

# Community-Based Wildlife Conservation Efforts In Old Oyo National Park, Oyo State Nigeria

**Adeyemi, Muhammed Adewole**

Department of Forestry and Wildlife,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

**Olawale, Saheed Olalekan**

Department of Forestry and Wildlife,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

**Oyeyemi, Ademola Ahmed**

Department of Educational Foundations,  
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka

*Abstract: The basic information of the respondents and their livelihood activities are presented in this section. Table 1 presents the marital status of the respondents. About 59% of the respondents are married. Forty per cent (40%) of the respondents are single while fractions (1.3%) of them are either widows or widowers. The genders of the respondents are half (50%) of the respondents were males while other half (50%) were females. shows the education background of the respondents. Majority of the respondent had formal education with levels ranging from primary through to the University level. It was gathered that 54% of the respondents had secondary education, 22% had primary education. Only 1.3% of the respondents had University education shows the education background of the respondents. Majority of the respondent had formal education with levels ranging from primary through to the University level. It was gathered that 54% of the respondents had secondary education, 22% had primary education. Only 1.3% of the respondents had University education. The primary occupations of the respondents are Majority (67.3%) of them are farmers. About 15% of the respondents are hunters with very few people (8%) engaging in one kind of trade or the others. The summary of descriptive statistics for respondent age, family size and their farm distance to the park boundaries. The family sizes of the respondents ranged between 3 and 12 households with an average of 3 people per household. They ranged between 18 and 70 years. The average age of respondents was 30 years. Also, the distances of their farms to the park boundaries were between 100m and 36km. The mean distance of the farms of respondents to the park boundaries was 11.5km. The earlier involvements of the respondents in community-based wildlife management. Sixty-four percent (64%) of the respondents were earlier involved in one form of community-based forest management or the other. However, 36% of the respondents were never involved in wildlife management in the area nor any other place. The Chi-square test of hypothesis of equal probability for distribution of opinions of respondents on the involvements in community-based wildlife management. The Chi-square analysis was significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). This implies that the opinion was equally distributed among the respondents. There were far more people earlier involved in community wildlife management than those without involvement.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Mutually supportive relationships between communities and nearby protected areas are critical to the long-term success of conservation efforts. In sub-Saharan Africa, many protected areas were first created during colonial times as hunting grounds or parks for European elites, with little or no regard

for the needs or desires of local communities (Adams, 2003; Anderson Neumann, 1998 and Grove, 1987). Today, many of these areas harbour long-standing conflicts over land tenure and resource use (IIED, 1994). These conflicts may create tensions between local communities, protected area staff, and conservation goals (Whitesellet *al.*, 2002; Lilieholm and Romney, 2000; Newmarket *al.* 1994).The Millennium

Ecosystem Assessment (2005) states that “Biodiversity is the foundation of ecosystem services to which human wellbeing is intimately linked. “During the late 19th century and much of the 20th century, efforts to protect bio-diversity in Africa emphasized the designation of protected areas (Adams and McShane, 1992).

Wildlife, like forestry, is a rural based industry which has been employed by early men as a source of food in terms of bushmeat, medicine, rituals, shelter, clothing, weapon, etc. Wildlife to them is indispensable even up till today for the rural populace. Mostly rural people hunt to survive. For example, community near forests in Nigeria obtain 84% of their annual protein from bushmeat (Ajayi, 1972). Grassroots’ wildlife conservation is an alien culture in Nigeria because in the past, hunting was a legitimate occupation of rural dwellers. Osemeobo (1990) remarked that the first attempt at wildlife management was to restrict the hunting rights to the rural people when it was realized that major wild animal species such as *Gorilla gorilla*, *Struthiocamelus* and others were becoming rare and were threatened with extinction and ineffective management of wildlife resources. According to Ayeni (1992), Wildlife conservation in Nigeria started formally in 1916 when the Eastern Nigeria Government Game Law was enacted. The theme of this and subsequent game laws enacted by the Western and Northern Regional Government in 1928 and 1963 respectively, was the preservation of the abundance wild animals for posterity. The idea led to creation game reserves in Nigeria and few other West African countries. Haywood also suggested the abolition of organized hunting drives, use of strong traps, night hunting and urged the establishment of game department to enforce game laws and give special consideration to the endangered species such as giraffes, pigmy hippopotamuses and others.

