# TWO SIDES OF DEVELOPMENT: PROJECTS AND CONFLICTS IN THE OIL PRODUCING AREAS OF ONDO STATE

**A.S. Jimoh**
**Peace and Conflicts Study Programme, Institute of African Studies, University of Ibadan**
**and**
**F.B. Olorunfemi**
**Social and Governance Policy Research Department, Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research, Ojoo, Ibadan**
**E-mail: felixba2000@yahoo.com**

**Abstract**
*It has been established that the processes of development and conflicts are intrinsically linked and that interventions aimed at speeding development or controlling conflict must take account of both dimensions. This study explored the multiple ways in which development projects in the oil producing areas of Ondo State cause or trigger new conflicts, and/or interact with existing tensions, as well as the different ways in which they can be used (directly and indirectly) to reduce the likelihood of conflicts turning violent. The study primary data for the information needed to successfully fulfill the objectives of the research. Primary data involved the use of structured questionnaire, in-depth interview and focus group discussions (FGDs). Results showed that most of the communities sampled have experienced conflicts at one time or the other endengered by development projects. Findings revealed that the nature of the conflicts they have experienced in various communities include communal clashes, rioting, vandalizaiton of projects, burning of the properties and rejection of projects. The causes of these conflicts were shown as those occasioned by sharing methods adopted, land disputes, project allocation, lopsidedness of projects, manipulation/shoddy work, corruption and segmentation. Most of these conflicts according to the findings started at proposal and through to execution and commissioning stages. As it is expected of most conflicts, tensions were generated, and the indicators of such tensions include social instability, migration from one community to another, delay/abandonment of projects lopsidedness, changing of project locations, demolition of projects, and rejection of projects.*

**Keywords:** Conflicts; development; development projects; communal clashes; oil.

## Introduction

It is broadly recognised that stability and peace are prerequisites for poverty alleviation and a successful development process – and that sustainable development, when successfully pursued, reinforces human security, stability, and peace. Years of investment in development projects have been destroyed because of violent conflict, and decades of development gains can be wiped out by one civil war. Many developing countries are fragile though they may not be experiencing violent conflict, and the engagement of outside actors, even in seemingly-unrelated sectors, is likely to have a significant impact on the way that a country's political, social, and economic tensions evolve or are resolved (Egunjobi, 2005; Albert, 2001; Bates, 2000; Nwafor 2006; Oshita 2005).

It is clear that the processes of development and conflict are intrinsically linked and that interventions aimed at speeding development or controlling conflict must take account of both dimensions. Development projects, when implemented well, can play a significant role. Creating and/or supporting spaces for deliberation and the involvement of civil society in them is vital to helping stimulate and smooth processes of social, political and economic change (Fung and Wright 2003). Such tasks are a 30 key ingredient in making 'the everyday state' (Corbridge et al 2005) in Indonesia—the state as encountered by poor and marginalized people— more inclusive, accountable and effective.

Development projects both shape and are shaped by the contexts—the social, political and economic structures—in which they operate (Mosse, 2005). The resources that development projects introduce, and the incentives these produce, help shape the structural and relational contexts in which conflict becomes more or less likely to arise and/or to escalate. Development projects are basically addition to existing resources. However, in recent years, development projects such as building construction for health or education, road construction and provision of electricity are gradually becoming intervention and peace building strategies particularly in the oil producing area of Nigeria, generally refer to as the Niger Delta Region.

According to Albert (2005), the Nigerian society is a social system compounded by contested demands on access to scarce resources especially in the political and economic fields. It is a society defined by natural cleavages and man-made conflicts. Natural membership of ethnic groups and occupational specializations threatened by the expanding interests of other multiple users in the same or adjoining ecological zones, surviving administrative attributes of colonialism, states and their political-administrative activities, religious practices and fanaticism, expected divergence in the identification and perception of the use of limited resources, etc., provide grounds for the emergence of conflicts. The scale and dimensions of conflicts vary according to the issues involved in relation to the cultures concerned. A major source of conflicts has been in the oil-rich Niger Delta region of Nigeria. While Otite and Albert, (2004) identified major clashes in communities in deltaic areas of Nigeria since 1960's and particularly in the 1990s for reasons being claims over territories in which oil exploration companies operate and for which royalty and amenities and development projects are expected; Egunjobi, (2005) is of the opinion that almost all conflict situations conceivable and empirically observable have environmental implications either by cause or consequence or both.

