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Abstract

This study investigates the socio-cultural integration of resettler and host communities in Kuti resettlement site in Gimbo woreda one of the resettlement sites selected for the 1985/86 resettlement program. The study was conducted with 20 participants selected from the resettled and host communities. The premise for the selection of the mentioned study site is the absence of prior research in the site and to add some additional knowledge on few researches done in socio-cultural integration aspect of resettlers in general. The research follows the procedures of an exploratory case study design in examining the experiences of socio-cultural integration between the host and resettler communities. Unstructured interview guide and two FGD sessions were used as the data collection instruments. Content analysis technique was applied in this study. This technique used to analyze their socio-cultural experiences and the perceptions towards each other. Three key findings are emerged from this study. The first is that both the resettler and host communities generally have positive regard towards each other. The second finding showed that different strategies of socio-cultural integration are used by the communities such as: intermarriage, sharecropping and adoption of cultural practices. The third major finding showed that the two greatest challenges to integration are lack of equal political participation and stereotyping by both communities. In conclusion, the study findings showed that there are aspects of socio-cultural integration which were manifested socially and culturally. The social manifestations included: intermarriage, God parenting, friendship, sharecropping, borrowing and lending. The cultural manifestation pertained to the adoption of different cultural practices by both communities. The challenges of integration were also perceived by the participants as resolvable in the long run and not severe to threaten future prospects for further integration.

*Keywords*: acculturation, host, integration, resettlement, resettler, socio-cultural.
Introduction

Background of the Study

Human movement has been and still remains to be one of the characterizing features of societies across time and space. People move from place to place in search of a better life at another place, to flee from natural or man-made disasters or as part of a national scheme to facilitate development, alleviate environmental degradation etc. Resettlement is one category of human movement, which involves the permanent settlement of an individual or people in a place different from their place of origin. It implies an attempt by the incomers to reconstruct life as it was at their place of origin (Mike, 1993, p.45).

Different reasons could be attributed to the initiation of a resettlement process. In most cases the causes are man-made (such as war or development schemes) like in the case of Mozambique, Rwanda, Lebanon, Somalia and Yugoslavia (Kane cited in Senait Tibebu, 1998, p.5). Other causes for resettlement may be natural, such as land degradation, famine, natural disasters and epidemics etc. (Senait Tibebu, 1998, p.5).

The history of government sponsored resettlement in Ethiopia is a recent one although increasing rate of spontaneous resettlement has existed as far back as the state expansion campaigns of the 19th century (Pankhurst, 1992, p.13). The first government sponsored resettlement took place during the reign of Emperor Haile Selassie I (1930-74) as a response to the 1974 famine which affected most parts of north east Ethiopia. However, the most massive government sponsored resettlement took place during the rule of the socialist regime (1974-1991). The establishment of relief and rehabilitation commission in 1974, land reform proclamation of 1975 and settlement authority in 1976 dramatically facilitated resettlement schemes in the country (Pankhurst, 1992, p.56).
Two types of resettlement took place during this period. These were: conventional and integrated resettlement. The conventional resettlement program (referred to as ‘medebegna sefera’ in Amharic) involved placing resettlers into ‘unoccupied land’, where as integrated resettlement (also known as ‘sigsega sefera’) was ‘small scale and involved filling empty spaces within already existing settlement sites’ as part of already existing settlement (Pankhurst, 1992, p.61). The latter represented the type of resettlement which took place at Gimbo woreda, Kuti Kebele, the site selected for this research. The immediate outcome of an integrated resettled scheme is that the resettled and host communities are required to share a common living space. A result of this arrangement is that communities become interdependent (economically, socially etc), maintain relationships to facilitate this and eventually integrate.

By and large, many of the state sponsored resettlement programs in Ethiopia were devised as a response to high population growth rate that puts strain on the available resources necessary to sustain it (van Leeuwen, 2001, p.61). Some of the strains that resettlement is expected to alleviate include: fragmentation of farmlands, landlessness, environmental degradation etc. (Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), 2003, p.1).

However, due to poor assessment and hasty implementation of programs most of the schemes have been reported to be unsuccessful. Numerous resettlement schemes have been undertaken in many countries, however, many of these efforts failed due to unforeseen problems in a number of these countries. So what is required is careful planning which will ensure the successful implementation of resettlement schemes (de Wet, 2004, p.52).

Similarly, the national resettlement program of 1984/86 was disastrous due to inadequate planning, disorganization and mismanagement, unethical settler recruitment and hastily taken
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actions (Woldeselasie Abutte, 2004, pp. 77-88). This may have had wide ranging consequences for both the resettled and host communities.

This study will explore the experiences of socio-cultural integration among the host and resettled communities in Kuti Kebele in Kaffa zone. Kuti Kebele is located in Gimbo woreda which is located 432 kilometers south west of Addis Ababa and was one of the sites selected for the 1984/86 resettlement scheme. The communities from drought stricken parts of Wollo, Tigray and Showa were resettled into established settlements inhabited by indigenous Kaffa communities. And it is the interest of this study to examine what has been the experience of integration for these communities in the course of 27 years.

Statement of the Problem

The problems and concerns of people affected by resettlement scheme and their aspirations are essential components to be considered before and during the implementation of any resettlement program (Cerneaa, 2003). The focus should not be limited to considerations of the loss of physical resources but also of social and cultural assets. Therefore an assessment of resettlement and rehabilitation plan requires a holistic understanding of the social, cultural, intellectual and economic background of the affected people and knowledge of good practices to elevate them to higher levels of development (de Wet, 2004, p.52).

Unless properly addressed by the state, involuntary resettlement operations are certain to degenerate into processes of massive impoverishment and social disorganization (Asian Development Bank 1995, p. 9-11; World Bank, 2001, p.1). Many studies (Scudder and Colson, 1982; Cernea, 1991, Woldesilasie Abutte, 1997; Cernea, 2000; Tesfaye Abebe, 2007) have noted that resettlement dismantles the long established socio-economic systems and networks. Abate
Mekuria (2006), stressed that resettlement of a community is a significant factor in causing social impacts such as anxiety and stress, uncertainty, disruption to daily living, potential change to family structure, as well as impacts such as homelessness, social disarticulations, and joblessness (cited in Tesfaye Abebe, 2007, p.34).

According to McDowell (cited in Tesfaye Abebe, 2007, p.41) socio-cultural stress arises from the failure to give adequate recognition to communities’ need to remain together, lack of economic sustainability after resettlement and the disruption of cultural activities as a result of dislocation. In his discussion of social disarticulation, Cernea (2000, p.3666) stated that compulsory population displacements ‘tear apart the social fabric’ of existing communities and create risks of impoverishment.

With resettlement, the patterns of community become disrupted and with that their ability to cope with uncertainty gets reduced (Cernea, 1991 and de Wet, 2004). As a result, it is impossible to overlook the social costs of resettlement, as the weakening of the social and cultural capitals of communities seems an inevitable resettlement phenomenon (de Wet, 2004, p.53).

Pankhurst (1992, p.15) stated that, resettlement schemes carried out in Ethiopia prior to the 1984/85 famine, proved to be socially disastrous and economically unsustainable. He argued the scheme ignored the interests of the host population, and did little to ease the agricultural and environmental crisis the country faced. In general, the damage caused by resettlement outweighed the benefits. The damage was manifested in terms of high death rates of resettlers, environmental degradation, low productivity, high rates of desertion, displacement of host communities, and separation of family members (Woldeselasie Abutte, 2000, p.420-423).
In general, the totalities of studies that have been conducted so far on resettlement in the Ethiopian context are narrow in their scope. The limitation in scope can be seen from two angles. One concerns the geographical scope and the other relates to the scope in terms of the subject matter they try to explore. In relation to the geographical scope, most of the studies (Getachew Woldemeskel, 1989; Woldeselassie Abutte, 1997; Berihun Mebratie, 1999; Woldeselassie Abutte, 2000; Dechassa Lemessa, 2002) conducted so far are limited to few selected areas such as Metekel, Bale and Illubabor and have limited coverage in the experiences of other regions. In terms of the subject matter, most of the studies (Getachew Woldemeskel, 1989; Fassil Gebrekiros, 1991; Markos Ezra, 2001) have tended to focus on the socio-economic aspect of resettlement such as competition over scarce resources and livelihood strategies (agriculture, trade etc).

In recent years, some studies (Berihun Mebratie, 1999; Woldeselassie Abutte, 1997; Assefa Tolera, 1995,) have emerged which try to look at the socio-cultural consequences of resettlement schemes. For instance, in his study of ‘spontaneous settlement and inter-ethnic relations in Mätäkäl’, Berihun Mebratie (1999) has indicated that occasional conflict is common experience between the host Gumuz community and the resettled Amhara community. Despite the recurrent conflicts, some manifestations of integration prevailed through such activities as share cropping and informal conflict resolution by elderly members from both communities.

In this regard Assefa Tolera (1995) in his study of 'Ethnic integration and conflicts: the case in indigenous Oromo and Amhara in Aaroo Addis Alem northern Wollega’ summarized that there were some aspects of apparent positive relations between the Wolloye settlers and indigenous Oromos. But, according to him these days all the tolerance and respect to each other
has gone away. They see each other as threat, and particularly the Oromos want the Wolloyes to flee from ‘their land’ so that they could control all important natural resources.

Desalegn Rahmato (1988) and Woldesilasie Abute (2000, p.420-421) have also highlighted socio cultural issues in their study of Metekel area resettlements. Study findings showed that there were tendencies towards inter-ethnic integration among the resettled communities although such tendencies were absent in the relations of the resettled communities with the indigenous Gumuz. Major reasons cited for this incongruence were: language barriers and incompatible economic practices (Woldeselassie Abutte, 2000, p.425).

The above studies have largely been motivated by a desire to understand the recent inter-ethnic clashes and socio-economic relations that have afflicted communities. But these studies again were limited in their geographical scope and do not explore inter-ethnic relations within my current study area of Kaffa.

Similar to the aforementioned cases, the resettlement scheme in Gimbo woreda of Kaffa zone accommodated resettlers from Amhara and Tigray regions. The resettlers are from the north which is ecologically and climatically different from Kaffa, with its dense forests and rainy seasons. There are also ethnic, linguistic, dietary and customary variations between the resettler and host communities, which account for the socio-cultural differences that will be the interest of this study.

This study attempts to fill the gap in the knowledge base regarding the experience of socio-cultural integration among the host and resettled communities in Gimbo woreda, Kaffa. Integration is a process which requires the passage of considerable time to be felt and take effect. Consequently, this research on the socio-cultural integration of resettled and host community, in
Kaffa is timely in its undertaking considering almost three decades have passed since the resettlement took place.

This study was conducted in the context of significant changes which have taken place during the last thirty years. Some of these include: intermarriage between members of the host and resettled communities, adoption of the host’s language and cultural practices by the resettled communities and vice versa. Although integration is an ongoing process, many years have passed to render this examination of existing experiences with regard to integration pertinent.

Socio-cultural integration is not a simple process to be understood only by observation without having conducted research. This truth was realized by research results in Bale, Illubabor, Metekel & Wolega, where communities were living together but recurrent violent conflicts and hatreds have been common phenomena. In other words the mere presence of living together does not necessarily imply the presence of peace and integration. Because, who knows, trusting simple observation of ‘living together’ as indicator of integration, may result to the other end unless it is known through research finding and tackled accordingly. Therefore, conducting this research in the study area could help by filling the knowledge gap about the nature of relationship in the communities of the study area and by adding knowledge base of socio-cultural integration issues. On the basis of this argument this research is conducted to answer the following research questions and objectives.

**Research Questions**

What is the experience of socio-cultural integration among the resettled and host communities in Gimbo?
This study also addresses the following specific questions which serve as input for answering the main research question.

1) What are the perceptions of the two communities towards each other?
2) What are the strategies of socio-cultural integration in the resettled and host communities?
3) What issues hold back the integration process as seen by the resettled and host communities?
4) What has been changed since the resettlement from both communities’ perceptions, culture etc?

Research Objectives

The general objective of this study is to explore the experience of socio-cultural integration between the resettler and host communities at Kuti Kebele, Gimbo Woreda, in Kaffa zone.

Specific objectives.

1. Understanding the perceptions of one community towards the other and the changes occurred through time.
2. Examining the strategies of socio-cultural integration among the resettled and host communities.
3. Examining the challenges that hold back socio-cultural integration between the resettled and host communities.

Significance of the Study

This study contributes by enriching the knowledge base in the social sciences and social work education in particular, regarding the socio-cultural opportunities and challenges inherent in a resettlement program. The implications for social work education is particularly
significant, as the school is in the process of revising its curriculum to accommodate local knowledge thereby rendering social work education in Ethiopia relevant to contextual needs.

The findings from this research could also unveil some areas which may require intervention. And since the study is dealing with aspects of inter-communities relations, issues such as cultural domination, inter-communities hostilities may emerge in the findings, which may necessitate an intervention by social work practitioners especially community workers. Consistent with the social work tradition of a strength based approach this study would also hopefully enable to highlight the strategies for coexistence used by both the resettled and host communities, based on which possible interventions could be designed. The finding of this research could have its own contributions to other fields and professions too.

Finally, this research could come up with data which would be relevant for local government offices (the woreda and zone offices), as it could help them gain an understanding of the structural barriers that limit the abilities of resettled and host communities to effectively integrate and be able to access different resources. The experience of resettled and host communities as depicted in this study could encourage planners and implementers of similar resettlement programs that are taking place in adjacent woredas to be more cautious in their approach and also take consideration of the social and cultural impacts of resettlement.