Presently in Nigeria we have 7 national parks namely Kainji Lake, National Park (534,084km<sup>2</sup>), Niger State, Gashaka Gumti National Park, Taraba State (630,300km<sup>2</sup>), Chad Basin National Park (228,000km<sup>2</sup>)BornoState, Cross River National Park (446,225km<sup>2</sup>) Cross River State, Old Oyo National Park (251,200km<sup>2</sup>) Oyo State, Kamuku National Park (120,000km<sup>2</sup>) Kaduna State, Okomu National Park (11,200km<sup>2</sup>) Edo State (Nigerian National Park Service, 2010).

The concept of community participation in National Park is considered along the line of natural resources for the common benefit of individuals who live within and around the park. The nature of magnitude of benefits derivable from park may very most time align with the ecological variation that exists, sustainability of such accruing benefit depend much on an effective legislation for its management. Park brings eco-tourisms development, findings for the scientists, job opportunity for the outsider and so on while communities around the park live in poverty. Participation in park management will help us know and even check what is taken out from the park at any given time. A participatory park approach will bring sufficient reward to the people and empower rural community to embark on self improvement and community development consequently reduces over dependence on government. By denying the local people access to resources essential for traditional livelihood, normal rural existence becomes impossible without breaking the law.

Hunters and farmers quite literally overnight become poachers and encroachers of such protected area. The conservationist are now beginning to realize that national park management that continues to ignore the needs, aspiration, right and involvement of local people cannot hope to survive and this involves the effective participation of local people in decision making, project design and implementation, project monitoring and project evaluation.

However, conservation and management of park is difficult in areas where communities have become antagonistic to the presence of the park. Therefore a token involvement of local people or community as passive beneficiaries or Oimplementer participation of plan conceived by the outsider is sufficient guarantee for long term security of the park.

Old Oyo National Park is one of the National Parks of Nigeria located across northern Oyo State and southern Kwara State, Nigeria (Nigeria National Park service, 2010). It is rich in plant and animal resources including buffalo bushbuck and a wide variety of birds. The park is easily accessible from south-western and north-western Nigeria. The nearest cities and towns adjoining Old Oyo National Park include Saki, Iseyin, Igboho, Sepeteri, Tede and Igbeti which have their own commercial and cultural attractions for tourism. The park covers a total area of 2,512k`m<sup>2</sup> mostly of lowland plains at a height of 330m and 508m above sea level.

Owing primarily to widespread park-people conflicts, and taking a cue from the worldwide trend in participatory management and its own successful experiences in community forestry, it is therefore necessary to engage the local people in the management of Old Oyo National Park hence, Community-based Wildlife Management.

The major objective of the old Oyo National Park is to conserve, preserve and protect the indigenous Nigerian flora and fauna recourses in the selected ecology enclaves for the benefit of present and future generations. To achieve this, the combination of conservation with rural development to protect the biodiversity of the park has to be ensured to bring about acceptability of the conservation philosophy. Sustainable utilization or provisions of alternative mean of substance are options which only supplement rural development to curb or eradicate any incident of conflict between the communities and the park officials. This is because conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity of greatly influenced by socio-cultural, economic activities and conditions and so requires the cooperation, support and participation of the people living in and around the park.

There is much hope as a term of consultants undertook a study to come up with a management plan for the park in which the social, cultural and agricultural aspects of communities around the park were examined. This was very necessary as a stepping stone towards improving the living standard by embarking on so developmental activities.

As is already known, community participation and compensation/substitution are important tenets of any social inclusive conservation strategy. However poor practice and misused of ability of the strategy to effectively address the problems of human pressure on protected areas and conflicts between surrounding communities and protected areas managers.

This study is aimed at obtaining an up-to-date assessment of the nature of the relationship between the Old Oyo National park and its support communities. The findings will also look into extent to which local perceptions and relationship between the park and its neighbour has improved or declined over time, and its implications for biodiversity conservation in the area.

This project seeks to address the following objectives:

- ✓ To have a better understanding of the rural communities' attitudes towards wildlife, protected areas and protected area staff.
- ✓ To examine participatory programmes and benefit sharing.
- ✓ To access measures for poverty alleviation in order to reduce poaching activities.

