

# WELFARE IMPLICATIONS OF DOMESTIC LAND GRABS AMONG RURAL HOUSEHOLDS IN DELTA STATE, NIGERIA

**\*Abimbola O. Adepoju, Scholastica Ewolor and Oluwakemi A. Obayelu**

**\* Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria**

## **Abstract**

In Nigeria, the key stakeholders in land and agriculture are the smallholder farming households. They constitute about 70 percent of the active labor force and produce more than 60 percent of the food consumed. Thus, their role in achieving a reduction in poverty and food insecurity cannot be ignored. However, these farmers are typically among the poorest and the most neglected in development support and investment terms. In most cases, rural households are displaced from their lands without any plan in place to resettle or compensate them, for a promise of improvement in their living standards through the promotion of agricultural investment, provision of housing and building of industries in their communities. This has not only resulted in a decline in the living standard of the rural populace in terms of loss of land and livelihood, the poor are also further marginalized and impoverished. In many cases, these land deals are accompanied by violence and conflict, thus compromising the lives and livelihoods of entire generations to come. It also threatens the welfare and survival of the people as food insecurity and lack of jobs, displacement, and reduced living standard becomes the order of the day. Yet, in most economies, the focus has been mainly on large-scale land acquisitions by foreigners while the more serious 'land grabbing' in rural societies by national and local elites has been ignored. This has deepened concerns about the possible negative effects that increased demand and competition for land and water are having on the land rights and food security of rural people. Based on the foregoing and the insufficient empirical information on the effect of land grabs on the livelihoods of rural communities, this study examines the welfare implication of domestic land grabs among rural households in Delta State, Nigeria, employing primary data obtained from one hundred and seventy-three representative farming households. Descriptive analysis revealed that majority were low-income earners engaged in farming as their major occupation while econometric analysis revealed that land size, secondary education and primary occupation of household heads, community leaders influence, compensation and the use to which the grabbed land was put into as some of the significant factors influencing domestic land grabs in the study area. Further, the size of land grabbed, no compensation for the use of land and low farm output were found to have negative effects on the welfare of the farmers. Thus, the need to step up efforts to secure local land rights to help local people avoid being arbitrarily dispossessed of their land becomes imperative. Also, there is the need for commensurate compensation of rural households whose lands were grabbed and periodical checks on community leaders who positively influence domestic land acquisitions arbitrarily. This is pertinent for improvement in the welfare of the farmers especially if these small-scale farmers are to be part of the solution for global food security.

**Keywords:** Welfare, Land grabs, Rural, Delta State, Nigeria

## **Introduction**

Globally, agriculture remains an important and vital sector of the Nigeria economy. In spite of being overshadowed by the oil and gas industry, the sector is the largest contributor to the Nigerian economy (GDP), accounting for 35.4% of the non-oil foreign exchange earnings and

employing about 70-75% of the active labour force of the population (FAO, 2010). In Nigeria, the key stakeholders in land and agriculture are the smallholder farming households. They constitute about 70 percent of the active labor force and produce more than 60 percent of the food consumed. Thus, their role in achieving a reduction in poverty and food insecurity cannot be ignored. In other words, farmers continually contribute to the sustainability and welfare of the economy and their efforts in land use is vital for achieving sustained increases in yield and productivity. However, these farmers are typically among the poorest and the most neglected in development support and investment terms owing among other factors to a considerable loss of fertile agricultural land over the years to land grabs, which is a process where local communities are displaced from their land and lose their ability to grow food and their livelihoods. In most cases, rural households are displaced from their lands without any plan in place to resettle or compensate them, for a promise of improvement in their living standards through the promotion of agricultural investment, provision of housing and building of industries in their communities. This has not only resulted in a decline in the living standard of the rural populace in terms of loss of land and livelihood, the poor are also further marginalized and impoverished. In many cases these land deals are accompanied by violence and conflict owing mainly to inadequate compensation of the farmers as well as non-involvement of those displaced, thus compromising the lives and livelihoods of entire generations to come (GRAIN, 2015; Ghatak and Mookherjee, 2013)

