

Article

Politics of Social Security and Welfare Administration in the Face of Weak Institutions in Nigeria

Obi, Emeka Francis, Ph.D¹, Ochuko Raphael Emuakpeje, Ph.D², Ohaeri, Chibuikem Sylvester, Ph.D.³

1. Department of Political Science, Kingsley Ozumba Mbadiwe University, Ideato, Imo State, Nigeria
 2. Department of Public Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria
 3. Department of Public Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Nekede, Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria
- * Correspondence: emeka.obi@komu.edu.ng

Abstract: Nigeria's public policy landscape has been affected by the absence of strong institutions. In the absence of strong and enduring institutions, Nigeria and other developing countries are left at the whims of strongmen who run weak institutions. Social security and welfare administration in Nigeria has been the pet project of various administrations and regimes. The proliferation of different social welfare programs with similar intended objectives lends credence to the absence of strong institutions to guarantee enduring policies and programs. In view of the foregoing, this paper interrogates the politics of social security and welfare administration in Nigeria from an institutional perspective. Anchored on the State Fragility Theory, this study argued that social security and welfare administration in Nigeria is more of a political game of chess, than a deliberate policy aimed at uplifting the economic and social standards of the people. Data for this paper were generated from secondary sources such as journals, books, internet publications, among others, which were analyzed based on their content. From the analysis, the paper concludes that majority of the intended beneficiaries of various social security schemes in Nigeria are either not properly targeted, poorly coordinated or that the funds for these projects are corruptly diverted to other uses. Thus, it was recommended that appropriate institutional and legislative frameworks should be developed to better coordinate and manage the implementation of the various aspects of social and welfare policies like data gathering and profiling of beneficiaries, development of a Social Security Number, funds disbursement, institutional logistics, and supports, among others.

Keywords: Institutions, Politics, Social Security and Welfare Administration

1. Introduction

The Nigeria as a country is endowed with a lot of natural and human resources. Having over 200 million people, abundant natural resources in various regions of the country, good topography and weather, one would have thought that Nigeria would have been a leading player among the most industrialized countries in the world. Unfortunately, the case seems to be the opposite as Nigeria remains in the state of economic under-development and technological backwardness. The National Bureau of Statistics pointed out that approximately 67 percent of the Nigerian population was below the poverty line [1].

The different social investment institutions and strategies developed by successive governments over the years to eliminate inequality and establish equitable distribution of resources with particular emphasis on increasing capital in agriculture, nano, micro and small-scale businesses, offering skill acquisition programs to achieve self-sufficiency and independence and improving education and good health care to achieve optimum

Citation: Obi E F, Ochuko R E & Ohaeri C S. Politics of Social Security and Welfare Administration in The Face of Weak Institutions in Nigeria. International Journal of Development and Public Policy 2025, 5(2), 107-116

Received: 20th Oct 2025
Revised: 30th Nov 2025
Accepted: 07th Dec 2025
Published: 01th Jan 2026



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

performance of the citizens have been developed. Such programs have taken the form of multi-dimensional phenomena that cut across all aspects of age group, educational levels and geographies [2]. Some of the intervention programmes initiated by the past Nigerian governments are Operation Feed the Nation (OFN), Directorate for Food Road and Rural Infrastructure (DFRRI), Agricultural Development Programs (ADP), National Directorate of Employment (NDE), Poverty Alleviation Programme (PAP), National Poverty Eradication Programme (NAPEP), National Economic Empowerment Development Strategy (NEEDS), Subsidy Reinvestment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P) and the Social Investment Scheme of the Muhammadu Buhari government.

These schemes were established to enhance living standards, offer jobs, enhance agriculture and offer basic physical and social infrastructure to the people. The performance, sustainability and the degree to which the objectives of these programs are met are greatly dependent on how successful they are implemented. Nevertheless, the introduction of such programs has been a significant source of contention because such interventions have not worked in the past because of ineffective implementation, excessive political instability and interference, absence of a well-defined framework, lack of continuity, and corruption [3]. Taiwo & Agwu note that some of the social security programs that have been adopted in Nigeria, rather than lessening the occurrence of poverty which is their only objective unfortunately became a source of siphoning the national resources because of the pursuit of parochial interests as a result of the festering corruption and dishonesty. Such programmes are not continuous because when new governments come to power, they drop the programmes of the former governments and introduce new ones that have led to wastage of the available resources. Lamidi & Igbokwe support this when they stated that change in government is a factor that is always present and is a hindrance to the implementation of Social Investment Programmes in Nigeria [4].

