

Contributions of N-Power Health And N-Power Non-Graduate Programmes to Poverty Alleviation in Rivers State, Nigeria

Amanie, S. L. and Elenwa, C. O.

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development,
Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
Email: caroline.albert@ust.edu.ng

DOI: 10.56201/ijaes.v10.no5.2024.pg258.269

Abstract

The study assessed the contributions of N-power health and N-power non graduate programmes to poverty alleviation in Rivers State, Nigeria. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select 387 participants of N-power programmes from the study area using interview schedule. Table, frequency, percentage, mean scores and ANOVA were used to present and analyse data. Findings revealed that N-power health has enhanced access to health facilities ($x=2.86$), improved immunization for children ($x=2.78$), reduced infant mortality ($x=2.75$), increased youth employment ($x=2.65$), reduced teen's pregnancy ($x=2.62$) among others. N-power non-graduate category has contributed poorly to poverty alleviation in the study area as the grand mean was 2.46. However, it contributed in: increased in assets ownership ($x= 3.00$), increased youth employment ($x= 2.89$), improved skill acquisition ($x= 2.68$), increase in income ($x= 2.61$) among others. Challenges encountered by N-Power health and N-Power non-graduate Programmes Participants are: lack of continuity ($x= 3.36$), excessive bottleneck/ logistics to access intervention ($x= 3.20$), political attachment to project intervention ($x= 3.12$) among others. There is a significant difference in the contribution of N-power programmes (N-power Health and N-Power Non Graduate) to poverty alleviation in River State. It was concluded that n-power programmes were executed and women, men and youths participated. The study recommends that concern authorities should reassess the programme and its challenges to ensure effective contributions.

Keywords: Contributions, N-Power Health, N-Power Non Graduate Programmes, Poverty Alleviation

INTRODUCTION

Rural areas in Nigeria account for the majority of the country's population, accounting for about 70.13 percent in 1985, 69 percent in the 1990s, 51 percent in 2011, and 49.9 percent in 2018 (World Bank, 2019). The increasing decrease in rural population from the World Bank (2019) report confirms the widespread rural-urban migration in search for better life. Rural areas in Nigeria serve as a basis for food production, a significant market for local manufacturers, and a source of capital formation for the country due to their participation in primary activities that constitute to the foundation for economic growth (Albert et al, 2013; Shah, 2016). Despite their significance, rural areas are unappealing places to live, with low living conditions, lack of infrastructure, illiteracy, hunger, widespread illness, and life expectancy (Albert, 2014; Elenwa et al, 2019). Rural development is a strategy that allows a specific set of individuals who are

impoverished in rural regions to obtain more of what they require (Brown and Wocha, 2017). By implication, this assumption frequently leads to rural residents' participation. Rural area represents a geographical location that cannot in nature and characteristics be classified as urban. The rural area is seen as a scenery where life is simple and nearer to nature (Nwosu, 2005). Rural dwellers predominantly rely on soil resources for agricultural activities and livelihood (Elenwa and Emodi, 2019). There is urgent need for rural development in order to uplift the socioeconomic well-being of its inhabitants (Marlier and Atkinson, 2010). These poor economic and social conditions are synonymous to what obtains in Rivers State.

Rivers State largely contributes to Nigeria's economy, since it produces almost half of Nigeria's crude oil and 95 percent of the country's gas exports (Rivers State, 2014). Despite its significant contribution to Nigeria's Gross Domestic Product (GDP), the state is plagued by poverty, unemployment, and bad infrastructure, particularly in rural areas (Mammud, 2019). In Rivers state, as well as the rest of the Niger Delta region, illiteracy, income disparity, economic marginalization, and millennial restlessness are all prevalent (Ijoko et al, 2019). According to the National Bureau of Statistics, out of a total population of 8,008,465 in Rivers State, 1,914,023 (23.9 percent) live below the poverty line. Poverty is more prevalent in rural areas (53.1%) than in urban areas (18%) (National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), 2019). Akuku-Toru, Degema, Khana, Ogu-Bolo, Okirika, and Tai are the poorest out of 23 local government areas (LGAs) in Rivers State, according to 2007 World Bank Poverty Mapping project for states in Nigeria. As a response, successive Nigerian governments either in collaborations with state governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) or in isolations have implemented rural development initiatives programmes aimed at easing rural problems and encouraging rural development. However, the Rivers state government's efforts through different programmes and organizations have not resulted in the desired level of development, particularly in rural areas. The situation in rural areas has deteriorated further, with more people moving to cities. This has hampered the push toward balanced national economic growth, which cannot be achieved until rural development initiative programmes are efficiently implemented (Olorunsola, 2022).

