

**PERCEIVED CONFLICT RESOLUTION STRATEGIES IN FARMER-HEADER CONFLICTS
AMONG FARMERS IN FARMER-HEADER CONFLICTS IN IMO STATE, NIGERIA.**

Echetama, J.A¹., Ohajianya, D.O⁴., Aja, O.O¹., Utazi, C.O.³ and Ojo, O.U².

¹Agricultural Extension Department, Federal University of Technology Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria.

²Extension Division, Abia State Ministry of Agriculture Umuahia, Abia State, Nigeria.

³Agricultural Management and Extension Department, Imo State Polytechnic Umuagwo, Imo State, Nigeria.

⁴Agricultural Economics Department, Federal University of Technology Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria.

Corresponding Author: jaechetama@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The study assessed perceived conflict resolution strategies in farmer-header conflicts among farmers in Farmer-Header conflict in Imo State, Nigeria. It specifically examined the socio-economic characteristics of farmers, identified various sources of information available to farmers on farmer-herder conflicts, determined perceived causes of conflict between the farmers and the headers, ascertained the perceived resolution strategies in resolving farmer-header conflicts and finally, identified the perceived constraints affecting the identified resolution strategies in effective farmer-header conflict control in the state. Data were collected with the use of questionnaire administered to 256 farmers in the three Agricultural Zones of the State. Data were analyzed using frequency, percentage, and mean and likert type scale measuring instrument. The results indicated that 63.3% of the farmers were males. Most (91.4%) of the farmers belonged to one social organization or the other. Two of the identified sources of information available to farmers on farmer-header conflict included use of local vigilante groups ($\bar{X}=2.3$) and use of community town criers ($\bar{X}=2.3$). Fear of carrying unauthorized guns by Header ($\bar{X}=2.4$), grazing on peoples farm lands ($\bar{X}=2.2$) and sexual harassment and raping of women ($\bar{X}=2.3$) were among identified causes of Farmer-Header conflicts. Reporting promptly to security agents like police of pre-planned attacks from either the headers or farmers ($\bar{X}=2.3$) and assisting in allocation of land, were cattle can graze to headers from communities (pastoral routes) ($\bar{X}=2.4$) were some of the conflict resolution strategies perceived by the farmers. Lack of pre-information on time of attack to farmers ($\bar{X}=2.3$) and lack of education among the headers ($\bar{X}=2.4$) were perceived as constraint that affected the farmer-header conflicts. It was recommended, among others, that caring unauthorized guns by headers should be banned; cattle owners should embrace or adopt modern cattle ranching and nomadic education to the headers should be scaled up as to bring lasting peace between farmers and headers in the state.

Keywords: Farmers, Farmer-Header Conflict, perceived conflict resolution strategies, Imo State and Nigeria.

Introduction

Agriculture remains an important economic sector in many developing countries. It is a source of growth and a potential source of investment opportunities for private sector.

Today' farmers are under unprecedented pressure. The world population is closing in on seven billion, and it is projected to reach nine billion by 2050 (Towery and Werblow (2010). Poverty eradication and food security have moved to the centre stage of the global development agenda. These are the greatest global challenges and their redress is an indispensable requirement for sustainable development in developing countries. Majority of African are small holder farmers and artisans, some three-quarters live in rural areas where they draw their livelihood from agriculture (Ogunleye and Oladeinde, 2013). In agriculture-based economies, which include most of sub-Saharan Africa, agriculture generates 29% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on average. In transforming countries – countries in which agriculture is no longer a major source of economic growth, which include most of South and East Asia and the Middle East and North African – the contributions of agriculture to GDP is much lower (Mahul and Stulley, 2010). Livestock is affected by climate change directly by extreme weather conditions such as heat stress and indirectly through reduction of fodder, water, desert encroachment in non desert lands, and the distribution of livestock diseases (IUCN, 2010). The increase in demand of crop land associated to the increased livestock population without any destocking strategies in the context of climate change, conflict and variability may lead to pasture degradation and the use of marginalized lands (Brook, 2006). Land recourses are very important to man as they provide people with living space raw materials for obtaining satisfaction for needs and constitute man's physical environment (Alawode, 2013). Agriculture also has been described as the backbone of many nations' economy including Nigeria. It is a source of food, fibre and other raw materials needed by the people but the place of agriculture in Nigeria and some states have been hampered by conflict between farmers and herders. Conflicts between farmers and herders have been a common feature affecting economic livelihood in West Africa and Nigeria in general (Tonah, 2006, Okpiliya, *et al*, 2013). According to MDRAH (2012),

