

**INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS' BASED SOCIAL WELFARE
PROGRAMMES AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC WELLBEING OF IDPS IN BAKASSI
RESETTLEMENT CAMP, CROSS RIVER STATE, NIGERIA**

BROWN EGBE ISOKON (Corresponding author)

Department of Social Work, University of Calabar, PMB
1115 Cross River State, Nigeria

ESTHER PATRICK ARCHIBONG

Department of Social Work, University of Calabar, PMB
1115 Cross River State, Nigeria

ORU TAKIM TIKU

Department of Social Work, University of Calabar, PMB
1115 Cross River State, Nigeria

&

EGBE EBAGU TANGBAN

Department of Social Work, University of Calabar, PMB
1115 Cross River State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The complex and diverse needs of IDPs necessitates urgent need for social welfare programmes that identifies and caters for the peculiar needs of IDPs. The objective of this study was to assess available social welfare programmes and the extent to which they impact on the wellbeing of IDPs. The study adopted case research method. The result showed that IDPs' based social welfare programmes as a sustainable means of catering for the socioeconomic wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi was not given adequate attention by government and scholars alike. Instead, the types of social welfare programmes available to IDPs were characterised by spontaneous, ad-hoc, narrow and uncoordinated approaches, leading to myriads of human right abuses, poverty and neglect of Bakassi resettlement camps. Result further revealed that the failure to domesticate social welfare policies and programmes in response to peculiar needs of IDPs was a major setback in the

attainment of socioeconomic wellbeing of IDPs. Therefore, government in collaboration with IDPs should develop a realistically domesticated social welfare programme that can address peculiar needs of IDPs, as this would serve as resource for sustained resettlement programmes.

Key words: Bakassi, Resettlement camp, IDPs based social welfare programme, Internally displaced persons, Socio-economic wellbeing, Social-welfare programme.

INTRODUCTION

The ceding of Bakassi peninsula to Cameroon and the consequent displacement of about 37,000 Bakassi indigenes from their ancestral homes in Bakassi peninsula brought untold hardship and suffering for the displaced persons (Mosikilu, Chiedozie & Chukwudi, 2008). The displaced persons first settled in make-shift camps in old dilapidated primary school blocks at Ekprikang and Ibaka, and treated like slaves without any welfare palliatives before they were hurriedly moved to Archibong, Abana and Atabong resettlement camps in Akwaobutong community in the present day Bakassi Local Government Area in Cross River State, Nigeria. The deplorable conditions in which they were subjected to affected their morale, psyche, political, social and cultural lives.

The fact that the IDPs had lost their right to return to their ancestral homes did not perturb the government of Nigeria and the international community to find long term solutions to their displacement challenges. More often than not, the IDPs were provided with social welfare packages that does not fully meet with international human rights standards including: housing, water supply,

environmental hygiene, health care, educational opportunities and infrastructural developments. In most cases, the social welfare benefits were distributed to IDPs in fragmented and uncoordinated manner which more often than not provoke protests and restiveness among the IDPs.

Some of the challenges encountered in the implementation of IDPs' based social welfare programmes in Nigeria include: "low coverage of existing programmes which only reach a fraction of people living in poverty, the implementation of only a narrow set of social protection instruments, and the fragmentation of approaches and projects across the country" (Holmes et al, 2012). The provision of social welfare programmes to IDPs is capital intensive, which many African countries are unable to afford, hence the failure of resettlement programmes in Africa (Olawajun, 2009). Also, corrupt practices played a major role in rendering social welfare programmes ineffective and non-functional in some resettlement camps (Terminski, 2013). For example, corrupt practices caused the Ethiopian rural resettlement project to fail in spite of the huge amount of money, totaling US

\$220 million spent annually on the project (Rahmato, 2004).

The development of comprehensive social welfare programmes that reflects the peculiar needs of IDPs could be found in most countries. The social welfare programmes for displaced persons in developed countries like China, Indonesia and Malaysia are durable and sustainable to mitigate the challenges confronting IDPs (Davies, 2012). Indeed, the absence of IDP based social welfare policies in third world countries had been the cause of sufferings and woes experienced by IDPs. This is why Cernea (1997) recommended that IDPs' based social welfare programme should be in conformity with the United Nation's policy on resettlement programmes which favour displacements that are development oriented and are characterized by the preservation of values, identity, ethos and culture of displaced persons.

The Brooking Institution of the University of Bern drafted a social welfare manual for Law and Policy makers on internally displaced persons. The manual stipulated the underlying need for states and governments to domesticate their social welfare policies and programmes, provide protection and humanitarian assistance to IDPs as well as their right to liberty and security. The manual provided guidelines on how activities in the development of social welfare policies on internally displaced persons would be implemented. For example, the social welfare policy provided opportunities for IDPs to

contribute their input to their problems, including the decision making process and development of the resettlement camps (Brooking Institution, 2008).