The literature has extensively covered the structural factors responsible for the variety of conflict in Nigeria. Particularly notable are Anifowose (1982), Okoye (1998), Otite and Albert (1999), Osagae et al (2001), Olowu (2001) and Albert (2005). There are also case studies on most of the major long-standing conflict in Nigeria, Egunjobi, (2005). However Bassey, (2003) detected a major gap that is "the psycho-cultural dispositions which determine the escalation of conflict in Niger Delta Region and by extension Ilaje and Ese Odo Local Government Areas, have been hardly addressed.

This study explores the multiple ways in which development projects cause or trigger new conflicts, and/or interact with existing tensions, as well as the different ways in which they can be used (directly and indirectly) to reduce the likelihood of conflicts turning violent. At best, development projects can support existing processes of change, manage the tensions generated by the projects themselves, widen participation, and have primarily indirect yet positive impacts on conflict management in general. At worst—particularly poorly implemented development projects and those which ignore context, variability, and local expertise—can exacerbate tensions, worsen community relations, and even trigger violent conflict, all undermining the development process.

The specific objectives of the study include identification of conflict impacts prior to project implementation; identification of local concerns and needs in advance and knowledge of how physical elements of a project interact with the social organization and psycho-cultural disposition of local communities, and provide proponents with the opportunity to ensure that there is concordance between the project and people; better and informed decision making on project implementation to ensure that desired benefits are enjoyed by the people.

## Ondo State Oil Producing Areas Development Commission and local projects

Ilaje and Ese Odo Local Government Areas are two oil producing areas of Ondo State that made the state to be constitutionally qualified as part of the Niger Delta Development Commission and by extension an oil producing state within the

fiscal framework of Nigeria. In recognition of special fiscal allocation accruing to the Ondo State Government by virtue of oil deposits in some communities, and an awareness of potential and real agitation associated with the Niger Deltas' socio-economic and environmental needs, the state government established the Ondo State Oil Producing Areas Development Commission (OSOPADEC) to cater specifically for the people of the oil producing communities by providing basic infrastructure, projects and other activities that could alleviate the suffering of the people.

The Ondo State Oil Producing Areas Development Commission (OSOPADEC) was created to achieve sustainable development of the oil producing areas of Ondo State through the receipt and exclusive administration of the 40% of the 13% oil derivation fund accruing to the Ondo State Government. The administrative structure of the Commission afford an indigene of the oil producing areas to be appointed as its full-time Executive Chairman, which created a lot of goodwill from the people.

The functions of the commission are to receive and administer exclusively, 40% of the 13% oil derivation fund accruing to Ondo State Government for the rehabilitation and development of oil producing areas in the state and other development projects as may be determined from time to time by the Commission; to liaise with the relevant Federal Government and State Government authorities on the control and effective methods of tackling the problems of coastal erosion, oil pollution and spillages in the State; to ensure fair and equitable distribution of development projects in the oil producing areas of the State.

The relationship between resources and conflict have been established in the literature (Okoye, 1998, Otite and Albert 1999, Osagae et al 2001, Olowu (Ed) 2001 and Albert 2001). Therefore, development projects (resources) embarked upon by OSOPADEC has potential to promote and sustain peace (intended outcome) and paradoxically it could be a source of violent conflict (unintended outcome). Thus, it is possible that a project may fail according to limited developmental criteria but succeed in terms of beneficial impact on peace. On the other hand, it is possible that a project may succeed according to pre-determined developmental criteria but fail in terms of a beneficial impact on peace (Bush 1998).

**Conceptualising the development-conflict nexus**

Over the last decades, the international development community has shown a renewed interest in the issue of conflict, as an item of both empirical study and policy concern, i.e., as a 'problem' to be addressed and whose unhappy consequences must be reduced and redressed. Much of this stems from the recognition of a number of truths which had previously received scant attention but which early failures of the post-colonial and (more recently) the post-socialist development effort exposed all too clearly.

First, in an increasing number of cases, early development 'wins' in terms of accelerated economic growths were undercut by outbreaks of social unrest. It became clear that destructive conflict could set back, by decades, hard-won social and economic development gains. In El Salvador, Sierra Leone and Kosovo, for example, outbreaks of civil war thwarted the best ideas of the development planners. It became increasingly clear that development investments which did not factor in the potential for conflict in the contexts in which they operated could be (and indeed were) wasted: what use was there in building a road, renovating a hospital or opening a school if the resulting infrastructure was burned down in a violent protest, if doctors would not work in the hospital because of security concerns, or if children were too frightened (or being lured) by local militia groups to pay much attention to their homework? This led to the rise of the field of 'conflict studies' within the development industry.

