Nigerian Agricultural Policy Research Journal (NAPReJ) Agricultural Policy Research Network (APRNet)
Vol. 10, Special Issue. Website:http:// www.aprnetworkng.org ©2022

ISSN 2536-6084 (Print) & ISSN 2545-5745 (Online)

Socio Economic Effects of Fulani and Farmers' Conflict on Maize Farmers' Output in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State

Emiko, Mercy[1], Nwali, Collins Sunday [2], Amuwah, Victor Onuorah[3], Agude, Terngohol[2]
[1]Delta State Local Government Service Commission, Warri South Local Government
[2]Department of Agribusiness and Management, Federal College of Agriculture Moor Plantation, Ibadan, Oyo state, Nigeria.
[3]Department of Agricultural Economics, Dennis Osadebay University, Asaba, Delta State Nigeria.

Corresponding authors Email: emikomearcy@gmail.com

A R T I C L E I NFO

Key words:

farmers' output,

farmers' conflict**,**

socio economic

ABSTRACT

This study determined the socio-economic effects of Fulani and farmers conflict on maize farmers' output in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo State. Objectives of this study were to; describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, identify the causes of the herdsmen-farmers conflict, determine the output differences before, during and after conflict and identify the farmer's perceived solution to end conflict in the study area. Multi stage sampling technique was used to select 120 respondents for this study. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to realize the objectives of the study. The results on socio economic characteristics of the respondents showed that 32.5% of the respondents were between the age of 45-54 years, majority (75.8%) of the respondents were male, most (66.7%) of the respondents were married. 33.3 % of the respondents had secondary education, most (68.3%)of the respondents had farming as their secondary occupation, majority (73.3%) of the respondent had 1-10 years of farming experience, majority (60.0%) of the respondents were not have access to extension services, majority (79.2%) of the respondents earn 10,000-50,000, 51.7% of the respondents were Christians, most (62.5%) of the respondents had 1-5 households, majority (92.5%) of the respondents had 1-5 farm size, most (60.8%) of the respondents were member of cooperative society, 38.3% of the respondents inherited their farmland. The result on causes of the herdsmen-farmers conflict showed that majority (81.7%) experience conflict between farmers and herdsmen, 91.7% of the respondents experienced negative effect of the conflict on maize production, destruction of maize by cattle (36.7%) and killing of farmers (31.7%), as the main causes of the conflict in the study area. The results on output differences before, during and after conflict revealed that farmers produced average of 1,235 (kg/tons), 1,198(kg/tons) and 1,029 (kg/tons) of maize before, during and after the conflict respectively. Also, farmers spent ₦2,677, ₦2,497 and ₦2,389 on maize production (kg/tons) before, during and after the conflict respectively. Moreover, farmers sold maize (kg/tons) for ₦2,500, ₦1,882 and ₦1,777 before, during and after the conflict respectively. Results on perceived solution to end conflict were: government should provide adequate security (40.0%) and making of rules and regulations that will guide grazing (33.3%). Results also revealed that there is significant relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of the farmers and their maize output. From the findings of this study, it is recommended that to prevent further community clashes in farming communities, government and relevant agencies should collaborate with traditional institutions to settle rivalries amicably among parties before it degenerates into serious security challenge. Also, government should provide palliative to the affected farmers in the study area as this will cushion the effect of conflict on them.

1.0 Introduction

The conflict between farmers and herders is one of the social problems that bestow serious security challenge and obstruct with severe threat to entrepreneurship practice and the unity of the Nigerian, particularly Southwestern states. Since the outbreak of farmers and herder's deadly clashes, the relationship that had existed with cordiality and report seems to be suffering with untold setback with several attending apprehensions that beckons for address. Therefore, the unity of the South Western states can only be enjoyed by all when the peaceful coexistence of the sub regions and their means of livelihood, upkeep and sustainability become a success with the presence and existence of reasonable security of lives and property. This is the phenomenological expectation of every sound -minded citizens of the South Western Nigeria (Abbas, 2018).

The South Western Nigeria has experienced and still experiencing conflicts of grave proportions among several ethnic and religiousness communities across the states. These conflicts significantly vary in dimension, process and the groups involved (Adisa,

ISSN 2536-6084 (Print) & ISSN 2545-5745 (Online)

2012). Monale, (2003) explained that some conflicts arise between same resource user group such as between one farming community and another, others occur between different user groups such as between farmers and herders or between foresters and farmers. (Popoola, Adewale, Idachaba and Shittu (2019) explained that struggle over grazing land and scarce resources have over the years resulted in perennial and growing violent conflicts in terms of frequency, intensity and geographical scope.

