



Effect of Land Speculators Activities on Crop Farming Management Practices in Akinyele Local Government Area, Oyo State

O.O. ABEGUNRIN
Federal College of Forestry, Jericho, Ibadan, Nigeria

O.O. OBADIMU
Forestry Research Institute of Nigeria

T. OMOSEBI
Federal College of Forestry, Jos, Nigeria

Abstract. The study was carried out to examine the effect of land speculators activities on crop farming management practices in Akinyele Local Government Area Oyo State. A four-stage random sampling was used to select 106 respondents. Data were collected through the use of questionnaire and were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study showed that most (56.6%) of the respondents were male, married (66.0%) and 59.3% had farming experience between 1-10 years. The study also revealed that the management practices such as irrigation practices (54.7%) and Planting (71.1%) were mostly affected by land speculators. Furthermore, the effect of land speculators included, displacement of farmers (48.1%), livelihood insecurities (51.9%) and short-term production of crops (51.9%). The coping strategies used by respondents involved monitoring land prices and value (57.5%), joining and forming organization (54.7%), diversify of crop farming (50.9%), and strengthening community ties (42.5%). Chi square analysis revealed a significant relationship between sex ($\chi^2 = 1.540$), marital status ($\chi^2 = 5.280$), educational level ($\chi^2 = 13.422$), membership ($\chi^2 = 5.694$) and effect of land speculators on crop farming management practices. It is therefore recommended that extension services should deploy intervention programmes on land management that will increase productivity among farmers.

Keywords: Land Speculators, Crop Farming, Management Strategies, Activities

1. Introduction

The most prominent human activity that can affect land accessibility factors is land speculation, which has a detrimental effect on the land market's performance, making land unaffordable, unavailable, and raising concerns about the security of its tenure (Gemeda et al., 2019; Gemeda et al., 2020). The detrimental effects of land speculation extend beyond agricultural delivery to housing delivery (Joshua, Glanda, and Ilesanmi, 2016). The scholars also claim that land speculation has an impact on urban planning and development.

According to Dimuna (2016) and Nwoko (2016), the issue of massive land holdings and acquisitions by primarily private persons is wide spread in Nigeria's rural and urban areas. The claim was made by the scholars without assessing how these private individuals operated. Farmers in poor nations typically use informal risk management techniques to deal with a variety of price and production issues. These techniques range from common risk sharing based on kinship and social networks to income diversification activities and production tactics.

However, Smith and Jones (2022) claim that the invasion of agricultural landscapes by land speculators presents a serious threat to crop farming management techniques, jeopardizing the resilience and sustainability of the agricultural system. Although land speculation has been acknowledged as a

worldwide problem with extensive ramifications, there is still a dearth of empirical study concentrating on its particular implications on crop farming management techniques. The development of focused policies and actions to lessen the detrimental effects of land speculation on agricultural sustainability and food security is hampered by this research vacuum.

A type of investment known as "land speculation" aims to increase the value of the land in the future. Economic growth and progress are encouraged by land speculation (Bello, 2007; Mosha, 2010). It is impossible to overstate how crucial land accessibility is to all human endeavors. Land availability, tenure security, affordability, and simplicity of land transactions are all indicators of land speculation (Omirin, 2002; Odudu and Omirin, 2012). These land accessibility characteristics can be affected by a variety of human activities, the most prominent of which is property speculation.

Land speculators raise land prices, which decreases the amount of agricultural land available and makes farmers' problems with affordability worse. Agricultural land becomes more expensive and scarce as land speculation rises, which affects farmers' capacity to obtain and efficiently manage land for crop cultivation. The resilience of farming communities and the long-term sustainability of the agricultural production system are called into question by this occurrence.

The connection between property speculation and land accessibility was highlighted by Aribigbola (2008). According to the scholar, a number of restrictions on land access resulted from the formal system's inefficiency, which in turn caused land speculation and an excessive increase in property prices. Land affordability, land availability, tenure security, and simplicity of land transaction can all be considered aspects of land accessibility (Omirin, 2002; Odudu and Omirin, 2012).

