

## **Responses of Community Leaders and Non-leaders to the Land Use Act (1978) in Oyo State of Nigeria**

A. A. JIBOWO

*Department of Agricultural  
Extension and Rural Sociology  
University of Ife  
Ile-Ife, Nigeria.*

### **Abstract**

This study determined the knowledge of some specific provisions of the Land Use Act by the respondents, their reactions to the Act, the personal, social and economic characteristics and the relationships of these to their attitudes towards the Act. Interviews were carried out among 110 leaders and 170 non-leaders between December 1978 and February 1979. Leaders were generally older, earned higher incomes than non-leaders; majority of leaders were full-time farmers. The respondents did not claim much landed properties. Most respondents were ignorant of many specific provisions of the Act and did not apply for land allocation. The majority expressed an unfavourable attitude towards the Act. Formal education, borrowing of farmland, receiving compensations on land, age, length of community residence and years of schooling were associated with attitude among the respondents. Occupation, method of acquiring houseland, and some other characteristics were associated with attitude among leaders. Community identification, place of origin, and some other characteristics were associated with attitude among non-leaders. Understanding these relationships should facilitate the design and implementation of public measures to promote the implementation of the Act.

### **Introduction**

Land is a very important factor of production in agriculture. Mellor (1966) appreciated this when he stated that land itself appeared to be the most significant input to the cultivator. The traditional tenurial system of land among the Yorubas of Western Nigeria of which Oyo State is a part, exhibits mainly communal ownership of land. This system ensures that land belongs to the community and members of that community therefore have access to the use of land after obtaining permission from the appropriate heads who are designated to hold land custody.

In family ownership, it is the family which controls the use of land and family members are allowed the use of the land or often part thereof on request. Individual ownership is more of a recent than traditional phenomenon. This is a case in which individuals obtain land either by purchase or inheritance and control absolute use of the land. Strangers in a community could be allocated plots of land for farming under certain conditions such as sharing of harvests and payment of cash. Such tenant farmers have no security of land occupancy, and prospective large scale farmers encounter difficulties in acquiring sufficient area of contiguous land either by purchase or lease. Several other problems of the traditional land tenure system are duplicity of ownership of land, land fragmentation, unwillingness of tenants to improve the land and tying down of land by absentee landlords (Fabiye, 1979).

It was therefore difficult for the government and individuals to acquire land for development purposes. Where such land could be obtained, the government had to pay heavy compensations with money which ought to have been spent on development projects. To ease these problems, the Federal Military Government promulgated the Land Use Act on March 29, 1978 through the publication of an extraordinary gazette.

### *The Land Use Act*

According to the Ogun State of Nigeria Gazette number 27 (1978), the commencement of the Act affirmed that it was in the public interest that the rights of all Nigerians to the land of Nigeria be preserved by law. Furthermore, it was in the public interest that the rights of all Nigerians to use and enjoy Nigerian land and its natural fruits in sufficient quantity to sustain themselves and their families should be preserved. All lands in each state were vested in the State Governor, who should have the right to allocate land to applicants and withdraw such land when necessary. A Land Use and Allocation Committee (LUAC) was set up in each state to advise the Governor on implementation. A Land Use Advisory Committee was also set up in each Local Government Area to advise on lands in the rural areas.

As they traditionally had the power to control the use of community lands in their domain, it was not surprising that some Yoruba kings made public pronouncements against the Land Use Act. This was because they saw the transfer of land trusteeship from them to the state as an attrition of their power. Such responses and those of the non-leaders who had no opportunity to express them publicly, needed to be systematically studied. The objectives of this study were to de-

termine: (i) the knowledge of some specific provisions of the Act by leaders and non-leaders; (ii) their attitudes towards the Act; (iv) some of their personal, social and economic characteristics and the relationships between these and their attitudes.

### **Materials and Methods**

Respondents were selected from eight Local Government Areas situated in all parts of Oyo State. These were Obokun, Irewole, Oranmian, Iseyin, Oyo, Ejigbo, Irepodun, Akinyele Local Government Areas (LGA). A minimum of one town and one village were chosen from each local government area and the leaders were chosen through the reputational approach. This was done by asking adult non-leaders and some positional leaders in each community to name those they considered as leaders, people of influence who made decisions or got things done for the development of their communities. A total of 155 leaders were nominated, out of which 110 were interviewed. A total of 170 adult non-leaders were also interviewed. These were chosen by using both cluster and systematic sampling techniques. Each block was regarded as a cluster. About 20-50% of the clusters in each town or village were selected randomly. The subjects studied in each cluster were chosen by the systematic sampling technique by interviewing the head of about every fifth to tenth household in all possible directions. Larger cluster percentages were taken in villages than in towns. Larger sample intervals were taken to choose subjects from towns than villages. interviews took place between December 1978 and February 1979.

