

HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT: TOWARDS THE REINTERGRATION OF INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS(IDPS) IN PUSHIT DISTRICT MANGU LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA OF PLATEAU STATE

¹*Veronica Yilret Nanle, ²Alice Bernard Benschak

^{1,2}Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Plateau State Polytechnic Barkin Ladi, Nigeria.

*Corresponding author's mail: venyilret@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7252-0035>

ABSTRACT

This study examines the housing conditions, destruction patterns, and reintegration needs of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in Pushit District of Mangu Local Government Area, Plateau State. The study adopts the descriptive research design. Simple random sampling was used to administer questionnaire to 357 IDPs (mostly household heads and adults above 18 years) from seven (7) villages that were completely destroyed. Descriptive statistics was used to analyse a total of 232 valid questionnaires. The findings revealed that before displacement, most households live in self-owned compound dwellings constructed with traditional materials. Banditry attacks impacted almost every house, with most houses entirely demolished. After displacement, most IDPs lived in rented and substandard housing, with most living in bad conditions lacking basic facilities. Despite these obstacles, cultural ties, access to farmland, and the restoration of livelihoods drive most of the respondent's strong desire to return to their ancestral communities. Their preferred assistance for reintegration includes reconstruction of destroyed homes and improved security. This study recommends that the government should engage physical planners to develop and implement a Comprehensive Reintegration Action Plan that holistically addresses housing reconstruction, security, essential services, and livelihood recovery for IDPs in Pushit District and other affected communities.

Keywords: Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), Housing Reconstruction, Security and Safety Livelihood Restoration, Sustainable Reintegration

1. INTRODUCTION

Housing remains one of the most basic human necessities, as well as a vital component of post-conflict recovery and long-term reintegration for internally displaced persons (IDPs). Internally displaced persons are people who have been forced to leave their homes because of conflict, violence, human rights violations, or natural catastrophes but who are still inside their nation's borders (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), 2023). Recently, the number of persons forcefully displaced has been significantly increasing. In 2016, there were 65.5 million cases of forced displacement globally, including refugees, internally displaced people, and asylum seekers (UNHCR, 2016). In 2018, there were 70.8 million displaced

individuals worldwide; this number increased to 79.5 million in 2019 and over 80 million in 2020 (UNHCR, 2018; UNHCR, 2019 :UNHCR, 2020). Internal displacement has escalated overtime. Currently, violence within their own countries has forced over 40 million individuals to flee their homes, accounting for 62% of all displaced people worldwide (International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2017).

Nigeria has the highest number of internally displaced people (IDPs) in sub-Saharan Africa, with an estimated 3.1 million (UNHCR, 2022). Internally displaced persons are among the world's most vulnerable people, suffering from several difficulties such as poverty, loss of educational opportunities, unemployment, marginalization, insecurity, and homelessness (IOM, 2017). In Plateau State, armed conflict, banditry and militia attacks have repeatedly returned, especially between 2022 and 2024. Over 160,000 internally displaced people (IDPs) were reported by the middle of 2022 (IOM DTM (Displacement Tracking Matrix), 2024).

Mangu Local Government Area has been one of the epicenters of the recent violence in North Central. The recent militia attacks have affected over 20 villages located in five districts (Bwai, Mangu, Kombun, Panyam, Pushit) and have claimed lives and destroyed properties. In Pushit District, several communities have been displaced as a result of the attack and insecurity. Many displaced families are still without permanent housing alternatives, relying on overcrowded temporary shelters (National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), 2022). For many internally displaced individuals (IDPs), going back home and leaving a normal life is their top priority. As a result, return and reintegration have remained the long-term alternative that the majority of the IDPs typically pursue (Teferra, 2012).

