Effects of Land Tenure Practices on Farmers' Output in Igbo Eze North Local Government Area of Enugu State, Nigeria

Arua Rosemary Nnedinso Eze Kenneth Ibe Justina Chituru Umaru Ibrahim Isaac

ABSTRACT

This study was based on the effect of land tenure systems on agricultural output in Igbo Eze North L.GA of Enugu State. A multi-stage random sampling technique was adopted for this study while data were collected through the use of structured questionnaire. A total of 50 farmers were used for this study. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used in analyzing the field data of this study. The results of the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents showed that majority of the farmers acquired their land through inheritance. More than 60% of the respondents practised individual land tenure in the area while 8% said that they practised public land tenure. Ninety percent said that land tenure system practised affect their productivity while only 10% said that the type of land tenure system practised does not affect their productivity. The constraints the farmers are facing in the area with respect to land tenure system practised include: lack of finance, unavailability of land, increase in population, not being member of village/community, government activities, competition with other non-agricultural activities, family/village conflict. It is recommended that adequate farmland be made available for farmers by removing stringent land laws that take accessibility of land away from small scale farmer, adequate provision of transportation facilities by the Government, Government should also place subsidies on improved input and give loans and grants to farmers and other related issues that will enhance farmer's output.

Keywords: Land, Tenure, Effects, Practices, Agricultural Outputs

INTRODUCTION

Land is probably one of the most important factors of production; because of the significance of land to all, society developed rules governing its ownership which were called land tenure. Land is probably the most

Arua Rosemary Nnedinso, Eze Kenneth and Ibe Justina Chituru, Umaru Ibrahim Isaac (Ph.D) are Lecturers in the Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State. E-mail: rosemary.arua@unn.edu.ng, ibrahim.umaru@unn.edu.ng.

This Article is Licensed under Creative Common Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/



important factor of production. The exclusive feature of land is its fixed nature and this has generated a lot of policies administration in its use rights and transfer. According to Amaechina (2012), land has been defined as the solid part of the earth's surface: the soil together with the vegetation, minerals, rivers, streams, lakes, ponds, hills, mountains, valleys and air space immediately above the land. Because of the significance of land to all, society developed rules governing its ownership which rules were called land tenure (Amaechina, 2012).

Land tenure is the relationship, whether legally or customarily defined, that exists amongst people as individuals or groups over ownership and usage of land (Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), 2002). It defines how property rights to land are to be allocated within members of a given society. They define how access is granted to rights to use, control and transfer land as well as associated responsibilities and restraints (Amaechina, 2012). Land tenure system determines who can use what resources for how long and under what conditions (FAO, 2002).

Over history, many different forms of land ownership have been established. Secured land tenure systems give sufficient incentives to the farmers to increase their efficiencies in terms of productivity and ensure environmental sustainability. Without secured land rights, farmers do not feel emotional attachment to the land they cultivate, do not invest in land development and will not use inputs efficiently (Tenaw, Zahidul and Parviainen, 2009). In Nigeria and other sub-Sahara countries, traditional land tenure system of ownership is still predominant. According to Deininger and Binswanger (1999), undefined land rights could affect economic growth in the following ways; Firstly, secure land rights will increase the incentives of households and individuals to invest, and often will provide them with better credit access, something that will not only help them make such investments, but will also provide an assurance substitute in the event of shocks. Secondly, it has long been known that in traditional agriculture, the operational distribution of land affects output, implying that a highly unequal land distribution will reduce productivity. Insecure land right or the lack of land ownership also restricts the farmers' access to credit that are necessary to improve agricultural land practices for better yield (Feder, Ohdaan, Chalaniwong and Hongladaron, 1988). This non-access to credit predisposed farmers to

go for traditional land-use practices which will eventually generate poor yield (Bamire and Fabiyi, 2002). Land insecurity has been recurring worries in Africa from the colonial period until the present day. It has been noted that land insecurity would reduce investment and lower agricultural productivity (Nwakobe, 2015). According to Clay (2008), the existence of fragmented holdings hinders agricultural mechanization, causes inefficiencies in production and involves large cost to alleviate its effects. Furthermore, according to Udoh (2000), in the southern part of Nigeria, the accessibility of most agricultural lands depends largely on land tenure system and the extent of competition by non-agricultural land uses.

