

## CHALLENGES FACED BY NIGERIA IN THE AFRICAN UNION'S (AU) PEACE AND SECURITY AGENDA, 2015-2025.

Kpochi Winifred Mimidoo<sup>1</sup>, Eugene T. Aliegba<sup>1</sup> & Mohammed Bello Baban'Umma<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Political Science, Nasarawa State University;  
[kpochiwinifred@gmail.com](mailto:kpochiwinifred@gmail.com); +2348100384224.

\* Correspondence: [kpochiwinifred@gmail.com](mailto:kpochiwinifred@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Nigeria has historically occupied a central position in Africa's peace and security architecture, playing a leading role in peacekeeping, conflict mediation, and the promotion of collective security within the African Union (AU). However, between 2015 and 2025, Nigeria's ability to advance the AU's peace and security agenda has faced increasing constraints. This study examines the challenges confronting Nigeria in the implementation of the AU's peace and security agenda during this period and assesses the measures adopted to address these challenges. Anchored in Role Theory, the study analyses the gap between Nigeria's self-conception and external expectations as a regional security leader and its actual performance within the AU's security mechanisms. Adopting a qualitative research design, the study relies exclusively on secondary data from scholarly literature, AU documents, official reports, and relevant institutional publications. Data were analysed using document analysis, qualitative content analysis, and process tracing. The findings reveal that escalating domestic insecurity, economic constraints, governance deficits, institutional weaknesses within the AU, and contested leadership among member states have significantly limited Nigeria's capacity to fulfil its expected leadership role. The study finds that Nigeria has responded through adaptive strategies, including multilateral engagement via the AU and the Economic Community of West African States, support for the African Peace and Security Architecture, and domestic peacebuilding and governance reforms to restore role credibility. The study concludes that Nigeria's effectiveness in advancing the AU's peace and security agenda depends on aligning domestic stability, material capacity, and institutional reform with its traditional continental leadership role.

**KEYWORDS:** Nigeria, African Union, Peace and Security and Role Theory

### Introduction

Nigeria occupies a central place in Africa's peace and security landscape. As the continent's most populous country and one of its largest economies, Nigeria has historically pursued an Afrocentric foreign policy, making Africa the centre-piece of its external relations and assuming major responsibilities in the formation of the OAU, its transformation into the AU, and in key integration and security initiatives such as NEPAD, the African Peer Review Mechanism, and the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) (Terwase et al., 2015; Arthur, 2017). From the 1960s through the early 2000s, this translated into robust diplomatic and military engagement in peacekeeping and conflict management across West Africa and beyond, a pattern often described as Pax-Nigeriana (Omotuyi, 2020). Nigerian troops and diplomacy were pivotal in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Darfur, Côte d'Ivoire and The Gambia, and its activism

was framed as a practical expression of the AU's call for "African solutions to African problems" (Omotuyi, 2020; Terwase et al., 2015).

The period 2015-2025, however, coincides with a profound transformation in both Nigeria's internal security situation and the broader African security environment. Domestically, Nigeria has experienced escalating insecurity: terrorism and insurgency (Boko Haram and ISWAP), armed banditry, kidnapping, farmer-herder conflicts, separatist agitations, and widening criminal violence have cumulatively produced what some analysts describe as a "war situation" within the country (Omotuyi, 2020; Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018; Adejumo & Etim, 2025; Titus, 2025). These crises have demanded massive troop deployments, exceptional budgetary allocations to defence, and sustained political attention, weakening the state's ability to project power externally and undermining its capacity to sustain earlier patterns of peacekeeping leadership (Omotuyi, 2020; Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018; Adejumo & Etim, 2025). Regionally and continent-wide, African security governance has shifted into a context marked by recurrent coups (e.g., Mali, Burkina Faso, Niger), complex transnational threats, porous borders, and growing reliance on ad hoc security initiatives such as the Multinational Joint Task Force in the Lake Chad Basin and the G5 Sahel Joint Force, which operate alongside and sometimes outside formal APSA structures (Adisa et al., 2025; Omoyama, 2024; Arthur, 2017).

