

**POVERTY REDUCTION COMMUNITY AND
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (CSDP) IN
YOBE STATE, NIGERIA**

KAWUWA SULEIMAN

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2023

**POVERTY REDUCTION COMMUNITY AND
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (CSDP) IN
YOBE STATE, NIGERIA**

by

KAWUWA SULEIMAN

**Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

April 2023

DEDICATION

Alhamdulillah. This work is dedicated to my beloved parents, **Alhaji Ahmad Muhammad Kawuwa** and **Hajiya Maryam Alhaji Ibrahim**, as well as to the entire vulnerable groups who are suffering from the scourge of poverty around the world and Sub- Sahara Africa in particular.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

All praises and adorations are due to Allah who created man from a clot of blood and bestowed upon him the blessings of knowledge. My thanks are immeasurable to Almighty Allah, who has made it possible for me to complete this all-encompassing journey of Doctor of Philosophy. This work was successful by the supports and contributions of many people. I would like to make loud my sincere appreciations and gratitude to many people who supported me during this Ph.D. journey. Foremost, my sincere gratitude goes to my main supervisor, Associate Professor Dr. Reevany Muhammad Bin Bustami for his valuable support, encouragement, comments and guidance as well as patience throughout the period of study. I have learned from him beyond the thesis to humbleness, sharing and kindness in cash and kind. Indeed, Dr. Reevany is a symbol of extra good ambassador of Malaysians I ever met. I would also like to thank my co-supervisor Dr. Dayang Haszelinna Binti Abang Ali for her constructive and valuable corrections and suggestions throughout the dissertation work. She supported me and encouraged my academic worldview.

Special gratitude also goes to my external examiner Prof. Dr Ahmad Martadha Mohamed and two internal examiners Assoc. Prof. Dr. Premalatha Karupiah and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nor Malina Malek of the faculty of social science University Sains Malaysia for taking their time to read and review this thesis for improvements of the its quality. I am highly grateful to the entire CenPRIS staff for their assistance and kind gesture during my stay as a student, particularly the Director Prof. Dr Azeem Fazwan Ahmad Farouk, Dr. Tang Chor Foon, Puan Nurulaein Mohammad Muslin Shah and Puan Roshimah Binti Hassan and Puan Rosliza Musa for always being there to guide

us on USM academic requirement and administrative procedures. I would like also to thank the valuable academic support and advices of Dr. Abubakar Jibril (Prince) of Sociology Department, Usman Dan-fodio University Sokoto and that of Professor Baffa Aliyu Umar of Bayero University Kano and Professor Isma'il Muhammad Zango for their fatherly advices and academic mentoring at Master degree level (M. Sc. Sociology).

I would also like to extend my sincere appreciations to my late Parents **Alhaji Ahmad Muhammad Kawuwa** and **Mother; Hajiya Maryam Alhaji Ibrahim** of bless memory for their unconditional love and consistent prayers of peace and success anywhere we find ourselves; and also to the entire family for their support in numerous ways, first and foremost to my brothers: Muhammad Ahmed Kawuwa, Associate Professor Dr. Muhammed Bello Kawuwa (The grand ladder), Zakariya Ahmad Kawuwa, Abubakar Ahmed Kawuwa, Muhammed Sani Gimba (Sarkin Arewa) Dr. Umar Muhammad Gimba, Adamu Ahmad Kawuwa, Yusuf Ahmad Kawuwa and the rest of the family members. The journey enjoyed the support, prayers and sacrifice of my dearest wives and children: Maryam Muhammed Disa, Fatima Aji Baitu Dapchi, and Hadiza Hussaini Adamu and their children Abdurrahman, Sa'adatu, Hauwa (Mama), Abdulsalam, Maryam (Momi), Ahmad (Abban Baba), Idris (Bah Disa), Muhammed (Mujahid, Yaya Baba) and Muhammad Bello (Prof..) Aji Baitu (Ameer) and Abubakar Sadeeq (Ya Bala) the youngest of them all.

I would also like to extend my due gratitude to my beloved friends at USM for their valuable support in this journey; the likes of Dr. Yusuf Adeneyi, Dr. Umar Muhammad Kani, Dr. Muftahu Jibrin Salihu of IPPT Malaysia, Dr. Abubakar Sani, Dr. Haladu Ali Gagman, Dr. Sanusi Alhaji Jibrin, Dr. Ibrahim Usman of Federal University Kashiyare, Dr. Ali Ado Siro, to mentioned but a few.

Lastly, but not the least, I am grateful to Yobe State University and Tetfund for facilitating and approving the scholarship to build my capacity in the academic career. Also, I am thankful to all my colleagues at Sociology Department of YSU; and finally, I appreciate the kind gesture of all the staff at e-health Africa office of Bill and Melinda Gates foundation Damaturu, for using their very conducive and state-of-the-art facilities during my study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
LIST OF APPENDICES	xvii
ABSTRAK	xviii
ABSTRACT	xx
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Poverty in Nigeria	9
1.2.1 Poverty in Nigeria by MPI Estimate.....	14
1.2.2 Rural and Urban Poverty in Nigeria	15
1.2.3 The Spread of Poverty across Regions and state in Nigeria	16
1.3 History of Yobe State.....	18
1.3.1 Economic Potential of Yobe state	19
1.3.2 Poverty Profile of Yobe State.....	20
1.4 Poverty Alleviation Strategies in Nigeria.....	21
1.5 Community and Social Development Project (CSDP).....	23
1.6 Problem Statement	26
1.7 Research Questions	29
1.8 Research Objectives	29
1.9 Significance of the Study.....	30
1.10 Scope and Limitation of the Study.....	31
1.11 Research Assumptions	31

1.12	Operational Definition of terms	32
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK		37
2.1	Introduction.....	37
2.2	The Concept of Poverty.....	37
2.3	Categorizations of Poverty	42
2.3.1	Absolute Poverty and Relative Poverty	42
2.3.2	Permanent and Transient Poverty.....	44
2.4	Causes of Poverty.....	44
2.5	Human Development Index (HDI) and Inequality-Adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI).....	47
2.6	Multidimensional Poverty	51
2.7	Theories of Poverty	52
2.7.1	Poverty Caused by an Individual Deficiency.....	53
2.7.2	Poverty Caused by Cultural Belief Systems that Support Sub-Cultures ofPoverty.....	55
2.7.3	Poverty Caused by Economic, Political, Social Distortions and Discrimination	58
2.7.4	Theorizing Poverty as a Result of Geographical Inequalities.....	61
2.7.5	Theory of Poverty Caused by Cumulative and Cyclical Interdependencies	64
2.8	Capability Approach	69
2.8.1	Criticisms of the Capability Approach	73
2.8.2	Relevance and Applicability of the Capability Approach to the Study.....	74
2.9	Review on Infrastructure	77
2.10	Infrastructure and Poverty Reduction	83
2.11	Health Infrastructure Project, Wellbeing Improvement and Poverty Reduction.....	92
2.12	Education Project, Wellbeing Improvement and Poverty Reduction.....	97

