Determinants of Agricultural Intensification among Crop Farmers in Ikwuano Local Government Area of Abia State, Nigeria

Nwaru, J. C.*, Onuoha, R.E.** and Onwukwalu, S. I.*

Abstract

This study was designed to examine the determinants of agricultural intensification among crop farmers in Ikwuano Local Government Area of Abia State of Nigeria. Primary data were collected using structured questionnaire from a random sample of 70 crop farmers. Simple statistical tools and the multiple regression models were used to analyse the data. Results show that farm output, number of soil management practices, farming experience and years of education positively influenced agricultural intensification while household size negatively influenced it. Farmers in the study area applied at least six soil management practices with bush fallowing, which has a mean of 5.15 years, taking the lead. Farm size was small with a mean of 1.40 hectares while household size was large, with at least six persons. It was recommended that the farmers should be encouraged to make use of appropriate soil conservation techniques while appropriate educational facilities should be provided to further enhance human capacity building and skills acquisition by the farmers. Policies and programmes for counselling farm households on family planning, birth control measures and soil conservation techniques were recommended.

* Department of Agricultural Economics, Michael Okpara University of
   Agriculture,Nigeria : Nwaruj@yahoo.com
** Department of Agriculture, AlvanIkoku College of Agriculture, Nigeria

Introduction

Nigeria is an agrarian economy with over 70 per cent of its populace engaged partially or completely in one form of agricultural production or the other (FMARD, 2001). This is carried out by the rural farmers on smallholder bases, and their products constitute about 95 per cent of the total agricultural production in the country (World Bank, 2007). Nigeria has a land area of 98 million hectares, of which nearly three-quarters is arable (Olayide, 1980). This gave the impression that Nigeria has abundant land resources for agricultural development. In deed, surplus land was considered to have played a significant role in food crop and export crop expansion (Eicher and Baker, 1970). However, recent developments and experiences have indicated that serious constraints are posed by land unavailability. For instance, FAO (1987) posited that a much smaller area of land is available for cultivation, leaving little room for agricultural expansion. As a result, great difficulties are being faced in producing enough food to sustain the present and future populations (Adedipe et al., 1997) especially as the deleterious impact of land tenure insecurity on agricultural production heightens. This underpins the report from FMARD (2001) of a decrease in the total area of land cultivated in the country from 84,985 hectares in 1981 to 71,900 hectares in 1996.

Thus, Africa is often cited as the only developing region where agricultural output and yield growth is seriously lagging behind population growth (Savadogo et al., 1994; Islam 1995). A number of daunting problems were associated with this. Nwaru (2001) observed that the problem of acute shortage of rural resources has been complicated by gross inefficiency in resource use. Moreover, the increasing pressure on available agricultural land indicates that expected increase in agricultural output could hardly be by land area expansion as much as from the application of higher levels of entrepreneurship manifested in the optimal use of available farm production inputs. Hence, Effiong (2004) posited that population density, access to market and their interactions were the major forces for agricultural intensification. In this vein, World Bank (1992) observed that in developing countries like Nigeria, population doubles every 25 years while agricultural

2

productivity has in fact declined from 1.9 per cent to 1.5 per cent during the past 15 years. Pingali and Binswanger (1987) noted that factors such as shortened fallow periods, topography of land, soil fertility, access to farmland and population pressure on a fixed land resource base are likely to promote several competitions for resources and drive agriculture progressively towards intensification.

In this case, the intensification of agricultural production has been considered an appropriate path to agricultural growth in the face of the growing population (Workneh, 2005) and for meeting national food demands in the face of rapid urbanization (Hazell, 1995). This involves intensive use of land through forest clearing; encroachment into areas traditionally used as pasture land and shortened fallow periods thus making external inputs necessary to maintain soil fertility (Okike *et al.*, 2001). Therefore, agricultural intensification involves additional inputs of capital, labour, skills and other materials against land (Mefzner, 1982). It entails a multidimensional process of response to increasing population density, technological change and commercialization (Shem *et al.*, 1994) which is characterized by substitution of labour for land in the initial stages and shift from forest farm through bush and grass land fallow to a more·continuous cropping and systems of crop rotation; followed by soil improvement and addition of yield-enhancing inputs such as chemical fertilizers, insecticides and high yielding seed varieties (Geertz, 1963; Boserup, 1965; Netting 1968; Waddell, 1972; Pingali and Binswanger, 1987).

