

## **Wildlife Conservation as a Mitigating Factor to Food Security in a Distressed Economy**

<sup>1</sup>Godwin E. Eze, <sup>1</sup>Cajethan U. Ugwuoke,

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka  
[cajethan.ugwuoke@unn.edu.ng](mailto:cajethan.ugwuoke@unn.edu.ng) +2348069343310

### **Abstract**

The study was aimed at determining the role of wildlife conservation as a mitigator to food security in a distressed economy like Nigeria. The population for the study was 423, comprising 400 farmers (registered hunters) and 23 extension agents. No sampling was made since the population was manageable. A 54-item structured questionnaire was developed to collect data from the respondents. The data collected were analysed using mean and t-test statistic at the probability of 0.05 level of significance. Results showed among others, that controlled hunting, refuge establishment, predator control, artificial stocking, among others were the sustainable practices for wildlife conservation

**Keywords:** Wildlife, wildlife resource, conservation practices, food insecurity, distressed economy

### **Introduction**

The agricultural industry remains the largest economic sector in Nigeria. Most of her citizens depend on agriculture for food security, economic distress relief and poverty alleviation. Food and Agricultural organization (2013) explained 'food insecurity' to mean when all the people in the country do not have physical safe and nutritious food at all times to meet their dietary needs for a healthy life. This scenario is a daily experience among Nigerians, as more than 50 per-cent of her population do not have access to safe food at all times. The effects are numerous: many children miss school (school dropout) while prostitution, robbery and cultism are on the increase. These are the indices of a distressed economy.

A distressed economy according to Uzonwanne (2015), is a condition when a nation and her citizen cannot generate enough revenue to

## ***Wildlife Conservation as a.....***

solve their basic life needs. The high unemployment rate, economic bankruptcy, poverty of the masses, hunger, high death rate, indebtedness among others are indicators of a distressed economy (Uzonwanne, 2015). Nigeria must not continue with food insecurity hence the need for wildlife resource conservation as a mitigation strategy to avert food insecurity.

Wildlife refers to plants and animals that are not domesticated by man but essential for his survival (International Hunter Education, 2003). Osinem (2005) in his view noted wildlife to mean all plants and other microbes that grow in an environment without being introduced by humans. Osinem and Mama (2008) explained that wildlife is one of the ecological capitals comprising every form of life, from the tiniest microbes to the mightiest beast and the ecosystem of which they are part of. The authors further emphasized that wildlife is now to some extent used interchangeably with biodiversity; a term that became common in the scientific literature from 1986. Biodiversity, as stressed by the authors, is the existence of a large number of different kinds of animals and plants which make a balanced environment. In the context of this work, wildlife is limited to animals. Wildlife is a diverse agricultural resource existing in various forms. Wildlife exists as mammals, reptiles, aquatics and arachnids with definite characteristic features (Avaaz Team, 2004). Wildlife is one of the agricultural resources needed by man for survival.

Wildlife resources are those products or materials obtained from untamed animals and plants to satisfy the specific need of man (Peres, 2001). Osinem (2005) emphasized that wildlife resource provides the nation with a cornucopia of goods and services ranging from food, energy and materials. According to the author, wildlife provides the nation with resources such as food, fibre, income, some religious, cultural and social values, fuel, meat, and industrial raw materials e.g fur, tusks, bone and others. Osinem (2005) stressed that for the sustainability of these wildlife resources among local users, conservation of wildlife becomes very crucial.

Wildlife conservation poses a peculiar challenge to the global community of Africa because wildlife resource has an impact not only on people living in an area where wildlife is found but also on people located at a considerable distance away. Mama and Osinem (2008) explained wildlife conservation to mean the management and protection of wild animal resources. According to the authors, it is a means whereby animals are allowed ample time to breed and increase in population in an environment that is not constantly harnessed by man. Good forest preservation is quite important in order not to destroy this great heritage. It should be called to mind that if any man interferes with nature, the balance that exists among the resources are interfered with and so it is important that our wildlife resources be used intelligently. Osimen (2005), affirmed that the intelligent selection of what can be changed or replaced in the community without harmfully disturbing or disrupting the balance in nature is known as conservation. The author noted that wildlife is conserved in game reserves which are large areas of land set aside for the conservation and protection of wild animals.