2.13	Role of Education in Wellbeing Improvement and Poverty Reduction.....	98
2.14	Nigerian Education System	102
2.15	Educational Infrastructure Project, Wellbeing Improvement and PovertyReduction.....	104
2.16	Water Infrastructure Project, Wellbeing Improvement and Poverty Reduction.....	105
2.17	Water, Wellbeing Improvement and Poverty Reduction: The Nexus.....	111
	2.17.1 Reduction in Health Risk	112
	2.17.2 Enhancement of Livelihoods Security	115
	2.17.3 Reduction in Vulnerability	118
	2.17.4 Enhancement of Pro-Poor Economic Growth.....	119
2.18	Environmental Infrastructure Project, Wellbeing Improvement and Poverty Reduction.....	121
2.19	Origin of Community and Social Development Project (CSDP)	123
2.20	Community-Based Poverty Reduction Project (CPRP) Programme and Projects Focus.....	125
2.21	An overview of Poverty Reduction Programmes in Nigeria	126
	2.21.1 The Pre-SAP Era	127
	2.21.2 The SAP Era.....	129
	2.21.3 Post-SAP Era.....	130
	2.21.4 Poverty Reduction Under President Muhammadu Buhari (2015 - date).....	133
2.22	The concepts of Measuring Poverty from MPI.....	134
2.23	Conceptual Framework	137
2.24	The Research Gap which the Study Intends to Fill.....	137
2.25	Summary of the Chapter.....	138
	CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	139
3.1	Introduction.....	139
3.2	Research Design.....	139

3.3	Mixed Methods Analysis.....	140
3.4	Population of the Study	140
3.5	Respondent Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria.....	142
3.6	Sample Size of the Study.....	143
3.7	Sampling Technique.....	146
3.8	Research Hypotheses.....	147
3.8.1	The first set contained four set of hypotheses (IV- MV paths):.....	148
3.8.2	The Second set contained one of the hypotheses for mediating variables (MV-DVpaths):	148
3.8.3	The third has four set of hypotheses (IV-DV) these are:.....	148
3.9	Data Collection Procedure.....	148
3.10	Primary and Secondary Data	149
3.11	Research Instruments	151
3.12	Ethical Issues	151
3.13	Pilot Study	152
3.13.1	Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Test	154
3.14	Methodology: Quantitative Data Analysis	155
3.14.1	Construct Validity.....	155
3.14.2	Bootstrapping	155
3.14.3	Mediation	156
3.15	Methodology: Qualitative Data Analysis	157
3.15.1	Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Face to Face Interview.....	157
3.15.2	Qualitative data collection and analysis.....	158
3.15.3	The FGD and the Role of Moderator and Note Taker.....	160
3.15.4	The Focus Group Discussion and Key Informant Interview Processes.	160
3.16	Methods of Data Analysis	161

CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS	163
4.1 Overview of the Chapter	163
4.2 Measurement Model Assessment.....	168
4.2.1 Composite Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE).....	170
4.2.2 Discriminant Validity	171
4.3 Structural Model Assessment	172
4.3.1 Parameter Estimates of Paths Coefficients for Hypotheses Testing	172
4.3.2 Direct Effects Relationship	175
4.3.3 Indirect Effects	176
4.3.4 Summary of Findings of the Hypothesis	178
4.3.5 R^2 Coefficient of Determination.....	179
4.3.6 Effect Size (f^2).....	180
4.3.7 Predictive Relevance Q^2 and Assessment of q^2 Effect Size	182
4.4 Qualitative Data Analysis: Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Key Informant Interview (KII).....	184
4.4.1 Focus Group Discussion (FGD)	184
4.4.1(a) The community Perceptions for Effective Poverty Reduction Strategy in Yobe State, Nigeria	185
4.4.1(b) Theme one: Increased Funding for Poverty Reduction Agencies	197
4.4.2 Challenges for Successful Poverty Reduction Programme.....	205
4.4.2(a) Inadequate Funding	205
4.4.2(b) Lack of Proper Targeting Mechanisms of the Poor People	207
4.4.2(c) Policy Instability	207
4.4.2(d) Too Many Programmes at a Time.....	208
4.4.2(e) Lack of Definite Agreed Policy Document for Poverty Reduction Agenda.....	208

4.4.2(f)	Lack of Consultation with Poor People on Policy Regarding Poverty Reduction	209
4.4.2(g)	Less Involvement of Religious Institutions	211
4.4.2(h)	Dysfunctional Micro Finance Institutions	211
4.4.3	Summary of Focus Group Discussion and Key informant Interview sessions.....	212
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION		214
5.1	Introduction.....	214
5.2	Summary of Major Findings of the Study	214
5.3	Discussion of Findings of the Study	217
5.3.1	Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents	217
5.3.2	Effects of Social Services Micro Infrastructure of Health and Education of the Community and Social Development Projects (CSDP) on Wellbeing and Poverty Reduction in Yobe state Nigeria	219
5.3.3	Effects of Economic Services Micro Infrastructure of Water and Environmental projects of the Community and Social Development Projects (CSDP) on Wellbeing and Poverty reduction in Yobe State Nigeria.....	222
5.3.4	Community Perceptions for Effective Poverty Reduction Strategy in Yobe State, Nigeria.....	223
5.3.5	Challenges of Successful Poverty Reduction Programme from the Stakeholders Views in Yobe State, Nigeria	225
5.4	Theoretical Contributions	226
5.5	Practical Contributions	227
5.6	Methodological Contributions	227
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS		229
6.1	Conclusion	229
6.2	Recommendations	230
6.3	Suggestions for Further Research	232
REFERENCES		234
APPENDICES		

