



Land Governance in an Interconnected World

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 19-23, 2018



Incentives for Joint Land Titling: Experimental Evidence from Uganda*

LUDOVICA CHERCHI, MARKUS GOLDSTEIN, JAMES HABYARIMANA,
JOAO MONTALVAO, MICHAEL O’SULLIVAN, CHRIS UDRY†

Paper prepared for presentation at the
“2018 WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY”
The World Bank - Washington DC, March 19-23, 2018

Copyright 2018 by author(s). All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

* We thank all those at Associates Research Trust and the Government of Uganda’s Ministry of Lands, Housing, and Urban Development for collaborative efforts in this project. We are grateful to Samuel Olweni, Iacopo Bianchi, and Deepika Ramachandran for outstanding research assistance. This work is an output of the Africa Gender Innovation Lab and financial support from the Umbrella Fund for Gender Equality is gratefully acknowledged. The views presented in this paper are those of the authors and do not represent those of the World Bank or its member countries. All errors remain our own.

† Cherchi [World Bank, lcherchi@worldbank.org]; Goldstein [World Bank, mgoldstein@worldbank.org]; Habyarimana [Georgetown, jph35@georgetown.edu]; Montalvao [World Bank, jmontalvao@worldbank.org]; O’Sullivan [World Bank, mosullivan@worldbank.org]; Udry [Northwestern, christopher.udry@northwestern.edu].



Land Governance in an Interconnected World

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 19-23, 2018



Abstract

We report results from a randomized field experiment assessing the effectiveness of conditional price subsidies and information in improving women's access to formal land tenure. We do so in the context of an ongoing land titling intervention in rural Uganda. We find that the intervention generated high demand for titling, as well as for co-titling. We find that both policy instruments further increased demand for co-titling, but had no effect on overall household demand for titling. Both instruments were therefore relatively more potent when offered in isolation. Our analysis is important given increasing policy attention to land rights institutional reforms and female empowerment in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Key Words: Land titling, formalization, gender, Uganda.



1. Introduction

Property rights over land play a critical role in economic development by governing the allocation of a fundamental productive resource. African governments are increasingly adopting land formalization reforms, often in the context of traditional customary systems of land tenure that limit women's ownership of land. There is thus a concern that these efforts could disempower women by potentially crystalizing or even exacerbating gender gaps in land tenure. It is therefore important to identify policy instruments that encourage female land ownership when implementing land formalization programs.

It is in this direction that we contribute by providing novel evidence from a randomized experiment assessing the effectiveness of two policy instruments, implemented alone or jointly, in improving women's access to formal land titles. The experiment takes place in the context of a land titling intervention offering fully-subsidized freehold land titles for untitled rural households in Uganda. The first policy instrument makes the subsidy conditional on including the wife's name on the land title. The second instrument provides households with information about the benefits of joint titling using an educational video.

Our main findings are as follows. First, our core intervention, which offered fully-subsidized land titles, successfully generated high overall demand for titling, as well as for co-titling. Second, imposing the gender conditionality on the subsidy in isolation further raises demand for co-titling, without dampening overall demand for titling. Third, providing additional gender information in isolation also further raises demand for co-titling, though not as much as the conditionality, and has no impact on demand for titling. Fourth, the two instruments are relatively more potent when implemented in isolation instead of jointly. This result is driven by the fact that both instruments induce households to shift from solo titles toward co-titles, not by an overall increase in the demand for titles.

The rest of this note is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the experimental design. Section 3 presents the empirical results. Section 4 concludes.

2 Experimental Design

2.1 Intervention



Land Governance in an Interconnected World

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 19-23, 2018



Our experiment was implemented by Associates Research Trust, in collaboration with the Government of Uganda's Ministry of Lands, Housing, and Urban Development. Associates Research is an applied research and implementation organization in Uganda with a depth of experience in land rights and gender. The intervention started in 2017, targeting about 1,090 households from 253 villages across four districts (Mbarara, Sheema, Buhweju, and Isingiro) in the Western Region of Uganda. Within each village, an average of 4 eligible households were randomly selected for the intervention. Those households with a married (or cohabitating) couple owning at least one unregistered parcel of land were deemed eligible for the intervention.

