**Perceived Effects of Insecurity on the Livelihood Activities of Farm Families in Ibarapa Central Local Government Area, Oyo State, Nigeria**

**ABSTRACT**

This study analyzed the perceived effect of insecurity on livelihood activities of farm families in Ibarapa Central Local Government Area of Oyo State Nigeria. The specific objectives are to describe the socio-economic characteristics of farm families, determine their perception of causes/sources of insecurity and perception of effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities in the study area. Multistage sampling was used to select 130 farm families from the study area. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics while Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to achieved the hypotheses. The result showed that majority (79.23 percent) of the respondents were married with mean age, household size and farming experience estimated at 46 years, 6 persons and 10 years respectively. Also, 70.77 percent, 23.85 percent, 51.54 percent, 65.38 percent, 50.77 percent and 58.46 percent of the respondents reported that clashes between rival cult groups, conflicting political factions, poor distribution of resources within a community or among communities, violent resistance to exploitation by government or natural resources exploitation by companies, encroachment without permission and overgrazing/indiscriminate grazing of farm land were the factors that always causes insecurity in the study area respectively while majority (90.77 percent) of the respondents reported that farmers to farmers conflict is always a source of insecurity in the study area as against 9.23 percent who reported that they are sometimes causes of insecurity to human life and their livelihood activities in the study area. Furthermore, 61.54 percent, 62.31 percent and 38.46 percent of the respondents believed that pastoralist-farmers conflicts, communal conflicts and political/civil unrest/disturbances is always a major sources of insecurity in the study area respectively. The perceived effects of insecurity on livelihood activities of the respondents include reduce crop yield/productivity, reduced farm income, scarcity of food items and loss of capital investment while the strategies employed to cushion the effect of insecurity are giving financial assistance to victims, provision of small scale credit facilities and free health facilities for injured victims while the test of hypotheses showed that there exist a significant relationship between the selected socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents and the causes of insecurity in the study area. The recommends that government in collaboration with companies operating in these crisis prone areas should engage stakeholders (community leaders, youth leaders and other leaders of Community Based Organizations) in a town hall meeting and collectively come up with lasting solutions to these insecurity issues that impede their development.

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 Background of study**

The fourth Democratic government was installed in Nigeria in 1999 after more than 16 years of military dictatorship. The aspiration of the populace was that with the coming of civilian government the dividends of democracy will spread to all nocks and crannies of Nigeria. However, their hopes have been dashed by insecurity in Nigeria. Fifteen years after civilian rule the country’s security situation is pathetic that nobody in the country is safe from the attacks of terrorists, kidnapers, armed gangs and militants. Electoral and communal violence have also compounded the security situation that has made Nigeria unsafe for residence. The factors responsible for insurgency includes; Armed robbery, Ethnic conflict, Religious conflicts, Poverty, Unemployment, Bad leadership and governance, illiteracy, weak security system and proliferation of arms and ammunition. The continued destruction of lives and properties due to insurgency has become a matter of great concern to the Nigerian government and the international community at large. The activities of insurgents have effects on the economy and the livelihood of the rural dwellers within which they operate (Oladayo, 2014).

In fact, this has degraded the quality of livelihood which includes; Basic staple, Shelter, Health, Education and Water. From 2009 to 2014 Boko Haram has killed more than 10,000 citizens despite the security measures taken by the federal government of Nigeria to contain the crimes committed by the sect against humanity. It was due to the inadequacy of government counter-terrorism drive that made youths in the north east to abandoned their livelihood activities and migrate to south west (Mgbado, 2017).

Human security is concerned with safe guarding the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats in a way that is consistent with long term human fulfillment. (Thomas, 2000). According to Williams (2008), security is an essential concept that is commonly associated with the alleviation of threats to cherished values, especially the survival of individuals, groups or objects in the nearest future and thus involves the ability to pursue cherished political and social ambitions. Food security can only be enhanced through practicing agriculture on commercial level using mechanized tools and improved varieties but it is saddened today that majority of the people that are involved in agriculture are old people that make use of crude implements, plants for their family alone (subsistence farming) while the youth that are agile and have the knowledge of mechanized agriculture are fleeing the practice for white collar job in the cities as a result of threats that are associated with agriculture, they ought to be secured but they are not, human insecurity leads them to abandon agriculture for another job (Ariwoola & Oladoyinbo, 2014).

Usman (2006) posited that agriculture is the major occupation of rural dwellers and provides subsistence for two-thirds of Nigerians who are low income earners; this is why the most urban dwellers are not participating in agriculture since they do not want to belong to the low class or live in poverty. Adeokun (2010) posited that the farmers comprising both old and youth are largely in the rural area with small and fragmented plots, having little or no contact with extension agent/services and thus lacking crucial information needed for production, processing and marketing. They have little knowledge of market prices and little access to input and output markets. The epileptic power supply of electricity also debars those farmers that want to expand their farms running on a commercial base since they cannot afford the cost of using generators. Consequently, yields are low, and incomes from agriculture leave little for the farmers to turn over. Adeokun (2001) opined that in order to fight poverty, hunger and lay good foundation for Nigerian economy, government should in serious terms concentrate efforts towards the involvement of rural dwellers in development of agriculture policy by making efforts to reduce or remove all threats faced by the rural dwellers that send them away from agriculture in order to make them feel secure in all aspect of life (economical, educational, social, food, nutritional, financial, political, environmental and health wise).**1.2 Problem Statement**

Prior to the discovery of oil in commercial quantity in Nigeria’s Niger Delta in 1956, agriculture occupied a central place in the Nigerian economy which is the major occupation of rural dwellers. There was a healthy economic competition among the then four regions of the country as each exploited its comparative advantage by focusing on the cultivation and production of specific set of cash crops. Thus, Nigeria was reasonably self-sufficient in food production and carved a respectable niche for itself as a major exporter of a bouquet of cash crops ranging from groundnuts, palm oil, cocoa, rubber to cotton, including hide and skin (Smith, 2018; Okotie, 2018).