Land is a critical input in agricultural production and the criticality is imposed by its availability, accessibility, quantity and quality (Raufus, 2010). The governments of Nigeria media revered efforts to solve the problem of land availability for agricultural production. Among such efforts was the establishment of land use decree of 1978 which vested ownership of all lands in the country on the government and its agencies (Ojo, 2008). This decree tends towards large scale production ignoring the small scale production. The large scale farming policy and programmes have always been taken a large proportion of the readily accessible land from the traditional owners without any significant positive increase in agricultural production and productivity. The best of their lands are taken from them by government for large scale farming (Ojo, 2008).

Some studies have been carried out on the effect of land tenure system on agricultural production in Nigeria. Ojo (2008) studied the effects of land acquisition for large scale in Nigeria. The study showed that performance of small scale farmers was affected by the land acquisition by government for large scale farming. Akinola and Adeyemo (2013) studied the effects of property rights on agricultural production in Osun State, Nwakobe, (2015), studied land acquisition and its effects on small scale arable crop farmers in Nsukka L.G.A, Enugu State. Ugwu (2009) also studied the land lease market and its effects on agricultural production in Enugu State, Nigeria. In this study, it was shown that the land lease market affects farmers output and income. The main aim of the study was to determine the effects of land tenure practices on agricultural output in Igbo-Eze North L.G.A of Enugu State. Specifically, the study described the socio-economic characteristics of farmers;

identified different land tenure practices; examined the effects of land tenure practices on farmers' output and identified the constraints facing farmers in land tenure processes in the study area.

PARTICIPANTS AND PROCEDURE

The area of study was Igbo Eze North L.G.A of Enugu State. Igbo-Eze North Local Government Area is made up of two Towns namely Enugu Ezike and Ette. Comparably, Ette is a very small town as Enugu Ezike has over ninety (90%) percent of the population of the local government so attention was focused much on Enugu Ezike or Ezike Oba that happened to be the founding father of the town (Odum, 2009). Enugu Ezike is located at the extreme North of Northern Igbo land. It forms the major part of the present Igbo-Eze North local government area of Enugu State. It is bounded on the North East by Benue State, North West by Kogi State, West and South by Igbo-Eze south Local Government Area of Enugu State (Ogbochie, 2011). It has a population of about 306,440 persons (National Population Commission (NPC), 2009).

According to Ogbochie (2011), the four sons of Ezike Oba in order of seniority include: Ezzodo,, Essodo, Umuitodo and Umuozzi. The thirty eight autonomous communities making up Enugu Ezike are: Aguibeje, Aji, Amachalla, Amaja, Amube, Amufie, Ezillo, Ekposhi, Igbelle, Igogoro, Umuogbo-Agu, Umuopu-Agu, Ikpamodo, Ikpuiga, Imufu, Inyi, Isiugwu, Iyionu, Umuogbo-Ekposhi, Nkpamute, Ogbodu, Ogrute, Okata, Umuogbo-Uno, Umuogbo-Inyi, Okpo, Olido, Onicha, Owerre-Eze, Uda, Ufodo, Ugbaikffe, Umachi, Umuagama, Umuida, Umuopu, Uroshi, Umunaja, (Ogbochie, 2011). The main industry in Igbo-Eze North Local Government Area is palm wine tapping and cultivation of some other crops.

A multi stage sampling technique was employed for the study. The first stage was random selection of 5 communities namely; Amufie, Olido, Uda, Umuida and Ogrute. In second stage, two villages were randomly selected from each of the autonomous communities making a total of ten villages. In the final stage, five farmers were randomly selected from each of the 10 villages making a total of 50 farmers for the study. Data were collected mainly from primary source. Data were obtained by the use of structured questionnaire which were administered to elicit information on the socio-economic characteristics of respondents like

age, education, gender, occupation, output, farming experience. It also obtained responses regarding the type of land tenure system available in the study area; effects of land tenure system on agricultural production in the area, and constraints facing farmers in land tenure processes. Data were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics such as means, percentage and frequency distribution and likert type scale rating technique were used. Multiple regression model was used to determine the effects of land tenure on farmers' output in Igboeze North Local Government Area. The Multiple Regression Model was used for data analysis. The multiple regression model is implicitly specified as follows:

$$Y = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8, X_9, e).$$

 $Y = farm output (\aleph)$

 X_1 = Transportation Cost (N)

