Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development
ISSN 2222-1700 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2855 (Online)
Vol.8, No.8, 2017

Analysis of Land Grabbing and Implications for Sustainable Livelihood: A Case Study of Local Government Areas in Nigeria

Christopher Emenyonu[1*] Aloysius Nwosu[2] Henry Ikenna Eririogu[1] Maryann Nnenna Osuji[1]
Onyekachi Umeadi Ejike[1] Clifford Chilasa Agbaeze[2]
1.Department of Agricultural Economics, Federal University of Technology P.M.B 1526, Owerri
2.Department of Agricultural Economics, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike

Abstract
Land grabbing and high-risk large scale land investments exploit the livelihood source of local resource users. One common trend among governments promoting land grabs has been the theme 'development promotion' and touting the benefits of agricultural development, job creation, increased cash crop and livestock production, and infrastructure provision as drivers towards economic development and eventual modernization. As a result, this study analysed land grabbing and its implications for sustainable livelihood in Owerri Municipal and Owerri West Local Government Areas of Imo State, Nigeria. These two LGAs have witnessed dispossession of ancestral lands for farming which were hitherto their main means of sustenance. Purposive sampling technique was employed for the study in order to ensure that it is only the real owners of the dispossessed lands were used in the study given the nature of land ownership in the state. Primary data were sourced through the use of structured questionnaire, while the secondary information were obtained from the repositories of international organizations such as GRAIN, FAO, World Bank etc. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, bivariate analytical model and Ordinary Least Square multiple regression model. The results showed that majority (76%) of the owners of the dispossessed lands were males, this gives an indication of land ownership rights in Nigeria. The mean household size of dispossessed families was 5 persons. About 58% of dispossessed land owners inherited their lands, and were full time farmers, indicating that farming is the major source of livelihood in the area. It was found that the lands were grabbed by the government via "legal" means (62%) through the land use act of 1978, while 38% of the lands were grabbed by private investors and other wealthy individuals who were connected to the government in power. The mean land size owned by the farmers before land grabbing was 1.8 hectares; while the mean land size grabbed was 1.9 hectares implying that more land areas than those used for farming were grabbed and thus leading to larger dispossessions; the mean land size available to farmers after land grabbing was 0.8 hectares. The grabbed lands were converted to built-up lands especially hotels and other constructions on land (74%), while 26% of the lands were used for other non agricultural establishments. The results also showed that decrease in land size available to the farmers due to increased land grabbing by one meter square, decreases the value of food crop produced, and hence decreases food-driven investments by N622.81k in the area thus leading to reduced food production and undermined the livelihood activities in the areas. The study recommended that compensatory lands should be released to the farmers and incentives granted to facilitate improvement in food crop production in the local government areas.
Keywords: Land grabbing, Food production, Poverty ties, Sustainable livelihood, land investments.

Introduction/ Problem Statement

One of the driving forces for foreign land deals in Africa has been attributed to the presumed availability of 'ridiculously' cheap lands. One key factor for this is the weak institutions/poor land governance prevalent in Africa. Food-importing countries with land and water shortages, but rich in capital are at the forefront of new investments in farmland in foreign countries. Countries with large populations and food security concerns such as China, South Korea, and India are seeking opportunities to produce food overseas (Joachim, 2009). These investments are targeted towards developing countries where production costs are much lower and where land and water are more abundant. Apart from cheap lands, other factors that are influencing investments in foreign land include geographic proximity and climatic conditions for preferred staple crops. In addition to acquiring land for food, many countries are seeking land for the production of biofuel crops. Many governments, either directly or indirectly, through state-owned entities and public-private partnerships, are in negotiations for or have already closed deals on arable land leases, concessions, or purchases abroad. The size and terms of contracts differ widely. Some agreements do not involve direct land acquisition, but seek to secure food supplies through contract farming and investment in rural and agricultural infrastructure, including irrigation systems and roads. Majority of land in Africa is categorized as "non-private" as a result of government policies on public land ownership and a lack of active titling, governments own or control most of the land that is available for purchase or lease. Outright purchases are less common than leases due to countries' constitutional bans on outright sale of lands to foreigners. The methods surrounding the negotiation, approval, and follow-up of contracts between investors and governments have attracted significant criticism for their opacity and complexity. The negotiation and approval processes have been closed in most cases, with little public disclosure both during and after the

finalization of a deal (Deininger and Derek, 2010).

