# Untangling the Urban Land Administration Problems in South-West Nigeria: Challenges and Solutions

**Akintomide Joseph Akinlabi**

Estate Management and Valuation Department. Rufus Giwa Polytechnic, Owo, Nigeria

**Prof. Fidelis Ifeanyi Emoh**

Estate Management Department, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria

**Abstract:** *This study examines the complexities of land management in urban South-West Nigeria, emphasizing its critical role in achieving sustainable urban development. Despite notable progress, the sector faces significant challenges stemming from the interplay of statutory and customary laws, institutional shortcomings, and rapid urbanization. The research encompasses six state capitals (Ibadan, Osogbo, Akure, Abeokuta, Ikeja, and Ado) drawing on survey data from 713 professionals in estate surveying, land surveying, and town planning. Utilizing the severity index and the Kruskal-Wallis H test, the study identifies several high-severity issues, including inadequate record keeping, a shortage of qualified personnel, and cumbersome administrative procedures. While the severity of these challenges varies regionally, corruption and personnel shortages emerge as particularly pressing concerns. The findings indicate that inefficiencies in land registries, low remuneration for staff, and a disconnect between formal and informal land governance structures are fundamental barriers to effective land administration. The Jonckheere-Terpstra test further corroborates the universality of these issues. To address these challenges, the study advocates for comprehensive multisectoral reforms aimed at enhancing the capacity of urban land management systems. It underscores the importance of collaboration among government entities, traditional leaders, and local communities to harmonize conflicting interests. Ultimately, the research calls for policy reform that aligns with the socio-economic and cultural contexts of urban systems, promoting integration and coherence as vital strategies for sustainable urban policy reform in South-West Nigeria.*

**Keywords:** customary and statutory land tenure, institutional capacity in land administration, land use conflicts, sustainable urban development, urban land governance

## INTRODUCTION

Land administration for urban development is one of the key ingredients for the effective development of integrated cities, especially in those regions that experience high levels of urbanization, as in the case of South West Nigeria. States such as Lagos, Oyo, Ogun, Ondo, Osun, and Ekiti make up this sub-region, which is characterized by an increase in rural-urban

land use dynamics, economic activities, and land use pressures. It must be understood that the population growth has been increasing at exponential rates in the region with increasing rates of urbanization, and with the regional economies expanding, the demand for land has been triggering what can be termed as complicated land issues in managing urban land. Overcoming these problems is crucial not only for urban and economic development but also for affordable land access, environmental and social equity, and land use.

Various statutes, usage practices, and modern land use policies govern the control of land in South West Nigeria. However one of the most important statutes that regulate the management of land in Nigeria is the Land Use Act of 1978. The act centralizes ownership of land in the state, with governors serving as the people's statutory trustees. Contrary to its intended goal of resolving land allocation problems and addressing equity issues, the Act has introduced additional challenges. These include the slow and cumbersome process of land titling, insecurity about tenure, and the confusing parallel between the formal and informal customary systems. According to Adeniyi (2011), there exists a loophole in land management due to poor institutional capacity, corruption, and a low level of technology enhancement. The statutory and customary systems have come into conflict at this point of convergence, resulting in the poor and inefficient administration of urban land in the South-West Nigerian State. Indigenous laws, which emphasize customary tenure in conflict with statutory tenure, give rise to disputes over ownership or access. The conflict between these systems obscures the land issue, making it difficult for developers, investors, and residents to comprehend. Weak cadastral systems, overlapping claims, and inadequate and/or ineffective conflict resolution mechanisms exacerbate this issue, leading to frequent land conflicts in the urban setting (Ekebuike, Ono, & Anyadiegwu, 2023).

