# **Cross Current International Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences**

Abbreviated Key Title: Cross Current Int J Agri Vet Sci ISSN: 2663-2454 (Print) & Open Access DOI: 10.36344/ccijavs.2022.v04i02.001

Volume-4 | Issue-2 | Mar-Apr, 2022 |

**Original Research Article** 

# Effect of Rural Banditary on IFAD-CASP Participating Crop Producer

Sanchi ID<sup>1\*</sup>, Alhassan YJ<sup>2</sup>, Sabo, AY<sup>3</sup>, Danmaigoro A<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,3</sup>Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Federal University of Agriculture Zuru, Kebbi State, Nigeria <sup>2</sup>Department of General Studies Federal University Wukari, Taraba State, Nigeria <sup>4</sup>Department of Agricultural Education, Adamu Augie Collage of Education Argungu Kebbi State, Nigeria

\*Corresponding author: Sanchi ID | Received: 02.03.2022 | Accepted: 09.04.2022 | Published: 19.04.2022 |

**Abstract:** The research study analyzed the effect of rural banditry on IFAD-CASP participating crop farmers in Zamfara State, Nigeria. Interview schedule was used to collect data from 360 respondents that were selected for the study. A multi stage and simple random sampling technique was used in selecting the respondents. Descriptive statistical tools (mean, percentages, frequency distribution) and inferential statistics (logic regression analysis, paired sample T-test and Spearman's correlation coefficient) were used for data analysis. The results of the study reveals that majority of the respondents were married with an average household size of 8 persons and income level of less than N 20,000/month. Most of the respondents (50%) indicate that the conflict is very severe resulting to great economic, physical and social effects on the respondents. The results of ranking of effect of rural banditry on IFAD-CASP in the study area, indicates poor participation, increased rural poverty, poor supervision of programme, poor economic growth and poor information dissemination were ranked 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> respectively. It could be concluded that rural banditry poses poor economic growth, increased rural poverty, poor participation, and poor programme implementation and induces fear and uncertainty. The study therefore, recommend that urgent provision of adequate security personnel to Mann the porous borders, prompt enrollment of the vulnerable into government social investment programmes, organize training/seminars for peace building purpose and also government should register all mining site and their activities properly monitored. **Keywords:** Effect, Rural Banditry, IFAD-CASP Participating Crop Farmers, Zamfara State.

# **INTRODUCTION**

Rural banditry has become a widespread social phenomenon that is fast ravaging several societies of the world. In most cases rural banditry is usually the decision of individual centrally organized parties geared to engage in open armed clashes in disputes about power over government and territory and such conflicts are caused by several factors (Murtala, 2018). Among the factor include is insincerity on the part of one or the parties that were involved, is the disappointment from either of the parties that were involved, is internal disagreement (Ashe, 2019), is inability to address the root cause of a long-standing conflict, is the proliferation of weapons and arms, that causes armed conflict, according to Babatunde (2016) is the ethnic factor. According to Atala and Hassan (2012) rural banditry can only be made possible when weapons are made available to fight, thereby inflicting injuries and sometime death of individuals. Similarly mischievous

individuals take advantage of it to cause disturbance in order to achieve their interest (Mueller, 2000).

According to Blattman and Miguel (2010), rural banditry is fast becoming popular in developing countries than in developed ones. It is also fast becoming an integral part of the activities in most developing nations like Nigeria. Earlier researchers (Bello, 2017) have shown that the aftermath of armed conflicts in society has been consistently negative, for instance, it increases the rate of poverty; resulting to an increase in the number of internal displacement of several persons, causes outbreak of diseases, reduce food security and stunt impediment in economic growth.

Just like other developing nations, Nigeria has in the last five decades, experienced various forms of armed conflict, most notably after independence (1960).

Quick Response Code



Journal homepage: https://www.easpublisher.com/ **Copyright © 2022 The Author(s):** This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

Citation: Sanchi ID, Alhassan YJ, Sabo AY, Danmaigoro A (2022). Effect of Rural Banditary on IFAD-CASP Participating Crop Producer. *Cross Current Int J Agri Vet Sci*, *4*(2), 9-17.