Within this evolving context, the AU's peace and security agenda, articulated through APSA and Agenda 2063, places heavy emphasis on conflict prevention, collective security, rapid response, and the consolidation of democratic norms. Yet research shows that APSA and AU peace operations continue to suffer from chronic constraints: inadequate and unpredictable funding, limited logistical and human capacity, slow and politicised decision-making, and over-reliance on external partners for finance, technology, and even strategic direction (Elamin, 2025; Omoyama, 2024; Arthur, 2017). Nigeria, as a key architect and intended pillar of this architecture, is simultaneously a principal troop and resource contributor, a norm entrepreneur for African integration, and a state whose own fragility and governance deficits increasingly call into question its ability to underwrite AU peace and security ambitions (Omotuyi, 2020; Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018; Emmanuel-Dio, 2025). The years from 2015 therefore mark a turning point where Nigeria's traditional leadership is increasingly at odds with its empirical capabilities and domestic realities, even as continental expectations remain high.

At the same time, the global and regional political economy has further complicated Nigeria's AU role. Harsh macro-economic conditions, foreign debt burdens, narrow tax bases and limited national and regional capacity constrain not only AU member states generally, but Nigeria in particular, restricting its fiscal room to fund peace missions, support AU assessments, or provide the kinds of financial and technical backing that

made its earlier leadership possible (Akinola, 2024; Arthur, 2017). New geopolitical alignments with African states diversifying partnerships away from former colonial powers towards actors like Russia and China compound existing coordination difficulties within APSA and raise strategic questions about the feasibility of a genuinely Afrocentric peace and development agenda (Emmanuel-Dio, 2025; Arthur, 2017). In addition, Nigeria's domestic human rights record, governance weaknesses, and persistent insecurity complicate its normative authority when advocating for democracy, rule of law, and human security as AU standards (Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018; Emmanuel-Dio, 2025; Iyamba & Yusuf, 2025). These tensions between ambition and capacity form the backdrop to the period 2015–2025 and frame the need for a focused study.

Despite Nigeria's long-standing image as Africa's "regional hegemon" and its foundational role in both the AU and APSA, evidence suggests that between 2015 and 2025 the country has faced mounting challenges that significantly limit its effectiveness in advancing the AU's peace and security agenda.

Consequently, there is a widening gap between Nigeria's long-standing image and expectations as a regional security provider and its constrained, often declining, practical contribution to the AU's peace and security agenda during 2015-2025, with implications for both continental conflict management and the realisation of Agenda 2063's aspiration for a peaceful and secure Africa (Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018; Vines, 2013; Akinola, 2024; Omotuyi, 2020; Mushoriwa, 2023).

Against this backdrop, this study is guided by the following research questions: What are the challenges faced by Nigeria in the African Union's (AU) peace and security agenda? What are the measures adopted to overcome the challenges faced by Nigeria in achieving the African Union's (AU) peace and security agenda? The main objective of the study is to examine the constraints facing Nigeria within the AU framework and to assess the strategies adopted to mitigate them. Specifically, the study seeks to explore the challenges limiting Nigeria's engagement and to evaluate the measures adopted in response.

### **Conceptual and Empirical Literature Review**

The concepts of peace and security are fundamental to understanding Nigeria's engagement with the African Union's peace and security agenda. For the purpose of this research, peace is defined as a dynamic and multi-dimensional process involving the absence of direct, structural, and cultural violence, alongside the presence of justice, good governance, social equity, and human security. It moves beyond the simplistic view of peace as merely the absence of war to include proactive conditions necessary for sustainable development and conflict prevention.

To Osimen and Aisedion, (2021), security can be defined as an all-encompassing condition in which individual citizens live in freedom, peace and safety; participate fully in the process of governance; Enjoy the protection of fundamental rights; have Access to resources and the basic necessities of life; And inhabit an environment which is not detrimental to their health and wellbeing not only in terms of the internal security of the State, but also in terms of secure systems of Food health, money and trade For the purpose of this study, security connotes freedom from, or elimination of threat not only to physical existence of the State but also to the ability for self-protection and development and the enhancement of the general wellbeing of all the people. This is not to say that security of the State is not important but rather the security of the State should be geared towards the security of human persons not of the regime in place.