According to Ademade et al. (2014), just 35% of Nigeria's 98.3 million hectares of arable land are under cultivation, despite the fact that 72% of it has the capacity to be cultivated. The process of controlling how land resources are used and developed in both urban and rural areas is known as land management. Organic farming, reforestation, the production of permanent and arable crops, building construction, water resource management, and ecotourism initiatives are some of the various uses for land resources. Adopting suitable land management techniques that enable land users to optimize the economic and social advantages of the land while

improving the ecological support functions of the land resources is known as sustainable land management (SLM) (FAO 2015).

There are agricultural crop management techniques that are well recognised. Results are obtained from these agricultural crop management techniques. These include, among other things, the use of cover crops, crop rotation, intercropping, agroforestry, soil testing, documentation, appropriate irrigation and water management, pesticide and/or fertiliser management, and tillage regimes. In agricultural crop management, paying strict attention to these important aspects will save overall environmental costs while maximising crop production, improving soil quality, and ensuring biodiversity protection.

Because it guarantees food security, maximizing agricultural crop output is essential to the survival of global society (Branca et al., 2011). The greatest agricultural crop management techniques must always be used in developing nations where agricultural production is the main source of income for the populace. This is essential to improving these communities' economic standing. According to UNPFA (2011), there will be 9.1 million people on the planet by the year 2050. Therefore, it is imperative that agricultural crops be managed sustainably and effectively in order to feed this growing population.

1.1 General Objectives

The general objective is to examine the effect of land speculator on crop farming management practices in Akinyele local government area, Oyo state. The specific objectives of the study are to:

- To identify the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents.
- To examine the level of crop management practice in a study area
- To determine the effect of land speculator activities in the area
- To ascertain the coping strategies used by respondents against the activities of land speculator
- To identify the constraint to use of coping strategies against land speculators activities

2. Methodology

2.1 Area of study

The study was Akinyele Local Government Area (LGA) of Ibadan, Oyo State Nigeria It has an area of 518km². Its geographic coordinates are 7°23' 47" N

and longitude 3°55'0"E with her headquarters in Moniya, and shares boundaries with Afijio Local Government to the north, Lagelu Local Government to the East, Ido local government to the West and Ibadan North local government to the south, it has a population of 105,59 males and 106,217 females (NPC, 2006). The town has a tropical climate and it is generally experiences both raining and dry season as well as harmattan, (Efenakpoet. al. 2016). It is one of the eleven Local Governments that make up Ibadan metropolis. Akinyele Local government Area was created in 1976 and It occupies a land area of 464.892 square kilometres with a population density of 516 persons per square kilometre. Using 3.2% growth rate The target population of the study was farmers that are affected by the activities of land speculators in Akinyele local government area of Oyo state.

2.2 Sampling procedure and sample size

A four-stage random sampling method was used to select the respondents for this study. The first stage involved random sampling of 40% of wards (wards 1, 2, 3, 10 and 12) in Akinyele local government area. Secondly, this stage involved random selection village headquarters in each ward selected in local government area. Thirdly, this involved random sampling of 30% of villages affected by the activities of land speculators in each village headquarters

from 2006 census figures, the 2010 estimated population for the Local Government is 239,745(NBS, 2009).

Akinyele LGA lies in the south – western zone of the state, which is roughly enclosed by latitude 7.53060 and 3.91100E north of the equator. The major occupation of the Akinyele local government area, LGA is farming. whereby the main crop grown are fruit and vegetables, also manyu of the people in the local government are involved in livestock production like snail and poultry. Akinyele local government area is sub-divided into 12wards.

selected, these are: Lastly, 35% of farmers in each village (Ikereku; 24, Arulogun:22, Amosun:19, Olorisaoko 25 and Iroko:20) were selected using systematic random sampling to give 110 respondents out of which 106 questionnaires were retrieved.

Data for this study were collected through the use of a well-structured questionnaire. The secondary source was use of relevant literature, research journals and other relevant publication. The data were analyzed using both descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage and mean score was use to present the results of the study while inferential statistics such as Chi-square to test hypothesis one and PPMC to test hypotheses.