Nigeria's Land Use Act of 1978 gave total control over land to the governing bodies. It stipulated that, all land in urban areas shall be under the control and management of the Governor of each State, and all other land shall, subject to this act, be under, the control and management of the Local Government within the area of jurisdiction of which the land is situated, as from the commencement of the Act. The Land management under this Act also provided an appropriate enabling environment for prospective investors, private individuals and other corporate bodies for land acquisition (LUA, 1978). It restructured the property rights system in Nigeria from a mixed private property rights system into a collectivist framework. Land therefore became the property of the government, delegated to the governor of the specific state, and administered by the Local Government, which provides citizens with customary rights of occupancy. Thus, Government is responsible for administration of concessions to companies for any use, be it agricultural, industrial, and extractive or real estate purposes. However, this act

neglected the more important question of how the various uses to which land is to be put into will be beneficial to the people without resulting into the loss of livelihood. Furthermore, the 1999 constitution recognizes communal use of land but not communal land rights because of the fact that all land is owned by the state (Sections 20, 44, 297, and 315). Although, the third of the Principles of Environmental Justice “mandates the right to ethical, balanced and responsible uses of land and renewable resources in the interest of a sustainable planet for humans and other living things” and the twelfth Principle, “affirms the need for urban and rural ecological policies to clean up and rebuild cities and rural areas in balance with nature, honouring the cultural integrity of all our communities, and providing fair access for all to the full range of resources” (Borras, WHO, 2011); domestic land grabs in the developing world violates both of these principles.

Over the years, land grabs have shifted production away from crops destined for local consumption, toward crops that are for export or for the production of bio-fuels and siting of industries (Deininger, 2010). This threatens the welfare and survival of the people as food insecurity and lack of jobs, displacement, and reduced living standard becomes the order of the day. Yet, in most economies, large-scale land acquisitions by foreigners has been largely focused on while the more serious ‘land grabbing’ in rural societies by national and local elites has been ignored. This has deepened concerns about the possible negative effects that increased demand and competition for land are having on the land rights and welfare of the rural people (Cotula *et al.*, 2009). Based on the foregoing and the insufficient empirical information on the effect of land grabs on the livelihoods of rural communities in Nigeria, this study examines the welfare implication of domestic land grabs among rural households in Delta State, Nigeria. The objectives are to; examine the perception of rural households about domestic land grabs, examine the factors influencing domestic land grabs and the effect of domestic land grabs on the welfare of rural households in Delta State.

## **Materials and Methods**

Delta State was purposively selected for this study because of the wide spread incidence of land grabs in the rural areas. The state lies approximately between Longitude 5°00 and 6°.45' East and Latitude 5°00 and 6°.30' North. It is bounded in the North by Edo state, the East by Anambra state, South-East by Bayelsa state, and on the Southern flank is the Bight of Benin on

the Atlantic Ocean, which covers about 160 kilometers of the state's coastline. Agriculture remains the major economic mainstay of the people in Delta State.

A multistage sampling procedure was employed in selecting respondents. In the first stage, five out of the twenty-five Local Government Areas (LGAs) in Delta state where cases of domestic land acquisitions have been reported were purposively selected. The second stage involved the random selection of two communities in each Local Government while in the third stage, 20 households were selected randomly in each community in the Local Government Areas to make up a total of 200 respondents. However, owing to incomplete questionnaire information only data from 173 respondents were used for analysis in the study. Descriptive statistics, Likert scale, Logit and the Ordinary least square regression models were the analytical tools employed in the study.

The logit specification provides a model for observing the likelihood of a rural household experiencing domestic land grab. The logistic regression model expresses a qualitative dependent variable as a function of several independent variables. It is used when the dependent variable is dichotomous and the independent variables are of any type. In this analysis, experience of land grab (Y) is the dependent variable which takes the value of 1, if household land was grabbed and 0 if otherwise. The cumulative density function of the logit regression model is specified as:  $P = \frac{\exp e}{1+\exp e}$  where P is the proportion of occurrence and stated explicitly as follows:

$$Y_i = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + + b_5X_5 + b_6X_6+-----+ b_{12}X_{12} + e \quad (1)$$

Where,

$Y_i$  = Experience of domestic land grab (D = 1 if Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_1$  = Age of Household Head (Years)

