

The Proceedings of the 15th National Research Conference and Network Meeting of CYIAP held in Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo state, Nigeria, from 9th to 12th March, 2020. CYAP-Network Publishing

Assessment of Roles of Governmental Extension Workers in Conflict-Resolution in Oyo State, Nigeria

¹Ojetayo, M.A. Adekunle, O. A. and ²Oyegbami, G.A.

¹Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

²Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, LAUTECH, Ogbomosho

Corresponding author email: gabrieloloyee2011@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study examined the roles of government Extension Workers in conflict-resolution in Oyo State, Nigeria. Multi-stage sampling technique was used to select 72 youth farmers, 36 pastoralists and 12 Extension Workers. Structured questionnaire was used to collect data. Data were described with frequency, percentages and mean while Pearson's product Moment Correlation was used to make deductions. Results showed that the overall mean of performed roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflicts-resolution was 3.26 ± 1.53 (youth-farmers), 1.00 ± 0.00 (pastoral Fulanis) and 3.20 ± 1.67 (Extension Workers) while mean of unperformed roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution was 2.13 ± 0.75 (youth farmers), 1.12 ± 1.88 (pastoral Fulanis) and 1.65 ± 0.44 (Extension Worker respondents). Awareness on stock route (3.73 ± 0.45) was ranked first while land tenure system was in the tenth position among information needs on conflict-resolution. Also, perceived constraints to conflict-resolution were: poor security alerts 3.00 ± 0.00 , and prevailing land tenure system 3.00 ± 0.00 among others. There was no significant relationship between intervention role of government Extension Workers and Extension Workers' perceived constraints to conflict-resolution. It was concluded that, Extension Workers were of low interventions and lacked information that may enable them to perform their roles in resolving conflicts in the study area. Therefore, equipping them with necessary information that would facilitate in the effective performance of their duty in conflict resolution is recommended.

Keyword: Assessment, Roles, Governmental Extension Workers, Conflict-resolution, Constraints and information needs.

INTRODUCTION

Land, among factors of production, is considered inadequate in supply, immobile and scarce by its nature. Therefore, it has subjected itself to diverse challenges amongst user factions due to its competitive nature. Adisa and Adekunle (2010) and Musa, Shabu and Igbawusa (2014) opined that of every resources of common interest, land has repeatedly been an enticing source of conflicts amid various user groups at irregular verges. Conflict between the youth-farmers and pastoral Fulanis are common in nearly every part of Oyo State. It is a

frightful challenge to youth economic development, danger to food security and sustainable livelihood of youth farmers. The relationship is increasingly characterized by incessant conflict. Also, Pasquale *et al.* (2007) reiterates that farmer-pastoral Fulanis disagreement is the most important kind of resource utilize conflict. The regular crises have endangered the safety of the youth, decrease their economic efficiency and yet deepen food crises in Oyo State as a whole. Beetseh *et al.* (2018) reported that the regular crises have uncovered the safety of

the state, condensed its economic efficiency and deepen food crises in Nigeria. These crises have been attributed to pastoral Fulanis escalating from the usual grazing routes into agricultural land which consequence lead to rivalry for resource of common interest which later degenerate into conflict. It is generally belief that pastoralists paraded themselves around with dangerous weapon such as Ak-47 raffle, sword etc. claiming to be part of dressing and occupational custom. Threaten the lives of farmers who challenge them of wrong grazing and farm destruction. If any of farmers carries this weapon they would be arrested by security men claiming to prevent reprisal attack by the farmers. Manu et al. (2004) reported that conflict originates from the greedy nature of human wants struggle for insufficient resources are the primary causes of community or inter-group conflicts. It has been noted that farmer-pastoralist conflict has persisted and stand out a threat to national food security and poverty eradication among youth farmers often regarded as vulnerable. Farmer-pastoralist conflict not only have a direct outcome on the lives and livelihoods of those concerned, they also dislocate and intimidate the sustainability of agriculture and pastoral production in West African (Mortiz, 2010). It is height time for extension institution ruminated on the way forward to get youth involved in agriculture, stand out the role of mitigating conflict and buckle up to define conflict-resolution that will ensure sustainable technologies and innovations founded to the farmers for maximum output. Adisa (2012) opined that resource pedestal conflict amid farmers and pastoralist undercut the contact of agricultural extension service delivery. Extension services are advisory delivery and other services that help rural farmers to make best use of resources at their disposal. It is generally believe that farm destruction,

