

Exploring the Impacts of Protected Areas on Local Community: the Case of Subba Sabbata Forest Park

By:

Bayissa Kisi

A Thesis Submitted to School of Social Work

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of
Social Work

Addis Ababa University

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

June 2013

Addis Ababa University

School of Graduate Studies

College of Social Sciences

**Exploring the Impacts of Protected Areas on Local Community: the Case of
Subba Sabbata Forest Park**

By:

Bayissa Kisi Lemi

Approved By Examining Board

_____	_____	_____
Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date

Acknowledgements

First, I praise my God who gave me health and strength during my academic years and this particular research project. There are also many people who made important contributions for the success of this work. I would like to forward my warm gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Fekadu Adugna whose invaluable comments did a lot to complete this thesis. I am also grateful to all my research participants from Subba Lammaffa Community and Subba Sabbata Forest Park Administration staff for their willingness to participate in the study. My heartfelt thanks also go to my beloved wife Lensa Etana for her emotional and moral support throughout the years of my study. My father Kisi Lemi and my mother Batire Dhugasa also deserve special thanks for my today's success is rooted in their unreserved support and proper upbringing from early childhood. I should also express my thankfulness to Addis Ababa University for financially supporting this research work. My friends Bikila Oljira, Jemal Taha and Robel Kassa have their own contribution for the success of this work. God bless you all!

Table of Contents

Acknowledgement.....	I
Abstract.....	1
Chapter One: Introduction.....	2
Background of the Study.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Objectives of the Study.....	7
Research Questions.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	8
Chapter Two: Research Methods.....	9
Study Design.....	9
Description of the Study Area.....	10
Study Participants and Method of Selection.....	10
Ways of Building Trust with Participants.....	11
Techniques of Data Collection.....	12
Data Quality Assurance Technique.....	14
Sources of Data.....	15
Ethical Consideration.....	15
Data Analysis Procedures.....	16
Limitation of the Study.....	16
Definition of Operational Terms.....	17
Chapter Three: Review of Related Literatures.....	18
Definition and Purpose.....	18
Historical Background.....	19
Increasing Size of Protected Areas.....	20
Protected Areas and Local People.....	22

Impacts of Protected Areas on Local Community.....	25
Benefits of Protected Areas.....	25
Costs of Protected Areas.....	27
Community Participation in the Management of Protected Areas.....	30
Chapter Four: Finding and Discussion.....	34
Findings.....	34
Personal Background of Participants.....	34
Historical Background of Subba Community and the Forest Park.....	34
Benefits of the Forest Park for the Community.....	36
Source of Employment.....	37
Alternative Income Generation.....	39
Forest as a source of Attachment.....	41
Permitted Use of the Forest and its Products.....	42
Recreational Benefits of the Forest.....	43
Using Plants for Medical Purpose.....	43
Costs of the Forest Park on Local Community.....	44
Displacement.....	44
Denial of Land Use Rights.....	46
Lack of Infrastructure.....	48
Declining Population Size and Care for Elders.....	49
Challenges Faced from Wild Animals.....	51
Discussion.....	51
Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusion and Implications.....	62
Summary and Conclusion.....	62
Implications for Social Work.....	65
Implications for Research.....	66

Implications for Practice and Policy.....	67
References.....	II
Annexes	
Consent Form.....	VI
Guiding Questions.....	VII
Observation Checklist.....	IX
Declaration.....	X

Abstract

This study entitled 'Protected Areas and Local Community' has the main objective of examining the impacts of protected areas on local community with particular reference to Subba Sabbata Forest Park. The study community is referred to as Subba Lammaffa Community and is found in the territory under the jurisdiction of Subba Sabbata Forest Park around its administration office. The specific objectives of the study are: discussing benefits that the local people obtain from forest park, exploring costs that the community incurs, to uncover how the staff and the local community conceptualize these benefits and costs and identifying some of the people's coping strategies to overcome the costs they incur due to the park's presence.

The study employed qualitative case study design in which key informant interview, focus group discussion, observation and review of different documents were used as techniques of data collection. The research participants were members of the local community and staffs of Subba Sabbata Forest Park purposively selected based on the researcher's judgment. Ten key informants (seven community members and three staff members) were interviewed. This size was determined based on the principle of data saturation. Besides, two FGDs consisting of six and seven discussants were conducted. The findings were organized into different sub-themes and themes and later discussed in relation to findings of other researchers.

The findings indicated that Subba Sabbata Forest Park has both benefits and costs on local community. The benefits include: source of employment, alternative income generation, permitted use of the forest and its resources, source of community identity, recreational benefits and medical purpose. On the other hand, the costs are dislocation, denied land use rights, poor infrastructure, restriction on the use of forest resources, declining population size and care for elderly and challenges encountered from wild animals. It was found that participants from local community and the park administration differ even sharply contrast in their perceptions regarding the costs and benefits of the forest park. In some cases, what the staff raised as benefits were found to be costs from the community's perspective while others were hardly acknowledged. There are also common understandings between the two on some other issues regarding costs and benefits of the forest park on local community.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Background of the Study

Protected areas as defined by World Conservation Union (IUCN) refer to “areas of land or sea dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity and of natural and associated cultural resources, managed through legal or other effective means” (p.5). There are different types of protected areas, of which forest parks form one category. A protected area may be a wetland, a tropical or deciduous forest, a cultivated landscape of value, an alpine region, a savannah, a marine area or any other types of natural or partially modified ecosystems or combination of types of ecosystems (Philips, 1998).

