



Challenges of Land Resettlement for the Inland Dry Port Project in Ibadan

Theophilus Olugbenga Babatunde*¹ (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7550-4380>) and Timothy Tunde Oladokun² (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2493-4639>)

^{1 2} Department of Estate Management, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

To cite this article: Babatunde and Oladokun (2025) Challenges of Land Resettlement for Inland Dry Port Project in Ibadan. *Journal of African Real Estate Research*, 10(1), pg. 16-29. DOI: 10.15641/jarer.v10i1.1591.

Abstract

One way the government often adopts to compensate people dispossessed of their land is to resettle the dispossessed landowners. Notwithstanding the good purpose for which resettlement is meant to be adopted, the act is not without a number of challenges. This study sought to investigate the challenges of land resettlement with respect to the land acquired by the government for inland port projects in Ibadan, Oyo State. Based on records from the Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development and the office of the Surveyor General of Oyo State, 44 households of the total 145 displaced landowners/households earmarked for resettlement were sampled. Data were collected from the respondents with the aid of questionnaires administered in person. The collected data were analysed using descriptive statistics tools such as percentages, mean and Relative Importance Index. The results indicated that in acquiring land for a public project, statutory procedures were followed, notifying the respondents of the government's intention to acquire the land and resettlement arrangements. The results of the study showed that the respondents suffered exposure to security and welfare risks from prolonged delays in the resettlement process. Additional challenges included loss of shelter and ancestral homes, as well as being deprived of access to a common heritage. The study concluded that the loss of livelihood and the increase in the cost of living led to a decline in the standard of living for the dispossessed landowners.

Keywords: *compensation, challenges, dry-port, resettlement, households*

*Corresponding author email address: theobaba2013@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Land is often seen as wealth for people, in addition to being regarded as one of the major factors of production (Duong, Samsura and van der Krubben, 2023). In addition to the economic value of land, it is also viewed as possessing physical, abstract, and spiritual values (Duong, Samsura and van der Krubben, 2023). For this reason, great importance is attached to the ownership right over land, and at times, leading some people to exercise constraint in selling their land. While land is believed to be fixed in supply (especially in the short run), there is always an ever-increasing need for its use at every point in time for specific purposes by individuals, groups of people, and even the government. The daily increase in land is apparent in urban areas because of the large population of people usually associated with rural-urban migration. The daily influx of people into cities in Nigeria, coupled with the natural increase in the population of the area, leads to urban development and expansion. This then prompts the government to build social amenities and infrastructural facilities to support the ever-increasing population (Abera, Yirgu and Unch, 2020). Most of the time, the provision of these amenities requires the government to acquire land from individuals, families, or communities.

In Nigeria, the enactment of the Land Use Act No. 6 of 1978 vested all land in the state government of the respective state in the country. The implication is that land within the states is held by the state governors. In addition, where private land is held before the enactment of the Law, the governors have the power to compulsorily acquire such private land from individuals, families, or communities for public use that will benefit the larger society. In the exercise of this power, the law provides that the governor should pay compensation for any physical development or crops on any of such land acquired for overriding public interest. Consequently, this gave birth to compensation, which could be in the form of a cash payment or the resettlement of the affected individuals, families, or communities by the government. Since urban development is associated with the delivery of infrastructural facilities for the benefit of all, occasions often arise that, as the government acquires land for public facilities, private land belonging to individuals, families, or communities could be taken over. As such, previous owners could be displaced from their homes, farmland, and other sources of livelihood. A similar scenario was observed in this study, wherein the state government acquired a substantial expanse of land for the development of the Ibadan dry inland port. To execute the project, previous settlers of the affected communities were given the option of resettlement as an alternative to monetary compensation to ameliorate their sufferings and loss.

Resettlement, according to Sherbinin et al. (2010), is the act or process of relocating a community or group of people who would no longer be permitted to live where they previously did to another location. As the appropriate process of organising and carrying out the relocation of individuals, families, and communities, it often provides monetary or in-kind compensation for lost resources, inconvenience, and assets, as well as support for the restoration and enhancement of livelihoods, the re-establishment of social networks, and the restoration or improvement of the social functioning of the community (Akingbehin et al., 2016). According to the author, resettlement practically involves measures adopted to lessen the negative effects of economic displacement on displaced individuals. This is necessary as resettlement could have a significant impact on the affected people or community. The displaced could be burdened with physical, economic, and occupational challenges like loss of shelter and land, loss of assets, marginalisation, loss of income source, unemployment, food insecurity, social disarticulation, and access to common properties and services, disruption of education and other sources of livelihood for community dwellers. (World Bank, 2011). While resettlement

is allowed under the law to relieve the inconvenience and pain of a dispossessed person, the difficulties associated with resettlement in large-scale public infrastructure projects like the Ibadan Dry Inland project seem to be underexamined in the literature. Even though every resettlement for development projects has some peculiar cost implications. The cost, apart from money, includes the social costs arising from the resettlement of the people displaced from their land. This paper, therefore, considers the challenges of land resettlement for inland port projects in Ibadan, Oyo State, with the aim of providing information that could enhance the land resettlement structure.

