

Women, Ownership and Access to Land in the Upper East Region of Ghana.

Samuel Ziem Bonye

Department of Community Development
Faculty of Planning and Land Management
University for Development Studies
P. O UPW 3, Wa, Ghana.

Rev. Alfred Kpieta

Department of Environment & Resources Studies
Faculty of Integrated Development Studies
University for Development Studies
Ghana

Abstract

Evidence shows that there are projects and programmes in place to address land issues holistically in Ghana and in so doing streamline land administration. But very little effort exists in allowing women to articulate their position in land matters. The marginalisation that has emerged out of the historical usurpation of women's rights to land is what this study sort to investigate. Various methods were used to collect data. Prominently, focus group discussions, key informant interviews, confrontational dialogue and critical arena analysis were used to break barriers and mind-sets. The findings established that: women do not own land because they do not sacrifice to the land spirits - the requirement for owning land. However, women can have access to land in the following instances; women who come from a Tindana family (earth priests) have the right to own land; women who have livestock can use to exchange for a lease and can gain long-term access to land and where a male family head has only women in his line, some women might take over the indigenous male roles. The study recommends the need to strengthen dialogue between men and women on issues of land.

Key Words: Women, Land, Access, Ownership

Introduction

The issue of land has always been seen as 'an all men's affair'. This is the perception that is purported of traditional land ownership and management systems and has become stereotypical or the mindset of many (Kasanga et. al., 1996). Unfortunately this perception has made in-roads into formal discourses on land and even policies are not altogether clear on women and land issues. Most of the official pronouncements on land tend to restrict ownership to Chiefs and Tindaabas (traditional 'ownerships' - institutions that are predominantly male) (Kumekpor, 1971). Then community, family and individually owned lands are another cluster of ownership arrangements and that subsumes that women are catered for (but not explicitly so). Very little effort exists in allowing women themselves articulate their position in this matter (Abdullahi et. al. 2003). The historical ramifications that have led to these perceptions are not well known. What arrangements out of the ordinary are made by traditional institutions to cater for women cases with respect to land are unclear. The frustrations, marginalisation, and conflicts that have emerged out of the historical usurpation of women's rights to land need to be brought to the fore.

Recently there are projects and programme to address land issues in Ghana and in so doing streamline land administration. Civil Society Organizations have become active partners to this initiative. The fear exists, and genuinely so, that if women issues are not drummed up in their various ramifications, they will once more be left out altogether, marginalised (by wholesale workshop approach where women have nominal representation), or be spoken for (also by a select group of women) without the voices of the poor and disadvantaged woman been heard.

First, the paper discusses the notion of continuum of land rights in the context of land conflicts. Second, the paper explains why securing land rights for all can contribute to land conflict management and prevention. Third, land and property right in the context of conflicts is explored and examples are provided.

Fourth, a particular attention is turned to the gender dimension of land conflicts, with reference to power arrangements. Finally, the paper discusses why and how the political economy of land (conflict) should be accounted for while dealing with land conflicts

Literature Review

Debates of Land Tenure

The purpose of this part is to briefly outline some of the major theoretical strands of literature regarding land tenure in Sub-Saharan Africa in general and Ghana in particular. Land tenure refers to the terms and conditions under which land is held and used. According to Lunds (2003:8),

“Land tenure denotes the system of landholding, which has evolved from the peculiar political and economic circumstances, cultural norms and religious practices of a people regarding land as a natural resource, its use and development. It includes rules, regulations and institutional structures both customary and enacted legislations, which influence the holding and appropriation of land and its resources for socio-economic reasons”.

It is important to note that tenure is not a matter of man's relation to land, but is a social system of arrangements between people regarding land, and closely linked to all other social arrangements between people.

The wordings indigenous, traditional and customary in relation to tenure are used in practical and theoretical literature regarding land tenure to describe the local and non-formalised social practices regarding land holdings as organised by communities. These adjectives bring with them the hints that there is something original or even primordial about these arrangements. It is important to stress that this is not the case. Indigenous tenure evolves as a dynamic social process over time, and any attempt to characterise tenure as a fixed bundle of rules and regulations is likely to ignore one of its most important characteristics, - that of adaptation and change (Birgegaard, 1993).

