

STATE AND NGO HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTIONS IN FLOOD MANAGEMENT: EVIDENCE FROM THE 2025 FLOODS IN ADAMAWA STATE

Muhammad Ahmad Usman¹, Rogers Roland Wazakari² and Yusuf Shamsudeen³

^{1,3}Department of Public Administration, Federal Polytechnic, Mubi

²Department of Political Science, Bayero University Kano, Kano State-Nigeria

uamohammad2006@gmail.com, rogersrolandwazakari@gmail.com,

Yusufshamsuddeen1@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Flooding remains one of the most recurrent and destructive natural disasters in Nigeria, with Adamawa State particularly vulnerable due to its topography and reliance on rain-fed agriculture. The 2025 floods displaced thousands, destroyed farmlands, and heightened risks of hunger and disease, exposing the limitations of state response mechanisms. This study assessed the humanitarian interventions of the Adamawa State government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as UNICEF, ActionAid, and the Nigerian Red Cross during the 2025 floods. Guided by Governance Theory, which emphasizes collaboration, accountability, and participation among state and non-state actors, the study employed a survey design. Data were collected from 320 flood victims through questionnaires and supplemented with interviews from key informants in NEMA, SEMA, and NGOs. Quantitative data were analysed using percentages and standard deviation, while qualitative responses were thematically analysed. Findings revealed that both state and NGO interventions were dominated by food and clothing distribution, though gaps existed in medical support and long-term recovery measures. While 69% of respondents affirmed positive impacts of interventions, challenges such as inadequate funding, weak synergy, diversion of relief materials, and political interference undermined effectiveness. The study recommended stronger collaboration between state and NGOs, involvement of traditional and religious institutions, and enhanced monitoring, funding, and early warning systems. The study concludes that sustainable and coordinated humanitarian governance is essential for building community resilience against recurrent flooding in Adamawa State.

Keywords: Flood disaster, Humanitarian intervention, NGOs, Governance theory, Adamawa State

Introduction

Flooding remains one of the most recurring and devastating natural disasters globally, disrupting the normal functioning of societies and threatening sustainable development. The intensifying effects of climate change, global warming, and weak environmental management policies, particularly in developing countries, have made floods increasingly destructive and more frequent (Igudaladan & Saulawa, 2021; Adelekan & Asiyambi, 2015; Echendu, 2020). The impacts are multifaceted ranging from the loss of lives and livelihoods to environmental degradation and

severe disruptions to social and economic development (Amangabara & Obenade, 2015). These disasters also impede the attainment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by undermining food security, health, and poverty reduction efforts (Igudaladan & Saulawa, 2021). Over the past four decades, the increasing frequency and intensity of floods have led to massive destruction of infrastructure, farmlands, and settlements across Nigeria. This has worsened environmental degradation and posed serious threats to human security and food production (Adedeji, Odufuwa & Adebayo, 2012; Danjibo, Adeoje & Ojo, 2021). Nigeria records some of the highest flood-related casualties in West Africa, with the northern states such as Adamawa, Jigawa, and Kano—consistently among the worst affected (African Research Bulletin, 2010). Population growth, unplanned urbanization, and poor drainage systems have further increased the vulnerability of communities, particularly those along riverbanks and low-lying areas.

In recent years, Adamawa State has faced recurring flood disasters with devastating humanitarian consequences. The state's geographical position along the Benue River Basin makes it highly prone to seasonal flooding, especially during heavy rainfall and water releases from upstream dams. The 2025 flood disaster was among the most severe in recent history, submerging farmlands, destroying homes, and displacing thousands of households across local government areas such as Yola North, Yola South, Numan, Lamurde, and Demsa. Beyond physical destruction, the floods heightened the risk of hunger, disease outbreaks, and loss of livelihoods, deepening the humanitarian crisis in the state.

While the Adamawa State Government bears primary responsibility for disaster response, the growing scale and complexity of humanitarian needs have necessitated stronger partnerships with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and international donor agencies. Organizations such as UNICEF, ActionAid, and the Nigerian Red Cross Society have played vital roles in providing emergency relief, healthcare services, and livelihood recovery support to affected populations. These collaborative efforts highlight the evolving role of NGOs as complementary actors in humanitarian response, particularly where government capacity is limited (Momoh, 2018).