X₂ = communal tenure system (yes=1, otherwise=0)

 X_3 = Public tenure type (yes=1, otherwise=0)

X₄ = Individual tenure type (yes=1, otherwise=0)

 $X_5 = Age of farmer (yrs)$

 $X_6 = \text{Cost of inputs } (\mathbb{N})$

 X_7 = Distance of farm from home (Km)

 X_8 = Farming experience (years)

X₉ = Educational level (years)

e = Error term

Likert scale rating of a 4-point rating was used in this work to measure the level of constraints facing farmer in land tenure type. The grading was in this order, Very serious(VS)=4, Serious(S)= 3, Less serious(LS)= 2, Not Serious(NS)= 1. This was ranked using a weighted mean (X) = "fx/"x. which is shown thus:

$$4+3+2+1 = 10$$

 $10/4 = 2.50$

Using the interval scale of 0.05, the upper limit cut-off point was 2.50+0.05 = 2.55; the lower limit was 2.50 - 0.05 = 2.45. Therefore, on the basis of the limit, mean score (MS) below 2.45 was ranked "Not serious (NS)", those between 2.45 and 2.54 was considered "Less serious (LS)", while mean scores that are greater than or equal to 2.55 was considered "Very Serious(VS)".

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondents:

The socio-economic attributes of respondents are discussed in Table 1. The table shows that the majority of the farmers in the area are comprising 76% male while minority are female comprising only 24%. This may be because male farmers have access to land easily than female farmers (Ugwu, 2009). It is also shown that 8% respondents fall in the age range of 20-29, 32% in the age range of 30-39, 38% in the age range of 40-49, 18% in the age range of 50-59, 4% in the range of 60 years old and above. The implication is that majority of farmers in the Igbo Eze North were in the age range of 40-49 and it is an indication that the active working population is involved in agricultural production as suggested by Nwakobe (2015). Table 1 also shows that 8% of the respondents were single while 92% of the respondents were married. It is shown that 18% of the respondents had 2-4 household size; 46% had 5-7 household size; 32% had 8-10 household size while 4% had 11-13 household size.

From Table1, it is shown that 16% of respondents had Primary education; 70% had Secondary education while least that had tertiary education were 10%; 4% obtained informal education. A good educated farmer is more likely to acquire, interpret and use technical advice from research allowing them effective land utilization (Akinola and Adeyemo, 2013). Table 1 also shows that 10% of respondents are engaged in full time farming; 82% are engaged in both farming and trading while 8% are engaged in farming and civil service. It is shown that 14% acquired their land through gift; 38% acquired their land through inheritance; 12% acquired theirs through lease; 8% said they purchased it while 28% said they acquired it through the community. From the study carried out, it is shown that 4% of the respondents were of the opinion that land can be leased at the cost of N5,000; 32% said it can be leased at 10,000-50,000; 44% opined that it is within the range of 50,000-100,000; 18% said it is within 100,000-150,000 while only 2% said it is above 150,000. It is also shown in Table1 that 6% of the respondents agreed that the cost of acquiring a private plot of land is within the range of 100,000-500,000; 20% said it cost between 500,000-1,000,000; 68% said it costs between 1,000,000-1,500,000 while 6% said it cost between 1,500,000-2,000,000 per plot.

Types of land tenure system practice in the area

From the field data, 32% claimed that communal land tenure existed in the area, 60% said that individual land tenure existed in the area while 8% said that public land tenure existed in the area.

The effects of land tenure practice on farmers' output

Table 3 shows the result of Ordinary Least Square Regression of factors affecting farmers' output in land tenure practices in Igbo Eze North L.G.A, Enugu State. The R-square and the Adjusted R-square values were 0.840 and 0.804 respectively. This implies that 84.0% of variations in farmers' output were jointly explained by the independent variables the other 16% maybe as a result of omission of relevant variables for the study and also due to erratic human behavior during data collection. The result showed that cost of input and distance to the farm are significant at 1% level and 5% respectively, this entails that the both variables affect farmers' output as regards land tenure system practice (Okechukwu, 2015).