Another issue is the ineffectiveness of urban land governance institutions. Key players in land registration and titling, as well as other land management functions, show limitations or constraints in their ability to meet the growing needs. Lack of timely updates of the manual systems and lack of adequate digital support for the systems affect the transparency and effectiveness of the administration of land in many developing countries. For instance, delays in issuing the Certificate of Occupancy (C of O), a legal requirement for land possession, impede economic activities and investment in the region (Makupa & Sanga, 2021). These institutional factors often lead to corruption and bureaucratic procedures, which erode the public's confidence in the land administration. In addition, urbanization has exerted tremendous pressure on physical land resources, resulting in environmental challenges such as land degradation, squatter lives, and unplanned land utilization. Urbanization on an uncontrolled scale contributes to the destruction of agricultural land and natural landscapes, thereby causing problems connected with environmental deterioration, floods, forest loss, and species loss. Squatter communities that accommodate a large percentage of urban dwellers are particularly complex in terms of servicing, rights to land, and their inclusion within the formal land management systems (Fabiyi, 2019). To resolve these concerns, there is a need for an appreciation of the social, economic, and cultural factors that shape the utilization of land in the urban South-West, of Nigeria.

This paper seeks to untangle the problem of urban land administration in South-West Nigeria by examining its challenges and proposing pragmatic solutions. The study examines how to

address these challenges to promote sustainable urban development, drawing on legislative frameworks, institutional dynamics, and case studies from the study area. The analysis is grounded in a multidisciplinary approach, integrating legal, economic, and social perspectives to provide a comprehensive understanding of the issues at hand. By highlighting the interplay between statutory and customary land tenure systems, inefficiencies in governance, and the environmental impacts of urbanization, this paper offers insights into how stakeholders can harmonize competing interests and priorities. Furthermore, it underscores the importance of leveraging technology, strengthening institutions, and fostering community participation in reforming urban land administration.

Against this background, the complexities of urban land administration in South-West Nigeria are multidimensional, shaped by historical legacies, contemporary challenges, and the evolving needs of urban centres. Addressing these issues requires innovative and context-specific solutions that balance economic growth with social equity and environmental sustainability. This article provides a roadmap for achieving these goals, emphasizing the need for collaborative efforts among government agencies, traditional authorities, private sector actors, and local communities to create a more efficient, equitable, and sustainable land administration system.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Effective land administration systems are challenging as they require financial resources and trained personnel which are often in short supply in most African countries. Informal land delivery activities and formal systems are often disconnected, and reconciling the two in a manner that serves land users denotes inadequate land administration arrangement. For instance, without effective land registries that can provide a record of title documents for the informal delivery system, land parcels can be allocated to multiple people. The resultant effect of this is conflict and insecure tenure. Disputes can further escalate into civil unrest and can turn violent where effective conflict resolution mechanisms are absent. Also, without effective land-use planning, land will not be put to its most efficient uses (Focus on Land in Africa, 2019).

Many African countries have taken drastic steps to manage informal land delivery systems. This includes the annihilation efforts to the recognition of informal land delivery and its integration. Such drastic steps include radical implementation of reform measures. For instance, in the Agrarian and Land Reorganization of 1984 in Burkina Faso, the Land Use Decree of 1978 in Nigeria and the Land Reform Decree of 1975 in Uganda. Similarly, Ivory Coast, Cameroon, Senegal, Guinea, Togo, Kenya and Tanzania, have tried to overlook the informal land delivery system in their land management. Nevertheless, an informal land delivery system is considered for compensation or when defining the boundaries and layout of land subdivision projects, but without conferring formal recognition on customary owners (Durand-Lasserve and Valérie, 1996).

Babalola, Hull and Whittal (2024) acknowledged that since the informal land delivery system is not part of the official land administration system, it becomes difficult to get information that may be useful in proper urban development planning which is an important thematic area of

land administration. Lamba (2005) pointed out that there is no coordinating mechanism to regulate actors in the informal land delivery system and that attempts to regularize the informality in the land delivery channel had yielded little or no success. Jenkins, Gateri and Nawangwe (2009), observed that the informal land delivery system has no records in the lands office, yet it exists as a vibrant land delivery channel. This is a very serious problem to the urban land administration, particularly in the twenty-first century where land information system is often required globally. Also, transactions in informal land markets are often not controlled and registered by the appropriate authorities. The implication of this is development without necessary permits as well as the provision of infrastructure that may be below expected standards (Oloyede, Osmond and Ayedun, 2019). This poses a serious problem for urban land administration.

