MSI Journal of
Multidisciplinary Research (MSIJMR)

Social Investment in Nigeria: Law, Institutional Accountability and the Limits of Developmental Impact

Fidelis Odumu, Ph. D[1*], Professor Hadiza Hamma[2]

[1*] Department of Political Science, Federal University Lafia.

[2] Dean of Law, Prime University Abuja.

*** Correspondence:** Fidelis Odumu, Ph. D

The authors declare that no funding was received for this work.

OPEN ACCESS

Received: 02-May-2026

Accepted: 21-June-2026

Published: 28-June-2026

This article is published in the **MSI Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (MSIJMR) ISSN 3049-0669 (Online)**

The journal is managed and published by MSI Publishers.

Volume: 3, Issue: 6 (June-2026)

ABSTRACT: Over the past two decades, Nigeria has elevated social investment to a central pillar of its development strategy, committing substantial public resources to poverty reduction, human capital formation and social protection. Despite the scale and visibility of initiatives such as the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP), poverty incidence, inequality and vulnerability remain persistently high. This paper interrogates the paradox of expansive social investment with limited developmental returns. Drawing on capability theory, institutional economics, political economy perspectives and law-and-development analysis, the study argues that Nigeria's social investment outcomes are constrained not only by weak policy design but also by gaps in legal accountability, institutional coordination, statutory enforcement, rights-based participation, transparent governance and policy learning. Using a qualitative, desk-based analytical approach grounded in official data, legal materials and global development scholarship, the paper demonstrates that scale without legally supported systems produces visibility rather than impact. The paper concludes that for social investment to become transformative rather than performative, Nigeria must embed social programmes within strong institutions, evidence-based design, enforceable accountability mechanisms, rights-sensitive implementation and long-term policy coherence.

Keywords: *Social investment; Governance; Law and development; Constitutional accountability; Nigeria; Public policy*

1. Introduction

Over the past two decades, Nigeria has increasingly relied on social investment as a central instrument for poverty reduction, human capital development, and social protection. This shift reflects both domestic pressures - rising poverty, unemployment, and inequality - and global policy trends that emphasize social protection as a foundation for inclusive growth and economic resilience. Following decades in which welfare interventions were fragmented, underfunded, and largely ad hoc, successive Nigerian governments have sought to institutionalize social investment within national development planning frameworks.

A major milestone in this trajectory was the establishment of the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) in 2016. The NSIP consolidated several flagship interventions, including N-Power (youth employment and skills development), the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) programme targeting the poorest and most vulnerable households, the Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (HGSFP) aimed at improving child nutrition and school enrolment, and the Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP), which provides microcredit to small-scale traders and informal workers (Federal Government of Nigeria, 2016). Collectively, these programmes represent one of the largest social investment efforts in Sub-Saharan Africa in terms of geographic reach and beneficiary numbers.

Public expenditure on social programmes expanded alongside these initiatives. Federal budgetary allocations to social investment and social protection rose steadily between 2016 and 2022, while Nigeria also committed to global frameworks such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly Goal 1 (No Poverty) and Goal 10 (Reduced Inequalities). Social protection has therefore shifted from a marginal welfare concern to a visible and politically salient pillar of national development policy, frequently cited as evidence of state responsiveness to widespread socioeconomic hardship.

Despite this scale and visibility, social outcomes remain deeply disappointing. According to the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), an estimated 63 per cent of Nigerians -

approximately 133 million people - were multidimensionally poor in 2022, experiencing overlapping deprivations in education, health, living standards, and employment (NBS, 2022). Poverty is heavily spatialized, with rural areas accounting for more than 70 per cent of the multidimensionally poor and northern states exhibiting significantly higher poverty intensity than the national average. Youth unemployment and underemployment remain widespread, while learning poverty and poor health outcomes continue to undermine human capital formation.

International evidence reinforces this picture. The World Bank notes that Nigeria's poverty reduction performance has stagnated over the past decade, even during periods of increased social spending, and that the country has struggled to convert public expenditure into sustained welfare gains (World Bank, 2023). Real income growth has been constrained by slow economic expansion, high inflation, insecurity, and weak service delivery systems, all of which erode the potential impact of social investment interventions. As a result, social programmes often function as short-term coping mechanisms rather than pathways to long-term economic security and capability expansion.

This persistent gap between the scale of social investment and its developmental outcomes raises a critical policy and analytical question: why has Nigeria's expansive social investment architecture failed to translate scale into impact? Addressing this question is essential not only for improving the effectiveness of Nigeria's social policies, but also for advancing broader debates on the limits of social investment in contexts characterized by institutional fragility, governance challenges, and structural economic constraints. Understanding the Nigerian case therefore offers important lessons for other developing countries pursuing ambitious social investment agendas under similar conditions.