attack of pastoral Fulanis and counter attack has led to decline in the number of youth farmers in agriculture. The fear of being attack has jeopardize sustainable livelihoods of many youth farmers. Less research has been done on assessment of roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution in the study area. This is gap in knowledge which needs urgent attention if agriculture has to be profession of youth that are regarded as future of this country. Hence, what are the assessment of roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution in Oyo State Nigeria?. Therefore, the following questions were raised: what are the intervention roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution?; what are information needs of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution? and what are the constraints perceived to conflict-resolution?. The objective of the study was to assess roles of governmental Extension Workers in Conflict-resolution in Oyo State, the specific objectives were to:

- i). examine the intervention roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution
- ii). determine information needs of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution
- iii). identify constraints perceived by governmental Extension-Workers in conflict-resolution

Hence, there is no significant relationship between role of governmental Extension Workers and governmental Extension Workers perceived constraints in conflict-resolution and there is no significant relationship between information needs of governmental Extension Workers and governmental Extension Workers perceived constraints in conflict-resolution.

METHODOLOGY

Oyo State is located in Southwest Nigeria with its capital at Ibadan. It is between Latitude $7^{\circ}21'$ and $9^{\circ}11'$ North of the equator and between Longitude $2^{\circ}05'$ and $4^{\circ}31'$ East of the Greenwich meridian. The state has land area of 28,454 square Kilometer. The dry season lasts from November to March while the wet season starts from April to October. Multi-stage sampling technique was used to select respondents from the population of youth farmer, pastoral Fulanis and governmental Extension Workers. Stage one: Six LGA's with perennial farmer-pastoral Fulanis conflict were: Iseyin, Ogo-Oluwa, Orelope, Orire, Saki East and Saki West purposively selected. Stage two: In each LGA, 6 farming communities' witnessing farmers-pastoral Fulanis conflicts were randomly selected. Stage three: 12 youth farmers were randomly selected from each selected farming community; this gave a total of 72 farmers. More so, in each of LGA's six pastoral Fulanis were randomly selected. This was done by random selection of one pastoralist from each of six transit camps randomly selected in each LGA's. This was given a total of 36 pastoral Fulanis. 2 governmental Extension Workers were randomly selected from each LGA's, making 12 respondents. A total of 72 farmers, 36 pastoral Fulanis and 12 governmental Extension Workers were used for the study. Data were collected through the use of interview schedule and analysed using both descriptive statistic tools such as mean and standard deviation to describe objectives and inferential statistic (T-Test) used for testing hypotheses. The hypothesis was tested at 0.05 level of significant. The respondents (government Extension Workers) were asked to indicate roles of governmental Extension Workers on conflict-resolution with a five- point scale of strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree and strongly disagree to rate variables to

performed and unperformed roles; information needs rated with a 4-point likert type scale of highly needed, medium need, low need and not needed, while perceived constraints was rated on 3-point likert type scale of yes, no and undecided