Therefore, the objective of this study was to examine the determinants of agricultural intensification among crop farmers in Ikwuano Local Government Area of Abia State. Among the strategies implemented by farming communities to improve their income is the intensification of agricultural production (Pape-Christiansen, 2001). The need to secure incomes that ensures the well being of the growing rural and urban populations gives imperatives to this process. In view of the observation from World Bank (1992) that in developing countries like Nigeria, population doubles every 25 years while agricultural productivity has in fact . declined from 1.9 per cent to 1.5 per cent during the past 15 years this study became relevant. To what extent have the farmers responded to this existential problem through production process intensification and how are

they adopting and using soil conservation practices which is a concomitance
of agricultural intensification are questions whose answers were sought for
in this study.

Literature Review

Agricultural intensification refers to any practice that increases agricultural
productivity per unit of land area (Boserup, 1965). Intensive agricultural
production could be expressed as increase in the use of inputs of labour or
capital on a small landholding, for the purpose of increasing the value of
output per hectare (Tiffen *et al.*, 1994). FAO (2004) observed that
agricultural intensification entails an increase in agricultural production per
unit of labour, land, time, fertilizer, seed, feed, or cash. It is characterized by
substitution of labour for land in the initial stages and a shift from forest
fallow through bush and grassland fallow; followed by more continuous
cropping and systems of crop rotation complimented by soil improvement
practices including green and animal manures and compost (Geertz 1963;
Boserup, 1965; Waddell, 1972; Pingali and Binswanger, 1987). This is
followed by additional modern yield enhancing inputs such as chemical
fertilizers, insecticides, use of draft animals or machinery to till the soil and
high-yielding seed varieties (Boserup, 1965). The intensification process
can be said, in practice, to result from (i) an increase in the gross output in
fixed proportions due to inputs expanding proportionately, without technical
changes, (ii) a shift towards more valuable crops or (iii) technical progress
that raises land productivity (Carswell, 1997).

Agricultural intensification has often occurred in response to the creation of
new markets following the separation of consumption and reproductive
objectives from those relating to production (Shem *et al.*, 1994). That is,
they are stimulated by market incentives. Consequences of the
intensification process can be an increased dependency of production
processes on input and output markets, as well as on capital markets to
facilitate related investments (Pape-Christiansen, 2001). For instance,
Rosegrant and Binswanger (1994) reported that the development of markets
for tradable water rights and collector well technologies found in parts of
Pakistan and India improved the access of land for poor farmers who do not

4

have the financial resources to invest on their own wells or who do not have groundwater access on their land.

Historically, African agrarian systems have been characterized by a relative abundance of land and critical seasonal scarcities of labour. Freeman (1994) reported on population pressure, land use and the productivity of agriculture systems in Northern Nigeria and Northern Benin Republic in West Africa that population increase and improved market access shielded by improved technology and a favourable policy environment are the two major driving forces of agricultural intensification. The result shows that these two determinants have different consequences for farmers' welfare, cropping patterns, intensity of purchased input use and productivity of farm resources. In population driven agricultural intensification, household food security is a major concern because of the low crop yields. On the other hand, household food security is not a major problem in market-driven agricultural intensification because household food needs are met through either high yield in crop production or food purchases. The major concern in these areas is to attain a modest increase in crop yields or sustain yield at their current levels because of the potential   problems associated with the physical deterioration of soils which threatens the long-run productivity of the soils. In population driven intensification, farmers have limited cash resources; so they are unlikely to adopt technologies that require high levels of purchased inputs but rather technologies that will permit modest yield increase without large amounts of external inputs. On the other hand, in market-driven intensification areas, farmers will adopt technologies that require external inputs if they are profitable.

Research shows that when the opportunity cost of land is high, farmers have more incentives to invest in technologies that maintain soil productivity (Smith *et al.*, 1994). On the other hand, when the returns to land is low, farmers may not be able to invest in technologies that maintain soil productivity even though they may be aware of the negative impact of soil degradation on crop productivity (Barbier, 1990). Thus, the relationships between farm resources, agronomic production systems, and the investment behaviour of farmers are important determinants of farm profitability as well as long run sustainability of agricultural production systems under different soil and land management practices.