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.1	Multidimensional poverty by zones in Nigeria.....	17
Table 1.2	Poverty reduction Performance in Nigeria	22
Table 3.1	Yobe State Senatorial Zones, LGAs and CSDP Projects CommunityBeneficiaries.	141
Table 3.2	Determining Sample Size from a Given Population.	144
Table 3.3	Sample Size of the Study.....	145
Table 3.4	Pilot Study Sample.	152
Table 3.5	Pilot study Cronbach’s Alpha reliability test results.	154
Table 3.6	List of Communities Selected for Focus Group Discussion.....	158
Table 3.7	The stakeholders of poverty reduction agencies and civil society.....	159
Table 4.1	Socio-Economic Characteristics of the Respondents.....	164
Table 4.2	Measurement Model Estimate of Convergent Validity.....	169
Table 4.3	Discriminant Validity. The Fornell-Larcker Criterion	172
Table 4.4	Parameter Estimates of Direct Effect, Relationship (IV → MV).....	174
Table 4.5	Parameter Estimate of Direct Effect Relationship (MV → DV).....	175
Table 4.6	Estimates of Indirect Effect, Relationships (IV → MV → DV).....	177
Table 4.7	Model fit	178
Table 4.8	Effect size (f^2) Results	181
Table 4.9	Assessment of the Predictive Relevance (Q^2) and Small q^2 effect size.....	183
Table 4.10	Research Question 3: The Community Perceptions for Effective Poverty Reduction Strategy in Yobe State, Nigeria.	187

Table 4.11	Research Question 4: Challenges For Successful Poverty Reduction Programme	192
------------	--	-----

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1.1	Globally number of people living on less than \$1.90 a day, 2015–2018, 2019 and 2022 projection before and after COVID-19 (millions)5
Figure 1.2	Rural and Urban Poverty in Nigeria..... 16
Figure 1.3	Map of Nigeria indicating Yobe state 19
Figure 1.4	Map of Yobe state indicating 3 Senatorial Zones of the study areasand their local government areas.....20
Figure 2.1	Nigeria Human Development Index (HDI)48
Figure 2.2	Nigeria Inequality Human Development Index (IHDI)49
Figure 2.3	The Research Conceptual Framework..... 137
Figure 3.1	Summary of Quantitative and Qualitative Research Procedure 149
Figure 4.1	Loadings and Composite Reliability 168

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADP	Agricultural Development Programme
AVE	Average Variance Extracted
BLP	Better Life Program
BOI	Bank of Industry
CBN	Central Bank of Nigeria
CCT	Conditional Cash Transfers
CPRP	Community-Based Poverty Reduction Project
CR	Composite Reliability
CSDP	Community Social Development Project
DFRRI	Directorate for Food, Roads and Rural Infrastructure
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
ESP	Economic services Infrastructure projects
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FEAP	Family Economic Advancement Program
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FMBN	Federal Mortgage Bank of Nigeria
FSP	Family Support programs
GEEP	Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme
GII	Gender Inequality Index
HDI	Human Development Index
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IDA	International Development Association
IPL	International Poverty Line
KII	Key Informant Interview
LEEDS	Local Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies

LEEMP	Local Empowerment and Environmental Management Project
LGAs	Local Government Areas
MICS	Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys
MPI	Multidimensional Poverty Index
NACRDB	Nigerian Agricultural Cooperative and Rural Development Bank
NALDA	National Agricultural Land Development Authority
NAPEC	National Poverty Eradication Council NDE National Directorate of Employment
NEEDS	National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy
NGO	Government, Religious Institutions, Local and International
NHGSFP	National Home-Grown School Feeding Programme
NPC	National Planning Commission
NDE	National Directorate of Employment
NPHCDA	National Primary Health Care Development Agency
NRDCS	Natural Resources Development and Conservation Scheme
N-SIP	National Social Investment Programme
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OFN	Operation Feed the Nation
OPS	Organized Private Sector
PAPFAM	Pan Arab Project for Family Health
PBN	People's Bank of Nigeria
PEF	Poverty Eradication Fund
PHCN	Power Holding Company of Nigeria
RBDA	River Basin Development Authorities
RBS	Rural Banking Scheme
RIDS	Rural Infrastructure Development Scheme
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals

SEEDS	State Economic Empowerment and Development Strategies
SGRP	Strategic Grains Reserves Program
SMIDA	Small and Medium Industries Development Agency
SOWESS	Social Welfare Services Scheme
SURE-P	Subsidy Re-Investment Programme
SSP	Social Services Infrastructure projects
UBE	Universal Basic Education
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UN	United Nation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children Education Fund
UPE	Universal Primary Education
USA	United States of America
WB	World Bank
WDI	World Development Indicator
WDR	World Development Report
WHO	World Health Organization's
YES	Youth Empowerment Scheme

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix I	Questionnaire
Appendix II	Focus Group Discussion (FGD) Guide With Respondents From The CSDP Beneficiary Communities In Yobe State
Appendix III	Key Informant Interview (KII) Guide with Stakeholders of Poverty Reduction Programmes in Yobe State
Appendix IV	Composite Reliability (CR)
Appendix V	Average Variance Extracted AVE)
Appendix VI	R Square
Appendix VII	FGD Welcome Remarks

**PENGURANGAN KADAR KEMISKINAN KOMUNITI DAN PROJEK
PEMBANGUNAN SOSIAL KOMUNITI DI YOBE STATE, NIGERIA.**

ABSTRAK

Kemiskinan semakin menjejaskan pembangunan dan kesejahteraan di Sub-Sahara Afrika, Nigeria dan Yobe State khususnya. Banyak komuniti menderita kemiskinan kerana akses yang tidak mencukupi kepada infrastruktur asas kesihatan, pendidikan, air, dan projek alam sekitar. Projek Pembangunan Sosial Komuniti (CSDP) adalah agensi pengurangan kemiskinan yang menyediakan projek infrastruktur mikro di negeri Yobe. Oleh itu, kajian ini meneroka kesan projek infrastruktur CSDP terhadap kesejahteraan dan pengurangan kemiskinan, persepsi masyarakat terhadap strategi pengurangan kemiskinan CSDP dan pandangan pihak berkepentingan mengenai cabaran program pengurangan kemiskinan di negeri Yobe. Kajian ini menggunakan pendekatan kaedah campuran untuk pengumpulan data. Kaedah ini melibatkan penggunaan teknik kedua-dua kaedah kuantitatif dan kualitatif pengumpulan data. Kajian ini menggunakan teknik persampelan kelompok pelbagai peringkat di mana Yobe State dibahagikan kepada Zon Senator, Negeri, LGA dan Komuniti yang sedia ada. Seramai 360 responden telah dipilih dan dihidangkan dengan soal selidik manakala KII dijalankan dengan tiga peserta masing-masing daripada CSDP, Kementerian Kebajikan Masyarakat dan CSO Negeri Yobe. Selain itu, dua belas sesi FGD telah dijalankan dengan pihak berkepentingan yang berkaitan di dua belas komuniti yang dipilih untuk kajian ini. Data kuantitatif telah dianalisis menggunakan perisian SPSS dan SmartPLS dan data kualitatif dianalisis dengan analisis tematik kod, kategori dan pengenalan tema. Hasil empirikal data kuantitatif mendedahkan bahawa pembolehubah bebas projek kesihatan, air, dan alam sekitar mempunyai kesan yang signifikan terhadap kesejahteraan dan pengurangan

kemiskinan manakala projek pendidikan tidak mempunyai kesan yang signifikan terhadap kesejahteraan dan pengurangan kemiskinan kepada masyarakat penerima manfaat. Data kualitatif telah mendedahkan bahawa masyarakat menuntut sokongan untuk penambahbaikan ke atas pelaburan penjanaaan pendapatan selain infrastruktur. Dapatan daripada pihak berkepentingan mendedahkan bahawa kejayaan program pengurangan kemiskinan memerlukan sokongan kolektif dan penglibatan serius daripada kerajaan, institusi agama, NGO tempatan dan antarabangsa.