Further to this debate, Birgegaard (1993:3) states that land tenure has always been of major importance to the development of countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, but this has been highlighted by recent debates by development trends in this region. Such debates include the growing emphasis on a liberalised market economy as the drive for economic development and the growing concern for the degradation of natural resources as a result of over-exploitation. The liberalisation school of thought gave rise to an individualised titling and ownership programme as a primary step to be taken in order to develop a land market which will, by the magic of the market forces, lead to a more efficient commoditisation of the agricultural production, and by enabling people to take up loans with land as collateral will boost the economy of the developing countries. The argument being that the realisation of this objective will set the third world free from dependence on development aid.

According to Lunds (2003), this argument seems to go hand in hand with the other recent trend that expresses concern about the degradation of the natural resource base. In this line of thinking the perceived insecure nature of indigenous tenure arrangements (the absence of exclusive individual ownership) restrains farmers from making long term investments in improvements of their farmland which inevitably leads to degradation of the soil quality, erosion, dependence of chemical fertilizers and the like. The ensnaring and persuasive strength of these arguments have led many countries including Ghana to start the process of a land reform, which has as its end goal an individualisation of land rights and the LAP does in many ways follow this line of thinking (Tsikata, et. al.,2003).

However there are several problems and flaws embedded in this. Firstly the practical problems in implementing a grand scale land registration and titling scheme are immense. Secondly an individualisation of land rights is a massive alteration of the existing arrangements, which can best be described as a revolution and very likely to cause violent conflicts, and thirdly the empirical evidence from countries that have pursued individual titling and ownership schemes are far from conclusive in recommending this as a beneficial route of development (Platteau, 1996). The advocates for this line of critique highlight the importance of many other structural reforms of the agricultural sector and that reforms focusing solely on tenure will not do. These other reforms include improving the market access, the rural infrastructure, technological packages, and extension service (Havnevik, 2002). This is not to say that land titling and land reforms are necessarily bad and should be avoided, but rather that they cannot stand alone. Another branch of theoretical literature argued that land registration and titling imposed as a government reform should not be considered for a long time to come.

'Formal titling should not be considered for decades to come in Sub-Saharan Africa other than for special situations such as peri-urban areas, irrigation schemes and possibly settlement schemes' (Birgegaard 1993: 5). The argument is that an intensification of the agricultural production alongside a growing population pressure by itself will lead towards an individualisation of land rights, which will be largely based on the cultural practices of the people themselves. The state should await the situation until the development has reached a stage where government titling is becoming a demand from the population, which will happen in its own time.

The evolutionary theory of land rights further points out that indigenous tenure systems are dynamic and vibrant, and that these systems will somehow manage to automatically adapt themselves to the changing conditions of the society (Platteau, 1996). This is on an assumption that the technological development will keep pace with the growing population resulting in equilibrium of food security and sustainable use of the natural resource base (Platteau 1994). Empirical evidence shows that this is far from the case in most of Sub Saharan Africa, and there is a growing consensus that interference in the customary arrangements is somehow warranted.

A possible way to overcome the problems, ranging from a top-down approach which does not work, or work in the opposite way of what was intended; and not doing anything, which is likely to result in further degradation of the environment and even lesser food security, is to take the indigenous arrangements as a starting point for a gradual reform process that does not have individualised ownership as a pre-given goal.

Take the rural communities and the indigenous systems as the starting point for this formalisation and reform process. Emphasizing a crucial role for village communities is not falling into the snare of romanticism, but is a rather pragmatic attitude. The top-down approach has miserably failed for most interventions all over Sub Saharan Africa, and these communities form living systems which have at their disposal many effective means to pre-empt or subvert any change ushered in from without (that are not endogenous), which they do not like. Turning them around or opposing them in land matters is all the more difficult as tenure rights are embedded in socio-cultural systems that are not easily bypassed. Hence, in analysing land issues, it is critical to understand the full extent and implication of what land means for all actors. In the light of this, Cotula et. al., (2004) analysis of the two images of land was adopted.

