

## **THE IMPACT OF VIOLENT CONFLICTS ON SELECTED SDGs IN NASARAWA STATE'S SOUTHERN SENATORIAL ZONE**

**Abubakar Okuwa Abdullahi<sup>1\*</sup> Abubakar Abbas Uthman<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of General Studies, School of General Studies and Pre-ND, Isa Mustapha Agwai I Polytechnic, Lafia, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business Administration and Management, School of Administration and Business Studies, Isa Mustapha Agwai I Polytechnic, Lafia, Nigeria

\*abukuwa50@gmail.com

**ABSTRACT:** The endemic nature of the violent conflict, which has led to the widespread destruction of lives and property in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State, has led many to wonder if the realization of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is possible in Nasarawa State by 2030. Thus, the study seeks to examine the effects of violent conflicts and their implications for the realization of SDGs in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State. The specific objectives of the study are to (i) analyse the nature of violent conflicts in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State, and (ii) examine the impact of violent conflicts on Sustainable Development Goals in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State. The study made use of the survey method due to the study population of 245,025 households in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State. A multi-stage sampling – Purposive, Stratified, and Random sampling techniques were used to select a sample for the study. Cross-sectional data were collected from October to November 2024 using a structured questionnaire and analysed at a 5% level of significance. Descriptive statistics (tables, frequencies, and cumulative frequencies) and multinomial logit were used to analyse the results. The findings of the study were that the nature of violent conflicts in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State is mostly unilateral attacks (91.88%), which affected most youths (44.16) and that violent conflict manifestation in terms of health care challenges, school access challenges, death, injury, displacement, drug addiction among youths, disruption of economic opportunity, unemployment, water challenge and destruction of dwelling, adversely affected the first four SDGs – No Poverty, Zero Hunger, Good Health and Wellbeing, Quality Education. The findings revealed that the No Poverty goal is the worst hit, with profound implications for the realisation of all the SDGs. The study concluded that the adverse effects of violent conflicts are generally ruinous in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State. The study recommended that the Nasarawa State government should be proactive in ameliorating the adverse effects of violent conflicts on No Poverty, Zero Hunger, Good Health and Well-being, and Quality Education goals to enhance the chances of realising sustainable development goals – SDGs in Nasarawa, Nigeria by 2030.

**Keywords:** Violent Conflict, Sustainable Development, SDGS, Households, Nasarawa State

## INTRODUCTION

A circle of violent conflict has hampered the development drive of Nigeria since an amalgamation of 1914 (Usman, 2002). It is noteworthy that most of the crises have struck Nigeria's Northern regions, particularly the North Central area, causing widespread displacement and the senseless loss of lives and property (Alubo, 2011).

As one of the states in the North-Central geopolitical zone, Nasarawa State seems to be most affected by the never-ending cycle of disputes that have always been brutally expressed shortly after the state's creation in 1999. Nasarawa State was engulfed by inter-ethnic violence where friends were separated, people were killed and butchered, property was destroyed and looted, people were displaced, and the development of Nasarawa State was retarded (Adamu, 2001, 2002; Almakura, 2013; Oyakata & Osumanyi, 2018. Violent conflicts which occurred in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State claimed 555 lives and cost the state over two billion naira of 2018 internally generated revenue (Nasarawa State Judicial Commission of Inquiry (NSJCI), 2014; Ogezi et al., 2021).

The endemic nature of violent conflict with wanton destruction of lives and property in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State may hinder the realization of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) by 2030. Despite this, there is inadequate information on the extent of the implication of violent conflicts on the realization of SDGs in the state which prompted this study. The relevant research questions are thus: what is the nature of violent conflicts in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State, and what are the impacts of violent conflicts on sustainable development goals in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State?

The objectives of the study are:

- i. to analyse the nature of violent conflicts in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State,
- ii. to examine the impacts of violent conflicts on selected sustainable development goals in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State.