The variables were measured with direct questions, except attitude towards the Land Use Act which was measured by designing ten negative and six positive statements many of which depicted the public attitudes towards the Act. Examples of such negative statements were: (i) like some other government acts, the Land Use Act is bound to fail; (ii) implementing the provisions of the Act is bound to generate chaos among the land owners. Examples of the positive statements were: (i) to check the exploitation of the land owners by land speculators, the Land Use Act is a good idea; (ii) since nobody brought land from heaven, I am happy that land now belongs to all as a result of the Act. These statements were validated by using five experts as judges to indicate whether the statements were "Very Appropriate", "Appropriate" or "Inappropriate" in measuring public attitudes towards the Land Use Act in Oyo State. They were asked to include other statements they considered as useful for the same purpose. Only one positive attitude statement was added by one of the judges. The experts judged all the statements as "Very Appropriate", hence all the state-

ments were used in the study. The experts included a sociologist, an architect, a land economist, a lecturer in land law and a traditional chief.

The total attitude score of each respondent was computed by awarding a score of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 for “strongly agree”, “agree”, “undecided”, “disagree” and “strongly disagree”, respectively to each positive statement and vice-versa to each negative statement, and adding the scores for all the statements before calculating the mean for each respondent. A mean score of 1.0–2.9 was regarded as unfavourable attitude, 3.0 was regarded as neutral, while 3.1–5.0 was regarded as favourable attitude. Frequency, percentage distributions and mean values were used to describe the data. Chi-square analysis was carried out to test the significance of the relationships of categorized normal variables such as occupation, place of birth and attitude towards the Act. Correlation analysis was carried out to determine the relationship of attitude to variables measured with ordinal scales such as age, length of residence, number of wives and others (Williams, 1968).

## **Results and Discussions**

### *Summary of Personal, Social and Economic Characteristics*

Data on the personal, social and economic characteristics are presented in Table 1. Most of the respondents were males. The mean age for leaders was 48 years. Most of them were indigenes of their respective communities and have lived there for many years. The mean lengths of residence were 42 and 30 years for leaders and non-leaders respectively. By virtue of their age and length of years residence, leaders would be expected to have acquired a considerable experience in community affairs such as land matters.

**TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF PERSONAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC  
CHARACTERISTICS OF SELECTED LEADERS AND NON-LEADERS  
IN OYO STATE OF NIGERIA.**

Characteristics		Leaders N = 110 (%)	Non-Leaders N = 170 (%)
Age less than 40		6	31
40 – 59		37	43
60 and above		57	26
Mean (years)		61	48
Length of residence:			
Less than 40 years		37	62
40 years and above		63	38
Mean (years)		42	30
Number of children			
1 – 5		31	62
6 – 10		44	27
11 – 15		10	3
16 and above		5	2
Mean (childrer)		7	5
Income (Naira):			
Less than ₦500		19	27
500 – 999		31	27
1,000 – 1,499		27	25
1,500 – 1,999		6	5
2,000 – 2,499		7	12
2,500 – 2,999		0	1
3,000 and above		10	4
Mean (Naira)		1,214.44	990.60
Community indigene	Yes	93	80
	No	7	20
Literacy	Yes	36	62
	No	64	38
Mean duration of formal schooling (years)		3.1	3.45
Membership of land owning family			
	Yes	98	91
	No	2	9
Possession of personal land			
	Yes	89	71
	No	11	29
Farming as fulltime occupation			
	Yes	66	47
	No	34	53
Living in personal house	Yes	69	38
	No	31	62
Method of acquiring houseland			
	Inheritance	74	74
	Gift	14	8
	Others	12	18
Source of getting houseland as gift:			
	Father	37	67
	Mother	20	17
	Others	43	16
	Male	99	91
Sex	Female	1	9
Marital Status	Married	97	92.4
	Single	1	6
	Others	2	1.6

Most respondents were married and the leaders has a mean of two wives while non-leaders had one. The mean number of children was seven for leaders and five for non-leaders. Illiteracy was widespread among them with the mean years of schooling being 3.12 and 3.54 for leaders and non-leaders, respectively.

Many respondents were members of land-owning families, and possessed personal land. Majority of the leaders were full-time farmers while most of the non-leaders were part-time farmers. Leaders earned higher income than non-leaders, with means of ₦1,214.44 and ₦990.60 respectively. Majority of leaders lived in their personal houses. Majority of non-leaders lived in houses built by other people. This confirms the custom of the Yoruba leaders to own houses and be largely resident in those houses, which could be used as a base to show their mettle in community affairs such as land matters.