The key thrust of Nigeria’s agricultural renaissance is to diversify its economy by making agriculture the hub of economic growth while also achieving a hunger-free country through enhancing other livelihood activities of her populace. A secured country leads to economic well being of the populace thereby transforming to economic growth of the rural dwellers. The Safety of the rural dwellers has become a national priority for the country considering that a vast majority of agricultural produce are from them (FMARD, 2016). Rural areas and insecurity is prevalent in Nigeria despite its favorable agro-ecological endowments. It has a total landmass of 92.4 million hectares, out of which only about 32 million hectares or 34.63 percent are under cultivation. Nigeria, therefore, lacks both the capacity and capability to cater for the food and sustainable livelihood of the populace. As such, livelihood activities of the rural dwellers and the prevalence of threat through insurgence and insecurity in Nigeria are among the worst globally (Olateju, 2025).

Nigeria is not at war in the real sense of the word but the carnage resulting from various forms of insecurity qualifies it to be regarded as conflict-ridden and at war. Conventionally, the threshold required to classify an armed conflict as a civil war is to record 1,000 battle deaths (Guseh and Oritsejafor, 2019). Nigeria has consistently recorded deaths in excess of 1,000 from various conflicts unleashed by various groups across the country for decades. Both the Nigeria Security Tracker and the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project (ACLED) estimated the total number of deaths associated with the Boko Haram Terrorist group alone between June 2011 and June 2018 at 34,261 and 37,530 people (Campbell & Harwood, 2018).

Apart from the Boko Haram sect, there are other sources of violent deaths, which include intra-community conflicts, herders-farmers’ conflicts, clashes between security agencies and socio cultural and religious groups and other criminal activities, especially ransom kidnappings. In addition to the deadly activities of the Boko Haram sect in the northeastern geopolitical zone of the country, another major threat to national security with serious implications for livelihood activities of the rural dwellers is the menace of Fulani herdsmen. The Fulani herders are mainly nomadic as they traverse the entire country in search of pastures for their herds. The transhumance tradition of the Fulani herders has often pitted them against sedentary farmers as a result of the destruction of the farms of the latter and mass invading of their households.

In Ibarapa communities of Oyo State, there have been serious economic, political and cultural conflict between fulanis and yorubas for decades which had led to loss of lives, shelter, farm land and resources to improve the rural dwellers' livelihood activities (IEP, 2020). This manifest adversely on the standard of living of the populace, loss of farm produce and livelihood activities due to migration of people from these areas to a secured neighboring town. The lethality of violence unleashed by the Fulani herders led the Institute for Economics and Peace to capture them in the global terrorism index and classify them as a terrorist group and the second deadliest group in 2020 after having been responsible for the death of thousands of people in this area (SERAP, 2020).

The severe threats that are confronting rural livelihood in Nigeria especially in Ibarapa communities of Oyo state appear integral to social order, human security leading to crisis. With social disorder, nothing is spared-man, the environment, assets, food-supply and community life. The more pitiable situation is that women whose diverse portfolio livelihood activities used to sustain families and communities are being forced to withdraw from farms, places of trade and meetings due to crises.

In view of these, the following research questions were examined:

1. What are the socioeconomic characteristics of farm families in the study area?
2. What are livelihood activities of farm families in the study area?
3. What are farm families' perception of causes of insecurity in the study area?
4. What are farm families' perception of sources of insecurity in the study area?
5. What are the farm families' perception of effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities in the study area?
6. What are the farm families' strategies adopted for cushioning the effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities in the study area?

**1.3 Objectives of the study**

The general objective of the study is perceived effects of insecurity on livelihood activities of farm families in Ibarapa Central Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria.

Specific objectives area to:

1. describe the socio-economic characteristics of farm families in the study area
2. identify livelihood activities of the farm families in the study area
3. determine farm families' perception of causes of insecurity in the study area
4. determine farm families' perception of sources of insecurity in the study area
5. determine farm families' perception of effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities in the study area
6. identify the farm families' adopted strategies for cushioning the effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities of in the study area

**1.4 Hypotheses**

Ho 1: There is no significant relationship between the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents and their perception of causes of insecurity in the study area

Ho 2: There is no significant relationship between their perception of sources of insecurity and perceived effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities in the study area

**1.5 Justification of the study**

In Nigeria, livelihood insecurity is worsened by national insecurity as a result of protracted armed conflicts involving sundry groups, especially the Boko Haram group and Fulani herders. The activities of these groups in terms of invasion and sacking of farming communities have resulted in many civilian fatalities, thus creating acute insecurity. The state of insecurity in many of these farming communities has made it practically difficult for farmers to continue to engage in agricultural production optimally, thus affecting productivity and causing market disruptions with attendant food price shocks (Oladoyinbo, 2024).

Therefore, a peaceful environment is a sine qua non for productive agricultural engagement, which results in food security (Ajayi et al, 2024). Food insecurity, on the other hand, mounts pressure on national security and invariably exacerbates national insecurity. The need for the study arises from the fact that the ongoing insecurity challenges in the communities have called for wider attention in the public discourse and generated a lot of scholarly interest and discussions in recent times. The study would be of immense benefit to students and researchers because it would serve as reference point in similar areas in the future thereby adding to the existing body of knowledge. The government and policy makers would equally use it as a veritable source of data for examining the effect of insecurity on the livelihood of communities with the aim of identifying their effectiveness and lapses and possibly stimulate administrators to correct the situation by making the governments at all levels and the governs to realize the import-ance of peace so as to be responsible and accountable in governance with a view to earning the confidence of the citizenry so that they can see government as truly theirs in order to embrace the essence of peace and development and to avoid conflicts and terrorism in order to attract local and foreign investments for economic development at both national and international levels.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**2.1 Origin and Causes of Insecurity in Nigeria**

 According to Ali (2013) the fear of insecurity in Nigeria is on the increase and this has been compounded by the rising waves of terrorism since the country returned to democratic rule in 1999. Violent crime has a root and history in Nigeria, and could be traced back to the period from 1960 to 1970. At independence in 1960 a federal structure was imposed on Nigeria by the British. Wheare (1963) conceptualizes federalism as a constitutional division of power between two levels of government which are independent and coordinating in their respective spheres of influence. Unfortunately, the federal structure bequeathed to Nigeria at independence did not conform to Wheare’s tenets of federalism as a system of government where two levels of government exist each sovereign in its sphere of jurisdiction Awotayo *et al*, (2013). Meanwhile Ewetan, (2011) says that, the incursion of the military into governance, and the consequent imposition of military command structure in a federation set the tone for the distortion of Nigeria’s federalism. Thus the practice of federalism in Nigeria no doubt has been distorted by overwhelming dominance of the federal government that distributes national resources to lower level of government at its own whims and caprices.

