ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION AND URBAN INTEGRATION DYNAMICS OF INTERNALLY DISPLACED PERSONS CAMPS IN THE FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY, ABUJA, NIGERIA

By

1. Salihu Abdullahi Ekkan, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Nasarawa State University, Keffi. **Corresponding Author's email**: *salihu2401693@nsuk.edu.ng*

2. Nasir Idris Medugu, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Nasarawa State University, Keffi. nasiru@nsuk.edu.ng

3. Dahiru Umar Abubakar, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Nasarawa State University, Keffi. umarad@nsuk.edu.ng

4. Adamu Musa Eya, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Nasarawa State University, Keffi. maeya@nsuk.edu.ng

Abstract

Internal displacement driven by armed conflict, regional insecurity, and generalized displacement drivers has transformed from a transient humanitarian crisis into a structural urban planning challenge in rapidly expanding African metropolises. This study examines the spatial distribution, locational characteristics, and urban integration dynamics of Internally Displaced Persons (IDP) camps within the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, Nigeria. Utilizing a descriptive research design combined with Geographic Information System (GIS) spatial analysis and Global Positioning System (GPS) field mapping, empirical data were gathered across twelve purposively selected IDP settlement sites representing eighteen identified displacement clusters. A sample of 372 household heads was surveyed using Yamane's sample size determination technique. Spatial point analysis reveals a highly skewed distribution pattern, with 66.7% of all IDP camps concentrated within the Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC), while peripheral Area Councils (Gwagwalada, Kuje, Bwari, and Kwali) exhibit lower camp densities. All identified camps operate under informal self-settlement arrangements without formal municipal land allocation or institutional planning oversight. Locational proximity to urban cores ranges from 0.06 km to 17.00 km, with 93.5% of displaced households arriving through self-selection driven by perceived security, social networks, and accessibility to informal economic opportunities. Physical assessments indicate severe infrastructural deficits: 100% of residents inhabit temporary makeshift structures, 83.9% experience acute overcrowding, and over 90% lack basic municipal water, sanitation, and electricity supply. The study demonstrates that protracted displacement (exceeding three years for 90.3% of respondents) has led to the spontaneous evolution of camps into semi-permanent informal settlements. To achieve sustainable urban integration, a spatial planning framework is proposed emphasizing informal settlement upgrading, land tenure regularization, decentralized service delivery across peripheral Area Councils, and the institutionalization of GIS-based spatial monitoring within urban master planning frameworks.

Keywords: Internally displaced persons; **Spatial distribution**; **Urban integration**; **Geographic Information Systems**; A**buja Federal Capital Territory**; **Central Place Theory.**

1.0 Introduction and review of related literature

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

Forced internal displacement represents one of the most severe humanitarian and spatial planning challenges of the twenty-first century. Globally, the total volume of internally displaced persons (IDPs) reached an unprecedented 83.4 million by the end of 2024, representing more than double the figure recorded six years prior (IDMC, 2025). Conflict and displacement drivers account for 73.5 million displaced individuals (88% of the global total), while natural disasters account for 9.9 million (IDMC, 2025; UNHCR, 2024). Africa hosts nearly half of the world's displaced population, with over 35.2 million individuals living in internal displacement across the continent (IDMC, 2023). Nigeria ranks among the nations most significantly affected by internal displacement in Sub-Saharan Africa (World Bank Group, 2016; IDMC, 2024).

In Nigeria, protracted forced migration has been triggered primarily by security conflicts in the North-East region, rural insecurity in the North-West, communal clashes, and climate-induced environmental pressures across the Middle Belt (Mohammed, 2017; UNOCHA, 2023; Innocent, 2022). While early humanitarian responses focused overwhelmingly on primary displacement zones in Borno, Adamawa, and Yobe states, secondary migration streams have increasingly directed displaced populations toward major urban centers, most notably the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja (Adewale et al., 2021; Lauren, 2015). As the administrative and economic hub of the country, Abuja offers relative physical safety, institutional presence, and perceived economic opportunities, making it a primary regional pull center for forced migrants (NEMA, 2022; UNHCR, 2023). However, the influx of over 25,000 displaced individuals into the FCT has resulted in the spontaneous proliferation of informal settlements and unorganized IDP camps across peri-urban fringes (Olanrewaju & Adebayo, 2022; Bitiyong & Sheriff, 2019).

