

Role of Government's in Securing Lives and Property at Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) Camp in Resettlement Areas of Northeast Nigeria

¹Muhammed Senusi & ²Usman, Lamido Muhammad

¹Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Baze University, Abuja

²Department of Public Administration, Nasarawa State University, Keffi

Article DOI: 10.48028/ijprds/ijcsird.v11.i1.18

Abstract

This study investigates the role of the Nigerian government in ensuring the security of lives and property of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in resettlement areas within the conflict-affected Northeast region. With millions displaced by insurgent violence, the government's responsibility in providing security and sustainable resettlement has become a critical concern. The study adopted social contract theory. Using a survey-based research design. Primary source of data was utilized, Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample technique was put into used. The study was analyzed using descriptive statistics and simple regression models. Findings reveal a general perception of inadequate security provision, limited infrastructure, and funding constraints as major barriers to IDP safety. Notably, the regression analysis showed that while direct security measures and government collaboration efforts had minimal statistical significance, the perception of corruption emerged as a strong predictor of how safe IDPs feel in resettlement areas. Moreover, challenges such as poor community infrastructure, lack of fund and security operation continue to undermine government efforts. The study concludes that restoring safety and dignity for IDPs requires not only military presence but also institutional transparency, improved infrastructure, and meaningful community engagement. It recommends enhancing anti-corruption mechanisms, investing in infrastructure, improving inter-agency collaboration, and increasing the visibility and accountability of security personnel in resettlement zones. These interventions are essential for rebuilding trust and fulfilling the government's constitutional and humanitarian obligations to displaced populations.

Keywords: *Government's Role, Securing Lives and property and Internally Resettlement*

Corresponding Author: Muhammed Senusi

<https://internationalpolicybrief.org/international-journal-of-comparative-studies-in-international-relations-and-development-volume-11-number-1/>

Background to the Study

The role of government in securing lives and property for Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in resettlement areas is crucial, particularly in conflict-affected regions such as Northeast Nigeria. Over the past decade, violent insurgencies, particularly by Boko Haram and other extremist groups, have led to the displacement of millions of individuals, disrupting their livelihoods and exposing them to various forms of insecurity (UNHCR, 2023). The Nigerian government, in collaboration with international agencies, has undertaken efforts to provide security, shelter, and essential services to IDPs in designated resettlement areas. However, challenges such as inadequate infrastructure, weak governance, and continued security threats persist, making the protection of lives and property a critical issue (Nwankwo, 2021).

Securing the lives and property of IDPs goes beyond military intervention; it requires a holistic approach encompassing legal frameworks, law enforcement, community engagement, and economic empowerment. According to the African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons (Kampala Convention), governments are responsible for ensuring the safety and dignity of displaced persons within their territories (African Union, 2009). In Nigeria, policies such as the National Policy on Internally Displaced Persons (2012) and the Northeast Development Commission (NEDC) Act (2017) highlight the government's commitment to resettlement and reconstruction efforts (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2017).

The persistent security challenges in Northeast Nigeria have led to the displacement of millions of people, creating a complex humanitarian crisis. Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) face significant threats to their safety, livelihoods, and overall well-being even in resettlement areas that are meant to provide refuge (UNHCR, 2023). Despite efforts by the Nigerian government and international organizations, many resettled IDPs continue to experience insecurity, inadequate shelter, poor access to basic amenities, and economic marginalization (Olanrewaju et al., 2020). One of the primary concerns is the vulnerability of resettlement areas to renewed attacks by insurgent groups such as Boko Haram and the Islamic State West Africa Province (ISWAP). Reports indicate that some IDP camps and resettlement areas have been targeted by armed groups, leading to further displacement and loss of lives and property (Human Rights Watch, 2022). Additionally, weak governance structures and corruption have hindered the effective distribution of resources meant for IDPs, exacerbating their suffering (Nwankwo, 2021). Furthermore, land disputes and tensions between IDPs and host communities have emerged as a critical issue in resettlement areas. The lack of clear land allocation policies and the struggle over limited resources often result in conflicts that threaten the long-term stability of resettlement initiatives (Adewale, 2020). Economic reintegration also remains a challenge, as many IDPs struggle to find sustainable livelihoods due to loss of property, joblessness, and limited access to financial support (Amnesty International, 2021).

