

## POVERTY AND INSECURITY IN NIGERIA

*Musa IDRIS <sup>a</sup>, Shehu Jafaru SALISU <sup>b\*</sup>*

<sup>a</sup>Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria

<sup>b</sup>Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria

---

### ABSTRACT

*The increasing incidences of poverty and insecurity have continued to be issues of great concern in Nigeria in spite of the concerted efforts made by successive regimes in the country. This paper sought to examine the significance of the relationship between poverty and insecurity in Nigeria for the period of 2010-2019. Specifically, the paper examined the significance of the relationship between poverty and personal insecurity; poverty and national insecurity; and national insecurity and personal insecurity. The study sourced data on multidimensional poverty from the United Nations Development Programme and the National Bureau of Statistics. Data on the rate of personal and national insecurity was sourced from the Mo Ibrahim Foundation. The data was presented in tables and analyzed using tables, averages, and percentages, as well as the Pearson Correlation Coefficient to test the hypotheses. The paper revealed that there is no significant relationship between poverty and national insecurity, on the one hand, and poverty and national insecurity, on the other hand, in Nigeria. The paper recommended for lesser government involvement in arm conflict, adherence to the rule of law, and capacity building for security agencies, among others.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Insecurity, national insecurity, personal insecurity, poverty.*

---

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The increasing incidence of poverty and the alarming rate of insecurity in Nigeria, especially in the two decades of the twenty-first century, has, more than ever before, become issues of public and academic concern. Poverty is a global phenomenon; however, its increasing incidence in Sub-Saharan Africa and Nigeria, in particular, poses a great threat to our quest for good governance and development. Citing the World 2015 and 2012 poverty incidence estimates Ingram, (2018, p. 1-2), explains that while the global number of the poor reduced to 9.6% in 2015 from 12.2% in 2012, the figures for people living in severe poverty Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) increased to 35.2 %. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (2019, p.1), using its Multidimensional Poverty Index, estimates the level of poverty in SSA at 57.5%. Using the World Bank \$1.90 Poverty line, Rose and Ortiz-Ospina (2010, p.27) assert that Africa has the highest number of people living in extreme poverty at 383 million, with Nigeria having 86 million. More than 44% of the Africans lack the income to enable them to meet their basic needs; 17%, 21%, and 29% are therefore deprived of food, clean water, and medicines and medical care, respectively. (Dulami, Mattes, and Logan, 2013).

Concerted efforts have been made by global, continental, and national governments over the years aimed at reducing the incidence of poverty and insecurity. The United Nations Millennium Development Goals number one is the eradication of extreme poverty and hunger by the year 2015. The Successive Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) number one seeks to end poverty in all its form in the world by the year 2030. The 16th SGD also seeks to “promote peaceful and inclusive societies to sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable

---

\* Corresponding author. E-mail address: shehusalisu@yahoo.com

and inclusive institutions at all levels (United Nations, 2020;2). The African Union launched the New Partnership for African's Development (NEPAD) in 2001 (African Union Development Agency, 2020) with five major objectives, with poverty eradication as the foremost.

The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (UN WOMEN, 1999) in Chapter II relating to the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy in section 14(26) provides that; "Security and welfare of the people shall be the primary purpose of the government". The social objectives also seek to recognise and enhance the sanctity and dignity of human life. The National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) has as part of its policy to increase the level of security of life and property as well as reduce the incidence of poverty as part of the social charter (National Planning Commission, 2004).

Pursuant to these, the Federal Government of Nigeria established the: National Directorate of Employment since 1986; Directorate of Foods, Roads and Rural Infrastructure in 1989; Nigeria Agricultural Cooperatives and Rural Development Bank in 2000; and the National Poverty Eradication Programme in 2003 (Kpakol, 2007, pp. 445-470). In addition, the Security sector has been reformed (Zebadi; 2007, pp 122-141, and Feyeye, 2007, pp 142-157), while security sector expenditure has been increasing over the years (Otto and Ukpere, 2012, p. 67). In spite of these efforts, the incidences of poverty are widespread in Nigeria. Poverty headcount for the country was 27.2% in 1980, 62.6% in 1996, 54.7% in 2004 and rose to 69.0% in 2010 (National Institute for Legislative Studies, (NILS), 2013 pp. 99-101; Osunikanmi 2014, pp. 223-226; & National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), 2020). The NBS (2020, p.5) also put the poverty rate in Nigeria at 40.1% for 2019.