Conceptualizing internal displacement requires distinguishing IDPs from international refugees. According to the United Nations Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, IDPs are defined as persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee their homes or places of habitual residence, particularly as a result of armed conflict, generalized displacement, human rights violations, or natural disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized state border (UNHCR, 2020; IASC, 2024). Unlike refugees, who benefit from established international legal protections, IDPs remain under the nominal jurisdiction of their home sovereign states, frequently resulting in legal ambiguities, protection gaps, and institutional neglect (Mussarat & Sajid, 2017; Durosaro & Ajiboye, 2011). Mooney (2020) stresses that internal displacement must be restricted to movement forced by external crises or threats to life, distinguishing IDPs from economic migrants residing in urban slums.

In urban planning discourse, the management of IDP settlements has traditionally been treated as an emergency humanitarian task involving temporary tent encampments (UNHCR, 2020; Olowu, 2022). However, as displacement becomes protracted, temporary encampments inevitably evolve into semi-permanent informal settlements characterized by spatial exclusion, structural insecurity, and environmental vulnerability (Adewunmi & Dung, 2021; Onifade & Osinowo, 2019). Empirical evidence from international contexts demonstrates that transitioning from traditional segregated camps to integrated urban settlements yields superior socio-economic outcomes. For instance, Uganda's Bidi Bidi settlement model recasts refugee accommodation into a component of regional development by granting land use rights, freedom of movement, and access to host community infrastructure (Berke & Larsen, 2022; Timothy & Larissa, 2022). Similarly, state-level initiatives in Borno

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

State, Nigeria, emphasize durable solutions through planned urban resettlement and social integration into existing municipal structures (Borno State Government, 2025). Furthermore, emergency interventions by the National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons (NCFRMI) in Keffi demonstrate the feasibility of transitioning displaced households into structured settlement cities provided with access roads, schools, markets, and clean water (NCFRMI, 2025).

Despite these emerging models, spatial planning responses in the Federal Capital Territory have remained largely reactive and uncoordinated (Adewale et al., 2021). Previous academic studies on displacement in Nigeria have focused predominantly on socio-economic vulnerability, human rights issues, psychological stress, and humanitarian aid shortfalls (Bolanle & Oluremi, 2024; Ekezie, 2022; Shaibu & Olu-Adeyemi, 2020). There is a critical empirical gap regarding the geospatial analysis of camp locations, spatial clustering patterns, and their structural interaction with the formal urban fabric (IDMC, 2020; Adeola, 2020). Without rigorous spatial data mapping camp coordinates, land availability, and service radii, urban authorities are unable to implement proactive land-use planning, infrastructure upgrading, or sustainable resettlement schemes (Esri, 2021; UN-Habitat, 2020).

To analyze the spatial distribution and urban integration of IDP camps in Abuja, this study synthesizes multiple urban geography and migration theories. Central Place Theory, originally formulated by Walter Christaller (1933/1966), provides a foundational conceptual framework. Christaller posits that human settlements and service provisions are organized in a hierarchical spatial network governed by principles of threshold and range. In the context of the FCT, high-order central places such as the Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC) act as primary service nodes offering security, humanitarian aid, health facilities, and informal markets, thereby attracting high densities of forced migrants (IOM, 2023; Johnston et al., 2000). Displaced populations settle within specific service radii around core urban nodes, while peripheral camps located beyond these radii suffer from severe spatial isolation and service deprivation (Christaller, 1966).

Complementing Central Place Theory, the Spatial Integration Model evaluates the functional alignment, connectivity, and physical accessibility of peripheral settlements relative to the dominant urban structure (Bertolini & Dijst, 2003; UN-Habitat, 2015). Spatial integration assesses whether vulnerable demographic groups are physically connected to transportation networks, municipal utilities, employment centers, and formal land-use schemes, or whether they remain functionally isolated in marginal peripheral zones (UN-Habitat, 2020). Furthermore, Lee's (1966) Push-Pull Theory of Migration elucidates the structural forces driving displacement: push factors such as rural insecurity and conflicts compel outward migration from North-East and North-Central states, while pull factors such as urban infrastructure, relative safety, and NGO presence attract IDPs to Abuja (IOM, 2024; NBS, 2023). Additional theoretical perspectives, including Park and Burgess's (1925) Human Ecology Theory, Hägerstrand's (1968) Spatial Interaction Theory, and Coser's (1957) Conflict Theory, further frame the structural resource competition underlying urban displacement in Nigeria (Adepoju et al., 2022; GRID3, 2023).