Ali, (2013) and Adamu, (2005) Noted that since independence, the demand for true federalism, fiscal and political restructuring by different ethnic nationalities in Nigeria has not abated. These agitations have contributed to violent rebellious reactions by aggrieved ethnic groups in the country, endangering the security, unity, and corporate existence of Nigeria as one country. Federalism that undermines the independence and autonomy of its federating units will only bring about conflict, threat to national cohesion and peace, and ultimate disintegration. Insecurity challenges can be traced to the early years of military rule when large quantities of arms were imported into the country for the use of the military during and after the Nigerian civil war, some of which got into the hand of the civilians. Soon after the civil war these arms were used by some civilians and ex-military men for mischievous purposes such as armed robbery. There was also the army of unemployed youths some of whom lost their job during the civil war. The level of insecurity assumed dangerous dimensions in the prolonged years of military rule beginning from 1970 during which people procure arms and light weapons for personal defense. Some of these arms and light weapons got into the hands of unemployed youths who used them for deviant purpose. While some researchers attribute youth violence to peer group influence and other psychological factors associated with growing up, others emphasized the impact of political and economic factors such as ethnic agitation, political agitation, unemployment, Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) as triggers of violent reaction among the youth.

**2.2 The Nature of National Security Challenges in Nigeria**

Nigeria is not at war in the real sense of the word but the carnage resulting from various forms of insecurity qualifies it to be regarded as conflict-ridden and at war. Conventionally, the threshold required to classify an armed conflict as a civil war is to record 1,000 battle deaths (Dupuy and Rustad, 2018; Guseh and Oritsejafor, 2019). Nigeria has consistently recorded deaths in excess of 1,000 from various conflicts unleashed by various groups across the country for decades. Both the Nigeria Security Tracker and the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project (ACLED) estimated the total number of deaths associated with the Boko Haram Terrorist group alone between June 2011 and June 2018 at 34,261 and 37,530 people (Campbell & Harwood, 2018). Apart from the Boko Haram sect, there are other sources of violent deaths, which include intra-community conflicts, herders-farmers’ conflicts, clashes between security agencies and socio cultural and religious groups and other criminal activities, especially ransom kidnappings. In 2018 alone, there were about 10,665 fatalities from various types of violence in Nigeria with the highest source of violent deaths resulting from criminal activities, which recorded 3,425 deaths in 1,191 incidents (Ukoji *et al,* 2019).

Since 2014, the Fulani herders are still deadly as they are responsible for various forms of attacks, especially ransom kidnappings and militia expeditions against farming communities considered antagonistic to their herding and pasturing activities. What must have emboldened the spates of attacks by the Fulani herders is the nonchalance of the Nigerian government despite the international classification of these herders as terrorists. The source of the boldness of the Fulani herders is linked to the open support of their socio-cultural organizations, notably the Miyetti Allah Kautal Hore, Miyetti Allah Cattle Breeders Association of Nigeria and Fulani Nationality Movement as well as the tacit support of the Nigerian president, Muhammadu Buhari. Despite the perception of Nigerians that the presidency is shielding the herder-killers and their sponsors, the government has not done anything substantial to controvert this perception (International Crisis Group, 2017; Amnesty International, 2018; Ilo *et al,* 2019).

**2.3 National Insecurity as Antithesis to Sustainable Rural Livelihood Activities**

Nigeria is the most populous country in black Africa. Its population has always been on the increase since it achieved statehood. Prior to 2013, the country’s population growth rate was 2.8 percent but since then, the growth rate has been 3.1 percent (CBN, 2018). The implication is that the country’s population as at 2018 was 198.1 million with projections for persistent growth due to high fertility rate and improved child and maternal mortality (NBS, 2018; CBN, 2018). What this means is that Nigeria has an ever-expanding need for food in order to meet the food and nutrition needs of its population and achieve food security. The current situation is that Nigeria lacks both the capacity and capability to produce enough food to feed its population despite its favorable agro-ecological conditions. In other words, rural livelihood activities are insecure. According to FMARD (2016, p. 8), “Nigeria still imports about [US] $3 to $5 billion worth of food annually, especially wheat, rice, fish and sundry items, including fresh fruits, leather and tiles”. The burgeoning population means that more and more resources would be devoted to raw materials importation in order to meet the basic needs of the country.

Therefore, Nigeria’s quest to rediscover and reposition agriculture and sustainable livelihood activities of rural dwellers in line with ECOWAP/CAADP agenda is two-pronged, namely, to modernize agriculture for enhanced productivity as well as competitiveness, and to develop strategic rural dwellers livelihood activities value chain approach for optimization of resources. Both of these preoccupations are essentially aimed at addressing problems affecting rural dwellers activities in the country. Nigeria has mobilized enormous investments in the rural development sector in order to beef up their livelihood activities and standard of living. These investments have tended to focus on addressing the productivity challenge and the attendant hiatus between domestic production and insecurity. The insecurity in Nigeria is having a serious negative impact on rural communities as it prevents them from engaging in livelihood activities at optimal levels. Between 2011 and 2015, reasonable progress was made in the resuscitation efforts of the government. For instance, through the initiative known as the Growth Enhancement Scheme (GES), a database of smallholder farmers was created, which facilitated the efficient distribution of farm inputs, especially fertilizer and improved higher yielding crop varieties to these farmers. Similarly, success was recorded in the concession of federal warehouses and storage assets (FMARD, 2016). All of these efforts were aimed at closing the huge demand-supply gap in crop production.