Therefore, this study focuses on examining the nature, scope, and effectiveness of humanitarian interventions implemented by the Adamawa State Government in partnership with NGOs to support flood victims. It seeks to assess how these interventions addressed the immediate and long-term needs of affected communities, the challenges encountered in implementation, and the overall impact on disaster resilience and recovery in Adamawa State.

Statement of the Problem

Flooding has become one of the most recurrent and destructive natural disasters in Nigeria, with devastating impacts on lives, livelihoods, and infrastructure. The increasing effects of climate change, global warming, and weak environmental governance have made floods more frequent and severe in recent years (Echendu, 2020; Igudaladan & Saulawa, 2021). In the northern region, Adamawa State is particularly vulnerable due to its topography, poor drainage systems, and

dependence on rain-fed agriculture. The 2025 flood disaster in the state displaced thousands of households, destroyed farmlands, and heightened risks of hunger, poverty, and disease outbreaks, leaving victims in dire need of humanitarian assistance.

Although the Adamawa State government has institutions such as the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) working in collaboration with the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), their capacity to respond effectively to large-scale flood disasters remains limited (Nnadi, Ezeani, & Nnadi, 2020). Frequent challenges include inadequate funding, lack of preparedness, diversion of relief materials, and weak coordination mechanisms (Orji, 2018). These gaps have necessitated the increasing involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as UNICEF, ActionAid, and the Nigerian Red Cross, which complement state interventions through the provision of food items, temporary shelters, medical care, and livelihood support (Momoh, 2018).

Despite efforts by state institutions and NGOs, many communities in Adamawa State still face unmet needs due to duplication, weak coordination, and poor monitoring of interventions. Responses are largely reactive, with little focus on disaster prevention or long-term recovery. Hence, an empirical study is required to evaluate the effectiveness of state and NGO interventions during the 2025 floods, identify gaps, and strengthen community resilience.

Research Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

- i To examine the types, scope, and impact of humanitarian interventions provided by the Adamawa State government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to victims of the 2025 flood disaster.
- ii To identify the challenges and gaps in the collaboration between state agencies and NGOs in delivering humanitarian assistance during the 2025 floods in Adamawa State.

Literature Review

Conceptual Clarification

Humanitarian Intervention

The scope of humanitarian intervention has broadened significantly over the past century, becoming increasingly complex and difficult to define in operational terms (Thompson, 2015; Macfarlane & Weiss, 2000). Bassey and Effiong (2022) describe it as the deliberate provision of aid aimed at saving lives, alleviating suffering, and restoring dignity during disasters and large-scale emergencies. Such assistance may take the form of potable water, food, shelter, medical services, rehabilitation projects, and human rights advocacy, and in some conflict situations, even extend to military interventions (Thompson, 2015; Momoh, 2018).

Macfarlane and Weiss (2000) further stress that humanitarian intervention is not limited to material support; it may include military or civil protection of vulnerable populations and initiatives

designed to restore communities to their pre-disaster state. Measures to safeguard life and property, promote adaptation, and foster environmental protection are also encompassed within the concept (Igudaladan & Saulawa, 2021; Momoh, 2018). Importantly, international humanitarian law, including the 1907 Hague and 1949 Geneva Conventions, requires that interventions be impartial, neutral, and independent, without discrimination on the basis of gender, race, creed, or politics (Momoh, 2018; Macfarlane & Weiss, 2000). In essence, humanitarian intervention reflects both state and NGO efforts to provide immediate relief such as food, clothing, water, and shelter to disaster victims who lack the means of survival (Bassey & Effiong, 2022).

Flood

Flooding is a recurring natural disaster, influenced by both environmental conditions and human activities (Danjibo, Adeoje, & Ojo, 2019). It is defined as a sudden event that overwhelms communities, leading to human, material, and environmental losses beyond local coping capacity (Igudaladan & Saulawa, 2021). According to Ijigah and Akinyemi (2015), flooding occurs when excessive water temporarily covers normally dry land, often resulting in serious damage to lives, property, and infrastructure. Similarly, Cirella and Iyalomhe (2018) note that flooding happens when natural or artificial water channels are overtopped. While excess water is not inherently problematic, its negative interaction with human and natural systems can result in destruction, death, and ecological disruption (Hamidu, 2014; Ijigah & Akinyemi, 2015). Rising global temperatures, glacier melt, sea-level rise, dam failures, and extreme rainfall events are key drivers, often leading to environmental degradation, livelihood losses, and in some cases, fatalities (Olanrewaju, Chitakira, Olanrewaju, & Louw, 2019; Rock, Nwankwor, Ahirakwem, & Alieze, 2016).