2.0 Study area and methods

The Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, is situated in the North-central region of Nigeria, lying between Latitudes 7°25′N and 9°20′N of the Equator and Longitudes 6°45′E and 7°39′E of the Greenwich Meridian. Occupying a total land area of approximately 8,000 km², the FCT is bounded by Kaduna State to the north, Nasarawa State to the east and southeast, Kogi State to the southwest, and Niger State

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

to the west. The territory is administratively divided into six Area Councils: Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC), Abaji, Bwari, Gwagwalada, Kuje, and Kwali. While the Federal Capital City (FCC) lies within AMAC and is administered by the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA), the surrounding satellite towns and rural communities fall under the governance of their respective Area Councils (FCDA, 2001; Abubakar, 2014).

The territory experiences a tropical wet-and-dry climate with annual rainfall ranging between 1,100 mm and 1,600 mm from April to October (Yaya, 2006). Originally planned under the 1979 International Planning Associates (IPA) Master Plan as an ethnically neutral, centrally accessible national capital, rapid demographic growth, exceeding 35% annually in satellite zones, has led to massive informal urbanization, housing deficits, and infrastructure strain (IPA, 1979; World Urbanization Prospects, 2018; NBS, 2018; Abduraman, 2016).

This study adopted a mixed-methods research design combining quantitative descriptive survey methods with Geographic Information System (GIS) spatial point-pattern analysis. Field reconnaissance conducted in collaboration with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) identified eighteen (18) IDP camp locations across the FCT. From this total sampling frame, twelve (12) camps were purposively selected across five Area Councils to capture the structural diversity of displacement settlement patterns: makeshift camp-like sites, self-organized IDP settlements, and host community integrations.

The sampling frame comprised household heads residing across the selected IDP sites. The sample size (n) was computed using Yamane's (1967) statistical formula at a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error:

n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}

Where N represents the total estimated household population across the target camps and e = 0.05. A total sample of 372 structured questionnaires was administered directly to household heads using a multi-stage stratified random sampling technique. Data collection was supplemented by primary field observations, structured checklists adapted from UNHCR camp assessment standards, and key informant interviews with camp leaders and NEMA/FEMA officials.

Spatial data collection involved recording geographic coordinates for all IDP camp locations using Garmin GPS Map 78 handheld receivers and the SW Maps mobile GIS application. Spatial coordinates were compiled in Microsoft Excel and imported into ArcGIS 10.5 software to project spatial point distributions onto the official FCT administrative base map (WGS 1984 UTM Zone 32N datum). Linear distances from each camp to the nearest formal urban center were calculated using spatial proximity tools. Satellite imagery was compiled to visualize camp boundaries and spatial growth patterns. Quantitative socio-economic data were processed using SPSS (Version 23) and analyzed using descriptive statistics, frequency distributions, percentages, and cross-tabulations.

3.0 Results and findings

The demographic and socio-economic composition of the surveyed IDP population provides essential context for interpreting spatial distribution patterns and urban integration vulnerabilities across the Federal Capital Territory. As detailed in Table 1, the sample (N=372) exhibits a male headship representation of 74.2% (n=276) compared to female respondents (25.8%, n=96). The age distribution reveals a predominantly active working-age population: 48.4% of respondents (n=180) are aged 30–39 years, 25.8% (n=96) are aged 18–29 years, 19.4% (n=72) are aged 40–49

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

years, and 6.5% (n=24) are aged 50 years and above. Furthermore, 87.1% (n=324) are married, with 74.2% residing in medium-to-large households containing 4 to 9 members.

Economic indicators highlight extreme financial vulnerability among displaced households. Over half of the respondents (54.8%, n=204) earn an average monthly income below ₦30,000, while 38.7% (n=144) earn between ₦30,000 and ₦50,000, and only 6.5% (n=24) earn above ₦50,000 monthly. Prior to displacement, 71.0% (n=264) were agrarian farmers, 19.4% (n=72) were petty traders, and 9.7% (n=36) were civil servants or formal employees. Educational attainment shows that 51.6% (n=192) have no formal education, while 22.6% completed primary, 16.1% secondary, and 9.7% tertiary education. Geographically, 64.5% (n=240) originated from Borno State, 19.4% (n=72) from Yobe State, 12.9% (n=48) from Adamawa State, and 3.2% (n=12) from Zamfara State.

