

POST-CONFLICT LIVELIHOOD CHANGE OF FARMERS IN IFE-MODAKEKE COMMUNITIES OF OSUN STATE, NIGERIA

Adegebo, S. A. and Akinbile, L. A.

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

Correspondence contact details: gbemigebo@gmail.com; 08038565132

ABSTRACT

Livelihood Change (LC) is often the foremost priority of the individual victims, affected communities, governments and non-governmental organisations after conflicts. This study therefore assessed the post-conflict livelihood change of farmers in Ife-Modakeke communities of Osun State, Nigeria. A three-stage sampling procedure was used to select 153 respondents for this study and interview schedule was used to elicit information on respondents' accessibility to rehabilitation support programme, livelihood outcome [during Conflict De-escalation (CD) and Post-Conflict (PC)] and livelihood change. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics such as percentages, frequencies and mean. Few farmers (19.3%) had access to rehabilitation support programme and majority (81.7%) of them at low level while, farmers ranked provision of building materials as the most important rehabilitation support item to them. Livestock production and material possession among farmers were high (72.1% and 64.7%, respectively) during post-conflict. However, crop output of farmers was low (73.7%) during post-conflict. The livelihood change was low (7.1%) as majority (57.3%) of the farmers had low livelihood change, 14.7% recorded negative change while, only 28.0% had high livelihood change. It is therefore recommended that further support and assistance in form of provision of farm inputs and credit by Osun State Government, affected Local Governments and NGOs should be rendered to farmers in the conflict areas in order to enhance post-conflict livelihoods of farmers.

Keywords: Livelihood change, Conflict de-escalation, Livelihood activities and Farm diversification

INTRODUCTION

Sustainable livelihood remains the panacea for poverty reduction. Eradication of extreme poverty represents one of the greatest challenges in the world. In realisation of this fact Governments and Multilateral Lending Institutions create or support programmes for combating poverty such as conditional cash transfers, microfinance, small/medium enterprises and rural employment guarantee schemes (Eneanya, 2007). Livelihoods are both the economic activities (agricultural and non-agricultural) and non-economic activities that people know, own and undertake to earn income today and into the future (Oyesola and Ademola, 2011). In other words livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (natural, physical, human, financial and social capital) and activities that are required for a means of living.

The concept of 'livelihood' seeks to bring together the factors that affect the vulnerability or strength of individual or family survival strategies. Livelihood activities may vary from one rural area to another depending on the available resources, infrastructures and climatic conditions of the environment (Ellis, 2000). Carney (1999) quoted in Bolarinwa (2007) opined that sustainability of the farmers' livelihood context will bring about livelihood outcomes such as food security, health, water, shelter, education, community participation and personal safety. However, in coping with livelihood sustainability, farmers compete for resources that are scarce or exist in limited quantities. Competition creates a situation whereby people struggle for possession of these scarce resources which often generate conflicts. Conflict is defined as agitation for change which could lead

to positive or negative outcome. When it is positive, it leads to growth and development but when negative it results into wanton destruction of life and properties. Conflict situations threaten livelihood outcomes and also cause termination of rural dwellers' sustainable livelihood income (Bolarinwa, 2007).

Nigeria is a large multi-ethnic country where ethnic cleavages remain a critical problem and ethnic violence has erupted periodically. Among the prominent conflicts in Nigeria are: Ife-Modakeke crisis in Osun State; Yoruba-Hausa clashes in Sagamu, Ogun State; Eleme-Okrika conflict in Rivers State; Zango-Kataf crisis in Kaduna State; Tiv-Jukun conflict in Wukari, Taraba State; Ogoni-Adoni conflict in Rivers State; Chamba-Kuteb crisis in Taraba State; Isekiri-Ijaw/Urhobo conflict in Delta State; Aguleri-Umleri crisis in Anambra State; Ijaw-Ilaje conflict in Ondo State; Basa-Egbura crisis in Nasarawa State and Hausa/Fulani-Sawaya conflict in Bauchi State.

The circumstances that led to the birth of Modakeke, the status of Modakeke and that of its people have always been a source of dispute and conflict due to issues relating to landlord/tenant relationship or indigene/non-indigene issues. Ife people who are the original settlers in the area insist that Modakeke people remain in perpetuity as tenants on their land, notwithstanding the fact that Modakeke people migrated and settled on the land as far back as 17th century as a result of the collapse of old Oyo empire. In both Ife and Modakeke, ethnic attachment is high and interpersonal relationship among the people of the two towns is not very cordial (Asiyanbola, 2012). Hence, the incessant conflicts between the two communities.



