



# Strategies for Conflict Resolution among Farming Communities in Ogu/Bolo and Eleme Local Government Areas of Rivers State, Nigeria

Nwaogwugwu, O. N.\*, Dabelema, D.

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

## \*Corresponding Author

**Abstract:** The study investigated the strategies for conflict resolution among farming communities in Ogu/bolo and Eleme Local Government Areas of Rivers State, Nigeria. Four specific objectives raised to guide the study were: to describe the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents, identify the causes of conflict in the study area, identify the types of conflict in the study area and to ascertain the strategies for conflict resolution in the study area. With the aid of a structured and validated questionnaire, data were collected from a sample size of 80 farm-family heads selected from a population of 342 farm-family heads in the study area using a 2-stage random sampling technique. Data obtained were analyzed using frequency, percentage and mean. The result shows that the causes of conflicts include: scramble for the use of limited community resources to increase food and income (mean=3.56), competition for the control of farmland and fishing ground (mean=3.36), farm boundary disputes (mean= 3.51), encroachment over existing boundaries (mean=3.30), community leadership tussles (3.40). The types of conflict were: periodic community clashes (mean=3.45), youth restiveness (mean=2.75), inter-community wars (mean=3.38), litigations at formal and informal courts (mean=2.90), severance of community ties and associations (mean=3.45) inter and intra community hostilities (mean=3.44). Result also shows that the strategies for conflict resolution were: organizing meetings between elders (mean=3.74), the use of military and police security (mean=3.51), enforcement of court decisions and rule (mean=2.65), government peace intervention missions (mean=3.45), all inclusive town hall peace meetings (mean=3.14), boundary demarcation (mean=2.89) It is recommended that community leaders both in Ogu/bolo and Eleme Local Government Areas should sign peace agreements and commit to uphold peaceful co-existence in the areas.

**Keywords:** Conflict Resolution, Farming Communities

## INTRODUCTION

The increasing Nigerian population has triggered off pressure on the use of available resources such as land, labour, capital etc. These are essential resources in the production process especially in rural farming communities who depend on available natural resources for their livelihood. The struggle for access, ownership and control over land and other resources has generated serious conflict between individuals, families and communities. According to Onyeche (2013), Conflict is defined as a fight, struggle, quarrel, bitter argument, opposition, differences and strong clash between contradictory impulses or wishes. According to Meludu (2006), Conflict is globally perceived as abnormal, dysfunctional and therefore detestable. According

to her, it is estimated that the World has witnessed 1,140 armed conflicts since 1984-1999 and that community conflict are becoming usual characteristic of social life in Nigeria since 1960. In the period before the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the problem was mainly restricted to the savannah belts of West Africa. According to Tonah (2006) there was a consensus between observers that farmer-herder clashes have only since the 20<sup>th</sup> century become widespread in the coastal countries of West Africa. Conflict in Nigeria have taken different forms such as person to person, family versus family, village versus village, group versus group, community versus community and state versus state. In whatever form it takes, lives and properties are lost, population displaced, sometimes leading to serious humanitarian disaster and hampering development activities in most farming communities.

Conflict arises from land tenure and land-use system, poor state of existing supply route by arable crop farmers, encroachment into grazing reserves, limited forum for consultation and development of resource use, enlightening of the rural dwellers and limited understanding of multiple resource use due to low capacity. Nevertheless, the complex land use system that has changed markedly over time has culminated in the present day tension and conflict between farmers and host communities. These conflicts therefore stems from the need to preserve and protect individual belongings since crops, livestock and other natural resources play roles in the development, maintenance and projection of socio-economic strength in the society.

Economically viable land has been a major cause of conflict between communities in Nigeria and specifically in the south-south region of the country in which Ogu/bolo and Eleme Local Government Areas are distinct ethnic groups co-dwelling in the same neighborhoods. Similarly, land tenure system which has serious implication for land acquisition tend to affect food security by creating food shortage, which disrupt both upstream input markets and downstream output markets thus deterring food production, commercialization and stock management. Crops cannot also be planted, weeded or harvested thereby decreasing dramatically the level of agricultural production. This has consequently affected farming populations in various communities thereby reducing labour and food shortage.

