STATE-LED POVERTY REDUCTION AND YOUTH EMPOWERMENT IN NIGERIA: A COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE N-POWER PROGRAMMES IN GOMBE STATE (2016–2022)

ABUBAKAR IDRIS, PhD
Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Gombe State University, Gombe State, Nigeria
idrisab33@gsu.edu.ng, idrisab33@gmail.com ORCID ID: 0009-0009-5442-1058

ABDULLAHI TAJUDEEN
Distance Learning Centre, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Kaduna State, Nigeria
abduly2k4real@gmail.com ORCID ID: 0009-0005-0532-4201

JAMILA ALI PhD
Department of Political Science, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Gombe State University,
jamilanyaya2030@gmail.com ORCID ID: 0009-0001-4745-9594

DOI: https://doi.org/10.64633/wissj.v10i2.02

Keywords

Poverty, Youth development, Social investment programmes, Poverty reduction strategies, Economic empowerment

Abstract

Research Problem: *Youth unemployment and poverty remain critical challenges in Nigeria, prompting state-led interventions such as the N-Power Programme. Despite its widespread implementation, limited empirical studies have comparatively assessed the effectiveness of its core components N-Power Teach, N-Power Agro, and N-Power Health in improving socio-economic conditions among beneficiaries, particularly in Gombe State between 2016 and 2022.*

Methods/theory: *The study employed a mixed-methods approach, drawing on both primary and secondary data. Primary data were collected through questionnaires and interviews, while secondary data included journals, textbooks, government publications, and online resources. Quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics and presented in frequency and percentage tables, while qualitative data were analysed thematically. The study was guided by structural theory as the theoretical framework.*

Results: *Findings indicate that the N-Power Programme is a distinctive state-led intervention that significantly contributes to poverty reduction,*

livelihood provision, and improvement of living standards among participants. Across its components, the programme positively influenced beneficiaries' socio-economic conditions in Gombe State.

Conclusion: *The study concludes that N-Power demonstrates the potential of state-led youth empowerment initiatives, but its long-term sustainability is contingent upon enhanced funding, transparency, and administrative efficiency.*

Key Contribution to Knowledge: *This research provides an empirical comparative assessment of N-Power's multiple components, offering evidence-based insights into the effectiveness of state-led poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria, specifically within the context of Gombe State.*

Recommendation: *The study recommends that the government increase commitment to financing, expand beneficiary coverage, and implement administrative reforms to enhance the programme's impact on reducing youth unemployment.*

Introduction

The issue of poverty and high level of unemployment among the youth have been a never-ending problem that continue to confront the country and this is despite the several economic policies, interventions and even economic reforms carried out over the years by successive administrations. This development has continued to be source of concern for stakeholders and government owing to the fact thatone of the fundamental responsibilities of the state is the provision of public goods and social services aimed at improving citizens' welfare and reducing poverty. These responsibilities include but not limited to access to quality education, comprehensive healthcare, creating employment opportunities, and social protection. Effective state intervention in these areas is widely regarded as critical to enhancing livelihoods, stimulating productivity, and reducing poverty. In this regard, poverty reduction is not limited to material assistance but also involves strengthening local economies through inclusive public policies and governance structures.

In Nigeria, successive administrations initiated and implemented policies and programmes targeted at curbing the menace of poverty such as; the National Directorate of Employment (NDE, 1986), Better Life Programme (BLP, 1987), Family Support Programme(FSP, 1994), the Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI, 1999), National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP, 2000), National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS, 2003), Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P, 2012) and of recent, National Social Investment Programme (N-SHIP, 2016) consisting of N-Power Programme, Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT), Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP) and Home Grown School Feeding Programme (HGSF). According to the World Bank (2018), Nigeria is a nation (capital) of extreme poverty and has overtaken India. The state of poverty as revealed by the World Bank (2018) is as follows: Nigeria leads with 86.9 million poor, India with 71.5million, Democratic Republic of Congo