Wildlife conservation is the practice of protecting endangered animal species and their habitat (Baldus et al., 2003). According to the authors, the goals of wild animal conservation are to ensure that nature will be around for future generations to enjoy and to recognize the importance of wildlife to humans. Endangered species are the animal populations that are at the danger of becoming extinct because of mismanagement, either that they are threatened by the very environmental factors or predation parameters (Baldus et al., 2003). Wildlife conservation may be faced with some threats of environmental degradation (International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, IUCN, 2008).

Environmental degradation is the act or process in which the balance in the earth ecosystem is disturbed or denatured (Mama and Osinem, 2007). This implies a reduction in the quality of the wildlife environment or habitat to a point of being noticed. Degradation may pose a serious threat not only to plants and human lives but also to wildlife resource making it imperative that further degradation should

## **Wildlife Conservation as a.....**

be checked. Avaaz (2004) noted the following as the major problems facing wildlife resource conservation in Nigeria. They include poor government policy that may not favour the conservation practices, poor education of the rural communities on the need for conservation, poaching, among others. To achieve a steady supply of wildlife products, food security and rescue of our distressed economy, some sustainable conservation practices must be adopted. Conservation practices are the different wise steps adopted for the management of the valuable wildlife resources to ensure a continuous supply for the future (Osinem and Mama, 2008). The authors further stated that it involves proper planning for wildlife production for commercial purposes as well as meeting the local needs for food security and health care without exploiting them to the point of extinction. According to the authors, conservation would be attained if harvesting of wildlife for economic, health, social, and cultural purposes do not adversely affect the animal population, their habitat and the ecological function they perform. Hence, the study is aimed at determining the influence of wildlife conservation as a mitigation strategy for food security.

Specifically, the study sought to determine:

1. environmental degradation threats on wildlife resource conservation
2. problems facing wildlife resource conservation
3. sustainable wildlife resource conservation practices
4. mitigation strategies for efficient wildlife conservation

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study:

1. What are the environmental degradation threats to wildlife resource conservation?
2. What are the problems facing wildlife resource conservation?
3. What are the sustainable practices for wildlife resource conservation?
4. What are the mitigation strategies for wildlife resource conservation?

### **Research Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were formulated and tested at 0.05 level of significance.

**HO1:** There is no significant difference between the mean responses of the registered farmers (hunters) and the extension agents on environmental degradation threats on wildlife resource conservation.

**HO2:** There is no significant difference between the mean responses of the registered farmers (hunters) and the extension agents on the problems facing wildlife resource conservation

**HO3:** There is no significant difference between the mean responses of the registered farmers (hunters) and the extension agents on the sustainable practices for wildlife resource conservation.

**HO4:** There is no significant difference between the mean responses of the registered farmers (hunters) and the extension agents on the mitigation strategies for wildlife resource conservation.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The study adopted survey research design. Survey research design is the procedure in quantitative research where the researcher administers a questionnaire or interview to a sample or population to describe the attitudes, opinions, behaviours or characteristics of the population (Creswell, 2012). The design is suitable for the study since it obtained data from extension agents and farmers on the influence of wildlife conservation as a mitigation strategy for food security in a distressed economy through the use of a questionnaire. The study was carried out in Nsukka Agricultural Zone of Enugu State, Nigeria. The zone is made up of three major local government areas namely: Nsukka, Igbo-Etiti, and Uzo-Uwani Local government areas. Wildlife availability is basically peculiar to these areas because they are naturally endowed with natural habitat which favours wildlife existence and adaptation. Also, the people in the areas are interested in the hunting of wildlife as a means of generating income and food.

The population of the study was 423 made up of 400 farmers (registered hunters) and 23 extension agents. Among the 400 farmers, 100 were from Nsukka, 250 from Uzo-Uwani and 50 from Igbo-Etiti Local Government Areas. Similarly, among the 23 extension workers,

11 were from Nsukka, 7 from Uzo-Uwani and 5 from Igbo-Etiti Local Government Areas (Enugu State, Ministry of Agriculture, 2019). The sample for the study constituted the entire population. No sampling was made since the population was manageable.