about 200 conflicts have been recorded between crop farmers and herders occurring yearly. These conflicts involved most of the time the death of farmers, herders, government agricultural extension service agents, the destruction of crops or houses and the injury or killing of animals. The causes of these conflicts are natural resources scarcity and their inequitable access, cattle eaten up crops planted by farmers, herders invading farmers communities, women harassment and raping, interference by rich cattle owners who are politicians, the non recognition of traditional rights, agricultural encroachments, inappropriate cattle management system, grazing land encroachments, obstructions of pastoral routes, crops damage and in some cases corruption (Adebayo and Olaniyi 2008; Ofuoku and isife, 2010; Olabode and Ajibade 2010; Benjaminsen *et al*, 2012). Conflict according to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 8th Edition is defined as a situation in which people, groups or countries are involved in a serious disagreement or argument. Likewise, resolution is the moment in which the conflict ends and outcome of the action is clear. In other words, it connotes strong will, determination or act or process of solving or solution. Strategy is equally defined as a plan of action intended to accomplish a specific goal.

Farmers are mostly affected in terms of conflict with headers. They are nongovernmental organizations but can receive patronage from the government as well as cooperative bodies operating in their communities and their activities are numerous as it included production of food for the teaming population, settlement of disputes, search for credible leaders, interventions in land matters and liaising with government in areas of help. Farmer members include representatives of age groups, improvement Union, women organization, the youths, opinion leaders and as well as community heads (Ofuoku, 2010). Nomadic cattle's rearing is common in Nigeria and the headers, who are mostly Muslims and speak Hausa language, move from the Northern part of Nigeria to the south. There have been several conflicts in the society and since conflict exist between the farmers and herders and much efforts have not been made to hear from the farmers on the resolution strategies of the conflicts as to bring lasting peace between the farmers and headers. This study therefore tried to fill this gap. It assessed the perceived conflict resolution strategies in farmer-header conflicts among farmers in farmer-header conflicts in Imo State, Nigeria.

The specific objectives of the study include to;

1. examine the socioeconomic characteristics of the farmers,
2. identify the various sources of information available to farmers on conflict with headmen,
3. determine farmers perceived causes of the conflict between them and the headers,
4. ascertain perceived various farmer-header conflict resolution strategies among farmers and

5. identify the constraints affecting the perceived identified conflict resolution strategies by farmers

Methodology

This study was conducted in Imo State. The state is located in the South Eastern part of Nigeria with a population of about 3,934,899 people made up of 2,032,286 males and 1,902,613 females (NPC, 2006). It is strategically located within the five South Eastern States and bordered on the East by Abia State, on the West by River Niger and Delta State, on the North by Anambra State, while the Rivers State lies to the South (MLS, 2002). The people are predominantly farmers as an average family engaged in the production of food crops like yam, cassava, cocoyam, rice and maize, and livestock like sheep, goat, rabbit, poultry birds and pig. Cattle rearing are not obtainable in the state. Cash crops cultivated include palm produce, rubber, oil bean, pear, mango, and oranges.

Imo State is divided into twenty seven (27) Administrative units known as Local Government Areas (L.G.A.). The state is also sub-grouped into zones both for political and agricultural administrative purposes. These are Okigwe Zone, Orlu Zone and Owerri Zone. The settlement structure is still rural with over seventy percent (70%) of the people living in rural areas (ISGN, 2007). The state is culturally homogenous and predominantly inhabited by the Ibo ethnic group of Nigeria, where Igbo language is spoken with minimal difference in dialects. The people are predominantly Christians and English language is however the official language. Moslems can be handpicked in the state. A multiple stage sampling technique was used in selecting the sample size. Stage one (1): proportionate selection of two (2) L.G.As namely Obowo, Ihite-Uboma from six (6) L.G.As of Okigwe Agricultural Zone; three (3) L.G.As namely Uguta, Ideato North and Orshu, from ten (10) L.G.As of Orlu Agricultural Zone and finally, three (3) L.G.As namely, EzinaiHITE, Ngor-Opkala and Mbaitoli from eleven (11) L.G.As of Owerri Agricultural Zone giving a total of eight (8) L.G.As. Stage two: 4 communities were selected from the 8 L.G.As making a total of thirty two (32) communities. Stage three: eight (8) farmers were also selected from the thirty two (32) communities making a total of two hundred and fifty six (256) farmers. All the selections in stages two (2) and three (3) were done based on simple random techniques since they have same characteristics. The list of communities and farmers in the study area were collected from the community development officers and extension agents in the L.G.As respectively. The list served as the sampling frame.