Land use intensity, which measures the allowance farmers give their farm land to fallow, is a widely used indicator of agricultural intensification (Ruthenberg, 1980; Okike *et al.*, 2001). Okike *et al.* (2001) noted that labour use intensity, manure use intensity, fertilizer use intensity and intensity of animal traction are other indicators that could be used. It is observed that some Nigerian farmers resorted to continuous cropping as family size increased and agricultural land became increasingly scarce (Oyekale, 2007). Three factors that influenced land use intensity are user's rights on land, farm yields and access to farm land (Osemeobo, 1993). However, the measure of land use intensity is reflected in cropping period, the fallow period and the farming systems adopted. Osemeobo (1993), using the expression by Ruthenberg (1980), reported that between 1989 and1990, land use intensity in Edo and Ogun States of Nigeria was 16 per cent for the rain forest zone (Ogun) and 14 per cent for the savannah zone (Edo). This implied that 86 per cent of farm land in the savannah zone was under fallow and can be converted into productive use. He further reported that the length of fallow, which reflected the rate of natural regeneration of the land, varied between 4 to 5 years in the savannah zone.

The induced innovation concept of Boserup (1965) asserts that increasing population stimulates increasing demand for agricultural products. As land becomes more costly compared to labour, the incentives for more intensive agricultural production systems emerge. In those parts of Africa where there is still some unexploited virgin bush, land use per household can be varied. The economic optimum policy is to operate an extensive system with a large land: labour ratio. This would imply low labour inputs and hence low yield per hectare.

Materials and Methods

This study was carried out in Ikwuano Local Government Area (LGA) of Abia State of Nigeria. This LGA has a land area of about 600 square kilometres with a population of 60,000 people, according to the 1991 census. It is surrounded by Bende and Umuahia LGA in the north, Isiala Ngwa LGA in the west, Ikoro and Obot Akara LGAs of Akwa-Ibom State in the East and Cross River State in the south. It lies between longitudes 7°32' East and latitude 5°28' North. It is about 122 meters above sea level.

Ikwuano L.G.A is made up of four autonomous communities namely Oboro, Ibere, Oloko and Ariam. The main occupation of the people is farming. The soils are fertile which often times makes the use of fertilizers secondary. The food crops grown by the people includes cassava, yam, cocoyam, maize, beans, rice, melon and various vegetables, while cash crops grown include cocoa, oil-palm, raffia palm, kola nut, oranges, plantain and banana. Additionally, various kinds of livestock are raised by the people.

Oboro Autonomous Community was purposively selected because arable crops are grown here and population density is quite high. A multi-stage random sampling technique was employed to select 70 arable crop farmers. The list of the villages in Oboro autonomous community was obtained from Ikwuano LGA. The list formed the sampling frame for the random selection of seven villages. These include Umuariaga, Umudike, Amaoba-Ime, Awom na ebo, Oru-gwe, Oru-Oboro, Agbolo-ozu. From each selected village, the list of farmers was obtained from the respective village heads. These formed the sampling frame for the random selection of ten farmers, giving a total sample size of seventy farmers. Data were generated through the use of structured questionnaire that was administered on the respondents. Attempts were made to elicit information from the respondents on the relevant parameters that determine agricultural intensification such as sex, occupation, household size, level of education, farm size, fallow periods, yield, etc.

Data were analyzed using descriptive statistical tools such as frequencies, percentages and the multiple regression analysis in which the dependent variable was taken as land use intensity used as a proxy for agricultural intensification (Ruthenberg, 1980; Okike *et al.*, 2001):

$$Y = f(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5, X_6, e_i) \quad (1)$$

where, Y is agricultural intensification proxied by land use intensity = C/L x 100/1   (Ruthenberg, 1980); where C is cropping years on land, and L is length of cycle of land cultivation, i.e. cropping years plus fallow year. X_1 is the output which was measured in Kg/ha, X_2 is the number of soil management practices used by the farmer, X_3 is the farming experience in

years, X_4 is the years of formal education, X_5 is the age of the farmer in years, X_6 is the household size measured by number of people living with the respondents, and e_i is the error term that follows the assumptions of the classical linear regression model. Four functional forms of equation (1) namely linear, double-log (Cobb-Douglas), semi-log and exponential were tried and with best fit was chosen as the lead equation.