Studies have been conducted on the situation of internally displaced persons (IDPs) around the world. Onifade & Osinowo (2019) investigated potential strategies to improve the living conditions of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Nigeria. The study considers the basic requirements for an IDP camp, looking at things like space, facilities, and surroundings. In a separate study, the availability of latrines and the health consequences were assessed in a sample of official IDP camps in Borno State, Nigeria. Findings shows that majority of respondents had restricted access to latrines; the bulk of the camp's latrines are conventional pit latrines (Asabe, Mahya, Emmanuel, Ribah & Fatai, 2022). A similar study looked into the water, sanitation, and hygiene issues at the Heipang IDP camp in Plateau State. The results shows that the camp's WASH facilities are in worse condition due to shortage of clean water and facilities for good sanitation and hygiene (Oluwatosin & Gang, 2021). A related study on health resilience techniques and camp management used by IDPs in camp-like environments was released (Ekezie, 2022). A more recent study investigates the experiences of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in four Nigerian cities: Lagos, Port Harcourt, Ibadan, and Onitsha. It investigated life before, during, and after the relocation to the current area, as well as the realities of modern living (Roberts & Lawanson, 2023). These studies have demonstrated the precarious situation of internally displaced people (IDPs) at various points in time, as well as the reality of their housing predicament and the necessity of offering a long-term solution to these housing issues. However, the housing needs of internally displaced people (IDPs) in relation to their return or resettlement in their ancestral home have not been thoroughly studied. This study offers the first empirical

evaluation of IDP housing needs and reintegration pathways in Pushit District, an under-researched post-conflict area of Plateau State. It is unique in that it takes a context-specific, integrative, and planning-oriented approach to understanding IDP housing needs and reintegration. The aim of this paper is to assess the housing needs of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Pushit District by examining the extent of housing damage, current living conditions, willingness to return, specific housing needs and forms of assistance required by the IDPs and to propose a sustainable housing-based strategies to support their reintegration.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 *Housing Situation of IDPs*

According to the United Nations housing is more than just having a roof over one's head; it also includes having access to sufficient space, tenure security, infrastructure, services, and affordability in a safe and healthy environment (United Nations (UN), 2017). Therefore, housing is a multifaceted concept that integrates social, economic, cultural, and environmental characteristics rather than only being a physical building (Agbola, 1998). Housing is seen as both a process and a product from the standpoint of planning and development (Aribigbola, 2008). As a product, it offers a livable area that enhances the productivity and well-being of residents; as a process, it entails site acquisition, finance, construction, and maintenance. The quality of life, human dignity, social and economic stability of households are all significantly impacted by adequate housing (United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS), 1996). On the other hand, inadequate housing frequently results in social breakdown, insecurity, overcrowding, and poor sanitation (Olotuah, 2010). In humanitarian and resettlement studies, housing is viewed as a critical component of recovery and reintegration. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee highlights that access to sufficient and safe housing is a critical indicator of long-term solutions for displaced populations (Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), 2010).

In most conflict-affected areas of Nigeria, displaced people are initially housed in temporary shelters such as schools, religious centers, public buildings, or impromptu camps set up by humanitarian organizations (IOM, 2021). Many IDPs eventually relocate into host communities, self-settled areas, or informal settlements as their displacement lengthens without the necessary authorization or access to land ownership (UNHCR, 2019). Similarly, a report from the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2023) suggests that IDPs dwell in camps, collective families, host families, or rented housing after displacement. IDPs frequently have inadequate housing that falls short of acceptable planning and humanitarian standards. UN-Habitat (2020) defines suitable housing as habitable, accessibility to services, affordable, and culturally appropriate. Nevertheless, the majority of IDP shelters fall short of these requirements; they are overcrowded, poorly built, and devoid of adequate security and sanitation (Olotuah, 2010; Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), 2020). Also, access to basic amenities such as electricity, water, sanitation, healthcare, and education is severely limited. Many host communities and displacement camps lack waste management facilities, adequate drainage systems, and working boreholes (UNHCR, 2022). IDPs in rural or peri-urban areas frequently travel long distances to obtain safe drinking water or medical care (NRC, 2020). The lack of basic infrastructure also impedes schooling for

displaced children and limits livelihood prospects, perpetuating the cycle of poverty and vulnerability (IOM, 2021).