## II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### STUDY AREA AND ITS LOCATION

The study area is Old Oyo National park located in Oyo State and one of the seven National Parks in Nigeria. It lies between North latitude 81° and 90° and east longitudes 3° and 42°.

The study area is surrounded by eleven (11) Local Government areas namely: Atiba, Oyo West, Iseyin, Itesiwaju, Atisbo, Orire, Olorunsogo, Irepo, Ooorelope and Shaki East all in Oyo State and Kaiama in Kwara State.

It was initially created by decree number 36 of 1991, which was later repealed and replaced with decree (now act) No 46 of 1999. Before then, the area had existed first as two contiguous forest reserves namely: Upper Ogun and Oyo-Ile gazetted in 1936 and 1941 respectively. Due to an encouraging species population and species diversity of wild animals, the then Western Regional Government merged the two forest reserves in the late 1960s to the early 1970s to form the Upper Ogun Game reserve. As a game reserve then, a few number of infra structural facilities were introduced. These included five patrol posts, a 28 km access road to the base camp. Ibuya with lodging facilities for adventure tourists and researchers.

The park covers a land area of approximately 2512 square kilometres (i.e. 151, 200ha) making it the fourth largest park in Nigeria after Gashaka-Gumti (637,100 ha) Kainji Lake (538,000ha) and Cross River (400,000ha); others are Chad Basin (255,000ha), Kamuku (112,000ha) and Okomu (19,600ha). Shape like a saxophone, the park is about 120 km long from the south west to the northeast and about 50 km at its widest in the south.

### ACCESS TO THE PARK

Travellers from eastern part of Nigeria and the Lagos/Ibadan axis can come in through Ibadan-Iseyin-Sepeteri to enter the park through Ajaku gate.

Travellers from the Abuja-Kaduna-Kano axis can come in through Ilorin-Igbeti to enter the park through Jokoro-TessiGaruba or TessiApata routes.

Those from Kainji Lake National Park can come in through Kaiama-Kishi-Sooro to enter the Park through Sooro gate, while those travelling from Central Benin Republic can come in through Yashi-Kirg-Kosubosu-Igboho to enter the Park through Alaguntan route. The park is approximately 300 km from Lagos, 160 km from Ibadan, 60 km from Ilorin, 660 km from Abuja, 660 km from Kaduna and 910 km from Kano (Old Oyo National Park hand bill, 2007).

### TOPOGRAPHY AND DRAINAGE

Most part of Old Oyo national Park are lowland plains, undulating from 300m to 500 m above sea level. Few hills, notably Yemoso and Gboguro, however rise several metres above their general surroundings. The greater part of the park is watershed and is well drained by two river systems; the Ogun flowing southwards to the Atlantic Ocean, and the Tessi flowing northwards to the river Niger. Several tributaries flow south-westwards, and eastwards, and north-westwards to join these two main rivers respectively. (Old Oyo National Park handbill, 2007). During wet season (April- October) most of the rivers are flooded. The speed is usually high and torrential, very dangerous to cross for both wildlife and human beings. According to Ayodele (1988) the dry season pools serve as habitats to aquatic animals during the period.

### CLIMATE AND WEATHER

Annual rainfall in the park ranges between 900mm and 1500mm, and main annual temperature is between 12°C and 32°C. The rainy season begins in April through September, with the highest rainfall record between July and August. The dry season begins in October through early April and the driest and hottest period is between March and April. The park experiences the harmattan period from November through February. During this time night temperatures are quite low (Old Oyo National Park Hand Bill, 2007).

### VEGETATION

The entire park lies in the southern part of the southern guinea savannah. This is revealed by (Okeyoyin, 1986) in a closer study of (Charter, 1970). The vegetation consists of four sub-types:

- ✓ Dense Woodland and forests outliers in the south eastern part.
- ✓ Mixed open savannah woodland in the central part.
- ✓ Outcrop vegetation in the north east and
- ✓ Riparian grassland and fringing woodland occupying the forest plains and valleys along the Ogun River.

The dominant tree species of the Park, that are most common are as follows: *Burkea africana*, *Vitelariaparadoxa*, *Combretum molle*, *Terminalia Spp*, *Kigelia africana*, *Bridelia ferruginia*, *Daniella oiverii*, *Maytenus senegalensis*, *Parinari polyandra*, *Azelia africana*, *Vitex doniana*, *Acacia spp*, *Lannea Schimperii*, *Parkia biglobosa*, *Anogeissus leiocarpus*, *Khaya ivorensis*, *Khaya senegalensis*, *Milicia excels*, *Antiaris africana*, *Triplochiton scleroxylon*, *Isobertia adoka* etc.