This study is expected to provide the Nasarawa State government, the Nigerian government and other stakeholders with empirical and logical explanations of the nature and multidimensional effects of violent conflicts on SDGs in Nasarawa State.

This study focused on analysing the nature of violent conflicts and their impact on selected SDGs in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State from 2012 to 2024.

Violent Conflicts in this study cover communal violence, farmers-herders conflict, and all other forms of inter-ethnic violence in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State. The selected goals are the first four SDGs: No Poverty, Zero Hunger, Good Health and Well-being, and Quality Education.

The study is limited to five (5) local government areas out of thirteen (13), which comprise the Southern Senatorial Zone. These local government areas are Awe, Doma, Keana, Lafia and Obi. The choice of the Southern Senatorial Zone is because violent conflict has been a recurring decimal in this zone despite efforts by successive governments to curb the situation. The choice of the topic is predicated on the fact that violent conflict is now seen as the most significant threat to the attainment of sustainable development goals because every development effort either by an individual, firm or government is neutralized by a single act of violent conflict via the wanton destruction of lives and property. Consequently, the choice of the period 2012-2024 was based on the fact that this period witnessed an elevated level of violence in the state.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Conceptual Clarification**

Conflict is a fact of life which is not desirable, yet no society is immune to it. Conflict is a situation in which two or more parties choose costly inputs that are adversely combined against one another and generate no positive externalities to third parties (Skaperdas, 2011). Conflict always appears in forms of tension, divergence of opinion within the group, physical or verbal abuse, disagreement, incompatibilities, annoyance, interference or rivalry (Anongo, 2006). Conflict occurs when two or more parties believe that their interests are incompatible, express a hostile attitude or take action that damages other parties' ability to pursue their interests. It becomes violent when parties no longer seek to attain their goals peacefully but resort to violence in one form or another. Conflict in this study is seen as the resort to open hostility or physical force to resolve a disagreement (violent conflict).

Conflict arises over land or resource contest, indigene-settler syndrome, competition over economic and political marginalisation, clash of values and way of lives, chieftaincy tussle, ethnicity, criminality, terrorism, cultism, religious fundamentalism, power struggle and general issues that relate to alienation, social and political exclusion amongst others (Alubo, 2011; Olumba, 2022); Usman, 2002; WB/NBS, 2018). There are other factors at the root of violent conflict, as provided by empirical works. Annan (2014) examined the causes, challenges and prospects of Violent Conflicts and Civil Strife in West Africa. The study found that conflicts are often hinged on several factors, including poverty, human rights violations, bad governance and corruption, ethnic marginalisation and small arms proliferation.

In the 1950s through the 1960s, economists dominated the development debates and saw development as synonymous with the growth in GNP/GNP per capita (Abdullahi et al., 2016; Jhingan, 2007). This perspective saw industrialisation and an increase in productivity as prerequisites for development. Jhingan (2007) defined economic development as the quantitative expansion of goods and services or wealth of society, which is often measured by the Gross National Product (GNP) and the Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Some commentators and writers raised objections to the economic perspective because history offers several examples where economic growth was achieved at the cost of higher poverty, greater inequality, higher unemployment, weakened democracy, loss of cultural identity, or overconsumption of natural resources needed by future generations (Seers, 1972). Thus, poverty, unemployment, and

inequality must all decline if not mitigated with development (Seers, 1972). According to Sen (1999), development is freedom.

The term sustainable development is defined as development that meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (WCED, 1987). The concept of sustainable development has gone through a series of metamorphoses and definitions and is currently being defined in terms of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). SDGs has 17 goals, which are summarised as no poverty, zero hunger, good health and well-being, quality education, gender equality, clean water and sanitation, affordable and clean energy, decent work and economic growth, industry, innovation and infrastructure, reduced inequalities, sustainable cities and communities, responsible consumption and production, climate action, life below water, life on land, peace, justice and strong institutions and partnership for the goals. Each goal has specific targets to be achieved over fifteen years (2015-2030) (UN, 2015).