Results and Discussion

Some socioeconomic characteristics and agronomic practices of the respondents were summarized and presented in Table 1. This Table indicates that, following Ruthenberg (1980), agricultural land use intensity ranges from 13.70 per cent to 93.10 per cent with a mean of 48.10 per cent. This implies that on the average, 61.90 per cent of land in Ikwuano Local Government Area was under fallow and could be converted into productive use or is waste land and could be recovered through land reclamation. This result is at variance with Osemeobo (1993), who reported that between 1989 and 1990, land use intensity in Edo and Ogun States of Nigeria was 16 per cent for the rain forest zone (Ogun State) and 14 per cent for the savannah zone (Edo State).

8

Table 1. Summary statistics of the sample farmers

Variable	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Index of intensity	48.10	22.62	13.70	93.10
Investment on soil mgt practices (N/ha)	14165.40	4044.51	7040.00	22000.00
No. of soil mgt practices	7.70	1.36	6.00	11.00
Output/ hectare (kg/ha)	220.50	69.36	62.35	390.91
Farming experience in years	24.97	3.57	2.00	60.00
Period of education (years)	9.09	4.92	2.00	17.00
Fallow period (years)	5.15	2.53	1.70	20.00
Farm size (ha)	1.40	0.40	0.60	2.00
Distance of home to farm (km)	4.07	1.94	1.00	9.00
Age of the farmer (years)	52.70	13.90	24.00	86.00
Household size	6.79	2.21	1.00	11.00
Total income (N)	366526.20	108494.30	11000.00	9298220.00
Amount spent on labour (N)	7659.29	1779.03	4500.00	12400.00
Years of continuously cropping	5.73	4.91	1.00	27.00

Source: Summarised from survey data (2007)

The Table further indicated that fallow period (years), which reflected the rate of natural regeneration of the land, ranged from 1.70 to 20.00 with a mean of 5.15 years. This is comparable to Osemeobo (1993) who further reported that the length of fallow varied between 4 to 5 years in Edo and Ogun States of Nigeria.

The number of soil management practices ranges from 6.00 to 11.00 with a mean of 7.70. Ogbonna (2004) opined that the application of soil conservation technologies such as alley cropping, minimum tillage, mulching, manuring, etc. is the only solution to soil degradation problems

when fragile and highly susceptible lands are brought under cultivation. Farm size ranges from 0.60 to 2.00 hectares with a mean of 1.40 hectares. This conforms to earlier reports that farms in Nigeria are largely small scaled and generally less than 5.00 hectares. For instance, Nwaru (1993) reported that the average farm size for cooperative and non cooperative farms in Imo State of Nigeria was 2.03 and 2.37 hectares respectively. Nwaru and Ekumankama (1999) reported that women operated farms averaged 1.47 hectares while men operated farms averaged 2.15 hectares.

The estimated determinants of agricultural intensification were summarised and presented in Table 2. The linear functional form was chosen as the lead equation based on the value of R^2, F- ratio and conformity of signs of the coefficients to *a priori* expectations. The F-ratio is statistically significant at 1 per cent indicating that the estimated model is adequate for use in further analysis. The regression result shows R^2 value of 0.4715 indicating that 47.15 per cent of the total change in agricultural intensification is explained by output, soil management practices, farming experience, years of education and age and household size of the farmer.

Output (measured in Kg/ha) has a coefficient that is highly significant (at 1 per cent) and positive. Given a non decreasing unit output price, this implies that as output increases, farm income per hectare increases leading to increased intensification of the agricultural production systems. Farm and family income is defined as the residual benefit of family resource inputs like labour, capital and land (Pape-Christiansen, 2001). This residual benefit is an expression of the efficiency of resource use. Therefore, it could be concluded that farmers who are more efficient in their use of the core resources in the rural economy namely land and labour and perhaps capital tend to practice intensification of their crop production systems more. For instance, Pape-Christiansen (2001) reported a strong positive correlation between irrigated crop production and farm income while rain fed crop production showed no significant correlation with farm income.