Results and Discussion

Table 1a shows performed roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution, as follows: education (Mean= 3.28 ± 1.40) of youth-farmers, (Mean= 1.00 ± 0.00) of pastoral Fulanis while Extension Workers mean was (3.90 ± 1.88). This infers that Extension Workers were of "High intervention" in the side of farmers while of "Low intervention" in the side of pastoralists. Information sourcing and sharing between two parties assumed mean score (3.16 ± 1.43) of youth farmers, (Mean= 1.00 ± 0.00) of pastoral Fulanis and (Mean= 3.10 ± 1.70) of Extension Workers. This suggests that Extension Workers had "High intervention" in given necessary information to farmers on production activities but of poor sourcing information on the side of pastoralists and regarded as "Low intervention" in conflict-resolution among youth farmers and pastoral Fulanis in the study area. Training and creating awareness on new technology to increase productivity (Mean = 3.00 ± 1.38) of youth farmers, (Mean= 1.00 ± 0.00) of pastoral Fulanis and (Mean= 3.00 ± 1.67) of Extension Worker respondents. Linking to input agencies and teaching to improve quality of living (Mean = 3.45 ± 1.75 and 3.45 ± 1.70) of youth farmers, (Mean= 1.00 ± 0.00 and 1.00 ± 0.00) of pastoral Fulanis and (3.00 ± 1.57 and 3.00 ± 1.55) of Extension Worker respondents. This implies that only farmers enjoyed service of governmental Extension Workers while pastoral Fulanis counterparts were out of coverage of Governmental Extension

Workers. Hence, it will be very difficult for both groups rubbing minds together to achieve productive goal since pastoralist were out of scheme and any blockage to achieve productive goals result to conflict of different reprisals attack.

Table 1b: shows the results of the findings on the unperformed roles of Extension Workers on conflict-resolution overall mean was (2.13±0.75) of youth farmers, (1.14±1.88) of pastoral Fulanis and (1.65±0.44) of Extension Workers. This denotes “Low intervention”. Teaching of new technology to each party rate (Mean= 1.98±0.36, 1.00±0.00, 2.90±1.28) of youth-farmers, pastoral Fulanis and Extension Workers respectively. This infers that Extension Workers were of “Low intervention”. Information sourcing and sharing between two parties, campaign against destruction and enforcement of payment to victims assumed mean score (1.76±0.43, 1.00±0.00 and 2.10±0.90) of youth farmers, (Mean= 1.67±0.47, 1.00±0.00 and 1.80±0.41) of pastoral Fulanis and (1.65±0.49, 1.00±0.00 and 1.25±0.49) of Extension Workers respectively. This suggests that Extension Workers had “Low intervention” in conflict-resolution among youth-farmers and pastoral Fulanis in the study area. Also, demarcation of grazing route / farmland, allocation of land to pastoralist for building camp and establish of grazing reserve (Mean= 1.00±0.00, 1.00±0.00 and 1.00±0.00) of youth farmers, (Mean= 1.00±0.00, 1.00±0.00 and 1.00±0.00) of pastoral Fulanis and (Mean= 1.00±0.00, 1.00±0.00 and 1.00±0.00) of Extension Workers respectively. This connotes “Low intervention” of Extension Workers in conflict-resolution among youth-farmers and pastoral Fulanis in the study area. The finding connotes with the expression of Extension Workers during focus group

discussion (FGD) that conflict-resolution is not well integrated in mandate of extension service. This might have been the excuses for “Low intervention”, even they had nothing to do with pastoralists. But if government can saddle conflict-resolution and conflict-prevention on extension service to co-opt youth-farmers and pastoral Fulanis and other resource user parties and spell out effective means of using resource of mutual interest to promote livelihood in our communities. Hence, peaceful co-habitation and mutual understanding would be enhanced. This is in line with findings of Adisa (2011) and Adelakun *et al.* (2015) posit in their separate studies that pastoral Fulanis were outside of extension service delivery and felt no effect of Extension Workers compare to their farmer counterpart in the usage of natural resource.

Table 2: shows the distribution of governmental Extension Workers according to their information needs in conflict-resolution. “Awareness on stock route” (Mean = 3.73 ± 0.45) was rated first position, “Demarcation of stock route, grazing and farming zone” (Mean=3.73±0.47), was ranked second position and “conflict coping mechanism that promotes peace and unity” (Mean = 3.63 ± 0.63) rated third position. Also, “farming and herding custom” (Mean = 3.13 ± 0.65) rated eight position, “Government policy on farming / herding system” (Mean = 3.05 ± 0.90) ranked nine position while “Land tenure system existing in the study area” (mean = 3.03 ± 0.70) ranked tenth position. From findings the average score for all of information needs were rated above decision mean rule which denotes evident, that information is highly needed on all ten (10) items of conflict-resolution, if there would be efficient and effective peaceful co-habitation between arable crop youth-farmers and pastoral Fulanis in the study area. The finding connotes Adisa

(2012) opined that resource supported clash between youth farmers and pastoralist destabilize the collision of agricultural extension service delivery. Also, assailed by Extension worker might have led unpleasant result on visitation and teaching of farm families (Adebayo et al., 2015).