Additionally, the fundamental problems in land administration in Nigeria are the widespread different systems among the States even when the same law is applicable. Though a system that encourages the recording of rights to land with a precise title deed plan has been embraced, the necessary infrastructure is yet to be put in place. The situation in Nigeria today is that there are many different land administration systems as there are States in Nigeria. This implies that there are thirty-six independent land administration offices. The resultant effect of the present situation is that a well-articulated land administrative system to ensure consistent and coordinated land management approaches is lacking in the Nigerian context (Ukaejiofo, 2008). According to Agyei (2010), land administration offers a policy for improving the basis of the land delivery system and re-orientating institutional structures to be client-focused and service delivery among other things. The precise objectives include; harmonization of land policies and the legislative framework with customary law for sustainable land administration, institutional reform and capacity building for comprehensive improvement in the land administration system, establishment of an efficient, fair and transparent system of land titling, registration, land use planning and valuation and issuance and register of land titles. However, it is surprising that this has been difficult to achieve in some of the developing countries including Nigeria over the past years.

Babawuro (2010) avowed that land administration in Nigeria is faced with poor remuneration, poor conditions of service, and inadequate logistics; lack of transparency in work processes, delays, and cumbersome manual procedures; poor records management; perceived corruption; mistrust in the part of customary land owners in land administration generally; lack of technical expertise in new technology available; and lack of effective collaboration and cooperation between the agencies. On the other hand, a study on the existing urban land delivery system for housing in Jinka town municipality of Ethiopia observed bureaucratic tendencies, inadequate amount of serviced land, shortage of workforce, and inadequate and distorted urban land information system as factors affecting management of the land delivery system (Grita and Tiwari, 2017). The study of Grita and Tiwari, (2017), apart from its difference in geographical location and cultural background from Nigeria with diverse land management challenges, is also different in focus from this present study.

In a study on pro-active land management in Nigeria (Emeasoba, 2011), it was found that land management has not been successfully implemented, frustrating, time-consuming, cumbersome, highly bureaucratic, and high cost of fees, delays and bribery. In addition,

Deininger, Hilhorst and Songwe (2014) further identified security of tenure as a prevalent problem of urban land administration. Though formalization is usually recommended as a means to secure informal land rights, it has its challenges (Birner and Okumo, 2012). Most urban lands have not been properly surveyed and demarcated, and numerous actors and bureaucratic processes and procedures are also involved in land acquisition and formalization of urban land rights. Also, Akinbola, Yassin and Olajide (2015) posited that the ineptitude of several policies on land administration is due to their failure to include the masses for which these policies were enacted factor into their drafting.

**METHODOLOGY**

The study employed a quantitative research method, survey research, and structured questionnaires to gather data from professionals in estate surveying and valuation, land surveying, and town planning. These groups were targeted because of their close working experience and their strong involvement in the land administration, especially in the analysis of the formal and informal land delivery mechanisms. The study was carried out in state capitals in southwestern Nigeria: Ado, Abeokuta, Akure, Ibadan, Osogbo, and Ikeja, to have a picture of the geographical spread. In all, 1,344 questionnaires were administered with a response rate of 53.1%. Out of 266 questionnaires distributed to estate surveyors and valuation professionals, 155 (58.3%) completed them. Questionnaires were distributed to 725 land surveying professionals, out of which 367 (50.6%) responded, while town planning professionals received 353, out of which 191 (54.1%) responded.