Published By East African Scholars Publisher, Kenya

It has occurred in almost all the six geopolitical zones of the country. Even though the incidences do not cut across every state in each geographical zones, yet almost all the states has suffered from its negative consequences either directly or indirectly (Mueller, 2000). Thus, the consequences of rural banditry on the Nigerian society are negative and endless because besides affecting almost all the states of the federation it also affected virtually every other area in the state where it occurred. For instance, in Zamfara, it has led to massive loss of lives and properties and caused disease and disabilities. It has also increased the numbers of widows, widowers and orphans. It has risen up the rate of depression, trauma, mental retardation, suicide and environmental destruction with dire consequences for agricultural production and food shortages (Bloisi, 2007).

The conflict has accounted for the severe food crisis and insecurity in several parts of Zamfara state. Similarly, several agricultural lands have equally been destroyed. It has also accounted for environmental changes, degradation of agricultural soil, erosion of the genetic base of agricultural biodiversity, water scarcity, poor governance, growing demand and changes in consumption patterns, uncontrolled deforestation, export-oriented agricultural development policies and political malfunctions (Kuna and Ibrahim, 2015).

In a bid to cushion the effects of hardship posed by conflict in the rural areas of Zamfara State, the state government introduced various programmes such as amnesty. This programme is aimed at relegating the effects of rural banditry on the people of Zamfara State. It was observed that similar strategy was adopted at the Niger Delta by the Federal Government of Nigeria through the amnesty programme when the military force failed to deter the militants and bring normalcy to the region (Dimelu, 2017) where people have been forced to device coping strategies to ensure that they survive.

Before the occurrence of rural banditry in Zamfara state, the federal government introduced International Fund for Agricultural Development-Climate Change Adaptation and Agribusiness Support Programme as a strategy to efficiently combat hunger and poverty, in seven northern Nigerian States Kebbi, Sokoto, Zamfara, Katsina, Jigawa, Yobe and Borno (Ashe, (2019). In these States, women and farmers with small farm holdings were the most vulnerable group of people because they suffer from hunger and poverty. Since the incessant rural banditry began in Zamfara State, the socio-economic status of these people has become extremely low apparently caused by decreased participation in rural development programmes which by implication pose a threat to the IFAD -CASP.

# **METHODOLGY**

#### **Research Design**

The researcher used an explanatory study. Friedman *et al.*, (2014) posited that explanatory research enables a researcher to explain the cause and effect of the phenomenon under study as well as describe the relationship between the variables identified in the phenomenon under study. One of the reasons for adopting the explanatory research is that, in addition to merely describing the phenomenon under study, the researcher wants to explain what and how of the study. Given (2008) described explanatory research as a systematic process of inquiry that explains the why and how of a phenomenon.

The research adopts a qualitative research design, in which two questionnaires were use in order to enable the researcher to gain a more comprehensive and in-depth insight into the subject matter. This gives a comprehensive explanation of the impact of rural banditry on participating crop producers of IFAD-CASP in Zamfara State Nigeria (Gregory, 2004).

#### **Description of the Study Area**

This study was conducted in Zamfara State, the capital of Zamfara State is Gusau. The state was established in 1996 by the then military administration of the Late General Sani Abacha. Zamfara State was carved out of Sokoto State. It comprises of fourteen (14) Local Government Areas, with an area landmass of 38,418 sq. km. The state stretches between Latitude 10 21' to 13 15'N and Longitude 60 20'E Fig 3.1 (Google maps, 2019). Zamfara Sate is bordered in the North by Niger Republic, in the South by Kaduna State, in the East by Katsina State and in the West by Sokoto, Kebbi and Niger States respectively, the state lies in the Sudan Savannah Agro Ecological Zone of Nigeria and has a population of 4,515,400 according to (NPC 2019) projection.