Decision rule:- Any mean score above 1.00 (Severe) and mean score below 1.00 (Not severe)

Findings in Table 3 showed distribution of governmental Extension Workers according to perceived constraints to conflict-resolution, “Poor security awareness / alert” (Mean = 3.00 ± 0.00) and “Prevailing land tenure system” (Mean = 3.00 ± 0.00) ranked first position and culture (custom, rules and regulation) of respondents” (Mean = 2.93 ± 0.27) ranked third position while “illiteracy of respondents” (Mean = 2.45 ± 0.50) and “poor remuneration of governmental Extension Workers” (Mean = 2.00 ± 0.00) ranked eleventh and twelve position respectively. It connotes from finding that mean of all items rated above decision mean rule which infer that all (12) items of perceived constraints to conflict-resolution are “severe”. Therefore, necessary solutions must be proffered to these constraints if governmental Extension Workers have to be effective in conflict-resolution in the study area.

Extension Workers and Extension Workers perceived constraints in conflict-resolution.

The summary of Pearson product moment correlation shows negative and no significant relationship between roles of governmental Extension Workers and Extension Workers’ perceived constraints in conflict-resolution. The co-efficient (r) value was – 0.309 and p-value was 0.058 which is greater than correlation significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed). Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative is rejected. This reveals that Extension

Workers do not involve in conflict-resolution in the study area. This corroborate the verdicts of Adebayo, Omotayo and Bolarinwa (2015) who ascertained that the concern of assault by extension personnel would have had negative things on the level of their training and visitation of farm communities which includes of farmers and pastoral Fulanis. Hence, addition of Extension Workers in preventing clash in the midst of resources user groups to promote peaceful co-habitation and food security at large is highly imperative. This result is in consonance with Adisa (2008) and Adelakun *et al.* (2015) who observed that resource used conflict amid farmers-pastoral Fulanis persist to demoralize the notion and opinion of extension service delivery system in the country at large.

The Pearson product moment correlation analysis result of Table 6 revealed, significant relationship between information needs of governmental Extension Workers and governmental Extension Workers perceived constraint in conflict-resolution. The co-efficient (r) value was -0.193 and p-value was 0.233 which greater than correlation significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed). The negative co-efficient (r) indicates the higher the information needs the lower the Extension Workers constraints in conflict-resolution. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative is rejected. This infers that an information need of governmental Extension Workers on conflict-resolution is a must.

Meanwhile, intervention of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution would serve as appropriate mitigation /tool in conflict prevention and resolution. The finding is consistent with Pipy (2006) who confirmed vital purpose participated in the accessibility of various agricultural information and in the used of the accessed information can’t be exaggerated. Likewise,

Shadrack (2008) affirmed the function performed by information and communication in conflict-resolution and crisis prevent disclosed the fact that many conflict have to confirm with assumption, typecasts, perception and attitudes that have remained used among conflict parties.

Conclusion and Recommendation

Conflict is everywhere and conflict-resolution is inevitable. The result shows that governmental Extension Workers were of low intervention in conflict-resolution. The information needs of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution is a must if the extension institution have to be a means to conflict mitigation, also perceived constraints must be properly addressed to ensure peaceful co-habitation between farmers and pastoral Fulanis groups in the study area. Also, there is a need to enforce and empower governmental Extension to reduce vulnerability in farming-herding exercise and preach conflict-resolution and peaceful co-existence if agriculture has to ensure sustainable livelihood among resource user groups. Farmers should dissociate from farming on stock route, ethnicity and harassment of pastoralists while pastoral Fulanis should stop night grazing, grazing in the farming zone, destruction of water course and sexual harassment. Local leaders and monarchy (Local institution) should exonerate themselves from conflict entrepreneur but develop means to reduce vulnerability in their domains.