2. Literature review

A review of many past studies has shown that there are divergent views concerning the resettlement of displaced people. Cernea (1997) and Egbenta and Falana (2020) believed that the resettlement scheme placed the displaced people in a better position than they were before the resettlement. However, Yntiso (2008), Akujuru and Ruddock (2014), Egbenta and Udoudoh (2018) and Obute (2023) argued that the scheme impoverished and placed the people worse off after the resettlement scheme. In addition, extant studies (Abera, Yirgu and Uncha 2020; Akingbehin et al., 2016) have conducted research with a focus on various aspects of public land acquisition, compensation and resettlement schemes. These studies are reviewed based on their different themes, which include the statutory provisions for resettlement schemes, the trend analysis of previous resettlement schemes, the impact of resettlement schemes, the problem of relocation, and those that developed models for the resettlement schemes.

2.1. Statutory provisions for the resettlement scheme

Several previous studies (Uduehi 1987; Akujuru and Ruddock, 2014; Egbenta and Falana, 2020) have examined the statutory power of the government to revoke land rights and to compensate affected individuals through monetary payments, relocation, and resettlement, as well as the procedures for such compensation. For instance, Uduehi (1987) reviewed the issue of public land acquisition and compensation practice in the Land Use Act of 1978 in Nigeria. Uduehi (1978) posited that it was clear from the Act that both the local authority and the state governor have the power to revoke the right of occupancy. In the case of the local authority, the power is limited to land in non-urban areas, while the governor has the power to revoke any right of occupancy over land within their state for overriding public interest. The paper made further reference to Section 28 (1) of the Land Use Act, which states that “it shall be lawful for the military governor to revoke a right of occupancy for overriding public interest”. It also pointed out that Section 28 of the Act sets out the grounds upon which a governor can revoke an interest in land. The review lamented that there was nothing in the Act to guide the local authority in the exercise of its powers in similar circumstances. No procedure or condition has been laid for such exercise.

Akujuru and Ruddock's (2014) study examined the constitutional provisions concerning land acquisition and their impact on the compensation process. The study faulted the use of predetermined compensation rates, which do not meet the compensation requirements of adequacy when compared with international standards. This, according to the author, usually results in inadequate compensation, which negates the compensation requirements of adequacy in line with international standards. Similarly, Murali and Vikram (2016) compared the various land policies operational in different countries - the Australian Land Acquisition Act 1989 as

amended in 2013, the Land Management Law in Canada, the Land Acquisition Act (LAA) 2014 in Singapore; Land Acquisition for Public Interest (Law No. 2 of 2012) and Regulation No. 71 of 2012 that facilitates Land Acquisition for Public Project purposes (LAPI Laws) in Indonesia; Land Use Act of 1978 of Nigeria; and the Land Acquisition Act 1960 from the government of Malaysia. The analytical and comparative study established that the current practices in the countries examined do not allow for a determination of equivalent compensation in all situations.

The study from Egbenta and Udoudoh (2018) with a focus on compensation for land and buildings compulsorily acquired in Nigeria, criticised the valuation technique being adopted. The findings revealed that the valuation estimates conducted by the acquiring authority, using the depreciated replacement cost method prescribed by the Land Use Act, did not reflect prevailing market values. Hence, it produces inadequate compensation that puts the claimants in a worse socio-economic position than they were prior to the acquisition. The study emphasised the need for a better method of valuation for compensation that will reflect market valuation. In Egbenta and Falana (2020), the adequacy of the resettlement scheme in Apo, Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria, was the focus. The study made use of depreciated replacement cost to determine the deprivation and bestowal values of acquired properties. The study found that the resettled property value was in excess of the value of the acquired property. It noted that the differential range of the excess value was between 62.72% and 85.92%. Although the study recommended a resettlement scheme as a better form of compensation, the challenges involved in this act were not mentioned, but are addressed in this study. The recent study by Oshikoya and Olayiwola (2023) analysed the satisfaction levels of claimants involved in the land acquisition and compensation process for the Amuloko road project in the Ona-Ara Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. A sample of 186 displaced people was analysed using the relative satisfaction index (RSI), and the analysis showed that the claimants were not satisfied with the process of compensation employed by the government. The study identified the following reasons for the dissatisfaction of claimants: inaccurate enumeration of assets, delay in the payment of compensation, lack of transparency by government officials, and low assessment rates for crops and trees. There is a need for a study to evaluate the perspectives and challenges faced by dispossessed people with resettlement schemes.