In view of the dysfunctional effects of conflicts on the productivity and development of rural communities, several efforts have been employed at resolving conflicts wherever they occur by individuals, groups and government at various levels in Nigeria. These include the use of town hall meeting, arbitration panels, boundary demarcation, etc. Despite these efforts, there have been increasing levels of crises, displacements, destruction of crops and livestock etc in farming communities nationwide. The above background raises the need to explore the strategies for Conflict Resolution among Farming Communities in Ogu/Bolo and Eleme Local Government Areas of Rivers State, Nigeria. In specific terms, the study was designed to: describe the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents in Ogu/bolo and Eleme Local Government Areas of Rivers State; identify the causes of conflict among farming communities in the study areas; identify the types of conflict among farming communities in the study areas; ascertain the strategies for conflict resolution among farming communities in the study areas.

## **Methodology**

The research was carried out in Ogu/bolo and Eleme Local Government Areas of Rivers State. Ogu/bolo Local Government Area lies between 4° 43' 23.3"N and 7° 11' 59.61"E while Eleme Local Government Area lies between 5° 04' 60.00" N and 6° 38' 59.9" E. It covers an area of 89km<sup>2</sup> and is situated 76.6km North of Port Harcourt. While Ogu/bolo is bounded by Port Harcourt Local Government Area in the North, Tai Local Government Area in the East, Bonny Local Government Area in the South and Okrika Local Government Area in the West, Eleme Local Government Area shares boundary with Tai in the North, Khana in the East and Ogu/bolo in the South. Ogu/bolo and Eleme Local Government Areas could be reached through the sea on Ogu creek and Bonny River while others by land through Port Harcourt and Tai Local Government Areas. They have a population of 280,114 (NPC, 2006) and ome land to the Okrikans and the Ogoni's. The population of the study consists of household heads. Multi-stage sampling technique was employed in the collection of

data for the study. Purposive sampling was used to select 4 communities (2 from each Local Government Areas). Simple Random Sampling was used to select 20 respondents from each community to obtain a total of 80 respondents. The main instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire designed and validated by the researchers. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. “Section A” sought for responses on the socio-demographic responses of the respondents. Section B was divided into three parts. Part 1 contained items on the causes of conflict; Part 2 contained items clusters on the types of conflict while Part 3 contained item-statements on the strategies for conflict resolution. Responses to items in Sections B and C were measured using a 4-point Likert-type rating scale of agreement, where SA (Strongly Agree) =4 A (Agree) = 3, D (Disagreed) =2 and SD (Strongly Disagree) =1. The values of the scale (4, 3, 2 and1) were summed up to obtain 10. The mean value of the sum gave 2.50, which became the benchmark for accepting any item as causes of conflict, types of conflict, and strategies for conflict resolution. Data collected were analyzed using frequency, percentage and mean.

## Results and Discussion

### Socio-demographic Characteristics of respondent

The result in Table 1 show that majority of the respondents were female (52.5%) while male accounted for 47.5% of the total sample. This indicates that in conflict areas, female farmers are more interested in processing, trading and distribution of agricultural produce. The findings corroborated with Yahaya (2002), who discovered that food processing and agricultural products distribution are main activities of women but when there is conflict, it is the men who carry out the attack or go to courts. The age distribution of the respondents showed no much variation of the percentage share of each age group/bracket clearly indicating percentage composition of each ranging between 15-21.3%, exception of age 60-69 years having 10.0%. the maximum percentage 21.3% constituted respondents aged 70 and above, followed by 18.8% for those aged 20-29 and 30-39years. 16.3% for those aged 50-59 years and 15.0% for those aged 40-49 years. The least was 10.0% for respondents aged 60-years. Most of the respondents are younger people aged 20-29 and 30-39 years and older people aged 70 and above. It is obvious from Table 1 that farming is dominated by young people to explore new horizons for green pastures of which attempt to block this ambition may result into personal and inter-group conflict in the society. Majority of the respondents (68.8%) are married. This is likely to favour resolution of conflict for the safety of the family members. Majority of the respondents (67.5%) attained tertiary education. This indicate that farmers in the study area are educated to understand the short and long term implications of conflict and properly disposed to sue for peace. This finding is substantiated in the assertion of Makinwa (1991) that broad mindedness can be determined by the level of education which is very important in farmers. Majority of the respondents (57.5%) are into farming. This implies that besides farming, there are other means of livelihood which can be sustained in an atmosphere of peace. Majority of the respondents (65%) have household sizes ranging from 4-6 persons. This is peculiar situation in some rural areas as most of these households lack the basic resources for development and consider land as their only source of livelihood and denial could lead to conflict. Result on Table 1 also show that almost all the respondents (90%) are Christians while the rest are traditionalists. On farming experience, the result showed that the respondents have different levels of experiences in farming. Majority of the respondents (65%), farm on relatively small piece of farm land. This is evidence that land partitioning as result of scarcity of arable land is acute in the study area. This goes to confirm that land holdings in the rural areas are usually small and is obtained mostly through inheritance.