3. Results and Discussions

Table 3.1 Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	60	56.6
Female	46	43.4
Total	106	100
Age (years)		
21-30	12	11.2
31-40	25	23.5
41-50	33	30.9
Above 50	36	33.7
Total	106	100
Marital status		
Single	14	13.2
Married	70	66.0
Divorced	11	10.4
Widow	11	10.4
Total	106	100
Religion		
Christianity	47	44.3
Islam	50	47.2
Traditional	9	8.4
Total	106	100
Education		
No formal education	24	22.6
Primary	22	20.8
Secondary	30	28.3
Tertiary	30	28.3

Total	106	100
Income		
Less than 100,000	55	51.5
100001-200000	38	35.8
200001-300000	11	10.2
Above 300000	2	1.8
Total	106	100
Years of experience		
1-10	63	59.3
11-20	22	20.8
21-30	8	7.6
31-40	9	8.3
Above 40	4	3.7
Total	106	100
Household size		
1-5	47	44.2
6-10	55	52.0
11-15	4	3.7
Total	106	100
Membership		
Yes	104	98.1
No	2	1.8
Total	106	100
Farm size		
1-5	89	83.9
6-10	15	14.1
Above 10	2	1.9
Total	106	100
Secondary occupation		
Artisan	24	22.6
Civil servant	19	17.9
Security agent	12	11.3
Trading	51	48.1
Total	106	100

The Table 3.1 above shows the socio-economic characteristics of respondents in the study area. It shows 56.6% are males and 43.4% are females which means males constitute a larger percentage which could be due to the energy requirement involved in farming and this is line with Ezekiel, *et al.*, (2019) that found out higher percentage of respondents are male. The age distribution shows 33.7% fall into the category above 50 are the largest group and the lowest group are those between the ages of 21-30 years and this means that most of the respondents are aged and are mature enough to make decisions on the farmland and this relates with Olawuyi and Moshunje, (2019) that reported age influence decisions making on farmland. Also, 66% are married, 13.2% are single and 10.4% are widowed and divorced respectively and this means most of the respondent are responsible and committed for the survival and living of the family. Educational background of the study shows 28.3% are having secondary and tertiary education respectively, and only 22.6% are not having formal education and this means a larger percentage of respondents are educated and will therefore increases the ability of farmers to use their resources efficiently and it enhances the farmer's ability to obtain, analyze and interpret information and this support Alene *et al.* (2000), in the case of Ethiopia, reported that farmers with a higher level of education had a higher probability of adopting improved farming practices than those with lower level of education.

The respondents years of experience in farming shows that 59.3% have between 1-10 years, and 20.8% are having 11-20 years, with the least (3.7%) having above 40 years and this implies that most of the respondents are still young in crop farming and will therefore be able to take actions on land use practices in order to ensure farming is sustainable and this relates with Ezekiel, *et al.*, (2019) that reported most farmers are still young in crop farming. About 52% of the respondents have a large household size of about 6-10 members and 44.2% have between 0-5 members and this means most of the respondents have a reasonable amount of members that could be used as labour on farm and this support (Bekele and Drake, 2003) who reported that Larger family size is generally associated with a greater labour force being available to the household for the timely operation of farm activities. Majorities (98.1%) of respondents were members of an association except 1.8% which do not belong and this implies that they can have access to information on farming and the activities of land speculator. Social capital such as cooperative societies has been found to enhance the interaction and cross-pollination of ideas among farmers. This in effect will positively affect land management enhancing technologies (Bamire and Fabiyi, 2002). In addition, 83.9% have a farm size of about 1-5 hectares and 14.1% have between 6-10 hectares and this can influence their spending on land management

technologies (Bekele and Drake, 2003). About 48.1% of respondents were traders as their secondary occupation, 22.6% are artisan and 17.9% are civil servant and this implies that most of the respondents have other income generating activities.