Conservation of biodiversity is the main purpose for establishing protected areas. Convention on Biological Diversity (2008) noted that establishment of protected areas is one of the major mechanisms for protecting the world’s biodiversity. World Bank (2010) also stated that the first priority of protected areas is the conservation of biodiversity, particularly when those areas contain rare, endangered or endemic species, or under-represented habitats such as grasslands or freshwater areas.

It is clear that, nowadays, conserving the world’s biodiversity is one among the issues which has received a global attention. As an increased attention on biodiversity conservation is evident, literatures indicate that there is a rapid increase in the number of protected areas worldwide. Coad et.al (2008) stated that protected area network has grown rapidly since the 1970s, and currently over 120, 000 designated areas are recorded in the World Database on

Protected Areas (WDPAs), covering approximately 12% of the terrestrial surface. World Bank (2010) also showed that protected areas constituted 13.9% of the world's land surface.

Even though there is increased attention on conservation and management of protected areas dedicated for this purpose, such attempts are mostly criticized for ignoring local people whose lives are dependent on the resources from these areas. Andrew (2009) stated that the central objective of protected area management in various countries of the world have for long over-looked the role of local people in the conservation process which results in the series of conflicts experienced in such areas. He further noted that this tends to undermine the conservation drive not only for the present, but also, for the future generations. Similarly, Ongugo et.al (2002) contend that management of protected areas has been based on the idea that protected areas are of primary importance to a nation; and, that they must be protected and shielded from people living adjacent to them. Local people are often protected from such areas through strict rules and regulations. Coad et.al (2008) put this fact as “protected area management strategies have mainly focused upon the preservation of biodiversity through ‘protectionist’ approaches. In many countries they are for the most part state-owned, with no-take policies, and provided little access other than for tourism” (p.8).

Impacts of protected areas on local communities are among the crucial issues that have to be given due emphasis in protected area management. Protected areas have both costs and benefits on the people living within or adjacent to them. Brockington & Igoe (2006) argued that protected areas provide employment and income nationally and locally, safeguard ecosystem services sustaining agriculture; provide the symbols to unite and forge nations. On the other hand, they also stated that providing more space for nature often requires constraining the people's lives and activities. Protected areas, as indicated in Coad et.al (2008), provide important

ecosystem services at the global, national and local scale while the costs are mostly incurred by the local people who rely on forest resources for their livelihoods. They further argued that carefully managed protected areas could help to alleviate poverty; conserving biological resources, providing developmental benefits to marginalized Communities while they can also increase poverty and marginalization, resulting in lost livelihoods and dislocation of communities.

Some literatures contend that protected areas should take into account their impacts on local community and consideration of alternatives. Giuliani (2007) forwarded that protected areas must provide livelihood opportunities for the people living in and around them. He further argued that if designed and managed properly, these opportunities can be compatible with goals of environmental services protection and biodiversity conservation. In contrast, Richardson (2008) argued that current proposals for expanding protected areas often continued to be made without appreciation of impacts on local people or consideration of alternatives.

As stated above, beyond their importance for biodiversity conservation, the effects (both positive and negative) of protected areas in general and forest parks in particular on local people got little attention. Therefore, the study aims to examine impacts of forest parks on local community with particular focus on Subba Sabbata Forest Park, which helps us better understand the situation in Ethiopia.

Subba Sabbata forest park is located in the Oromia Regional State, Finfinne Special Zone Walmara District. Previously, the park was known as Menagasha Subba Natural and Man Made Forest Park. It is one of the forest protected areas found in Ethiopia. Subba Lammaffa Community, the study community, is found in the territory of the forest park around Subba Sabbata Forest Park Administration Office.

Statement of the Problem

Various studies were conducted on issues revolving around protected areas and local communities in different countries. Even though it is difficult to outline all the studies in the area, the researcher tries to mention most of the studies he has accessed with the major issues they tried to emphasize on as follows.

Ongugo et.al (2002) in their study entitled ‘Livelihoods, Natural Resource Entitlements and Protected Areas: the Case of Mt. Elgon Forest in Kenya’ tried to investigate the links between forests and livelihoods in the agriculturally rich Mt. Elgon community. The study has also tried to cover the extent to which the linkages are enshrined in the forest governance structures and how such linkages impact on the management of protected forests and the game reserves.