Constraints of farmers in acquiring land for agricultural production Table 4 shows the average constraints facing farmers in their act to secure land for agricultural production in Igbo Eze North L.G.A, Enugu. For instance, farmers in this area agrees that: lack of finance, unavailability of land, lack of credit facilities, increase in population, not belonging to cooperative society, not being member of village/community and government activities are serious constraints that affect the type of land tenure system adopted and therefore their output while variables like competition with other non-agricultural activities, family/village conflict, Religious belief/value and family/individual needs were not serious constraints facing farmers in land tenure system in the area. This result supports the work of Akinola and Adeyemo (2013).

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents				
Socio-economiccharacteristics	Frequency	Percentage		
Gender				
Female	12	24		
Male	38	76		
Age				
20-29	4	8		
30-39	16	32		
40-49	19	38		
50-59	9	18		
Above 60	2	4		

This Article is Licensed under Creative Common Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/



International Journal of Economic Development Research and Investment Volume 10, Number 3; December 2019; ISSN: 2141-6729 Published By:

International Centre for Integrated Development Research, Nigeria In collaboration with:

Copperstone University, Zambia.

Married 4 8 Single 46 92 Educational level 9 16 Primary 35 70 Tertiary 5 10 Informal 2 4 Household Size 2 4 24 9 18 5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 7 14 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Trading 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 12 2 Purchase 4 8 2 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 12 2 S000 2 4 1 00,000-50,000 16 32 2 S0000-10,000 10 20 2 Obve 150,000 3	Marital Status				
Educational level 8 16 Primary 8 16 Secondary 35 70 Tertiary 5 10 Informal 2 4 Household Size 2 4 24 9 18 5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 7 14 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 7 14 Inheriatree 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 7 14 10,000-50,000 16 32 5000 2 4 100,000-50,000 100,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 100,000-50,000 <td< td=""><td>Married</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Married				
Primary 8 16 Secondary 35 70 Tertiary 5 10 Informal 2 4 Household Size 2 4 2-4 9 18 5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 5 10 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Jeasing a private plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 32 4 100,000-150,000 16 32 Jobove 150,000 10 20 I00,000-150,000 3 6 Jobove 150,000<	Single		46	92	
Secondary 35 70 Tertiary 5 10 Informal 2 4 Household Size 9 18 2-4 9 18 5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 1 8 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Communal 14 28 Purchase 6 12 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Jong a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 14 28 Do0,000-150,000 16 32 Jono,000-150,000 16 32 Jono,000-150,000 3 6 Joooo-20,00,000 3 <	Educational level				
Secondary 35 70 Tertiary 5 10 Informal 2 4 Household Size 9 18 2-4 9 18 5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 1 8 Farming and Trading 5 10 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Communal 14 28 Purchase 6 12 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 32 4 100,000-150,000 16 32 100,000-150,000 10 20 100,000-150,000 3 6 100,000-150,000 3 6 100,000-2,000,000 3 6			8	16	
Informal 2 4 Househokl Size 9 18 2-4 9 18 5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 5 10 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 24 4 100,000-50,000 2 4 100,000-50,000 22 44 100,000-50,000 10 20 Obyou-150,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 34 68 100,000-150,000 34 68 100,000-150,000 34 6 100,000-1,00,000 34 6 100,000-1,00,000	-		35	70	
Household Size 9 18 2-4 9 18 5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Mage Compation Full time farming 5 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 12 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 2 4 100,000-50,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 2 100,000-150,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 500,000-1,000,000 3 6 <td>Tertiary</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>10</td> <td></td>	Tertiary		5	10	
2-4 9 18 5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation Full time farming 5 10 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land Gift 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 22 4 10,000-50,000 2 4 100,000-150,000 22 4 100,000-150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 2 4 100,000-150,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 1000,000-1,500,000 3 6<	Informal		2	4	
5-7 23 46 8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 5 10 Full time farming 5 10 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 S000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 10 20 100,000-50,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 10 20 100,000-50,000 3 6 S00,000-100,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 S00,000-100,000 3 6 50,000 3 6	Household Size				
8-10 16 32 11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 5 10 Full time farming 5 10 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 28 5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-50,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 2 Nobve 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 100,000-50,000 3 6 100,000-50,000 3 6 100,000-1,500,000 3 6 100,000-1,500,000 3 6	2-4		9	18	
11-13 2 4 Major Occupation 5 10 Full time farming 5 10 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 28 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 28 S000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 S0,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-50,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 2 2 Nobve 150,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 100,000-150,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 3 6 100,000-2,000,000 3 6 50,0000-100,000 3 6	5-7		23	46	
Major Occupation 5 10 Full time farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 S000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-50,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 2 1 Nobove 150,000 3 6 500,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 32,0 6 <t< td=""><td>8-10</td><td></td><td>16</td><td>32</td><td></td></t<>	8-10		16	32	