These programs are executed by the institutions of government which act as the engine to the execution of the public policies and programs. The fact that these institutions are run at the mercy of any political leader who is in power makes them weak and the men and women who are in charge of the institutions strong. This explains the high instances of policy summersaults that are witnessed after a new leader assumes the leadership of the affairs. The absence of continuity in the majority of policies and programs of government provides an opportunity of unhealthy combination of politics and policy-making. This is the core of this paper as we look into the different social investment programs that have been implemented by the past and the present governments to determine why they have succeeded and failed and give recommendations on how to reposition the public institutions to perform better [5].

The theoretical foundation of this paper is the State Fragility Theory. State fragility theory examines the factors that lead to a weak or failed state and its institutions. Some of the factors that contributes to the fragility of states include policy inconsistencies, instability, violence and crime. Machiavellian and Weberian perspectives influenced the state fragility theory, which states that fragility is occasioned by the failure of the state to offer basic services to its citizens. Rotberg centers his study on failed states and clarifies that failure can occur in many aspects of the society including the economic performance, the security sector and the quality of the political representation in the state. What he means is that in the majority of the cases, fragility may manifest itself in one or several of these dimensions, or as in Somalia, in all of them at the same time [6].

Good governance is one of the popular Western concepts of the factors that lead to state fragility. This has been employed in the development sector as a synonym to a state that is governed by several institutions and policies founded on democratic principles. The point is that a state must have a good governance in order to become a stable and functioning participant of the global arena. On the contrary, bad governance will lead to an environment where civil wars will tend to recur because of lack of legitimacy exhibited by the government. This can be seen in the form of lack of government accountability, lack

of access to the political arena by the population and poor transparency exhibited by the elites. This idea has been criticized in terms of the limited scope of administrative reforms that do not take into consideration social structures that may have a significant role in stabilizing or de-stabilizing a state [7]. The basic assumptions of the state fragility theory are the following;

- a) Make sure that no harm is done by state activities
- b) Make state building the main goal
- c) Identify the connections between political, security and development goals
- d) Enhance nondiscrimination as a foundation of inclusive and stable societies
- e) Conform to local priorities in various ways and in various contexts
- f) Agree on feasible co-ordination mechanisms among international actors
- g) Avoid exclusion pockets.

This theory emphasizes the need to evaluate the ability and performance of the Nigerian state institutions to execute policies and programmes particularly as they touch on social security and welfare management. It points out corruption, political instability and inability of the state institutions to handle the situation as the greatest burden to the making and implementation of the public policy, therefore, making the social security and welfare administration in Nigeria more of a political game of chess, than a policy that is meant to raise the economic and social standards of the people. When a state has weak institutions, the environment is created where strongmen can take over and dominate [8].

2. Materials and Methods

This study is qualitative and exploratory since it is meant to interrogate the politics of social security or the politics of welfare administration in Nigeria as one would expect in cases with an appreciable weak scheming structure. The analysis drew on secondary data sources only, which we deemed appropriate, particularly given the historical, policy-oriented, and institutional lens within which our analysis was framed. Data came from a variety of documented sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, university level texts, government policy documents, official reports of national and international organisations, established newspaper outlets, and appropriate web-based sources of information on SS, welfare programmes, public institutions and governance in Nigeria. Sources were deliberately chosen to represent a range of viewpoints on the policy development, implementation, institutional performance and political interference among the various administrations. The qualitative content analysis was used as an analytical approach, in which phrases with similar meaning were grouped from the materials reviewed, and then compared and interpreted to discover repeat patterns, themes and contradictions in relation to institutional weakness, policy discontinuity, corruption, and targeting of beneficiaries. The analysis was steep through the State Fragility Theory that allowed the study to connect the reported policy failures to the general governance issues of capacity, accountability and state effectiveness. Instead of studying new empirical data, the methodology focused on analytical depth by combining existing evidence to elucidate the reasons why successive social security initiatives cannot achieve sustainable results. It permitted the study to place particular welfare programmes in Nigeria within the context of its political and institutional setting, evaluate their outcomes over time, and provide lessons for policy. The methodology combined triangulation of different secondary sources with an analytical framework that is widely adopted in development literature, ensuring that the analysis is internally consistent, analytically rigorous, and relevant and timely in relation to current debates on social protection and institutional reform in Nigeria.