Statistics have shown that more than 80% of the people living in Zamfara State engage in various forms of agricultural activities ranging from crop production of millet, guinea corn, maize, rice, groundnut, cotton, tobacco and beans to livestock and fish farming. The climate exhibits a definite mark of wet and dry seasons. Tropical continental air mass predominates during the dry season while harmattan last from December to February and wet season June to mid-October. Rainfall distribution varies from 675mm to 1000mm with an average annual temperature of between 26 and 30 degree centigrade (Mamman, 2000). Sanchi ID et al, Cross Current Int J Agri Vet Sci, Mar-Apr, 2022; 4(2): 9-17



Fig-3.1: Map of the Study Area; Google map Source: Department of Geography UDUS

#### Sampling Techniques and Sample Size

The population of the study comprises of participating crop producers of IFAD-CASP in Zamfara State, North West Nigeria. The State is divided into three agricultural zones namely: Northern Zone (Birnin Magaji, Kaura Namoda, Shinkafi and Zurmi LGAs), Central Zone (Bungudu, Gusau, Maru and Tsafe LGAs), and Western Zone (Anka, Bakura, Bukkuyum, Gumi, Maradun and Talata Mafara LGAs).

A comprehensive list of CDAs was obtained from IFAD-CASP office in Gusau, and then the selection of sample for the study was done using multistage sampling technique. At the first stage, from each of the three agricultural zones, three LGAs were purposively selected to obtain a total of nine (9) LGAs. At the second stage, twelve (12) CDAs were selected from each of the LGA selected to obtain a total of thirty six (36) CDAs. At the third and final stage, ten (10) respondents were selected using simple random sampling from each of the selected CDA to obtain a total of three hundred and sixty (360) respondents.



**Fig-3.2: Sampling Procedure** 

#### METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

The researcher engaged the services of research assistants. Both the researcher and the research assistants administered the structured questionnaire directly to the respondents and immediately retrieved them upon completion. While secondary information was obtained through journal, books, magazines, internet, past thesis, Online Library, encyclopedias and research proceedings etc.

# METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS

After the data collection process, the researcher reviewed, sorted and labeled the instruments before the commencement of the analysis. This was done using the variables in line with the research instruments. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) and 5 point Likert scale.

#### Models Specification Likert Scale

This scale falls under the criterion group instrument whereby items are collected and analyzed against a criterion. Each item has a weight or score attached to it. A person's score on the final attitude scale is simply the sum of the weight of the alternatives he/she has checked. Weights are usually assigned to those high scores which indicated favorable attitude.

For perception scale under positive statement, scores assigned are;

Strongly	
Agreed	5
Agreed	4
Undecided	3
Strongly Disagreed	2
Disagreed	1

While for negative statements, the scores assigned are:

Strongly	
Disagreed	1
Disagreed	2
Undecided	
Strongly	
.Agreed	4
Agreed	5

Where average mean score=<u>Total sum of perception score</u> Total number of respondents

Most important positive and negative (attitudinal) statements

The mean score 
$$= \sum_{N}^{fxi}$$
  
=  $\frac{5+4+3+2+1}{5} = 3$ 

Then an arbitrary number of 0.5 will be added to 3.0 to obtain 3.5 while 0.5 will be subtracted from 3.0 to obtain 2.5 for negative statements. Hence, the important positive statements will be all those from 3.5 and above while the negative statements will be those below 3.5

# **RESULTS**

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Sex	Trequency	Tercentuge
Male	259	71.9
Female	101	28.1
Age	101	20.1
18-27	56	15.5
28-37	117	32.5
38-47	79	21.9
48-57	80	22.2
58<	28	7.9
Marital Status		
Single	49	13.6
Married	280	77.8
Divorced	9	2.5
Separated	5	1.4
Widowed	17	4.7
Income/Month		
>20,000	199	55.3
20,001-50,000	132	36.7
50,001-80,000	16	4.4
80,001-110,000	10	2.8
110,001<	3	0.8
Residence		
Rural	298	82.7
Urban	62	17.3
Household Size		
0-5	122	33.8
6-10	135	37.5
11-15	70	19.4
16-20	33	9.3

Table-1: Distribution of Socio-Economic Characteristic of the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers in Zamfara State N 360

Source: Field survey, 2020.