2.2. Trends in the land resettlement schemes

Previous studies focused on the trend analyses of resettlement schemes, where issues such as the process involved, strategies, and characteristics of the resettlement programmes were reviewed. The study of Cernea (1997) extracted the general trends and the common characteristics that were revealed by empirical data, which were used to construct a theoretical model of displacement and reconstruction. The study identified key risks and impoverishment processes in the displacement of people, which included: landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalisation, food insecurity, loss of access to community property resources, increased morbidity, and community disarticulation. The model, which suggested that reconstructing and improving the livelihood of those displaced requires risk reversals through explicit strategies backed by adequate financing, warranted a study of this nature to corroborate the view of the author from the perspective of the displaced. The study of Oluwamotemi (2010) examined land acquisition, compensation, and resettlement in developing economies with particular reference to Nigeria. The study was an in-depth review of the various land tenure systems and their constraints on economic, social, and infrastructural development. The author argued that communities initially resisted the government, but they were compensated and resettled after their land was acquired. The study, which concluded that

one general law may not be sufficient for the government to process land for development purposes because of community agitations, seems to leave out the social and economic challenges of resettlement.

Mendie and Ofem (2010) examined the Land Use Act using the public land acquisition policy in Akwa State, Nigeria. The study found that between 1990 and 2005, the state government was able to develop 43% of the total land acquired for various developmental projects. Furthermore, the spatial and temporal dimensions showed a strong and positive relationship between the hectares acquired and the hectares developed. The study focused only on the assessment of development carried out on all government-acquired land compared to the total land acquired within the period covered by the study.

Onwe and Nwogbaga (2015) studied the three main strategies for resettling displaced people to achieve durable solutions: repatriation, integration, and relocation strategies. Each of these strategies concerns itself with the provision of housing, relief materials, jobs, security, and legal protection for displaced people. The study concluded that choosing the appropriate resettlement strategy and adopting a more inclusive participatory approach that involves displaced people, the local government, state government, national government and other key stakeholders is key to achieving success in resettlement schemes. Akingbehin et al (2016) assessed the process of public land acquisition in Oyo state, Nigeria. The study found, among other things, that the government did not follow established procedures for land acquisition in the public interest, and that the objectives of the enabling legislation were largely unfilled. The study by Lo and Wang (2018) sought to understand whether the voluntary resettlement program by the Chinese government targeted at alleviating poverty was genuinely voluntary. A survey of the resettlers was conducted using both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. The analysis revealed a high level of willingness among the younger and wealthier individuals and those engaged in off-farm employment. The willingness was primarily driven by a desire to improve the quality of their life. However, the study also noted that the consent to relocate was not fully informed due to inadequate stakeholder consultation.

2.3. The impact of the resettlement scheme

No developmental project undertaken by the government is without adverse side effects (Egbenta and Falana, 2020). Some of the previous studies on resettlement schemes assessed the impact of resettlement schemes on individuals and the environment. Yntiso (2008) reviewed the impact of resettlement projects on low-income households in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The relocation had broken down and disrupted the relocates' business ties with customers, caused a loss of locational advantage on jobs, and incurred high transportation costs, which culminated in a drop in their incomes. Many displaced people were also exposed to water, sanitation, education, and healthcare problems. Farmers lost their land to investors, and the new resettlers complained of low compensation and a lack of economic options to make a living. The study concluded that developmental projects in the urban areas exacerbated poverty among the study group. However, applying the result of the study to a fast-growing country like Nigeria, with different economic and political situations, might be misleading; hence this study.

