ASSESSING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF NIGERIA'S POVERTY ALLEVIATION INITIATIVES UNDER PRESIDENT MUHAMMADU BUHARI'S ADMINISTRATION (2015–2023)

ABU OPOTU OTOKITI
KOGI STATE POLYTECHNIC, LOKOJA, NIGERIA
otokitiabdulazeez@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64633/wissj.v10i6.03

Keywords

Poverty, N-power, Conditional cash Transfers, NHGSFP and NSIP

Abstract

Research problem: *This study examines the extent to which these initiatives achieved their objectives of reducing poverty and improving the socio-economic well-being of beneficiaries.*

Methods/Theory: *The study adopts a qualitative research design using documentary and content analysis of secondary data obtained from government publications, policy documents, reports from international organizations, and scholarly literature. The analysis is guided by Capability Theory (Amartya Sen), which emphasizes improving people's opportunities and capabilities as a pathway to sustainable poverty reduction.*

Results: *The findings indicate that the poverty alleviation initiatives provided short-term relief by increasing access to financial support, temporary employment, and basic social services for many beneficiaries. However, their overall effectiveness was constrained by inadequate funding, weak monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.*

Conclusion: *The study concludes that while Buhari's poverty alleviation initiatives contributed to improving the welfare of some vulnerable groups, they were insufficient to achieve sustainable poverty reduction due to institutional and structural challenges.*

Key Contribution to Knowledge: *This study contributes to existing literature by providing a comprehensive assessment of Nigeria's poverty alleviation initiatives during the Buhari administration, identifying the major factors that influenced their effectiveness, and demonstrating the importance of integrating social welfare programmes with sustainable economic and institutional reforms for lasting poverty reduction.*

Recommendation: *The study recommends strengthening transparency and accountability in programme implementation, improving beneficiary targeting through reliable national databases, increasing investment in*

education, healthcare, agriculture, and skills acquisition, enhancing monitoring and evaluation systems, promoting job creation through private sector development, and ensuring policy continuity beyond political administrations to achieve sustainable poverty reduction in Nigeria.

Introduction

The issue of poverty has caused significant concern among policymakers, scholars, and development partners worldwide. It is a complicated issue that has persistently tested humanity in every aspect of life, having a significant impact on political, social, economic, and environmental development (Dannan, 2018). The fact that it is multifaceted and widespread in developing nations, particularly in Africa like Nigeria, is even more concerning. Even though Nigeria has an abundance of natural resources, such as petroleum, agricultural, human, and undeveloped solid minerals, it is not immune to the prevalence of poverty in comparison to wealthy countries (Aderounmu et al., 2021).

According to the Federal Office of Statistics (1996), as cited in Oshewolo (2010), poverty is increasing significantly throughout Nigerian states, affecting a sizable portion of the populace. In 2003–2004, the estimated annual poverty level per person was N28,836.70; in 2009–2010, it was N55,235.20 (National Bureau of Statistics [NBS], 2012). Similarly, according to the United Nations Development Programme (2010), 68.7 million Nigerians lived in poverty in 2014. The aforementioned is identical to Omotola's (2008) assertion that 70% of Nigerians are living in extreme poverty. Nigerians make about $1,000 per person on average, while Americans make $32,000 (Ikhariale, 2007).

The country's successive governments have been forced to take specific steps to address the aforementioned contentious issue. The importance of eradicating poverty is underscored by Sustainable Development Goal 1 (SDG1), which aims to eradicate all forms of poverty by 2030 (Aderounmu et al., 2021). Aibieyi&Dirisu (2010, p. 243) noted that "studies have demonstrated that previous policies and programs directed at alleviating poverty by various governments have not made much impact for several reasons," supporting this claim. Examples include the following: Obasanjo's Operation Feed the Nation (OFN), Shagari's River Basin Development Authority (RBDA) and Green Revolution (GR), Babangida's Mass Mobilization for Social and Economic Recovery (MAMSER), the National Directorate for Employment (NDE), the Directorate for Food, Road and Rural Infrastructural (DFRRI), the Better Life for Rural Women Programme (BLP), the National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA), the People's Bank of Nigeria (PBN), the Nigerian Agricultural and Cooperative Bank (NACB), Abacha's Family Economic Advancement Programme (FEAP), Obasanjo's Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP), and others. None of them succeeded not to a bad idea, but rather to a haphazard, unfocused, hazy, corrupt, and self-serving implementation process.