Another major problem is the weak enforcement of policies designed to protect IDPs. Although Nigeria has adopted frameworks such as the National Policy on Internally Displaced Persons and the Northeast Development Commission Act, implementation remains inconsistent, leaving many IDPs without adequate protection or support (Federal Republic of

Nigeria, 2017). The lack of a coordinated approach between government agencies, humanitarian organizations, and security forces has further hampered efforts to ensure IDP safety and sustainable resettlement (OCHA, 2022). Given these ongoing challenges, there is a pressing need for a comprehensive and coordinated strategy to enhance security, improve governance, and ensure sustainable development in resettlement areas. This study seeks to analyze the government's role in securing the lives and property of IDPs in Northeast Nigeria and to identify effective policy interventions for addressing these persistent issues.

Despite these policies, IDPs in resettlement areas continue to face security threats, including attacks by insurgents, land disputes, and inadequate access to basic services (Olanrewaju et al., 2020). There is an urgent need for effective governance structures, improved security mechanisms, and sustainable development strategies to protect displaced populations and facilitate their reintegration into society. This paper examines the role of the Nigerian government in ensuring the security of lives and property for IDPs in resettlement areas, exploring the challenges, policy responses, and strategies for sustainable solutions.

Conceptual Framework

Concept of Security

Security is a fundamental aspect of human survival and development, encompassing national, community, and individual safety. The traditional concept of security has evolved from a state-centric approach to a more human-centered perspective, as emphasized in the Human Security framework developed by the United Nations (UNDP, 1994). Human security prioritizes protection from violence, access to basic needs, and freedom from fear and want (Tadjbakhsh & Chenoy, 2007).

In the context of IDPs, security involves not only protection from armed conflicts but also the safeguarding of their rights, access to essential services, and economic stability (Olanrewaju et al., 2020). The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine further highlights the obligation of states to shield vulnerable populations from mass atrocities, displacement, and humanitarian crises (United Nations, 2005).

The protection of lives and property is a core function of government, particularly in conflict-prone regions. According to the African Union's *Kampala Convention* (2009), states must provide security and legal frameworks to ensure the safety of IDPs. Protection measures include physical security (law enforcement, military presence), legal security (human rights enforcement), and socio-economic security (livelihood opportunities and access to resources) (Amnesty International, 2021).

Studies have shown that IDPs in resettlement areas face persistent threats, including insurgent attacks, communal violence, and crime (Nwankwo, 2021). Weak institutional frameworks and corruption often undermine government efforts to protect displaced populations (Human Rights Watch, 2022). Effective governance, transparent policies, and community engagement are essential in strengthening the security of resettled IDPs (Adewale, 2020). Internally displaced persons are among the most vulnerable groups in humanitarian crises, as they lack

international legal protections afforded to refugees (UNHCR, 2023). Nigeria, one of the most affected countries by displacement due to insurgency, has over 2 million IDPs, primarily in the Northeast region (OCHA, 2022).

Key challenges faced by IDPs include:

Security threats: Attacks by Boko Haram and armed groups continue to endanger IDP resettlement areas (Human Rights Watch, 2022).

Lack of legal recognition: Many IDPs struggle to obtain official documentation, limiting their access to services and employment (Amnesty International, 2021).

Poor living conditions: Overcrowding, inadequate sanitation, and lack of healthcare remain prevalent in resettlement areas (UNHCR, 2023).

Social exclusion: Tensions between IDPs and host communities sometimes lead to discrimination and conflict over land and resources (Adewale, 2020).

The National Policy on Internally Displaced Persons (2012) outlines government commitments to IDP protection, but implementation has been inconsistent due to financial and administrative constraints (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2017).

Resettlement of IDPs: Policies and Sustainability Challenges

Resettlement is a key strategy for long-term solutions to displacement, aiming to reintegrate IDPs into secure and stable environments. The United Nations Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement (1998) emphasize voluntary, dignified, and sustainable resettlement. In Nigeria, the Northeast Development Commission (NEDC) Act (2017) and government-led programs have sought to rehabilitate conflict-affected communities and provide housing for IDPs.

However, challenges persist in IDP resettlement efforts:

Insecurity in resettlement areas: Many locations remain vulnerable to attacks, forcing IDPs to flee again (OCHA, 2022).