The displacement history reveals that rural insecurity and armed attacks accounted for 77.4% of forced movements (n=288), followed by generalized armed conflict (12.9%, n=48), regional security crises (6.5%, n=24), and communal clashes (3.2%, n=12). The peak period of displacement occurred between 2015 and 2017 (71.0%, n=264). Crucially, 90.3% of respondents (n=336) have resided in their current IDP camps for more than three years, demonstrating that displacement in Abuja has transitioned from an acute emergency into a protracted, structural urban condition.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the IDPS	Category / Class	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	276	74.2
	Female	96	25.8
Age Group	18–29 years	96	25.8
	30–39 years	180	48.4
	40–49 years	72	19.4
	50 years and above	24	6.5
Marital Status	Single	48	12.9
	Married	324	87.1
Household Size	1–3 members	84	22.6
	4–6 members	144	38.7
	7–9 members	132	35.5
	10 members and above	12	3.2
Average Monthly Income	Less than ₦30,000	204	54.8
	₦30,000–₦50,000	144	38.7
	Above ₦50,000	24	6.5
Educational Attainment	Primary Education	84	22.6
	Secondary Education	60	16.1
	Tertiary Education	36	9.7
	No Formal Education	192	51.6
Pre-Displacement Occupation	Farming	264	71.0
	Petty Trading	72	19.4
	Civil Service / Formal	36	9.7
State of Origin	Borno State	240	64.5
	Yobe State	72	19.4
	Adamawa State	48	12.9
	Zamfara State	12	3.2
Primary Cause of Displacement	Rural Insecurity / Armed Attacks	288	77.4
	Armed Conflict / Insecurity	48	12.9
	Regional Security Crises	24	6.5

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

	Communal Clashes	12	3.2
Duration in Current Camp	1–3 years	36	9.7
	Above 3 years	336	90.3

Geospatial mapping geolocated eighteen (18) IDP camps across the six Area Councils of the FCT, housing an aggregate population of 25,419 displaced individuals across 3,772 households (Abdullahi, 2025). As presented in Table 2, spatial analysis demonstrates an uneven distribution across the territory. Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC) hosts twelve (12) out of eighteen camps (66.7%). Gwagwalada and Kuje Area Councils host two (2) camps each (11.1%), while Bwari and Kwali Area Councils host one (1) camp each (5.6%). Abaji Area Council recorded zero IDP camps.

Population concentrations vary widely across sites. The largest clusters are located within AMAC: Karmajiji (2,740 residents), Waru (2,688 residents), Kabusa (2,380 residents), and Gwoza/Bama in Durumi II (2,226 residents), together accounting for 39.5% of the total FCT IDP population. Intermediate camps include New Kuchingoro (1,502 residents), Wassa (997 residents), Kuchiyako Kuje (987 residents), Old Kuchingoro (782 residents), Pegi Kuje (763 residents), and Orozo (754 residents). Smaller settlements include Kutunku II (711 residents), Kuduru Bwari (504 residents), Kwali (502 residents), EFAB Apo (426 residents), and Old Kutunku (210 residents).

