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ABSTRACT

The study was conducted to provide information on students Willingness to Pay (WTP) for social services provided by tree species on the campus of the Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi (FUAM), Benue State, Nigeria. Random sampling technique was used to select 200 students from 10 Departments of the University. The semi-structured questionnaire was used to obtain data from the students. Vegetation survey was conducted to indentified tree species present in the selected colleges. The result of the study shows that Albizia zygia was the dominant tree species on the campus. Majority of the students (86.5%) were willing to pay (WTP) for social services of the tree species while (23.5%) were not WTP. Provision of shade (WMS= 4.19>3.00) and beautification (WMS=3.64>3.00) were the most social services provided by tree species. The mean amount the students were WTP for social tree services was N$\text{46}$ per month. Sex of the students differed significantly (P<0.05) from their WTP for the trees social services. Also, there was a significant difference (P<0.10) between the students level of study and their willingness to pay for the trees social services. The major reasons responsible for the insufficiency of trees on the campus as

*Corresponding author: E-mail: anchapaul@gmail.com;
stated by the students were clearance for construction purposes (WMS4.15>3.00) and bush burning (WMS=3.62>3.00). It was recommended that harnessing of human, financial and material resources to address issues of sustainability of forest goods and services on the campus of FUAM should be prioritized. School administration, Departmental Staff and students should promote tree planting on campus.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Forests are renewable natural resources which provide essential goods and services that are useful to human being [1]. Agbogidi and Eshegbeyi [2] maintained that forests play an important role in contributing to carbon sequestration and other global ecological services such as provision of wood, food, fresh water, fiber, genetic resources and medicines, climate regulation, natural hazard regulation, water purification and waste management amongst others. Forests have been central to human survival for as long as humans inhabited the earth. According to [3], how people use and value forests at a particular place and time, however, depends in large part on their scarcity or abundance relative to changing human needs. Most research related to household use of forest resources in developing countries is concerned with forest depletion and sustainable use of natural resources. The diversity of forest products has attracted renewed attention in recent years. Emery [4] noted that the commercial potential of these products is growing, and their production can improve forest management. Certain products can be economically harvested from the forest while maintaining biodiversity, wildlife habitat, clean air, and clean water as well as social and cultural values. Many non-timber forest benefits, on the other hand, cannot easily be bought and sold such as biodiversity, watershed protection, carbon storage among others. Others generate little or no revenue for the land owner, although they may have significant value to the general public such as aesthetic values. Where non-timber forest benefits are also non-marketed, private land owners will have little motivation to produce them unless compelled to do so. Similarly, public forest agencies may underestimate the importance of such benefits, which are often less visible than the revenue, taxes and jobs generated by the timber and agriculture industries [3]. [5] noted that the true value of the forest must include not only its productive value as a commodity timber, but also its non-timber use values; which include the indirect use of the forests’ environmental service functions and relevant existence values.

In order to formulate and implement management approaches that support the supply of multiple services, quantitative insight into the complete bundle of services and values supplied by protected areas is therefore required [6]. Willingness to pay (WTP) is a concept used by environmental economist to elicit values placed on natural resources by people. UNEP [7] defines willingness to pay (WTP) as the amount an individual is ‘willing to pay’ to acquire some good or service. This amount may be elicited from stated or revealed preference approaches. Israel and Levinson [8] noted that WTP can be used to improve economic growth and environmental quality by analyzing different trends in the population to generate a reversal in conservation projects. Tsi et al. [9] remarked that the WTP for conservation of species often leaves people who must decide in a social dilemma. Carson et al. [10] describes the choice as mechanism that asks each respondent how they would vote if faced with a particular program and the prospect of paying for the program through some means, such as higher taxes. Tsi et al. [9] also noted that the choice is between one’s self-interests and those of the community or group. In either case the problem of choice is often affected by attitudes, motivation, perceptions, and culture.

