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**ABSTRACT**

The cost of rural crime is at its highest since return to democracy in Nigeria. However, the picture is not quite the same in every part of the rural areas. This study was, therefore conducted to find out the effects of crimes in rural family livelihoods in Ogbomoso Agricultural zone of Oyo State. In conducting this study, 90 rural families were selected from the zone through a multistage sampling procedure. Data were analyzed using both descriptive (frequency count, percentage and mean) and inferential (Pearson Product Moment Correlation) statistics using SPSS version 22. The result showed that prevalence crimes include: stealing /theft of all forms, invasion of farm by herdsmen, barn breaking, illegal hunting and arson/bush burning. The study also found out that crime posed major effects on rural family livelihoods which included loss of stored products, loss of resources, loss of soil fertility, loss of yield of crop, crop destruction and loss of work time. The frequency of occurrence of various crime was found to be positive and significantly related to the effects of crime on rural family livelihoods. The outcome of this study revealed that the effects of crime were massive on rural family livelihoods. The study recommended an urgent need to implement security framework at farm level to curtail the menace of crime/criminality in order to enhance rural family livelihoods.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Rural crime primarily refers to criminal acts that transpire within areas classified as being rural. These acts are generally the same acts (i.e., burglary, robbery, assault, etc.) that are frequently perpetrated in urban and suburban environments. Agricultural crime involves offenses that either target agricultural property or are committed on agricultural property (Dunkelberger, Clayton, Myrick, and Lyles 1992). While normally involving a wide spectrum of offenses, some of the more prevalent acts include agricultural theft, vandalism, illegal hunting/poaching, illegal dumping of trash/refuse, and trespassing. Overall, crime including corruption is much more pronounced in developing countries than in industrialized countries (Zvekic and Alvazzi del Frate, 1995). Similarly, the Corruption Perception Index from Transparency International shows that developing countries are mostly the ones being represented at the bottom of the list indicating high levels of corruption. Property crime is the most frequent type of crime exceeding, sometimes, even the 50% level. Within the developing world, Sub Saharan Africa (SSA) is the most affected by crime, while Asia is least affected (Zvekic and Alvazzi del Frate, 1995).

Crime has been found to hamper development of rural areas in a serious way.

Ceccato (2016) points out that “crime and safety are important dimensions of sustainable rural development”. In other words, persisting crime in rural areas is likely to result in unsustainable development, depriving people of their livelihoods and promoting the outmigration of often. The report from the zones verbally has shown that crime in the zone has caused devastating effects on livelihood, food security and rural development in the zone

Against this background, this study seeks to identify the effects of crime in the zone in order to proffer solution to the problem. On that note the the general objective was to examine the effect of crime on rural family livelihood in ogbomoso agricultural zone oyo-state

The specific objectives were to:

1. examine the socio-economic characteristics of the rural family in the study area;
2. determine frequency of occurrence of various crime in the study area;
3. investigate the effects of crime on rural family livelihoods in the study area.

The hypothesis tested for the study is as follows; Ho: There is no significant relationship between frequency of occurrence of crimes and effects of crimes on rural family livelihoods.

**METHODOLOGY**

The study was carried out in Ogbomoso

Agricultural Zone of Oyo State.

Ogbomoso Agricultural Zone is made up of five Local Government Areas (LGAs), namely Ogbomoso North Local Government Area (LGA), Ogbomoso South LGA, Ogo-Oluwa LGA, Oriire LGA and Surulere LGA respectively.

Multi Stage Sampling technique was used to select 90 respondents which involves purposive selection of three Local Government Areas (Oriire, Surulere and Ogo-Oluwa) rural in nature.

Random selection of 3 wards out of 14 wards from each of the selected Local Government Areas. Thirty (30) rural families each from the selected wards were randomly chosen. This give us a total sample size of 90 respondents.

Data collection from the respondents was mainly through structured questionnaire. Information contained in the structured questionnaire were based on the objectives of the study. Data were analyzed using both descriptive (frequency count, percentage and mean) and inferential (Pearson Product Moment Correlation) statistics using SPSS version 22.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Socioeconomic characteristics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Distribution of respondents by** **socioeconomic characteristics (n = 90)**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Socioeconomic characteristics** | **Frequency** | **Percentage** | **Mean** | | **Age** |  |  |  | | ≤ 30 | 2 | 2.2 |  | | 31 – 40 | 9 | 10.0 |  | | 41 – 50 | 39 | 43.3 | 50.10 | | Above 50  **Marital status** | 40 | 44.5 |  | | Single | 4 | 4.4 |  | | Married | 81 | 90.1 |  | | Separated | 1 | 1.1 |  | | Widowed  **Household size** | 4 | 4.4 |  | | 1 – 2 | 2 | 2.2 |  | | 3 – 4 | 4 | 4.4 | **6.02** | | 5 – 6 | 51 | 56.7 |  | | Above 6  **Level of education** | 33 | 36.7 |  | | No formal education | 14 | 15.6 |  | | Primary school education | 38 | 42.2 |  | | Secondary school education | 28 | 31.1 |  | | Tertiary education | 9 | 10.0 |  | | Non-formal education  **Primary occupation** | 1 | 1.1 |  | | Farming | 63 | 70.0 |  | | Herding | 6 | 6.7 |  | | Trading | 11 | 12.2 |  | | Civil services | 6 | 6.7 |  | |