Some of the rural development initiatives set up by federal, state government and NGO's in Rivers State are: N-Power (2016); School to Land Programme (1985); Better Life for Rural Women Programme (1987); State Employment and Expenditure for Results (SEEFOR) (2009); FADAMA I, II and III- (1992, 2003, and 2008) respectively; International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) programme (1985); Skills Acquisition Programmes (2006); Lift Above Poverty Organization (LAPO) Credit Schemes Programme (1987); Songhai Agricultural programme (2013); State Economic Empowerment Development Strategy (SEEDS) programme (2003); FADAMA AF (Additional Finance) (2008) among others. However, the impact of these programmes on alleviating poverty has been contentious as the desired results of these programmes are yet to be ascertained. With the return of democracy on May 29, 1999, the Federal Government embarked on poverty reduction programmes, the government put up the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP) in the year 2000 which took off in 2001. It is real that despite the current high level of unemployment, harnessing Nigeria's young demography through appropriate skill development efforts to provide an opportunity to achieve inclusion and productivity within the country has not yielded required results (Okoro et al, 2022). By 2015 the Nigerian Federal Government lunched the N-

Power scheme which was aimed at poverty reduction among Nigerian youths to enhance skills development.

N-Power is a scheme set up by the President of Nigeria, Muhammadu Buhari since 8 June 2016, to address the issue of poverty reduction and help increase social development. The scheme was created as a component of National Social Investment Programme, to provide and to ensure that each participant comes out of poverty (Inagaki, 2007). N-Power addresses the challenge of poverty reduction while linking its core and outcomes to fixing inadequate public services and stimulating the larger economy. The modular programme under N-Power ensures that participants learn and practice what he/she has been trained to reduce poverty. The N-Power Volunteer Corp involves a massive deployment of 500,000 trained graduates who assist to improve the inadequacies in Nigeria's public services in education, health and civic education. Some of these graduates also help in actualizing Nigeria's economic and strategic aspirations of achieving food security and self-sufficiency.

N-power is one of the rural development initiatives established to reduce poverty. The N-Teach programme lasts for a year and each beneficiary is entitled to 30,000-naira monthly stipend for work done. In collaboration with the Ministry of Education, N-Power has been able to train and deploy N-Teach 900,000 beneficiaries to schools across the country. N-Power has different components such as N-power health, N-power non-graduate scheme, N-power education and N-power Agro. They are provided with content on the curriculum to help them learn and deliver to the students. They are then deployed as teaching assistants to primary schools, health centres, rural areas etc in their localities to support and complement in the areas where they were trained. It has been in existence for over 5 years, therefore there is need to assess how it has achieved the purpose for which it has been established. It is in the light of the highlighted statement that the study intends to assess N-Power programme for poverty reduction in Rivers State.

Objectives of the Study

- . The specific objectives were to;
 - i. ascertain the contributions of N-Power Health in poverty alleviation;
 - ii. establish the contributions of N-Power Non-Graduate Scheme in alleviating poverty; and
 - iii. identify the challenges face by N-Power programme participants in poverty reduction in the study area.

Statement of the Hypothesis

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the contributions of N-power Programmes (N-power Health and N-Power Non Graduate) to poverty alleviation in the study area.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study area was carried out in Rivers State. Rivers State is one of the states in Nigeria and has a coordinate of 49°27.0012''N and 7°2'0.9996''E and a latitude of 4.824167 and longitude of 7.03361. Rivers State is a predominantly low-lying pluvial state in southern Nigeria, located in the eastern part of the Niger Delta on the ocean ward extension of the Benue Trough. The inland part of the state consists of tropical rainforest, and towards the coast, the typical Niger Delta environment features many mangrove swamps. Rivers State has a total area of 11,077

km² (4,277 m²), making it the 26th largest state in Nigeria (NPC, 2017). Surrounding states are Imo, Abia and Anambra to the north, Akwa Ibom to the east and Bayelsa, Delta to the west. On the south, it is bounded by the Atlantic Ocean. Its topography ranges from flat plains, with a network of rivers to tributaries (Pepple, 2013). Rivers state has 23 Local government areas. Most of the government agricultural projects are however hosted in the following Local Government Areas, Khana, Obio Akpor, Emuoha, Etche, Gokana, Oyibo, Ikwerre and Tai. The population of Rivers State as at 2006 was 5, 198,716, this is according to National Population Commission report of 21st march 2006, (NPC, 2006). The local government hosted school to land programme (STLP), Risonpalm (now SIART NIG), Songhai Rivers Initiative Farm located on a 314 hectre of farm at Bunu in Tai LGA, Roots and Tuber Expansion Project at Emohua, Etche, and Asari Toru LGAs. The model primary school projects are also located in all LGAs of the state.