The core intervention offers fully-subsidized freehold land titles to rural households in Uganda. It entails four door-to-door household visits. During the first visit, households are provided with information about costs and benefits of titling, and offered the opportunity to receive a fully-subsidized freehold title for one parcel of land (randomly selected for households with multiple parcels). At the end of this visit, households are asked whether they accept the offer, and if so which names they want to be listed on the title. During the second visit, parcel boundaries are defined for households that accept the offer in the presence of neighbors and local government officials, and the households are assisted with filling the land title application forms. On this visit, households have the option to revise their original decisions made during the first visit. During the third visit, the core land demarcation and surveying activities take place. During the fourth visit, the freehold land titles are delivered to the households after being processed by the Government of Uganda.¹

2.2 Treatment Arms

The goal of this experiment is to assess the effectiveness of conditional price subsidies and information, in isolation or jointly, in improving women's access to formal land. To do so, the 253 study villages were randomized into the following two treatments, fully crossed with each other and stratified by parish.

Conditional Subsidies vs. Unconditional subsidies. All households were offered a fully-subsidized freehold title for an eligible parcel of land. We varied the conditionality of the subsidy as follows: (i) half of the households received the subsidy conditional on registering the wife as a co-owner of the land; and (ii) the other half received the subsidy unconditionally. This allows us to isolate the impact of the gender

¹ On average, the second household visit takes place about twelve days after the first visit, and it takes approximately one month per household to complete the first three visits.



conditionality over and above the impact of the subsidy.

Gender Information vs. General Information. All households were shown a short educational video clip. We varied the content of the video clip as follows: (i) half of the households were shown general information about titling (such as benefits, legal implications, prices); and (ii) the other half were additionally shown information on the benefits of female co-titling.

2.3 Data

For this experiment, we draw mostly on intervention monitoring data, systematically captured during each household visit, to record household decisions and other indicators related to the intervention. We also use data from two household surveys conducted prior to the intervention in July-September 2015 and February-March 2017, which elicited information from both spouses on socio-demographic characteristics, landholdings and investment, plot-level agricultural production, and intra-household bargaining and decision-making.

The main outcomes of interest are: (i) whether the household accepts the land title offer; and (ii) if so whether the household registers the wife as a co-owner of the land. We examine these household decisions at two different points in time: on the day when the educational video was shown and the offer was first presented to the household (during the first household visit), and on the day when the land title application form was filled (during the second household visit). This time lapse allows us to provide some tentative evidence on the effect that providing households with additional time for reflection could have on take-up rates for these complex interventions.

Appendix Table A1 presents summary statistics for a selected set of baseline characteristics. We note that there are no systematic significant differences across treatment arms.

3. Results

3.1 Descriptive Evidence

We first present descriptive evidence of the main findings. Figure 1 shows the share of households accepting the land title offers, by type of title (solo or joint), in each of the four subsidy-information treatment arms, separately for the first visit (Figure 1A) and the second visit (Figure 1B).



The following points are of note. First, demand for titling and demand for co-titling are high: 91% of households assigned to the core intervention (which offered land titles unconditionally and provided general information about titling) accepted the land title offers on the first visit, and 62% decided to co-title.

Second, while imposing the gender conditionality and providing additional gender information in isolation both further increase demand for co-titling, adding a condition is particularly effective: with the probability of co-titling increasing to 89% under the condition, relative to 76% with gender information.

Third, implementing the conditionality and the information jointly does not improve their stand-alone effectiveness in increasing co-titling: in fact, imposing the conditionality appears to be more potent *in the absence of* gender information, and the gender information only makes a difference without the conditionality.

Fifth, neither the conditionality nor the gender information, in isolation or jointly, affects overall household demand for titling: titling take-up rates on the first visit remain high at around 90% across the four experimental arms. Sixth, comparing Figures 1A and 1B we see a reduction in overall household demand for titling between visits: titling take-up rates decrease to 69-75% on the second visit, compared to 89-91% on the first visit.

3.2 Treatment Impact Estimates

To examine more formally the impact of imposing the conditionality and providing gender information, in isolation or jointly, we estimate the following linear probability specification for household h in village v and parish p , using data from households in treatment communities, separately for the first and second visits,

$$y_{hvp} = \alpha + \beta_C C_{hvp} + \beta_I I_{hvp} + \beta_{C \times I} (C_{hvp} \times I_{hvp}) + \delta \mathbf{x}_{hvp} + \lambda_p + \varepsilon_{hvp}. \quad (1)$$

y_{hvp} is one of two dummies: (i) whether the household accepts the land title offer (“titling”); (ii) whether the household includes the wife’s name on the title application (“co-titling”). C_{hvp} is a dummy for whether the household was assigned to be offered land titles conditional on registering the wife as co-owner of the land or unconditionally. I_{hvp} is a dummy for whether the household was assigned to receive additional information around gender equality or general information about land titling only. \mathbf{x}_{hvp} controls for



baseline characteristics of the parcel and household to improve the precision of the estimates. λ_p is a strata (i.e., parish) fixed effect. The error term ε_{hvp} is clustered by village, the unit of randomization.