**POVERTY REDUCTION COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
PROJECTS (CSDP) IN YOBE STATE, NIGERIA**

ABSTRACT

Poverty is increasingly affecting development and wellbeing in Sub-Saharan Africa, Nigeria and Yobe State in particular. Many communities suffer from poverty due to inadequate access to basic infrastructure of health, education, water, and environmental projects. The Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is a poverty reduction programme which provides micro infrastructure projects in Yobe state. Therefore, this study explores the effects of the CSDP infrastructure projects on wellbeing and poverty reduction. The study also finds out the community perception on CSDP poverty reduction strategies as well as stakeholders' views on the challenges of poverty reduction programme in Yobe state. The study adopted a mixed-method approach to data collection. The method involved the use of techniques of both quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection. The study also adopted a multi-stage cluster sampling technique in which Yobe State was divided into the existing Senatorial Zones, States, LGAs and Communities. A total of 360 respondents were selected and served with questionnaires while Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) were conducted with three participants, one each from CSDP, Yobe State Ministry of Social Welfare, and CSOs. Moreover, twelve Focus Group Discussion (FGD) sessions were conducted with relevant stakeholders across the twelve communities selected for the study. The quantitative data was analysed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) and Smart Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modelling (SmartPLS) software and the qualitative data was analysed with thematic analysis of codes, categories and themes identification. The empirical results of quantitative data

reveal that the independent variables of health, water, and environmental projects have significant effects on wellbeing and on the poverty reduction while education projects have no significant effects on wellbeing and poverty reduction on the beneficiary communities. The qualitative data have revealed that the communities demand support for improvement on income generating investment in addition to infrastructure. The findings from the stakeholders reveal that the success for poverty reduction programmes requires collective support and serious engagements from the government, religious institutions, local and international Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs).

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Poverty impedes realisation of wellbeing and people capability. The assertion, as substantiated by the Philadelphia Declaration of the International Labor Organization in 1944 which states that “Poverty everywhere is a threat to prosperity everywhere,” is an obvious reality (Perera, 2009). Accordingly, governments and development organisations across the world prioritise poverty reduction and promotion of wellbeing. These are at the core import by global organisations such as the World Bank and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), especially through the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) pursuits. For that reason, development agencies should invariably promote infrastructural development in order to reduce poverty and increase wellbeing.

The situation of poverty is an impairment to global development, which means that in any society where the problem of poverty was allowed to worsen, the entire society would bear its consequences (Rein 1971; Sen, 1982; Gillis, Shoup & Sicat, 2001; World Development Report WDR, 2000). Poverty is at the forefront of the numerous social problems the world is confronted with. It remains a challenge to the peace and prosperity of humankind. Being a poor individual or society is not a matter of choice but of consequence; especially where the individual found him/herself in a disadvantaged socio-economic, political and environmental position.

To be poor means to lack the basic necessities of life. A major indicator of poverty is cognizance of economic resources owned by a person, which is measured in terms of the income and expenditure or wealth. These comes in terms of the amount of money one earns, the amount of money one spends or saved as well as assets one possesses. This kind of poverty is identified as economic poverty. Other forms of poverty are multidimensional, which are identified in terms of social, cultural, environmental, infrastructural as well as nutritional indicators.

The poor in any given society, who lacks resources and necessary infrastructure, is invariably the vulnerable one. The poorest are those who are likely to face the higher effect of poverty, which includes infant mortality, having stunted children, poor educational attainment, and lack of access to electricity and potable water. In order to end poverty and improve the livelihood of citizens, policymakers and authorities must access accurate information as regards statistics on the impoverished, why they are in such status and where they live. In order to achieve an all-inclusive wellbeing and community growth, effective mechanism to reduce poverty globally, regionally and nationally is vital.

Reviewing policies on poverty requires taking cognizance of issues such as the 2019 Covid-19 pandemic, which had impeded the efforts to reduce global poverty index. The pandemic reversed the over 25 years of effort to address poverty level by increasing the number of poor in the world. More so, inflation on essential goods and conflicts across the globe have also confounded the poverty index in the world. Crises in the world, particularly, had added about 75 to 80 million poor in 2022. That was even above the pre-pandemic projections on poverty. Despite the various new measures adopted by many countries to respond to the crisis, many are unable to access the measures in place and remained in extreme poverty. The goal is to end poverty by

2030 but the poorest countries need unprecedented level of pro-poor growth to realize this goal (United Nations, 2022).

There was a continued decline on global poverty between 2015 and 2018. The poverty level fell from an unprecedented 10.1 % and 8.6%. By this, the number of people living below \$1.90 dropped from 740 million to 656 million over the period. However, Covid-19 had dented the progress achieved. From 2019 to 2020, there was a sharp increase from 8.3% to 9.2%. This was the highest rise in extreme poverty since 1998. It is also the largest, the closest being in 1990. What has been achieved in terms of poverty reduction was deleted by these rises and expansions. Because of the pandemic, an additional 93 million people became extremely poor (United Nations, 2022).

The concept of poverty is generally a contested one as people tend to describe it differently. The varied conceptualisation and understanding of poverty are largely because it manifests itself in multidimensional ways at different space and time. The simple definition and description of poverty are about not having enough money to meet basic needs including food, clothing and shelter. However, poverty is much more than just not having enough money. The World Bank (2011:p.35) describes poverty more elaborately, saying that:

Poverty is pronounced deprivation in wellbeing and comprises many dimensions. It includes low incomes and the inability to acquire the basic goods and services necessary for survival with dignity. Poverty also encompasses low levels of health and education, poor access to clean water and sanitation, inadequate physical security, lack of voice, and insufficient capacity and opportunity to better one's life.

