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SUMMARY
This paper presents the perception of claimants to land acquisition and variation in compensation paid for compulsory land acquisition exercise in some selected city in Ondo State in year 2012. This is a survey research which adopts a questionnaire design to elicit data from the claimants of the compensation paid during the period. Claimants’ perception on compensation paid for compulsory land acquisition was measured on a 5 point Linker scale. Data were analysed using paired sample t-test and relative satisfaction index. The research revealed a wide disparity between the mean of compensation paid and market value of the acquired property, while the relative satisfaction index of claimants towards compensation paid were below acceptable satisfaction level. The study then recommended among others that, in order to have a peaceable society devoid of conflict and chaos, adequate valuation methods and payments of adequate compensation that will not make claimants worse off than they were, are essential.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The importance of land in realising the basic necessity of life is indispensable (Salil, 2009). It is therefore not difficult to understand why there are high demands for land; owners having different perspective to land and thus portray different attitudinal behaviour and reactions especially in compulsory land acquisition and compensation made by government (Silvery, 2006 and Larbi, 2008). In Nigeria, Compulsory Acquisition is a statutory practice under the Land Use Act of 1990 available to the government to acquire land (Sections 28 (1); 2 (a), (b), (c); 3(a), (b), (c), (d) and (4)) as government cannot rely on land markets alone when and where land is needed to provide major infrastructure facilities for the general public and to promote sustainable development (Moses and Sophia 2008; Food and Agricultural Organization 2009 and Pashoulis 2010). Property owners are thus denied their property rights for overriding public benefit and are usually compensated.

However, when there is difference between the amount required by the claimants and the value to be offered as compensation. They often exhibit negative and uncoordinated responses as they would not be able to realize the full economic benefits from the property; in that they know the worth of property in their environ coupled with the fact that their removal from their businesses and homes makes the trauma of physical dispossession their most indelible memory of the process (Ghatak, and Mookherjee 2011; German, Schoneveld, and Mwangi, 2011).

Though, there may be some bias and imprecision in owners’ own beliefs concerning what their land would have commanded due to sociological consideration, financial security, complementarity with farming skills, or locational preferences. Land owners in an urban area may have reservation prices for property that may exceed its market value and probably display negative attitude towards land acquisition and compensation than that of property-owners in rural area where property value may not be expensive and not very much sociological importance is attached to property (Asian Development Bank 2007).

Also, this situation could result in unplanned and unwelcome negative attitudes by the affected property owners and consequent grievances generating conflicts between government and landowners. These could possibly escalate and assume biased dimensions that may further undermine the socio-economic sustainability, particularly of the poor, as well as constituting a threat to peace and stability; and in the long run have several negative impacts on land management system such as forfeiture of public confidence in the state machinery for the management of land (Moses and Sophia 2008).

It is noteworthy that among other problems of variation in compensation for compulsory acquisition and the value of the acquired property in the open market is the fact that the mechanisms that governments and institutions use in arriving at valuation methods, rates and parameters under which compensation are paid, raises a number of concerns Nuhu (2008).
One of which is the appropriateness of those mechanisms used in addressing the adverse socio-economic impact of large scale compulsory land acquisition project (Usha and Sridhar 2009). These issues are prevalent in Nigeria as in other developing countries. Unimpressive valuation practice in compulsory land acquisition according to Onugu, Schopp, Czebiniak and Otegbulu (2003) often results in conflict and civil strife in Nigeria.

In view of the current challenges of variation in compensation for compulsory acquisition and the value of the acquired property in the open market, there is the need to carry a study that focus on the overall perceptions of the affected property owners. The study, will for that reason evaluate the level of claimants satisfaction towards compensation paid and determine the level of variability in compensation paid and the worth of the acquired properties in the open market. Apart from this introduction, the paper is divided into six parts in order to achieve the stated objectives. Further sections in this paper include; literature review, study area/scope of the study, research methodology, discussion of results, conclusion and recommendation.