The omitted category in Equation (1) comprises households assigned to the core intervention treatment arm, in which households were offered land titles unconditionally and provided with general information about titling only. The parameters of interest are: β_C and $\beta_C + \beta_{C \times I}$, measuring the impact of imposing the gender conditionality on the land title offer for gender uninformed and gender informed households, respectively; β_I and $\beta_I + \beta_{C \times I}$, the impact of providing gender information for households that are offered land titles unconditionally and conditionally, respectively; and $\beta_{C \times I}$, the complementarity/substitutability effect between the gender conditionality and the gender information.

Table 1 presents the results. Focusing first on the first visit, Columns 1 and 2 show that the conditionality and the information do not affect overall household demand for titling, but they substitute each other in increasing demand for co-titling. Imposing the conditionality significantly raises the co-titling probability by 31 percentage points among the gender uninformed households, and by 14 percentage points among the informed households. Providing information significantly raises the co-titling probability by 16 percentage points among households offered titles unconditionally, and has no impact among the households offered titles conditionally. The coefficient on the interaction term is negative and statistically significant.

Focusing next on the second visit, Columns 3 and 4 show a similar qualitative pattern to that observed during the first visit, although the magnitudes of the coefficients decrease relative to those estimated for the first visit due to the reduction in overall demand for titling between visits.

4. Discussion

We report results from a randomized field experiment assessing the effectiveness of price subsidies and information in improving women's access to formal land tenure. We do so in the context of an ongoing land titling intervention in rural Uganda.

The results indicate that the core intervention, which offered unconditional fully-subsidized land titles and provided households with general information about titling can be successful at formalizing land tenure *and* improving female formal land ownership. This finding casts some doubt on the concern that land titling programs in the context of customary systems of land tenure can disempower women by crystalizing or even exacerbating underlying gender gaps in land tenure.



Land Governance in an Interconnected World

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 19-23, 2018




Our evidence shows that making the subsidy conditional on the wife being registered as a co-owner of the land and providing additional information about the benefits of co-titling further increase the demand for co-titling, without affecting overall household demand for titling. The evidence that imposing the conditionality does not dampen demand for titling is encouraging in light of a concern that a redistribution of property rights within the household could trigger anticipatory feelings of conflict between husbands and wives.

We also find that the two policy instruments substitute each other in improving women's access to formal land titles: imposing the gender conditionality is relatively more effective without gender information, and vice versa. This result is driven by the fact that both instruments induce households to shift from solo titles toward co-titles, not by an overall increase in the demand for titles.

Finally, we observe that households revise downwards their willingness to title over time during the course of the intervention. This provides suggestive evidence that providing households with additional time for reflection can have important effects on take-up rates for these complex interventions.

Moving forward, the next step in the analysis will explore the rich baseline household survey data to analyze heterogeneity in the main impacts reported in this note to identify potential mechanisms driving the results.

Figure 1: Take-Up Results



Graphs by Information

Figure 1A: First Household Visit



Graphs by Information

Figure 1B: Second Household Visit

Table 1. Treatment Effects on Titling Decisions

OLS regression coefficients, standard errors reported in parentheses clustered by village

	First Visit		Second Visit	
	Titling (1)	Co-Titling (2)	Titling (3)	Co-Titling (4)
Conditionality [β_C]	.004 (.026)	.312*** (.039)	-.026 (.049)	.178*** (.048)
Information [β_I]	-.001 (.023)	.158*** (.039)	-.004 (.043)	.084** (.040)
Conditionality x Information [$\beta_{C \times I}$]	-.016 (.033)	-.177*** (.049)	-.001 (.066)	-.085 (.065)
Conditionality + (Conditionality x Information) [$\beta_C + \beta_{C \times I}$]	-.012 (.023)	.135*** (.032)	-.027 (.049)	.093** (.047)
Information + (Conditionality x Information) [$\beta_I + \beta_{C \times I}$]	-.017 (.024)	-.019 (.029)	-.005 (.050)	-.002 (.050)
Observations	1,087	1,087	1,087	1,087
R-squared	.137	.229	.198	.218
Control Mean [Core Treatment Arm]	.909	.620	.746	.551

Notes: *** denotes significance at 1%, ** at 5%, and * at 10%. OLS regression estimates are presented, where standard errors clustered by village. The outcome variable in Columns 1 and 3 is a dummy for whether the household accepts the land title offer. The outcome variable in Columns 2 and 4 is a dummy for whether the household registers the wife as co-owner of the land. In all specifications we include strata (i.e. parish) fixed effects and the following controls (as measured at baseline): a dummy for whether the wife is de facto owner of the parcel, the number of parcels owned by the household, the first principal component of total household, farm, and livestock assets owned by the household, and a dummy for whether the household is polygamous. The control means correspond to the mean of the outcome variable for households assigned to the core treatment arm, where households were offered land titles unconditionally and provided with general information about titling only.