### **Theoretical Framework**

Theoretically, there is a bidirectional relationship between conflict and development – Conflict is as much a consequence of development as it is a constraint on development (Collier, 2004; Murshed, 2010). Collier's (2004) model can be written in functional form as thus:

$$CF = f(LI, RG, SI, EF, RF, PR, CH) \dots\dots\dots (2.1)$$

Where CF is conflict, f is a functional sign, LI is Level of Income, RG is Rate of Growth, SI is Structure of Income, EF is Ethnic Fractionalization, RF is Religion Fractionalization, PR is the Political Right, CH is Colonial History

However, the frequency and intensity of violent conflicts can aggravate development problems such that economic activities can be expressed as a function of not only traditional economic factors but also security:

$$Y=f(L, K, T, E, S) \dots\dots\dots (2.2)$$

Where Y is Output, L is Labour, K is Capital, T is Technology, E is Entrepreneurship, and S is Security.

Zgurovsky (2009) mathematically expressed sustainable development as the sum of the security of the population ( $I_{sp}$ ) and the quality of life ( $I_{ql}$ ). The quality of life consists of economic dimension ( $I_{ec}$ ), sociopolitical dimension ( $I_{spl}$ ) and environmental dimension ( $I_e$ ). The generalized form of sustainable development measure (index) can be represented by (Q) as a function of the imaginary scarla ( $jI_{sp}$ ) and the real vector part ( $I_{ql}$ ) thus:

$$Q = jI_{sp} + I_{ql} \dots\dots\dots (2.3)$$

However, there is consensus in the literature that the attainment of SDGs is a panacea for economic, sociopolitical and environmental challenges. However, the literature did not envisage that the phenomenon of violent conflict inherent in most developing countries can claim a lot of resources to meet the needs of the future generation, thereby frustrating the realisation of SDGs. Thus, the attainment of sustainable development can be impaired by the effects of the incessant circle of violent conflicts, resulting in another set of challenges of an unimaginable proportion. Thus, the central crux of this study is to identify the effects of violent conflicts, which constitute a significant threat to the attainment of sustainable development.

### **Empirical Evidence**

The effects of conflict on livelihood cannot be overemphasised. Violent conflict affects poverty directly through the destruction or reduction of physical productive capital and physical capital for the provision of public and communal services, such as labour force (through killings, injuries and displacement) and infrastructure (including bridges, buildings, communications and energy sector infrastructure) (Adli, 2024; Humphreys, 2003; Ojewole, 2022; Stewart et al., 2001). Economic conditions, such as employment, income, agricultural production, public and private investment and growth, tend to be directly reduced by conflict violence (Collier et al., 2009; Hoeffler & Reynal-Querol, 2003; Stewart et al., 2001). Collier et al. (2009) asserted that violence has directly reduced economic growth significantly, hampered poverty reduction efforts and limited progress towards Development Goals. Goodhand (2001) notes that conflict can lead to an unrecoverable collapse in livelihood as poor families consume their assets and return to subsistence production. Goodhand cautions that the processes that keep households in chronic poverty are unlikely to change suddenly in the event of a peace settlement. Otite (1990) argued that most ethnic violence in Nigeria is premised on land space and resource competition, disputed jurisdiction of traditional rulers, and the creation and location of local government councils. This argument outlines the context of the Farmers-Herders conflict in Nigeria. Ogezi et al. (2021) revealed that violent conflicts grip Nasarawa State N2,289,859,549, constituting 30.28% of the Internally Generated Revenue (₦7,566,920,656.91) for 2018. Armed conflict is associated with limited access to maternity and reproductive health services, poor quality of care, increased neonatal morbidity and mortality, destruction and looting of facilities, targeted killings, abduction of health workers, migration of health workers, health complications and food scarcity (Chi et al. 2015; Lin et al. 2023; Olumba, 2022).