Land is an important resource in farming (Babalola and Olayemi, 2013), and a major resource for the livelihood of the poor (Raufu and Adetunji, 2012). Demand for land for agricultural purposes is increasing globally implying a limitation in land resources, and necessitating a yearning for decisions leading to the most beneficial use of limited land resources (Abah, 2013). This increases the risk of land grabbing, a process whereby local communities are displaced from their land and lose their ability to grow food and their livelihoods (CEED/ERA/FoEN/GRAIN/Global Justice Now, 2015). Land grabbing involves the (coercive) transfer of land ownership or access (enclosure) from traditional or customary uses (usually small-holder agriculture or forest lands) to corporate agriculture, special economic zones (SEZ), housing developments or nature conservation (Vicol, 2015). Land grabbing is popularly understood as change in both ownership and use of land, where local land uses (subsistence crop production, domestic cash crops, grazing, forests, etc) are replaced with export food or fuel crops (Hall, 2011). It involves purchase or lease of vast tracts of land by wealthier, food-insecure nations and private investors from mostly poor, developing countries in order to produce crops for export (Daniel and Mittal, 2009). Land grabbing is the contentious issue of large-scale land acquisitions: buying or leasing of large pieces of land in developing countries, by domestic and transnational companies, governments, and individuals. One common trend among governments promoting land grabs has been the theme 'development promotion'. Target governments often tout the benefits of agricultural development, job creation, increased cash crop and livestock production, and infrastructure provision as drivers towards economic development and eventual modernization. Many of the governments hinge their actions as being ready and viable tools for fast tracking agro-industrial development in their countries. The current land grab is characterized by unprecedented pressures on land tenure systems. Those most at risk of losing access to land are small-scale producers who do not have formal tenure over the land that they use, as well as women, indigenous people, pastoralists, and fisher-folks (International Land Coalition, 2008). The global estimate of foreign interest in land acquisition has been between 15 to 20 million hectares (IFPRI, 2009). The estimate of the scale, based on evidence presented in April 2011 at an international conference convened by the Land Deal Politics Initiative, estimated the area of land deals at 80 million ha; of these deals, the median size is 40,000ha, with one-quarter over 200,000 ha and one-quarter under 10,000 ha; 37% of projects deal with food crops, 21% with cash crops, and 21% with bio-fuels (Borras *et al.,* 2011).

In the past decades, land acquisition abroad has been driven by the profit-making motives of the private sector in developed countries and has often focused on perennial tropical cash crops rather than basic staples. China started leasing land for food production in Cuba and Mexico 10 years ago and continues to search for new opportunities to feed its large population. More recent transnational land deals are partly an effect of the larger changing economic valuation of land and water. Although additional investments in agriculture in developing countries by the private and the public sector should be welcome in principle, the scale, the terms, and the speed of land acquisition have provoked opposition in some target countries. According to news reports, the Ogonis in Rivers State Nigeria and in the instant case, Owerri Municipal and Owerri West LGAs have protested and continued to protest against the state government's undue grabbing of their land; Philippines blocked a land contract with China because of serious concerns about its terms and legal validity, as well as about its impact on local food security. Mozambicans have resisted the settlement of thousands of Chinese agricultural workers on leased lands—a situation that would limit the involvement of local labor in the new agricultural investments. A similar scenario played out in Imo and kwara states, Nigeria respectively. News reports have helped shed light on these developments, but details about the status of the deals, the size of land purchased or leased, and the amount invested are often still murky. Acquisition of farmland in developing countries by other countries seeking to ensure their food supplies is one of the lingering effects of the food price crisis of 2007–08 on the world food system. Increased pressures on natural resources, water scarcity, and export restrictions imposed by major producers when food prices were high, and growing distrust in the functioning of regional and global markets have pushed countries short in land and water to find alternative means of producing food. These land acquisitions have the potential to inject much needed investment into agriculture and rural areas in poor developing countries. However, they also raise concerns about the impacts on poor local people, who risk losing access to and control over land on which their livelihoods depend (IFPRI, 2009).