In February 2007, the state of Georgia formulated a social welfare policy to reflect the peculiar needs of her internally displaced persons. This welfare policy was divided in thematic areas such as: infrastructural development (e.g. like road construction, schools, health care and power supply), social services, economic, legal, security, agriculture and food among others. The policy also stipulated the standard of living expected of the IDPs and safe conditions under which they may return to their permanent homes. It also provided a comprehensive framework for integration and reintegration of IDPs as well as improvement of their socio-economic conditions (Ministry of Refugees and Accommodation of Georgia, Decree 47, 2007).

IDP based social welfare programme should be development focused, protect the rights of the displaced persons on sustainable basis. It should be able to determine the needs of IDPs, when and how they should be met. It should also set the goals of government and other stake holders on the displacement process, the living conditions of IDPs, duration of the displacement process and the possibility of returning the IDPs to their permanent homes. The social welfare programmes for displaced persons in China is holistic with emphasis on

social integration, social assistance, self-reliance and improvement of socio-economic conditions of IDPs (Fredga, 2011). IDPs' based social welfare programme should also define the roles of all stakeholders such as government, nongovernmental organisations, experts, international organisations, scholars and IDPs to avoid role conflicts (Isokon & Ekeh, 2014). There must be an action plan for implementing the social welfare programme for IDPs in each country.

The inability of government to provide realistic social welfare programmes that can protect the rights of IDPs, has become a more serious challenge. It has not only affected their wellbeing but also the socio-economic development of the camps (Holmes, Akinrimisi, Morgan & Buck, 2012). It is against this background that this study was carried out to examine IDPs' based social welfare programmes and socioeconomic wellbeing of internal displaced persons in Bakassi resettlement camp, Cross River State, Nigeria.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To determine the relationship between availability of IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camps.
2. To determine the relationship between accessibility to IDPs' based social welfare programmes and

wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camps.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant relationship between availability of IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camps
2. There is no significant relationship between accessibility to IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camps.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept and characteristics of IDPs:

Internally displaced persons (IDPs) are persons or group of persons that were uprooted, disposed or thrown out of their ancestral homes and compelled to live elsewhere within their own countries. The United Nations (1998) defined internally displaced persons as persons or groups of persons who were forced to flee their homes due to armed conflict, violations of human rights, violence, and disasters among others. IDPs may be triggered by tribal conflicts, rifts, political upheavals, border clashes and disasters. Displacement may also be caused by development projects such as the construction of dams, irrigation farms, and road networks among others (Ewereji, 2009).

According to Brusset, Nautrup, Immajati and Pedersen (2004) displacement of persons is usually accompanied by much

sufferings and pain. In some resettlement camps, IDPs experienced disenfranchisement and treated as slaves, stigmatized, discriminated, abused and maltreated (Foss & Bonn, 2009; Yering & Malcolm, 2008). Cernea (1997) also affirmed that displacement of persons brought about untold hardships as some IDPs lose their valuables. For example, Bakassi IDPs were excised from their source of livelihood in the Peninsula which is an island, entirely surrounded by the sea (Isokon & Okom, 2014). These were fishermen who hitherto depended on the sea for their livelihood. This therefore became a matter of deep concern to the IDPs as they found it extremely difficult to live without the sea life.

Displacement programmes caused by natural disasters like flooding, earthquake, tsunamis to mention but a few sometimes deter government interventions (Holmes, Akinrimisi & Buck, 2011; Bassel, 2019). Given the critical roles the government, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and international community played towards the care and protection of IDPs, it is worrisome to find a greater percentage of them suffer from poverty, disease and hunger. IDPs are one of the most vulnerable populations, having lost their homes and livelihood (USAID, 2010). The growing discontent amongst IDPs had led many of them into criminal and immoral behaviors such as drug addiction, armed robbery, youth restiveness, kidnapping, rape among others.

In some resettlement camps, IDPs live in thatch houses or dilapidated old structures,

while in some, available accommodations are fewer than the IDPs population, creating congestion in the camps. Some IDP camps lack social infrastructures such as roads, market, health care, educational institutions, good drinking water and power supply.

The government in most African countries tends to be insensitive to the plight of IDPs, resulting to protests and negative social reactions in IDP camps (Bassel, 2019). Many IDPs found it difficult to cope and adapt to changes, which invariably undermine their ability to survive the tensions associated with displacements (Brenda, 2011).