The dominant grasses are: *Andropogontectorum*, *Andropogongayanus*, *Pennisetumpurpleum*, *Sorghum alnum*, *Panicum maximum*, *Hyparrhenia spp*, *Themeda spp*, *Desmodiumintronum*, *Prosopis spp*, *Stylosanthesguyanesis*, *Cynodon spp*, *Canchrusciliarisetc* which are commonly burnt in the dry season.

## GEOLOGY

The park is not only Wildlife based but has archaeological/cultural historical sites. In certain sites of the park are numerous, beautiful and marvellous sceneries of fascinating rocks formations, some like "OkeAgbele", looking as though they would topple over the next minute. Others like Agbaku, Idi Are, and Mejiro, have formed large caves that seemed as good shelters in the olden days during war. Mountaineering is possible at Igbeti, a support zone. (Old Oyo National Park hand bill, 2000)

### DATA SOURCES AND COLLECTION

The researcher employed two basic sources of data collection which are primary and secondary sources.

#### PRIMARY SOURCES

The primary sources of data collection with administration of questionnaire, personal interview and visual observations. The questionnaire has two sections. Section A is for villagers living around the national park, while section B is for the staff of Old Oyo National Park.

#### SECONDARY SOURCES

Secondary data were obtained from desk review of relevant literature, journal, government records, proceedings of conference and other relevant texts.

### DATA COLLECTION

The data collection methods utilized in this study included a combination of; (i) closed-ended questions: the respondents were asked to choose from a list of answers provided, (ii) open-ended questions; the respondents were asked to express their views on certain issues relevant to this study. Close-ended questions have the advantages of a greater degree of uniformity of responses and are easily converted into quantitative data that can be used for comparisons. Open-ended questions, on the other hand, have the advantage of allowing the interviewer to probe for more information (Rubin and Babbie, 2001).

Open-ended questions were used as follow-ups to closed-ended questions in instances where the respondent had opinions different from those provided and allowed respondents to express personal views, rendering information which might not be easily classified but which are nonetheless pertinent to this study. The inclusion of qualitative methods allows the development of a deeper theoretical understanding of the meanings of statistical findings emerging from

quantitative measurement and may allow for the generation of new hypotheses for quantitative study.

In the visit to the park support zone area, I observed a low level of literacy among the local people. As a result, the respondents were interviewed orally and their responses were indicated on the questionnaire to ensure proper data collection. A total of thirty-five household heads in the five villages, selected by random sampling, were questioned.

### TARGET AUDIENCE

The questionnaire used was divided into 2 parts. The first were given to the villagers that surround the park while the other to the park officials 250 questionnaires were given to the 10 villages, each village has 25 questionnaires which investigate their level of education, occupation, their feeling about the park, benefit they derive level of involvement and their willingness in the protection of the park, 50 questionnaires were allocated to staff asked about their function in their various departments, level of education, the ranges they are familiar with, level of participation of local communities in conservation and materials needed for effective participation.

### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Data collected were subjected to analysis of variance (ANOVA), significance t-test, and chi-square.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. RESULTS

#### a. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

The basic information of the respondents and their livelihood activities are presented in this section. Table 1 presents the marital status of the respondents. About 59% of the respondents are married. Forty per cent (40%) of the respondents are single while fractions (1.3%) of them are either widows or widowers.

Status	Frequency	percentage
Single	60	40
Married	88	58.7
Widow/widower	2	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 1: Marital status of the respondents

The genders of the respondents are presented in Table 2. Half (50%) of the respondents were males while other half (50%) were females.

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	75	50
Female	75	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 2: Gender of the respondents



Table 3 shows the education background of the respondents. Majority of the respondent had formal education with levels ranging from primary through to the University level. It was gathered that 54% of the respondents had secondary education, 22% had primary education. Only 1.3% of the respondents had University education. The details are presented in Table 3.