Similarly, according to Olayemi (2012), poverty can be conceptualised in four ways: lack of access to basic needs/goods; lack of or impaired access to productive resources; inefficient use of common resources and as well as a result of exclusion mechanism. The Central Bank of Nigeria (1999) views poverty as a state where an individual is not able to cater adequately for his or her basic needs of food, clothing and shelter, is unable to meet social and economic obligations, lack gainful employment, skills, assets and self-esteem and has limited access to social and economic infrastructure such as education, health, portable water and sanitation; and consequently, has limited chance of advancing his or her welfare to the limit of his/her potentialities

All the above perspectives substantiated the multidimensional causes of poverty. Thus, poverty has many faces, changing from place to place and across time, and has been described in many ways. No nation is free from poverty. The main difference is the intensity and prevalence of this social challenge. Poverty, admittedly is a plague afflicting people all over the world. It is considered one of the symptoms or manifestations of underdevelopment (CBN/World Bank, 1999).

There were more than 20 nations in Sub-Saharan Africa with the most prominent number of the world's poor society. These regions have an unbearable level of human insecurity, violence, unrest, poor capacity utilisation as well as an unacceptable low standard of living. (Rojas, 2008; World Bank, 2001; Handley, Higgins, Sharma, & Cammack, 2009). The problems of poverty are complex and vary depending on many different factors. This is plainly described in the various definitions of poverty and competing theories.

Between 1990 and 2015 (over the past twenty-five years), there was a significant progress in reducing global poverty rate. In 2015, the world poorest people reduced to less than a billion people compared to 1990, when the number was estimated to be about 1.9 billion living in extreme poverty. A vigorous global economic expansion and the expanding economies of many emerging nations, notably in the most populated areas of the globe, East, South, and Asia-Pacific, were the driving forces behind this development. By 2030, the World Bank has set a target of cutting severe poverty to less than 3 percent of the global population. In half of the nations, 3% of their population lives below the International Poverty Line (IPL), which defines extreme poverty for worldwide monitoring.




Figure 1.1 Globally number of people living on less than \$1.90 a day, 2015–2018, 2019 and 2022 projection before and after COVID-19 (millions)

Source: United Nations (2022:26).

Figure 1.1 depicts the manner in which the trend in reduction of poverty progresses from pre covid-19 through the pandemic and after it. The figure also shows the impact of the War in Ukraine and other conflicts on efforts to end extreme poverty

by 2030. There was steady decline in global poverty between 2015 and 2018. The extreme poverty rate fell from 10.1% to 8.6%, which denotes the number of people living on less than \$2 dropped from 740 million to 656 million within the space of the three years. However, with the advent of the Covid-19 pandemic this progress was hampered. A forecast suggests that between 2019 and 2020, there was a spiral rise of global poverty scale from 8.3% to 9.2 %. This was the highest rise of global poverty since 1998 and the largest since 1990, within just a year. It means that the success recorded in four years was destroyed within this span. By this, about 93 million people across the world fell into the abyss of extreme poverty due to the pandemic. The situation remained barely unchanged even with the passing of the pandemic. It is forecast in 2022 that additional 75 million people would further fall into abject poverty. This goes beyond what was the forecast before the Covid -19 pandemic. Further contributing factors are the rising cost of food and the effect of the Ukraine war, which estimated that about 95 million people would be pushed into poverty. With this trend, the global goal of ending poverty by 2030 would be a mirage.

East Asia and the Pacific have made the most progress in poverty reduction during the last quarter-century. Due to China's emergence as an economic power, millions of people have been pulled out of poverty. The poverty rate in this part of the world went from about 62% in 1990 to less than under 3% in 2015. In recent years, South Asia has helped the rest of the world bring down poverty and also played an important key role in the reduction of poverty among world nations. The number of poor people in South Asia dropped to 645 million in 2015, as opposed to the half-billion who were poor as of 1990 (World Bank, 2018).

With shared prosperity in mind, these two regions (South Asia and the Pacific) have done creditably in the World Bank's core goal of increasing economic equality by ensuring that the relatively poor people of communities take part in and profit from global economic success. This aim is assessed by examining the rate of growth in the average income of the lowest 40% of the population (40 and under) in each nation. East Asia, the Pacific, and South Asia have made the most headway in this respect, and economic development is shared throughout these regions. According to statistics, the average yearly income of the bottom 40 nations in the two areas increased by 4.7 percent and 2.6 percent, respectively, between 2010 and 2015. This commitment is worthy of emulation by the entire world, particularly the African countries and Nigeria in particular.

Although the number of individuals living in poverty in Africa has decreased significantly, the continent remained the home to global poor people. Nevertheless, the area is not shrinking nearly as fast as in the South- central and South-southeast regions. African poverty is increasingly occurring because of lower economic growth rates instability, which comes from conflicts, but it is not much use to reducing poverty, as well as low levels of success in channeling economic growth to the local population. While the rest of the world has mostly seen progress over the last decade, Sub-Saharan Africa is currently home to the poorest populations, and it will continue to do so for the next few decades. The estimated number of people who were in poverty had risen from 278 million in 1990 to 437 million in 2015, with the most recent estimates suggesting that the problem could be worse than this. The number of people below the official poverty line in the continent of sub-Saharan Africa was on the border of 13 to 14 percent in 2015. All 27 of the poorest countries in the world have a poverty rate above 30 percent, making them 27 of the 28 most economically underdeveloped nations.

About 43% (556 million) of the global multidimensional poor live in SSA. A 2019 population data for countries in the global MPI database revealed that 53% of the 1 billion people in SSA are considered MPI poor. Out of the total people in the rural areas of SSA, about 457 million people (70%) are multidimensionally poor; while in the urban areas, the multidimensional poor are only 99 million (26%). A survey shows that the incidence of poverty varies in countries across the world (See Figure 1.1). South Africa and Sychelles are at the bottom rung of the ladder with less than 1 in 10 people that are multidimensionally poor. On top of the scale are South Sudan and Niger with 9 out of 10 people as multidimensionally poor in that year's survey. In Burkina Faso, Chad and Central African Republic, the scale is 8 out of 10 poor while about one third of the population in Cameroon, Togo and Kenya are multidimensionally poor. Such a wide disparity is equally observed at the subnational level with 30 subnational regions having an incidence of less than 10% and 33 regions having an incidence of over 90 % (Alkire, Kanagaratnam & Suppa, 2021).

However, the fight against extreme poverty is by no means actually completed, and in some ways, it's getting more difficult. The number of poor worldwide remains unacceptably high, and it is increasingly clear that the benefits of economic growth have been shared unequally across regions and countries of the world. The poverty is becoming more deep-rooted in certain areas of the world, particularly in countries laden by violent conflict and weak institutions. Poor households are overwhelmingly located in rural areas, have a large number of children, and suffer from lack of basic needs and education. They lack in vital aspects of essential services which improved wellbeing, such as health care and sanitation and are often exposed to natural hazards and physical challenges of inadequate security and peace.