These programs are frequently taken over by dishonest, self-serving, and self-centered people or organizations in positions of authority. The end result is always epilepsy and inadequate program execution or performance. One notable example is the Family Economic Advancement

Programme (FEAP), which was a letdown because, despite significant investment of time, money, and human capital, it never produced the intended impact on poverty reduction.

The Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P), an initiative launched by the Goodluck Jonathan administration in 2011, was implemented with the primary goal of eliminating poverty by giving jobless graduates employment opportunities (Dauada et al., 2019). However, this noble objective has not been achieved because youth unemployment and poverty have been increasing (Ahiauzu&Asawo, 2016). While attempting to establish the correlation between income inequality, poverty and economic development in Nigeria, Nwosa and Ehinomen (2020) argued that poverty has not impacted significantly on the economic growth of the country unlike the submission by Olowa (2012) that poverty in Nigeria is attributed to lack of job opportunities, poor economic growth and low productivity.

According to the above analysis, this topical issue has arguably garnered a lot of scholarly attention; however, there appears to be little research on the methods Nigeria has used to eradicate poverty since 2015. Aderounmu et al. (2021) support this argument by stating that research on the issue and its effects on national development is necessary given Nigeria's incapacity to guarantee a healthy life for its people in comparison to other nations. The scholarship disposition of this paper is to advance a more robust sustainable mechanism to cub the incessant poverty in the developing countries of the word. Specifically in Nigeria while placing Buhari's administration (2015–2023) in perspective.

Poverty and the Reduction of Poverty

For the purpose of this study, "poverty" is defined as a situation in which a portion of a country's population is unable to meet their most basic needs, such as clothing, food, and health care. In this perspective, the entire economic well-being of the poor without the distribution of social welfare is referred to poverty. Also, lack of resources compared to others in one's social group is another definition of poverty. This definition of poverty only considers the interactions between groups and social classes, which are connected to the differences in the distribution of wealth and well-being between social classes in a particular location (Nguyen et al., 2021).

Contrarily, poverty alleviation refers to the initiatives, plans, or policies implemented by governments, groups, and private citizens in an attempt to drastically reduce the rate of poverty in the society. Its strategy is demonstrated by the policies, initiatives, and programs put in place to deal with poverty-related problems like unemployment, inequality, and lack of access to essential services.

It is argued that over the past 60 years, theoretical frameworks for ending poverty have changed. Scholars and international development organizations intensified their debates on methods for ending poverty and promoting development in the 1970s and 1990s (Sen, 1976; Streeten&Burki, 1978; Wong, 2012). Over the past three decades, organizations like the World Bank and the United Nations have taken the lead in the fight against poverty, particularly in developing countries.

These discussions led to the creation of the Millennium Development Goals, which aimed to drastically lower extreme poverty in developing

nations by the year 2015 (United Nations, 2000; United Nations, 2011; United Nations Publications, 2010). Furthermore, as a follow-up to the MDGs, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), specifically SDG1, have been put into effect with the intention of eliminating extreme poverty globally by 2030 (United Nations, 2017).

The World Social Summit proclaimed that ending poverty was a moral, social, political, and economic necessity for all people. It also called on governments to address the root causes of poverty, provide for the basic needs of their citizens, and make sure that the impoverished have access to resources that will increase their productivity (United Nations, 2023).

The N-Power Program

The goal of N-Power, a job creation and skill development program, is to help young Nigerians acquire and develop lifelong skills that will help them become creative players in both local and global markets and useful solution providers in their communities. Participants in the N-Power program had to be young Nigerians between the ages of 18 and 35.

According to Attah, Omang, Ojong-Ejoh, and Botchway (2021), the program was further separated into Graduate and Non-Graduates programs (N-power Information Guide, 2017). The program's main goals were to reduce unemployment and increase youth social security. Beyond giving Nigerian youth long-lasting skills, it sought to make them change agents in their communities and, consequently, improve the nation's public services in a variety of areas, including education and health (NSIP, 2017).

Furthermore, both graduates and non-graduates can access the N-Power program, which is "geared towards graduates' job creation; poverty alleviation and empowerment initiatives through volunteering services" and is run by the Nigerian Federal Government's National Social Investments Programs (Federal Government of Nigeria [FGN], 2018, as cited in Dauda et al., 2019, p. 42). The two-year paid volunteer program has been in place for over five years.

According to the program's goals, graduate volunteers were expected to carry out their primary responsibilities at particular neighborhood public services. Every beneficiary was given a mobile device, and they were also eligible for a monthly mobile data allowance from their network provider, on top of their monthly stipend. They could view training materials that were placed on the tablet to assist them in their work by connecting to the internet with their mobile data (FGN, 2017, as cited in Ijoko, Balami, & Alkali, 2020).