Increasing the intensity of land use, without a corresponding improvement of the systems for restoring soil nutrients, may result in declining soil fertility and ultimately loss of soil structure and soil erosion. Therefore, a concomitance of agricultural intensification is the adoption and use of soil

conservation practices. Investment on soil management practices has a coefficient that is statistically significant (at 5 per cent) and positive, implying that farmers that practice agricultural intensification must invest more on soil management practices. Application of soil management practices improve soil fertility leading to higher output. Ogbonna (2004) opined that the application of soil conservation technologies such as alley cropping, minimum tillage, mulching, manuring, etc. is the only solution to soil degradation problems when fragile and highly susceptible lands are brought under intensive cultivation. Farmers in the area show proper knowledge of this, hence the number of soil management practices they employed ranges from 5 to 11 with a mean of 7.70 while the concomitant expenditure on soil management practices ranges from N7040.00 to N22000.00 with a mean of N14,165.40 per hectare (Table 1).

Farming experience was statistically significant (at 5 per cent) and positive implying that experienced farmers practice agricultural intensification more. Nwaru (2004) opined that experience is the knowledge and skill gained by contact with facts and events. The number of years a farmer has spent on the business of farming may give an indication of the practical knowledge he has acquired (Olomola, 1988); this would reflect on a higher level of agricultural intensification by the farmer. Therefore, policies to boost food production in high population rural economies and curb the deleterious effects of agricultural intensification on the environment should be targeted more at the experienced farmers.

Table 2. Determinants of agricultural intensification

Variables	Linear$^+$	Exponential	Semi-log	Double log
Intercept	3.157 (6.85)***	3.155 (6.36)***	3.237 (7.29)***	2.665 (1.81)*
Output kg/ha	0.019 (3.24)***	-0.001 (-0.42)	0.757 (2.80)**	-0.457 (-3.27)***
Soil management practices	18.157 (2.92)**	-0.008 (-0.21)	-6.728 (-0.50)	-0.087 (-0.31)
Farming experience	0.774 (2.80) **	0.015 (3.29)**	17.947 (2.83)**	0.481 (3.59)***
Years of education	0.476 (3.61)***	18.157 (2.92)**	-0.663 (2.60)**	-0.010 (-0.12)
Age	-0.113 (-0.41)	0.001 (0.25)	-2.548 (2.50)**	1.942 (1.73)*
Household size	-1.245 (-1.81)*	0.019 (0.73)	-2.518 (-0.47)	-0.064 (-0.56)
R^2	0.4715	0.3423	0.3858	0.3744
R^{-2}	0.3791	0.2796	0.2673	0.3148
F-ratio	5.10***	4.49***	4.70***	6.28***

Source: Field survey, 2007.

+ = *Lead equation. Figures in parenthesis are the t-ratios.*

***, ** and * = Significant at 1%, 5% and 10% test levels, respectively.

Years of education has a coefficient that is highly significant (at 1 per cent) and positive indicating that education is directly related to agricultural intensification. This result agrees with *a priori* expectations that education enhances the farmers' ability to understand and evaluate new production techniques, and is consistent with the results of Onu *et al.* (2000) and Nwaru (2007). Moreover, Jaja *et al.* (1998) and Nwaru (2001) viewed education and training as being of utmost importance in any attempt to enhance farmers' capabilities to understand and accept technological innovations in economic activities, which ultimately would lead to increased and sustainable agricultural production. A more intensive market oriented production would require special management and marketing skills

12

(Pape-Christiansen, 2001), which higher and more appropriate education offers. However, Azhar (1991) and Bravo-Ureta and Evenson (1994) contend that elementary education (4 – 5 years of formal schooling) does not have much effect on agricultural productivity. Results from Antiporta (1978) and Cotlear (1986) agree with this assertion.

Agricultural labour demand is usually met through available family labour resources and through hired permanent and seasonal labour. According to Onyenweaku and Nwaru (2005), large household size should ease labour constraints on the farm thereby leading to increases in productivity and income of the farm household. Variations in household size and composition result in different labour capacities available to meet household labour requirements (Pape-Christiansen, 2001). The coefficient for household size was found to be statistically significant at 10 per cent and negative, reflecting an inverse relationship with agricultural intensification. This result is consistent with Nwaru (2007) who suggested that male headed households might have utilised household labour beyond the point where the marginal value product of labour was equal to the wage rate. Moreover, given the weak financial position of the farmers arising from their poor initial resources endowment and stagnating production and incomes, additional membership to the household would pose a stiff competition for resources that could have been channelled to the management of agricultural intensification.