The widespread extreme poverty is increasingly becoming a problem for Sub-Saharan African countries, which is connected to poor governance and lack of innovation. Africans' poverty is increasing because of their high reliance on extractive industries that have weaker ties to the incomes of the poor, the widespread of conflict, and their vulnerability to natural disasters such as droughts and insects, which attacks the farm produce of the farmers. Despite some level of economic growth in some African economies, the dividends of the economy do not go round for shared prosperity between the lower class and upper-class people. Between 2010–2015, the bottom 40 in the dozens of Sub-Saharan African countries covered by the World Development Indicator (WDI) saw their incomes rise by an average of 1.8 per cent per year (slightly below the global average of 1.9 per cent per year). More worrying, however, is that the incomes of the bottom 40 decreased in a third of those 12 countries (WDI, 2017).

1.2 Poverty in Nigeria

Nigeria has been battling with the problems of poverty since independence, which led to many programmes aimed at alleviating the monster of poverty amidst its fast-growing population. Despite the fact that poverty is a global problem, Nigeria is one of the world's poorest countries. The depths of poverty in Nigeria reach their maximum scales as the majority of Nigerians have over the years, less than enough income to feed themselves well, educate their children and enhance their physical and mental wellbeing. There are tremendous resource advantages to Nigeria. The country is heavily blessed with abundant resources and fertile farm land, and wide-open spaces. Unfortunately, the utilisation of these resources is becoming more

complicated due to several sentiments which border on corruption and regional primordial issues.

With a population of over 200 million, Nigeria is considered the most populous country in Africa and seventh largest in the world. An estimate by the United Nations posits that Nigeria's population would double by the year 2050, which would place it as the 7th populous country in the world. (UNDESA, 2019, NBS and MPI 2022). Both Nigerian government and partners must double efforts, given its size and for its development and growth potential, for the improvement of the lives of its citizens. The results of the 2022 Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) Survey conducted in Nigeria were revealed by the Federal Government of Nigeria, in collaboration with National and International partners which include the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), the National Social Safety-Nets Coordinating Office (NASSCO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI), revealed, the organisations include. The survey, conducted between November 2021 and February 2022, sampled over 56,000 households across the 36 states of the Federation and the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. It provided the multidimensional poverty estimates of Nigeria at senatorial district level.

A wide gap caused by inequality and low inclusive economic growth had caused deep poverty even before the Covid-19 pandemic. This was revealed in a recent official household survey data, which showed that about 4 in 10 Nigerians were living in poverty and millions more were vulnerable to falling below the poverty line. A data from Nigeria's National Bureau of Statistics indicated that 39.1% Nigerians lived below the international poverty line of \$1.90 per person per day (2011PPP) in 2018/19. Moreover, the consumption levels of 31.9 per cent of Nigerians were put between \$1.90 and \$3.20 per person per day.

This made the people liable to fall into extreme poverty. Further, according to World Bank Nigeria Poverty and Equity Brief (2021) what made it difficult for Nigeria to address the problem of poverty were unproductive population increase with no economic diversification, which just relied so much on oil, leading to limited job creation.

The prevalence of poverty in the rural areas was wide even before the advent of Covid-19 pandemic. About 84.6 percent of those living below the \$1.90 poverty line were living in the rural areas in 2018/19. Out of this, 76.3 percent lived in the country's northern regions. The twin effect of Covid-19 and oil price crisis could push about 10 million additional Nigerians into poverty by 2022. This is above the predicted slower rise in the number of poor people. A study in November 2020 revealed that about 18.3 percent of households went a whole day for 30 days without eating. This means at least one adult member in the population were affected. The data indicated a rise from 6.4 percent recorded in January/February 2019 (as per the NLPS and Nigeria's General Household Survey). The current crisis could, therefore, have long-term consequences on future generations in Nigeria.

Issues that include poor health services, lack of access to quality education, inadequate infrastructure for access to various communities and environmental degradation, food inflation, rising cost of living among other social and economic challenges are some of the issues that Nigeria continued to grapple with. These are likely the cause for more people falling into poverty than getting out of it. A forecast by the World Bank (2022) saw an upsurge of the number of the poor persons to 95.1 million in 2022 from the 89.0 million of poor people in the year 2020. By this, it means in just within two (2) years, 6.1 million persons would have fallen below the poverty line between 2020 and 2022, an increase of 6.7%. With the projected 2022 figures in

four years, the number of poor persons in Nigeria increased to 14.7% from the 2018/19 figure of 82.1 million, and to the projected 95.1 million in 2022.

A report by the World Bank, “A Better Future for All Nigerians: Nigeria Poverty Assessment 2022” reveals that as many as 4 in 10 Nigerians live below the national poverty line . The report, which brings together the latest evidence on the profile and drivers of poverty in Nigeria, further revealed that many Nigerians especially in the country’s northern region lack access to basic education and infrastructure, such as electricity, safe drinking water, and improved sanitation. The report further notes that having a job does not mean an escape from poverty because most workers are engaged in small-scale household farm and non-farm enterprises. Only 17 percent of Nigerian workers hold the wage jobs that would make them out of poverty.

Further, the report indicates that the effect of the climate and conflicts have inflated poverty, which is again confounded by the Covid-19 pandemic. Despite all these, the government has done little to ameliorate their condition, consequent upon which the households had to adopt dangerous coping strategies such as reduction of education opportunities and scaling back food consumption in the family. These measures would eventually bring about unfavourable consequence on human capital in the long-run. Some parts of Nigeria are affected more than others. The report reveals this through statistics at state levels in Nigeria because it’s a federation. In order to take millions of people out of poverty in Nigeria, the World Bank Country Director for Nigeria, Shubham Chaudhuri, suggests that social protection should be expanded by implementing pro-poor policies such as unlocking the fiscal space and reforming expensive subsidies such as fuel subsidies, health care and education sector should be strengthened.

The World Bank suggests three types of reform for effective growth and poverty alleviation for Nigerians these include:

- (1) macroeconomic reforms in the areas of fiscal policy, trade, and exchange rate policy;
- (2) Effective policies to boost the productivity of agricultural produce of farm and non-farm household enterprises; and
- (3) improving access to electricity, water, and sanitation while strengthening information and communication technologies.

Together, these reforms may contribute to the economy's diversification, boost structural change, produce quality work, support social protection programs, and other redistributive government policies. These policy changes should hastily be put into place given Nigeria's population growth and development. The moment has come for the nation to grab the opportunity for economic prosperity presented by its young people. It continues by stating that intensifying efforts to consistently collect and evaluate data will be crucial in determining the specifics of Nigeria's plans to reduce poverty. Organizations like the United Nations, World Bank, and Global Citizens must collaborate with various governments to increase the access of the poor people to clean water, sufficient food, affordable education, health care, access to infrastructure, and other necessities in order to break the cycle of poverty (National Bureau of Statistics, 2020; World Bank, 2022).