The Graduate N-Power Programme

Stating the objectives of the programme, the Nation (2021) reported that “through this initiative, the government trains unemployed school leaders such as graduates in different vocations to be gainfully engaged. The graduates were posted to different organizations and institutions to work for a given period.

They were paid stipends as a stopgap before they secure permanent paid employment”. The Graduates Programme was further divided into N-Teach, N-Agro, and N-Health. Under the N-Teach, volunteers were deployed as teachers' assistants in primary schools in their respective localities. The schools relied on them to offer teaching, instructional, and advisory services. Volunteers of N-Teach were expected to assist in enhancing the delivery of fundamental education in Nigerian schools.

The N-Health required its beneficiaries to help vulnerable members of society, such as pregnant women, children, families, and individuals, by promoting and enhancing healthcare in their local areas. Only individuals who studied medical-related courses were qualified.

Beneficiaries of the N-Agro served as agricultural extension agents who advised farmers across the nation. The volunteers were expected to disseminate information provided by the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development through their extension programmes. They were also expected to collect information on Nigeria's agricultural resources. Youth who undertook courses related to agriculture were engaged in this particular area.

N-power assessment report revealed that 200,000 young people participated in the programme in 2017 which resulted to reduction in youth unemployment from 23.6 percent to 16.6 percent, and another 300,000 in 2018, thereby leading to further reduction in youth unemployment from 32.45 percent to 29.75 percent (NBS, 2019, as cited in Attah et al., 2021).

The Non-Graduate N-Power Program

The federal government under President Buhari also created some program components especially for young Nigerians without degrees who were unemployed in an effort to guarantee that a respectable proportion of young people took part in the program. The program's N-Knowledge, N-Creative, and N-Build components are among them.

N-Knowledge volunteers who were classified as nongraduates were trained in various fields and given certificates. In order to make them relevant in the knowledge-based economy, this was done to improve their ability to compete successfully in both domestic and foreign markets.

Volunteers for N-Build underwent extensive training in a range of trades, such as carpentry, welding, plumbing, fabrication, and painting. This component also included N-Creative, where non-graduates received training in scriptwriting, animation, postproduction, and graphic design. The non-graduate component was only supposed to last a year, during which they were given a stipend of N10,000 per month. As part of their departure package, volunteers received toolkits (FGN, 2017, as cited in Ijoko, Balami, & Alkali, 2020).

The country's state and local governments were essential to the N-Power program's implementation. A tripartite strategy comprising the federal, state, and local governments was used for the decentralized implementation. Some young Nigerians without jobs have been temporally engaged by the program. Between 2016 and 2018, 520,000 young people nationwide were employed through various NSIP programs, particularly N-Power (National Social Investment Office, 2018, as cited in Onah & Olise, 2019).

Obi-Ani and Isiani (2020) and Okeke et al. (2020) deconstructed it from a perspective, arguing that while human resources drive the socioeconomic and political life of most world-famous cities like China, Japan, and several Asian nations, the situation differs in many developing countries, including Nigeria, where youths in urban centers struggle with poverty, unemployment, slum life, and other socioeconomic issues primarily due to a lack of effective youth development policies. However, the results of many of these programs have remained unclear, raising concerns (Holt & Neely, 2011; Ogunmefun&Okuneye, 2020). This is because successive governments, non-

governmental organizations, and international organizations have launched numerous youth empowerment and poverty alleviation programs in Nigeria, acknowledging the importance of young people in the country's development. Through empowerment initiatives, entrepreneurship, and training and retraining programs, the Nigerian government and other pertinent stakeholders have attempted to improve the lives of Nigerian youth. The World Bank, non-governmental organizations, and even the private sector have backed these initiatives.

There is no doubt that some NGOs and well-known people, such as the Tony Elumelu Foundation and LEEP Africa, have donated money to help prevent future unemployment crises. By increasing job creation, decreasing poverty, and generating income for the government and individuals, all of these measures aimed to diversify the economy, reduce dependency on government spending and oil revenue, and foster economic growth and development. Nigeria's unemployment rate has increased in spite of these initiatives, which has led to social exclusion, youth unrest, and general underdevelopment. Similarly, Holt and Neely (2011) noted that even with some of these programs and policies that emphasize employability and entrepreneurship skills, the youth unemployment and vulnerability rate is still rising.