60.9 million, Ethiopia 23.9 million, Tanzania 19.9 million, Mozambique 17.8 million, Bangladesh 17million, Kenya 14.7 million, Indonesia 14.2 million and finally Uganda with 14.2 million. Also, National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2022) stated categorically that 63% of Nigerians amounting to 133 million are poor due to lack of access to health care services, qualitative education, lack of portable drinking water, unemployment, insecurity, high cost of living, inflation, layoffs of staff and poor standards of living. Poverty profile of Gombe State is rather severe, a situation that warrants the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) in 2022 to rank Gombe as the state that has the most incidence of poverty, with a poverty rate of 74.6%, the poorest in the Northeast zone and this is prior to the implementation of the N-Power Programme.

Statement of Research Problem

Poverty and youth unemployment remain persistent socio-economic challenges in Nigeria, with Gombe State experiencing significantly high levels despite various government interventions. In response, the N-Power programme was launched in 2016 to empower Nigerian youth and reduce poverty through targeted components: N-Power Teach, N-Power Agro, and N-Power Health**.** Several previous studies have evaluated aspects of the programme's outcomes. For example, Efayena and Buzugbe (2020) examined the impact of the N-Power initiative on unemployment in Delta State and found no significant reduction in unemployment or substantial skills translation into broader employment, while Tahir and Bello (2021) reported that the programme enhances income-generating capacity and entrepreneurial skills among beneficiaries in Yobe State, but focused primarily on employability and income rather than long-term livelihood effects. Other research, such as Komolafe et al. (2024), assessed the *perceived* effects of the N-Power Agro programme on empowerment and income generation in Lagos State, without comparing across other programme components , and studies in Ekiti State (Abdu-Raheem et al., 2025) found *no* significant relationship between programme participation and poverty reduction, indicating mixed evidence on its effectiveness .Although these studies provide useful insights into aspects of N-Power implementation, they have generally been state-specific, component-limited, short-term, or focused on general employability outcomes rather than systematically comparing how individual components contribute to sustained livelihood improvement**.** Consequently, there is limited empirical evidence onwhich specific N-Power components contribute most effectively to youth empowerment and poverty reduction especially at the state level and over an extended period**.**

This study therefore adopts acomparative component analysisto assess howN-Power Teach, N-Power Agro, and N-Power Health have individually influenced the economic well-being and livelihood outcomes of youth beneficiaries inGombe State between 2016 and 2022**,** offering a more nuanced and context-specific perspective that previous research has not fully addressed.

Research Objectives

The objectives of the study are to:

i. Evaluate the nature of N-Power programme in Gombe State.

ii. To appraise comparatively the components of N-Power program in poverty reduction in Gombe state

Conceptual Clarification

For the purpose of this study, the following terms are hereby defined within the context of the study.

Poverty: The concept of poverty like any concept in social sciences suffers from lack of watertight definition so that different scholars see it from different perspectives.Varshney (2005), maintained that poverty is used in three ways; the conventional usage, which is linked to consumption and hence income, focusing primarily though not exclusively on a calorie in-take that human body, on average, needs to function normally. In this narrow sense, hunger and endemic malnutrition more or less define poverty.Baratz and Grisgby (1972) defined poverty as a situation that involves some deprivations and unfavourable occurrences that are closely but unavoidably linked with inadequate economic resources to cater for day-to-day human basic needs.For the purpose of this study, poverty is seen asthe inability to live a fundamentally basic progressive life that would guarantee a sustainable and prosperous future. It is a pronounced deprivation in well-being.

Poverty Alleviation: There is agreement by scholars in the field of social sciences about a single, uniform acceptable conceptual understanding about the concept of poverty alleviation. This is to say that scholars see differently. Oviasuyi (2020) sees poverty alleviation to include all the methods, ways or techniques adopted by government, non-governmental organizations or wealthy individualstoreduceor eradicatepovertyfrom collectively.

For the purpose of this study, poverty alleviation refers to a set of measures both economic and humanitarian that are intended to lift an individual out of poverty by functioning as a source of savings, investment and permanent increases in income and welfare.