This study employed the descriptive survey design. The population consists of individuals who benefited from the N-Power programme in the three agricultural zones of Rivers State. The population of these beneficiaries are 11, 731 people (N-Power Zonal Office- Rivers State, 2022), which are youths. The Taro Yamene Formula (1973) was used to purposively select three hundred and eighty seven (387) respondents from the three (3) agricultural zones in the state. Data for the study is generated from primary sources using interview Schedule. The data collected was presented and analysed using both descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, percentage, mean scores and standard deviation (SD) were used to present and analysed the data. A 4-point rating scale of Very High Extent (VHE), High Extent (HE), Low Extent (LE), Very Low Extent (VLE), with weights of 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively was computed. The weights of the scales was added together and divided by the number of scales: $(VHE+HE+LE+VLE)/n = (4+3+2+1)/4 = 10/4 = 2.5$ acceptance level. The inferential statistics used was Z-test at 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Contribution of N-Power Health Programme to Poverty Alleviation

The mean distribution of respondents by perceived contribution of N-power Health programme to poverty alleviation in Rivers State is shown in table 1. The table revealed that to a high extent, N-Power Health has enhanced access to health facilities ($x=2.86$), improved immunization for children ($x=2.78$), reduced infant mortality ($x=2.75$), increased youth employment ($x=2.65$), reduced teen's pregnancy ($x=2.62$), reduced incidence of disease outbreak ($x=2.54$), better birth control ($x=2.53$) and reduced maternal death ($x=2.53$). On the other hand, N-power Health has recorded low contributions in granting quick access to medical records ($x=2.47$), more healthy society ($x=2.47$), increased skill acquisition ($x=2.47$), less dependence on traditional medication ($x=2.30$), reduced youths rural-urban migration (2.30), and increased rural health amenities ($x=2.24$). The grand mean score was 2.54.

Table 1: Mean Distribution of Respondents by Contribution of N-Power Health Programme in Poverty Alleviation

Contributions of N-Power Health	VHE	HE	ME	LE	Sum	Mean (x)
Increase rural health amenities	38	102	163	84	867.00	2.24
Quick access to medical records	79	104	123	81	955.00	2.47
Reduced infants mortality	89	173	66	59	1066.00	2.75
Improved immunization for children	98	166	61	62	1074.00	2.78

More healthy society	79	104	123	81	955.00	2.47
Enhanced access to health facilities	153	91	78	65	1106.00	2.86
Increased youth employment	111	124	57	95	1025.00	2.65
Reduced youths rural-urban migration	49	119	119	100	891.00	2.30
Reduced incidence of disease outbreak	78	126	112	71	984.00	2.54
Better birth control	52	186	63	86	978.00	2.53
Reduced Teens pregnancy	82	145	91	69	1014.00	2.62
Reduced Maternal death	52	186	63	86	978.00	2.53
Less dependence on traditional medication	49	119	119	100	891.00	2.30
Increased skill acquisition	79	104	123	81	955.00	2.47
Grand Mean						2.54

Source: field survey, (2023)

.M \geq 2.50 = Agreed; M $<$ 2.50 = Disagreed

Perceived Extent at which N-Power Non-Graduate Programme has contributed to Poverty Alleviation

The mean response on the perceived extent of N-Power Non-graduate programme has contributed to poverty alleviation as shown in table 2 indicates that, N-Power Non-graduate category has contributed poorly to poverty alleviation in the study area. Six items had mean scores less than the required mean score of 2.50; others were higher. The most prominent amongst these items were; increased in assets ownership (x= 3.00), increased youth employment (x= 2.89), improved skill acquisition (x= 2.68), reduced youths rural-urban migration (x= 2.67), increase in income (x= 2.61), reduced social vices (x= 2.57) reduced youth unrest (x= 2.57) and enhanced greater self-employment (x= 2.55). The contribution of N-Power Non graduate to poverty alleviation in terms of increasing cottage industries (x = 1.99), enhancing educational opportunities (x= 2.30), increase rural social amenities (x = 2.09) and increased community self-help projects (x= 1.74) was low. The grand mean was 2.46.