Table-2: Distribution of participating crop producers according to Effect of rural banditry on IFAD-CASP

Effect of rural banditry	SA (%)	A (%)	SD (%)	D (%)	UD (%)	SUM	Mean	Rank
Poor supervision of programme	87 (24.1)	164(45.5)	39(10.8)	48 (13.3)	22 (6.1)	1326	3.68	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Poor economic growth	76(21.1)	148(41.1)	37(10.2)	94 (26.1)	5(1.3)	1276	3.54	4 <sup>th</sup>
Poor implementation of programme	49 (13.6)	202(56.1)	34 (9.4)	47 (13.0)	28 (7.7)	1277	3.54	4 <sup>th</sup>
Poor participation	164(45.5)	87 (24.1)	39(10.1)	48 (13.3)	22 (6.1)	1403	3.89	1 <sup>st</sup>
Increased rural poverty	117(32.5)	139(38.6)	47(13.0)	44(12.2)	13 (3.6)	1383	3.84	2 <sup>nd</sup>
Poor information dissemination	55 (15.2)	171(47.5)	30 (8.3)	84 (23.3)	20 (5.5)	1237	3.43	$6^{th}$
	banditryPoor supervision of programmePoor economic growthPoor implementation of programmePoor participationIncreased rural povertyPoor information	banditrySA (%)Poor supervision of programme87 (24.1)Poor economic growth76(21.1)Poor implementation of programme49 (13.6)Poor participation164(45.5)Increased rural poverty117(32.5)Poor information55 (15.2)	banditrySA (%)A (%)Poor supervision of programme87 (24.1)164(45.5)Poor economic growth76(21.1)148(41.1)Poor implementation of programme49 (13.6)202(56.1)Poor participation164(45.5)87 (24.1)Increased rural poverty117(32.5)139(38.6)Poor information55 (15.2)171(47.5)	banditry SA (%) A (%) SD (%)   Poor supervision of programme 87 (24.1) 164(45.5) 39(10.8)   Poor economic growth 76(21.1) 148(41.1) 37(10.2)   Poor implementation of programme 49 (13.6) 202(56.1) 34 (9.4)   Poor participation 164(45.5) 87 (24.1) 39(10.1)   Increased rural poverty 117(32.5) 139(38.6) 47(13.0)   Poor information 55 (15.2) 171(47.5) 30 (8.3)	banditry SA (%) A (%) SD (%) D (%)   Poor supervision of programme 87 (24.1) 164(45.5) 39(10.8) 48 (13.3)   Poor economic growth 76(21.1) 148(41.1) 37(10.2) 94 (26.1)   Poor implementation of programme 49 (13.6) 202(56.1) 34 (9.4) 47 (13.0)   Poor participation 164(45.5) 87 (24.1) 39(10.1) 48 (13.3)   Increased rural poverty 117(32.5) 139(38.6) 47(13.0) 44(12.2)   Poor information 55 (15.2) 171(47.5) 30 (8.3) 84 (23.3)	banditrySA (%)A (%)SD (%)D (%)UD (%)Poor supervision of programme87 (24.1)164(45.5)39(10.8)48 (13.3)22 (6.1)Poor economic growth76(21.1)148(41.1)37(10.2)94 (26.1)5(1.3)Poor implementation of programme49 (13.6)202(56.1)34 (9.4)47 (13.0)28 (7.7)Poor participation164(45.5)87 (24.1)39(10.1)48 (13.3)22 (6.1)Increased rural poverty117(32.5)139(38.6)47(13.0)44(12.2)13 (3.6)Poor information dissemination55 (15.2)171(47.5)30 (8.3)84 (23.3)20 (5.5)	banditrySA (%)A (%)SD (%)D (%)OD (%)SUMPoor supervision of programme87 (24.1)164(45.5)39(10.8)48 (13.3)22 (6.1)1326Poor economic growth76(21.1)148(41.1)37(10.2)94 (26.1)5(1.3)1276Poor implementation of programme49 (13.6)202(56.1)34 (9.4)47 (13.0)28 (7.7)1277Poor participation164(45.5)87 (24.1)39(10.1)48 (13.3)22 (6.1)1403Increased rural poverty117(32.5)139(38.6)47(13.0)44(12.2)13 (3.6)1383Poor information dissemination55 (15.2)171(47.5)30 (8.3)84 (23.3)20 (5.5)1237	banditrySA (%)A (%)SD (%)D (%)OD (%)SOMMeanPoor supervision of programme87 (24.1)164(45.5)39(10.8)48 (13.3)22 (6.1)13263.68Poor economic growth76(21.1)148(41.1)37(10.2)94 (26.1)5(1.3)12763.54Poor implementation of programme49 (13.6)202(56.1)34 (9.4)47 (13.0)28 (7.7)12773.54Poor participation164(45.5)87 (24.1)39(10.1)48 (13.3)22 (6.1)14033.89Increased rural poverty117(32.5)139(38.6)47(13.0)44(12.2)13 (3.6)13833.84Poor information dissemination55 (15.2)171(47.5)30 (8.3)84 (23.3)20 (5.5)12373.43