N-Power: is a federal government scheme under the National Social Investments initiated and implemented with the sole purpose of poverty alleviation, job creation, and empowerment initiatives through volunteering services for young people (NMI, 2022).

Research methodology

Generally, data used for the study was obtained from two broad sources i.e. primary and secondary sources. The primary data was collected through instruments such as questionnaires and key in-depth interviews to gather first-hand information. The target populations of the study are N-Power Agro, N-Power Health and N-Power Teach beneficiaries. These constitute the first category of the population of the study; data would be obtained from them through structured questionnaire. The second category of the target population comprises of N-Power staff and the data were obtained from them through structured and unstructured interview.

Available statistics from N-Power office revealed that the total number of N-Power beneficiaries in the three (3) sampled local governments: Gombe, Yamaltu-Deba and Shongom is eleven thousand and thirty seven (11,037) benefited from N-Power Agro, N-Power Health and N-Power Teach. Out of these number, Gombe Local Government alone as an urban area has eight thousand, five hundred and ninety six (8,596) beneficiaries who benefited from N-Power Agro, N-Power Health and N-Power Teach within the period under study. Yamaltu-Deba as semi-urban has one thousand five hundred and three (1, 503) beneficiaries and Shongom as rural had only nine hundred and thirty eight (938) beneficiaries.

From 11,037 beneficiaries of the N-Power programmes, three hundred and eighty six (386) were selected, hence constituted the sample size of this study. N-Power Agro seventy four (74),

N-Power Health twenty one (21) and N-Power Teach two hundred and ninety (290) making the total of three hundred and eighty six (386).The study used Taro Yamane's formula (1967) to obtain the sample size of each Local Government and programme, which is calculated below with a margin error of 5% and 95% confidence level.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n = sample size

N = Total Population

E = Merging of error at 5% and 95% confidence level

Cluster sampling technique was used to divide the state into three Senatorial Districts namely; Gombe North, Gombe South and Gombe Central into cluster one local government was selected from each Senatorial District using judgemental sampling technique which include one urban, one semi-urban and one rural i.e. Gombe Local Government in Gombe North (urban), Yamaltu-Deba Local Government (semi-urban) in Gombe Central and Shongom Local Government (rural) in Gombe South were selected. Stratified sampling technique has been used to draw the population for interview. Snowballsampling technique was used for questionnaire administration on different categories of N-Power beneficiaries.The study adopted qualitative and quantitative methods of data presentation and analysis.

Theoretical Framework

This study adopts the structural theory of poverty to explain state-led poverty alleviation in Nigeria, with a focus on N-Power Teach, Agro, and Health in Gombe State (2016–2022).

Structural Theory of Poverty

The theory was rooted in Marxist school of thought, structural theory attributes poverty to socio-economic and political structures rather than individual failings. Early contributions from Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Mills, Harrington, and later scholars like David Brady and William Julius Wilson emphasize the role of institutional arrangements, labour market dynamics, and unequal access to resources in perpetuating poverty (Brady, 2009; Wilson, 1996). The two strands of structural theory inform this study:

i. **Modernization theory**which a attributes poverty to cultural and technological backwardness, suggesting that capacity-building, skills acquisition, and economic development policies can reduce poverty (Chen &Ravallion, 2008; Sachs, 2011) and

ii. **Dependency theory that** attributes global poverty to exploitative economic relationships between developed and developing countries, where the latter supply raw materials cheaply while importing high-value goods at a loss (Amin, 1990; Chimhowu, 2009). Solutions include local production, value addition, and regional trade integration.

The relevance of structural theory to this study is that poverty is systemic, caused by dysfunctional economic, social, and political structures. It explains unemployment, low wages, and limited access to education and health, and governance failures as root causes of persistent poverty. By applying this theory, the study examines whether N-Power addresses structural barriers or merely provides short-term relief. It is particularly relevant to Gombe State,

where geographical and institutional inequalities shape the effectiveness of federal poverty alleviation programmes.