Andrew (2009) also conducted a study on ‘Conflicts, Conservation and Natural Resource Use in Protected Area Systems: An Analysis of Recurrent Issues’. The study deals with key issues that aid to exacerbate conflicts within and around the protected area management authority and the surrounding local communities. Finally, it forwards possible solutions to reduce conflicts in protected areas, between local people and protected area management.

Another study was conducted on one of the costs of protected areas, dislocation of local communities, under the title ‘Eviction for Conservation’ by Brockington and Igoe (2006). As stated in (p.1) the research, “examines one aspect of displacement; eviction from protected areas”. This implies that it doesn’t incorporate displacement from access to livelihood or resource use. Similarly, Brockington’s (1999) research entitled ‘Conservation, Displacement and Livelihoods, the Consequences of Eviction for Pastoralists Moved from the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania’, emphasized on the consequences of eviction from the area on pastoralists.

Salisma (2000) conducted a study on ‘Local People and Protected Areas, a case study from Miraflor, Nicaragua’. The research tried to analyze the needs and expectations of different people and different interest groups affected by the conservation schemes. It also examined the possibilities of taking the local opinions into account in the management of protected areas. There are also other studies conducted on protected areas and local people (H. Redford & Fearn, 2007; Coad et.al, 2008; Giuliani, 2007; Langton, 2005 and Masozera, 2005).

However, all these studies were conducted on protected areas in different countries, while impacts of protected areas on local community are rarely studied in Ethiopia. Three studies were found while assessing literature on the area. In their research on ‘Community Attitudes towards Wildlife Conservation in Ethiopia’, Tessema et.al (2009) studied local community attitudes towards wildlife, protected areas, and protected area staff in and around four Ethiopian protected areas. Selecting four protected areas (Abijata-Shalla Lakes National Park, Awash National Park, Bale Mountains National Park and Senkelle Swayne’s Hartebeest Sanctuary), they tried to indicate whether the local communities held positive or negative attitude towards wildlife, protected area and the staff. They have also indicated justifications behind having positive or negative perceptions. While their focus was only protected areas dedicated for wild animals’ conservation, issues regarding forest protected area and local communities remained out of touch.

Another study was conducted by Bekabil & Animut (2007) focusing on farmers’ willingness to pay for the net loss as a result of conservation in Semien Mountain National Park under the title ‘ Park with People Conservation Strategy: Local Peoples’ Willingness to Pay Expected Net Losses in Ethiopia’. However, the study does not clearly indicate the costs and benefits that the local community incurs or derive due to the park’s presence.

Finally, Getachew (2007) studied impacts of conservation policies in Nechsar National Park and Yayu Forest in Illuabbabora. The study focused solely on negative consequences while there might also be certain benefits for local communities from some protected areas.

Therefore, as only few studies were conducted in Ethiopia on protected areas and local community, the researcher was interested to address the existing knowledge gap by emphasizing on Subba Sabbata Forest Park. Besides, there is no study previously conducted in the research area. The study mainly focused on examining the impacts or costs and benefits of the forest park on local community.

Objectives of the Study

The study is aimed to meet both general and specific objectives.

General objective

The general objective of the study is to examine impacts of protected areas on local people with particular emphasis on Subba Sabbata Forest Park.

Specific objectives

To meet the above general objective the research aims to address the following specific objectives.

- To discuss benefits of Subba Sabbata Forest Park for local community
- To uncover costs that the local community incurs due to the park's presence
- To explore how the local community members and the staff conceptualize benefits and costs of the forest park
- To identify the community's coping strategies to overcome costs incurred due to the park

Research Questions

The study attempts to answer the following questions.

- ✓ What are benefits that the local community gains from Subba Sabbata Forest Park?
- ✓ What are costs that the local people incur due to the park's presence?
- ✓ How the local people and staff conceptualize benefits and costs of the forest park?
- ✓ How the people try to cope with the costs incurred due to the park's presence?

Significance of the Study

This study is mainly important for three major reasons. First, as protection of natural resources, especially forest reserves is currently one of the country's attention, it is believed that the study will serve as an input for concerned bodies working on environmental conservation. Secondly, the findings of the research can also serve as valuable input for the country's environmental policy, especially concerning the impacts of protected area on local community. Thirdly, since there are only few studies conducted on local community and forest park in Ethiopia, the study contributes to fill the knowledge gap in the area. It can also serve as a basic reference for other researchers who want to conduct a study on the issue in our country.

CHAPTER TWO

Research Methods

Study design

The study employed qualitative research design to examine views of local people and the forest administration staffs on costs and benefits of the Subba Sabbata Forest Park. As Flick et.al (2004) stated “qualitative research claims to describe life worlds ‘from the inside out’, from the point of view of the people who participate” (p.3). Berg (2001) also asserts that qualitative research properly seeks answers to questions by examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings. Therefore, employing qualitative research helps the researcher to better understand views of local community and other concerned groups on impacts of the forest park.