Social Welfare Programmes and Socioeconomic Wellbeing of IDPs

Social welfare programmes facilitates IDPs socio-economic fortunes. To effectively achieve this, most countries such as India, China, Indonesia and India, embarked on the provision of social infrastructures / amenities such as tarred roads, pipe borne water, and power supply to resettlement camps (Morgen, Acker & Weigr, 2013). Social welfare programmes has diverse sub components such as skill acquisitions, nutrition, education, employment opportunities, small and medium scale businesses, social security, farming incentives and empowerment programmes. However, some social welfare programmes are comprehensive to cover technical, financial, social and psychological dimensions, and each aspect has a desirable impact on IDPs' socioeconomic wellbeing and the development

of IDP camps (Morgen, et al, 2013).Whereas, displaced persons in China are paid monthly stipends as palliatives (Holmes et al, 2012), Nigeria on her part lack the political will to do same for IDPs.

The primary purpose of social welfare programmes is to alleviate poverty and suffering that characterises internal displacements. IDPs require social welfare needs to survive. For example, skill acquisitions had given IDPs workplace experience while social infrastructures had accelerated the development and growth of IDP camps. On the whole, social welfare programmes creates opportunities for IDPs to attain individual and collective goals as a people with the same destiny, reinvigorates their perceptions, attitudes and behaviors as well as the ability to cope and adapt to their new environments (Olawajun, 2009). The status of IDPs in most developed countries improved due to social welfare support. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) had provided social welfare interventions to IDPs inform of basic essential needs such as foodstuff, housing and water, legal protection and infrastructural development (USAID, 2010).

Research had shown that social welfare support has contributed to the establishment of small and medium enterprises and promoted business booming environment to most IDPs in Nigeria (Enwereji, 2009).The social welfare programmes had also assisted in the development of resettlement camps in Nigeria,

especially in the provision of social amenities and infrastructural development, thus, changing the behavior and self-concept of displaced persons (Algbokhan, 2008). It has also led to improve the health and literacy status of IDPs. e.g., many IDPs in North East of Nigeria benefitted from social welfare packages from the government, including health care (Ogbonna, 2017). More so, social welfare programmes under the auspices of social work services had played major role in eradicating poverty, depravity and desperation among IDPs in Nigeria, especially as so many IDPs benefitted from skill acquisition and empowerment programmes provided by social workers as well as helped a lot of IDPs to eradicate poverty from their lives by engaging in meaningful ventures such as trading, craft work and other businesses (Amadasun, 2019).

Some IDPs had attained high social status and were able to provide all the necessities they need in life. Many IDPs who hitherto were peasant farmers with very meager income had begun to experience new levels of growth and better social status as a result of social welfare packages provided by the Nigerian government (Okpukpara, Chine & Uguru, 2006). With social welfare programmes put in place by the government, some IDPs were able to educate their children and break from poverty cycle that is endemic among displaced persons (Oriole, 2009; Atolagbe, 1989). Besides, adequate provision of social welfare support had helped to mitigate restive

behavior, uncontrolled temper, suicide cases and rascality among IDPs (Atolagbe, 1989).

However, research had shown that social welfare programmes in most resettlement camps had no meaningful impact on those it was meant for due to ineffective coordination and corrupt practices (Olawaju, Sulaiman & Omobowale, 2004). Also, the nonavailability of social welfare benefits had rendered displacement schemes ineffectual (Cosgrave, 2004). The barriers to effective distribution of social welfare to IDPs were related to shortage of material resources, heavy workload on the part of social welfare officials, disjointed care, and ignorance, cultural beliefs and negative attitudes among the IDPs (Bagshaw, 2003).

Studies in developing countries had also shown that inadequate social welfare support for IDPs is one of the major causes of the failure of resettlement programmes in sub-Saharan Africa. The factors responsible for the poor social welfare programmes in Africa include poor implementation capacity and failure to secure sustainable funding for the programme (James, 1998). Some of the reasons why African countries fail to incorporate IDPs needs and challenges as specific component of their social welfare programmes include inadequate human, financial and material resources, and most importantly, government insensitivity to the plights of the displaced persons (Bahle, Pfeifer & Wendt, 2010). Some of the factors that affect the overall performance of social welfare programmes in

Nigeria include: inadequate social welfare facilities/structures, poor human resources and management, poor quality of services, lack of basic infrastructure, lack of sustainable financing and IDPs' negative perceptions arising from their nonparticipation in the decision making process (Morgen et al, 2013).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study adopted the Participatory development theory by Chambers (1994). This theory assumed that the involvement, engagement and participation of the rural populace in any development project would lead to the success and sustainability of the project. The essence of involving the people in the planning, decision making process and implementation stages is to boost their confidence and trust and for them to have a sense of ownership of the project. This theory emphasise the need to give rural dwellers opportunity to initiate and design their projects with the hope that development activities will be more sustainable (Ottong & Bassey, 2009). The theory further assumed that mass participation is possible only when majority of community members are involved in the development process. The theory also assumed that active participation of the rural dwellers would help to break the mentality of dependence among the rural folks as well as promote self-awareness, self-confidence and self-reliance.

