



**EFFECT OF N-POWER TRAINING PROGRAMME ON INCOME STATUS OF
NIGERIAN YOUTHS. EVIDENCE FROM SOUTHWEST NIGERIA**

***Ogunwande, I. O., Esan, M. O. and Adeosun, K. V.**

Department of Agricultural & Resource Economics, Federal University of Technology Akure,
Ondo State, Nigeria

***Corresponding Author Email: ioogunwande@futa.edu.ng GSM: +2348055935271**

ABSTRACT

The survey was carried out to assess the impact of N-Power training programme on income status of Nigerian youths in Southwest Nigeria. A multi-stage sampling procedure was employed to select 240 respondents which were disaggregated into 120 beneficiaries and 120 non-beneficiaries of N-power programme. Data were collected using structured questionnaires. Descriptive statistics (DS), Endogenous Switching Regression (ESR) and Likert Scale Rating (LSR) were used in analyzing the socioeconomic characteristics, impact of N-power training on welfare and perceived benefits of N-power training. The result shows that the average age of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries was put at 29 years and 28 years, respectively. The beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries had mean household size of 9 members and 6 members respectively with and monthly income of ₦58, 273.00 and ₦17, 246.00 respectively. Log-likelihood (-2.6554; $p < 0.01$) and Wald chi² (79.20; $p < 0.01$) suggest that the ESR model was fit and appropriate; welfare was positively influenced by household size, monthly income and frequency of training while participation in N-power training was found to be influenced by household size, frequency of training and access to information. Pair t-test hypothesis correlation result (0.224; $p < 0.01$) led to acceptance of alternate hypothesis that there is a significant difference in the monthly income of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of N-power. It was recommended that more resources should be mobilized towards recruiting more youths for the N-power scheme.

Keywords: Empowerment, Income, Regression, Status, and Programme

INTRODUCTION

Youth unemployment remains a persistent challenge in Nigeria as one of the countries grappling with a high population of young individuals seeking employment opportunities in the sub-Saharan Africa where productive resources are essentially under-utilized and capital formation is abysmally low. Both military and democratically elected leaders since the post-independence had made efforts in the area of empowering the youths both in agriculture and other areas of interest to train the youths through various empowerment programmes. Narayan (2005) defined empowerment as the expansion of assets and capabilities of poor people to participate in, negotiate with, influence, control and hold accountable institutions that affect their lives. Empowerment is not a one-time event but a process that its outcome will be favourable to the livelihood, well-being and standard of living of the participants. According to the available data in the first quarter of the year 2020, it was reported that the youth unemployment was all time high with 42.5% and the trend is likely to rise due to the massive population transiting from teenagers to youths (Nigerian Bureau of Statistics, 2021). Empowerment reduces the incidence of poverty, increase employment opportunities and household income which will eventually lead to sustainable economic development (Adeleke *et al.*, 2016). Oli (2000) opined that to ensure a positive future for Nigeria, the youth who are believed to be the future leaders of the country ought to be well equipped with basic skills to drive the economy.



In a related development, Omotosho *et al.* (2009) reported that one of the developmental tasks of the youth is the attainment of economic independence which invariably emanate from the youth becoming gainfully employed. If the youths are denied of the opportunity to secure employment, the outcome is disastrous to the economy and the society; particularly, it tends to have negative psychological effect, maladjustment and upward trend in crime trend given that young people constitute about 60% of our total population (Awogbenle and Iwuamadi, 2010).

To reverse the trend of unemployment in the country, government has made frantic efforts in stemming the tide. Notable among these were the introduction of programmes such as Young Farmers' Club (YFC) in the 1960s, Mass Mobilization for Social and Economic Recovery (MAMSER) and National Directorate of Employment (NDE) in the 1990s, National Economic Employment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), the Open Apprenticeship Programme (OAP), the National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP), the Youth Empowerment Scheme (YES), the Subsidy Re-Investment Programme (SURE-P) and Youth Enterprise and Innovation in Nigeria (YouWin) from 2000 till date. All these programmes had impact on the intended beneficiaries but they eventually deviated from the set goals due to corruption, government instability and paucity of funds (Bashir *et al.*, 2017; Umar, 2016).