In terms of strategy of inquiry, the study utilized descriptive case study. Case study, as indicated in Yin (2003), investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. Individuals were selected as participants from Subba Lammaffa community and Subba Sabbata Forest Park Administration based on their experience so as to get detailed data on the issue. The study is also descriptive in that it mainly tries to answer ‘what’ questions. Descriptive research aims to describe the state of affairs as it exists (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994).

The study is also cross-sectional in that it was conducted within time from March up to June, 2013. Cross-sectional study design, as indicated in Abiy et.al (2009) takes place at one point in time.

Description of the study area

Subba Sabbata Forest Park is one of the protected areas dedicated for biodiversity conservation, mainly forest resources in Ethiopia. It is found in Oromia National Regional State; Surrounding Finfinne Special Zone, Walmara District. The forest park is rich in diverse plant species and wild animals. It is managed under Oromia Forest and Wildlife Conservation Enterprise Finfinne District.

Subba Lamaffa Community is a community living in the territory of the forest park around Subba Sabbata Forest Park Administration, south west of Holeta, the capital town of Walmara district. It is one of the twenty four ‘gares’ found under Subba Kebele Administration. Subba Lamaffa Community has eighty nine (89) households of which fifty (50) are male headed while the remaining thirty nine (39) are female headed according to data obtained from the Kebele Administration.

The researcher was inspired to select the study area while he conducted a community assessment being with his group members as a partial fulfillment for one of the Social Work courses (Integrated Method I) in 2011/2012 academic year. Besides, closeness of the area is also taken into account while selecting the study area.

Study participants and method of selection

Participants of the research consisted of community members and concerned staffs from Subba Sabbata Forest Park Administration. Selections of the participants were made purposively based on the researcher’s judgment of who can provide detail information on the issue. When developing a purposive sample, as indicated in Berg (2001,) researchers use their special knowledge or expertise about some group to select subjects who represent this population.

Individuals from different age, gender, educational, economic and other social groups of the community were incorporated while selecting participants. As Maykut & Morehouse (2005) noted, in qualitative research, participants are carefully selected for inclusion, based on the possibility that each participant will expand the variability of the sample. They further stated that “purposive sampling increases the likelihood that variability common in any social phenomenon will be represented in the data, in contrast to random sampling which tries to achieve variation through the use of random selection and large sample size” (p.40). Place and time of interviews and focus group discussions were decided based participants’ convenience. The interviews mainly took place at participants’ residence and workplaces whereas the FGDs were conducted at the community’s meeting hall.

The size of participants to be included (both in in-depth interview and focus group discussions) were determined in the field during data collection based on data saturation. Ten informants were interviewed (seven from community members and three from the staff). The data started supporting the previous interviews when interviewing the ninth key informant; with only little variation. Then, the researcher stopped after interviewing the tenth key informant, which brought almost no different views from the previous interviews. Similarly, Abiy et.al (2009) argued that, if the different data sets reconfirm each other or no new data comes up any more we may stop at this point. In addition to key informant interviews, two FGDs consisting of six and seven discussants were conducted.

Ways of building trust with participants

Formerly established rapport with the community members helped the researcher to build trust. The researcher became acquainted with the area and the community while he went there to conduct community assessment with other group members a year before as indicated above. In

order to build rapport with the community at that time, we used two gate keepers who are university students and members of the community. This former acquaintance with the community made the trust easy and possible while dealing with the participants from the community.

However, the park administration staffs were unwilling to participate even while the researcher had shown them letter of cooperation written from the School of Social Work. They stressed that they could not provide any information about the organization without the permission of Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise. Thus, for the matter of trust, the researcher brought letter of cooperation from Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise Finfinne District under which the park is administered which helped to build good rapport with staffs and win their willingness for participation.

Techniques of Data Collection

As stated above, the study employed purely qualitative research design. Maykut & Morehouse (2005) put “the data of qualitative inquiry is most often people’s words and actions, and thus requires methods that allow the researcher to capture language and behavior” (p.42). Therefore, the researcher employed in-depth interview (mainly key informant interview), FDG and observation as tools of data collection.

In-depth interview

In-depth interview, as indicated in Darlington (2002), takes seriously the notion that people are experts on their own experience and so best able to report how they experienced a particular event or phenomenon. According to Mack (2005), it is an effective qualitative method for getting people to talk about their personal feelings, opinions, and experiences. Marvasti (2004) also stated that “by not limiting respondents to a fixed set of answers, in-depth

interviewing has the potential to reveal multiple, and sometimes conflicting, attitudes about a given topic” (p.114).

Since the main purpose of the study is to examine the costs and benefits of Sabbata Subba Forest Park, based on views of local community and staffs of the park, in-depth interview was used as one of the data collection techniques. The researcher prepared semi-structured interview guide based on specific objectives and personal experiences. However, this was used only as guide while the researcher also used to raise other questions during interview based on the participants’ responses. The interviews were made in language of the participants (Afan Oromo) since they are mainly from Oromo ethnic group and speak Afan Oromo.