A 56-item structured questionnaire developed from the literature was used to collect data from the respondents. The instrument was face validated by three experts. These validates were requested to scrutinize the instrument to ensure clarity and unambiguity. The comments and suggestions of the validates were used to improve the quality of the instrument. The instrument was pilot-tested on 20 farmers and 10 agricultural extension agents from Awgu Agricultural Zone who were not part of the study. Then, the reliability of the instrument was computed using Cronbach alpha method to determine the internal consistency which yielded a coefficient of 0.68. Four hundred and twenty three copies of the questionnaire was administered on the respondents while 360 copies were retrieved a week later. This gave a return rate of 85%.

### **Method of Data Analysis**

The data collected were analysed using Mean to answer the research questions. Values were assigned to different scaling points of the questionnaire and the corresponding mean score was interpreted using the real limit of numbers. Any item that had a mean score of 3.50 or above was regarded as Strongly Agree, 2.50 to 3.49 was interpreted as Agree, 1.50 to 2.49 as Disagree and 0.50 to 1.49 as Strongly Disagree. Similarly, the four null hypotheses were tested using a t-test statistic at the probability of 0.05 level of significance. The hypothesis of no significant difference was upheld for any item whose p - value was greater than 0.05 and rejected for any item whose p - value was less than 0.05.

**RESULTS**

**Table 1: Mean and t-Test Statistic of the Responses of Farmers and Extension Agents on the Environmental Degradation Threats to Wildlife Conservation**

**N=360**

S/N	Items	$\bar{X}$	SD	Dec	Farmers		Extension Agents		t-cal	p-value (2-tailed)	Rem
					$\bar{X}_1$	SD1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD2			
1	Rapid deforestation	3.85	0.42	SA	3.92	0.30	3.77	0.53	1.80	0.07	NS
2	Overhunting/overexploitation	3.83	0.49	SA	3.92	0.36	3.73	0.63	1.99	0.05	NS
3	Bush burning	3.89	0.33	SA	3.92	0.30	3.86	0.35	0.77	0.44	NS
4	Pollution	3.87	0.42	SA	3.93	0.35	3.82	0.50	1.26	0.21	NS
5	Improper disposal of refuse	3.86	0.41	SA	3.91	0.32	3.82	0.50	1.13	0.26	NS
6	Clean clearing	3.85	0.43	SA	3.92	0.33	3.77	0.53	1.70	0.09	NS
7	Soil erosion	3.86	0.38	SA	3.89	0.36	3.82	0.39	0.87	0.39	NS
8	Desertification	3.84	0.45	SA	3.90	0.38	3.77	0.53	1.36	0.18	NS
9	Bush encroachment	3.85	0.46	SA	3.92	0.30	3.77	0.61	1.70	0.09	NS
10	Soil salinization	3.85	0.47	SA	3.93	0.32	3.77	0.61	1.75	0.08	NS
11	Use of poison and explosives	3.86	0.37	SA	3.90	0.35	3.82	0.39	0.99	0.56	NS
12	Urbanization	3.85	0.47	SA	3.93	0.32	3.77	0.61	1.75	0.08	NS

*Note:  $\bar{X}$  = mean, SD = Standard Deviation, Dec = Decision,  $\bar{X}_1$  = Mean values of farmers, SD1 = Standard Deviation values of farmers,  $\bar{X}_2$  = mean values of extension, SD2 = Standard Deviation of Extension Agents, t-cal = calculated t-values, Rem = Remarks, NS = Not Significant, SA = Strongly Agree*

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that the 12 items had their grand means ranging from 3.82 to 3.89. This implies that the respondents strongly agree that rapid deforestation, overhunting/overexploitation, bush burning, pollution, improper refuse disposal, clean clearing, soil erosion, desertification, bush encroachment, soil salinization, use of poison/explosives and urbanization are the environmental degradation threats on wildlife conservation. Also, Table 1 above showed that the standard deviation values of the 12 items ranged from 0.33 to 0.49 which implies that the responses of the respondents were not far from the mean and from one another.

**Wildlife Conservation as a.....**

Similarly, the data presented in Table 1 showed that the p - values of the 12 items ranged from 0.05-0.56 which was equal or greater than 0.05. This implies that there is no statistically significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) in the mean responses of farmers and extension agents on rapid deforestation, overhunting/overexploitation, bush burning, pollution, improper refuse disposal, clean clearing, soil erosion, desertification, bush encroachment, soil salinization, use of poison/explosives and urbanization as the environmental degradation threats to wildlife conservation. The null hypothesis one which stated that there is no significant difference in the mean responses of registered farmers and extension agents was therefore upheld for each of the items.