Empirically, several studies have examined the dynamics of peace and security in Africa and the role of the African Union. Uwa and Iloh (2023) wrote on ‘Sustainable Peace and Security in Africa: Strategy for Attainment of Agenda 2063 of African Union’. Data were obtained using secondary sources and the data were analyzed qualitatively. The causes of conflict and insecurity were revealed. The study also observed that the prospect of achieving Agenda 2063 of African Union is profoundly depends on proper mechanisms for conflict prevention, management and resolution in the region. Therefore, the study recommended among others, that the putting into practice of the African policy on Governance Architecture must be given the required importance as APSA and AGA are two sides of one coin. Whereas AGA focuses on comprehensive questions of governance, APSA places importance on the instruments for conflict management, resolution, and peace-building.

These two must work together, as this will not only bring about peace and security needed in the continent of Africa but, will also guarantee and serve a lead way for the Attainment of Agenda 2063 of African Union. The study only focused on examining sustainable peace and security in Africa while failing to include the challenges faced by Nigeria in the African Union’s (AU) peace and security agenda in its analysis which is a gap this study seeks to examine.

Bakare (2024) in his work ‘African Union and the Developmental Transformation of Africa: Challenges, Achievement and Prospects’, evaluates the activities of AU with respect to these specificities in tackling past and present challenges facing the continent in the wave of Afro-pessimists’ argument that Africa cannot claim its place in the 21st century. The study adopted qualitative methodology. The study identified the challenges facing the AU in coordinating African developmental transformation but recognised the fact that Africa of the end of the first decade of the 21st century is not exactly the same as the Africa of the early sixties in term of developmental improvement. It identified the challenges crippling the continent’s developmental potentials from been actualised to

include: Possible spread of Arab Spring uprisings to Sub-Sahara Africa, diversification and integration into the global economy, income inequalities, hunger and poverty, restricted movement of people, goods and services, troika of African institutions, contingency plan for malaise in the West, systemic corruption, dearth of infrastructural facilities, leadership and followership problems, increasingly complex neoliberal globalization, changes in intercultural relations at the global level, the ICTs revolution, the evolution of gender and intergenerational relations, the evolution of spirituality and of the status and the role of religion in modern societies, the emergence of a multi-polar world and the phenomenon of emerging Asian powers and the issue of competing regionalism among others.

The study recommended that AU focus on issues such as the high mobility of African people, and its consequences in terms of citizenship rights; the issue of natural resource management and food security; the recurrent problem of African integration with a focus on the issue of common borders and most importantly, the issue of competing regionalism especially on the polarisation of the continent along Anglo-francophone delineation.

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study adopts Role Theory as its analytical framework. Role Theory explains state behaviour in terms of roles defined by expectations, norms, and interactions within the international system. It emphasizes how states conceive their roles, how these roles are perceived by others, and how effectively they are performed.

Role Theory is operationalized in this study through three key dimensions: role conception, role expectation, and role performance. Nigeria's role conception reflects its self-perception as a regional leader and security provider, rooted in its Afrocentric foreign policy and historical involvement in peacekeeping operations. Role expectations arise from external actors, including the African Union and regional organizations such as ECOWAS, which expect Nigeria to play a leading role in conflict management and peacebuilding.

However, role performance reflects Nigeria's actual ability to fulfill these expectations. While Nigeria has historically demonstrated strong leadership in conflicts such as Liberia, Sierra Leone, and The Gambia, its performance in recent years has been constrained by domestic insecurity, economic limitations, and governance challenges (Omotuyi, 2020; Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018). This has resulted in role strain, where competing internal and external demands limit effective role execution.

By applying these dimensions, Role Theory provides a useful framework for understanding the gap between Nigeria's expected leadership role and its actual performance within the AU's peace and security architecture.

## **Methodology**

This study adopts a qualitative research design based on secondary data analysis. The qualitative approach is particularly appropriate for examining complex policy processes, diplomatic behaviour, and institutional dynamics within the African Union, as it allows for in-depth interpretation of patterns and contextual relationships that cannot be adequately captured through quantitative methods.

Data were obtained from a range of secondary sources, including African Union policy documents, official reports, academic literature, and institutional publications relevant to Nigeria's role in the AU's peace and security agenda. These sources provide comprehensive insights into both the structural constraints and strategic responses shaping Nigeria's engagement.

