Journal of Agriculture Research and Entrepreneurship

(JARE)

ISSN: [XXXX-XXXX] (Print) | ISSN: [XXXX-XXXX] (Online)

Volume 3, Issue 1 (July, 2026)

Page(s): 53–62

DOI: https://doi.org/10.66024/vzrpf844

Received: 29-12-2025 Accepted: 26-07-2026

EFFECTS OF BANDITRY ON THE INCOME OF LIVESTOCK FARMERS IN ZURU EMIRATE, KEBBI STATE, NIGERIA

Shehu Alhaji Alhaji, Mohammed Abubakar Maikasuwa, Yahaya Kaka,

Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Abdullahi Fodiyo University of Science and Technology, Aliero.

Corresponding Email: shehuzz190@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Banditry represents a critical security challenge that has profoundly impacted the northwest region of Nigeria over the past decade. The relentless operations of bandits have led to alarming increases in kidnapping, loss of lives, the displacement of rural farmers, and the theft of livestock. This research provides a decisive examination of the effects of banditry on the income generation of livestock farmers in the Zuru Emirate of Kebbi State. Our study, which involved a robust sample of 200 livestock farmers utilizing multi-stage random sampling techniques, yielded significant insights. The analysis of the collected data using independent t-tests and regression models revealed a significant difference in income. Before the onset of banditry, the average annual income of cattle farmers was estimated at ₦12,028,000, a figure that plummeted to ₦4,408,000 during the banditry crisis. The result of exponential regression showed that the payment of ransom by livestock farmers was negatively significant at 1% level of probability, while migration of livestock farmers, frequency of attacks during banditry, livestock number owned access to veterinary services and farming experience were positively significant at1% level of probability. The result concluded that the majority of areas attacked by bandits are closer to forests that link northwest of Nigeria, and the majority of the farmers reared cattle and sheep. It is recommended that policymakers need to discourage paying of ransom, create job opportunities, and empowerment scheme for idle rural youths that is usually recruited by bandits.

Keywords: Banditry effect, income, livestock farmers, Zuru emirate.

INTRODUCTION

A bandit is a robber or an outlaw belonging to a gang, who uses weapons to steal or rob from the people and typically operating in an isolated or lawless area of a country (Sulaiman and Balkisu, 2020). Banditry is a term used to refer to acts of robbery and violence in areas where the rule of law has broken down (Collins, 2000). It also consists of the organization of armed bands for the purpose of attacking state or social institutions or enterprises or individual persons. Participation in such bands and in the attacks committed by them is equally regarded as banditry (Collins, 2000).

Banditry means occurrence or prevalence of armed robbery or violent crime. It involves the use of force, or threat to that effect, to intimidate a person with the intent to rob rape or kill. Banditry is a crime against persons. It has been a common genre of crime, as well as cause violence in contemporary societies (Nigeria Watch, 2011).

In Northwest of Nigeria particularly Kebbi State most especially Zuru emirate criminal gangs are engage in banditry by stealing, kidnapping, robbery and killing that lead to displacement of rural farmers. Agriculture is the major source of livelihood and revenue to Kebbi state being one of the Northern States of Nigeria. Farmers in the state have been enjoying good harvest of both food and cash crops production thereby contributing their quota to the Nation building.

Livelihoods are 'means of making a living', the various activities and resources that allow people to live. Different people have different lifestyles and ways of meeting their needs. Households perform various activities to gain and maintain their livelihoods. The nature of these livelihood activities depends on the availability of assets, resources (including climate), labour, skills, education, social capital, seasonality, agro-climate/agro-ecology, and gender (Pasteur, 2002; Ali, 2005; Okali, 2006; Porter et al, 2007; Ogunlela and Mukthar, 2009; Akinwale, 2010).