Several studies have been carried out in different localities of the world on peoples WTP for environmental resources. For example, [11] estimated Jordanians WTP for improvement of the national park. Nielsen et al. [12] used a choice experiment to assess the willingness to pay for species composition, height structure, and standing and fallen dead trees in Danish forests. Rambonilaza and Brahic [13] used a choice experiment to estimate the willingness to pay for forest attributes in publicly owned forests representing 15% of all the forests in France. Tilahun et al. [14] valued rural households’ willingness to pay for frankincense forest conservation. Kamri [15] assessed Willingness to
Pay for Conservation of Natural Resources in the Gunning Gading National Park, Sarawak. Tisdell and Wilson (2004) [16] noted the knowledge and WTP for the conservation of wildlife species in Australian.

In Africa, studies on WTP for forest resources include [17] who reported on the WTP for the control of water hyacinth in an urban environment of South Africa. [9] documented the willingness to pay (WTP) for the conservation of Derby Eland (Taurotragus derbianus gigas) and the African wild dog (Lycaon pictus) in North Cameroon. [18] assessed soil degradation, poverty, and farmers’ willingness to invest in soil conservation in highland of Southern Ethiopia. In Nigeria, [19] worked on monetization of forest service functions for sustainable management. [20] reported on WTP for rehabilitation of Ibadan urban environment through reforestation projects. [21] conducted economic valuation of forest plants used in traditional treatment of guinea worm (Dracunculus medinesis Linn) infections in Ogun State, Nigeria. [22] assessed cooperate organizations WTP for environmental service of forest trees in Abeokuta. Also, [1] used the Contingent Valuation Methods (CVM) to value urban forest in the University of Agriculture in Abeokuta. [23] documented public WTP for ecosystem service functions of a peri-urban forest in Abeokuta. [24] reported residents of neighborhoods WTP for Park development in Makurdi metropolis, Benue State, Nigeria. Studies on the social benefits of forest tree species in the Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi is lacking. Thus, this study was conducted with the aim of investigating the students WTP for social services of tree species in the University for decision and policy making.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Study Area

The study was conducted on the campus of the Federal University of Agriculture Makurdi. The University is one the three Federal Universities of Agriculture established by the Nigerian Government in 1988. The University lies within the coordinates of Latitude 7°47′ and 10°00′ East and Longitude 6°21′ and 8°8′ North (Fig. 1). The University occupies an arable land area of 8,040 hectares thus making the University the largest holder of agricultural land area among other institution of its kind. The University is located in the southern guinea savanna. Continuous clearance of the vegetation has led to the development of re-grown vegetation at various stages. Some of trees species found on the University campus includes; Parkia biglobosa, Khaya senegalensis, Prosopis africana, Vitellaria paradoxa, Danieelli oliveri, Terminalia mentalis, among others which produce valuable seeds, wood and fruits which are used in industries.

The climate of the University area is of the tropical sub humid with two distinct seasons via: rainy (wet) season which last for about seven (7) months beginning from April down to October and the dry season lasting for about a period of five (5) months cutting across November to March. The annual rainfall range is between 1200-2000 mm.

The Temperature is generally high in the day with a maximum and minimum temperature of 35 and 21 respectively.

2.2 Population, Sampling Procedure and Sample size

The study population consisted of the undergraduate students of University. The University was stratified into the existing ten (10) Colleges. Five (5) Colleges were randomly selected. In each of the selected college, two Departments were randomly selected and in each Department, ten students were randomly selected, giving a total of forty (20) students in each college.

The colleges sampled included: College of Agronomy, College of Engineering, College of Science, College of Agricultural and Science Education and College of Animal Science. Thus, the sample size for the study was 200 students.

2.3 Data Collection

Primary data was used for the study. The Data were generated with aid of semi-structured questionnaire. The data were collected within a period of two months. The questionnaire was divided in the following eight thematic areas:

1. Socio economic characteristic of the students. The closed and open ended questions were used to obtain responses from the students.
2. Social Services provided by trees on campus. Five points Likert scale rating format as used by [25] was adapted to measure the extent of benefits provided by trees social services on the campus. The
weighting scale was derived from the following values with respect to the social services of trees provided on the campus; Very High (VH) = 5, High (H) = 4, Moderate (M) = 3, Low (L) = 2, very Low (VL) =1.

3. Willingness to Pay for trees Social Services and the continued existence of trees on Campus. The closed and open ended questions were used to get the students WTP for the trees social services.