Abebe and Hesselberg (2013) examined the effect of slum resettlement projects on the socio-economic well-being of the poor households relocated in Addis Ababa. The analysis of the data revealed that although the relocated households benefited in terms of new houses and improved quality housing, there were some negative effects experienced by the families. The negative

effects included increased cost of rent, loss of income, changes in children's school, health challenges, and loss of savings. While the study recommended that urban redevelopment and resettlement plans should include the factors in the lives and livelihood opportunities of the relocated poor households, a similar study is missing in the context of sub-Saharan African countries. Hussen and Kibret (2018) explored the perceived social and psychological effects of development-induced displacement on low-income households in Addis Ababa. Findings from the study showed that relocating people from their original settlement to a new location led to social breakdown as well as psychological problems. Moreover, the relocation resulted in job losses, increased transportation costs, and affected access to education and healthcare services. The study concluded that the damage caused by the resettlement of poor people significantly outweighed the benefits associated with the resettlement scheme. Abera et al. (2020) interrogated the impact of the resettlement scheme on vegetation cover and its implications on conservation in the Chewaka district of Ethiopia. The study utilised ArcGIS 10.3 ERDAS Imagine 9.1, Landsat Imagery from 2000, 2009, and 2018, alongside socio-economic data to analyse the land use and land cover changes of the district. The analysis showed that the district had undergone substantial land use and land cover changes since population resettlement in the area left a gap to be filled in a developing country like Nigeria. The study from Getu (2021) investigated the impact of urban relocation on the livelihoods of poor households displaced by development projects in Bahir Dar, Northwestern Ethiopia. Using a qualitative approach to data collection and analysis, the study revealed that the relocation of urban landowners caused several livelihood risks, such as loss of homes or shelter. The finding that the new neighbourhood lacked main urban infrastructural facilities such as roads, electricity, marketing, and portable water services might not apply to other African countries with different socio-economic environments. In addition, the finding that displaced people received adequate compensation while some remained landless might not necessarily be the same in other developing countries like Nigeria.

Obute (2023) examined the problem with the relocation scheme at Pegi, located in the Kuje Area Council of the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja, Nigeria. Data collected was analysed using an independent sample t-test, a custom table, and a chi-square to ascertain the effect of the relocation. The study found that the relocation of the displaced people had a negative influence on their occupation, brought a decline in their level of income, and worsened their access to public services. However, the study concluded that the relocation facilitated improved housing and proximity to schools and clinics for the displaced people. Gai, Wahome and Bett (2023) studied how the relocation constrained resources for extensive pastoralism and how pastoral cope through adaptation of old pastoral knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions and the creation of new strategies for resilient livelihood using the case of the RAPland community. The study found that relocation significantly affected access to pastures and water resources. Before the relocation, the highest-ranking constraints were drought, livestock diseases, pasture inadequacy, and wildlife predation. Similarly, after the relocation, all these identified constraints were experienced. The study concluded that the community's dependence on pastoral livestock, as well as food and nutritional security, was threatened.

Duong et al. (2023) investigated the impact of the land acquisition process on the socio-economic conditions and environment of the affected communities in Vietnam. The findings indicated there was no significant change in the living conditions of the affected communities. However, the study identified participation and compensation as the two factors that lead to socio-economic and environmental effects. Notably, the authors did not consider the challenges associated with resettlement, which is the focus of this study. Sapre and Gori (2023) assessed the predicament of land acquisition, displacement, and resettlement in India. The study found

that people were adversely impacted by the developmental projects initiated by the government and that the failure to adequately implement resettlement and rehabilitation strategies and plans led to several obstacles for displaced people and the government. The study argued that the Supreme Court of India attested that there are some administrative deficiencies on the part of the state concerning land acquisition, displacement, and resettlement. However, generalising these findings to African countries like Nigeria might not be reflective of the peculiarities of resettlement practices on the continent. This is because the legal framework in India would be different from the policy adopted in African countries like Nigeria. As such, there is a compelling need to conduct this study to substantiate the findings in Nigeria.

2.4. Model for Effective Resettlement Scheme

A few studies focused on the presentation of models for resettlement schemes. Notably, Cernea (2007) developed the Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) model to serve as a predictor of risks and problems that could be encountered in projects and also to be used as a guide in applying strategies to counter, overcome, and mitigate the risks. The study presented eight basic risks of impoverishment during displacement and resettlement, which include landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalisation, food insecurity, loss of access to common property resources, and community disarticulation. A similar study by Kurniati et al. (2013) developed a land acquisition and resettlement action plan (LARAP) for a dam project using an Analytical Hierarchical Process (AHP). The study aimed at selecting the best location for resettlement, comparing two alternatives – the dam's surrounding area and a convenient area – based on benefit-cost and risk indices. The AHP priority vector analysis showed that Mujur village, located near the dam, had a vector score of 0.1294 and was the best resettlement location. Similarly, the best resettlement location in a convenient area was Kawo village with a vector score of 1.1190. An inclusive model was proposed by Isokpan and Durojaye (2018), where the affected people were engaged from the planning stage of the resettlement process. The study highlighted the importance of meaningful engagement with persons affected by evictions in Badia East in Lagos, Nigeria. The authors showed that meaningful engagement with affected persons before an eviction occurs can mitigate human rights violations. The study emphasised the importance of engaging affected communities before land acquisition or eviction programmes.