Structural theory is critiqued for overemphasizing broad structural factors, oversimplifying poverty, and providing limited guidance for specific policy interventions. Despite this, it provides a valuable lens to analyse systemic causes of poverty and inform policies such as job creation, social welfare, and education initiatives.

Literature Review

State-Led Poverty Reduction in Developing Countries

The state plays a central role in addressing socio-economic challenges such as poverty by providing public goods and implementing welfare-oriented policies aimed at improving citizens' well-being. Fundamental public goods include healthcare services, education, environmental sanitation, public order, and infrastructure, all of which contribute to enhancing livelihoods and productivity, thereby reducing poverty (Zameer & Shahbaz, 2020). Poverty reduction is not merely the provision of material resources but also the upliftment of local economies through social, economic, political, and environmental policies that improve living standards (Sachs, 2015; Balarabe, 2012).

Good governance is essential for effective poverty reduction. The quality of governance determines the efficiency and accessibility of public services to citizens and is considered a major factor in improving living conditions and sustaining development (Anan, 2003; Jamil, Yaping, Din, & Nazneen, 2022). In this regard, state interventions are critical in shaping human development outcomes through social investment and policy frameworks designed to address socio-economic deprivation.

Poverty remains a global challenge, more pronounced in less-developed countries, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. Reports from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2020) indicate that over 736 million people, representing 8.6% of the global population, live on less than $1.90 per day, with Sub-Saharan Africa accounting for 413 million people experiencing extreme poverty. The World Bank (2018) highlights Nigeria as the country with the highest number of poor people, totaling 86.9 million, while the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2022) reports that 63% of Nigerians, approximately 133 million people, live in poverty due to factors including unemployment, lack of access to education and healthcare, insecurity, and poor standards of living.

In developing countries, state-led poverty reduction has historically been pursued through various programs and international initiatives. Globally, strategic interventions include the World Bank's Strategic Partnership with Africa (1987), the United Nations' Agenda for the Development of Africa (1990s), IMF-led Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (1999), NEPAD (2001), and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) aiming to end poverty by 2030 (Orji, 2018). In Nigeria, national poverty alleviation initiatives include the National Directorate of Employment (1986), Better Life Programme (1987), Family Support Programme (1994), Directorate of Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure (1999), National Poverty Eradication Programme (2000), National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (2003), SURE-P (2012), and the National Social Investment Programme (2016), comprising N-Power, Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT), Government Enterprise and

Empowerment Programme (GEEP), and Home Grown School Feeding Programme (HGSF).

The theoretical justification for state-led poverty reduction is embedded in both liberal and welfare perspectives. The liberal school of thought views the state as a neutral, essential institution capable of initiating development programmes for societal benefit (Laski, 1929; Weber, 1964; Appadorai, 1997). Similarly, the Welfare School emphasizes the state's responsibility to safeguard socio-economic well-being and improve living standards (Williams, Wight, & Evans, 1993; Mato, 2008; Marshal, 1950). From the utilitarian perspective, the state exists to promote the greatest happiness for the greatest number, ensuring citizens enjoy adequate standards of living and access to civil, economic, political, and social rights (Mato, 2008). Strong (1972) also underscores that effective poverty reduction requires a supreme authority the government to design and enforce policies and programmes such as social investment initiatives, including youth employment schemes like N-Power.

Youth Unemployment and Employment in Nigeria

Youth unemployment in Nigeria represents a critical socio-economic challenge with direct implications for poverty, social exclusion, and national development. A significant proportion of Nigeria's population is youth, yet access to gainful employment remains limited. The National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2022) reports that youth unemployment is highest in the North-East and North-West geopolitical zones, where over 75% of young people live below the poverty line. Gombe State, in particular, exhibits one of the highest youth poverty and unemployment rates in the country, highlighting the urgent need for targeted interventions.