**Rationale of the Study**

The researcher is interested in conducting this study, because the socio-cultural aspects of resettlement schemes were not well studied as compared to other aspects of resettlement effects. The other reason is the timing of such a research, which made it conducive to study the post resettlement effects more adequately. The large interval between the resettlement and time of
study made it possible to capture a more or less accurate picture of the level of integration. Moreover, my experience of living with the communities and the related advantage of fluency in both Amharic and Kafinoonoo, which are the most widely used languages in the area, have given the author the advantage and interest to do this research.

Last but not the least is social integration as social capital is the concern of social work in its strength based development approaches; So this research could have something to contribute to the profession by showing the gap to be given attention and exploring good experiences as a lesson for future interventions as social work implications.

The Study Area

Location.

The research is conducted in Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples Region (SNNPR), Kaffa Zone, Gimbo woreda, Kuti cite of resettlement. The place is one of the sites in the south west of the country, along with Illubabor and Wellega, selected for the 1984-86 resettlement schemes organized during the Derg regime. The study area (Gimbo Woreda) is located at about 430KMs from Addis Ababa and 90KMs south west of Jimma town and 18 KMs north of zonal capital Bonga.

Socio-cultural perspective.

The conquest of southern regions was followed by settlement of Amhara/Tigre soldiers which changed the ethnic composition of many small towns and some villages in the rural areas. Increased inter-group mobility, immigration from conquerors’ ethnic groups and introduction of victors’ system of the ethnic classification and valuation were incidents and circumstances contributing to the present ethnic situation in southern Ethiopia (Assefa Tolera, 1995, p.15).
Kaffa Kingdom was one of the provinces controlled after continued bloody wars in the then historical context (Bekele Woldemariam, 2010). Therefore, the resettlers’ general nature is not totally new to host communities, because there were spontaneous settlers in Kaffa after the conquest. That means the resettlement has taken place after Kaffas’ adoption of some Amhara cultures.

According to CSA (2007, p. 86) the population of Kaffa is 8080,251. Out of this 870,213 are native and the remaining constitutes different nationalities. Kaffa zone generally has a mild climate owing to its thick vegetation and altitude.

Kaffa has an amalgamation of cultural practices relating to both agriculture and animal husbandry. Kaffa hosted migration of the northern people (Amhara & Tigre) sometime in the middle ages of Ethiopia. This kingdom then incorporated various cultural traits from the north. Majority of the population in the area are Christians because it was introduced as far back as 16th century (Amnon, 1969, p. 53-62).

Considering all the evidences it becomes quite clear that the history of Kaffa, is not one of a single homogenous cultural system. Rather, Kaffa has a history of continual migrations and incorporation of other peoples (Amnon, 1969, p. 65).

Kaffas living in the south western province (Kaffa Zone) are different in their language (Kafinoonoo) and aspects like geographic location, and some cultural and social aspects from Amharas. But the major differences to be considered are the claim of language difference Kafinoonoo by the host and Amharic by resettlers, and claim to be original to the area by host community. Except that there is no major cultural trait to be taken as a major difference.
Limitation of the Study

Although it is very important to look into different consequences of the resettlement scheme on resettlers and host communities, however this study dealt only with the experience of socio-cultural integration aspect of resettler and host communities. This is because of author’s interest to the specific issue and also because of resource and time constraints to deal with other issues of resettlement together with the issue under consideration.
Operational Definition of Terms

**Acculturation** - refers to a process which groups or individuals undergo when they are confronted with changes in their cultural surrounding (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.96).

**Compulsory-voluntary resettlement**- occurs when people embrace forced removal out of desperation, and when voluntarily resettled people are denied the right to leave the resettlement area (Gebre Yintso, 2004).

**Conflict** - is an inherent and necessary process in human lives. They are the result of long term process and interaction between people. Conflict as understood by scholars has dual nature. On one hand it can tear apart the relationship of group of people living together and on the other hand it can be the force to build relationships (Ager & Strang, 2008).

**Ethnic conflict**- is a disagreement quarrel or strife over the important social, cultural, economic, political or territorial issues between two or more ethnic communities (Tsega Endale, 2006).

**Host community**- the indigenous residents at the resettlement site

**Induced-voluntary resettlement**- takes place when people leave their home place to resettle elsewhere due to deliberate acts of inducements coming from outside agencies (Gebre Yintso, 2004).

**Integration**- is a long-term two-way process of change that relates both to the conditions for and the actual participation in aspects of life in the given geographic area (Ager & Strang,2008, p.12)

**Involuntary resettlement**- refers to the forcible uprooting of people from their original place of residence because of natural and/or human induced disasters and/or forces (Gebre Yintso, 2004).

**Resettled community**- the new comer community at the resettlement site
Resettlement—Desalegn Rahmato (2004) defines resettlement as a phenomenon of population redistribution, either planned or unplanned. Kassahun Berhanu (cited in Helena Gizachew, 2007, p. 12) defined resettlement as the movement of people from areas where there is no other factors that are suitable for the smooth maintenance of life to areas presumed to be endowed with potentials that could provide opportunities to the same end. Hence the term resettlement is understood as planned or unplanned movement of people to get access to enough land and adequate rainfall for the betterment of their livelihood.

Socio-cultural—social and cultural associations and practices such as intermarriage, sharecropping, neighborhood, rituals, friendship, idir, iqub, mahber etc (summarized by author from interview and FGD, 2011).

Voluntary resettlement—occurs when the migrants have the power to make informed and free relocation decisions and the willingness to leave their original place (Gebre Yintso, 2004).
Literature Review

Resettlement: Global Perspective

Resettlement refers to a planned or spontaneous redistribution of phenomena of population Piguet and Dechassa Lemessa (2004, p. 133), which renders a complex process that involves intricate combinations of socio-political and economic factors that render the consequences difficult to predict and manage (Pankhurst, 2004. P.113). Researchers usually dichotomize resettlement as voluntary and involuntary resettlements (Gebre Yintso, 2004, p.96).

According to Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) over 90 percent of the increase in the world population is expected to occur in the developing nations (FAO, 1988). Many of these nations are located in humid tropics where there are major constraints on intensification of land use and sustainable development of resources. Resettlement is one of the major options available for coping with the increasing population; however, due to fragile environment very careful planning is required to implement successful resettlement schemes (FAO, 1988).

The global magnitude and frequency of development cause resettlement to highly increase. Perhaps the largest and most notorious colonization resettlement projects are those in Latin America, particularly in Brazil and adjacent countries that share portions of the same rainforest ecosystem in the Amazon basin (Guggenheim, 1994).

Numerous land development schemes have been undertaken in many countries, where an unforeseen problem in a number of these countries has been the failure of settlers to adapt to their new environment to settle (Barrow, 1997). Most Asian countries like Indonesia, Thailand and Malaysia are known for their big operations of resettlement for various purposes. China,
very recently has planned three gorges dam, which is the largest ever dam on earth (Barrow, 1997).

Many African countries (Ethiopia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Somalia, Tanzania, Zimbabwe), have experience of either development induced or disaster (human or nature) induced involuntary resettlements and new land development voluntary or spontaneous settlements (Tesfaye Abebe, 2007, p. 29).

**The Ethiopian Experience of Resettlement**

The last three governments of Ethiopia have all carried out resettlement projects with different objectives and with varying intensity but, broadly speaking, the premises on which each justified the need for resettlement were similar, at least in theory. In the 1960s and 1970s, under the Imperial regime, there were a few settlement schemes run by various government departments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Nevertheless, these were invariably small in size, *ad hoc* in nature, and were mainly designed to achieve specific and limited objectives (Tegegne 1988 and Pankhurst 1997 cited in Kebede Berhane, 2003, p. 82).

At that time state-sponsored-resettlement was largely undertaken to promote two objectives. The first of these was to rationalize land use on government “owned” land and thus raise state revenue. The second was to provide additional resources for the hard pressed northern peasantry by resettling them to the southern regions (where most government land was located) and which was mainly inhabited by ‘subordinate populations’ (Desalegn Rahmato, 2003). It was seen as a viable program because it was believed that it would expand the farmed area of the country and thereby increase gross agricultural production. It was also recommended as a means of creating employment and solving the problem of the growing excess labor force. The settlers
comprised landless peasants, evicted tenants, pastoralists and shifting cultivators, urban unemployed and ex servicemen (Pankhurst, 1992).

In dealing with resettlement schemes in Ethiopian context, several issues have been discussed such as cause of population displacement, the manner of resettlement (voluntary or involuntary, spontaneous or planned), and the resultant effects (societal and environmental). The subject of population is viewed in terms of the interaction between human and natural endowments. Such interaction akin to use of natural resources leads us to the population-environment relations since resources play a vital role in the rise and fall of societies. Often the function of environmental resources, particularly fertile land, water, and forests are viewed parallel with population trends (Almeneh Dejene, 2003, P.17).

Apart from above stated nexus, Getachew Woldemeskel (1989) pointed out the relationship between resettlement and agrarian economy and the consequence of resettlement in increasing vulnerability and impeding agricultural productivity to recurrent famine. He believed that the unjust agrarian relation of imperial regime hampered the productivity and affected the ability to produce food and sustain households. In addition to these, Getachew, citing the case of Matekel resettlement site as example, argues the resettlement measures that were taken to combat the 1974-75 famine aggravated the already existing food shortage in the country.

Yet it is hard to claim as it was successful, since it often failed to meet the intended objectives. In brief, settlement costs were high, the rate of success was low, and the viability of a number of schemes was under question. Some assessments noted specifically that the difficulties stemmed from the inadequate planning of programs, inappropriate settler selection, inadequate
Planned resettlement gained currency and gathered momentum vastly after the commencement of the revolutionary process in 1974 (Kebede Brehane, 2003). The government believed that resettlement would provide a “lasting solution” for the ‘hard-pressed’ peasantry, and particularly for the population living in the drought prone areas. It was conceived as a primary measure to rehabilitate victims of famine. For instance, planned resettlement, involving hundreds of thousands of afflicted people, took shape in the immediate aftermath of the 1984/85 famine and there were great hopes that it would provide a permanent solution for the victims of famine (Pankhurst 1992).

Resettlement under the Derg, however, encountered a series of setbacks and a host of problems. Desalegn Rahmato (2004, p. 24) sums up this experience as follows:

*In the period 1984-86, the Derge resettled some 600,000 people mostly in the lowlands of western Ethiopia. In this same period, some 33,000 settlers lost their lives due to disease, hunger, and exhaustion, and thousands of the families were broken up. It is estimated that close to half a Billion Birr was spent on emergency resettlement, but the cost of damage caused to the environment, of the loss of livestock and other property, or of the distress and suffering caused to numerous people and communities will never be known.*

In relation to this, it is worthwhile to mention the different arguments proclaimed by several researchers as to why the Derg regime forcefully resettled 600,000 people particularly from the northern parts of Ethiopia. Gebre Yintso (2004) stated that the rationale behind the large
scale resettlement was to depopulate areas where there was TPLF insurgency. However, Pankhurst (1992) refuted this argument by stating that only 15% resettlers came from Tigray. Nevertheless, Gebre Yintiso reinstated his argument that the government was highly criticized if the rational of the government was political, environmental or development induced.

De Wet (2004) had on the other hand, outlined the causes for prevailing crisis in the resettlement program is not only just on poor management or decision but rather on misunderstanding of the complexities involved. By and large, he stated the executor envisaged resettlement as a solution for a wide variety of social and economic problems instead of being designed as a specific and limited measure to meet specific objective.

Following the ousting of the Marxist military regime, with the exception of a few isolated attempts to resettle people, it seemed that planned resettlement was indefinitely suspended for some years. Recently, however, the EPRDF government has shown itself to be in favor of launching planned resettlement schemes, primarily to tackle the chronic food insecurity problem in some parts of the country. According to official statements, voluntary resettlement is viewed as a major and essential component of endeavors aimed at addressing the paramount problem of food insecurity in Ethiopia (GFDRE, 2001).

As under previous regimes, it is believed that the voluntary planned resettlement of vulnerable individuals and households will be instrumental in ensuring food security, while at the same time easing overwhelming pressure on the fragile resource base in the highlands (GFDRE, 2001). The government considered resettlement the cheapest and most viable solution to the problem of food insecurity on the basis of the availability of land in receiving areas, the labor
force of resettlers, and easing pressure of space for those remaining behind (Woldesilasie Abute, 2004).

Helena Gizachew (2007) has pointed out on the similarities and differences of the previous and the current resettlement schemes. According to her both programs share lots of similar objectives as well as outcomes. Their difference lie mainly on mobility right and land security, with people having the right to keep their land at their original location up to three years. In addition, the idea of intra-regional resettlement has reduced ethnic based conflicts in recipient areas. The notion of volunteerism and reduced government aid are also some of the difference between the previous and current resettlement programs (Helena Gizachew, 2007, p.18).

Generally, studies on resettlement signify understandings under a broader framework of migration and as Piguet and Pankhurst (2004) stressed, it requires a complex process of planning, implementation and creation of sustainability in terms of social, economic and environmental aspects.