Conditional Cash Transfer

The goals of social protection measures are to improve the social status of vulnerable individuals, shield them from threats to their livelihood, and give them money or consumption transfers. According to Eluma, Yinusa, and Bamidele (2018, p. 2), who traced the historical evolution of conditional cash transfer, "The CCT originated from Latin America and the Caribbean." More than four million families, or 20% of Mexico's total population, were served by the CCT program in 2002. Its yearly budget was about Mex$18 billion (US$1.8 billion, or roughly 0.32% of GDP). However, there is conflicting evidence regarding the efficacy of conditional cash transfers. They can effectively address poverty-related issues, according to some studies, but others have argued that they are insensitive to sustainability (Holmes et al., 2012). Given that a significant section of Nigeria's population lives in poverty, the World Bank and the Federal Government of Nigeria worked together on the National Social Safety Nets Project (NASSP). The National Social Safety Net Coordinating Office (NASSCO) and the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) under the National Social Investment Programmes were also established by the government for that purpose. They were intended to give safety net transfers to particular low-income and vulnerable households across Nigeria.

They were expected to make safety net transfers to targeted poor and vulnerable households across Nigeria. As the Nation (2021) puts it “Conditional Cash Transfer is a scheme where comprehensive database of poor and vulnerable Nigerians are captured with a view to giving them monthly stipends to cushion the effects of poverty across the country. It utilized the support and cooperation of local community leaders in its efforts to capture poor households”. Conditional Cash Transfer is aimed at giving poor and vulnerable households access to transfers through a strengthened national social safety net system. Between 2016 and 2019, the Conditional Cash Transfer initiative provided assistance to 297,973 extremely impoverished Nigerians (Onah & Olise, 2019).

National Home Grown School Feeding Programme

With an emphasis on boosting school enrollment, lowering the prevalence of malnutrition, particularly among the impoverished, and empowering cooks while promoting local agriculture through small-holder farmers, the National Home Grown School Feeding Program aimed to offer an affordable homegrown school feeding program that would boost economic growth along the socioeconomic value chain. The program's goal was to address the issues that the educational system faces, particularly those that have to do with the large percentage of school-age children who are not enrolled.

In particular, by providing food while students are in class, the program aims to increase student enrollment. Given the high rate of poverty in the nation and the fact that many parents cannot afford to feed their children, let alone send them to school, the program was decided to be implemented. In order to close the gap, the government decided to implement school feeding programs, which would allow young students to eat at least once a day in schools. Along with the corresponding improvement in the caliber of output produced by school-leaving graduates, the goal was also to guarantee that the attention of the younger students would be captured. The Nation (2021) explains the program more succinctly, saying that it "equally aimed to boost the local economy of rural areas by engaging women who cook as well as source their materials from local farmers who ultimately provide the needed inputs." The program's specific objectives were to:

1. Increase school enrollment.
2. Strengthen local agricultural economies by establishing a school feeding market where farmers can sell their produce directly, in conjunction with the revival of community warehouses.
3. Create job opportunities in catering and healthcare.
4. Improve a child's nutrition and health.

The Home Grown School Feeding Programme created 96,972 jobs for cooks (National Social Investment Office, 2018, as cited in Onah & Olise, 2019). There is a claim that the program was somewhat successful. One reason for the rise in student enrollment is the Home Grown School Feeding Program. In Nigeria, school attendance and enrollment are gradually increasing. The attendance rates for males and females aged 5-14 who were enrolled in school in 2018 were 78.4 and 78.7 percent, respectively (World Bank, 2019).

National Social Investment Programme

The National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) is a government initiative to reduce poverty, improve education, create jobs, and support vulnerable people through various social welfare and economic empowerment programmes. This comprises of N-power graduate and Non- graduate population, NHGSFP, Conditional Cash Transfer.

Methodology

This study is based on a review of the literature and is motivated by content analysis. One distinguishing feature of the literature review is its systematic and reproducible approach to identifying and evaluating the state of the art in a particular field of study (Fink, 2005). It incorporates research in a systematic, open, and reproducible manner to promote knowledge and direct practice and policy (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). Also, publications from government establishments

and international organizations such as the NBS, Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development (FMHDS), United Nations and World Bank were equally considered.

Theoretical framework

A theory is a systematic explanation of interconnected ideas that condenses and organizes knowledge about the social world (Neuman, 2014). For the purpose of this research, the study adopted a content-analysis-driven approach that is based on a literature review. Previous researchers only focused on poverty reduction mechanism without mentioning the sustainability of every social investment program. The researcher was able to put forth sustainability to fill the identify gap in the previous literatures.