In summary, efforts have been made to examine the activities of the government from different perspectives. However, earlier studies have not examined the adverse effects and the challenges faced by resettlers whose land is acquired for public interest. This study seeks to fill the identified gap and provide information that could inform policymakers on the need for inclusivity in land administration in African countries like Nigeria.

3. Methodology

The study adopted a survey research design where data were collected through a structured, closed-ended questionnaire. The questionnaire was administered to landowners/households affected and displaced by the Ibadan inland dry port project at Olorisaoko in the Akinyele Local Government, Ibadan, Oyo State. Records from the Ministry of Land, Housing and Urban Development, and the office of the Surveyor General of Oyo State revealed that 145 displaced landowners/households were earmarked for resettlement in the scheme. From this figure, 43 households, representing 30% of the landowners/households, were sampled. The landowners/households were sampled using the snowballing method because of the difficulty of locating resettlers. A face-to-face, closed-ended questionnaire was used to elicit information

from the 43 resettled landowners. While the first part of the questionnaire addressed the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, the second part asked respondents questions on the perception of compliance when dealing with government officials about the land acquisition procedure. The last section focused on the challenges associated with the relocation scheme. Data were analysed using frequency, percentages, mean, standard deviation, and mean ranking.

4. Data presentation and discussion

The data is presented in four sections. The first section considers the socio-demographic characteristics of the landowners/households, while the second section describes the land resettlement procedure. The third section shows the challenges encountered by the landowner/households in the course of resettlement, while the fourth section presents a discussion of the findings.

4.1. Socio-demographic data of landowners

The landowners were asked to indicate their socio-economic characteristics, and their response is represented in Table 1.

Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents

Variables	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	34	79.1
Female	9	20.9
Academic qualification of the landowner		
SSC	36	83.7
ND	5	11.6
HND/BSc	2	4.7

Table 1 shows that most of the respondents (79.1%) were males, while the remaining (20.9%) were females. Similarly, 83.7% of the respondents had a secondary school certificate (SSC) as their highest certificate. While 11.6% claimed to possess a National Diploma (ND), the remaining 4.7% of them were holders of Higher National Diploma (HND)/BSc. Certificates. The high percentage of respondents with SSC as their highest certificate indicated that a substantial number of landowners had limited formal education. This is expected as the community is situated in the hinterland, occupied mostly by low-income individuals who struggled to obtain land for building owner-occupied houses. In addition, the proportion of landowners/residents who are ND holders and HND/BSc. holders represented a small proportion of the community landowners who understood the benefits of government actions on land resettlement. Overall, these socio-demographic findings highlight the diversity in the socio-economic characteristics of landowners in the community.

4.2. Land resettlement procedure

The landowners in the study area were asked to rate the perception of compliance by government officials with the land resettlement procedure using strictly complied, complied, partially complied, and not complied, as ranking variables. This was rated on a Likert scale of 1-4, and the result is contained in Table 2.

Table 2: Land resettlement procedure according to the landowner in the inland dry port project in Ibadan

Resettlement procedure	Strictly complied	Complied	Partially complied	Not complied
Acquisition Notice	0(0.00)	43(100)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Acquisition Gazette	0(0.00)	43(100)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Mapping out the affected area	0(0.00)	43(100)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Preparing preliminary survey	0(0.00)	43 (100)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Reconnaissance survey	0(0.00)	43 (100)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Enumeration of affected crops and Valuation of affected buildings	0(0.00)	43 (100)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)
Submission of a power of attorney	0(0.00)	32(74)	10(23)	1(2)
Compensation to affected occupants due compensation	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	34(79)	9(20)
Consultation with affected occupants/community about the resettlement action strategy	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	32(74)	11(25)

Table 2 shows in ranking order that the first action taken was to serve acquisition notice on the landowners at the inland dry port, Akinyele, Ibadan. The notice was to inform them of the intention of the state government to acquire their properties and to communicate the reason for the acquisition and the appropriate means of resettlement to them. In this acquisition, the step complied with the Land Use Act of 1978, which stipulates that the acquisition and resettlement process is incomplete if an acquisition notice is not served to the landowners. Government compliance with this requirement was to follow due process in the acquisition and resettlement of the landowners. The next step after the service of the notice, as required by the law, was for the state government to gazette the acquisition notice. This step was necessary to notify the public of the intention of the state government to acquire the parcel of land, and the purpose of the acquisition, and to serve as a means of passing the information to all the stakeholders. The government complied with the second step as a requirement for the resettlement process to get members of the public informed and convinced of the need for the project. It also served to secure the cooperation of the citizens during the acquisition and resettlement.