Second, the rise of the view of development as being the pursuit of increased 'freedom' Sen (1999) provided a basis for mainstreaming consideration of security issues into development thinking. The physical, economic and psychological insecurity that accompanies

outbreaks of violence—and that lingers long thereafter—negatively impacts on freedom, opportunity and choice, the basis of development itself. This helped give rise to the concept of 'human security' and, coupled with the rise of human rights approaches Uvin (2004) and the clear persistence of intra-state wars in the aftermath of the Cold War, provided a broad basis for both scholars and practitioners to take a more pragmatic interest in conflict.

Third, it became increasingly clear that not only were development interventions at times ineffectual in the face of violent conflict, they were also, in other cases, an actual cause of conflict. One extreme example, carefully documented by Uvin (1998), was the development industry's role in the lead-up to the tragic genocide in Rwanda in 1994. In the humanitarian field, a debate emerged over the political role of interventions and the inability of actors (such as the International Red Cross or Medicin San Frontier) to be neutral agents. Recognizing the damaging impacts of conflict, aid agencies increasingly tried to design projects that were "conflict sensitive" and that would "do no harm" Anderson (1999). Over time, as Uvin (2002) usefully outlines, paradigms about the linkages between development and conflict changed, from early efforts to ensure development projects promoted peace to work on post-reconciliation, conflict prevention and the use of human security as an organizing concept for development programming.

However, the theoretical and empirical basis for integrating understanding of conflict into development practice is still weak, and arguably, limits evaluation of the complexities of the development-conflict nexus. One reason is that conflict is primarily seen (in much, although certainly not all, of the literature, but overwhelmingly in development practice) as a problem that can be prevented or mitigated through either policies that change underlying structures (e.g., reducing poverty, changing the prevailing ethnic make-up of localities) or that can be contained within development projects, through attention to distributional issues and other aspects of 'conflict sensitivity' in project design and implementation. That violent conflict constitutes a barrier to development should be self evident; however, such views inadequately recognize the necessity of non-violent social conflict in all countries, but especially developing countries, where poverty and lack of opportunity underscore the need for change and where, conversely, otherwise desirable periods of economic growth themselves can readily become, as discussed above, a potentially destabilizing force by realigning class structures and reshaping the bases of group identity (Moore 1967; Bates 2000; Bayly 2003).

Another reason is that despite the theoretical and methodological diversity of work on conflict, only a small portion has significantly influenced development policy and practice. Methodologically, there has been an almost exclusive focus on large-scale conflicts ('revolutions', 'civil wars') at the national level using large-scale cross-country datasets, at the expense of consideration of local conflicts. While conflict management has become a sub-field of the development enterprise, recent advances in social and political theory on the relationship between conflict and development (Varshney, 2002) are yet to fully inform the mainstream perspectives (on the means and ends of development) that drive contemporary development policy and practice. Even within the contemporary 'mainstream', practical theories and models for understanding when and how conflict can be productive (rather than destructive) are still to emerge.

**Methodology**
The analysis of the research questions adopt the Actor-Trigger-Conflict Model (Bush, 1998) that explains differences between patterns of conflict development within the social systems in which the eruption of violence is dependent on the existence of intervening variables (dynamics, trends, triggers and potential scenarios). The study utilised primary data to address the objectives of the study. This was obtained from the use of structured questionnaire and Focus Group Discussions as well as indepth interviews. The questionnaires elicited interview on the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents, projects in their communities,

conflicts and resolution methods. Key persons interviewed are top management staff of OSOPADEC, individuals and groups in Ilaje and Ese-Odo Local Government Areas. This was, however, complemented with information from secondary sources such as government published and unpublished documents and policy statements.