The N-Power programme was instituted by the Nigerian government in 2016 as a component of the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) to address the unemployment rate among youth through skill acquisition in different sectors of the economy. The programme consists of 6 units: N-Teach, N-Agro, N-Creative, N-Tech, N-Build and N-Health. It was the aim of the government that each participant of the programme will ultimately become employable and even become an employer of labour (National Employment Policy, 2017). The need to quantify the impact of the N-Power programme in a bid to assess its efficiency has been emphasized in recent times (Nwaobi, 2019).

The success of the N-Power programme has come under severe scrutiny as regards unemployment reduction. While some proponents of the social intervention programme asserted that the N-power programme has significantly reduced youth unemployment (Abayomi, 2020; Ezech, 2019), the reverse is the case for others (Effiong, 2019; Akujuru and Enyioku, 2019). It becomes imperative to examine the impact of the N-Power programme on unemployment reduction as well as investigate the employability of volunteers at the end of the tenure.

The specific objectives are formulated to describe the socioeconomic characteristics, identify the training area for the youth on the programme, and determine the effect of N-power participation on the welfare of the respondents and to examine the perceived benefits of N-power on the livelihood status of the respondents. Numerous work had been done on empowerment of the youth but just a few dwelled on relating their studies on the youth and N-power on which this study will intensively carry out the findings with outcome characterized with potent policy relevance.

Test for Hypothesis

There is no significant relationship between the monthly income of Npower participants and non-participants.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The Study Area

The study area was Southwest, Nigeria. It is one of the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria. It is made up of six states namely Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, Ekiti, Osun and Oyo. The region enjoys

tropical climate with two distinct seasons, the rainy season (April-October) and the dry season (November to March). It has a total land area of 77,818km² with a population of 28,767,752 and the land-man ratio of 0.003km² (National Population Commission, 2006). The Southwest is bounded in the West by Republic of Benin, in the South by the Atlantic Ocean, in the North by Kwara and Kogi State and in the East by Edo State.

Sampling Technique

A multistage sampling procedure was used in the selection of. In the first stage, purposive sampling technique was used to select Oyo and Osun States due to high concentration of able and educated youths. Second stage involve random selection of three local government areas (LGAs) from each of the States cutting across the three senatorial districts making a total of six local government areas. The third stage involved the random sampling of two communities from each of the LGAs forming a total of 12 while in the fourth stage was the random selection of ten youths from each of the community. In the third stage was the random selection of 20 from each wards comprising five beneficiaries and five non-beneficiaries of N-power programme. Finally, a total of 120 trainees and 120 non-trainees of N-power were selected forming a total of 240 respondents which was used in the study.

Analytical Tools

(i) Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics was used in describing the socioeconomic characteristics of the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of N-power programme, this comprised the mean, frequency counts and percentages among others.

(ii) Endogenous Switching Regression (ESR)

ESR was employed in determining participation or otherwise of youths in N-power trainings. To achieve this, probit regression was first used to determine the factors that participation of the youths sampled while switching regression model was used to correct for sample selection bias which may arise from other interventions that provided multiple status to the youths in addition to welfare (Lee 1978, Madalla, 1983). In using Switching regression model, separate regression equations are used to model the income status condition on a specified criterion functions (Fuglie and Bosch, 1995). The condition of the respondents is described by an unobservable income function of a vector of exogenous household socioeconomic and income status variables. The relationship between rural women status and the vector of explanatory variable is specified as in equation 1:

$$I^* = \delta Z_i + \mu_i \quad \dots(1)$$

Where Z is a vector of exogenous variable δ is a vector of parameters and μ_i is a random disturbance term that is distributed with zero mean and constant variance δ^2 .

I , which is the indicator of income status not observed, but responses from survey is used to determine the youth with income status, that is,

$$I^* > 0$$

These responses are used to define the criterion function which is observable dichotomous variable I_i where;

$$I = 1 \text{ if } I^* = \delta Z_i + \mu_i \geq 0 \quad \dots(2)$$

$$I = 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

The dependent variable in the first stage probit equation is the participation of youth condition N-power training as organized by the Federal Government. The variable takes a value of 1 if a youth receives N-power training and 0 if otherwise. The explanatory variables are continuous and binary.