Table A1: Descriptive Statistics

Means and standard deviations in curly brackets reported in Column 1

OLS coefficients and standard errors in parentheses reported in Columns 2-4

P-values on joint test of equality reported in Column 5

	Control/Core Treatment (1)	Gender Conditionality (2)	Gender Information (3)	Conditionality + Information (4)	P-value on joint test (5)
Household/spousal characteristics					
Household size	6.74 {2.91}	.112 (.228)	.246 (.233)	.232 (.240)	[.697]
Household assets [0-15 score]	5.41 {1.75}	.048 (.178)	-.233 (.168)	.004 (.204)	[.287]
Polygamous household [yes=1]	.185 {.389}	-.003 (.019)	-.031 (.019)	-.029 (.018)	[.198]
Wife decision-making power index [0-6 score]	3.27 {1.83}	-.341* (.176)	-.000 (.178)	-.276 (.174)	[.090]
Quality of spousal relationship index [0-7 score]	4.86 {2.02}	-.228 (.173)	-.102 (.170)	-.126 (.191)	[.622]
Farm characteristics					
Total number of parcels	3.15 {2.04}	-.297 (.193)	-.156 (.196)	-.210 (.193)	[.481]
Transformed total land size [log acres]	1.31 {1.06}	-.018 (.126)	-.070 (.108)	.085 (.115)	[.624]
Transformed farm yields [IHS USD/Acres]	5.49 {1.25}	-.263 (.208)	-.209 (.205)	.039 (.157)	[.367]
Farm assets [0-10 score]	3.38 {1.33}	-.090 (.132)	-.166 (.122)	-.098 (.142)	[.602]
Livestock assets [0-9 score]	2.28 {1.90}	.111 (.179)	.025 (.171)	.159 (.182)	[.789]
Parcel characteristics					
Transformed parcel area [log acres]	.211 {1.20}	.069 (.135)	.015 (.115)	.094 (.121)	[.857]
Transformed parcel yield [IHS USD/Acres]	4.71 {2.28}	-.383 (.287)	-.360 (.255)	-.172 (.237)	[.433]
Parcel was purchased [yes=1]	.558 {.498}	-.041 (.045)	-.062 (.043)	.022 (.045)	[.254]
Wife is de facto owner of parcel [yes=1]	.587 {.493}	-.055 (.061)	.026 (.061)	-.029 (.063)	[.556]
Parcel grows a cash crop [Yes=1]	.319 {.467}	-.007 (.051)	.0007 (.052)	-.011 (.050)	[.995]

Notes: *** denotes significance at 1%, ** at 5%, and * at 10%. Column 1 reports means and standard deviations for households assigned to the core intervention, which offered unconditional fully-subsidized land titles and provided general information about titling. Columns 2-4 report OLS coefficients and standard errors (clustered by village) obtained from regressing the corresponding variable on a dummy for whether the household was assigned to conditioning the subsidy on registering the wife as co-owner of the land, a dummy for whether the household was assigned to additional information on benefits of co-titling, and a dummy for the household was assigned to both the gender conditionality and the gender information. Household assets is the sum of 15 dummies indicating ownership of: house, other buildings, furniture, television, radio, generators, electric inverters, bicycle, motor cycle, motor vehicle, jewelry, watches, mobile phone, computer, and internet access. Wife decision making power index is the sum of 3 dummies for whether the wife has a say (either alone or jointly with the husband) on: (i) which food to buy, (ii) buying an house asset, and (iii) bringing a sick child to the health facility. Quality of spousal relationship is the sum of 7 dummies indicating whether the husband: (i) is not jealous or angry if wife talks to other men, (ii) does not frequently accuses the wife of being unfaithful, (iii) permits his wife to meet with female friends, (iv) does not limit contact with family, (v) does not insist on knowing where his wife is at all times, (vi) does not humiliate his wife in front of others, and (vii) dies not physically harm his wife. Farm assets is the sum of 10 dummies indicating ownership of: hoes, pangas, animal-drawn carts, wheel barrows, tractors, fork hoes, slashers, ploughs, and sprayers. Livestock assets is the sum of 9 dummies indicating ownership of calves, bulls, oxen, heifers, cows, goats, sheep, pigs, and poultry (chickens, turkeys, ducks, etc.). IHS in transformed yields denotes the inverse hyperbolic sine transformation. Cash crops include coffee, cocoa, sugarcane, tea, and tobacco.