The study employs document analysis and qualitative content analysis to identify recurring themes and patterns, while process tracing is used to examine the evolution of Nigeria's role over time. Role Theory guides the interpretation of Nigeria's role conception, expectations, and performance within the AU framework.

## **Data Analysis and Interpretation of Results**

### **Research Objective One: To explore the challenges faced by Nigeria in the African Union's (AU) peace and security agenda.**

Nigeria's engagement with the African Union's peace and security agenda is shaped by a long-standing Afrocentric foreign policy and a self-image as regional hegemon, yet this role is increasingly constrained by deep domestic, regional and institutional problems. Since 1999, Nigeria has tried to use the AU's emerging security architecture-articularly the Peace and Security Council and African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA)-to promote democracy, conflict resolution and "African solutions to African problems", a posture scholars describe as neo-conservative: assertive on democracy promotion and regime change when necessary, but operating through multilateral AU and ECOWAS frameworks (Bakare, 2019; Omotuyi, 2020; Vines, 2013). Nigeria's diplomatic and military activism in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Côte d'Ivoire, Darfur and elsewhere reflected this ambition, but the sustainability of that role is now in question (Akinola, 2024; Omotuyi, 2020; Eyeh, 2024; Adedeji, 2023).

A core challenge is the deterioration of Nigeria's internal security, which narrows its capacity to lead continent-wide initiatives. The Boko Haram insurgency since 2009,

alongside banditry, communal clashes and other forms of violence, has forced the Nigerian state to reorient security resources inward, stretching its military and finances (Terwase et al., 2015; Omotuyi, 2020; Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018). Studies on “Pax-Nigeriana” argue that the proliferation of domestic crises such as terrorism, inequality, and political instability has had dire implication for Nigeria’s willingness and ability to shoulder a self-assigned responsibility to protect in Africa, visible in its hesitant and sometimes inconsistent role in operations such as Mali (Omotuyi, 2020; Omoyama, 2024). The fiscal burden of internal security combines with broader macro-economic weaknesses such as debt obligations, narrow tax base and under-resourced institutions, identified as constraints on Nigeria’s ability to underwrite AU integration programs like NEPAD and APSA, and hence to back ambitious peace and security commitments with predictable funding and capacity (Terwase et al., 2015; Vines, 2013).

At the continental level, Nigeria operates within an AU architecture that itself suffers from capacity, coherence and legitimacy deficits. The development of APSA since 2002 has created formal mechanisms including a Standby Force, early warning system and Panel of the Wise but their operationalization is patchy, heavily donor-dependent and sometimes outpaced by the more agile regional economic communities, which complicates coordination between ECOWAS, where Nigeria is most influential, and the AU in Addis Ababa (Vines, 2013; Apuuli, 2020; Gottschalk, 2020). AU-mandated missions, including those addressing non-state actors such as Boko Haram and Sahelian jihadist groups, have faced chronic funding gaps, logistical shortfalls and mandate ambiguities that limit the impact of Nigerian troop contributions and diplomatic efforts (Apuuli, 2020; Gottschalk, 2020; Eyeh, 2024). Even in specific theatres where Nigerian contingents played a crucial role, such as Darfur, research finds that leadership failures within the AU and inadequate international backing severely constrained mission effectiveness, illustrating how Nigeria’s influence is bounded by institutional weaknesses beyond its control (Eyeh, 2024).

Nigeria’s leadership is further challenged by questions of legitimacy and contested hegemony among African peers. While its Afrocentric policy and heavy sacrifices in peacekeeping have supported regional stability and earned international praise, there is evidence that some West African states, including Liberia and Sierra Leone, have not fully recognised or rewarded these efforts, even opposing Nigeria’s bids for a UN Security Council seat (Ahmed & Najimu, 2025; Oghuvbu, 2024; Adedeji, 2023). Such ingratitude and suspicion feed into a wider pattern where Nigerian activism is sometimes perceived as self-serving, especially amid rivalries with other continental powers and Francophone states, diluting its authority within AU peace and security deliberations (Ahmed & Najimu, 2025; Akinola, 2024; Omotuyi, 2020). At the normative level, Nigeria’s push to entrench liberal norms of democracy and human rights via the AU sits uneasily with the persistence of authoritarian practices both across the continent and at

home, undermining its credibility when advocating sanctions against coups or unconstitutional changes of government (Bakare, 2019; Omotuyi, 2020; Emmanuel-Dio, 2025).