The data collected were analysed using simple statistical tools such as, frequency distribution, percentage, mean (\bar{X}), and likert scale type measuring instrument. Objective 1 was analysed

using simple statistical tools like frequency, percentage and mean. A 3-point likert type rating scale was used to measure the mean of 'most available', 'available', and 'not available' for objective 2, while 'strongly agree', 'agree' and 'not agree' was used for objectives 3 and 4. Also a 3-point likert type of 'most serious', 'serious' and 'not serious' for objective 5.

The mean score was obtained using the formula:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum fx}{n}$$

Where \bar{X} = Mean score

\sum = Summation sign

f = total number of respondent (frequency)

\bar{X} nominal value of each category

n = sample size

The mean of the response options were gotten from $3 + 2 + 1/3 = 6/3 = 2$

DECISION RULE:

Any mean score below 2.00 was negative while mean score above 2.00 was positive.

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Socioeconomic characteristic of the farmers

Table 1 shows distribution of farmers according to their socioeconomic characteristics. The result showed that majority (63.3%) were males while

36.7% were females. The result also showed that majority (61.7%) of the farmers practice farming alone and 71.9% were between the ages of 40 and 59 with a mean value of 48.1. Majority (68.4%) of the farmers attended either primary or secondary education while 24.6% had tertiary education. This implied that most of the farmer are literates and can read and write while 67.2% were married. Extension contact with farmers was poor since 64.8% of the farmers agreed that they had no contact with farmers in every two months. Majority (82.9%) of the farmers had between 11 and 30 years or a mean of 19.1 years of farming experience while 91.4 % belonged to one social organizations or the other. Most (61.3%) of the farmers earn annual farm income of between #50,000.00 and #100,000.00 with mean value of #111,132.83 Naira. This implies poor farm annual income for the farmers considering the fact that exchange rate of Naira to Dollar is #460 Naira to 1 USD (CBN, 2019). Majority (57.4%) of the farmers had a household of 5-8 people and only 22.3% had household of 9-12 people. According to Aderinto and Adisa (2006), social organisation areas are avenues where experience and information are shared among members. Also Akubuiro (2008), agreed that farmers with formal education are more receptive to new ideas than those who are illiterates

Table 1. Distribution of farmers according to their Socio-economic characteristics

Socio-economic characteristics	frequency	percentage	mean(x)
Sex			
Male	162	63.3	
Female	94	36.7	
Age			
20 –29	8	3.1	
30 -39	40	15.6	
40 – 49	84	32.8	48.1
50 – 59	100	39.1	
60 – and above	24	9.4	
Educational level			
No formal education	18	7.0	
primary	69	27.0	
secondary	106	41.4	
tertiary	63	24.6	
Marital Status			
Single	4	1.6	
Married	172	67.2	
Separated	18	7.0	
Divorced	4	1.6	
Widowed	58	22.6	
Extension Contacts (2 months)			
No contact	166	64.8	
1 - 2	88	34.4	1.3
3 - 4	2	0.8	
Main Occupation			
Farming	158	61.7	
Farming and Other business	98	39.3	

Experience as farmers			
1 – 10	32	12.5	
11 -20	112	43.8	19.1
21 – 30	100	39.1	
31 – Above	12	4.6	
Social Organization			
Yes	234	91.4	
No	22	8.6	
Household Size			
1 – 4	36	14.1	
5 – 8	147	57.4	7.3
9 – 12	57	22.3	
13-above	16	6.2	
Annual Farm Income (Naira)			
50,000-100,000	157	61.3	
101000-150000	51	19.9	
151000-200000	25	9.8	111,132.81
201000-250000	12	4.7	
251000-300000	7	2.7	
301000 and above	4	1.6	

Source: Field Survey. 2020

2.0: Identify various farmer–header conflict information sources among farmers.