References

Adebayo, A.A, Bolarinwa, K.K. &Omotayo, A.M (2015): Conflict Management and Farmers Production Level In OkeOgun Area of Oyo State. *British Journal of Applied Science and Technology* 5(2): 189- 197.

Article no. BJUST. 2015- 018. ISSN: 2231-0843. www.sciencedomain.org.

Adelakun, O.E, Adurogbangba, B. &Akingbile, L.A (2015) Socio-economic Effects of Farmer pastoralists Conflict on Agricultural Extension Service DeliuveryIn Oyo State Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Extension*. Vol.2.ISSN(C):24086851. Pp 59-70 .

Adisa, S.R. &Adekunle, O.A (2010): An Empirical Phenomenological Psychological Study of Farmer Herdsmen Conflicts in North Central Nigeria. *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Science*.Pp 59 – 64.

Adisa, R.S (2008): Correlates of Conflicts Between Arable Crop Farmers And Cattie Herdsmen InKwara State Nigeria. Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development,University of Ilorin, Ilorin. Kwara state. Unpublished Ph. D Thesis.

Adisa, R.S (2012): Land Use Conflict Between Farmers and Herdsmen-Implications for Agricultural Influence Adoption of Improve Cowpea Technologies in Nigeria. *Journal of International agricultural and Extension Education*. 11 (1): 79-86.

Beetseh, K., Dzever, S.T &Terwase, V.M (2018): Herdsmen/Farmers Crises In Nigeria: The Roles of Librarian in Resolving Crises.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/1787>. Retrieved Oct. 2018

Dimelu, M.U; Salifu, E.D; Chad, J.M; Enwelu, I.A &Igbokwe, E.M. (2016): Challenges of herdsmen-farmers' Conflict In Livestock Production In Nigeria, Experience of Pastoralists InKogi State, Nigeria. *African Journal of African Research*, Vol.12(8)Feb.2017 ISSN 199-6374. [Http://www.occenicjournals.org/Ajar](http://www.occenicjournals.org/Ajar). Pp 642–650.

The Proceedings of the 15th National Research Conference and Network Meeting of CYIAP held in Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo state, Nigeria, from 9th to 12th March, 2020

Manu, I.M, Bime Mary-Juliet, Fon, D.E, &Ajaga, N. J(2014):Effects of Farmer-grazer Conflicts on Rural Development: A Socio-economic Analysis. Schol. Journal Agric. Sc. 4(3):113-120

Musa, S.D, Shabu, T. &Igbawusa, M.I (2014): Resource Use Conflict Between Farmers and Fulani herdsmen in Guma Local Government Area of Benue State, Nigeria. Journal of Basic and Applied Research International. xx (x&x): xx- xx 2014.

Moritz, M (2010): Understanding Harder-Farmer Conflicts in West Africa: Outline of a

processual approach: hum.org. 69(2): 138-148.

Shedrack, G.B. (2008):” The Methods of Conflict Resolution And Transformation”. UniversityFor Peace. Introduction To Conflict Studies In West Africa. Spectrum Books Limited Spectrum Houses ring road Ibadan, Nigeria. Pp 93-114.

Popy, F.O. (2016): Poultry Farmers ‘Utilization of Information in Lagelu Local Government area, Oyo State Nigeria International Journal of Poultry Science 3(3): Pp. 499-300.

