

## Impacts of Chieftaincy Tussle on Socio–Economic Development of Selected Communities in Benue State, Nigeria

**Joy Uloko Ameh, Ngbede Eluma Willams**

Department of Social Studies, School of Arts and Social Sciences, Federal College of Education,  
P.M.B 102 102, Benue State, Nigeria

**Ekirigwe-Edeh Isaac**

Registry Department, Federal College of Education Odugbo, P.M.B 102 102 Benue State, Nigeria

**Abstract:** The study investigated the impact of chieftaincy tussle on Socio – Economic Development on selected Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities of Benue State. The thrust of this paper is to examine the impact of chieftaincy tussle on social economic development of the study area. The study was guided by two research questions and two corresponding objectives. The study adopted the descriptive survey design. The sample of, 1000 respondents from the total population of 4500 was carefully selected, using simple random sampling technique. The sample size was carved out of five communities in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu. The instrument for data collection was a structured questionnaire item. Out of the distributed 1,000 questionnaires, only 800 were retrieved and find useful and valid as 200 of the questionnaire items were discarded. The data collected was analyzed using frequency count and simple percentage. From the findings, the study revealed serious negative impact of chieftaincy tussle on the socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities which is majorly caused by crisis variables such as, struggle for power, struggle for scares resources, weak traditional institutions and government interference. The study recommended amongst others that, the impact of chieftaincy tussle on socio economic development on Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities is one that has impeded on project executions and disruption of social unity therefore, the study recommend that, local government leaders should establish processes to determine who becomes a chief in communities and kingdoms within their territory in line with the customs, traditions of the people and the extant laws of governments.

**Keywords:** Chieftaincy tussle, socio economic development, community, power, struggle, scares resources.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

## Introduction

Chieftaincy institutions contribute immensely to socio-economic, cultural, and political development (Abotchie, 2006). Chieftaincy emerged naturally as the evolution of human society. In the earliest days of migration, a group of people followed a courageous leader to search for a suitable place for settlement. The group leader emerged naturally as a chief and has allodial title over all customary land in his state. The allodial title was used for the installation of newly elected chiefs. Chieftaincy titles were also acquired through conquest. Chieftaincy became ancestral stool from which succeeding chiefs were selected (Odotei & Awedoba, 2006). The selection and enskinment of chiefs has been known to be associated with several chieftaincy tussles across Africa. Chieftaincy tussles are caused by the use of partisan politics to influence the process of selection, enskinment, and destoolment (Agyeman-Duah, 2008). Chieftaincy tussle is defined as a struggle over a vacant traditional position resulting from the death of the incumbent chief (Awedoba, 2009).

Literature shows that chieftaincy tussles can impede development for many years thereafter (Canterbury & Kendie, 2010). The term development is a multi-faceted concept in academic discourse and it is used differently by a social scientist, and other professionals to suit their context (Battaglia et al., 2011). Traditionally, development was equated to the sustained economic growth rate of a country's gross domestic product. This development economist perspective which has been the benchmark for measuring, understanding, and addressing developmental problems is asymmetrical and insufficient (Gyeke, 1994). Development is also defined in terms of sufficient responses to the conditions within which human beings function, conditions which encompass the economic, political, social, and cultural (Gyeke, 1994). This definition suggests that development is multidimensional, and sustained economic growth rate cannot be used as the sole indicator of measuring development (Battaglia et al., 2011). From the above analysis, it is clear that development encompasses the conditions that improve human welfare and it is influenced by factors such as social, economic, cultural, and political.

Several studies have explored the links between violent chieftaincy tussles and development (Ohene-Amoah, 2016). The incidence of violent chieftaincy tussles creates insecurity in the society or state and thus leads to underdevelopment (Hegre, 2012). A distinction is often made between chieftaincy tussles and violent chieftaincy tussles. Chieftaincy tussle is defined as a struggle between two or more people over value, status, power, and resources comes unsurprisingly as a consequence of human interactions in which the aims of the parties are

not only to gain the desired outcomes but also to get rid of their rivals (Coser, 1956 as cited in Tona, 2016).