Table 2 shows the distribution of farmers according to various farmer-header conflict information sources available among them in the study area. Farmers were aware of conflict through local vigilante groups, farmers' cooperatives membership, community town criers, friends and neighbours, youth organizations, radio broadcasts, traditional rulers and local community development committees with mean values of $\bar{X}=2.3$, $\bar{X}=2.3$, $\bar{X}=2.3$, $\bar{X}=2.3$, $\bar{X}=2.2$, $\bar{X}=2.3$, $\bar{X}=2.2$ and $\bar{X}=2.0$ respectively. Ekong (2003), agreed that existence of Community Development

Committees should exist in every locality or community. Umeh (2013), also opined that awareness of any the existence of any organization is key factor for farmers' acceptability of its roles. Sources of conflict information were not readily available to farmers through law enforcement agents like police, posters, television broadcasts, agricultural extension agents, telephone calls by pre-informants and use of internet social messages with mean values of $\bar{X}=1.5$, $\bar{X}=1.5$, $\bar{X}=1.9$, $\bar{X}=1.9$, $\bar{X}=1.7$ and $\bar{X}=1.9$ respectively. This implies that information from this set of sources may always come to the farmers late since they were considered not good available sources of information.

Table 2: Distribution of the farmers according to information sources on farmer-header conflict

Information sources to farmers	Most Available (3)	Available (2)	Not Available (1)	Mean (x)
Traditional rulers (Ezes, Nze na Ozos, Chiefs, etc)	85 (255)	139 (278)	32(32)	2.2
Radio broadcast	91(273)	141(282)	24((24)	2.3
Television broadcast	75(225)	89 (178)	92(92)	1.9
Local vigilante groups	100(300)	130 (260)	26 (26)	2.3
Df				
Local community development committees	72(216)	158(306)	24(24)	2.0
Farmer cooperatives members	98(294)	138(276)	20(20)	2.3
Friends and neighbours	91(273)	139(278)	26(26)	2.3
Law enforcement agents (police, Army etc)	59(177)	131(262)	66(66)	1.5
Farmer-herder development committees	78(234)	139(278)	21(21)	2.0
Telephone calls by pre-informants	14(42)	143(286)	99(99)	1.7
Community town criers with drums, 'ogene' etc	98(294)	146(292)	12(12)	2.3
Farmers at their farming locations harvesting, etc	89(267)	115(230)	52(52)	2.1
Youth associations or organizations	95(285)	113(226)	48(48)	2.2
Agricultural extension agents	59(177)	128(256)	69(69)	1.9
Use of internets social messages eg whatsapp	65(195)	94(188)	97(97)	1.9
Use of posters	10(30)	101(202)	145(145)	1.5

Source; field data 2020

3.0 Perceived causes of conflict between farmers and headers among farmers

Table 3 below shows distribution of the farmers according to perceived causes of conflict between farmers and herders. The result indentified some of the causes as fear of Fulani jihadist movement clamming to Islamize Nigeria through headsmen by killing and kidnapping of farmers (X=2.3), rich Fulani Muslim political cattle owners

being insensitive and supportive to headers or farmers crops destruction by cattle (X=2.2), uncontrollable movement of herders from North to South of Nigeria (X=2.2), fear of carrying unauthorized guns by herder (X= 2.4), and non recognition of traditional rights or culture the people by herders (X=2.3). Others included neglect by government in addressing issues conflict and killing of host farmers in their communities (X=2.2), obstruction of unconventional pastoral routes, by farmers or

host communities ($X=2.3$) and grazing on local people's farm by headers cattle ($X=2.2$). Also stealing and killing of cattle by local communities ($X=2.0$), invading of farmers' communities and killing of local people by herders ($X=2.2$), sexual harassment and raping of women farmers by herders in their farms ($X=2.3$) and inappropriate cattle management system by having no pastoral routes for headers ($X=2.3$) were identified as a causes of conflict between farmers and headers. This support the works of Ofuoku (2009) and Chikaire *et al* (2017), who said that most frequent causes of conflict between farmers and herders, are the destruction and

eating up of crops in farming seasons and pre-harvest period by cattle. Nweze (2005) stated that many farmers and herders have lost their lives and herds, while others have experienced dwindling productivity, malnutrition, loss of farm settlement and low productivity in their herds. The result supported the work of Ekong (2003) when he said that causes of conflict is mostly caused by insatiable nature of human wants and competition for scarce resources. According to Nnadi *et al*, 2013, the choices the farmers make are based on the knowledge they have and their survival strategies to cope with conflicting situations.