The study utilized two primary data analysis methods. Firstly, it employed the Severity Index (S.I.) to measure the difficulty of the task facing the urban land administration. This measure used participants' weighted answers to figure out the level of severity. The results were divided into four groups: not severe (S.I. $\leq 1.4$), moderately severe ($1.5 \leq$ S.I. $\leq 2.4$), serious ($2.5 \leq$ S.I. $\leq 3.4$), and very serious (S.I. $\geq 3.5$). The Severity Index assisted in classifying the challenges, aiming to identify the most severe ones for immediate attention. Also, this research used the Kruskal-Wallis H test to test the difference in the perceived severity of challenges across the three categories of professionals. The Kruskal-Wallis H test can be applied when the research goals involve comparing the means of three or more independent variables, particularly when the data is ordinal and may not always follow a normal distribution. Using this method, the study was able to ascertain whether there were statistically significant differences in the perceived severity of these challenges among estate surveyors, land surveyors, and town planners. This approach assisted in determining the degree of agreement or divergence among professionals in their perception of these challenges, thereby offering insight into the challenges experienced across different professional silos. The Severity Index, which ranks problems, and the Kruskal-Wallis H test, which compares them, further strengthened the methodological foundation. This dual method enabled the study to identify not only the number of challenges within the urban land market but also the professional and locational differences. It extends knowledge of the problems of urban land administration and forms the basis for intervention and policy formulation to address the challenges in the land administration systems. The following section presents the findings and discusses the results.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section involves analysing various urban land administration problems across six state capitals in South-Western Nigeria, namely Ibadan, Osogbo, Akure, Abeokuta, Ikeja, and Ado ekiti.. Severity indices (S.I.) for each problem and the results of the Kruskal-Wallis H Test to ascertain any significant differences in the severity of these problems among the various state capitals are presented. The Kruskal-Wallis H test was used for this analysis.

Table 1: Kruskal-Wallis Test of the Urban Land Administration Problems

| S/N | Parameters | Severity Index | State Capitals in the South-West, Nigeria | Kruskal-Wallis Test Mean Rank | Kruskal-Wallis H Test | Asymp. Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Poor records management/keeping | 4.04 | Ibadan | 361.28 | 3.598 | 0.609 |
| | | | Osogbo | 316.89 | | |
| | | | Akure | 358.04 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 355.89 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 361.5 | | |
| | | | Ado | 384.53 | | |
| 2 | Poor remuneration, poor condition of service and inadequate logistics | 3.88 | Ibadan | 357.28 | 1.404 | 0.924 |
| | | | Osogbo | 340.49 | | |
| | | | Akure | 364.17 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 345.33 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 364.53 | | |
| | | | Ado | 359.92 | | |
| 3 | Delay and cumbersome manual procedures | 3.86 | Ibadan | 347.93 | 5.181 | 0.394 |
| | | | Osogbo | 370.81 | | |
| | | | Akure | 351.22 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 384.03 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 351.33 | | |
| | | | Ado | 314.13 | | |
| 4 | Lack of technical expertise in new technology available | 3.81 | Ibadan | 360.76 | 2.649 | 0.754 |
| | | | Osogbo | 332.98 | | |
| | | | Akure | 345.16 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 356.25 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 370.59 | | |
| | | | Ado | 340.56 | | |
| 5 | Perceived corruption | 3.78 | Ibadan | 343.03 | 11.142 | 0.049 |
| | | | Osogbo | 377.52 | | |
| | | | Akure | 348.62 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 383.94 | | |

| | | | Ikeja | 361.21 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Ado | 266.25 | | |
| 6 | Development without the necessary permit as well as the provision of infrastructure that is below acceptable standard | 3.76 | Ibadan | 344.26 | 1.382 | 0.926 |
| | | | Osogbo | 364.97 | | |
| | | | Akure | 356.48 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 366.69 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 360.11 | | |
| | | | Ado | 337.8 | | |
| 7 | Disconnection between the informal land delivery activities and formal systems | 3.71 | Ibadan | 347.5 | 4.082 | 0.538 |
| | | | Osogbo | 396.41 | | |
| | | | Akure | 345.68 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 348.85 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 365.97 | | |
| | | | Ado | 340.98 | | |
| 8 | Transactions in informal land markets are often not controlled and registered by the appropriate authorities | 3.69 | Ibadan | 342.97 | 1.102 | 0.954 |
| | | | Osogbo | 366.54 | | |
| | | | Akure | 362.76 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 354.73 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 360.86 | | |
| | | | Ado | 364.14 | | |
| 9 | Lack of effective collaboration and cooperation between the agencies | 3.68 | Ibadan | 354.18 | 5.048 | 0.410 |
| | | | Osogbo | 369.21 | | |
| | | | Akure | 334.83 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 373.06 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 364.72 | | |
| | | | Ado | 306.47 | | |
| 10 | Ineffective land registries | 3.67 | Ibadan | 353.26 | 8.466 | 0.132 |
| | | | Osogbo | 379.48 | | |
| | | | Akure | 338.72 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 340.17 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 381.59 | | |
| | | | Ado | 304.52 | | |
| 11 | Mistrust on the part of customary landowners in land administration generally | 3.61 | Ibadan | 356.29 | 5.068 | 0.408 |
| | | | Osogbo | 345.29 | | |
| | | | Akure | 345.35 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 359.49 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 374.16 | | |