Level	Frequency	Percentage
No formal education	13	8.7
Primary education	33	22
Secondary education	81	54
OND/HND/NCE	21	14
University	2	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 3: Education levels of the respondents

The primary occupations of the respondents are presented in Table 4. Majority (67.3%) of them are farmers. About 15% of the respondents are hunters with very few people (8%) engaging in one kind of trade or the others. The detail of these is presented in Table 4.

Occupation	Frequency	Percentage
Farming	101	67.3
Fishing	5	3.3
Hunting	22	14.7
Trading	12	8
Civil Servant	10	6.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 4: Primary occupations of the respondents

The summary of descriptive statistics for respondent age, family size and their farm distance to the park boundaries are presented in Table 5. The family sizes of the respondents ranged between 3 and 12 households with an average of 3 people per household. They ranged between 18 and 70 years. The average age of respondents was 30 years. Also, the distances of their farms to the park boundaries were between 100m and 36km. The mean distance of the farms of respondents to the park boundaries was 11.5km.

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std Dev.
Family size	150	3	12	6	2.36
Age(year)	150	18	70	30	12.93
Farm distance to the park (km)	150	0.1	36	11.5	13.83

Table 5: Summary of descriptive statistics for the respondents

**b. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY-BASED WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT**

Table 6 presents the earlier involvements of the respondents in community-based wildlife management. Sixty-four percent (64%) of the respondents were earlier involved in one form of community-based forest management or the other. However, 36% of the respondents were never involved in wildlife management in the area nor any other place.

Involvement	Frequency	Percentage
Involved	96	64
Not involved	54	36
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 6: Earlier involvement in community-based wildlife management

Table 7 shows the Chi-square test of hypothesis of equal probability for distribution of opinions of respondents on the involvements in community-based wildlife management. The Chi-square analysis was significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). This implies that the opinion was equally distributed among the respondents. There were far more people earlier involved in community wildlife management than those without involvement.

	Calculated	Tabulated	P-value
$X^2$	4.414	3.841	0.016
Df		1	

Table 7: Chi-square test for earlier involvement in community-based wildlife management

Table 8 present the frequency and percentage of people's level of involvement in Park management. The levels of participations vary among the respondents from decision making through to benefit sharing. Majority (82.7%) of the respondents are involved in part protection in the area. Only 9.3% are involved in decision making in the park, while 8% are involved in the benefit sharing.

Level	Frequency	Percentage
Decision making	14	9.3
Park protection	124	82.7
Benefit sharing	12	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 8: Level of involvement of respondent in wildlife management of the Park

**c. WILLINGNESS OF THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES TO PARTICIPATE IN WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT**

The results for the willingness of the respondents and those of other members of the community to participate in community-based wildlife management are presented in Table 9. The results show that majority (95.3%) of the respondents are willing to participate in community based wildlife management. About 5% of the respondents are not willing to participate in the community-based wildlife management. Similarly, about 98% of the respondents were able to ascertain that others will also be willing to adopt this initiative for sustainability.

Willingness			Willingness of others		
Response	Frequency	Percentage	Response	Frequency	Percentage
Willing	143	95.3	Willing	147	98
Not willing	7	4.7	Not willing	3	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 9: Willingness to participate in community-based wildlife management

Table 10 presents the opinions of the respondents with respect to the idea of conservation. About 95% of the respondent agreed with the concept of conservation while only few of them disagreed. The reasons being given by the respondents in support of their opinions about the idea of conservation and wildlife protection are presented in Table 11. It was stated by the respondents that when government and people agree on sincere conservation, the benefits itemized in the table could be achieved.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Agree	143	95.3
Not agree	7	4.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 10: Agreement of the surrounding communities with the idea of conservation

Opinion	Frequency	Percentage
Provision of incentives	6	4
Enlightenment campaign	11	7.3
Adequate protection	95	63.3
Joint wildlife management	38	25.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 11: Perception of people about wildlife resources protection

Similarly, Table 12 presents some benefits derived by the surrounding community in the past. About 45% of the respondents asserted that there has been provision of basic amenities as a result of the presence of the national park in their area. In the same vein, 24% stated that there has been provision of job opportunity because of the park's presence in the area. About 19% of the respondents stated a boost in their income-generation activities as a result of the park's presence in the area. The details of the other benefit(s) are shown in Table 12

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Job opportunity	36	24
Provision of basic amenities	68	45.3
Income-generation/market	29	19.3
Environmental protection	17	11.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Field Survey, 2013