Farmers' livelihoods are dominated by agriculture. The conditions of contemporary land grabbing favour corporate accumulation via dispossession of poor farmers' land, threatening rural livelihoods and reproducing social and economic differentiation and inequality (White *et al*., 2012). According to Liversage (2015), focusing on the potential threats to the land rights and livelihoods of smallholder farmers, pastoralists, indigenous communities and other vulnerable groups is important, as some large-scale acquisitions have not met expectations and, instead, have had a negative impact, especially on the livelihood of the dispossessed land owners. White *et al* (2012) argue that it is important to maintain focus on the implications of land deals that involve acquisition (land access), rather than other forms of control over land use, as acquisition is essentially permanent, expels local land users and removes future land rights for local farmers.

With the promise of job opportunities, schools and health centers by these land grabbers, farmers give out the rights to use land their land for a period up to 99 years. According to Hans and Brita (2010) investments on these lands are not development initiatives, but high-risk projects where failure can bring devastating consequences. The question then is 'will farmers continue to suffer these devastating consequences on their livelihoods for 99 years?'

The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) argues that if there is transparency in negotiations, respect for existing land rights, and sharing of benefits between local communities and foreign investors, foreign investment can provide key resources for agriculture, including development of needed infrastructure and expansion of livelihood options for local people (Daniel and Mittal, 2009). Chambers and Conway (1991) defined livelihood as the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. Assets are not simply resources that people use in building livelihoods; they are assets that give them the capability to be and act (Bebbington, 1999). According to DFID (2002) and World Bank (2005) reports, livelihood can only be seen as sustainable when the poor are capable of coping with stresses and shocks, and most importantly when the livelihood activities provide benefits without undermining the natural resource base on which they rely. People need five vital resources in order to achieve a sustainable livelihood. These are human, natural, physical, financial and social capital. The natural capital includes land, water, forest and pastures (De Haan, 2009).

There is insufficient information on the impacts of land grabbing on the livelihoods of rural communities, either negative or positive (Andrianirina-Ratsialonana and Teyssier, 2010). Over 90 percent of Nigerians live in rural areas and rely on agriculture for survival; dispossessing this greater percentage of the population of their major source of livelihood, will make land unsuitable for farming and in turn intensify poverty among these marginalised farmers. Since large corporations and transnational make emphasis on the type of crops that is mostly required by their nations, the implication of this is that emphasis on type of production will shift and eventual loss of food sovereignty of the host communities. Very few studies exist on land grabbing in Nigeria, the most recent being that of Osabuohein, 2012, but none of such has the food sovereignty or livelihoods of the host communities as its core focus. This study is also justified as it will stimulate policy dialogue on how to protect the rights of the vulnerable communities. A number of questions therefore become pertinent for governments of developing nations promoting modern land deals in their countries: to what extent has large scale sale of farmlands to foreign investors promoted agro-industrial development of their countries and communities; what rights do communities have in their lands; to what extent has the nations promoting land grabs achieved increased farm productivity, income and welfare among the people; etc

Objectives of the Study

The broad objective of this study is to analyze land grabbing and its implications for sustainable livelihood in Owerri Municipal and Owerri West Local Government Areas of Imo State, Nigeria. The specific objectives are to;

i. examine the socioeconomic characteristics of the affected farmers;
ii. examine the land grabbing strategies used by the grabbers and hence examine the legal rights that government, bodies (local) have to access lands meant for others and if due process of acquisition followed;
iii. determine the area of land acquired and the purpose they were used for and hence the area of land available for the land owners;
iv. ascertain the relationship between the historical patterns of farming cost and livelihood patterns,
v. estimate the effects of the grabbed land on local food-driven investments in the study area.

Hypothesis of the Study.

The null hypothesis that land grabbing has no significant effect on food-driven investments in the LGAs was tested.

Methodology

The Study Area

The study was carried out in Owerri Municipal and Owerri West Local Government Areas of Imo State, Nigeria. There are eleven five (5) communities and (11) communities in Owerri Municipal and Owerri West Local Government Areas respectively, namely; Umuoyima, Amawo, Umuodu, Umuororonjo and Umuonyeche for the Munucipal while the West has Amakohia-ubi, Avu, Eziobodo, Emeabiam, Irete, Nekede, Obinze, Umuguma, Umudibia, Ihiagwa and Okolochi. Agriculture is the predominant occupation of the people, for almost all the farm families either as primary or secondary occupation. The ecological zone favours the growing of tree crops, roots and tubers, cereals, vegetables and nuts. These crops are grown in small holder plots usually in mixtures of

at least two simultaneous crops (Imo ADP, 1994).