Table 1 shows that the mean age of all the respondents was approximately 50years which implies that majority of these respondents are still in their active years and productive age. The education distribution of the respondents shows that 15.6% of the respondents had no formal educational while only 1.1% had non-formal education, 42.2% of the respondents had primary school education, 31.1% had secondary education while 10.0% had tertiary education. This shows that respondents in the study are not illiterate, the high education level can increase the productivity of the respondents because it has been sh**Effects of crime on rural family livelihoods in the study area**

Based on the result in the Table 3, the perceived effects of various types of crimes/criminality on rural family livelihoods identified in the study area in their rank order include loss of soil fertility (WMS = 4.97), loss of yield of crop (WMS = 4.91), increased in migration patterns of youth (WMS = 4.87), crop destruction (WMS = 4.81), loss of work time (WMS = 4.73), financial and personal losses for farmer (WMS = 4.69), increased prices of goods/agricultural products (WMS = 4.60), reduction in food quality\quantity (WMS = 4.46), displacement/migration of labour (WMS = 4.44) and increased incidence of deforestation through illegal felling of timber (4.44) and others.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Table 2:** **Distribution of respondents by frequency of occurrence of various types of crimes (n = 90)**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Type of crimes/criminality** | **Frequency of occurrence** | | |  |  |  | |  | **Very often** | **Often** | **Rarely** | **Not at all** | **WMS** | **Rank** | | Grievous Harm or Wounding (GHW) | 0(0.0) | 12(13.3) | 17(18.9) | 61(67.8) | 0.46 | 10th | | Invasion of farm by herdsmen | 14(15.6) | 58(64.4) | 16(17.8) | 2(2.2) | 1.93 | 2nd | | Assault | 0(0.0) | 12(13.3) | 20(22.2) | 58(64.4) | 0.49 | 9th | | Vandalism | 3(3.3) | 13(14.4) | 10(11.1) | 64(71.1) | 0.50 | 8th | | Arson/Bush burning | 10(11.1) | 51(56.7) | 12(13.3) | 17(18.9) | 1.60 | 5th | | Stealing/theft of all forms | 15(15.6) | 73(81.1) | 2(2.2) | 0(0.0) | 2.14 | 1st | | Barn Breaking | 7(7.8) | 52(57.8) | 27(30.0) | 4(4.4) | 1.69 | 3rd | | Poisoning of livestock | 1(1.1) | 12(13.3) | 30(33.3) | 47(52.2) | 0.63 | 7th | | Raping | 0(0.0) | 5(5.6) | 5(5.6) | 80(88.9) | 0.17 | 13th | | Illegal hunting | 4(4.4) | 63(70.0) | 14(15.6) | 9(10.0) | 1.69 | 3rd | | Homicide (killing) | 0(0.0) | 6(6.7) | 4(4.4) | 80(88.9) | 0.18 | 12th | | Drug abuse | 10(11.1) | 27(30.0) | 30(33.3) | 23(25.6) | 1.34 | 6th | | Cultism | 2(2.2) | 8(8.9) | 2(2.2) | 78(86.7) | 0.27 | 11th | | Kidnapping | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 11(12.2) | 79(87.8) | 0.12 | 14th | |   **Various types of crimes and frequency of occurrence in the study area**  Based on the result in the Table 2, the frequency of occurrence of various types of crimes/criminality identified in the study area in their rank order include stealing/theft of all forms (WMS = 2.14), invasion of farm by herdsmen (WMS = 1.93), barn breaking (WMS = 1.69), illegal hunting (WMS = 1.69), arson/bush burning (WMS = 1.60), drug abuse (WMS = 1.34), poisoning of livestock (WMS = 0.63), vandalism (WMS = 0.50), assault (WMS = 0.49), Grievous Harm or Wounding (GHW) (WMS = 0.46), cultism (WMS = 0.27), homicide (killing) (WMS = 0.18), raping (WMS = 0.17) and kidnapping (WMS =  0.12). It was the  **Table 3:** **Distribution** **of respondents by perceived effects of the crime (n = 90)**  **SA = Strongly Disagree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Perceived effects of the crime/criminality** | **SA** | **A** | **U** | **D** | **SD** | **WMS** | **Rank** | | Loss of household resources | 78(86.7) | 12(13.3) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.37 | 15th | | Increased in migration patterns of youth | 33(36.7) | 57(63.3) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.87 | 3rd | | Displacement/migration of labour | 40(44.4) | 50(55.6) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.44 | 10th | | Increased prices of goods/agricultural products | 54(60.0) | 36(40.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.60 | 8th | | Loss of stored products | 74(82.2) | 16(17.8) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.82 | 4th | | Loss of yield of crop | 82(91.1) | 8(8.9) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.91 | 2nd | | Loss of soil fertility | 87(96.7) | 3(3.3) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.97 | 1st | | Loss of land | 20(22.2) | 55(61.1) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 3.90 | 18th | | Destruction of houses, property and farm stead | 2(2.2) | 30(33.3) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 2.09 | 20th | | Loss of self-esteem | 41(45.6) | 48(53.3) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.42 | 12th | | Job dissatisfaction/unwillingness to invest in agriculture beyond subsistence level | 35(38.9) | 55(61.1) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.39 | 14th | | Reduction in food quality\quantity | 41(45.6) | 49(54.4) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.46 | 9th | | Emotional exhaustion/ Psychological stresses e.g. fear of shock | 38(42.2) | 17(18.9) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.42 | 12th | | Crop destruction | 73(81.1) | 28(31.1) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.81 | 5th | | Financial and personal losses for farmer | 62(68.9) | 24(26.7) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.69 | 7th | | Loss of work time | 66(73.3) | 60(66.7) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.73 | 6th | | Loss of future breeding herbs and blood lines | 30(44.4) | 50(55.6) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.33 | 16th | | Increased incidence of deforestation through illegal felling of timber | 40(44.4) | 57(63.3) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 0(0.0) | 4.44 | 10th | | Losses of animals | 30(33.3) | 9(10.0) | 0(0.0) | 1(1.1) | 2(2.2) | 4.24 | 17th | | Loss of life | 11(12.2) | 41(45.6) | 1(1.1) | 5(5.6) | 64(74.1) | 1.87 | 21th | | Relocation/migration of affected farmers | 16(17.8) | 41(45.6) | 1(1.1) | 7(7.8) | 25(27.8) | 3.18 | 19th | |

