TERRORIST ACTIVITIES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA: AN EARLY WARNING SIGNAL

Patrick L. Akpan ^a, Ebele Mary Onwuka ^b, Chinedu Onyeizugbe ^c

^a Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,
 Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
 ^{b, c} Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences,
 Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
 ^a Corresponding authour: patricklinusonline@yahoo.com

©Ontario International Development Agency ISSN: 1923-6654 (print)
ISSN 1923-6662 (online). Available at http://www.ssrn.com/link/OIDA-Intl-Journal-Sustainable-Dev.html

Abstract: This paper examines the implications of terrorist activities on economic development in Nigeria. The series of challenges associated with terrorism, revolution, different forms of strike actions, conflicts, pre-medicated application or threats of violence against religious groups, by the Boko Haram Sects, politically motivated and other expressions of violence following the emergence of democracy in recent time are singled out as having the most deleterious effect on the Nigerian economy. The paper examines empirically, the relationship between economic development and terrorist activities using Nigeria data. A four-step analytical methodology which captures five equations is adopted. The result reveals that the number of bomb attacks/strikes and other forms of violence, number of man hours lost, number of workers involved, number of Nigerians and foreigners killed and the extent of infrastructural destruction vis-a-vis business relation cost increased tremendously. The output lost in terms of growth in per capita real GDP is considerably on an astronomical magnitude. It is established that terrorist activities have significant negative effect on National development in Nigeria. As a preventive strategy therefore, this paper advocates that efforts should be made to reduce terrorist activities by government through appropriate sanction and machinery put in place towards demarcation of the country to four different political states on the basis of ecology of nations. A negation of this, the paper argues, is a danger signal to a collapse of democracy and a severe religious/ethnic war.

Keywords: Conflict, Economic, Development, Terrorism, Violence

INTRODUCTION

ike many Developing nations of the world, Nigeria is significantly in dire need of uninterrupted development, sustained governance, investment-friendly democratic environment as well as ultimate macroeconomic stability. Development therefore is multifaceted and multidimensional capturing structural, institutional, political, social and all round transformation process. Thus, there can be no meaningful growth without development and development becomes an illusion without growth. The achievement of growth and development therefore has been challenged by the astronomical incidence of terrorist activities in Nigeria in recent times. The pattern and trend of terrorism, revolution, different forms of strike actions, premeditated application or threats of violence against religious groups and politically motivated expressions of violence in the present democratic era have threatened development, democratic governance and economic activities in the land. As popularized by Czinkota and Ronkainen (2009), the impact of terrorist activities on economic development, management and international business has increased tremendously in Nigeria. It therefore becomes an issue of concern to government, individuals, multinational enterprises, religious groups and all meaningful components of the country. From a harmless group of about 12 in year 2002, the protagonist of terrorist activities in Nigeria

- the Boko Haram has in recent times increased to about 10,000 violent members. They provide the platform for Nigerian politicians some of whom aim at destabilizing the government and international terrorist establishment searching desperately for a base for the Al Qaeda infrastructure in Nigeria. The Boko Haram as an anarchist Islamic sect is campaigning against democracy in Nigeria and has found Nigeria suitable for their deadly activities. This is as a result of political and religion variables. They are determined to make Nigeria a base for plotting terror attacks and have multiple targets. The growing incidence of insecurity of lives and property caused by terrorist activities deserve government attention timeously. Regrettably, efforts by government to halt the activities of terrorist are seemingly yielding negligible dividend in view of the fact that some northern politicians who are stakeholders in these deadly activities are frustrating the efforts of government. Insecurity therefore makes Nigeria less competitive in a global economy. It is an issue of growing significance to international business and Foreign Direct Investment. As a micro-level political risk experienced in many formations most especially in the northern part of Nigeria, particularly in politically conflictive areas such as North East, North West and North Central, insecurity has deadly implications. States in the North East include Borno, Bauchi, Taraba and Adamawa while Katsina, Kano, Kaduna, Jigawa are in the North West. North Central covers Plateau, Benue, Nasarawa, Niger and Kwara states. The incidence of terrorist activities keep increasing as it is being midwifed by some politicians in these zones of the country.