Table 2: Mean Distribution of Respondents by Perceived Extent N-Power Non-graduate Programme has contributed to Poverty Alleviation

Contribution of N-Power Non-graduate Scheme	Very High Extent	High Extent	Moderate Extent	Low Extent	Sum	Mean
Increase rural social amenities	45	98	89	155	807	2.09
Increased community self-help	36	32	115	204	674	1.74
Increased in assets ownership	148	138	54	47	1161	3.00
Increase in income	101	106	108	72	1010	2.61
increased cottage industries	37	71	132	147	772	1.99
Enhanced educational opportunity	50	118	116	103	889	2.30
Greater self-employment	148	54	47	138	986	2.55
Increased youth employment	114	154	82	37	1119	2.89
Reduced youths rural-urban migration	113	103	102	69	1034	2.67

Reduced social vices	115	104	56	112	996	2.57
Reduced insecurity	75	98	100	114	908	2.35
Reduced youth unrest	83	139	80	85	994	2.57
Improved skill acquisition	110	141	38	98	1037	2.68
Grand Mean						2.46

Source: field survey, (2023)

.M \geq 2.50 = Agreed; M $<$ 2.50 = Disagreed

Challenges Encountered by N-Power health and N-Power non-graduate Programmes Participants in Rivers State

The challenges to N-Power programme in Rivers State presented in Table 3 shows that the programme was encumbered with plethora of challenges as 21 (84%) of the items outlined had mean scores above the decision of mean (2.50) except; programme timeline (2.39), lack of information/knowledge (2.39), Illiteracy/ignorance (1.89) and cultural/ religious myths (2.32). The most prominent challenges were lack of continuity (x= 3.36), excessive bottleneck/ logistics to access intervention (x= 3.20), political attachment to project intervention (x= 3.12), poor monitoring and evaluation (x= 3.08), elites interference (x= 3.04), embezzlement of fund for development (x= 3.02), and corruption/insincerity on the part of agencies (x= 3.02). Other challenges encountered by the beneficiaries includes; inadequate credit facilities (2.99), communal clashes (2.98), inadequate supervision of programmes (x=2.95), poor level of involvement of local people in programme (x= 2.95), poor coordination and poor implementation of projects (x= 2.94), inadequate coverage of programme on community needs (x= 2.91), poor monitoring by authorities(x= 2.89), lack of electronic device for reporting (x= 2.88), lack of training opportunity (x= 2.88), lack of viable cooperative society (x= 2.87), poor community leadership (x= 2.85) and late payment of workers by the government (x= 2/84). The grand mean was 2.82

Table 3: Mean Response on the Challenges encountered in N-Power Programme

Challenges	N-power Health (n=93)			N-Power Non- Grad Programme (n=74)			Pool (n=387)		
	TS	MS	Rem	TS	MS	Rem	TS	MS	Remark
Lack of continuity	310	3.33	A	235	3.18	A	1308	3.25	A
Poor monitoring by the authorities	272	2.92	A	212	2.86	A	1119	2.89	A
Late payment to workers by the government	258	2.77	A	211	2.85	A	1100	2.81	A
Insecurity	224	2.41	N	184	2.49	N	977	2.45	N
Programme time line	225	2.42	N	175	2.36	N	923	2.39	N
Lack of electronic device for reporting	261	2.81	A	217	2.93	A	1112	2.87	A
Lack of access to land for demonstration	251	2.70	A	203	2.74	A	1064	2.72	A
Inadequate credit facilities	279	3.00	A	221	2.99	A	1155	2.99	A
Lack of viable cooperative society	265	2.85	A	213	2.88	A	1110	2.87	A
Lack of training opportunity	278	2.99	A	226	3.05	A	1102	3.02	A
Lack of information and knowledge	224	2.41	N	176	2.38	N	924	2.39	N
Illiteracy /ignorance	181	1.95	N	143	1.93	N	727	1.94	N
Inadequate coverage of programmes on community needs	270	2.90	A	216	2.92	A	1126	2.91	A