A concomitance of agricultural intensification is the use of appropriate soil conservation practices for maintaining soil structure, restoring soil fertility and checking soil erosion. Table 3 shows that a total of 11 soil management practices were employed by the farmers. Bush fallow was used as a major soil management practice by 97.1 per cent of the respondents although the mean fallow period is five years (Table 1). The next most frequently used soil management technique is adequate tillage, with more than 92 per cent of farmers applying it. This was followed by planting seeds at shallow depths; 90 per cent of the farmers applied it. The result agrees with Ruerd and Lee (2000) who reported that high cost of inorganic fertilizers and other agrochemicals often drives farmers to rely on locally available resources.

Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to soil management practices used

Soil management practices	Frequency	Percentage
Planting seeds at shallow depths	63	90.0
Mulching	10	14.3
Applying crop residues	24	34.3
Keeping the soil moist	6	8.6
Planting two to four seeds	60	85.7
Providing adequate drainage	27	38.6
Organic manure application	41	58.6
Inorganic fertilizer application	20	28.6
Crop rotation	49	70.0
Bush fallowing	68	97.1
Adequate tillage	65	92.9
Total	433	618.7*

Source: Field survey (2007)
Total of percentage exceeds 100, indicating that respondents gave multiple responses.

They opined that low external input agriculture (LEIA) has spread rapidly to different parts of the globe as a challenging alternative or, more frequently, a compliment to Green Revolution technologies. LEIA farming typically relies on cover crops, animal manure, and improved fallow management to maintain soil organic matter content; employs conservation measures (terraces, windbreaks, hedges, alley cropping, etc) to control soil erosion; and applies cultivation methods (contour farming, minimum tillage, integrated pest management) to enhance environmental outcomes while contributing to household food security (Ruerd and Lee, 2000). Other identified soil management practices in a decreasing order of importance are planting two to four seeds, crop rotation, and organic manure, providing adequate drainage, applying crop residues, inorganic fertilizer, mulching and keeping the soil moist. Mortimore (1992) stressed that land use intensification in most farming systems involves the substitution of manure for fallow as the principal means for maintaining soil fertility.

Summary and Conclusions

Results from this study indicate that farm size was small with a mean of 1.40 hectares while household size was large, with at least six persons. Fallow period, which reflected the rate of natural regeneration of the land, ranged from 1.70 to 20.00 with a mean of 5.15 years. Farmers in the study area applied at least six soil management practices with bush fallowing being most frequently applied. Farm output, soil management practices, farming experience and years of education positively influenced agricultural intensification while household size negatively influenced it.

Appropriate economic policies needed to refocus the farmers in agricultural intensification were recommended. Policies on functional educational facilities should be provided to further enhance human capacity building and skills acquisition by the farmers. Through appropriate policies for land consolidation and redistribution, the farmers should be encouraged to make optimal use of their land resources, especially in the face of rising population pressure. Given that the mean rate of natural regeneration of the land is quite low, soil fertility augmentation measures should be seriously enhanced. This would require appropriate policies for the optimum investment in soil management practices such as organic manuring, providing adequate drainage, applying inorganic fertilizers and mulching. Policies and programmes for checking rising household size such as mass literacy programmes, counselling on birth control measures and family planning should be given prominence.

References

Adedipe, N. O., Olawaye, J. E., Olarinde, E. C. and Okediran, N. Y. 1997. Rural Communal Tenure Regime and Private Land ownership in Western Nigeria. *Land Reform Bulletin, Vol.* 2, P. 11.

Antiporta, D. B. 1978. Agro-climatic Factors in Rice Production. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development,* Vol. 8, Pp. 53 – 77.

Azhar, R. 1991. Education and Technical Efficiency during the Green Revolution in Pakistan. *Economic Development and Cultural Change,* Vol. 39, Pp. 651 – 665.

Barbier, E .B. 1990. The Farm- Level Economics of Soil Conservation: The Uplands of JAVA. *Land Economics, Vol.* 66(2): 199 - 211.