The participatory development theory is relevant to this study in the sense that it

recognises the need for a social welfare programme that would involve IDPs in the decision making process and implementation of the programme. In other words, the involvement of IDPs in the decision making and implementation of social welfare programmes is critical to the socioeconomic wellbeing of the IDPs, as this would help to reduce tensions, frictions and infightings that characterises the distribution of social welfare resources among the IDPs. Moreover, the IDPs would see the social welfare programme as their own project. This also implies that any social welfare programmes that addresses the peculiar needs of IDPs through the involvement and participation of IDPs becomes IDPs' based social welfare programme. Such an IDPs based social welfare programme would also be domesticated to allow IDPs to identify, determine and resolve their welfare needs without undue interference from outsiders. This would also enable them to develop a sense of belonging, develop confidence and trust among themselves.

METHODOLOGY

The survey design was used in this study. The population of the study comprised IDPs in the three resettlement camps of Bakassi: namely Abana, Archibong and Atabong. The population of the IDPs was 18,000 (Agande, Ochayi, Chris & Nyong, 2008). The stratified and simple random sampling methods were used to draw

respondents for the study. The resettlement camps were divided into 3 strata according to the existing resettlement camps. In other words, Abana resettlement camp represented stratum 1; Archibong resettlement camp represented stratum 2, and Atabong resettlement camp represented stratum 3.

Next, respondents were drawn from each stratum using simple random sampling method. This involved cutting pieces of papers and writing "YES" or "NO" on each. These pieces were then folded and put in a hat. The IDPs were asked to pick just one piece of paper and anyone who picked "YES" was served with a copy of the questionnaire. This process was carried out in the three strata and a sample of 700 respondents was arrived at.

This was complemented with Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) which was conducted in each of the three resettlement camps. Ten participants were selected for each FGD panel, using contact persons selected from each of the stratum. Participants in the FGD panel include household heads, opinion leaders and government officials in charge of social welfare programmes for the resettlement camps. The government officials in charge of social welfare programmes for the resettlement camps were part of the FGDs because they were in a better position to supply dependable information concerning the social welfare programmes and services provided by government. Each FGD panel had a facilitator selected from among the IDPs population. These ones were found to be literate and can

read and write in English language. They were tutored on their expected duties such as note taking, tape recording and moderating the sessions. Research assistants drawn from students of the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Calabar were used to facilitate the administration and collection of the instrument.

The discussions arising from the Focus Group Discussion went through content

analysis. All the statements, verbatim quotes and responses raised by discussants were noted and evaluated to check their correlation or otherwise on the issues under study. The generated data from the questionnaire were appropriately coded and tested with Pearson product moment

correlation. The sample distribution of respondents by strata and selection is shown on Table 1.

Table 1 Sample distribution of respondents by strata and selection

S/n	Resettlement camps	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
1	Abana	210	30.0
2	Archibong	199	28.4
3	Atabong	291	41.6
	Total	700	100

Source: Fieldwork, 2021

Results

Table 2: Distribution of responses on availability of IDPs' based social welfare programmes in Bakassi resettlement camps(n=700)

S/n	Items	Available	Unavailable	Don't know
1	Tarred roads	187 (26.7%)	513 (73.3%)	
2	Pipe borne water	192(27.4%)	508 (72.6%)	15(2.1%)
3	Power supply	219(31.3%)	471(67.3%)	10(1.4%)
4	Skill acquisitions	406(58%)	290(41.4%)	4(0.6%)
5	Nutrition	123(17.6%)	571(81.6%)	6(0.9%)
6	School	291(41.6%)	402(57.4%)	7(1.0%)
7	Employment opportunities	366(52.3%)	329(47%)	5(0.7%)
8	Small and medium scale businesses	291(41.6%)	402(57.4%)	7(1.0%)
9	Social security	42(6%)	653(93.3%)	5(0.7%)

10	Farming incentives	107(15.3%)	590(84.3%)	3(0.4%)
11	Empowerment programmes	194(27.7%)	505(72.2%)	1(0.1%)
12	Monthly stipends as palliatives	180(25.7%)	518(74%)	2(0.3%)
13	Small and medium enterprises	163(23.3%)	533(76.1%)	4(0.6%)
14	Foodstuff	496(71%)	201(28.8%)	2(0.3%)
15	Housing	154(22%)	542(77.5%)	4(0.6%)
16	Legal protection	87(12.4%)	613(87.6%)	2(0.3%)
17	Humanitarian assistance	499(71.3%)	200(28.6%)	1(0.1%)
18	Markets	80(11.4%)	618(88.3%)	2(0.7%)

Source: Fieldwork, 2021

Table 2 shows the distribution of responses on availability of IDPs' based social welfare programmes in Bakassi resettlement camps. The responses indicates that apart from foodstuff and humanitarian services which had majority of respondents agreeing that they were available, in all other items, majority of the respondents disagreed that there were available in the camps.