Most of the leaders and non-leaders who had houses acquired their houselands through inheritance. Others got theirs as gifts mainly from their parents, and by purchase. This suggests that the common source of house land acquisition in Oyo State was by inheritance. Purchase was rare and gift was often within the family.

#### *Landed Properties of Respondents and their Families*

Data in Table 2 show that the respondents did not claim to have much landed properties by themselves or their families, although leaders and their families appeared to have more land than non-leaders and their families. The means of nearly all categories of landed properties of leaders were more than those of non-leaders, except for uncultivated farmland of respondents which was about equal.

Detailed analysis showed that 56% of leaders and 62% of non-leaders had no uncultivated family farm-land; 20% and 10% respectively had 0.5–2.4 ha; 6% and 10% had 2.5–4.4 ha; 6% and 9% had 4.5–6.4 ha; 12% and 9% had 8.5 ha. and over. Most leaders (74%) and non-leaders (75%) had no uncultivated personal farmland; 4% and 2% respectively claimed less than 0.5 ha of uncultivated personal farmland; 11% and 16% had 0.5–2.4 ha; 11% and 7% had 4.5 ha and over. Fifteen percent of leaders and 35% of non-leaders claimed to have no cultivated farmland; 3% of non-leaders had less than 0.5 ha; 34% of leaders and 40% of non-leaders claimed 0.5–2.4 ha; 34% and 15% respectively claimed 2.5–4.4 ha; 17% and 7% respectively claimed 4.5 ha and over.

Forty percent of leaders and 62% of non-leaders indicated that they has no undeveloped non-farm land; 31% and 22% respectively had less than 0.5 ha; 21% and 16% had 0.5–2.4 ha; 7% of leaders had 2.5 ha

TABLE 2; MEAN HECTARAGE OF LANDED PROPERTIES OF  
RESPONDENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Land Possessed	Leaders	Non-leaders
Uncultivated farmland of family	3.02	2.07
Uncultivated farmland of respondents	0.76	0.81
Cultivated farmland of respondents	2.68	1.21
Undeveloped non-farmland of families	1.99	1.72
Undeveloped non-farmland of respondents	0.92	0.17
Developed non-farmland of respondents	0.45	0.12

and over. Twenty-four percent of leaders and 4.3% of non-leaders claimed that their families had none; 3% of non-leaders claimed less than 0.5 ha; 47% of leaders and 45% of non-leaders claimed 0.5—2.4 ha; 11% and 7% respectively claimed 2.5—4.4 ha, 18% and 2% claimed 4.5 ha and over as areas of undeveloped non-farm land possessed by their families. Thirty-one percent of leaders and 55% of non-leaders claimed that they had no developed non-farm personal land; 65% and 41% respectively claimed less than 0.5 ha; 4% of the respondents claimed 2.5 ha and over of developed non-farm personal land.

The finding that most respondents and their families had no uncultivated farmland was unexpected. It is possible that respondents suspected that if they indicated possession of uncultivated farmland, such land might be taken over by the government in implementing some of the provisions of the Act. A much greater proportion of non-leaders had no cultivated farm land. This is probably because leaders earned higher incomes than non-leaders, and invest a part of their income in establishing and maintaining farms. The percentage of non leaders who had no developed non-farm land was much greater than that of leaders possibly because leaders were richer financially than non-leaders and hence had money to develop their lands.

#### *Knowledge of Some Provisions of the Land Use Act*

Nearly all the respondents (97%), were aware of the Act. Three percent had not heard of it. Most of the leaders (95%) and non-leaders (93%) correctly indicated that the Act vested the final power for land control in the State. The other respondents, except the non-leader who indicated that the power to control land was still vested in the

community, had no idea. The medium of information through which most leaders (76%) and non-leaders (74%) first heard of the Act was the radio; 16% and 19% from neighbours; 2% of leaders mentioned Local Government Officials, newspaper and other media. One percent of non-leaders mentioned the television, while 2% mentioned newspapers. The other respondents were not aware of the Act.

Data in Table 3 summarize the respondents' knowledge of some specific provisions of the Act.