Relations between the Host and Resettled Communities: the Trend in Ethiopia

Solomon (cited in Tesfaye Abebe, 2007), has mentioned the profile of successful settlers in Quara woreda. He draws that most have good working habit and dedication to improve their livelihood in the resettlement cite, he explained this as an indicator of good relations, on the other hand number of writers have concluded that the resettlement programs in Illubabor, Wollega and Metekel resulted in failure during previous regimes. For example so far the problem of socio-cultural integration has been indicated by (Assefa Tolera, 1995; Berihun Mebratie, 1999; Gebre Yintiso, 2004; Piguet & Dechasa Lemesa, 2004; Woldesilasie Abute, 2004).
The major factors listed for lack of smooth socio-cultural integration include resource competition; cultural difference and the historical background of ethnic groups. The inconveniences were manifested through livelihood deterioration, major health risks and deadly conflicts over resources (Gebre Yintiso, 2004). The following paragraph describes what has been used to happen in Metekel years ago.

*The Gummuz inhabitants were not keen in having the resettlers … for the resettlers were taking away their land. The movement of resettlers outside their village was checked by Gummuz’s poisonous arrow. Unfortunately, even communication among resettlers of different origin was very difficult (Getachew Woldemeskel, 1987, p. 271).*

Wood (1977, p. 329) however, in his study of ‘resettlement in Illubabor’, categorized the degree of integration process into the indigenous community into two. According to him, the short distance resettlers were rapidly integrated into the community; whereas the long distances were not. This was because short distance resettlers moving to the areas already have some friends and contacts. In contrast long distance although soon accepted by their fellow, did not become well integrated into the indigenous (Oromo) community and restricted their social contact primarily to their fellow from place of origin (p. 329).

A contact between Oromos and non-Oromos, especially Amharas, was restricted because of cultural, historical and often economic differences. The indigenous community and that of the resettlers to the province remain distrustful of each other (Assefa Tolera, 1995).

However, the co-existence of Amharas and Oromos over century has resulted in a variety of innovations in Illubabor from the adoption of teff on the part of indigenous people to the
increasing acceptance of Oromo wives by Amharas. But there was an occasional conflict between these communities (Wood, 1977, 333). On the other hand (Tsegaye Endale 2006; & Berihun, 1999) appreciated the traditional conflict resolution mechanisms in metekel through elderly.

As pointed out by Tsegaye Endalew (2006, p. 167), though there are strong relations, intra and inter-ethnic conflicts have been arising from various factors. In spite of ‘assimilation’ and eventually ‘integration’ among different ethnic groups in Metekel, there were ethnic frictions and conflicts. Generally, according to him as the case in other African countries scarcity and mobility made the conflicts in evitable.

The following is quote describes the general nature of inter-ethnic relation in the country for decades, “The major migrations of the past gave rise to endless strife, memories of which continue to nourish contemporary hatreds…occasionally; such conflict is enmeshed with major confrontations and exalted out of control” (Tsegaye Endale, 2006, p.167). That means the history of population movement has played a great role on the nature of inter-ethnic/community relationship of Ethiopia, because, as indicated above, the movements were followed by wars and conflicts.

**Types of Resettlement**

Source of initiatives for the movement matters to consider a resettlement as voluntary resettlement as spontaneous or planned (Gebre Yitso, 2004. P.96). The occurrence of spontaneous resettlement is expected to be when people on their own initiatives move to other places where they think they will be more secure in various aspects such as peace, resource ownership and health. Involuntary resettlement, on the other hand, is imposed by external agent
in a planned and controlled manner, so that the resettlement is due to external circumstances that force them to do so. The reasons include bad climatic conditions most notably scarcity and variability of rainfall, population pressure, depletion of natural resources like water and farmlands, development induced factors such as urbanization, infrastructure construction and farmland development, and social conflicts (Gebre Yintso, 2004. P.96; Mike, 1993, p. 41-48).

However, Guggenheim (1993) recognized that the distinction of resettlement schemes as voluntary and involuntary is more of theoretical than empirical (cited in Asthana, 1996, p.1468). Some researchers argue that these two distinct forms of displacement fail to highlight the specific conditions of resettlement. In an attempt to tackle this limitation Gebre Yintso (2004) has proposed a modified and more practical conceptual scheme, which identifies four major types of resettlement: voluntary, induced-voluntary, involuntary or forced, and compulsory-voluntary movements. This classification bases on the nature of willingness to move and the causes of displacement.

In this study, informed and free resettlement decisions and the willingness to leave their original place, characterizes voluntary resettlement, whereas involuntary resettlement, also known as compulsory resettlement or forced displacement (Cerne, 2000), refers to forcible uprooting of people due to natural and/or human induced disasters and/or forces. Induced-voluntary movement happens when people leave their original place due to “deliberate acts of inducements” from outside agencies. In this case the decision-making power of resettlers may be respected, but resettlers made their decisions based on the facts provided and analyzed by external agencies. It is said to be compulsory-voluntary resettlement when people agree to forced
removal out of desperation, and when “voluntarily resettled people are denied the right to leave the resettlement area” (Gebre Yintso, 2004, P.107).

Unlike the case in the conceptual dichotomy approach, Gebre Yintso (2004, p.106) argues, the modified conceptual resettlement tool provides a clear practical importance in identifying and taking care of a responsible body for the failure or success of the program. It also helps to identify and address the resettlers’ reaction to the program and identify which remedial measure is appropriate for which resettlement type. For instance, Gebre Yintso (2004, p.107) states, “compulsory-voluntary migrants embrace forced resettlement initiatives, while involuntary migrants tend to resist it. Resistance to forced resettlement tends to affect the pace and degree of reestablishment in the new environment.”

The case of population resettlement scheme under discussion in this paper may be described as state planned though different researchers argue it lacks genuine and full inclusion of the host community, key principles, approaches, implementation arrangements and in-depth planning (de Wet, 2004; Pankhurst, 1992; Woldesilasie Abutte, 2004).

Most resettlement schemes have been reported to have been failed to meet targets because of acute inappropriate planning, hasty implementation, exclusion of the host (receiving) community, inappropriate selection of the resettlers and site and other multifaceted biophysical and socioeconomic constraints. (Getachew Woldemeskel, 1989; Gebre Yintso, 2004; Pankhurst, 2004; Piguet & Dechassa Lemessa, 2004). As a result, resettlers usually face multidimensional risks in the new areas which eventually may lead to complete or partial failure of the scheme. In order to minimize, if not avoid, such risks, one requires conceptual frameworks which are capable of explaining how resettlement may lead to social and economic impoverishments.
Modes of Acculturation and Adaptation

Another important group of variables we have to deal with are acculturation styles applied by resettlers to adjust to a new culture. Acculturation refers to a process which groups or individuals undergo when they are confronted with changes in their cultural surrounding (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.96). It refers both to process and outcome. According to the writers, it occurs when groups of individuals from different cultures come into continuous contact with each other, and subsequently, there are changes in the original cultural patterns of either or both groups.

According to (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.96-97), acculturation cannot be understood as a simple process of reaction to changes in the cultural context, but rather as an active dealing with challenges experienced by newcomers when being confronted with cultural changes. Process and outcome of acculturation can be circumscribed by different strategies of adaptation which are preferred by a society and by its members. Migrant groups also differ in the extent to which their culture is similar or dissimilar to that of the host society.

Research findings show that extent and type of acculturative stress, indicated by characteristics, such as feelings of unwell-being, homesickness, depressive reactions, psychosomatics and psychopathic behavior, depend on a series of factors: At the societal level, relevant factors are nature of the host society, such as ideologies concerning acculturation(Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.96-97), and characteristics of the acculturating group, e.g., status, support, type of migration.
According to Padilla (2003, p.46), migration affects many aspects of the self, requiring significant redefinition and reconstruction of both personal and social identities. Some identities relate to membership in the host culture, and others reflect attachment to values of their heritage culture. Within their new social context, newcomers form perceptions regarding expectations that members of the dominant group have of them. Perceptions are likely to affect the process of redefining their identity and whether and to what extent they choose acculturation and membership in the host culture.

Newcomers, regardless of their heritage culture and whether they are temporary stay, must in one form or another adapt to their new cultural environment (Ward, Bochner, & Furnham cited in Padilla, 2003 p.50). According to these writers social identities they bring with them and the identities they develop in the new environment influence social cognitions that in turn guide their behavior such as the clothes they wear, the foods they eat, the people with whom they associate, the values to which they adhere, and the strategies used to accommodate to the new culture and its people (p.50-51).

To understand acculturation, it is important to keep in mind that newcomers are not always free to pursue the acculturation strategy they prefer (Berry cited in Padilla, 2003, p51). Furthermore, the expectations that a host culture has of newcomers will likely affect the acculturation and adaptation of newcomers (Schmitz, 1995). Schmitz pointed out that social stigmas affect the acculturation and adaptation of newcomers. The prevailing attitudes, whether positive or negative, have the power of constraining the adoption of the social identity of the host and thereby the acculturation path of newcomers (Schmitz, 1995).
Tajfel (cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.100) suggested the following three alternative responses open to the newcomer group when the dominant group fails to positively recognize the social identities of the newcomer group: newcomers can leave the heritage group physically and/or subjectively through a reduction in their identification with their heritage group, newcomers can reinterpret their group attributes to justify the negative stigma or to make it acceptable, and newcomers can engage in social action to promote desirable changes both inside and outside the heritage group.

Phases of Acculturation and Stress Reactions

As written by Berry & Kim (1988) cited in Schmitz (1995, p.88), when we intend to understand individual differences in reactions to acculturative stress, we also have to take into consideration the phases of acculturation. Migrants usually pass through the following phases of acculturation: pre-contact, initial contact, conflict, crisis, and adaptation. The duration of each phase varies from one person to the other. According to Berry & Kim (1988), behavioral adjustments are often accompanied by feelings of uncertainty and anxiety. In the phase of conflict immigrants often feel overwhelmed by the experience of discrepancies between demands of their own traditional system of values and norms and that of the host society (cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.88).

During the crisis phase, the newcomer attempts to test different acculturative strategies such as integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization in order to find a personally adequate coping strategy. Usually this is still accompanied by a relatively high degree of uncertainties and experienced by resettlers/newcomers as highly stressful. Once having reached the phase of adaptation and having selected a successful acculturation strategy, the amount of
acculturation stress and acculturative stress reactions, such as emotional complaints, homesickness and depressive reactions, are decreasing (Schmitz, 1995, p.88).

**Theoretical Framework**

**Scudder and Colson’s four stage model.**

Scudder-Colson Model (1982) focused on socio-cultural systems and resettlers’ stress and their specific behavioral reactions in each stage of the resettlement process. They proposed a four stage (recruitment, transition, potential economic and social development, and the consolidation or handing over stage) of model of how people and socio-cultural systems respond to resettlement.

In the first or recruitment stage, policy-makers and/or developers formulate development and resettlement plans, often without informing those to be resettled. During the second or transition stage, the targeted people learn about their future resettlement, which stimulates stress in the potential resettlers. The third stage or potential development usually occurs after the resettlers are physically moved and resettled in their new areas. At this stage, it is assumed that resettlers begin the process of rebuilding their economy and social networks. The fourth stage or incorporation refers to the handing over of local production systems and community leadership to a second generation of residents that identifies with and feels at home in the community. This theoretical framework tends to conclude that resettlement is deemed to be successful if and only if it passed through the stages and achieved the fourth resettlement stage successfully (Cernea, 2000, p. 3661).
De Wet’s “inadequate input” and “inherent complexity” approaches.

According to de Wet (2004, p.52), there are at least two broad approaches as to why things often go wrong in resettlement. These are the ‘inadequate inputs’ approach and the ‘inherent complexity’ approach. In the first approach de Wet argues resettlement goes wrong basically because of lack of appropriate inputs into the program. These include absence or lack of national legal resettlement framework, policies, planning, consultation and monitoring; political unwillingness; inadequate funding and pre-resettlement surveys; and careless implementation of the program. Cernea (cited in de Wet, 2004, p.52) pointed out these problems as “…can be controlled through a policy response that mandates and finances integrated problem resolution”.

Another de Wet’s approach (2004, p.52), is that gives an insight for the usual unsuccessfulness of resettlement programs have considered involuntary resettlement. The formulator of this approach, de Wet; called it “Inherent Complexity Approach”. In this approach, de Wet argues, resettlement fails because of the complex nature of involuntary resettlement which results in a range of problems that cannot be addressed only by the above mentioned kind of inputs. The inherent complexity nature of the involuntary resettlement arises from its basic characteristics including imposed spatial change of resettlers, significant change in the patterns of access to resources, larger and heterogeneous environment, involvement of the people in wider structure, and accelerated socioeconomic changes (p.52).

Cernea’s impoverishment risks and reconstruction model.

Cernea (2000) has already developed what he called ‘Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR)’ Model. He constructed the model around three core elements: risk,
impoverishment and reconstruction. This model is considered to be very important in the analysis and prediction of risks in relation to resettlement, particularly of development induced. According to this model, population displacement may lead to at least eight forms of socioeconomic risks: unemployment, landlessness, homelessness, food insecurity, loss of access to common property resources, social marginalization (social exclusion), community disarticulation or disjoin, and faster rate of morbidity (Cernea, 2000, p.3663). Other researchers, however, seem to expand the IRR model by including other risk variables and losses, such as the loss of access to public services (Mathur, 1998 and 1999 cited in Cernea 2000, p.3673), loss of civil rights (Downing, 1996 cited in Cernea 2000, p.3673), and temporary loss of access to schooling for school-age children (Mahpatra, 1999 cited in Cernea 2000, p.3673).