In recent times, insecurity has negatively impacted agricultural production and other livelihood activities of rural dwellers. Majority of livelihood activities such as farming, hinting, food gathering and animal rearing in the core rural areas of Nigeria are completely suspended as a result of the terrorist activities of the Boko Haram group in that Northeast geopolitical zone and herds-men in the Southern part geopolitical zone. The devastation, which the activities of Boko Haram has caused, is not only obvious but also far-reaching in its impact on rural dwellers. Besides the Boko Haram group, insecurity in Nigeria has been aggravated by the criminal activities of sundry groups. The group with the most devastating impact is the Fulani herders whose murderous campaigns have targeted farming communities, with no challenge from the state (Amnesty International, 2018; Ilo et al, 2019). Since 2013, there has been a steady increase in the number of displaced persons as a result of conflicts across Nigeria. United Nations sources estimated that over 2.4 million people have so far been displaced with new records of displacement from conflicts expanding the number (UNHCR, 2018). According to IDMC (2019), between January and June 2019, about 142,000 new displacements were recorded with a caveat that the figure could most likely be an underestimate. Out of this figure, 140,000 people were displaced through conflict and 2,000 people were displaced because of disasters.

**2.4 Empirical Studies**

Gassebner, (2005) in his study on insecurity and terrorism, he emphasized that Insecurity and terrorism has a huge economic, socio and physical cost. It is obvious that the loss of human lives and the suffering of survivors in the aftermath of an attack can be tremendous. Apart from the loss of lives, terrorist attacks are likely to have negative consequences on the investment behaviour. No meaningful growth and develop-ment can take place in the continuous face of insecurity. This will not only reduce GDP and fuel inflation but also the flow of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). McKenna (2005) assert that the increase in government expenditure due to rising insecurity especially in less developed countries may likely result in the sales of foreign reserves and seinorage. As a consequence inflation in those countries will rise.

Previous studies on effect of insecurity such as the research by Okechukwu (2011) on the challenges of insecurity in Nigeria, Adeleke, (2013) Insecurity a threat to human existence and economic development in Nigeria and the research by Wantana (2013) on the effect of insecurity on socio-political development of Borno State unpublished project have not considered economic consequences in terms of crop production, livestock and fishing and commercial activities as it affect livelihood particularly in Maiduguri Metropolis. It is conventional wisdom that there can be no development without peace. It is against the backdrop of these identified problems and gap in knowledge that the effects of insecurity on livelihood of communities in Maiduguri Metro-polis is conducted.

Oladunjoye and Omemu (2013) conducted a study on the “Effect of Insecurity on School Attendance in Northern Nigeria, using descript-tive survey. The study cover schools in the most vulnerable states in Northern Nigeria: Yobe, Bauchi and Borno states were selected for the study. 2 tertiary institutions were selected from each state and 30 urban primary and secondary schools were randomly selected from each of the 3 states as well as 30 rural primary and secondary schools. The findings revealed that School attendance is affected in areas prone to Insecurity attacks in Northern Nigeria; the rural schools are often neglected and the children live in perpetual fear of attacks; the primary schools record very low school attendance as parents disallow their children from attending school as soon as there is an attack or rumours of attack. David, (2009) conducted a study titled: The Consequences of Conflict: Livelihoods and Development in Nepal. His study has shown that the implications of conflict on livelihoods are complex: some groups benefit from the conflict setting and others lose out depending on a complex range of factors. While conflict and instability clearly affect the potential for economic development and production, the effects are not clear-cut. Indeed, this study has shown that some local government services continue to be delivered in areas controlled by Maoists in Nepal and some argue that these are even more effective in these areas. Development may be impeded as formal and governmental service delivery mechanisms are compromised by the disincentive to development agencies and professionals to work in conflict settings; however, new mechanisms may emerge to maintain some form of local government and to deliver services even where the Maoists maintain control or conflict is severe.

**2.5 Theoretical Framework**

The concept of insecurity has been defined differently by several scholars theoretically and subject specific, some theories of insecurity are examined below: The functional superiority of theories as guideposts in all fields of human endeavour lies in the fact that rather than base action on judgment derived from mere experience, guesswork or speculations, theories enable a chosen line of action to be anchored in and guided by evidence derived from scientific research, which makes the consequences of such an action fall as close in line with the intend direction as possible (Onah, 2014).

**2.5.1 Emotional Insecurity Theory**

Emotional insecurity theory is a feeling of general unease or nervousness that may be triggered by perceiving of oneself to be vulnerable in some way, or a sense of vulnerability or instability which threatens one’s self-image or ego. This concept of insecurity is related to that of psychological resilience in as much as both concern the effects which setbacks or difficult situations have on an individual. However, resilience concerns over-all coping, also with reference to the individual’s socio-economic situation, whereas the emotional security specifically characterized the emotional impact. In this sense, emotional security can be understood as part of resilience. This theory is propounded by Maslow (1942).

The notion of emotional insecurity of an individual is to be distinguished from that of emotional safety or security provided by a non-threatening, supportive environment. Abraham Maslow describes an insecure person who perceives the world as dangerous and selfish feels rejected and isolated person, anxious and hostile; is generally pessimistic and unhappy shows sign of tension and conflict, tend to turn inward; is troubled by guilt-feeling, tends to be necrotic and generally selfish and egocentric (Maslow, 1942).

**METHOLOGY**

**3.1 Study Area**

The study was carried out in Ibarapa Central Local Government Area of Oyo State Nigeria. It consists of two principal towns which are Igboora and Idere with its headquarters at Igboora. Ibarapa Central is the largest communities in Ibarapa communities. It is located along longitude 70 26’ O N and Latitude 30 17’ O E with land mass of 440 square kilometers. It is bounded to the East by Ibarapa North Local Government Area. It shares boundary with Ogun State in the South–West. The Local Government is made up of ten political ward which encompasses a number of primary health care centres, schools and religion centres.

The population census of 2006 of the Local Government is 102, 979 people. The rainfall pattern of the area follows a tropical type of annual rainfall of between 1000mm and 1450mm and high temperature. The vegetation is largely rainforest and savannah and this makes it possible to cultivate many crops ranging from tree crops to arable crops and food crops such as maize, cowpea, cassava, melons, cashew, cocoa, oil palm and vegetables.