Majority of leaders and non-leaders were ignorant of many provisions of the Act. They did not know that: (i) payment of rent was required for new allocations of land to be used for all purposes; (ii) the State Land Use and Allocation Committee was responsible for urban land allocation; (iii) the maximum area of undeveloped urban house-

TABLE 3: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED LEADERS AND NON-LEADERS IN OYO STATE OF NIGERIA BASED ON KNOWLEDGE OF SOME PROVISIONS OF THE LAND USE ACT

Provision of the Act	Leaders				Non-leaders			
	Yes	No	Idea	No	Yes	No	Idea	No
Payment of rent required for now:								
Agricultural Land	27	60	13	18	63	19		
Industrial land	37	54	9	26	57	17		
Housing plot of land	35	54	11	25	57	18		
Sale of land allowed	2	4	94	0	4	96		
The land allocation body was:								
The State L U A C*	12	25	63	6	39	55		
The L A A C*	63	25	12	55	39	6		1
Maximum undeveloped area of urban houseland allowed was half (½) ha	1	98	1	1	97	2		
Maximum grazing land allocable was 5,000 ha	2	98	0	1	98	1		

\*LUAC = Land Use and Allocation Committee

LAAC = Land Allocation Advisory Committee



land allowed per person at a time was half a hectare; (iv) the maximum area of farmland which could be allocated to a person for farming was 500 hectares; and for grazing, 5,000 hectares. However, majority of them knew that: (i) sale of land was not allowed; (ii) the Land Allocation Advisory Committee was responsible for allocating land in rural areas.

### *Reactions to the Land Use Act*

Data in Table 4 summarize the reactions of the respondents to some provisions of the Act.

Most of the respondents did not apply for a certificate of occupancy. Many leaders expressed their desire to apply for certificate of occupancy on their developed and underdeveloped non-farm land while many non-leaders did not express a similar desire. The reason given by 48% of leaders and 37% of non-leaders was that applying was unnecessary. Fifty-five percent of leaders and 44% of non-leaders did not apply because they did not know that they could apply. Only few leaders (5%) and non-leaders (3%) found the idea of applying

TABLE 4: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF LEADERS AND NON-LEADERS IN OYO STATE OF NIGERIA BASED ON REACTIONS TO SOME PROVISIONS OF THE LAND USE ACT

Reactions	Leaders			Non-leaders		
	Yes	Undecided	No	Yes	Undecided	No
Applied for certificate of occupancy	1	0	99	2	0	97
Willing to apply for certificate of occupancy on:						
Developed non-farm land	68	27	5	43	3	54
Undeveloped non-farm land	60	36	4	38	62	3
Applied for allocation of farm land	1	0	99	1	0	99
Rent payment on allocated land is proper	13	2	85	13	4	83
Compensation desired for acquired land is:						
Another land	89	3	8	68	21	11
Finance	4	3	93	9	21	70

unacceptable; 2% and 1% thought the process of applying was too long; 2% of non-leaders did not know how to apply. The remaining 1% of leaders and 2% of non-leaders applied. As many respondents did not know that they could apply for a certificate of occupancy, the limited effectiveness of the publicity and education machinery of government on the Act was obvious. Similarly, that many non-leaders thought it was unnecessary to apply shows ignorance about the utility of the certificate as commanding recognition by financial institutions when such properties are to be mortgaged.

Virtually all the respondents did not apply for allocation of any form of land. Only one leader and one non-leader applied for farm land. None applied for non-farm land and industrial land. The reasons for not applying for these categories of land might be similar to those for not applying for certificate of occupancy in addition to the fact that the Act guarantees continued use of already occupied farm land. The respondents did not favour the idea of paying rent on land. Most leaders (85%) and non-leaders (83%) did not share the view that rent payment on allocated land is proper. Only 13% thought it was proper; 2% of leaders and 4% of non-leaders were undecided. Those who did not favour payment of rent argued that if the government stopped the practice of paying tribute to land-lords, there was no moral justification for it to obtain rent from land occupants. It must be realized, however, that the minimal rent to be charged by the government is to remind the land occupier that the land does not belong to him.

Most leaders (89%) and non-leaders (68%) desired that another land be allocated to them when the government acquires their land. The leaders (93%) and non-leaders (70%) rejected financial compensation for improvements on land only.

#### *Attitudes Towards the Land Use Act*

Majority of leaders (66%) and non-leaders (60%) had an unfavourable attitude towards the Act. Their mean attitude score ranged from 1.0–2.9 out of a maximum mean score of 5. About one-third (34%) of leaders and 39% of non-leaders had a favourable attitude towards the Act. Their mean scores ranged from 3.2 to 5. Only one non-leader who had a mean score of 3 expressed a neutral attitude towards the Act. These findings suggest that the respondents disliked the Act and is consistent with the Yoruba custom of having a rigid attachment to their land. Further analysis revealed the following as some of their reasons for disliking the Act: (i) it would widen the gap between the rich and the poor because the former would have greater access to land and greater means of developing it than the latter: (ii) the

politicians would change the provisions of the Act to suit themselves; (iii) individuals should be allowed to exercise their land property rights; (iv) the Act eroded the traditional power of leaders on land.