This approach seems to suggest that viably conceived, well planned and implemented resettlement scheme could at least minimize the possibility of happening of adverse effects on resettlers and host community as well as the environment. It also tends to forward that resettlement goes wrong basically because of lack of proper inputs on appropriate time and place. Cernea’s Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) model emphases the fact that potential impoverishment risks can reversed, the resettlers’ livelihoods can effectively be reconstructed and nice experiences can be learnt through appropriate planning and deep concern endeavors (Cernea, 2000, p. 3667).

de Wet’s “inadequate input” approach together with Scudder and Colson’s first and second stages (which are about the recruitment and transition stages) helped me to discuss condition of resettlers’ at about arrival in the area, while de Wet’s “inherent complexity” approach provides the means to discuss complex socio cultural integration issues after decades of
the implementation of the plan of resettlement. Whereas I used only the issue of social
disarticulation, social exclusion, community disarticulation, and vulnerable groups’ issue in
accordance with human rights as discussed in Cernea (2000,p.3666) from IRR model. Because
my area of study is related to socio-cultural integration, I preferred the social and cultural issues
rose in Cernea’s model. This has given me an insight to see socio-cultural issues from different
angles as compared to natural resource issues for which he has given more attention.

By and large Scudder & Colson’s model is used in my future discussions according to its
importance to discuss the selected thematic areas. Since the major issue of my study is socio-
cultural integration, this model, focusing on socio-cultural systems and resettlers’ stress and their
specific behavioral reactions in each stage of the resettlement process, is best fit to my purpose.
Methodology

The Study Design

The study is an exploratory case study which includes descriptive facts, folk concepts, cultural artifacts, structural arrangements, social processes, and beliefs and belief systems normally found in the group, process, activity, or situation under study (Given, 2008, p.327). According to Creswell (2007), case study is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports) (p.81)

Consequently, the research approach employed is qualitative as I was exploring a subject matter about which little is known.

The qualitative approach is more suitable in conducting an exploratory study because it helps initiate the primary grasp of social phenomena (Given, 2008, p. 327). Moreover, a qualitative –exploratory approach fits my interest which involves channeling conversation and inquiring about the experiences of study participants in a detailed manner.

Generally, this approach is suitable for doing a contextual inquiry on the experience of socio-cultural integration and the current inter-ethnic relations in the context of the existing integration from the perspective of community members.

Sampling Procedure

By using purposive sampling procedure, study participants were selected from both the host and the resettler communities. As the research is about the integration challenges and
experience in doing so, it would be appropriate to include members from both groups as targets for the study because integration is the process resulted from the participation of the two communities. The selection criteria used is age at the time of arrival to the resettlement site. The age selected for this purpose is school age (assumed to have a recollection of experiences during and after the resettlement) and above, as it is expected this category of individuals to have a more profound memory of their experiences at the time (Aslund, 2009, p. 5). Because the resettlement took place in 1984/85, the present age bracket of participants is 33 and above. There is no upper limit of age except individuals lose their capacity of recalling their experience because of age related health problems or other physical and biological problems that could affect her/his ability to talk and recall the experience.

Ten participants from each community were selected; sex proportionality and religious composition is also considered because these inclusion criteria helped to minimize the gap which might result from failure to consider diversity. Of the 20, 6 were volunteered females participants and the rest were males.

**Data Collection Method**

In doing this study both primary and secondary sources of data were utilized. The primary sources of data include members of the host and resettled communities in Gimbo woreda, Kaffa zone. The data collection instruments used include: unstructured interview and focus group discussions.

The unstructured interview was used to generate detailed data about the experiences of the resettled and host communities. In unstructured interview the researcher engages in informal conversation with the target of study, which is guided by open ended questions (Given, 2008, p.
907). This enabled the author to gain a comprehensive understanding of the range of challenges and opportunities inherent in the social integration process.

Two focus group discussions were also conducted one with the host and the other with resettled communities. Discussion points used for FGDs were few questions selected from individual interview questions based on the objective of the study. The questions were posed by the author for them to discuss on it and the author was only facilitator of the discussion. This method enabled the generation of data regarding shared experiences and highlights the core challenges experienced and strategies adopted by the community. In addition to this it added trustworthiness to my data.

In addition, secondary sources of data are reviewed to get a grasp of the existing knowledge base on the subject of study. Secondary sources of data reviewed include: articles, books, book chapters and government documents, publications by international organizations, theses and doctoral dissertations.

By and large, my world view is influenced by social constructivist thinking. In a social constructivist paradigm the research process is highly focused in understanding the subjective experiences of participants of a study and how they come to give meaning to things. Emphasis is given to coming up with a contextual understanding of what people say and do under certain circumstances or in specific situations (Given, 2008, p. 826).

**Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Data collected through the unstructured interview and the focus group discussions are analyzed together, because the objective of the FGDs is to understand how much do they commonly share experiences raised during individual interview in group level. The interview
was used to get an in depth understanding of the overall experiences of members from both the resettled and host communities, while the focus group discussions conducted to get more understanding of how each community conceptualizes ‘the other’ community and why.

Data collected through the interview with the help of a tape recorder was first transcribed word for word. The transcription, which is in Kafinoonoo or Amharic, was then translated to English, which is the medium of instruction at the University. The analysis of data collected through a qualitative approach requires the researcher to manage a large mass of data all of which may not be directly relevant to the study. So the entire processes of analyzing the transcribed data involve a continuous process of coding data and identifying categories.

The technique which was used to analyze transcribed data from the interview was content analysis. Content analysis is an important technique which enables the categorization of data for purposes of summarization and further interpretation (Hancock, 2002, p.17). Two major categories exist in this analysis: the experiences of the resettled community and that of the host community. It is under these broad categories that the experiences of study participants from each community were discussed. The reason for this categorization is my assumption that the experiences of the resettled and host communities are very distinct and need to be dealt with accordingly.

The process of analysis was as follows: first the transcribed data from each case was read thoroughly. Then different concepts, terms and texts that are related to the research questions were coded. A code book was prepared that served as an organizing tool for listing the codes identified in each case and classifying them into categories. Each major category
constitutes a concept or an issue under which one or more minor categories were discussed. New categories were continuously formed as new data continued to emerge.

Once all possible categories of data were identified, each category was examined and themes that run throughout the categories were identified. Consequently, thematic areas comprising of one or more major categories were formed. These thematic areas formed the pillars for discussing the study findings from the unstructured interviews. It is under these thematic areas that study findings were further analyzed in light of the theoretical framework.

Content analysis was again used to analyze data collected through the focus group discussions. The tape recorded sessions were transcribed and then translated to facilitate further analysis. The transcriptions from the resettled and host communities were analyzed in the same sections with interview data for each community separately. Finally the study findings and discussions found from interview and FGDs data were analyzed together under each thematic area for each community.

**Ethical Considerations**

In the process of conducting this study several ethical considerations were taken into account. At the beginning of the study participants were provided with a written consent form that states the purpose of the study, roles and rights of participants, the author’s responsibilities as a researcher and the possible risks associated with participation in the study. I read the consent to them and after few minutes of discussion on the consent form they signed the form.

The ethical considerations were aimed at preserving participants’ right to self-determination and the right to be respected. The consent form which informed them of the possible risks associated with participation alleviated the occurrence of risks by allowing
participants to self assess their capacities to cope with stressful memories. However, utmost care has been taken during the interview process or the focus group discussions by keeping the line of questioning appropriate and thereby eliminated any possibility for traumatizing.

Data collected from the interviews and the focus group discussions were kept confidential. An exception to this was my academic advisor who has authorized access to the collected material. Study participants also have the right to be respected and request access to the draft and final copy of the research paper.

**Trustworthiness of the study**

This study used multiple sources of data (study participants, articles, books, unpublished materials etc) which were triangulated to ensure the trustworthiness of the study. Multiple data collection strategies and theories were also employed which further enhanced the trustworthiness of the study (Lather cited in Creswell, 2007, p.204).

Other strategies which were employed to ensure the trustworthiness of this study include peer review of the draft paper at different stages of the research process. A draft of the research findings were also presented to the people who participated in the study in order to ensure that their experiences and feelings have been accurately presented. This technique, also known as ‘member checking’, is considered to be ‘the most critical technique’ for ensuring trustworthiness because it takes into account the opinions of the study participants who are the primary stakeholders of the study (Lincoln & Guba cited in Creswell, 2007, p.208).
Findings of the Study

This section has two major parts: in the first part the experiences of the resettlers’ and in the second part the experiences of the host community are presented. Under each part the following themes were presented: descriptions of the socio demographic profiles of participants, their perceptions about the other community, strategies of socio-cultural integration, their experiences of integration and finally the challenges faced by participants in the integration process. All of the thematic areas were developed in accordance with the objectives outlined at the beginning of the study.

Moreover, fictitious names were used to interview participants to represent their real names. FGD participants were represented by participants’ age and given respective numbers. Because, during group discussion they did not introduce their names and this made it difficult to have fictitious names to represent their real names.

Resettler Community’s Experience

Socio-demographic profile of interviewees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Place of origin</th>
<th>Educational status</th>
<th>Livelihood</th>
<th>Years since arrival</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tsehay</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Wollo</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aynalem</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Wollo</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebene</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Wollo</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damene</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Wollo</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Gondar</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andarge</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Wollo</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melesse</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Tigray</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debebe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Wollo</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tofik</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Wollo</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The participants are selected from resettler communities that arrived there at different times. The first group arrived in 1985/86 directly from Wollo. The second group arrived in 1988/89 after 4 years stay at Gurafarda an area in the present Benchmaji Zone. Members of the latter group were originally from different parts of North and Northeast Ethiopia. They came to the site because the climate and culture of the community in Gurafarda was inhospitable. Five participants were selected from each of these groups.

The participants are between the ages of 38 to 56 and have stayed in the current site 23 to 26 years. Three of the participants are Muslims (one of them is female) while seven of the participants are Orthodox Christians (two of them are females). All of them are married with the exception of a divorced female participant. Their educational status ranges from basic education to 6th grades. Eight of them came from Wollo, two from Gondar and the remaining one from Tigray. The livelihood of all study participants is dependent on agriculture.

**Profile of the focus group discussants from the resettled community.**

The participants selected for the focus group discussion were 8, out of which five were females and the rest three were males. This is because fewer males were willing to participate in the FGD since it was a time of preparation of land for agriculture (March, April, &May). So as to fill this gap I used more female participants during FGD.

The age range in this group was from 38 to 65. Both the oldest and the youngest were female participants. All of them were Christians, this is because the majority of the community members were Christians and I did not observe any difference in experience across religious groups during the interview. The educational status of FGD participants varied from illiterate to 6th grade. Five of them were illiterate, of which three were females, in terms of marital status all
were married and have children. Two female participants have grandchildren. The livelihood of
all of the participants is agriculture based.

age and sex distribution of focus group participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resettler community’s perceptions towards host community.

Feelings at the time of arrival.

When they described their initial reaction to the resettlement program, they said all of
them were expressing their gratitude to the government at the time. They felt like their lives
were being saved and the government was kind enough to give a helping hand at a time when
brothers, sisters, mothers and fathers and children turned on each other because of miserable
living conditions.

All of the participants explained about the extremely harsh conditions that prevailed in
their place of origin at the time of resettlement. All of the participants also explained in different
ways how welcoming the people in Kuti (the resettlement site selected for this study) were.
They said when we arrived every man was tilling the land for us, constructing houses, paving
roads, while every woman was clearing the environment, preparing coffee, participating in
agriculture, bringing furniture to be divided among us. Their description shows their satisfaction
during arrival. One of the interviewee said “it was after seeing their warm welcome and how
similar our way of lives are that I brought my wife from Asosa (Northwest Ethiopia) to join me here”.

Current experience of socio-cultural integration.

All participants of the interview attested to the presence of socio-cultural integration manifested through the presence of social, cultural and economic alliances. Some of the ways through which these alliances are expressed are: intermarriage, christening, and close friendships. Sharecropping, collective husbandry and collective work groups during different agricultural activities and house construction (wonfel and debo) were also some of the indicators of socio-cultural integration mentioned by study participants. Alliances are also further manifested in financial support among the communities through such activities like borrowing and lending of cash and animals (particularly oxen and pack animals). The above listed activities were taken as indicators for the presence of socio-cultural integration between the two communities.

According to the focus group discussants, the communal celebration of holidays, participation in different rituals, cooperation during preparations for wedding ceremonies, mahiber (a group formed to commemorate different saints through monthly meetings of members), tezkar (a feast to commemorate dead relatives), lending a hand during funeral processions, midwifery, carrying patients to the nearby clinic, as manifestations of integration. Moreover, some interviewees explained the presence of trust between the two communities, an example was given as an incidence where one of the resettler families lost a cattle and the host community found it in their backyard and returned it to the family. The families are very close
now, and there are many such examples where families from the two communities are closely allied.

’We are one flesh and one face’ is the phrase most of the interviewees used to explain their perception about the integration. The same sentiment was reflected during the FGD by two of the female participants (participants 1 & 3). They are both married with men from the host community. One of the participants said that her son-in-law is also a member of the host community and that they have now given birth to three children. According to this participant, the grandchildren are one flesh of two different ethnic groups. She said ‘be dem tekela klenal’ which literally means ‘our blood is mixed’ but which could also be taken to indicate integration.

Another participant further consolidated the previous claim by recalling the fluency of second generation civil servants from the resettler community in the local language (Kafinoono). He particularly cited the experience of a journalist working in the community radio station, in which the local language is used as the media of transmission. He said “tirit yale kefa inji man amara yilewal… kafawoch enkua esu yibetal yilalu” which means it is difficult to identify him as an Amhara when he speaks the kafinoono language on the radio.