Some of the recent conflicts between the two communities include conflict over the establishment of Modakeke High School, conflict over the establishment of Olorunsogo plank market, opposition to self-help development projects by a fund raising activity of Modakeke in 1980 and the request for a separate Local Government Council which began as far back as 1950s. Self-determination with respect to request for a separate Local Government Area by Modakeke was the major cause of serious violent crisis between Ife and Modakeke in 2000-2001 which claimed several lives and properties including destruction of farmers' settlements and farms worth millions of Naira.

One of the major consequences of conflict is the diversion of resources from production to destructive activities such as destruction of assets which leads to a corresponding reduction in economic productive activities. As a result, re-building livelihood and economic recovery are major challenges in conflict areas and therefore livelihood recovery in post conflict situations is often the foremost priority of the individual victims of conflict, the affected community as well as governments and NGOs. Shortly after the violent crisis of 2000/2001 in Ife and Modakeke in Osun State stopped, that is conflict de-escalation stage, intervention structures like governments, NGOs and traditional institutions moved in to provide support and assistance in form of distribution of agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilisers, agro-chemicals among others), supply of agricultural tools and equipment, provision of capacity building trainings and re-building of damaged public infrastructures (schools, health and maternity centres, markets among others). These interventions were meant to assist conflict victims in their livelihood efforts to escape from poverty and enhance their well-being while, at the same time address the major risk factors for conflict re-occurrence.

Previous studies which included Bajo (2015), Alimba (2014), Omotere (2013), Bolarinwa *et al* (2010), Olayiwola and Okorie (2010), Bolarinwa (2007), Agbe (2001), Toriola (2001) and Albert (2001 and 1999) have documented the historical perspectives of conflicts, the effect of conflict on farmers' livelihood and well-being as well as conflict management, resolution and transformation methods. However, there is dearth of information on studies conducted to determine the post-conflict livelihood change of farmers in Ife and Modakeke communities in Osun State. Hence, this study is conceptualised to investigate the post-conflict livelihood change of farmers in Ife and Modakeke communities in Osun State by comparing the livelihood status of farmers in 2003 (conflict de-escalation) and 2016 (post-conflict).

This study will address the following specific objectives;

- i. determine farmers' level of accessibility to rehabilitation programme for conflict victims.
- ii. ascertain farmers' livelihood outcome viz crop and livestock production and material possession in 2003 (conflict de-escalation) and 2016 (post-conflict).
- iii. determine farmers' post-conflict livelihood change viz level of crop and livestock production, material possession and Per Capita Expenditure (PCE).

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in Osun State, Nigeria which has four administrative zones namely Osogbo, Ife/Ijesa, Ikirun and Iwo with 30 Local Government Areas. It has a population of 3.42 million (NPC, 2006). It also has a land area of 10,245.00 square kilometres. The climate is low land tropical forest with distinct wet (April-October) and dry (November-March) seasons. Mean annual rainfall is above 1200mm while, average annual temperature is 24.7°C (climate-data.org, 2019). The southern part of the State is covered by secondary forest, northern part is dominated by forest savannah mosaic while, the western part is mostly woody savannah. Majority of the rural populace are farmers cultivating tree crops like cocoa, oil palm, kolanut and citrus as well as food crops such as yam, cassava, maize and rice.

A three-stage sampling procedure was used. The first stage was the purposive selection of four LGAs namely Ife Central, Ife North, Ife South and Ife East which constituted the core conflict areas. The second stage was the purposive selection of 31 villages out of a total of 54 villages in the selected LGAs based on the degree of violent crisis that occurred in these villages while, the final stage was the random selection of 2.5% out of 6120 farmers in the selected villages. The list of villages as well as farmers' population was obtained from the village listing exercise conducted by Osun State ADP in 2002. Thus, a total of 153 respondents were selected for this study. Recall method was used to collect data on what farmers' livelihood condition was in 2003 (conflict de-escalation) and what the condition was in 2016 (post-conflict). Interview schedule using structured questionnaires was used to elicit information from respondents on relevant variables as specified in the objectives of this study. Questionnaires were administered on 153 farmers but 150 were retrieved.