2.2 *IDPs Willingness to Return to Ancestral Home*

Internally displaced persons (IDPs) make difficult decisions based on a variety of interrelated considerations regarding whether to relocate, integrate locally, or return to their home land. Return intentions are rarely motivated by a single factor, rather, they involve evaluations of security, access to resources and services, tenure and property rights, social ties, and psychosocial variables (IOM, 2024; Joint Data Center (JDC) on Forced Displacement, 2024). Security is typically the most important indicator of willingness to return. According to studies and operational monitoring, IDPs are unlikely to return if they perceive unresolved or recurring security risks in their ancestral home (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), 2019; IOM Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM), 2024). For example, global tracking of return intentions consistently shows that improvements in local security boost the proportion of IDPs willingness to consider voluntary return, whereas persistent violence or fear of assault reduces return intentions (IDMC, 2019; IOM, 2024). Return decisions are also heavily influenced by the availability of livelihoods, infrastructure, and essential services like water, health care, and education. According to empirical research, the lack of schools, health facilities, marketplaces, and roads lowers the attractiveness of return even in situations when security circumstances are acceptable. This is especially true for households with children or those who rely on certain sources of income (World Bank, 2021; JDC, 2024).

The state of housing, land, and property (HLP) rights, loss of documents, land disputes, and damaged or destroyed homes is a deciding factor. Where IDPs anticipate long, uncertain processes to re-establish ownership or are at risk of dispossession, their readiness to return is reduced (UN Habitat, 2020). Higher return rates are correlated with the restoration of HLP rights and explicit enforceable tenure agreements because families feel more secure investing in reconstruction (JDC, 2024). Additionally, some households are encouraged to return by kinship ties, community networks, and attachment to the location. According to research from numerous countries, high social cohesion and the presence of family/kin in origin communities considerably raise return propensity but targeted violence, revenge assaults, or unresolved disputes lower it (Collado, 2020; JDC, 2024).

2.3 *Housing Needs and Assistance for IDP Reintegration/Return*

Housing support is crucial to the reintegration of internally displaced persons (IDPs) into their home communities or new settlements. The provision of suitable housing extends beyond the physical repair of devastated homes to the restoration of dignity, security of tenure, and access to key services that support long-term stability (IASC, 2010; UNHCR, 2022). The concept of durable solutions, entails not only rebuilding structures but also addressing the social, economic, and legal aspects that enable sustainable return and reintegration, this must serve as the foundation for housing support for internally displaced people (IOM, 2022). Housing assistance for displaced people can take various forms depending on the environment, available resources, and the level of housing devastation. Some of the major modalities include:

- i. **Emergency shelter and transitional accommodation:** Urgent shelter support such as tents, makeshift buildings, or shared housing is frequently needed during the first stages of relocation. However, because they don't address tenure, services, or livelihoods, they are insufficient for long-term reintegration (IOM, 2020).
- ii. **Cash-based interventions (CBIs):** These provide cash transfers or vouchers to displaced households, allowing them to choose housing options (rent, repair, rebuild) depending on their priorities, restoring dignity and supporting the local economy. CBIs enable displaced people to prioritize and fulfil their needs in a dignified manner and can serve as a pathway to reintegration (UNHCR, 2022).
- iii. **Rental support / individual accommodation in host communities:** IDPs may be assisted in renting private housing in host communities as an alternative to living in camps (UNHCR, 2022)
- iv. **In-kind repair, reconstruction and housing provision:** Direct assistance (building supplies, contractor services, land distribution) is required in situations where the housing stock has been destroyed or damaged. According to IOM housing & affordable housing guidance, social and affordable housing programs play a critical role in facilitating sustainable integration (IOM, 2022).
- v. **Security of tenure:** A key factor in the success of housing assistance and reintegration is security of tenure. Restoring property ownership and protecting land rights are crucial elements of durable solutions (IASC, 2010). IDPs are nonetheless vulnerable to eviction, secondary displacement, and exclusion from housing support programs in the absence of tenure security (UN-Habitat, 2020). To promote fair and long-lasting reintegration, housing interventions must incorporate Housing, Land, and Property (HLP) support, such as legal assistance, land documentation, and dispute resolution procedures.

Sustainable reintegration is not ensured by housing support alone. Interventions must be connected to livelihood recovery, access to healthcare, education, and community infrastructure in order for returnees to reconstruct their lives (World Bank, 2021; JIPS, 2024). Evidence from post-conflict reintegration programs shows that when housing assistance is linked with access to income-generating opportunities and social services, IDPs are more likely to stay in their resettlement regions (IASC, 2010; UNHCR, 2022). As a result, housing policies should be multi-sectoral, linking shelter, protection, and socioeconomic recovery.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1 *The Study Area*