Finally, the AU's broader dependence on non-African actors for peace operations and funding complicates Nigeria's aspiration to anchor genuinely African-owned solutions. Analyses of West African coups and peacekeeping argue that reliance on external powers has become counterproductive and recommend that AU establish a standing army for rapid response and that Nigeria even pause some outward deployments to prioritise its own security crisis (Omoyama, 2024; Omotuyi, 2020; Gottschalk, 2020; Emmanuel-Dio, 2025). Yet proposals for more autonomous African forces run into the same financial and political constraints that already limit APSA, including uneven political will among member states and the persistent influence of shifting global alliances with powers such as Russia and China (Vines, 2013; Gottschalk, 2020; Emmanuel-Dio, 2025). These overlapping domestic vulnerabilities, legitimacy issues and structural weaknesses in AU and UN-AU arrangements together explain why, despite its size and historical activism, Nigeria now struggles to consistently drive and implement the AU's peace and security agenda.

**Research Objective Two: To assess the measures adopted to overcome the challenges faced by Nigeria in achieving the African Union's (AU) peace and security agenda.**

Nigeria has responded to the obstacles limiting its role in the AU's peace and security agenda through a combination of foreign-policy reorientation, institutional reforms, regional partnerships and internal governance initiatives. These measures aim both to restore Nigeria's capacity as a regional security provider and to align domestic realities with AU norms on peace, democracy and development.

One central measure has been the consolidation of an explicitly Afrocentric and neo-conservative foreign policy that frames peace and security in Africa as a core national interest. Since 1999, successive civilian governments have used the AU and ECOWAS as primary platforms for conflict management, democracy promotion and collective security, thereby embedding Nigeria's leadership within multilateral institutions rather than purely unilateral interventions (Bakare, 2019). This has included championing the creation and strengthening of AU security structures such as the Peace and Security Council and African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA), and supporting liberal peace norms (democracy, human rights, good governance) as the continental standard for resolving crises (Bakare, 2019; Vines, 2013; Arthur, 2017). By anchoring its activism in AU frameworks, Nigeria seeks to overcome legitimacy deficits and suspicions of hegemonic ambition, presenting its interventions in Côte d'Ivoire, Togo,

The Gambia and elsewhere as enforcement of agreed AU norms rather than narrow national projection (Bakare, 2019).

Institutionally, Nigeria has invested in and leveraged AU integration initiatives such as NEPAD, APSA and the African Peer Review Mechanism to strengthen both continental and domestic governance foundations for peace. As a co-initiator and major supporter of NEPAD, Nigeria has used its peace and security programme focused on conflict prevention, management, resolution and post-conflict reconstruction, to coordinate with federal ministries, state and local governments, civil society and the private sector on strategies to address insecurity at home, particularly Boko Haram violence (Terwase et al., 2015). NEPAD's emphasis on democracy and political governance has encouraged reforms such as attention to equitable zoning of political offices across Nigeria's six geopolitical zones, intended to reduce grievances, promote inclusion and enhance internal stability, thereby freeing more capacity for AU obligations (Terwase et al., 2015). More broadly, Nigerian engagement with NEPAD and APSA attempts to tackle structural constraints such as weak institutions, poor governance, and limited capacity, that had undermined both domestic security and the credibility of Nigeria's AU-level leadership (Terwase et al., 2015).

Nigeria has also sought to mitigate capacity and coordination problems by deepening security cooperation with regional economic communities, chiefly ECOWAS, in line with APSA's design. ECOWAS has been used as a nimble first responder in West African crises, with Nigeria providing the backbone of mediation, sanctions and military deployments that were later endorsed or complemented by the AU, as seen in the resolution of Côte d'Ivoire's post-election crisis and the restoration of constitutional order in The Gambia and Togo (Bakare, 2019; Vines, 2013; Arthur, 2017). This "regionalisation" of security provision, combined with AU-REC division of labour, is intended to overcome AU's limited rapid-deployment capacity, harmonise responses and reduce over-reliance on extra-continental actors (Vines, 2013; Arthur, 2017). At the same time, Nigerian and AU debates have increasingly emphasised the need for stronger African funding of peace operations and, in some proposals, the creation of an AU standing force for rapid response, which would gradually lessen dependence on donors and enhance African ownership of security initiatives (Vines, 2013; Omoyama, 2024).