### **Statement of Research Problem**

Chieftaincy tussle is one of the challenges facing the world today. Anderson and Sumner (2006) argued that the money that could have been used to provide social services was spent to resolve chieftaincy tussles. Chieftaincy tussles affect international trade and thus lower fiscal growth (Magee & Massoud, 2011). Chieftaincy tussle is a widespread attribute of human society and ascribed to virulent diseases like HIV/AIDS (Freedman & Poku, 2005). Chieftaincy tussles have made African communities vulnerable to economic distortions, erosion of public health systems, loss of human life, destruction of property, and displacement of people (Francis, 2006). Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities has experienced their share of chieftaincy tussles. Chieftaincy tussles are caused by the competition between the royal gates over the right of succession, and the use of money to influence the process of selection or enskinment, and destoolment (Agyeman-Duah, 2008). Chieftaincy tussles have been described by Anamzoya (2010) & Tona (2017) as the main threat to Nigeria socio-economic, cultural, and political development. Research shows that chieftaincy tussles are common in Benue state Nigeria .

### **Research questions**

Three research questions guided the study:

1. What are the causes of chieftaincy tussle in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities?
2. What are the impacts of chieftaincy tussle on socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities?

### **Objectives of the study**

The broad objective of this study is to examine the impacts of chieftaincy tussle on Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities socio economic development the specific objectives are to:

1. Identify the causes of chieftaincy tussle in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities
2. Examine the effects of chieftaincy tussle on socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities

### **Significance of the Study**

The study will add to the existing body of academic literature on the role or impact of chieftaincy tussle socio economic development. It provides a nuanced understanding of the challenges faced by inhabitant in some communities during a defined period, contributing to the broader discourse on socio economic development in developing countries. Findings from the study will also guide the development and implementation of strategies aimed at overcoming challenges to socio economic development, by scrutinizing the actions and decisions of community leaders, the study will contribute to fostering accountability and transparency in governance. The insights on the

factors that contribute to or hinder socio economic development will enable the public to hold leaders accountable for their roles in shaping the developmental trajectory of the State.

## **Conceptual Review**

### **Chieftaincy tussle**

In many African societies — and in other customary polities — the institution of chieftaincy serves as a core mechanism for social organization, political authority, and community identity. Traditional chiefs or rulers often hold symbolic, spiritual, administrative, and economic powers over their domains. However, the process of succession, recognition, and allocation of chieftaincy titles is frequently contested. A “chieftaincy tussle” refers to conflicts, disputes, or competition surrounding these processes — a phenomenon that has serious implications for social cohesion, governance, resource control, and communal stability.

Ukase and Abraham (2016) frame a chieftaincy tussle as a succession conflict resulting from colonial and post-colonial distortions of customary land and authority arrangements. According to their research, many contemporary chieftaincy disputes in Central Nigeria are rooted in the transformations introduced during colonial rule, which turned land — previously under communal or custodial management by chiefs — into a valuable commodity in the capitalist economy. As land and chieftaincy titles became assets with economic value, competition over who holds the stool or title intensified. The authors argue that the admixture of colonial administrative laws and indigenous customary systems created contradictions that produce “chieftaincy disputes,” frequently manifesting as chieftaincy tussles.

Orji (2022) emphasizes that a chieftaincy tussle is a challenge to socio-political stability and rural development. In a recent empirical study of rural communities in South-East Nigeria, communal chieftaincy tussles were shown to have detrimental effects on healthcare delivery, human capital formation, and overall rural development. The study describes “communal chieftaincy tussle” as a conflict over traditional leadership that undermines community development and public service delivery. In this framing, the tussle is not simply about titles or prestige, but about control of resources, governance mechanisms and the capacity to deliver social goods, making it a structural problem affecting community wellbeing.

Tseer and Sulemana (2022) locate a chieftaincy tussle within the intersection of customary law, state regulation, and the ambiguity of legal recognition. Their work explains how conflicts arise when customary claims to authority clash with statutory laws or modern legal frameworks. For

instance, in several Nigerian contexts, the appointment or recognition of traditional rulers must navigate between customary norms and state legislations like the Chiefs Law. When stakeholders — including kingmakers, ruling houses, and government officials — differ on who has the rightful claim, disputes emerge. The inherent tension between customary succession practices and statutory regulation often triggers chieftaincy tussles, underscoring the complexity of chieftaincy in plural legal systems.