A legal perspective is necessary because social investment is not merely a question of public expenditure or administrative efficiency. It is also a question of constitutional responsibility, institutional accountability and development justice. In Nigeria, social investment is connected to the constitutional commitment to democracy, social justice and the welfare of the people, even though many socio-economic objectives remain difficult to enforce directly in court. This creates a gap between welfare as a constitutional aspiration and welfare as an enforceable entitlement.

The central argument of this paper is that Nigeria's social investment problem is not merely one of inadequate spending or weak policy implementation. It is also a legal and institutional problem arising from weak enforceability of social welfare commitments, politicised discretion, insufficient statutory safeguards, poor accountability systems and limited rights-based participation. Scale has not translated into impact because Nigeria's social investment framework has not yet fully developed the legal and institutional conditions needed to convert welfare commitments into durable developmental outcomes.

2. Conceptual Framework: Social Investment as Capability Expansion and Development Justice

This study is grounded in Amartya Sen's capability approach, which conceptualizes development as the expansion of individuals' substantive freedoms - the real opportunities people have to lead lives they value - rather than as income growth or welfare provision alone (Sen, 1999). From this perspective, social investment should be assessed not by the scale of public expenditure or the number of beneficiaries reached, but by its effectiveness in expanding human capabilities such as education, employable skills, health, agency, and long-term productivity. Developmental success therefore depends on whether public interventions enhance individuals' ability to convert resources into sustained improvements in life chances.

Within the capability framework, social investment is inherently forward-looking and transformative. It emphasizes policies that build human capital, strengthen resilience to economic shocks, and enable beneficiaries to transition into stable and productive livelihoods. Recent development literature reinforces this view, arguing that social protection systems in low- and middle-income countries must move beyond short-term income support toward integrated models that link transfers with skills development, labour market access, and institutional support (International Labour Organization [ILO], 2023; World Bank, 2022).

This framework is particularly relevant to Nigeria, where structural constraints - high youth unemployment, skills mismatches, informality, and weak labour market absorption - limit the extent to which social spending translates into durable welfare gains. Nigeria's National Social Investment Programme (NSIP), especially the N-Power component, illustrates this challenge. While N-Power was designed to enhance youth employability through temporary work placements and monthly stipends, recent evaluations indicate that its impacts have been largely short-term. World Bank assessments of Nigeria’s social assistance architecture find that programmes such as N-Power have improved short-run income stability but show limited evidence of sustained employment or long-term earnings growth after programme exit (World Bank, 2022, 2023).

Similarly, UNDP (2023) reports that although social investment programmes in Nigeria have expanded coverage among vulnerable youth, weak alignment with labour market demand, limited certification of acquired skills, and insufficient post-programme support have constrained their contribution to lasting capability expansion. As a result, many beneficiaries cycle back into unemployment or informal work once programme support ends, underscoring the gap between distributive reach and transformative impact.

Joseph Stiglitz’s institutional critique complements Sen’s capability approach by emphasizing that the effectiveness of social investment depends critically on governance quality and institutional capacity. Stiglitz argues that public spending yields low developmental returns where institutions are weak, accountability mechanisms are limited, and monitoring and evaluation systems are underdeveloped (Stiglitz, 2019; Stiglitz, Fitoussi, & Durand, 2018). In the Nigerian context, institutional challenges - including fragmented programme coordination, politicization of beneficiary selection, payment delays, and weak performance tracking - have reduced the efficiency and credibility of social investment initiatives (World Bank, 2023). These governance deficits undermine the conversion of public resources into genuine capability gains.

A law-and-development perspective extends this framework by asking whether social investment is supported by legal rules, institutions and remedies capable of protecting beneficiaries from arbitrary exclusion, corruption, discrimination and policy instability. From this perspective, law is not simply a background instrument for creating agencies or appropriating funds. It is a tool for structuring institutional mandates, distributing public resources, defining beneficiary rights, creating grievance channels, regulating administrative discretion and demanding public accountability.

Taken together, Sen's capability approach, Stiglitz's institutional perspective and law-and-development analysis provide a coherent framework for evaluating social investment in Nigeria. They highlight that social programmes must extend beyond redistribution and short-term poverty alleviation to focus on sustained capability formation within a supportive legal and institutional environment. Without strong governance structures, rights-sensitive implementation and deliberate integration with labour market systems, social investment risks remaining palliative rather than transformative - offering temporary relief without expanding the substantive freedoms and life opportunities of beneficiaries.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative, desk-based analytical approach to examine Nigeria's social investment framework. The focus is on understanding governance structures, institutional design, political interference, legal safeguards, administrative accountability and alignment with capability expansion, rather than estimating causal effects. This approach is suitable for policy-oriented and law-and-development research that aims to integrate theory with empirical evidence and generate insights for institutional, legal and programmatic reform.