Image One of Land

Cotula et al., (2004) states that another name for Land is Earth. Though debatable, has a deep meaning for what images we have of Land. His position enable the land to have a physical form given to it by its minerals and plants rooted in it, minds and senses of beauty, from the a relation to its contours, colours, textures, tastes, and smells; and where we ultimately go into when life on earth is over. As in the African philosophy, Cotula's et. al., (2003) position of the land/earth having a life force or vital energy that animates us, flows through, and is concentrated in the soil, rocks and plants is shared with other philosophers. Hence we share a subjective presence, soul, consciousness and unconsciousness with our lands. Warmth and cold, sorrow and joy, love and hate, tenderness and rough all being the attributes of land. Hence land is part of a physical body of a living being not an inanimate entity. The Daggaba, Gruni and most of the ethnic communities of northern Ghana believe that people belong to and are shaped by their lands (Millar, 2003). Land, among these peoples has a power over their minds and hearts. They have cultural expressions such: songs of exile lamenting their being uprooted from the soils of their youth, names, performances, dances to signify the earth, when far from home look at the landscape and recall memories of the past with nostalgia, effigies that remind them of homelands. Land is therefore sacred and must be treated as such to avoid punishment and rather obtain blessings from the All-father ("*Te zaa saa*").

Image Two of Land

Another image of land posit by Cotula et al., (2004) is that land is perceived by a dominant discourse as a commodity. The so called dominant cultures understand land as a property that may be exploited, bought, sold, exchanged, or traded off, abused or misused in one form or another devoid of any personal attachments or sacredness. In fact the owner may never even see the land let alone have any personal relationship with it. The owner might not even have the capacities of loving the land (as in lands owned by institutions or companies). Hence land can be surveyed, demarcated to separate it from surrounding lands, crating parcels and plots, and maps made of them to be sold or exchanged as part of general goods in a market 'per square meter or hectare'. The extent and location of each demarcated portion of earth/land and the details of its owner are then recorded in a registry of titled deeds.

Thereafter, that land can be treated as deemed fit by that owner so identified – this includes altering the physical, chemical, biological, and aesthetic qualities of that land. The current owner is given virtually absolute power over that land, including the power to transform or transfer, in part or in whole, to another temporary or permanent user (Meer, 1997). The free to use or abuse gets passed on in this process and the cycle continues.

Gender and Land Rights

While several researchers have drawn attention to gender inequalities in land tenure systems, others have insisted that there is no problem of gender inequalities in land tenure and the majority think that women's access to land is improving as a result of factors such as migration, education and economic change in rural communities. Also, it is argued that though men appear to dominate, there is no discrimination or restriction to access to land based on sex for any purpose, whether for agriculture or for building houses. However, certain customary practices rob women of their rights in land and these have to be changed (FAO 1995).

One of the studies on Gender and Land Rights in Ghana is the IFAD (1998) report on women's access to land in the Upper East Region of Ghana. The report showed the difficulty in enhancing women's land rights in the region. It observed that, although women supply 80% of labour in farm activities, women have limited access to and control over resources such as land. Decision making on land are left to male village chiefs and elders as well as heads of clans at the community level. Women obtain temporary use of plots from their husbands. Widows tend to lose access to land unless they have male children. Unmarried women seldom have access to land. Women who gain access to land get the least productive plots that are farthest away. Another relevant study is the FAO study by Duncan and Brants (2004) which studied men and women's access to and control of land in seven districts of the Volta Region (VR) of Ghana.

They used both primary and secondary data in their study. To obtain greater insight into women's perceptions of access to and control over land and to assess both past and current developments with regard to men and women's access to and control over land in the Region, 60% of the 300 respondents interviewed were women and 40% of them were men. When interviewed initially, most respondents answered that both men and women had equal access to land in their communities since land use rights of lineage, clan and stool land were open to both sexes. However, their findings showed significant differences with regard to men and women's access to and control of land in the region, whilst men have full access right to land, women often had partial or conditional access right. Duncan and Brants (2004) further stated that ownership of land was largely vested in lineages, clans and family units and control over land was generally ascribed to men by lineage or clan heads. Some of the factors they identified to affect men and women's access to and control over land in the Volta Region include: gender, land ownership, the patrilineal inheritance system, local traditions and customs, decision-making powers, perceptions and marital status, among others. They expected factors such as knowledge of land legislations and education to have a positive impact on men and women's access to and control over land, but these could not be proven by the study. They also noted in their study that land ownership has evolved from family ownership (e.g. acquired through allocation and inheritance) to individual ownership (e.g. through purchase and gifts)