S/N	IDP Camp Name	Location / Community	Area Council	Geographic Coordinates (X, Y UTM 32N)	Camp Population	Distance to Urban Center (km)
1	Abuja IDP Camp	Gidan Daya, Orozo	AMAC	343072.36, 984098.91	754	14.50
2	Gwoza and Bama IDP Camp	Durumi II, Area 1	AMAC	330047.37, 997051.40	2,226	0.06
3	Old Kuchingoro (Gongola)	Old Kuchingoro	AMAC	314234.91, 998598.99	782	15.50
4	New Kuchingoro IDP Camp	New Kuchingoro	AMAC	325542.75, 994677.22	1,502	10.00
5	Karmajiji IDP Camp	Karmajiji, City Gate	AMAC	313130.25, 997498.05	2,740	17.00
6	Guzape IDP Camp	Guzape, Asokoro Ext.	AMAC	333305.48, 1002574.10	661	9.37
7	Durumi I IDP Camp	Durumi I, Area 1	AMAC	330049.99, 997046.86	671	0.06
8	EFAB IDP Camp	Apo Mechanic Village	AMAC	329619.04, 996539.93	426	0.55
9	Kabusa IDP Camp	Kabusa	AMAC	334615.18, 992261.14	2,380	6.52
10	Wassa IDP Camp	Wassa Community	AMAC	328518.61, 996323.41	997	1.88
11	Piwoyi IDP Camp	Piwoyi, Lugbe Axis	AMAC	323356.75, 995173.39	678	3.93
12	Waru IDP Host Community	Waru Community	AMAC	313161.23, 1004134.30	2,688	5.00
13	Kuduru IDP Camp	Kuduru, Bwari	Bwari	322680.14, 1025802.11	504	0.46
14	FCT III IDP Camp	Kutunku II, Gwagwalada	Gwagwalada	286739.58, 997629.53	711	0.40
15	Old Kutunku IDP Camp	Old Kutunku, Gwagwalada	Gwagwalada	286739.58, 997629.53	210	0.40
16	Pegi IDP Camp	Pegi, Kuje	Kuje	305094.60, 981995.52	763	7.00
17	FCT I IDP Camp	Kuchiyako, Kuje	Kuje	305358.87, 982049.56	987	0.16
18	FCT II IDP Camp	Kwali Town	Kwali	304138.39, 956615.20	502	1.52

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

Proximity analysis indicates distances to formal urban cores range from 0.06 km to 17.00 km. High-density camps cluster adjacent to urban cores or arterial transit corridors (Durumi I and II: 0.06 km; Kuchiyako Kuje: 0.16 km; Kutunku II/Old Kutunku: 0.40 km; Kuduru Bwari: 0.46 km; EFAB Apo: 0.55 km). Intermediate camps fall within 1–5 km (Wassa: 1.88 km; Piwoyi: 3.93 km; Waru: 5.00 km). Outer-ring peri-urban camps lie at substantial distances (Pegi Kuje: 7.00 km; Guzape: 9.37 km; New Kuchingoro: 10.00 km; Orozo: 14.50 km; Old Kuchingoro: 15.50 km; Karmajiji: 17.00 km), creating transportation penalties and service isolation.

Area Councils	Number of Camps	Percentage of Total (%)	Dominant Settlement Pattern	Total Council IDP Population
Abuja Municipal (AMAC)	12	66.7	High-Density Urban Peripheral Clustering	17,441
Gwagwalada	2	11.1	Semi-Urban Satellite Integration	921
Kuje	2	11.1	Peri-Urban Dispersed Enclaves	1,750
Bwari	1	5.6	Isolated Sub-Regional Settlement	504
Kwali	1	5.6	Rural Hinterland Fringe	502
Abaji	0	0.0	No Recorded IDP Camps	0
Total FCT	**18**	**100.0**	**Territory-Wide Informal Network**	**25,419**

Institutional governance analysis confirms an absence of state-planned IDP camps. All 18 identified camps operate under informal self-settlement ownership structures (n=372). Survey data show that 93.5% of respondents (n=348) arrived through spontaneous self-selection driven by familial networks and perceived security, while only 6.5% (n=24) settled via formal government referral.

Physical assessments underscore severe infrastructural deprivation across all displacement clusters. As detailed in Table 4, 100% of surveyed households inhabit temporary makeshift structures. Over 90% (n=336) reside in informal squatter settlements, while 9.7% (n=36) occupy uncompleted buildings. Overcrowding is identified as the primary environmental hazard by 83.9% (n=312), solid waste by 12.9% (n=48), and soil erosion/flooding by 3.2% (n=12). Shared pit latrines often exceed 50 persons per drop-hole.