3. Results and Discussion

Government policies and programs cannot be achieved without the use of public institutions. The 16th Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) focuses on the establishment of robust institutions that will foster peace, justice, and inclusiveness. The SDGs number 16 is one of the targets that aim at developing effective, accountable and transparent institutions, which highlights the significance of institutions in the process of governance and policy making [9].

Institution is not just the name of the private organizations and the governmental ones, it is also the rules, laws, and the informal codes of social interactions [10]. Good institutions enable a peaceful and harmonious working relationship between the people who constitute the social system. Institutions are also fair when they make sure that all people are given equal rights, that they have an opportunity to better their lives and also have access to justice when they are victimized. Institutions may be formal and informal. The core formal institutions are laws, contracts and formal processes of public management (such as public financial management, procurement, and human resources management) whereas informal institutions are more general norms and values that may affect behaviour.

Institutions (formal or informal) in essence, however, determine the way power is exercised and controlled, the way states and societies make decisions and how they execute the decisions and how they quantify and report the outcomes. Good institutions may be in various forms: sound legal systems and representative parliaments that have the capacity to oversee; competent civil services and the delivery of public services in a timely and quality manner; effective judiciaries that enforce the rule of law; active civil societies; and free and independent media. These institutions rely on the creation of decentralised, democratic decision-making. Atul identified four desirable characteristics that are widely acknowledged to be important for strong institutions that are responsible for governance. These characteristics are;

1. **Governed by Rules:** The rules that govern a strong institution are written and re-written by individuals who are considered experts in the field. The authority that the rules grant to the institution, should be applied to all the citizens in the same way, and there should be no special privilege to a politically or otherwise influential citizen. Instead, weak institutions are controlled by the good or bad will of the leaders of the institutions. It is not unusual to hear the Nigerian leaders promising the citizens and the international community that they are ready to hold free and fair elections. This is an indicator that the institutions that are involved in the management, security and funding of elections are weak and can be compromised easily.

2. **Accountable:** The institution is accountable to a body which gives it oversight and guidance, e.g. a committee of the legislature, either the State House of Assembly, the Senate or Federal House of Representatives. This body is supposed to consist of qualified members and they review the performance of the institution periodically. The governing committee should also review the performance of the institution and this should be done by the leader who should be qualified and competent. The institution should have had an internal ombudsman and roles and responsibilities of people in the institution should have been clearly identified. The responsibility system of most of the public institutions in Nigeria is barely to the people but to the man in charge of the affairs- either the President or the Governor of a state. The same problems that were used against a former Governor of the Central Bank of Nigeria, Godwin Emefiele, under the Bola Tinubu administration that led to his removal, detention and prosecution, were raised under the Muhammadu Buhari administration who ignored the problems. The various accountability measures under various political regimes also reveals the frailties of the public institutions in Nigeria and most of the third world countries.

3. **Responsive:** The institution is supposed to be responsive and prompt in introducing rules or making decisions in the interest of the people. Its institutional processes must make sure that deliberations, discussions and independent review of rules and decisions are carried out in a time bound manner. The rules and decisions must be clear and must not leave any grey areas and must be written in simple language which can be understood by a person who is familiar with the language in one reading. It ought to invite comments and complaints about its operations, and address the comments and complaints within a time bound manner. Security agencies being an institution of government in Nigeria are barely responsive to the needs of the people. The ENDSARS campaign that compelled the Nigerian police to undergo series of reforms is a clear indication that the institution is weak, not responsive and not responsible.

4. **Transparent:** The institution is supposed to make its review reports, summary of feedback and grievances received and actions taken on them easily accessible. It must have easy access to its ombudsman. It must have a new and detailed web site in the contemporary times. Most of the government institutions in Nigeria lack functional websites and those that have are barely updated.