Accessibility of respondents to the rehabilitation programme was measured at nominal scale with Yes response assigned 1 point and No response zero point for the eight rehabilitation support items listed while, the importance of each

of the items was measured on a 3-point scale with very important assigned 2 points, important 1 point and not important zero point. Percentage was used to summarise the level of farmers accessibility to the rehabilitation programme while, weighted mean score was calculated for each rehabilitation support item and it was used to rank the rehabilitation support items on the basis of their importance to the respondents. Interval scale was used to measure quantity of crops, livestock and income produced/earned by each farmer and scores were assigned. Mean score was calculated and it was used to classify farmers' level of crop and livestock production as well as annual income.

With regards to material possession, the material items farmers had and their weights were adapted from previous studies (Akinbile, 1997 and Yahaya, 1995). Standard scores of validated items were calculated using sigma-scoring method to arrive at the weight of each item. The total score of material possession for each farmer was calculated as well as the average. A farmer whose performance under each of these variables of crop production, livestock production, annual income and material possession was above the average was classified as high level and those below average as low. Descriptive statistics such as frequency,

percentage, mean as well as standard deviation were used to analysis the data collected.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Farmers' accessibility to rehabilitation programme

The study reveals that few (19.3%) farmers had access to rehabilitation support programme provided by Osun State Government, affected Local Governments and NGOs when the violent conflict stopped. As shown in Table 1 farmers ranked provision of building material (\bar{x} =1.76) the most important to them, followed by provision of shelter for displaced people (\bar{x} =1.75) and 3rd position to provision of drugs/dressings (\bar{x} =1.74). The implication of this finding is that conflict victims in the State preferred relief materials for housing, shelter for displaced victims and medication. The Table also shows that vast majority (81.72%) of the few farmers that had access to rehabilitation programme had low level of rehabilitation support. This low level of access to rehabilitation support by few conflict victims is likely to impact negatively on the post-conflict livelihoods of farmers in the state.

Table 1: Distribution of farmers based on accessibility to rehabilitation programme and its level of importance

Type rehabilitation support	Very important	Important	Not important	Mean
1.Capacity building	69.1	30.9	0.0	1.69
2.Supply of farm inputs (seed, agro- chemicals, fertiliser etc)	52.7	47.3	0.0	1.53
3.Provision of credit	66.0	33.0	1.0	1.65
4.Provision of household materials	62.2	35.7	2.1	1.60
5.Provision of building materials	77.8	20.0	2.2	1.76
6.Provision of food items	71.8	26.5	1.7	1.70
7.Provision of drugs/dressings	76.0	21.4	2.6	1.74
8.Provision of shelter for displaced people	77.1	21.2	1.7	1.75
Level of accessibility to rehabilitation programme	Frequency	Percentage		
Low (0.00 - 10.42)	24	81.7		
High (10.43- 16.00)	5	18.3		
Total	29	100.0		

Source: Field survey, 2017

Livelihood outcome (crop and livestock production and material possession)

Crop production - Table 2 shows that the farmers' average crop output in 2003 in tonnes was 3.88 for maize, 2.47 for yam, 5.26 for cassava and 2.67 for cocoa while, in 2016 the mean output in tonnes was 2.95, 2.46, 7.72 and 2.33, respectively. Comparing the crop output in 2003 and 2016 shows that average yield of cassava and citrus increased in 2016 at the rate of 46.77% and 13.41%, respectively, while, for other crops (maize, yam, cocoa and kola), it declined. The implication

of this finding is that generally crop production in the study area was better in 2003 than in 2016. Perhaps the decline of crop output in 2016 was due to high cost and scarcity of fertilisers, a vital farm input for crop production. The finding of this study is consistent with Bolarinwa (2007) who reported (data collected in 2003) the mean yield of 3,966kg and 6,718kg for maize and cassava, respectively for the core conflict area of Ife-Modakeke.

Level of crop production - The result in Table 3 reveals that 66.4%of the respondents had low level of crop production in 2003, while 33.6%



of the farmers had high level of crop production for the same year. However, in 2016, 73.7% of the farmers had low level of crop output, while 26.3% of the farmers recorded high level of crop output for the same year. The implication of this finding is that crop output recorded by farmers was lower in

2016 than in 2003. The low crop output in 2016 may be attributed to high cost of farm inputs which may prevent farmers from using recommended rate of input. Low crop output is likely to impact negatively on farmers post-conflict livelihoods.