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

Inadequate compensation level is the main reason causing social conflicts in government land acquisitions, and it is the main challenge in land acquisition projects. Studies have shown that the living standards of affected property owners have been degraded after land acquisition. In order to ensure land acquisition is done legally, an adequate compensation must be made to the affected landowners. According to Kotaka (2002), adequate compensation must fulfil three conditions namely: payment of all the losses incurred as agreed during a harmonized negotiation (or hearing) in an arm’s length sale transaction; consideration of the physical factors as well as non-sentimental value during payment; the date of valuation should be based on the date of first proposal to acquire the land and not when it was being actually acquired. According to Ghatak, Mitra, Mookherjee and Nath (2012) an adequate compensation would be the reservation price for the owner, that is, the price at which the owner would be indifferent between releasing and not releasing the expropriated property.

Hence, payment of adequate compensation is the most vital stage throughout land acquisition process whereby the affected land owners are paid for all loss and damages they face due to the acquisition. The compensation requirement under the law demands that the acquisition authority reimburses the affected land owners for the property interest acquired and place them in a good financial position as if the property had not been taken (Ambaye, 2009). An adequate compensation in land acquisition is always being referred to as the open market value of the land taken simultaneously with its consequences including severance, injurious affection and disturbances. It is constantly been referred to as the value of property to affected property-owners (Omar and Ismail, 2009). On the other hand, the manner by which the governments in many developing countries like Nigeria exercise the rights of compulsory acquisition undermines tenure security because often, little or no compensation is paid, which afterwards have negative impacts on fairness and transparency (Kortey 2003 and Larbi, 2008).
Therefore, the fundamental subject matter in the compensation provisions of the land acquisition statutes is to ensure that a dispossessed property-owner is no worse off and no better off as a result of his eviction (Brown, 1991). Nuhu (2007) pointed out that claimants whose interest are revoked are always at the losing end and usually left in a situation far worse than they were before the revocation; thus, defeating the aim of compensation. The rationale behind compensation payment is justified on socio-political, as well as economic theories as it is a means to keep the stability of social justice. It protects the privileges of the politically under-represented groups, requiring the government to accept the inconveniences resulting from land acquisition (Ndjovu, 2003).

Nuhu (2006) further affirmed that when land is compulsorily acquired for a just motive there should be prompt and adequate payment of compensation that will better the lots of the concerned parties in question in order to enhance their livelihood and contributions to the economic and social activities of the society. Kakulu, (2007) consequently identifies lack of transparency; lack of professional standards; bad governance and an underlying fabric of corruption as being accountable for inadequate compensation assessment and payment. In United States, United Kingdom, and most Commonwealth countries, there exists a standard that is aimed at financially reimbursing a dispossessed person adequately known as fair compensation. In the United States, the market value of the subject property is generally held as fair compensation for the dispossessed landowners (Eaton 1995).

Adequate compensation is thus a fair payment by the Government for property it has acquired under land acquisition and compensation so that the owner is not worse-off after the acquisition. It is also described as due compensation or land damages. While reasonable market value is regarded as the price that a seller is willing to accept and a buyer is willing to pay on the open market and in an arm’s-length transaction; the point at which supply and demand intersect (Garner, 1999). The sum payable may represent a sum not only for the property acquired, but also other losses suffered in consequence of the acquisition. The fundamental principle is to place the affected property-owners in the same position, after the acquisition as they were before (Brown, 1991; Teo and Khaw, 1995; Usilappan, 1997). Compensation payment should for that reason equitable to the price at which the owner would willingly have parted with the right expropriated (Trefzger 1995). In contrast, compensation is based on the yardstick of value to the owner in the United Kingdom. The value to the owner compensation principle comprises of market value together with other losses suffered by the claimant (Denyer-Green 1994).

