Restoration of power supply to post-conflict communities in Northern Nigeria: Implication for sustainable Reintegration of Returning Migrants
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Abstract: North-East Nigeria is currently emerging from brutal insurgent attacks that lasted for almost a decade since 2009 and has thereby plunged the region deeper into poverty and economic chaos, making it the poorest region in Nigeria. As thousands of displaced people prepare to move back to their rural communities, a large proportion of the predominantly farm-based rural populations are going to grow food crops and live in built-houses for the first time in a decade. The questions that come to mind, among several others are; what is the situation of the villages especially in the area of social infrastructures, particularly electricity? Can restoration of power and building of skill acquisition centre guarantee their sustainable reintegration? Drawing upon several past studies undertaken in post-conflict communities in many other countries, this paper provides empirically-based responses to these questions. Responses from returning migrants which serve as results of the findings in this study show that sustainable reintegration and meaningful rural development cannot be achieved unless power (electricity) is restored to the post-conflict communities where the forced migrants are set to return. This is because it will serve as a catalyst to social and economic development in the post-conflict agrarian communities.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Insurgency and terrorist attacks on civilians and cities are not new to countries ranked low in world terrorism index (WTI) such as Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan in the Middle East and Somalia in Africa (Institute of Economics & Peace, IEP) [1, 2]. However, this infamous
trend spread to sub-Saharan Africa, particularly Nigeria in the early 2000 and has since stayed. Nigeria began to experience insurgency and terrorism when a dreaded group named Boko Haram began attacking civilians, religious establishments and political leaders since year 2002. Boko Haram emerged with two goals: to establish an Islamic Caliphate governed by Sharia Law in northern Nigeria and to eliminate western education which is considered as abeyance to the Islamic precepts [3]. The insurgent group has its operation base in North-eastern zone of Nigeria that comprises six states, namely; Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Taraba and Yobe States. However, three of the six states, Adamawa, Borno and Yobe received deadlier attacks than the other three, accounting for close to 82% of the population of the displaced through Boko Haram insurgency in Nigeria [4, 5].

Since Boko Haram’s activities assumed a deadly dimension particularly from 2009, over 2000 people have been killed in more than 100 attacks in North East Nigeria as well as Abuja [6]. According to United Nations High Commission for Refugees [7], over 68 million people are currently displaced through insurgency and other civil conflicts globally. Poor management of data of the displaced in Africa makes getting an accurate data of forced migrants extremely difficult in the region. However, available statistics shows that Nigeria, Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan have the higher statistics of forced migrants in Africa than any other country in the continent. Nigeria for instance has over 3.3 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) scattered across IDP camps and host communities in northern Nigeria [7, 8]. Another set of reports from humanitarian organizations shows that about 190,000 Nigerian refugees displaced by Boko Haram reside temporarily among our West African neighbours, particularly Cameroon, Niger and Chad [9]. Past studies on insurgency in North-Eastern Nigeria show that as of 2016; over 1.4 million forced migrants are in Borno State alone, with about 20% living in camps and 80% residing in host communities [8; 10]. There are 84 IDP camps in Borno State alone as at 2016 with several thousands of IDPs residing there, 53% of who are women and children and 47% men [9; 11].

Peace has however returned to the region in the last twelve months. The government has therefore asked the displaced persons from North-Eastern region to return to their communities of origin (COO). According to UNHCR and other sources [9, 12; 13], Nigeria government is putting measures in place to ensure their sustainable reintegration to their COO. The Federal government is therefore working with relevant agencies such as National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons (NCRMIDPs), National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) to ensure that this is done effectively. Other international humanitarian agencies joining hands with federal government include United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), International Organisation for Migration (IOM), International Red Cross and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). This partnership is enshrined in Principle 28, Section 1 of the UN Guiding Principles on IDPs which states that the government of a country should fully take care of the welfare of the displaced population within her boarder both in the camp and during reintegration. Any country can however ask international community for assistance if the humanitarian demand is higher than the available supply [13]. Nigeria is not oblivion of this principle, hence, the collaboration with these international bodies to ensure sustainable and dignified reintegration of returning migrants in Nigeria.
The challenge however is that the displaced persons in Nigeria are actually reluctant to return to their COO because of the despicable state of some of those communities. When the insurgency peaked between 2009 and 2016 social infrastructures such as piped water, electricity, telecommunication infrastructures and roads were completely destroyed in North East Nigeria [11]. Moreover, many closed organizations are yet to resume work and medical services are not provided at full capacity especially in the worst-hit states: Borno, Yobe and Adamawa. This is particularly so in gravely affected communities like Gwosa, Chibok, Mubi, communities along Nigeria-Niger Republic boarder, Maiduguri, Biu, Damboa, Bama, Baga, Mafa, Kunduga, Monguno, Benisheikh, Dikwa, Bara, Bayo, Hawul, Shani, Kwaya Kusar districts and Banki. These communities are in various local government areas of Adamawa, Bauchi, Borno, Gombe and Yobe States [9; 14]. In fact, most of these communities have been nicknamed ‘ghost towns’ because they are now a shadow of themselves having been torn to shreds socially and economically; hence the reluctance of some of the forced migrants to return home.