Table 1. Trajectory of Poverty Rate in Nigeria

Year	Poverty Rate
1985	46.3%
1992	42.7%
1996	65.6%
2004	64.2%
2009	53.5%
2010	62.4%
2013	33.1%
2019	40.1%
2022	62.9%

Source: NBS, 2023.

Buhari's Government Poverty Alleviation Model

Given the alarming poverty rate and the widely held belief that the government serves the people, Buhari's administration launched several programs to combat poverty in the nation when it took office in 2015. The National Social Investment Programme (NSIP), which consists of a number of components, is the focal point of the government's model for reducing poverty. According to Punch (2016), which cited President Buhari, "we are committed to providing job opportunities for 10,000 artisans and 500,000 teachers across the nation." Through our school feeding program, 5.5 million children will receive wholesome meals to enhance learning outcomes, enrollment, and completion rates. Up to one million vulnerable beneficiaries will receive financial assistance through the conditional cash transfer program, which will supplement the enterprise program, which will target 200,000 agricultural workers,

460,000 artisans, and up to one million market women nationwide. Lastly, we will lay the groundwork for the generation's human capital development by encouraging students to pursue studies in math, science, technology, and engineering through the education grant program. Similar to this, Lamidi and Igbokwe (2021) contended that the NSIP is a collection of numerous programs created by the administration to address social issues like growing unemployment, poverty, cybercrime, a drop in educational standards, and others brought on by escalating global economic crises.

The program's many elements—N-Power, Conditional Cash Transfer, and Home Grown School Feeding—were designed to guarantee a more equitable allocation of resources to marginalized populations, including women, children, and youth. The NSIP was established in 2016 and is best described as an "agency within the purview of the office of the vice president, but the creation of the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Poverty Alleviation and Disaster Management meant that the agency has a new supervising authority away from the busy office of the vice president," according to The Nation (2021).

Limitation

Challenges faced are poor funding, lack of transparency and accountability.

Discussion

The study's findings imply that the N-Power program's implementation did not produce the intended result, which was to lower youth unemployment and thereby lessen poverty among the nation's youth. This result supports the argument made by Onah and Olise (2019) that while 520,000 Nigerians benefited from the N-power program, the trajectory of poverty among the country's youth from the time Buhari's government took office (May 29, 2015) to the time it left office (May 29, 2023) indicates that the program had little effect. 58.7% of adults over 18 suffer from numerous problems associated with poverty (NBS, 2022). The N-power program was created primarily because unemployment is a key indicator of poverty among the nation's youth. However, the program was unable to accomplish this main goal, as evidenced by the alarmingly persistent rise in youth unemployment in the nation.

According to NBS, as cited in Ofoma (2022), young people comprise 42.5 percent of the population, and the country's unemployment rate was 33.3%. Since 2018, Nigeria's unemployment rate has increased, specifically from 21.8% in the third quarter of 2018 to 33.3% at the end of 2020. Furthermore, the underemployment rate increased from 16.3 percent in the third quarter of 2018 to 22.8 percent in the fourth quarter of 2020. Young people have been most affected during this time. According to estimates, 53.4 percent of people aged 15 to 24 were unemployed in 2020. The states with the highest unemployment rates prior to the onset of COVID-19 were Imo (56.6 percent), Adamawa (54.9 percent), and Cross River (53.7 percent) (NBS, 2022).

According to Osabuohien et al. (2020), Nigerian youth have been affected by a number of issues, such as poverty, unemployment, and social exclusion, instead of making use of their vast human capital. According to an NBS report, Nigeria's youth unemployment rates in the third quarter of 2017 alone were 23.1 percent for those between the ages of 15 and 24 and 20.2 percent for those between the ages of 25 and 34 (Ojoye, 2018). Given the vast amount of material and human resources the country possesses, the paradox of suffering amid plenty is sufficient (Apata et al., 2010).

Furthermore, the results demonstrate that the Conditional Cash Transfer program was unable to meet its goal due to its unsustainable nature as well as its notable inefficiency in light of the growing rate of inflation and the fluctuating value of the naira relative to other currencies. This view is further supported by Jacho's (2022) observation that it is hard to conclude that the Conditional Cash Transfer was effective in giving these individuals a meager 5,000 naira (N5,000) monthly stipend, even considering the value of Nigerian currency. According to Naushad et al. (2020), the percentage of Nigerians living in extreme poverty rose from 40.1% in 2018 to 42.8% in 2020, based on a purchasing power parity of $1.90 per day. This shows that more than 80 million Nigerians lived in extreme poverty as of 2020. So where does Conditional Cash Transfer have an impact?