The incidence of insecurity in Nigeria is not less worrisome. Okenyodo, Godiyi, and Lewis (2015) and Afrobarometer's (2015) studies; "Security and armed extremism in Nigeria; setting a new agenda and Nigerians' perceptions of insecurity and armed extremism," respectively observed that 39% of Nigerians do not feel safe in their neighborhoods. In addition, 33% of Nigerians fear crime in their homes, 31% experienced theft, and 20% were physically attacked. The Global Peace Index for Nigeria (KNOEMA, 2020) has been persistently poor over the years. This ranged from 26.28%, 25.93%, 28.77% and 28.98% in 2010, 2013, 2016 and 2019 respectively (<https://countryeconomy.com/nigeria>). The NILS 2013 indicates an increasing incidence of insecurity in the form of serious crime in Nigeria. Terrorism, militancy, banditry, kidnapping, farmer/herdsmen, and ethnic crisis are ripe across Nigeria (Obarisuagbon and Akintoye, 2019, p. 46; Nwagu and Ononughu, 2014; Onifade, David & Moses, 2013, p. 50). Why are the incidences of poverty and insecurity still high in spite of efforts made by successive administrations in Nigeria?

The major objective of this paper is to examine the significance of the relationship between poverty and insecurity in Nigeria for the period 2010 – 2019. Specifically, this paper seeks to examine the significance of the relationship between poverty and personal insecurity; poverty and national insecurity; and the national insecurity and personal insecurity in Nigeria. The null hypothesis states that: There is no significant relationship between poverty and personal insecurity in Nigeria; there is no significant relationship between poverty and national insecurity in Nigeria; and there is no significant relationship between national insecurity and personal insecurity in Nigeria.

The timeframe of this study is 2010 – 2019. This choice of this period can be justified as the year 2010 recorded a high incidence of poverty and an alarming rate of insecurity across the country. The paper also has a national rather than state or regional coverage for maximum utility. It is also concerned with Multidimensional poverty as this is the phenomenon in Nigeria, like other developing countries. In addition, insecurity is conceived from the perspectives of personal and national insecurity in Nigeria as the two are mutually exclusive.

Studies relating to poverty and insecurity abound in the existing literature. Most of these studies are mainly conceptual and descriptive as they attempt to conceptualize and identify the dimensions and challenges of either poverty or insecurity (Stritzel, 2014, pp. 1-19; Ibagere, 2010, p. 122; Fatai; 2012, pp. 129-130; Kpakol, 2007, pp. 445-470; Todaro & Smith, 2009, pp. 208-251; Chambers, 2007, pp. 20-25; Shepherd, 2007, pp.48-56 & Zupi, 2007, pp. 31-41) among others. Empirical studies on the

relationship between poverty and security in Nigeria are very few. These include those of Osunikanmi (2014, pp. 221-227) who interrogated the influence of poverty on insecurity in Nigeria. Others include "National Security and Sustainable Economic Development in Nigeria since 1999; Implication for 20:20:20 by Nwangwu and Onowogbu (2014) and National Security and Development in Nigeria by Otto and Ukpere (2012, pp. 6767-6768).

Osunikanmi (2014, pp. 221-627) analyzed poverty trends in Nigeria from 1980 – 2010, but never provided any data on insecurity for the same period nor established any empirical relationship between the two variables. It, therefore, suffers from methodological defects. While the study by Otto and Ukpere (2012, pp. 6765-6770) is empirical, it presides national security and development by security sector expenditure and the Gross Domestic Product, respectively, and the same in the study by Nwangwu and Ononogbu (2014). The latter used security sector expenditure and expenditures on educational, agricultural, health, and construction sectors as proxies for National Security and sustainable economic development, respectively. Yet, the study was merely descriptive rather than inferential. This paper seeks to cover these gaps by employing actual data on the incidence of poverty and insecurity in Nigeria and also establish the empirical relationship that exists between the variables.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **2.1. Concept of Insecurity:**