Previous studies from post-conflict communities have shown that the restoration of social infrastructures such as power supply (electricity), water, access roads and telecommunication is pivotal to sustainable reintegration of returning migrants [8; 15; 16; 17; 19; 20]. In the same vein, past studies in areas that have experienced massive environmental disaster like earthquakes and tsunami show that reconstruction of infrastructural facilities, especially restoration of electricity is key to sustainable reintegration of returning migrants [21; 22]. However, studies linking the repair or reconstruction of infrastructural facilities, especially electricity with sustainable reintegration of returning migrants are scanty in Africa as a whole and in Nigeria in particular, to the best of the researchers’ knowledge. IOM [8] defines reintegration sustainability as “the absence of migration after return because the returnee is fully integrated socially and economically in the home community.” This is not to say that re-migration is no more possible for the coming migrants again. For instance, a returning IDP may get job in another country or community after being reintegrated to his or her community of origin. If he or she uses the skill he acquired as part of reintegration packages to get job, then the reintegration is sustainable. It is therefore necessary to ask forced migrants in Nigeria who are set to return to their COO which social infrastructure is likely to aid their sustainable reintegration in their order of priority since stakeholders may not have enough resources to provide all of such resources. This will help the government and other spirited NGOs the infrastructures of highest priority in the face of scarce resources. Results derived may also assist stakeholders and policymakers, particularly the government and humanitarian organisations to formulate a policy framework on which facilities will be given priority for construction or reconstruction in those communities.

This article, however, concentrates more on the effect of restoration of electricity (power supply) to sustainable reintegration of returning migrants. In sustainable development goal (SDG) number eleven, United Nations admonished all nations to build inclusive, safe and sustainable cities and human settlements for their citizens by year 2030. If Nigerian government will pursue this seriously, then returning migrants back to communities with no power supply is not a step in the right direction. Therefore, the main research question in this article is to what extent does restoration of electricity (power supply) in post-conflict communities guarantee sustainable reintegration of returning migrants? This
research also tests a null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the socio-demographic characteristics of returning migrants and supply of electricity as a social infrastructure.

2 DATA AND METHODS

The method used for this study is a research design survey method. Respondents are 928 randomly selected forced migrants, 15 years old and above (male & female) from systematically selected IDPs camps in North-East Nigeria who are set to return to their COO. The forced migrants were asked to rank the four basic social infrastructures: water, electricity, access roads and telecommunication in order of priority on a scale of 1-12 which is likely to aid their sustainable reintegration. Ratings from 1-3 means that the infrastructure is not a priority to their sustainable reintegration while ratings from 4-6, 7-9 and 10-12 mean that such social infrastructures are of low, high and highest priorities to their sustainable reintegration respectively. The essence of this ranking was to attempt a pre-return assessment of social infrastructures which is likely to aid their sustainable reintegration and quick return to normal livelihood on getting to their COO.