Data were drawn from secondary sources, including official publications from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), World Bank reports, OECD and UNDP assessments, statutory and constitutional materials, and peer-reviewed academic literature on social investment, development policy, governance and law. These sources were selected for their credibility, relevance and policy significance, enabling the study to triangulate findings across legal instruments, institutional reports, statistical indicators and scholarly analyses.

The study employs thematic content analysis to identify patterns across five domains: governance and institutional design, political interference, legal accountability, evidence use and monitoring, and programme alignment with capability expansion. Themes were derived both deductively, from the theoretical framework of the capability approach and law-and-development analysis, and inductively, from recurring empirical observations. While limitations of secondary data are acknowledged, the approach provides a rigorous, evidence-based assessment of Nigeria's social investment policies and their capacity to enhance long-term human capabilities within a legally accountable institutional framework.

4. Legal and Institutional Framework for Social Investment in Nigeria

The legal foundation of social investment in Nigeria is partly constitutional, partly statutory and partly grounded in regional and international development commitments. Although the Nigerian Constitution does not create a directly enforceable general right to social investment, it contains important normative commitments that justify social welfare intervention. Section 14(1) declares that Nigeria shall be a state based on the principles of democracy and social justice, while section 14(2)(b) provides that the security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of government. Section 16 further directs the state to promote national prosperity, welfare, equality of status and opportunity, and to provide suitable and adequate shelter, food, minimum living wage, old age care, pensions, unemployment benefits, sick benefits and welfare for persons with disabilities.

The main constitutional difficulty is the non-justiciability of the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy under section 6(6)(c) of the Constitution. This means that citizens generally cannot directly enforce Chapter II welfare commitments in court in the same way as the civil and political rights contained in Chapter IV. However, Chapter II remains legally important. It supplies a constitutional basis for legislation, policy design and judicial interpretation, and it provides a normative standard against which public welfare institutions may be assessed. Besides, the Supreme Court has recognised that although Chapter II of the 1999 Constitution is generally non-justiciable by virtue of section 6(6)(c), this non-justiciability is not absolute. In *Attorney-General of Ondo State v. Attorney-General of the Federation* (2002, 9 NWLR (Pt 772) 222), the Court upheld the validity of legislation enacted to give effect to section 15(5) of the Constitution. The position was reaffirmed in *Olafisoye v. FRN* (2004, 4 NWLR (Pt 864) 580), where the Court held that once the National Assembly legislates pursuant to relevant constitutional authority, the affected Chapter II provision may become enforceable.

At the statutory level, the National Social Investment Programme Agency (Establishment) Act, (2023) provides a legal basis for institutionalising the National Social Investment Programme. The Act is significant because it moves social investment beyond ad hoc executive discretion by creating a statutory agency for coordinating social intervention programmes. This statutory foundation should, in principle, strengthen institutional continuity, define administrative responsibility and support accountability in beneficiary management, payment systems and coordination with federal and subnational actors.

Regional human rights law also provides an important legal lens. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, domesticated in Nigeria through the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (Ratification and Enforcement) Act, recognises several rights relevant to social investment, including equality before the law, participation in public affairs, access to public property and services, the right to work, the right to health, the right to education, special protection for the aged and persons with disabilities, and the right to development. Article 22 is particularly relevant because it recognises the right of peoples to their economic, social and cultural development and imposes a duty on states to ensure its exercise.

This legal framework suggests that social investment should not be treated merely as charity, political benevolence or short-term relief. It should be understood as part of Nigeria's broader constitutional and human rights responsibility to promote welfare, dignity, equality, participation and development. The weakness of the current framework lies not in the absence of policy ambition, but in the limited translation of these legal commitments into enforceable standards for targeting, participation, transparency, grievance redress, continuity and institutional accountability.

5. Scale Without Impact: The Limits of Nigeria's Social Investment Framework

Nigeria's social investment framework presents a clear paradox: considerable programme expansion and the existence of formal legal and institutional structures have not translated into durable developmental impact. Although the state has invested in cash transfers, youth employment schemes, school feeding, micro-enterprise support and other welfare-oriented interventions, the persistence of poverty, inequality and vulnerability shows that scale alone is insufficient. The limits of Nigeria's social investment framework are therefore not merely financial or administrative; they are also legal, institutional and structural. This section examines those limits through four interrelated issues. Together, these factors explain why social investment in Nigeria has often produced visibility without sufficient transformation.

5.1. Institutional Fragility, Rule of Law and Accountability Constraints

Nigeria's social investment outcomes are significantly shaped by institutional fragility and governance constraints that weaken programme effectiveness. A central challenge lies in data quality and targeting mechanisms. The World Bank's 2025 report on Nigeria's social safety nets reveals that while government programmes aim to support vulnerable populations, only 44 per cent of total social benefits actually reach poor households, even though about 56 per cent of beneficiaries are poor (World Bank, 2025). This inefficiency stems from fragmented implementation, benefit design that does not adequately account for household size, and weak integration of real-time data systems for targeting and delivery. The report highlights the National Social Registry (NSR) as a potentially strong platform - with coverage of over 85 million individuals - but notes that systemic weaknesses in programme design and delivery diminish its effectiveness in ensuring accurate targeting and benefit distribution (World Bank, 2025).