There are two major perspectives in defining the concept of security and insecurity. There are the traditional, militaristic, and state-centric approaches and the human-centered approach. The former is primarily concerned with defense in terms of the military might of the state to ensuring the territorial integrity of the state against external aggression and internal insurrection. The latter approach perceives security and insecurity from the aspect of human security safety of the citizens from deprivation and harm, either potential or real. The militaristic and state-centric approach had been the trend right from the origin of the modern state and the Cold Wars, especially in the 1940s. This trend, however, changed as new security challenges evolved down, dominating the security debate of the 1990s. These challenges include ethnic conflicts, economic and environmental threats, mass movement by people, transnational organized crime and terrorism, cybersecurity, kidnappings, gang-rape, and protection of critical infrastructure, among others (Stritzel, 2014, pp. 15-16).

Literature relating to security from the 1990s focuses not only on the traditional militaristic and state-centric approach but stress on the importance of human security as the two are mutually exclusive. Thus, Zabadi (2007, pp. 123-126); Fayeye (2007, p. 143); Nnoli (2006, p. 16); Ewetan and Urhie (2004, p. 142); Igbagere (2010, p. 122); Nwangwu and Ononogbu (2014); Otto and Ukpere (2012, p. 67); Adegbam (2013, p. 8) and Fatai (2002, pp. 129-130) conceptual security as the ability of the state to secure and maintain territorial integrity, internal insurrection, maintain law and order and protect the citizens against potential and actual socio-economic, political and environmental threats (Zabadi:2007, p. 126 & Fayeye (2007, p. 143) by individual groups, society and the country at large. Security is, therefore, multidimensional and the supreme priority (Strizel, 2014, p. 15). It is also objective and subjective. In the objective sense, security can be measured by the absence of any form of danger. Subjectively, it can be measured by the absence of fear that threat or danger will occur (Nnoli, 2006, p. 16).

Operationally, the Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2015, 2018, p8) classified security into personal safety and national security. Personal safety encompasses the presence of police services, the absence of social unrest, violent crimes, political violence, and human trafficking, which are seen as the elements of human security in the existing literature. National security consists of the extent of governmental involvement in armed conflict, domestic armed conflict, cross-border tensions, internally displaced people, and political refugees. This working definition of security is adapted for this paper. Insecurity thus implies the extent of deprivation of basic needs, environmental threats, ethnic unrest and

conflicts, armed robbery, banditry, militancy, kidnapping, human trafficking, transnational organized crimes, and terrorism.

## **2.2. Concept of Poverty**

There are two major perspectives on conceptualizing poverty. There are the reductionist money-motive view and the multidimensional perspective. The former is led by the World Bank while the latter is championed by the United Nations Development Project (UNDP, 2019;2020, pp. 1-2) and the United Nations International Children Education Fund (UNICEF). Todaro and Smith (2009, pp. 208-251) and Rose and Ortiz-Ospina (2019, p. 1) toed the line of the World Bank in their attempt to define the concept of poverty. However, Kpakol, (2007, p. 445); Osunikanmi, (2014, p. 223); Chambers, (2007, p. 20); Zupi (2007; pp. 31-33), Shepherd, (2007, p. 49); and the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2020, pp. 1-2) adopt the multidimensional approach embracing both monetary and non-monetary elements in conceptualizing poverty as championed by the UNDP and UNICEF. According to Rose and Ortiz-Ospina (2019) and Todoru and Smith (2009), poverty is the incidence of deprivation measured monetarily by a person's income and consumption as championed by the World Bank. The extent of poverty is measured by the International Poverty Line at \$1.90, revised in 2015. Some of the difficulties of this approach in differences in price levels in different countries, the exchange rate, and the necessity for cross-country differences in purchasing power parity.

Kpakol (2007) averred from the money-metric perspective represented by the \$1.90 International Poverty Line. He asserts that poverty entails not only lack of income but also of access to a wide range of services such as education, healthcare, shelters, and food. This view is also shared by Osunikanmi (2014;223) poverty from the perspective of UNICEF (1986) as the deprivation from a material requirement for minimally acceptable fulfilment of human needs, including food.