4. Amount Willing to Pay for social tree services for the conservation of tree species. The elicited monetary values of social services of tree species were obtained through the Payment Card System (CPS) of Contingent Valuation Method (CVM) as used by [21] and [26]. The students were asked to indicate the maximum amount they will be WTP per month for social services provided by the tree species from their allowances.

5. Reasons for Students not WTP for conservation of tree species. The multi-choices question format was used to get the students responses on the reasons were not WTP for social services of the tree species.

6. Distribution of tree species on the campus. The “Yes or No” question type was used to get the students response on the distribution of tree species on the campus.

7. Students reasons for trees been insufficient on campus. Five points Likert weighted scale rating format as used by [25] was adapted to measure the reasons for the insufficiency of trees on campus. The weighting scale was derived from the following values with respect to the insufficiency of tree species on the campus; Strongly Agree (SA) = 5, Agree (A) = 4, Undecided (M) = 3, Disagree (D) = 2, Strongly Disagree (SD) =1.

Two hundred (200) questionnaires were distributed to students in the selected colleges in the University out of which one hundred and sixty-three questionnaires were returned which amounted to 81.5% of questionnaires collected for analysis.

The questionnaire administration was carried out concurrently with vegetation survey to indentify tree species present in the selected Colleges. The tree species were identified with the assistance of a Taxonomist in the Department of Forest Production and Products of the University Agriculture Makurdi. In each of the colleges, the different tree species were counted and recorded accordingly.

2.4 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics such as frequency mean and percentage were used to present result for socioeconomic characteristic of the students, tree species on campus, WTP for, or not on tree species and distribution of the tree species on campus.

Following [21], the mean WTP for social services of trees on campus was expressed as:

$$WTP = \frac{\sum fx}{n}$$

where:

- $WTP= \text{mean willingness to pay value}$
- $\sum = \text{Summation sign}$
- $f = \text{frequencies of mention of tree species}$
- $x = \text{Species value in Naira (N)}$
- $n = \text{Number of respondents}$

The Likert rating Mean Score (MS) of the student was expressed as:

$$MS = \frac{\sum f}{n}$$

where:

- $f = \text{Sumation of the five point rating scale}$
- $n = \text{Number of points}$

Therefore, for a five point Likert scale, MS is expressed as:

$$MS = \frac{1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5}{5} = 3.0$$

The Likert Weighted Mean Score (WMS) is expressed as:

$$WMS = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i x_i}{N}$$

Where:

- $f = \text{frequency of respondent}$
- $x = \text{Likert scale point}$
- $N = \text{Total Number of respondents}$
Using the interval scale of 0.05, the Upper Limit (UL) cut-off is MS+0.05 (3.0+0.05 = 3.05). The Lower Limit (LL) cut-off is MS - 0.05 (3.0-0.05 = 2.95). Based on these two extreme limits any variable with WMS below 2.95 (WMS<2.95) was considered ‘Low’. Variable with MWS between
2.95 and 3.05, ‘Moderate’ any variable MWS greater than 3.05 (MWS>3.05), ‘High’.

The Mann-Whitney U test (U) as used by [27] was used to test for the significant difference between Gender and willingness to pay for trees social services on the campus.

The Mann-Whitney U test (U) is expressed as:

\[ U = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_2 (n_2 + 1)}{2} - \sum_{j=n_{11}+1}^{n_2} R_j \]

where:

- \( U = \) Mann-Whitney U test
- \( N_1 = \) sample size one
- \( N_2 = \) Sample size two
- \( R_i = \) Rank of the sample size

Kruskal-Walis H test was used to test for significant relationship between Departments, level of study of the students and their willingness to pay for trees social services.

\[ H = (N - 1) \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} n_i \left( \bar{R}_i - \bar{r} \right)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (r_{ij} - \bar{r})^2} \right) \]

where:

- \( H = \) Kruskal-Walis
- \( n_i = \) Number of observations in group \( i \)
- \( r_{ij} = \) the rank of observations \( j \) from group \( i \)
- \( N = \) Total number of observations across all groups