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **Study Area**

The study area is the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State, which comprises five local government areas, namely Awe, Doma, Keana, Lafia and Obi

### **Population of the Study**

The study population consists of 245,025 households across the local government areas in the zone – Awe (51,522, Doma (35,951), Keana (12,708), Lafia (100,461) and Obi (44,383) (NSPHDA, 2020).

### **Research Design**

The study used the survey method due to the study population of 245,025 households in the Southern Senatorial Zone. This method involves collecting cross-sectional data from the sampled respondents.

### **Sample Size Determination**

Yamane's (1967) formula was used to arrive at 400 samples – Awe (84), Doma (59), Keana (21), Lafia (164) and Obi (72), which is proportional to their respective household population.

### **Sampling Technique and Procedure**

Multi-stage sampling – Purposive, Stratified and Random sampling techniques were used to select a sample for the study. The Southern Senatorial Zone was purposively selected based on the incessant circle of violent conflict between 2012 and 2024. The five (5) local government areas in the zone were taken as five (5) strata, and a random sample of four (4) communities were drawn from each stratum to form (20) clusters for the study where a proportional number of households were selected based on the sample of each Local government. The selected communities and respondents were: Awe 21 households from each community (Ihuman, Gidan Kobene, Gidan Biyana, Ukpo), Doma 15 households from each community (Agbashi, Rukubi, Burum-burum, Iggah), Keana 5 households from each community (Giza, Kadarko, Kadarko Tasha Jirgi, Gidan Atuma), Lafia 41 households from each community (Alakyo, Assakio, Arikya, Kwandare), Obi 18 households from each community (Obi, Agyaragu, Tudun-Adobu, Daddare). At the community level, the study used a random sampling technique, specifically the Expanded Programme of Immunization (EPI) sampling method. Using the EPI sampling method requires spinning a pen at the community centre to get the random direction of houses to survey (Bostoen & Chalabi, 2006). One house was then randomly selected, using a spurned pen as the first to be included in the survey and other houses were selected at adjacent intervals to the right until a required number of households were surveyed in each of the selected clusters

### **Sources of Data**

The study used both primary and secondary data-gathering methods. Data on the total number of households in the zone was obtained through secondary sources. At the same time, pre-coded questionnaires were used to collect cross-sectional data from sampled respondents.



### Model Specification

To examine the impact of communal violence on Sustainable Development Goals in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State (objective two), this study adapts Zgurovsky's (2009) model in equation (2.3) with slight modification. The literature on sustainable development contends that sustainable development can be proxied by SDGs. Thus, sustainable development represented by (Q) in equation (2.3) can be substituted with (SDGs):

$$\text{SDGs} = jI_{sp} + I_{ql} \dots\dots\dots (3.1)$$

Where:

$j$  = Scalar

$I_{sp}$  = Security of the population

$I_{ql}$  = Quality of Life

When there is conflict, ( $jI_{sp}$ ) becomes zero and equation (3.1) changes to:

$$\text{SDGs} = c(I_{ql}) \dots\dots\dots (3.2)$$

Where, the quality-of-life component ( $I_{ql}$ ) consists of the economic dimension ( $I_{ec}$ ),

socio-political dimension ( $I_{spl}$ ) and environmental dimension ( $I_e$ ), thus equation

(3.2) becomes:

$$\text{SDGs} = c(I_{ec} + I_{spl} + I_e) \dots\dots\dots (3.3)$$

The empirical literature on violent conflicts in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State revealed that during violent conflicts, poverty incidences are worsening, hunger is widespread, access to health are blocked and health challenges are heightened, access to school are blocked and learning are obstructed, women are abused, environment is overstretched, legitimate occupations are crippled, and economic opportunities are disrupted, people are killed or injured, communities are vacated, and people are displaced, human rights are abused, and human relations are shattered. Hence, the economic, socio-political and environmental effects of violent conflicts on SDGs in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State are represented by: conflict-associated health access challenges (cahac), conflict-associated school access challenges (casac), conflict-associated gender abuse (caga), conflict-associated death (cad), conflict-associated injuries (cai), conflict-associated displacement (cadp), conflict-associated drugs addiction among youths (cadaay), conflict-associated insecurity (cais), conflict-associated disruption in economic opportunity (cadeo), conflict-associated unemployment (cauep), conflict-associated sanitary and water challenges (caswc) and conflict-associated destruction of dwelling (cadd).