$X_2$  = Gender (D = 1 if Male, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_3$  = Primary Education of Household Head (D = 1 if Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_4$  = Secondary Education of Household Head (D = 1 if Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_5$  = Tertiary Education of Household Head (D = 1 if Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_6$  = Marital Status (D = 1 if Married, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_7$  = Land Size (Hectares)

$X_8$  = Primary Occupation (D = 1 if Farming, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_9$  = Compensation (D = 1 if Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_{10}$  = Knowledge of Land Use (D = 1 if Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_{11}$  = Political Influence (D = 1 if Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_{12}$  = Community Leaders Influence (D = 1 if Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$b_i$  = Unknown parameters to be estimated

$e$  = error term

The Ordinary Least Squares regression model was used to examine the effects of domestic land grabs on rural household welfare. The Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) or linear least squares is a method for estimating the unknown parameters in a linear regression model, with the goal of minimizing the sum of the squares of the differences between the observed responses (values of the variable being predicted) in the given dataset and those predicted by a linear function of a set of explanatory variables. Per capita monthly household expenditure on food and non-food was used to proxy rural household welfare. Based on economic, econometric and statistical criteria, the semi-log functional form was best suited for the analysis after several functional forms were tested. The OLS model is specified as  $Y = X\beta + \varepsilon$  where  $Y$  is the response variable and  $X$ 's are predictor variables,  $\beta$  is the vector of unknown parameters and  $\varepsilon$  are unobserved scalar random variables (errors). The model is stated explicitly as follows:

$$\ln Y_i = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + b_5X_5 + \dots + b_{11}X_{11} + e \quad (2)$$

Where;

$\ln Y_i$  = Log of per capita monthly household expenditure on food and non-food

$X_1$  = Age of Household Head (Years)

$X_2$  = Gender of Household Head (1 = Male, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_3$  = Primary Education of Household Head (1 = Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_4$  = Secondary Education of Household Head (1 = Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_5$  = Tertiary Education of household head (1 = Yes, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_6$  = Marital Status (1 = Married, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_7$  = Size of land grabbed (Hectares)

$X_8$  = Primary Occupation (1 = Farming, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_9$  = Farm Output (1 = Low, 0 = Otherwise)

$X_{10}$  = Compensation (1 = No, 0 = Otherwise)

$b_i$  = Unknown parameters to be estimated

e = error term

## Results and Discussion

Table 1 revealed that a larger proportion of the respondents were male with almost four-fifths aged between 46 and 65 years. This implies that most of the respondents were still in their active and productive years. The mean age of the respondents was  $57.0 \pm 7.4$  years. Respondents that were married also accounted for more than three-fifths while majority had household sizes comprising of between 6 and 10 persons. About forty five percent (45.1%) of the respondents had at least primary education with more than half engaged primarily in farming. The mean years of farming was  $30.0 \pm 9.2$  years. Further, almost half of the respondents earned income of between ₦30,000.00 and ₦60,000.00. This implies that most of the respondents were low income earners and most likely cultivated their land for food. Mean size of land acquired was  $2.6 \pm 1.9$  hectares, as more than four-fifths of the respondents reported that their land had been grabbed.

**Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of the Respondents**

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	65	37.6
Male	108	62.4
<b>Age</b>		
36-45	3	1.7
46-55	59	34.1
56-65	86	42.7
>65	25	21.5
<b>Marital status</b>		
Married	121	69.9
Divorced	40	23.1
Widowed	12	7.0
<b>Household size</b>		
1-5	36	13.9
6-10	108	62.4
11-15	23	9.8
>16	6	1.2
<b>Educational status</b>		
No formal education	34	19.7
Primary education	78	45.1
Secondary education	39	22.5
Tertiary education	22	12.7
<b>Primary occupation</b>		

Farming	97	56.1
Trading	37	21.4
Government job	39	22.5
<b>Monthly income</b>		
<30000	22	13.0
30000-60000	79	47.4
60001-90000	58	34.8
>90000	14	8.4
<b>Size of Land Acquired (Ha)</b>		
<1	4	2.8
1-2	71	48.9
>2	70	48.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source:** Field survey

### **Household Perception of Domestic Land Grabs**

A 5-point Likert scale was used in analyzing rural households' perception of land grabs. From the results, most of the respondents perceived domestic land grabs as an occurrence that has negative effects on their welfare and that of their households. This is clearly seen in the perception index generated from the mean of the sum of each statement score which stood at 29.3. Thus, about 46.2 percent of the respondents with indices below the benchmark were favorably disposed to domestic land grabs while more than half of the respondents with indices above the benchmark were unfavorably disposed to domestic land grabs. This result, as presented in Table 2, clearly shows that land grabs is perceived as a major threat to rural households' livelihood, owing mainly to its welfare reducing effects. This result is consistent with the findings of Friis and Reenberg (2010) and Dominguez (2011).