Table 1a: Distribution of respondents according to performed roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution

Variables	Youth-farmers (n = 72)						Pastoral Fulanis (n = 36)						Extension Workers (n = 12)								
	SA	A	U	D	SD	Mean	R	S	A	U	D	SD	Mean	R	S	A	U	D	SD	Mean	R
	%	%	%	%	%	±SD		A	%	%	%	%	±SD		A	%	%	%	%	±SD	
Education of both parties	36.3	53.7	0	10	00	3.28±1.40	HI	00	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.00	LI	7	1	0	10	00	3.90±1.88	H
Information sourcing and sharing	00	76.2	0	23.8	00	3.16±1.43	HI	00	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.00	LI	8	2	0	00	00	3.10±1.70	H
Training and creating awareness on new technology to increase productivity	23	51	0	26	00	3.00±1.38	HI	00	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.00	LI	7	1	0	11	10	3.00±1.67	H
Linking both side to input agencies	40	45	0	15	00	3.45±1.75	HI	00	0	0	0	00	1.00±0.00	LI	7	2	0	5	00	3.00±1.57	H
Teaching both side to improve quality of living	32	53	0	15	00	3.40±1.70	HI	00	0	0	0	00	1.00±0.00	LI	6	2	0	10	00	3.00±1.55	H

Source: Field survey.2018.

KEY's:- SA = strongly agree, A = agree, U = undecided, D = disagree and SD = strongly disagree.

Decision rule:- Any mean mark above 3 (High intervention) and any mean mark below 3 (Low intervention).

KEY's:- HI = High intervention and LI = Low intervention.

Table 1b: Distribution of respondents according unperformed roles of governmental Extension Workers in conflict-resolution

Variables	Youth-farmers (n = 76)							Pastoral Fulanis (n = 32)							Extension Workers (n = 12)						
	S	A	U	D	SD	Mean	R	S	A	U	D	SD	Mean	R	S	A	U	D	SD	Mean	R
	A					±SD		A					±SD		A					±SD	
	%	%	%	%	%			%	%	%	%	%			%	%	%	%	%		
Teaching of new technology to each party	00	63.7	00	36.3	00	1.98±0.40	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI	00	85	00	15	00	2.90±1.28	LI
Information sourcing and sharing between two parties	00	00	00	76.2	23.8	1.76±0.43	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI	00	00	00	80	20	2.10±0.90	LI
Campaign against destruction	00	00	00	67.1	32.9	1.67±0.47	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI	00	00	00	80	20	1.80±0.41	LI
Enforcement of payment of fines and compensation	00	00	00	65	35	1.66±0.48	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI	00	00	00	25	75	1.25±0.44	LI
Enforcement of ban on night grazing	00	00	00	62.5	37.5	1.65±0.49	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI
Third party/ Arbitrator	00	00	00	68.8	31.2	1.65±0.46	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI	00	00	00	25	75	1.25±0.44	LI
Sharing of the resources among resource user groups	00	00	00	76.7	23.3	1.57±0.42	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI
Negotiation for grazing land	15	00	00	85	00	1.53±0.36	LI	00	00	00	00	10	1.00±0.00	LI	00	00	00	75	25	1.75±0.44	LI

The Proceedings of the 15th National Research Conference and Network Meeting of CYIAP held in Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo state, Nigeria, from 9th to 12th March, 2020

Negotiation with communities for reception and approval of pastoralists	0	00	0	71.	28.	1.31±0.	LI	0	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	00	10	1.00±0.	LI
	0		0	2	8	54		0	0	0	0	0	00		0	0	0		0	00	
Allocation of land for pastoral Fulanis for building camp	0	00	0	52.	47.	1.25±0.	LI	0	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	00	10	1.00±0.	LI
	0		0	1	9	94		0	0	0	0	0	00		0	0	0		0	00	
Demarcation of stock route / grazing zone and its enforcement	0	00	0	00	00	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	00	10	1.00±0.	LI
	0		0			00		0	0	0	0	0	00		0	0	0		0	00	
Demarcation of farm land and its enforcement	0	00	0	00	00	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	00	10	1.00±0.	LI
	0		0			00		0	0	0	0	0	00		0	0	0		0	00	
Peace meeting between both sides / parties	0	00	0	00	00	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	00	10	1.00±0.	LI
	0		0			00		0	0	0	0	0	00		0	0	0		0	00	
Establish of grazing reserve	0	00	0	00	00	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	0	10	1.00±0.	LI	0	0	0	00	10	1.00±0.	LI
	0		0			00		0	0	0	0	0	00		0	0	0		0	00	

Source: Field survey.2018.