From a broader perspective, Zupi (2007) and Chambers (2007) sees conditions of deprivation from material wellbeing, food, shelter, clothing, good job, housing, and decent livelihood; physical wellbeing in terms of physical health, strength and appearance; security in terms of peace of mind, freedom from crime, violence, injustice and natural disasters. The dimensions of poverty, according to Zupi (2007) and Chambers (2007), include freedom and participation. The United Nations (2019) also resonates with the multidimensional nature of poverty by asserting that: poverty entails more than the lack of income and productive resources to sustain livelihoods. Its manifestations include hunger and malnutrition, limited access to education and other basic services, social discrimination and exclusion as well as lack of participation in decision making.

In the same vein, the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2020), using its Nigerian Living Standards Survey (NLSS), measures poverty from a multidimensional perspective viz; access to education, health, and basic services, employment, assets, and income. In addition, the NBS uses consumption expenditure rather than income. This is based on the argument that consumption expenditure on food and non-food items as opposed to an income better reflects the achievement of a particular level of welfare by a household, while income represents the opportunity of reaching a certain level of wellbeing. However, in establishing a national poverty line, the NBS estimates it at ₦137,430 per person in a year. In view of these shortcomings, this paper adopts the UNDP's Multidimensional Poverty Index for Nigeria and other developing countries as published by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP, p. 209) and the NBS (2020).

## **2.3. Empirical Studies**

Studies exist in the relationship between poverty and insecurity in Nigeria. These include those of Obarisuagbon and Akintoye (2019, pp. 445-51); Osunikanmi (2014, pp. 221-227); Afrobarometer (2015); and Okenyodo, Godiyi and Lewis (2015, pp. 1-10) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (2016, pp. 220-221) among others. Obarisuagbon and Akintoye (2019, pp. 44-51) in their article: Insecurity Cross in Nigeria: The Law Enforcement Agents a Panacea? Identified poverty as one of the pre-depressing factors in a security crisis, among other factors using



responses from questionnaire administration in Benin-City, Edo State. While the title of the article had national coverage, data obtained was only from the capital of only one of the thirty six states in Nigeria. The study also relied only on data obtained through a questionnaire, which was analyzed only descriptively without deploying inferential tools, and therefore references could not be made to indicate the extent of the relationship between poverty and insecurity in Nigeria.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (2016, pp. 20-21) country profile for Nigeria asserts that the rising incidence of poverty in especially Northern Nigeria and the rural areas, in particular, has strong implications for the peace and stability of the country. Afrobarometer (2015) and Okenyodo, Godiyi, and Lewis (2015, pp. 1-10) using face-to-face interviews and questionnaires across the six ethnopolitical zones using simple random sampling techniques, identified that poverty and unemployment as the main reason people join extremist groups. While their studies have robust descriptive data analysis, they lack inferences.

Osunikanmi (2014, pp. 221-227) sought to interrogate the influence of poverty on insecurity in Nigeria. The article relied on the Poverty Index for Nigeria, as published by the NBS. She also made reference to a study by the Brookings Institute, which discovered that only 10% of the global poor live in stable low-income countries as against 40% who live in a fragile and conflict-affected countries. But data on the state of insecurity in Nigeria was not provided. It also attempted to derive the relationship between poverty and insecurity from the perspective of the Progressive Social Change Theory by Karl Marx. The paper, therefore, lacks data on the incidence of insecurity in Nigeria. In addition, no statistical inference has been drawn in the relationship between the variables. This paper seeks to provide data on both poverty and insecurity in Nigeria and also draw inferences between the variables.

## **2.4. Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this paper is the Relative Deprivation Theory. The theory is largely associated with Gurr (19970). It was used by Omonijo, et al (2017, pp. 70-71) in their study, "Exploring Social Theories in the Study of Insecurity in Contemporary Nigeria". The theory states that the primary source of human desire and capacity for violence is the frustration-aggression mechanism. (Gurr (1970) emphasizes that though frustration does not necessarily lead to violence when it is prolonged and sharply felt, it often leads to anger and eventual violence. This theory is based on the relative deprivation hypothesis, which is the discrepancy between what people think they can get. Gurr (1970; p. 24) adds that "the potential for collective violence varies strongly with the intensity and scope of relative deprivation among members of a collectivity,... people can be insured to a bad state of affairs, even one that offers so little access to life-sustaining resources that members of the group are starving or dying of remediable diseases or exposure". As frustration produces aggressive behaviours in individuals, so does relative deprivation result in collective violence by social groups.