Probit maximum likelihood estimates is used to estimate the parameter δ in equation (2). It is assumed that $\text{var}(U_i) = 1$, since δ is estimable only up to a scale factor. Following from Federet *al.* (1990) and Freeman *et al.* (1998), the participation of the two groups of youths is modelled by reduced form equation specified by:

$$Y_{1t} = \beta_1 X_{1t} + U_{1i} \text{ if } i = 1 \quad \dots(3)$$

and,

$$Y_{2t} = \beta_2 X_{2t} + U_{2i} \text{ if } i = 0 \quad \dots(4)$$

Where;

β_1 and β_2 are vector parameters

X_{1i} and X_{2i} are vectors of exogenous variables defined in 5.

U_{1i} and U_{2i} are random disturbance terms

Y_{1i} and Y_{2i} are the monthly expenditure function for graduates with and without N-power training. Ordinary least square (OLS) method is used to estimate the parameters β_s equation (4). The random disturbance terms U_{1i} , U_{2i} and U_i are assumed to have trivariate normal distribution with zero mean and non-singular covariance matrix. Maximizing the bivariate probit likelihood function is feasible but time consuming to a two-stage estimation method is used to estimate the systems of equations (3) and (4). The conditional expected values of the error terms U_1 and U_2 in equation (4).

Where ϕ and Φ are the probability density function and the cumulative distribution function respectively. The ratio $\frac{\phi}{\Phi}$ evaluated at $\delta^1 z_i$ for each 1 is the inverse mills ratio. For convenience, define

$$\lambda_{1i} = \phi(i\delta^1 z_i) / \phi(\delta^1 z_i) \text{ and} \quad \dots(5)$$

$$\lambda_{2i} = \phi(i\delta^2 z_i) / \phi(\delta^2 z_i)$$

These terms are included in the specification of equation (5) to yield

$$Y_{1t} = \beta_1 X_{1i} + \sigma_{1u} \lambda_{1i} + e_{1i} \text{ if } I = 1 \quad \dots(6)$$

$$Y_{2t} = \beta_2 X_{2i} + \sigma_{2u} \lambda_{2i} + e_{2i} \text{ if } I = 0 \quad \dots(7)$$

Where e_{1i} and e_{2i} , the new residuals have zero conditional means. These residuals are however heteroskedastic. Therefore, estimating equation (6) by weighed least square (WLS) rather than OLS would give efficient estimates.

Thus the two stage estimation procedure that is used to estimate the model proceeds as follows: In the first stage, probit maximum likelihood is used to obtain estimate of δ from equation (3). By substituting the estimated values of δ for δ ; estimates are obtained for λ_{1i} and λ_{2i} from equation (5). In the second stage (equation 6) is estimated by WLS using the estimated value λ_{1i} and λ_{2i} as instrument for λ_{1i} and λ_{2i} respectively.

Likert Scale Rating

The five point Likert type scale was used to examine perceived benefits derived from N-power training by among the youths. These are defined as: 5= Strongly Agreed 4= Agreed, 3 = Undecided, 2= Disagreed and 1= Strongly Disagreed. The scores were then calculated as follows: Weighed Score (WS) = $5n + 4n + 3n + 2n + 1n$ = Total Score for each constraint $\dots(8)$ where n = Frequency of each constraint for each rating.

$$\text{Mean Score (MS)} = \frac{\text{Total Score of Each Constraint}}{\text{Total Number of Respondents}} \quad \dots(9)$$

Rank = Value of the MS was then used to rank responses given by the respondents.

Test of Hypothesis

Pair sample T-test was used in the test of hypothesis stating that there is no significant relationship between the monthly income of N-power training beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The formula is as given below:

$$t = \frac{\sum d}{\sqrt{\frac{n(\sum d^2) - (\sum d)^2}{n-1}}} \dots(10)$$

Where: d= Difference per paired value
n = Number of samples

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents. From the result, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of N-power training had average ages of 29.4years and 28.2years respectively, suggesting that respondents in both categories are in their economically active ages in which they can learn productively and apply the knowledge to generate income and improve their welfare. Household size of the respondents in the two categories revealed that an average of 9members and 6members were from the beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. It could be inferred from this result that the households of the beneficiaries of N-power training was fairly large while their counterparts had small household size and this may be an effort made to have more opportunities of further income generation to cater for their needs. Result on sex showed that the more (57.5%) of trainees under N-power training were female while for non-beneficiaries of the training, males were found to be more with 65.8%. The result indicates that more females were interested in the acquisition of skills than their male counterparts. About 63% of the beneficiaries of N-power training were married while 54.1% of the non-beneficiaries were highest among the singles. This result suggests that married categories have vested interest in learning most especially the type that that can improve their skills and knowledge acquisition. Cooperative membership of the respondents revealed that the majority (72.5%) of beneficiaries of N-power training were members of the cooperative societies, conversely, majority (73.3%) of the non-beneficiaries of N-power training were non-members of the cooperative societies. It could be inferred from this result that the unity establishes among the beneficiaries of N-power through the training enhanced their readiness to join cooperative society which is believed to be an avenue for information, loan acquisition and other benefits.