Conflict invariably affects economic prosperity where it exists. It is spreading and intensifying across Nigeria, so it is important to implement programmes to support poor and vulnerable Nigerians affected by this crisis while also limiting the risk of what, according to Tara Vishwanath, World Bank Lead Economist and co-author

“exacerbating fragility and conflict”. The World Economic Forum has recommended among other things, that Nigeria must invest in education, especially girl child education, prioritise health and well-being of its citizenry and enhance economic opportunities while embracing technology to improve economic productivity and opportunities for the countrymen. The World Bank has also noted that Nigeria may find it hard to tackle poverty if violence continues to occur in the country. While urging tackling violence, the apex bank noted that Nigeria should also prioritise provision of power in the country. This will help to reduce monetary poverty occasioned by spending on electricity which can encourage investments and job creation in the country.

1.2.1 Poverty in Nigeria by MPI Estimate

The Nigeria national MPI value is 0.257, showing that poor people in Nigeria experience just over one-quarter of all possible deprivations. The value ranges from 0 to 1, with 0 reflecting zero poverty and 1 universal poverty and deprivation. The aim of the Nigeria MPI (2022) is for this number to reduce over time. The major findings from Nigeria Multidimensional Poverty Index survey reveal as follows:

- i) Nearly 133 million (63%) persons living in Nigeria are multidimensionally poor.
- ii) The National MPI is 0.257, indicating that poor people in Nigeria are experiencing over one-quarter of all possible deprivations.
- iii) 65% of the poor (86 million people) live in the North, while 35% (nearly 47 million) live in the South. Poverty levels across states vary significantly, with the incidence of multidimensional poverty ranging from a low of 27% in Ondo to a high of 91% in Sokoto.

- iv) Over half of the population of Nigeria are multidimensionally poor and cook with dung, wood or charcoal, rather than cleaner energy. High deprivations are also apparent nationally in sanitation, time to healthcare, food insecurity, and housing.
- v) In general, the incidence of monetary poverty is lower than the incidence of multidimensional poverty across most states. The 2018/19 national monetary poverty line in Nigeria, according to the National MPI 2022, was 40.1% of people are poor and 63% are multidimensionally poor.
- vi) Multidimensional poverty is higher in rural areas, where 72% of people are poor, compared to 42% of people in urban areas.

1.2.2 Rural and Urban Poverty in Nigeria

The Poverty aggregate spread between rural and urban population showed that multidimensional poverty is higher in rural areas, where 72% of people are poor, compared to 42% of people in urban areas. Approximately 70% of Nigeria's population live in rural areas, yet these areas are home to 80% of poor people; the intensity of rural poverty is also higher which was estimated to about 42% in rural areas as compared to 37% in urban areas




Figure 1.2 Rural and Urban Poverty in Nigeria.

Source: NBS (2022).

1.2.3 The Spread of Poverty across Regions and state in Nigeria

Poverty in Nigeria was spatially spread across regions of the country, where the bulk of the poverty exists in the northern part. According to the MPI, sixty-five percent of the poor people estimated to about 86 million, live in the North, while 35%, which is nearly 47 million, live in the Southern part of the country. In a federal system, it is vital to understand the level of poverty by State. Poverty levels across states vary significantly, with the proportion of the population (incidence) living in multidimensional poverty, ranging from as low as 27% in Ondo state of the southern part to a high of 91% in Sokoto state of the northern part.

The poor states in Nigeria are Sokoto, Bayelsa, Jigawa, Kebbi, Gombe, and Yobe, according to the MPI value of 2022, which measures the percentage of poor people as well as the severity of their poverty. However, we cannot say for sure which of these states is the poorest because statistically speaking, their confidence intervals (or the range within which the true value falls considering the sample) overlap.

The senatorial district level offers representative statistics that show how patterns of poverty differ in Nigeria even across individual States. In Kano State, for instance, the percentage of the population living in poverty varies from 50% in Kano Central to 77% in Kano South. In terms of MPI composition, the deprivations in years of education and food security contribute more to MPI in Kebbi South, whereas in Yobe South and Sokoto North, it is the deprivations in school attendance. These three districts are among the poorest in the country (NBS, 2022)

Table 1.1 Multidimensional poverty by zones in Nigeria.

Area	MPI	Incidence (H, %)	Intensity (A, %)	Population share (%)	Number of poor people (million)
National	0.257	62.9	40.9	100.0	132.92
North Central	0.272	66.3	41.0	14.4	20.19
North East	0.324	76.5	42.4	12.7	20.47
North West	0.324	75.8	42.7	28.4	45.49
South East	0.183	49.0	37.3	10.5	10.85
South South	0.250	62.6	39.8	14.8	19.66
South West	0.151	40.0	37.7	19.2	16.27

Source: (NBS, 2022).

The above table displays the multidimensional poverty based on zone in Nigeria. The federation of Nigeria is categorised into major parts of North and South, which are further sub divided into 6 geopolitical zone as shown in table 1.1 above.

According to NBS (2022) Nigeria has a total of about 132.92 million poor people. The poverty distributions show that the disparities between zones are greater than those between rural and urban areas. In the least poor zone, the South West, the MPI of 0.151 shows that poor people experience 15% of possible deprivations, while in North East and North West, the MPI of 0.324 shows they experience over 32% of possible deprivations. Overall, 65% of poor people (86 million) live in the North, while

35% nearly (47 million) people live in the South. In general, a disparity between North and South is evident in both the incidence and intensity of multidimensional poverty, with the North being poorer. However, the level and number of poor people needs to be addressed in all zones each of which are home to between 11 and 20 million poor people except North West, which has 45 million poor people due to its larger population and a higher level of poverty (NBS, 2022).

1.3 History of Yobe State

Yobe State capital is Damaturu and it's one out of the 36 states federation unit of Nigeria. The state was created from Borno state on the 27th of August 1991 during the military regime of General Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida. The geographical location of the state was situated in the North-Eastern part of Nigeria. In contrast to the southern states in which moist tropical rain forests are dominant, Yobe state is dry savanna land that often does not receive much tropical rain. The state has a land mass of about 45,502 square km, which borders Borno State to the east, Gombe to the south and Bauchi and the Niger Republic to the west and north, respectively. Yobe state is a multi-ethnic society which includes Kanuri, Fulani Kare, Bolewa, Bade, Ngizim, Ngamo and Babur/Manga. Islam is the dominant religion of the people of the state. Yobe state has a diverse culture, although the practice of religion has made it a common and homogenous society living peacefully with one another and other host communities.