Poor coordination and poor implementation of projects	266	2.86	A	216	2.92	A	1140	2.89	A
Inadequate supervision programmes	272	2.92	A	220	2.97	A	1142	2.95	A
Poor monitoring and evaluation of projects	280	3.01	A	230	3.11	A	1191	3.06	A
Communal clashes	276	2.97	A	218	2.95	A	1156	2.96	A
Embezzlement of fund for development	277	2.98	A	226	3.05	A	1167	3.02	A
Poor community leadership	264	2.84	A	208	2.81	A	1105	2.83	A
Corruption and Insincerity on the part of agencies	278	2.99	A	224	3.03	A	1168	3.01	A
Religious and cultural myths	201	2.16	N	150	2.03	N	918	2.10	N
Elites interference	281	3.02	A	222	3.00	A	1179	3.01	A
Poor level of involvement of local people in programs	272	2.92	A	217	2.93	A	1142	2.93	A
Political attachment to development interventions	288	3.10	A	237	3.20	A	1205	3.15	A
Excessive bottleneck/logistics to access intervention	295	3.17	A	242	3.27	A	1234	3.22	A
Grand Mean		2.82	A		2.83	A		2.82	A

Source: field survey, (2023)

.M \geq 2.50 = Agreed; M $<$ 2.50 = Disagreed

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the Contribution of N-power programmes (N-power Health and N-Power Non Graduate) in River State.

The summary of ANOVA result on the significant difference in the contribution of N-power programmes (N-power Health and N-Power Non Graduate) to poverty alleviation in River State presented in Table 4 showed that the computed f-value is 16.118 with a corresponding probability value of (p=0.000 < 0.05), the null hypothesis is therefore rejected. More so, F-calculated = 16.118 > F-tabulate (3,383) = 2.60, hence, the null hypothesis is also rejected and concluded that there is a significant difference in the contribution of N-power programmes (N-power Health and N-Power Non Graduate) to poverty alleviation in River State.

Table 4: Summary of ANOVA on significant difference between N-power health and non-graduate Programme

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	27.660	1	9.220	16.118	.000
Within Groups	219.095	383	.572		
Total	246.755	386			

Haven established that significant difference exist in the contribution of N-power Health and N-Power Non Graduate to poverty alleviation in River State, it is therefore necessary to carry out further analysis to ascertain the programmes were significant difference exist in their contribution to poverty alleviation. The multiple comparisons result in Table 5 shows that the contribution of N-Power Non Graduate to poverty alleviation was significantly different from the contribution of N-power Health (P = 0.000), and N-Power (P = 0.000).

Table 5: Multiple Comparisons of the difference in the contribution of N-power Health and N-Power Non Graduate to poverty alleviation in River State

	(I) N-Power Programmes	(J) N-Power Programmes	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Tukey HSD (Honest Significant Difference)	N-Power Health	N-Power (Non-Graduate Programme)	.58269*	.11782	.000	.2787	.8867
	N-Power (Non-Graduate Programme)	N-Power Health	-.58269*	.11782	.000	-.8867	-.2787

DISCUSSION

The grand mean score of 2.54. in favor of high extent was recorded, it is fondly said that a healthy nation is a wealthy people, going by the result one can confidently say that N-power health has contributed immensely to poverty alleviation in the study area. This indicates that N-Power Health category of the programme has enhanced social development to a considerable degree. This result coincide with the findings of Odey and Sambe (2019) who in a study on the assessment of the contribution of N-Power programme to youth empowerment in Cross River State, Nigeria, reported that the programme has enabled improvement in healthcare delivery in Nigeria. This outcome helps to reduce medical bills and expenses, reduced infant mortality, improved birth control, improve people's health condition for a more productive engagements thereby indirectly alleviating poverty in the area. Thus, N-power Health is increasingly gaining momentum towards achieving the programme objectives. Additionally, N-Power Health create job for both graduate and non-graduate youths in the health sector and the stipends received monthly by the programme participants are largely used in improving living conditions of the participants and there relative. By so doing, N-power Health becomes a useful tool for poverty alleviation in Rivers State in various ways such as reduced infant's mortality, improved immunization for children, and enhanced rural households' access to healthcare facilities, among others. As a social development programmes in Nigeria, it is not surprising that the study found that N-power Health increased youth employment, reduced incidences of diseases outbreak among others. This is so because, the programme participants after they have received training, and are deployed to rural areas where they offer vital healthcare services to underserved rural communities, have been instrumental in enhancing the welfare of the members of the society (Bisong, 2019).