The study focused on Ilaje and Ese Odo Local Government Areas (Oil Producing Areas) of Ondo State. 10 communities were selected in which 20 questionnaires each were administered. Therefore, in all, 200 questionnaires were administered in 10 communities. The sampling frame is as presented in

Table 1

Table 1: Sampling frame

| Local Government Areas | Communities | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ilaje | Igbekebo | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Kiribo | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Igbobini | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Arogbo | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Ajapa | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |
| Ese Odo | Igbokoda | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Awoye | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Molutehin | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Ode Ugbo | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Ode Mahin | 20 | 20.0 |
| | Total | 100 | 100.0 |

The study utilized qualitative data analysis. The qualitative data analysis involves the description of the data contained in the household questionnaires using simple frequency tables and percentages. Qualitative data analysis was also used to do the content analysis of information obtained from the FGDs in various communities as well as the interviews conducted with OSOPADEC officials and other Ondo State officials.

**The study area**
The Study areas for this study comprise two local government areas in the southern part of Ondo State: Ese-Odo LGA and Ilaje LGA. Ese-Odo Local Government comprises of two tribes that is the Ijaw Arogbos' and the Apois'. These are the 2 ethnic groups in Ese- Odo LGA. These two ethnic groups live in 2 different geographical locations. The Apois' live in the upland – Keribo, Igbobini, Igbekebo, Igbotu while the Ijaws' lives in the riverine areas, they live on the water – Arogbo, Ajapa, Opoba, Bolowo, Andolesema.

The headquarters of Ese-Odo LGD is Igbekebo. The communities are mostly rural except the administrative headquarters that are quite urban. Therefore the livelihoods of the people are tied mostly farming, fishing and trading.

**Results and discussions**

**Socio-demographic characteristics of respondents**
The results presented in Table 2 shows that majority of the respondents are between age grade of 30-49 years old (48.5 per cent) followed by those who are 50 years and above (32.0 per cent). The implication of this is that most of the respondents are matured enough to understand the isues at hand and can reflect to some extent events that are happening within their domain now and in the recent past. As a result of this, their responses could be relied upon for empirical analysis. Also the data revealed that the male respondents are in majority in this study (59.5

percent) while females consituted the remaining    40.5 percent.

Table 2: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

| Age | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Less than 30 years | 39 | 19.5 |
| 30 – 49 years | 97 | 48.5 |
| 50 years and above | 64 | 32.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |
| Occupation | | |
| Trading | 35 | 17.5 |
| Farming | 21 | 10.5 |
| Fishing | 60 | 30.0 |
| Civil service | 55 | 27.5 |
| Schooling | 18 | 09.0 |
| Others | 11 | 5.5 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |
| Length of Stay in the Community | | |
| Less than 20 years | 99 | 49.5 |
| Between 20 – 50 years | 80 | 40.0 |
| Above 50 years | 21 | 10.5 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

Source: Authors' analysis, 2012

The educational qualification of the respondents revealed as follows: tertiary education (37.5 percent), holders of secondary school certificate (31.5 percent); primary school (16.5 percent) while 14.5 percent did not have any formal education.

More than half of the total number of respondents is self employed (Table 2). The major occupations engaged in include trading (17.5 percent); Farming (10.5 percent); Fishing (30 percent); Artisan (1.5 percent); Business (3.5 percent)]. Another equally substantial proportion (27.5 percent) of the respondents are into paid employment (Civil service) while about 9 percent of the respondents are students.

On the average income earned by the respondents per month, data shows that 30.5 percent earns between N20, 000 – N50, 000 per month; 37 percent earns between N10, 000 – N20, 000 per month and 21 percent earns less than N10, 000 per month. About 10.5 percent of the respondents did not indicate their average income per month.

It is also revealed in Table 2 that 49.5 percent of the respondents have spent less than 20 years in the communities under focus in this study. Those that have been living in the community between 20 – 50 years are 40 percent while those who have spent more than 50 years in these communities are 10.5 percent. From the foregoing, majority of the respondents have spent more than 20 years in the communities thereby putting them in vantage position to give detail information about issues under focus in this study.

**Patterns and problems of project implementation in the area**

As revealed in Table 3, it is obvious that the Local Government is the largest provider of health care services (87 percent) followed by the state government (49 percent). The state government topped the list in provision of educational (schools) facilities for the people in the study areas (78.5 percent), OSOPADEC (16 percent) and Local government (12 percent) are the next in ranking. In terms of provisions of electricity OSOPADEC took the lead (50.5

percent) followed by the Federal Government (18.5 percent).

OSOPADEC still maintained the top position in provision of water (62 percent) to the people in the study area. The state government also played significant role (28 percent); followed by those who are into water provision for commercial purposes (private sector) (21 percent) and the

Local Government 17 (percent). OSOPADEC (36 percent) the Local Government (13 percent) and the State Government (12.5 percent)   were very prominent in provision of road facilities for the poor in the study area. Only the local government played significant role in provision of recreation centres (25 percent).