Analytical Techniques

The LGAs were purposively chosen for this study due to the prevailing land grabbing by the government, private investors, and other highly placed individuals in the area. The samples were drawn from dispossessed farming families in the area. The sampling method was purposive and drwan as follows: two out of the five communities in Owerri Municipal were selected and they were Amawom and Umuoyima while three (3) out of the eleven communities in Owerri West area were selected and they were, Umuguma, Avu/Obinze and Irete/Egbeada. The list of the farming families who owned the lands that were were dispossessed were got from the community heads to be 65, but fifty (50) were willing and able to give the requisite information and hence the sample size of 50.The data which were primary in nature were got with a set of structured questionnaire. The variables included in the survey instrument were but not limited; the socioeconomic characteristics, land grabbing strategies in the area, costs of farming, livelihood patterns, hectares of lands grabbed, etc. While the secondary information were obtained from the repositories of international organizations such as GRAIN, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and World Bank; and other national bodies in the State.Data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics, bivariate analytical model and Ordinary Least Square multiple regression model. Objectives 1 to 3 were achieved using descriptive statistics and the rights –based- approach r part of objective three. This requires that the provisions for any land acquisition is duly followed and that the original land owners are not in any way alienated in the process and hence protected.; objective 4 was realized using bivariate analytical model; while objective 5 was achieved using Ordinary Least Square multiple regression model.The bi-variate model is stated implicitly as:

$$Y_i = f(X_i) \quad (1)$$

Where;

$$Y_i = f(X_{1i}, X_{2i}, X_{3i}, e_i) \quad (2)$$

Y_i = Livelihood patterns and poverty ties of the i^{th} dispossessed farmers (Measured as income in naira)
X_i = Historical patterns of farming cost of the i^{th} dispossessed farmer, which includes the following:
X_{1i} = transportation cost to and fro farm (Naira)
X_{2i} = labour wage (Naira)
X_{3i} = value of crop inputs used (Naira)
e_i = error term

The model was fitted for both time regimes, namely; before and after grabbing, and used to show the correlation between the two variables. The Ordinary Least Square multiple regression model is stated implicitly as:

$$Y_{ij} = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, e_i) \quad (3)$$

Where;

Y_{ij} = Value of j^{th} food crop of the i^{th} farmer (Naira), which is given as:

$$Y = y_1 + y_2 + y_3 \quad (4)$$

Where;

y_1 = value of cassava produced (Naira)
y_2 = value of yam tubers produced (Naira)
y_3 = value of maize cobs produced (Naira)
X_1 = total area of land available to the farmers (Hectares)
X_2 = value of inputs used (Naira), also given as:

$$X_2 = x_{21} + x_{22} + x_{23} \quad (5)$$

Where;

x_{21} = value of cassava stem cuttings used (Naira)
x_{22} = value of yam minisetts used (Naira)
x_{23} = value of maize cobs used (Naira)
X_3 = labour wage (Naira)
X_4 = Age of dispossessed farmers(Years)
X_5 = Household size (in number)
X_6 = Farming experience of the farmers
e_i = error term

The model was fitted in four functional forms, namely; linear, double, semi-log and exponential forms. The choice of lead equation was based on economic, econometric and statistical criteria. It was *a priori* expected that the coefficients of $X_4, X_5, X_6 > 0$ and $X_1, X_2, X_3 < 0$.The hypothesis however was realized using the F-statistics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socioeconomic characteristics of dispossessed farmers

Table 1 shows the socioeconomic characteristics of dispossessed farmers in the study area. It showed that the

mean age of the dispossessed farmers was 54 years, majorly (76%) males, educated (36%), married (43%) with a mean household size of 5 persons. This is an indication that the affected land owners in the area are mostly married male farmers, who are no more in their active age, but have the advantage of spending less in labour due to the available number of family labour. The mean household size is also an indication of more responsibilities as parents, and therefore requires more productive assets such as land which have a high economic value, and other sustainable livelihood means.

Land ownership in the study area is mostly by customary mode of ownership. According to customary land law, land is owned by males who also only inherit it; and those that are not likely to inherit land are expected to buy land elsewhere. Table 1 also showed that dispossessed land owners inherited (58%) their lands. This implies that the customary owners of lands in the area got them from their parents. However, as majority (58%) of landowners was full time farmers, it is an indication that food crop production is the major source of livelihood in the area.