|  |  |  | Ado | 298.11 |  |  |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | Conflict and insecure tenure | 3.6 | Ibadan | 351.39 | 8.92 | 0.112 |
|  |  |  | Osogbo | 360.12 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Akure | 337.78 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Abeokuta | 367.65 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ikeja | 375.42 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ado | 276.00 |  |  |
| 13 | Underutilization of land due to ineffective land-use planning | 3.59 | Ibadan | 345.1 | 15.3 | 0.009 |
|  |  |  | Osogbo | 386.53 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Akure | 338.03 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Abeokuta | 385 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ikeja | 364.85 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ado | 249.66 |  |  |
| 14 | Difficulty in getting proper information useful in urban development planning | 3.59 | Ibadan | 341.38 | 11.919 | 0.036 |
|  |  |  | Osogbo | 410.8 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Akure | 336.66 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Abeokuta | 375.08 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ikeja | 362.02 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ado | 287.7 |  |  |
| 15 | Lack of coordinating mechanisms to regulate actors in the informal land delivery system | 3.58 | Ibadan | 352.26 | 4.647 | 0.460 |
|  |  |  | Osogbo | 392.34 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Akure | 348.38 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Abeokuta | 364.3 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ikeja | 357.69 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ado | 306.64 |  |  |
| 16 | Attempts to regularize the informality in the land delivery channel had yielded little or no success | 3.53 | Ibadan | 351.31 | 4.518 | 0.477 |
|  |  |  | Osogbo | 336.38 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Akure | 378.33 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Abeokuta | 359.45 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ikeja | 346.9 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ado | 400.81 |  |  |
| 17 | The informal land delivery system has no records in the land office | 3.51 | Ibadan | 341.84 | 4.925 | 0.425 |
|  |  |  | Osogbo | 385.32 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Akure | 354.86 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Abeokuta | 372.92 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ikeja | 357.34 |  |  |
|  |  |  | Ado | 307.7 |  |  |
| 18 | Lack of transparency in the work process | 3.41 | Ibadan | 355.55 | 10.159 | 0.071 |
|  |  |  | Osogbo | 373.45 |  |  |

| | | | Akure | 323.5 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Abeokuta | 369.87 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 373.66 | | |
| | | | Ado | 287.42 | | |
| 19 | Widespread different systems across the southwest state of Nigeria | 3.36 | Ibadan | 352.82 | 6.548 | 0.256 |
| | | | Osogbo | 346.86 | | |
| | | | Akure | 340.62 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 364.12 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 376.44 | | |
| | | | Ado | 292.72 | | |
| 20 | Insufficient financial resources | 3.35 | Ibadan | 351.16 | 5.042 | 0.411 |
| | | | Osogbo | 392.79 | | |
| | | | Akure | 348.97 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 348.41 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 367.74 | | |
| | | | Ado | 309.05 | | |
| 21 | Shortage of trained personnel | 3.33 | Ibadan | 364.79 | 11.572 | 0.041 |
| | | | Osogbo | 330.84 | | |
| | | | Akure | 350.56 | | |
| | | | Abeokuta | 347.72 | | |
| | | | Ikeja | 381.92 | | |
| | | | Ado | 266.31 | | |

Source: Field survey, 2024

Table 1 analyses the various urban land administration problems across six state capitals in South-Western Nigeria. With an S.I. of 4.04, poor record management emerges as the most severe issue. This indicates that it is a very serious problem across all state capitals, profoundly affecting land administration. The Kruskal-Wallis H Test result (H = 3.598, p = 0.609) suggests no significant differences between the state capitals, highlighting a uniformly critical challenge in records management. Poor remuneration, poor condition of service, inadequate logistics (S.I. = 3.88) and delay and cumbersome manual procedures (S.I. = 3.86) are also identified as very serious issues. The Kruskal-Wallis H Test results (H = 1.404, p = 0.924, and H = 5.181, p = 0.394, respectively) indicate no significant regional variations, emphasising the widespread and consistent impact of these problems.