Table 3: Providers of facilities

| Facilities | Federal Government | State Government | Local Government | OSOPADEC | Private Individuals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Health Services | 12% | 49% | 87% | 7% | 2% |
| Schools | 6.5% | 78.5% | 12% | 16% | 6% |
| Electricity | 18.5% | 6% | 1.5% | 50.5% | - |
| Water | 4.5% | 28% | 17% | 62% | 21% |
| Road | 4% | 12.5% | 13% | 36% | 2.5% |
| Recreation centre | 2% | 2% | 25% | 1.5% | 1.5% |
| Assisted Mass transit | 0.5% | 5.5% | 2.5% | - | - |

Source: Authors' Analysis, 2012

Environmental problems are of serious concern in the oil producing region of Nigeria and a major source of conflict. Therefore we sought information on environmental problems that are present in the study area. Information on environmental problems in the study area (Table 4) revealed that deforestation was prominent though not severe according to 44.5 percent of the respondents. Those who perceived it as severe were 19.5 percent. 65.5 percent of the respondents said soil erosion constituted another

major environment problem in the study area. On the issue of water pollution, 71 percent of the respondents saw this as constituting major environmental problem. Inadequate potable water is another significant problem mentioned by the respondents. 64.5 percent noted its severity. For habitat destruction 49 percent of the respondents said the situation is severe; Though noted as constituting environmental problem, bush burning was noted as not being severe by 41.5 percent. Only 10.5 percent saw it as being severe.

Table 4: Existence and degree of environmental problems in the area

| Environmental problems | Very severe | Severe | Not severe | Not Applicable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Deforestation | 3% | 16.5% | 44.5% | 36% |
| Soil Erosion | 40% | 25.5% | 28.5% | 6% |
| Water pollution | 60.5% | 10.5% | 29% | |
| Inadequate potable water | 55.5% | 9% | 10% | 25.5% |
| Habitat destruction | 33.5% | 15.5% | 14% | 37% |
| Bush Burning | 1.0% | 9.5% | 41.5% | 48% |

Source: Authors' Fieldwork, 2012

The information presented in Table 5 revealed that the local concerns and their needs have to some extent informed the implementation of development projects. These concerns/needs include social protection, freedom and participation; the levels of participation by women in political processes; traditional authority structures; formal or informal political structures or processes; economic infrastructure; equitable sharing of project benefits; access to scare resources; employment/income generation; positive interaction between groups; social services and health care; the ability of individual to work together for mutual benefits; the community's vulnerability to violence from outside, or their capacity to community violence against outsiders; and the individuals or group sense of security. Rather than being hindrance to development projects these concerns/needs have helped greatly. This is evidenced in the data generated from the study (see Table 5).

Table 5: Local concerns/needs on development projects

| Activities | Helped | Hindered | NR/NA |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Protection, freedom and participation | 96.5% | 2.5% | 1% |
| The levels of participation by women in political processes | 97.5% | 2.5% | - |
| Traditional authority structures | 97% | 3% | - |
| Formal or informal political structures | 94% | 6% | - |
| Economic infrastructure | 85.5% | 14.5% | - |
| Equitable sharing of project benefits | 78.5% | 21.5% | - |
| Employment/income generations | 92.5% | 7.5% | - |
| Positive interaction between groups | 91.5% | 8.5% | - |
| Social services and health care | 91% | 9% | - |
| The ability of individual to work together for mutual benefits | 80% | 20% | - |
| The community's vulnerability to violence from outside | 77.5% | 22.5% | - |
| The individuals or group sense of security | 76.5% | 23.5% | - |
| Access to scarce resources | 81.5% | 18.5% | - |

Source: Authors' Analysis, 2008

Central interests and incentives of different actors (political/pressure groups) in the area according to the information obtained from the questionnaire include promotion of peace and order (40 percent); even distribution of resources (14 percent); promotion of peace and development (32 percent); rapid infrastructure development (5.5. percent) and poverty reduction (2.5 percent). This information is as presented in Table 6

Table 6:  Central interests and incentives

| Interests/Incentives | Frequency | Percentage |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Promotion of peace and order | 80 | 40.0 |
| Even distribution of resources | 28 | 14.0 |
| Promotion of peace and development | 64 | 32.0 |
| Promotion of human dignity | 9 | 4.5 |
| Poverty reduction | 5 | 2.5 |
| Rapid infrastructure development | 12 | 6.0 |
| Youth empowerment programme | 2 | 1.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

Source: Authors' Analysis

**Stakeholders appraisal of peace and conflict problems in development projects**

Conflicts do arise as a result of project execution in various communities in the study area. This was revealed during the FGD sessions conducted in various communities during the field survey.
A participant at an FGD session in Igbekebo, Mr Owolabi corroborated the conflict situation.