The mapping out of the affected area, preparation of the preliminary survey, and reconnaissance survey were done consecutively to ascertain the size of the land portion. These were necessary to determine the land area and to prevent encroachment. The mapping out of the affected area and erecting the boundary beacons were carried out by a government land surveyor who then prepared a preliminary survey of the land showing the terrain, topography, and delineation. The reconnaissance survey was done to inspect the area to identify the type of existing land use in the area and to estimate the number of affected landowners. After the preliminary survey and inspection of the area, all improvements on the land were enumerated and valued based on approved rates. The adopted rates were predetermined by the officials of the Land Ministry. This was an essential step to improve compensation to landowners. A subsequent step taken in the resettlement process was to request all landowners to submit power of attorney. This could be done personally by the landowners or, in some instances, by their representatives, who are usually estate surveying firms. Thereafter, compensation was made by the government to affected landowners through their representative estate surveying firms. The above steps were duly complied with. Compliance with the resettlement procedure was a demonstration of the commitment of the government to fairness and transparency in the land acquisition process. To

finalise the resettlement process, the government representatives arranged a consultation meeting with the affected occupants/community about the resettlement action strategy. This was to enlighten them about the intended steps to be taken. Altogether, the adopted land resettlement procedure allowed for stakeholder participation through the various stages. Their involvement largely minimised potential grievances and ensured a more equitable outcome for the affected individuals.

In addition, the adherence to the established land resettlement procedure demonstrated an orderly and organised process of acquiring land for a large project. This helped to prevent confusion, mitigate potential disputes, and maintain the integrity of the land acquisition process. At the same time, the government's compliance with the land resettlement procedure proved to the public the adherence to the relevant legal requirements and regulations governing land acquisition. By following the established procedure, the project developers confirmed their commitment to upholding legal obligations, which were necessary to avoid any possible legal complications or challenges in the future. While government compliance with the established resettlement process was found to promote a sense of accountability and trust among the project developers, the finding is at variance with Akingbehin et al. (2016) who found government failed to follow the laid down procedure in the acquisition of land responsible for the social crisis that arose from a previous state-owned project in Oyo state.

4.3. Challenges of land resettlement

The landowners in the study area were asked to rate identified challenges based on the extent to which they were affected by the resettlement exercise using strongly disagree, disagree, indifferent, agree, and strongly agree as rating indices on a Likert scale of 1 to 4.

Table 3: Challenges of resettlement

Challenges	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	Std. dev	Rank
Exposure to security and welfare issues	43	100.0	4.56	0.541	1
Loss of livelihood and decreased standard of living	35	81.4	4.45	0.611	2
Loss of shelter and ancestral homes	34	79.1	4.36	0.694	3
Loss of access to communal resources	29	67.4	4.31	0.743	4
Adequacy of compensation	25	58.1	4.27	0.885	5
Short notice of acquisition	20	46.5	4.03	0.916	6

The results in Table 3 show the types of challenges of resettlement in the study area. Exposure to security and welfare issues ranked first at 100%, followed by loss of livelihood and decrease in standard of living at 81.4%, which ranked second. Loss of shelter and ancestral homes ranked third at 79.1%, while loss of access to communal resources such as rangeland and pasture, non-timber forest resources, woodlots for timber, and fuel wood or fishing grounds ranked fourth at 67.4%. With the resettlement scheme, the African culture of communal living was destroyed. Inadequate compensation at 58.1% ranked fifth, and short notice of acquisition at 46.5% ranked last. Overall, the data showed that landowners faced challenges in the resettlement process.

The results indicated that households were mostly exposed to security and welfare issues in their new locations. As newcomers in an unfamiliar environment, many reported feelings like

strangers and experienced several security issues due to the government's compulsory acquisition of their properties. Displaced individuals claimed that they experienced increased vulnerability to crime, loss of social support networks, and a decline in their overall well-being. These outcomes may be attributed to inadequate security measures, social support systems, and access to basic services for the affected communities. The results also showed high rates of loss of livelihood and a decrease in the standard of living among landlords. As the respondents were part of a rural community, they depended on land for farming and related agricultural practices. Respondents also reported that the resettlement process affected their sense of land ownership and deprived them of their source of income. The loss of their land caused a loss of farming jobs, thereby affecting their livelihood, and decreasing their standard of living and affecting their means of survival. Additionally, many villages in the study area ranked third, lost their shelter and ancestral homes, which were spaces for practising their culture and traditional norms.