The following passage captures the difference between resettlers’ first reaction upon arrival and their current relations with the community:

Before we adapted to the environment, cared about each other or shared every detail in our lives (hod lehod sanigenagn) like we do today, there was a kind of fear towards the other community. Thanks to their encouragement and acceptance, we are one people now and at the end love has brought us together (Melesse, male, age 56).
According to Debebe except isolated incidents where individuals get into conflicts there are no major problems experienced at the community level. He feels the two communities are fully integrated to the extent that members of the host community stand up for the resettler community in terms of preserving their interests in the decision making process at different levels.

This view was further reflected during the FGD in phrases such as

- *we are intermarried… related as God parents… in any aspect we are relatives,*
- *God knows about the future, we are one people, where would we go to if a problem occurred between the two communities except by solving it together* (participant 2, male, age 65).
- *It is hard to betray one to another. Friendship between individuals from the two communities is stronger than a friendship formed from the same community. So you cannot talk negative things to one who have a friend from the other community about his friend* (participant 7, female, age 37).

Study participants were also asked about the prospects for them to stay in their current site of residence. Most of them responded that the prospects for permanent residence at the resettlement site are very high. Six of the interview participants said that their children are the basic factors to make them stay in the resettlement site. The children both matured and young adults and kids in the school identify themselves as members of the Kaffa people and because it is place of origin to them. Hence it is very difficult for the parents to uproot and take them to their own place of origin. But five of the participants said they used to visit their relatives at the
place of origin and they want to keep on doing that and show the area to their children and grandchildren.

The other factor that they identified as influencing their decision not to return to their place of origin is the fact that, now a days, it has become very difficult to get agricultural land at their respective places of origin because of different factors like government policy, the occupation of their previous holdings by second generation residents and the absence of welcoming conditions from relatives dwelling in the place of origin. Tofik during interview explained it as follows:

*If possible I will take my children to show them the area, this is the only reason I want to go, I don’t want to go anywhere, having children it is difficult to find land there, I went to my birth place four years ago. Our land is given to other people, my relatives did not want to give me land, then I came back to Kaffa and started to cultivate (cash crops and cereals) and eucalyptus, you can see you are interviewing me in a corrugated roof house on construction. From this time onwards I will make no attempt to go back to Wollo to live there (Tofik, male, age 50).*

According to Andarge, another participant in the interview, he has never considered of going back. His plan is to try to find more land to bring his relatives from his place of origin to the resettlement area. Tsehay, a female interviewee, said she speaks on behalf of many resettlers when she says that no one wants to go back to their place of origin because the people here are interrelated and integrated or in her own words ‘*tedebalken... tewahidenal*’ which means ‘we have been mixed... we have morphed into one’.
According to Damene, the only way he would decide to go back to Wollo (his place of origin) is if he goes mad. He explained he was only 18 years old when he left his place of origin and came to the resettlement site. At the time he hadn’t attained any social standing at his place of origin because he was a young boy and as a result feels he has lost nothing as a result of the resettlement. According to him, his current status in his community, his children’s lives and other aspects of his social life are intertwined with the resettlement area. He said his children identify themselves as Kaffa and as a result has no reason to return to his place of origin.

**Strategies of integration.**

**Social support system.**

In relation to issues related to social aspects of integration, all participants (both in interview and FGD), agreed about the presence of a strong social relationship between the two communities.

*When someone from the host community dies I participate in the preparation of grave and casket. I also provide emotional support to the grieving family. The grieving period sometimes lasts up to 14 days in the host’s culture. Throughout this period my wife prepares coffee, food and drinks which she takes to the grieving family. She also stays there for some days helping out with work and giving emotional support to the family during the day time and I would spend the nights there. The degree of closeness with the family matters in determining my level of involvement. For example, when I don’t have strong relationship I only do what is expected of me as per the rules and regulations of our Idir (Ibrahim, male, age 50).*
As was described by participant 2 (male, age 47) during the FGD with resettler community, the social life of host community is very good. According to him, they lend their oxen to members of the host community when someone asks them to borrow and even divide their farmland when one is facing acute shortage of land.

*Cultural practices.*

All participants explained that the only difficult element to adopt from the host’s culture has been the local language. Aside from that, they described that they have adopted the cultivation of different root crops like *enset*, *godere* and other cereals and legumes like ’*tiliqu adenguare’*, *tiliqu tef*, coffee, which they did not cultivate at their place of origin. They also have adopted the practice of preparing & drinking ‘*borde*’ (traditional drink mostly made of *tef* flour). The only thing they identified as having to trouble to adopt is extracting the *qocho* from *enset* and making *qocho* bread. So after cultivating the *enset* plant they have either to sell or give it for sharecroppers from the host community.

Damene said that his community has learned a lot from the host community in terms of stopping the practice of early marriage among the resettler community. According to this participant, the resettlers used to widely practice early marriage but after a long stay in Kuti where such practices are considered as taboo, the resettlers have stopped the practice.

Some traditional practices have also been adopted by resettlers. According to most of the interview participants they visit witch doctors (a tribal magician credited with powers of healing, divination, and protection against the magic of others) from the host community. They have also adopted the practice of traditional honey production on large trees in the forest as well as hunting wild animals from dense forest.
Most participants of interviewed believe that their work ethics (particularly of field work) is stronger than the host community’s work ethic.

\emph{Our women and children cooperate and participate in agriculture work compared to host community’s but now they become hard worker as like as us.}

\emph{Most lands here were forests and grasses just during our arrival, after passing years of life here, now you can see everywhere in this area, there is no place without cereals and coffee trees (Tofik, male, age 50).}

**Political participation.**

Full political participation according to interview participants is hindered due to lack of skill in the \textit{kaffinoonoo} language. And without a good grasp of the language it is impossible to stand for election for public office at the \textit{kebele, woreda} or zonal level. During the interviews the participants stressed that this was not the result of problems in the relations with the community but changes in the government system.

According to the participants, although there are obstacles to participation in public office, their participation in community and faith based organizations like churches, schools and idir is not compromised still. When describing the dynamics of the resettlers’ relationship with the host community, participants said

\emph{the people of Kaffa are kind, but now because our community (resettlers) used to be prudent and/or wise (bilih) then they (host) become also prudent and wise; so that things are not like they were before. But the good part is we are still two}
faces of the same coin and we are like a candle and the thread in it (semina fetil) 
(Ibrahim, male, age 50).

They are not able to exercise power in positions at the zonal, woreda, and kebele levels. This is because of their lack of skill in the local language, and the system is imposed by the government not by the host community (Teka, interviewee from host community, male, age 44).

It would also be good to cite what was said by G/Mariam

They used to participate highly in decision making together with us at kebele, church, and school. Most of the time, it is by them that good points are raised and discussed; and moreover the ideas they raise in meetings mostly represent our thoughts (G/Mariam, interview participant from host community, male, age 62).

Melesse (interview participant from resettler community) highly stressed the issue with regard to political participation.

An Amhara person does not have the right to be elected in kebele. We are asking for our rights to be recognized. If we are not allowed to express our view points in Amharic, it would be better if the kebele doesn’t invite us to attend the meetings. 

But after all is said and done, we haven’t been harmed by the community. We are even treated fairly by the kebele administration, so our level of participation hasn’t brought much difference for us in terms of the quality of services we receive from the kebele (Melese, male, age 56).

Points raised during the group discussion with the resettler community further strengthened the views of the interviewees. According to participant 4, when he was working in
kebele as a member, anyone who can read and write kafinoonoo had the right to be elected but the problem is most of the adult group of resettler community particularly the elder ones don’t have the language skill. Most of the participants in the FGD hope that this problem won’t be present among the second generations because they grew up using the language and are fluent.

Most of the participants from the FGD affirmed the fact that the service delivery is equitable and there is no segregation based on ethnic background. The only thing they wanted to have changed currently is that members of the resettler community be equally represented within the administrative unit as it was before the implementation of kaffinoonoo as the working language in public offices.

**Challenges of integration.**

The major challenge identified by participants during interview was language barrier which hampers their communication in daily life, impedes their ability for political participation. Other challenges that were identified were isolated incidents of personal conflicts between individuals and shortage of agriculture land.

Language was identified as the major barrier for their integration and played great role for weakening the strength of integration. Seven of the interview participants described that the only difficult thing to adopt is the language (*kaffinoonoo*), and it is only the language which hinders their political participation, acts as barrier for effective communication.

This challenge is especially being experienced among the elderly members of the resettled community. In this regard, the second generation is facilitating communication between the first generation resettlers and the host community by acting as interpreters for their parents and grandparents. It was pointed out by the participants that, since the second generation group can
communicate using both languages, it will be easier for them to integrate with the host community.

**The Host Community’s Experience**

**Socio-demographic profile of interviewees.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Educational status</th>
<th>Livelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demise</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamene</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/Mariam</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jemal</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Madrasa</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petros</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Church education</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemede</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>Agriculture &amp; trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenebech</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Widow</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negash</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alemitu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Basic edu.</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the study participants from the host community have been residents in the area their whole lives. Of the ten participants seven are males and three are females. All except one of the participants are Orthodox Christians. This selection reflects the actual religious make up of the community in the area which is predominantly Orthodox Christianity.

The age range in this group is 43 to 65 years, and the educational status of participants’ ranges from illiterate to 11th grades. All of the participants included in the interview depend solely on agriculture for their livelihood, with the exception of one who earns additional income through trade.
Profile of focus group discussants from the host community.

The number of study participants from the host community that were included in the focus group discussion was 7. Out of these 6 were males. The large disparity between the number of male and female focus group discussants was created due to the lack of female members of the host community who were willing to participate in the focus group discussion.

The age of study participants ranged from 37 to 75. The youngest member was a female and the oldest was a male. All of the participants are married. All have children, while three of them have grandchildren as well. All of them have stayed their whole lives in the area. Their educational status ranges from illiterate to 10th grades. Among the participants two are religious leaders, one is sheikh (a religious title in Islam) and the other is a priest. The only female participant is 9th grade and her livelihood is based on agriculture and petty trade, particularly of tej (traditional drink made of honey and other ingredients). The livelihood of the rest of the participants is based on agriculture.

Age and sex distribution of focus group participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions towards the resettler community.

Feelings at the time of arrival.

When asked about how they were informed about the resettlement program, all participants said that it was very hasty that it seemed more like a short term campaign than a government program. Phrases which were frequently used with this regard included: “like patriots we are told to be ready”, “it was a hasty campaign”, “we also had drought stricken
relatives but the government disregarded that”, “we were expected to accept what the
government had thrown at us…we did not have the time to discuss about the issue or even be
well informed about the program”, “we were forced to prepare the land and give out furniture…
we did not even agree to give the 3 birr (per household) that they collected in the name of
facilitating the implementation of the resettlement”. From this it is possible to see how the
implementation was not coordinated and well informed particularly from the side of host
community.

Six participants of the interviews said that they were not happy by the coming of
resettlers. The reasons they put forth were described by some participants in the following way:
“we were hungry ourselves at the time”, “the government did it by force and it was dictatorial
decision”, “since it was by force we were not happy”.

But two of the participants, Alemitu and Negash said they were happy because the area
occupied by resettlers was a forest area and no settler was there. Before the resettlers came and
the forest was cleared, wild animals would come out of the forest and create havoc in the
villages. They also said because of the resettlers they have learnt to speak Amharic and the
resettlement has also increased the population size in the area, which they considered to be
good.

**Current experience of socio-cultural integration.**

Participants from the host community described the presence of socio-cultural integration
between them and resettler community and described their relationship as strong and positive.
When they described their feelings towards the resettlers they used phrases like: “they are very
nice”, “we are one”, “we are related now” “We love each other”, “there is no difference between
us”, “we help each other”, “now we can say that they are Kaffa”, “now we are just like brother and sister” and “we are one community and one flesh”.

Few participants expressed dissatisfaction using words like “we are beneath them these day”, “we made them humans but we didn’t get anything for our efforts”, “they consider themselves to be governors of Kaffa”, “there are individuals from Kaffa serving them as a slave”, “they don’t want to return the favors we did for them”, “when they first came, they used to collect kolo (roasted cereal) from the ground, but everything is the reverse now”, “now they’ve started drinking beer and teji because of us”, “they are not like the previous Amhara (spontaneous settlers who are highly integrated because their long time resettlement) resettlers”, “they have forgotten their previous life”, “some Kaffa people regret their decision to accept the resettlers”.

The interview result generated two viewpoints from a single participant, which shows the twofold attitude that the host community holds towards the resettlers.

*Kaffa is not wise because their thinking was that the area selected for resettlement was unoccupied, and that the resettlement site would act as a protection shield from the wild animals. They didn’t think about problems that would happen like shortage of farmland, shortage of forest area for honey production, and agricultural instruments (Zemede, male, age 43).*

During the interview the same interviewee said “now it is possible to say that they are Kaffa, they are just like our brothers and sisters”. Another participant said:

*Their livelihood is improving timely while we are growing down just like the horn of an aging ox. We tried to help them by sharing our cereals and worked to help*
them establish their life here. We made them proud but they have failed us. It was
them who used to collect kolo from the ground to eat but now it is our turn to do
that……..I’m an old man, to tell you the truth there is no conflict be it in market,
drinking house, in any gatherings, it is only love, we love each other so much!”
(Petros, male, age 57).

Strategies of integration.

Social support systems.