Youth unemployment in Nigeria is often driven by structural factors such as limited access to quality education, inadequate skills training, poor labor market linkages, and economic underdevelopment (Sachs, 2015; UNDP, 2020). Poverty and unemployment are mutually reinforcing: lack of employment opportunities constrains youth income and capabilities, while high youth poverty exacerbates social exclusion and reduces access to essential services, including health, education, and social welfare.

State-led interventions, including social investment and youth employment programmes, have been deployed to address this issue. Notable initiatives include the National Directorate of Employment (NDE, 1986), Better Life Programme (BLP, 1987), Family Support Programme (FSP, 1994), National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP, 2000), Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P, 2012), and the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP, 2016), with N-Power as a flagship scheme. These programmes provide temporary employment, skills development, stipends, and entrepreneurship support aimed at increasing youth employability and reducing poverty.

The theoretical justification for state-led youth employment interventions aligns with the liberal welfare perspective, which posits that the state is a neutral actor responsible for initiating programmes that promote societal welfare (Laski, 1929; Weber, 1964; Appadorai, 1997). Welfare and utilitarian perspectives further emphasize that youth empowerment through employment schemes enhances human capabilities, social inclusion, and sustainable development (Mato, 2008; Marshal, 1950; Williams, Wight, & Evans, 1993). By targeting young people, programmes such as N-Power seek to expand substantive freedoms, including

income security, skills acquisition, and participation in civil society, thereby addressing multidimensional poverty (Sen, 1987).

Despite these interventions, challenges persist. Implementation issues, inadequate funding, limited coverage, and political patronage often reduce the effectiveness of youth employment programmes (Zameer&Shahbaz, 2020; Orji, 2018). Furthermore, structural inequalities across regions and socio-economic groups mean that youth in northern states like Gombe are disproportionately affected, indicating the need for localized, context-specific policy design and implementation.

Social Investment and the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP)

Poverty and unemployment remain persistent challenges in Nigeria, contributing to social vices such as prostitution, political thuggery, armed robbery, banditry, and kidnapping (Somasundra, 2015). To address these socio-economic issues, President Muhammadu Buhari's administration launched the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) in 2016, a comprehensive social welfare initiative aimed at supporting vulnerable populations, including children, youth, and women, while providing temporary job opportunities (Zhema&Nyati, 2019).

The NSIP complements broader national strategies such as the National Poverty Reduction with Growth Strategy (NPRGS) and the National Development Plan (NDP, 2021–2025), which targeted lifting 35 million Nigerians out of poverty. In 2016, the Federal Government allocated ₦500 billion for poverty reduction and social housing, initially implemented under the Office of the Vice President, Yemi Osinbajo, and later coordinated by the Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development under Sadiya Umar Farouk (NDP, 2021–2025). Below are the main thrust of NSIP:

i. National Home Grown School Feeding Programme (NHGSF): Provides free nutritious meals to public primary school pupils, aiming to increase school enrollment. The programme collaborates with local farmers and empowers women as cooks (Zhema&Nyati, 2019).

ii. Conditional Cash Transfer Programme(CCTP): Offers monthly cash transfers to low-income households to reduce poverty, improve nutrition, and promote self-sustainability (Zhema&Nyati, 2019).

iii. Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP): A micro-lending initiative targeting farmers, petty traders, and market women. It includes TraderMoni, MarketMoni, and FarmerMoni, providing no-cost loans to beneficiaries (Zhema&Nyati, 2019).

iv. N-Power Programme: Designed to combat youth unemployment and enhance livelihoods for graduates and non-graduates through voluntary service, skills acquisition, and direct financial support (FGN, 2018).

The main objective of N-Power programme are; to alleviate poverty and unemployment among Nigerian youth, develop employability, entrepreneurial, and technical skills, support public service delivery and government diversification policies and contribute to Nigeria's knowledge economy (FGN, 2018).

The Drivers of Poverty in Gombe state

The literature broadly conceptualizes poverty as a multidimensional phenomenon characterized by material and non-material deprivation. Olaolu, Akinnagbe and Agber (2013) describe poverty as economic, social and political deprivation manifesting in individuals' inability to meet basic needs. International development bodies such as the United Nations (1995) and the World Bank (2001) further emphasize that poverty encompasses lack of income, hunger, malnutrition, poor health, low educational access, homelessness, exclusion and limited participation in civic life. These perspectives underscore the complexity of poverty and justify state-led interventions.