Furthermore, lack of technical expertise in new technology (S.I. = 3.81) is another uniformly severe problem, with the Kruskal-Wallis H Test result (H = 2.649, p = 0.754) further indicating no significant differences between the state capitals. This uniformity underscores the need for comprehensive technical training across the region. Perceived corruption (S.I. = 3.78) stands out due to its significant regional variation (H = 11.142, p = 0.049). This suggests that while corruption is a very serious problem overall, its impact varies significantly between different

state capitals, necessitating region-specific anti-corruption measures. Development without necessary permits and provision of substandard infrastructure (S.I. = 3.76) is uniformly a very serious problem (H = 1.382, p = 0.926), whereas disconnection between informal and formal land systems (S.I. = 3.71) also presents severe but regionally consistent challenges (H = 4.082, p = 0.538).

Other important problems affect the whole region, not just one state capital. These issues encompass unregulated and unregistered transactions in informal land markets (S.I. = 3.69), ineffective coordination among agencies (S.I. = 3.68), ineffective land registries (S.I. = 3.67), mistrust among traditional land owners (S.I. = 3.61), and conflict and unstable tenure (S.I. = 3.60). Underutilization of land due to ineffective land-use planning (S.I. = 3.59) and difficulty in getting proper information for urban development planning (S.I. = 3.59) are both significant problems with notable regional differences (H = 15.300, p = 0.009, and H = 11.919, p = 0.036, respectively). These findings highlight areas requiring targeted interventions.

Additionally, there remain significant issues with the lack of coordination for informal land delivery (S.I. = 3.58) and the inability to formalise informal land delivery (S.I. = 3.53). These problems don't change much from one state to the next. The lack of transparency in work processes (S.I. = 3.41) and the widespread differences in systems across the South-Western States (S.I. = 3.36) are profound issues, albeit without significant regional variation. Insufficient financial resources (S.I. = 3.35) and a shortage of trained personnel (S.I. = 3.33) are identified as profound problems. Notably, the shortage of trained personnel exhibits significant regional differences (H = 11.572, p = 0.041), indicating the varying impact of personnel shortages across different state capitals. The findings reveal that urban land administration problems in South-Western Nigeria are generally very serious, with most issues having severity indices above 3.5. The significant regional differences in certain parameters, such as perceived corruption, underutilization of land, difficulty obtaining proper information, and shortage of trained personnel, suggest a need for region-specific strategies alongside broader policy reforms.

Therefore, while some problems are uniformly severe across the region, others exhibit significant regional variations, necessitating a combination of uniform policies and region-specific interventions. Through targeted resource allocation, technology adoption, enhanced collaboration, and focused training programmes, significant improvements in urban land administration can be achieved, fostering more effective and equitable development across South-West, Nigeria.

Table 2: Jonckheere-Terpstra Testa of the Urban Land Administration problems

| S/N | Parameters | Observed J-T Statistic | Mean J-T Statistic | Std. Deviation of J-T Statistic | Std. J-T Statistic | Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Insufficient financial resources | 100133 | 100470.5 | 2991.269 | -0.113 | 0.91 |
| 2 | Shortage trained personnel | 100992.5 | 100470.5 | 3016.008 | 0.173 | 0.863 |
| 3 | Disconnection between the informal land delivery activities and formal systems | 101244 | 100470.5 | 2956.872 | 0.262 | 0.794 |
| 4 | Ineffective land registries | 102187 | 100470.5 | 2975.99 | 0.577 | 0.564 |
| 5 | Conflict and insecure tenure | 101747.5 | 100470.5 | 2972.323 | 0.43 | 0.667 |
| 6 | Underutilization of land due to ineffective land-use planning | 99617 | 100470.5 | 2995.149 | -0.285 | 0.776 |
| 7 | Difficulty in getting proper information useful in urban development planning | 99999 | 100470.5 | 2970.536 | -0.159 | 0.874 |
| 8 | Lack of coordinating mechanism to regulate actors in the informal land delivery system | 98822 | 100470.5 | 2932.46 | -0.562 | 0.574 |