Result on the educational level of the respondents revealed that the highest (65%) of the beneficiaries of N-power training were holders of HND/BSc certificate while NCE certificate holders was the highest qualification in the category of the non-beneficiaries. Monthly income shows that the beneficiaries of N-power training realized an average monthly income of ₦58, 273.00 while the non-beneficiaries of the training realized an average monthly income of ₦17, 246.00. It could be inferred from this result that the N-power enhanced the beneficiaries the opportunity to realize more income far above their counterparts and this can go a long way towards increasing their purchasing and general household welfare.

Table 1: Distribution of the Respondents Based on their Socioeconomic Characteristics

| Variable | N-Power Training Beneficiary | | | Non N-Power Training Beneficiary | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|------------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| | Frequency | Percent | Mean | Frequency | Percent | Mean |
| Age (years) | | | | | | |
| ≤20 | 5 | 4.2 | 29.4years | 12 | 10.0 | 28.2years |
| 21-30 | 93 | 77.5 | | 87 | 72.5 | |
| >30 | 22 | 16.3 | | 21 | 17.5 | |
| Household Size(No.) | | | | | | |
| ≤6 | 10 | 8.3 | 9 members | 82 | 68.3 | 6 members |
| 7-10 | 101 | 84.2 | | 14 | 11.7 | |
| >10 | 9 | 5.0 | | 24 | 20.0 | |
| Sex | | | | | | |
| Male | 51 | 42.5 | | 79 | 65.8 | |
| Female | 69 | 57.5 | | 41 | 34.2 | |
| Marital Status | | | | | | |
| Single | 28 | 23.3 | | 65 | 54.1 | |
| Married | 75 | 62.5 | | 42 | 35.0 | |
| Widowed | 8 | 6.7 | | 5 | 4.2 | |
| Separated | 9 | 7.5 | | 8 | 6.7 | |
| Cooperative Member. | | | | | | |
| Yes | 87 | 72.5 | | 32 | 26.7 | |
| No | 33 | 27.5 | | 88 | 73.3 | |
| Educational Level | | | | | | |
| NCE | 36 | 30.0 | | 68 | 56.7 | |
| HND/BSc | 78 | 65.0 | | 22 | 18.3 | |
| Postgraduate | 6 | 5.0 | | 30 | 25.0 | |
| Monthly Income(₦) | | | | | | |
| ≤20,000 | - | - | ₦58,273.00 | 87 | 72.5 | ₦17,246.00 |
| 20,001-40,000 | 38 | 31.7 | | 15 | 12.5 | |
| 40,001-60,000 | 67 | 55.8 | | 18 | 15.0 | |
| >60,000 | 15 | 12.5 | | - | - | |
| Total | 120 | 100.0 | | 120 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

Types of N-Power Training and Choice by Respondents

Different areas of training were planned for the trainees in order to have ample opportunity of making choice of a particular training each has passion for. Most (43.3%) of the beneficiaries of the N-power training were posted to N-teach. The decision behind this step was probably due to wide demand-supply gap in teaching work force most especially in the peri-urban and rural Nigeria. N-Agro is next to N-Teach with 30.0% as one of the pressing needs in the country is food to feed the ever-increasing population. It is believed that, when graduates are trained to learn new technologies and acquire skills in agriculture, it will go a long way in the enhancement of mass food production to alleviate hunger and poverty. This result supports the findings of Nwaogwugwu and Obele (2017) that fewer youths take up agriculture as profession because of poor social and

wrong values attach to agriculture in the nation. N-creative is also very crucial in the training of youths in order to develop naturally endowed talent to produce items or materials that meet the felt needs of households and also serve as source of income for them too. Trainees under N-Health, N-Build and N-Tech were 6.7%, 5.8% and 3.4% respectively. Trainees under these plans are few in number probably due to insufficient number of graduates in these areas but the fact still remains that they are equally important and contribute significantly to the welfare of households.