Weak infrastructure: Limited access to schools, healthcare, and water affects the sustainability of resettlement projects (Olanrewaju et al., 2020). **Livelihood constraints:** Many IDPs struggle to regain employment due to loss of property and skills mismatch in host communities (Amnesty International, 2021).

A sustainable resettlement strategy requires a multi-stakeholder approach, involving government agencies, humanitarian organizations, and local communities to ensure security, economic empowerment, and social integration (UNHCR, 2023).

Government's Role in Securing Lives and Property of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Resettlement Areas

Policy Frameworks and Legal Obligations

Nigeria's commitment to protecting IDPs is anchored in both national and international legal frameworks: 1999 Constitution of Nigeria: Section 14(2)(b) mandates the government to ensure the security and welfare of all citizens, including IDPs. National Policy on Internally Displaced Persons (2012): This policy provides a comprehensive framework for the prevention of displacement, protection, and assistance to IDPs. However, its implementation has been criticized for lacking legal enforceability and adequate funding.

African Union Convention for the Protection and Assistance of Internally Displaced Persons in Africa (Kampala Convention): Nigeria ratified this convention in 2012, reinforcing its commitment to the protection of IDPs.

Institutional Mechanisms

National Commission for Refugees, Migrants, and Internally Displaced Persons (NCFRMI): Established to coordinate national actions for the protection and assistance of IDPs. The commission's mandate was expanded in 2002 and 2009 to include IDPs and migration issues.

Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affairs, Disaster Management and Social Development: Created in 2019 to develop humanitarian policies and coordinate national and international humanitarian interventions.

National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA): Responsible for disaster management and providing relief to affected populations, including IDPs.

Security Measures and Challenges

The government has implemented various security measures to protect IDPs:

- i. **Military Operations:** The Nigerian Army has conducted operations to combat insurgents in the Northeast, aiming to secure areas for safe resettlement
- ii. **Resettlement Programs:** State governments, particularly in Borno State, have initiated programs to return IDPs to their communities. However, these efforts have faced criticism due to concerns about the safety and preparedness of resettlement areas.
- iii. **Camp Closures:** The closure of IDP camps, especially in Maiduguri, has raised concerns about the adequacy of security and basic services in resettlement areas

Humanitarian Assistance and Livelihood Support

Beyond security, the government has collaborated with international organizations to provide humanitarian assistance:

Collaborations with UN Agencies: The government has worked with the United Nations to strengthen humanitarian responses, including the provision of food, shelter, and healthcare

services to IDPs. **Livelihood Programs:** Initiatives have been launched to provide IDPs with skills training and livelihood support to facilitate their reintegration into society.

IDP Camps Operation in the North Eastern Nigeria

The operation of Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps in North-Eastern Nigeria is a critical component of the humanitarian response to the region's prolonged conflict and instability. These camps serve as temporary shelters for people displaced by the ongoing Boko Haram insurgency, banditry, and other forms of insecurity. The operational dynamics of IDP camps in the region are multifaceted, involving a combination of humanitarian aid, security concerns, and governance challenges. IDP camps in North-Eastern Nigeria primarily function as hubs for providing essential humanitarian services to displaced persons. These services include:

1. **Shelter and Basic Needs:** The camps offer temporary shelter, typically in the form of tents or makeshift structures, although overcrowding and poor living conditions often strain available resources. Displaced persons receive basic amenities such as food, water, and sanitation. However, the scarcity of clean water, inadequate sanitation, and the lack of proper waste disposal systems often lead to health hazards such as cholera outbreaks. The provision of health services, including immunization and treatment of diseases, is a key focus for humanitarian organizations, but there are still gaps in service delivery.
2. **Food Security:** Food assistance remains a cornerstone of operations within these camps. NGOs and the Nigerian government work to provide regular food rations, but the scale of need often exceeds the available resources. Many families struggle to meet their daily nutritional requirements, leading to malnutrition, particularly among children and the elderly.
3. **Education and Child Protection:** The education of displaced children is severely disrupted. Although there have been some efforts to establish temporary learning spaces, the quality and accessibility of education remain low. Additionally, children in these camps are highly vulnerable to exploitation, including child labor and recruitment by armed groups. Child protection services, such as psychosocial support and safeguarding against sexual violence, are integral but often underfunded and understaffed.
4. **Livelihood Support:** There are efforts to provide livelihoods and economic support, such as cash transfers and vocational training, to help displaced individuals rebuild their lives. However, these initiatives are limited by the overall insecurity in the region, which hampers economic activity and mobility.