**Table 2: Household Perception Index**

<b>Perception Indices</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>
<b>Low (Favorably disposed)</b>	80	46.2	29.30	4.44
<b>High (Unfavorably disposed)</b>	93	53.8		

**Source:** Field Survey

### **Factors Influencing Domestic Land Grabs**

Table 3 presents the results of the Logit regression analysis on the factors influencing domestic land grabs. The Log likelihood ratio of 119.27 and Chi-square value of 114.63 which was

significant at ( $p < 0.01$ ) indicates the overall significance and goodness of fit of the model. Out of the twelve explanatory variables included in the model, six were significant in explaining the likelihood of occurrence of domestic land grabs in the study area. These six variables include: Land size, secondary education, primary occupation, community leaders influence, compensation and the knowledge of use to which the acquired land was put into. The marginal effects result of the analysis is discussed as follows:

**Table 3: Factors Influencing Domestic Land Grabs**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Coefficients</b>	<b>Z</b>	<b>Marginal effects</b>
Gender of Household Head	1.317	0.89	0.104
Age of Household Head	-0.203	-1.40	-0.101
Married	-2.475	-1.50	-0.205
Land Size	0.477*	1.91	0.401
Primary Education	-2.423	-1.44	-0.109
Secondary Education	-4.975**	-2.10	-0.411
Tertiary Education	-2.253	-1.13	-0.217
Farming	1.191*	1.76	0.303
Political Influence	0.805	0.57	0.702
Comm. Leaders Influence	2.023*	1.76	0.107
Compensation	3.975**	2.54	0.331
Knowledge of Land use	2.280***	2.83	0.206
Constant	6.839	0.86	
Prob > $\chi^2$	0.0000		
Log likelihood	-119.27		
Number of observation	173		
LR $\chi^2(12)$	114.63		

**Source: Result of Logistic Regression Analysis**

Note: \* \*\* and \*\*\* represent significance level at 10%, 5% and 1% respectively.

A percentage increase in the size of the land increased its likelihood of being grabbed by 10.4%. This could be attributed to the fact that the bigger the land, the more attractive it is to intending



investors who are not likely to be interested in fragmented land holdings. On the other hand, secondary education of the household head decreased the likelihood of land being grabbed by 41.1 %. This could be attributed to the fact that being educated confers on these household heads the ability to at least know their land use rights and thus avoid being arbitrarily dispossessed of their land, as well as the ability to obtain better deals from incoming investors. Further, being primarily engaged in farming increased the likelihood of land grabs by 30.3%. This is because farming households as the holders of agricultural land cannot refuse to release their land. In other words, as stipulated by law, they do not have the right to own land but only have land use rights since the land belongs to the state (Nguyen *et al.*, undated). In addition, households in which influence of community leaders is high, where there is adequate compensation and where there is sufficient knowledge of the use to which the land is to be put into have increased likelihood of about 10.7%, 33.1% and 20.6% of their land being grabbed respectively. This is because the success of the land grab process rests on the satisfaction and dissatisfaction of these rural households which are greatly influenced by these factors.

### **Results of the Ordinary Least Squares Regression Analysis**

The Ordinary Least Square Regression analysis of per capita total monthly household expenditure (welfare proxy) on predictor variables using the semi-log functional form produced a good fit for the data as the computed *F* value of 11.88 was statistically significant. The result is as presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Effects of Domestic Land Grab on Household Welfare**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	<b>P-value (sig)</b>
Gender	-0.077	-1.64	0.103
Age	0.039	1.01	0.315
Marital status	0.042	0.95	0.346
Size of Land grabbed	-0.070***	-8.24	0.000
Primary education	0.040	0.88	0.382
Secondary education	0.089	1.33	0.186
Tertiary education	0.112**	1.99	0.048
Primary occupation	-0.037	-1.45	0.149
Farm output	-0.075*	-1.90	0.059
Compensation	-0.011***	-2.67	0.008