Changing access to land

Although it is believed that in most communities, women's access to land is guaranteed due to kinship ties as well as her position in marriage, there is a school of thought which has a view that access is changing over time which is putting the women in a disadvantaged position as compared to the men. Gray and Kevane (1992) attested to this fact when studying the land tenure system in Sub-Saharan Africa. They observed that changing values of land affects women's access to land more than men. They stated that "as land increases in value, individual men and corporate groups dominated by men, including state authorities, find it in their interest to renegotiate and challenge, before traditional authorities and statutory bodies, the direct and indirect ties that support women's rights to land." (Gray and Kevane, 1992: 6)

They also observed that women's access is customarily lost through formal titling and registration. Women, particularly, rural women are severely restricted in their financial and social ability to gain land through government or market routes. This fact is supported by a research work by Kotey and Yeboah (2003) who observed the disadvantaged position faced by women in the peri-urban areas as a result of competition between infrastructural development and agriculture for the limited supply of land. One of the reasons for the land tenure differences is the different meanings applied to concepts such as discrimination, access and control.

The failure to distinguish access from control leads to writers ignoring the fact that while women may have access to land, they often do not have control over the land. Change will require simultaneous struggles.

Methodology

A case study approach was adopted for this exercise. However, to make the cases fairly representative, the spread covered the Upper East Region as widely as possible. From the far east of the Region, Kanjaga and Chobsa were the communities interviewed in the Builsa District, and Kalbeo and Gorie-Kunkwah in the Bolgatanga Municipal and Bongo District respectively were the communities visited. A combination of methods used included:

- Stratified Group Discussions. This meant separating the men and women and interviewing the groups separately. In some cases they were brought together and made to confront one another and in others the findings remained separated.
- Focus Group Discussions. These were mixed groups of elderly men and women with land rights or potential rights to land.
- Key Informant Interview. A one-on-one interview with traditional institutions (men, women, and youth), elders, and some functionaries (also Government like teachers and extension staff from the area) living in the community.
- Phased Assertion, Confrontational Dialogue and Critical Arena Analysis had to be adopted to break initial barriers and mind-sets.

In whichever case, the findings were later processed in discussions by a larger group. The data analysis was purely qualitative (descriptive). Hence, data analysis was made at the same time during the data collection process and after the overall data collected. In the data collection process, qualitative field notes captured on daily basis on, conversations, interviews and stories on land issues during group discussions and interactions with specialised groups were analysed after the day's work. The rationale is to keep track of important events/ issues that cropped up in the days work and prepare adequately for the next day.

Findings from the Case Studies

Earlier work done in Zimbabwe (Gonese, 1999) and Southern Africa (Abu et. al., 2001) on women and land were confirmed by Millar (2003) recent research. The findings underscore the fact that traditional ties between rural people (also women) and land are not only material but also religious or spiritual. Land belongs to God ('Naamwin', 'Yini', Allfather), the ancestors or their spirits, founders of the lineage, clan or tribe interred therein, and the yet unborn.

To demonstrate this, landmarks such as certain hills, ponds, trees are named after ancestors whose spirits they honour. Every descendant (man or woman) is entitled to enough of this land to support his family. It is allotted, most often by the 'Kosug-dana' (landowner – not necessarily the Tindana - one with spiritual responsibilities for especially Traditional Protected Lands (TPL)). Other forms of allotments are by family, family head, clan, or by individual as in husbands allotted land to their wives and sons.

It is important to state here that the Tindana is not necessarily synonymous to owners of land. Tindanas are the custodians of spiritual lands and trees, sacred lands and trees, and any unclaimed property that is found in the village. They perform all spiritual requirements of the land. Tindanas may double as agricultural land owners where they have land to farm on their own

The tribal territories of land are guarded and protected by the spirits of the ancestors buried there, particularly by those of the oldest founding ancestors. These are often very powerful spirits who guide many aspects of the daily life of the family or tribe in order to keep harmony with the natural environment.

Land use allocations are by consultations. There are layers and levels of intensities of consultations. They might be simple and informal or formalised with sacrifices and other specialised performances by special persons (including spirit mediums). Change of 'ownership of land' often goes through similar practices. This engenders the need to define OWNERSHIP OF, ESPECIALLY, RURAL LANDS.

Ownership of land for both men and women in the rural sector is, from this study, a nebulous concept. Is there outright ownership even for the men? What do we mean by ownership and is there such an ownership concept among rural people (men and women)?