Participants from both the interview sessions and FGD explained the presence of
coordination and working together in times of happiness and hardships. For instance except
G/Mariam who said that he has no experience of working together with resettlers because of the
large size of his family, all male participants said they work through debo (cooperative field
work) in the fields of resettlers vice versa. They also explained how they support each other
through traditional social support systems such as debo, wonfel, idir, share cropping, share
animal husbandry and provide support to each other in times of sickness, during birth or death.

According to participants of the interview they have established relations with the
resettlers through God parenting, intermarriage and in the selection as best man and bridesmaid.
In addition, relations are further strengthened through involvement in social associations like
idir, mahiber, neighborhood, and friendship.

We are intermarried communities, just the society is hybrid (yaro baceheton), and
in the future the two groups are integrated and if you ask all people around here
you cannot find even four pure kaffa (ethnically) individuals, and I am sure there
will be a time that the concept of pure kaffa and amhara will be totally absent

(Tamene, male, age 65).

Teka, opposed the views of other participants who see the coming of relatives of already resettlers from other areas to live in resettlement area as danger for the future, he believes this shows the strength of the relationship they have built with the host community. In his view this is a good indicator that the resettlers have effectively been integrated and have confidence on us.

The participants (FGD and interview) felt optimistic about the future in terms of the prospects for social integration. The reason they have provided for this is promising conditions among the second generation. Since the second generation of resettlers can use the local language as a result of schooling and interaction with peers there’d be more opportunities for intermarriage and friendship ties. Other economic and cultural relationships are also expected to strengthen and occasional conflicts between members of the two communities will get reduced.

**Cultural practices.**

Regarding the adoption of cultural practices, the participants explained that they have learnt many practices from the resettler community. All of the participants particularly stressed that they have learnt to develop a strong work ethic from the resettlers.

*They (resettlers) work in the jungle and long grasses, in which there are large wild animals and snakes, in which the Kaffa community is afraid to work in. That is why now there is a surplus in the supply of many commodities in the market.*

*Thanks to them, they brought millet, white sorghum, black wheat, boleke to us and even they have better skill in fattening thin and sick cattle, sheep and goats (Teka, male, age 44).*
According to him, the resettlers are very hard working especially when compared to the host community.

Most of the participants believed that there is a big gap in the work culture between the two communities.

Our women do not work as much as their women, our children do not help their parents as much as their children do. Our people have a lot to learn from the resettlers. Both our males and females couldn’t adopt their work culture that is why their standard of living is better than ours (Tamene, male, age 65).

Regarding the females’ work culture the female participants from the host community believe women in resettler community are strong in field work. They also believe the absence of a clear division of labor between the males and females among the resettler community is a good thing. They admire the males in the resettler community for helping their wives by fetching water, washing clothes, preparing coffee, putting cereals into the mill, buying commodities from market and sometimes even baking injera (traditional bread) and preparing wot (traditional sauce served with the bread). According to the female participants, this culture is absent in the host community where it is considered shameful to engage in household chores.

Most of the participants shared the views of the FGD, about the presence of a strict division of labor among the host community. As Petros, Jemal, and Netsanet described during the interview the husband in the host culture prefers to work 24 hours on the field than help his wife for a very short period with house work. This may sometimes extend to the extent of failing to provide her with firewood.
The female participants from the host community provided the fact that they are overburdened with house chores as the reason why they don’t engage with as much field work as the resettler women. In addition to the house chores, they are charged with responsibilities of taking the cattle out for grazing, fetching water, and collecting firewood from distant areas (Alemitu, Zenebech, & Negash). According to Alemitu, “we are not totally absent from field work; we help them sometimes, though incomparable with amhara women” (Alemitu, female, age 45).

Demisse described the work culture among the resettler community as follows:

They bring well kept cattle, sheep, goats and good crops and cereals for market sale. We are traditional, awakening up from our sleep now (bat tokotoche tiyabeton), even as the origin of coffee and the first producers we are not as good as them, thanks to them the market is satisfied after the resettlement, so we have many things to change and to do to be equal with them (Demisse, male, age 51).

Where as few female participants were resistant to adopt housekeeping culture of resettler communities. To quote what was said some participants: “Oh I do not want to adopt culture of housekeeping from their females, it is only their culture of hard work that I want to adopt but I couldn’t,’ (Alemitu, female age 45).

Moreover there is a problem of cultural competence from host community members to resettlers’ dressing style, they used to wear closes contaminated by butter and they use butter for their hair and body as ointment like water pouring from jug, for which the host community does not have positive feeling to entertain (Demisse, male, age 51).
In terms of general ethics, the participants admire the resettlers’ culture, for instance as Teka explained about this point:

*Though all of us have not equal relations and formation of relatives, most of the community members have different types of attachment like God parents, best man and bridesmaid, and the like. The best thing of their culture is they don’t want to cheat, they are people whom you trust, and they respect their promises, no culture of stealing so they are very nice people. They even keep the cattle or sheep and goat of our community until they find the owner of the animal when animals get in to their neighborhood or crops (Teka, male, age 44).*

According to all of the participants, the resettlers have adopted the grave preparation technique used by the host. The grave preparation of the resettler community was described as hasty. It has only one level and is shallow, which exposes the corpse to scavengers, whereas in the side of the hosts’ a grave is made to have two levels. In the deepest level the casket is put. On the second level, which is the topmost level of the grave, slabs of wood are placed for protection against wild animals. According to them this technique was not used by the resettlers when they first came, but now most have adopted this technique.

Teka believes the funeral procession and the grieving process is different in the host community when compared to resettler. Among the host community people grief the dead person for 7-14 days based on the status, wealth and age of the deceased. The older the deceased is, the longer the duration of grieving becomes. The duration of grieving period among the resettler community according to Teka is 4-5 days. Most of the participants agreed that the funeral
procession and grieving period among the resettlers is far too short and does not adequately honor the dead.

The other culture the resettlers couldn’t adopt from the host according to Teka is *hicho* (a ritual accompanied by singing, dancing and crying of the participants and is performed separately by males and females) usually done when older and respected men passed away. The absence of this practice among the resettlers according to the participants indicates a lack of respect and love for the dead.

Teka says his community is proud of the cleansing ritual practiced by females during menstruation. The practice involves an isolation period of 4-7 days starting from the first day of menstruation until it ends. During this period, females are considered as unclean and unfit to perform any domestic or field activity and are expected to stay in a small house built for this purpose. The inability of the resettler communities to practice this is not interpreted positively.

Duummo is another ritual practiced among Kaffa women. This ritual is performed when a woman gives birth to a non-human and/or a child with physical defects. The ritual involves the disposal of the leaves to the nearest river. When doing the practice, the group of women chanting hymns asking for God’s forgiveness and glorifying Saint Mary. Dwellers in the other side of the river take the responsibility until they find the next river so as to pass the responsibility and it goes this way until non believers of this practice come across. This ritual is performed so to avert similar misfortunes from happening in the future. According to the study participants, the failure of the resettlers to observe this ritual is unfortunate and not approved of by the resettlers.

Most of the participants showed appreciation towards the resettlers eating habits. According to the participants, during *debo* and other field activities the resettlers bring food to
eat before and after work, which according to the participants boosts the workers energy and morale. This habit, according to Zemede, is also being adopted by the host community who merely used to bring snacks (such as kolo, nifro (boiled cereals), tella (traditional beer) and borde (traditional beer prepared from teff)) to the field.

**Resource utilization.**

The resettlement site (land) was ‘not occupied’ by anyone before the resettlers came. So it can be said the resettlers did not take a land which belonged to someone, as a result of which, there was premise to compete over resource. Sometimes there would be quarrels that might happen when domestic animals destroy their crops during spring and summer seasons. But even such problems were usually solved by negotiation between the two parties or mediation by the elders. But there was not any big conflict on the basis of resource utilization competition.

*We are one people. Consequently, there have been no conflicts over resource. We use the same forest to make agricultural tools, and other materials without problem. The only problem is we don’t have as much spare land as we did before the resettlers came. You cannot fallow the land even for six months let alone for four, five and six years like we did before they came. Their coming has had an impact on our work culture…we have become hard workers and competitive. But this also leads to increasing demand for agricultural land and shorter fallow periods which compromises soil fertility. We are using artificial fertilizers now. This was not the experience of the local people before the resettlers came to the area and occupied the space we ocasionally used the land for fallowing.*

(Zemede, male, age 43).
Challenges of integration.

The interview results indicated the absence of major challenges in integration. The problem identified by the participants of the host community primarily related to the lack of commitment from the resettler community to adopt some of the host’s cultural practices. Some of these practices include: the cleansing ritual practiced among females during menstruation, hicho (funeral ceremony accompanied by music and dancing to honor the deceased) and dummoo (a ritual practiced among Kaffa women in the occurrence of defective birth).

Teka shared the resettler’s point of view in terms of “lack of language skill to communicate using the kaffinoonoo language” as a barrier to full political participation for resettlers and as barrier to easily communicate, particularly with older members of host community. According to him this used to holdback effective integration process.
Discussion

In the previous section, commonalities identified across the cases were presented. These commonalities were treated under each thematic area, although each case and experience was unique. In this section, the narrative provided under each thematic category is examined in light of the existing literature and the theoretical framework. This helps to compare the study findings with the existing knowledge base on the study area. To maintain consistency and precision, this discussion is organized based on the findings presented in the previous chapter.

The Nature of the Resettlement

The characteristics of the resettlement process at Kuti site was compulsory-voluntary, because the proposal for resettlement came from the government at the time. A resettlement is compulsory-voluntary, when people agree to forced removal out of desperation, and when “voluntarily resettled people are denied the right to leave the resettlement area” (Gebre Yintso, 2004, P.107). But it was also voluntary because the people agreed to the proposal out of necessity, since there was famine and drought in the area of origin. According to the participants that was why they agreed to resettle since there was no other option given by the government. Therefore, based on the participants’ account of the resettlement process, the type of resettlement that took place can be categorized as ‘compulsory-voluntary’ resettlement.

There were problems during the time of resettlement from the viewpoint of both the host and resettled communities. The first categories of problems were experienced by the resettlers and these are related to: acute problems of sickness, death, and trouble adapting to new physical and human environment. Those problems experienced by the host community at the initial stages of the resettlement process pertained to: food shortage caused from crop
failure, villagization program, and hardships of the then government and on top of these the preparation of resettlement site. In this regard, Pankhurst (1992, p.15) stated that, resettlement schemes carried out in Ethiopia prior to the 1984/85 famine, ignored the interests of the host population, and did little to ease the agricultural and environmental crisis the country faced during that time.

The case of population resettlement scheme under discussion may be described as state planned though different researchers argue it lacks genuine and full inclusion of the host community, key principles, approaches, implementation arrangements and in-depth planning (de Wet, 2004; Pankhurst, 1992; Woldesilasie Abutte, 2004). This was further illustrated by the study participants from the host community who explained that, though they were happy about the coming of resettlers, they were burdened with government programs like villagization, shortage of food and a hasty order by the government to contribute 3birr per household in preparation for the resettlement site. When seeing their explanation from de Wet’s, Pankhurst’s, and Woldesilasie’s point of views, it becomes evident that the conditions and interests of the host communities in the study area were not given any consideration.

The process of Socio-Cultural Integration as Compared to Scudder and Colson’s Model

Participants’ perception of socio-cultural integration is interpreted from Scudder-Colson four stage model of resettlement process. These are recruitment, transition, potential economic and social development, and the consolidation or handing over stage. These stages describe how people and socio-cultural systems respond to resettlement (Scudder and Colson, 1982).

During the recruitment stage, policy-makers and/or developers formulated development and resettlement plans, often without informing those to be resettled. In this regard both
communities explained in different ways that the program was hasty. Most of the participants from the resettler community thanked the government, and they explained despite its hastiness for arranging things like selling properties before moving to place of resettlement, since their life condition was too bad to live for a long time in place of origin they preferred resettlement. Most participants from the host community blamed the then government for its implementation of an unplanned and hasty program while there were persistent problems of hunger, crop failure and villagisation program in the area of host community.

Because of the severe famine and drought at the place of origin and the comparably better environment at the place of destination and help provided from government and host community, the resettlers did not complain about the conditions at the place of destination. However, the resettlers mentioned that they experienced emotional distress as a result of their loss of social, cultural and physical capital in the place of origin. This is because with resettlement, the patterns of community become disrupted and with that their ability to cope with uncertainty gets reduced (Cerneea, 1991 and de Wet, 2004). As a result, it is impossible to overlook the social costs of resettlement, as the weakening of the social and cultural capitals of communities seems an inevitable resettlement phenomenon (de Wet, 2004, p.53).

Because of its hasty nature, it is very difficult to understand whether or not the program encompasses the first and second stages of resettlement described by Scudder and Colson. For example during the second or transition stage, the targeted people learn about their future resettlement, which stimulates stress in the potential resettlers (Scudder & Colson, 1982). But in the case of this study they have been told suddenly and spent their time of second stage along the road and for some of them in temporary resettlement site (Gurafarda) which means there is
no clear time which could be categorized as to be second stage of Scudder and Colson. They might deal with this stage along the road while going to the resettlement site.

The third stage or potential development usually occurs after the resettlers are physically moved and resettled in their new areas. At this stage, it is assumed that resettlers begin the process of rebuilding their economy and social networks (Scudder and Colson, 1982). From the description of participants, it is easy to understand that third stage has been occurred. In light of this both communities’ participants explained the presence of social and cultural relationships. Participants from both communities explained that they already started sharecropping, intermarriage and other forms of relations, work cooperation, sharing resources, helping each other during problems, borrowing and lending of seeds, animals (pack animals and oxen), and money. This is a clear indication of the occurrence of Scudder& Colson’s third stage in the case of the study participants.