3. RESULTS

3.1 Socio-economic Characteristics of the Students

The socio economic characteristics of students of the University are shown in Table 1. Female (52.76%) interviewed were more than the male students (47.24%). The age category of 21-25 years was highest (57.1%) while the age category of 30 and above was the lowest age group (3.1%). The mean age of the students was 23 years. Majority of the students were single (93.3%) while 6.7% were married. Based on the monthly allowance of the students, 52.8% of the students receive allowance in the category of N1000-5000 monthly and 19.6% of students receive allowance of N10,100 and above making them the highest and lowest respectively. In terms of the level of students, 25.77% of the students that provided information were at 100 levels while 9.82% were at 400 levels.

3.2 Tree Species from the Selected Colleges

A total of 28 different tree species were identified on the campus of the University with Albizia zygia having the highest percentage occurrence of (19.30%) and was followed by Terminalia mentalis (13.29%) and Delonix regia (8.86%).

| Table 1. Socio-economic characteristics of the students |
|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Characteristics                  | Category  | Frequency (n=163) | Percentage (%) |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------------|
| Sex                              | Male      | 77                | 47.24          |
|                                   | Female    | 86                | 52.76          |
| Age (Yrs)                        | 15-20     | 33                | 20.2           |
|                                   | 21-25     | 93                | 57.1           |
|                                   | 26-30     | 32                | 19.6           |
|                                   | 30 and above | 5              | 3.1            |
| Mean age (Yrs)                   | 23        |                   |                |
| Marital status                   | Single    | 152               | 93.3           |
|                                  | Married   | 11                | 6.7            |
| Monthly allowance (N)            | 1000-5000 | 86                | 52.8           |
|                                  | 5100-10000 | 45               | 27.6           |
|                                  | 10100 and above | 32        | 19.6           |
| Level of study                   | 100       | 42                | 25.77          |
|                                  | 200       | 39                | 23.93          |
|                                  | 300       | 36                | 22.09          |
|                                  | 400       | 16                | 9.82           |
|                                  | 500       | 30                | 18.40          |
Other tree species found in the University which were among the top ten tree species were Polylathia longifera (8.86%), Azadirachta indica (7.91%), Moringa oleifera (5.70%), Daniella oliveri (5.38%), Gmelina arborea (4.75%), Ficus sycomorus (4.75%) and Hura criptens (3.48%). The least five tree species found in the University were Pilistigma thorngii (0.32%), Khaya senegalensis (0.32%), Detarium microcapum (0.32%), Stereospermum kunthianum (0.32%), and Anogiosus leoicarpa (0.32%).

### 3.3 Social Services Provided by Trees on Campus

The social services provided by trees on campus are shown in Table 3. Provision of shade was the highest social service provided by tree species on the campus (WMS= 4.19>3.00) followed by beautification of the environment (WMS= 3.64>3.00). Other very high social services provided by tree species were landscaping / viewing (WMS=3.45>3.00), health benefit (WMS=3.32>3.00), recreation (WMS=3.30>3.00), enhance social cohesion (WMS=3.17>3.00) and improving academic performance (WMS=3.12>3.00).

### 3.4 Willingness to Pay for Trees Social Services and the Continued Existence of Trees on Campus

Table 4 shows the students willingness to pay for social benefits of trees on the campus. The students who were willing to pay for the social services of the trees were (86.50%) while 13.50% of the students were not willing to pay for tree services.

### 3.5 Amount Willing to Pay for Social Tree Services for the Conservation of Tree Species

The amount willing to pay for social tree services for the conservation of tree species is shown in Table 5. Majority of the students (73.76%) were willing to pay between N100-500 per month.