This paper in its five sections is organized as follows: section one is introduction while section two centres on pattern and trends of terrorist activities in Nigeria with stylized evidence on Nigeria experience, international terrorism, and terrorist activities attributed to Al Qaeda. Analytical methodology associated with empirical modeling on terrorism forms the tenet of section three while section four focuses on data analysis and discussion of result. The paper terminates with early warning signals, policy recommendations and concluding remarks in section five.

PATTERN AND TRENDS OF TERRORIST ACTIVITIES IN NIGERIA

Theoretically, terrorism lacks universally recognized definition as it is a debatable notion. Lacking universally recognized term is not unconnected with the fact that to a reasonable degree, it is highly politicized rather than being an academic issue. This gives rise to various interpretations on the political

demands at the time. The difference in opinion is as a result of differences in the form and typologies of terrorism which embrace international and domestic terrorism. The basic distinction is seemingly blurred that in a case where international terrorism is viewed as deadly terrorist activities conducted on the territorial borders of more than a single state and or involves citizens of multiple states and not just one state.

Domestic terrorism otherwise known as home grown or internal terrorist activity is not strictly separated from international terrorism in that they are interconnected. Terrorist groups whose political agenda become localized to a certain political or national context tend to increasingly internationalise some of their logistics, fund raising as well as planning and other propaganda activities. The Nigerian case is one that fits unto this connectivity and the country has been on the throes of daring suicide bombers masquerading as Islamic and Boko Haram adherents. This group has gained national prominence and has reached threatening dimensions through the adoption of suicide bombing. In various parts of Nigeria about 60 attacks have been recorded as at September 18 2011. Areas and agencies attacked by terrorist activities are as stated below with comparative evidence in table 1a.

From the foregoing, it is pertinent to note that terrorist activities tend to happen more in democratic countries than the non democratic economies. The Nigerian case as stated in Tables 1a and 1b reveal the extent of bomb blast, the number of people killed and injured as well as other descriptive evidence for the period 2007 to date. Comparatively table two shows the pattern and trends of international terrorism on a global perspective for the period 1995 to 2004. Table 3 is a demonstration of terrorist activities attributed to Al Qaeda, the location, description and number of people killed vis-à-vis the impact of Boko Haram on economic development. There is reasonable suspicion that the Boko Haram members are trained in Al Qaeda secret training camps in Northern Mauritania and Somalia. Terrorist activities in Nigeria were not very significant in the early 1990s up to 2005, but the emergence of Democracy ushered in terrorist activities with international linkages thereby threatening the economy of the country. This is buttressed by the fact that Boko Haram activities have become very severe in Nigeria as a result of recent political situation in which the Presidency has shifted from the northern part of the country to the southern zone, about 50 years after Nigeria's independence - hence the Abuja bomb blast near a parade marking the Nigeria's 50th anniversary in independence.