Table 3.2: Crop Farming Management Practices

	Larger extent	Lesser extent	Rarely	Not at all
Irrigation practices	58(54.7)	47 (44.3)	1(0.9)	0(0)
Improved soil quality by following the best practices	55(51.9)	51(48.1)	0(0)	0(0)
Fertilizer application	79(74.5)	26(24.5)	1(0.9)	0(0)
Harvesting	68(64.2)	36(34.0)	2(1.9)	0(0)
Crop nutrients	62(58.5)	38(35.8)	6(5.7)	0(0)
Pest management	63(59.4)	40(37.7)	3(2.8)	0(0)
Tillage practices	61(57.5)	35(33.0)	9(8.5)	1(0.9)
Crop Rotation	46(43.4)	49(46.2)	11(10.4)	0(0)
Seed bed preparation	65(61.3)	33(31.1)	8(7.5)	0(0)
Increasing harvesting	49(46.2)	49(46.2)	8(7.5)	0(0)
Increasing crop diversity	50(47.2)	49(46.2)	7(6.6)	0(0)
Use of improved weed control	59(55.7)	43(47.6)	4(3.8)	0(0)
Planting	76(71.7)	26(24.5)	4(3.8)	0(0)
Farm labour management	44(41.5)	58(54.7)	4(3.8)	0(0)
Keeping good farm record	41(38.7)	57(53.8)	8(7.5)	0(0)
Increase in storage	34(32.1)	66(62.3)	6(5.7)	0(0)

Source: Field Survey, 2024

The result on management practices engaged by respondents as presented in Table 3.2 shows that 74.5% practiced fertilizer application to a large extent, 24.5% to a little extent and only 0.9% practiced it rarely and this implies that respondents are aware of the important of nutrient for yield of crops and this is line with Ande, *et al.*, (2008) that identified the use of fertilizer was practices on cassava farm in order to prevent nutrient loss. In line with the above practice, 58.5% practice crop nutrients and 35.8% to a lesser extent. Also, 71.7% practice planting to a large extent, 24.5% to a less extent and only 3.8% practiced it rarely. Harvesting was practiced to a larger extent among 64.2% of the respondents and 34% practiced to a lesser extent and this could be attributed to the fact that timely harvesting help farmers to harvest at the right season in order to ensure other crops are planted while maintaining the quality of produce harvested (Alene, *et al.*, 2000). Pest management was practiced to a larger extent among 59.5% of respondents and 37.7% to a little extent and this suggest the fact that respondents were managing pest such as insect, lizards etc to avoid attacking crops. The use of tillage practices was used to a large extent among 57.5% and in the same line 61.3% reported they practice seed bed preparation and both findings implies that crops thrive well and survive in areas where there is proper tillage system and beds or rideges for planting as according to Enisan and Adeyemi, (2013) that identifies tillage system is practiced by the farmers in the study area.

Table 3.2.1: Categorization of the respondents based on their management practices on crop farmers.

Categorization	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Mean
High (above mean)	43	40.6	
Low (below)	63	59.3	39.7925
Total	106	100.00	

The result in Table 3.2.1 shows majority (59.3%) of the respondents considered the management practices on crop farmers. to be high while 40.6% had a low management practice on crop farmers.

Table 3.3: Effect of land speculators on crop farming management practices

Variables	Larger extent	Lesser extent	Rarely	Not at all
Displacement of farmers	51(48.1)	49(46.2)	6(5.7)	0(0)
Driving up high prices of land	60(56.6)	45(42.5)	1(0.9)	0(0)
Contribute to economic inequality among the farmers	63(59.4)	39(36.8)	4(3.8)	0(0)
Reduce resilience to rural communities	32(30.2)	71(67.0)	3(2.8)	0(0)
Uncertainty of crop production	57(53.8)	46(43.4)	3(2.8)	0(0)
Livelihood insecurities	55(51.9)	45(42.5)	6(5.7)	0(0)
Short term production of crops	55(51.9)	43(40.6)	8(7.5)	1(0.9)
Encouraging monoculture	36(34.0)	60(56.6)	10(9.4)	0(0)
Neglect of conservation practices	37(34.9)	56(52.8)	12(11.3)	1(0.9)
Crop farmland fragmentation	35(33.0)	59(55.7)	12(11.3)	0(0)