There are two main planting seasons in the area, early planting season which begins around March and ends around July – August while late planting season which usually begins from September and ends around December. The major occupation in the area is farming (mainly subsistence farming). Also, few proportion of the dwellers are civil servants, traders, artisans and hunters. The area is heterogeneously populated by many tribes of Nigeria such as Yorubas, Hausas, Igbo, Fulanis and Benin. However, Yoruba language is the most common and predominant language

**3.2** **Population of the Study**

The population of the study comprises farming rural households in the study area

**3.3 Sampling Procedure and Sample Size**

Multistage sampling procedure was used to select respondents for the study area. First stage involves purposive selection of Ibarapa Central Local Government Areas (due to recent insecurity issue in the area). Thirty percent (30%) of wards in the local government areas were randomly selected for easy administration of interview guide and management of data (this gives three (3) wards). Each ward contains 8 villages making twenty-four (24) villages in total. Fifty percent (50%) of all the villages in the selected wards were randomly selected to make twelve (12) villages. List of farm families in the selected villages were computed while 10% of the farm families from the lists were randomly selected from each of the villages selected making one hundred and thirty (130) farm families.

**List 1-: Summary of Sampling Procedure and Sample Size**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Selected LGAs | No of Wards | Selected 30% Ward | Name of Wards | No of Villages | Selected 50% Village | Farm families in selected villages | Selected farm families (10%) |
| Ibarapa Central | 10 | 3 | Pako tuntun | 8 | 4 | 450 | 45 |
|  |  |  | Igbole | 8 | 4 | 500 | 50 |
|  |  |  | Idonfin 1 | 8 | 4 | 350 | 35 |
| Total |  |  |  | **24** | **12** | **1300** | **130** |

**3.4 Development of Research Instrument**

Interview schedule was development based on the objectives of the study and used to collect relevant information necessary for this study from the respondents in the study area

**3.5 Validation of the instrument**

Face and content validity was used to adjudge the instrument. Experts in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development of Olabimis Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, were contacted for the assessment of face validity. However, content validity was done by computing the level of agreement among five lecturers who were experts in the field of agricultural extension and rural development.

**3.6 Reliability test of the instrument**

Assessment of the reliability of this instrument was carried out by using the test-retest technique. The prepared interview schedule was administered to thirty (30) respondents whom were randomly selected from a village in Ibarapa East local government of Area of Oyo State which is outside the study area. The instrument was administered twice on the same set of farmers within a time frame of two weeks’ interval. The Data collected were subjected to statistical analysis. A high correlation coefficient (87%) was considered adequate for the reliability of the instrument.

**3.7 Sources of Data**

Data for the study were obtained mainly from primary sources using a set of well-structured questionnaire assisted with interview schedule to take care of the illiterate respondents.

**3.8 Method of Data Collection**

Five Extension agents from of Oyo State Agricultural Development Programme (OYSADEP), were contacted, trained and used as enumerators, for the administration of the instrument.

**3.9 Measurement of Variables**

Two major variables considered in this research. They are the independent and dependent variables. These variables were operationalized and measured as follows:

1. **Independent variables**:

Independent variables of this research include the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents such as age, marital status, gender, religion, income from watermelon, educational level, household size, watermelon farm size, watermelon farming experiences

1. **Age**: This was measured by asking the respondents to give their actual age in years. This was measured at the interval level.

**2. Marital status**: This was measured nominally by asking the respondents to indicate (by ticking) the most appropriate option that reflects their marital status as either married, separated, widowed, divorced or single. Then, the scores were attached nominally such that married=1 and single = 0.

3. **Educational level**: This was measured by asking the respondents to indicate the option that best describes their educational status or level and this was measured at the nominal level as follows: No formal education = 1, primary school = 2, secondary school = 3 and tertiary education = 4. However, the respondents were asked to give the actual years spent in school to corroborate their real level of education.

1. **Household size**: Respondents were asked to state their household size. This was measured at the interval level.
2. **Farm size**: This is a measure of farm size cultivated by each respondent. This was determined by asking the respondents to state their actual size of land
3. **Livelihood activities**: Respondents were asked to state their various income generating activities. This was measured at the nominal level.
4. **Religion**: This was captured by asking the respondents to indicate their religion by ticking the appropriate option. It was measured nominally Christianity =1, Islam =2 and Traditional religion =3.
5. **Sex**: Respondents’ gender was determined as either male or female. It was measured at nominal level as Male =1 and Female =2.
6. **Causes of human insecurity:** This was captured by asking the respondents to indicate the various causes of human insecurity
7. **Strategies adopted against human insecurity:** This was captured by asking the respondents to list out the various measure or strategies employed/adopted to mitigate against these human insecurity problems.

**B . Dependent variable**

The dependent variable of the study is perceived effect of human insecurity on agricultural enterprises of the respondents.The perception statements on the effect of insecurity on farm families’ livelihood activities was used for measuring the dependent variable of this study.

**3.10 Method of Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistic such as frequency count and percentage was used to achieve the objectives. Inference statistics such as Chi Square and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) was use to analyzed the hypotheses

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**4.1 Socioeconomic characteristics of Respondents**

The socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1. The result shows that 6.15 percent of the respondents are aged 30 years and below, 18.46 percent of the respondents fall within the age range of 30 - 40 years, 50.77 percent were in the age range of 41 - 50, while 24.62 percent were above 50 years of age respectively with mean age of the respondents estimated at 46 years. This revealed that majority of the respondents are in economic productive age. The distribution of the respondents based on their believe (religion) shows that 47.69 percent are Muslims while 42.31 percent and 10.0 percent of the respondents are Christians and traditional worshipers respectively.

In terms of their marital status, majority (79.23 percent) of the respondents are married while 15.38 percent and 5.38 percent of them are single and divorced/separated/widowed respectively. Also, education qualification distribution of the respondents revealed that 23.85 percent of the respondents had no formal education while 29.23 percent, 44.62 percent and 2.31 percent of the them had primary education, secondary education and tertiary education respectively. In terms of house hold size as shown in Table 1, 15.38 percent of the respondents have household size of less than 4, 76.15 percent have household size between 4 - 8 while 8.46 percent of the respondents have household of more than 8 members with mean household size estimated at 6 persons.