Table 2: Distribution of farmers by average crop production

Crop	Average output (tonne)		Percentage change
	2003	2016	
1.Maize	3.88	2.95	-23.97
2. Guinea corn	0.00	0.00	0.00
3. Yam	2.47	2.46	0.00
4. Cassava	5.26	7.72	46.77
5. Cocoa	2.67	2.33	-12.73
6. Kola	1.90	1.32	-43.94
7. Citrus	0.82	0.93	13.41

Table 3: Distribution of farmers based on level of crop production

Level	2003		2016	
	F	%	F	%
Low	79	66.4	98	73.7
High	40	33.6	35	26.3
Total	119	100.0	133	100.0

Mean = 3.53±1.56 Maximum = 16.22 Minimum = 0.00

Source: Field survey, 2017

Livestock production

Table 4 shows that the average livestock output in 2003 was 5.00 for cattle, 12.33 for sheep and goat, 374.07 for poultry bird and 6,543.75 crates for egg as against 9.50, 26.22, 657.27 and 14,622.50, respectively in 2016. The figures show that the mean output for all livestock enterprises viz cattle, sheep and goat, poultry bird and egg increased in 2016 when compared with 2003 at the rate of 90.0%, 112.7%, 75.7% and 123.46%, respectively. The implication of this finding is that farmers recorded increase in all their different enterprises of livestock in 2016 when compared with 2003 with egg production giving the highest increase. This may be due to improved

management practices including disease control undertaken by farmers during post-conflict in the study area.

Level of livestock production

Table 5 reveals that 68.2% of the farmers had low level of livestock production in 2003, while 72.1% of the farmers had high level of livestock production in 2016. The implication of this finding is that livestock output was higher in 2016 when compared with 2003. The low livestock output recorded by farmers in 2003 in the study area could be attributed to the conflict since farm produce including animals were destroyed during the crisis.

Table 4: Distribution of farmers by average livestock production

Enterprises	Average output (Number)		Percentage change
	2003	2016	
1.Cattle	5.00	9.50	90.00
2.Sheep and Goat	12.33	26.22	112.65
3.Poultry birds	374.07	657.27	75.71
4.Eggs (in crates)	6,543.75	14,622.50	123.46

Source: Field survey, 2017

Table 5: Distribution of farmers based on level of livestock production

Level	2003		2016	
	F	%	F	%
Low	30	68.2	12	27.9
High	14	31.8	31	72.1
Total	44	100.0	43	100.0

Mean = 1.86±1.51 Minimum = 0.00 Maximum = 13.17

Source: Field survey, 2017

Material possession

Table 6 shows the material possession of the respondents in the study area delineated into large, medium and small household items. With respect to large household items, 58.0% and 21.3% of the respondents possessed other homes in village and house in city, respectively in 2003, while in 2016 it was 44.7% and 29.4%, respectively. As for the percentage change, functioning deep well with pump and house in city increased by 149.2% and 38.2%, respectively in 2016 when compared with 2003. With respect to medium household items, 84.7%, 80.7%, 23.3% of the respondents possessed radio cassette player, wooden bed with mattress and motorcycle, respectively in 2003, while in

2016, 95.3%, 83.3%, and 26.5% of the respondents possessed radio cassette player, wooden bed with mattress and motorcycle, respectively. Percentage increase of 73.2.4%, 48.5%, 44.5% and 32.7% was recorded for grinders, cushioned executive chairs, refrigerator and personal generator, respectively. In the case of small household items, 68.7%, 42.0% and 32.7% of the respondents possessed cooking stove, glass plates and bicycle, respectively in 2003, while in 2016, the percentage was 73.3%, 54.7% and 35.5%, respectively. The Table further shows that the percentage of respondents who possessed glass plates in 2016 increased by 30.2% when compared with 2003, whereas pit latrine decreased by -37.8%.

Table 6: Distribution of farmers based on material possession

Type of material	(% n=150)		
	2003	2016	% Change
A Large household items			
1. Storey building in village	6.7	4.7	-29.6
2. Other homes in village	58.0	44.7	-22.9
3. House in city	21.3	29.4	38.2
4. Functioning vehicles	4.7	5.0	6.7
5. Milling machines	8.7	8.7	0.0
6. Deep well with pumping machine	6.3	15.7	149.2
7. Size of farm (ha)	6.6	4.5	-31.8
B Medium household items			
8. Wooden bed with mattress	80.7	83.3	3.2
9. Cushioned executive chairs	10.7	15.9	48.5
10. Dining table	6.1	6.9	13.1
11. Floor rug	4.0	4.7	16.7
12. Refrigerator	3.7	5.3	44.5
13. Ceiling/Table/Standing fan	12.3	14.1	14.9
14. Television	10.6	12.8	20.7
15. Radio cassette player	84.7	95.3	12.5
16. Personal generator	8.5	11.3	32.9
17. Motorcycle	23.3	26.5	13.9
18. Grinders	12.7	22.0	73.2
19. Toilet with water system	3.5	4.1	17.7
20. Well	6.3	7.1	13.1
C Small household items			
21. Pit latrine	4.5	2.8	-37.8
22. Bicycle	32.7	35.5	8.5
23. Electric stove	2.7	2.8	4.6
24. Cooking stove	68.7	73.3	6.7
25. Glass plates	42.0	54.7	30.2

