- Omeje, P.N. Ogbu, M.O., Nkwede V.I. and Njoku C.M., (2021). Effective and Efficient Management of Social Investment Programme in Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science* Vol. 26
- Onah, R.C. & Olise C.N. (2019). Social Investment Programme (SIP) and Sustainable Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: Challenges and Prospects. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, Vol. 24, Issue (10), Series 11
- Orji, J.I. (2009). An Assessment of the Impacts of the Poverty Reduction Programme in Nigeria as a Development Strategy (1970 – 2005), An Unpublished PhD Thesis, St. Clements University, Turks & Caicos Islands
- Oyekunle, O.I. (2020). Addressing Youth Unemployment and Poverty through Social Investment Programme in Nigeria: A Case Study of Nigeria's Social Investment Programme. Master's Thesis, University of Agder, Kristiansand. Published by University of Adger
- Philip, J.G., Kye Woo Lee, A., M.S., J.J., A (2013). Poverty Alleviation and Social Investment Funds: The Latin American Experience. Published by the World Bank Group.
- Rovallian, M. (2003). Targeted transfers in poor countries: revisiting the trade-off and policy options. World Bank, Social Protection Discussion Paper Series
- Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.
- Scott, H. & Elsevier, L. (2013). The Private Sector Role in Poverty-Developing Countries Inequality Economic and Social Development Sustainable Development Livelihood, Published by the Asia Journal of Sustainable Development.
- Smith, P., Nelms, I., Perkins, D. (2014). Beyond neo-liberalism, the Society of St. Lawrence and the University of Melbourne Centre for Public Policy
- Taiwo, J.N. & Agwu, M.E. (2016). Problems and prospects of poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Review* Vol. 4, Issue (6)
- Todaro, M.P., & Smith, S.C. (2020). Economic Development. Pearson Publications.
- Ucha, C. (2010). Poverty in Nigeria: Some dimensions and contributing factors. *Global Majority E-Journal* Vol. 1, Issue (1)

- Uche I. (2021). Can social investment programmes reverse the trend of poverty in Nigeria? Institute for African Studies at the London School of Economics and Political Science online Publication by LSE
- Ugo, A. (2016). Eradicating Poverty with Social Investment Programme: A Report examines the Effectiveness of the Social Investment Programme (SIP) in ending poverty in Nigeria since its launch in 2016. Published online by ThisDay Newspaper Ltd, Creek Road, Apapa, Lagos, Nigeria.
- Umar H.S. & Ibrahim H. (2008). Determinants of poverty among farming households in Nassarawa state, PAT 4(1), 11- 21
- UNDP, C. (2019). Nigeria has become the world's poverty capital. Retrieved 23 April 2020, from <https://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/NGA>
- UNESCO (2019). www.unesco.org
- UNICEF www.unicef.org/nigeria/1971-2199.html
- Wells, P. (2012). Understanding Social Investment Policy: Evidence from evaluation of future builders in England Voluntary Sector Review 3(2)
- World Bank. (2018). Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2018: Piecing together the Poverty Puzzle. World Bank Publications
- Yamane, T. (1973). Statistics: An Introductory Analysis. Harper and Row, New York.