In furtherance to the above, Morris and Pandey (2007) posited that market values are higher than the value used to compensate the affected party when compensation is paid. Compensation in financial form or as replacement land or structures is at the heart of compulsory acquisition. As a direct result of government action, people lose their homes, their land, and at times their means of livelihood. Compensation is to repay them for these losses, and should be based on principles of fairness and equivalence. Though, there are no strict rules requiring the owner to secure a similar property from the compensation awarded (Viitanen, Falkenbach and Nuuja 2010). The principle of equivalence is crucial to determining compensation; affected claimants and occupants should neither be enriched nor
impoverished as a result of the compulsory acquisition. Financial compensation on the basis of equivalence of only the loss of property rarely achieves the aim of putting those affected in the same position as they were before the acquisition; since the money paid cannot fully replace what is lost (Debnath 2008). In line with the shortcoming pointed out in Debnath (2008) above, Viitanen and Kakulu (2008) butressed that in some countries there is legal provision recognizing it in the form of additional compensation to reflect the compulsory nature of the acquisition. Although, in practice given that the aim of the acquisition is to support development, there are strong arguments for compensation to improve the position of those affected wherever possible. For instance, Section 44 (1) of the Federal Republic of Nigerian 1999 Constitution states that, no movable property or any interest in an immovable property shall be taken possession of compulsorily and no right over or interest in any such property shall be acquired compulsorily in any part of Nigeria except in the manner and for the purposes prescribed by law that, among other things: (a) Requires the prompt payment of compensation thereof; and (b) Gives to any person claiming such compensation a right of access to the determination of his interest in the property and the amount of compensation to a Court of law or tribunal or body having jurisdiction in that part of Nigeria. According to Ndjovu (2003) the indemnity principle is predominant in most western countries; the theory assumes that a dispossessed titleholder would go out into the market and purchases with his compensation money a property more or less similar to that which had been acquired. However, in USA and in France compensation indicates what the owner has lost; to compensate for the taking and not to directly pay the cost of equivalent reinstatement (Eaton, 1995).

Compensation determination requires sufficient valuation skills and the use of appropriate techniques to yield fair and adequate amount payable (Wilfred and Anim 2011). The practice of valuation for compulsory acquisition of landed property is governed by legislative statutes that vary from one country to another. The assessment of compensation which is described as statutory valuation is usually influenced by local and national statutes, enactments or laws that provide the basis upon which existing professional standards and methods may be applied. This process introduces some difficulty into the practice of valuation for compensation that is not usually associated with other forms of valuation (Viitanen and Kakulu 2008). Proper valuation process is the most important step for the claimant, which Ndjovu (2003) pointed out as the way to reach adequate compensation. However, the process of valuation for compensation in compulsory acquisition of land takes place within distinct legal, cultural, socio-economic, political and historical environments which influence the delivery of the practice by key actors in it (Kakulu, Byrne and Viitanen 2009). Compensation valuation is statutory and claims must therefore meet the statutory requirements if they are to succeed. Therefore, legal provision guiding its practice and the accuracy of its interpretation is essential to a valuation ensuing in adequate compensation (Hayward 2008).

Kakulu, (2007) asserts that valuation for compensation is not only expected to satisfy professional standards of valuation but in addition, constitutional provisions and international requirements for just, fair, adequate and equitable value must be met. This is often far from reality; which was why Nuhu (2007) attributes the controversies connected with
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Compensation in Nigeria perspective to the provisions of statutory methods of valuation contained in the Land use Act (LUA). Compensation for compulsory land acquisition under the LUA is calculated on the unexhausted improvement on land, based on depreciated replacement cost plus rent, if any, paid by the occupier in the year of revocation of the right of occupancy as provided in section 29 (4) (a) of the (LUA). This contradicts the basis of open market valuation and provides for a basis of valuation which Omuojine (1999) and Adisa (2000) established as inadequate.

Further details was given by Nuhu, (2008) that the LUA opposes the basis of open market valuation for assessment of compensation payable to the claimant and embraces dictated valuation. It forms the basis for assessment of compensation for compulsory land acquisition otherwise refers to as head of claims (LUA, Section 29 (4)). The replacement cost method of valuation is based on a faulty assumption that cost is related to value. This explains why the method is rightfully used for valuing properties of a unique nature, which are rarely sold. Some properties compulsorily acquired are income - yielding properties which might best be valued using the investment or income method of valuation. Hence, the prescription of the replacement cost method of valuation for the consideration of compensation for all kinds of properties compulsorily acquired remains contentious.