### Personal, Social and Economic Characteristics and Attitudes towards the Act

#### *The Chi-square Analysis*

Results of the chi-square analysis for testing the hypotheses relating some of the variables to attitude can be seen in Table 5.

**TABLE 5: RESULTS OF THE CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS FOR TESTING THE HYPOTHESES RELATING SOME PERSONAL, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS TO ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE LAND USE ACT**

Characteristics	Chi-square Value	Degree of freedom	Chi-square Value	Degree of Freedom
Formal education	5.608**	1	11.3300**	2
Community identification	2.5681	1	3.8800*	1
Occupation	5.1326	1	2.8000	1
Place of origin	1.7974	1	7.0100**	1
Membership of land-owning family	0.8821	1	7.7106**	
Possession of personal land	0.1625	1	5.8942*	1
Method of acquiring personal house land	13.1498**	2	2.7136	2
Borrowing of farm land	6.6098**	1	9.9951**	2
Cultivating annual and/or permanent crops	1.3070	2	2.7651	2
Allowed cultivation of annual and/or permanent crops on borrowed land	1.5600	1	5.9136*	2
Receiving compensation on land	5.0552*	1	4.4281*	1
Knowledge of the primary provision of the Land Use Act	0.2557		2.8463	1
Knowledge of rent provision in the Act for allocated:				
(a) agricultural land	2.2450	1	0.2370	1
(b) industrial land	4.9397*	1	1.9500	1
(c) housing land	3.9436 *	1	2.1193	1

\*Significant at 0.05 level

\*\*Significant at 0.01 level

No significant relationship was found between cultivation of annual and/or permanent crops, knowledge of the primary provision of the Land Use Act, knowledge of the rent provision in the Act for freshly allocated agricultural land, and attitude towards the Act among leaders, and non-leaders.

Regardless of whether they cultivated permanent and/or annual crops, majority of respondents showed favourable attitude towards the Act. The one leader and 67% of non-leaders who cultivated permanent crops only, had an unfavourable attitude; 33% of non-leaders had a favourable attitude. Fifty-nine percent of leaders and 53% of non-leaders who cultivated annual crops only, had an unfavourable attitude; 41% and 47% of leaders and non-leaders respectively had a favourable attitude. Sixty-eight percent of respondents who cultivated both annual and permanent crops had a favourable attitude; 32% had an unfavourable attitude.

Most of the leaders (64%) and non-leaders (59%) who knew the major provision of the Act which vests power for land control in the State, had an unfavourable attitude towards the Act; 36% and 41% respectively had a favourable attitude. Similarly, 83% of the respondents who wrongly identified other bodies such as individuals, families and communities still had unfavourable attitudes; 17% had favourable attitudes. Majority of leaders (67%) and 50% of non-leaders who erroneously indicated that the Act provided payment of rent for freshly allocated agricultural land had unfavourable attitudes; 33% and 50% respectively had favourable attitudes. However, 57% and 56% who correctly indicated that they did not have to pay for allocated agricultural land had a favourable attitude.

A more discernible pattern of relationship appeared among the non-leaders. Majority (54%) of those with formal education had a favourable attitude, while 45% had an unfavourable attitude; 1% was neutral. Most (70%) of those without formal education had an unfavourable attitude; 30% had a favourable attitude. These findings may have been due to the tendency for people without formal education to hold fast to traditions. Formal education did not make a difference among leaders possibly because they themselves were custodians of their community traditions, and some of them may also have benefitted from the traditional land control. Hence, they disfavoured the Act which would wrestle such control from them.

Majority (60%) of leaders and non-leaders (59%) who had borrowed farmland for farming had a favourable attitude towards the Act; 40% and 41% respectively had an unfavourable attitude. On the contrary, 71% and 67% who had not borrowed land for farming had an unfavourable attitude; 29% and 33% respectively had a favourable attitude.

It was reasonable to expect people who borrowed farm land to favour the Act which was likely to confer ownership of such land on them, and in addition, give them the opportunity to acquire fresh farm land through government allocation.