The hypothesis testing result of the Pearson’s Products Moment Correlation (PPMC) analysis indicated that the frequency of occurrence of various crime was positive and significantly related to the perceived effects of crimes on rural family livelihoods (r=0.31\*\*\*; p= 0.002).

Therefore, we reject Ho.

**C**own that farmers with high education level will be able to adopt new technologies in production.  **CONCLUSION**

The research concludes that most frequent crime in the zone was stealing of any form, invasion of farm by herdsmen, breaking of barn and bush burning. The most perceived effect of crime in the study area were loss of soil fertility, yield losses, youth’s migration and financial losses.

All these have negative effects (food insecurity and poverty) on livelihood of farmers in the zone.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are necessary:

1. There is need for all security outfits to give priority to crime reduction rather than enforcement, particularly by using indicators that measure crime trends such as victimization surveys.
2. There is also adequate need for all security outfits to use planning and strategy at the command level, set targets in terms of crime reduction, and use tactics focused on repeat offender, victim and location considerations.
3. Planning must select targets that are amenable to enforcement and collabourate with other agencies able to tackle the underlying causes.

**REFERENCES**

Ceccato, V. (2016): Rural crime and community safety, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Van Dijk, J. (2008): The World of Crime. Breaking the Silence on Problems of Crime, Justice, and Development across the World. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks et al.van Kesteren, J., Van Dijk, J. and P. Mayhew (2014): The international crime victims surveys: A retrospective, *International Review of Victimology*, 20(1), 49–69.

Zvekic, U. and A. Alvazzi Del Frate (eds.) (1995): Criminal victimisation in the developing world. United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute, Rome.

Adeola, R. G. and Ayoade, A. R. (2009). Effects of gender differences on access to technologies among farmers in Ibadan/Ibarapa

Agricultural zone of Oyo State, Nigeria. *Ozean Journal of Social Science 2(2) 2009 pp 65-72.*

Dunkelberger, J. E., Clayton, J. M., Myrick, R. S., and Lyles, G. J. (1992). Crime and Alabama Farms: Victimization, Subjective Assessment, and Protective Action. Alabama Agricultural Experiment Station:

Auburn University