Table 12: Benefits to the surrounding communities

The most important opinion for the adoption of community-based wildlife management (willingness of the surrounding communities to keep conservation law) is presented in Table 13. Majority of the respondents (96%) are willing to keep the conservation law if in-force. A negligible percentage (4%) indicated that they are not willing to keep the conservation laws, except they are forced.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Willing	144	96
Not willing	6	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 13: Willingness to keep conservation law

The relationships between park officials and the surrounding communities have been said to be mostly friendly as 54% of the respondents confirmed this statement. In the same vein, 44.7% of the respondents equally termed the relationships to be cordial. The details are presented in Table 14.

Relationship	Frequency	Percentage
Cordial	67	44.7
Friendly	81	54
Casual	2	1.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 14: Relationship between park official and the surrounding communities

Table 15 contains the suggestions offer by the respondents about the best ways communities could further benefit from the park conservation efforts. About 61% of the respondents suggested that recruitment of the community members to park services may be the best idea for effective conservation of the park in the area. Twenty-four per cent (24%) were of the opinion that provision of basic infrastructure to the surrounding communities may be the best idea for effective conservation of the park. The details are shown in Table 15.

Way	Frequency	Percentage
Recruitment by of community people	92	61.3
Provision of infrastructure	36	24
Provision of loan to people	4	2.7
Local participation	18	12
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 15: Best ways communities can further benefit from the park conservation

Table 16 presents the result of Chi-square test of dependence for willingness of respondents' to reduce hunting intensity and community-based wildlife management. The test was significant since  $P < 0.05$ . This implies that that the willingness of the respondents to participate in community-based wildlife management depends on their willingness to reduce hunting intensity in and around the park. Majority of the respondents (88.7%) supported the reduction of hunting activities in the park.

	Calculated	Tabulated	P-value
$X^2$	36.213	3.841	0.000
Df		1	

Table 16: Chi-square test for willingness to reduce hunting activities and community-based wildlife management

Table 17 presents the perspective of people towards wildlife management. About 77% of the respondents are of the opinions that the people should be involved in wildlife management, and that it should not be the government business alone. Only 23.3% are of the opinion that wildlife management is a responsibility to be borne by government alone.

Wildlife management	Frequency	Percentage
Government only	35	23.3
Involving people	115	76.7
<b>Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 17: Perspective of the people towards wildlife management

The Chi-square test for the distributions of opinions of respondents about the cooperation of all stakeholders in community-based wildlife management is shown in Table 17. The test was significant ( $P < 0.05$ ). This implies that the opinions of respondents were not equally distributed. Majority are of the opinions that there will be cooperation among the stakeholders if community-based wildlife management is adopted.

	Calculated	Tabulated	P-value
$X^2$	48.600	3.841	0.000
Df		1	

Field Survey, 2013

Table 18: Cooperation among the stakeholders and community-based wildlife management

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

##### CONCLUSION

The work demonstrated that local people could work and provide the means for sustainable management and conservation of wildlife. Local people can be easily incorporated in wildlife law enforcement, through strengthening the existing or establishing new local institutions such as the village game scouts and the village natural resources committees. These institutions together with the traditional elders in villages can serve as entry points in search for more participatory management approaches in wildlife management. The study demonstrates the need for more participation of various stakeholders related to wildlife in order to bring about a collaborative anti-poaching network in the Old Oyo National Park region, since poachers come from different corners of the National Park, some of them originating from a neighbouring country.

According to Murphree (2001b), there is a remarkable evolution in wildlife conservation from the *conservation against the people* during early colonialism with a strategy of taking large tracts of land away from rural people for the establishment of protected areas and removing their jurisdiction over the natural resources. Later followed the *conservation for the people* where African governments introduced legislation governing the use of land and natural resources, and the creation of the government agencies to provide extension services and enforce good practice.

Recently a new strategy emerged that seeks to involve local communities in wildlife management known as *conservation with the people*. Community based conservation was never designed as a substitute for protected area approaches, but it was designed to be part of a suite of conservation approaches within national conservation strategies.

The aim of this study is to come out with possible recommendation in order to solve problems facing Old Oyo National Park and reconciling the involvement of local community in the management of the park.