Source: Field survey, 2017



The implication of this finding is that more farmers were able to possess material items in 2016 when compared with 2003. Perhaps the respondents had higher annual income in 2016 as improved income normally afford people the opportunity to purchase more household materials.

Level of material possession

Table 7 reveals that 53.3% of the respondents had low material possession in 2003

while in 2016, 64.7% of the respondents had high material possession. The implication of this finding is that the proportion of farmers who had high level of material possession was higher in 2016 than in 2003. This improvement in the material possession of farmers in 2016 is likely to impact positively on the post-conflict livelihoods of farmers in the study area.

Table 7: Distribution of farmers based on level of material possession

Level	2003		2016	
	F	%	F	%
Low	80	53.3	53	35.3
High	70	46.7	97	64.7
Total	150	100.0	150	100.0

Source: Field survey, 2017

Livelihood change (level of crop and livestock production, material possession and per capita expenditure)

Components of livelihood change

The result of analysis in Table 8 reveals that the mean crop production scores were 3.65 and 3.34 for 2003 and 2016, respectively. Percentage change in level of crop production over the period was -8.49%. The reduction of crop output during post-conflict period could be attributed to loss of land due to conflict, outbreak of diseases and pests, poor access to loan and high cost/scarcity of essential farm inputs especially fertilisers.

With respect to livestock production, the Table further reveals that the mean scores were 2.08 and 2.26 for 2003 and 2016, respectively. Percentage change in level of livestock production between 2003 and 2016 was 8.65%. The increase in livestock production during post-conflict period could be due to adoption of improved management practices including disease control by farmers. The increase in livestock output is expected to translate into improved post-conflict livelihoods of the farmers.

The Table also shows that the average scores for material possession were 3.14 and 3.32 in 2003 and 2016, respectively. Meanwhile, the change in level of material possession between 2003 and 2016 was 5.73%. This implies that there was improvement in the quantity of household items possessed by farmers in 2016. May be farmers recorded higher income in 2016 as better income is expected to positively influence material possession.

The Table further reveals that the mean Per Capita Expenditure (PCE) scores of respondents were 2270.73 and 2782.10 for 2003 and 2016, respectively. Meanwhile, the percentage change in respondents' annual PCE between 2003 and 2016 was 22.52%. The higher PCE recorded by farmers in 2016 when compared with 2003

could have been influenced by improved income because when people earn more income there is the propensity to spend more.

Livelihood change of farmers in this study was measured by the average percentage change in the level of change across variables of crop production, livestock production, material possession and per capita expenditure. In this regard, Table 8 further shows that livelihood change of farmers in the study area was 7.10% between 2003 (conflict de-escalation) and 2016 (post conflict).

The implication of this result is that farmers' post-conflict livelihood change was positive indicating that livelihoods of farmers in the study area witnessed improvement in 2016 (post-conflict) when compared with 2003 (conflict de-escalation). Albeit the livelihood change is low, it is an indication that farmers in the study area are gradually recovering from the trauma and losses they suffered during the violent conflict. Thus, post-conflict economic recovery has taken place in the study area. The main drivers of post conflict economic recovery include the rehabilitation of infrastructure, reinvesting in human capital, reintegration of ex-combatants and special groups, securing economic opportunities and creating jobs, strengthening local institutions and mediating access to financial resources (UNDP, 2008).

Level of livelihood change

Table 9 reveals that 57.3% of the farmers had low livelihood change, while 28.0% had high change. Meanwhile, 14.7% of the farmers had negative change. This finding implies that majority (72.0%) of the farmers had poor livelihood change. Low level of rehabilitation support to conflict victims as well as production challenges faced by farmers which include poor access to credit, high cost of farm inputs and poor market for farm produce may be responsible for the low level of livelihood change among the farmers.