According to the results of the GEEP, the program had a noteworthy positive effect. In support of this submission, Onah and Olise (2019) claimed that 317,212 and 1,061,592 people, respectively, obtained loans through TraderMoni and MarketMoni, while 4,084 cooperative societies received financial support. As of 2018, more than a million women, young business owners, farmers, and other economically vulnerable producers were eligible for low-cost microloans through the program. This suggests that GEEP outperformed other national social investment programs in promoting the expansion of a demographic that would not have been productive otherwise, bringing millions of people into the contemporary economy and eliminating poverty in local communities.

This view is further supported by Obasi and Uduji (2023), who note that GEEP has had a major influence on young women's entrepreneurial abilities in Nigeria, particularly in rural areas. In 2018, 725,000 businesses received training and financial support through GEEP. In addition, 42,000 cooperative societies in the federation's 36 states received loans (FMHDS, 2018). Furthermore, Obasi and Uduji stated that their examination of the loan distribution in determining the FGN's investment and the spread revealed that "just around 2 percent of GEEP participants have received financial assistance worth more than one hundred Nigerian Naira (N100,000)." According to additional data, 46% of respondents received between N61,000 and N80,000, 16% received between N41,000 and N60,000, and 18% received between N81,000 and N100,000. Six percent only received N1,000 to N20,000, whereas 12 percent received N21,000 to N40,000. This demonstrates how much money the federal government has put into the intervention to increase the creation of good jobs (Obasi&Uduji, 2023: p. 15-16).

Additionally, the results show that the National Home Grown School Feeding Program had negligible success. This submission is predicated on the idea that the nation's school enrollment situation appears to be still dire. Among all children of school age, 29% do not go to school. Multidimensional poverty is closely linked to the fact that 94% of all children who are not enrolled in school live in poverty. This is a critical issue that requires urgent attention because 27% of all school-aged children are uneducated and impoverished (with no appreciable gender differences). According to the 2018 Nigeria Multi-dimensional Poverty Index, the two factors that contribute most to poverty in the country are employment and education (years of schooling and attendance of children). In terms of employment, years of education, and child attendance, Nigerians are more deprived, according to the findings, which contributed 24.89 percent, 21.98 percent, and 13.19 percent to poverty, respectively (NBS,

2022). In addition, it is estimated that 47.4 percent of children under the age of 18 are impoverished. Children in rural areas make up 59.5 percent of the population, compared to 22.9 percent in urban areas. These projections are based on the Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning's (MFBNP) and NBS's Monetary Child Poverty Analysis (United Nations Children's Fund, 2021).

Conclusion and Recommendation

This study examined the National Social Investment Programme, a model for reducing poverty that was implemented by the previous Nigerian government under President Buhari. The study examined the efforts taken by Buhari's predecessors, along with their difficulties and results, in order to provide a fair discussion. As a result, it reviewed the various elements of Buhari's government model (NSIP), along with their procedures, undertakings, and problems. The study's conclusions and discussions show that only N-POWER had a noteworthy beneficial effect. The aforementioned suggests that Buhari's style of governance was unable to address poverty in Nigeria in a way that would be sustainable. The poverty rate was 33.1 percent prior to Buhari's administration and 62.9 percent just before the government was set to leave office. As a result, the above's policy implications call for a shift in approach.

This paper therefore recommends an infrastructure investment model that is based on a public-private partnership arrangement. In order to demonstrate a practical commitment to infrastructure in vital areas like power, transportation, health, security, and education, the private sector must be enlisted. In addition to raising people's standard of living, this will create an environment that encourages business growth, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises that actively involve the poorest of the poor. Furthermore, more research examining the politics of poverty alleviation in Nigeria is required.

References

Adamgbe, E. T., Belonwu, M. C., Ochu, E. R., & Okafor, I. I. (2020). Analysis of the impact of Central Bank of Nigeria's agricultural interaction fund on the economy. Economic and Financial Review, 58(1), 57-80.