Table 2: Distribution of Beneficiaries of N-Power Based on Training Area

| Training Area | Frequency | Percentage | Rank |
|---------------|------------|--------------|-----------------|
| N-Health | 8 | 6.7 | 4 th |
| N-Teach | 52 | 43.3 | 1 st |
| N-Agro | 36 | 30.0 | 2 nd |
| N-Build | 7 | 5.8 | 5 th |
| N-Tech | 4 | 3.4 | 6 th |
| N-Creative | 13 | 10.8 | 3 rd |
| Total | 120 | 100.0 | |

Source: Field Survey, 2023

Endogenous Switching Regression Estimate of N-Power Effect on Youth Welfare

Table 3 presents results of the effects of WIA training on rural households' welfare. The correlation coefficient ρ_1 and ρ_2 is $-0.8257(p<0.01)$ and $-0.9956(p<0.01)$ which are significantly different from zero in both cases, that is, cases of income and participation in N-power training. ρ_1 and ρ_2 being negatively and significantly different from zero, the model suggests that individuals increased youth income in that category than a random individual from the sample would have realized. The log likelihood (2655.40) and Wald chi2 (79.20) are significant at 1% suggesting that the model is fit and appropriate. The variable sigma, $\lnst1$, $\lnst2$, $\lnr1$ and $\lnr2$ are ancillary parameters used in the maximum likelihood procedure. Sigma₁ and Sigma₂ is the square root of the variances of the residuals of the regression part of the model, and insignificant is its log. $\lnr1$ and $\lnr2$ are the transformation of the correlation between the errors from the two equations. Household size influences welfare positively and found to be significant at 1%. A unit increase in household size leads on the average to 3.4037 increase in income. The result suggests that with many members of household, more income will accrue to the family. Productive asset increased with income of the youth and found to be significant at 1%. A unit increase in productive asset leads on the average to 5.3844unit increase in income. The result indicates that ownership of productive assets increases income of the respondents as its use results in the generation of streams of income as long as the asset stays. Training enhances acquisition of skills and knowledge. Frequency of training among the youths has a direct relationship with their income realized and this is significant at 1%. A unit increase in frequency of training by the respondents leads on average to 2.5710unit increase in income realized. It could be inferred from this result that time to time trainings acquired by the respondents increased their chances of income realization. Participation in N-power training was strongly influenced by household size at 5%. A unit increase in household's size leads on average to 0.2643 increase participation in N-Power training by the respondents. It could be inferred from this result that many large households participated in the training probably with the hope of harnessing the opportunity to increase family income. Frequency of training is directly related to participation in N-power training and found significant at 5%. A unit increase in frequency of training leads on average to 0.2826 unit increase probability of participation in N-power training. This result suggests that with incessant

participation in diverse past trainings, there is a likelihood of being eligible to participate in N-power training. Access to information is found to be positively significant at 1%. A unit increase in access to access to information leads on average to 0.2158 unit increase probability of participation in N-power training among the youths.

Table 3: Endogenous Switching Regression Effect of N-Power Training on Youth Income

| Variable | Income=1 | | Income=0 | | Participat ion | |
|--------------------------------|------------|-------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| | Coeff. | Prob. | Coeff. | Prob. | Coeff. | Prob. |
| Constant | 1.0231*** | 0.00 | 4.2844** | 0.05 | 0.0923 | 0.40 |
| Household Size | 3.4037*** | 0.00 | 1.0576 | 0.61 | 0.2643** | 0.01 |
| Association Membership | -1.2175 | 0.37 | 5.1951* | 0.09 | 0.1170 | 0.47 |
| Productive Asset | 5.3844*** | 0.00 | 6.1260*** | 0.00 | 0.0945 | 0.25 |
| Marital Status | 5.2378 | 0.76 | 3.1651 | 0.43 | 0.0749 | 0.72 |
| Unemployment Status | 5.2717 | 0.42 | 1.2149 | 0.47 | 0.0183 | 0.83 |
| Frequency of Training | 2.5710*** | 0.00 | 4.8192** | 0.01 | 0.2826** | 0.04 |
| Access to Information | | | | | 0.2158*** | 0.00 |
| /Inst1 | 8.9884*** | | Sigma_1 | | 8009.30 | |
| /Inst2 | 0.9093*** | | Sigma_2 | | 20117.48 | |
| /r1 | 1.1746*** | | Rho_1 | | 0.8257 | |
| /r2 | -3.0607*** | | Rho_2 | | -0.9956 | |
| LR test of indep. Eq.(chi2(1) | 72.92*** | | | | | |
| Log likelihood=-2655.40 | | | | | | |
| Wald chi2(6) =79.20 | | | | | | |
| Prob>chi2 =0.00 | | | | | | |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