In relation to this paper, the people of Nigeria deserve security and wellbeing, income, access to education, health, and decent livelihood, among others, as provided by the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (UN WOMEN, 1999). However, when the citizens feel threatened, insecure, and deprived individually and collectively, especially in comparison with others, it results in a circle of violence and insecurity in the form of armed robbery, banditry and kidnapping, and terrorism as experienced across Nigeria.

## **3. METHODOLOGY**

This paper relies on secondary data on the Multidimensional Index for Nigeria, as published by the UNDP (2019, 2020), the NBS (2020), and the Ibrahim Index of African Governance (IIAG) as published by the Mo Ibrahim Foundation for African Governance for data on Insecurity in Nigeria.

The World Bank International Poverty Line fixed at \$1.90 per day in 2015 as an Index for measuring the incidence of poverty is a money-metric-centered approach based on income only.

The Mo Ibrahim Foundation is the most Afrocentric non-governmental organization primarily concerned with providing freely accessible data to researchers. It uses its IIAG to rate the quality of governance in the fifty-four African countries using four categories, fourteen sub-categories, and one hundred and two (102) indicators. The IIAG sources data from thirty-five independent sources (Mo Ibrahim Foundation, 2020, p. 18). Personal safety and national security are two sub-categories of the safety and the rule of law category.

Data on the dependent and independent variables will be presented in a table and analyzed using averages and percentages. The hypothesis postulated will be tested using Pearson Correlation Coefficient to test the hypotheses at a 10% level of significance with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

#### 4. DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The variables in this paper are poverty, personal insecurity and national insecurity. Table 1 contains the data on the variables as sourced from the UNDP, NBS, and the Mo Ibrahim Foundation.

**Table 1. Rate of Poverty and Insecurity in Nigeria (2010 – 2019)**

Year	Poverty	Personal Security	National Security
2010	60.9	74.8	20.3
2011	35.64	71.7	32.9
2012	33.1	82.6	37.2
2013	55.9	82.5	41.5
2014	51.53*	79.8	36.2
2015	47.17*	66.5	49.2
2016	42.8	61.7	48.5
2017	55.6	62.1	49.6
2018	54.8	60.78*	49.12*
2019	40.1	59.45*	48.63*

*Source:* Adapted from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS), Federal Republic of Nigeria, United Nations Development Project (UNDP) (2019), and Mo Ibrahim Foundation (2015 and 2018).

The data in Table 1 indicates that the incidence of poverty in Nigeria for the period 2010-2019 ranges from the highest of 60.9% in 2010 to the lowest of 33.1% in 2012. When the rate of personal insecurity was at the peak of 82.6%. The poverty rates undulate with no regular pattern. It is noteworthy that figures for 2014 and 2015 as asterisked could not be obtained from any secondary source and were arrived at using Linear Interpolation in the E-view. The average rate of poverty in Nigeria for the period was 47.75%.

The annual figures for personal insecurity in Nigeria were higher than those of poverty for the same period. These range from the highest of 82.6% in 2012 to the lowest of 59.445% in 2019. It is worthy to note that personal insecurity scores for 2018 and 2019 could not be obtained but were arrived at using Linear Interpolation in the E-view. The average score for personal insecurity was 70.19%. This indicates a very high level of personal insecurity in Nigeria for the period 2010-2019.

Unlike the very high incidences of personal insecurity, the annual scores for national insecurity are ironically relatively low. These range from the highest of 49.6% in 2017 to the lowest of 20.3% in

2010. These figures, like those of Poverty and Personal Insecurity, stagger without any pattern. Scores for 2018 and 2019 could not equally be attained from the secondary sources but were obtained through Linear Interpolation in the E-view as asterisked. The average rate of national insecurity for the period 2010-2019 was 41.32%.