From Derg regime to 2007/8, they were exercising political power equally with the host community, but now things are changed and the ‘major’ political positions like kebele chair person, secretary, even school directors could not be elected from resettler community using host’s language ability as pretext to have those positions, while in other social and cultural aspects the two communities experienced integration and/or incorporation which means Scudder and Colson’s forth stage. The fourth stage which refers to the handing over of local production systems and community leadership to a second generation of residents that identifies with and feels at home in the community. The second generation’s identification as at home in community is one of the finding of this study which even was described by participants of both communities and both FGDs as hope of further integration for the future.
The resettler community participants complained about being systematically denied their right to equal political participation based on the premise that they don’t have full command of the local language. For this, the resettlers blamed the incumbent government system and not the local community. They strengthened this claim by recalling that they exercised equal right to elect and be elected during the previous regime of Derg, and there was no complain from the host community since both communities were proportionally represented in leadership positions. This implies the absence of well established fourth stage of Scudder and Colson’s model in the communities under study. Of course because of difference in geographical location, technology, socio-cultural aspects and the like, there could be difference in the process of the occurrence of each stage at different places and time.

**Perceptions of Participants towards the Other Community and changes occurred through time**

Participants perceived socio-cultural integration as ranging from greeting each other to forming different forms of relations between members of the two communities. And few individuals interview and FGDs results showed that the concept of socio-cultural integration extends to the level of thinking as ‘one flesh’, ‘shared blood’, ‘one community’ and ‘identifying oneself to the group’. This clearly revealed what Schmitz described about acculturation. According to him once having reached the phase of adaptation and having selected a successful acculturation strategy, the amount of acculturation stress and acculturative stress reactions, such as emotional complaints, homesickness and depressive reactions, decrease (Schmitz, 1995, p.88), which means the feeling of oneness, togetherness, ownership and belongingness replace those stressing thoughts and actions.
Relevant factors could affect the integration process, such as ideologies concerning acculturation (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.96-97), and characteristics of the acculturating group, e.g. status, support, and type of migration. One of the participants from resettler community explained that he had no social status at his place of origin but now he’s a highly esteemed person among the community in his current area of residence. As a result, he does not want to go back to his place of origin and he has no care and plan to go. According to him, all of his good and bad memories are linked with the place of resettlement and he is used to the way of life here and feels like he is part of it. Therefore, according to him he has no reason to go since the social status he has now was not developed in place of origin.

Groups differ in the extent to which their culture is similar or dissimilar to that of the host society (Berry, Poortinga, Segall, & Dasen, cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.96-97). That is why most resettlers particularly those who came from the temporary resettlement site of Gurafarda and Christian resettlers repeatedly described the similarities in religion and dietary and dressing customs as encouraging conditions for integration. Process and outcome of acculturation can be circumscribed by different strategies of adaptation which are preferred by a society and by its members. From this it is possible to infer that, the apparent similarity of the socio-cultural context of the two communities has positively affected their relationship and the integration process in general.

But there was also acculturative stress during time of arrival. The model of phases of acculturation views resettlers as passing through the phases of: pre-contact, initial contact, conflict, crisis, and adaptation. Behavioral adjustments are often accompanied by feelings of
uncertainty and anxiety. In the conflict phase individuals often feel overwhelmed by the experience of discrepancies between demands of their own traditional system of values and norms and that of the host society (Berry & Kim, 1988 cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.88). In light of this, according to some of the study participants there was stress at the time of arrival prior to adapting to the new environment and people. The resettlers were apprehensive about how they’d be perceived and treated by the other community.

Results from the interviews and FGD participants from the host community showed that working together, sharing material, sharecropping, and intermarriage are considered to be indicators of integration and the presence of different forms of social bonding through friendship and marriage formation of relatives as socio-cultural integration and indicator for the presence of strong interrelationship. These indicators also holds true for participants from resettler community as well.

As has been indicated in the previous section, although the presence of integration has been indicated in different forms, the participants from the host community also expressed some problems in the integration process. The problems related to: being undermined, economic dominance, and insults from the side of resettler community. From this it can be understood that there is reservation and/or boundary when they said there is integration.

The same applies for resettler community participants when describing about the presence of integration, because after long narration of integration in different aspects by using phrases like ‘we are one’, ‘one flesh’, ‘two sides of the same coin’, and the like they started to complain about losing their political right to be elected and elect because of language barrier. This shows the host community has upper hand in terms of political participation. Therefore
still this shows the presence of gap or boundary in their integration or in other words the integration they are explaining about its presence is with reservations on such issues. Moreover, the attitude of a community towards the other is not easily understandable and/or it is mixed feeling and hard to be determined.

**Strategies of Integration**

The manifestations of socio-cultural integration described by the participants of the two communities are more or less similar both in the case of interview and FGDs. But to understand socio-cultural relations, it is important to keep in mind that newcomers are not always free to pursue the acculturation strategy they prefer (Berry cited in Padilla, 2003, p51). The study participants from both communities recognized the presence of integration as indicated before and the aspects of integration described (social and cultural) have manifested themselves in terms of formation of relations through different mechanisms such as intermarriage, assigning members from the other community as groomsman and/or maid of honor, God parents and etc. Therefore degree of freedom they have to choose the acculturation strategy suitable to them and the degree of similarity/difference between the socio-cultural backgrounds of the two communities could affect the integration process positively or negatively.

The other strategies of socio-cultural integrations are in terms of share cropping, share animal husbandry, borrowing and lending of financial and physical assets, cooperation in fieldwork, attending funeral ceremony, helping in the preparation of grave and providing support in for families grieving the loss of a relative. Cooperation is also common in the preparation of feast during weddings and other gatherings in commemoration of saints, the deceased and christenings.
Participation in the celebration of national and religious holidays and participation in different local rituals were also described as strategies of integration between the two communities. The participants from the host community were appreciative of the ideas forwarded by members of the resettler community in community meetings that are beneficial for both communities. This can also be taken as another manifestation of integration, as the expression of similar interests in decision making is indicative of a shared purpose by the two communities.

Another manifestation of socio-cultural integration is the extent to which resettlers are willing to go back to their place of origin. According to the study findings the capacity to go back to the place of origin can be seen as determined by two factors. The first is the prevailing condition at the place of origin and the second is the conditions at the place of destination. Some participants have already tried going back to place of origin, but because the conditions there were not suitable, they refrained from doing so. Conditions which were indicated as discouraging at the place of origin included shortage of farmland and disagreement on land issues with relatives at the place of origin. In this case, the factors which hindered return were discouraging situations at the place of origin.

But the factor that most participants from the resettler community cited as the reason for choosing to live in the resettlement site was the second one (that is favorable conditions at the place of resettlement). Most indicated that their attachments to the resettlement site through intermarriage, children and friendship as the major reason for not returning to their place of origin. The strong attachments and identification of second generation residents of the resettler
community with the host community were especially indicated as major reasons that members of the resettler community don’t want to return to their place of origin.

Manifestations of cultural integration are highly related to manifestations of social integration as it sometimes gets difficult to delineate between the two. Strategies of social integration relate to the social support mechanisms devised by the two communities. The strategies of cultural integration relate to the extent to which cultural practices of one community are adopted by the other one.

Cultural issues that have been examined in this regard pertain to language, religion, rituals, cultivation practices and preparation of dishes to mention a few. According to participants from the resettler group, they have adopted the food culture of the host community like preparing and consuming *gocho bread and borde*. They also reported to have adopted the cultivation of root crops (such as inset, godere, harekote and anchote) and coffee which are not cultivated in their place of origin. Participants from the resettled community also reported to have adopted, from the host community, the practice of drinking coffee in the early hours of the morning.

Tajfel (cited in Schmitz, 1995, p.100) suggested the following three alternative responses open to the newcomer group when the dominant group fails to positively recognize the social identities of the newcomer group: newcomers can leave the heritage group physically and/or subjectively through a reduction in their identification with their heritage group which was not the path chosen by the resettler community under study. The second option is newcomers can reinterpret their group attributes to justify the negative stigma or to make it acceptable, which seems the strategy used by the resettler community under study have
used. Because the resettler communities have not faced any big problems from the host communities yet hence most attributes of resettlers could have been acceptable by host communities, and resettlers are free of the legendary dangers expected to happen from God because of not practicing some of the above cultures like day of cleansing. This could justify the negative stigma given to them because of their reservation to practice such culture traits.

The final option put by Tajfel is newcomers can engage in social action to promote desirable changes both inside and outside the heritage group. This is the major strategy used by resettler community members to create a middle ground between the cultures of the two communities. For instance by adopting some cultural practices (such as dish preparation, dressing and cultivation practices) from host community and using integration strategies such as intermarriage and formation of ties they have tried to build trust among the members of the two communities. It is possible to say that this strategy has helped them to build and maintain considerable socio-cultural integration.

Participants from the host community also described their experience in the adoption of cultural practices of the resettled community. Most of the participants said that they have tried to adopt the practices of hard work and also of involvement of the entire family unit in the process of production. They said this is the best mechanism to generate better income as it promotes productivity. Moreover, participants from the host community said they have learnt a lot from the resettled community in terms of the techniques they use in protecting crops from wild animals and farming on rugged and dilapidated terrains

Members of the host community also appreciated the absence of a strict division of labor among the resettler community. They indicated that the host community has largely
adopted this culture from the resettlers and they regarded it as a good practice since females in the host community have traditionally been over burdened with house chores and farming activities. The husband and wife help each other in the resettler community’s culture as opposed to host’s culture where the greatest share of workload is placed on the wife. In the Kaffa culture passing the line of demarcation is considered to be taboo but this has been continually changing with the coming of the resettlers.

**Challenges of Integration**

Similar explanations were provided by members of the two communities with regard to the strategies they used for integration. While describing their experience in relation to integration, both communities identified some problem areas.

Participants from the resettler community complained about being systematically denied their political rights because of their lack of knowledge of the local language. Language barrier was also identified as an obstacle for the smooth interaction between the elder members of the resettled group and the host community. This further slows the rate at which socio-cultural integration takes place.

Participants from both communities attributed the problem of language barrier, especially in relation to limiting political participation among the resettled community, as an outcome of changes in the government system rather than problems inherent to the communities. This barrier was viewed by participants from both groups as negatively affecting future prospects for integration. This could also be seen in relation to the risks identified by Mathur (1998) and Downing (1996) and Mahpatra (1999) as additions to Cernea’s IRR model (cited in Cernea, 2000, p. 3673). These risks included: loss of access to public services, loss of
civil rights and temporary loss of access to schooling for school-age children all of which hold true for the resettled community.

The fact that they were explaining about was loss of full political participation and the usage of the host community’s mother tongue (kaffinoonoo) as media of instruction in school, which are among the listed risks of loses by researchers, negatively affected the process of socio-cultural integration though participants from resettler both in interview and FGD accepted the case in the school as important tool for their future integration by providing chance to the children to participate equally with host members in all aspects of socio-economic, socio-cultural and socio-political systems of the two communities.

Host community participants also complained about the house hold and environmental hygiene problem in resettler community. In addition to this, they also identified language barrier as a problem for strengthening social relations with members of the resettled community. Participants from the host community also underlined the limitation that language barrier has put on resettlers’ capacity to be involved in the decision making process.

Undermining of the host community’s culture, insults on members of the host community and economic dominance of the resettler community were identified as factors that negatively contributed to the socio-cultural integration of the two communities. Economic rivalry was identified by the host participants as the major bone of contention in their relationship with the resettled community. The host community feels let down by the resettled community because they feel the resettled community is prospering at their expense.

All female participants from the host community expressed revulsion to the homemaking practices of females of resettler communities. Some of the problems they
described related to sanitary problems particularly in the preparation of milk, milk products and other drinking and food items.

According to Padilla (2003, p.46), resettlement affects many aspects of the self, requiring significant redefinition and reconstruction of both personal and social identities. Some identities relate to membership in the host culture, and others reflect attachment to values of their heritage culture. Within their new social context, newcomers form perceptions regarding expectations that members of the dominant group have on them. Perceptions are likely to affect the process of redefining their identity and whether and to what extent they choose acculturation and membership in the host culture.

Another challenge that was expressed by participants from the host community was the failure of the resettler community to observe the cleansing ritual practiced when females are on their menstrual cycle. During this cleansing period the woman is expected to stay out of the main quarters and stay in a small house prepared for this purpose. The fact that females from the resettler community fail to observe this ritual was identified as one reason why they prefer kaffa women over women from the resettled community for marriage. This can therefore be seen as one barrier for the integration of the two communities. It also might contribute in the other way by encouraging the resettler women, to practice the rituals used to be practiced by kaffa women, to be competent enough for marrying kaffa man.

The other challenge identified by the host participants was the short duration of grieving period. According to host’s members, resettlers disregard the deceased and forget about them once they passed away. The host participant also expressed discontent toward the resettled communities for their hasty and low standard grave preparation and not practicing *hicho* (music
and dancing accompanied by crying, used to be practiced by taking rest along the road when
taking the dead to the grave, and at church). Usually this ritual is practiced in two groups of
males and females when a prominent person passes away.
Conclusion

The results of the study can be categorized into three timeframes: the time during the resettlement, the time after resettlement has taken place and the present time. Participants described the nature of relationships in all the three periods between the two communities. The participants had different perspectives about their experience during time of arrival. The resettler participants were happy about the program of the resettlement because of the hardships they faced at their place of origin. The participants from the host community painted a gloomier picture as they reported to have faced a lot of hardship in the preparation of the resettlement site at a time when most of the labor force was conscripted to serve in the military. The conditions at the resettlement site were also not suitable as a result of crop failure. In general, though they felt differently about the resettlement program, once the program was executed peaceful relations prevailed at the time of arrival.