Focus group discussion

Focus groups, according to Dawson (2009), are effective for capturing information about social norms and the variety of opinions or views within a population. He further noted that the richness of focus group data emerges from the group dynamic and the diversity of the group. Thus, the researcher employed focus group discussions in order to explore various views among community members regarding impacts of the forest park (both positive and negative). Two FGDs were conducted consisting of individuals selected from the community. They incorporated individuals from different age, gender, educational, economic and other social status groups so as to raise the likelihood of getting various viewpoints. Even though the researcher has made efforts to include staffs in the discussions, they were unwilling.

According to Berg (2001), typical focus group session consists of a small number of participants (6 up to 8) under the guidance of a facilitator, usually called the moderator. In this study, the researcher served the roles of both moderator and note taking during discussions.

Observation

Observation was employed in order to collect data concerning the physical setting, living conditions and socio-economic activities of the community. Sapsford & Jupp (2006) assert that “as observation enables the researcher to note down what he or she sees as it occurs, observational data are often more accurate” (p. 58). They further stated that as many important features of the environment and behavior are taken for granted by participants, it requires the trained eye of the observer to ‘see the familiar as strange’ and provide the detailed description required. Therefore, the researcher prepared semi-structured observation checklist about things to be observed. Then, he took field notes about things observed in the study area based on the checklist.

Data Quality Assurance Technique

Dawson (2009) stated that determinations of accuracy in qualitative research involve verifying the information with participants or triangulating among different sources of information. The two techniques were employed by the researcher in order assure the quality of data obtained. In each interview or focus group discussion, the researcher took time with the participants to check whether the data really represents their view either by reading his notes of interview or focus group discussion or by expressing the way he understood them. Then, corrections were made based on the participants’ feedback.

Triangulation was also used to assure the trustworthiness of the data. The researcher tried to triangulate data obtained through the three techniques (in-depth interview, FGD and observation) against one another in order to enhance its trustworthiness.

Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary sources of data were employed in the research.

Primary Sources: The primary sources include information collected directly from research participants through in-depth interview, focus group discussion and observation.

Secondary sources: These are information obtained through accessing different books, journals, articles relevant to the issue under discussion. Documents of Subba Sabbata Forest Park and Oromia Regional State Forest and Wildlife Conservation Institute and other organizations working on forest conservation or protected areas were also utilized.

Ethical Consideration

Ethical issues in research were given due emphasis throughout the study. The researcher develops an informed consent form for participants to sign before they engage in the research which acknowledges that participants' rights have been protected (Creswell, 2004). Informed consent, as described in Abiy et.al (2009), is a process by which a study participant voluntarily confirms his or her willingness to participate in a particular study, after having been informed of all aspects of the study that are relevant to the study participant's decision to participate.

Similarly, the researcher prepared an informed consent form which was read for the participants before each key informant interviews or FGDs started. The consent form briefly described purpose of the research, rights and responsibilities of the participants and confidentiality issues. Then, participants signed on the form indicating their voluntary decision to participate in the study. Participants were also informed that they can withdraw or stop participation at anytime they do not want to continue. The study participant has also rights to privacy and confidentiality (Abiy, et.al, 2009). For this purpose, the researcher did not use names of participants in any part of this research, only their responses or views were taken.

Data Analysis

First of all, the data obtained through key informant interviews and FGDs were transcribed and then translated into English from the original language (Afan Oromo). Then, the transcriptions were carefully reviewed for better understanding. As quoted in Ezzy (2002) the researcher should spend considerable time with transcribed interviews absorbing them into consciousness and letting them float about, writing memos, talking about them with friends, and exploring any ideas that came to him/her. After having good comprehension of the whole data through reading and discussion with peers, the researcher organized them into different themes or categories. The researcher, therefore, employed thematic analysis. Thematic analysis aims to identify themes within the data (Ezzy, 2002).

The findings were presented along the emerged themes and specific objectives. Finally, the findings were discussed in relation to the findings of previous researchers and the researcher's personal understandings and experience.

Limitation of the Study

There are two main challenges and limitations of the study. First, the study was conducted only on Subba Lammaffa community, the community living in the territory of the forest park. It did not include communities residing surrounding the park's territory which can also be affected by the park's presence. Secondly, failure to include the park administration staffs in the FGDs was also another limitation of the study. The researcher has tried his best to involve some staffs in the FGDs with the local community, especially in order explore whether conflicts of interest exists between the two. However, it did not succeed because some staffs were unwilling to participate in the discussions with the community members under the guise that the

community is always complaining, thus discussion with them only brings them a headache while others told that they were so busy with office works.

Definition of Operational Terms

Biodiversity- refers to the variety of life on earth.

Gare- is the smallest local administration unit which accountable to 'Kebele'.

Gesho- is a plant that people mainly cultivate in their backyard which serves as one of the ingredients for making local beer or 'tela'.

CHAPTER THREE

Review of Related Literatures

Protected Areas: Definition and Purpose

It is important to have clear definition of the term before proceeding to other related explanations regarding protected areas. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (2010) defined protected areas as clearly defined geographical spaces, recognized, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values.