The result also revealed that 6.15 percent, 78.46 percent and 15.29 percent of the respondents have farm size of less than hectares, 5 - 10 hectares and above 10 hectares respectively. The distribution of respondents based of their livelihood activities revealed that 50.77 percent of the respondents were into crop farming while 4.62 percent, 28.46 percent and 10.00 percent of them were into trading, livestock farming and crop/food processing respectively.

**Table 1: Socioeconomic characteristic of Cassava Farmers in the study area**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | Frequency |  Percentage |  Mean |
| Age  |  |  |  |
| Less than 30 | 8 | 6.15 |  |
| 30 - 40  | 24 | 18.46 |  |
| 41 - 50 | 66 | 50.77 | 46 |
| Above 50 | 32 | 24.62 |  |
| RELIGION |  |  |  |
| Christianity | 55 | 42.31 |  |
| Islam | 62 | 47.69 |  |
| Traditional | 13 | 10.00 |  |
| MARITAL STATUS |  |  |  |
| Single | 20 | 15.38 |  |
| Married | 103 | 79.23 |  |
| Widow/Divorced/Separated | 7 | 5.38 |  |
| SEX |  |  |  |
| Male | 79 | 60.77 |  |
| Female | 51 | 39.23 |  |
| EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION |  |  |  |
| No Formal | 31 | 23.85 |  |
| Primary | 38 | 29.23 |  |
| Secondary | 58 | 44.62 |  |
| Tertiary | 3 | 2.31 |  |
| FARMING EXPERIENCE (YEARS) |  |  |  |
| Less than 5 | 9 | 6.92 |  |
| 5 - 10  | 77 | 59.23 | 9.2 |
| 11 - 15 | 21 | 16.15 |  |
| Above 15 | 23 | 17.69 |  |
| FARM SIZE |  |  |  |
| Less than 5 | 8 | 6.15 |  |
| 5 - 10 | 102 | 78.46 | 7.4 |
| Above 10 | 20 | 15.29 |  |
| HOUSEHOLD SIZE |  |  |  |
| Less than 4 | 20 | 15.38 |  |
| 4 - 8 | 99 | 76.15 | 6 |
| Above 8 | 11 | 8.46 |  |
| Type of livelihood activities |  |  |  |
| Trading | 6 | 4.62 |  |
| Livestock Farming | 37 | 28.46 |  |
| Crop Farming | 66 | 59.77 |  |
| Crop/Food processing | 13 | 10.385 |  |
| Artisan | 8 | 6.16 |  |
| Total | 130 | 100.00 |  |

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**4.2 Perceived causes of Insecurity in the Study Area**

The percentage distribution of the respondents based their perceived causes of insecurity in the study area was presented in Table 2. In term of causes of insecurity in the study area as perceived by the respondents, 70.77 percent, 23.85 percent, 51.54 percent, 65.38 percent, 50.77 percent and 58.46 percent of the respondents reported that clashes between rival cult groups, conflicting political factions, poor distribution of resources within a community or among communities, violent resistance to exploitation by government or natural resources exploitation by companies, encroachment without permission and overgrazing/indiscriminate grazing of farm land were the factors that always causes insecurity in the study area respectively. Also, 64.62 percent, 56.15 percent, 26.92 percent and 44.62 percent of the respondents perceived that election activities, increasing population, loss of respect for culture and encroachment without permission respectively occasionally causes insecurity in the study area as against 51.54 percent and 56.15 percent of them who perceived that scarcity of land and land grabbing never causes insecurity in the study area respectively.

**Table 2: Distribution of the Respondents based on Perceived Causes of insecurity in the study area (n=130)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Causes of Insecurity | Always | Occasionally | Never |
|  |  | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) |
| 1 | Clashes between rival cult groups is a major cause of insecurity in the study area | 92 (70.77) | 24 (18.46) | 14 (10.77) |
| 2 | Conflicting political factions also cause insecurity in the study area | 31 (23.85) | 95 (73.08) | 4 (3.08) |
| 3 | Poor distribution of resources within a community or among communities generates violent agitations that lead to insecurity in the communities. | 67 (51.54) | 47 (36.15) | 16 (12.31) |
| 4 | Violent resistance to exploitation by government and natural resources exploitation by companies is a cause of insecurity in my community. | 85 (65.38) | 43 (33.08) | 2 (1.54) |
| 5 | Election activities are major cause of insecurity in my community. | 42 (32.32) | 84 (64.62) | 4 (3.08) |
| 6 | Increasing population | 6 (4.62) | 73 (56.15) | 51 (39.23) |
| 7 | Loss of respect for culture | 2 (1.54) | 35 (26.92) | 93 (71.54) |
| 8 | Encroachment without permission | 66 (50.77) | 58 (44.62) | 6 (4.62) |
| 10 | Land tenure system | 67 (51.54) | 61 (46.92) | 2 (1.54) |
| 11 | Land grabbing | 5 (3.85) | 52 (40.00) | 73 (56.15) |
| 12 | Scarcity of land | 2 (1.54) | 61 (46.92) | 67 (51.54) |
| 14 | Overgrazing/indiscriminate grazing of farm land | 76 (58.46) | 12 (9.23) | 42 (32.31) |

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**Percentages are in Parentheses**

4.3 Perceived Sources of Insecurity in the study area

Table 3 revealed the distribution of the respondents based on their perceived sources of insecurity in the study area. Majority (90.77 percent) of the respondents reported that farmers to farmers conflict is always a source of insecurity in the study area as against 9.23 percent who reported that they are sometimes causes of insecurity to human life and their livelihood activities in the study area. Furthermore, 61.54 percent, 62.31 percent and 38.46 percent of the respondents believed that pastoralist-farmers conflicts, communal conflicts and political/civil unrest/disturbances is always a major sources of insecurity in the study area respectively while 58.46 percent of the respondents reported that pastoralist-conservation conflicts is never a source insecurity as against 35.38 percent and 76.15 percent of the respondents that claimed religious conflicts and farmers-conservationist conflicts occasionally are sources of insecurity in the study area respectively.