Physical & Infrastructural Indicator	Assessment Parameter / Class	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Shelter Typology	Temporary Makeshift Structure	372	100.0
	Permanent Housing Unit	0	0.0
Nature of Accommodation	Informal Squatter Settlement	336	90.3
	Uncompleted Building Occupation	36	9.7
Perceived Environmental Condition	Clean	12	3.2
	Moderately Clean	252	67.7
	Dirty / Degraded	108	29.0
Dominant Environmental Challenge	Acute Overcrowding	312	83.9
	Poor Waste Disposal & Sanitation	48	12.9
	Soil Erosion & Flooding	12	3.2
Internal Access Road Quality	Good (Paved / Motorable)	84	22.6
	Fair (Unpaved / Passable)	228	61.3
	Poor (Impassable / Severely Gullied)	60	16.1
Public Transport Availability	Inadequate Service	336	90.3
	Completely Unavailable	36	9.7
Basic Service Availability	Potable Pipe-Borne Water Access	12	3.2
	Functional Healthcare Center	12	3.2

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

	Formal Grid Electricity Supply	12	3.2
	Adequate Sanitation / Latrines	48	12.9
	Temporary School Learning Space	288	77.4
Overall Infrastructure Condition	Fair (Strained / Substandard)	252	67.7
	Poor (Dilapidated / Non-Functional)	120	32.3
Resettlement Perception	Favorably Disposed to Relocation Outside FCT	264	71.0
	Prefer Local Integration Within FCT	72	19.4
	Undecided / Uncertain	36	9.7

Basic services are severely limited: pipe-borne water, health clinics, and grid electricity are available to only 3.2% of respondents (n=12), whereas temporary school spaces are accessible to 77.4% (n=288) via NGO interventions. Road conditions are fair (61.3%) to poor (16.1%), with 90.3% citing inadequate transit access. Regarding future relocation, 71.0% (n=264) favor relocation outside the FCT if provided with housing and agricultural land, 19.4% (n=72) prefer local integration within the FCT, and 9.7% (n=36) remain undecided.

Synthesizing these findings demonstrates that camp spatial distribution is driven by five spatial factors: (1) Proximity to Urban Services and Humanitarian Aid, validating Christaller's Central Place Theory (Christaller, 1966; IOM, 2023); (2) Transportation Corridors and Spatial Mobility along major expressways (Hägerstrand, 1968; Rakodi, 2009); (3) Security Buffers in central FCT zones (UNHCR, 2023); (4) Land Availability on vacant public or customary land (Buscher, 2021); and (5) Kinship Chain Migration driving self-selection arrival (Adepoju et al., 2022).

Conclusion and recommendation

This study demonstrates that internal displacement in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, has evolved from a transient emergency into a protracted urban planning challenge. Empirical geospatial mapping reveals a highly concentrated spatial pattern, with 66.7% of camps located within AMAC. Driven by service accessibility, transportation corridors, and social networks, camp distribution validates Christaller's Central Place Theory and the Spatial Integration Model. However, 100% self-settlement informality has resulted in severe overcrowding (83.9%), structural housing deficits, and exclusion from basic municipal utilities. Residing in camps for over three years (90.3% of respondents) has transformed temporary sites into informal slums, threatening the sustainability of Abuja's Master Plan.

To achieve sustainable urban integration, the following ten (10) strategic spatial planning recommendations are proposed for implementation by the Federal Capital Territory Administration (FCTA), Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA), NEMA, NCFRMI, and development partners:

a) Institutionalize Spatial GIS Monitoring: Establish a centralized geospatial geodatabase within the FCT Department of Urban and Regional Planning to monitor camp expansion and land-use changes (Esri, 2021; UN-Habitat, 2023).
b) Strategic Regional Camp Decongestion: Restructure the eighteen informal camps into three (3) planned regional integration sectors provided with municipal services (Abdullahi, 2025).
c) Decentralized Area Council Land Allocation: Implement a decentralized settlement policy distributing future integration housing across Gwagwalada, Kuje, Bwari, and Kwali to relieve pressure on AMAC (Adeola, 2020).

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

d) Master Plan Incorporation: Integrate long-term IDP settlements into official FCT district urban master plans and regional expansion schemes (UN-Habitat, 2024).
e) Participatory In-Situ Upgrading: Execute urban upgrading programs in high-density corridors (Durumi, Karmajiji, Kabusa, Kuchingoro), providing paved roads, drainage, solar power, and waste management (UN-Habitat & UNHCR, 2022).
f) Progressive Land Tenure Regularization: Issue temporary occupancy permits or community land trust instruments to prevent forced evictions and encourage housing investment (UN-Habitat, 2023).
g) Modular Climate-Resilient Housing: Replace makeshift zinc shacks with low-cost, climate-resilient three-bedroom housing units adapted to family sizes (Obayanju, 2021).
h) Municipal WASH and Health Infrastructure Extension: Extend public water networks, sanitary block latrines, and health centers to all hosting zones (Sphere Association, 2018; WHO, 2022).
i) Livelihood and Enterprise Zoning: Establish commercial enterprise zones and artisanal workshops within settlements to support skill retraining and income generation (UN-Habitat, 2024).
j) Multi-Agency Governance Coordination: Formalize an operational governance matrix between FCTA, FCDA, NEMA, NCFRMI, and NGOs to eliminate service fragmentation (IASC, 2015).