Livelihood pattern in rural households cuts across agricultural and non-agricultural activities. It has been established that majority of households especially in developing countries live in rural areas and rely on agriculture for their livelihood (FAO, 2000; Akinlo, 2001; World Bank, 2006). According to Alimi, et. al. (2001) as to cited Nwaogwugwu and Matthews-Njoku, 2015) that about two-third of rural households earn their livelihood from subsistence agriculture, either as small-scale farmers or as low-paid farm workers while the remaining one-third engage in petty services. Understandably, agriculture for now and in the near future will remain the bedrock of the rural household economies because of their access to land (a major input in agricultural enterprises) through various forms of traditional land holdings the potential of agriculture to readily meet their basic needs for food and to some extent cash.

Reports indicate the flourishing of bandit groups, whose members were seen displaying automatic weapons, terrorizing herders" settlements, farms, villages and the highways with the mission of killing people, kidnapping and pillaging cows (Olaniyan, 2018). It was reported that between October, 2013 and March, 2014, 7,000 cattle were rustled from commercial livestock farms and traditional herders in Northwest Nigeria (Bashir, 2014; Tauna, 2016) while about 330 attacks were made by bandits and 1,460 deaths were recorded between January and July, 2019 (Abdullahi, 2019). In most cases, the bandits killed and maimed the people and raped the women before dispossessing them of their cows (Akowe and Kayode, 2014) while in some instances, they also kidnapped girls or women in the process (Adeniyi, 2015; Yusuf, 2015).

Suffice to say that the northwestern region of Nigeria encompasses seven states namely Kano, Jigawa, Katsina, Kaduna, Zamfara, Sokoto and Kebbi. Five of these states, which are Katsina, Kaduna, Zamfara, Sokoto and Kebbi have been mostly affected by the scourge of banditry (Rosenje and Adeniyi. Of these five states, Kaduna, Katsina and Zamfara have been the most critical hot spots. It is however, pertinent to note that the incidences of banditry are not limited to northwestern Nigeria. In fact, it is also prevalent in some parts of north-central region, in states like Niger, Nasarawa, Benue and Plateau which are equally regarded as hotbeds (Kuna and Jibrin 2016).

There is no gainsaying the fact that banditry poses a serious challenge not only to the security of Northwest states but to the country at large in view of its ever increasing impacts and implications. The level at which armed bandits operate within the northwest region calls for attention by both the State and Federal governments, more especially, since the latter controls the state security apparatuses. This complex situation of social violence and insecurity in the affected states had been on for almost a decade now (Okoli and Ogayi, 2018). The increasing attacks by bandit groups have led to the destruction of lives and properties, displacement of people from their communities; and a growing numbers of widows; widowers and orphans, who now reside in Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) camps following the continued attacks of armed bandits on both farming and pastoral communities across different areas of the states (Okoli and Ochim, 2016; Mustapha, 2019).

Kidnapping is a crime committed for ransom the victims of the crime are often those perceived by the perpetrators to possess money which will be paid as ransom based on individual socio-economic status. Kidnapping in Kaduna State involves highway-armed abduction whereby travelers are ambushed

and abducted by bandits and then taken to a hideout in the forest where their relatives or associates are contacted for ransom payment (Okoli & Okpaleke, 2014).

In the last decade, rural banditry and violent conflicts between pastoralists and farmers in Nigeria have been on the rise. This social conflict has traditionally consisted of disputes over natural resources and is often presented as a conflict between settlers and nomadic people. However, what began as conflict between pastoralists and farmers over land has recently developed into rural banditry with heavy human and economic cost, ranging from the sexual assault of women and girls, attacks on villages, to cattle rustling, amongst others. The bandits traversing Benue, Plateau, Niger, Kwara, Nassarawa, Zamfara, Kaduna, Sokoto, Kebbi, and Kano are involved in crimes such as armed robbery and kidnapping. There have also been reported cases of rural banditry in Delta, Enugu, Ondo, Oyo and Ebonyi states (Hassan, 2016). Kebbi State has borne the brunt of the insecurity due to the activities of Banditry which has led to the loss of many lives. This has affected local economy such small businesses who earn a living on a daily basis in Zuru Emirate. Loss of man hours due to shortened working hours has become the order of the day, and this is likely to take its toll on livelihood in Zuru Emirate of Kebbi State.