KEY's:- SA = strongly agree, A = agree, U = undecided, D = disagree and SD = strongly disagree.

Decision rule:- Any mean mark above 3 (High intervention) and any mean mark below 3 (Low intervention).

KEY's:- HI = High intervention and LI = Low intervention.

Table 2:- Distribution of governmental Extension workers according to information needs in conflict-resolution.

Information needs of Extension Workers in	Extension Workers (n=40)					
	HN	M	LN	NN	Means	Rank
	%	%	%	%	±SD	
Awareness on stock route	72.5	27.5	00	00	3.73±0.45	1 st
Demarcation of stock route and grazing zone and farming zone	67.5	32.5	00	00	3.68±0.47	2 nd
Conflict coping mechanism that promote peace and unity	70	22.5	7.5	00	3.63±0.63	3 rd
Needs to embrace peace and mutual understanding among resource user groups	57.5	42.5	00	00	3.58±0.50	4 th
Resources of common interest among resource user groups that cause conflict	52.5	37.5	10	00	3.43±0.68	5 th
Level of compliance with stock route/grazing zone and farming zone	45	47.5	7.5	00	3.38±0.63	6 th
Languages and cultural difference of resource user groups	25	65	10	00	3.15±0.58	7 th
Farming/herding traditional custom	27.5	57.5	15	00	3.13±0.65	8 th
Government policy on farming/herding system	42.5	20	37.5	00	3.05±0.10	9 th
Land tenure system existing in the area	25	52.5	22.5	00	3.03±0.70	10 th

Source: Field survey, 2018. *Multiple response. ±SD= Standard deviation

KEYS:- HN= Highly needed, MN= Medium need, LN= Low need and NN= Not needed.

Decision rule:- Any mean score above 2.5 regarded as “Highly needed” while mean score Less than 2.5 considered “Low needed”.

Table: 3: Distribution of governmental Extension Workers according to perceived constraints to conflict-resolution.

Perceived constraints to conflict-resolution	Extension Workers (n=40)				
	Yes	No	Und.	Mean	Rank
	%	%	%	±SD	
Poor security awareness/alert	100	00	00	3.00±0.0 0	1 st

Prevailing land tenure system	100	00	00	3.00±0.00	1 st
Culture/custom, rules and regulation of respondents	92.5	7.5	00	2.93±0.27	3 rd
Poor accessibility to extension service	87.5	12.5	00	2.88±0.33	4 th
Poor governmental policy on land use act of 1978	85	15	00	2.85±0.36	5 th
Inadequate transportation and transport facilities	82.5	17.5	00	2.83±0.38	6 th
Language barrier	82.5	17.5	00	2.83±0.38	7 th
Social factor	67.5	32.5	00	2.68±0.47	8 th
Poor attitude of respondents to extension service	87.5	12.5	00	2.63±0.49	9 th
Inadequate knowledge of conflict-resolution	52.5	47.5	00	2.53±0.51	10 th
Illiteracy of respondents	45	55	00	2.45±0.50	11 th
Poor remuneration of governmental extension workers	00	100	00	2.00±0.00	12 th

Source:- Field survey, 2018. *Multiple responses. ±SD = Standard deviation.
n = Number of respondents sampled.

Table 4: Governmental Extension Workers' perceived constraints in conflict-resolution.

Variables	Extension (n=12)	Workers
	r-value	p-value
Governmental Extension Workers perceived constraints in conflict-resolution.	-0.309	0.058
Information needs of governmental Extension Workers and governmental Extension Worker perceived constraints in conflict-resolution.	-0.193	0.233

Correlation significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Source: Field survey, 2018.

The Proceedings of the 15th National Research Conference and Network Meeting of CYIAP held in Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo state, Nigeria, from 9th to 12th March, 2020