Source: Field Survey 2020

**Key** \*S/A = Strongly Agree Scored 5, \*A = Agree Scored 4, \*S/D = Strongly Disagree Scored 3, \*D = Disagree Scored 2 and \*UD = Undecided Scored 1.

## **Decision rule**

Mean less than 3 not having effect on armed conflict, Mean greater than or equal to 3 has effect on armed conflict.

banditry in the study area			
Severity of the rural banditry	Frequency	Percent	
Very Severe	180	50.0	
Severe	93	25.8	
Moderate Severe	87	24.2	
Total	360	100	
Source	Field Survey 202	20	

Table-3: Distribution of IFAD-CASP participating crop producers according to Severity of the rural				
banditry in the study area				

Source:	Field	Survey	202
---------	-------	--------	-----

#### DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the Socio-Economic Characteristic of the IFAD-CASP Participating Crop Producers. Socio-economic information of the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers with regards to impact assessment of rural banditry is very important as studies have shown that outstanding factors which include age, gender, marital status, educational level, income, residence, and household size are considered as the major socio-economic characteristics in this study area.

The gender of the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers is expected to have effect on the level of involvement in farming activities and also IFAD-CASP, this are accredited to the religious and cultural background of IFAD-CASP participating crop producers in the study area, Majority 71.9% of the participating crop producers of IFAD-CASP were male due to their active involvement in outdoor activities such as farming and animal rearing. While female participates mostly in indoor farming activities such as small animal rearing, processing, threshing and packaging of farm produce this is so because Islam is the predominant religion and has put some restrictions on women to interact freely outside the matrimonial homes and getting responses from such category is sometimes impracticable. These discrepancies are believed to have been influenced by the nature of the study theme- rural banditry which is highly practiced by the male counterparts (Joh., 2018). Again, some women felt this is not their area of interest because they hardly participate. Even though they are also directly affected by these harmful acts as they are mostly the victims of rape abduction and other forms of sexual abuses (Mohammed, 2017).

The age of IFAD-CASP participating crop producers has effect on the level of activities. It determines the level of participation in the programme and it is an important measure of farm productivity. The age grouping can be divided into say the active group and dependent age group. Table 1 shows that about (32.5%) of the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers were between the age ranges of 28-37 years which is the active age range. At this age, the respondents are expected to be virile and able to do a lot of farm work if given proper incentives. According to Mohammed, (2017) majority of the respondents were within their youthful ages of active involvement in rural occupations which are mostly farming and rearing of domestic animals and invariably became more affected by the problem of cattle rustling as they are usually the target.