Adisa, (2012) observes that the farmer's herdsmen conflict has remained one of the most preponderant resource-use bloody conflicts in Nigeria. Other studies show that land related issues, especially on grazing fields, account for the highest percentage of conflicts. Putting it straight, studies indicate that struggles over the control of economically viable lands cause more alarm and security hazards as well as violent conflicts among communities. Social and economic factors continue to provoke violent conflicts among the farmers and Fulani pastoralists. The intensity variations of the conflict largely depend on the nature and type of the user groups where the pastoralists graze. These conflicts have constituted serious threats to the means of survival and livelihoods of both the farmers and pastoralists with what both groups are tenaciously protecting. According to Abbas, (2018) the conflicts (though provocative) over access rights to farmland and cattle routes, have become ubiquitous and seems to have no defined solutions. However, Coser, (2000) observed that, the inevitability of conflict in the claim for scarce resources is considered here as the bane for struggles over the inestimable value for land and its resource, with the claim for ownership and the claim for its position as a common resource. However, the complexity of land use system that has changed overtime has culminated in present day tension and conflicts between the host farmer's communities and Fulani herdsmen.

Meanwhile, the usual resultant effects of the conflict are loss of lives, crops, destruction of houses, displacement of persons, decline in income, distrust; as well as threat to food and national security (Popoola *et al*, 2019). It is against this background that the study focused on the aforementioned issues to assess the prevalence of herdsmen-farmers conflict on maize farmers output in Akinyele Local Government area of Oyo State. Specifically,

1. describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents in the study area;
2. identify the causes of the herdsmen-farmers conflict in the study area;
3. determine the output differences before, during and after conflict in the study area;
4. identify the farmers perceived solution to end conflict in the study area

1.5 Hypothesis of the study

There is no significant relationship between the socio economic characteristics of the respondents and the maize output

2. Methodology

2.1 Study Area

The study area for the research work was Akinyele Local Government Area of Ibadan Oyo State. Akinyele local government is one of the eleven Local Governments that make up Ibadan suburb. It headquarters are at Moniya. Akinyele local government area was created 1976 and it shares boundaries with Afijio local government to the North, Lagelu local government to the East, Ido local government area to the west and Ibadan North local area to the South. The town is located on latitude 7021'-80N and longitude 4002' - 4028'E. It occupies a land area of 464.892 square km with a population density of 516 persons per square kilometre. Using 3.2% growth rate from 2006 census figures, the 2010 estimated population for the local government is 239,745. Akinyele local government is sub-divided into twelve (12) wards Ikereku, Olanla / Oboda / Labode, Arulogun / Eniosa / Aroro, Olode / Amosun / Onidundu, Ojo-Emo / Moniya, Akinyele / Isabiyi / Irepodun, Iwokoto / Tolonta / Idioro, Ojoo / Ajibode / Laniba, Ijaye / Ojedeji, Ajibade / Alabanta / Elekuru, Olorisa`Oko / Okegbemi / Mele, and Iroko. The local government is governed by an elected chairman and 12 councilors, one elected from each ward. The major crops grown in the state include cassava, maize and yam, the major livestock reared in the state include cattle, sheep, goat, fish production and poultry production.

2.2 Population of the study area

The population of the study consists of maize farmer in Akinyele Local Government Area of Oyo state.

2.3 Sampling techniques and sample size

A multi-stage sampling technique was used for this study. In the first stage Akinyele Local Government was purposively selected due to the predominance of maize farmers in the area. In the second stage, out if 12 wards in Akinyele Local Government Area 6 wards were randomly selected. In the third stage 2 villages each were randomly selected from the 6 wards to give a total number of 10 villages. In the fourth stage 10 maize farmers were selected from each village to give a total number of 120 respondents.