References

Abubakar, I., and Yusuf, S. (2024). Livelihood strategies in IDP camps in Nigeria. Journal of Urban Social Policy, 9(1), 23-37.

Abubakar, I. R. (2014). Abuja city profile. Cities, 41, 81-91.

Abduraman, O. (2016). Housing deficit and squatter settlement dynamics in Nigerian satellite towns. African Real Estate Journal, 4(1), 112-128.

Abdullahi, S. E. (2025). Assessment of spatial distribution of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) camps in FCT, Abuja (Unpublished M.Sc. dissertation). Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nigeria.

Adeola, G. L. (2020). Urban displacement and informal settlements in Nigeria: Implications for sustainable urban planning. Journal of Urban Management, 9(3), 245-257.

Adepoju, A., Olanrewaju, F., and Akinyemi, O. (2022). Human ecology and the adaptation of internally displaced persons in Nigeria. Journal of Migration Studies, 14(2), 55-72.

Adewale, A., Sulaiman, J., and Tanko, L. (2021). Informal settlements and urban resilience in Nigeria. Urban Planning Review, 7(4), 118-132.

Adewunmi, O., and Dung, P. (2021). Socio-economic conditions of internally displaced persons in Nigeria. African Journal of Development Studies, 11(2), 65-82.

Berke, T., and Larsen, L. (2022). Using land to promote refugee self-reliance in Uganda. Land, 11(3), 410.

Bertolini, L., and Dijst, M. (2003). Mobility environments and network cities. Journal of Urban Design, 8(1), 27-43.

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

Bitiyong, Z. J. A., and Sheriff, G. I. (2019). The plight of Internally Displaced Persons in unofficial camps in the Federal Capital Territory of Nigeria, Abuja. African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, 2(3), 28-37.

Bolanle, O., and Oluremi, H. A. (2024). Social displacement and camp environment among internally displaced females in Abuja (FCT) IDP camps. Journal of Urban Social Studies, 8(1), 45-62.

Borno State Government. (2025). Borno State strategy for durable solutions to internal displacement. Borno State Government Press.

Buscher, K. (2021). Spatial suitability and land governance in urban fringes. Geoforum, 122, 145-156.

Christaller, W. (1966). Central places in Southern Germany (C. W. Baskin, Trans.). Prentice Hall. (Original work published 1933)

Coser, L. A. (1957). The functions of social interaction. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Durosaro, D. O., and Ajiboye, J. O. (2011). The psychological impact of internal displacement on adolescents. Nigerian Journal of Clinical Psychology, 9(1), 52-65.

Ekezie, W. (2022). Resilience actions of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) living in camp-like settings: A Northern Nigeria case study. BMC Public Health, 22(1), 340.

Esri. (2021). Participatory GIS and community spatial mapping guide. Environmental Systems Research Institute.

Federal Capital Development Authority (FCDA). (2001). Master plan for Abuja the Federal Capital of Nigeria. FCDA.

GRID3. (2023). Nigeria displacement and humanitarian mapping report. Geo-Referenced Infrastructure and Demographic Data for Development.

Hägerstrand, T. (1968). Innovation diffusion as a spatial process. University of Chicago Press.

Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). (2015). Reference module for the implementation of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle. IASC Secretariat.

Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). (2024). Policy on protection of internally displaced persons. IASC Secretariat.

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). (2020). Internal displacement in Nigeria: 2019-2020 overview. IDMC.

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). (2023). Global report on internal displacement 2023. IDMC.

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). (2024). 2024 global displacement figures and trends. IDMC.

Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC). (2025). GRID 2025: Global report on internal displacement. IDMC.

International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2023). Displacement tracking matrix (DTM) Nigeria report 2023. IOM.