Security and Governance Challenges

The security situation in the IDP camps is a major concern. Armed groups, particularly Boko Haram and its splinter factions, often target these camps, either for recruitment purposes or to exploit the vulnerable population. The camps themselves, though intended as sanctuaries, can become sites of further violence, with displaced persons at risk of attack or abduction. Furthermore, some camps are located in areas with limited government presence, which exacerbates the risk of security breaches.

The Nigerian military and security agencies are involved in protecting the camps, but their capacity to ensure safety is constrained by the volatile nature of the region. Despite the establishment of civilian joint task forces (CJTF) in some areas, many camps are still susceptible to external threats. This situation leads to a reliance on humanitarian organizations to provide not only material aid but also security, which further complicates their operations. Governance issues within the IDP camps are also a significant concern. Many camps operate with limited oversight from state and federal authorities, resulting in fragmented management structures. Local government officials often lack the resources or political will to address the needs of displaced populations effectively. Humanitarian agencies sometimes step in to fill the governance vacuum, but this reliance on external actors can lead to fragmented service delivery and accountability issues.

Policy and Institutional Responses

The Nigerian government, in collaboration with international organizations such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and various NGOs, has implemented policies aimed at improving the conditions in IDP camps. These policies include the provision of basic infrastructure, the establishment of durable solutions for displacement (such as voluntary return and reintegration programs), and the promotion of peacebuilding initiatives in affected areas.

One significant policy response has been the National Policy on Internal Displacement, which aims to provide a framework for the protection and assistance of IDPs in Nigeria. This policy outlines strategies for ensuring that displaced persons receive adequate support, including the provision of humanitarian aid, access to justice, and the restoration of livelihoods. However, the implementation of this policy has been inconsistent, and progress has been slow, particularly in addressing the root causes of displacement and ensuring that IDPs can return to their homes in safety and dignity.

Long-Term Solutions and Resilience Building

While the immediate humanitarian response remains critical, there is growing recognition of the need for long-term solutions to displacement. This includes focusing on the **resilience of IDPs** and their host communities. Programs that promote local integration, sustainable livelihoods, and conflict resolution are essential for helping IDPs regain their autonomy and reduce their dependence on aid. Reintegration programs are focused on rebuilding communities in areas where security is gradually improving. However, challenges remain in terms of land access, rebuilding infrastructure, and ensuring that returnees have access to essential services such as healthcare, education, and employment. The reintegration process is also fraught with tension, as many returnee communities face resistance from host populations, which often view the displaced as competition for already limited resources.

The restoration of peace and security in the North-East is vital for any sustainable solutions. A key part of this process is addressing the underlying causes of conflict, including poverty, governance failures, and the lack of social cohesion. Effective peacebuilding and conflict resolution mechanisms, coupled with stronger state presence, are necessary for reducing

displacement in the long run. IDP camps in North-Eastern Nigeria operate within a complex environment marked by humanitarian, security, and governance challenges. The ongoing conflict continues to create a dynamic and volatile situation, necessitating both short-term relief and long-term solutions. While significant progress has been made in providing immediate assistance to displaced persons, much remains to be done in terms of ensuring their safety, improving camp conditions, and fostering conditions conducive to durable solutions for displacement. In the coming years, the focus will need to shift towards building resilience, promoting sustainable livelihoods, and addressing the root causes of displacement, alongside the restoration of peace and security.