Flood Disaster in Nigeria and Humanitarian Interventions

Flooding in Nigeria remains one of the most destructive hazards, with the 2012 flood displacing 2.3 million people, killing 363, and reversing years of development gains (Echendu, 2020). Beyond physical destruction, floods inflict psychological stress, poverty, and disease outbreaks, with as much as 20% of the population estimated to be at risk (Adedeji, Odufuwa, & Adebayo, 2012; Rock et al., 2016). Displaced persons often live in overcrowded and unhygienic camps, where basic livelihood opportunities are lacking (Amangabara & Obenade, 2015).

In response, the Nigerian government has established policies and agencies such as the National Erosion and Flood Control Policy (NEFCP) and the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA). However, studies reveal that these institutions are often reactive, underfunded, and poorly coordinated, with rescue operations delayed and recovery efforts undermined by the absence of a national flood risk management strategy (Jeb & Aggarwal, 2008; Echendu, 2020; Cirella & Iyalomhe, 2018).

Role of the State and NGOs

In states like Adamawa recurrent flooding has eroded confidence in government-led humanitarian response, creating space for NGOs such as ActionAid, UNICEF, and the Nigerian Red Cross to play complementary roles. These organizations provide food, shelter, medical care, and other forms of relief. However, many institutions still lack adequate understanding of flood dynamics, preparedness, and the specific needs of victims (Danjibo, Adeoye, & Ojo, 2018). Response to emergencies is often slow, with poor coordination among state agencies, weak grassroots structures, and political interference (Olanrewaju et al., 2019; Echendu, 2020).

Moreover, state interventions are frequently inadequate, with relief distribution sometimes marred by corruption, diversion of aid, and provision of inappropriate materials (Nnadi, Ezeani, & Nnadi, 2020; Olawale, 2015). By contrast, NGOs have adopted more innovative and targeted approaches, especially in reaching hard-to-access communities (Rieff, 1996). Nevertheless, Nigerian state humanitarian agencies continue to face serious challenges in capacity, oversight, and coordination of NGO efforts, limiting the overall effectiveness of humanitarian response (Macfarlane & Weiss, 2000; Nnadi et al., 2020).

Theoretical Framework

Governance Theory provides a useful framework for understanding the dynamics of humanitarian interventions in disaster management, particularly in contexts where the state's capacity is weak and non-state actors play increasing roles. Governance in this sense extends beyond the formal authority of government institutions to include networks of state agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international donors, and local communities working together to provide public goods and services (Rhodes, 1996; Pierre & Peters, 2000). Unlike traditional state-centric approaches, Governance Theory emphasizes coordination, accountability, participation, and legitimacy in managing collective challenges. It therefore reflects the plural and multi-level nature of humanitarian response during natural disasters.

The strength of Governance Theory lies in its ability to explain how different actors contribute resources, expertise, and legitimacy to disaster management. It captures the reality that the state, especially in developing countries, often lacks the capacity to respond adequately to large-scale crises. In such circumstances, NGOs and international partners step in to complement government efforts by providing food, shelter, medical services, and livelihood support. Governance Theory thus underscores the importance of synergy, collaboration, and institutional mechanisms to ensure that interventions are well-coordinated and effective.

However, the theory is not without limitations. It tends to assume that collaboration among actors is seamless and beneficial, often overlooking underlying power struggles, political interference, and corruption that may weaken coordination. In some cases, governance arrangements risk legitimizing the state's abdication of its core responsibilities, portraying NGOs as substitutes rather than complementary actors. Furthermore, coordination challenges such as diversion of relief

materials, duplication of efforts, and weak monitoring systems highlight the practical difficulties of achieving “good governance” in humanitarian contexts.