International Organization for Migration (IOM). (2024). Displacement tracking matrix: Nigeria round 44 report. IOM.

Innocent, W. I. (2022). Protection challenges of internally displaced persons in Nigeria. Human Rights Journal of West Africa, 4(2), 91-108.

International Planning Associates (IPA). (1979). The Master Plan for Abuja, Federal Capital of Nigeria. FCDA.

Johnston, R. J., Gregory, D., Pratt, G., and Watts, M. (2000). The dictionary of human geography (4th ed.). Blackwell Publishers.

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

Lauren, M. (2015). Displacement dynamics in Nigeria's Federal Capital Territory. Migration and Security Studies, 6(2), 25-39.
Lee, E. S. (1966). A theory of migration. Demography, 3(1), 47-57.
Mohammed, A. (2017). Forced migration and internal displacement in North-Eastern Nigeria. African Security Studies, 26(4), 410-429.
Mooney, E. (2020). The conceptual limits of internal displacement. Refugee Survey Quarterly, 39(1), 14-33.
Mussarat, J., and Sajid, M. (2017). Understanding Internally Displaced Persons and refugees: A comparative view. Asian Journal of Social Sciences, 5(1), 11-22.
National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2018). Demographic statistics bulletin 2018. NBS.
National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). (2023). Nigeria IDP survey report. NBS.
National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons (NCFRMI). (2025). Keffi Resettlement Camp Phase I implementation report. NCFRMI.
National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA). (2022). Internally displaced persons situation report. NEMA.
Obayanju, O. (2021). Integrating displaced persons into urban hosting communities through appropriate housing typology (Unpublished Master's thesis). Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.
Olanrewaju, D., and Adebayo, A. (2022). Growth of informal settlements in Abuja. Nigerian Journal of Urban Studies, 6(1), 34-50.
Olowu, E. E. (2022). Spatial planning and IDP camp design: Planning for emergency settlements in West Africa. Journal of Disaster Risk Studies, 2(3), 66-83.
Onifade, V., and Osinowo, O. (2019). Human security and displacement in Nigeria. African Security Review, 28(2), 133-148.
Park, R. E., and Burgess, E. W. (1925). The city. University of Chicago Press.
Rakodi, C. (2009). Strategic spatial planning in Sub-Saharan Africa. International Development Planning Review, 31(2), 157-174.
Shaibu, M., and Olu-Adeyemi, L. (2020). Humanitarian interventions and internally displaced persons in Nigeria. African Journal of Political Science, 14(1), 77-94.
Sphere Association. (2018). The Sphere handbook: Humanitarian charter and minimum standards in humanitarian response (4th ed.). Sphere Association.
Timothy, B., and Larissa, L. (2022). Uganda's refugee policy as a development model. Refugee Settlement Review, 15(2), 77-95.
UN-Habitat. (2015). Guiding principles for citywide inclusive sanitation. UN-Habitat.
UN-Habitat. (2020). World cities report 2020: The value of sustainable urbanization. UN-Habitat.
UN-Habitat. (2023). Spatial planning guidelines for urban displacement integration. UN-Habitat.
UN-Habitat. (2024). Integrating displaced populations into municipal master plans. UN-Habitat.
UN-Habitat, and UNHCR. (2022). In-situ urban upgrading for displacement-affected communities. UN-Habitat / UNHCR.
UNHCR. (2020). Camp coordination and camp management handbook. UNHCR.
UNHCR. (2023). Nigeria country operational report 2023. UNHCR.
UNHCR. (2024). Nigeria annual results report. UNHCR.
United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA). (2023). Humanitarian needs overview: Nigeria. UNOCHA.

ISSN: 2971-7760 | VOL 10, ISS 1 | 25 NOVEMBER 2026
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24522755
NASARAWA STATE UNIVERSITY, KEFFI, NIGERIA

World Bank Group. (2016). Forcibly displaced: Toward a development approach supporting refugees, the internally displaced, and their hosts. World Bank.

World Health Organization (WHO). (2022). Guidelines for drinking-water quality (4th ed.). WHO.

Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics: An introductory analysis (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.

Yaya, O. (2006). Climate dynamics and environmental factors in the Federal Capital Territory. Journal of Environmental Sciences, 10(2), 45-58.

Generated by AI based on user-provided sources and instructions Terms of Service|Privacy Policy|Learn more