Beyond technical data issues, governance deficits at national and subnational levels undermine social investment performance. Nigeria's ranking in global governance benchmarks demonstrates ongoing institutional challenges. In the 2024 Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) compiled by Transparency International, Nigeria ranked 140th out of 180 countries with a score of 26 out of 100, reflecting pervasive governance risks that can affect public sector performance, including the administration of social programmes (Transparency International, 2024; BusinessDay Nigeria, 2025). Additionally, Nigeria ranked 116th on the 2025 Good Governance Index, which assesses government capability, institutional strength, financial stewardship and policy effectiveness - dimensions directly relevant to the capacity of public institutions to deliver social services robustly and equitably (Chandler Good Government Index, 2025).

These weaknesses create fertile ground for leakages, bureaucratic inefficiencies and political interference. Though there have been some high-profile anti-corruption efforts and recoveries by agencies like the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission, systemic corruption remains a structural constraint on public service delivery. The prevailing perception of corruption has eroded public trust, reduced accountability and sometimes redirected resources away from intended social investments (Reuters, 2025). In governance terms, such constraints limit the ability of federal, state and local authorities to coordinate social investment effectively and to build the institutional continuity necessary for capability expansion. These dynamics reflect scholarly arguments that in weak governance environments, public spending can be diverted toward rents or administrative costs rather than meaningful social outcomes, thereby undermining the potential of social investment to transform lives and reduce poverty.

From a legal perspective, institutional fragility is also a rule-of-law problem. Social investment institutions must operate according to clear legal mandates, predictable procedures, transparent eligibility rules, auditable payment systems and accessible complaint mechanisms. Where beneficiary selection is opaque, payments are delayed without explanation, or programme records are inaccessible, affected persons are not only administratively disadvantaged; they are also denied the protection that legality and public accountability are meant to provide. The rule of law therefore requires that social investment be administered through procedures that are fair, transparent, reviewable and insulated from arbitrary discretion.

5.2. Political Patronage, Administrative Discretion and the Weakness of Legal Safeguards

Political interference remains a defining constraint in Nigeria's social investment ecosystem. Rather than being anchored in long-term development planning, many social programmes are shaped by short-term electoral incentives and elite political calculations. This has resulted in frequent restructuring, abrupt termination, or rebranding of programmes across successive administrations, undermining continuity and institutional learning.

Nigeria's political economy is commonly characterized as neo-patrimonial, where formal bureaucratic institutions coexist with informal patron-client networks that influence decision-making (Erdmann & Engel, 2007). Within this context, social investment programmes often become instruments for political mobilization and patronage distribution rather than vehicles for sustainable poverty reduction. Political elites may use programme benefits, public sector appointments, or contracts to reward supporters and consolidate power, weakening the developmental logic of social policy (Joseph, 2014).

Electoral cycles play a particularly destabilizing role. Social programmes are frequently expanded or redesigned in the lead-up to elections to generate political goodwill, while incoming administrations often discontinue or rename existing initiatives to signal political departure from predecessors (Akinwale, 2019). For instance, several federal social investment initiatives introduced in one administration have faced funding disruptions, administrative restructuring, or outright suspension following changes in political leadership, limiting their long-term impact and scalability (World Bank, 2020).

Patronage politics also undermines bureaucratic professionalism and institutional capacity, which are essential for effective social policy implementation. Appointments to key administrative positions are often influenced by political loyalty rather than technical competence, reducing efficiency, accountability and policy coherence (Lewis, 2011). This weakens monitoring and evaluation systems and constrains the ability of institutions to generate evidence-based adjustments to programmes over time.

Fukuyama's (2014) theory of political order provides a useful analytical framework for understanding these dynamics. He argues that weak political order emerges when state institutions lack autonomy from political elites and are captured by patronage networks. In such settings, the civil service is unable to operate on meritocratic principles, and public policies are continually distorted by personalized interests. Nigeria's experience reflects this condition, as social investment policies are repeatedly reshaped to serve partisan objectives, resulting in fragmentation and policy instability.

The legal problem is that broad administrative discretion is often not matched by strong safeguards. A social investment framework that permits frequent programme suspension, political rebranding, discretionary beneficiary selection and weak reporting requirements cannot produce durable social rights outcomes. Legal safeguards are therefore needed to protect core programmes from abrupt political disruption, require objective eligibility criteria, regulate appointment processes, establish statutory reporting duties and preserve institutional memory across political cycles.