Addressing Nigeria's own internal fragilities is widely recognised in literature as a prerequisite measure if the country is to sustain its AU role. Studies on Pax-Nigeriana recommend that Nigeria temporarily scale back some external peacekeeping commitments and redirect resources to tackling domestic terrorism, inequality and governance deficits, arguing that a more secure and cohesive Nigeria will be better able to shoulder continental responsibilities in the long term (Omotuyi, 2020; Kehinde & Ezugwu, 2023). In parallel, peacebuilding and conflict-resolution strategies inside

Nigeria such as community-based initiatives, development commissions like the Niger Delta Development Commission, and programmes of dialogue, mediation and demobilization have been used to reduce conflicts that absorb military resources and damage Nigeria's regional standing (Nwachukwu, 2025; Emmanuel, 2025). These internal measures echo AU and Agenda 2063's insistence that sustainable peace requires not only hard security operations but also attention to socio-economic development, rule of law and human rights in security and justice institutions (Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018).

To address constraints linked to limited capacity, weak coordination and funding across APSA, Nigeria has supported broader AU reforms and partnerships. Within AU and NEPAD frameworks, African leaders including Nigeria have endorsed conflict-prevention mechanisms, early-warning systems and post-conflict reconstruction as priorities, while seeking more predictable financing through mechanisms such as assessed contributions and greater engagement with the international community on joint frameworks (e.g., UN-AU partnership for peace and security) (Terwase et al., 2015; Vines, 2013; Gathii, 2025; Mushoriwa, 2023). These steps are designed to ensure that when Nigeria contributes troops or diplomacy under AU auspices, missions are less hampered by ad hoc funding, unclear mandates or fragmented command structures. At the same time, there is recognition that external partnerships must be rebalanced to avoid over-dependence; proposals that the AU "do more to secure the continent" and that reliance on non-African powers is increasingly counterproductive reflect Nigerian and regional concern to develop more autonomous, best-practice-driven approaches to security in line with Agenda 2063 and the Sustainable Development Goals (Vines, 2013; Omoyama, 2024; Aborisade & Adedayo, 2018).

Ultimately, the measures adopted combine outward-looking and inward-looking strategies: reasserting Afrocentric, multilateral leadership within AU and ECOWAS; investing in integration instruments such as NEPAD and APSA; pushing for stronger African capacity and funding; and prioritising domestic governance and peacebuilding reforms to restore Nigeria's ability to act as a credible and capable anchor of the AU's peace and security agenda.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study examined the challenges faced by Nigeria in advancing the African Union's peace and security agenda between 2015 and 2025. The findings reveal that Nigeria's effectiveness has been significantly constrained by domestic insecurity, economic limitations, governance deficits, and institutional weaknesses within the AU. These challenges have created a gap between Nigeria's traditional role as a regional leader and its actual performance within the AU's security architecture.

Despite these constraints, Nigeria has adopted adaptive strategies, including increased reliance on multilateral frameworks such as the AU and ECOWAS, support for APSA, and domestic peacebuilding initiatives. These efforts reflect a shift from unilateral leadership to a more collaborative and institution-based approach.

Based on these findings, the study makes the following recommendations:

First, Nigeria should prioritize strengthening domestic security, governance, and economic resilience as a foundation for sustaining its leadership role within the African Union. Addressing internal conflicts, improving military capacity, and enhancing institutional effectiveness will reduce role strain and improve Nigeria's external performance.

Second, Nigeria, in collaboration with other AU member states, should advocate for sustainable financing and institutional strengthening of the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA). Reducing donor dependency and improving coordination between the AU and Regional Economic Communities will enhance the effectiveness of peace and security interventions.

These measures are essential for aligning Nigeria's domestic capacity with its continental responsibilities and ensuring its continued relevance in Africa's evolving security landscape.