Table 1a: Pattern and Trends of Terrorism – Nigerian Experience

S/n	Date	Location and Description	
1	October 1, 2010	Abuja bomb blast, car bomb exploded near a parade marking	
		Nigeria' s 50 th Anniversary independence – 12 killed.	
2	June 11, 2011	Bomb blast at Abuja, Aberdeen – Kaduna	
3	June 16, 2011	Explosion occurred outside police headquarters in Abuja	
4	June 20, 2011	Abuja bomb blast – Nigerian police headquarters	
5	June 23, 2011	Suicide bomb blast at Abuja – Police Headquarters attacked	
6	July 3, 2011	Suicide bomber (Mission) by Boko Haram	
7	August 26, 2011	Bomb blast - UN office - 18 killed after 6 bomb explosion	
		outside burning in Nigeria capital	
8	Sept 1, 2011	Bomb blast – Nigeria security agencies have failed the nation	
9	December 26, 2011	Bomb attack – many killed and some injured at Abuja	
10	April 8, 2012	Kaduna Bomb blast on Easter Sunday – 25 killed – Deadly Easter	
		attack	
11	April 25, 2012	Jos bomb blast – pastor, wife and children among 52 victims on	
		admission	
12	April 26, 2012	Bomb blast of Abuja – 13 killed	
13	April 27, 2012	Destructive and disruptive bomb blast (highly offensive and	
		saddening at Abuja and Kaduna - Boko Haram claimed	
		responsibility for the attacks on This day's Newspaper office in	
		Abuja and Kaduna – 3 killed, Jabi offices of This Day	
		Newspaper bomb blast	
14	April 29, 2012	Bomb blast at Nigerian Police Station in Maiduguri – North East	
		Nigeria – Borno State – many killed	
15	April 30, 2012	Bomb blast – 2 professors and many others killed in church	
16	May 27, 2012	Bomb blast – church bombed in Kaduna - 58 killed	
17	June 09, 2012	Bomb blast in a church at Abuja – 5 killed	
18	June 10, 2012	Abuja bomb blast – 4 killed, 41 injured in a suicide bomb blast	
		that rippled through a church	
19	June 16, 2012	Bomb blast at Utako, Abuja	
20	June 16, 2012	Bomb blast in Jos Catholic Church – 28 killed	
21	June 17, 2012	Bomb blast of churches at Kaduna – 36 killed, 72 injured.	

Source: http://www.google.com.ng - Abuja, Nigeria bomb blast google search

Table 1b: Related terrorist activities in Some other regions of Nigeria

Year	Victims/Acts	Killed	Injured
2004	NA	NA	NA
2005	NA	NA	NA
2006	NA	NA	NA
2007	06	06	2
2008	12	12	2
2009	45	43	2
2010	28	28	-
2011	11	11	-2
2012*	351	186	165

Source: Global Concord Newspaper Vol. No. 3 June, 2011 *Updated from table 1a

Table 2: Pattern and Trends of International Terrorism

Year	Acts	killed	Injured
1995	440	165	6292
1996	296	311	3652
1997	304	221	693
1998	273	741	5952
1999	392	233	706
2000	423	405	791
2001	346	3547	1080
2002	199	725	2013
2003	208	625	3646
2004	-	-	-

Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php/title=patterns of Global Terrorism & oldid = 483887883

Another related development reveals that terrorism has never been appreciated as having any good thing to offer in any part of the world where it thrives. It complicates the already unattractive Nigerian economy in view of its cost. It reduces the chances of Foreign Direct Investment and hinders greater productivity. The indexes associated with this include lost in man-hours of productivity, wastages, high incidence of poverty, poor capacity utilization, breakdown in industrial production, decline in economic growth, high incidence of unemployment, as well as prevalence of an unfriendly investment climate. As opined by Sonubi (1973), Otobo (1983) and Owoye (1991), terrorism are often caused by a combination of political, economic and institutional factors.

Table 3 confirms that attacks attributed to al Qaeda between 1992 and year 2007 were mostly motivated by economic and political factors. Year 2004 attack in Saudi Arabia in the month of May was a refinery attack; year 2002 November attack was a Hotel bombing, as well as that of Indonesia in August 2003. In Kenya 2002, attack was equally a Hotel bombing. Bomb blast in Nigeria is politically motivated aimed

at distablizing the government and with a view of igniting religious and ethnic crisis.

Thus, there is a need to measure the relationship between economic development and terrorist activities with the use of Nigerian data and empirical modelling.