The above four factors may seem to be self-evident but how many institutions of governance in countries near and far, can pass the test even on these. It is even worse in the developing world such as Nigeria where strongmen reign and emasculate these institutions and place them under their tight control. The presence and dominance of weak institutions has policy implications on the formulation and implementation of policies particularly in the context of social security and welfare administration [11].

Weak Institutions and the Failures of Social Security Policies in Nigeria

On 29th May 2023, a new President - Bola Tinubu - was inaugurated when the term of the previous President Muhammadu Buhari ended. The handover was an amicable one since the incoming and outgoing Presidents belonged to the same political party the All-Progressives Congress (APC). Given the kind of politics in Nigeria, it was expected that the new President will build on the legacies of the former President. The pledge was made by Bola Tinubu himself in his acceptance speech when he was declared the winner of the elections. But barely two months in the saddle of power, the Presidency, through the National Economic Council (NEC) which is an organ made up of state governors and chaired by the Vice President of Nigeria, repudiated the National Social Register compiled by the former government. The Council argued that the register was not of integrity and the process of listing the names in the register was not correct [12].

The National Social Register (NSR) is a list of low-income and vulnerable households eligible to receive different social protection programs, such as cash transfers, school meals, health insurance, and skill development. The government has developed and established the National Social Register of the Poor and Vulnerable in 2016. There are 12 million people in the social register, 50 million people, 8 million poor and vulnerable households and 150,000 communities in 752 local government areas. The NSR will enable numerous agencies and stakeholders to coordinate and harmonise their activities more easily to target, enroll and monitor the beneficiaries of social programs [13].

The officials who worked in the Buhari government between 2015 and the expiry of the government in 2023 argued that the National Social Register is a compilation of the social registries of the 36 states and the Federal Capital Territory. The World Bank country Director for Nigeria, as quoted by The Guardian Newspaper stated that the methodology was such that the ministries of budget and planning at the state level compiled data that was developed through geographical and community-based selection where the communities and wards in the different local government areas were prioritized on the basis of their poverty levels. The multisectoral process was focused on

vulnerable households, profiled and accumulated the relevant data which was stored in the different units, verified and accumulated at the state level and sent to the database of the National Social Register. Assuming that these processes were carefully and responsibly pursued, then, it is a matter of concern that its integrity will be challenged in the future by the same state governments who were the active players in the collation process [14].

This policy somersault can be adduced to two possible reasons. The first is that the mapping, targeting and data collection procedures may have been undermined at some point or the other in the process of developing the social register. In case it is so, it is clear that there are no institutional means to protect the process. This would have spared us the national humiliation of undergoing the process of coming up with a national social register starting at the ground level. The second reason could be that the shift in political leadership could have as it has always been the case, influenced the decision to come up with a new register that will fit the fancies of the new sheriffs in town.

Whichever the case, this is a clear indication of poor institutional structures, where strongmen, and not strong institutions are the order of the day. Keeping these recent developments in mind, we shall, in no order of precedence, take a look at the road travelled so far in the never-ending quest of Nigeria in the social security and welfare policy delivery to the poor and vulnerable in our midst.

Operation Feed the Nation: This was an initiative that was initiated by the Military government of Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo with the aim of advancing agricultural activities by enhancing production. Some of the major issues that were faced with the implementation of this program that influenced the overall performance of this program includes poor planning, poor political will and lack of commitment [15].

Structural Adjustment Programm (SAP): This was implemented to achieve economic reforms to encourage more participation of the private sector in economic activities, lessen over reliance on oil which was and still is the main stay of the economy through diversification to other sectors. This program was however reported to have adversely affected the income distribution and augmented interpersonal conflicts.

Better Life Program: The Better Life Program was initiated by the wife of General Ibrahim Babangida who was the then Military Head of state of Nigeria. Its major goals are to empower women particularly in the rural regions in order to enhance their living standards and quality of life. Unluckily, this program was largely controlled by the urban women and the elitist group and therefore did not affect the rural women much.