Table 3: Distribution of responses on accessibility to IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camps (n=700)

S/n	Items	SA	A	SD	D	UD
1	Primary health care is accessible in my camp	16 (2.3%)	25 (3.6%)	315 (45%)	327 (46.7%)	17 (2.4%)
2	Social welfare programmes are ad-hoc in nature	358 (5.1%)	251 (35.9%)	43 (6.1%)	38 (5.4%)	10 (1.4%)
3	My camp has educational facilities I can access	34 (4.9%)	8 (1.1%)	403 (57.6%)	250 (35.7%)	5 (0.7%)

4	I am not comfortable with the distribution pattern of social welfare benefits	411 (58.7%)	189 (22.9%)	86 (12.3%)	41 (5.9%)	2 (0.3%)
5	I find it difficult to access the markets in the camp	272 (38.9%)	270 (38.6%)	88 (12.6%)	66 (9.4%)	4 (0.6%)
6	Non-accessibility of social infrastructures affects the development of my camp	263 (37.6%)	350 (50%)	52 (7.4%)	33 (4.7%)	2 (0.3%)
7	I cannot access officials coordinating social welfare	340 (48.6%)	159 (22.7%)	97 (13.9%)	103 (14.7%)	1 (0.1%)
8	Inaccessible social welfare programmes has impoverished many IDPs	340 (34.3%)	265 (37.9%)	69 (%)	25 (3.6%)	1 (0.1%)
9	Health care delivery services is hardly accessed by the IDPs	381 (54.4%)	152 (21.7%)	89 (12.7%)	74 (10.6%)	4 (0.6%)
10	IDPs cannot access skill acquisition programme in the camps	250 (35.7%)	403 (57.6%)	34 (4.9%)	8 (1.1%)	5 (0.7%)

programmes in my camp

Source: Fieldwork, 2021

Table 3 indicates the result of respondents' responses with regard to access to IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camps. The response pattern to Item 1 revealed that majority of IDPs did not have access to primary health care. The responses to Item 2 shows that social welfare programmes were ad-

hoc in nature. This implies that there were no institutions or legislature to guide social welfare programmes, instead they were served as temporal palliatives to IDPs. Item 3 reveals that majority of IDPs had no access to educational facilities such as primary and nursery schools. The response patterns in item 4 revealed that majority of respondents were not comfortable with the distribution pattern of social welfare benefits. The response pattern to

Item 5 suggests that they found it difficult to access the markets in the camp.

The analysis of responses to item 6 showed that majority of respondents believed that non-accessibility of social infrastructures affects the development of their camps. The response pattern indicated that IDP camps lacked social amenities such as power supply, housing, pipe borne water, good roads and markets. On the responses to item 7, data shows

that majority of respondents cannot access officials coordinating social welfare programmes in their camps. The responses to item 8 indicated that majority of respondents believed that the inaccessibility of social welfare programmes has impoverished many IDPs. The responses to item 9 also showed majorities of respondents believed that they hardly access health

care delivery services. By the response pattern to H_1 : There is significant association between availability of IDPs' based item 10, it was concluded that IDPs' cannot access skill acquisition programme in the social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp.

Test of hypotheses

The result of each hypothesis presentation is tested as follows:

Hypothesis one

H_0 : There is no significant association between availability of IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp. The independent variable was availability of IDPs' based social welfare programmes while the dependent variable was wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp. The Chi-square (X^2) statistical technique was adopted to test the hypothesis. The result of the analysis is presented in Table 4a and 4b

resettlement camp

TABLE 4a: Chi-square statistical analysis of the significant influence of availability of IDPs' based social welfare programmes on the wellbeing of IDPs(N =700)

Programmes	IDPs social welfare	Wellbeing of IDPs		Total	X^2	df	p-
	Improved	Not improved	value				
Health care	15(15.4)	92(91.6)	107(15.3%)	7.65	4	.001	
Educational	24(15.7)	85(93.3)	109(15.6%)				
Social infrastructures	26(26.7)	159(158.3)	185(26.4%)				
Markets	21(21.4)	127(126.6)	148(21.1%)				
Social services	15(21.8)	136(129.2)	151(21.6%)				
Total	101(14.4%)	599(85.6%)	700				

* $p < .05$; Critical $X^2 = 9.49$

Table 4b: Coputation of X^2

Cells	OF	EF	OF-EF	OF-EF ²	OF-EF ²		
EF							
1		15	15.4	-0.4	0.16	0.01	

2	92		91.6	0.4		0.16	0.002
3	24		15.7	8.3		68.89	4.39
4	85	93.3	-8.3	68.89	0.74		
5	26	26.7	-0.7	0.49	0.02		
6	159	158.3	0.7	0.49	0.003		
7	21	21.4	-0.4	0.16	0.007		
8	127	126.6	0.4	0.16	0.001		
9	15	21.8	-6.8	46.24	2.12		
10	136	129.2	6.8	46.24	0.36		
			X ²	7.65			

Source: Fieldwork, 2021.