2.4 Data Analysis

Data for this study were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency, mean and percentage while the inferential statistics was used to analyzed the

ISSN 2536-6084 (Print) & ISSN 2545-5745 (Online)

hypothesis. Objective 1-4 were analyzed with descriptive statistics while the hypothesis was analyzed with regression

2.5 Model specification

The empirical model for the ordinary least square multiple regression

$C= f(x_1, x_{2,} x_{3,} x_{4,} x_{6,})$…….implicit form …….(1)

$C = B_O+B_1 X_I+B_2 X_2+B_3 X_3+B_4 X_4+B_5 X_5+B_6 X_6+B_7 X_7+ \mu$ explicit form …….. (2)

Where

C = maize output (kg)

X_1 = Age of the farmers (in years);

X_2 = Sex (1=male, 2=female)

X_3 =Marital status (married=1, single=2, divorced=3, widowed=4)

X_4 = Educational level (Adult education=1, primary education=2, secondary education=3, Tertiary education=4)

X_5 = Secondary occupation (Farming=1, Trading=2, Civil servant=3)

X_6=Farming experience (Years)

X_7= Access to extension services

X_8=Income (Naira)

μ = Error term

3.0 Results and Discussion

3.1 Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

Age

Results in Table 1 shows that 32.5% of the respondents were between the age of 45-54 years, 25.8% of the respondents were between 35-44, 20.8% of the respondents were between the age of 55-64 years, 11.7% of the respondents were above 65 years, while 9.2% of the respondents were between 25-34 years of age. The mean age was 50. This implies that majority of the respondents were adult. This finding is conforms with similar findings of Adejare and Arimi (2013) who reported that the majority of agricultural labour force in Nigeria falls between 35 to 55 years.

Sex

Result in Table 1 also shows that majority 75.8% of the respondents were male, while 24.2% of the respondents were female. This implies that majority of the respondents in the study area were male. This may be due to the fact that maize farming involves tedious activities. This agrees with the finding of Olaleye *et al.,* (2010) which revealed that males are more involved in both farming and pastoral activities.

Marital Status

Furthermore the results also showed that most (66.7%) of the respondents were married. 14.2 % of the respondents were single while 12.5 % of the respondents were widowed, while 6.7 % of the respondents were divorced. This implies that most of the respondents in the study area were married. The result is in consonance with the findings of Shittu, (2020) who found that in his study that majority of farmers in Nigeria were married. This is a reflection of the high value placed on marriage in the study area.

Educational Status

Also, Table 1 shows that 33.3 % of the respondents had secondary education, 22.5% of the respondents had tertiary education, 17.5% of the respondents had adult education 14.2% of the respondents had primary education, while 12.5% of the respondent had no formal education. This implies that the respondents in the study area were literate. This finding disagrees with that of Olaleye, Odutola, Ojo, Umar and Ndanitsa. (2010) who reported that the majority of farmers do not have formal education in their study.

Secondary occupation

Table 1shows that most (68.3%)of the respondents had farming as their secondary occupation 19.2% of the respondents had trading as their secondary occupation, 12.5% of the respondents had civil servant as their secondary occupation. This implies that the farmers still plant another crop apart from maize which shows that they earned from other crops planted

Farming experience

Results in Table 1 shows that majority (73.3%) of the respondent had 1-10 years of farming experience, 21.7% of the respondents had 11-20% years of farming experience, while 5.0% of the respondents had above 21 years of farming experience. The mean of farming experience is 10. This implies that majority of the respondents had enough years of farming experience on maize production which will help in adapting to any conflict that may affect their farming activities. This is in line with the work of Aliyu, (2015). who also found more experience farmers in their study which may be translated to higher level of productivity due to the experience gained over time

Access to extension services

Table 1 shows that majority (60.0%) of the respondents were not have access to extension services, while only 40.0% of the respondents have access to extension services. This implies that the respondents in the study area have no access to extension service, this may be due to the fact that the respondents in the study area were semi-literate.

Income

Table 1 shows that majority (79.2%) of the respondents earn 10,000-50,000, while 20.8% of the respondents earn 50,001-100,000. This implies that majority of the respondents in the study area were low income earners

Nigerian Agricultural Policy Research Journal (NAPReJ) Agricultural Policy Research Network (APRNet)
Vol. 10, Special Issue. Website:http:// www.aprnetworkng.org ©2022
ISSN 2536-6084 (Print) & ISSN 2545-5745 (Online)

Religion
Result in Table 1 revealed that 51.7% of the respondents were Christians, 40.8% of the respondents were Muslims while 7.5% of the respondents were traditionalist. This implies that both Christians and Muslims were involved in maize farming in the study area

Household size
Table 1 shows that most (62.5%) of the respondents had 1-5 households, 30.8% of the respondents had 6-10 households, while 6.7% of the respondents had above 11 households. The mean household is 4. This could likely translate to family labour on the farm. This is in line with the findings of Christopher, (2018) that household size has a great role to play in family labour usage in the agricultural sector.