National Directorate of Employment: This is an institution that was formed in 1986 and the aim of its formation was to deal with the issue of unemployment particularly among the youths who constitute the majority of the working population. Its major goal was to provide jobs by means of skill training and empowerment schemes that will promote self-employment and promote labour intensive work schemes.

Family Economic Advancement Program (FEAP): This program was developed by the Late General Sani Abacha and it was meant to improve the living standards of families by providing health care services, proper nutrition, maternal and child health care. This program provided credit facilities to support agriculture and small scale businesses, create capital through cooperative societies with the aim of raising family income and survival. It was however noted that there was poor loan monitoring since some of the individuals who borrowed loans failed to repay and this threatened the sustainability of the program. There were also no corrupt and sharp practices lacking in the implementation process.

Poverty Alleviation Program (PAP): The Poverty Alleviation Program was launched in the year 2000 and its aim was to generate income through creation of job to the citizens. This program was implemented by the involvement of youths in direct labour, environmental maintenance by sanitation activities and maintenance of government properties and buildings [16]. Some of the factors that impeded the realization of the goal of this program are poor funding, poor project planning and monitoring and corruption.

National Poverty Eradication Program (NAPEP): The government introduced the National Poverty Eradication Program (NAPEP) because of the ineffective execution of the Poverty Alleviation Program. The key aim of this program was to establish the measures of eradicating poverty and a new strategy that took a wholistic measure by engaging all stake holders in the Federal, state, local governments and the private sector was established. This strategy provided space to extensive consultations in the field of project identification and implementation. Youth empowerment programs and skill acquisition programs were initiated and at the same time proper monitoring mechanisms were established. However, the United Nations identified some of the key challenges that included diversion of resources, misappropriation of funds and corrupt practices that hindered the success of the program.

National Economic Empowerment Development Strategy (NEEDS): President Olusegun Obasanjo introduced this program in the year 2004. The program also possessed its institutions on the state level. This framework was to manage empowerment to self-sufficiency and economic and development strategies by enhancing transportation network, rural-urban drift, enhancement of educational and health institutions and promotion of job creation strategies.

Seven Point Agenda: President Musa Yar adua on taking over power in 2007 presented the Seven-point agenda with the aim of reviving major sectors of the economy. Some of the areas of interest are power and energy, food security, wealth creation, transport sector, land reforms, security and education. This program aimed at solving the teeming problems that were facing social and economic development in the country with focus on provision of a conducive and secure environment to both local and foreign investors.

National Social Investment Program (NSIP): The Federal Government of Nigeria launched the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) in 2016 to solve the socio-economic issues of its citizens. This program was initiated by the Buhari administration in order to curb the level of poverty and vulnerability in the country.

The Social Investment Programme under the leadership of Muhammadu Buhari can so far be described as a daring venture into investing in the human capital of the Nigerian nation. The reason is that, some of the policy initiatives in this respect have been mostly ad hoc in character, ill-coordinated and tend to die at the expiry of the administration that developed them. This was the same case with the Subsidy Re-investment and Empowerment Programme (SURE-P) of the government of former President Goodluck Jonathan and others preceding it.

In their bid to fulfill their campaign promises, the APC-led federal government of President Muhammadu Buhari, with an initial take off allocation of N500 billion in the 2016 budget, initiated its social investment policy which is based on four major programmes namely N-power, Home Grown School Feeding (HGFS), Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT), and Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme.

N-power volunteer corps scheme is a human capital program that targets to employ 500,000 unemployed graduates in different areas including teaching and community education (N-Teach), agriculture (N-Agro), and health services (N-Health). The non-graduate category of the N-power volunteer corps scheme is also there and is aimed at

taking in another 100,000 young Nigerians in other areas such as building and construction (N-Build) and computer repairs and maintenance, both hardware and software (N-Tech). The graduate category of N-power was a two-year paid volunteer scheme where the volunteers are deployed to their areas of primary assignment in various parts of the country and the federal government pays them a monthly stipend of N30,000, directly into their bank accounts. Besides offering temporary jobs to unemployed Nigerian graduates, the N-power volunteer corps scheme is also expected to keep these young Nigerians occupied within a two year period in different activities so that they can learn the relevant job skills and become more employable.