Source: Field survey, 2024

The findings above show the effect of land speculators in the study area. It shows 59.4% reported it contribute to economic inequality to a large extent, 36.8% to a lesser extent and this could be attributed to the fact land speculation brought about disparity in the financial capacity of respondents. Also, 56.6% reported driving up high prices of land was an effect due to land speculation. Fatta (2014) posited that land speculation negatively affected housing demand and housing supply and consequently led to a high increase in land prices beyond the reach of the citizens. About 53.8% claimed to a large extent and little extent among 43.4% that there is uncertainty of crop production and this is also in line with 52.9% that there is short term of production of crops and this could be attributed to the fact that land can be used for other non-agricultural purposed thereby affecting cultivation of crop. Joshua *et al.* (2016) established that uncontrolled land speculation led to poor farm management practices, lowering food crop production and premature urbanization of rural area. Livelihood insecurities was found out to be an effect of land spectators among 51.9% at a large extent and 52.5% to a little extent and this could be due to the fact that respondents are vulnerable to poverty, reduction in food security, and standard of living as a result of land speculation and this is in line with a Agwu, *et al.*, (2010) that reported the issue of food insecurity and other means of livelihood directly depends on the availability and quality of fertile land.

Table 3.3.1: Categorization of the respondents based on their effect of land speculators.

Categorization	Frequency	Percentage
High (above mean)	69	64.5
Low (below)	37	34.9
Total	106	100.00

The result in Table 3.3.1 shows majority (64.5%) of the respondents considered the effect of land speculators to be high while 34.9% had a low effect of land speculators

Table 3.4: Coping strategies used by farmers

Variables	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
Monitoring land prices and value	61(57.5)	26(24.5)	19(17.9)	0(0)
Joining and forming organization	35(33.0)	58(54.7)	13(12.3)	0(0)
Negotiating with speculators	51(48.1)	49(46.2)	6(5.7)	0(0)
Developing alternatives land use	33(31.1)	57(53.8)	16(15.1)	0(0)
Diversifying of crops farming	54(50.9)	41(38.7)	11(10.4)	0(0)
Investing in land properties	43(40.6)	55(51.9)	8(7.5)	0(0)
Preserving tradition knowledge towards land use	44(41.5)	45(42.5)	16(15.1)	1(0.9)
Strengthening community ties	43(40.6)	45(42.5)	18(17.0)	0(0)
Partnership with government agencies on land use	41(38.7)	50(47.2)	15(14.2)	0(0)
Diversifying into the income generating activities	33(31.1)	55(51.9)	18(17.0)	0(0)
Seeking legal advice and advocating for fair policy	35(33.0)	59(55.7)	12(11.3)	0(0)
Collaboration with agricultural organization	36(34.0)	60(56.6)	10(9.4)	0(0)
Collaborating with farmers' cooperative societies	35(33.0)	64(60.4)	7(6.6)	0(0)
Building strong relationship with local community leaders and members	40(37.7)	57(53.8)	9(8.5)	0(0)

Source: Field survey, 2024

The Table 3.4 above shows the coping strategies used by farmers in the study area. It shows 57.5% often monitor land price and value, 24.55% sometimes and only 17.9% rarely and this means farmers monitor land price and value in order to know when the land is to be offered for sale and amount. Also, 48.1% of respondents often negotiate with

speculators and 46.2% sometimes negotiate and this means a larger percentage of the respondents negotiate with the speculators in terms of land usage, and land tenure and this support (Odudu and Omirin, 2012) who identified negotiation between farmers and speculators help to understand the land affordability, land availability, tenure security and ease of land transaction. About 50.9% often diversify from crops farming and 38.7% sometimes diversify from farming into other business in order to alleviate the problem faced by the activities of land speculators. In addition, 40.% invest in land properties often and 51.9% sometimes which means the farmers are also investing in landed properties in order to prevent the land speculators from converting agricultural land into non agricultural land and this was in line with Nwoko, (2016) that reported farmers invest in landed properties in order to generate wealth and also settle conflict between farmers and land speculators. Also, 40.6% of the respondents are often strengthening community ties and 52.5% sometimes and this could be due to the fact that the sales of the land is made by the community residents and therefore good relationship with the community residents will allow for easy negotiation when land speculators want to purchase land meant for agriculture and this finding also corroborates the finding of Oyedeji and Sodiya (2016) who established that family was the most prevalent source of land acquisition in Nigeria and therefore farmers make good relationship with them as a strategy against effect of land speculators. Most (41.5%) reported preserving the tradition knowledge towards land use was often used and 52.5% were sometimes used. Furthermore, 38.7% reported they often partner with government agencies on land use and only 47.2% sometimes partner and this means farmers are engaging government in the decisions making on land use and this support Adeniyi, (2011) that identified that there is collaboration between government and other relevant stakeholders on decisions regarding land use.