Table 1: Socioeconomic characteristics of Dispossessed farmers in Owerri Municipal and Owerri West LGAs

Variables	Frequency	% Distribution	Mean	S.D
Age (years)			54	10.784
Household size			5	2.652
Sex				
a. Male	38	76		
b. female	12	24		
Marital Status				
a. married	43	86		
b. single	4	8		
c. widow	3	6		
Education				
a. primary	16	32		
b. secondary	14	28		
c. tertiary	18	36		
d. none	2	4		
Source of income				
a. farming	29	58		
b. non-farming	21	42		
Land Ownership				
a. inheritance	29	58		
b. purchase	14	28		
c. rent	5	10		
d. gift	2	4		
Observations	**50**			

Source: Computed Results, 2016.

Land grab strategy, area of land acquired and land area available to the farmers

Table 2 shows the land grab strategy; land size acquired and land area available to the farmers in the area. It showed that 68% of the lands were grabbed by the government via legal means (62%) through the land use act of 1978, and 38% had their lands grabbed illegally by private investors and other wealthy individuals.

Table 2: Land grab strategy, area of land acquired and land area available to the farmers

Variables	Frequency	% Distribution	Mean	S.D
Land Grabbers				
a. government	34	68		
b. foreign investors	1	2		
c. local investors	8	16		
d. NGOs	1	2		
e. individuals	6	12		
Land Grab Strategy				
a. legal means	31	62		
b. illegal means	19	38		
Purpose/intended Use				
a. building and constructions	37	74		
b. other establishments	13	26		
c. agricultural use	0	0		
Land Size				
a. Before grabbing			1.8	1.738
b. Grabbed			1.9	1.642
c. Available			0.8	0.531
Observations	**50**			

Source: Computed Results, 2016

The results also showed that 74% of the grabbed lands were converted to built-up lands and other constructions on land, 26% of the lands were used for other non agricultural establishments. This implies that most of the land grab occurring in the study area is orchestrated by the state government for developmental purposes. It also implies that grabbed lands in study area are not being used for agricultural purposes but for non agricultural ventures that have little or no benefit to the dispossessed land owners. This will have negative impacts on food production and farming as a sustainable livelihood means in the LGAs of Imo State.

Table 2 also showed that the mean land size owned by the farmers before land grabbing was 1.8 hectares; the mean land size grabbed was 1.9 hectares; and the mean land size available to farmers after land grabbing was 0.8 hectares. This implies that food production reduced drastically after the land grab and has undermined the livelihood activities in the area, and if not well compensated for, sustainable livelihood cannot be secured since farming is a livelihood means in the area.

Historical Patterns of Farming cost, poverty ties and other livelihood patterns

Tables 3 and 4 show the parameter estimates of bivariate regression analysis before and after land grabbing. Linear function was chosen as the lead equation for both time regimes (before and after land grabbing).

Table 3: Parameter estimates of bivariate regression before land grabbing

Variable	Linear Function	Exponential Function	Double log Function	Semi log Function
Intercept	2015.451	8.067837	5.325316	-17473.4
	(4.398615)	(112.5733)	(14.45901)	(-4.75882)
X-variable	3.203033	0.000337	0.477513	3549.271
	(13.57946)***	(9.12812)***	(8.716125)***	(6.498395)***
R^2	0.793461	0.634488	0.612812	0.468021
F-value	184.4017	83.32258	75.97083	42.22914
Observations	**50**	**50**	**50**	**50**

Figures in parenthesis are t-ratios
***significant at 1%, **significant at 5%
Source: Computed Results, 2016

Table 4: Parameter Estimates for bivariate Regression after land grabbing

Variable	Linear Function	Exponential Function	Double log Function	Semi log Function
Intercept	-98.8638	7.356499	5.387326	-8653.86
	(-0.23323)	(83.12559)	(9.867046)	(-2.60972)
X-variable	1.854554	0.000285	0.343023	1637.31
	(9.468923)***	(6.979127)***	(4.534168)**	(3.563493)**
R^2	0.651316	0.503662	0.29987	0.209206
F-value	89.66051	48.70821	20.55868	12.69848
Observations	**50**	**50**	**50**	**50**

Figures in parenthesis are t-ratios
***significant at 1%, **significant at 5%
Source: Computed Results, 2016

The coefficients of multiple determinations (R^2) were 79% and 65% for land grabbing before and after respectively. This implies that the independent variables explain at least 79% of the variability in livelihood patterns before land grabbing and 65% of the variability in livelihood patterns after land grabbing in the study area. The coefficients of X-variable (Historical farming costs of the farmers) for both time regimes were positive and significant at 1% probability level for all the functions. This therefore implies a positive relationship between the livelihood patterns, poverty ties and historical farming costs in the area.