Constant	8.823	11.51
R <sup>2</sup>	0.423	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	0.388	
F-calculated	11.880	
Prob > F	0.000	

---

**Source: Result of the Ordinary Least Square Regression Analysis**

Note: \* \*\* and \*\*\* represent significance level at 10%, 5% and 1% respectively

The coefficient of size of land grabbed was negative and significant implying that the larger the size of the land grabbed the lower the welfare of the households. This could be as a result of inadequate compensation by the investors or government, coupled with increased living costs as well as the fact that the farmers cultivating these lands lose their livelihoods and are not able to get employment elsewhere. Tertiary education had a positive and significant effect on household welfare, indicating that household heads with a higher level of educational attainment have a higher level of welfare when compared with households with no formal education. This conforms with *apriori* expectations as education is expected to confer on a person the ability or allows for the opportunity to diversify livelihood choices which ultimately leads to the improved welfare of the household as a whole. In addition, the coefficient of farm output was negative indicating that a low level of output, decreased the welfare of the households, since low output from farms imply less income for the farm family. Also, as expected, households who had not received any compensation for the use of their land had a lower level of welfare when compared with those that had received compensation.

**Conclusion**

Various attempts to push farmers off their land has become a global phenomenon in most rural areas of the developing world, where agriculture is the mainstay of the populace and where most of the poor reside. In Nigeria, over recent years, there has been a focus on increasing foreign direct investment in agriculture as a strategy to increase national food production and by extension improve the food security situation in the country. This process involves the identification and acquisition of tracks of agricultural lands for large scale projects by the government and investors. However, in most cases, local farmers are not consulted about the

deals and are not aware of any compensation or resettlement plan. Domestic land grabs which is expected to contribute positively to the growth and development of rural communities is thus perceived among rural households' as a negative phenomenon which adversely affects their welfare. Based on the foregoing, the need to step up efforts to secure local land rights to help local people avoid being arbitrarily dispossessed of their land becomes imperative. Also, there is the need for commensurate compensation of rural households whose lands were grabbed and periodical checks on community leaders who positively influence domestic land acquisitions arbitrarily. This is pertinent for improvement in the welfare of the farmers especially if these small-scale farmers are to be part of the solution for global food security.

## **References**

- Amaza, P., Abdoulaye, T., Kwaghe, P. and Tegbaru, A. (2009). Changes in household food security and poverty status in Promoting Sustainable Agriculture in Southern Borno State, International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Nigeria. 40(1): 13-16.
- Ansoms, A. (2011). The 'bitter fruit' of a new agrarian model: Large-scale land deals and local livelihoods in Rwanda. Paper presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing, 8 April 2011- (retrieved 3/10/16).
- Ariyo, J. A. and Mortimore M. (2011). Land Deals and Commercial Agriculture in Nigeria: The New Nigerian Farms in Shonga District, Kwara State. Paper presented at the International Conference on Global Land Grabbing, 6-8 April 2011.
- Braun, J.V. and Meinzen-Dick, R. (2009). Land grabbing by foreign investors in developing countries: risks and opportunities, International Food Policy Research Institute, paper 13.
- Borras, J., Scoones I. and Hughes, D. (2011). Small-scale farmers increasingly at risk from global land grabbing. The Guardian.co.uk: Poverty Matters Blog. (retrieved 22/03/15).
- Borras, S. and Franco, J. (2010). Regulating land grabbing. Pambazuka News: Poverty Matters Blog. (retrieved 22/02/15).
- Cotula, L., Vermeulen, S., Leonard, R. And Keeley, J. (2009). Land Grab or Development Opportunity? Agricultural Investment and International Land Deals in Africa, IIED/FAO/IFAD, London/Rome. ISBN: 978-1-84369-741-1