**Table 1:** Socio-demographic Characteristics of the Respondent

| Variables     | Frequency | Percentage |
|---------------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Gender</b> | 38        | 47.5       |
| Male          | 38        | 47.5       |

|                             |    |      |
|-----------------------------|----|------|
| Female                      | 42 | 52.5 |
| Age category                |    |      |
| 20-29 years                 | 15 | 18.5 |
| 30-39 years                 | 15 | 18.8 |
| 40-49 years                 | 12 | 1.0  |
| 50-59 years                 | 13 | 16.3 |
| 60-69 years                 | 8  | 10.0 |
| 70 years and above          | 17 | 21.3 |
| Marital Status              |    |      |
| Married                     | 55 | 68.8 |
| Single                      | 16 | 20.0 |
| Divorced                    | 2  | 2.5  |
| Widowed                     | 7  | 8.8  |
| Educational Level           |    |      |
| No Formal Education         | 2  | 2.5  |
| Primary Education           | 3  | 3.8  |
| Secondary Education         | 21 | 26.3 |
| Tertiary Education          | 54 | 67.5 |
| Occupation                  |    |      |
| Fishing                     | 8  | 10.0 |
| Farming                     | 46 | 57.5 |
| Civil Service               | 26 | 32.5 |
| Household Size              |    |      |
| 1-3 persons                 | 10 | 12.5 |
| 4-6 persons                 | 52 | 65.0 |
| 7-9 persons                 | 18 | 22.5 |
| 10 persons and above        | 0  |      |
| Religious Affiliation       |    |      |
| Christianity                | 72 | 90.0 |
| Islam                       | 0  | 0.0  |
| Traditionalist              | 8  | 10.0 |
| Years of Framing Experience |    |      |
| 1-5 years                   | 30 | 37.5 |
| 6-0 years                   | 24 | 30.0 |
| 11-15 years                 | 11 | 13.8 |
| 16 years and above          | 15 | 18.8 |
| Farm Size                   |    |      |
| 1-5 plots                   | 52 | 65.0 |
| 6-10 plots                  | 21 | 26.3 |
| 11-15 plots                 | 7  | 8.9  |
| 16 plots and above          | 0  | 0.0  |

Source: Field Survey, 2016.

### Causes of Conflict among farming Communities in in the Study Area.

Results on the causes of conflict among farming communities in the study area are presented in Table 2. Result show that farmers' wanting to expand their farming activities is a major cause of conflict in the area (mean = 3.56). This finding is critical in an era when arable lands are becoming scarce due to other alternative land uses in the area. Thus farmers in an attempt to expand their farm holdings resort to encroachment, which result in severe actions and conflicts Also it is found that Farmers' disagreement over farming boundary (mean = 3.51), is a cause of conflict in the area of study. Further result in Table 2 indicate

that farmers compete for the control of farmland and fishing ground (mean = 3.36) causes conflicts. The finding is validated in view of one of the principle of social processes, competition. This indicate that land is a limiting factor for both individuals in the communities and is declining as population increases since agriculture is the major contributor to economy of the rural sector, Other causes includes; farmers disagreement over farmland ownership (mean = 3.35), rise in population (3.22), struggle to possess larger farmland and water ways (mean = 3.21). Land disputes between crop farmers and fishermen are a cause of conflict (mean = 3.36) and the respondents agreed that destruction of farmland by neighboring communities is also a cause of conflict (mean = 2.89). Unemployment was also seen as a cause of conflict (mean = 2.70). However, the remaining factors such as inter-communal clashes with communities, fighting for fish rights and stealing of farm produce by area boys from neighbouring communities were not seen as causes of conflict among farmers in the area of studied.