Ebo and Udentia (2023) define a chieftaincy tussle as a socially disruptive conflict over chieftaincy rights and resource control. Research on communities such as the Angalabiri in Bayelsa State demonstrates that chieftaincy tussles can lead to “destruction of economic activities, intolerance, enmity, quarrelling and fighting,” thereby displacing community cohesion and undermining socio-political development. Here, the tussle is not merely about symbolic leadership, but about tangible control over resources, economic activities, and social order — making it a catalyst for communal violence and underdevelopment.

Alo (2014) expands on the definition of chieftaincy tussle, viewing it as a challenge in customary succession and legitimacy, often exacerbated by external political interference and ethnic tensions. Studies from Ghana and Nigeria indicate that succession conflicts arise when multiple factions — such as ruling families, queen-mothers, or ethnic groups — assert competing claims based on lineage, customary rights, or historical precedence. These conflicts are frequently worsened by interference from state authorities or political actors who leverage chieftaincy disputes for broader political gain. Such tussles are therefore seen as manifestations of broader contestations over communal identity, authority legitimacy, and political power.

A chieftaincy tussle is a contested struggle — often multi-dimensional — among claimants, traditional institutions, governmental authorities, and community stakeholders over the rightful succession, recognition, and control of a chieftaincy title or stool. This struggle typically arises when customary norms, statutory laws, economic stakes (such as land or resource control), and political interests intersect and conflict. The tussle manifests in disputes over legitimacy, leadership authority, resource allocation, and governance control within a community, frequently triggering social instability or development setbacks.

### **The Concept of Socio-Economic Development**

Socio-economic development on the other hand, refers to the process of improving the social and economic well-being of individuals, communities, and societies as a whole. It involves enhancing people's quality of life, reducing poverty, promoting economic growth, and addressing social

inequalities (UNDP, 1990; Todaro & Smith, 2015). Socio-economic development encompasses various dimensions, including economic, social, and environmental aspects. It involves creating opportunities for productive employment, improving access to education, healthcare, and basic services, promoting gender equality, fostering social cohesion, and ensuring environmental sustainability (UNDP, 1990; Todaro & Smith, 2015). A key objective of socio-economic development is to achieve sustainable and inclusive growth that benefits all segments of society. It aims to create an enabling environment that supports equitable distribution of resources, reduces disparities, and promotes social justice (UNDP, 1990; Todaro & Smith, 2015). Efforts towards socio-economic development require a multi-sectoral approach and collaboration between various stakeholders, including governments, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector. It involves formulating and implementing policies and programs that address the specific needs and challenges of different communities and regions (UNDP, 1990; Todaro & Smith, 2015).

### **Community Development**

Community development is an approach to bring about planned changes in a community. It involves local community in a systematic way to improve their living standard. These efforts give a clear direction to strengthening community structure for human well-being. For past few decades, community development programs have identified a discipline of interest to both academicians and practitioners. A good number of academicians believe it is a process to build the capacities of people collectively and improving their skills. While the majority of practitioners say community development as an outcome to improve the social, economic and physical conditions of the community (Phillips & Robert, 2008). According to Pawar (2014) community development as a process, developing and enhancing the ability to act collectively, and an outcome, taking collective actions to improve the community various sectors such as physical, environmental, cultural, social, political, economic and etc".

Ekong, (1977) cited in Anikeze 2014, sees community development as any action in a locality by any agency with the primary intention of bringing some benefits to such locality. This implies that community development is a movement designed to promote better living for the whole community with active participation and on the initiative of the community.

Ezeani, (2004) holds a similar view, he affirms that community development is an educational process; it is something of the spirit more than something material. It must reach into deep cultural pattern of people, examining them and testing them as principle of faith. It is not a temporary, physical construction. It is a building within the heart and mind of men not a recreation centre in the middle of a field.