ANALYTICAL METHODOLOGY

To implement this study, the Ordinary Least Square Technique (OLS) is adopted. The control variable used include Terrorism (Ter), Man hours lost (MAL), Wastages (WAST), Capacity utilization (Cap), Manufacturing (MANU), Gross Domestic Product (GDP), that is, Economic Growth, Industrial Production (INDP), World Gross Domestic Product (WGDP) and inflation (INFLA) amongst others. Data for the study were obtained from World Bank Development report (various issues), International Financial Year book, Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) Statistical Bulletin, Publications of Wikipedia free encyclopedia, the country report on terrorism, US Department of States report with supplementary documents and statistics form Berkshire Publishing Com Group.

33

S/n **Date** Location **Description** Number killed 1 1992 December Aden, Yemen Hotel bombing 2 1993 February New York World Trade Centre Bombing 6 3 1994 October Mogadishu, Somalia Ambush of US forces 18 4 1995 Mashad, Iran 27 June Shia-Shrine bombing 1998 5 November Royadh, Saudi Arabia Truck bomb 7 2000 301 6 Kenya and Tanzania US embassies bombed August 7 2001 October Aden, Yemen USS Cole bombing 17 8 2002 September New York, Virginia and 9/11 attacks 3,000 approx. Pennsylvania 9 2002 Djerba, Tunisia Synagogue bombing 21 April 10 2002 May Karachi, Pakistan Hotel bombing 10 2002 Karachi, Pakistan US consulate bombing 11 11 June 2002 Yemen, Coast 12 October Limburg oil tanker bombing 1 2002 202 13 October Bali, Indonesia Nightclub bombings 14 2002 November Mombasa, Kenya Hotel bombing 15 2003 Riyadh, Saudi Arabia Expatriate compound bombing 15 May 35 2003 Casablanca, Morocco Multiple bombings 45 16 May 2003 Jakarta, Indonesia Hotel bombing 16 17 August 18 2003 November Riyadh, Saudi Arabia Car bombs 17 19 2003 November Istanbul, Turkey Synagogues bombed 57 20 2004 February Philippines Ferry bombing 116 21 Madrid, Spain Train bombings 191 2004 March 22 2004 April Riyadh, Saudi Arabia Government building bombing 3 23 2004 Yanbu, Saudi Arabia 5 May Refinery attack 24 22 2004 Khobar, Saudi Arabia Expatriate compound attack May 25 2004 5 December Jeddah, Saudi Arabia US consulate attack 2005 26 July London Underground/bus bombing 56 Resort bombings 27 2005 July Sharm et-Sheikh, Egypt 88 28 2005 November Amman, Jordan Hotel bombings 63

Table 3: Terrorist Activities Attributed to Al – Qaeda

Source: "http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title = patterns of global terrorism & o1did = 483887883"

TERRORISM EQUATIONS FOR EMPIRICAL MODELLING

Algiers, Algeria

29

2007

April

The menace of terrorist activities in Nigeria has been alarming. This specifically impacts on the economic development of Nigeria. Thus Nigerian case could be measured based on its impact on the macroeconomic variables. The relationship between terrorist activities and economic development is expressed using the following models:

Car bombs

The model takes the form: Eq(1) Ter $= n(MHL, WAST, CAP, MANU, GDP, INDP, WGDP) e_t$(i) Econometrically, this becomes: Eq(2) $= n_0 + n_1 LMHL + n_2 LWAST + n_3 LCAP + n_4 LMANU + n_5 LGDP + n_6 LINDP + n_7 LWGDP)$ $+ e_t$ (ii) Similarly, we have Eq(3)GDP $= f(Ter, MHL, CAP, FDI, EXP_{t-1}, IMP_{t-1}, INFL) e_t \dots (iii)$ Restating this we have: Eq(4) $= u_0 + U_1LTer + U_2LMHL + U_3LCAP + U_4LFDI + U_5LEXP_{t-1} + U_6LIMP_{t-1} + U_7LINFL + U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}U_{t-1}$ e_t(iv) Thus, equation 5 then takes the form thus: $= b(FDI, WAST, MHL, CAP, MANU, INDP, GDP, WGDP, POV) e_t \dots (v)$ Eq(5)This is restated as:

$$Eq(6) \quad Ter = b_0 + b_1 LFDI + b_2 LWAST + b_3 LMHL + b_4 LCAP + b_5 LMANU + b_6 LINDP + b_7 LGDP + b_8 LWGDP + b_9 LPOV + e_t (vi)$$