Table 3: Distribution of Farmers According to perceived Causes of Conflict between the Farmers and Herders

Causes of conflict between farmers and herders	Strongly agree (3)	Agreed (2)	Not agreed (1)	Mean (X)
Fear of Fulani` jihadist headsmen claiming to Islamise Nigeria through killing of farmers and kidnapping	127(371)	93(186)	36(36)	2.3
Rich Fulani Muslim political cattle owners insensitivity to crop destruction and support to headers.	106(312)	97(194)	53(53)	2.2
Grazing on local people's farms by headers cattle	111(333)	95(190)	50(50)	2.2
Sexual harassment and raping of women farmers by herders in farmers their farms	118(354)	88(176)	50(50)	2.3
Invading of farmers' communities by herders and killing local people	97(291)	100(200)	59 (59)	2.2
Stealing and killing of cattle by local Communities	56(168)	142(284)	58(58)	2.0
Inappropriate cattle management system. example, lack of pastoral routes by herders	94(282)	132(264)	30(30)	2.3
Neglect by government in addressing the issues of conflict and killing of host farmers in their communities.	100(300)	114(228)	42(42)	2.2
Obstructions of unconventional pastoral routes by farmers or host communities	98(294)	127(254)	31(31)	2.3

Uncontrollable movement of herders from North to South of Nigeria	86(258)	132(264)	38(38)	2.2
Non recognition of traditional rights or culture of the people by herders	107(321)	109(218)	40(40)	2.3
Contamination of streams, roads and farm land by cattle dung's by headers	97(291)	119(238)	40(40)	2.2
Fear of carrying unauthorized guns by Herders	116(348)	128(256)	12(12)	2.4

Source: Field survey data, 2020.

4.0 Perceived farmer–header conflict resolution strategies among farmers

Table 4 shows distribution of the farmers according to perceived Farmer-Herder conflict resolution strategies. Such resolution strategies included adoption of developed countries cattle ranching system ($X=2.3$), giving nomadic education to the headers who mostly illiterates ($X=2.3$), discouraging political leaders who are cattle owners from interference in farmer-header conflict ($X=2.3$), ensuring peaceful coexistence among farmers and headers by having regular meetings with the farmers and headers (collaboration) ($X=2.3$), encouraging stronger leadership among farmers and headers ($X=2.3$), assisting in allocating land to headers where cattle can graze by communities (pastoral routes) ($X=2.4$), legitimizing headers entry into communities with local traditional rulers e.g. from Ezes ($X=2.5$), reporting promptly to security agents like police of pre-planned attacks from either farmers or headers ($X=2.3$) and payment of ransoms by nomadic headsmen for crops destroyed by cattle to serve as deterrent ($X=2.0$). Others included taking findings of previous conflicts to government that instituted them for necessary actions to avoid future reoccurrence

($X=2.2$). This result supports that of Ofuoku (2009), which listed the work of community development committees as planning and overseeing the settlement of the aggrieved parties, improve community living, bringing the attention of government to the situations. Also Slaymaker, *et al* (2005), identified the need to work with security agents like police, community vigilante groups etc, as they provide avenues for closer relationship and early identification of problems with a view of nipping early the conflict off from the bud. Ekong (2003), agreed that resolution of conflict, is an integral part of the functions of community development committees. The farmers did agree on accepting losses or bearing the cost alone of crops destroyed by headers cattle ($X=1.7$). This implies leading to dwindling productivity, lost of income and malnutrition in the State. Non acceptability of fear of jihadist movement of Fulani headsmen to Islamize Nigeria by killing farmers and kidnapping ($X=1.8$) was not agreed at as farmer-header conflicts resolution strategies. This implies infringement on the freedom of religion in the State in particular and the country in general.