The empirical model for Sustainable Development Goals in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State can be written as:

$$SD_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 cahac_i + \beta_2 casac_i + \beta_3 caga_i + \beta_4 cad_i + \beta_5 cai_i + \beta_6 cadp_i + \beta_7 cadaay_i + \beta_8 cais_i + \beta_9 cadeo_i + \beta_{10} cauep_i + \beta_{11} cawc_i + \beta_{12} cadd_i + \beta_{13} \mu_i \dots\dots\dots (3.4)$$

The sign of the coefficients: cahac, casac, caga, cad, cai, cadp, cadaay, cais, cadeo, cauep, cawc and cadd are expected to be negative because blockage of access to health care, blockage of school access, gender abuse, death, injuries, drugs addiction among youths, insecurity, disruption of economic opportunity, unemployment, trimming access to portable drinking water and destruction of dwelling occasioned by violent conflict have negative effects on people which reduce the probability of attaining sustaining Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in Nasarawa State.

**Table 1: Variable Description and Measurement**

SN	Variable Name	Variable Type	Categorization	Variable Measurement
1.	$SD_i$	Nominal	1-4	1 for no poverty, 2 for zero hunger, 3 for good health and well-being, 4 for quality education
2.	$cahac_i$	Baniry	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
3.	$casac_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
4.	$caga_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
5.	$cad_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
6.	$cai_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
7.	$cadp_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
8.	$cadaay_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
9.	$cais_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
10.	$cadeo_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
11.	$cauep_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
12.	$cawc_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes
13.	$cadd_i$	Binary	0,1	0 if No, 1 if Yes

Note in Table 1 that SD is measured as a multinomial variable while all other variables are measured as dummy variables

### Technique of Analysis

Descriptive statistics (tables, frequencies, and cumulative frequencies) were used to achieve objective one of the studies. To achieve objective two, multinomial logit regression was used to estimate equation (3.4) using Stata 15.0 at a 5% level of significance.



## RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

**Table 2: Nature of Violent Conflict**

Type of violent conflict	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Combat	30	7.61	7.61
Unilateral Attack	362	91.88	99.49
Ambush	2	0.51	100.00
Total	394	100.00	
Category of people affected by violent conflict			
Men	37	9.39	6.78
Women	22	5.58	14.97
Children	24	6.09	21.06
Youths	174	44.16	65.22
Elderly people	137	34.77	100.00
Total	394	100.00	

Source: (Survey, 2024)

The result in Table 2 shows the type of violent conflict prevalent in the communities. The estimates indicate that most of the respondents, constituting 362(91.88%), categorised the violent conflict as a unilateral attack, 30(7.61%) of them identified the conflict as combat conflict, and 2(0.51%) of the respondents witnessed an ambush. It is also revealed that most of victims – 174(44.16%) are youths followed by elderly 137(34.77%), men 37(9.39%), children 24(6.09%) and women 22(5.58%) in the study area. This demonstrates the fact that violent conflicts in the Southern Zone are mostly in the form of unilateral attacks, and youths are most affected by the violent conflicts.