After the resettlement took place, the participants explained that there was progress in social, cultural, economic and political interrelationships between the two communities. Language was mentioned as a major challenge or barrier by participants from both communities for further integration. This particularly, negatively affected the integration process among the elder group of both communities.

The study findings show that, in the present time different strategies of integration are in use, like intermarriage and friendships, etc and adoption of cultural practices. Once having reached the phase of adaptation and having selected a successful acculturation strategy, the amount of acculturation stress and acculturative stress reactions, such as emotional complaints, homesickness and depressive reactions decrease (Schmitz, 1995, p.88). This would be true for
communities under study particularly for resettler community, because most of the participants from the resettler group expressed their desire to stay at the resettlement site on a permanent basis and want and to go back to their place of origin only to visit relatives there. The reasons behind this desire in the case of most participants were: the favorable living conditions and the sense of attachment they have developed to the resettlement site and the other reason indicated by some participants was unfavorable conditions at the place of origin.

The finding revealed the presence of challenges from the sides of both community members. For example lack of full political participation for resettler community was repeatedly indicated by all participants of resettler community and few host community participants. For this the major reason put forth was lack of skill in the host’s language (Kafinoonoo) particularly by adult and old members of the resettler community. The participants from the resettled community considered this to be a major barrier to socio-cultural integration with the host community currently.

Participants both from the host and resettler group hope that the second generation is adopting most of the cultural practices which they believe ensures a bright future for a stronger socio-cultural integration. However, members from the host community still believe that the lack of commitment from resettler community to adopt some cultures like day of cleansing from the host community is the other challenge for more integration between the two communities.

The other challenge is prejudice from both communities towards the other’s culture. Most of the stereotypes the host community holds towards the resettler community relate to lack of hygiene. Plus to this host community participants described those individuals from the
resettler community used to insult their community and feel superior. Moreover the host participants did not feel good when describing the general economic superiority of resettler community which implies the presence of rivalry and competition over resources.

To conclude, the study findings show that there are differences and similarities in the ways that the host and resettler communities perceive the social and cultural make up of one another. Given the circumstances and the socio-cultural differences, the two communities have managed to coexist although there have been some challenges in the process. Integration is an ongoing process that never ends at any one point and from the study findings it was also possible to observe that changes have occurred in the social and cultural make up of both communities between the time of resettlement and the point at which this study was carried out. Both communities have adopted elements of the social and cultural system of the other community although not completely.

Integration is strongest on indicators of social support, intermarriage and interrelations between community members. The level of integration is weakest with regard to the resettlers’ level of participation in decision making. There are still differences in the ways of lives of the two communities however the emergence of an interbred second generation will take the integration process to the next stage.
Implications of the Study

There should be a coordinated response of different constituencies to protect and provide services to people stricken by any natural or manmade disasters. Using government intervention, like the case of the resettlement program under study, which does not take into consideration the interests of both communities particularly of host communities’, is not an effective way of solving problems. To achieve the goal, there is a need to design a multi-layered approach in practice, research, and policy levels that could addresses the structural causes of drought and famine while providing immediate service to the affected people to ensure sustainability.

Implication for Social Work Practice

Socio-cultural understanding and socio-cultural competence on the basis of diversity is a concern of social work profession and a skill needed from social work professionals. Therefore social workers should promote the full involvement of all stakeholders of resettlement like government, resettlers, host community, environmentalists, resource analysts and other crucial stakeholders that will enable them to be empowered in decisions and actions related to decision making about the implementation of resettlement program. This is aimed at ensuring the implementations of resettlement programs that are planned, wanted, and occur at an optimal time as opposed to hasty and disintegrated because of lack of organized & coordinated resettlement program as the case under study. Hence, enabling communities to seek the process of resettlement which could result to strong socio-cultural integration among resettler and host community members is important.

This implies that social work practice should utilize a person-in-environment framework in order to address socio-cultural integration through an understanding of the socio-cultural
context of both communities. This means that, resettlement programs should consider the socio-cultural context rather than solely focusing on the economic and political implications on the communities under consideration. Programs and social work practices should focus on the promotion and management of social and cultural competences of individuals and groups and should be grounded in full understanding of complex inherent issues of resettlers and host communities social-cultural context.

There is a need for programs that treat the two communities with equal attention economically, psycho-socially, culturally, spiritually as well as politically. Social workers should also engage in advocacy aimed at bringing the better conditions for the resettler and host communities and facilitate integration so as to help communities overcome the major challenges identified by participants of the study.

Moreover, mechanisms like community-based literacy programs or short term trainings and workshops on issues like skill of cultural competence, and/or tolerance, importance of integration, issues of diversity and issues about stereotyping etc; are important in creating an environment conducive for socio-cultural competence and integration. This is important because it can particularly help members of both [host and resettler] communities to develop their self-esteem, and confidence needed to improve their well-being. It is also necessary to ensure community assistance for already established integration and to build strong foundation of future socio-cultural integration. For doing this, utilization of community-based institutions would be a mechanism to deal with the issues.

Local institutions like church and school are well-positioned to bring about a cultural-revolution in attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors, and to provide appropriate support for
communities. This enables them to address the unbalanced power relations between the communities through the development of new ways of socializing children in which virtually all will come to believe in equality between the two communities. Such intervention points would also create successful strategies to address the challenges.

Initiatives aimed at promoting socio-cultural integration at community level should ensure the participation of members of community, who will act as agents of change. Members’ disproportionate share of political participation is considered to be one of the challenges to socio-cultural integration process. Therefore, efforts to alleviate the problem cannot be successful without the meaningful involvement of all members of the two communities.

This research affirms the necessity of strength-based approaches to interventions dealing with socio-cultural diversity and integration issues. This helps to explore and develop the strengths perceived and explained by the participants of the study to create better lives and create the awareness of the community and policy-makers. The more that the community and its leaders recognize the scope of the problem, understand its implication and the severity of its emotional, political and psychosocial consequences, the more likely a consensus to take action will develop.

Understanding the feelings of community members about their differences, social relationships and the meanings they attach to living together will be important in developing strategies to enhance socio-cultural integration. Moreover, this helps to understand the complex nature of socio-cultural integration and to identify the strengths, personal strategies, and level of emotional and psychosocial support demanded by members of each community.
In addition, programs of community conversation may encourage communities to share feelings previously kept secret and to facilitate self discovery, positive subjective interpretation, and acceptance of diversity among communities.

**Implication for Future Research**

The study shows the need to have a deep understanding of aspects in socio-cultural integration like the presence or absence of stereotype, impact of differences in socio-cultural background and attitude of communities to each other. This enables us to understand the prevailing social problems and build appropriate interventions by taking into consideration the experiences, feelings, coping mechanisms, and context of the communities.

Moreover, the findings of this study can serve as the basis for further research in several directions. For instance, studying the experiences of families created as a result of intermarriage, the experience of resettler children at school in which language of instruction is not their mother tongue etc. would provide broader view on the different aspects of socio-cultural manifestations at different levels of society. The findings also raise questions about the intention of few host participants when they said “we are beneath them”, “it is our turn to pick kolo from ground”, “they undermine us” and the like.

**Implication for Social Policy**

The government of Ethiopia has implemented policies and, signed major declarations, and conventions to protect human right and to respect diversity and promote peaceful and coordinated interrelationships among diverse population of Ethiopia in every context. However, the findings of this study put into question the effective implementation of these policies. This indicates the need for greater effort and commitment on the part of the government, to bring
about significant improvement and ensure the effective practical implementation of these policies. Effective & practical implementation of the declared policies is a key to bring genuine respect and tolerance for difference and assuring strong socio-cultural integration among different communities living together just like communities in the study area.

This implies that the concerned bodies should critically analyze several issues. For instance like, are they dealing with diversity when planning resettlement particularly with multi ethnic groups? How wide is the gap between the claims and realities regarding equality of communities? How should this gap be addressed?

There are some manifestations of socio-cultural integration as indicated in the study findings. This could provide a good foundation to promote further integration and alleviate challenges of integration. The government has to use this as important input so as to bring strong socio-cultural integration. The government has to device polices empowering the process of integration on the basis of local resources.

Therefore, policies should ensure equal right to political participation for both resettler and host communities. The government should also develop a system of follow up in such areas where different communities cohabitate. The follow up could be either to strengthen the already existing integrations or to minimize adversarial relationship between the two communities. But this should be done primarily through providing support to local institutions and valuating indigenous knowledge rather than direct intervention.
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Appendix I

Informed consent form

This interview guide is developed to gather all relevant information for practical fulfillment of MA degree in Social Work. The data will be utilized only for academic purpose. That is to conduct research on socio-cultural integration of resettlers with the host community. Basing on that, I want to conduct academic research on the above issue giving particular concern to Keffa Zone, Gimbo Woreda sites.

Thus this study/finding will contribute the concerned public institutions and the public at large to strengthen the positive aspects and avoid or at least minimize the negative consequences of resettlement related socio-cultural problems.

To this end this interview is designed to gather all relevant information (data) from you as resettler and host community members as well.

Moreover, tape recorder will be used while interviewing, but you will not be asked to tell your name. While interviewing, you might have possibility of retrieving past traumatic experiences. Your information is very much valuable in properly undertaking this study, and it is solely used for study purpose. And I would like to stress that all the information you provide will be strictly confidential and will be destroyed after analyzing the data. But you have the right to withdraw at any time, from the study.

Thank you!

I certify that I agree to the terms of this agreement

Signature________________________________                       Date________________
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Mashaamiyoo (informed consent form to the host community)

Ta Tizazu Gezanny geteehoo, Addisabi Universtich Social Worke masterse doyecho tatuneti qodooch dirriye korron shunabet. Ebi shunnoch eti degona qoodiyonon ta echemona oggiyonaniye.


Ebi shuunooch eti qoodiyoo ta doyoon ciichooch oggee gaccoonee. Ebiyee wott hinich yaree researcho ebiye aff shuniye biquoyooch hini sunnoo ebichi kata beti shappon ceechooch oggichi gaciyee. Baree shaligichoo taqwabebettoo echa wochee goraa besheti moyoon shaligona woyem ayinoona gaccaciinoonaa bemo hakiiyee, etanna ebin echiyooch echa wochonn ekaffoch nechoo, bare aboch beshiyoo, woyee ciiraa nechoo hakehe.


Echa wochooch qodeet ashi dukkoo____________decoo____________
Appendix IV

Interview guide

Areas of discussion for the interview with study participants from the resettled community

The conditions under which the resettled communities were brought from their place of origin
1. First reaction upon arrival
2. The initial reaction of host community as perceived by the resettled community
3. Discrepancy between expectations at the time of arrival and what was actually experienced
4. Challenges for interaction with host community/ Barriers to communication, interaction
5. Variations of experience across different groups (e.g. sex, age category, religion etc)
6. Resettled community’s attitude towards the host community
7. Current relation patterns (social support systems) compared to previous times
8. Any efforts to strengthen relations with the host community
9. Plans for return or stay
10. Any experience of cultural shock
11. Constraints to maintain cultural practices (e.g. religion, eating habits, dressing style etc.)
12. Any cultural practices that have been adopted from the host community
13. Cultural practices that have not been adopted and reasons for not doing so
14. Experience of discrimination, the reasons for it and strategies employed to manage it/minimize the effects
15. The presence of livelihood support systems
16. Experience regarding the accessibility of public services
17. Any constraints in utilizing resources (e.g. credit, farmland, forests etc.)
18. Experience of involvement in decision making (e.g. public office, traditional associations etc)
19. The presence of any separate social, cultural, political or economic system.
20. Any government programs or policy that has particularly affected the resettled community
21. Anything that the community has demanded from the government and the response from government.
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Areas of discussion for the interview with study participants from the host community

1. The conditions under which they were informed of the plans for resettlement
2. First reaction upon being informed
3. How the resettled communities were perceived initially/ how the host community felt they were being perceived by the resettled community
4. The nature of relations at the beginning
5. Discrepancy between expectations at the time of arrival and what was experienced once they arrived
6. Challenges for interaction with the resettled community/ Barriers to communication, interaction
7. Current attitude towards the resettled community
8. Current relation patterns (social support system) compared to previous times
9. Any efforts to strengthen relations with the resettled community
10. Any experience of cultural shock
11. Constraints to maintain cultural practices (e.g. religion, eating habits, dressing style etc.)
12. Any cultural practices that have been adopted from the resettled community
13. Cultural practices that have not been adopted and reasons for not doing so
14. Experience of discrimination, the reasons for it and strategies employed to manage it/minimize the effects
15. The presence of livelihood support systems
16. Any experience of competition over economic resources (e.g. farm land, grazing land, forests, water resources etc.)
17. Any government programs or policy targeted at the resettled community that have affected the host community (e.g. the education policy)
18. Perceptions regarding entitlements of the resettled community
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Guide for group discussion

1. The commonly used areas for coming together

2. The impact of diversities like age, sex, social status, education, religion etc have on the socio-cultural relations

3. The impact of the use of Kaffinoonoo language as media of instruction

4. Challenging aspects of socio-cultural relations
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