**Table 3: Distribution of the respondents based on Perceived Sources of insecurity in the study area (n=130)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Sources of Human insecurity | Always | Sometimes | Never |
|  |  | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) |
| 1 | Farmers to farmers conflict | 118 (90.77) | 12 (9.23) | 0 (0.00) |
| 2 | Farmers-conservationist conflicts | 27 (20.77) | 99 (76.15) | 4 (3.08) |
| 3 | Pastoralist-conservation conflicts | 1 (0.77) | 53 (40.77) | 76 (58.46) |
| 4 | Pastoralist-farmers conflicts | 80 (61.54) | 44 (33.85) | 6 (4.62) |
| 5 | Communal conflicts | 81 (62.31) | 49 (37.69) | 0 (0.00) |
| 6 | Religious conflicts | 2 (1.54) | 46 (35.38) | 82 (63.08) |
| 7 | Political/civil unrest/disturbances | 50 (38.46) | 78 (60.00) | 2 (1.54) |

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**Percentages are in Parentheses**

**4.4 Perceived Effect of insecurity on Livelihood Activities of the respondents**

The perceived effects of insecurity on livelihood activities of the respondents was presented in Table 4. The results showed that 90.77 percent, 70.00 percent, 65.38 percent, 50.77 percent, 60.77 percent and 61.54 percent of the respondents claimed that insecurity in the study area lead to reduce crop yield/productivity, inadequate food for family, reduced farm income, Poor harvest, Loss of capital investment and Scarcity of food items in a great extent respectively as against 56.15 percent, 26.92 percent and 40.77 percent of the respondents that perceived the effect of insecurity on the livelihood activities to be minimal in term of land redundancy, missing of planting season and migration/loss of farm labour respectively.

**Table 4: Distribution of the respondents based on the Perceived effect of insecurity on Livelihood Activities of the respondents in the study area**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Effect on livelihood Activities of the respondents | Great Extent | Minimal Extent | No Extent |
|  |  | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) |
| 1 | Reduce crop yield/productivity | 118 (90.77) | 12 (9.23) | 0 (0.00) |
| 2 | Burning of crops in field | 37 (28.46) | 93 (71.54) | 0 (0.00) |
| 4 | Inadequate food for family | 91 (70.00) | 37 (28.46) | 2 (1.54) |
| 5 | Reduced farm income | 85 (65.38) | 43 (33.08) | 2 (1.54) |
| 6 | Land redundancy | 6 (4.62) | 73 (56.15) | 51 (39.23) |
| 7 | Missing of planting season | 2 (1.54) | 35 (26.92) | 93 (71.54) |
| 8 | Poor harvest | 66 (50.77) | 58 (44.62) | 6 (4.62) |
| 9 | Loss of capital investment | 79 (60.77) | 45 (34.62) | 6 (4.62) |
| 10 | Migration/loss of farm labour | 1 (0.77) | 53 (40.77) | 76 (58.46) |
| 11 | Scarcity of food items | 80 (61.54) | 44 (33.85) | 6 (4.62) |
| 12 | Loss of stored produce/livestock products | 81 (62.31) | 49 (37.69) | 0 (0.00) |
| 13 | Reduced access to farm resources | 74 (56.92) | 56 (43.08) | 0 (0.00) |
| 14 | Reduction in quality of food crop/animal product | 2 (1.54) | 53 (40.77) | 75 (57.69) |
| 15 | Engagements in non-farm activities | 101 (77.69) | 27 (20.77) | 2 (1.54) |

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**Percentages are in Parentheses**

**4.5 Strategies to cushioning effect of insecurity on Livelihood Activities of the respondents in the study area**

Table 5 shows the distribution of respondents based on strategies adopted to mitigate the effect of insecurity on livelihood activities of the respondents. The result revealed that 90.77 percent, 81.54 percent and 55.38 percent of the respondents strongly agreed to fact that resettlement package for victims, giving financial assistance to victims and provision of small scale credit facilities respectively were adopted to mitigate the effect of insecurity on livelihood activities of the respondents. Also, 59.23 percent, 38.46 percent and 46.15 percent of the respondents agreed that creating job opportunity to the internally displaced, counseling services for victims and livelihood development programmes cushioned the effect of insecurity on livelihood activities of the respondents.

**Table 5: Distribution of respondents based on the strategies adopted to cushioning effect of insecurity on Livelihood Activities of the respondents in the study area (n=130)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Strategies of Human insecurity | SA | A | UN | SD | DA |
|  |  | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) | Freq. (%) |
| 1 | Resettlement package for victims | 118 (90.77) | 6 (4.62) | 0 (0.00) | 4 (3.08) | 2 (1.54) |
| 2 | Giving financial assistance to victims | 106 (81.54) | 14 (10.77) | 0 (0.00) | 0 (0.00) | 10 (7.69) |
| 3 | Creating job opportunity to the internally displaced | 4 (3.08) | 77 (59.23) | 16 (12.31) | 17 (13.08) | 16 (12.31) |
| 4 | Provision of small scale credit facilities | 72 (55.38) | 27 (20.77) | 9 (6.92) | 11 (8.46) | 11 (8.46) |
| 5 | Counseling services for victims | 54 (41.54) | 50 (38.46) | 18 (13.85) | 6 (4.62) | 2 (1.54) |
| 7 | Livelihood development programmes | 45 (34.62) | 60 (46.15) | 23 (17.69) | 2 (1.54) | 0 (0.00) |
| 8 | Health facilities for injured victims | 70 (53.85) | 29 (22.31) | 0 (0.00) | 4 (3.08) | 27 (20.77) |
| 9 | Provision of free drugs | 62 (47.69) | 38 (29.23) | 2 (1.54) | 14 (10.77) | 14 (10.77) |
| 10 | Trauma healing therapy provision | 32 (24.62) | 4 (3.08) | 0 (0.00) | 60 (46.15) | 34 (26.15) |
| 11 | Compensation for land owners | 77 (59.23) | 11 (8.46) | 4 (3.08) | 16 (12.31) | 11 (8.46) |

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**Percentages are in Parentheses**

**4.6 Test of hypotheses**

The hypotheses of the study were tested and results presented below. It is to be noted that all the hypotheses were stated in null form.