| Tree specie          | F* | %    | Ranking |
|----------------------|----|------|---------|
| Albizia zygia        | 61 | 19.30| 1       |
| Terminalia mentalis | 42 | 13.29| 2       |
| Delonix regia        | 28 | 8.86 | 3       |
| Polylathia longifera | 28 | 8.86 | 4       |
| Azadirachta indica   | 25 | 7.91 | 5       |
| Moringa oleifera     | 18 | 5.70 | 6       |
| Daniella oliveri     | 17 | 5.38 | 7       |
| Gmelina arborea      | 15 | 4.75 | 8       |
| Ficus sycomorus      | 13 | 4.11 | 9       |
| Hura criptens        | 11 | 3.48 | 10      |
| Prosopis Africana    | 10 | 3.16 | 11      |
| Cacis spectabilis    | 8  | 2.53 | 12      |
| Vitex doniana        | 7  | 2.22 | 13      |
| Mangifera indica     | 6  | 1.90 | 14      |
| Sarcocephalus latifolius | 4 | 1.27 | 15      |
| Anacardium occidentale| 3 | 0.95 | 16      |
| Cocos nucifera       | 3  | 0.95 | 17      |
| Ficus exasperata     | 2  | 0.63 | 18      |
| Vitellaria paradoxa  | 2  | 0.63 | 19      |
| Citrus sinensis      | 2  | 0.63 | 20      |
| Strychnos spinosa    | 2  | 0.63 | 21      |
| Elaeae guinensis     | 2  | 0.63 | 22      |
| Eucalyptus camaldulensis | 2 | 0.63 | 23      |
| Pilistigma thorngii  | 1  | 0.32 | 24      |
| Khaya senegalensis   | 1  | 0.32 | 25      |
| Detarium microcapum  | 1  | 0.32 | 26      |
| Stereospermum kunthianum | 1 | 0.32 | 27      |
| Anogiosus leoicarpa  | 1  | 0.32 | 28      |
| Total                | 316| 100  | -       |
Others were willing to pay between N600-1000 (17.02%), N1100-1500 (2.84%), N1600-2000 (3.55%) and N2000 and above (2.84%). The mean amount per month the students were willing to pay was N46.

3.6 Amount Willing to Pay by Male and Female Students for Social Tree Services in the University

Table 6 presents the results of the amount of money in naira the male and female students were willing to pay for the social services of trees. The male students (44%) were WTP N18,160 yearly giving a mean yearly amount of N293 and mean monthly amount WTP of N24. The female students (56%) were WTP N20,520 with mean yearly amount WTP of N260 and mean monthly amount WTP of N22. On yearly basis, the mean amount WTP by the students was N553 and while the monthly mean WTP was N46.

3.7 Reasons for Students not Willing to Paying for Conservation of Tree Species

Table 7 shows the reasons the students were not willing to pay for conservation of the tree services on the campus. Twenty six students were not WTP for the conservation of tree species on the campus. The reasons put forward by the students were financial constraints (34.62%), responsibility of the school administration (34.62%), trees were free gift of nature (15.38%), responsibility of the Federal Government (7.69%) and trees are sources of nuisance (7.69%).

### Table 3. Social services provided by trees in the study area

| Services                      | VL | L    | M    | H    | VH  | N  | MS | WMS | D  |
|-------------------------------|----|------|------|------|-----|----|-----|-----|----|
| Provision of shade            | 0(0)| 7(14)| 37(11)| 37(148)| 82(410) | 163| 683 | 4.19 | VH |
| Beautification                | 3(3)| 17(34)| 58(174)| 43(172) | 42(210) | 163| 593 | 3.64 | VH |
| Landscaping / viewing         | 6(6)| 20(40)| 68(204)| 33(132) | 36(180) | 163| 562 | 3.45 | VH |
| Health benefit                | 10(10)| 26(52)| 59(177)| 38(152) | 30(150) | 163| 541 | 3.32 | VH |
| Recreation                    | 3(3)| 34(68)| 64(192)| 35(140) | 27(135) | 163| 538 | 3.30 | VH |
| Enhance social cohesion       | 9(9)| 29(58)| 71(213)| 33(132) | 21(105) | 163| 517 | 3.17 | VH |
| Improving academic performance| 25(25)| 20(40)| 54(162)| 39(156) | 25(125) | 163| 508 | 3.12 | VH |

Number of students (N) = 163, Mean score (MS) = 3.0, Upper Limit (UL) = 3.05, Lower Limit (LL) = 2.95.

Note: Values in the brackets are products of Likert scale values and values outside the brackets are frequency of the students.