According the information presented in Table 7, even distribution of resources (17.5 percent); inadequate social amenities (14 percent); and

corruption (24 percent) are listed as events that might trigger the balance towards violence/peace in the communities. Other events are: Political instability (8 percent); project awarding process (11.5 percent); marginalization of the less privilege (13 percent); unequitable representation of the less privileged (13 percent); unequitable representation of communities (6 percent); Lack of commitment to execution of project (4 percent) and involvement of stakeholders (2 percent).

Table 7: Conditions triggering conflicts in the area

| Conditions | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Uneven distribution of resources | 35 | 17.5% |
| Inadequate social amenities | 28 | 14.0 |
| Corruption | 48 | 24.0 |
| Political instability | 16 | 8.0 |
| Project awarding process | 23 | 11.5 |
| Marginalization of the less privileged | 26 | 13.0 |
| Unequitable representation of communities | 12 | 6.0 |
| Lack of commitment to execution of projects | 8 | 4.0 |
| Involvement of stakeholder | 4 | 2.0 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

Source: Authors' Analysis, 2012

**Communities, conflicts and peace promoting initiatives**

Data from the study revealed that many of the communities have experienced conflicts before as claimed be 82.5 percent of the respondents.

The remaining 17.5 percent of the respondents said their communities have never experienced conflict before. The nature of the conflicts is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Nature of conflicts in the area

| Nature of Conflicts | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Burning of the properties | 25 | 12.5 |
| Communal clashes | 41 | 20.5 |
| Vandalization of projects | 33 | 16.5 |
| Violent protests | 52 | 26.0 |
| Rejection of project | 10 | 5.0 |
| No response | 39 | 19.5 |
| Total | 200 | 100.0 |

Source: Authors' Analysis, 2012

As seen in the table, violent protests recorded highest response (26.0 percent) followed by communal clashes (20.5 percent); vandalization of projects (16.5 percent) and burning of the properties (12.5 percent). Inquiry on the causes of conflicts in these communities revealed as

follows: project allocation (12 percent); sharing method adopted (20 percent); land dispute (12 percent) political manipulation/shoddy works (8 percent); deception/bad information (1 percent); corruption (7 percent); kidnapping (0.5 percent); lopsidedness (11.5 percent); and segmentation

(2.5 percent); 25.5 percent of the respondents did not answer this question.

Indicating the stage at which conflict started, 62.5 percent of the respondent said it was at proposal stage; 14 percent said at execution stage, while 1.5 percent said the conflict started at project completion stage. Majority of the respondents (65.5 percent) were of the view that tension was generated during the conflict; while 34.5 percent said no tension was generated. Furthermore, the respondents revealed the following as some of outcomes of conflicts; social instability in the communities (34.5 percent); project delay/abandonment (7 percents); rejection project (0.5 percent); demolition of projects (4 percent); failure to fulfill promises by OSOPADEC (0.5 percent); migration from one community to another (6.5 percent); and changing of project location (6.5 percent). The respondents who noted that some groups face discrimination in the community are 83.5 percent; 16.5 percent were of contrary opinion.

**Summary and conclusion**
This study explored the multiple ways in which development projects cause or trigger new conflicts, and/or interact with existing tensions, as well as the different ways in which they can be used (directly and indirectly) to reduce the likelihood of conflicts turning violent. Specifically aim to contribute to the current Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment debate that seeks to integrate peace and conflict issues into the formulation, implementation and evaluation of development projects through a process similar to that used to introduce gender into mainstream of development research and practice. The study is justified based on the fact that stability and peace are prerequisites for poverty alleviation and a successful development process – and that sustainable development, when successfully pursued, reinforces human security, stability, and peace.