Where:

 n_0 to n_7 represent parameter estimate/structure u_0 to u_7 represent parameter estimate/structure b_0 to b_7 represent parameter estimate/structure

 e_t represents stochastic/disturbance term with usual normality properties

LTer = Log of terrorist activities in Nigeria

LMHL = Log of man hours lost

LWAST = Log of wastages caused by terrorist activities

LMANU = Log of manufacturing
LCAP = Log of capacity utilization
LGDP = Log of economic growth GDP
LINDP = Log of industrial production
LFDI = Log of foreign direct investment
LWGDP = Log of World Gross Domestic Product

LPOV = Log of poverty

Table 4: Empirical results and related statistics – impact of terrorism on economic development

Method of Estimation = Ordinary Least Squares

Dependent Variable: Ter

Current Sample: 1990 to 2012

Number of observations: 22

Mean of dep. Var.	= 9.40420	LM het. Test	= 3.62583	[.057]
Std. dev. Of dep. Var.	= 1.70189	Durbin-Watson	= .997316	[.000]
Sum of squared residuals	= 10.5719	Jarque-Bera test	= 2.82663	[.243]
Variance of residuals	= 364549	Ramsey's RESET2	=6.06735	[.020]
Std. error of regression	= .603779	F (zero slopes)	= 58.2978	[000.]
		Schwarz B.I.C	= 37.2011	

R-squared =.889394

Adjusted R-squared = .874138 Log likelihood = 28.3852

Variable	Estimated	Standard error	t-statistic	p-value
	coefficient			
С	9.81536	.337733	29.0625	[000.]
ΔGDP	859708E-02	.1226	-2.703206	[.026]
ΔMANU	033158	.014339	-2.31239	[.028]
ΔMHL	.48457E-06	.774386e-07	6.25718	[.000.]
ΔWAST	.014822	.012174	1.21758	[.233]
ΔCAP	-0.19237	.257723E-02	-7.46412	[.000.]
ΔINDP	-018247E-02	.896364E-08	5.31246	[.0100]
ΔFDI	-029148E-0	.7897475	-2.62451	[.0108]
ΔWGDP	98/9768	0.15448	-2.560301	[.031]
ΔΡΟΥ	-028549	.287634E-02	-6.45513	[.000]

 $R^2 = .888394;$ DW = .997316

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULT

The above table 4 presents the regression results for the implications of terrorism on economic development and a careful perusal necessitate the following observations. Thus deriving inspiration from this, the estimated coefficient of the constant term is positive and is 9.81536 which is statistically significant at better than 0.1 per cent. This implies that at zero performance of all the independent variables, economic development should be increase at about 9.81536 but not for terrorist activities in the country. Further examination reveals that Economic Development (GDP) carries a negative sign and the associated t-value is statistically significant at 0.03 per cent level. The implication here is that increase in terrorist activities leads to decrease in level of economic development as this moves in concert with apriori expectation considering the ills of terrorism. Terrorism is bad for the economy of Nigeria. It leads to political, economic and regional instability. Terrorism is a threat to investors' confidence in the economy. The coefficient of manufacturing subsector is negatively signed and it is significant at 0.03 per cent level of significance. This implies that an increase in terrorist activities leads to a corresponding reduction in the manufacturing output in view of the dangers of terrorism in an economy. The pace of manufacturing is reduced and or destroyed by bomb attacks in the economy. Lives are lost and production activities are halted. This is dangerous to the economy of Nigeria. The coefficient of manhours lost is positive and is statistically significant at better than 0.1 per cent level. This implies that terrorism has no impact on manhours and this is contrary to apriori and or management expectations as terrorist activities lead to loss of hours and even lives and property. This situation is equally applicable to the case of wastages which is statistically not significant. Capacity utilization is negatively signed and it is statistically significant at better than 0.1 per cent implying that terrorist activities impact on capacity utilization of firms and economic activities of Nigeria. This is applicable to industrial production whose estimated coefficient also carries a negative sign and is statistically significant at 0.1 per cent. Increased terrorist activities in Nigeria result in subsequent reduction of industrial production in the economy. Nigerian business climate then becomes unfriendly to investors.