The main objective of the research is to examine the effect of banditry on income of livestock farmers in Zuru Emirate of Kebbi State. The specific objectives of the research are to: (i) evaluate the income before and during banditry in the study area. (ii) assess the relationship between income and banditry attacks.

METHODOLOGY

Zuru Emirate is one of the four Emirates in Kebbi State. The emirate comprises four Local Government Area namely Danko/Wasagu, Fakai, Sakaba, and zuru. The Emirate is located in northern Guinea Savannah ecological zone of Nigeria on Latitude 11°35¹N-11°55¹N, Longitude 4°E451-5°25E, of the equator and Altitude of about 250m above sea level (ASL) (Kebbi State Government, 2003).The area has a total land mass of 653km with a human population of 163,543 (census, 2006) the climate of the area is Guinea Savannah with mean annual rainfall of about 950mm. The relative humidity ranges from 40% in the dry season and 85% in the rainy season. The average temperature ranges from 27°C to 38°C (Girma, 2004).The Emirate was carved out of the former Sokoto State in 1991 which is Located in the south-eastern part of the State that consist of hilly terrain and bounded in the north by Gummi Local Government and north-east by Bukkuyum of Zamfara State, while in the north-west by Koko Local Government and south-west by Yauri Local Government of Kebbi State and in the southern part by Rijau Local Government of Niger State (Girma, 1998). The area has a long dry season characterized by cool dry air (harmattan) during November to February and hot dry air Match to April. The area is also characterized with well drained sandy barns soil that is moderately deep in nature which is good for arable crop production.The various indigenous cultural and linguistic groups of the emirate are Dakarkari, Fakkawa, Kelawa, Katsinawan laka and achifawa .Other non indigenous group in the area are Hausa, Fulani, Yoruba, Igbo and other tribes found in Nigeria. The different religious groups found in the area are Islam, Christianity and traditionalist. The people are predominantly small scale farmers. The land is mostly used for cultivation of crops and rearing of animals as well as hunting (Kebbi State Government, 2003).Other economic activities are local

handcrafts like pot making and weaving by women and blacksmithing by men (Augie and Lawal, 1990).

Sampling Procedure and sample size: Zuru Emirate comprises four Local Government Area namely Danko/Wasagu, Fakai, Sakaba, and zuru with eight, four, two, and six administrative district respectively. A multi-stage sampling technique was used for the study. First stage involved purposive selection of four districts where the activities of banditry is prominence from each Local Government. The second stage involved random selection of two villages from each of the districts selected. The third stage involved simple random selection of twenty (25) livestock rearers from the selected villages giving a total of two hundred (200) livestock rearers used in the study.

Instrument of Data Collection: The instrument for data collection is by administration of interview schedule questionnaires which used as a source of primary data. The questionnaires have alternative responses for the respondents to fill as appropriate or tick in the appropriate boxes as provided by the researcher. Secondary information was collected from materials such as Journals, seminar, conference proceedings and related literature. The data of the study collected with the help of trained enumerators. After data was coded, then cleaning the data, and entered in the computer for analysis using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).This research was produced both quantitative and qualitative data. The data was analyzed in line with the objectives of the study.

Analytical Tools: The following analytical tools were used to achieve the objective of the study; (i) Independent t-test for comparing of the sample means were used to achieve objective one. (ii) Multiple regression analysis is used to achieved objective two.

Model Specification

Regression Model:

(1) Multiple regression analysis was used to obtain effects of banditry on livelihood of livestock farmers. The model is expressed in implicit form as shown in equation below:

$Yi = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8, X_9, X_{10} + \mu i)$ ..... (1)

Linear function

$Y = a + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_5X_5 + \beta_6X_6 + \beta_7X_7 + \beta_8X_8 + \beta_9X_9 + \beta_{10}X_{10} + \mu$..... (2)

Double-log form.