The cumulative effect of these processes is a social investment ecosystem marked by weak sustainability, limited accountability and low public trust. Policy instability not only reduces the effectiveness of social programmes but also discourages long-term investment by development partners and erodes citizen confidence in the state's capacity to deliver social protection. Without insulating social investment policies from partisan politics and strengthening institutional autonomy through legal rules, these challenges are likely to persist.

5.3. Ethno-Regional Pressures, Equality and Targeting Failures

Nigeria's ethno-regional diversity and political economy significantly complicate the implementation of social investment programmes, often weakening evidence-based targeting and shaping allocation decisions along political and regional lines rather than vulnerability criteria. Research on social protection in northern Nigeria highlights how local political dynamics and institutional pressures at the state and community levels influence targeting outcomes, with leaders and influential actors exerting control over who is included or excluded from benefits, sometimes leading to perceptions of unfairness and exclusion among communities. These pressures can distort objectively defined measures of need and skew the reach of social assistance away from the most vulnerable households (BASIC Research programme, 2025).

Nigeria's political system is marked by neo-patrimonial and clientelist practices, where public programmes and social transfers are at times used to secure political support rather than to advance equitable welfare outcomes. Recent political-economy analyses show that components of Nigeria's social protection architecture - including cash transfer schemes and employment support initiatives - have been instrumentalized in electoral contexts, with public resources used to elicit voter compliance or reward politically aligned constituencies (Springer study, 2025). Such patterns reinforce regional and partisan networks and can encourage regional bloc politics that prioritize representation over vulnerability. This dynamic aligns with broader observations in development scholarship that politically negotiated interventions, when heavily shaped by distributive bargaining, risk becoming symbolic or patronage-driven rather than transformative, undermining their capacity to expand capabilities and reduce exclusion systematically.

These political pressures are particularly consequential in a federal system where ethno-regional identities and resource competition intersect with public policy. Long-standing regional inequalities in access to infrastructure, employment and public services often coincide with ethnic and geopolitical cleavages, which in turn shape how social investment programmes are perceived and administered. When allocation decisions are influenced by political calculations - such as appeasing key regional constituencies or consolidating party support - the link between programme objectives and actual social vulnerability weakens, leading to targeting failures and reduced legitimacy of welfare interventions. This is consistent with broader development theory that warns of the limitations of policy interventions in contexts where political bargaining and elite interests dominate policy design and distributional choice.

A rights-based legal perspective reframes targeting failures as equality and non-discrimination concerns. Social investment programmes distribute public resources and access to state-supported opportunities. They must therefore be administered in ways that respect equal protection, non-discrimination, transparency and participation. Where beneficiaries are selected through informal influence, political loyalty, regional bargaining or unclear community processes, the result is not only inefficient targeting; it is also a failure of fair public administration. Legal standards should require objective vulnerability criteria, published beneficiary selection procedures, gender- and disability-sensitive inclusion, and independent grievance mechanisms for persons or communities wrongly excluded.

5.4. Evidence Deficits, Transparency and Legal Accountability

Effective social investment depends on the systematic use of evidence generated through rigorous monitoring, evaluation and continuous policy learning. Evidence-based policymaking enables governments to refine programme design, allocate resources efficiently and scale interventions that demonstrate measurable impact. Banerjee and Duflo (2019) argue that adaptive programme design - grounded in credible empirical evidence, particularly randomized evaluations - is central to achieving sustained poverty reduction and improving development outcomes.

In Nigeria, however, the integration of evidence into social investment policy remains weak and inconsistent. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems are often sporadic, donor-driven and weakly institutionalized, limiting their influence on policy formulation and programme adjustment (World Bank, 2020). Many social programmes lack clearly articulated theories of change, baseline data or robust performance indicators, making it difficult to assess outcomes beyond headline beneficiary numbers.

A major challenge is that evaluation practices are frequently introduced externally by development partners rather than embedded within domestic governance systems. While donor-funded programmes may incorporate evaluation frameworks to meet reporting requirements, these practices are rarely sustained once external funding or technical assistance ends (OECD, 2018). As a result, lessons learned are not systematically integrated into future programme cycles, reinforcing a pattern of policy repetition rather than learning.

Institutional discontinuity further deepens the evidence deficit. Frequent restructuring of ministries, departments and agencies responsible for social investment disrupts data collection systems and undermines institutional memory. Incoming administrations often abandon existing evaluation frameworks alongside discontinued programmes, resulting in the loss of valuable data and analytical capacity (UNDP, 2023). This weakens the feedback loop between evidence generation and policy design.

Politicization also constrains the use of evidence in decision-making. Evaluation findings that challenge political narratives or reveal programme underperformance may be ignored or suppressed, particularly in environments where social investment programmes are closely tied to electoral legitimacy (Akinwale, 2019). This limits honest appraisal and discourages adaptive reform, reinforcing implementation inefficiencies.