The grand mean of 2.46 however indicates that the N-Power Non graduate programme has contributed poorly to poverty alleviation in Rivers State. This ultimately implies that non-graduate youth have not been greatly empowered through the N-power non graduate programme hence, has not made tangible contributions to poverty alleviation in Rivers State. However, the result reveals that the programme has empowered some unemployed non-graduates with valuable skills and financial provision, thereby giving them opportunity to become useful members of the society. For instance, the programme equipped non-graduates with vocational skills in various fields, such as technology, agriculture and construction

keeping them in an employable state. These skills enable the non-graduates to grab job opportunities or start their own businesses in a small-scale level thereby taking them out of poverty. Again, the non-graduates category of the N-power programme provided non-graduates participants in the programme access to monthly stipends which most of them have used to access life changing opportunities. For instance, the non-graduates category of the N-power programme has enabled some non-graduates youths to enroll in higher institutions of learning to acquire educational qualifications and upgrade and improved their knowledge level. This confirms the statement of Yusuf and Ahmed (2021) who noted that one of the goals of integrating youths in development programmes is to train and change young people to become agents of social transformation. This is because young people integration in development activities will enhance the development of their experiences, opportunities and settings in which capacity, knowledge and skills are developed for positive impact in the society. This result agrees with the findings of Akujuru and Enyioko (2019) who reported that N-power programme participants faced several challenges such as delay in payment of stipends, lack of access to credit facilities, undue interference among others. These challenges are re-occurring in almost all tenures of the programme. For instance, delay in payment of stipends was reported by participants in almost all tenures. Participants always encounter non-payment of stipends at stipulation time owing to irregularities associated with the programme administration, thereby resulting to financial lack and difficulty in the part of the participants. This limits the ability of the programme to provide financial relief to the participants. Additionally, administrative issues and undue third-party influence especially, from the political elites, to a greater extent affects the programme credibility and trust of the participants towards the public. Again, certain issues which are said to be culminated into poor training facilities and infrastructure are encountered by the participants. Many N-power programme participants were trained in unfavourable environment which affects their ability to acquire the requisite valuable knowledge and skills for socio-economic transformation. This coincides with the report of Aderinoye-Abdulwahab (2021) who in their study on the training need of N-Power Agro beneficiaries in Kwara State, Nigeria, found that inadequate training facilities, administrative bottleneck, inadequate fund, among others, plagued the programme participants training in the study area.

There is a significant difference in the contribution of N-power programmes (N-power Health and N-Power Non Graduate) to poverty alleviation in River State. The result has shown that the N-power programmes differ significantly in their contribution to poverty alleviation. Alwell et al. (2021) reported that agricultural youths from University of Ibadan (UI) and Federal University of Agriculture Abeokuta shows varying interest in agricultural education.

The multiple comparisons result showed that the contribution of N-Power Non Graduate to poverty alleviation was significantly different from the contribution of N-power Health. This result brings into bear rural dwellers in Rivers State who always seek professional support to improve their livelihood as to come out of poverty. N-Power Health create job for both graduate and non-graduate youths in the health sector and the stipends received monthly by the programme participants are largely used in improving living conditions of the participants and there relative. By so doing, N-power Health becomes a useful tool for poverty alleviation in Rivers State in various ways such as reduced infants' mortality, improved immunization for children, and enhanced rural households' access to healthcare facilities, among others; as a

social development programmes in Nigeria. Overall, the results has shown that N-Power Non graduate with a lower mean value (2.460) as shown in Table 4.6 had not contributed as much as N-power Health.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

N-Power Health and N-power Non-Graduates were implemented in Rivers State. To a high extent, the various categories of N-power programme have contributed to poverty alleviation among youths which have obviously trickled down to indirect benefits to non-participants in Rivers State. The programme in Rivers State was faced with challenges such as lack of electronic device for reporting, political attachment to project intervention, poor coordination and poor implementation of projects, corruption and insincerity on the part of agencies, among others. The contributions of N-power programmes to poverty alleviation were significantly different. Particularly, the contribution of N-power Non graduate to poverty alleviation was significantly different from N-Power health. Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made: The result has shown that the contribution of N-Power Non graduate to poverty reduction was poor compared to other N-Power programmes. Based on the findings, the study recommended that concern authorities should reassess the programme and its challenges to ensure effective contributions. Also, attempt should be made by relevant bodies to reduce or totally eradicate undue political interference in the N-power programme especially during selection of participants so as to enable adequate recruitment of the target vulnerable group.