| 9 | Attempts to regularize the informality in the land delivery channel had yielded little or no success | 101159.5 | 100470.5 | 2909.146 | 0.237 | 0.813 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 10 | The informal land delivery system has no records in the land office | 100177 | 100470.5 | 2995.074 | -0.098 | 0.922 |
| 11 | Transactions in informal land markets are often not controlled and registered by the appropriate authorities | 102298 | 100470.5 | 2985.161 | 0.612 | 0.54 |
| 12 | Development without necessary permits as well as the provision of infrastructure that is below acceptable standards | 101664 | 100470.5 | 2977.789 | 0.401 | 0.689 |
| 13 | Widespread different systems across the Southwest States in Nigeria | 102365.5 | 100470.5 | 3008.716 | 0.63 | 0.529 |
| 14 | Poor remuneration, poor conditions of service, and inadequate logistics | 101637 | 100470.5 | 2957.05 | 0.394 | 0.693 |

Publication of the European Centre for Research Training and Development UK

| 15 | Lack of transparency in work processes | 101364.5 | 100470.5 | 2940.374 | 0.304 | 0.761 |
| 16 | Delays and cumbersome manual procedures | 99567 | 100470.5 | 2914.593 | -0.31 | 0.757 |
| 17 | Poor records management/ Keeping | 102544.5 | 100470.5 | 2854.377 | 0.727 | 0.467 |
| 18 | Perceived corruption | 99799.5 | 100470.5 | 2954.063 | -0.227 | 0.82 |
| 19 | Mistrust on the part of customary landowners in land administration generally | 101670 | 100470.5 | 2990.443 | 0.401 | 0.688 |
| 20 | Lack of technical expertise in new technology available | 102400 | 100470.5 | 2962.52 | 0.651 | 0.515 |
| 21 | Lack of effective collaboration and cooperation between the agencies. | 100744 | 100470.5 | 2986.3 | 0.092 | 0.927 |

Source: Field survey, 2024

The analysis using the Jonckheere-Terpstra test reveals no significant trends in the severity of urban land administration challenges across South-Western Nigeria. Issues such as inadequate financial resources (p = 0.91), shortage of trained personnel (p = 0.863), poor record management (p = 0.467), procedural delays (p = 0.757), and perceived corruption (p = 0.82) are consistently severe across the region. Similarly, challenges like ineffective land registries (p = 0.564), informal land delivery system issues (p = 0.574), and inadequate technical expertise (p = 0.515) show uniform severity across the study area.

These findings highlight the widespread and systemic nature of urban land administration problems, suggesting that region-wide, uniform policy interventions are necessary. Recommended actions include improving financial and technical resources, enhancing

personnel training, adopting advanced technologies for record management, and implementing anti-corruption measures. Comprehensive reforms targeting these common challenges can significantly enhance urban land governance, fostering transparency, efficiency, and sustainable development across the region.

**CONCLUSION**

This paper affirmed that several challenges hamper sustainable urban land use and equitable distribution in South West Nigeria's urban land management. Inefficiency in governance, fragmentation between statutory and customary land tenure systems, and the effects of rapidly growing urbanization intensify the challenges that are involved with managing land in the region. The main problems identified in this study include poor record management, delays in manual operations, a lack of technical skills, and systemic corruption, all of which have a significant impact on land administration. Emerging problems of similar severity across the region were identified, but there were regional differences that would need tailored solutions, such as perceived corruption and shortage of trained human resources. The Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that the level of threat perception was similar between the professional groups. The Jonckheere-Terpstra test confirmed that the state capitals of the region experienced similar ranking crises. Based on these findings, it is clear that there is a desperate need for radical reforms that cover the entire region to conform to best practices. The enhancement of most land administration processes requires measures such as leveraging modern records management information technology to support records management functions, building more institutional capacity, and promoting more transparency. Also, country-specific measures taken solely to address issues such as corruption and personnel shortfalls can complement the reform. As such, sustainable land administration in south-west Nigeria will need cooperation from the federal, state and local government, traditional institutions, private actors and the society in general. It can accommodate cross purposes and align the interests and needs for reforms across the various spectra of sustainable development, encompassing social, cultural, as well as economic and legal. Through addressing these challenges with intensified policies and creative solutions, the region will be able to turn its urban land administration systems into best practice models of efficiency, equity, and sustainability, opening the way to wider socio-economic development.