How is this operationalized and how can we better understand and deal with the various nuances therein? How do we marry or reconcile the spiritual under-pinning of land with our material interpretations? These and many more are questions raised by this study into Women and land. This said, we now introduce some shades of ownership that were encountered in this study:

The study found out that the first position that is often generally taken is that women do not own lands in northern Ghana and that is final. The statement is made by both men and women in group discussion that, "...we own the women or they own us. Not to talk about the land. This is no issue for discussion. It has been so and will continue to be so; period!!!" Breaking through this mind-set required tact and experience. With a bit of phased assertion and confrontational dialogue and also refereeing some critical arenas, the following findings have been an eye-opener for the interviewer and the respondent, and a rich occasion for learning for all including the youth who sat round to listen in.

Ownership

The following understandings of land ownerships were revealed (these were not any very different from the men):
Box 1

- Absolute and permanent ownership. Here the occupant has all the rights to use the land and the trees for whatever purpose including out-right sale in consultation with family members.
- Absolute ownership of land but not the trees. Except for the trees, the occupant has all the rights to use the land for whatever purpose including out-right sale in consultation with family members.
- Ownership of the land in so long as the occupant is using for agricultural purposes or the purpose for which it is designated for only. For all other uses the occupant has to consult the owner.
- Temporary ownership. This is as seasonal use of land. After each season the land goes back to the owner.
- Sale of land is rare. Symbolic exchanges occur to guarantee land use rights.
- Obligations for consultations spread over all titled and non-titled arrangements.

Sources: Field Data, 2010

Why do women not own land?

The initial responses to this question by the women themselves include the following:

Box 2

- Women used not to be in full-time farming like they do today. They used to be supportive to their husbands and therefore did not need land on their own.
- They are not permanent members of their father's homes.
- They have come from a different place to be at their husbands' homes.
- Their permanency cannot be guaranteed in their husbands' house.
- They are not good managers so if entrusted with a valuable commodity like land they may misuse it.
- Women cannot and do not sacrifice to the spirits of land hence do not satisfy the ultimate qualifications to own land.

Sources: Field Data, 2010

Case Probes

Among The Builsa

It must be stated here that, among the Builsas, the *tindapoa* (Female, applicable in some parts of northern region) or the earth priest operates as spiritual leaders of a community and wield powers in their control over land just as their male counterparts (Bonye and Millar, 2004).

The study revealed rare instances where women own land in the district as follows:

Box 3

- When a woman comes from the Tindana family, she has right to land ownership and can and do claim land when they are still in their father's home. This right, however, is temporary. It is lost when she decides to marry, and cannot also pass it on in old age or after death.
- Communal lands and traditionally protected lands (shrines, groves, sacred places and trees) are owned by all.
- There are certain cultural practices (including sacrifices) that are done to publicly declare that a piece of land belongs to a woman. Even then she does not own the trees and confiscations of such lands, though rare, are possible.
- When a man has all daughters, female headed homes, and widows have their own lands but have to consult the male members of the family on its use.
- These day women are given productive lands by their husbands to themselves. If husband dies the land remains the woman's own. But when the woman dies, one of the Brothers of the man or the man who performs her funeral takes that land. Ownership of this cannot be passed on automatically.
- No performance is required for a husband to give part of his '*Nagang*' (land in front of his house that is his own – not family or communal land) to his wife. Proof of ownership is for her to continuous cultivating that piece over time.

Sources: Field Data, 2010

As to their views of the status quo

The women indicated that, now women are farmers not helpers and will want to have their own lands distinctively identified. They are also quick to say that the situation is not like before when men do not give women land. Now they give. They give poor lands and sometimes very rich lands. In some cases the women say which piece they prefer. This is because the men have noticed the women's ability to bring in income for the use of the family thus liberating the man's own income for his personal use.

This notwithstanding, women will want to maintain the situation as it is. Why?

Box 4

- because, they cannot meet the sacrifices and the spiritual requirements of the land.
- because, they are not good managers of land and mismanage it.
- because, the risk is that the men might give them so much land that they cannot cultivate or exploit their labour by allocating them land and sit back to watch them suffer.

The men welcomed the idea of formalising women ownership of the land. Why?