**Table 2:** Mean Distribution of Causes of conflict among farmers in the Study Area

| Items  | SA       | A        | D        | SD       | Mean | Remark   |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|----------|
| Expanding farming activities for more food and income                  | 58(72.5) | 14(17.5) | 3(3.8)   | 5(6.3)   | 3.56 | Accepted |
| Competition for the control of farmland and fishing ground             | 46(57.5) | 20(25.0) | 11(13.8) | 3(3.8)   | 3.36 | Accepted |
| Disagreement over farm boundary  | 55(68.8) | 14(17.5) | 8(10.0)  | 3(3.8)   | 3.51 | Accepted |
| Unemployment   | 20(25.0) | 29(36.3) | 18(22.5) | 13(16.3) | 2.70 | Accepted |
| Disagreement over control of market share to sell farm produce         | 18(22.5) | 23(28.8) | 25(31.3) | 14(17.5) | 2.56 | Accepted |
| Disagreement over farmland ownership                                   | 45(56.3) | 22(27.5) | 9(11.3)  | 4(5.0)   | 3.35 | Accepted |
| Disagreement over loss of their crops                                  | 20(25.0) | 29(36.3) | 17(21.3) | 14(17.5) | 2.69 | Accepted |
| Moving off land that have become barren to fresh land                  | 20(25.0) | 32(40.0) | 15(18.8) | 13(16.3) | 2.74 | Accepted |
| Non-indigenes that prevent fellows from producing large produce        | 22(27.5) | 28(35.0) | 22(27.5) | 8(10.0)  | 2.80 | Accepted |
| Struggle between communities for power and access to financial benefit | 15(18.8) | 38(47.5) | 17(21.3) | 10(12.5) | 2.73 | Accepted |
| Land disputes between crop farmers                                     | 37(46.3) | 25(31.3) | 12(15.0) | 6(7.5)   | 3.16 | Accepted |
| Demand for royalties by community youth                                | 22(27.5) | 15(18.8) | 23(28.8) | 20(25.0) | 2.49 | Accepted |
| Rise in population   | 45(56.3) | 17(21.3) | 9(11.3)  | 9(11.3)  | 3.22 | Accepted |
| Destruction of farmland by neighboring communities                     | 28(35.0) | 26(32.5) | 15(18.8) | 11(13.8) | 2.89 | Accepted |
| Struggle to possess larger farmland                                    | 32(40.0) | 35(43.8) | 11(13.8) | 2(2.5)   | 3.21 | Accepted |
| Inter communal clashes with other communities                          | 12(15.0) | 25(31.3) | 26(32.5) | 17(21.3) | 2.40 | Rejected |
| Taking away of fishing gears and harvested fish                        | 13(16.3) | 28(35.0) | 22(27.5) | 17(21.3) | 2.46 | Rejected |
| Blocking of waterways for annual river festival                        | 10(12.5) | 22(27.5) | 23(28.8) | 25(31.3) | 2.21 | Rejected |
| Fighting for fishing rights  | 4(5.0)   | 26(32.5) | 28(35.0) | 22(27.5) | 2.15 | Rejected |
| Stealing of farm produce by area boys from neighboring communities     | 14(17.5) | 15(18.8) | 28(35.0) | 23(28.8) | 2.25 | Rejected |

Source: Field survey, 2016.

Figures in parenthesis are percentage weights

Note: Note: mean  $\geq$  2.50 implies acceptance while mean  $\leq$  2.50 implies rejection.

### Types of Conflicts among Farming Communities in Ogu/bolo and Eleme L.G.A

Entries on Table 3 are results on the types of conflicts in farming communities in Ogu/bolo and Eleme local government areas. It is revealed that quarrel and hostile actions against one another (mean = 3.44) is a type of conflict common in the study area. This form of conflict may persist between kindred and families over time and may be attached to historical events between the families involved. Also the result show that Clash between different community- based groups (3.45) is a common type of conflict in the study area. These may arise from differences in group ideology, interests and quest for supremacy. Farmers group clashes based on different value system (mean = 3.45) is indicated by the respondents as a type of conflict in the study area. This is because differences in values creates point cleavages and may determine bases for solidarity among group members in communities. The result further revealed that disagreement due to insecurity about the behavior of one another is another form of conflict (mean = 3.08). Behavioral differences arise from individual differences. Result in Table 3 also indicated that Quarrel between farmers and fishermen due to farmland and fishing ground (mean = 3.28) as a form of conflict in the study area. This is because claims and counter claim over property rights remain pronounced in many communities. Clash due to border demarcating the land (mean = 3.28) is found to be a form of conflict in the study area. The challenge of border demarcation has remained intractable to peaceful co-existence in farming communities and between boundary communities in various states of the federation. This arises because most border demarcation exercises may be biased. The result further revealed that disagreement between farmers over power in their communities (2.55) as a form of conflict. Power tussle and claim to the tradition stool is recurrent in rural farming communities. The finding further revealed that denial of rights to land (mean = 2.71) bases for conflict in the study area. This arises because land is a major resource but the tenure systems practiced in some communities raise leaves much room for questioning on equity issues.