**Table 2: Mean and t-Test Statistic of the responses of the Respondents on the Problems Facing Wildlife Resource Conservation N=360**

S/N	Items	$\bar{X}_G$	SD	Dec	Farmers		Extension Agents		t-cal	p-value (2-tailed)	Rem
					$\bar{X}_1$	SD	$\bar{X}_2$	SD <sub>2</sub>			
1	Unfavourable government policies	2.97	0.81	A	2.92	0.79	3.02	0.82	1.26	0.94	NS
2	Poor education of the rural communities on wildlife conservation	2.71	0.86	A	2.58	0.67	2.83	0.92	1.13	0.39	NS
3	Poaching	3.05	0.78	A	2.92	0.79	3.17	0.77	1.49	0.32	NS
4	Invasion of pests and diseases	2.92	0.83	A	2.83	0.83	3.00	0.84	1.19	0.55	NS
5	Deforestation	2.69	0.77	A	2.50	0.80	2.88	0.75	1.10	0.14	NS
6	Urbanization	2.95	0.78	A	3.00	0.74	2.90	0.80	0.59	0.71	NS
7	Poor funding of conservation programme	2.93	0.72	A	2.92	0.79	2.93	0.72	1.49	0.97	NS
8	Poverty of the rural communities	3.26	0.84	A	3.50	0.71	3.02	0.85	1.48	0.44	NS
9	Population increase of the rural dwellers	3.06	0.79	A	2.83	0.83	3.29	0.75	1.70	0.08	NS



The result presented in Table 2 revealed that the grand means ranged from 2.69 to 3.26 which implied that the respondents agree that unfavorable government policies, poor education of the rural communities, poaching, pests and diseases invasion, deforestation, urbanization, poor funding, poverty of the rural community and population increase of the rural dwellers are the problems facing wildlife resource conservation. Similarly, the probability values of the items ranged from 0.08 to 0.97 which is greater than 0.05. This signifies that there is no statistically significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) in the mean responses of farmers and extension agents on the problems facing wildlife resource conservation. Therefore, the hypothesis of no significant difference was upheld on all the items.

**Table 3: Mean and t-Test Statistic of the Responses of the Respondents on the Sustainable Wildlife Conservation Practices to Preserve Wildlife Resources**  
**N=360**

S/N	Items	$\bar{X}_G$	SD	Dec	Farmers		Extension Agents		t-cal	p-value (2-tailed)	Rem
					$\bar{X}_1$	SD1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD2			
1	Controlled hunting	3.87	0.70	SA	3.92	0.30	3.82	0.39	1.36	0.18	NS
2	Refuge establishment – hiding holes against predators	3.81	0.48	SA	3.90	0.33	3.73	0.63	1.91	0.06	NS
3	Predator control	3.90	0.61	SA	3.93	0.26	3.86	0.35	1.01	0.31	NS
4	Artificial stocking	3.83	0.46	SA	3.89	0.39	3.77	0.52	1.25	0.22	NS
5	Maintenance of habitat carrying capacity	3.87	0.35	SA	3.92	0.30	3.82	0.39	1.36	0.18	NS
6	Habitat improvement	3.81	0.49	SA	3.90	0.35	3.73	0.63	1.82	0.07	NS
7	Use of taboo	3.87	0.36	SA	3.92	0.33	3.82	0.39	1.26	0.21	NS
8	Use of sacred site	3.82	0.49	SA	3.91	0.34	3.73	0.63	1.95	0.05	NS
9	Use of totemic as a conservation practice	3.88	0.34	SA	3.94	0.28	3.82	0.39	1.71	0.09	NS
10	Control of animal population	3.86	0.44	SA	3.90	0.38	3.82	0.50	0.90	0.37	NS
11	Public enlightenment campaign and education	3.89	0.33	SA	3.92	0.30	3.86	0.35	0.77	0.44	NS
12	Conservation law enforcement as a tool for sustainability	3.81	0.51	SA	3.88	0.40	3.73	0.63	1.52	0.13	NS
13	Fire control and prevention of habitat destruction	3.84	0.39	SA	3.90	0.35	3.77	0.43	1.51	0.13	NS
14	Control of erosion	3.82	0.48	SA	3.88	0.43	3.77	0.53	0.99	0.33	NS
15	Adoption of afforestation and deforestation	3.86	0.37	SA	3.91	0.35	3.82	0.39	1.13	0.26	NS