Eze (1999) defined community development as efforts provided for advancement of communities, hesitated that the major emphasis of the concept was upon those activities which aim at prorating the improvement of the basic condition of the community's non material need. This implies that community development is aimed at community action where community action is used as a phenomenon that recommends that community members resolve their problems by directly participating in development activities.

## **Theoretical Framework**

### **Socio-cultural Approach**

Socio-cultural approach is the best suited as the theoretical framework for this study because it is the culture of the people that placed chieftaincy tussle as weaker vessels, and sees them as less important when decisions need to be taken for the growth of communities and even in their household, and this belief moves from generation to generation. This cultural approach deals with tradition, beliefs, values, norms and practices system of the people living in the same society. As explained in the socio-cultural perspective, culture and its beliefs and practice of a particular people and society has been the major drawback for chieftaincy tussle as regards to their participation in developing their communities and also been empowered. The socio-cultural viewpoint of chieftaincy tussle, beings with the assumptions that human behavior and conduct are largely directed and determined by culture that is learned recipes for behaviors shared by members of a society. Prominent supporters of this view include Ann Oakley, Bruno Bettheim, Enestine Fried and Sherry B. Octnear. From their perspective, gender role are the product of culture rather than biology and as such the present condition of chieftaincy tussle, particularly in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities community.

### **Methodology**

#### **Research Design**

In this study, survey research design was used. Due to its advantages in distinguishing characteristics of a wide population from a chosen group of people, this design is thought to be appropriate.

#### **Population of the Study**

A research population is generally a large collection of individuals or objects that is the main focus of a scientific inquiry. The population of the study is 4500 chieftaincy tussle (projected).

---

## **Sample and Sampling Technique**

The sample size of the study consisted of 1, 000 adult respondents carefully selected, using simple random sampling technique. The sample size was carved out of five villages in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities .

This study provided questionnaire and conducted interview using a straightforward random sampling technique, giving each potential respondent a chance to be chosen. This is done to ensure that there is the least amount of bias in the respondent selection.

## **Method of Data Collection**

Data were collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data was collected from seven villages in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities community. This approach was used to enable respondents to convey in-depth, unbiased information that might not be captured by the questionnaire.

Secondary data was gathered from reports that have already been published, books, the internet, journals, newspapers, and magazines.

## **Instruments for Data Collection**

Personal interviews and a properly crafted questionnaire given to the respondents was used to gather the data. The questionnaire served as the primary tool for gathering data overall. Sections A and B of the questionnaire are included. The respondents' individual characteristics are listed in Section A. The questionnaire's primary substance is Section B.

## **Method of Data Analysis**

The data that was collected from various sources, analyzed using the simple percentage. It is appropriate to use percentages when determining number of respondents that is in agreement with the question to be asked.

## **Data presentation and analysis**

### **Data Presentation**

The analysis and presentation of data collected during the field survey through the use of questionnaires. Questionnaire administered and returned were statistically analyzed using relevant statistical tools. Percentages and frequency distributions of respondents' demographics made use

of the descriptive statistics. The data collected was presented in form of table to facilitate easy understanding, analysis and discussion of the respondents view in relation to issues raised in the questionnaires. These enables the researcher to form opinion based on the analyzed data.

Table 4.1: Administration and Retrieval of Questionnaires

No of Questionnaire Administered	No of Questionnaire Retrieved	No of Questionnaire not useful	% of Success
1,000	800	200	90.5%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

Table 4.1: Show that one thousand (1000) questionnaires were successfully distributed but eight hundred (800) were completed and returned, while 200 were not returned by the respondents. Therefore, this analysis is based on responses from eight hundred (800) retrieved questionnaires.