Home-Grown School Feeding is one of the social investment initiatives of the Buhari government to address poverty, health, and education of school children and other vulnerable populations. The programme will target to assist state government to feed more than 24 million school children collectively. This will render it the biggest school feeding programme of this nature in Africa. The objective of the Home-Grown School Feeding programme is;

- 1) Raising school enrolment and completion. The current rate of dropout in primary schools in Nigeria is approximately 30 percent.
- 2) Enhance the health and nutrition of children. Nigeria ranks third in the number of chronically undernourished children in the world.
- 3) Empower the local agricultural economies by offering a school feeding market where farmers can sell their products.
- 4) Provide jobs in catering, processing, farming etc.

Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) is a part of the social investment programme of the Buhari administration to ensure a social safety net of the poorest and most vulnerable Nigerians. The government under the scheme alleged to have paid the amount of N5,000 monthly payments directly to one million vulnerable Nigerians. The federal government purported to have identified this group of vulnerable Nigerians using Community-Based Targeting (CBT) to identify the now controversial National Social Register of very poor Nigerians in communities, local government areas and the states. The federal government under former President Muhammadu Buhari with the assistance of the World Bank introduced the Community-Based Targeting (CBT) whereby the government would visit two of the poorest local governments in each state and therein they would identify two of the poorest villages or communities in such state. A list is made out of the poorest community. The criteria to be used in identifying beneficiaries were; school enrolment of the parents of school going children, immunization of the children against child-killer diseases, the aged and the disabled poor.

The Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP) targets to assist micro, small and medium enterprises through soft loans to enable them to grow their businesses and generate employment. The federal government information shows that the program, which is aimed at market women, traders, artisans, etc. has given interest free loans to 57,234 entrepreneurs.

The National Social Investment Programme (NSIP); The Buhari government attempted to establish institutional structures of welfare management in Nigeria. The National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) was initially under the office of the Vice President, but was transferred to the Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development established in 2019. The Ministry was formed with an objective of institutionalizing the process of implementing social security programmes, after the issue of the sustainability of social investment programmes was raised.

The ministry vision is to ensure the existence of proactive, humane, inclusive and sustainable social protection systems to enhance and overall welfare of the people. The ministry is charged with the responsibility of formulating humanitarian policies and offering effective coordination of National and International humanitarian interventions; strategic disaster mitigation, preparedness and response; and coordination of formulation and implementation of equitable focused social inclusion and protection programs in Nigeria. The realization of this vision, as far as it can be seen, will be largely determined by the body language of the President or what is usually termed as political will.

The failures and lack of sustainability of social investment policies and programmes in Nigeria can be said to be a failure of the Nigerian state and its institutions. How do we strengthen state institutions to enhance public service delivery? The following suggestions were put forward in that regard;

1) **Effective legislation:** It is curious to note that the Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development was created by the Buhari administration through executive pronouncement. The administration of Bola Tinubu also created the Ministry of Maritime and Blue Economy, following the same process. It is therefore our view that enduring institutions are supposed to be products of effective legislation. The legislation will help to define the functions of the institution, powers and limitation to the exercise of such powers, among other issues.

2) **Multi-stakeholders' engagement:** In democratic societies, strong institutions have inbuilt mechanisms for checks and balances. The checks and balances ideally, should come from multiple stakeholders – the civil society, the press, the judiciary, among others. The multi-stakeholders' engagement promotes transparency and accountability. The National Social Register that is currently being disputed appears not to have enjoyed the input of relevant stakeholders. Otherwise, the integrity question, which is coming almost seven years after would have been addressed earlier before now. Multi-stakeholders' engagement promotes transparency and accountability.

3) **Effective Coordination:** Social security initiatives and the administration of welfare policies is multi-faceted in nature, requiring the involvement of different institutions and agencies. Therefore, appropriate institutional frameworks should be developed to better coordinate and manage the implementation of the various aspects of social and welfare policies like data gathering and profiling of beneficiaries, development of a Social Security Number, funds disbursement, institutional logistics, and supports, among others.