Applied to this study, Governance Theory provides a lens for analyzing the humanitarian response to the 2025 floods in Adamawa State. The findings show that although both the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) and the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) provided some assistance, their efforts were constrained by inadequate funding, weak preparedness, and poor coordination. NGOs such as UNICEF, ActionAid, and the Nigerian Red Cross filled critical gaps, but their interventions were also undermined by lack of synergy with state agencies. From a governance perspective, these challenges represent deficits in coordination, accountability, and transparency. The study’s recommendations such as strengthening state–NGO collaboration, establishing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, and involving local institutions align with the governance framework’s emphasis on inclusive, participatory, and well-coordinated disaster management.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted the survey research design, which is suitable for collecting data from a large population within a short time.

Population of the Study

The study population comprised 2,000 individuals affected by the 2025 flood disaster in Adamawa State, alongside selected officials from the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA), the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA), and representatives of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as ActionAid, UNICEF, and the Nigerian Red Cross, all of whom were actively involved in the humanitarian response.

Sampling Technique and Sample Size

A multi-stage cluster sampling technique was employed to divide the study area into clusters. From the two local government areas (LGAs) which were purposively selected as clusters (Yola South and Hong). Victims in each selected LGA were identified using the snowball sampling technique. Taro yamane sample size calculation, is used to determine the sample size for the questionnaire respondents. The following is the formula for the calculation:

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

where :

n= sample size required

N = number of people in the population

e = allowable error (%)

Substitute numbers in formula

$$n = \frac{2,000}{1 + 2,000(0.05)^2}$$

$$n \approx 333$$

Methods of Data Collection

In this study, two primary methods were utilized to collect data. First, questionnaires were administered to individuals affected by the flood, aiming to gather detailed information on their experiences and perceptions regarding the interventions provided by both state agencies and non-governmental organizations. Second, interviews were conducted with key informants drawn from relevant state agencies and NGOs. These interviews offered deeper insights into the nature, scope, and challenges associated with the humanitarian interventions, complementing the quantitative data obtained from the questionnaires.

Methods of Data Analysis

Data collected via the questionnaire were analysed using percentage (%) distribution and standard deviation (SD), with the results presented in tables for clarity. The information obtained from interviews was analysed thematically (themes), providing qualitative insights that complemented the quantitative findings from the questionnaires.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Age, Gender, and Occupational Distribution of Respondents

Category	Variable	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	237	74.1
	Female	83	25.9
Age	18–30	128	40.0
	31–40	90	28.1
	41–50	79	24.7
	51+	23	7.2
Occupation	Civil Servants	113	35.3
	Farming	85	26.6
	Business	78	24.4
	Students	44	13.8
Total	Respondents	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Out of 320 respondents, 74% were male and 26% female, indicating a male-dominated sample. The largest age group was 18–30 years (40%), followed by 31–40 years (28%) and 41–50 years (25%), while only 7% were 51 years and above. In terms of occupation, civil servants made up the highest proportion (35%), followed by farmers (27%), business operators (24%), and students

(14%). This suggests that the study population was largely composed of young, male civil servants and farmers.

Table 2: Educational Qualification of Respondents

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Tertiary	190	59.4
Secondary	79	24.7
Primary	51	15.9
Total	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Most respondents (59%) attained tertiary education, followed by 25% with secondary education and 16% with primary education. This suggests that the study population was relatively well educated.

Table 3: Awareness of State Humanitarian Intervention

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	205	64.1
No	115	35.9
Total	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Nearly two-thirds of respondents (64%) were aware of state humanitarian interventions for flood victims, while 36% indicated they had no such awareness.

Table 4: Types of State Humanitarian Interventions

Intervention	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Food & clothing	107	33.4
Building materials	73	22.8
No response	73	22.8
Sacks for embank.	39	12.2
Medical supplies	15	4.7
Local boats	13	4.1
Total	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Food and clothing were the most frequently reported interventions (33%), followed by building materials (23%). Sacks for embankment (12%) were also significant, while medical supplies and local boats were the least reported.

Table 5: Awareness of NGO Humanitarian Intervention

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	199	62.2
No	121	37.8
Total	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

A majority of respondents (62%) were aware of NGO humanitarian interventions, while 38% reported no awareness.