- Daniel, S. (2011), Land grabbing and potential implications for world food security, in: M. Behnassi et al. (eds.), Sustainable agricultural Development. Springer Science and Business Media B.V. 2011.
- Deininger, K. and Byerlee, D. (2010). Rising Global Interest in Farmland: Can it Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits? World Bank, Washington DC, United States.
- Federal Ministry of Agriculture (2012). Nigerian small scale farmers and civil society meet with the minister of agriculture on critical issues of concerns. Voice for food security, Policy Advocacy series 002.
- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation (2008). Ministerial Conference on Water for Agriculture and Energy in Africa: The Challenges of Climate Change. 15-17 Dec, 2008. <http://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/factsheet/global-land-grab/> (retrieved 21/12/15).
- Galaty, J.G. (2012). 'Unused' Land and Unfulfilled Promises: Justifications for Displacing Communities in East Africa. <http://www.cornelllandproject.org/download/landgrab2012papers/galaty.pdf> (retrieved 23/11/16).
- Ghatak, M., Mookherjee, D. (2013). Land acquisition for industrialization and compensation of displaced farmers, Journal of Development Economics, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2013.01.001>
- Government of Nigeria, (1990), Land Use Act: Chapter 202, Laws of the Federation of the Republic of Nigeria. <http://www.nigeria-law.org/Land%20Use%20Act.htm> (retrieved 3/10/15).
- GRAIN (2010). Stop Land Grabbing Now. <http://www.grain.org/o/?id=102/>(Retrieved 01/12/15).
- GRAIN (2012). Land grabbing and food sovereignty in West and Central Africa. <http://farmlandgrab.org/post/view/> (retrieved 18/12/15).
- GRAIN (2015). Dominion Farm's land grab in Nigeria. <https://www.grain.org/article/entries/5126-dominion-farm-s-land-grab-in-nigeria>. (retrieved 18/06/2017)

- International Federation of Surveyors (2009). Land Governance in Support of the Millennium Development Goals: A New Agenda for Land Professional. Paper presented at the FIG/World Bank Conference, Washington DC, USA, 9-10 March,2009.  
FIG Publication No 45.
- Kadiri, W., and Oyalowo, B. (2011). Land Alienation and Sustainability Issues in the Peri-urban Interface of South-West Nigeria. *Palgrave Journal of Development* 54: 64- 69.
- Mabogunje, A.L. (2012). Land reform in Nigeria: progress, problems and prospect, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTARD/Resources/336681/mabogunje.pdf> (retrieved 3/03/15).
- Makochekanwa, A. (2012). Foreign land acquisitions in Africa – An analysis of the impacts of individual land deals on local communities. Paper presented at the World Bank Conference on land and Poverty. 23 – 26 April 2012. Washington DC, USA.
- National Bureau of Statistics (2010). Nigeria poverty profile 2010. <http://www.nigerianstat.gov.ng> (retrieved 18/12/16).
- Nguyen, T.D., Phillipe, L. and Vu, D. T. (Undated). Land conversion to industrialization and its impacts on household food security in Red River Delta, Vietnam. (Unpublished Manuscript).
- Nigeria Land Use Act, (1978). <http://www.onlinenigeria.com/Land use act/> (retrieved 28 /01/16).
- Rodgers, Y. and Menon, N. (2012). A Meta-Analysis of Land Rights and Women’s Economic Well-Being. *Feminist Economics* 15(2): 112-142.
- Saturnino, M., Borrás Jr. and Franco, J. (2010). Towards a Broader View of the Politics of Global Land Grab: Rethinking Land Issues, Reframing Resistance Initiative in Critical Agrarian Studies. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 36: 6-10.
- Olayiwola, L.M. and Adeleye, O. (2006). Land Reform – Experience from Nigeria, Promoting Land Administration and Good Governance. 5th FIG Regional Conference Accra, Ghana, [http://www.fig.net/pub/accra/papers/ts18/ts18\\_02\\_olayiwola\\_adeleye](http://www.fig.net/pub/accra/papers/ts18/ts18_02_olayiwola_adeleye)
- Oxfam (2011). “Land Grabs-Why it matters”. Oxfam International Research Paper. (Retrieved 03/12/15).
- World Bank (2010). Rising Global Interest in Farmland Can It Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits? World Bank, ESW final report.

World Bank, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and International Fund for Agricultural Development (2010), Principles for responsible agricultural investment that respects rights, livelihoods and resources. <http://www.responsibleagroinvestment.org/rai/node/> (retrieved 25/07/2011).