Majority of leaders (55%) and non-leaders (57%) who received compensations for granting land to others for farming did not favour the Act; 45% and 43% respectively favoured it. The former category disfavoured the Act possibly because they saw it as being capable of taking such entitlement from them. The finding that 76% of leaders and 73% of non-leaders who did not get such compensations had an unfavourable attitude was unexpected. Twenty-four percent of leaders and 27% of non-leaders who got no such compensation, favoured the Act. However, further analysis revealed that most (75%) of the leaders who received cash compensation had an unfavourable attitude while 25% had a favourable attitude. Whereas 61% of leaders who got no cash compensation had a favourable attitude, 39% had an unfavourable attitude. the desire of the leaders to maintain the position of obtaining cash compensation for granted land must have contributed to their dislike for the Act. The chi-square value of 3.80, at one degree of freedom was significant at 5% level. There was no relationship between obtaining cash compensation and attitude among non-leaders. The chi-square value of 0.7683 was not significant. The relationship between receiving harvest compensation and the attitude of respondents was also not significant. The practice of receiving cash compensation must have been a greater determinant of attitude among the leaders than that of receiving harvest compensation.

There was a significant relationship between occupation, method of acquiring personal houseland, knowledge of rent provision in the Act for allocated industrial and housing lands, and attitude towards the Act among leaders only. Most leaders (74%) who are farmers had an unfavourable attitude toward the Act while 26% had a favourable attitude. Only 50% of those who are non-farmers had a favourable attitude. Leaders who are farmers did not favour the Act possibly because it threatened to reduce the degree of their control over agricultural land.

Most leaders (73%) who acquired their houseland by gift did not favour the Act. This might be because most of them got the lands from their parents, as stated earlier, and therefore disfavoured any move towards attrition of their right to control such lands within their family circle. Most (78%) of those who acquired their houselands by purchase and lease favoured the Act possibly because of the expectations that it would equalize land access and control among the traditional land-owning and tenant families. Eighty percent of the leaders who

acquired their houselands through inheritance did not favour the Act. They disfavoured it possibly because they prefer to keep the control of the land within their families and offsprings. The common belief that the land-owning families who had passed land from generation to generation were those who were likely to oppose the Act was confirmed by this study in the case of houseland. It is hypothesized that the same attitude exists among owners of farm and industrial lands. Most (68%) of leaders who had the knowledge of the rent provision for allocated industrial land in the Act had an unfavourable attitude towards it. They disfavoured the Act possibly because of their unwillingness to pay rent for allocated industrial land. Most of those who did not have the knowledge of this provision (70%) had a favourable attitude.

Majority (66%) of the leaders who knew the provision of the Act for rent payment on allocated housing land disfavoured the Act. On the other hand, most (67%) of the leaders who were ignorant of this provision favoured the Act. These findings suggest that the leaders, most of whom had traditionally received compensations for granting land to others disfavoured the Act which required that they should pay rent for allocated industrial and housing lands.

There was a significant relationship between community identification, place of origin, membership of land-owning family, possession of personal land, cultivation of annual and/or permanent crops on borrowed land and attitude towards the Act among non-leaders only (Table 5).

Most non-leaders (67%) who expressed much community identification by choosing to stay in their various communities, had an unfavourable attitude towards the Act, understandably because they wanted to retain control over their community lands. The percentage of non-leaders who exhibited little community identification by choosing to leave their respective communities and still had favourable attitude towards the Act was 53%.

Most non-leaders (65%) who were indigenes of their respective communities had an unfavourable attitude towards the Act. Majority of non-indigenes (61%) favoured the Act, while 39% disfavoured it. The indigenes did not like the Act possibly because they had the tradition on land ownership and control to protect while the non-indigenes possibly liked a discontinuance of such traditions. The non-significance of the relationship among the leaders might be because as leaders, they were expected to protect the traditions of their communities such as land matters, whether they were indigenes or not.

Majority (63%) of non-leaders who belonged to land-owning families disfavoured the Act. Consistent with expectation, most (73%)

non-leaders who were not members of land owning families favoured the Act. The members of the land-owning families disfavoured the Act presumably because they have an anxiety that it might erode or completely remove their powers on their family lands, whereas those who were not members of land-owning families favoured it because they considered it as a measure to increase their access to land.

About two-thirds (66%) of non-leaders who had personal land had a favourable attitude towards the Act. Fifty-five percent of those who has no personal land also favoured it. Most non-leaders (79%) who planted both permanent and annual crops on borrowed land favoured the Act. Those who planted permanent crops only, and half of those who planted only annual crops disfavoured the Act. The potential opportunity the Act provided for planting annual and permanent crops on allocated land was important in developing positive attitude towards it among borrowers of land for farming. The few non-leaders who planted permanent crops saw no reason to favour the Act because it would give them no additional benefit in this regard. Those who planted annual crops were evenly distributed among those with the propensity to acquire more land for annual and permanent crop farming, which the Act would facilitate, and that of preserving the *status quo* regarding land ownership and control.