**Wildlife Conservation as a.....**

16	Use of shifting cultivation	3.83	0.52	SA	3.88	0.41	3.77	0.61	1.05	0.30	NS
17	Standard emission control for industries	3.87	0.36	SA	3.92	0.33	3.82	0.39	1.27	0.21	NS
18	Initiation and execution of conservation policy and regulation by government	3.83	0.51	SA	3.89	0.41	3.77	0.61	1.15	0.25	NS
19	Empowering the traditional rulers on checking overhunting in their area	3.85	0.37	SA	3.92	0.30	3.77	0.43	1.93	0.06	NS
20	Non hunting of breeding mothers	3.87	0.42	SA	3.92	0.33	3.82	0.50	1.19	0.24	NS

Table 3 indicated that the grand means of the 20 items ranged from 3.81 to 3.90 which were greater than 3.50. This showed that controlled hunting, refuge establishment, predator control, artificial stocking, maintenance of habitat carrying capacity, habitat improvement, use of taboo, use of sacred sites, control of animal population, public enlightenment campaign and education, fire control and prevention, control of erosion, among others were the sustainable wildlife conservation practices to preserve wildlife. Similarly, the table showed that the standard deviation values of the 20 items ranged from 0.33 to 0.70 with a mean value of 0.37. This also implied that the responses of the respondents were not too far from the mean and from one another.

Table 3 also showed that the p - values of the 20 items ranged from 0.05 to 0.44 which were equal or greater than 0.05. This signifies that there was no statistically significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) in the mean responses of the respondents on those items. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference in the mean responses of farmers and extension agents on the sustainable wildlife conservation practices was accepted for those items

**Table 4: Mean and t-Test Statistic of the responses of Farmers and Extension Agents on the mitigation strategies for wildlife resource conservation**

**N=360**

S/N	Items	$\bar{X}_G$	SD	Dec	Farmers		Extension Agents		t-cal	p-value (2-tailed)	Rem
					$\bar{X}_1$	SD1	$\bar{X}_2$	SD2			
1	Public enlightenment campaign and education	3.52	0.51	SA	3.50	0.52	3.54	0.50	0.40	0.83	NS

2	Enactment of conservation laws	3.52	0.51	SA	3.50	0.52	3.54	0.50	0.50	0.83	NS
3	strict enforcement of conservation laws and decrees	3.00	0.73	A	3.00	0.74	3.00	0.71	0.29	1.00	NS
4	Controlled hunting	2.94	0.73	A	3.00	0.74	2.88	0.71	0.54	0.61	NS
5	Reforestation programme	3.12	0.57	A	3.00	0.60	3.24	0.54	0.24	0.18	NS
6	Forest conservation	2.95	0.71	A	2.92	0.67	2.98	0.76	0.29	0.81	NS
7	Use of traditional institutions	2.72	0.60	A	2.42	0.51	3.02	0.69	0.29	0.15	NS
8	Safety measures to check oil spillage	2.97	0.58	A	3.17	0.58	2.76	0.58	0.25	0.43	NS
9	Controlled grazing	3.22	0.71	A	3.33	0.65	3.10	0.77	0.13	0.34	NS

The data presented in Table 4 show that items 1 and 2 had the grand means of 3.52 which implies that public enlightenment campaign and enactment of conservation laws were strongly agreed by the respondents as the mitigation strategies for wildlife resource conservation. The Table equally shows that items 3 to 9 had their grand means ranged from 2.7 to 3.22 which signifies that strict enforcement of conservation laws, controlled hunting, reforestation, forest conservation, use of traditional institutions, safety measures to check oil spillage and controlled grazing were agreed by the respondents as the mitigation strategies for wildlife resource conservation. Similarly, the probability values of the entire items ranged from 0.15 to 1.00 which are greater than 0.05. This implied that there was no statistically significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) in the mean responses of farmers and extension agents on the mitigation strategies for wildlife conservation. The null hypothesis was, therefore, accepted for the entire items.