#### Bio-Data Information of Respondents

Table 4.2: Distribution of Questionnaire based on Sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Female	200	40%
Male	600	60%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

From the above table shows 200 respondents are females. While 600 respondents are males. It is obvious from the above table that male respondents are more than the number of female. This is because the male respondents are more concerned about chieftaincy tussle than female respondents during the distribution and collection of questionnaires on the field.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Questionnaire based on Age

Age	Frequency	Percentage
20-30yrs	555	45.3%
31-40	70	25.7%
41-50	35	4.3%
51-60	75	3.3%
Above 60	65	21.4%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

The above table shows that 555 respondents representing (45.3%) belong to the age group of 20 to 30 years. 70 respondents representing (25.7%) belong to the age group of 31-40 years, 35 respondents representing (4.3%) belong to the age group of 41-50 years, 75 respondents representing (3.3%) belong to the age group of 51-60 years and 65 respondents representing (21.4%) belong to the age group of 60 and above.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Questionnaire based on Marital Status

<b>Marital Status:</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Single	500	65.3%
Married	105	20.1%
Widows / widowers	95	15.3%
Divorced	100	5%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

The above table shows that 500 respondents representing (65.3%) are single, 105 respondents representing (20.1%) are married, 95 respondents representing (15.3%) are widow and 100 respondents representing (5%) are divorced. It is obvious from the above table that singles have the highest number as youths compare to other respondents.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Questionnaire based on Educational qualification

<b>Educational Qualification</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
SSCE	460	40.5%
OND/NCE	90	40.0%
HND/B.Sc.	150	15.7%
Post-graduate	100	5.3%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

The table above shows that 460 respondents representing (40.5%) have SSCE certificate, 90 respondents representing (40.0%) have OND/NCE certificate, 150 respondents representing (15.7%) have HND/B.Sc. certificate, 100 respondents representing (5.3%) have postgraduate certificate. This means that SSCE educational qualification has the highest figure of respondents than other educational qualification.

Table 4.6: Distribution of Questionnaire based on Employment Status

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage %</b>
Employed	230	15.3%
Self-Employed	310	35.7%
Unemployed	70	45.7%
Student	190	5.3%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

The above table shows that 230 respondents representing (15.3%) are employed, 310 respondents representing (35.7%) are self-employed, 70 respondents representing (45.7%) are unemployed while, 190 respondents representing (5.3%) are students.

### Data Analysis

#### Questionnaire Response from Respondents

**Research Question One:** What are the causes of chieftaincy tussle in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities?

Table 4.7: struggle for power birth chieftaincy tussle in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	465	47.4%
Agree	150	33.6%
Disagree	101	12.2%
Strongly Disagree	84	8.4%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities,2025

The above shows 465 respondents representing 47.4% and 150 respondents representing 33.6% percent strongly agree and agree respectively that struggle for power cause chieftaincy tussle in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities. While 101 respondents representing 12.2% and 84 respondents representing 8.4% disagree and strongly disagree respectively that struggle for power of chieftaincy tussle on socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities

Table 4.8: Resource control is another cause of chieftaincy tussle in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	520	62.1%
Agree	50	20.9%
Disagree	150	10.1%
Strongly Disagree	80	2.9%
Total	800	100

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

From the above table, it shows that 520 respondents representing 62.1% and 50 respondents representing 20.9% strongly agree and agree respectively that resource control causes chieftaincy tussle in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities. While 150 respondents representing 10.1% and 80 respondents representing 2.9% disagree and strongly disagree respectively that resource control causes chieftaincy tussle in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities.

Table 4.9: Claim to secure status is one major cause of chieftaincy in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities

Responses	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	430	54.7%
Agree	150	22.2%
Disagree	100	18.9%
Strongly Disagree	120	5.1%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

The above table shows that 430 respondents representing 54.7% and 150 respondents representing 22.2% strongly agree and agree respectively that Claim to secure status is a major cause Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities. While 100 respondents representing 18.9% and 120 respondents representing 5.1% disagree and strongly disagree respectively that Claim to secure status is a major cause of chieftaincy tussle Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu.

**Research Question Two:** What are the impact of chieftaincy tussle on socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities?

Table 4.10: project abandonment affects socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities.

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	300	47.4%
Agree	150	33.6%
Disagree	200	12.2%
Strongly Disagree	150	8.4%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

The above shows 300 respondents representing 47.4% and 150 respondents representing 33.6% percent strongly agree and agree respectively that project abandonment affects socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities in Benue state. While 200 respondents representing 12.2% and 150 respondents representing 8.4% disagree and strongly disagree respectively that project abandonment affects socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities.