**Table 3: Impact of communal violence on First Four Sustainable Development Goals**

VARIABLES	Base outcome: No Poverty					
	Zero Hunger		Good Health and Wellbeing		Quality Education	
	(1) Coefficients	(2) Odd ratio	(3) Coefficients	(4) Odd ratio	(5) Coefficients	(6) Odd ratio
cahac	1.212** (0.334)	2.712** (1.447)	0.867** (0.381)	2.501** (0.631)	1.062** (0.535)	2.859** (4.528)
casac	-1.669 (0.827)	0.254 (0.153)	2.141 (1.325)	3.120 (4.315)	3.612*** (1,298)	1.865*** (0.577)
caga	-0.364 (0.332)	0.639 (0.579)	-0.352 (0.384)	0.630 (0.525)	0.327 (0.324)	1.684 (0.891)
cad	-0.868** (0.261)	0.280** (0.137)	-0.740** (0.146)	0.532** (0.116)	-0.854** (0.438)	0.485** (0.128)

cai	0.324 (0.273)	0.689 (0.531)	0.956*** (0.226)	2.543*** (0.436)	-0.180 (0.410)	0.927 (0.322)
cadp	1.964*** (1.221)	0.770*** (0.315)	3.617*** (0.847)	0.937*** (0.0664)	2.530*** (1.344)	0.434*** (0.0671)
cadaay	0.313 (0.370)	0.240 (0.546)	0.324 (0.345)	0.352 (0.377)	1.592** (0.535)	4.732** (2.221)
cais	0.628 (0.982)	1.695 (1.677)	2.933** (1.013)	6.905** (2.895)	1.533 (1.527)	5.520e+06 (8.473e+09)
cadeo	-1.695*** (0.117)	1.562*** (0.210)	-1.530*** (0.313)	2.314*** (0.299)	-5.879*** (2.298)	2.5356 (0.1933)
cauep	2.099** (0.233)	3.091** (0.699)	1.893** (0.618)	2.511** (1.002)	-1.133 (1.527)	5.50e-06 (7.825e-04)
caswc	0.162 (0.951)	1.176 (0.947)	0.255 (0.396)	1.231 (0.911)	-0.0199 (0.710)	0.980 (0.696)
cadd	-0.052 (0.398)	0.678 (0.390)	-0.573** (0.221)	0.587** (0.151)	-0.667 (0.549)	0.657 (0.544)
Observations	394	394	394	394	394	394

Source: (Survey, 2024); Note that \*\*\* and \*\* stand for significance at 1% and 5%, respectively.

The multinomial regression test of significance in Table 3 reveals that conflict-associated health access challenge(cahac), conflict-associated school access challenge (casac), conflict-associated dead (cad), conflict-associated injury (cai), conflict-associated displacement (cadp), conflict-associated drug addiction among youths (cadaay), conflict associated insecurity (cais), conflict-associated disruption in economic opportunities (cadeo), conflict-associated unemployment (cauep), conflict-associated sanitary and water challenge (caswc) and conflict-associated destruction of dwelling (cadd) have significant relative adverse effects on the first four goals of SDGs. The sign of coefficients in Table 3 reveals that the probability of the Zero Hunger goal being adversely affected increased with healthcare challenge (1.212) but decreased with death (-0.868) and disruption of economic opportunities (-1.695) relative to the No Poverty goal; the probability of Good Health and Wellbeing goal being adversely affected increased with healthcare challenge (0.867), injury (0.956), displacement (3.617) and unemployment (1.893) but decreased with death (-0.740), disruption of economic opportunity (-1.530) and destruction of dwelling (-0.573) relative to No Poverty goal; the probability of Quality Education goal being adversely affected increased with healthcare challenge (1.062), school access challenge (3.612), displacement (2.530) and drug addiction (1.592) but decreased with death (-0.854) and disruption in economic opportunity (-5.879) relative to no poverty goal.

## DISCUSSION OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The estimates of the multinomial logistic regression used to evaluate the impact of communal violence on the first four Sustainable Development Goals in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State jointly considered all factors in the model. The base outcome (reference category) used is the No Poverty goal of the sustainable development goals. This suggests that the

interpretation of the results of each of the other three sustainable development goals (Zero Hunger, Good Health and Wellbeing, and Quality Education) is made in reference to the No Poverty goal.