### The Correlation Analysis

The results of the correlation analysis are presented in Table 6. The Pearson's correlation coefficients relating age and length of residence for both leaders and non-leaders were negative and significant. This means that the older the respondents, and the greater their lengths of community residence, the less favourable were their attitudes towards the Act. This was not surprising because as people advance in age and years of community residence, they are expected to imbibe community values, including the preservation of traditional community land control rights, more intensely; and hence, their decreasing tendencies to favour the Act.

**TABLE 6: RESULTS OF THE CORRELATION ANALYSIS FOR TESTING  
THE HYPOTHESIS RELATING SOME PERSONAL AND ECONOMIC  
CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS TO ATTITUDE TOWARDS  
THE LAND USE ACT**

Characteristics	Leaders		Non-Leaders	
	Correlation Coefficient	Level of Significance	Correlation Coefficient	Level of Significance
	r		r	
Age	-0.30	0.001**	-0.13	0.048*
Length of residence	-0.34	0.001**	-0.18	0.011**
Years of schooling	0.20	0.020*	0.15	0.026
Number of wives	-0.15	0.065	-0.15	0.030*
Number of children	-0.12	0.108	-0.17	0.016*
Income	0.17	0.039*	0.10	0.091
Farmland hectareage				
Uncultivated family land	-0.11	0.131	-0.01	0.448
Cultivated family land	-0.02	0.411	-0.03	0.343
Uncultivated personal land	-0.07	0.230	-0.06	0.228
Cultivated personal land	-0.20	0.016*	0.05	0.245
Non-farm land hectareage				
Undeveloped personal land	-0.04	0.345	-0.11	0.068
Developed personal land	-0.22	0.008**	-0.07	0.193

\*Significant at 0.05 level

\*\*Significant at 0.01 level

There was a positive and significant correlation between years of schooling and attitude of the respondents. While having formal education *per se* might not have been a conclusive factor associated with positive attitude towards the Act among the leaders as previously stated, the number of years of formal schooling by the respondents actually made a difference. The finding suggests that increasing years of schooling predisposed the respondents to increasing awareness, understanding and possibly appreciation of the Act provisions; and hence, positive attitude towards the Act.



The correlation coefficients relating number of wives and number of children to attitude were respectively negative and significant for non-leaders, but not for leaders. This might be due to the apprehension that the Act could deny the respondents the right to allocate land to members of their families. When the family members are many, the apprehension and hence the dislike for the act will be deepened. This speculation is, however, difficult to sustain with the results obtained on the leaders.

There was a positive and significant correlation between income and attitude among leaders. The reason might be that regardless of their generally unfavourable attitude towards the Act, the leaders still increasingly appreciated its value, particularly in affording them the potential opportunity to acquire and develop as much land as they wished, as their incomes improved. There was a negative and significant correlation between the hectareage of cultivated personal land of leaders and attitude towards the Act. This might have been due to the widespread ignorance of the provisions of the Act among the respondents, as earlier indicated. Such ignorance might have generated fear among the leaders who therefore disfavoured the Act which might reduce their control over their land. This disfavour naturally increased with increasing hectareage of their cultivated land. Contrary to expectation, the correlation coefficient was positive but not significant among non-leaders.

The correlation coefficient between hectareage of developed personal non-farm land of leaders and their attitude towards the Act, was negative and significant. The reason for this might be similar to that given for the significant relationship between hectareage of cultivated personal farmland and attitude.

The correlation coefficients between hectareage of uncultivated family farmland, cultivated family farmland, uncultivated personal land, undeveloped personal non-farm land, and attitude were negative and non-significant among the respondents. These showed that although the respondents tended to increase their disfavour of the Act with increasing areas of these various types of farmland and non-farm-land possessed, such a position could not be categorically taken.

In the above analysis where a significant relationship was reported between a variable and attitude for leaders but not for non-leaders, similar but non-significant trend was found for the latter, and vice versa.

## Conclusions

The leaders were generally older with more years of community residence than non-leaders. Both groups were married with many children. Both groups were mainly indigenes of their respective communities, and therefore claimed to be members of land-owning families and had their own personal lands. Most leaders were full-time farmers, unlike the non-leaders, who were mainly part-time farmers. The leaders earned higher incomes than the non-leaders and had higher incidence of living in personal houses than the non-leaders. The land for building the houses were acquired mainly through inheritance or gift from parents.