Table 4: Distribution of the farmers according to perceived farmer-herder conflict resolution strategies

Perceived farmer- herder conflict resolution Strategies by farmers	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Mean
Adoption of developed countries modern cattle ranching system	121(363)	88(176)	47(47)	2.3
Ensuring effective nomadic education to illiterate headers	111(363)	94(188)	91(91)	2.3
Non acceptability of jihadist movement of Fulani headsmen to Islamise Nigeria by killing and kidnapping farmers	71(213)	78(156)	107(107)	1.8
Payment of ransom by nomadic headmen for crops destroyed to serve as deterrent to headers	55(165)	100(200)	101(101)	2.0
Extending nomadic education to headers who are mostly illiterates	115(345)	107(214)	34(34)	2.3
Discouraging political leaders interference in farmer-header conflict	102(306)	125(250)	29(29)	2.3
Ensuring peaceful coexistence among farmers and herders by having regular meetings (collaborations)	98(294)	136(272)	22(22)	2.3
Develop strategies, coordinate and implement an integrated approach to farmer-herder conflict with the use of dialogue	101(303)	116(232)	39(39)	2.2
Encouraging stronger leadership among farmers and herders	128(384)	89(178)	39(39)	2.3
Reporting promptly to security agents like police of pre-planned attacks from either farmers or herders	118(354)	101(202)	37(37)	2.3
Assisting in allocating lands from communities where herders can graze. (example, pastoral routes)	117(351)	116(232)	23(23)	2.4
Advising herders and farmers to have leaders who will represent them in case of problems	100(300)	112(224)	44(44)	2.2
Taking findings of previous conflict to the government that instituted them for necessary actions to avoid future reoccurrences	101(303)	95(190)	60(60)	2.2
Design ways of aiding/assisting farmers and herders in case of destructions resulting from fight among them	97(291)	99(198)	60(60)	2.1
Legitimizing herders entry into communities by herders with local leaders like Ezes, Nze na Ozo, etc	145(435)	80(160)	31(31)	2.5
Settlement of conflict among farmers and herders by compromising eg sharing losses	107(321)	76(152)	73(73)	2.1

Advice the herders especially the non Ibo speaking ones to have interpreters as to communicate effectively with the local people	—	121(363)	95(190)	40(40)	2.3
Accepting loses or bearing the costs alone by farmers on damages to crops	—	58(174)	62(124)	136(136)	1.7
Charging headers to court for justice on crop damages (arbitration) as deterrent	—	127(381)	89(178)	40(40)	2.3

Source: Field survey data, 2020

5.0 Perceived constraints affecting the farmer-header conflict resolution strategies by farmers

Table 5 shows the distribution of the farmers according to the perceived constraints affecting farmer-header conflict resolution strategies in the study area. The result identified lack developed countries modern cattle ranching system (X=2.2), unwarranted opening of Nigerian borders thereby allowing influx of hired killer headsmen into the country (X=2.3), problems of most of the headers being young boys and nomadic in nature (X=2.2), religious (Christians/Muslims), ethnicity (race) and cultural (language) barriers/sentiments (X=2.4), local communities negative attitude to headers-header conflict compromising efforts (X=2.2), lack of finance on the part of the Farmer-Header Community Development Committees for carrying out their functions (X=2.2), lack of pre-information to the farmers on the time of attack by headers (X=2.3) and lack of regular meetings of the three parties (farmers, headers and government) involved in peacemaking (X=2.3) were perceived

as constraints by farmers in the study area. It also identified delay in time of reaction among security agents in case of planned attack by either the farmers or the herders (X=2.1) and negligence from government in rendering necessary assistance to the farmer-header peace committees (X=2.3), poor leadership roles among the two warring parties (farmers and headers) (X=2.1) and security agents lack of putting into use past farmer-header conflict reports between farmers and headers (X=2.2) as constraints affecting the farmer-header conflicts. Also included as constraint to farmer-header conflicts was poor level of education among headers (X=2.4). This result supported that of Mansuri and Rao (2004), who agreed that poor leadership, lack of pre-information to security agents on eminent attacks are part of the constraints acting the performance of Community development committees. Lack of education among farmers (X=1.7) and lack of agricultural extension agents visit to farmers (X=1.8) were not consider problems in the farmer-header conflict resolution strategies.