VL= very low, L= low, M= moderate, H= high, VH= very high, N= total number of frequency, WMS=weighted mean score, D= decision

### Table 4. Willingness to pay for trees social services and distribution of trees in the study area

| Willingness to pay | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Yes                | 141       | 86.5       |
| No                 | 22        | 13.5       |
| Total              | 163       | 100        |

### Table 5. Amount willing to pay social tree services for the conservation of tree species in the study area

| Amount (N) | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| 100-500   | 104       | 73.76      |
| 600-1000  | 24        | 17.02      |
| 1100-1500 | 4         | 2.84       |
| 1600-2000 | 5         | 3.55       |
| 2000 and above | 4 | 2.84 |
| Total     | 141       | 100        |

Mean WTP= N46
Table 6. Amount willing to pay by male and female students for social tree services for the conservation of tree species

| Gender   | F  | %  | Total yearly amount WTP(N) | Mean yearly amount WTP(N) | Mean monthly WTP(N) |
|----------|----|----|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Male     | 62 | 44 | 18160                     | 293                       | 24                 |
| Female   | 79 | 56 | 20520                     | 260                       | 22                 |
| Total    | 141| 100| 38680                     | 553                       | 46                 |

Table 7. Reasons for students not paying for tree species conservation

| Reasons for not Paying                  | F* | %   | Ranking |
|-----------------------------------------|----|-----|---------|
| Financial constraint                    | 36 | 34.62| 1       |
| Responsibility of the school administration | 36 | 34.62| 2       |
| Free gifts of nature                    | 16 | 15.38| 3       |
| Responsibility of the federal government | 8  | 7.69 | 4       |
| Source of nuisance                      | 8  | 7.69 | 5       |
| Total                                   | 104| 100  |         |

*Multi-choice response

3.8 Distribution of Tree Species on the Campus

Table 8 shows the students responses on the distribution of tree species on the campus. Majority of students (62%) reported that tree species were insufficient on campus while 38% of the students were of the opinion that trees were sufficient on the campus.

Table 8. Distribution of trees on campus

| Enough tree distribution | F  | %  |
|-------------------------|----|----|
| Yes                     | 62 | 38 |
| No                      | 101| 62 |
| Total                   | 163| 100|

3.9 Students Agreement on Reasons for Trees Been Insufficient on Campus

The students' agreements on reasons for insufficiency of trees on campus are presented in Table 9. The students seriously agreed on all the reasons put forward to them that could be responsible for the insufficiency of tree species on the campus. The reason the students mostly agreed on as been responsible for the insufficiency of trees on the campus is Clearance for construction purpose (WMS=4.15>3.00) followed by Bush burning (WMS=3.62>3.00). Other reasons put forward by the students were farming activities (WMS=3.48>3.00), illegal felling (WMS=3.48>3.00), Animal grazing (WMS=3.42>3.00) and Wind (WMS=3.25>3.00).

Table 9. Reasons for trees been insufficient on campus

| Reasons                               | SD  | D   | UD   | A    | SA   | N   | MS | WMS | D   |
|---------------------------------------|-----|-----|------|------|------|-----|-----|------|-----|
| Clearance for construction purpose    | 1(1)| 10(20)| 16(48)| 41(164)| 95(475)| 163| 676| 4.15| SA  |
| Bush burning                          | 8(8)| 26(52)| 34(102)| 47(188)| 48(240)| 163| 590| 3.62| SA  |
| Farming activities                    | 10(10)| 34(68)| 35(105)| 35(140)| 49(245)| 163| 568| 3.48| SA  |
| illegal felling                       | 8(8)| 34(68)| 32(96)| 50(200)| 39(195)| 163| 567| 3.48| SA  |
| Animal grazing                        | 4(4)| 35(70)| 41(123)| 54(216)| 29(145)| 163| 558| 3.42| SA  |
| Wind                                  | 10(10)| 37(74)| 42(126)| 50(200)| 24(120)| 163| 530| 3.25| SA  |

Number of students (N) = 163, Mean score (MS) = 3.0, Upper Limit (UL) = 3.05, Lower Limit (LL) = 2.95.