The findings reveal that the effects of violent conflicts in terms of healthcare challenges, school access challenges, death, injuries, displacement, drug addiction among youths, insecurity, disruption of economic opportunities, unemployment, water challenge and destruction of dwellings have relative adverse effects on the attainment of the first four SDGs – Zero Hunger, Good health and Wellbeing, Quality education and No poverty goal in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State. This is consistent with the findings of Chi et. al that Participants linked armed conflict with limited access to maternity and reproductive health services, poor quality of care, increased neonatal morbidity and mortality, destruction and looting of facilities, targeted killings, abduction of health workers, migration of health workers, and subsequent health complications.

However, it should be noted that other variables, such as gender abuse and water challenge, were not significant in the model.

### **Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations**

This study examined the nature and impact of violent conflicts on the first four SDGs in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State. Descriptive Statistics and a multinomial Logit were used to achieve research objectives and answer research questions.

In conclusion, the study reveals that violent conflicts in the Southern Senatorial Zone of Nasarawa State are mostly unilateral attacks, and youths are the most affected. The study further reveals that violent conflicts have associated adverse effects on the No Poverty, Zero Hunger, Good Health and Well-being, and Quality Education goals of the SDGs, with the attainment of the No Poverty goal being the worst.

For Nasarawa State to mitigate the adverse effects of violent conflict and set the stage for sustainable peace towards the realization of SDGs, the study made the following recommendations:

1. Government should provide unhindered access to healthcare, schools and security in post-conflict scenarios to ameliorate the adverse effects of cahac, casac, cai and cais on Zero Hunger, Good Health and Wellbeing and Quality Education goals of SDGs
2. The government should be proactive in averting violent conflicts and providing economic opportunities in the post-conflict communities to mitigate the adverse effects of cad, cadeo and cauep on the No Poverty goal of SDGs.
3. There should be community-based intervention through the provision of shelter in the settled destination to ensure that the displaced people receive life-sustaining care promptly to ameliorate the adverse effects of cadd on the No Poverty goal of SDGs.
4. The government should adopt a modern approach to rehabilitating conflict victims in Nasarawa State, Nigeria, as it does in modern communities in other parts of the world. This

involves the timely provision of humanitarian assistance and protection through prompt delivery of economic, health, and security interventions to facilitate victims' resilience.

5. The government should establish a ministry for peace and conflict resolution, employ conflict officers and post them across local governments, development areas and autonomous communities. Conflict officers should have the mandate to report early warning signs of violent conflicts so that the government can intervene and resolve the issues in order not to snowball into avoidable crises that could frustrate the realisation of SDGs.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, A. O., Ari, M. O., & Iliya, I. D. (2016). Development plan experience and implementation in Nigeria: A critical analysis of the new democratic dispensation (1999-Date). *Researchjournali's Journal of Economics*, 4(2), 1-8. Available at [www.researchjournali.com](http://www.researchjournali.com)
- Adamu, A. (2002, June 13-17). Ethnic Conflicts in Nigeria. A Paper Presented at the Presidential Retreat on Peace and Conflict Resolution, National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, Kuru, Jos.
- Adamu, A. (2001). Let's sheath the swords. Text, Radio and Television Broadcast, July 2.
- Adli, K. (2024). The impacts of Wars on Sustainable Development Goals. The Jordan Times. <https://jordantimes.com/opinion/adli-kandah/impact-wars-sdgs>
- Almakura, U. T. (2013). Contemporary security challenge in Nasarawa State. A Paper delivered at (EIMC) 6, Abuja-Retrieved 1/9/14, <http://www.nagis.org>.
- Alubo, O. (2011). *Ethnic conflicts and citizenship crises in central Nigeria*. Lagos, Nigeria: Eddy Asae Nigeria Press.
- Anongo, L. (2006). Kwande Crisis: A Community Conflict of Many Interests. *Journal of Conflicts in the Benue Valley*.
- Annan, N. (2014). Violent conflicts and civil strife in West Africa: Causes, challenges and prospects of stability. *International Journal of Security and Development*. 3(1). [doi.org/10.5334/stada](https://doi.org/10.5334/stada)
- Chi, P.C., Bulage, P., Urdal, H. & Sundby, J. (2015). Perceptions of the effects of armed conflict on maternal and reproductive health services and outcomes in Burundi and Northern Uganda: A qualitative study. *BMC International Health and Human Rights*, 15(1), 1-7
- Collier, P. (2004). Development and Conflict. *Centre for the study of African economies*. Department of Economics, Oxford University.