Table 3.4.1: Categorization of the respondents based on their coping strategies used by farmers.

Categorization	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
High (above mean)	70	65.9	
Low (below)	36	33.9	31.8113
Total	106	100.00	

The result in Table 3.4.1 shows majority (65.9%) of the respondents considered the coping strategies used by farmers. to be high while 33.9% had a low coping strategies used by farmers.

Table 3.5: Constraints of use of coping strategies

Variable	Major constraints	Minor constraints	Not a constraints
Inadequate training on farm land use and regulations	63(59.4)	41(38.7)	2(1.9)
Literacy level of the farmers	54(50.9)	44(41.5)	8(7.5)
Inadequate information on farm land ownership and tenureship	65(61.3)	41(38.7)	0(0)
Inadequate fund	48(45.2)	53(50.0)	5(4.7)
Poor training support on crop management practices	58(54.7)	48(45.3)	0(0)
Cultural and traditional land barrier	39(36.8)	64(60.4)	3(2.8)
Unfavorable land ownership system	51(48.1)	53(50.0)	2(1.9)
Poor access to improved technologies on crop land management	54(50.9)	51(48.1)	1(0.9)
Poor implementation of land use by government	56(52.8)	49(46.2)	1(0.9)
Poor loan facilities to farmers	45(42.5)	58(54.7)	3(2.8)

Source: Field Survey 2024

Table 3.5 shows the constraints of use of coping strategies against land speculator activities in the study area. It reveals the major constraints were Inadequate training on farm land use and regulations (59.4%), Inadequate information on farm land ownership and tenureship (61%), literacy level of the farmers (50.9%), poor training support on crop management practices (54.7%), poor implementation of land use by government (52.8%) and poor access to improved technologies on crop land management (50.9%) and this is similar to Titus and Adefisayo, (2012) that many smallholder farmers in Nigeria were not active adopters of coping strategies due to their limited access to information on land ownership, meagre resources, low educational level, lack of technical know-how, and poor knowledge on sustainable crop management practices were known to pose challenges on the adoption of coping strategies in Sub-Saharan Africa, including southwest Nigeria.

Table 3.5.1: Categorization of the respondents based on their constraints of use of coping strategies against land speculators activities

Categorization	Frequency	Percentage	Mean
High (above mean)	54	50.9	
Low (below)	52	48.9	14.9717
Total	106	100.00	

The result in Table 3.5.1 shows majority (50.9%) of the respondents considered the constraints of use of coping strategies against land speculators activities to be high while 48.9% had a low constraints of use of coping strategies against land speculators activities.

3.6 Hypothesis of Study

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between socio-characteristics and the effect of land speculator on crop farming management practices

Table 3.6.1: Chi square analysis of socio economic characteristics of respondents

Variable	Chi square value	p- value	Decision
Sex	1.540	0.673	NS
Marital status	5.280	0.809	NS
Religion	16.941	0.050	S
Education	13.422	0.144	NS
Membership	5.694	0.770	NS

The Chi square analysis in Table 3.6.1 shows that there is no significant relationship between the effect of land speculator on crop farming management practices and the socio-economic characteristics of respondents in the study area except religion (x value= 16.941 and p value=0.050). This means most of the socio-economic characteristics does not have significant influence on the effect of land speculator on crop farming management practices.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between the coping strategies used against the effect of land speculation and the effect of land speculator on crop farm management practices

Table 3.6.3: PPMC analysis showing the relationship between crop management practices and effect of land speculators

Variables	r-value	p-value	Decision
Effect of land speculators and crop farming management practices	0.602	0.000	S

Source: Field Survey, 2024.