Poverty is shaped by both structural and transitional factors. Yahie (1993) identifies structural causes such as resource constraints, locational disadvantages, and socio-political exclusion, while transitional causes include economic reforms, unemployment, environmental shocks, and conflict, highlighting poverty's dynamic nature. Historical analyses by Effiong (1982) and Rodney (1972) link African poverty to systemic inequities created through slavery, colonialism, and neo-imperialism, showing that historical legacies continue to affect contemporary livelihoods. More recent studies emphasize internal governance failures: Aliyu (2001) argues that corruption undermines public resource allocation, Sagay (2004) notes that policy inconsistency disrupts development programmes, Igwe (2012) demonstrates the consequences of resource mismanagement, and Uma and Ozoh (2017) highlight ineffective programme execution as a persistent barrier to poverty reduction. While these studies provide important insights, they often underplay emerging factors such as climate change, which increasingly threaten livelihoods and exacerbate vulnerability.

Beyond economic implications, poverty generates far-reaching social and political consequences. Von Hauff and Kruse (1994) highlight human deprivation, institutional underperformance and weakened democratic participation as major outcomes. Similarly, Aku, Ibrahim and Bulus (1997) argue that mass poverty erodes trust in state institutions and produces apathy and disillusionment. Contemporary factors such as insecurity, low diversification of the economy, weak infrastructure and volatile exchange rates further exacerbate poverty outcomes, particularly in agriculture-dependent rural regions.

Policy Context of the N-Power Programme

The N-Power was established in 2016 designed to provide temporary employment, skills acquisition, and livelihood support, and it represents a major state intervention aimed at addressing socio-economic vulnerability (Osimen, 2025; Amanie and Elenwa, 2024). The creation of the programme was influence by many interrelated challenges that include but not limited to; high level of youth unemployment, skills mismatch, poverty reduction.

The program is targeted at unemployed and underemployed Nigerian youths between the official ages of 18-35. The programme is not restricted to graduates alone but also include those without a university degree. The process of selection of the beneficiaries is based registration, screening and competency test. The program is divided into components; N-power Agro, N-power Health, N-power Teach. The placement of the beneficiaries which is sector based is design to enable them gain practical experience

A well detail analysis revealed that the distribution or the level of engagement and the

effects of the npower programme on the people in Gombe state varies across the state. This aptly captured in the tables 1 below:

Table 1: Comparative Population of N-Power Beneficiaries across the Selected Sample Areas in Gombe State (2016-2022)

S/NO.	L.G.A	Components	Descriptions	No. of Beneficiaries	Sample
1.		N-Agro		1,621	57
	Gombe	N-Power Health	Urban	238	8
		N-Power Teach		6,737	236
2.		N-Agro		372	13
	Yamaltu-Deba	N-Power Health	Semi-Urban	210	7
		N-Power Teach		921	32
3.		N-Agro		127	4
	Shongom	N-Power Health	Rural	183	6
		N-Power Teach		628	22
4.	Total			11,037	386

Source: Gombe State Social Investment Office 2025

Discussion of Findings

From the data presented and analysed, the following findings are drawn:

Available statistics from N-Power office revealed that the total number of N-Power beneficiaries in the three (3) sampled local governments: Gombe, Yamaltu-Deba and Shongom is eleven thousand and thirty seven (11,037) benefited from N-Power Agro, N-Power Health and N-Power Teach. Out of these number, Gombe Local Government alone as an urban area has eight thousand, five hundred and ninety six (8,596) beneficiaries who benefited from N-Power Agro, N-Power Health and N-Power Teach within the period under study. Yamaltu-Deba as semi-urban has one thousand five hundred and three (1, 503) beneficiaries and Shongom as rural had only nine hundred and thirty eight (938) beneficiaries.In comparing the programme components, N-Power Teach attracted the highest number of participants,followed by N-Power AgroandN-Power Health.This distribution pattern indicates that the education sector absorbed the highest share of enrollees, likely due to existing teacher shortages in basic education and the relative ease of deployment within schools. On the other hand, the health and agricultural components experienced lower enrolment, which may be linked to skill requirements, certification expectations, or limited placement opportunities in rural health facilities and extension services.