Table 6: Types of NGO Humanitarian Interventions

Intervention	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Food & clothing	111	34.7
Medical supplies	34	10.9
Building materials	62	19.4
Temporary shelter	30	9.4
No response	51	15.9
Blankets & mosquito nets	19	5.9
Money	13	4.1
Total	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Food and clothing were the most reported NGO interventions (35%), followed by building materials (19%) and medical supplies (11%). Monetary support and blankets were the least mentioned.

Table 7: Awareness of Collaboration between State and NGOs

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	169	52.8
No	151	47.2
Total	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Just over half of the respondents (53%) were aware of collaboration between state and NGOs, while 47% were not aware.

Table 8: Areas of State-NGO Collaboration

Area of Collaboration	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Funding & distribution of relief	122	38.1
No response	131	40.9
Policy formulation & implementation	28	8.8

Evacuation of flood victims	25	7.8
Early warning & sensitization	15	4.7
Total	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Funding and distribution of relief items was the most acknowledged area of collaboration (38%). However, a significant proportion (41%) did not respond. Policy formulation (9%) and evacuation (8%) were less reported.

Table 9: Challenges in State-NGO Collaboration

Challenge	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Rank
Lack of synergy & mechanisms for collaboration	86	26.9	1
Inadequate funds & relief materials	76	23.8	2
No response	83	25.9	3
Lack of harmonized policy framework	40	12.5	4
Delay in counter-funding	25	7.8	5
Shortage of personnel	10	3.1	6
Total	320	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The main challenge reported was lack of synergy and mechanisms for collaboration (27%), followed by inadequate funds and relief materials (24%). About 26% of respondents did not provide a response.

Table 10: Impact of State and NGO Interventions

Response	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Yes	221	69.1
No	99	30.9
Total	320	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2025

A large majority (69%) believed the interventions had a positive impact on flood victims, while 31% felt the interventions made no significant difference.

Table 11: Challenges in Humanitarian Service Delivery

Challenge	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Rank
Diversion of relief materials	61	19.1	1
Minimum cooperation from affected community	54	16.9	2

Delay/no proactive response	51	15.9	3
Unprecedented number of victims	39	12.2	4
Difficulty accessing victims	35	10.9	5
Lack of synergy between state and NGOs	26	8.1	6
Political interference	19	5.9	7
Poor professional conduct	19	5.9	7
No response	16	5.0	9
Total	320	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The most common challenge in service delivery was diversion of relief materials (19%), followed by low community cooperation (17%) and delays in response (16%).

Table 12: Suggested Solutions to Improve Humanitarian Services

Suggested Solution	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Rank
Traditional/religious institutions' involvement	81	25.3	1
Adequate funding	47	14.7	2
Community representatives' involvement	44	13.8	3
Monitoring & supervision	38	11.9	4
Modern access to hard-to-reach areas	30	9.4	5
Direct contact with victims	25	7.8	6
No response	56	17.5	7
Total	320	100.0	

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The most frequently suggested solution was greater involvement of traditional and religious institutions (25%). Adequate funding (15%) and community engagement (14%) were also emphasized, alongside monitoring (12%) and improved access to victims (9%).

Discussion of Findings

The findings from Tables 1 to 12 provide insights into the demographic composition of respondents, their awareness and perception of humanitarian interventions, the nature of state and NGO involvement, as well as the challenges and suggested solutions for improving service delivery to flood victims. From Table 1, it is evident that the respondents were predominantly male (74%) and largely youthful, with 40% aged between 18–30 years and another 28% within the 31–40 age group. Occupationally, civil servants accounted for the largest share (35%), followed by farmers (27%) and business operators (24%). This composition suggests that the study population was dominated by young, economically active males who are engaged in both formal and informal economic activities. Educationally, the majority (59%) had attained tertiary education, while 25%

had secondary education and 16% had primary education (Table 2). The high level of education among respondents implies that their views on humanitarian interventions are informed by some degree of literacy and awareness.