$\ln Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + \beta_3 \ln X_3 + \beta_4 \ln X_4 + \beta_5 \ln X_5 + \beta_6 \ln X_6 + \beta_7 \ln X_7 + \beta_8 \ln X_8 + \beta_9 \ln X_9 + \beta_{10} \ln X_{10} + \mu$ ..... (3)

Semi–log form

$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + \beta_3 \ln X_3 + \beta_4 \ln X_4 + \beta_5 \ln X_5 + \beta_6 \ln X_6 + \beta_7 \ln X_7 + \beta_8 \ln X_8 + \beta_9 \ln X_9 + \beta_{10} \ln X_{10} + \mu$ ..... (4)

Exponential form

$\ln Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_5X_5 + \beta_6X_6 + \beta_7X_7 + \beta_8X_8 + \beta_9X_9 + \beta_{10}X_{10} + \mu$ ..... (5)

Quadratic form

$Y = a + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_1X_{12} + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_2X_{22} + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_3X_{32} + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_4X_{42} + \beta_5X_5 + \beta_5X_{52} + \beta_6X_6 + \beta_6X_{62} + \beta_7X_7 + \beta_7X_{72} + \beta_8X_8 + \beta_8X_{82} + \beta_9X_9 + \beta_9X_{92} + \beta_{10}X_{10} + \beta_{10}X_{102} + \mu$ ..... (6)

Afterwards, the model with the best fit was selected as lead equation

Where:

Y = livestock income (was measured in naira)

X1 = Ransom paid to bandits (was measured in naira for money paid)

X2 = Migration due to banditry (was measured by distance of migration)

X3 = Frequency to bandits attacks (was measured number of attacks/year)

X4 = Number of livestock own (was measured in cost/value of animal in naira)

X5 = Access to veterinary service (was measured in naira for the cost of treatment)

X6 = Participation on weekly contribution (Adashi) (was measured in Yes=1, No=0)

X7 = Restrictions on local livestock market (was measured in number of days)

X8= Restriction on inter- state market (was measured in number of days)

X9= Restrictions on mobile network (was measured in number of days)

X10= Farming experience (was measured in years of experience)

β0= Constant

βi= Coefficient of determination to be estimated

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the distribution of the respondents according to their income from livestock farming. The table revealed that a cattle rearer obtained higher average annual income before the banditry (₦12,028,000) compared to the average annual income during banditry (₦4,408,000) and the average annual income difference of (₦7,620,000) was significantly at 1% level of probability. The same scenario was obtained in the case of sheep owners where by the average annual income they obtained from the enterprise before the banditry (₦295,200) was higher than what obtained during the banditry (₦177,600) and the average annual income differences (₦117,600) was significantly at 1% level of probability. In the case of goat producers, however, average annual income obtained before banditry (₦219,150) was lower than during banditry (₦368,850) and the average annual income differences (₦149,700) was statistically significant at less than 5% level of probability. Tamim, (2019) in his study Economic implications of insecurity on agricultural productivity in Kankara local government Katsina state reported that livestock reared by the people are used as sources of income, milk, oil and food in general. In addition the bye product of the livestock are allowed to decompose with corn stalks, grasses, shrubs and household refuse to become manure that is taken to the farm.

Table 3 shows distribution of other sources of income of the respondents in the study area apart from livestock farming. The table revealed that crop farmers obtained higher average annual income before the banditry (₦3,277,372) compared to the average annual income during banditry (₦1,966,423) and the average annual income difference (₦1,310,949) was significantly at 1% level of probability. The same scenario was obtained in the case of traders where by the average annual income they obtained before the banditry (₦1,536,458) higher than what obtained during the banditry (₦1,102,127) and the average annual income differences (₦434,331) was significantly at 1% level of probability. In the case of transporters the average annual income they obtained before the banditry (₦2,125,000) higher than what obtained during the banditry (₦1,062,500) and the average annual income differences (₦1,062,500) was significantly at 10% level of probability. In the case of weavers the average annual income they obtained before

the banditry (₦800,000) higher than what obtained during the banditry (₦480,000) and the average annual income differences (₦320,000) was significantly at 5% level of probability. In the case of tailors the average annual income they obtained before the banditry (₦427,272) higher than what obtained during the banditry (₦299,091) and the average annual income differences (₦128,182) was significantly at 1% level of probability. In the case of mechanics the average annual income they obtained before the banditry (₦1,500,000) was higher than what obtained during the banditry (₦750,000) and the average annual income differences (₦750,000) was significantly at 10% level of probability. This finding is related to findings by Onunka and Olumba, (2017) whose stressed that this is a combined activities engaged in by the rural households, as a means of earning livelihood. They noted that, in recent times the rural dwellers no longer restrict themselves to crop and livestock-rearing activities, but rather are involved in a diverse portfolio of activities.