Univariate analysis, using frequency table examines the frequency distributions of selected socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents while bivariate analysis examine the relationship between selected background characteristics of the respondents and electricity (power supply) as a social infrastructure through Chi-square analysis. Chi square analysis is a statistical analysis developed by Pearson Chi in the early 19th century and is used to compare the variations between observed data and expected data. Observed data is the data collected from the fieldwork while expected data, otherwise called tabulated data can be called the null hypothesis in a scientific research of this nature. It helps researchers to know if the variation in the data is due to chance or in the variables tested. This analysis adopted 0.05 as the level of significance which gives 95% confident interval on the assurance on decision taken on stated hypothesis. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20 was used for all analyses. Chi-square analysis was used to test the hypotheses for this study and the description is given by is given by:

\[ \chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{(O_i - E_i)^2}{E_i} \]  

(1)

Where \( \chi^2 \) represent chi-square symbol, \( \sum = \) sum of observations, \( O_i = \) observed frequency for measurement i which is the data actually collected and \( E_i = \) is the expected (theoretical) frequency for measurement i which in this case is calculated from chi-square distribution table and asserted by the null hypothesis.

To accept or reject any null hypothesis in research using chi-square analysis, two terms are important. The first is the degree of freedom and the second is the critical value. Since the whole idea is to check whether to accept or reject the null hypothesis, it is necessary to check whether the critical value has been exceeded or otherwise. For the degree of freedom, since two outcomes are being compared, there must be at least two outcomes. Therefore, degree of freedom is summation of all observations minus one. The implicit function of the hypothesis for this study is;
SDC = \( f (I) \) \hspace{2cm} (2)

Where, SDC is the vector for the socio-demographic characteristics and I is the vector of infrastructures. The SDC are specified as \(( \text{SOO, CT, AC, Sex, LOE, R, MS, OBD, DIC} \) meaning; State of Origin, Community Type, Sex, Age Category, Level of Education, Religion, Marital Status, Occupation Before Displacement and Duration in the Camp. For Vector I which considers the place of the four basic infrastructures: Water, Electricity, Telecommunication and Access Roads on sustainable reintegration, it is specified as

\[ I = (W, E, T, AR) \] \hspace{2cm} (3)

The null hypothesis \(( H_0 )\) of this article as stated in the introduction again states that there is no significant relationship between the socio-demographic characteristics of the returning migrants in North-Eastern Nigeria and restoration of electricity as an infrastructure towards their sustainable reintegration. To accept or reject this null hypothesis, the following steps were taken

i. A Chi-square table was created as follows;

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{Background Variables} & \text{Restoration of Electricity as an Infrastructure} & \text{Accept or Reject Null Hypothesis} \\
\hline
\text{Observed Value} & 1438.204 & \text{Reject Null Hypothesis} \\
\text{Expected Value} & 19.68 & \\
\text{Degree of freedom} & \text{DF}(c-1)+(r-1) = (4-1)+(9-1) = 3+ 8 = 11 & \\
\end{array}
\]

ii. Observed value was calculated from the field data using cross-tabs and Chi-square analysis.

iii. Expected value was calculated using Chi-square distribution table

To know the expected chi-square value, degree of freedom (DF) was determined from where critical value was looked up in the chi-square distribution table. DF is given by formula \((c-1) + (r-1)\) which mean total number of variables in the column minus one plus total number of variables in the row minus one. The column according to Table 1 contains the infrastructures which are four in number while the row contains the background variables which is nine (9) of them as earlier specified. Applying the DF formula, this gives a total value of eleven (11) as calculated in the chi-square table above. To get the expected chi-square value, the DF which is 11 will be looked up under a critical value of 0.05 from the chi-square statistic distribution table which equals 19.68. The above null hypothesis was rejected since the expected value of 19.68 is significantly less than the analyzed observed value from the fieldwork. Note that the observed value was the cumulative of all Chi-square values calculated for relationship between each SDC and supply of electricity as a social infrastructure.
3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Distribution of selected Socio-demographic Characteristics of Respondents