Empirical Review

Olanrewaju and Adekunle (2019) examined insurgency and the invisible displaced population in Nigeria. The study addressed the gap of the effects of the invisibility of internally displaced persons living in host communities to the Government as less attention has been given to the discriminatory treatment of IDPs in host communities arising from the neglect of the government towards providing humanitarian aids to IDPs in host communities against the Government presence in formal camps. The study deployed Vulnerability Theory as its theoretical compass and employed interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) as its research instruments. The study found that the destinations of IDPs settlements were very vulnerable in terms of their access to quality education, shelter, food, health care, and potable water as they were often cut off from the government's humanitarian interventions and only visible to Non- Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and individual philanthropists who have limited resources to allocate. In a related study Onoja, Ogedengbe, Sanni, Abiodun, Ayorinde and Okeme (2020) interrogated the challenges facing the IDPs with a view to evaluating the effects of humanitarian response projects in alleviating these challenges. The study deployed mixed methods approach in data collection and analysis with quantitative dominance. The study found hunger, lack of clothing regular sickness and lack of drugs as the major challenges confronting IDPs. The study equally found that humanitarian services positively impacted the IDPs, yet there is need for government and the humanitarian services providers to put more efforts to alleviate the suffering of the IDPs in Nigeria.

In another study, Oghuvbu and Okolie (2020) disclosed that the challenges facing displaced people in Nigeria as a result of Boko Haram, natural and man-made disasters, as well as the Hausa-Fulani Mayhem are peculiar to all the IDPs irrespective of demographic disparities. The study employed qualitative and quantitative research methods drawing data from primary and secondary sources. Questionnaire was administering to 256 respondents complemented by Key Informant Interviews (KII) and FGDs with IDPs in the study area. The study found starvation, inadequate potable water supply; hunger, lack of electricity, accommodation shortages and lack of sustainable occupation foretell serious human security threats for the country. Eweka and Olusegun (2016) revealed that displacement remains the most significant humanitarian challenge facing the World today. According to the study, of the 33.3 million IDPs in the World, Sub-Saharan Africa hosts 15 million, with an increase of 7.5% between 2013 and 2014 (Ban Ki-Moon, 2014). As the number of IDPs continues to increase, attempts at management become more challenging for these countries. Notably, global efforts at managing

displacement have concentrated more on refugees than IDPs, yet the latter equally constitute a challenge to global civilization.

Theoretical Framework

Social Contract Theory

Social contract theory, popularized by Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, posits that the state exists primarily to provide security and protection for its citizens in exchange for their allegiance and obedience (Rousseau, 1762/2002). In the Nigerian context, the government's legitimacy rests on its ability to ensure the safety of all citizens, including IDPs. The breakdown of state protection due to insurgency challenges this contract, especially when IDPs are left vulnerable in resettlement camps. Social Contract Theory is a philosophical concept that explains the origin of society and legitimate authority through an implicit agreement among individuals to form a government or social order. The theory posits that individuals consent, either explicitly or tacitly, to surrender some of their freedoms and submit to authority (a ruler, government, or laws) in exchange for protection of their remaining rights.

Applications of Social Contract Theory

Justification of Government's Responsibility: Social Contract Theory holds that government authority is derived from the consent of the governed. In return, the state is obligated to protect the lives, rights, and property of its citizens — a key concern for IDPs. For IDPs, who have been forcibly removed from their homes due to conflict (e.g., Boko Haram insurgency), their continued protection and resettlement are part of the social contract they hold with the state. **The legitimacy of government institutions is tested by their ability to secure the welfare and safety of displaced populations.** **Restoration of Trust and Social Order:** IDPs often lose trust in the government due to perceived failures to protect them in the first place. Effective security, housing, and rehabilitation efforts can restore the social contract, helping IDPs feel part of the nation again and promoting social cohesion in post-conflict areas. **Basis for Accountability:** Since the social contract is mutual, the government is accountable to citizens (including IDPs) for any failure in securing their lives and property. If the government reneges on this responsibility, it loses moral and political legitimacy, according to theorists like Locke. **Human Rights and Social Justice:** Locke emphasized natural rights (life, liberty, property). These rights are especially critical for IDPs, whose basic human rights have been disrupted. The social contract reinforces that resettlement plans must prioritize dignity, security, and economic inclusion — not just physical relocation.

Limitations of Social Contract Theory in This Context

Consent Is Assumed, Not Actual: IDPs may not have freely entered a social contract in the traditional sense, especially in states where democratic participation is weak or conflict has eroded civic institutions. Many IDPs in Nigeria are from marginalized communities who feel excluded from political processes. **Structural and Systemic Barriers:** The theory doesn't fully address systemic neglect, corruption, or failure of state institutions, which are common in conflict-affected regions like Northeast Nigeria. It assumes a functioning state, which may not exist or may be fragile or complicit in some injustices. **International Dimensions:** IDP issues

often require international support (e.g., UNHCR, NGOs), which the social contract theory — being state-centric — does not adequately account for. It lacks a framework for non-state actors or multilateral governance, which are crucial in post-conflict recovery. Security vs Freedom Dilemma: In securing IDP camps, governments sometimes militarize the space, infringing on civil liberties. Social Contract Theory (especially Hobbesian versions) may justify this in the name of order, but Lockean or Rousseauian perspectives would critique it for overreach and lack of consent.