Table 3 shows the result of the regression model that indicated the effect of the banditry on the income of livestock farmers in the study area as presented in table 3 The result of multiple regression analysis shows R2 value of 0.634 which implies that 63.4% variations of effect of banditry on income of livestock farmers in the study area was explained by the independent variables included in the model. Five functional forms (linear, double log, semi log, exponential and quadratic) were tried. Exponential function gave best fit. The coefficient of payment of ransom of livestock farmers and their household (-0.12) was highly negative and significant at 1% level of probability. This implies that increase on ransom payment by livestock farmers the income of livestock farmers was decreased by 12% of their income. This mean that increase in the rate of kidnapping for ransom and the income of livestock farmers decreased as the amount of labour and investment was decreased. The payment of ransom make farmers to become poor and in some cases the farmers had no option but to sell their properties including their farmlands to get money for the payment of ransom. This finding agrees with Mohammed (2021) who reported that killing and kidnapping of yam marketers reduced the patronage of yam consumers both within and outside thereby reduce the yam marketers' income. The coefficient of livestock farmer's migration as a result of banditry is (0.38) is positively significant at 1% level of probability. This implies that increased in an income of livestock farmers by 38% the rate of migration of livestock farmers' increases. This means that the as the constant increase on banditry attacks the rate of migration increased which affected livestock farmers income. Olabanji (2014) shows that insecurity halts business operations during period of violence and outright closure of many enterprises in the areas or zones where incidence of insecurity is rife and are on daily occurrences.

The coefficient of frequency of banditry attacks (0.13) was positively significant at 1% level of probability. This implies that increases in income of livestock farmers by 13% rate of theft, raids of village and burning of properties due banditry was increases. This means that the constant increased in banditry attacks the rate of income of livestock farmers was affected as a result of theft, looting, burning of properties and raiding in study area. In line with Ladan and Matawalli, (2020), reported that bandits direct a group among them that specialize in cattle theft to enter the houses and steal cattle from where they are kept. The increase in number of livestock owns (0.20) was positively

significant at 1% level of probability. This implies that an increase in the number of livestock owns by 20% the income of livestock farmer also increased. This means that the increases in banditry the number of livestock owns are decreased I which the income also decreased. Adesoji (2010) reported that many business men, farmers and students have lost their lives and properties as a result of insurgence in the North Eastern Nigeria.

The Coefficient of access to veterinary service (0.27) was positively significant at 1% level of probability. The implication is that the increased in accessing veterinary service by 27% the rate of livestock farmers' income increased. This mean that increased in the banditry attacks the rate of wounded and other health disorders increase the amount spend on medication and the farmer's income was decreases. In the study of Florence et al (2020) reported that insecurities has degraded the quality of livelihood which includes; Basic staple, Shelter, Health, Education and Water. The Coefficient of low participation on weekly contributions (Adashi) of livestock farmers (0.6) was positively significant at 10% level of probability. The implication is that as the income increases by 60% the rate of participation of weekly contribution increased. This means that increased in banditry attacks the rate of participants on weekly contributions was low because decrease on the income of livestock farmers. That is to say the higher the banditry attacks the fewer farmers' contributions (Adashi). This result consonance with Mohammed 2021, who suggested that lack of weekly contributions possess a negative threat to livelihood of yam marketers and also reported that in the findings of Adewale (2019), who agreed that lack of access to contributions in any agricultural enterprises, will affect farmers' productivity and income. The coefficient of farming experience (0.63) was positively significant at 1% level of significant. This implies that the increase on livestock farmers experience by 63% the income of livestock farmers increased. This means that increase on banditry activities the rate of experience farmers decreased that resulted to the decrease of livestock farmers' income. In line with Soomiyo and Fadairo (2020), this finding indicates that most of the farmers operated small to medium scale farming and are well experienced in the operation.