After the field work, 866 questionnaires were retrieved and used for the study. As shown in Table 2, majority (73.6%) of the returning migrants in Nigeria are from Borno State, while 4.5% and 21.9% are from Adamawa and Yobe States respectively. Inquiry into the kind of community where they lived before being displaced reveals that most (71.8%) of the returning migrants were actually from rural agrarian communities. While about 13% of them were displaced from urban communities, 15.2% of them came from semi-urban communities. Inquiries into their age categories show that 19.9% of the returning migrants belong to 15-24 years age cohort, 38.5% are between 25-34 years old, 25.4% are between 34-44 years, 11.3% are between 45-54 years and 5% are 55 years & above. Results about their sex distribution show that 30.4% of the returning migrants are female while 69.6% of them are male. Results about the educational status of the respondents show that more than half (65.1%) of them do not have formal education. Those who have primary education were 16.7% of the respondents while 3.0%, 12.1% and 3.0% have nomadic primary education, secondary education and tertiary education respectively. As for their religious attachment, majorities (93.1%) of the returning migrants in North-East Nigeria are Muslims, 6.4% are Christians and 0.5% of them are traditional worshippers. An inquiry into their marital status shows that 15.4% of the returning migrants are single while 71.4% are married. It was also discovered that 4.2% of them are divorced while 7.4 are widowed. Questions were also asked about their occupation before being displaced and more than half (55.3%) of the respondents were into farming while only 8.4% were civil servants. Those who were into trading/business before being displaced were 13.3% and 8% were artisans. Those who were self-employed were 4.7% while ‘other’ and those who ticked not applicable (probably those who were not working at all) were 1.8%. Finally, inquiry into duration spent so far in camp shows that 3.7% of them have spent a year in the camp and 20.2% have spent two years in the camp. Lastly, those who have spent three years and those who have spent four years & above in the camp were 41.8% and 34.3% of the returning migrants respectively.
| Selected Socio-demographic Characteristics | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| **State of Origin**                       |           |                |
| Borno State                               | 637       | 73.6           |
| Adamawa State                             | 39        | 4.5            |
| Yobe State                                | 190       | 21.9           |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
| **Community Type**                        |           |                |
| Rural                                     | 622       | 71.8           |
| Semi urban                                | 132       | 15.2           |
| Urban                                     | 112       | 12.9           |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
| **Age Category**                          |           |                |
| 15-24                                     | 172       | 19.9           |
| 25-34                                     | 333       | 38.5           |
| 35-44                                     | 220       | 25.4           |
| 45-54                                     | 98        | 11.3           |
| 55 & above                                | 43        | 5.0            |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
| **Sex**                                   |           |                |
| Female                                    | 263       | 30.4           |
| Male                                      | 603       | 69.6           |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
| **Level of Education**                    |           |                |
| No formal education                       | 564       | 65.1           |
| Primary education                         | 145       | 16.7           |
| Nomadic primary education                 | 26        | 3.0            |
| Secondary education                       | 105       | 12.1           |
| Tertiary education                        | 26        | 3.0            |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
| **Religion**                              |           |                |
| Christianity                              | 55        | 6.4            |
| Islam                                     | 806       | 93.1           |
| Traditional religion                      | 4         | .5             |
| Others                                    | 1         | .1             |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
| **Marital Status**                        |           |                |
| Single                                    | 133       | 15.4           |
| Married                                   | 618       | 71.4           |
| Divorced                                  | 36        | 4.2            |
| Widowed                                   | 64        | 7.4            |
| Never Married                             | 15        | 1.7            |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
| **Occupation Before Displacement**        |           |                |
| Farming                                   | 479       | 55.3           |
| Civil Service                             | 73        | 8.4            |
| Trading/Business                          | 115       | 13.3           |
| Artisan                                   | 69        | 8.0            |
| Self-employed                             | 41        | 4.7            |
| Others                                    | 73        | 8.4            |
| Not applicable                            | 16        | 1.8            |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
| **Duration in the Camp**                  |           |                |
| 1 Year                                    | 32        | 3.7            |
| 2 Years                                   | 175       | 20.2           |
| 3 Years                                   | 362       | 41.8           |
| 4 Years & Above                           | 297       | 34.3           |
| **Total**                                 | 866       | 100.0          |
3.2 Social Infrastructures Facilitating Sustainable Reintegration of Returning Migrants

Social infrastructures are resources provided by the government of any nation to make life easy for her citizens. In a post-conflict situation such as the one upon which this article was based, many times, such infrastructures are destroyed or razed down. That was what exactly happened in the case of North East Nigeria. Many of the former bubbling communities are now a shadow of themselves (see Figure 4). There has been power outage in some of such communities for years now because transformers and electric wires were vandalized and water pipes were busted for those that had pipe born water prior to the heat of Boko Haram insurgency in North East Nigeria. The researcher is not oblivion of this fact and so the returning migrants were asked to rank the infrastructures that are likely to aid their sustainable reintegration back to their communities of origin according to priority. Four basic infrastructures, namely; water, electricity, telecommunication and roads were identified and presented to them for the ranking. The results of their responses are presented in Table 3 and Figure 1 respectively.