Aderounmu, B., Azuh, D., Onanuga, O., Oluwatomisin, O., Ebenezer B., &Azuh, A. (2021). Poverty drivers and Nigeria's development: Implications for policy intervention. Cogent Arts & Humanities, 8(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2021.1927495

Adeyonu, A. G., Balogun, O. L., Amao, I. O., & Agboola, T. O. (2022). Does farmers' entrepreneurial competencies explain their household poverty status? Evidence from rural areas of Kwara State, Nigeria. Cogent Economics & Finance, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2022.2071384

Ahiauzu, A., &Asawo, S. P. (2016). Advanced Social Research Methodology. Port Harcourt, Nigeria: CIMRAT

Aibieyi, S., &Dirisu, E. O. (2010). National poverty eradication programmes in Nigeria: Problems and prospects. LWATI: A Journal of Contemporary Research, 7(2). https://doi.org/10.4314/lwati.v7i2.57550

Apata, T. G., Apata, O. M., Igbalajobi, O. A., & Awoniyi, S. M. O. (2010). Determinants of rural poverty in Nigeria: evidence from small holder farmers in South-Western, Nigeria. Journal of Science and Technology Education Research, 1(4), 85-91.

Attah, F. M., Omang, T. A., Ojong-Ejoh, M. U., & Botchway, H. (2021). Information on the impact national N-Power scheme on employment creation. JINAV: Journal of Information and Visualization, 2(1), 42-49. https://doi.org/10.35877/454RI.jinav313

Cantarelli, C. C., & Genovese, A. (2023). Innovation potential of megaprojects: a systematic literature review. Production Planning & Control, 34(14), 1350-1370. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2021.2011462

Dauda, A., Adeyeye. M. M, Yakubu, M. M., Oni, O. O. & Umar, H. (2019). The impact of N-Power programme on youth enterprise in Minna Metropolis. Nigeria Journal of Business Administration, 17(1 & 2), 40-52.

Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development. (2018). Investing in Our People: A Brief on the National Social Investment Programmes in Nigeria, Abuja. Abuja, Nigeria: National Social Investment Office.

Fink, A. (2005). Conducting Research Literature Reviews: From Paper to the Internet. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Gandolfi, F., & Neck, P. A. (2010). Poverty: A social disgrace and dilemma. In Kao, R. W. Y. (Ed.). Sustainable Economy Corporate, Social and Environmental Responsibility. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing

Gweshengwe, B., & Hassan, N. H. (2020). Defining the characteristics of poverty and their implications for poverty analysis. Cogent Social Sciences, 6(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2020.1768669

Hagen-Zanker, J., & Holmes, R. (2012). Social Protection in Nigeria: Synthesis Report. Retrieved November 2020, from https://odi.org/en/publications/social-protection-in-nigeria-synthesisreport/.

Holt, N. L., & Neely, K. C. (2011). Positive youth development through sport: A review. RevistadeIberoamericana de Psicología del Ejercicio y elDeporte, 6(2), 299–316.

Ijoko, A. O., Balami, E. L., & Alkali, M. (2020). Review of the contribution of N-Power programme to poverty reduction and achievement of sustainable development goals in Nigeria. FUDMA Economic and Development Review, 4(2), 19-35.

Ikejiaku, B. V. (2009). The relationship between poverty, conflict and development. Journal of Sustainable Development, 2(1), 15–28. https://doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v2n1p15

Ikhariale, M. (2007). Poverty in Nigeria. The Daily Independent, pp. B4.

Imoudu, P. (1998). Poverty alleviation and sustainable income in rural communities: The challenge for industrial reforms. In Oludimu, O., &Imoudu, P. (Eds.). Institutional Reforms for Agricultural Development. Chicago: Triumph Books Publisher.

Lamidi, K. & Igbokwe, P.I. (2021). Social investment programmes in Nigeria: Impact and challenges. African Journal of Social Work, 11(1), 1-11.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2012). Nigeria Poverty Profile 2010. Retrieved from https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/pdfuploads/Nigeria%20Poverty%20Profile%202010.pdf.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2019). Demographic Statistics Bulletin 2018. Abuja, Nigeria: Author

National Bureau of Statistics. (2020). Poverty and Inequality in Nigeria 2019: Executive

Summary. Retrieved from https://nigerianstat.gov.ng/download/1092.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2022). 2022 Multidimensional Poverty Index Survey. Abuja, Nigeria: Author

National Social Investment Programme. (2017). N-Power Information Guide. Federal Government of Nigeria.

Nguyen M. H., Nguyen, D. L., & Pham, T. K. (2021). The impact of urbanization on poverty reduction: An evidence from Vietnam. Cogent Economics & Finance, 9(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2021.1918838

Nwosa, P. I., &Ehinomen, C. (2020). Inequality, poverty and economic growth in Nigeria. EuroEconomica, 2(39), 1-9. Retrieved from https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/EE/article/view/293.