Farm size (Acres)
Table 1 shows that majority (92.5%) of the respondents had 1-5 farm size, while 7.5% of the respondents had 6-10 farm size. The mean is 3. This implies that majority of the respondents in the study area had low farm size and this shows that farmers operate on small scale

Members of cooperative society
Table 1 also shows that most (60.8%) of the respondents were member of cooperative society while 39.2% were not member of cooperative society. This implies that the respondents in the study area were members of cooperative society and they may have access to loan facilities to boost the financial activities involves in maize farming.

Mode of land ownership
Table 1 shows that 38.3% of the respondents inherited their farmland, 25.0% of the respondents purchased their farmland, 18.3% of the respondents were gifted their farmland, 12.5% of the respondents rented their farm land, while only 5.8% of the respondents leased their farmland. This implies that the respondents in the study area inherited their farm land and they have no cost to be incurred on land

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of the respondent

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Age			
25-34	11	9.2	50
35-44	31	25.8	
45-54	39	32.5	
55-64	25	20.8	
65 and above	14	11.7	
Sex			
Male	91	75.8	
Female	29	24.2	
Marital status			
Married	80	66.7	
Single	17	14.2	
Divorced	8	6.7	
Widowed	15	12.5	
Educational status			
Adult education	21	17.5	
Primary education	17	14.2	
Secondary education	40	33.3	
Tertiary education	27	22.5	
No formal education	15	12.5	
Secondary occupation			
Farming	82	68.3	
Trading	23	19.2	
Civil servant	15	12.5	
Farming experience			
1-5	61	50.8	
6-10	27	22.5	10
11-20	26	21.7	
21 and above	6	5.0	
Access to extension			
Yes	48	40.0	
No	72	60.0	
Income			
10,000-50,000	95	79.2	
50,001-100,000	25	20.8	
Religion status			
Islam	49	40.8	

ISSN 2536-6084 (Print) & ISSN 2545-5745 (Online)

Variables	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Christian	62	51.7	
Traditional	9	7.5	
Household size			
1-5	75	62.5	5
6-10	37	30.8	
11 and above	8	6.7	
Farm size			
1-5	111	92.5	3
6-10	9	7.5	
Members of cooperative society			
Yes	73	60.8	
No	47	39.2	
Mode of land ownership			
Purchased	30	25.0	
Inherited	46	38.3	
Rented	15	12.5	
Gifted	22	18.3	
Leased	7	5.8	

Source: Field survey, 2022

3.2 The causes of the herdsmen-farmers conflict in the area

Existence of conflict between farmers and herdsmen in their locality

The result shows that majority (81.7%) of the respondents experience conflict between farmers and herdsmen in the study area, while 18.3% of the respondents did not experience conflict between farmers and herdsmen in the study area. This implies that the respondents experience conflict between farmers and herdsmen in the study area.

Negative effect of the conflict on maize production

Table 2 shows that majority (91.7%) of the respondents experience negative effect of the conflict on maize production, while 8.3% of the respondents did not experience negative effect of the conflict on maize production.

Causes of the conflict

Furthermore, table 2 also shows the causes of conflict in the study area. The result shows that destruction of maize by cattle (36.7%) has the highest percentage closely followed by killing of farmers (31.7%), contamination of stream (12.5%), weakness/incompetence of law enforcement agents (11.7%), and disregard for traditional authority (7.5%) were the main causes of the conflict in the study area. The result indicates that destruction of maize by cattle is the major causes of conflict because it causes loss the farmers.

Table 2: Causes of the herdsmen-farmers conflict in the area.

Causes	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
Has there been any conflict between farmers and herdsmen in your locality			
Yes	98	81.7	
No	22	18.3	
Has there been any negative effect of the conflict on maize production			
Yes	110	91.7	
No	10	8.3	
What is the main cause of the conflict			
Destruction of maize by cattle	44	36.7	
Weakness/incompetence of law enforcement agents	14	11.7	
Killing of farmers	38	31.7	
Contamination of stream	15	12.5	
Disregard for traditional authority	9	7.5	

Source: Field survey, 2022

ISSN 2536-6084 (Print) & ISSN 2545-5745 (Online)

3.3 Output differences before, during and after conflict

Results in Table 3, shows the output differences before and after conflict. The results revealed that farmers produced average of 1,235 (kg/tons), 1,198(kg/tons) and 1,029 (kg/tons) of maize before, during and after the conflict respectively. Also farmers spent ₦2,677, ₦2,497 and ₦2,389 on maize production (kg/tons) before, during and after the conflict respectively. Moreover farmers sold maize (kg/tons) for ₦2,500, ₦1,882 and ₦1,777 before, during and after the conflict respectively.