Table 4.11: insecurity affects socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities in Benue state.

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	280	25.0%
Agree	120	25.9%
Disagree	200	25.5%
Strongly Disagree	200	27.0%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

The above table shows that 280 respondents representing 25.0% and 120 respondents representing 25.9% strongly agree and agree respectively that insecurity affects socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities. While 200 respondents representing 25.5% and 200 respondents representing 27.0% disagree and strongly disagree respectively that insecurity affects community development in Benue state.

Table 4.12: Chieftaincy tussle holding sensitive political positions affects socio economic development of Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities.

<b>Responses</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Strongly Agree	370	35.1%
Agree	230	25.2%
Disagree	200	20.3%
Strongly Disagree	200	20.1%
Total	800	100%

Source: Field Survey in Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities, 2025

The table above revealed that 370 respondents representing 35.1% and 230 respondents representing 25.2% strongly agrees and agree respectively that Chieftaincy tussle holding sensitive political positions affects community development in Apa Local Government Area.

While 200 respondents representing 20.3% and 200 respondents representing 20.1% disagree and strongly disagree respectively that Chieftaincy tussle holding sensitive political positions affects Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities.

### **Conclusion**

The challenges emanating through chieftaincy crisis in Nigeria societies has crippled community developed and can impede on the development of any nation (UNDP, 2006). Considering the issues of development, Seers (1969), gave an insight on development as involving not only economic growth but also conditions in which people in a country have sufficient food and jobs and that the income inequality among them is to a great extent reduced which is in direct opposite of the impacts of chieftaincy tussle on Ter Ukum, Tyoor Ukum, Ter Buruku, Tyoor Buruku and Oga Edikwu communities in Benue State of Nigeria.

### **Recommendations**

1. The study recommend government at all levels to formulate and implement policy to make the traditional stool less attractive through ministry of chieftaincy affaires. When this done, it reduces the level of crisis that emanate from chieftaincy tussle in our society.
2. The impacts of chieftaincy tussle on socio economic development is one that has impeded on project executions and disruption of social unity therefore, the study recommend that, local government leaders should establish processes to determine who becomes a chief in

communities and kingdoms within their territory in line with the custom and traditions of the people.

## REFERENCES

1. Abdulsalam, A. A., Olokooba, I. N., Okafor, I. P., & Adika, A. C. (2020). Roles of traditional rulers in conflict resolution for sustainable democracy in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Social Studies*, 23(1).
2. Abugu, S.O. (2014). The role and challenges of local government in community development: An insight. *Review of Public Administration and Management*, 3(6), 7-9.
3. Adeleke, J. O. (2012). Effects of the national policy implementation strategy on the working conditions of chieftaincy tussle in agricultural development: A case study of Akungba and Oka Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Arts & Social Sciences*, 5(3), 315-324.
4. Adi, A. N. (2015). Employee engagement construction newest condition (during 2012-2014). Adoption to achieve competitiveness in global condition combining with technology interaction and people value. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 211(8), 2-9.
5. Afolabi, M. M. (2008). Chieftaincy tussle as pillars of national economy in Nigeria: A study of economic activities of rural chieftaincy tussle in six local Government Areas of Ondo State. *International Association for Feminist Economy*, 5(2), 5-8.
6. Agu, S. (2007). Gender equality, education and chieftaincy tussle empowerment: The Nigerian challenge. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Research Development*, 8(1), 66-72.
7. Ainabor, A. E., & Ovbiagele, A.I.O. (2007). Implications of chieftaincy tussle education for poverty alleviation in Nigeria. *Journal of Academics*, 2(2), 43-47.
8. Ainabor, A.E., Eregha, E.E., & Obiagele, A.I.O. (2006). Chieftaincy tussle education in Nigeria: Implications for socio-economic development. *Journal of Academics*, 1(1), 8-12.
9. Ake, C. (1994). *Democratization of disempowerment in Africa*. Malthouse Press.
10. Alo, L. K. (2014). *Legal regulation of chieftaincy disputes in Yorubaland 1939-1960* (Ph.D. thesis, University of Ibadan).
11. Anikeze, N. H. (2014). *Theories and practice of local government administration in Nigeria: A comparative perspective*. Academic Publishing Company.
12. Anugwom, E.E. (2009). Chieftaincy tussle education and work in Nigeria. *Educational Research and Review*, 4(4), 127-134.
13. Awe, B. (2001). *Nigerian chieftaincy tussle: A historical perspective*. Bookcraft Ltd.
14. Care International. (2018). *Chieftaincy tussle's economic empowerment strategy*. Retrieved from [https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/media/k2/attachments/CARE-Chieftaincy\\_tussles-Economic-Empowermentstrategy\\_2016.pdf](https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/media/k2/attachments/CARE-Chieftaincy_tussles-Economic-Empowermentstrategy_2016.pdf)