REFERENCES

- Aderinoye-Abdulwahab, S. A., Mohammed J. M. & Issa, F. O. (2021). Training Needs of N-power Agro beneficiaries in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 25(1), 32-42
- Ahmed, A. O., Gbadebo, O. V., Iselobhor, F., & Tokede, A. M. (2021). An Appraisal of Nigeria's Rural Development Programmes and Policies: Lessons Learnt and the way forward. *FUTY Journal of the Environment*. 15 (1): 83
- Akujuru, C. A. & Enyioko, N. C. (2019). The impact of N-Power programmes on poverty alleviation in Nigeria: A study of Rivers State. *Global Journal of Political Science and Administration* 7(3): 29-50.
- Albert, C.O. (2013). Changes in rural livelihoods systems in oil producing communities: Implications for agricultural development. *International Journal of Rural Studies (IJRS)*, 1(20), 5-11.
- Albert, C.O & Ezeano, C.I (2014). Assessment of Local Government status of funding for agricultural sector in Rivers state (2005 – 2010). *Nigerian Journal of Rural Sociology*, 1(15), 7-14.
- Alwell N, & Nosiri, G.U. (2021). Government Agricultural project and rural development in lected Local Government areas in Rivers state. *Journal of Applied economics and business*. 9 (4); 1-25

- Bisong, D. B. (2019). Impact assessment of the N-power scheme: a study of Southern Senatorial District of Cross River State. *Journal of Public Administration and Social Welfare Research*, 4,(1): 31-38.
- Brown, I & Wocha, C (2017).Community Participation: Panacea for Rural *Development Programmes in Rivers State, Nigeria. Asian Journal of Environment & Ecology*3(1): 1-13
- Elenwa, C. O. & Emodi, A. I. (2019). Soil conservation practices among rural farmers in arable crop production in Omuma Local Government area of Rivers State, Nigeria. *Journal of Tropical Agriculture, Food, Environment and Extension*, 18(3), 42-47
- Elenwa, C.O., Okorie, U.G. & Okwukwu, E. (2019). Assessment of gender attitudes towards community health programmes in rural Rivers State, Nigeria. *The International Journal of Agriculture, Management and Technology*, 3(1), 77-85.
- Ijoko, A. O., Balami, E. L. & Alkali, M. (2019). Review on the contributions of N-power programme to poverty reduction and achievement of Sustainable Development Goals in Nigeria.
- Inagaki, N. (2007). Communicating the Impact of communication for development: Recent trends in empirical research. World Bank Working Paper No. 120. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Johannary, K. (1987). Forward in *the community development committee in rural development*. Port Harcourt. Ministry of Local Government and Community Development.
- Mammud, V. E. (2019). Rural development in Nigeria: concept, approaches, challenges and prospects. *Global Scientific Journals*, 7(5), 444 – 459.
- Marlier, E. & Atkinson, A. B. (2010). Indicators of poverty and social exclusion in a global context. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 29(2), 285-304.
- National Bureau of Statistics. (2016). Unemployment/Under-Employment report Q4 2015.
- National Population Commission (NPC), (2017). 2006 Port Harcourt Priority Tables.
- Nwosu, I. E. (2005). Rural mobilization for development in Nigeria. *Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology*. In: Nwachukwu, I. and Onuekwusi, G.C. (ed), SNAAP Press Limited, Enugu, pp 187 – 195.
- Odey, S. A. & Sambe, N. (2019). Assessment of the contribution of N-Power programme to youth empowerment in Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology Research*, 5(4): 1-13.
- Okoro, S., N. & Bassey, U. E. (2018). N-Power teachers competence and resource utilization: Implication for effective and efficient teaching in Nigerian primary and post primary schools. *International Journal of Education and Evaluation* 4(1), 53-62
- Olorunsola, J. O. (2022). An Evaluation of Impact of N-Power Programme among Youth in Nigeria. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research (IJM CER)*, 4(2):172-175.

Pepple, N. (2013). Uniport Rivers State Sustainable Development Agency sign MOU on agricultural training' *Uniport weekly*, 15(5) August.

Rapley, J. (2002). *Understanding development: theory and practice in the third world*. Boulder, Colo., Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Shah, M. K. (2016). *The myth of community: Gender issues in participatory development*. ITGD Publishing.

World Development Report 2016 Working Version. (2016). *World Development Report 2016: Internet for Development*