From the analysis in Table 4b, the calculated X² value of 7.65 is less than the critical X²-value of 9.49 at 0.05 level of significance with 4 degree of freedom. It shows that the null hypothesis is retained and alternate hypothesis is rejected. Hence, there is no significant association between availability of IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp, Cross River State, Nigeria.

Hypothesis two

H₀: There is no significant association between accessibility to IDPs' based social welfare

programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in

Bakassi resettlement camp

H₁: There is significant association between accessibility to IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp In this hypothesis, accessibility to

IDPs' based social welfare programmes is the independent variable while wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp is the dependent variable. The Chi-square statistical technique was adopted to test the hypothesis. The result of the analysis is presented in Table 5a and

TABLE 5a: Chi-square (x²) analysis of the association between accessibility to IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp (N=700)

Access to IDPs social welfare	IDP's wellbeing	Total	X ²	Df	p-value	programmes Improved
Not improved						
Access to primary health care	15(18.7)	190(186.3)	205(29.3%)	5.69	4	
.001						

*p<.05; Critical X², = 9.49

Access to school	13(12.2)	120(120.8)	133(19.0%)
Access to markets	12(14.9)	151(148.1)	163(23.3%)
Access to farm incentives	15(9.1)	85(90.9)	100(14.3%)
Access to good roads	9(9.1)	90(89.9)	99(14.1%)
	64(9.1%)	636(90.9%)	700(100.0%)

Table 5b: Computation of X^2

Cells	OF	EF	OF-EF	OF-EF ²	$\frac{OF-EF^2}{EF}$
1	15	18.7	-3.7	13.69	0.73
2	190	186.3	3.7	13.69	0.07
3	13	12.2	0.8	0.64	0.05
4	120	120.8	-0.8	0.64	0.005
5	12	14.9	-2.9	8.41	0.56
6	151	148.1	2.9	8.41	0.06
7	15	9.1	5.9	34.81	3.83
8	85	90.9	-5.9	34.81	0.38
9	9	9.1	-0.1	0.01	0.001
10	90	89.9	0.1	0.01	0.0001
				X^2	5.69

Source: Fieldwork, 2021.

From Table 5b, analysis indicated that calculated X^2 value of 5.69 is less than the critical X^2 -value of 9.49 at 0.05 level of significance with 4 degree of freedom. This shows that the null hypothesis is retained and alternate hypothesis is rejected. Hence, there is no significant association between accessibility to IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp, Cross River State.

DISCUSSIONS

The first finding of this study revealed that there is no significant association between availability as well as access to IDPs' based social welfare programmes and wellbeing of IDPs in Bakassi resettlement camp in Cross River State, Nigeria. As observed, there were no realistic IDPs' based social welfare programmes to cater for the needs of IDPs in the camps. At inception of IDPs' arrival at the resettlement camps, they were provided with social welfare packages including foodstuffs, confectioneries and other domestic needs like

blankets, clothing, and many other items which lasted a year. Thereafter, the IDPs were left to fend for themselves, thereby pushing them to limits of poverty and hunger. This finding was in agreement with Foss et al (2009), who reported that IDPs were subjected to human right abuses, especially the denial of their right to social security and social welfare benefits. This finding also support Yeringet al (2008), who reported that IDPs were not only abandoned by relevant authorities who refuse to care for their welfare needs but also suffered from want and social security challenges.

The social welfare programmes coordinated by government agents had been irregular and inconsistent in the three Bakassi resettlement camps. Most times, the distribution pattern of social welfare packages generated infightings and competitiveness. With the non-provision of IDPs' based social welfare programmes, the IDPs found it difficult to cope with the complexities of living in a resettlement camp, especially as they experienced hunger and depravity on daily basis. It was also observed that there were little or no social infrastructures such as good motor-able roads, health care, portable water and educational institutions in the camps. Indeed, government's lack of interest in the provision of IDPs' based infrastructural development was observed to be a major hindrance to the development of the resettlement camps.