- Collier, P., Hoeffler, A., & Robiner, D. (2009). Beyond greed and grievance: Feasibility and civil war. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 61,1-27.
- Goodhand, J. (2001). Violent conflict, poverty and chronic poverty. *Centre Research Working Paper*.
- Hoeffler, A., & Reynal-Querol, M. (2003). *Measuring the costs of conflict*. Oxford University.
- Humphreys, M. (2003). *Economics and violent conflict*. Manuscript, Harvard University, (<http://www.preventconflict.org/portal/economics/Essay.pdf>).
- Jhingan, M. L. (2007). *Economics of development and planning*. Delhi, India: Vrinda Publications (P) Ltd.
- Lin, F. Lix, X. & Jia, N. (2023). The impact of Russia-Ukraine conflict on global food security, 36: 10661
- Murshed, S. M. (2010). *Explaining Civil War: A Rational Choice Approach Survey*: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Nasarawa State Judicial Commission of Inquiry (NSJCI) (2014). Report of a communal clash in Agyaragu.
- Nasarawa State Primary Health-Care Development Agency (2020). Households Statistics, State Immunization office.
- Ogezi, E., Abdulhameed, Y., Nasiru, Y. & Salua, E. S. (2021). Impact of violent conflicts in Nasarawa State, Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension Economics & sociology*. 39(11): 492-511. Dio:10.9734/AJAEES/2021/V39i1130777
- Ojewole, O. (2022). What's behind terrorist attacks on churches in Nigeria. The conversation Africa. <https://theconversation.com/whats-behind-terrorist-attacks-on-churches-in-nigeria-188605>
- Olumba, E. (2022). The politics of Eco-violence: Why is conflict escalating in Nigeria's Middle Belt? *Terrorism and Political Violence*
- Otite, O. (1990). *Ethnic pluralism and ethnicity in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Shaneson
- Oyakata, S. O. & Osumanyi, O. B. (2018). Inter-ethnic relations and crisis in Nasarawa state: A study of Nasarawa South senatorial district 2001-2015. *African Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 1(1): 74-92.
- Seers, D. (1972). What are we trying to measure? *Journal of Development Studies*, 8(3), 21-36.

- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skaperdas, S. (2011). Guns, lawyers and money: Some economic consequences of costly conflict
- Stewart, F., Huang, C., & Wang, M. (2001). Internal wars in development countries: An empirical overview of economic and social consequences. In F.V. Stewart, & A. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *War and Underdevelopment, 1*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- United Nations (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development knowledge platform. Available at <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld>
- Usman, Y. B. (2002). Historical perspective of violent conflict in Nigeria. A Paper Presented at the Presidential Retreat on Peace and Conflict Resolution, National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies, Kuru, Jos.
- WCED. (1987). *Our common future. The Brundtland report, World Commission for Environment and Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yamane, T. (1967). Sample size determination formula available at [https://www.academia.edu/33027/DETERMINATION\\_OF\\_SAMPLE\\_SIZE\\_IN\\_MANAGEMENT\\_RESEARCH\\_docx](https://www.academia.edu/33027/DETERMINATION_OF_SAMPLE_SIZE_IN_MANAGEMENT_RESEARCH_docx)
- Zgurovsky, M. (2009). Global analysis of sustainable development in context of quality and security of human life. *System Research and Information Technology*. 1, 7-21. Retrieved from <http://dspacc.nbu.gov.vua:8080/dspace/handle/123456789/12400>