- ✓ There is a need for the park to establish village game scouts and giving allowances and incentives to enhance effective anti-poaching patrol.
- ✓ There is a need to employ both wildlife and agricultural extension officers in Old Oyo National Park to provide awareness of the importance in integrating crop-livestock systems.
- ✓ There is also a need to establish more markets for livestock to aid an increase in offtake and eventually reduce grazing competition with wildlife.
- ✓ People surrounding communities should be discouraged of using non-lethal deterrents for crop protection as method of vermin control.
- ✓ Ecotourism of this area should be improved in order to increase their income and standard of living
- ✓ More employment opportunities be created for the youths in order to reduce illness which in turn reduces poaching.
- ✓ Empowerment, inform credits and loans should be given to reduce their dependence of the wildlife species. There is need to update wildlife policies and legislation in Old

Oyo National Park

- ✓ Since it is the culture of the people in the community to hunt game, efforts should be made to integrate small holder game farming into agricultural system to reduce poaching activities within the project area.
- ✓ I recommend that workshops, seminar, talk shows, should be organized regularly to the people in the community for the awareness of conservation and conservation laws.
- ✓ Also there should be formation of schools conservation clubs at primary to the tertiary level.  
Federal government should ensure fair and equitable financing conservation activities.

##### REFERENCES

- [1] Anderson, D., and R. Grove. 1987. The scramble of for Eden: Past, present and future in African conservation. In Conservation in Africa: People, policies and practice, ed. D. Anderson and R. Grove, 21–39. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Imposing Wilderness: Struggles over Livelihood and Nature Preservation in Africa. By Roderick P. Neumann. University of California Press,
- [3] Adams, W. A. 2003. Nature and the colonial mind. In Decolonizing nature: Strategies for conservation in the post-colonial era, ed. W. A. Adams and M. Mulligan, 63–75. London, UK: Earthscan
- [4] Adams, K. and Keene, M. (2000) Research and Writing across the Disciplines. 2nd Edition, Mayfield Publishing Company, California
- [5] IIED (1994): Whose Eden? An Overview of Community Approaches to Wildlife Management. International Institute for Environment and Development, London.
- [6] Lillieholm, R. J., and L. R. Romney. 2000. Tourism, national parks, and wildlife. In Tourism and national parks: Issues and implications, ed. R. W. Butler and S. W. Boyd, 137–151. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- [7] Neumann, R. P. 1998. Imposing wilderness: Struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [8] Adams, Jonathan S., and Thomas O. McShane. The Myth of Wild Africa: Conservation Without Illusion. 1992, xix + 266 pp., \$@-@21.95. and Bonner, Raymond. At the Hand of Man: Peril and Hope for Africa's Wildlife. 1993, 322 pp., \$@-@24.00
- [9] S.S. Ajayi Wildlife and tourism in Tanzania: Possibilities in Nigeria. Nigerian J. For. (1972)
- [10] Osemeobo, G. J. (1990) Poaching in wildlife conservation: The experience in Nigeria, The Nigerian Journal of Forestry 20: 36-40
- [11] On-farm livestock research: a framework for planning. In Goat production systems in the humid tropics, A.O. Ayeni, H.G. Bosman (eds.). Ile-Ife, Nigeria 1992. Pudoc, Wageningen (pp. 89-96)