## References

- Aborisade, R., & Adedayo, S. (2018). Security and the 2063 agenda for sustainable development in Africa: Whither Nigeria? *African Research Review*, 12(1), 23–34. doi:10.4314/afrev.v12i1.3
- Adedeji, A. (2023). The contribution of Nigeria to the advancement of African and global peace and the resolution of the Liberia long-standing conflict. *Indonesian Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Research*.
- Ahmed, F., & Najimu, B. (2025). Impact assessment of Nigeria's Afrocentric foreign policy on peace and security in West Africa. *International Journal of Social Science Humanity & Management Research*. doi:10.58806/ijsshmr.2025.v4i7n16
- Akinola, A. (2024). The declining role of Nigeria as Africa's peacekeeper in the UN Security Council. *African Security*, 17, 59-86. doi:10.1080/19392206.2024.2359761
- Amuhaya, C. (2024). The African peace and security architecture (APSA) organizational structure in context of implementation of peace and security in Eastern Africa. *Asian and African Studies*, 8(3), 25-35.
- Apuuli, K. (2020). The African Union and peacekeeping in Africa: Challenges and opportunities. *Vestnik RUDN. International Relations*. doi:10.22363/2313-0660-2020-20-4-667-677
- Arthur, P. (2017). Promoting security in Africa through regional economic communities (RECs) and the African Union's African peace and security architecture (APSA). *Insight on Africa*, 9, 1–21. doi:10.1177/0975087816674577
- Bakare, A. R. (2024). African Union and the developmental transformation of Africa: Attainment of Agenda 2063 of African Union. *Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(3), 66–85.
- Bakare, O. (2019a). An assessment of Nigeria's foreign policy and the African Union security architecture: Neo-conservative perspectives. *International Relations and Diplomacy*. doi:10.17265/2328-2134/2019.05.001
- Bakare, O. (2019b). The Nigerian-Commonwealth and UN relations: Nigeria from pariah state to exporter of democracy since 1999. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 5. doi:10.1080/23311886.2019.1658999
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent developments in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1).
- Dauda, M., Ahmad, M. Z. B., & Keling, M. F. (2020). *Foreign policy and Afrocentrism*.

- Dauda, S., & Obadan, A. (2024). Nigeria's role in African Union. *ResearchGate*.
- Denisova, T. (2022). Africa in the 21st century: New insights into the problem of security. *Asia and Africa Today*, 3, 22–32.
- Denisova, T., & Kostelyanets, S. (2023). African solutions to African problems: Peacekeeping efforts of the African Union and African regional organizations. *Vestnik RUDN. International Relations*. doi:10.22363/2313-0660-2023-23-3-451-465
- Elijah, I. (2023). 10 strongest African military powers by country in 2023.
- Emmanuel, J. (2025). Corroding armed conflicts through peacebuilding initiatives in Northeast Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities, Education, and Social Sciences*. doi:10.58578/ijhess.v3i2.6127
- Emmanuel-Dio, C. (2025). Twenty-two years after: The African peace and security architecture (APSA) in the face of shifting geopolitics and regional security dynamics. *Journal of Central and Eastern European African Studies*. doi:10.12700/jceeas.2025.5.1.351
- Eyeh, E. (2024). A study of Nigerian Army's involvement in African Union peacekeeping mission in Darfur, 2004–2007. *African and Asian Studies*. doi:10.1163/15692108-bja10031
- Eziakonwa, A. (2023). Foreword in *Soldiers and citizens: Military coups and the need for democratic renewal in Africa*.
- Garba, D. (2020). Sixty years of Nigeria's Afrocentric foreign policy: A critical review. *FUDMA International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2)
- Gathii, F. (2025). Peace and conflict resolution in East Africa and the Horn of Africa: How efficient does the African Union (AU) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) achieve these aims? *Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*. doi:10.36347/sjahss.2025.v13i01.001
- Gerhart, G., Baregu, M., Landsberg, C., & Vale, P. (2023). From Cape to Congo: Southern Africa's evolving security challenges. *Foreign Affairs*, 82(4), 190–201.
- Gottschalk, K. (2020). African peacekeeping and African integration: Current challenges. *Vestnik RUDN. International Relations*. doi:10.22363/2313-0660-2020-20-4-678-686