**REFERENCES**

Adeniyi P. O. (2011). Improving land sector governance in Nigeria: implementation of the land governance assessment framework. Washington DC: World Bank. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/28525.

Akinbola, K. B., Yassin, A. M. and Olajide, S. E. (2015). A comparative study of the performances of land administration machineries in Nigeria and Malaysia. In a Global built environment in transition. *Proceedings of the 9th Asean postgraduate research conference (APGS2015)*, organised and held at The Faculty of The Built Environment, University of Malaya, 8th December, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Agyei, B. G. (2010). Improving the land delivery system for the urban poor – A case study of Kumasi. M.Phil Thesis. University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Kumasi, Ghana

Babalola, K. H., Hull, S and Whittal, J. (2024). Peri-urban Land Administration and Management: Understanding the Challenges in Ekiti State, Nigeria, Using Case Study and Soft Systems Methodologies. Survey Review, 1-20. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/00396265.2024.2370598 on 20th August 2024.

Babawuro, U. (2010). Cadastral Information System for Title Management in Nigeria. *The Pacific Journal of Science and Technology,* 11(2), 408-415.

Birner, R. and Okumo, A. (2011). Challenges of Land Governance in Nigeria: Insights from a Case Study in Ondo State: Insights from a case study in Ondo state. NSSP Working Paper 22. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI). Retrieved from http://ebrary.ifpri.org/cdm/ref/collection/p15738coll2/id/126875 on 20th August 2024.

Deininger, K., Hilhorst, D. and Songwe, V. (2014). Identifying and addressing land governance constraints to support intensification and land market operation: Evidence from 10 African countries. Food Policy, 48, 76-87.

Durand-Lasserve, A. and Valérie, C. (1996). Regularization and integration of irregular settlements: lessons from experience. UNDP, UN-Habitat, World Bank, Urban Management Program (UMP), *Working Paper* no 6, 113p, Urban Management and Land.

Ekebuike, A. N. Ono, M. N. & Anyadiegwu, P C. (2023). Examining the Current Situation of Customary and Statutory Land Tenure Practices in Anambra State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Research Publications and Reviews*, 4(12), 3945-3949.

Emeasoba, U.R.B. (2011). Towards a pro-active land management in Nigeria. *The Tropical Environment*, 10 (1). 144-145.

Focus on Land in Africa (2019). Land administration at a crossroads in Ghana. Retrieved from: http://www.focusonland.com/land-administration-at-a-crossroads-in-ghana/ on 14th September, 2024

Grita, A. B. and Tiwari, P. K. (2017). Assessment of Urban Land Delivery System for Housing Development in Jinka Town, Ethiopia. *Global Journal of Current Research*, 5(1), 14-21.

Jenkins, D., Gateri, C. and Nawangwe, B. (2009). Integrating informal land delivery systems into urban land use planning: a case study of Mbale Municipality, Namatala Ward. Paper presented at *RICS COBRA Conference* 2009.

Lamba, A. (2005). Land Tenure Management Systems in Informal Settlements: A Case Study in Nairobi. MSc. *Thesis* Submitted to the International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observations (ITC). Enschede, the Netherlands, 78.

Makupa, E., & Sanga, S. A. (2021). Understanding resource constraints in land administration in Dodoma, Tanzania. *Journal of Building and Land Development*, 21(1), 64–80.

Ohwo, O., & Abotutu, A. (2015). Environmental Impact of Urbanization in Nigeria. Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology, 9(3), 212–221. https://doi.org/10.9734/BJAST/2015/18148

Oloyede, S. A., Osmond, I. E., and Ayedun, C. A. (2019). Informal land market: Alternative approach to mass residential housing provision in South-Western Nigeria. African Journal of Estate and Property Management, 6 (8), 001-006.

Ukaejiofo, A. N. (2008). Perspectives in Land Administration Reforms in Nigeria. *Journal of the Environment,* 2(1), 43-50.