CONCLUSION

The study revealed that there were significant differences between livestock farmer's average annual income before banditry obtained and annual income obtained during banditry. The result from regression concluded that payment of ransom negatively affected income of livestock farmers while migration of livestock farmers, frequency of attacks, the number of livestock owned, access to veterinary service, weekly contribution and farming experience affected income of livestock farmers positively. Based on findings it is recommended that policy makers need to discourage the paying of ransom, creation of jobs opportunities, empowerment scheme for idle rural youths that usually recruits by bandits and provision of subsidy, credits and loans to boost their businesses due to their diversification to other businesses apart from livestock rearing.

REFERENCES

Abdullahi, A. (2019). Rural banditry, regional security, and integration in West Africa.a Journal of Social and Political Sciences, 2(3), 644-654.

Adeniyi, T. (2015). Why incoming FCT Minister must act fast on cattle rustling. Daily Trust, July 1st. Retrieved from: www.dailytrust.com.ng /daily/index.php/city-news/58662-why-incoming -fct-administrationmust-act-fast-on-cattle-rustling>

Adewole, M. S. (2019). Food Crisis Looms as Banditry Resurfaces in North Central Nigeria. Retrieved From https://www.dailytrustlive.com

Adesoji, A. (2010), The Boko Haram Uprising and Islamic Revivalism in Nigeria. Publish in Africa spectrum, vol.45, no. 2 pp. 95-108

Akinlo, A.E. (2001). "Poverty; Global Trends and Challenges" In Afonja, S.; Adelekan, D.;Soetan, F.; Alimi, T. & Ayanwale, B.(eds.).Research and Policy Directions on Poverty in Nigeria. Ile-Ife, Anchor Print Limited. Pp. 5-23. Akinwale, A.A. 2010. Livelihood and environmental challenges in coastal communities of Nigeria. Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa, 12(8): 79-88.

Akowe, T. & Kayode, B. (2014). Cattle rustling: A northern nightmare. The Nation, March 30th. Retrieved from: http://thenation onlineng.net/cattle-rustling-northern-nightmare>

Alli, A. (2005). Livelihood and food security in rural Banglesh: The role of social capital. PhD thesis WageningenUniversity, The Netherlands.

Alimi, T., Ayanwale, A.B. and Bamire, A.S. (2001). Improving Resources Reprodctivity in Women-owned Farmers: A Household Poverty Alleviation Strategy. In Afonja`s et al (eds) Research and policy Direction on Poverty in Nigeria. Ile- Ife Obafemi Awolawo University press pp. 201-209.

Augie, A.R. & Lawal, S.U. (1990). Studies in history of the people of Zuru emirate. Enugu Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd., 112p

Bashir, M. (2014). Hopes for an end to cattle theft. Daily Trust, September 4th. Retrieved www.dailytrust.com.ng/daily/feature/33468-hopes-for-an-end-to-cattle-theft>

Census (2006). National Census Report. Official website of kebbi state

Collins H (2000). Social Banditry, 3rdEdition, Harper Collins Publishers.Retrieved https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/banditry

Fadairo O. S. Williams P. A. Nalwanga F. S. (2019): Perceived livelihood impacts and adaptation of vegetable farmers to climate variability and change in selected sites from Ghana, Uganda and Nigeria. Environment, Development and Sustainability 21: 1 – 19. https://doi.org/10.1007/ s10668-019-00514-1.

Florence, B. & Paul, Y.M. (2020). Effect of insecurities on Livelihood of Communities in Maiduguri Metropolis. Journal of public administration vol.2 issue 1, 2020, pp 31-36. Longhurst,Rechard

Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). (2000). Rural Women and Food Security, Current Situation and Perspectives. Rome, FAO Publications Pp. 173 – 187.