This agrees with the findings of Hazen, (2008) who posited that youth perform most active farm operation and majority of the youth are between the ages brackets of 18-35 years. This was an expected indicator based on the fact that the youths have been highlighted as the main players in the rural banditry activities. This agrees with the findings of Dimelu, (2017) who opined that Majority (52.2%) of the farmers were below the mean age indicating that the farmers were still in their active and productive years. Consequently, they may respond violently to conflict issues or become very aggressive to herdsmen due to youthful exuberance. Also, the results show the dominance of male in farming probably because men are more energetic and capable of involving in tedious production activities associated with farming than women.

It is believed that married couples are likely to participate more in IFAD-CASP than single parent families due to labour supply in farming activities and access to productive resources in agriculture (Momale et al., 2019). The research findings show that, majority of the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers are married having (77.8%), single having (13.6%), widowed (4.7%) and divorced (2.5%). This implies that most of the participating crop producers have some responsibilities; therefore marital status is an important factor to be considered in any programme of change to be introduced to the study area since family decision will be required in any activity to be embarked upon Muller, (2000).

Zamfara State Climate Change Adaptation and Programme Agribusiness. Support Officer (IFADCASP), said that the Programme was aimed to providing access to improved seeds and technologies that has helped farmers increase production as well as

their income. According to the State Programme Officer raising the income of farmers through the provision of improved seeds and farming practices, which the farmers adopt has recorded high yields.

"The programme has helped many farmers by increasing their yields and enhancing the farmers' income". However, this research finding was in disagreement with the above statement due to rising issue of rural banditry and rural banditry in the study area. Majority (53.3%) of the IFADCASP participating crop producers in the study area has an income of <N20, 000. This implies that participating crop producers suffer more loss such as reduction in output and income from crop as a result of the destruction of crops and indiscriminate bush burning by rural bandits. The findings of Adelakun et al., (2015) shows that majority of the farmers suffer more losses from farmerpastoralist conflicts, especially economic losses such as reduction in output (20.0%), loss of properties (28.3%), and scarcity of food (23.3%) were regarded as severe economic losses experienced by farmers. A larger percentage (46.7%) of the farmers indicated loss of properties as a major economic loss encountered as a result of conflict. It is necessary to establish the residence of the participating crop producers, in such a way to find out the location of the participating crop producers either urban or rural dwellers. Majority of IFAD-CASP participating crop producers (83%) are rural dwellers in the study area which are more affected by the issue of rural banditry and rural banditry while (17%) are urban dwellers.

According to Dimelu (2017) in his studies on Livelihood issues in herdsmen-farmers' conflict among farming communities in Kogi State, find out that (22%) of the farming family lives in urban area. This could negatively affect the farmers' perception of conflict situation and subsequently their behavior and altitude to conflict. This might be one of the reasons why farmerherders' conflict has remained unabated and a regular phenomenon in Zamfara state. This is in agreement with finding of this research which revealed 83% of IFAD-CASP participating crop producers are rural dwellers.

Relatively the larger the family size of the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers may mean more people to cater for and more labour force will be available to work on the farm and help with other farming activities. The result in Table 1 shows that majority (33.8%) IFAD-CASP participating crop producers have a household size of 0-5, followed by (37.5%) of the participating crop producers have household sizes of 6-10 people. This implies that most of the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers have a larger household size which may have resulted from the need for family labour which may increase household and larger household productivity size may consequently result to more dependent family members.

Table 2 is an indication of the Effect of Rural banditry on IFAD-CASP participating crop producers. The result in table 2 shows that majority 75.3% of IFAD-CASP participating crop producers experience one form of conflict or the other while 24.7% do not experience any form of conflict. This might be due to the location or residence of the respondents. The high percentage could be because majority of the crop producers leave in rural areas where the conflict is predominant (Given, 2008). The effects of conflict are generally considered as a negative phenomenon which often lead to loss of lives and properties, which invariably impact negatively on the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers. The violent conflict between IFAD-CASP participating crop producers and bandits have been manifesting in form of bloody clashes which have become one major insecurity problem that created social and or relational implication and pose adverse economic effect in Zamfara State.