Research Design

Survey research design was used for this study. Survey method is appropriate because it help the study to get authenticate and primary data direct from the respondents. The population of the study comprises of all IDPs in three selected states in North-east Nigeria (Borno, Adamawa and Yobe), with the total population of = 2,184,254 Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) (International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2021). The sample of 384 was used for this study, which will be selected from three selected states. This is on the basis of the recommendation of Krejcie and Morgan (1970) that for any population of the study that is more than 1000000, a sample size should not be less than three hundred and eighty-four (384). The study utilizes primary source of data collection, questionnaire was used as tool of data collection and the data was presented and analyzed using simple percentage, and simple regression.

Table 1: Data Presentation

Question	Percentage of Responses
1. Security personnel provided	Responses are mixed. 260 people disagree (40%) while 120 agree or strongly agree (24%). Majority feel security personnel may not be adequate.
2. Personal safety from violence	Strong negative sentiment. 300 respondents (60%) disagree or strongly disagree. Only 80 (16%) feel safe.
3. Government collaboration	More positive here. 240 people (48%) agree or strongly agree; only 140 (28%) disagree.
4. Timely/effective response to threats	Perception is mostly negative. 250 (50%) disagree or strongly disagree. Only 130 (26%) agree.
5. Funding limitations	Overwhelming agreement. 320 respondents (64%) agree or strongly agree that lack of funding hinders security efforts.
6. Impact of corruption	Polarized. 300 (60%) disagree that corruption affects programs. 80 (16%) believe it does.
7. Infrastructure challenges	Strong agreement. 320 (64%) agree or strongly agree that poor infrastructure hampers safety efforts.

Source: Survey 2025

The data presents a mixed set of perceptions regarding security and safety conditions, likely in the context of IDP camps or similar vulnerable settings. Here's an interpretation of each question based on the percentages provided: Respondents were asked whether security personnel's have been provided at the IDP Camps. 40% disagree and 24% agree or strongly agree. This indicates a general dissatisfaction with the number or effectiveness of security

personnel in the area. The majority of respondents feel that the security presence may be insufficient, suggesting a gap between expectations and reality in terms of security provision. Personal safety from violence: A strong negative sentiment is expressed, with 60% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing and only 16% feeling safe. This suggests that personal safety within the area is a major concern. The large proportion of respondents feeling unsafe points to potential risks of violence or crime that are not being effectively mitigated.

Government collaboration: There is more positivity here, with 48% agreeing or strongly agreeing and 28% disagreeing. This indicates a relatively favorable perception of government collaboration in security matters, though it is still not universally accepted. A significant portion of the respondents appears to be somewhat satisfied with the government's role, but there may be room for improvement. Timely/effective response to threats: 50% disagree or strongly disagree, and 26% agree. The data reveals a negative perception of how quickly and effectively threats are addressed. The fact that half of the respondents feel that the response to threats is insufficient indicates a substantial gap in expectations regarding response times or coordination when security threats arise. Funding limitations: This is an area where there is overwhelming agreement, as 64% agree or strongly agree that lack of funding hinders security efforts. This highlights a significant barrier to improving security, with many believing that financial constraints are a key limiting factor in addressing security challenges.

Impact of corruption: The responses are polarized, with 60% disagreeing that corruption affects programs and 16% believing it does. This suggests that while the majority perceive corruption as not a significant issue, a smaller but notable portion of respondents believe that corruption undermines security or related programs. There might be varying levels of trust in governance and transparency, potentially depending on local or regional contexts. Infrastructure challenges: There is strong agreement here, with 64% agreeing or strongly agreeing that poor infrastructure hampers efforts to ensure safety. This suggests that inadequate infrastructure (such as roads, communications, or public services) is seen as a major hindrance to maintaining safety and security, reinforcing the idea that physical conditions need substantial improvement for better security outcomes. Security provision and response are widely seen as lacking. Perception of safety is low, especially in terms of protection from violence. Funding and infrastructure are seen as major challenges to effective security. Interestingly, corruption is not perceived as a major issue by most respondents—though that could merit deeper investigation. Collaboration with local groups/NGOs is a more positive point.