**Table 2. Correlation Analysis Ordinary**

Correlation Analysis: Ordinary			
Date: 09/28/20    Time: 12:15			
Sample: 1 10			
Included observations: 10			
Correlation			
Probability	Personal insecurity	National insecurity	Poverty
Personal insecurity	1.000000		
	-----		
National insecurity	0.584461	1.000000	
	0.0760	-----	
Poverty	0.066431	-0.140155	1.000000
	0.8553	0.6994	-----

Source: SPSS Printout

The hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient at 10% (0.1) level of significance. The paper failed to reject the H01, which stated that there is no significant relationship between poverty and personal insecurity because the r and p values were 0.066 and 0.855, respectively. The paper also failed to reject the second H02, which states that there is no significant relationship between poverty and national insecurity in Nigeria. This is because the r and p values with respect to the hypothesis tested were 0.140 and 0.699, respectively. However, the paper failed to accept the H03 hypothesis which stated that there is no significant relationship national insecurity and personal insecurity in Nigeria because the r and p values were 0.584 and 0.076 respectively. The first two findings were contrary to those of UNCEA (2016), Afrobarometer (2015) and Okenyodo, Godyi, and Lewis (2015) and the Theory of Relative Deprivation Theory by Gurr (1990;24), which linked the incidence of insecurity to poverty. The third finding however assert that national insecurity and personal insecurity are mutually exclusive.

## 5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This paper concludes that there has been a high incidence of poverty (47.75%) in Nigeria for the period 2010-2019. The rate of personal insecurity was very high (70.19%), while the rate of national insecurity was only 41.32%. However, there exists no significant relationship between poverty and personal insecurity on one hand and poverty and national insecurity on the other hand. However, the relationship between national insecurity and personal insecurity in Nigeria was found to be significant. Thus, poverty is not the major cause of insecurity in Nigeria. In essence, other variables such as non-adherence to the rule of law, weak institutions, porous borders, incidence of internally displaced persons and proliferation of arms could be more potent factors responsible for the state of insecurity in Nigeria. The study therefore, recommended lesser government involvement in arm

conflict, reduce cross border tension, and the incidence of internally displaced persons. Others include greater adherence to the rule of law, capacity building for security agencies. The study also recommends further research on the effect of rule of law on insecurity in Nigeria.

## REFERENCES

- Adegbami, A. (2013). Insecurity: a theory of human existence and economic development in Nigeria. *Public Policy and Administration Research*. 3(6): 8-13.
- Afrobarometer. (2015). *Nigerians perceptions of security and armed extremism. Findings from the Round 6 Afrobarometer survey in Nigeria*, www.afrobarometer.org. (Accessed June 12, 2020).
- UN WOMEN. (1999). *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended)*. <https://constitutions.unwomen.org/en/countries/africa/nigeria>. (Accessed June 12, 2020).
- Dulami, B., Mattes, R. and Logan, C. (2013). *After a decade of growth in Africa Little change in poverty at the grassroots*. Afrobarometer, www.afrobarometer.org. (Accessed May 8, 2020).
- Ewetan, O.O. and Urlie, E (2014). Security and socio-economic development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development Studies*. 5(1):40-63. ISSN 2201-4268.
- Fatai, A. (2012). Democracy and national identities: the travails of national security in Nigeria. *Britain Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 9(11):126-139.
- Fayeye, J.O. (2007). Reforming the security sector, in Salihu H., Ahmadi, E., and Olawepo, R. (eds). *Nigerias Reform Programme: Issues and challenges*. Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin, 142-157.
- Gurr, T. (1970). *Why men rebel*. Princeton: N.J, Princeton University Press.
- Ibagere, E. (2010). The mass media, the law and national security: the Nigerian experience. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 24(5):121-128.
- Ingram, D. (2018). *World crisis and underdevelopment: A Critical Theory of Poverty, Agency and Coercion*. Cambridge, University Printing House.
- Kpakol, M. (2007). Poverty eradication efforts in Salihu H., Ahmadi, E., and Olawepo, R. (eds), *Nigerias Reform Programme: Issues and challenges*. Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin, 445-470.
- Mo Ibrahim Foundation. (2015). *Ibrahim Index of African Governance, Country Insights, Nigeria*. research@moibrahimfoundation.org. (Accessed June 12, 2020).
- Mo Ibrahim Foundation. (2018). *Ibrahim Index of African Governance, Country Insights, Nigeria*. research@moibrahimfoundation.org. (Accessed June 12, 2020).
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2020). *2019 Poverty and inequality in Nigeria*. www.nigerianstat.gov.ng. (Accessed June 12, 2020).
- National Institute for Legislative Studies (NLS). (2013). *Nigerias Social Indicators*. Abuja, National Assembly.
- National Planning Commission. (2004). *Nigeria: National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy*. Abuja; The MEEDS Secretariat.
- African Union Development Agency. (2020). *New Partnership for Africas Development (NEPAD)*. <https://www.nepad.org/>. (Accessed September 25, 2020).
- KNOEMA. (2020) Nigeria- The Global Peace Index. <https://countryeconomy.com/demography/global-peace-index/nigeria>. (Accessed September 25, 2020).
- Nnoli, O. (2006). *National security in Africa, a radical perspective*. Enugu; Pan African Centre for Research on Peace and Conflict Resolution.
- Nwangwu, C and Ononogbu, A.O. (2014). National Security and sustainable economic development in Nigeria since 1999: Implications for the vision 20:2020. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. 4(5). ISSN 2239-987X.



