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ABSTRACT

Acquiring developable land for property development in suitable locations especially in urban areas is considered as a global problem, and is no exception in Nigeria. Some of the reasons responsible for this phenomenon are uncontrolled urbanisation, increasing demographic growth, complex bureaucracies, unskilled technocracy, corruption and weak institutional machineries, among others. All these had hampered smooth and efficient delivery processes and finally had decreased delivery and accessibility of urban lands in Nigeria. Therefore, this study was conducted, essentially to simplify the processes for land administrators while discharging their responsibilities, by examining and resolving those underlying factors that are affecting the optimal performance of formal land administration and regulation systems. This study adopted quantitative approach, with the use of both probabilistic and non-probabilistic sampling techniques. The respondents participated in this study were relevant government agencies and committees that are directly involved in the supply of urban land; low, medium and high density land users in eighteen (18) formal land development schemes, from two cities in each of six states of the Southwestern Nigeria. These schemes were found in Isheri and Ikorodu in Lagos State; Abeokuta and Ijebu-Ode in Ogun State; Ibadan and Ogbomoso in Oyo State; Osogbo and Ile-Ife in Osun State; Akure and Ondo in Ondo State; and Ado-Ekiti and Ijero-Ekiti in Ekiti State. Furthermore, the independent land consultants and shelter or land mandated non-governmental organisations (NGOs) were considered as the intermediate component of the land delivery and accessibility equation; so as to have balanced results that are sufficient to address these challenges. By using the Analysis of Moments of Structures Software Package (AMOS), via Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), the results show that merely nine percent (9%) of causal relationship exists between the duo of formal land administration and regulation system (FLARS) and policy development and compliance engineering (PDCE), as determining agents of formal land delivery and accessibility in Nigeria. Furthermore, these are due to the stand-alone structure of the lands regulo-administrative machineries, leading to their insignificant contribution of nine percent (9%) towards formal land delivery and accessibility. As a conclusion, close to 70% of these challenges were caused by ill-structuration, corruption, lack of collaboration and policy summersault, and thus will remain unsolved if this trend continues. Among the suggestions is that, there should be improvement to land administration operations which can be achieved through SLADECOM Model applications, where restructuring of departments and land administration regulation systems, as well as policy frameworks will be made to improve the efficiency and performances of land administration and regulation systems in Nigeria.
ABSTRAK

Memperolehi tanah yang boleh dibangunkan untuk pembangunan harta tanah di lokasi yang sesuai terutamanya di kawasan persekitaran bandar dipertimbangkan sebagai masalah global, dan tidak terkecuali di Nigeria. Beberapa sebab yang disebalik fenomena ini adalah pembandaran yang tidak terkawal, peningkatan pertumbuhan demografi, birokrasi yang kompleks, kurang kemampuan, rasuah, dan jentera institusi yang lemah. Keadaan ini telah menghalang kelican dan kecekapan proses penghantaran dan akhirnya mengurangkan aksesibiliti terhadap tanah-tanah bandar di Nigeria. Oleh itu, kajian ini telah dijalankan, secara asasnya untuk mempermudahkan peranan pentadbir tanah ketika melaksanakan tanggungjawab mereka, dengan mengkaji dan menyelesaikan faktor-faktor asas yang mengesani prestasi optimum sistem perundangan dan pentadbiran tanah. Kajian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif, dengan menggunakan teknik persampelan kebarangkalian dan bukan kebarangkalian. Responden yang terlibat dalam kajian ini adalah agensi kerajaan dan jawatankuasa yang berkaitan secara langsung dengan penawaran tanah kediaman; kepadatan rendah, sederhana dan tinggi, di dalam lapan belas (18) skim pembangunan tanah formal, dari dua bandar iaitu Nigeria Selatan dan Nigeria Barat. Skim-skim ini didapati di Isheri dan Ikorodu bertempat di Lagos; Abeokuta dan Ijebu-Ode di Ogun; Ibadan dan Ogbomoso di Oyo; Osogbo dan Ile-Ife di Osun; Akure dan Ondo di Ondo; serta Ado-Ekiti dan Ijero-Ekiti di Ekiti. Selain itu, perunding tanah bebas dan tempat perlindungan atau tanah mandat Organisasi Bukan Kerajaan (NGO) dianggap sebagai komponen perantaraan untuk penyerahan tanah dan persamaan aksesibiliti; untuk menghasilkan keputusan seimbang untuk menangani cabaran-cabaran yang dihadapi. Dengan menggunakan perisian Analysis of Moments of Structures Software Package (AMOS), melalui teknik Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), dapan kajian menunjukkan hanya Sembilan peratus (9%) daripada hubungan bersebab wujud antara system Perundangan Dan Pentadbiran Tanah Formal (FLARS) dan Kejuruteraan Pematuhan Dan Pembangunan Polisi (PDCE), sebagai ejen yang menentukan aksesibiliti dan penghantaran tanah formal di Nigeria. Selain itu, ianya adalah disebabkan oleh struktur persendirian oleh jentera pentadbiran tanah, menyebabkan sumbangan yang tidak signifikan sebanyak Sembilan peratus (9%) ke atas aksesibiliti dan penghantaran tanah formal. Kesimpulannya, 70% daripada cabaran-cabaran ini disebabkan oleh penyempit struktur yang lemah, rasuah, kekurangan kolaborasi, dan ketidakstabilan polisi, yang akhirnya akan kekal tidak selesai sekiranya keadaan ini berlanjutan. Sebagai cadangan, penambahbaikan operasi pentadbiran tanah boleh dilakukan melalui aplikasi SLADECOM Model, di mana penyusunan semula jabatan-jabatan dan unit pentadbiran tanah, dan sistem perundangan akan dibuat bagi meningkatkan kecekapan prestasi pentadbiran tanah di Nigeria.
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