15. Centre for Development and Population Activities (CEDPA). (1997). *Empowering chieftaincy tussle at all levels of society to be full partners in development (organizational literature)*. Available at HTTP: <http://www.cedpa.com>
16. Chafetz, J. S. (1988). *Feminist sociology: An overview of contemporary theories*. F. E. Peacock Publishers.
17. Chen, M., & Mahmud, S. (1995). *Assessing change in chieftaincy tussle's life. A conceptual framework*. BRAC-ICDDR.
18. Crawley, H. (1998). Living up to the empowerment claims: The potential of PRA. In I. Guijt, & M. K. Shah (Eds.), *The myth of community* (pp.67-81). Intermediate Technology Publications.
19. Damisa, M. A., & Yohanna, M. (2007). Role of rural chieftaincy tussle in farm management decision making process: Ordered probit analysis. *Trends in Applied Science Research*, 2(6), 241-245.
20. Ebo, K. A., & Udentia, J. O. E. (2023). Communal conflict and rural development in South East Nigeria: Communal land disputes, chieftaincy tussle, and natural resource control. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(1), 122–133.
21. Economist (2000). A survey of Nigeria: Here is hoping. *Economist*, 1(1), 4-9.
22. Elizabeth, R. (2007). Woman empowerment to support gender mainstreaming in rural agricultural development policies. *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, 25(2), 126–135.
23. Esu, A. & Essang, M. (1992). *Activism and national development in Nigeria: In agricultural and rural development*. Sage.
24. Esu, A. E. O. (1996). *Empowerment of chieftaincy tussle through adult education in Nigeria*. A Paper presented at the workshop organized by UNDP University of Calabar.
25. Everett, J. (1991). *The global empowerment of chieftaincy tussle association for chieftaincy tussle*. Development Publication.
26. Eze, C.A. (1999). *Theory and practice of community development: An introduction to community development*. Liberty Printing Press.
27. Ezeani, O.E. (2004). *Local government administration*. Zik-Chuks Nigeria Ltd.
28. Ezumah, N. N. (1988). Chieftaincy tussle in agriculture: Neglect of chieftaincy tussle's role. *Journal of the Institute of African Studies*, 3(6), 9-15.
29. Fakih, M. (1996). *Analysis of gender transformation*. Pustaka.
30. Federal Ministry of Chieftaincy tussle Affairs (2006). *Nigerian gender statistics*. Digest.
31. Federal Ministry of Education (2007). *National Bureau of Statistics*.
32. Federal Republic of Nigeria (1987). *Report of the political bureau*. Directorate for Mobilization (MAMSER).

33. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (1979). *The state of food and agriculture*. FAO Publications.
34. Freire, P. (1974). *The pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
35. Friedman, J. (1992). *Empowerment: The politics of alternative development*. Blackwell.
36. Friedmann, J. (1987). *Planning in the public domain*. Princeton University Press.
37. Gabriel, A. O. (2000). Chieftaincy tussle empowerment in the Niger-Delta: Past, present and future. *Journal of Niger Delta Research*, 2(7), 21-39.
38. Gajanayake, S. J. (1993). *Community empowerment: A participatory training manual on community project development*. Office of International Training and Consultation.
39. Garba, P. K. (1997). A strategy for empowering chieftaincy tussle: Application to trade union activities. In P. K. Garba, et al. (Eds.), *Chieftaincy tussle and economic reforms in Nigeria* (pp. 45-52). Chieftaincy tussle's Research and Documentation Centre.
40. Godwin, C. I. (2015). Chieftaincy tussle's empowerment, sustainable development and sustainability in Nigeria's local governments. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 17(8), 123-130.
41. Griffin, V. (1989). *Chieftaincy tussle, development and empowerment: A pacific feminist perspective*. Asian and Pacific Development Centre.
42. Gutierrez, L. M., & Ortega, R. (1991). Developing methods to empower Latinos: The importance of groups. *Social Work with Groups*, 14(2), 23-43.
43. Hoop, T. de, Kempen, L. van, Linssen, R., & Eerdewijk, A. van. (2010). *Chieftaincy tussle's autonomy and subjective well-being in India how village norms shape the impact of self-help groups*. Sage.
44. Huis, M. A., Hansen, N., Otten, S., & Lensink, R. (2017). A three-dimensional model of chieftaincy tussle's empowerment: Implications in the field of microfinance and future directions. *Frontiers in Psychology Journal*, 8(5), 7-33.
45. IFDA (International Foundation for Development Alternatives) (1980). *Building blocks for alternative development strategies IFDA Dossier 17*. [http://www.dhf.uu.se/ifda/readerdocs/pdf/doss\\_17.pdf](http://www.dhf.uu.se/ifda/readerdocs/pdf/doss_17.pdf).
46. James, V. U., & James, M. M. (1995). The current and future directions for African chieftaincy tussle farmers. In V. U. James (Ed.), *Chieftaincy tussle and sustainable development in Africa* (pp. 78-89). Praeger Publishers.
47. Kabeer, N. (2005). Gender equality and chieftaincy tussle's empowerment: A critical analysis of the third millennium development goal 1. *Gender & Development*, 13(1), 13-24.

48. Kagitabasi, C. G., Goksen, F., & Gulgoz, S. (2005). Functional adult literacy and empowerment of chieftaincy tussle: Impact of a functional literacy program in Turkey. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(6), 472-498.
49. Kahneman, D., & Deaton, A. 2010. High income improves evaluation of life but not emotional well-being. *Psychological and Cognitive Sciences*, 107(38), 16489–16493.
50. Kappelman, E. (2016). *Empowerment and subjective and emotional well-being in South Africa*. University of Missoula Montana Press.
51. Kelly, B.O.E (2013). Gender equality and chieftaincy tussle empowerment in Nigeria: The desirability and inevitability of a pragmatic approach. *Developing Country Studies*, 3(4), 59-66.
52. Ker, B.O. (1999). Enhancing chieftaincy tussle's economic contribution to national development. *The Counsellor*, 17(1), 259-269.
53. Khadijah S. A. (2018). Chieftaincy tussle empowerment as a catalyst for sustainable development in Nigeria: Adult education as a tool. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(11), 136-142.
54. Lasiele, Y.A. (1999). Chieftaincy tussle empowerment in Nigeria: Problems, prospects and implications for counselling. *The Counsellor*, 17(1), 132-137.
55. Longwe, S. H. (1995). *Chieftaincy tussle's empowerment framework*. Sage.
56. Lopez-Claros, A., & Zahidi, S. (2005). *Chieftaincy tussle's empowerment: Measuring the global gender gap*. Sage
57. Iudayo, A. O., Anyaegbunam, M. A., Nnenum, O. A. U., Chine, B. C., Omonijo, D. O., & Ohunakin, F. (2015). Roles of chieftaincy tussle in national development: A study of Late Prof. Dora Nkem Akunyili. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 133(2), 143-160.
58. Orji, U. D. (2022). The roles of traditional rulers in conflict resolutions in South Eastern Nigeria. *IDOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 71–81.
59. Tseer, T., & Sulemana, U. (2022). Collaboration between traditional and central authorities in chieftaincy succession conflicts management in Ghana: Evidence from Bole traditional area. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2022.934652>
60. Ukase, P. I., & Abraham, V. O. (2016). The political economy of land and chieftaincy disputes in contemporary Africa: Examples from Central Nigeria. *International Journal of English, Literature and Social Science*, 1(1).