Mangu Local Government Area (LGA) is situated in the central part of Plateau State, Nigeria. It is one of the 17 LGAs of the state. It lies between latitude 9°0'0"N & 9°40'0" North of the equator. Longitude 8°50'0"E & 9°20'0"E of the Greenwich Meridian (Figure 1). The total land area of Mangu LGA is estimated at about 1,653 square kilometres, making it one of the largest LGAs in Plateau State (National Bureau of Statistics, 2021). It is bounded by Bokkos LGA to the North, Pankshin LGA to the East, Barkin Ladi LGA to the West, and Kanke and Kanam LGAs to the South (National Population Commission, 2006). Administratively, Mangu LGA is made up of eleven (11) districts namely; Mangu, Kombun, Panyam, Pushit, Kerang, Ampang West, Mangun, Chakfem, Jipal, Gindiri, and Langai. Pushit District been one of the districts is located

in the southern part of the LGA. Pushit serves as one of the major rural districts and administrative units within Mangu, comprising of several villages such as Tilengpat, Vodni, Mararaba, Jwakji, Aper, and Puka, Kumtol, Mutong, Lamor, Pyantuhul, Gohotgung, Gwet among others. It functions as an important agricultural settlement and a nodal point linking communities within Southern Mangu (Plateau State Government, 2023).




Figure1: The Study Area, Pushit District Mangu LGA

Source: Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Plateau State Polytechnic Barkin Ladi

3.2 Research Design, Population and Sampling

This study adopts the descriptive research design and the simple random sample method is used. IDPs in Pushit District make up the study's population, approximately eighteen (18) communities were impacted by the militia attack; eleven (11) villages were partially devastated and seven (7) villages were completely destroyed. Furthermore, around 1,200 families and a total of 4,000–5,000 individuals were affected. Using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) standard table for computing sample sizes for diverse populations, the recommended sample size for a finite population of 5,000 people with a 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error is 357 persons.

3.3 Data Collection and Analysis

A well-structured close ended questionnaires with multiple choices was designed and administered to a sample of 357 people from seven (7) most affected villages as follows: Gwet 1&2, Mutong, Kumtol, Mbor, Pyantuhul, Gohotgung and Lamor. The questionnaire was administered to invited IDPs at LEA Primary School Pushit, it is separated into two sections: the first section is the demographic characteristics of the respondents while the second section captures questions on housing conditions, displacement and assistance required for the return of IDPs to their ancestral homes. Questionnaires were administered manually to respondents in person by the researcher assisted by field assistance using the respondent's preferred language (Mwaghavul, Hausa & English). In order to provide a first-hand, accurate data on the extent of

housing damage, photographic observation was adopted. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze a total of 232 valid questionnaires in the form of frequencies and percentages using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), version 23 while the photographic observations are presented in form of pictures.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Socio- Demographics Characteristics

Table 1 shows that the majority of respondents (50.4%) are female. The data also revealed that 25.0%, 32.3%, and 24.1% are between the ages of 21-30, 31-40, and 41-50 years respectively. A substantial number of respondents (80.2%) are married. This proves that the bulk of the population (21-50 years old) are likely to be economically active or responsible. The affected communities are purely Christians constituting 100% of the total respondents. In terms of educational status, 51.7% have secondary education, 23.7% tertiary education, 17.7% primary education and 6.9% non-formal education. This implies that most respondents are likely able to read, understand, and respond effectively to questionnaires, which improves the trustworthiness of the data collected. Farmers made up 88.8% of the respondents prior to displacement, but that number dropped to 69.0% following displacement. This suggests that the IDPs' main source of income has been severely disrupted by their displacement.