Obasi, E. N. O., &Uduji, J. I. (2023). Government enterprise and empowerment program (GEEP) and women's performance in entrepreneurship development in Nigeria. Development in Practice, 34(1), 3-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2023.2178639

Obi-Ani, N. A., &Isiani, M. C. (2020). Urbanization in Nigeria: The Onitsha experience. Cities, 104, 102744. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2020.102744

Ofoma, C. V. (2022). Unemployment and youth restiveness in South-East Nigeria (2010-2022). Cross Cultural Communication, 18(4), 56-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/12864

Ogunmefun, F. M., &Okuneye, M. Y. (2020). Youth employment insecurity and development in Nigeria. Randwick International of Social Science (RISS) Journal, 1(2), 94-106. https://doi.org/10.47175/rissj.v1i2.49

Ojoye, T. (2018). Unemployment fear grows as more Nigerians lose jobs. The Punch. Retrieved from https://punchng.com/unemployment-fear-grows-as-more-nigerians-lose-jobs/.

Okeke, F. O., Eziyi, I. O., Udeh, C. A., & Ezema, E. C. (2020). City as habitat: Assembling the fragile city. Civil Engineering Journal, 6(5), 1143–1154. https://doi.org/10.28991/cej-2020-03091536

Olowa, O. W. (2012). Concept, measurement and causes of poverty: Nigeria in perspective. American Journal of Economics, 2(1), 25–36. https://doi.org/10.5923/j.economics.20120201.04

Onah, R. C., & Olise, C. N. (2019). National social investment programme (NSIP) and sustainable poverty reduction in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects. Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 24(10), 20-31. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-2410112031

Osabuohien, E. S., Efobi, U., Gitau, C. M., Osabohien, R. A., & Adediran, O. (2020). Youth (un)employment and large-scale agricultural land investments: Examining the relevance of indigenous institutions and capacity in Tanzania. In Osabuohien, E. S. (Ed.). The Palgrave Handbook of Agricultural and Rural Development in Africa. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Oshewolo, S. (2010). Galloping poverty in Nigeria: an appraisal of government interventionist policies. Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa, 12(6), 264-274.

Ravallion, M. (2012). Why don't we see poverty convergence? American Economic Review,

102(1), 504-523. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.1.504.

Sen, A. (1976). Poverty: An ordinal approach to measurement. Econometrica, 44(2), 219-231. https://doi.org/10.2307/1912718

Streeten, P., & Burki, S. (1978). Basic needs: Some issues. World Development, 6(3), 411-421. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(78)90116-X

The Nation. (2021). Buhari Administration and Poverty Alleviation. Retrieved June 24, 2023, from https://thenationonlineng.net/buhari-administration-and-poverty-alleviation/

Tomizawa, A., Zhao, L., Bassellier, G., & Ahlstrom, D. (2019). Economic growth, innovation, institutions, and the great enrichment. Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 37(1), 7–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-019-09648-2

Tranfield, D., Denyer, D. & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. British Journal of Management, 14(3), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375

United Nations Children's Fund. (2021). UNICEF Nigeria Country Office Annual Report 2021. Retrieved from https://www.unicef.org/reports/country-regional-divisional-annual-reports-2021/Nigeria.

United Nations. (2000). United Nations Millennium Declaration. Retrieved from https://undocs.org/en/A/RES/55/2.

United Nations. (2010). The Millennium Development Goals Report 2010. New York: United Nations.

United Nations. (2011). The Millennium Development Goals Report 2011. New York: United Nations.

United Nations. (2017). Sustainable Development Goals. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/.

United Nations. (2023). Social Perspective on Development. Retrieved June 29, 2023 fromhttps://www.un.org/development/desa/socialperspectiveondevelopment/issues/povertyeradication.html.

Wong, S. Y. (2012). Understanding poverty: Comparing basic needs approach and capability approach. SSRN Electronic Journal. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2066179

World Bank. (2014). Nigeria Economic Report: Improved Economic Outlook in 2014, and Prospects for Continued Growth Look Good. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria/publication/nigeria-economic-report-improvedeconomic-outlook-in-2014-and-prospects-for-continued-growth-look-good.

World Bank. (2018). Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2018: Piercing Together the Poverty Puzzle. Washington, DC: Author.

World Bank. (2019). Aspiring Indonesia - Expanding the Middle Class. Retrieved from https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/indonesia/publication/aspiring-indonesia-expandingthe-middle-class.