Full time farming 5 10 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 2 4 10,000-50,000 2 4 100,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 16 32 Above 150,000 10 2 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017: Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.	11-13		2	4	
Full time farming 5 10 Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 S000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 S0,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 3 6 S00,000-1,500,000 34 68 S00,000-1,500,000 34 68 S00,000-2,000,000 34 68 Source: Field Survey, 2017: 32.0 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017: 16 32.0 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice: 1 1 Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 1 Individual 30 60.0	Major Occupation				
Farming and Trading 4 8 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Farming and Teaching 14 28 Ways of acquiring land 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-50,000 9 18 Above 150,000 10 20 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 T 5 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System System Prequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 1 Individual 30 60.0			5	10	
Ways of acquiring land Gift 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 2 4 10,000-50,000 2 4 100,000-50,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 20 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 5 5 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice 1 1 Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100			4	8	
Gift 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 22 4 100,000-50,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 10 20 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 20 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 3 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice 1 1 Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage 1 Communal 16 32.0 1 Individual 30 60.0 1 Public 4 8.0 1 Total 50 100 1 <	Farming and Teaching		14	28	
Gift 7 14 Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 20 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-100,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 16 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100	Ways of acquiring land	1			
Inheriatnce 19 38 Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 2 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 34 68 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice 1 1 Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100		L	7	14	
Lease 6 12 Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
Purchase 4 8 Communal 14 28 Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 2 4 5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 2 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 3 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage 5 Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
Cost of Leasing a Plot of Land 5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 1 2 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 5 5 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 3 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100	Communal		14	28	
5000 2 4 10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 3 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100	Cost of Leasing a Plot o	fLand			
10,000-50,000 16 32 50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 3 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Percentage 50 Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100		<i>J</i> Zuna	2	4	
50,000-100,000 22 44 100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 3 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice 4 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
100,000-150,000 9 18 Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 1 2 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 3 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice 4 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
Above 150,000 1 2 Cost of Acquiring a private plot of Land 1 1 100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 3 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
100,000-500,000 3 6 500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100		vate plot of I and			
500,000-1000,000 10 20 1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100		vale plot oj Lana	3	6	
1000,000-1,500,000 34 68 1,500,000-2,000,000 3 6 Source: Field Survey, 2017 5 6 Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System Practice Land Tenure System Frequency Percentage Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
1,500,000-2,000,00036Source: Field Survey, 2017Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System PracticeLand Tenure SystemFrequencyPercentageCommunal1632.0Individual3060.0Public48.0Total50100					
Source: Field Survey, 2017Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System PracticeLand Tenure SystemFrequencyPercentageCommunal161632.0Individual309060.0Public450100					
Table 2: Type of Land Tenure System PracticeLand Tenure SystemFrequencyPercentageCommunal1632.0Individual3060.0Public48.0Total50100)17	0	0	
Land Tenure SystemFrequencyPercentageCommunal1632.0Individual3060.0Public48.0Total50100			-+		
Communal 16 32.0 Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100	•	•			
Individual 30 60.0 Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100	-		-		
Public 4 8.0 Total 50 100					
Total 50 100					
			100		

This Article is Licensed under Creative Common Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/



Table 3: Effects of Land Tenure on Farmers' Output				
Model	Coefficients	Std. Error	T-test	Significance
(Constant)		13467.146	1.907	0.064
Age	0.048	5801.148	0.730	0.469
Educational Experience	-0.066	6466.699	-0.950	0.348
Communal Tenure	0.0107	574.623	0.120	0.905
Individual Tenure	-0.062	6353.440	-0.876	0.386
Public Tenure	0.045	11986.353	0.605	0.548
Farming Experience	-0.012	892.616	-0.174	0.863
Cost of input	0.796	0.1299	0.789*	0.000
Distance to the farm	0.217	941385.008	2.688**	0.010
Transportation cost	0.048	16.824	0.644	0.523
R-square (R ²)	0.840			
Adjusted R-square (R ²)	0.804			
Source: Field Survey, 20	17 **signif	icance at 5%	*= Signifi	icance at 1% level.