There are various types of protected areas; of which forest protected areas constitute one category. A protected area may be a wetland, a tropical or deciduous forest, a cultivated landscape of value, an alpine region, a savannah, a marine area or any other types of natural or partially modified ecosystems or combination of types of ecosystems (Philips, 1998).

As it can be understood from the above definitions, maintaining biological diversity is the main purpose for establishing protected areas. Convention on Biological Diversity (2008) noted that establishment of protected areas is one of the major mechanisms for protecting the world's biodiversity. It is further stated that maintenance of ecological integrity, conservation of wildlife habitat and species, or spiritual and cultural values are often the dominant reasons for establishing protected areas. Similarly, World Bank (2010) also expressed that the first priority of protected areas is the conservation of biodiversity, particularly when those areas contain rare, endangered or endemic species, or under-represented habitats such as grasslands or freshwater areas. Protected areas are the cornerstones of biodiversity conservation.

However, it is important to recall that this is not the only purpose for which protected areas are established. According to Saalismaa (2000), protected areas can also have many other purposes, such as landscape protection or watershed protection, scientific research, protection of specific cultural and natural features, tourism and recreation.

To sum up, protected areas are designated for the main purpose of conserving biodiversity which is one of the current global agendas. Being one of the different types of protected areas, forest parks mainly work to ensure sustainable use of forest resources with consideration of the next generation.

Historical background

Literatures indicate that protected areas in modern sense have a recent history while protection of certain areas for different purposes existed many years ago. Saalismaa (2000) stated the first recordings of some kind of protection of specific areas date back to China and India for 2000 years ago. It is said that these nature preserve areas were dedicated to gods and animals. However, as described in the same source, these were not protected areas in the similar way as they are understood nowadays; rather they were communally owned lands where land use was controlled by traditional customs and rules.

Modern protected areas were first witnessed on the frontier of the North American West more than 100 years ago, a time when the indigenous population was being displaced by immigrants, mostly with considerable violence (McNeely, 1992). It is further stated that this protected area was known as Yellowstone National Park which was established in 1872, in an area which was formerly occupied by Shoshone, Crow and Blackfoot Indians. As Pimbert & Pretty (1995) noted, the inhabitants of Yellowstone National Park mainly Crow and Shoshone

Native Americans, either left for reservations or were driven out by the army, which then managed the Park until 1916.

As cited in McNeely (1992), the North American model of the national park grew slowly at first but, beginning in the late 1960s, many more countries established national parks that excluded people following the 1969 World Conservation Union's definition of national park as “a relatively large area that is not materially altered by human exploitation or occupation and where the highest competent authority of the country has taken steps to prevent or eliminate exploitation or occupation in the whole area” (p.1).

In many parts of Africa, protected areas were first created during colonial times as hunting grounds or parks for European elites, with little or no regard for the needs or desires of local communities (Cited in Mekbeb et.al, 2007).

From the above explanations, one can comprehend that exclusion of local people by protected areas had been evident starting with the origin of these areas. Local people's participation, consideration of their impacts on local people and alternative strategies were largely unconsidered.

Increasing size of protected areas

Biodiversity conservation, nowadays, has attracted the attention of many countries worldwide. As protected areas are considered to be the main instruments for conserving biological diversity, countries are encouraged to allocate certain areas of their land for this purpose. According to the Fourth World Congress on National Parks and Protected Areas, CNPPA (1992), it was decided that each country should designate a minimum of 10% of each biome under its jurisdiction (e.g. oceans, forests, tundra, wetlands, grasslands etc.) as a protected area.

The Fifth World Park Congress (2003) revealed that there were only 1,000 protected areas, covering 3% of the earth's surface in 1962. A dramatic increase has been observed in the size of areas designated as protected since then. Pimbert & Pretty (1995) stated that over 20,000 protected areas have been established, covering more than 5 percent of the globe, an area roughly equivalent to twice the size of India. They further stated that many developing countries have more than 10% of their land area set aside for conservation purposes, and others are seeking to transform as much of their land as possible to strictly protected areas. The size of protected areas have reached 102,102, covering 18.8 million km², 11.5% of the global land surface as expressed on Fifth World Park Congress (2003).

As indicated in, Coad et.al (2008), protected area network has grown rapidly since the 1970s, and currently over 120, 000 designated areas are recorded in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA), covering approximately 12% of the terrestrial surface. An increase in these areas is still evident as expressed by World Bank (2010) showing that protected areas constituted 13.9% of the world's land surface. This being the world's average until 2010, some countries have already exceeded the average in designating much of their land for conservation even two decades ago. For instance, as cited in Pimbert & Pretty (1995), Costa Rica, Honduras, Bhutan, Botswana, Panama, Guatemala and Nicaragua have 29, 22, 22, 18, 18, 16, 14 percent of their land surface designated as protected respectively even in 1993, twenty years ago. In the same source, it is also stated that there are also an extremely large number of unofficial protected areas, community reserves, sacred natural sites and indigenous people' lands that are managed in ways that support biodiversity and are gradually being recognized by governments.