The most significant finding of the study revealed that the N-Power Teach, and N-Power Agro, and N-Power Health programmes have been instrumental in providing financial support, skills acquisition, and empowerment to participants, many of whom were engaged in low-income activities or unemployed prior to enrolment.

The study also revealed that the N-Power Teach programme, N-Power agro and N-Power health had a positive impact on employment, income level, and living standard of its participants in Gombe state.

Another finding of the study is that while financial irregularities such as bribery were not widespread, significant challenges exist within

the N-Power teach programme, particularly concerning the availability of instructional materials and teaching experience. Timely payment of stipends is identified as a critical factor in improving the effectiveness of the programme, and the majority of respondents viewed the implementation of the programme positively

Conclusion

Poverty has continued to pose a threat to the livelihoods of citizensdespite the establishment of N-power programme fundamental challenge threatening the political stability and economic development of the state. Nevertheless, the study concludes that N-Power Programme with a particular reference to N-Power Teach, N-Power Agro and N-Power Health is a unique approach for poverty reduction and provision of livelihood to beneficiaries. The N-power programme has touched the lives of unemployed youth despite being a temporary employment.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proffered:

i. Governments at the federal, state and local levels should intensify supervision and inspection of both management staff and volunteers to ensure effective control and implementation of the programme. This could be done through the establishment of management quality assurance unit in every place of primary assignment.

ii. The study also recommends that N-power should be properly funded by the government so that staff are appropriately motivated with incentives such as better salary packages and bonuses for excellent job performance. This is to enable them increase the period of training, the number of beneficiaries and improve the loan package. The issue of corruption, favouritism, nepotism in the implementation of the programme could also be mitigated through optimal and timely remuneration of operators.

iii. Finally, considering the rapid increase in the number of unemployed youths graduating from Colleges of Educations, Polytechnics and Universities, government should increase the number of N-power beneficiaries.

References

Abdu-Raheem, K. A., Adekunmi, A. O., Owoeye, R. S., & Kolawole, A. O. (2025). Impact of N-Power social investment programme on poverty alleviation among youths in Ekiti State, Nigeria. Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies, 51(10), 1178–1185.

Aku, P. S., Ibrahim, A., &Bulus, Y. D. (1997). Perspectives on poverty in Nigeria. Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Aliyu, A. (2001). National poverty eradication programme: Completion, implementation, coordination and monitoring. Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Amanie, M., &Elenwa, C. (2024). State intervention and youth empowerment in Nigeria: An evaluation of the N-Power programme. Journal of Public Administration and Policy Studies.

Amin, S. (1990). Delinking: Towards a polycentric world. Zed Books.

Anan, K. (2003). Good governance and sustainable development. United Nations.

Appadorai, A. (1997). The substance of politics. Oxford University Press.

Balarabe, M. (2012). Poverty reduction strategies and governance in Nigeria. Journal of Development Studies, 4(2), 45–59.

Baratz, M., &Grisgby, W. (1972). Thoughts on poverty and its elimination. Basic Books.

Brady, D. (2009). Rich democracies, poor people: How politics explain poverty. Oxford University Press.

Chen, S., &Ravallion, M. (2008). The developing world is poorer than we thought, but no less successful in the fight against poverty. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper.

Chimhowu, A. (2009). Moving forward in Africa: The role of dependency theory. African Development Review, 21(2), 1–18.

Durkheim, É. (1893/1964). The division of labour in society. Free Press.

Effiong, E. (1982). Colonialism and underdevelopment in Africa. Fourth Dimension Publishers.