| Infrastructural Needs | No Priority | Low Priority | High Priority | Highest Priority | Total |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|-------|
|                       | Freq. (%)   | Freq. (%)    | Freq. (%)     | Freq. (%)        |       |
| Water System          | 30 3.5      | 8 0.9        | 777 89.7      | 866 100          |       |
| Electricity           | 35 4.0      | 35 4.0       | 620 71.6      | 866 100          |       |
| Telecommunication     | 40 4.6      | 62 7.2       | 669 77.3      | 866 100          |       |
| System                | 34 3.9      | 37 4.3       | 684 79.0      | 866 100          |       |

Source: Researcher Field Survey, 2019

It is important to state that only discussion on electricity will be attempted here since that is the focus of this article. About 72% of the returning migrants said that restoration of electricity is of utmost priority to the sustainability of their return while 30.3% also confirmed that restoration of electricity is of high priority to their sustainable reintegration. Cumulatively therefore, about 92% of the returning migrants would want electricity to be restored into their communities before they can desire to return and for their return to be sustainable. Only 4.0% of them said electricity is not a priority to their return.

![Figure 1: Ranking of Social Infrastructures based on Priority by Returning Migrants](image-url)
Authors are not in any way surprised that electricity was ranked that high among the returning migrants giving its importance, especially at night in such a rural region of Nigeria. According to Boyce [23], the use of light (electricity) at night brings benefits such as greater safety for pedestrians and drivers, reduced fear of crime, more use of outdoor facilities after dark, enhanced economic growth and creation of built and natural environments that are a source of beauty and entertainment (Figure 2). This implies that light at night offers some internal and intuitive motivation for which residents of any community may not be willing to sacrifice.

Figure 2: Illumination at Blackpool @ Night
Source: Boyce, 2019 (p. 363)

Although authors agree that nowhere in North-East Nigeria is as developed as Blackpool City, as drawn in Figure 2, the general consensus however is that the agrarian society still requires power supply if not for illumination but for other domestic use and storage of farm produce. Besides, most attacks from the insurgents prior to being displaced took place in the night when everywhere was dark. The effect might not be a severe if everywhere was illuminated with beaming light because people would have been able to either protect themselves or at least escape.

3.3 Suggested Social Infrastructures Facilitating Sustainable Reintegration of Migrants
The social needs ranked above were generated from extensive review of the literature particularly from post-conflict areas where migrants have been reintegrated [8; 15; 16; 17; 18; 19; 22]. Researchers were therefore asked to suggest any other social infrastructure left out among those presented to them for ranking but may make their reintegration sustainable. This gave rise to Table 4 and Figure 2. Apart from those (37.5%) who said that all necessary infrastructures have been mentioned and there is therefore no need for any other
infrastructure, all others mentioned were almost a repetition of what was available in Table 2 except one. The one that was not listed is the building of entrepreneurship centres across the communities where 11.7% of the respondents said it is of utmost importance to the sustainability of their return. This is not surprising because the returning migrants were trained to acquire some skills when they were in camp. Authors are of the opinion that this might have instilled the desire for more of entrepreneurship training in them, hence the desire for a skill acquisition centre.

Table 4 Suggested Infrastructural Needs that may Sustainable Reintegration

| S/N | Suggested Infrastructural Needs                                      | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1   | Reconstruction of roads and drainages                                | 215       | 24.8           |
| 2   | Provision of clean water and electricity                            | 150       | 17.3           |
| 3   | Build Entrepreneurship/Skill Acquisition Centres                    | 101       | 11.7           |
| 4   | Opening of markets, schools and health centres                      | 75        | 8.7            |
| 5   | Nil- Core infrastructural needs have been mentioned                  | 325       | 37.5           |
| **Total** |                                                                         | **866**   | **100.0**      |