3.0 SCOPE / STUDY AREA

The main focus of this study was to describe the level of satisfaction of claimants’ to variation in compensation paid during compulsory land acquisition exercise embarked upon by the State Government in some selected areas across the three senatorial districts of Ondo north, central and south respectively between 2010 and 2012. The exercise is one of the current forms of urban renewal, developmental projects and modernization of infrastructures within three major cities namely Akure, Owo, and Ondo in the State. However, for manageability, thorough analysis and the available data, the study is restricted to the selected Ondo State occupies an area of approximately 15,317km2, which represents only 1.66 percent of Nigeria’s land mass. It is located in the South Western part of Nigeria and lies within latitudes 5°45' and 8° 15' North and longitudes 4°45' and 6° East. The total population of Ondo State in 1991 was 2,249,548 (NPC, 1991) and later sprang up to 3,441,024 in 2006 (NPC, 2006). The trend of urbanization in Ondo State is on the increase as more people are moving to urban areas. This has led to many urban problems which often occasion great demand for land for the provision of infrastructure and services within the increasingly areas. In order to secure more developable land to accommodate these demands, government has implemented various measures including compulsory land acquisition exercise.

4.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a quantitative survey method for data collection. To achieve the objectives, the research explores the attitudes of claimants’ on issues of claimant’s satisfaction towards compensation paid and disparity in compensation for compulsory land acquisition in the study areas, through a questionnaire survey. The targeted respondents are
the affected claimants’ in five land acquisition projects located in Akure, Auga, Ikota, Igbokoda, Ondo and Owo between 2010 and 2012. Sample sizes of 976 claimants were adopted from these cities through simple random sampling technique. Claimants’ view of compensation paid for compulsory land acquisition was measured on a 5 point Likert scale. Data were analysed using paired sample t-test and relative satisfaction index. Paired t-test is used to compare two population means where there are different samples in which observations in one sample can be paired with observations in the other sample (Ruth 2004). For the purpose of this study relative satisfaction index is represented as follows:

\[ RSI = \frac{(5n_5+4n_4+3n_3+2n_2+n_1)}{5N} \]

Where: 
- \( n_5 \) = number of respondents who answered very satisfied (VS) 
- \( n_4 \) = number of respondents who answered satisfied (S) 
- \( n_3 \) = number of respondents who answered undecided (U) 
- \( n_2 \) = number of respondents who answered not satisfied (NS) 
- \( n_1 \) = number of respondents who answered very dissatisfied (VD) 
- \( N \) = Total number of respondents

5.0 PRESENTATION OF DATA

Table 1: Background Information of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency (N)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 20years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40years</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50years</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50years</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below SSCE</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSCE</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE/ND</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deg/HND</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mas/PhD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Job</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Table 1 shows the background information gathered on claimants’. Majority (90.3%) of the respondents are married. This may have implication on their overall livelihood when their properties are acquired. The age distribution of majority (34.1%) of respondents’ ranged from 41 to 50 years, 32.3% falling between 31 and 40 years, 28.4% are more than 50 years old, while the remaining 5.1% of the respondents are between the age of 20 and 30 years. It is also observed that 41.4% of the affected landowners had NCE/ND, while 27.7% have SSCE, 22.5% had Deg/HND, 5.8% have below SSCE and 2.6% had Mas/PhD. This shows that an average claimants’ is educated. 27.9% of the respondents are into business, 17.7% are civil servants and the remaining 25.2% are farmers.

Table 2: Paired Samples of the Mean of Property Market Value and Compensation Paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig. (2tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Paid</td>
<td>1,505,761.2554</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,233,585.34911</td>
<td>-11.092</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth of Property</td>
<td>1,771,914.2451</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,450,840.38601</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266,152.98976</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>217,284.37954</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, 2012

From Table 2, Paired samples t-test indicates a wide disparity between the mean of compensation paid and market value of the acquired property. The analysis further indicates that the t-value is -11.097 signifying a statistically significant difference between the means of the 2 variables value at 99.0% confidence level. Since the resulting P-value of .000 is less than 0.01, it implies that there is a significant difference between compensation paid and the market value of the acquired property.

Table 3: Relative Satisfaction Index of Claimants towards Compensation Paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Factors/Variables</th>
<th>VD(1)</th>
<th>D(2)</th>
<th>U(3)</th>
<th>S(4)</th>
<th>VS(5)</th>
<th>RSI</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The approach of the acquiring authorities to claimants on compensation matter</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Response of land officers when clarifications and questions were raised</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The time taken for the payment to be effected</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The idea of appointing agents by</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Attitudes of Claimants’ to Variation in Compensation for Compulsory Land Acquisition in Ondo State, Nigeria, (6820) Adejoke Oladapo (Nigeria)

FIG Congress 2014
Engaging the Challenges – Enhancing the Relevance
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia 16-21 June 2014

As tabulated in Table 3, compensation paid compared with worth of property ranked the highest among the main factors highlighted to be determinants of claimants satisfaction towards compensation paid on land acquisition. This was evident from its relative satisfaction index of 0.47. Response of land officers when clarifications and questions were raised came next with a relative satisfaction index of 0.44. From the Table, all the factors highlighted scored a relative satisfaction index below 4.0, meaning that the responses from claimants tend towards dissatisfaction.