Perceived Benefits of N-Power Training on the Beneficiaries

A lot of benefits were perceived by the respondents in the area of benefits the N-power training contributed to their lives both in the quantifiable and unquantifiable terms; this is presented in Table 4. Skill improvement and capital formation (3.91) was ranked first by the beneficiaries of the training. It is believed that with their participation in the training, from the monthly stipends provided given, apart from the knowledge and skills acquired, they were able to save part which was used in the procurement of basic equipment that would go a long way in ensuring the practice of what was learned. This corroborates with the findings of Thomas and Eforuoku (2016) that youths have favourable attitude towards skill acquisition and entrepreneurship development because of the innovations embedded in it, which make them to always explore new ideas that will enhance their livelihood activities and make them to be self-reliant instead of depending on the white-collar jobs. Job creation and security (3.68) was scored second. This suggests that many of the trainees, apart from the period of training they were kept busy, post the training phase; some invested the savings made from the training in micro-businesses and productive assets to create further wealth. Forster *et al.* (2016) affirmed that the practical contents of the training facilitated the entrepreneurship undertaking, and in this case fosters employment creation. Third among the prioritized benefits perceived by the respondents was income generation (3.64). Many trainees agreed that the training had been a veritable source of regular income for their households, and had moreover improved the welfare of the households

significantly. Financial independence (3.58) was scored fourth and this strongly suggests that the trainings of N-power were able to be in full control of their finances and based on this are able to provide basic necessities for their respective households. This supports the findings of Aligba and Fusch (2017) that finance serve as motivational factor for graduate youths' participation in skill acquisition and entrepreneurship development. N-power trainee agreed that the training enhanced their employability value (3.48). It could be inferred from this that with the knowledge and skills acquired by the training from the N-power programme, they are fit and eligible to work anywhere. Respondents also advanced welfare improvement (3.47) as the sixth benefit of participating in skill acquisition training. Trainees agreed that participation in N-power training increased households' job opportunities and income which resulted in better welfare. This is in line with the findings of Ihugba *et al.* (2013) that improved standard of living through broader thinking process is part of the benefits associated with participation in skill acquisition and entrepreneurship development. N-power training enhanced lesser dependency on white collar job (3.38) and was scored seventh. The trainees agreed that since they were able to set up their own businesses and realizing good income to cater for themselves and their households, it was not compulsory to still take up jobs under the government or private sector.

Table 4: Distribution of Perceived Benefits of N-Power Training on the Youths

| Statements | SA | A | U | D | SD | Wt | Mean | Rank |
|---|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|-----------------|
| Skill improvement and capital formation | 37.9 | 32.1 | 17.1 | 9.2 | 3.8 | 939 | 3.91 | 1 st |
| Job creation and security | 30.0 | 30.8 | 32.1 | 11.7 | 5.4 | 884 | 3.68 | 2 nd |
| Increased employability value | 23.3 | 28.8 | 26.3 | 15.4 | 6.3 | 834 | 3.48 | 5 th |
| Financial independence | 25.0 | 32.1 | 23.8 | 14.6 | 4.6 | 860 | 3.58 | 4 th |
| Welfare improvement | 21.7 | 30.4 | 26.3 | 15.8 | 5.8 | 833 | 3.47 | 6 th |
| Income generation | 23.8 | 31.7 | 25.8 | 14.2 | 4.6 | 873 | 3.64 | 3 rd |
| Lesser dependency on white collar jobs | 18.8 | 32.1 | 24.2 | 18.8 | 6.3 | 812 | 3.38 | 7 th |
| Reduction in social vices | 15.0 | 27.9 | 26.3 | 21.3 | 9.6 | 762 | 3.18 | 8 th |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

Test of Hypothesis

Table 5 presents the pair t-test hypothesis relating the income of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of N-power training. The null hypothesis was rejected based on the calculated t-value (23.511) found significant at 1%. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between the income of the respondents who benefited N-power training and those who did not.