Girma,S. (2004). Geography of Zuru Emirate,A semimar presentation at ZEDs Centre. May 15, 2004

Girma,S. (1998). Agro-climatology of Millet Production in Desert Fringe Zone of Nigeria: A case study of Kebbi State. M.Tech.SSSE/066/96

Hassan,Y. Hassan A.A, & Hussaini, N. (2016). Occupational politics myths and realities in Nigeria: A case study of Farmers-Pasturalist conflict. International Journal of Technical Research and Science, 3(10), 329-337

Kebbi State Government (KBSG) (2003). Kebbi State Government Official Diary. Directorate of information, Kebbi, Nigeria.26p

Kuna, M. J. & Jibrin. I. (eds.) (2016). Rural banditry and conflicts in Northern Nigeria, Abuja: Centre for Democracy and Development. (2015). combating cattle rustling digitally: The el-Rufai model. August 26th. Retrieved from: http://leadership.ng/opinions/456170/combating-cattle-rustling-digitally-the-el-rufai-model

Ladan, I. S. & Matawalli, U. B. (2020). Impacts of Banditry on Food Security in Katsina State. Research Paper, Department of Basic and Applied Sciences, College of Science and Technology, Hassan Usman Katsina Polytechnic, P. M. B. 2052, Katsina, Katsina State, Nigeria.

Mohammed, U., Umar, I.S., Olaleye, R. S., Pelemo, J. J., Ahmad, B. S., Mohammed, U., and Umar, A. (2021). Effect of banditry on income and livelihoods of yam marketers in Shjroro local government area of Niger state, Nigeria. Journal of Agriculture and Food Sciences Volume 19 Number 1, April 2021, pp163-178.

Mustapha, U.N. (2019). Armed banditry and internal security in Zamfara State. International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research, 10(8), 1219-1226.

Nigerian Watch (2011). Third report on violence in Nigeria (2006-2011). A publication of the Nigerian Watch, June 2011.

Nwaogwugwu,O.N. and Matthews-Njoku, E.C. (2015). Cultural FactorsAffecting Livelihood Strategies of Rural Household I Sotheast Nigeria; Implication for Agricultural Transformation Agenda. R.JOAS 12(36) December 2014

Ogunlela, Y.I. & Mukhtar, A.A. (2009). "Gender issues in agriculture and rural development in Nigeria: The role of women." Humanity and Social Sciences Journal, 4(1) pp 19-30.

Okali, C. (2006). Linking livelihood and gender analysis for achieving gender transformative change. Livelihood Support Programme (LSP) Working Paper, 41, FAO.

Okoli, A, C. & Okpaleke, F N. (2014): "Cattle rustling and dialectics of security in Northern Nigeria International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science,[online] Vol 2 109-115.

Okoli, A. C. & Ochim, F. (2016). Forestlands and national security in Nigeria: A threat-import analysis. IIARD International Journal of Political and Administrative Studies, 2(2), 43-53.

Okoli, A. C. & Ogayi, C. O. (2018). Herdsmen militancy and humanitarian crisis in Nigeria: A theoretical briefing. African Security Review, 27(2), 129-143.

Olaniyan, A. (2018). Foliage and violence: Interrogating forests as a security threat in Nigeria. African Security Review, 27(1), 1-20.

Olabanji, O. E. & Ese, U. (2014). Insecurity and socio-economic development in Nigeria. Journal of Sustainable Development Studies,5(1), 40-63.

Onunka,. N & Olumba, C. C. (2017). Analysis of effect of livelihoods diversification on food security status of rural farming household in Udi local government area Enugu State. International Journal of agriculture science and research IJASR), vol.7,issue 6 Dec.2017,389-398. Pasteur, K. 2002. Gender analysis for sustainable livelihoods framework, tools and links to other sources. Eldis Document Store, www.eldvis.com,. Accessed February, 2012.