### 6.0 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

In completing the study, several land acquisition projects was chosen for investigation. Questionnaires were administered to 976 claimants in the five study areas to extract necessary information for the study. 703 (72.03%) responded and analysis was carried out using both descriptive and inferential statistics. The respondents were asked to score their answers based on 5 point Likert scale.

Table 1 shows the background information gathered on claimants’. (90.3%) of the respondents are married. This may have implication on their overall livelihood when their properties are acquired. The age distribution of majority revealed that they are middle-aged and economically active. Thus their ability to go about their daily activities in order to earn income with which they cater for their family basic needs may be interrupted by compulsory land acquisition. Analysis on educations indicates that an average claimants’ is educated while the types of jobs reveals respondents cover people from different segments of the society. The overall implication is that considerable numbers of the respondents are literate; ability to supply accurate information that is required for this study was therefore not in doubt.

From Table 2, a wide-range discrepancy between compensation paid and market value of the acquired property in the study area is apparent. The results from paired-samples t-test set at alpha level of 0.01 reveals a t-value of -11.097 suggest a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of compensation paid and the market value of the acquired property at 99.0% confidence level. Since the P-value of the T-test is less than 0.01, there is a statistically difference between compensation paid and the market value of the acquired properties. The study therefore corroborates Otegbulu (2009) that there is the degree of deviation between values arrived at under existing practice and the value arrived based on total economic value. The implication of the wide disparity observed in this study is negative attitudinal responses such as protest and varying grievances from claimants. Kakulu (2008) opines that communities are dissatisfied with the quantum of compensation paid to them resorting to violence and litigation. On the other hand, Rowan-Robinson (1995) observed that
if compensation is generous and adequate, property owners will welcome compulsory acquisition.

The respondents (claimants) were given opportunity to rank their satisfaction level on compensation paid as presented in Table 3. Relative satisfaction index (RSI) analysis was carried out using certain factors that were considered determinants of claimant’s satisfaction towards compensation for land acquisition. Relative Satisfaction Indexes of below 4.0 was revealed, denoting that claimants’ responses tend towards dissatisfaction. It should be noted that compensation paid compared with worth of property appears to be the main factor as evidence from its relative satisfaction index of 0.47. This is thus in consonance with the findings of Alias and Daud (2006); Omar and Ismail (2009); Nuhu (2009) that the major challenge faced in land acquisition is the quantum of compensation perceived by respondents as inadequate to fulfil adequate compensation perception under relevant laws.

7.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is evident from this study that discrepancy between compensation paid by the acquiring authority and the actual worth of claimants’ property in the open market is a sensitive issue requiring utmost attention. Data analysis reveals wide gap between compensation paid and the worth of the acquired property resulting to a widespread dissatisfaction with compensation paid by claimants’. The implication of this is varying forms of negative attitudes that could bridge the peace of the land. Therefore adequate valuation methods and payments of adequate compensation that will not make claimants worse off than they were, are crucial aspects in acquisition exercise that require comprehensive guidelines that will improve the whole process.

The following recommendations are made based on the findings:
1. Differences in compensation amount and the property value of the acquired property in the open market should be kept to the minimum.
2. Valuers should make judgment on compensation value based on current market conditions. This will meet the expectations of the claimants and ensure hitch free acquisition process and enhance smooth running of planned development.
3. Estate Surveyors and Valuers should improve their skills.
4. Valuers should be allowed to use the applicable methods rather than the sticking to a particular method of valuation as provided in the Land Use Act.
5. The acquiring agency should take steps to ensure that claimants receive full payment of the compensation.
6. Affected landowners should be involved in planning and implementation of acquisition project and should be given help to understand every aspect of the process.
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