Moving in concert with the above is the fact that the coefficient of Foreign Direct Investment is negative and the associated t-statistic is statistically significant at 0.01 per cent level of significance. This implies that increase in terrorist activities has negative effect on Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) as world GDP which also carries a negative estimated coefficient is statistically significant at 0.01 per cent. Confirming

this management expection is the fact that FDI capital to Nigeria declined from \$8.28 billion in 2009 to \$6.1 billion in year 2010. Thus, FDI has been on the decline as stated by world investment report prepared by United Nations conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). Most foreign missions have adviced their citizens to be wary and careful of doing business in Nigeria in view of high level of security risk. It is clear that terrorism discourages Foreign Direct Investment in Nigeria and terrorist activities affect FDI of nations generally. Terrorism of whatever nature be it international or domestic is characterized by rising wave of destruction, high poverty rate and poor economic development.

Therefore, poverty here has a negative sign and is statistically significant at better than 0.1 per cent level. This implies that increase in terrorist activities lead to high level of poverty and unemployment. Poverty and unemployment are twin sisters. Most young men are associated with terrorist activities as a result of unemployment. They are used by politicians to distailize the government, create political injustice and all other types of terrorist activities. The R² is 0.888394 explaining a good fit for the model. The value of DW is 0.997316 and is greater than R² of 0.888394 implying a case of no serious auto correlation. In summary, most of the parameters particularly, estimated coefficient of constant term were statistically significant as revealed by the pvalues corresponding to the estimated parameters.

WARNING SIGNALS, POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study has revealed that there is a relationship between terrorist activities and economic development. The econometric model developed is of great significance since it has predictive power for the explanation of the relationship. Considering the extent of damages and evils of terrorist activities in the Nigerian economic environment, there is a danger signal to severe political instability, collapse of Democracy, religious and ethnic rivalry, degenerating crisis situation, abuse of office by some government security officials, environmental inadequacies and macroeconomic instability. This paper maintains that these variables if not checked by government are dangerous to the sustainance of democracy. As a preventive strategy therefore, appropriate sanctions deemed deterrent should be implemented on those found guilty, their sponsors and those associated with terrorist activities of whatever nature and form in Nigeria and not just setting up kangaroo panels which nobody would be sanctioned after all.

In view of the religious and political effect of these deadly activities on some ethnic and religious groups, this study further advocates that appropriate machinery be put in place by the government towards demarcating the country to four different political states through the application of ecology of nations as this will gradually reduce the ills of terrorist attack in the new political entities. A negation of this is a danger signal to collapse of democracy and severe religious/ethnic conflict.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

A work of this nature is absolutely impossible to execute without adequate utilization of suggestions, experiences, time and assistance of numerous people. In recognition of this, sincere gratitude and appreciation go to the Almighty God, the fountain and source of wisdom for lavishing his unending love on us and without whom it would not have been possible to surmount all obstacles to the successful completion of this research work. Specifically, we remain ever grateful to the Vice Chancellor of Nnamdi Azikiwe University, his management team and others too numerous to mention for supporting this research work.