- Idagu, E. A., Obiageli, N. L., & Luka, M. B. (2020). Nigeria and conflict resolution in Mali. *International Journal of Social Sciences*, 2(2), 96–107.
- Jamila, E. L. (2022). The panel of the wise: A comprehensive introduction to a critical mechanism of the African Union.
- Kehinde, T., & Ezugwu, O. (2023). Rethinking Nigeria's external relations: A critical evaluation of foreign policy perspectives and imperatives. *International Journal of Emerging Multidisciplinaries: Social Science*. doi:10.54938/ijemdss.2023.02.2.249
- Loic, M., & Daniele, N. (2024). Legal conditions for the implementation of the “Silencing weapons by 2020” program of the African Union Agenda for the period up to 2063. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(7), 451–466.
- Malan, M. (2025). Conflict prevention in Africa: Theoretical construct or plan of action.
- Monsuru, A. K. (2024). *Principles of security practices & management*. NOUN Course Guide.
- Murithi, T. (2023). Between reactive and proactive interventionism: The African Union peace and security framework.
- Mushoriwa, L. (2023). The African Union's quest for a “peaceful and secure Africa”: An assessment of aspiration four of Agenda 2063. *Law, Democracy and Development*. doi:10.17159/2077-4907/2023/idd.v27.3
- Mustapha, A. H. (2020). Nigeria and the African Union (2002–2019). *Journal of Globalization Studies*, 11(2), 35–54.
- Nwachukwu, E. (2025). The effectiveness of peace building and conflict resolution strategies in addressing conflicts and insecurity in Nigeria. *Ibadan Journal of the Social Sciences*. doi:10.36108/ijss/5202.32.0160
- Oghuvbu, E. (2024). Salient foreign policy implications of Nigeria’s role in regional integration and peacekeeping in Africa. *Gusau International Journal of Management and Social Sciences*. doi:10.57233/gijmss.v7i3.9
- Omoruyi, I., Idahosa, S. O., Mugadam, M. M., & Sidibe, O. (2020). Nigeria–South Africa rivalry in quest for regional power status: From material potential to UN Security Council membership. *Vestnik RUDN. International Relations*, 20(1), 147–157.

- Omotuyi, S. (2020). Pax-Nigeriana and Nigeria's conflict management in Africa in the twenty-first century. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 3, 186–200. doi:10.37231/apj.2020.3.1.154
- Omoyama, O. (2024). Coups, regional security complexes and the impact of Nigeria's peacekeeping in West Africa, 1960–2022. *Hadmérnök*. doi:10.32567/hm.2024.1.9
- Osimen, G. U., & Aisedion, R. (2021). Ethical issues and security practice in Nigeria: The aftermath of #EndSARS and the Nigerian police force reform agenda. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 11(6), 114–126.
- Oyibokure, G., & Okolie, U. (2023). Security challenges and nation building in Africa: Nigeria in focus. *Journal of Public Administration, Finance and Law*, 29, 249–264.
- Role Theory Leadership. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.leadership-central.com/roletheory>
- Terwase, I., Abdul-Talib, A., & Zengeni, K. (2015). The implementation of peace and security programme initiative in Nigeria: The role of NEPAD. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 6, 54. doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n3p54
- The Conversation. (2021). What drives instability in Africa and what can be done about it.
- Trifunović, D. (2025). Contemporary security threats in Africa. *Journal of Central and Eastern European African Studies*, 4(3–4), 105–118.
- Ukaeje, O. (2022). Political instability and insecurity in Africa: Implications for African Union Agenda 2063. *Journal of Contemporary International Relations and Diplomacy*, 10(3), 66-81.
- Uwa, O. G., & Iloh, E. C. (2023). Sustainable peace and security in Africa: Strategy for attainment of Agenda 2063 of African Union.
- Vines, A. (2013). A decade of African peace and security architecture. *International Affairs*, 89, 89–109. doi:10.1111/1468-2346.12006
- Williams, P. D., & Hashi, A. (2016). *Exit strategy challenges for the African Union mission in Somalia*. Mogadishu: Heritage Institute for Policy Studies.
- Williams, P. D., & Boutellis, A. (2024). Partnership peacekeeping: Challenges and opportunities in the United Nations-African Union relationship. *African Affairs*, 113(451), 254-278.
- World Bank. (2023a). *Population, total*.