This is an indication that farmers produced, spent on production and sold higher before conflict and produced, spent on production and sold lesser after conflict. This might be due to the fact that Fulani/herders conflict damages have negative effect on their production which reduces their profit on maize production

Table 3: Output differences before during and after conflict

Maize produce by the farmer	
Before the conflict (kg/tons)	1,235
During the conflict (kg/tons)	1,198
After the conflict (kg/tons)	1,029
Cost of production kg/tons ₦	
Before the conflict	₦2,677
During the conflict	₦2,497
After the conflict	₦2,389
How much do you sell kg/tons	
Before the conflict	₦2,500
During the conflict	₦1,882
After the conflict	₦1,777

Source: Field survey, 2022

3.4 Farmers perceived solution to end conflict

Table 4 shows the farmers perceived solution to end conflict in the study area. The result shows that government should provide adequate security (40.0%) has the highest percentage, closely followed by making of rules and regulations that will guide grazing (33.3%), provision of grazing land (15.8%), Fulani headers should go to their place (10.8%) were the farmers perceived solution to end conflict in the study area.

The result implies that government should provide adequate security is the main perceived solution to end conflict by the respondents in the study area so as to enforce law and punish whosoever that goes against the law.

Table 4: Farmers perceived solution to end conflict

Solution	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Government should provide adequate security	48	40.0
Fulani headers should go to their place	13	10.8
Provision of grazing land	19	15.8
Making of rules and regulations that will guide grazing	40	33.3

Source: Field survey, 2022

3.5: Regression analysis showing the significant relationship between the socio economic characteristics of the respondents and the maize output

This section determines the significant relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents and the maize output in the study area. This was achieved by using multiple regression analysis and the hypothesis tested at 5% significant level. The results are presented in Table 5.

Age: Table 4.5 reveals that age of the farmers had positive coefficient value implying that there is a direct effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.631) on farmers maize output

Sex: Result in Table 5 reveals that sex of the farmers had positive coefficient value implying that there is a direct effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.910) on farmers maize output

Marital status: Result further reveals that marital status of the farmers had positive coefficient value implying that there is a direct effect on their maize

ISSN 2536-6084 (Print) & ISSN 2545-5745 (Online)

output and shows no significant differences (p=0.910) on farmers maize output

Educational status: Result also shows that educational status of the farmers had positive coefficient value implying that there is a direct effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.138) on farmers maize output

Secondary occupation: Result also shows that secondary occupation of the farmers had negative coefficient value implying that there is an inverse effect on their maize output and shows significant differences (p=0.0.40) on farmers maize output

Farming experience: Result also shows that farming experience of the farmers had positive coefficient value implying that there is a direct effect on their maize output and shows significant differences (p=0.003) on farmers maize output

Access to extension services: Result also shows that access to extension services of the farmers had negative coefficient value implying that there is an inverse effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.186) on farmers maize output

Income: Result also shows that farmers income on maize production had positive coefficient value implying that there is a direct effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.258) on farmers maize output

Religion status: Result also shows that farmers religion had negative coefficient value implying that there is an inverse effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.864) on farmers maize output

Household size: Result also shows that household size of the farmers had negative coefficient value implying that there is an inverse effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.125) on farmers maize output

Farm size: Result also shows that farmers farm size had negative coefficient value implying that there is an inverse effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.580) on farmers maize output

Members of cooperative society: Result also shows that farmers membership of cooperative society had negative coefficient value implying that there is an inverse effect on their maize output and shows significant differences (p=0.010) on farmers maize output

Mode of land ownership: Result also shows that farmers mode of land of ownership had positive coefficient value implying that there is a direct effect on their maize output and shows no significant differences (p=0.607) on farmers maize output

The adjuster R^2 was 0.789 indicating that 78.9% of the farmer's maize output was explained by the influence of the socio economic characteristics. Since the p-value (0.001)<0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative was accepted meaning that there is significant relationship between the socio economic characteristics of the respondents and the farmers maize output

.