Table 5: Distribution of the farmers according to the perceived constraints affecting the farmer-header conflicts resolution strategies in the study area.

Perceived constraints affecting the Farmer-Header conflict resolution strategies	Most serious (3)	Serious (2)	Not serious (1)	Mean (x)
Lack of developed countries modern cattle ranching system	101(303)	92(184)	63(63)	2.2
Unwarranted opening of Nigerian boarder thereby allowing influx of hired killer headsmen	98(294)	124(248)	34(34)	2.3
Ignorance /negligence from government in rendering necessary assistance to farmer-header peace committees	92(276)	139(278)	25(25)	2.3
Lack of effective communication (language barrier) between header and farmer	91(273)	159(318)	6(6)	2.3

Lack of finance on the part of farmer-herder community development committees for carrying out their functions	63(189)	167(334)	26(26)	2.2
Finance on the part of farmer-herder committees in sitting regularly for meetings	67((201)	158(316)	31(31)	2.1
Lack of pre-information to the farmer-header on the time of attack by headers	98(294)	138(276)	20(20)	2.3
Lack of regular meetings of the three parties (farmers, herders and government) involved	102(306)	139(278)	15(15)	2.3
Local communities negative attitudes towards farmer-herders conflicts compromising efforts	75(225)	146(292)	35(35)	2.2
Biased members of farmer-herder community development committees in handling the situations	94(282)	141(282)	21(21)	2.3
Security agents Lack of putting into use past Conflict reports between farmer-herder	88(264)	134(268)	34(34)	2.2
Religion (Christian/ Muslim), ethnic sentiment and cultural (language) barrier/sentiments	115(345)	130(260)	11(11)	2.4
Poor level of education among the herders	123(369)	107(214)	26(26)	2.4
Lack of education among the farmers	27 (81)	113(226)	116 (116)	1.6
Poor leadership among the two warring parties (farmers and herders)	85(255)	128(256)	43(43)	2.1
Problem of most herders being young boys and they are nomadic in nature	99(297)	114(228)	43(43)	2.2
Delay in the time of reaction among the security agents in case of planned attack by herders or farmers	90((270)	105(210)	61(61)	2.1
Lack of agricultural extension agent visits to farmers	68(204)	65(130)	123(123)	1.8

Source: Field survey data, 2020.

Conclusion and Recommendations.

Every nation in the world needs to be included among the developed nations. Agricultural sector of any developed nation therefore cannot be neglected. There is need for those involved in effective crop and animal production to work as a team since it eliminates conflict among the stakeholders. To achieve this, farmers and headers should avoid issues that may give rise to conflicts. In case of conflicts, farmer and headers must work in synergy with security agents; accommodate each other as to avoid low farm annual income as recorded in this study. Conflicts existed between the farmers and the headsmen since most of the headers are illiterates, carried unauthorized guns, lacked effective communication in the area of language barrier and had support of their proprietors who are political rich Fulani leaders. The farmers perceived quick intervention by security agents, coming together for dialogue among farmers and headers leaders among others as conflict resolution strategies. Major constraints affecting the effective relationship between farmers and headers were also identified carrying of authorize guns. It therefore recommended that level of education especially among the headsmen be improved through nomadic education. Security agents should be at alert in case of pre-information on eminent attack by famers or headsmen reached them. Also headsmen should not be allowed to carry unauthorized guns to avoid fear of intimidations and sexual harassment or raping of women farmers. These strategic farmer-header conflict resolution strategies shall to a large extent help in achieving the necessary peace required between farmers and headers for increased sustainable food production, high income and healthy living standard of the people of the fdkijkostate in particular and Nigeria in general.