4. Conclusion

This paper finds that social security and welfare administration in Nigeria has not been largely effective in achieving the redistributive and protective objectives of its provisions as enshrined in various policy documents given the structurally weak institutions, politicization of the policy process, poor targeting mechanisms, lack of continuity, and endemic corruption, which coalesce to make welfare programmes short-term political instruments rather than enduring social policies, based on the analysis provided in the study which we attach in this paper. Its principal message is that an irresponsible proliferation of welfare schemes, lacking coherence in institutional coordination, systematic baseline data on beneficiaries, and above all a rights-based approach to policy-making, leads to massive policy repeals, squandering of resources, and disenfranchisement of genuinely poor populations. This has strong implications for policy and practice: absent intentional institutionalization through legal framework, accountability systems, transparent data systems and working mechanisms of inter-agency coordination, social protection programs will continue to be brittle and fly to the

next regime change. The study also suggests that sustainable welfare provision in Nigeria is linked to more comprehensive governance reforms to protect public institutions from elite capture and whimsy political meddling. To complement the existing literature, future research should go beyond descriptive programme evaluations, to provide empirical, causal evidence on the links between institutional capacity or governance quality, and resulting welfare outcomes, including through comparative sub-national studies, experimental evaluations of targeting strategies, and comparative longitudinal studies investigating how policy legacies shape the sustainability and effectiveness of social security reforms over time in fragile state settings.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Atul, "Strong institutions of governance are necessary for sustainable prosperity," *The Times of India*, Dec. 10, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/blogs/ecopinion-by-atul/strong-institutions-of-governance-are-necessary-for-sustainable-prosperity/>
- [2] Central Bank of Nigeria, *A Profile of Regional/Zonal Poverty in Nigeria: The Case of Enugu Zone in Measuring and Monitoring Poverty in Nigeria*, Proc. 7th Annual Conf. Enugu Zone Research Unit, 1998.
- [3] M. Doornbos, "Good governance: The rise and decline of a policy metaphor," *Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 23–31, 2011.
- [4] D. Elumoye, "Cash transfer: NEC rejects Buhari's national social register over integrity issue," *ThisDay Newspaper*, Jul. 20, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.thisdaylive.com/cash-transfer-nec-rejects-buharis-national-social-register-over-integrity-issue/>
- [5] N. Enyioko, *The Impact of N-Power Programmes on Poverty Alleviation in Rivers State, Nigeria*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.grin.com> (accessed Jun. 10, 2023).
- [6] Guardian Newspapers, "How World Bank, states built national social register, by country director," *The Guardian*, Jul. 24, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.guardian.ng/news/how-wbank-states-built-national-social-register-by-country-director/>
- [7] H. Mustapha, "Poverty alleviation programs in Nigeria: Issues and challenges," *International Journal of Development Research*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 717–720, 2014.
- [8] U. Igwe, "Can social investment programs reverse Nigeria's poverty trend?" *Premium Times*, Jun. 27, 2021.
- [9] K. O. Lamidi and P. I. Igbokwe, "Social investment programmes in Nigeria: Impact and challenges," *African Journal of Social Work*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2021.
- [10] R. Morphy, *Nigeria: Youth Unemployment, Poverty – A Time Bomb for the Country*, Annual Socio-Economic Report, 2008.
- [11] OECD, *OECD and Post-2015 Reflections*, 2016. [Online]. Available: [https://www.oecd.org/dac/ POST-2015%20effective%20and%20accountable%20institutions.pdf](https://www.oecd.org/dac/POST-2015%20effective%20and%20accountable%20institutions.pdf) (accessed Sep. 02, 2023).
- [12] U. Okoye and E. Onyukwu, "Sustaining poverty reduction efforts through agency collaboration in Nigeria," in *State–Society Relations in Nigeria: Consolidation, Conflicts and Reforms*, K. Omeje, Ed. London, UK: Adonis & Abbey, 2007.
- [13] Punch Newspaper, "Strengthening social investment schemes to protect the poor," *Punch*, Feb. 18, 2018.
- [14] R. Rotberg, "The new nature of nation-state failure," *Washington Quarterly*, no. 25, 2012.
- [15] J. N. Taiwo and M. E. Agwu, "Problems and prospects of poverty alleviation programmes in Nigeria," *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, vol. 4, no. 6, pp. 18–30, 2016.
- [16] United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report: Work for Human Development*. New York, NY, USA: UNDP, 2015.