## DISCUSSION

### Environmental Degradation Threats on Wildlife Conservation

The findings revealed the following environmental degradation threats which affect wildlife conservation. They include rapid deforestation; overhunting; bush burning; pollution; improper waste disposal; clean clearing; soil erosion; desertification; bush encroachment; soil salinization; use of poison/explosives and urbanization. The findings of the study were in line with Osinem

## ***Wildlife Conservation as a.....***

(2005) who reported that environmental degradation in the form of bush burning, pollution, soil erosion, deforestation and desertification affect wildlife and their habitat.

In support of the findings, Dilip (2012) found that agricultural practices such as tree felling causes deforestation and can drive away a good number of wildlife from their natural habitat. The author reported that the trees removed would usually guard the soil against rain and wind (rain and windbreak) as their roots hold the soil in place. According to the author, many landowners cut down trees and clear vegetation to create space for domestic animals without considering its consequences on erosion which renders the habitat un-conducive for the growing wildlife. Osinem (2005) reported that soil and wildlife habitat can be damaged as a result of waste products and pollutants being deposited and left on them. The author explained that when unwanted products from factories, mines and house are dumped in a natural environment, they pollute the land and leave its toxins in the soil thus affecting animal species and the environment.

### **Problems Facing Wildlife Resource Conservation**

The findings show that unfavourable government policies, poor education of the rural communities, poaching, pests and diseases, deforestation, urbanization, population increase, among others were the problems facing wildlife resource conservation. The findings were in consonance with Idowu and Morenikeji (2015) who reported that human activities like bush burning, damming of rivers, draining swamp, environmental pollution, hunting and poaching have continued to threaten wildlife existence in Nigeria. The authors maintained that many animals are faced with extinction and are classified either as threatened or endangered species. In support of the findings, Olaleru and Egonmwan (2014) reported that Okomu National Park faced the dangers of people getting into the park for farming, hunting, logging and collection of non-timber products despite the illegality of the actions. Logging, poaching, livestock grazing, uncontrolled burning, and mining were found to be the major problems affecting wildlife conservation in Gashaka-Gumti National

Park (Yager et al., 2018). Invasion of wildlife in their natural habitat can be attributed to hunger and over population. When the population of people begin to increase, the majority will depend on the natural resources around the environment.

### **Sustainable Wildlife Conservation Practices to Preserve Wildlife Resources**

The findings also revealed that the following sustainable conservation practices were efficient to preserve wildlife resources. They include: controlled hunting; refuge establishment; predator control; artificial stocking; maintenance of habitat carrying capacity; habitat improvement; use of taboo; use of sacred sites; use of totemic as a conservation practice; control of animal population; public enlightenment campaign and education; conservation laws enforcement; fire control and prevention of habitat destruction; control of erosion; adoption of afforestation and reforestation; use of shifting cultivation; standard emission control in industries; empowering the traditional rulers on checking excessive hunting and protection of breeding mothers from hunting.

These findings were in agreement with the findings of Benneth and Robinson (2000) in a study on hunting of wildlife in tropical forests: implications for biodiversity forest people where it was reported that conservation would be attained if harvesting of wildlife for economic, health, social, and cultural purposes do not adversely affect the animal population, their habitat and the ecological function they perform. In support of the findings, Mbotiji (2002) found out that controlled hunting, refuge establishment, predator control, artificial stocking, maintenance of stocking capacity, and habitat improvement are the good wildlife conservation practices. Limitation of hunting according to the findings of the author is very useful as a means of wildlife conservation since it assures the survival of breeding stock of different wildlife species. The findings were also in line with Egwuma (2013) in a study on forest and wildlife management where it was found out that provision of water holes, encouragement of salt licks, productivity estimation and creation of small holes in the habitat are

major habitat improvement principles which encourage effective sustainable conservation of wildlife resource

### **Mitigation Strategies for Wildlife Resource Conservation**

Public enlightenment and education, enactment of conservation laws, strict enforcement of conservation laws and decrees, controlled hunting, reforestation programme, forest conservation, among others, were found to be the strategies for mitigating the challenges of wildlife resource conservation. The findings were in agreement with Olaleru and Egonmwan (2014) who reported that conservation of wildlife resources could be enhanced if government laws on the protection of wildlife could be strictly enforced. According to the authors, creation of buffer zones where local people could use to meet their needs, education/enlightenment campaign on the values of wildlife resources could help in reducing the rate of encroachment. Involvement of community leaders plays significant roles in educating their members on the laws concerning wildlife harvesting in the area since failure to do so often generates unpleasant situation (Isiugo and Obioha, 2015).