Awareness levels of humanitarian interventions were generally high. As shown in Table 3, nearly two-thirds (64%) were aware of state humanitarian assistance, while Table 5 indicates that 62% were aware of NGO interventions. Awareness of collaboration between state and NGOs was slightly lower, with 53% acknowledging joint efforts (Table 7). These findings imply that while state and NGO activities were visible, there remains a significant proportion of the population that is either unaware or insufficiently informed about such interventions. Both state and NGO interventions were dominated by the provision of food and clothing, as revealed in Tables 4 and 6, with 33% and 35% of respondents respectively identifying this as the most common form of assistance. Building materials and medical supplies were also provided but at lower levels. The reliance on food distribution reflects the immediate relief priorities following disasters, but the relatively lower provision of medical support and infrastructure reconstruction points to a gap in longer-term recovery measures. The study revealed moderate levels of awareness regarding collaboration between state and NGOs (Table 7). Table 8 further shows that the primary area of collaboration was funding and distribution of relief materials (38%). Policy formulation (9%) and evacuation of victims (8%) were less reported, while a large proportion (41%) provided no response. This indicates that collaboration was mostly operational and logistics-oriented rather than strategic, reflecting a short-term relief focus rather than long-term planning.

Several challenges were identified across different levels. In terms of collaboration, the lack of synergy and mechanisms (27%) and inadequate funding (24%) were the most reported (Table 9). Service delivery challenges were more diverse: diversion of relief materials (19%), poor community cooperation (17%), and delays in response (16%) were the most pressing (Table 11). These findings suggest weaknesses in transparency, accountability, and coordination between actors, which undermines the effectiveness of humanitarian efforts. Despite these challenges, a large majority of respondents (69%) acknowledged that the interventions of both state and NGOs had a positive impact on affected communities (Table 10). This suggests that while the interventions may not have been perfect, they played a critical role in alleviating the immediate suffering of victims. However, the 31% who reported no positive impact underscores the unevenness of aid distribution and effectiveness. Respondents proposed several strategies for overcoming the identified challenges (Table 12). The most widely endorsed solution was the involvement of traditional and religious institutions (25%), followed by adequate funding (15%) and greater engagement of community representatives (14%). Other suggestions included improved monitoring and supervision (12%) and adopting modern methods for accessing hard-to-reach areas (9%). These solutions highlight the importance of local participation, community trust, and accountability in ensuring effective humanitarian service delivery.

Conclusion

Flooding is a natural disaster with far-reaching consequences on the socio-economic wellbeing of affected populations. Its impacts often overwhelm the capacity of the state to respond effectively, thereby necessitating the involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in providing complementary humanitarian assistance. The participation of these actors has helped in alleviating the suffering of victims and improving their living conditions in the study area. Although the process of delivering humanitarian aid was not without challenges such as inadequate funding, weak coordination, and accountability concerns the interventions nonetheless played a significant role in cushioning the effects of the disaster. Given the recurring nature of floods and the increasing demands they place on emergency response systems, it is evident that effective management of humanitarian crises requires sustained collaboration between the state, NGOs, and local communities. Only through such concerted efforts can timely and impactful interventions be ensured for vulnerable populations.

Recommendations

In view of the study's findings, the following recommendations are made:

- i. Since both the state and NGOs play crucial roles in humanitarian aid delivery, there is a pressing need for stronger collaboration and synergy between the two. This can be enhanced by reviewing and strengthening existing policies and legal frameworks that regulate their partnership, ensuring that interventions are better coordinated and complementary.
- ii. A dedicated monitoring and evaluation team should be created to oversee the distribution of relief materials. Such a team should include representatives of the affected communities, ensuring transparency, accountability, and equitable access to aid by those most in need.
- iii. Humanitarian agencies should intensify efforts in public awareness, early warning systems, and timely evacuation strategies. Proactive sensitization and disaster preparedness will help mitigate the negative impact of flooding and reduce the vulnerability of communities when disasters occur.

References

- Adedeji, O. H., Odufuwa, B. O., & Adebayo, O. H. (2012). Building capabilities for flood disaster and hazard preparedness and risk reduction in Nigeria: Need for spatial planning and land management. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 14(1), 45–58.
- Adelekan, I. O., & Asiyanbi, A. P. (2015). Flood risk perception in flood-affected communities in Lagos, Nigeria. *Natural Hazards*, 80(1), 445–469. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11069-015-1977-2>
- African Research Bulletin. (2010). Nigeria: Floods devastate communities. *African Research Bulletin: Political, Social and Cultural Series*, 47(9), 18603–18604. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-825x.2010.03304.x>
- Amangabara, G. T., & Obenade, M. (2015). Flood vulnerability assessment of Niger Delta states