Effects of the Grabbed Lands on local food-driven investments

Table 5 shows the multiple regression results for the effect of land grabbing on value of food crop produced in the study area. It showed that the linear production function was the lead equation, as indicated by the R^2 and F-values.

Table 5: Multiple Regression result for the effect of land grabbing on value of food crop produced

Variable	Linear Function	Exponential Function	Double log Function	Semi log Function
Intercept	-510.091	7.191387	3.342423	-1.6975
	(-0.46596)	(33.99478)	(2.845976)	(-1.92603)
X_1	-622.818	-0.0434	0.068578	-131.19
	(-3.01189)***	(-0.89651)	(0.707697)	(-0.18041)
X_2	3.629539	0.000543	0.668907	3101.705
	(13.45852)***	(9.279656)***	(8.024747)***	(4.958494)***
X_3	-0.9676	-0.00054	-0.23817	-1456
	(-1.42909)	(-3.09428)***	(-2.30524)**	(-1.87788)*
X_4	15.47149	0.007284	0.395069	2269.82
	(0.548205)	(1.357888)	(1.563894)	(1.197317)
X_5	127.1973	0.010965	0.044902	789.7053
	(0.859299)	(0.373718)	(0.351516)	(0.823818)
X_6	-102.11	-0.00796	-0.15461	-1323.67
	(-1.0777)	(-0.42707)	(-1.36156)	(-1.55332)
F-value	32.50288	18.55249	16.50526	6.517025
R^2	0.819341	0.721349	0.69725	0.476262
Observations	**50**	**50**	**50**	**50**

Figures in parenthesis are t-ratios
***significant at 1%, **significant at 5%, *significant at 10%
Source: Computed Results, 2016

The coefficient of multiple determinations (R^2) for linear function was 82%. This implies that the independent variables explain at least 82% of the variability in food production in the area. Variables such as X_3, X_4, X_5, and X_6 were not significant at any probability level. The coefficients of X_1 (land available to the farmers) was significant at 1% probability level. This is an indication that decrease in land size available to the farmers due to increase in land grabbing by one meter square, decreases the value of food crop produced, hence food-driven investment decreases by N622.81k in the area. Since food crop production (farming) is the major livelihood means in the area, increase in land grabbing decreases the livelihood of the landowners. As a result, sustainable livelihood cannot be secured in LGAs since the land grabbing undermines livelihood source in the area. In addition, the value of inputs used by the farmers (X_2) was also significant at 1% probability level, though did not comply with the *a priori* expectation. This implies that as a result of this land grabbing which reduces the land area available to the farmers, investing on the available farm land through the procurement of farm inputs and intensification of the available land increases food crop production in the area. It also indicates that

sustainable livelihood can only be secured if both private and public investments are channeled towards agricultural development, since the livelihood of landowners in the area depends on the value of food produced. However, the null hypothesis that land grabbing has no significant effect on the food crop production in the area was rejected, and hence the study accepted the alternative that land grabbing in the study area has significant effect on the food crop production in the area.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Arising from the findings of the study, the following conclusions can be drawn;

The dispossessed landowners in the study area are mostly males, educated, and married with a mean household size of 5 persons.

The dispossessed land owners inherited their lands from their ancestors; and majority are full time farmers, indicating that food crop production is the major source of livelihood in the area.

Lands were grabbed by the government through "legal'means, by the so called land use act and the owners were not duly compensated as all lands belong to government. The grabbed lands are converted to built-up lands especially hotels and other constructions on land.

Given the reduction in size of owned land by the farmers after land grabbing,sustainable livelihood cannot be secured in the LGAs since the land grabbing the major livelihood source in the area.

Increase in land grabbing by one meter square, decreases the value of food crop produced by N622.81k in the area, as food crop production (farming) is the major livelihood means in the area. Increase in land grabbing decreases the livelihood of the landowners.

The study therefore recommended that compensatory lands should be released to the farmers and incentives granted to facilitate improvement in food crop production in the LGAs. In addition, the intended use of subsequent land grabbed by the government should be geared towards agricultural development projects following the provisions of the land use act instead of the gross violation as observed. Focusing on promoting and supporting farmers and ensuring full employment of farmers in the area will not only increase food crop production in the area, but will ensure sustainable livelihood peaceful governance.