Table 5: Regression analysis showing the significant relationship between the socio economic characteristics of the respondents and the maize output

variables	B	Std. Error	T	Significant	Decision
(Constant)	42345.950	13272.354	3.191	0.002	Significant
Age	71.250	147.817	0.482	0.631	Not Significant
Sex	456.923	4036.885	0.113	0.910	Not Significant
Marital status	191.067	1686.010	0.113	0.910	Not Significant
Educational status	2051.332	1371.069	1.496	0.138	Significant
Secondary occupation	-5518.049	2658.970	-2.075	0.040	Significant
Farming experience	1072.300	357.580	2.999	0.003	Significant
Access to extension	-4948.091	3717.823	-1.331	0.186	Significant
Income	0.095	0.084	1.136	0.258	Significant
Religion status	-459.950	2678.492	-0.172	0.864	Not Significant
Household size	-1289.717	833.900	-1.547	0.125	Significant
Farm size	-504.483	909.245	-0.555	0.580	Not Significant
Members of cooperative society	-9982.430	3780.130	-2.641	0.010	Significant
Mode of land ownership	796.048	1542.384	0.516	0.607	Not Significant
Adjusted R^2	0.789				
F-value	2.982				
P-value	0.001				

Source: Field survey, 2022

ISSN 2536-6084 (Print) & ISSN 2545-5745 (Online)

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

5.2 Conclusion

From the findings of this study, majority of the maize farmers were male who have average of 50 years, they are married with average household size of 5 members. They have average 5 years of farming experience. It is also concluded that, farmers have negative experienced on the conflict of farmers and herders, the major causes of crisis between maize farmers and herder in the study area are destruction of maize by cattle and killing of farmers. It is also concluded that farmers produced, spent on production and sold higher before conflict and produced, spent on production and sold lesser after conflict. Finally it is concluded that there is significant relationship between the socio economic characteristics of the respondents and the farmers maize output.

5.3 Recommendations

1. To prevent further community clashes in farming communities, government and relevant agencies should collaborate with traditional institutions to settle rivalries amicably among parties before degenerating into serious security challenge.
2. Government should provide palliative to the affected farmers in the study area as this will cushion the effect of conflict on them.
3. Government should collaborate with the village headers, farmers association, religion leaders, local security personnel to ensure maximum security to farmers and headers in the study area.

References

Abbas, I.M. (2018).No Retreat No Surrender Conflict For Survival Between Fulani Cattle Herders and Farmers In Northern Nigeria. European Scientific Journal,Vol.8(1)

Adejare, G. T, & Arimi, K. (2013) Determinants of labour use for selected tree crops in Oyo and Ondo States, Nigeria. New York Science Journal, 24(4): 21-26

Adisa, R. S.,(2012). Land Use Conflict Between Farmers And Herdsmen; Implications For Agricultural And Rural Development In Nigeria .10.5772/45787

Aliyu, A.S. (2015). Causes and resolution of conflict between cattle herders and crop farmers in Katsina State.A Published M.Sc. Dissertation by the School of Postgraduate Studies, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, pp.1-74.

Christopher, N. I.(2018). A Critical Analysis Of Conflicts Between Herdsmen And Farmers In Nigeria. Causes And Socio-Religious And Political Effect On National Development. ADSIS Publishing. Vol.74 (1).

Coser, L. A.(2000).Continuities In The Study Of Social Conflict, London. Macmillan Publisher. Retrieved From www.amazon.com

Monale , H. T. (2013).Dynamics Of Farmers And Herdsmen Conflict In Nigeria; The Implication To Social Work Policy Intervention. International Journal Of Humanities And Social Science. Vol.8(7)

Olaleye, R.S., Odutola,J.O., Ojo, M.A., Umar, I.S. and Ndanitsa, M.A. (2010). Perceived effectiveness of conflict resolution methods for improved Farmer-Pastoralist relationship in Chikun Local Government Area of Kaduna State, Nigeria. The Nigerian Journal of Rural Extension and Development, 3:54-58.

Popoola, M. A., Adewale, J. A., Idachaba, O. I. and Shittu, M. O.(2019). Analysis Towards Effective Policing In Crime Control And Prevention In Nigeria. IJARW/ISSN(0)-2582-1008. July 2019/Vol.1 Issue.1

Shittu, M. O. (2020). Farmers And Herders Conflict In South-West Nigeria. From 2011 – 20219; Unpublished M. Sc. Thesis. Department Of Peace Studies And Conflict Resolution, Faculty Of Social Science. National Open University Of Nigeria (NOUN).