### **Conclusion**

Wildlife is one of the precious natural resources that should be conserved for the future generation. Reduction in the human interferences on wildlife habitat will help to preserve wildlife and the forests. Similarly, anthropogenic activities on the environment promote climate change which affects wildlife and its habitat. Adoption of sustainable wildlife practices will help to preserve the environment from climate change and as well ensure wildlife biodiversity conservation.

### **References**

- Avaaze Team (2004). Hours to save the elephant. Retrieved on January 12, 2019 from [http://secure.avaaz.org/en/hours\\_to\\_save\\_elephant/?tqusvab](http://secure.avaaz.org/en/hours_to_save_elephant/?tqusvab).
- Baldus, R, Kibonde, B & Siege, L. (2003). Seeking conservation partnership in the Selous Game Reserve, Tanzania. *Parks.*, 13: 50–61

- Benneth, E. L & Robinson, J. G. (2000). Hunting of wildlife in tropical forests: Implications for biodiversity forest peoples. Biodiversity series-impact study paper. No 76.EUWCS. New York USA
- Creswell. J.W. (2012). Educational Research: Planning, Conduction and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research, USA: Pearson Education Inc
- Dilip, K. D. (2012). Introductory soil science. India: Kalian Publisher Ltd
- Egwuma, P. O. (2013). Forestry and wildlife management. Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi/ National open University of Nigeria
- Food and Agricultural Organization (2013). Millions at risk of food insecurity in Central African Republic. From on January 12, 2019 from <http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/210674/icode/>
- Idowu, M.A. & Morenikeji, O.A. (2015). Wild Fauna Conservation in Nigeria. Environment and Natural Resources Research, 5(3) 98-108
- International Hunter Education Association (HEA) (2003). What is wildlife? Retrieved on August 13, 2013 from <http://www.lhea.Com>.
- International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (2008). Redlist of threatened species. Retrieved 4th Sept, 2015 from <http://www.iucuredlist.org>
- Isiugo, P.N. & Obioha, E.E. (2015). Community participation in wildlife conservation and protection in Oban Hills Area of Cross River State, Nigeria. Journal Sociology and Social Anthropology, 6(2) 279-291
- Mama, R. O. & Osinem, E. C (2007). The ecological features of tropical forests and environmental forestry. Nsukka Great AP Express publisher ltd.
- Mbotiji, J. (2002). Sustainable use of wildlife resources: the bush meat crisis. Wildlife Management workshop paper Number 5 FAO Rome. Retrieved from <fip/fip.fao.org/docrep/fao/010/ai569e/ai569e00>. Pdf on October 12, 2014.
- Ministry of Agriculture (2018). Enugu State Ministry of Agriculture Statistics

- National Bureau of Statistics (2013). Gross domestic product for Nigeria estimate for the first quarter. Retrieved on June 18, 2013 from <http://www.nigerianststs.gov.ng>
- Olaleru, F. & Egonmwan, R.I. (2014). Wildlife conservation challenges in Okomu National Park, Nigeria. *Ethiopian Journal of Environmental Studies & Management*, 7(6): 670 – 676
- Osinem, E. C. & Mama R. O. (2008). *Tropical Forest Resources Management Education and Institution* Enugu. Nigeria; Cheston publishers
- Osinem, E. C. (2005). *Environmental Education in Agriculture*. Enugu: Cheston Ltd.
- Peres, C. A. (2001). Synergistic effects of subsistence hunting and habitat fragmentation on Amazonian forest vertebrates. *Conservation Biology*. 15(6) 1409 – 1505
- Stewart, R. (2000). Welcome address proceedings at the 7<sup>th</sup> world sugar conference in Durba
- Talathi, J. M; Naik, G. V. & Jalgaokar, V. N. (2011). *Introduction to Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness Management*. India: Ana book Publishers
- Uzonwanne, M.C. (2015). Economic Diversification in Nigeria in the Face of Dwindling Oil Revenue. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 6(4). 61-67
- Yager, G. O., Alarape, A. A., Enogela, O. M. & Tyowua, B.T. (2018). Biodiversity conservation problems and their implication on rangeland and ecotourism management in Gashaka-Gumti National Park, Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Forestry, Wildlife & Environment*, 10(1) 119-129