Before displacement, 40.9% of respondents earned ₦21,000 or more, while after displacement, only 8.6% earned that much. Additionally, 76.3% earned less than ₦5,000 after displacement compared to 18.5% before displacement. This means that displacement has resulted in a loss of regular income, which is strongly related to decrease in farming activity and other livelihood alternatives. This drastic decline in income indicates that a large number of IDPs are now extremely susceptible to poverty, food insecurity, and aid dependency. This agrees with the results of Gwanshak & Wuyep (2024) who noted that number of people displaced from their ancestral land due to the insecurity has disrupted their agricultural activities hence, leads to disruption of food supply.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	115	49.6
Female	117	50.4
Age		
Less than 20yrs	10	4.3
21-30yrs	58	25.0
31-40yrs	75	32.3
41-50yrs	56	24.1
Above 51yrs	33	14.2
Marital Status		
Single	30	12.9
Married	186	80.2
Widow/Widower	15	6.5
Divorced	1	.4
Religion	232	100
Educational Level		
Primary	41	17.7
Secondary	120	51.7
Tertiary	55	23.7
Non-Formal	16	6.9
Occupation before Displacement		
Farming	206	88.8
Petty Trading	8	3.4
Both	13	5.6
Civil Servant	1	.4
Nothing	4	1.7
Occupation After Displacement		
Farming	160	69.0
Petty Trading	42	18.1
Both	12	5.2
Civil Servant	1	.4
Nothing	17	7.3
Income Level/ Month Before Displacement (#)		
Less than 5,000	43	18.5
6,000-10,000	59	25.4
11,000-15,000	7	3.0
16,000-20,000	28	12.1

21,000 and above	95	40.9
Income Level/ Month After Displacement (#)		
Less than 5,000	177	76.3
6,000-10,000	30	12.9
11,000-15,000	1	.4
16,000-20,000	4	1.7
21,000 and above	20	8.6

4.2 *Housing and Displacement Survey*

The housing characteristics of the respondents is displayed in Table 2. According to the data, the majority of households were moderately large, with 50.9% having 6-9 individuals. Before being displaced, 80% of respondents had their own homes, most of which were compound (82.8%), constructed with mud blocks (43.5%) and mud (34.5%). These houses are mostly roofed with aluminum/zinc roofing sheets (69.0%). The prevalence of compound dwellings reflects the needs of extended or relatively big families, while the usage of traditional materials implies vulnerability to environmental dangers. In order to improve resilience, post-displacement housing solutions should take into account more durable materials, accommodate larger households, and give priority to culturally recognizable dwelling designs. Furthermore, practically all houses (99.6%) were damaged by the militia attack, resulting in a near-complete loss of shelter and personal investments. The majority of IDPs currently live in rented apartments, accounting for 87.1% of all responses.

Table 2: Housing and Displacement Data of Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Household Size		
2-5 persons	59	25.4
6-9 persons	118	50.9
10-14 persons	41	17.7
15 and above	14	6.0
House Ownership Before Displacement		
Rented	135	20.0
Self-Owned	97	80.0
House Type Before Displacement		
Compound	192	82.8
Detached	21	9.1
Semi Detached	13	5.6
Bungalow	5	2.2
Hut	1	.4
Roof Type		
Thatched	56	24.1
Aluminum	160	69.0
Decked/Mud	16	6.9
Material used for Construction		
Mud	80	34.5
Concrete Block	50	21.6
Mud Block	101	43.5
Others	1	.4
House Affected by Crises		
Yes	231	99.6
Partially	1	.4
Places IDPs Lived Presently		
IDP camp shelter	6	2.6
Rented apartment	202	87.1
With relative	18	7.8
Specify others	6	2.6

4.3 Types of Houses Destroyed

Figure 2 shows that residential houses made up 88% of the destroyed structures, followed by farmhouses (4%) and both residential and farm-related structures (8%). This suggests that

dwelling areas were the main target of the banditry attacks, which seriously disrupted social stability, safety, and household shelter. A further impact on livelihoods is suggested by the destruction of farmhouses and mixed-use buildings, especially for those that rely on farming for income or subsistence.




Figure 2: Type of Houses Destroyed

4.4 *Extent of Destruction*

The data in Figure 3 reveals that 81% of the houses were totally destroyed, 15.1% had partial structural damage, and 3.9% only had roof damage. This demonstrates the extreme destruction caused by the attack, which left the majority of households without a place to live. The pictorial evidence presented in Plate 1 further reinforces the extent of the devastation, demonstrating the near-total collapse of residential houses in the affected area.




Figure 3: Type of Destruction **Plate 1:** Showing the extent of Houses Destroyed

4.5 Current Living Condition of IDPs

The majority of IDP households (63%) live in substandard housing, and more than a quarter (27.6%) lack all basic amenities, including water (26.7%), security (23.7%), sufficient space (18.1%), power (3%), and sanitation (0.9%) as shown in Figures 4 and 5. This means that displacement has resulted in acute housing inadequacy and multidimensional deprivation among IDPs, with the majority of households living in hazardous, unhygienic, and undignified conditions. This finding agrees with previous studies that unveiled the living condition in IDPs camps as deplorable, characterized by lack of access to water sources, poor condition of toilet facilities among others (Ekenzie (2022); Oluwatosin & Gang, 2021).