The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD, 2018) identifies weak institutional incentives, limited technical capacity and political interference as key barriers to evidence-informed policymaking in many developing countries, including Nigeria. Similarly, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, 2023) highlights fragmented data systems, inadequate financing for evaluation and low demand for evidence among political elites as structural constraints on effective social policy.

The cumulative effect is a persistent best-practices gap, where global evidence on what works in social investment - such as targeted cash transfers, early childhood interventions and skills-based employment programmes - is unevenly translated into Nigeria's policy context. Without strong domestic evaluation institutions and a political commitment to learning, social investment programmes risk remaining symbolic rather than transformative.

Transparency is also a legal accountability issue. Public funds used for social investment should be traceable from appropriation to beneficiary-level outcomes. This requires statutory reporting obligations, open data on programme design and coverage, privacy-protective beneficiary management systems, independent audits and parliamentary oversight. Evidence deficits therefore should not be understood only as technical weaknesses; they are also failures of public finance accountability, administrative transparency and democratic control over welfare spending.

Closing this gap requires not only technical investment in M&E systems but also institutional reforms that insulate evaluation processes from political pressures and embed evidence use into routine policymaking. Until such reforms are undertaken, evidence deficits will continue to limit the effectiveness, scalability and credibility of Nigeria's social investment efforts.

6. From Spending to Systems Thinking: Legal Coordination and Integrated Governance in Nigeria

Global evidence shows that social investment yields transformational outcomes only when embedded within integrated development systems that coordinate across sectors rather than operate in isolated silos. Jeffrey Sachs, one of the leading development economists, has long argued that poverty reduction and sustainable development require holistic strategies linking health, education, infrastructure, agriculture and economic policy, instead of addressing them piecemeal. In The End of Poverty (2005), Sachs promotes coordinated interventions as essential to overcoming structural barriers to human development. Later work associated with the Sustainable Development Goals reinforces this systems perspective, highlighting that progress across goals depends on managing the synergies and trade-offs among sectors rather than treating them as separate checklists.

A key illustration of why isolated spending often underperforms comes from Nigeria's own social protection landscape. The Federal Government's National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) was launched to reduce poverty, improve human capital and support vulnerable populations through multiple pillars such as N-Power, the National Home-Grown School Feeding Programme, Conditional Cash Transfers and the Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP). The programme is now statutorily anchored through the National Social Investment Programme Agency (Establishment) Act, 2023, which provides a legal framework intended to coordinate and strengthen social interventions under one institutional roof. This structuring represents an effort to move beyond ad hoc spending toward a more integrated social protection system, harmonizing efforts across education, poverty reduction, nutrition and youth employment.

Empirical studies on NSIP's impacts in states such as Enugu and Bayelsa provide insight into how integrated social investments can produce concrete human development outcomes when they connect across sectors: evaluations found that (a) the N-Power programme contributed significantly to skill acquisition and employment opportunities for youth, (b) GEEP supported entrepreneurship and small business empowerment, and (c) the Home-Grown School Feeding Programme enhanced school enrolment and reduced hunger, demonstrating that combining education, nutrition and economic support can yield broader gains in livelihoods and well-being.

Another Nigerian example of systems thinking - although at a subnational and sectoral level - is the State Supported Health Insurance Schemes (SSHIS) adopted in multiple states, including Cross River, Oyo, Enugu, Kwara, Sokoto and Taraba. These schemes apply a more integrated approach to health financing and care delivery than traditional out-of-pocket models by covering formal and informal workers, improving access equity and strengthening health infrastructure - effectively linking financial protection systems with healthcare access and workforce mobilization.

More narrowly, multisectoral health actions at the community level - such as coordinated initiatives involving education, water, sanitation, environmental health and nutrition - show how non-health sectors can contribute to improved primary health outcomes when deliberately aligned, even without formal policy frameworks. These efforts reveal both the potential of systems approaches and the constraints when policy coherence and sustained funding are missing.

From a legal-institutional standpoint, systems thinking requires more than policy coordination meetings. It requires clearly defined statutory duties across federal, state and local institutions; information-sharing rules; fiscal responsibility standards; inter-agency reporting obligations; and mechanisms for resolving overlap among ministries, departments and agencies. A social investment system that lacks legal coordination duties is likely to reproduce fragmentation, even when multiple programmes pursue related development goals.

These Nigerian cases reflect a broader lesson: social spending on its own often fails to unlock sustained, economy-wide productivity gains, but when social investments are institutionalized, aligned across sectors and supported by governance systems, they can reinforce each other and generate lasting human development outcomes. This transition - from isolated programmes to systemic, cross-sector integration - is essential for realizing the full multiplier effects of social investment in contexts like Nigeria.