**4.6.1 H01: There is no significant relationship between selected socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents and their perception of causes of insecurity in the study area**

The test of significant relationship of between selected socioeconomic characteristics (age, household size, income, farm size and farming experience) of the respondents and the perception of causes of insecurity in the study by the respondents was presented in Table 6. Pearson Correlation analysis revealed that age (r = 0.431, p<0.05), household size (r = 0.280, p<0.05), farm size (r = 0.309, p<0.05), income from livelihood activities (r = 0.462, p<0.05) and farming experience (r = 0.334, p<0.05) exert a significant relationship with the perception of causes of insecurity in the study by the respondents. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Table 6: Summary of Pearson Correlation analysis showing Relationship between selected socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents and their perception of causes of insecurity in the study area (N=130)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Socio-economic characteristics** | **r-value** | **p-value** | **Remark** |
| Age  | 0.431 | 0.011 | S |
| Household Size  | 0.280 | 0.021 | S |
| Income  | 0.462 | 0.017 | S |
| Farm Size | 0.309 | 0.016 | S |
| Farming Experience | 0.334 | 0.022 | S |

S = significant; NS = not significant

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**4.6.2 H02: There is no significant relationship between the perception of sources of insecurity by the respondents and perceived effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities in the study area**

The test of significant relationship between the perception of sources of insecurity by the respondents and perceived effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities in the study area was presented in Table 7. Pearson Correlation analysis revealed that there exist a significant relationship between them (r = 0.581, p<0.05). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Table 7: Summary of Pearson Correlation analysis showing Relationship between the perceived sources of insecurity by the respondents and perceived effects of insecurity on their livelihood activities in the study area (n=130)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **r-value** | **p-value** | **Remark** |
| **Perceived sources of insecurity and effect of insecurity on livelihood activities of the respondents** | 0.581 | 0.011 | S |

S = significant; NS = not significant

**Source: Field Survey, 2021**

**SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

**5.1 Summary of Major findings**

The socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents showed that 6.15 percent of the respondents are aged 30 years and below, 18.46 percent of the respondents fall within the age range of 30 - 40 years, 50.77 percent were in the age range of 41 - 50, while 24.62 percent were above 50 years of age respectively with mean age of the respondents estimated at 46 years. This revealed that majority of the respondents are in economic productive age. The distribution of the respondents based on their believe (religion) shows that 47.69 percent are Muslims while 42.31 percent and 10.0 percent of the respondents are Christians and traditional worshipers respectively. The result also revealed that 6.15 percent, 78.46 percent and 15.29 percent of the respondents have farm size of less than hectares, 5 - 10 hectares and above 10 hectares respectively. The distribution of respondents based of their livelihood activities revealed that 50.77 percent of the respondents were into crop farming while 4.62 percent, 28.46 percent and 10.00 percent of them were into trading, livestock farming and crop/food processing respectively

The percentage distribution of the respondents based their perceived causes of insecurity in the study area was presented in Table 2. In term of causes of insecurity in the study area as perceived by the respondents, 70.77 percent, 23.85 percent, 51.54 percent, 65.38 percent, 50.77 percent and 58.46 percent of the respondents reported that clashes between rival cult groups, conflicting political factions, poor distribution of resources within a community or among communities, violent resistance to exploitation by government or natural resources exploitation by companies, encroachment without permission and overgrazing/indiscriminate grazing of farm land were the factors that always causes insecurity in the study area respectively. Also, 64.62 percent, 56.15 percent, 26.92 percent and 44.62 percent of the respondents perceived that election activities, increasing population, loss of respect for culture and encroachment without permission respectively occasionally causes insecurity in the study area.

Furthermore, the distribution of the respondents based on their perceived sources of insecurity in the study area. Majority (90.77 percent) of the respondents reported that farmers to farmers’ conflict is always a source of insecurity in the study area as against 9.23 percent who reported that they are sometimes causes of insecurity to human life and their livelihood activities in the study area. Furthermore, 61.54 percent, 62.31 percent and 38.46 percent of the respondents believed that pastoralist-farmers conflicts, communal conflicts and political/civil unrest/disturbances is always a major sources of insecurity in the study area respectively while 58.46 percent of the respondents reported that pastoralist-conservation conflicts is never a source insecurity as against 35.38 percent and 76.15 percent of the respondents that claimed religious conflicts and farmers-conservationist conflicts occasionally are sources of insecurity in the study area respectively.

The perceived effects of insecurity on livelihood activities of the respondents showed that 90.77 percent, 70.00 percent, 65.38 percent, 50.77 percent, 60.77 percent and 61.54 percent of the respondents claimed that insecurity in the study area lead to reduce crop yield/productivity, inadequate food for family, reduced farm income, Poor harvest, Loss of capital investment and Scarcity of food items in a great extent in the study area respectively.

**5.2 Conclusion**

The study concluded that majority of the respondents were male, married with secondary education. Also, crop farming was the major livelihood activities of the respondents in the study area while majority of them also engaged in occupations such as livestock farming, trading and artisan. Islam was the major religion believe of the respondents with mean household size, age, farm size and experience estimated at 6 persons, 46, 7 hectares and 9 years respectively. Furthermore, majority of the respondents concluded that clashes between rival cult groups, violent resistance to exploitation by government or natural resources exploitation by companies, encroachment without permission and overgrazing/indiscriminate grazing of farm land by pastoralist were the major causes of insecurity in the study area while pastoralist-farmers conflicts, political/civil unrest/disturbances and communal conflicts were the major sources of insecurity of live, properties and livelihood activities of the respondents in the study area.

In addition, the perceived effects of insecurity on livelihood activities of the respondents include reduce crop yield/productivity, reduced farm income, scarcity of food items and loss of capital investment while the strategies employed to cushion the effect of insecurity are giving financial assistance to victims, provision of small scale credit facilities and free health facilities for injured victims. The test of hypotheses showed that there exist a significant relationship between the selected socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents and the causes of insecurity in the study area.

**5.3 Recommendation**

Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended that:

1. Community leaders should shun factional politics and take unbiased stand in using some traditional institutions and methods in uniting the people they lead.

2. Government should deploy security agents to communities where there are cult groups and frequent kidnapping to ensure such groups are completely dealt with.

3. Government in collaboration with companies operating in these crisis prone areas should engage stakeholders (community leaders, youth leaders and other leaders of Community Based Organizations) in a town hall meeting and collectively come up with lasting solutions to these insecurity issues that impede their development.
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