The respondents or their families had small hecтарages of land, although the leaders and their families appeared to have more land than their non-leader counterparts. A policy of concentrating on allocation of small land of one individual to another should be discouraged initially in favour of allocating community lands, particularly to the community indigenes so as to minimize local resentment and promote the Act implementation.

While most of the respondents were aware of the Land Use Act and its primary provision of vesting the power to control land in the State, they were grossly ignorant of many of its specific provisions such as the role of the State Land Use and Allocation Committee, and half a hectare area of undeveloped urban land allowed per person at a time. They, however, knew that sale of land was prohibited by the Act, and that the Land Allocation Advisory Committee in each Local Government Area was responsible for land allocation in the respective area. The widespread ignorance uncovered suggests the need to establish a public enlightenment unit in the Ministry of Lands of the State to be charged with the responsibility of educating the public on the provision of the Act and measures being taken by the Government to implement them.

Respondents did not utilize some of the beneficial provisions of the Act. They did not apply for certificate of occupancy on their existing lands or allocation of fresh land. While many leaders were willing to apply for certificate of occupancy, the non-leaders did not express this desire. The public enlightenment unit earlier suggested should therefore pay a particular attention to non-leaders.

Most respondents considered payment of rent on allocated land as improper, therefore rent should be very small if the low income people in particular, are not to be discouraged from applying for land allocation. As most respondents rejected monetary compensations for improvement on acquired land only, and opted for allocation of another

land as well, a policy of paying compensation for improvements on land should be supplemented with allocation of alternative lands to people who had been dispossessed and had applied for allocation of alternative lands.

Most people did not favour the Act because of various reasons such as its resultant effect of exacerbating the land grabbing propensities of the rich to the disadvantage of the poor, politicising of land allocation and erosion of local leaders' power on land. These fears could be removed through the public enlightenment programme suggested which should increase their understanding of the Act and hence induce a favourable change in attitude. Detailed studies of the implementation problems of the Act at all levels of its administration should be carried out. Some of the areas to be examined should include: (i) organizational set-up for the Act implementation, such as, the need to establish a village Land Allocation Advisory Committee to advise the Local Government Level Land Allocation Advisory Committee; (ii) propriety and amount of rent chargeable on land which will not induce local resentment; (iii) surveying and settlement planning problems, their financial and technical implications (iv) problems of completing various applications; (v) problems of compensations on land. Findings of these studies should be applied to induce positive attitude towards the Act.

The respondents who more frequently showed unfavourable attitudes towards the Act than their counterparts included those without formal education, full-time farmer leaders, non-leaders with much community identification, non-leader community indigenes, non-leader members of land-owning families and those with personal land. Others were respondents who had never borrowed farmland, non-leaders who planted both annual and permanent crops on borrowed land, and respondents who received compensations on land lent to others. The leaders who disfavoured the Act included those who acquired their personal houselands by inheritance and those who knew that the Act provided rent payment on allocated industrial and housing lands. These categories of people need special attention in the public enlightenment programme suggested.

The degree of favourable attitude of respondents towards the Act decreased with age and length of community residence. The older people with many years of community residence therefore also need a special attention in the aforementioned public enlightenment programme. Residents with good formal education who are well informed about the Act could assist as trained volunteers in such a programme because the degree of favourable attitude of such respondents increased with years of formal schooling.

The degree of favourable attitude of leaders decreased with hectares of personal farmland cultivated and non-farmland developed. For non-leaders, it decreased with number of wives and children. Leaders with developed landed properties and non-leaders with large families should therefore receive special focus on the public enlightenment programme. As the degree of favourable attitude among leaders increased with income, rich leaders could be used as some of the legitimizers of the recommended public enlightenment programme. However, they must have high credibility in the community so that they would not be perceived as working for their own selfish ends of cooperating with the government to get community and other people's land which they could turn around to acquire for investing their relatively high income upon. The recommended series of public enlightenment campaigns should be capable of influencing the people's attitude favourably and hence assist government in making public land available for agricultural and other development purposes.

## References

- Fabiyi, Y. L. 1979. Land Tenure Reform in Nigeria: Implications of the Land Use Decree for Agricultural Development. *Ife J. Agric.*, 1(2): 235–257.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria Official Gazette, Extra-Ordinary 65, 14. Decree No 6 – Land Use Decree 1978. Federal Government Printers, Lagos.
- Mellor, J. W. 1966. *The Economics of Agricultural Development*. Feffer and Simons Inc. New York, 403 pp.
- Ogun State of Nigeria Gazette No. 27, Vol. 3, 1978, pp B13–B48.
- Williams, Fredrick 1968. *Reasoning with Statistics. Simplified Examples in Communications Research* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. New York.