7. Legal and Policy Implications

The analysis of Nigeria's social investment programmes indicates that the core challenge lies less in financial resources and more in structural, institutional and legal weaknesses. While programmes such as the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) have attracted substantial funding, evidence suggests that simply increasing scale does not automatically translate into meaningful impact. For instance, the Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT) programme, despite reaching millions of beneficiaries, has faced challenges related to data accuracy, duplication of recipients and inconsistencies in disbursement, which undermine the intended poverty-reduction outcomes (World Bank, 2022). Similarly, the Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (HGSFP), although widely visible, has struggled with local procurement inefficiencies and weak monitoring mechanisms, reducing its potential benefits for child nutrition and school attendance.

These experiences highlight that scale without robust institutional and legal systems produces visibility rather than sustainable impact. Consequently, policy reforms should emphasize the following areas:

7.1. Institutional autonomy and capacity building: Effective social investment requires independent institutions capable of making technical decisions insulated from political interference. Strengthening agencies responsible for social investment with trained personnel, clear operational mandates and secure institutional memory can enhance programme implementation. Lessons from countries like Brazil and Mexico, which have successfully reduced poverty through Bolsa Família and Prospera, show that institutional capacity and autonomy are central to programme effectiveness.

7.2. Clear statutory duties and administrative safeguards: Social investment legislation should define the duties of implementing institutions more precisely. These duties should cover beneficiary identification, payment timelines, data management, grievance redress, publication of programme information, reporting to the legislature and coordination between federal and subnational institutions. This would reduce arbitrary discretion and create standards against which administrative performance can be assessed.

7.3. Data credibility and rights-sensitive management: Reliable data is essential for targeting, monitoring and evaluating social programmes. The proliferation of fragmented databases and weak beneficiary identification systems in Nigeria has led to leakages and inefficiencies. Investing in digital identity systems, integrating government databases and adopting real-time monitoring tools can improve transparency and ensure that resources reach intended beneficiaries. However, data systems must also respect privacy, avoid discriminatory exclusion and provide correction mechanisms for persons whose records are inaccurate or missing.

7.4. Grievance redress and access to remedy: Social investment programmes should provide accessible grievance mechanisms for excluded beneficiaries, wrongly removed households, unpaid participants and communities affected by targeting errors. Such mechanisms should be simple, decentralized, time-bound and independent enough to command public trust. Without grievance redress, social investment remains a discretionary benefit rather than a rights-sensitive instrument of development justice.

7.5. Evaluation culture and evidence-based policy: Establishing a culture of rigorous evaluation helps policymakers identify what works and what does not. Randomized controlled trials, impact assessments and periodic audits should be institutionalized, not treated as ad hoc exercises. Evidence from the N-Power programme, for example, shows that while it provides temporary employment, the lack of follow-up support limits long-term skill acquisition and employability, underscoring the need for continuous programme evaluation.

7.6. Legislative oversight, audit and public finance accountability: Social investment spending should be subject to regular legislative scrutiny, independent audit and public reporting. Annual reports should disclose appropriations, releases, administrative costs, number of beneficiaries, geographic distribution, complaints received, complaints resolved and measurable outcomes. Such reporting would help shift the system from political visibility to verifiable impact.

7.7. Policy continuity across political cycles: Frequent changes in political leadership in Nigeria often disrupt programme consistency. Social investment initiatives require long-term commitment beyond electoral cycles to achieve meaningful results. Developing legal and regulatory frameworks that safeguard programme continuity - such as statutory funding provisions, multi-year strategic plans and restrictions on abrupt suspension without transparent reasons - can reduce the risk of disruption and ensure sustained poverty reduction outcomes.

7.8. Rights-based participation and inclusion: Beneficiaries and vulnerable communities should not be treated merely as passive recipients of state support. Programme design and evaluation should include consultation with women, youth, persons with disabilities, rural communities and informal workers. Participation improves legitimacy and helps align social investment with real needs rather than assumptions made by central administrators or political actors.

From the foregoing, it is evident that the success of Nigeria's social investment programmes hinges on addressing structural deficiencies rather than increasing expenditure alone. By prioritising institutional autonomy, credible data systems, legal safeguards, evaluation culture, grievance redress, parliamentary oversight and policy continuity, policymakers can transform visible interventions into sustainable social impact, thereby strengthening Nigeria's social protection architecture and contributing meaningfully to human capital development.

8. Conclusion

Nigeria's social investment architecture reflects both ambition and the government's recognition of the urgent need to reduce poverty, address inequality and strengthen human capital. Programmes under the National Social Investment Programme (NSIP) - such as N-

Power, Conditional Cash Transfer (CCT), Home-Grown School Feeding Programme (HGSFP), and the Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme (GEEP) - have demonstrated the potential to reach millions of vulnerable citizens and create pathways for economic empowerment.

However, despite significant financial commitments, the impact of these programmes has often been constrained by weak institutional frameworks, poor coordination across agencies, limited monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, and insufficient legal accountability. Studies have highlighted challenges such as delayed payments, inadequate targeting and duplication of efforts, which undermine efficiency and long-term outcomes. Without adherence to international best practices - such as rigorous needs assessments, data-driven implementation and transparent accountability mechanisms - social investment risks remaining performative, offering short-term relief rather than durable transformation.