- [12]"Functions". Nigeria National Park Service. Archived from the original on 2017-12-11. Retrieved 2010-10-21.
- [13]Matzke, G. E. and Nabane, N. (1996) Outcomes of a community-controlled wildlife program in a Zambezi valley community. *Human Ecology* 24 (1), 65–85
- [14]Siachoono SM (1995). Contingent Valuation as an additional tool for wildlife management in Zambia; a case for Mumbwa Game management area. *Ambio* 24(4):246-249.
- [15]Freeman, R.E. (1994) The Politics of Stakeholder Theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 4, 409-421. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3857340>
- [16]Gibson, C. C., & Marks, S. A. (1995). Transforming Rural Hunters into Conservationists: An Assessment of Community Based Wildlife Management Programs in Africa. *World Development*, 23, 941.
- [17][http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(95\)00025-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(95)00025-8)
- [18]Parry, D. & Campbell, B. (1992) Attitudes of rural communities to animal wildlife and its utilisation in Chobe Enclave and Mababe Depression. *Environmental Conservation* 19(3): 245– 52
- [19]Metcalf, Les and Zapico, Eduardo (1994 forthcoming) *European Integration and National Autonomy*. Maastricht: EIPA.
- [20]Liebenberg, L. and Grossman, D. 1994. *Towards a New Nature Conservation Policy - Discussion document prepared for the Land and Agriculture Policy Centre (LAPC), South Africa*
- [21]Murphree, M. W. (1993). Decentralizing the Proprietorship of Wildlife Resources in Zimbabwe's Communal Lands. *Voices From Africa: Local Perspectives on conservation*. D. Lewis and N. Carter, WWF: 133-145
- [22]Wells, M. & Brandon, K. (1992) *People and parks: linking protected areas management and local communities*. Unpublished report, World Bank, Washington, DC, USA: 99 pp.
- [23]Parry, D. & Campbell, B. (1992) Attitudes of rural communities to animal wildlife and its utilization in Chobe Enclave and Mababe Depression. *Environmental Conservation* 19(3): 245–52
- [24]Wells, M. & Brandon, K. (1992) *People and parks: linking protected areas management and local communities*. Unpublished report, World Bank, Washington, DC, USA: 99 pp.
- [25]Parry, D. & Campbell, B. (1992) Attitudes of rural communities to animal wildlife and its utilisation in Chobe Enclave and Mababe Depression. *Environmental Conservation* 19(3): 245– 52.
- [26]Parry, D. & Campbell, B. (1992) Attitudes of rural communities to animal wildlife and its utilisation in Chobe Enclave and Mababe Depression. *Environmental Conservation* 19(3): 245– 52.
- [27]Parry, D. & Campbell, B. (1992) Attitudes of rural communities to animal wildlife and its utilisation in Chobe Enclave and Mababe Depression. *Environmental Conservation* 19(3): 245– 52
- [28]Parry, D. & Campbell, B. (1992) Attitudes of rural communities to animal wildlife and its utilisation in Chobe Enclave and Mababe Depression. *Environmental Conservation* 19(3): 245– 52
- [29]Wells, M. & Brandon, K. (1992) *People and parks: linking protected areas management and local communities*. Unpublished report, World Bank, Washington, DC, USA: 99 pp
- [30]Parry, D. & Campbell, B. (1992) Attitudes of rural communities to animal wildlife and its utilisation in Chobe Enclave and Mababe Depression. *Environmental Conservation* 19(3): 245– 52
- [31]Western, D. and Wright, Michael R, eds. (1994) *Natural Connections: Perspectives in Community-based Conservation*. Island Press, Washington, DC
- [32]McNeely, J. A. (1996) Foreword. In *Tropical Deforestation: The Human Dimension*, ed. Leslie Sponsel, Thomas N. Headland, and Robert C. Bailey, pp. xix–xxi. Columbia University Press, New York
- [33]Neumann, Roderick (1998) "Introduction and Chapter 4: Protecting the Fauna of the Empire: The Evolution of National Parks in Tanzania." In *Imposing Wilderness*. California Press
- [34]Brandon, K. 1996. *Ecotourism and Conservation: A Review of Key Issues*. Environment Department Papers, Biodiversity Series, paper # 033. Washington DC: World Bank.
- [35]Brandon, K., K.H. Redford, and S.E. Sanderson (eds.). 1998. *Parks in Peril: People, Politics, and Protected Areas*. Washington DC: Island Press. Brooks, J.S., M.A. Franzen, C.M. Holmes, and M N. Grote. Forthcoming. Testing hypotheses for the success of different conservation strategies. *Conservation Biology*.
- [36]Matzke, G.E. and N. Nabane. 1996. Outcomes of a community-controlled wildlife utilization program in a Zambezi Valley community. *Human Ecology* 24(1): 65-85.
- [37]F. A. Ayodele, "Ecological Basis for the Management of Oyo National Park," Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis of University of Ibadan, Ibadan, 1988.
- [38]Okeyoyin, O. A., Gashaka-Gumti National Park Taraba State, Nigeria harter JR (1970) *Vegetation Ecological Zones*.
- [39]Unpublished M. Sc Federal Department of Forestry, [40] Ibadan
- [41]Charter JR (1970) *Vegetation Ecological Zones*. Unpublished M. Sc Federal Department of Forestry, Ibadan