Also, the non-provision of sufficient

IDPs' based skill acquisition programmes in Bakassi resettlement camps account for the idleness of many IDPs, a situation that pushed many into criminal and immoral activities. Worst still, is the fact that so many of them were unemployed, having lost their fishing business in the Peninsula, which had been the source of livelihood for ages. The failure of government to address the welfare needs of IDPs was also observed to have led to the migration of some IDPs to the cities to seek for greener pastures. It was also observed that IDPs were mostly prone or exposed to poverty and health related hazards which were caused by lack of IDPs' based health care programme. It was further observed that IDPs more often than not failed to access social welfare programmes due to the abrupt and dismissive attitude of the coordinating officials, and who sometimes were distracted from giving attention to the IDPs.

Similarly, participants in the Focus groups unanimously agreed that the unavailability of IDPs' based social welfare programme led to the untimely demise of many IDPs. According to a female discussant, the inability of government to provide social welfare support was a betrayal of trust, since that was the promise given to them during the displacement process. Consequently, the feeling of despair and abandonment took precedence in the lives of IDPs. Again, a male discussant mentioned that in Atabong resettlement camp where he lives with his family members, only a few persons, not more

than 10 per cent of the total population of IDPs in the camp actually benefitted from social welfare packages brought to his camp. It was also agreed by discussants that inadequate social welfare programmes made so many IDPs unhealthy to carry on with life. The discussants had mentioned that most IDPs were passing through depression, anxiety and suicidal attempt as a result of inadequate social welfare interventions. One of the discussants during the focus group discussions held in Archibong resettlement camp said: “displacement of a people from their ancestral homes without compensation and social welfare support is a painful reality that we continue to witness its effects on daily basis”.

CONCLUSION

The condition of IDPs in the Bakassi resettlement camps in Cross River State is awful with myriads of human right abuses. This tends to have negative effect on the wellbeing of IDPs and development of the resettlement camps. Therefore, IDPs’ based social welfare programmes must be seen as an important instrument that can scale up the wellbeing of displaced persons. There is no doubt that the availability and accessibility to social welfare programmes would complement and even stimulate growth and sustainability of the IDP camps.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It suffice to state that IDPs’ based social welfare programmes should be initiated

and put in place to ameliorate the sufferings and hardships experienced by IDPs. The government needs to establish a social welfare programme that takes into consideration the peculiar needs of IDPs. Such a welfare programme should be backed by a social welfare legislature. More so, sustainable and comprehensive social welfare programme is required to scale up better living conditions for the IDPs. IDPs should be involved in the planning and decision making process and implementation of the IDPs’ based social welfare programme. More so, awareness creations and sensitization campaigns are needed to cause behavior change among the IDPs since most of them may perceive social welfare packages as a right and not a privilege and may likely want to be totally dependent on welfare benefits rather than strive to live independent life. The government should also put in place monitoring mechanism to checkmate corrupt practices and excesses of social welfare officials in charge of the social welfare programmes. When the IDPs’ based social welfare programme is fully developed, IDPs would be innovated to play important role in the socio-economic development of the resettlement camps.

REFERENCES

- Agande, B., Ochayi, B., Chris. A. & Nyong, T. (2008). Bakassi: No stopping us on handover today-Federal government. Vanguard Newspaper. 12, p.24, August, 60651. (www.vanguardngr.com).

- Algbokhan, B. E. (2008). Poverty, inequality and growth in Nigeria: A case study. ACGS/MPAMS. Discussion paper 3 prepared for UNECA, .p10
- Amadasun, S. (2019). Social work services for internally displaced persons in Nigeria, pp17, <https://lite.m.grin.com/document>.
- Atolagbe, M.O.B. (1989). Principles and practice of social welfare. Ibadan External Studies Programmes Services., pp11.
- Bagshaw, S. (2003). Project on internal displacement: IDP protection survey and IDP response matrix. Diane Paul: Brookings Institution-SAIS, Protection Survey. Advance version of study.
- Bahle, T., Pfeifer, M. & Wendt, C, (2010). Social assistance. In Castles FG, Leibfried S, Lewis J et al. (Eds). The Oxford handbook of the welfare state. Oxford University Press
- Bassel, H, J. (2019). Development strategies and issues for land settlement in West Africa. Environmental and Social Studies. <http://www.dev.org/strategies/issues/indexi.fm>.
- Brenda, C.C. (2011). Bakassi: The forgotten and abandoned people. Vanguard, August 21, p6, 234. (www.vanguardngr.com).
- Brookings institution (2008). Manual for law and policymakers on internal displacement. Brookings Institution, University of Bern.
- Brusset, E., Nautrup, B., Immajati, Y.& Pedersen, S. B. (2004). Assistance to Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Indonesia. SIDA Evaluation 04/27, Department for Co- operation with NonGovernmental Organisations and Humanitarian Assistance. Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency. <http://www.sida.se/publications>
- Bukar, A.B. (2010). Nigeria needs to take responsibility for its Internally Displaced Persons (IDPS), pp 21 <https://www.fmreview.org>bukar>.
- Cernea, M.M. (1997). African involuntary population resettlement in a global context: social assessment series. The World Bank. Pp045.
- Chambers, R. (1994). The origin and practice of participatory rural appraisal. World Development Review 22(7), 953-969
- Cosgrave, J. (2004). Synthesis findings on echo's policy of treating affected populations without regards to preconceived categories, specifically IDPS, refugees and returnees and local population, based on reviews in Sudan, Angola