The paper has argued that Nigeria's social investment challenge is not merely a matter of scale, funding or policy design. It is also a question of law, rights and institutions. Constitutional commitments to social justice and welfare, statutory frameworks such as the National Social Investment Programme Agency Act, and regional human rights norms such as the African Charter's right to development all provide a basis for treating social investment as part of a broader legal responsibility to promote dignity, equality and inclusive development.

For social investment to be genuinely transformative, programmes must be embedded within strong institutions capable of systematic planning, implementation and impact evaluation. Evidence-based policies, effective governance, legal safeguards, grievance redress and community engagement are critical to ensuring that interventions reach intended beneficiaries, improve livelihoods and foster inclusive and sustainable development. Only through strengthening the legal, institutional and operational foundations of social investment can Nigeria translate ambition into measurable social and economic progress.

References

1. Adebayo, A. (2020). Social protection in Nigeria: Challenges and opportunities. Lagos: University of Lagos Press.

2. Afolabi, F. (2019). Evaluating the impact of the National Social Investment Programme on poverty reduction in Nigeria. Journal of Social Policy and Governance, 11(2), 45-61.
3. African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, 1981.
4. African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (Ratification and Enforcement) Act, Cap A9, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 2004.
5. *Attorney-General of Ondo State v Attorney-General of the Federation* (2002) 9 NWLR (Pt 772) 222.
6. Banerjee, A. V., & Duflo, E. (2019). Good economics for hard times. PublicAffairs.
7. Collier, P. (2007). The bottom billion: Why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it. Oxford University Press.
8. Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended).
9. Federal Government of Nigeria. (2016). National Social Investment Programme (NSIP): Implementation framework. Office of the Vice President, Abuja.
10. Fukuyama, F. (2014). Political order and political decay: From the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
11. Hamma, H. (2020). Bilateral investment treaties and the erosion of permanent sovereignty over natural resources in developing countries. *University of Ibadan Journal of Public and International Law, 10*, 157–174.
12. Hamma, H. (2013). An examination of the evolution of international sustainable development law and the contributions of the New Delhi Declaration 2002. *Olabisi Onabanjo University Journal of Public Law, 1*(3), 172–201.
13. National Bureau of Statistics. (2022). Nigeria multidimensional poverty index (MPI) 2022. National Bureau of Statistics. https://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng
14. National Social Investment Programme Agency (Establishment) Act, 2023.

15. OECD. (2018). Social protection system review of Nigeria. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/social/

16. Obi, C., & Eze, J. (2021). Social investment programme and human capital development in Nigeria: Evidence from N-Power and CCT. African Journal of Public Administration, 14(1), 77-95.

17. *Olafisoye v. FRN* (2004) 4 NWLR (Pt 864) 580)

18. Olayemi, J. K. (2018). Home-Grown School Feeding Programme and food security in Nigeria. Journal of Development Studies, 54(5), 812-830.

19. Sachs, J. D. (2005). The end of poverty: Economic possibilities for our time. Penguin Press.

20. Sachs, J. D., Schmidt-Traub, G., Mazzucato, M., Messner, D., Nakicenovic, N., & Rockström, J. (2021). Six transformations to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Nature Sustainability, 2(9), 805-814. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0352-9

21. Sanusi, L. S. (2022). Nigeria: Economic growth, inequality, and social welfare. Central Bank of Nigeria Research Monograph.

22. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.

23. Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future. W. W. Norton & Company.

24. Stiglitz, J. E., & Fitoussi, J.-P. (2018). For good measure: Advancing research on well-being metrics beyond GDP. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264307278-en

25. Transparency International. (2024). Corruption perceptions index 2023. https://www.transparency.org/en/cpi/2023

26. UNDP. (2023). Nigeria human development report: Governance and human capital development. United Nations Development Programme. https://www.undp.org/nigeria

27. World Bank. (2018). The state of social safety nets 2018. World Bank Group. https://www.worldbank.org

28. World Bank. (2023). Nigeria development update: Poverty and shared prosperity in a high-inflation environment. World Bank Group. https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/nigeria

29. World Bank. (2024). Strengthening social protection delivery systems in Nigeria. World Bank Social Protection Global Practice. https://www.worldbank.org

30. Woolcock, M. (2010). The rise and routinization of social capital, 1988-2008. Annual Review of Political Science, 13, 469-487. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.031108.094151

31. Woolcock, M., & Andrews, M. (2015). Escaping capability traps through problem-driven iterative adaptation. World Development, 51, 234-244. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.11.011

32. Yahaya, A., & Musa, H. (2020). The role of social investment in achieving Sustainable Development Goals in Nigeria. International Journal of Social Economics, 47(9), 1123-1137.