Source: Researcher’s Field survey, 2019

Even if this skill acquisition centre is to be provided by policymakers or other stakeholders, there is still the need for electricity to get it functioning particularly for the equipment that will be bought with huge investment. There is almost no social or economic structure or institutions that can function effectively in this 21st century without adequate supply of power. In a similar but very interesting study, Maconachie & Binns [24] found that the livelihood of formerly displaced persons who just returned to their rural communities in Sierra Leone after over a decade of a nasty and economic-debilitating civil war depends on coal mining. However, power supply is needed to mine the resource. Experience, Geography and reality have combined to show that raw materials are mostly found in rural communities. Unfortunately, the raw materials have almost become a source of curses to some of such communities because of brutal civil war, insurgency or terrorism mostly caused by fight over the raw material itself. All these have combined to affect power supply for optimum mining of raw minerals especially in sub-Saharan Africa with diverse implications on rural economic and social recovery especially in post-conflict situation. In the case of Sierra Leone mentioned here, economic and social rejuvenation of such post-conflict rural communities is a mirage unless power is quickly restored for the mining of the coal upon which the rural life of Sierra Leone depends.
4 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN ELECTRICITY (POWER SUPPLY) AS A SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SELECTED SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RETURNING MIGRANTS

To determine if there is significant relationship between the selected socio-demographic characteristics of the returning migrants and electricity (power supply) as a social infrastructure, bivariate relationships were sought through cross tabulations and Chi-square analysis to establish that. For state of origin, results show that only about 26% of the respondents from Borno State do not see electricity (E) as a priority while about 95.2% of them said it of highest priority to their sustainable reintegration (SR). In Yobe State, 8.6% of them said E is not a priority to their SR while cumulatively, 77.8% said it of highest priority to their SR. In Adamawa State however, far more respondents (65.7%) said that E is not their priority as compared to those who said it is important (2.9) to their SR. The reason for this may be partly because most displaced persons in Adamawa State did not have their communities vandalized like it happened in the other two states where villages were completely razed down and all sources of power completely cut-off. There is also a significant relationship between E and state of origin of the respondents ($X^2 = 683.1263; p<0.001$). About 23% of respondents from rural areas said that E is not a priority while majority (87.1%) of said it of highest priority to their SR. More than 65% of those who live in semi-urban areas said E is not important to their sustainable reintegration perhaps because they do not have their sources of power cut off during the peak of the insurgency and 45.1% of those who reside in urban areas also said E is of utmost importance to their sustainable reintegration. There is also a significant relationship between E and community type of respondents ($X^2 = 320.167; p<0.001$). As for their age categories, about 20% of those between the ages of 12 and 24 years said E is of highest priority to their sustainable reintegration. For those in age cohort 25-34 years of age, 65.7% of them said that E is not a priority to their SR while 38.5% of them said it is of highest priority. Other age groups, 35-
44 years, 45-54 years and 55 years & above ranked E as 25.4%, 12.3.9% and 6.5% respectively as a top priority to their sustainable reintegration. The reasons for this shocking results lies in the fact that there are things these returning villagers according to our focus group discussions with them which they rank higher than electricity. Among such are human security, water supply and financial provision for start-up capital [26].

As for education, about 23% of those without any formal education said that E is not a priority to their SR. For those with primary and nomadic primary education, 16.8% and 2.7% of them respectively said that E is of utmost priority while 3.4% of those with tertiary education also affirm same. This result is also shocking but as earlier stated; these returning migrants placed water provision and human security in their quest for SR among power supply. Besides, majority of them are agrarian illiterates who may not really appreciate the direct and indirect importance of power supply. Relationship between occupation before displacement and electricity supply was also sought. Results show that 59.4% of the returning migrants who were farmers prior to being displaced opined that restoration of electricity to their communities is of highest priority to their SR. Shockingly once again, 60% of civil servants said that power restoration is not their priority. These are perhaps high thinkers who rate their security above power supply. Finally, relationships between how long displaced persons have stayed in the camp and desire for electricity (E) as they prepare to return to their communities were also sought and the results as presented in Table 5 shows that those who have stayed in the camp for three years desire restoration of electricity in their communities than other people. This is because about 48% of them affirm that power restoration is of utmost priority to their SR compared to about 29% of those who have stayed in the camp for four years and above.