Note: Values in the brackets are products of Likert scale values and values outside the brackets are frequency of the students.

SD= Strongly Disagree, D= Disagree, UD= Undecided, A= Agree, SA= Strongly Agree, N= total number of frequency, WMS=weighted mean score, D= decision

3.10 Relationship between Sex of the Students and Willingness to Pay for Trees Social Services

The Mann-Whitney U test used to test for significant difference between sex of the students and their willingness to pay for the trees social services is presented in Table 10. There was a significant difference (P<0.05) between sex of the students and their willingness to pay for the trees social services.
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Table 10. Mann-Whitney test of relationship between sex of the students and willingness to pay for trees social services

| Test Variable            | U. Value | P. value | Decision |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Sex of Students Vs WTP   | 1089     | 0.05     | Significant |

Significant Level= 0.05

Table 11. Kruskal-Wallis test of relationship between departments, level of study of the students and willingness to pay for trees social services

| Test Variables            | H. Value | P. value | Decision |
|---------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Departments Vs WTP        | 1103.5   | 0.10     | Significant |
| Levels of Study Vs WTP    | 1098.5   | 0.09     | Significant |

3.11 Relationship between Departments, Level of Study of the Students and Willingness to Pay for Trees Social Services

The Kruskal-Wallis H test used to test for significant difference between the Departments, level of study and their willingness to pay for the trees social services is shown in Table 11. There was a significant difference (P=0.10) between the departments of the students and their willingness to pay for the trees social services. Also, there was a significant difference (P<0.10) between the students level of study and their willingness to pay for the trees social services.

4. DISCUSSION

High numbers of the students were willing to pay some amounts for social services of tree species on the campus. Their willingness to pay indicates the importance they place on tree species. This finding corroborates the assertion by [9] that high level of WTP for the conservation of species in Northern Cameroon shows that conservation has been seen by respondents as important. This finding also agrees with [24] that many persons were WTP for park development in Makurdi metropolis, Benue State, Nigeria. This is also similar to the works of [20] and [21] in which 77% of the respondents were WTP for the environmental service functions of the forest. It also agrees with [28] that 87.3% of their respondents were willing to pay in cash and kind for church forest conservation in Ethiopia.

However, the finding of this study contradicts the results obtained by [1] that the people not WTP for environmental service functions of forest trees in University of Agriculture Abeokuta were more than the people WTP. Similarly, [29] reported that (78.3%) of their respondents were not WTP for environmental service function of mangrove forest in Uzere, Delta State, Nigeria. [23] also observed that 54% of their respondents were not willing to pay for ecosystem service functions of a peri-urban forest in Abeokuta, Nigeria.

There was a variation between male and female in the elicited amounts they were willing to pay for social services of the trees. Whereas the males were willing to pay a mean amount of N24, females were willing to pay a mean amount N22 per month. This is an indication that sex play a role in the determination of amount a person may be willing to pay for services provided by trees. This finding agrees with [1] who submitted that males were willing to pay higher amount for tree services than the females at the University of Agriculture Abeokuta.

The mean yearly and monthly students WTP of N553 and N46 respectively compares well with the WTP figures of N444.50 obtained by [24] in Makurdi metropolis. It is also similar to [9] where the people were WTP from 50-500 FCFA (10¢ to US $1) for wildlife conservation in North Cameroon and some individuals were willing to accept a deduction at source of 50 FCFA (10¢) from their monthly salaries. Their findings also revealed that international visitors were willing to pay RM16.14 for conservation fee compared to local visitors at only RM 7.38. The finding is also supported by [30] who estimated the value of the social and environmental benefits of forestry to the people of Britain at around £1 billion per year. [31] ascertained annual value of the ecosystem services provided by one hectare of German forests at about 319 Pounds.

This study found that male and female students differ significantly in their willingness to pay for the trees social services in the University. This finding could be attributed to the differences in which male and females view and appreciated
natural resources. This finding agrees with [15] that gender significantly influence peoples willingness to pay for conservation of natural resources in the Gunung Gading National Park, Sarawak, Malaysia. The result is also in line with [32] that gender influences WTP for nature conservation policies in state-owned forests in Austrian. However, the finding contradicts [33] who found no significant difference between gender and willingness to pay for conservation of selected Zoos in Southwest Nigeria. In same vein [34] found that gender have no influence on the student's environmental conservation awareness among secondary school students in Makurdi local government area of Benue State, Nigeria.