- Obarisuagbon, E.I. and Akintoye, E.O. (2019). Insecurity Cases in Nigeria: the law enforcement agents in panacea?. *Journal of Sociology and Social Work*. 7(1): 44-51.
- Okenyodo, K, Gondyi, N.D and Lewis, P. (2015). Security and armed extremism in Nigeria: Setting a new agenda. *Afrobarometer Dispatch*. 29.
- Omonijo, D.O., Obiorah, C.D, Oliver, O. and Uche, C. (2017). Exploring social theories in the study of insecurity in contemporary Nigeria. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*. 3(7): 59-76.
- Onifade, C., Imhoopi, D. and Urom, U.M. (2013). Addressing the insecurity challenges in Nigeria: the imperative of moral values and virtue ethics. *Global Journal of Human Social Science Political Science*. 13(1). ISSN 2249-460X.
- Osunikanmi, A.F. (2014). Interrogating the influence of poverty on insecurity in Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 4(12): 221-227.
- Otto G. and Ukpere, W.I. (2012). National Security and development in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*. 6(23):6765-6770.
- Rose, M and Ortiz-Ospina, E. (2019). *Global extreme poverty*. <https://ourworldindata.org/extreempoverity>. (Accessed May 8, 2020).
- Shepherd, A. (2007). Chronic poverty: Some policy implications. *Development, Society for International Development*, 50(2):48-55.
- Stritzel, H. (2014). *Security in translation; Securitization Theory and the location of threat*. London: Plogave Macmillan.
- Todaro, M.P. and Smith, S.C. (2009). *Economic Development*. (Tenth Edition). London; Addison-Wesley.
- UNDP. (2019). *Global multidimensional poverty index 2019, Illuminating inequalities*. <https://undp.org>. (Accessed July 26, 2020).
- UNDP. (2020). *Clearing Pathways out of Multidimensional Poverty: Achieving the SDGs* <http://ophi.org.uk/multidimensional-poverty-index/>. (Accessed July 26, 2020).
- United Nations. (2020). *Ending Poverty*. <https://www.un.org/en/sectors/issues-depth/poverty/>. (Accessed July 26, 2020).
- United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. (2016). Country Profile, Nigeria. <https://repository.uneca.org/handle/10855/23709>. (Accessed July 26, 2020).
- Zabadi, I.S. (2007). Security Sector reforms in Salihu H., Ahmadi, E., and Olawepo, R. (eds), *Nigerias Reform Programme: Issues and challenges*. Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, University of Ilorin, 122-141.
- Zupi, M. (2007). The multi-d-dimensions of poverty: some conceptual and policy challenges. *Development, Society for International Development*. 50(2): 31-41.