Furthermore, the results revealed that displaced individuals experienced severe disruptions to their income-generating activities, such as agricultural land, businesses, and employment opportunities. This led to economic instability, poverty, and a decline in their standard of living. This finding aligns with Abebe and Hesselberg (2013), who previously found that inadequate urban redevelopment and resettlement plans were responsible for the loss of lives and livelihood opportunities among relocated households. Another primary challenge associated with resettlement was the loss of shelter and ancestral homes, which disrupted the social and cultural fabric of the affected individuals and communities. This finding is consistent with Getu's (2021) study, which identified the loss of home or shelter as a livelihood risk. Consequently, the loss of ancestral homes diminished their sense of identity, and weakened community cohesion, and a sense of stability.

Furthermore, the resettlement process severely impacted the community's access to communal resources such as rangelands, forests, and fishing grounds, which were vital for sustenance and livelihoods. Their loss contributed to food insecurity, decreased income opportunities, and increased vulnerability. This finding is consistent with Cernea's (1997) findings that outlined key impoverishment risks such as homelessness, food insecurity, loss of access to community property, and community disarticulation. Many respondents considered inadequate compensation a critical issue that they experienced during the resettlement process. The compensation provided for lost assets, such as land, crops, or structures, was perceived to be insufficient and responsible for grievances, disputes, and further impoverishment among affected individuals. This finding aligned with the study from Akujuru and Ruddock (2014), who concluded that inadequate compensation determination rendered agricultural practices unsustainable. They recommended the adoption of valuation methods that reflect adequate compensation sums that are equivalent to market realities to sustain agricultural practices.

Lastly, the respondents identified the short notice given before land acquisition as another significant challenge. With limited time to prepare for relocation, the resettled individuals encountered logistical difficulties, emotional distress, and difficulties in finding suitable alternative housing or business locations. This finding corresponds with that of Isokpan and Durojaye (2018), who highlighted the social consequences of not engaging the affected people before the acquisition and eviction processes.

5. Conclusion and recommendation

The study evaluated the challenges associated with the resettlement of landowners/households for inland dry ports in Ibadan, Nigeria. It employed a snowball sampling method to sample and administer a questionnaire to the affected landowners/households. The findings from the study revealed that the government complied with the land acquisition procedure by issuing a notice to the affected landowners. However, consultation with the affected landowners about the resettlement strategies was partially complied with. The study also discovered that exposure to security and welfare issues was paramount on the list of the challenges faced by the resettled landowners. To help preserve the communal land-holding pattern that existed in the area, the government should integrate cultural heritage sustainability into the resettlement scheme. This would assist in replicating their cultural heritage in any new areas being proposed for resettlement. It will also provide alternative access to resources that were held in common, such as rangeland and pasture, non-timber forest resources, woodlots for timber and fuel wood or fishing grounds. It is recommended that adequate compensation practices be practised. By adopting a market value form of valuation, compensation payments will mitigate the negative impact of receiving inadequate compensation, which reduces their standard of living.

There is also a need for the government to adopt a resettlement practice that has adequate provisions for the resettled community in a new location before they are moved from their original land. It may also be necessary to plan the establishment of a new town, which will be provided with adequate infrastructure and security facilities that will guarantee the security of lives and properties of the dispossessed landowners in the new location. The study also recommends that the government should always take steps that minimise exposure to security and welfare issues and mitigate risks arising from the delay in timely resettlement. The provision of adequate modern security infrastructure will eliminate potential security and welfare threats, which could compromise their standard of living by denying them access to raw materials that they previously had. It is also recommended that sufficient notice of acquisition and resettlement will enable affected individuals to make informed decisions, plan their relocation, and minimise the disruptions caused by the resettlement process.

References

- Abebe, G. and Hesselberg, J. (2013). Implications of urban development-induced resettlement on poor households in Addis Ababa. *Ghana Journal of Geography*, 5, pp. 32-50.
- Abera, A., Yirgu, T. and Uncha A. (2020). Impact of resettlement scheme on vegetation cover and its implications on conservation in Chewaka district of Ethiopia. *Environmental Systems Research*, 9(2), pp. 1-17.
- Akingbehin A.M., Idhoko K.E., Hamzat A.A. and Ayuba T. (2016). The process of land acquisition in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Studies*, 5(1), pp. 37-48.
- Akujuru, V. A. and Ruddock, L. (2014). The determination of compensation payable in the Niger Delta for compulsory acquisition and the need for a sustainable practice. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 16(2), pp. 102-114.
- Cernea, M. (1997). Risks and reconstruction model for resettling displaced population. *World Development*, 25(10), pp. 1569-1587.
- Cernea, M. M. (2007). IRR: An operational risks reduction model for population resettlement. *Hydro Nepal: Journal of Water Energy and Environment*, 1(1), pp. 35-99.