Evidences as revealed through the data from this study showed that environmental problems abound in the communities. Environmental problems noted include deforestation; soil erosion, water pollution, inadequate potable water, habitat destruction and bush burning. All the environmental problems noted in the study areas are on severe side except deforestation and bush burning.

Within the entire communities selected for this study, the development projects have helped them in various ways. The projects have enhanced the way they articulate their rights, demands, and how they carry out their social, economies, and political responsibilities. The findings also showed that groups within the communities such as youths, religious, women and political leaders are at the forefront in promoting peace/conflict resolution within the communities.

Creation of peace and order; promotion of peace and development and even distribution of resources are the top priorities of different actors in these communities. To achieve positive results, the findings showed that the stakeholders do (synergize) collaborate to channel their demands into political processes for positive output. The people who have little power to voice their concerns are never neglected but always taken into consideration within the communities so that the peace processes will be further consolidated.

Also, it was shown that most of the communities have experienced conflicts. The nature of the conflict they have experienced include communal clash, rioting/shooting; vandalizaiton of projects, burning of the properties and rejection of projects. The causes of these conflicts were shown as those occasioned by sharing method adopted; land dispute; project allocation; lopsidedness of projects, manipulation/shoddy work; corruption; segmentation. Most of these conflicts according to the findings started at proposal and execution stages. As it is expected of most conflict, tensions were generated; the indicators of such tension include social instability, migration from one community to another, delay/abandonment of projects lopsidedness, changing the project location, demolition of projects, and rejection of projects.

Finally the following were the factors noted in the study as militating against peace process in the communities: corruption/injustice, neglect of

the people, exclusion of youth/stakeholder in decision-making, marginalization, wealth/unequal sharing of dividends among the people; political thuggery, intolerance/misinformation, inadequate infrastructure and lack of government commitment to the people and their demands.

## References

Albert, I.O. (2001): *Introduction to Third-Party Intervention in Community Conflicts*. Ibadan: Peaceful Transformation Forum/John Archers.

Albert, I.O. (2005) *Perspectives on Peace and Conflict in Africa*, Published by Peace and Conflict Studies Programme, Institute of African Studies, University of Ibadan, Ibadan in Collaboration with John Archers (Publishers) Ltd., Dugbe, Ibadan.

Anderson, Mary B. (1999). *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace – Or War.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Anifowose, R. (1982): *Violence and Politics in Nigeria*: NOK

Atkinson, A. and Allen, A. (1998): *The Urban Environment in Development Cooperation: An Overview,* Commission of European Communities, Luxembourg.

Bates, Robert (2000). *Violence and Prosperity: The Political Economy of Development.* New York: Norton.

Bayly, Christopher (2003). *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780-1914: Global Connections and Comparisons.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Corbridge, Stuart, Rene Veron and Manoj Srivastava (2005). *Governance and Governmentality in India*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Crost, B and Johnston, P.B (2010) " *Aid Under Fire: Development Projects and Civil Conflict*". Belfer Center Discussion Paper Series. Discussion Paper No 2010-18. Cambridge MA. Pp 81

Egunjobi Layi (2005): Nigerian Environment Conflict Situation: A review of Selected Cases.

Fung, Archon and Erik Olin Wright (eds.) (2003) *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance.* London: Verso.

Goodhand, Jonathan (2001) *Conflict Assessments: A Synthesis Report*, London: Centre for Defence Studies.http://www.peacestudiesjournal.org.uk/aboutus.asp.

Moore, Barrington (1967). *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lords and Peasants in the Making of the Modern World.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Mosse, David (2005). *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice*. London: Pluto Press.

Nalin Singh Negi and Sujata Ganguly (2011) *"Development Projects vs. Internally Displaced Populations in India: A Literature Based Appraisal"* COMCAD Arbeitspapiere - Working Papers Series on Environmental Degradation and Migration No. 103. Pp 24

Osaghae, E. and Onwudiwe, E. (2001): The Management of the National Question in Nigeria, Ibadan.

Otite, O. and Albert, I.O. (eds) (1999): *Community Conflicts in Nigeria – Management Resolution and Transformation Academics Associates Peace Works/Spectrum, Book Ltd., Ibadan.

Sen, Amartya (1999). *Development as Freedom.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Uvin, Peter (1998). *Aiding Violence: The Development Enterprise in Rwanda.* West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Uvin, Peter (2004). *Human Rights and Development*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Varshney, Ashutosh (2002). *Ethnic Violence and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India.* New Haven: Yale University Press.