Federal Government of Nigeria. (2018). N-Power programme implementation guidelines. Government Press.

Harrington, M. (1962). The other America: Poverty in the United States. Macmillan.

Igwe, O. (2012). Governance and poverty reduction in Nigeria. African Journal of Political Science, 6(1), 89–102.

Jamil, M., Yaping, L., Din, S. U., & Nazneen, S. (2022). Governance quality and poverty reduction nexus. Sustainability, 14(3), 1–15.

Komolafe, O. D., Taiwo, A. M., Fapojuwo, O. E., &Oyewole, A. Q. (2024). Perceived effects of N-Power Agro programme on youth empowerment and income generation in Lagos State, Nigeria. ADAN Journal of Agriculture, 3(1), 29–39.

Laski, H. J. (1929). A grammar of politics. Allen & Unwin.

Marshall, T. H. (1950). Citizenship and social class. Cambridge University Press.

Marx, K. (1867/1976). Capital: A critique of political economy (Vol. 1). Penguin.

Mato, D. (2008). Welfare state and social protection in developing countries. Journal of Social Policy, 5(2), 67–80.

Mills, C. W. (1956). The power elite. Oxford University Press.

National Bureau of Statistics. (2022). Nigeria multidimensional poverty index report. NBS.

National Development Plan. (2021–2025). National development plan 2021–2025. Federal Government of Nigeria.

Olaolu, M. O., Akinnagbe, O. M., &Agber, T. (2013). Poverty alleviation and rural development in Nigeria. Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa, 15(7), 38–51.

Orji, N. (2018). State-led poverty reduction strategies in Africa. African Governance Review, 7(1), 23–40.

Osimen, G. U. (2025). Youth unemployment and social investment in Nigeria. Journal of African Public Policy, 12(1), 55–72.

Oviasuyi, O.P. (2020). Poverty And Poverty Alleviation. Volume 1, pp. 221-229. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340082494_POVERTY_AND_POVERTY_ALLEVIATION

Oviasuyi, P. O. (2020). Poverty alleviation strategies in Nigeria: An assessment. Journal of Public Administration, 8(3), 101–115.

Rodney, W. (1972). How Europe underdeveloped Africa. Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Sachs, J. D. (2011). The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time. Penguin.

Sachs, J. D. (2015). The age of sustainable development. Columbia University Press.

Sagay, I. (2004). Policy inconsistency and governance in Nigeria. Nigerian Journal of Public Policy, 2(1), 12–28.

Sen, A. (1987). On ethics and economics. Blackwell.

Somasundra, R. (2015). Poverty and social vices in developing countries. International Journal of Social Sciences, 6(4), 44–58.

Strong, C. F. (1972). Modern political constitutions. Sidgwick & Jackson.

Uma, K. E., &Ozoh, H. (2017). Public programme implementation and poverty reduction in Nigeria. African Journal of Economic Review, 9(2), 112–130.

United Nations Development Programme. (2020). Human development report 2020. UNDP.

United Nations. (1995). The Copenhagen declaration and programme of action. United Nations.

Varshney, A. (2005). Poverty and political development. World Politics, 57(3), 1–30.

Von Hauff, M., & Kruse, C. (1994). Poverty and institutional development. Development and Change, 25(3), 1–15.

Weber, M. (1964). The theory of social and economic organization. Free Press.

Williams, F., Wight, D., & Evans, T. (1993). Welfare state and social justice. Social Policy Review, 5, 25–47.

World Bank. (2001). World development report 2000/2001: Attacking poverty. World Bank.

World Bank. (2018). Poverty and shared prosperity report. World Bank.

Yahie, A. (1993). Structural causes of poverty in Africa. African Development Review, 5(1), 30–45.

Zameer, H., & Shahbaz, M. (2020). Governance and poverty reduction nexus. Journal of Economic Studies, 47(4), 845–861.

Zhema, S., & Nyati, R. (2019). Social investment programmes and poverty reduction in Nigeria. Journal of African Social Policy, 10(2), 67–82.