- Duong, M.T.T., Samsura, D.A.A. and van der Krubben, E. (2023). Socio-economic and environmental impacts of land acquisition for tourism development in Vietnam. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 9(2), Article 2283923. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2283923>
- Egbenta, I. and Udoudoh, F.P. (2018). Compensation for land and building compulsorily acquired in Nigeria: A critique of the valuation technique. *Property Management*, 36(4), pp. 446-460.
- Egbenta, R. and Falana, F. (2020). Adequacy of resettlement scheme: A post resettlement review of Apo settlement scheme, Abuja, Nigeria. *Middle East Journal of Scientific Research*, 28(1), pp. 29-38.
- Gai, A.B., Wahome, R.G. and Bett, R.C. (2023). New homes, new challenges: The experience of resettled Maasai pastoral of RAPland Village, Olkaria Kenya. *Cross Current International Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences*, 5(2), pp. 14-24.
- Getu, A.T. (2021). Urban displacement by development project and its livelihood risks in Bahir Dar North Western Ethiopia. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 23(1), pp. 101-116.
- Hussen, A.K. and Kibret, B.T. (2018). Perceived effects of development-induced displacement on low-income households in Addis Ababa. *Scholarly Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 1(2), pp. 34-45. <https://dx.doi.org/10.32474/SJPBS.2018.01.000108>
- Isokpan, A. and Durojaye, E. (2018). Eviction process in Nigeria: The need for meaningful engagement. *Commonwealth Law Bulletin*, 44(1), pp. 3-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050718.2018.1557063>
- Kurniati, E., Sutanahaji, A.T. and Anggraini, O.A. (2013). Land acquisition and resettlement action plan (LARAP) of dam project using Analytical Hierarchical Process (AHP): A case study in Mujur Dam, Lombok Tengah District-West Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. The 3rd International Conference on Sustainable Future for Human Security. *Procedia Environmental Science*, 17(2013), pp. 418-423.
- Lo, K., and Wang, M. (2018). How voluntary is poverty alleviation resettlement in China? *Habitat International*, 73, pp. 34-42.
- Mendie, A., Atser, J. and Ofem, B. (2010). Analysis of public land acquisition in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 31(3), pp. 197-203.
- Murali, K., and Vikram, A. (2016) Land acquisition policies: A global perspective. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 6(5), pp. 406-411.
- Obute, M.A. (2023). Problem of relocation scheme in Pegi-Kuje area of the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(8), pp. 732-749.
- Oluwamotemi, K. (2010). Land acquisition, compensation and resettlement in developing economics: Nigeria as a case study. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science Research*, 10(3), pp. 7-12.
- Onwe, S. O., and Nwogbaga D.M.E. (2015). Reflections on the challenges of displacement and effective resettlement strategies. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(3), pp. 51-56.
- Oshikoya, T.P., and Olayiwola, F.E. (2023). Analysis of claimant satisfaction with land acquisition and compensation process in Ona-Ara Local Government Area, Oyo State Nigeria. *British Journal of Earth Sciences Research*, 11(2), pp. 52-70.
- Sapre A.A, and Gori S. (2023). The predicament of land acquisition, displacement and resettlement: An analysis of Indian scenario. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 60(2), 750-760. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096231179651>.

- Sherbinin, A., Castro, M. and Gemenne, F. (2010). Preparing for population displacement and resettlement associated with large climate change adaptation and mitigation projects. *Background Paper for the Bellagio Workshop*, 2-6 November.
- The Land Use Act of 1978, CAP 15 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 2007.
- van der Geest, K., Kreibich, N. and Neef, A. (2012) Negotiating land: Institutional innovation and land-tenure change in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(1), pp. 105-133.
- World Bank. (2011). *Migration and remittances factbook* (2nd ed.).
<http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/630421468163744010/pdf/578690PUB0Mi-gr11public10BOX353782B0.pdf>
- Yntiso, G. (2008). Urban development and displacement in Addis Ababa: The impact of resettlement projects on low-income households. *Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review*, 24(2), pp. 53-77. <https://doi.org/10.1353/eas.0.0001>