The table 3.6.3 above shows there is significant relationship between the coping strategies used against the effect of land speculation and the effect of land speculator on crop farm management practices and by implication means the respondents develop the strategy in line with the effect, i.e the more the effect the more the strategies and vice versa.

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between the coping strategies used against constraints faced in using the coping strategies and the effect of land speculator on crop farm management practices

Table 3.6.3: PPMC analysis showing the relationship between constraints and effect of land speculator on crop farm management practices

Variables	r-value	p-value	Decision
Effect of land speculators and crop farming management practices	0.431	0.000	S

The table 3.6.3 above shows there is significant relationship between the coping strategies used against constraints faced in using the coping strategies and the effect of land speculator on crop farm management practices

4. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it could be inferred that the communities were dominated by old household head with secondary and tertiary education with large household size and have stayed long in the community. The study shows majority of the respondents practice some management techniques

such as irrigation practices (54.7%), harvesting (64.2%), and pest management (59.4%) etc. The result shows the majority of the respondents had effect of land speculators. It further revealed that the respondents had high coping strategies. The Chi square test statistic revealed a significant relationship existed between sex ($\chi^2 = 1.540$), Marital status ($\chi^2 = 5.280$) and Educational level ($\chi^2 = 13.422$),

membership capacity ($\chi^2 = 5.694$) while religion ($\chi^2 = 16.941$) had no significant relationship between the effect of land speculators on crop farming management practices and the socioeconomic characteristics of the respondents except religion (χ^2 value=16.941 and p value=0.050).

5. Recommendations

The following recommendations were made from the findings of the study:

- Extension services should seek to deploy intervention programmes that will intensify dissemination information on land management strategies in improving crop farming practices for increased productivity among farmers.
- There should be strict compliance to land use act and town planning master plan as designed by the government planning authorities, such that lands are not committed to the purpose they are not meant for.
- Farmers should be given enough notice to round up their farming activities to avert being abruptly chased out of their farmland, making them lose their investments, where it becomes inevitable that land be acquired for other purposes aside agriculture
- There should be a thorough examination of the quality or fertility of the land, such that only lands that have been depleted in fertility and nutrients are committed to other purposes aside agricultural production

References

- Abonesh, T., Nigussie, A. and Ambaw, G. 2021. Monitoring socioeconomic impacts of climate-smart agricultural practices at Doyogena and Basona Worena climatesmart landscapes, Ethiopia. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security.
- Adego, T., Simane, B. and Woldie, G.A. 2018. Sustainability, institutional arrangement and challenges of community-based climate smart practices in northwest Ethiopia. *Agriculture & Food Security* 7(1):1-14, doi:10.1186/s40066-018-0206-0.
- Adgo, E., Teshome, A. and Mati, B. 2013. Impacts of long-term soil and water conservation on agricultural productivity: The case of Anjenie watershed, Ethiopia. *Agricultural Water Management* 117:55-61, doi:10.1016/j.agwat.2012.10.026.
- Adeniyi, P. (2011). *Improving Land Sector Governance in Nigeria: Implementation of the Land Governance Assessment Framework*; The World Bank: Washington, DC, USA, 2011.
- Agwu, K., Amasiatu, O.G. & Onuoha, O.U. (2010). Land rights characteristics and access to land: Implications on food security in Nigeria. *Journal of Environmental Issues and Agriculture in Developing Countries*, 2(2 & 3):146- 156.
- Alemu, T., Tolossa, D., Senbeta, F. and Zeleke, T. 2023. The effects of continuous sustainable land management practices on agricultural land productivity in Central Ethiopia. *Journal of Degraded and Mining Lands Management* 10(3):4389-4403, doi:10.15243/jdmlm.2023.103.4389. 9
- Alene, A.D., Poonyth, D., Hassan, R.M. (2000). Determinants of adoption and intensity of use of improved rice varieties in the Central Highlands of Ethiopia: A Tobit analysis. *Agrekon (South African Journal of Agricultural Economics)* 39(4): 633–643.
- Bekele, W., Drake, L. (2003). Soil water conservation decision and behavior of subsistence farmers in the Eastern highlands of Ethiopia: A case study of the Hunde-Lafto area. *Ecological Economics* 46(3): 437–451.
- Bello, M. O. (2009). Squatter settlement, accessibility of land and the urban poor. FIG Working Week, Surveyors Key Role in Accelerated Development. [chrome extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgglefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.fig.net%2Fresources%2Fproceedings%2Ffig_proceedings%2Ffig2009%2Fpapers%2Fts07a%2Fts07a_bello_3326.pdf&clen=352316&chunk=true](https://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgglefindmkaj/viewer.html?pdfurl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.fig.net%2Fresources%2Fproceedings%2Ffig_proceedings%2Ffig2009%2Fpapers%2Fts07a%2Fts07a_bello_3326.pdf&clen=352316&chunk=true)
- Branca G., “Climate-Smart Agriculture: A Synthesis of Empirical Evidence of Food Security and Mitigation Benefits from Improved Cropland Management”. Mitigation of Climate Change in Agriculture Series 3: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2011).
- Ezekiel, A. A., Ayinde, E.O. And Akinsola, G.O. (2019). Economic Analysis Of Land Management Practices Among Crop Farmers In Osun State, Nigeria. *Agrosearch*, 19(2): 100-108
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). 2019. Soil Erosion–The Greatest Challenge for Sustainable Soil Management. Rome, 100 pp, doi:10.5897/JDAE2016-0736.