REFERENCE

- Adebayo, O. O and O.A Olaniyi, 2008, "Factors associated with pastoral and crop farmers conflict in Derived Savannah zone of Oyo State, Nigeria". *Journal of Human Ecology*, 23 (1): 71-74.
- Aderinta O. and Adisa U. (2006), Poultry Farmers Knowledge of management practices involved in the prevention and control of Bir Flu in Ibadan/Ibarapa Agricultural Zone of Oyo State Nigeria. Proceeding of 11th Annual Conference (AESON) at Ibadan 13th-16th April. Pp. 228-234.
- Akubuiro, C.Y.A. (2008), Modern Approach to Agricultural Extension, New Generation Books, Enugu Nigeria.
- Alawode, O.O.(2013). Determinants of Land use Conflict among Farmers in South-western Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Peace. Gender and Development (JRPGD)*. Vol. 3(4) pp58-67.
- Benjaminsen, T. A.C. Alinon, H. Buhang and J.T. Buseth, 2012. "Journal of Peace Research 49(i): 97-111.
- Brook, N. (2006). "Cultural response to aridity in the middle Holocene and increased social complexity" *Quaternary international* 151:29-49.
- Chikaire, J.U., Onoh., P.A. and Echetama, J.A. (2017). Perceived Causes of Crop Farmers and Pastoralists Land Use Conflicts in South-East Agro-Ecological Zone of Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment* , 13(4) pp. 7-15
- Ekong E. E (2003), Introduction to Rural sociology, Uyo-Nigeria, Dove Educational Publishers, pp. 70-85.
- ISGN (2007). Imo State Government of Nigeria; Achike Udenwa, Governor 199-2007: In The Eye of History, Lagos Nigeria Green leaf communication limited.
- IUCN, (2010), International Union for Conservation of Nature. Building Climate Change Resilience for African livestock in sub-Saharan Africa: Eastern and Southern Africa. Nairobi.
- Mahul, O. and Stulley, C.J. (2010). Government Support to Agricultural Insurance : Challenges and Options for Developing Countries , World Bank , Washington D.C
- Mansuri .G. and Rao V. (2004), Community Base and Community driven development. a critical review research observers 19(1): 1-39.
- MDRAH (2012) Ministere Des Ressources Animals et Halientique, Rapport Annuel d' Activite, Ouagadougou, Niger.
- MLS (2002). Ministry of Lands and Survey, Imo State, Nigeria: Annual Report Review.
- Nnadi, F.N., J, Chikaire., J.A., Echetama, R.N. Iheanacho., and C.O. Utazi (2013). Assessment of extension strategies for poverty alleviation in Imo State, Nigeria.
- NPC (2006). National Population Commission. Population of the Federal Republic of Nigeria report. .
- Nweze N.J. (2005), Minimizing farmer-herder conflicts in Fadama Areas through local development plans: implication for increased crops/livestock productivity in Nigeria. a paper presented at the 30th Annual conference of the Nigerian society for Animal production held 20th-24th March.
- Ogunleye, Y.I. and Oladeinde, C. (2013). The role of community self help projects in rural development of Kwara State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*, 2(1) in press.
- Okpiliya, F.I., Ekong, A.E. and Eni, I. (2013). Wetland Ecosystem Conflict: Implication

- for Agricultural Productivity and Food Security in Odukpani, Cross river State, Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4, pp. 55-61
- Olabode, A.D, and I.T Ajibade (2010). "Environment induced conflict and sustainable development. a case of Fulani farmers' conflict in Oke Ero L.G.A, Kwara state Nigeria" *Journal of sustainable development in Africa* 12(5): 259-273.
- Ofuoku A.U. (2009), the role and performance of Community Development Committees in Delta Central Senatorial zone of Delta State Nigeria. Unpublished M.sc Thesis. Dept of Agricultural Economics and Extension. River State University of Science and Technology Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
- Ofuoku A. U. and B.I Isife (2010), Causes, Effects and Resolution of Farmers-Nomadic cattle herders conflict in Delta State. *Journal of alternative perspective in the social science* vol.1,No3, 921-937.
- Slaymaker, T., Christiansen, K., and Hemming I.(2005). "Community Based Approaches and service Delivery; Issues and Options in Difficult Environment and Partnerships", Overseas Development Institute London.
- Tonah, S. (2006), Migration and Farmer-Herder conflict in Ghana Volta Basin. *Canadian Journal of African studies* 40(1): 152-178.
- Towery, D. and Werblow, S. (2010). Facilitating Conservation Farming Practices and Enhancing Environmental Sustainability with Agricultural Biotechnology. Conservation Centre. United States of America.
- Umeh (2013). Farmer Field School as an Extension Methodology. In Nwachukwu, I.: Agricultural extension and Rural Development. Lambhouse Publishing, Umuahia Nigeria.