| Variable | Electricity (Power Supply) | Chi Square | P-value |
|----------|-----------------------------|------------|---------|
|          | No Priority | Low Priority | High Priority | Highest Priority |
| State of Origin |                  |            |            |                  |
| Borno    | 9(25.7) | 12(34.3) | 49(27.8) | 567(91.5) |
| Adamawa  | 23(65.7) | 3(8.6) | 2(1.1) | 11(1.8) |
| Yobe     | 3(8.6) | 20(57.1) | 125(71.0) | 42(6.8) |

| Community Type | Electricity (Power Supply) | Chi Square | P-value |
|----------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------|
| Rural          | 8(22.9) | 11(31.4) | 63(35.8) | 54(87.1) |
| Semi-urban     | 23(65.7) | 17(48.6) | 42(23.9) | 50(8.1) |
| Urban          | 4(11.4) | 7(20.0) | 71(40.3) | 30(4.8) |

| Occupation | Electricity (Power Supply) | Chi Square | P-value |
|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------|
| Farming    | 5(14.3) | 24(68.6) | 82(46.6) | 368(59.4) |
| Civil Servant | 21(60.0) | 1(2.9) | 3(1.7) | 48(7.7) |
| Trading/Business | 1(2.9) | 3(8.6) | 26(14.8) | 85(13.7) |
| Self-employed | 4(11.4) | 6(17.1) | 15(8.5) | 16(2.6) |
| Others     | 1(2.9) | 0(0.0) | 16(9.1) | 16(2.6) |

| Age Group | Electricity (Power Supply) | Chi Square | P-value |
|-----------|-----------------------------|------------|---------|
| 15-24 years | 2(5.7) | 2(5.7) | 29(16.5) | 56(9.0) |
| 25-34 years | 23(65.7) | 18(51.4) | 77(43.8) | 333(38.5) |
The null hypothesis of this article which states that there is no significant relationship between electricity (power supply) and the socio-demographic characteristics of the returning migrants is therefore rejected because the expected value of 19.68 is significantly less than the observed value, 1438.204 which is the cumulative Chi-square value of the relationship between electricity (power supply) and all the six selected socio-demographic characteristics.

**Figure 4: Rebuilding North-East Nigeria: What’s the Place of Electricity after Water?**

Source: Google picture accessed March 2, 2019 @ https://www.google.com.ng/search?hl=north-eastern+nigeria&oq=north+eastern+nigeria&gs_l=img.1.0.0j0i24.3980.11940.347.4236.0j13j6j2
5 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There are three basic findings among several others in this empirical article. One, the cumulative rating of approximately 92% for restoration of electricity (power supply) for their return to be sustainable goes to show how important electricity is for returning migrants. Two, returning migrants shockingly require that skill acquisition centres should be built in their communities for their return to be sustainable. This finding is shocking in the sense that authors feel that they are peasant farmers who may not know much about skill acquisition. However, authors later found that they were trained on various skill acquisition scheme based on choice when they were in camp. Finally, results from this study show that there is significant relationship between electricity and selected socio-demographic characteristics of the returning migrants in North-East Nigeria which goes to underscore the importance of power supply to the economic development of rural dwellers.

Evidences have emerged both in developed countries (Germany, France) and developing countries (Sierra Leone, Nigeria) that insurgency or recurrent crises in mineral-rich or fertile agricultural rural land is not uncommon [24, 25]. Unfortunately, economic and social potentials of such rural communities may not be reached unless insurgency or recurrent crises are nipped in the bud. In view of this and other results found in this study, the following recommendations are offered

✓ Policymakers must therefore take decisive steps towards ensuring lasting peace in rural communities so that returning migrants can settle down and earn their livelihood through productive engagements. For instance, evidence from Hambach mine, the largest opencast lignite coal in the world suggest that corporate social responsibility such as securing the support of political leaders at the local settings, involvement in social events, infrastructural projects of which rural electrification is key, among several others is the way to ward-off local terrorists operation from the mine [25]. In a similar fashion, policymakers in Northern Nigeria should partner with local political leaders especially in rural communities in the aforementioned programs as it was done in rural Germany so that insurgency can be kept at bay for continuous economic recovery of the area. One of such important rural project as found in this study is the building of skill acquisition centres.

✓ Electricity must of necessity be supplied in rural communities either before or shortly after returning migrants back home.

This study concludes by stating that returning migrants to communities without power supply is to prepare them for re-displacement through attacks. This is because Boko Haram insurgents who caused their displacement in the first place love to attack in the night or vey early in the morning when everywhere is still dark. If there is light everywhere, it may not be easy for them to carry out some operations successfully.
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