- Gemeda, B. S., Abebe, B. G., and Eckardt, F. (2019). Urban land speculation; failure of the land market. *Survey Review*, 53(376), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00396265.2019.1661165>
- Gemeda, B. S., Abebe, B. G., and Cirella, G. T. (2020). The role of land speculators around the urban edge of Shashemene city, Ethiopia. *European Journal of Sustainable Development Research*, 4(1), Article em0108. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejosdr/6296>
- Enisan, G. and Adeyemi A. G (2013). Effects of Agricultural Practices on Residential Land Use in Ipinsa Town, Akure, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research* Vol. 1 No. 7 July 2013
- Joshua, P. B., Glanda, G. G., and Ilesanmi, F. A. (2016). The effects of land speculation on urban planning and development in Bajabure Area, Girei local government. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, 6(4)
- Kiaya V. “Post-Harvest Losses and Strategies to Reduce Them”. ACF International: Scientific and Technical Department (2014).
- Masha, M., Yirgu, T. and Debele, M. 2021. Impacts of soil and water management measures on crop production and farm income of rural households in the Damota Area Districts, Southern Ethiopia. *International Journal of Agronomy* 2021:1-13, doi:10.1155/2021/5526713.
- Mosha, A. C. (2010). Making land and housing accessible to the urban low income in Botswana. The Regional Symposium Organized by Ardhi University and Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors.
- Nwoko, K. C. (2016). Land ownership versus development in the era of globalisation: A trajectory of conflict and wealth accumulation in Southern Nigeria. *Journal of African Transformation*, 1(2), 77–94
- Odudu, C. O., and Omirin, M. (2012). Evaluating the constraints affecting land access among urban crop farmers in metropolitan Lagos. *Journal of Agribusiness in Developing and Emerging Economies*, 2(2), 130–140.
- Omirin, M. (2002). Land accessibility withers Nigeria. Workshop on land tax reform in Lagos State Nigeria.
- Olawuyi, S.O.; Mushunje, A. (2019). Sustainability Article Social Capital and Adoption of Alternative Conservation Agricultural Practices in South-Western Nigeria. *Sustainability* 11, 716.
- Masha, M., Yirgu, T., Debele, M. and Belayneh, M. 2021. Effectiveness of community-based soil and water conservation in improving soil property in Damota Area, Southern Ethiopia. UNPFA State of the World Population United Nations: United Nations Population Fund. (2011). WhitePA. “The Growing Business of Cover Crops”. Natural Wildlife Federation (2014) Wildlife Federation (2014).