- relative to the 2012 flood disaster in Nigeria. *American Journal of Environmental Protection*, 3(3), 76–83. <https://doi.org/10.12691/env-3-3-3>
- Bassey, I. E., & Effiong, E. N. (2022). Humanitarian intervention in Nigeria: A case of internally displaced people in Benue State, 2018–2021. *Humanus Discourse*, 2(2), 1–15.
- Cirella, G. T., & Iyalomhe, F. O. (2018). Flooding conceptual review: Sustainability-focalized best practices in Nigeria. *Applied Sciences*, 8(9), 1558. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app8091558>
- Danjibo, N. D., Adeoje, A. E., & Ojo, O. S. (2019). Climate change and flooding in Nigeria: Causes, impacts and coping strategies. *African Journal of Environmental Studies*, 7(2), 33–47.
- Danjibo, N. D., Adeoje, A. E., & Ojo, O. S. (2021). Climate change, flooding and human security in Nigeria. *African Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 9(2), 44–59.
- Danjibo, N. D., Adeoye, A. E., & Ojo, O. S. (2018). Dynamics in the response mechanisms of major stakeholders during flood disaster: A case study of Kogi State, Nigeria. *African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 2(2), 29–42.
- Echendu, A. J. (2020). The impact of flooding on Nigeria's sustainable development goals (SDGs). *Ecosystem Health and Sustainability*, 6(1), 1791735. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20964129.2020.1791735>
- Hamidu, H. (2014). Environmental hazards and flood disasters in Northern Nigeria: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Geography and Regional Planning*, 7(2), 25–33.
- Hyden, G., Court, J., & Mease, K. (2004). *Making sense of governance: Empirical evidence from 16 developing countries*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Ijigah, E. A., & Akinyemi, T. A. (2015). Flood disaster: An empirical survey of causative factors and preventive measures in Kaduna, Nigeria. *International Journal of Environment and Pollution Research*, 3(3), 53–66.
- Igudaladan, S., & Saulawa, J. Y. (2021). Flood disaster response and recovery in Nigeria: A case study of the 2018 Jibia flood disaster, Katsina State. *IOSR Journal of Environmental Science, Toxicology and Food Technology*, 15(4), 8–18.
- Jeb, D. N., & Aggarwal, S. P. (2008). Flood inundation hazard modelling of the River Kaduna using remote sensing and geographic information system. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 4(12), 1822–1833.
- Macfarlane, S. N., & Weiss, T. G. (2000). Political interest and humanitarian action. *Security Studies*, 10(1), 112–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09636410008429422>
- Momoh, Z. (2018). Development partners, humanitarian assistance and quest for reconstruction of north-eastern Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Reviews*, 8(2), 3348–3361.
- Nnadi, G. O., Ezeani, O. E., & Nnadi, H. C. (2020). The National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) and the challenge of effective management of internally displaced persons in North-Eastern Nigeria. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 25(7), 14–27.
- Olanrewaju, C. C., Chitakira, M., Olanrewaju, O. A., & Louw, E. (2019). Impacts of flood disasters in Nigeria: A critical evaluation of health implications and management. *Jàmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*, 11(1), 557. <https://doi.org/10.4102/jamba.v11i1.557>

- Olawale, T. (2015). Disaster management in Nigeria: Issues and challenges. *African Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 77–89.
- Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2000). *Governance, politics and the state*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rieff, D. (1996). The humanitarian trap. *World Policy Journal*, 12(4), 1–11.
- Rock, O. M., Nwankwor, G. I., Ahirakwem, C. A., & Alieze, V. I. (2016). Flood, causes and coping strategy in Abakaliki Area, South Eastern Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Applied Science and Engineering*, 5(2), 133–144.
- Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652–667. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1996.tb01747.x>
- Thompson, A. (2015). Humanitarian intervention: Conceptual and legal debates. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 18(3), 312–329.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
- 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>
- Kooiman, J. (2003). *Governing as governance*. Sage Publications.
- Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (7th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal*, 50(155), 17–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2451.00106>
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Sampling methods in research methodology; How to choose a sampling technique for research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(2), 18–27. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205035>
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.