Boserup, E. 1965. *The Conditions of Agricultural Growth: Economics of Agrarian Change under Population Pressure.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Bravo-Ureta, B. E. and Evenson, R. E. 1994. Efficiency in Agricultural Production, the Case of Peasant Farmers in Eastern Paraguay. *Agricultural Economics,* Vol. 10(1), Pp. 27 – 37.

Carswell, G. 1997. Agricultural Intensification and Rural Sustainable Livelihoods-A Think Piece. *Working Paper 64,* Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussese, Brighton, United Kingdom, P. 27.

Cotlear, D. 1986. Farmer Education and Farm Efficiency in Peru: the Role of Schooling, Extension Services and Migration. *Discussion Paper EDT49,* Education and Training Department, World Bank, Washington, DC.

Effiong, E. O. 2004. Agricultural Intensification and Factor Use in Selected Food Crop Production in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Agricultural Research,* Vol.12, Pp. 25 – 28.

Eicher, C. K and Baker, D. C. 1970. *Research on Agricultural Economics.* East Lansing: Michigan State University.

FAO. 1987. *Atlas of African Agriculture*. Rome.

_____. 2004. The Ethics of Sustainable Agricultural Intensification. *FAO Ethics Series 3*, Rome.

FMARD (Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, 2001). *Agricultural Census Report*, 1992 – 2000, Abuja.

Freeman, A.H. 1994. Population Pressure on Land Use and Productivity of Agricultural System in the West African Savannah. In *Issues in African Rural Development*. Breth A.S (ed) .Winrock International Anigton VA. USA.

Geertz, C. 1963. *Agricultural Involution: The Process of Ecological Change in Indonesia*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hazell, P.B. R. 1995. Managing Agricultural Intensification. 2000 Vision Brief 11. Washington D.C., USA: International Food Policy Research Institute.

Islam, N. 1995. *Population and Food in the Early Twenty-First Century: Meeting Future Food Demand of an Increasing Population*. Washington D.C., USA: IFPRI (International Food Policy Research institute), P. 239.

Jaja, J. S., Chukwuigwe, E. C. and Ekine, D. I. 1998. Stimulating Sustainable Agricultural Development through Youth Mobilization Schemes: The Case of the School-to-Land Programme in Rivers State, Nigeria. *Sustaining Agricultural Investment in Nigeria,* Nwosu A. C and J. A. Mbanasor (eds), Proceedings of the 13th Annual Conference of Farm Management Association of Nigeria, Owerri: Alphabet Nigeria Publishers, Pp. 294 - 301.

Mefzner, J. K. 1982. Agriculture and Population Pressure in Sikka, Isle of Flores. *Monograph Series 28*, Development Studies Centre, The Australian National University, Australia.

Mortimore, M. J. 1992. Land and Population Pressure in Kano Closed Settled Zone, Northern Nigeria. In Pathero, R. M. (ed.), *People and Land in Africa South of the Sahara*. London: Oxford University Press.

American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 76, pp. 608 - 612.

Shem, M. A, Hazell, P. B., Blarel, B. and Place, F. 1994. Indigenous Land Rights Systems in Sub–Saharan Africa: A Constraints on Productivity in Land Reforms, Land Settlement and Corporation.

Smith, J. A., Barau, D., Goldman, A. and Mareck, J. H. 1994. *The Role of Technology in Agricultural Intensification: The Evolution of Maize in the Northern Guinea Savannah of Nigeria.* Ibadan: International Institute of Tropical Agriculture.

Tiffen, M., Mortimore, M. and Gichuki, F. 1994. *More People, Less Erosion: Environmental Recovery in Kenya.* London: Wiley.

Waddell, E. 1972. *The Mound Builders: Agricultural Practices, Environment, and Society in the Central Highlands of New Guinea.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Workneh Negatu, 2005. Land Tenure and Technological Improvement in Smallholder Agriculture of Ethiopia: A draft paper prepared for presentation at a conference on Land and Sustainable Development: a public dialogue co-hosted by forum of Social Studies, the Ethiopian Economic Association (EEA) and the Agricultural Economics Society of Ethiopia (AESE) held on August 5, 2005 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

World Bank. 1992. *World Development Report.* Washington, D. C.: The World Bank.

_____. 2007. World Population Data Sheet 2005. The Population Reference Bureau: The World Bank.