A significant part of Northwest is dry land, but the land is fertile and agrarian for farming and livestock development. In spite of the potentials of the Northwest, the zone has since the return of democracy experienced devastating rural banditry which claims thousands of lives and properties. It began as localized disputes between headers and farmers over access to land and water resources. The poor handling of the rural banditry has significantly contributed to its transformation into a deadly conflict posing a major threat to national and regional security. The pattern and intensity of rural banditry in the Northwest are connected to socioeconomic, environmental, and political forces which shape the development of the geo-political zone. This section contains results on rural banditry experience, direct and indirect consequences of armed conflict, severity of conflict, magnitude effect of armed conflict, productivity before and during conflict, intensity of armed conflicts in zones and effect of rural banditry on IFAD-climate change adoption and agribusiness support programme.

Table 3 shows the Extent of the Effect of Rural banditry in the Study Area. These explain the extent of the consequence of conflict on IFAD-CASP participating crop producers on their livelihoods. The physical effect of conflict is mostly felt among the rural inhabitants.

Also all the economic variables affect the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers as a result of armed conflict. The psychological trauma which include fear, stress, sleepless night, worry and anxiety have greatly affected the IFAD-CASP participating crop producers, so also displacement, and migration, wanton destruction of infrastructure and above all disruption of developmental programme of IFAD-CASP as the case may be.

The result in table 3 also indicated the extent to which conflict affected the participating crop producers of the programme. Significant proportion (50%) are of the view that rural banditry is very severe in the study area while 25.8% said the occurrence of rural banditry is severe while few participating crop producers 24.2% are of the view that rural banditry occur moderately severe in the city centers of the study area. Thus, the result further reveals that rural banditry is being experience in virtually all community in the study area. This finding is in tandem with John, (2018) who reports several attacks are carried out by bandits against settlement of herders/farmer thereby killing, stealing of cattle and farm produce.

According to Bloisi (2007), farmers who could not sleep at night as a result of fear or anxiety would definitely experience weakness and would not have enough energy for action, thus leading to ineffectiveness and low productivity. The finding of (Ashe, 2019) shows that (57%) of the respondents consider the effects of conflict on availability of extension services as severe. About (29%) and (33%) have affirmed that there is mild effect of rural banditry on adoption of improved technology and continued use of adopted technology. The fact that the responses of the sampled respondents are low especially from the pastoralists suggesting that less impact of extension services are felt in the study area. This is agrees with the response of one of the respondents during the focus group discussion that "The days of substantive agricultural extension activities are during the time of Ovo North Agricultural Development Project (ONADEP) which spanned from 1982 to 1989 but it is now no longer effective. Regardless of the effectiveness of extension service delivery, any improved technology adopted won't take nomads a single day to scatter. However, continuous resource-based conflicts between farmers and herdsmen continue to undermine the impact of agricultural extension service delivery in Nigeria.

# CONCLUSION

Based on the summary finding of this study, the research established that majority of IFAD-CASP participating crop producers were male, married with a mean age of 33 years and an average income of less than N 20,000/ month. The factors influencing the participation of IFAD-CASP participating crop producers in the programme appears positive and statistically significant. This implies that a probability increase in the independent variables (conflict, insecurity, fear, location and experience in conflict) would led to decrease in dependent variable (participation). Further established was widespread poverty, proliferation of small arms and weapons competition for gold mines and dispute over farm land account for causes of rural banditry in the study area, resulting to economic, social and physical decline in livelihood of the crop producers. These conflict engagements have drastically affected the activity of IFAD-CASP in carrying out its mandate to the respondents in the study area. In addition, IFAD-CASP participating crop producers were perceived to derive less benefit from the programme.

The research therefore concluded that rural banditry has significantly affected IFAD-CASP participating crop producers in Zamfara state Nigeria.

# RECOMMENDATION

Based on the finding of the research, the following recommendation was deemed necessary with a view to make IFAD-CASP viable instrument for the implementation of Agriculture, rural poverty and development.