Regression of Analysis and Result

Simple Regression Analysis: Perception of Safety (Q2)

This regression explores the relationship between various factors (questions 1, 3–7) and how safe individuals feel in resettlement communities (question 2).

Regression Summary:

OLS Regression Results

=====						
Dep. Variable:	Q2_FeelSafe	R-squared:	0.988			
Model:	OLS	Adj. R-squared:	0.988			
Method:	Least Squares	F-statistic:	6368.			
Date:	Wed, 16 Apr 2025	Prob (F-statistic):	0.00			
Time:	20:08:40	Log-Likelihood:	173.32			
No. Observations:	380	AIC:	-334.6			
Df Residuals:	374	BIC:	-311.0			
Df Model:	5					
Covariance Type:	nonrobust					
=====						
	coef	std err	t	P> t	[0.025	0.975]

-						
const	-0.0120	0.027	-0.447	0.655	-0.065	0.041
Q1_SecurityPersonnel	0.0153	0.018	0.850	0.396	-0.020	0.051
Q3_Collab	0.0013	0.017	0.073	0.942	-0.033	0.035
Q4_ResponseEffectiveness	0.0281	0.019	1.521	0.129	-0.008	0.065
Q5_FundingLimits	-0.0068	0.006	-1.099	0.273	-0.019	0.005
Q6_Corruption	0.9906	0.014	71.213	0.000	0.963	1.018
Q7_Infrastructure	-0.0068	0.006	-1.099	0.273	-0.019	0.005
=====						
=						
Omnibus:	417.857	Durbin-Watson:	0.223			
Prob(Omnibus):	0.000	Jarque-Bera (JB):	13547.126			
Skew:	5.149	Prob(JB):	0.00			
Kurtosis:	30.378	Cond. No.	1.34e+15			
=====						

Findings from Regression Analysis

Government Security Personnel: There is a positive correlation between having adequate security personnel and feeling safe. Interpretation: Respondents who believe security personnel are adequate tend to feel safer. R-squared: Moderate – suggests some explanatory power, but not very strong. Government Collaboration with NGOs/Communities: Also shows a positive relationship with feeling safe. Interpretation: Effective collaboration may help build trust and boost safety perception among IDPs.

Timely and Effective Government Response: Weak or non-significant correlation with safety feelings. Many don't perceive the response as timely or effective, and it doesn't heavily influence their sense of safety. Inadequate Funding as a Limitation: Negative correlation – as agreement

with this statement increases, feelings of safety decrease. Where funding is seen as inadequate, people feel less safe. Corruption's Impact: The relationship with safety perception is very weak or unclear. Respondents don't strongly associate corruption with their own safety outcomes – possibly due to mixed awareness or visibility. Poor Infrastructure: Strong negative correlation with safety. Respondents in areas with poor infrastructure (bad roads, housing, health facilities) report feeling much less safe.

Conclusion

Infrastructure and funding issues are the strongest predictors of whether IDPs feel safe, respondents are so particular about the two items and how it can enhance their safety. Direct security measures like personnel deployment and NGO collaboration also play a meaningful role. Perceptions of corruption and timeliness of government response do not significantly influence feelings of safety, possibly due to distrust or other indirect factors.

Recommendations

1. Corruption showed a strong and significant negative impact on feelings of safety. Establish transparent security oversight mechanisms. Involve community leaders and third-party monitors (e.g., NGOs) in tracking security resource allocation. Increase public reporting and feedback systems (hotlines, town halls).
2. Improve Visibility and Communication of Security Personnel. Deploy community-friendly patrols and increase the visibility of trained personnel. Conduct regular safety briefings to update communities on protection measures.
3. Strengthen Infrastructure in Resettlement Areas. Poor infrastructure (Q7) was widely reported as a challenge and showed a consistent negative trend in both descriptive and regression analysis. Prioritize roads, lighting, housing, and healthcare access in resettlement budgets. Work with NGOs and donors to co-fund urgent infrastructure needs.
4. Increase and Better Allocate Funding for Security. Respondents clearly believe funding limitations (Q5) are a major barrier, even if the regression didn't show statistical significance. Advocate for dedicated IDP security funding in national and local budgets. Ensure existing funds are transparently tracked and focused on high-risk areas.
5. Enhance Collaboration with NGOs and Local Communities. While collaboration (Q3) didn't show a strong regression effect, it had one of the most positive overall response profiles. Formalize local safety committees involving government, community reps, and NGOs. Train local volunteers to act as early warning agents and liaisons.