Porter, G., K. Blaufuss, A. Owusu & F. Cheampong,(2007). Youth, mobility and rural livelihoods in Sub-Saharan Africa: Perspectives from Ghana and Nigeria". Africa Insight 37(3): 420-43.

Soomiyo, M.V& Fadairo, O.(2020). Climate-induced conflicts and livelihoods of farming households in Nigeria: lessons from farmers-herdsmen conflict-ridden communities in Benue State. Agricultura Tropica et Subtropica, 53/2, 93–103, 2020

Suleiman, I. L. & Bilkisu, U. M. (2020). Impacts of Banditry on Food Security in Katsina State. Research Paper, Department of Basic and Applied Sciences, College of Science and Technology, Hassan Usman Katsina Polytechnic, P. M. B. 2052, Katsina, Katsina State, Nigeria.

Tamim, Y. A. (2019).Economic Implications of Insecurity on Agricultural Productivity in Katsina State; a case study of Kankara Local Government.Research Paper. Department of' Economics A.B.U. Zaria, Nigeria.

Tauna, A. (2016). We have tamed cattle rustling; we will tame kidnapping–Northern governors. Daily Post, January 30th. Retrieved from: http://dailypost.ng/2016/01/30/we-have-tamed-cattlerustling-wewill-tackle-kidnapping-northern-governors

Yusuf, V. (2015). Deadly persistence of cattle rustling. Daily Trust, May 16th. Retrieved www.dailytrust.com.ng/weekly/index.php/features/20488-deadly-persistence-of-cattle-rustling

TABLES

Table 1: Effect of banditry on income of the livestock farming

Before Banditry (2018)	**Before Banditry (2018)**	**Before Banditry (2018)**	**During Banditry (2024)**	**During Banditry (2024)**	**During Banditry (2024)**	**During Banditry (2024)**
Variables	Average Income (₦)	SD	Average Income (₦)	SD	Difference	t-value
Cattle	12,028,000	3893148	4,408,000	1973069	7,620,000	24.690***
Sheep	295,200	143611	177,600	113112	117,600	9.098***
Goat	219,150	133495	368,850	133414	-149,700	-11.217***

Table 2: Other Sources of Income apart from Livestock Farming in the Study Area

Before Banditry (2018	**Before Banditry (2018**	**Before Banditry (2018**	**Before Banditry (2018**	**During Banditry (2021)**	**During Banditry (2021)**	**During Banditry (2021)**	**During Banditry (2021)**
Average	Average Income (₦)	SD	Average Income (₦)	Average Income (₦)	SD	Difference	t-value
Crop Farmers	3,277,372	1687889	1,966,423	1,966,423	1012733	1,310,949	7.795***
Traders	1,536,458	693798	1,102,127	1,102,127	481219	434,331	3.538***
Transporter	2,125,000	629153	1,062,500	1,062,500	314576	1,062,500	3.021*
Weavers	800,000	100,000	480,000	480,000	480000	320,000	4.753**
Civil Servant	480,000	146969	480,000	480,000	146969	0	ns
Tailors	427,272	64667	299,091	299,091	45267	128,182	5.386***
Welders	2,000,000	707107	1400,000	1400,000	494974	600,000	1.703ns
Mechanics	1,500,000	500000	750,000	750,000	250000	750,000	2.324*

Table 3: Perceived effect of banditry on the income of the respondents in study area

Predictor Variable (Impact of Banditry)	Regression Coefficient (β)	Standard Error (SE)	t-value
Ransom payment	-0.12	0.033	-3.636***
Migration due banditry	0.38	0.059	6.441***
Frequency of attacks	0.13	0.030	4.333***
Livestock numbers owns	0. 20	0. 047	4.255***
access to veterinary service	0.27	0.081	3.333***
Low in participation Weekly contribution	0.60	0.271	2.216*
Restrictions on local Market	0. 3	0.3	1.000ns
Restrictions on inter-.Market	0 .3	0 .3	1. 000ns
Restrictions on mobile Network	0.3	0.3	1.000ns
Farming experience	0.63	0.016	4.049***
Constant	12.23	0 .399	30.652***