1.3.1 Economic Potential of Yobe state

The people of Yobe state are substantially agrarian working in agriculture, which made the state a significant stakeholder in food production and livestock rearing, which help support approximately 80% of the population. Apart from being an agricultural state, Yobe is endowed with a variety of rich resources such as fishing grounds as well as important mineral deposits such as gypsum, kaolin, and quartz. Yobe state's major agricultural products include gum Arabic, groundnuts, beans, sesame, Bambara-nut, and cotton. Yobe state also has many livestock potential. In fact, the State is said to have one of the largest cattle markets in West Africa, which is located in the Potiskum Local Government Area of the State.



Figure 1.3 Map of Nigeria indicating Yobe state



Figure 1.4 Map of Yobe state indicating 3 Senatorial Zones of the study areas and their local government areas.

1.3.2 Poverty Profile of Yobe State

Yobe state has a population size of 3,900,000 with a poverty headcount and intensity of 83.5% and 44.3%, respectively. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), MPI 2022, Yobe state MPI is 0.370, which signifies that the people who are multidimensionally poor in the state are about 3,230,000. Yobe is an agrarian state that has a large potential for farming and is the country's largest cattle provider but still, the state is one of the poorest in the country (MPI 2022). Yobe state is among the poorest and multidimensionally poor in Nigeria as the state is mentioned among the highly affected in MPI. Out of the three MPI dimensions of Health, Education and

living standard poverty index, Yobe state is affected heavily by the MPI dimension of education and living standard.

According to the Nigeria MPI (2022), deprivations in the Education dimension together contribute 17.9% to multidimensional poverty in Nigeria. The Education-related deprivations that the National MPI 2022 captures for each household include school lag; school attendance and years of schooling. The 3 States with the highest rate of people who are multidimensionally poor and deprived in school attendance are Kebbi (60.8%), Sokoto (60.7%) and Yobe state (58.6%). The Deprivations in the Living Standards dimension together contribute 33.6% to multidimensional poverty in Nigeria. About 4 of every 10 Nigerians are multidimensionally poor and experience deprivation in at least one of the Living standards related deprivations that the National MPI 2022 captures for each household. This includes: water, sanitation, housing material, cooking fuel, and assets. The 3 States with the highest rate of people who are multidimensionally poor and deprived in clean cooking fuel are Sokoto (84.8%), Yobe (77.5%) and Gombe state (76.9%), as reported by Nigeria Poverty Map (NPM 2022).

1.4 Poverty Alleviation Strategies in Nigeria

Historically, most of the poverty reduction strategies of Nigeria have targeted rural areas and the agriculture sector. Food for human consumption, raw materials for manufacturing operations and the major employer of labour are all provided by the agriculture sector in the plan to reduce poverty. The programmes which aim to reduce

poverty in the past include the National Agricultural Land Development Authority (NALDA), the Agricultural Development Programmes (ADP), and the Strategic Grains Reserves Programmes (SGRP). A good influence was made on the

agricultural sector, and poverty was decreased. There was a drawback, however, due to the lack of sustainability.

Similarly, numerous poverty-reduction initiatives have been launched in the health, education, and housing sectors. Primary Health Care and Polio Eradication Programmes are examples of such programmes. This is primarily due to programming inconsistencies, poor execution, corruption of government officials and public officials, inadequate targeting methods, and failure to directly target the poor in Nigeria (Ogwumike, 1998; Edgware, 1997).

Table 1.2 Poverty reduction Performance in Nigeria

Indicator	Baseline 2015	Derived (2020) Bench mark	2030 Target
Proportion of the population below the international poverty line, disaggregated by sex, age group, employment status and geographical location (urban/rural).	62.6	41.8	0
Proportion of the population living below the national poverty line, disaggregated by sex and age.	62.6	41.8	0
Proportion of men, women and children of all ages living in poverty in all its dimensions according to the national definitions.	42.2	35.2	21.1
Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services (improved sanitation).	60.3	73.6	100
Proportion of the population living in households with access to basic services (improved water source).	69.6	79.7	100

Table 1.1 (Continued)

Indicator	Baseline 2015	Derived (2020) Bench mark	2030 Target
Number of deaths, missing people, injured, relocated or evacuated due to disasters per 100,000 people. This indicator is classified into three parts, namely: i) Deaths (ii) Missing people (iii) Affected by way of injury, relocation or evacuation.	5.07	2.61	0

National Bureau of Statistics 2015, and (MDGs Nigeria, 2017)

The above Table 1.1 summarizes the efforts of the Nigerian government in line with goal 1 objective of the SDGs alongside the 2015 baseline and the projected 2020 targets, and more fundamentally, the 2030 targets aspirations of ending all forms of poverty.

1.5 Community and Social Development Project (CSDP)

Over the years, concerns for reducing poverty have become a central issue in development and policy matters. Thus, attempts were made at both national and international levels to reduce poverty in Nigeria. Among those attempts, social services infrastructure projects such as health, education, water, electrification, road, and environment/natural resources projects for poor people, particularly in developing countries, were provided. The growing concerns on infrastructure development as a way of reducing poverty largely stems from the fact that most households in developing countries spend a significant portion of their meagre income on health, education, road transport, water, and electricity. This trend is similar to the observed situation in Yobe state (Kawuwa, 2014; Foster & Yepes, 2005).

Moreover, many studies have revealed that between one-third and one-half of the poor people's income go to infrastructure services (Prud' Homme, 2005; Fay & Morrison, 2007). Thus, the development of infrastructure can serve as a way of meeting key final consumption items in a household, particularly health, education, water, road, and electrification. Aschauer (1989) thus, argued that the public infrastructure affects the quality of life. Therefore, the importance of investment in infrastructure for communities' and, by extension, countries' development is an indispensable issue for strategic poverty reduction policy as well as wellbeing improvement. The direct and indirect benefit of improved infrastructure on rural communities and how it impacted wellbeing and poverty reduction were understudied. However, the assumption was that social infrastructure always facilitates human capital development.

The Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) is one of the strategies of poverty reduction in Yobe State through the massive investment in infrastructure. The Federal Government of Nigeria applied and obtained funding from the International Development Association (IDA) of the World Bank Group to support the implementation of the Community and Social Development Project (CSDP) in 26 states and Federal Capital Territory Abuja (FCT). Yobe State was one of the 26 states assigned to carry out the CSDP project in Nigeria. The CSDP is founded on the Local Empowerment, and Environmental Management Project (LEEMP) and Community-Based Poverty Reduction Project (CPRP) structures that aimed to improve the duties of Local Government Areas (LGAs) in service delivery to their communities. The project seeks to efficiently target the social and environmental infrastructure at the community level.