**Table 4:** Mean Distribution of the Types of Conflicts among Farming Communities in Ogu/bolo and Eleme L.G.A

| Items   | SA       | A        | D        | SD       | Mean | Remark |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|--------|
| Quarrel and Hostile actions against one another.                          | 52(65.0) | 14(17.5) | 11(13.8) | 3(3.8)   | 3.44 | Accept |
| Clash between different community- based groups.                          | 49(61.3) | 22(27.5) | 5(6.3)   | 4(5.0)   | 3.45 | Accept |
| Clash in different group based on different value system.                 | 46(57.5) | 25(31.3) | 8(10.0)  | 1(1.3)   | 3.45 | Accept |
| Disagreement due to insecurity about the behavior of one another.         | 22(27.5) | 46(57.5) | 8(10.0)  | 4(5.0)   | 3.08 | Accept |
| Quarrel between farmers and fishermen due to farmland and fishing ground. | 40(50.0) | 25(31.3) | 12(15.0) | 3(3.8)   | 3.28 | Accept |
| Clash due to border demarcating the land.                                 | 38(47.5) | 32(40.0) | 4(5.0)   | 6(7.5)   | 3.28 | Accept |
| Disagreement between farmers over power in their communities.             | 12(15.0) | 31(38.8) | 26(32.5) | 11(13.8) | 2.55 | Accept |
| Quarrel as a result of denial of rights to land.                          | 17(21.3) | 29(36.3) | 28(35.0) | 6(7.5)   | 2.71 | Accept |
| Disagreement over absence of regulation and delineated land.              | 10(12.5) | 22(27.5) | 34(43.5) | 14(17.5) | 2.35 | Reject |
| Disagreement between executive committee and members.                     | 10(12.5) | 31(38.8) | 22(27.5) | 17(21.3) | 2.43 | Reject |

Source: Field survey, 2016.

Figures in parenthesis are percentage weights

Note: Note: mean  $\geq$  2.50 implies acceptance while mean  $\leq$  2.50 implies rejection.

### Strategies for Conflict Resolution among Farming Communities in the Study Area.

Results on strategies on conflict resolution in the study area are presented on Table 4. From the Table 4, it is shown that Meetings between elders in both communities is a strategy to resolve conflict (mean = 3.74). This

strategy may be potent since elders in many communities serve as opinion leaders, household heads, community leaders and representative of the people. Their views are respected and are regarded as emblems of truth and maturity. Use of military and police Securities (mean = 3.51) is indicated by the respondents as a strategy for conflict resolution in the study area. However, expressions indicate that this strategy may be the last resort especially when total breakdown of law and order looms. The result in Table 4 further indicate that use of vigilante groups in the communities (mean = 2.96) as a strategy for conflict resolution in the study area. This is given credence in the light of current practices in which vigilantes have been popularized in forestalling breakdown of law and order in many Nigerian communities. Also, adjusting the boundaries between the farmlands in the communities (mean = 3.60) is revealed as a strategy for resolving conflicts. This strategy has been popularly used by individuals, groups, agencies and government to resolve land disputes between families, communities and states across Nigeria. However, though boundary adjustment is usually done but implementation will be critical to resolve conflict. Result in Table 4 show that using court judgment and ruling (mean = 3.48). The court is revered as the final arbiter for disputes in any country. This is in view of the fact that due process may be used to deliver judgment and proper documentation and penalty spelt out. He law court appears one of the most potent. Several litigations in the law court over community matters justify this finding. Workshop/programs to enlighten the farming communities to resolve or stop the occurrence of conflict (mean = 3.04) is indicated as a strategy for resolving conflicts in the study area. Furthermore, it is found that use of community traditional leaders in both communities (mean = 3.33) is an effective strategy to resolve conflicts. The findings validates since such members of the community remain strong power brokers in the communities. Also, the result show that government intervention by setting up panel (mean = 3.49) as indicated by the respondents. This is evidenced by government visitation panels in many communities and states. Their potency may lie on the fact that they are backed up by law and their recommendations drives government decisions and actions. Negotiation between crop farmers and fishermen to solve their differences (mean = 2.70) represent another strategy to resolve conflicts. This may likely occur when the affected members are the initiators of the peace move. Also, the result revealed payment of compensation to crop farmers (mean = 3.00) as strategy for conflict resolution. Compensation may be tenable when physical losses are incurred.