REFERENCES

- [1] Burke,R. J and Cooper, C.L. (eds). 2008. International terrorism and threats to security: managerial and organizational challenges. Cheltenham, PA: Edward Elgar
- [2] Czinkota, M.R and Ronkainer, I. A. 2009 Trends and indications in international business: topic for future Management International Review, 49: 249 266
- [3] Czinkota, M.R, Knight, G.A, Liesch, P.W, and Steen, J 2005 Positioning terrorism in management and marketing: research propositions. Journal of international management 11(4):581-604
- [4] Emeka Umejei. 2011 Nigeria: counting economic cost of terrorism. Publication of Sun Newspaper Sept 18
- [5] Frey, S.B, Luechinger, S and Stutzer, A . 2007. Calculating tragedy: Assessing the cost of terrorism. Journal of economic Surveys, 21(1): 1 – 24
- [6] Global Concord Newspaper. Volume 1 No 13, May 2010. Online.www.globalconcord.com
- [7] Hoffman, B. 2006. Inside terrorism (Second Edition). New York Columbia University Press.
- [8] Jerard, J., Astuti, F., Feisal, M. 2009. Bombing of JW Marriot and Ritz Carlton, Jarkata. Nanyang Technological University, Singapore: International Centre for Political Violence and terrorism Research
- [9] Kogut, B and kulatilaka, N. 1994. Operating flexibility, global manufacturing, and the option value of a multinational network. Management science, 40 (1): 123 139
- [10] Kunreuther, H.C. and Micheal-Kerjan, E.O 2007. Assessing, managing and benefiting from global

- interdependent risks: the case of terrorism and natural disasters. Proceedings of CREATE Symposium, 17 -18 August 2007, Los Angeles,
- [11] March, C and Simon, H. 1958. Organisations. New York: John Wiley and Sons
- [12] Milward, H.B and Raab, J. 2009. Dark networks and the problem of Islamic Jihadist Terrorism. In S. Goldsmith and D.F. Kettl (Eds.), Uunlocking the power of networks: keys to high performance government: 168 – 189. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution press.
- [13] Mustapha Bello. 2011 Nigeria Investment Promotion. A publication of executive secretary of Nigeria Investment Promotion, Abuja
- [14] Sonubis. 1973, Otobo. 1983 and Owoye. 1991 Terrorism and international business environment. Special electronic issue 1-6
- [15] Tell: Nigeria's Independent Weekly Magazine. 2011, No. 39, October 3, Km 22 Lagos – Ibadan express Way, Lagos
- [16] Tell: Nigeria's Independent Weekly Magazine.2011, No. 38, September 26, Km 22 Lagos Ibadan express Way, Lagos
- [17] Tell: Nigeria's Independent Weekly Magazine.2011, No. 37, September 19, Km 22 Lagos Ibadan express Way, Lagos
- [18] The Nation Newspaper. 2012, Vol 7 No. 2088, April 9, Vintage Press Limited Matori, Lagos
- [19] The Nation Newspaper. 2012, Vol 6 No. 2061, March 11, Vintage Press Limited Matori, Lagos
- [20] The Nation Newspaper. 2012, Vol 5 No. 20025, February 4, Vintage Press Limited Matori, Lagos
- [21] UNCTAD. 2011 The year 2011 World Investment Report prepared by United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.
- [22] http://www.gl.iit.edu/govdocs/maps/maps.htm
- [23] http://www.google.com.ng Abuja, Nigeria bomb blast google search
- [24] http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title = patterns of global terrorism & o1did = 483887883"

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Name: Author 1

Patrick L. Akpan holds two Ph.D Degrees, M.Sc and MBA Degrees. He is an Associate Professor at Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria. Currently he is the Director, NAU/UNIZIK Business School as well as the Coordinator of Faculty Based MBA Programme in the Faculty of Management Sciences, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

Tel: +2348033373788

Email: patricklinusonline@yahoo.com

Name: Author 2

Ebele Mary Onwuka holds two Ph.D degrees. She is presently a Lecturer in the Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Nigeria.

Tel: +2348037161111

Email: ebeleonwuka@yahoo.co.uk

Name: Author 3

Chinedu Uzochukwu Onyeizugbe holds a Ph.D degree. He is a Lecturer at Department of Business Administration, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

Tel: +2348034548236 Email: edu_phd@yahoo.com