Table 5: Comparative analysis of Beneficiaries and non-Beneficiaries' Monthly income

| Variables Interaction | Paired(95%Confidence) | t | df | Sig.(2-tailed) |
|---|-----------------------|--------|-----|----------------|
| Monthly income of participants and non-participants N-power training. | 19566.88 | 23.511 | 239 | 0.000 |

Source: Field Survey, 2023.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It could be concluded from this study that beneficiaries of N-power training, based on the findings, evidently acquired skills and knowledge which made them more employable (human



capital) or set up their own businesses to augment household income, purchasing power and general welfare. It can be recommended that:

- (i) More youths should be enlisted for N-power training in order to reduce unemployment rate in the country.
- (ii) The training should be more accommodating to different age categories and be inclusive to all able Nigerians.
- (iii) More fascinating training areas should be localized so that the skill acquired will be harnessed towards making the immediate environment developed and independent.

REFERENCES

- Abayomi, O. (2020). N-power not solving Nigeria's unemployment problem. Vanguard, Retrieved from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2020/09/n-power-not-solving-nigerias-unemployment-problem/> 27th September 2020.
- Akujuru, C. A. and 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.
- Bashir, M., John, C. A. and Mbag, E. V. (2017). Bridging the Gap of Unemployment Through Technical Skills Acquisition Programme (TSAP) for National Security in Nigeria. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Science, Technology and Vocational Education*, 2(10): 163-175.
- Effiong, U. E. (2019). N-power programme and unemployment in Akwa Ibom power programme and unemployment in Akwa Ibom state: A comparative analysis. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Conflict Management*, 4(3):81-95.
- Ezeh, K. T. (2019). Government Social Intervention and Job Creation in Nigeria: A Study of SURE-P and N-POWER Programmes, 2012- 2018. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 19(1):1-11.
- Feder, G., Lau, L.J., Lin, J.Y. and Luo, X. (1990). The Relationship between credit and productivity in Chinese Agriculture: A microeconomic model of equilibrium. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 72(5):1151-1157.
- Federal Government of Nigeria. (2016). N-Power – History, Philosophy, Vision and Mission. Accessed May 18, 2018, from <http://portal.npower.gov.ng>.
- Freeman, H. A., Ehui, S. K. and Jabbar, M. A. (1998). Credit Constraints and Small Holders Dairy Production in the East African Highlands: Application of Switching Regression Model. *Agricultural Economics* 19, 33-44.
- Fuglie, K. O. and Bosch, D. (1995). Economic and Environmental Implications of Soil Nitrogen Testing: A Switching Regression Analysis. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 77(4):15-19.
- Ihugba, O. A., Odi, A. and Njoku, A. C. (2013). Challenges and Prospects of Entrepreneurship in Nigeria. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(5):25-36.
- Lee, L. (1978). A Simultaneous Equations Model with Qualitative and Limited Dependent Variables. *International Economic Review*, 19(2):415-433.
- Madalla, G. S. (1983). **Limited Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Economics**, New York: Cambridge University Press, Pp. 257-291.
- Ministry of Information and Culture (2019). Annual Report of the Federal Government of Nigeria, Garki, Abuja, Federal Capital Territory.



- National Employment Policy, NEP. (2017). Objectives, measures, strategies and institutional framework to meet the challenges of rising unemployment and underemployment. Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment, Abuja, Nigeria.
- National Employment Policy, NEP. (2017). Objectives, measures, strategies and institutional framework to meet the challenges of rising unemployment and underemployment. Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment, Abuja, Nigeria.
- National Population Census (2006). National Population Census Report, Federal Government of Nigeria. www.nigerianstat.gov.ng
- Nigerian Bureau of Statistics (2021). Labour Force Statistics - Unemployment and Underemployment. Retrieved from [https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary?queries\[search\]=unemployment](https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng/elibrary?queries[search]=unemployment).
- Nwaobi, G. (2019). The Impact of N-Power (Training and Empowerment) Program on the Duration of Youth Unemployment in Nigeria. MPRA Paper No. 96323, retrieved from <https://mpa.ub.uni-muenchen.de/96323/>.
- Umar, B. (2016). Role of Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) in Sustainable National Development. Being a keynote address presented at *the 24th Annual International Conference of the Nigeria Vocational Relationship (NVA) held at Jalingo from 8th -11th*.