There was a significant difference between the Departments (course of study) of the students and their willingness to pay for the trees social services. This may be due to level of exposure of the students to environmental services of trees. This finding is in line with the submission by [35] that when students are actively involved in environmental issues, they demonstrate interest to learn about environmental topics. Also, there was a significant difference between the students’ level of study and their willingness to pay for the trees social services. This finding agrees with [15] that education is a significant variable in influencing peoples WTP for conservation of natural resources. Also, [36] agrees that education significantly influence WTP for forest resources in India. [34] agrees that the class of students has a significant role in determining the student’s level of environmental awareness. The higher the class the higher the level of environmental awareness as student in the higher class tends to be more aware of environmental conservation than the students in the lower classes. [16] asserted that the degree of knowledge that individuals have of different wildlife species influences their economic valuation of the different species and their willingness to pay for their conservation. Also, [1] noted that the higher the income and educational level of an individual the more the willingness to pay for forest service function especially in a campus environment. However, [33] reported that education do not significantly influence peoples willingness to pay for conservation of selected Zoos in Southwest Nigeria.

The highest social service provided by the tree species on campus was provision of shade. Other services provided by the trees were beautification of the environment, landscaping / viewing, health benefit, recreation, enhanced social cohesion and improving academic performance. This finding agrees with [22] and [1] that provision of shade was the highest service provided by trees in the campus of University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria. Other services provided by trees in that University were Climatic amelioration, Air pollution reduction and Ornamental, aesthetics food medicinal services.

The reason the students mostly agreed on as been responsible for the insufficiency of trees on the campus is clearance for construction purpose. Other reasons put forward by the students were bush burning, farming activities, illegal felling, animal grazing and Wind. This finding is in consonance with [37] that forest is been lost as a result of fragmentation and this represents a global threat to the forest land. [38] estimated that over 350,000 ha of forest and natural vegetation are lost annually due to farming. [39] also supported the finding that farming activities such as slash, clear cutting and burning play a major role in influencing the plant community composition and structure in Agoi-Ekpo, Cross River State Nigeria. These farming activities bring about rapid change in vegetation characteristics and the continuous cultivation of land results in the alteration of the forest vegetation. The burning of forest after clearing may hinder rapid vegetation regeneration, because the propagules that would have facilitated vegetation re-growth are killed or destroyed by the fire [40]. Agriculture, basically farming among other human activities has left distinctive imprints on plant communities by altering their richness and density [41]. Thus, [42] and [43] noted that small trees are much more vulnerable to destruction as they suffer severe injury and check back than larger ones.

5. CONCLUSION

The study has established that students of FUAM were aware of the social services provided by tree species in the University. Majority of the students were WTP for social services of the tree species to ensure conservation and continuous existence of these trees on campus. The most reason advanced by the students for their unwillingness to pay for social tree services were financial constraints. The highest social service provided by the tree species on the campus is provision of shad. Other services provided by the trees wee beautification of the environment, landscaping / viewing, health benefit, recreation, enhance social cohesion and improving
academic performance. The study also documented variation in the elicited amounts the male and female students were WTP for social services of the trees on campus. The students significantly differed in their willingness to pay for the trees social services in the University. Also, there was a significant difference between the students’ level of study and their willingness to pay for the trees social services indicating that level of studies influences students WTP for natural resources. Clearance of the tree species on campus for construction purpose was the major reason responsible for the insufficiency of trees on the campus. Other reasons put forward by the students were bush burning, farming activities, illegal felling, animal grazing and Wind. There is need to pool human materials and financial resources together to address issues relating to sustainability of forest goods and services. Therefore, awareness rallies should be conducted to intimate the students and the general populace on the importance of trees on the campus especially during remarkable days. Individuals, private firms and the government should invest in this sector through plantation establishment, reforestation, and recreational centers to ensure continual provision of the services to the people.
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