Table 8: Post conflict livelihood change of farmers

Variable	2003 Mean score	2016 Mean score	% Change
Crop production	3.65	3.34	-8.49
Livestock production	2.08	2.26	8.65
Material possession	3.14	3.32	5.73
Mean PCE	2270.73	2782.10	22.52
Livelihood change			7.10

Source: Field survey, 2017

Table 9: Distribution of farmers based on level of livelihood change

Level of change	F	%
Negative	22	14.7
Low	86	57.3
High	42	28.0
Total	150	100.0

Mean 76.62±107.48 Minimum -26.57 Maximum 926.41

Source: Field survey, 2017

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The paper concluded that farmers' accessibility to rehabilitation support programme was too low and majority of the few farmers that accessed the rehabilitation programme had low level of rehabilitation support. Substantial increase in livestock production was recorded during post-conflict while, crop output declined. Post-conflict livelihood change was very low in the study area. The paper therefore recommended that rehabilitation support programme from governments and NGOs for conflict victims should be based on need assessment of conflict victims and the quantity as well as quality of the relief materials/farm inputs should be reasonably high and timely so that the rehabilitation programme could be effective and make the desired impact on the livelihoods of the affected farmers. Osun State Government as well as Local Governments in Ife-Madakeke area should find a way of rendering further assistance to the conflict victims in Ife-Modakeke communities.

REFERENCES

- Adegebo, S. A. (2019). Post-conflict livelihood adjustment of farmers in selected communities of Osun and Taraba States, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. pp 24.
- Agbe, A. G. (2001). Ife-Modakeke crisis: An insider view. *Ife Psychological* 9.3: 14-20.
- Akinbile, L. A. (1997). Measurement of agricultural indigenous knowledge of crop farmers in two agro-ecological zones of Oyo State, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Nigeria. pp 40-61.
- Albert, I. O. (2001). USAID/OTI Nigeria intervention in Ife-Modakeke conflict in *building peace, advancing democracy: Experience with third party intervention in Nigeria's conflict*, Ibadan, John Archers Publishers Ltd.
- Albert, I. O. (1999). *Ife-Modakeke crisis in community conflicts in Nigeria*. Ibadan. Spectrum Books Limited.
- Alimba, C. N. (2014). The place of peace education in achieving the millennium development in Nigeria. *Journal of Education Research and Policies* 3.1: 21-26.
- Asiyanbola, R. A. (2012). Identifying issues in urban ethno-communal conflict in Africa: An empirical study of Ife-Modakeke crisis in Nigeria. *Journal of African Sociological Review* 13.2:81-100.
- Bajo, K. (2014). Impact of communal conflicts on agricultural production in Oke-Ogun area of Oyo State, Nigeria. Unpublished M.Sc. Thesis in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Administration, Federal University of Agriculture, Nigeria.
- Bolarinwa, K. K., Oyeyinka, R. A., Ajayi, M. T. and Fakoya, E. O. (2010). Socioeconomic impact of communal conflict on cocoa farmers' livelihood in Nigeria. *International Journal of Sustainable Development* 2.1: 59-65.
- Bolarinwa, K. K. (2007). Assessment of farmers' livelihood in conflict and non-conflict areas of Osun and Taraba States, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Carney, D. (1999). Approaches to sustainable livelihoods for developing rural poor. ODI



- poverty briefing, publications@odi.org.uk
climate-data.org/2019
- Ellis, F. (2000). The determinants of rural livelihood diversification in developing countries. *Journal of Agricultural Economics* 51. 2: 289-302.
- Eneanya, A. N. (2007). Poverty reduction strategies and policies in developing countries: myth or reality. *Journal of Research in National Development*, Vol.5 (2) pp.13.
- NPC (2006). National Population Commission: The Nigeria Population Census, 2006.
- Olayiwola, S. and Okorie, N. (2010). Integrated education: An instrument for resolving Ife-Modakeke conflict in Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences* 2.2: 953-965.
- Omotere, T. (2013). Historical appraisal of Ife-Modakeke crisis: Implication for conflict resolution in Nigeria: Project topics in education, sciences, humanities and management. Ego Booster Research Center, Ijebu-Ode, Nigeria.
- Oyesola, O. B. and Ademola, O. A. (2011). Livelihood in University of Ibadan social laboratory in Ileogbo community of Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology* 34.2: 91-100.
- Toriola, O. J. (2001). The Ife-Modakeke crisis: An insider view. *Ife Psychological: An International Journal* 9.3: 14-29.
- UNDP (2008). United Nations Development Project: 2008 Report.
- Yahaya, M. K. (1995). Determination of agricultural information needs and media use pattern of women farmers in North-Central, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ibadan, Nigeria