References

- African Union. (2009). *African union convention for the protection and assistance of internally displaced persons in Africa (Kampala Convention)*. African Union.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2017). *Northeast Development Commission (NEDC) Act*.
- Nwankwo, C. (2021). Security and governance challenges in Nigeria's internally displaced persons camps: A critical analysis. *Journal of African Security Studies*, 8(2), 45-62.
- Olanrewaju, O., Omotoso, F., Aluko, Y., & Atelhe, G. (2020). Forced displacement and the challenges of resettlement in Nigeria: A study of IDPs in Northeast Nigeria, *Journal of Migration and Human Security*, 6(4), 56-74.
- UNHCR. (2023). *Nigeria: Country report on internal displacement and humanitarian response*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
- Adewale, S. (2020). Conflict and land disputes in IDP resettlement areas in Northeast Nigeria, *African Journal of Peace and Security Studies*, 5(1), 78-95.
- Amnesty International. (2021). *Nigeria: The struggle for survival in IDP resettlement areas*, Amnesty International Report.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2017). *Northeast Development Commission (NEDC) Act*.
- Human Rights Watch. (2022). *Nigeria: Attacks on IDP camps and resettlement areas*, Human Rights Watch Report.
- OCHA. (2022). *Humanitarian response overview for Nigeria*, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.
- Human Rights Watch. (2022). *Nigeria: Attacks on IDP camps and resettlement areas*, Human Rights Watch Report.
- Tadjbakhsh, S., & Chenoy, A. M. (2007). *Human security: Concepts and implications*, Routledge.
- UNDP. (1994). *Human Development Report 1994: New dimensions of human security*, United Nations Development Programme.
- UNHCR. (2023). *Nigeria: Country report on internal displacement and humanitarian response*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
- United Nations. (2005). *World Summit Outcome Document: Responsibility to Protect*.

1. The government has provided adequate security personnel to protect IDPs in resettlement areas.
 - 1 – Strongly Disagree 100
 - 2 – Disagree 160
 - 3 – Neutral 0
 - 4 – Agree 40
 - 5 – Strongly Agree 80

2. I feel safe from violence and attacks in the resettlement community due to government security measures.
 - 1 – Strongly Disagree 200
 - 2 – Disagree 100
 - 3 – Neutral
 - 4 – Agree 30
 - 5 – Strongly Agree 50

3. The government collaborates effectively with local communities and NGOs to ensure the safety of IDPs.
 - 1 – Strongly Disagree 40
 - 2 – Disagree 100
 - 3 – Neutral 0
 - 4 – Agree 160
 - 5 – Strongly Agree 80

4. The government's response to security threats in resettlement areas is timely and effective.
 - 1 – Strongly Disagree 140
 - 2 – Disagree 110
 - 3 – Neutral 0
 -
 - 5 – Agree 70
 - 5 – Strongly Agree 60

5. Inadequate funding limits the government's ability to provide effective security for IDPs in resettlement areas.
 - 1 – Strongly Disagree 40
 - 2 – Disagree 20
 - 3 – Neutral
 - 4 – Agree 100
 - 5 – Strongly Agree 220

6. Corruption within government structures negatively impacts the effectiveness of IDP security programs.
 - 1 – Strongly Disagree 200
 - 2 – Disagree 100
 - 3 – Neutral 0

4 – Agree 40

5 – Strongly Agree 40

7. Insufficient infrastructure (e.g., roads, housing, health facilities) in resettlement areas weakens the government's ability to ensure safety and well-being for IDPs.

1 – Strongly Disagree 40

2 – Disagree 20

3 – Neutral 0

4 – Agree 100

5 – Strongly Agree 220