Figure 4: Present Condition of Shelter




Figure 5: Basic Facilities Lacking

IDPs Willingness to Return and Reasons

According to the statistics shown in Figures 6, 97% of the IDPs expressed a strong wish to return voluntarily to their communities of origin. Figure 7 revealed that the primary reasons given by the respondents were ancestral land (40%), farmland (16%), and dissatisfaction with insufficient space (3%), source of livelihood (3%) while 38% chose all factors together demonstrating that the motivation to return is multifaceted. This finding aligns with the World Bank/Joint Data Center Report (2021) which indicates that many IDP in six Northeastern states in Nigeria (major displacement areas) households expressed willingness to return. Additionally, the overwhelming desire of the respondents to return reveals strong cultural, emotional, and economic links to their ancestral home and a need to promote sustainable reintegration, long-term solutions and to prioritize a safe and dignified return, supported by increased security, the reconstruction of damaged homes, the restoration of farmland, and the revitalization of rural livelihoods.




Figure 6: IDPs Return or Relocation Opinion




Figure 7: Reasons for Return

4.6 IDPs Preferred Assistance to Return Home

The data in Figure 8 revealed that the preferred form of assistance among IDPs is reconstruction of their destroyed houses (40%), followed closely by security provision (29%) and repairs (6%). This suggests that the two most important requirements for return are adequate and safe housing and reliable security guarantees. The choice for reconstruction indicates the magnitude of physical destruction caused by displacement and highlights that many households lack the financial and material resources to rebuild on their own. In a similar vein, persistent concerns about new attacks are highlighted by the rising need for security. This implies that without protective measures, housing reconstruction is insufficient on its own. The 25% who chose "all of the above" imply that return is determined by a combination of safe housing, security, and reconstruction support. This finding agrees with the World Bank/Joint Data Center Report (2021), many IDP households expressed conditional willingness to return but reported they needed housing repair/reconstruction, livelihood re-establishment, access to services (health/schools), and security before return.




Figure 8: IDPs Preferred Assistance

5. CONCLUSION

Internally displaced people in Pushit District, Mangu Local Government Area (LGA) have experienced severe housing deprivation, lack of basic amenities, and increased social and economic vulnerability as a result of the banditry/militia attack. Despite these hardships, most of the respondents showed a strong desire to return to their ancestral communities. Their motivations are based on ancestral land, farming, livelihood recovery, and dissatisfaction with present living conditions, which reflect deep cultural and economic ties to their places of origin. Furthermore, the preferred kinds of assistance which includes; rebuilding destroyed houses and providing security underscore that return is primarily dependent on the restoration of safe housing and protection.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the outcomes of this study, which show that safe, voluntary, and dignified return of IDPs is both desired and attainable, as long as focused initiatives fulfill the vital requirements of service delivery, livelihood restoration, housing recovery, and security stabilization. Therefore, the government should employ the services of physical planners to prepare and implement a Comprehensive Reintegration Action Plan for internally displaced people in Pushit District. A reintegrated design approach that combines housing, livelihood, facilities and services, security, and infrastructure into a single resilient community framework. This approach will enhance sustainable solution, strengthen community resilience and reduce the risk of secondary displacement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND) for the award of Institutional Based Research Grant (IBR) to conduct this research.



REFERENCES

- Agbola, T. (1998). *The housing of Nigerians: A review of policy development and implementation in the housing sector* (Research Report No. 14). Development Policy Centre.
- Aribigbola, A. (2008). Improving urban land use planning and management in Nigeria: The case of Akure. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, 3(9), 1–14.
- Asabe, H. M., Mahya, S., Emmanuel, I. N., Ribah, M. M., & Fatai, A. A. (2022). Assessment of the latrine facilities and the health condition in IDP camps in Borno State. *Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports*, 16(8), 33–44.
<https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2022/v16i830490>
- Collado, Z. C. (2020). Determinants of return intentions among internally displaced persons (IDPs) of Marawi City, Philippines. *Development in Practice*, 30(1), 113–124.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2019.1673320>
- Ekezie, W. (2022). Resilience actions of internally displaced persons (IDPs) living in camp-like settings: A Northern Nigeria case study. *Journal of Migration and Health*, 6, 100115.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmh.2022.100115>
- Gwanshak J.Y. & Wuyep S. Z. (2024). A Survey of the Impact of Rural Insecurity-Driven Displacement on Agricultural Practices and Food Security in Plateau State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in all Subjects in Multi Languages*, 12 (10), 1-15.
- IASC. (2010). *Framework on durable solutions for internally displaced persons*. United Nations.

- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) (2019). *Global report on internal displacement 2019*. IDMC/Norwegian Refugee Council.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2017). *IOM framework for addressing internal displacement* (pp. 1–17). www.iom.int
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) 2020. *Reintegration handbook – Module 2: Access to housing and accommodation*.
https://publications.iom.int/system/files/pdf/module_2.pdf
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2021). *Housing, land and property (HLP) rights of internally displaced persons: Guidance note*. IOM.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2022). *IOM cash-based interventions strategy 2022–2026*. IOM Publications.
- International Organization for Migration (IOM) (2023). *Nigeria displacement tracking matrix report, round 43*. <https://dtm.iom.int/nigeria>
- International Organization for Migration. (2024). *Return intention — Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM)*. <https://dtm.iom.int/component/return-intention>
- IOM DTM (Displacement Tracking Matrix) (2024). *DTM Nigeria — Household Intention Survey (April 2024; Plateau State report / August 2024)*. International Organization for Migration. Retrieved from <https://dtm.iom.int>
- Joint Data Center (JDC) on Forced Displacement (2024). *Return and reintegration literature and digest*. <https://www.jointdatacenter.org>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2023). *Report of internally displaced persons in Nigeria (2023)*. National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) (2022). *Situation report on internally displaced persons in Plateau State*. NEMA.
- Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) (2020). *Housing, land and property rights of displaced persons in Nigeria*. NRC Nigeria Programme.
- Olotuah, A. O. (2010). Housing development and environmental degeneration in Nigeria. *The Built & Human Environment Review*, 3, 45–51.
- Oluwatosin, B., & Gang, T. (2021). An assessment of the state of water sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in Heipang Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camp, Plateau State. *Himalayan Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, 2(4), 1–6.
<https://doi.org/10.47310/Hjhcs.2021.v02i04.001>
- Onifade, V., & Osinowo, R. (2019). Living conditions of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in Northern Nigeria. In *Urbanism and Crisis Management in Nigeria* (pp. 369–388). Plateau State Government. (2023). *Official profile of Plateau State local government areas*. Government Press.
- Roberts, R. E., & Lawanson, T. (2023). *Understanding IDPs in Nigerian cities* (Working Paper No. 36).

- Teferra, Z. M. (2012). Return and reintegration of internally displaced persons in post-conflict situations: Right-based approach to peacebuilding. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2180226>
- United Nations (UN) (2017). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (Article 25). United Nations General Assembly.
- United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) (1996). *An urbanizing world: Global report on human settlements*. Oxford University Press.
- UN-Habitat. (2020). *The right to adequate housing: Fact Sheet No. 21/Rev.1*. United Nations Human Rights Office.
- UN-Habitat. (2022). *Housing and urban recovery for conflict-affected populations: Global policy review*. UN-Habitat.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2018). *Global trends: Forced displacement 2018 review*.
<https://www.unhcr.org/uk/statistics/unhcrstats/5d08d7ee7/unhcr-global-trends-2018.htm>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2019). *Global trends: Forced displacement 2019 review*.
<https://www.unhcr.org/uk/statistics/unhcrstats/5ee200e37/unhcr-global-trends-2019.htm>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2020). *Global trends: Forced displacement 2020 review*. <https://www.unhcr.org/flagship-reports/globaltrend>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2022). *Nigeria emergency*.
<https://www.unhcr.org/nigeria-emergency.html>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2023). *Durable solutions for internally displaced persons: A housing and land perspective*. UNHCR.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2023). *Shelter and settlement need assessment guidelines*. UNHCR Emergency Handbook. <https://emergency.unhcr.org>
- World Bank (2021). *Supporting the housing needs of displaced populations: Policy and programmatic guidance note*. World Bank Group.