Box 5

- because, the inheritance system might deny your wife and children of land when you die. Hence there is the need to guarantee that they have property.
- because, it is not only for today. The girls now go to school and therefore are or will be different so we need to prepare for some securities for them and land is one major security.
- what about the sacrifices that has to be done on the land by the men only? The reply is that things are changing these days. Some of their Brothers have land but are down south for many years so no sacrifices are done to those lands.

Sources: Field Data, 2010

Among the Kalbeo and Gorie-Kunkwa People

There is the need to mention a special phenomenon here. When a male family head realises that he has only women in his line, in order to perpetuate that line one of the girls is chosen to sit at home and have children for the family. Also a well to do woman might keep other women as wives and they intend have children for her. In these instances the woman is seen as a man and therefore owns land and has land rights like all other men in the community. Hence is easy to find female '*Kusog Daanas*'. Also if the Tindaana family is left with only women, one of them becomes the Tindaana and performs all the duties of the Tindaana that a man would.

Rare instances when women own land indicated by respondents includes:

Box 6

- Women can also have access to land when they have cattle, sheep or goats they can use in exchange for a lease. In these land tenure arrangements, a number of sheep or goats are paid to a landowner for a lease spanning a period of five to ten years. In the arrangement involving cattle, a woman gives a cow to a landowner to assume ownership of a particular piece of land; the land remains the property of the woman until such time that the landowner pays back the cow to revert ownership. When there is a default in payment, the landowner forfeits all rights to the land and it now becomes the property of the woman. In this instance, women can do as they please with the land including selling it out or using it for construction purposes.
- When a woman comes from the Tindana family, she has right to land ownership and can and do claim land when they are still in their father's home. This right, which temporary, is lost when she decides to marry and she cannot also pass it on in old age or death.
- When Brothers share land (which they do very often these days), when one dies and the children are still young the land belongs to the wife. It cannot be taken from [here](#) by any family member.
- When a man has all daughters, female headed homes, and widows have their own lands but have to consult the male members of the family on its use. Also once a woman is accepted or given the responsibility as the head of the home, she automatically controls all land. It was put this way, "...once you control the men, you also control the land".
- When a man dies, his land holdings are available to any male member of the family provided that person assumes responsibility for the upkeep of the wife and children of the previous owner. When there is no one prepared to shoulder such responsibility, the land remains the property of the woman and her kids. First the woman takes over ownership until the sons are grown enough to take it over. But if she has only daughters, it becomes the woman's own land.

Sources: Field Data, 2010

As to their views of the status quo

Both the men and women agreed on the position that land allocation to women is a regular affair now. It is the aspect of outright ownership that needs regularisation. The issue of sacrifice to the land was raised and discussed. Since women do not sacrifice to the land what happens to the woman's land? The conclusion was that since the husband will be alive or there will be male members sacrificing to family lands in general at the beginning of the rainy season, this sacrifice will be all encompassing. It will not leave out the woman's land, more so if the woman makes a contribution to the sacrifice by offering some of her harvest. When asked where they would prefer to acquire such formalised land rights, the women said in their husbands' homes.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The general perception is that, women do not own lands in northern Ghana. This statement is however, substantiated by both men and women in the study communities that, "...we own the women or they own us. However, both men and women agreed on the position that land ownership is changing. Where men before were reluctant to give women land, a growing number of men now allocate land to women because men have noticed their ability to bring in income for the family. On the other hand, it was also revealed that, giving women land would increase their chances of creating wealth and hence, might undermine the position of their husbands; more so, because women are not permanent members of their father's homes as they may marry out, and so giving land to women would render the male-headed households landless.

The study recommends that:

The study recommends the need to strengthen dialogue between women and men on issues of land. When men appreciate the benefits of making land available to women it facilitates the ease of giving out land. Workshops and fora are recommended as opportunities through which intensive gender based advocacy activities can be implemented in a participatory fashion to disabuse the minds of men and women on gender-based discrimination on land.

Second, economic empowerment of women is also proposed as a way of making land more accessible to women. The women contend that when they have money or wealth in the form of livestock these assets makes it easier for them to either hire land or engage in some form of traditional land tenure arrangement to acquire land for farming purposes. Alternative livelihood schemes (beekeeping, shea butter and groundnut processing, or rearing of small ruminants and poultry etc.) were therefore proposed as activities that can make this objective a reality.