It is said that the majority of protected areas are located in the south where 90% of the world's biodiversity are found (Convention on Biodiversity, 2008). In Ethiopia, as indicated in

Mekbebe et al. (2007), there were forty (40) protected areas constituting 16.4% (186,000 km²) of the country's total land surface.

The data outlined above indicates the size of protected areas until 2010, referring to different sources. Generally, it is shown that there is a dramatic increase in the size of protected areas worldwide as biodiversity conservation has become a concern of the day. However, what has received relatively lesser attention is the impact of these area designations on people residing within or surrounding protected areas.

Protected areas and local people

It is also worthwhile to emphasize that most areas designated for conservation in different parts of the world are not vacant lands without human settlements. According to Pimbert & Pretty (1995), most of the world's protected areas already had people living in these areas, or at least had people with legitimate historical claims to the land. Therefore, complex issues arise with regard to the roles of local people in protected area management and their impacts (which can be both positive and negative) on the community. It is thus essential to discuss these issues with great concern.

The idea of strictly controlling protected areas from the surrounding community came starting from the early history of protected areas. In fact, such conception, as indicated in Lurralde (2010), was spread at the time that the first National Park was declared in Yellowstone (U.S.) in 1872. A key concept behind the national park was that people - except for park staffs - were not allowed to live permanently in the area (McNeely, 1992). It is further stated that the North American model of the pristine national park grew slowly at first but, beginning in the late 1960s, many more countries established national parks that excluded people following the 1969 World Conservation Union's definition of "national park" as "a relatively large area that is not

materially altered by human exploitation or occupation and where the highest competent authority of the country has taken steps to prevent or eliminate exploitation or occupation in the whole area” (p.1). Ongugo (2001) also argued that the management of protected areas has been based on the idea that protected areas are of primary importance to a nation; and, that they must be protected and shielded from people living adjacent to them. This is often achieved through the strict enforcement of rules and regulations of the park.

Such exclusion of local people from their environment raises both ethical and practical questions. Both governments and international conservation organizations (Saalismaa, 2000) recognize that new management approaches are needed to build a more positive relationship with the people who live in and around protected areas. Lurralde (2010) also assured that the idea of intrinsic natural beauty strictly protected from the surrounding community for which Parks served has been slowly replaced by the perception of an indisputable human-natural relationship within these areas. He further noted that a new vision about natural protected areas has emerged through which local community participation has been reinforced insofar as it is necessary for conservation purposes as well as for local development.

In their study on Livelihoods, Natural Resource Entitlements and Protected Areas, Ongugo et.al (2001) claimed that attempts to protect forest reserves and national parks through exclusion have often led to local people developing hostile attitudes towards forests and wildlife. Even open conflicts were reported to have occurred which have resulted into losses of life and property. Furthermore, they stated that there are existing conflicts between the objectives of the conservation programs and those of the local communities.

Essien & Bisong (2009) contend that conflicts within protected areas arise from diverse interests, goals and aspirations that individuals or groups within legally established and secluded

environments have, which all too often resulted in either positive or negative impacts on the use value of the area. It is also stated that the presence of any conservation effort often robs the indigenous people of the vital resources on which their existence depend upon. According to Ongugo (2001), the sense of traditional ownership, responsibility and control of forests and their benefits by local communities have largely been ignored in many conservation endeavors. The study reported that most communities therefore view government control and management negatively thus making them indifferent to conservation initiatives led by the government. The study also noted that as population grows, the pressures on the forests are increased and this has exacerbated the conflict between the local communities and the government. Finally, it claimed that the conflict between 'resource users' and 'resource conservers' has been the biggest hindrance in conservation efforts. Richardson (2008) also noted that many protected areas face pressure from increasing populations whose economic well-being has suffered from a cumulative neglect of land and other resources.

Mutually supportive relationships between communities and nearby protected areas are critical to the long-term success of conservation efforts (Mekbeb, et.al, 2007). It is mainly because it is practically difficult for protected area management to successfully implement its conservation effort without the support of the local community. Richardson's (2008) argument supported this idea while he stated "protected areas cannot coexist in the long term with communities that are hostile to them" (p.2). Coad, et.al (2008) argued that for protected area managers, detailed knowledge of the people whose lives are affected by the establishment and management of parks is as important as information about the plant and animal species to be conserved.

Saalismaa (2000) pointed that the current controversy in conservation is the role of the local people in protected areas and their management. He claimed that this issue is especially relevant in the so-called developing countries, or in the South, which host both the majority of the world's population and the majority of the world's biological richness.

To summarize, the nature of interaction between local community and protected areas highly determines the success of the conservation efforts. Excluding local community brings adverse effects making people have negative attitude towards the forest and wildlife while mutual support between the two has positive effect on the park's conservation effort.