**Table 4:** Mean Distribution of Strategies for Conflict Resolution among Farmers in the Study Area

| Items  | SA       | A        | D        | SD       | Mean | Remark   |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|----------|
| Meetings between elders in both communities                                | 62(77.5) | 5(18.8)  | 3(3.8)   | -        | 3.74 | Accepted |
| Use of military and police Securities                                      | 45(56.3) | 31(38.8) | 4(5.0)   | -        | 3.51 | Accepted |
| Use of vigilante groups in the communities                                 | 29(36.3) | 28(35.0) | 14(17.5) | 9(11.3)  | 2.96 | Accepted |
| Adjusting the boundaries between the farmlands in the communities          | 54(67.5) | 20(25.0) | 6(7.5)   | -        | 3.60 | Accepted |
| Using court judgment and ruling  | 52(65.0) | 18(22.5) | 6(7.5)   | 4(5.0)   | 3.48 | Accepted |
| Workshop programmes that will ensure peace between the communities         | 26(32.5) | 34(42.5) | 17(21.3) | 3(3.8)   | 3.04 | Accepted |
| Use of community traditional leaders in both communities                   | 43(53.8) | 26(32.5) | 5(6.3)   | 6(7.5)   | 3.33 | Accepted |
| Government intervention by setting up panel                                | 48(60.0) | 23(28.8) | 9(11.3)  | -        | 3.49 | Accepted |
| Local communities crop/fish farmers intervention                           | 15(18.8) | 13(16.3) | 37(46.3) | 15(18.8) | 2.45 | Rejected |
| Negotiation between crop farmers and fishermen to solve their differences. | 25(31.3) | 22(27.5) | 17(21.3) | 16(20.0) | 2.70 | Accepted |
| Payment of compensation to crop farmers                                    | 25(31.3) | 35(43.8) | 15(18.8) | 5(6.3)   | 3.00 | Accepted |
| Distribution of improved seedlings and fertilizers                         | 22(27.5) | 14(17.5) | 40(50.0) | 4(5.0)   | 2.33 | Rejected |
| Government protection of right to fishing ground                           | 6(7.5)   | 15(18.8) | 28(35.0) | 31(38.8) | 2.15 | Rejected |

|  |          |          |         |        |      |          |
|--|----------|----------|---------|--------|------|----------|
| and farm through community base management     |          |          |         |        |      |          |
| Government provide resources to settle quarrel | 28(35.0) | 37(46.3) | 8(10.0) | 7(8.8) | 3.08 | Rejected |

Source: Field Survey, 2016.

Figures in parenthesis are percentage weights

Note: mean  $\geq 2.50$  implies acceptance while mean  $\leq 2.50$  implies rejection.

## Conclusion

Based on the findings, it is concluded that conflicts are caused by several factors and appear in different forms in many communities. Also there is no single strategy for conflict resolution in all situations given the multi-dimensional nature it assumes in rural communities.

## Recommendation

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are made:

- Community leaders in affected communities should sign peace agreements and commit to uphold peaceful co-existence in the areas.
- Different strategies for conflict resolution should be adopted by the intervening parties in resolving conflicts.
- Due consultations with the various segments of the affected communities should be carried out and their views taken into consideration in the settlement process.
- A bottom-up approach should be adopted in the use of any strategy by allowing members of the affected communities to play active part in the peace process.

## References

1. Makinwa, A.P. (1991): The role of women in small scale food processing and distribution industries in Eronsho and Bello Imam eds. Perspective on Small Scale Food Processing and Distribution Industries in Nigeria. Social Economic Council of Nigeria. *Vantage Publishers International Limited Ibadan*.pp 2025.
2. Meludu, N. T. (2006). Conflict Management Strategies for Effective Performance of Agricultural Extension: A case of Ife-Modakeke Saga in Osun State, Nigeria. *International Journal for Agricultural and Rural Development* 7(1), 143-151.
3. Mustapha, A., R., (2007). Institutionalizing Ethnic Representation: How Effective is the Federal Character Commission in Nigeria? *Journal of Conflict Peace Studies* 2(4), 107-111.
4. Onyeche, C. M (2013). Conflict Management in the Administration of Secondary Schools in River State, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Research (JFAR)*, 5(1), 94-100.
5. Tonah, S. (2006) Managing Farmer- Herder conflicts in Ghana's Volta Basin. *Ibadan Journal of Social Sciences* 4(1), 33-45.
6. Yahaya, M. K. (2002): "Development and Challenges of Bokolori Irrigation Project in Sokoto State Nigeria". *Nordic Journal of African Studies: 11(3)*, pp. 411-430.