Third, a great majority of the traditional governance structures in the study area did not have women occupying positions such as chiefs, tindanas, clan heads etc. as a result, their voices in decision making processes in land matters is greatly constrained. The district assembly may consider negotiating with traditional authorities (TAs) on ways of expanding women's economic roles for increased productivity by exploring non-traditional spaces for generating interest and invoking discussions on the socio-economic benefits of women's expanded access to land. Such fora may include palace visits, meetings and informal interactions, during which time the TAs can be lobbied and involved in designing strategies to support women's access to land in the district.

References

- Abdullahi, H.J. and Hamza, I (2003), 'Women and land in Northern Nigeria: the rights', zed Books ltd, London
- Adams, W. M., Brockington, D., Dyson, J., and B. Vira. 2003. Managing tragedies: understanding conflict over common pool resources. Science (New York, N.Y.
- Abu, A. and Millar, D. (2004), Land, Natural Resources and Spirituality; Policy Implication on Rural Livelihood in Northern Ghana, Bolgatanga, Ghana
- Aidoo, A. A. (1988). Women and Food Security: The Opportunity for African Development. Vol. 2, No.3: Pp 56-61.
- Benneh, R., K. Kasanga, and Ameyaw, D. (1996), "Women's access to agricultural land in the household: A case study of three selected districts in Ghana" In: E. ArdayfioShandorf (Ed.) *The Changing Family in Ghana*. University of Ghana and Ghana Universities Press, Accra. Pp. 1 69-178
- Birgegård, Lars-Erik (1993): Natural Resource Tenure, A Review of issues and experiences with emphasis on Sub-Saharan Africa in Rural Development Studies no 31
- Bonye, S. and Millar, D. (2004), Traditional Institutions: Entry Points for endogenous Development. Compass Magazine for Endogenous Development, No. 7., Netherlands
- Cotula, L, Toulmin, Caad Hesse, C (2004) Land Tenure and Administration in Africa: Land Tenure and resource Access in Africa, IIED/FAO, London.
- Gonese, J. (1997), Capacity Building of Traditional Institutions for the use of Indigenous Knowledge System in Natural Resource Management, Southern African Mission.
- Hilhorst, T (2000), 'Women's Land rights: current developments in **Sub-Saharan Africa**', London pp 181 – 196.
- Havnevik, K. (2005), The land Question in Sub-Saharan Africa in IRDC no 15
- Jacobsen, K. (2002). Livelihoods in Conflict: The Pursuit of Livelihoods by Refugees and the Impact on the Human Security of Host Communities. International Migration, 40(5), 95-123. Doi.
- Kumekpor, T.K. 1971. "Land tenure inheritance in Anlo". *Ghana Journal of Sociology* Vol. 7 No. 1
- Lund, C. (2003): 'Bawku is still volatile' – Ethno-political conflict and state recognition in Northern Ghana in J. of Modern African Studies, 41, 4 (2003), pp. 587–610. f 2003 Cambridge University Press
- Meer, S. (ed) (1997), Women, Land and Authority: perspectives from South Africa, David Philip, Oxfam, National Land Committee, Cape Town.
- Millar, D. (2003c), Forest in northern Ghana: Local Knowledge and Local Use of Forest. Sahel-Sudan Environmental Research Initiative. Occasional Paper nos 15.Copenhagen.
- Platteau, J-Ph (1996), The Evolutionary Theory of Land Rights as applied to Sub-Saharan Africa: A Critical Assessment in Development and Change vol. 27
- Small, J. (1997), 'Women's Land Rights: a case study from the Northern Transvaal', in Meer, S. (1997) ed., Women, Land and Authority: Perspectives from South African, Oxfam, London.
- Whitehead, A and Tsikata, D. (2003), 'Policy discourses of women's land rights in sub-Saharan Africa: the implications of the return to the customary', Journal of Agrarian Change, vol. 3 Nos 1 & 2, January and April, pp 67 – 112
- USAID. (2004), Land and conflict: a toolkit for intervention. Office for Conflict Management and Mitigation. [Http://www.usaid.gov/our work/cross-cutting programs/conflict/publications/docs/CMM Land and Conflict 2004.pdf](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/conflict/publications/docs/CMM_Land_and_Conflict_2004.pdf)