- and Afghanistan. Version 1, 28. Jan. 04. Channel Research for ECHO.
- Davies, A. (2012). IDPs in host families and host communities: assistance for hosting arrangements division of international protection. Protection Operational Support.
- Division of International Protection United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. CP2500, 1211 Geneva 2 Switzerland. www.unhcr.org
- [Enwereji, E.E. \(2009\). Assessing interventions available to internally displaced persons \(IDPs\) in Abia State, Nigeria. Libyan Journal of Medicine 4\(1\), 23–26.](#)
- Foss, H. & Bonn, O. (2009). To protect or to violate human rights. Paper presentation at the international conference on realizing the rights to health and development for all. ItaNoivietnam, pp26-29.
- Fredga, R.T. (2011). Fighting related intolerance: exposing the link between refugees, stigma and discrimination. UNAIDS Global Reference Right 6(4), 19.
- Holmes, R., Akinrimisi, B. & Buck, R. (2011). Social protection in Nigeria: An overview of programmes and their effectiveness, <https://www.wodi.org/publications/60>, pp17-19.
- Holmes, R., Akinrimisi, B., Morgan, R. & Buck, R. (2012). Social protection in Nigeria: Mapping programmemes and their effectiveness. Overseas Development Institute, 111 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JD, UK
- Isokon, B. E & Ekeh, J. E. (2014). Household structure and the welfare of Bakassi settlers in Cross River State, Nigeria. International Journal of Innovative Social Sciences and Humanities Research 2(2), 75-80, June 2014 © SEAH Publications, ISSN: 2354-2926.
- Isokon, B. E. & Okom, M. I. (2014). Selfhelp initiatives and sustainable development in resettlement schemes: The case of bakassi resettlement programme in Cross River State, Nigeria. Journal of Sociology and Social Work 2(1), 09-20. ISSN: 2333-5807
- James, K. (1998). The needs of internally displaced women and children: guiding principles and considerations office of emergency programmes Working Paper Series. Office of Emergency Programmes, UNICEF, New York September 1998.

- Ministry of Refugees and Accommodation of Georgia, Decree 47 (2007). State strategy for Internally Displaced Persons – Persecuted. 2 February, 2007, available at www.refworld.org/pdfid/5a268c564.pdf
- Morgen, S., Acker, J. & Weigr, J. (2013). Stretched thin: poor families, welfare work and welfare reform. Cornell University Press.
- Mosikilu, G., Chiedozi, S. & Chukwudi, K. (2008). The Bakassi question. *The Nation*, p2-8, August 13.
- Ogbonna, B.O. (2017). Social welfare schemes: A neglected component of public health care services in Nigeria. *MOJ Public Health* 5(3):101-104, <https://medcraveonline.com>
- Okpukpara, C.B., Chine, P.V. & Uguru, F.N.O. (2006). Child welfare and poverty in Nigeria. A paper presented at poverty phase 11 dissemination workshop in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia on 12-13 October, pp1-37
- Olarewaju, N. (2009). Understanding changing patterns of settlement and resettlement in Africa. Spring Publications, pp22. http://www.adb.org/settlement/inpopn/index_i.cfm.
- Olarewaju, O., Sulaiman, Y. & Omobowale, O. (2004). Social protection strategy for Nigeria. Policy note for NPC.pp5-18
- Oriole, E.O.A. (2009). Framework for food security and poverty reduction in Nigeria. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 8(1), 132-139.
- Ottong, J. & Bassey, A. (2009). Community development principles and practice. Calabar: University of Calabar Press
- Rahmato, D. (2004). Ethiopia: rural resettlement programme criticized. Inter-American Development Bank, Inter American initiative on social capital, ethics and development, <http://www.iadb.org/etical/ingles/index.i.cfm>.
- Terminski, B. (2013). Development-induced displacement and resettlement: Social problems and human rights issues (a bibliography) (Studies in internal displacement), pp12-21, <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ss09r-329026>
- UN (1998). Guiding principles on internal displacement. UN, 1998.
- USAID (2010). Assistance to internally displaced persons policy implementation guidelines. Internal USAID Document.
- Yering, G. & Malcolm, O. (2008).

Displacement and human
right approach in Nigeria.

Good

Year Publications, pp17.