- 1. The Federal Ministry of Humanitarian Affair, Disaster Management and Social Investment in collaboration with States, Local Government and Non-Government agencies should enroll the vulnerable into its social support investment programmes such N-power, Presidential youth empowerment scheme (P-YES) conditional cash grant, market money and other special intervention scheme.
- 2. Government should as a matter of urgency provide adequate security to Mann the porous borders of the north-western states. This can be achieved through the Nigeria immigration service and other sister security and intelligence communities.
- 3. Federal Government in conjunction with State and Local Government should hence forth register all mining sites and the activities of mining companies be properly monitored by the Nigeria police force, security agencies and the community
- 4. Both primary and secondary stakeholders like the community, traditional leaders, politicians, government and NGO should focus on providing information for early warning; organize training, workshop and seminar on peace building process and reconciliations. Promises made during such gathering should respect and redeemed.

# REFERENCES

- Ashe, M. O. (2019). International agencies and the quest for food security in Nigeria, 1970-2015. *Ubuntu: Journal of Conflict Transformation*, 8(Special Issue 1), 251-274.
- Atala, T. K., & Hassan, M. B. (2012). Adopted Village Concept and Vision 20: 2020. Paper presented at the North West Zonal REFILS Workshop, held at the Institute for Agricultural Research, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria. 23-24 Feb. 2012.
- Babatunde, O. (2016). Differential Poverty Reduction Impact of Small-Scale Irrigated Development between its Beneficiaries and Non-

*beneficiaries in Nigeria*. Technical Report on the Agropolis Award

- Bello, A. (2017). "Herdsmen and Farmers conflicts in North-Eastern Nigeria: Causes, Repercussions and Resolutions." University Farm Research, Yobe State University, Damaturu, Nigeria. Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary studies Rome: MCSERCEMAS- Sapienza, University of Rome, 2(5), 129.
- Blattman. C., & Miguel, E. (2010). "Civil War," Journal of Economic Literature, American Economic Association, 48(1); 3-57,
- Bloisi, W. (2007). An introduction to Human Resource Management. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Dimelu M. U. (2017). Livelihood issues in herdsmen-farmers' conflict among farming communities in Kogi State, Nigeria African Journal of Agricultural Research Vol. 12(24), pp. 2105-2115
- Friedman, H. S., & Schustack, M. W. (1999). *Personality: Classic theories and modern research* (p. 576). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Given, L. M. (2008). *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, Los Angeles; California. Sage Publications
- Gregory, D. (2004) *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq* (pp. 1-15). Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Hazen, M. J (2008) Small Arms, Armed Violence, and Insecurity in Nigeria: The Niger Delta

Perspective, Small Arms Survey, Occasional Paper No. 20, Geneva,

- John P. O. (2018) Herdsmen/Farmers Conflict and Its Effects on Socio-Economic Development in Nigeria Journal of Peace, Security, and Development Volume 4, No. 1, 2018. Pp.143158. ISSN: 2360-9435
- Kuna, M. J. and Ibrahim, J. (2015). Eds., *Rural Banditry and Conflicts in Northern Nigeria* (Abuja: Center for Democracy and Development, 2015), 11..
- Magnus T. O. (2008). Blood and soil Resource scarcity and internal rural banditry revisited. *Journal of Peace Research*, 45(6), 801-818.
- Mohammed, K. A. (2017). The Socio-economic Repercussions of Cattle Rustling in Gusau Local Government Zamfara State, Nigeria. Master of Arts (Sociology) Dissertation.Lovely Professional University, Punjab.Momale, S.B; Nawaj, S; and Dupeyras, A.S. (2019)
- Mueller, J. (2000). The banality of "ethnic war".*International Security*, 25(1), 42-70.
- Murtala, A. R. (2018). Vigilante Groups and Rural Banditry in Zamfara State: Excesses andContradictions. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention*. 7(6):6573
- Zamfara Conflict Analysis and Multisectoral Needs Assessment (MSNA), a joint report by Pastoral Resolve, Search For Common Ground and Terre Des Hommes in October 20.