Table 4: Constraints of Farmers in the Land	l Tenure	System Practice
	3.6	CD

Variables	Mean	SD
Lack of Finance	2.9000**	0.54398
Unavailability of land	3.9400**	0.23990
Lack of credit facilities	2.6200**	0.53031
Competition with other non-agricultural activities	2.4000*	0.75593
Increase in population	3.8200**	0.43753
Family/village conflicts	2.3600*	0.56279
Religious beliefs and values	1.8800*	0.77301
Family/individual needs	2.3200*	0.58693
Not being a member of the village/community	2.5400**	0.83812
Government activities.	2.8000**	0.45175
Not belonging to cooperative society	2.5400—	4.31991
Very Serious=**, Not Serious=*, Less serious= —.		
<i>Source:</i> Field Survey, 2017		

CONCLUSION

Land tenure system practice is highly inter-related with agricultural output of farmers. Acquiring land for the purpose of agricultural production is an essential catalytic force for revenue generation, employment opportunity, food security and agricultural sustainability in general. The major factors that affect agricultural output as found in this study were cost of input and distance to the farm. It is recommended that government should provide subsidies on farm improved inputs and also give incentives such as loans and grants to boast their agricultural

activities. There should be adequate provision of transportation facilities by Government which should include expansion, construction and maintenance of urban-rural roads to ensure reduction in transportation cost to their farms and targets markets.

REFERENCES

- Akinola, O. A. and Adeyemo, I. (2013). *The effects of property rights on agricultural production in Osun State(Project)*. Department of Agric. Economics, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State.
- Amaechina, E. C. (2012), *Farm management*: Hand book of Practical Agriculture, p. 261. Chenglo Publishers Limited, Enugu.
- Bamire A. S. and Fabiyi Y. L. (2002). Adoption pattern of fertilizer technology among farmers in the ecological zones of South-Western Nigeria: A Tobit analysis. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 53:901-910.
- **Clay, K.** (2008). Property *rights and agricultural production.* H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh.
- **Deininger, K.** and **Binswanger, H.** (1999). *The evolution of the World Bank's and land policy: principles, experience and future challenges.* World Bank Res. Obser. 14:247-276.
- FAO (2002). Land tenure and rural development. FAO Land Tenure studies 3.
- Feder, G., Ohdaan, T., Chalaniwong, Y and Hongladaron, C. (1988). *Land policy and farm productivity in Thailand*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University press.
- NPC (2009). www.citypopulation.de, accessed on the 27th of March, 2017.
- Nwakobe, S. I. (2015), Land acquisition and its effects on small scale arable crop farmers in nsukka L.GA, Enugu State, Nigeria (Project). Department of Agric. Economics, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State.
- **Odum, O.** (2005) *Enugu Ezike book of records and who is who*. Ndubest Publisher, Asata, Enugu.
- **Ogbochie A. N.** (2011). *The role of human resource development in poverty eradication: a study of Igbo-Eze North Local Government Area of Enugu State (these).* Department of public administration and local government, University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- **Ojo, M. O.** (2008). *The effectiveness of agricultural policies on Nigeria economic development.* Rural Economy and Sociology, University of Ibadan, 8:2 (2011).
- **Raufus, M. O.** (2010), *Pattern of land use among selected crop farmers in Ogun State.* Research Journal of social and water management 1(1)113-126.
- **Tenaw, S. K. M., Zahidul, I.** and **Parviainen, T.** (2009). *Effects of land tenure and property rights on agricultural productivity in Ethiopia, Namibia and Bangladesh.* University of Helsinki, Department of Economics and Management Discussion Papers no 33 Helsinki.
- Udoh, E. J. (2000), Land management and resource use efficiency among farmers in South-Eastern Nigeria (Ph.D Thesis), University of Ibadan, Nigeria.

This Article is Licensed under Creative Common Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