REFERENCES

Abah, R. C(2013) Importance of Agricultural Land Use Evaluation in Nigeria: A Review of Literature. *Agricultural Journal 8 (5):* 262-275

Andrianirina-Ratsialonana, R., and A. Teyssier. (2010). Large-scale agricultural investments in Madagascar: Lessons for more "inclusive" models. In *Alternatives to land acquisitions:Agricultural investment and collaborative business models,* eds. L. Cotula and R. Leonard.London: International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED)/ Berne: SwissAgency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)/ Rome: International Fund forAgricultural Development (IFAD)/ Maputo: Centro Terra Viva (CTV).

Babalola, D.A and Olayemi, J.K (2013). Determinants Of Farmers' Preference For Sustainable Land Management Practices For Maize And Cassava Production In Ogun State, Nigeria. Invited paper presented at the 4th International Conference of the African Association of Agricultural Economists, September 22-25, 2013, Hammamet, Tunisia.

Bebbington, A. (1999). Capital and Capabilities: A Framework for Analyzing Peasant Viability, Rural Livelihoods and Poverty. *World Development. 27(12):2012-2044.*

Borras, S.M; Ruth, H; Ian, S; Ben, W and Wolford, W. (2011). Towards a better understanding of global land grabbing: an editorialintroduction. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(2), pp.209–216.

Centre for Environmental Education and Development, Environmental Rights Action/Friends of the Earth, Nigeria GRAIN and Global Justice Now (2015). The Dominion Farms' land grab in Nigeria. Retrieved on July 26, 2015, from http://www.globaljustice.org.uk/sites/default/files/files/resources/dominion_farms_land_grab_in_nigeria_-_web.pdf.

Chambers, R and Conway, G. (1991). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st century. Discussion paper 296, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Daniel, S and Mittal, A. (2009). The great land grab. Rush for world's farmland threatens food security for the poor. The Oakland Institute, Oakland, USA.

De Haan, L. J. (2009). Globalisation, Localisation and Sustainable Livelihood. *Sociologia Ruralis 40 (3): 340-365*

Deininger, K and Derek, B (2010). *Rising Global Interest in Farmland: Can it Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits?* . World Bank, Washington, D.C, pp1-199

Department for International Development (DFID, 2002) Linking Poverty Reduction and Environmental Management - Policy Challenges and Opportunities., DFID/EC/UNDP/WORLD BANK.

Hall, R. (2011). Land grabbing in Southern Africa: the many faces of the investor rush. *Review of African Political Economy, 38(128), pp.193–214.*

Hans, T and Brita, B. (2010). Land Investments or Land grab? A critical view from Tanzania and Mozambique. Retrieved on July 26, 2015, from http://www.spireorg.no/files/spire/documents/Land_investment_or_land_grab08112010.pdf.

International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI, 2009). *"Land Grabbing" by Foreign Investors in Developing Countries: Risks and Opportunities.* IFPRI Policy Brief no. 13.

Imo State Agricultural Development Programme (Imo ADP,1994). Crop area and yield survey (CAYS). Summary report. Owerri, Imo State, Nigeria.

International Land Coalition (2008). Land and Vulnerable people in aworld of change. Commission on sustainable Development Session 16. New York. May 5-16.

Liversage, H. (2015). *Responding to land grabbing and promoting responsible investment In Agriculture.* International Fund for Agricultural Development. Paolo di Dono,44 – 00142 Rome, Italy.

National Population Commission (2006) National Census Figure, National Population Commission, Abuja, Nigeria.

Raufu M.O and Adetunji, M.O (2012) Determinant of Land Management Practices among Crop Farmers in South-Western Nigeria. *Global Journal of Science Frontier Research Agriculture & Biology. Volume 12 Issue 1 Version 1.0.*

Vicol, M. (2015). Corporatisation of rural spaces: Contract farming as local scale land grabs in Maharashtra, India. Land grabbing, conflict and agrarian‐environmental transformations: perspectives from East and Southeast Asia. An international academic conference. Conference Paper No. 38. Chiang Mai University. June 5‐6.

White, B., Borras, S.M., Jr, Hall, R., Scoones, I. and Wolford, W. (2012). The New Enclosures: Critical Perspectives on Corporate Land Deals. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(3-4), pp.619–647.