Impacts of Protected Areas on Local Community

Protected areas have both costs and benefits for local communities living within or adjacent to them. Effects of protected areas, as described in Brockington & Igoe (2006) are diverse which can mainly be categorized as 'good' or 'bad'. Many literatures however, exclusively emphasize on negative consequences or costs of protected areas. Since the main objective of the study is to assess both positive and negative impacts of protected areas on local community, it is worthwhile to briefly review literatures on each.

Benefits of Protected Areas

Many scholars and institutions argue that protected areas should contribute for socioeconomic development of the local community. When placed in the proper context, protected areas can make significant contributions to human welfare (McNeely, 1995). World Bank (2002) also noted that protected areas should contribute to poverty reduction and development. It further argued that conservation measures should at least 'do no harm'.

A study conducted by Redford and Fearn (2007) on protected areas and human livelihoods suggested that protected areas must provide livelihood opportunities for the people

living in and around them. The study also noted that if designed and managed properly, these opportunities can be compatible with goals of environmental services protection and biodiversity conservation.

Coad, et.al (2008), in their review of costs and benefits of protected areas on local livelihoods noted that benefits of protected areas have traditionally been calculated as the benefits of conserving biodiversity, at a global or national scale. Such benefits include provisioning services (such as food, firewood, and water), supporting (nutrient cycling, primary production), regulating services (climate or water purification) and cultural services (spiritual, recreational).

Brockington & Igoe (2006) asserted that consequences of protected areas are part of a whole variety of social, economic and political consequences many of which are more positive. They noted that protected areas provide employment and income nationally and locally, safeguard ecosystem services sustaining agriculture; they provide the symbols to unite and forge nations. World Bank (2010) also stated that natural ecosystems more generally, and protected areas specifically, supply numerous goods such as food, medicinal plants, building materials and services, such as soil stabilization and provision of clean water.

Lurralde (2010) argued that national Parks used to be seen as just natural reserves for contemplation and conservation, but have been gradually considered as sites which to some extent may contribute to development and enhancement of local communities. He further noted that within this context the existence of positive socioeconomic impacts consequent on the establishment of national parks are assumed, such as revenues derived from tourism, creation of local employment, and targeted aids for farming and rural development projects.

Another study conducted by Coad et.al (2008) categorized benefits of protected areas as being direct or indirect. Accordingly, direct benefits include the use of natural resources for construction, food, medicine or fuel, whilst indirect benefits may be watershed protection and improved agricultural productivity. On local scales benefits include those derived from protected area management and infrastructure, such as financial gains from ecotourism and employment and through payments for environmental services. Other benefits comprise greater community participation in sustainable resource management and development schemes (or Integrated Conservation and Development Projects ICDP's), strengthened land tenure and protection from external threats, enhanced conservation of essential resources, and improved recognition of community conserved areas.

In addition to the benefits outlined above, protected areas are also said to have importance for diversifying the local economy. Andrew (2009) contends that local livelihoods may be enhanced by diversifying sources of assets, or switching livelihood strategies to a singular but rewarding activity. Diversification is defined as opening up several of opportunities for a specific community. In the same source, benefits are discussed as those provided by successful protection of forest ecosystem services, and those directly gained from the management structure of the protected area, ranging from direct income to provision of local amenities.

Costs of protected areas on local community

While protected areas have important benefit of maintaining the ecosystem at national and worldwide, the costs are mainly incurred by the local community who rely on the resources of the area.

There are various negative consequences of protected areas on local community as described in different literatures. It is also important to understand that such aspect of protected areas (impacts on local community) was acknowledged only recently. Effectiveness of protected areas has long been examined in terms of their capacity to safeguard biodiversity and reduce deforestation and only relatively recently have any social impacts of conservation initiatives come under examination (Richardson, 2008). Protest against the experience of displacement and marginalization by protected areas, against impoverishment and injustice, against disempowerment and disenfranchisement, as Brockington & Igoe (2006) argued has become one of the defining features of the politics of protected areas in the last two decades.

Displacement of local people for conservation is one of the negative consequences of protected areas widely documented in different literatures. Displacement is often taken to mean the forced removal of local communities from their land. However, Coad et.al (2008) noted that conservation displacement comprises two processes. These are: the forced removal of people from their homes and economic displacement, the exclusion of people from particular areas in their pursuit of a livelihood. They further asserted that People dwelling on the edge of a park but unable to gather firewood or wild foods, to hunt, or fish, or unable to walk to their farms on the other side of the park, would be unable to live as they were before. Thus, exclusion of economic activity which does not lead to moving house still displaces that activity elsewhere.

Similarly, World Bank's (2002) definition also includes displacement from resources without community movement. It defined displacement as follows:

- (i) relocation or loss of shelter; (ii) loss of assets or access to assets; or (iii) loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected persons must move to another

location, or the involuntary restriction of access to legally designated parks and protected areas resulting in adverse impacts on the livelihoods of the displaced persons (p.).

It is further stated that communities living in or around strictly protected areas, where resource restriction is incurred, could therefore now fall under this definition. Therefore, restriction on local communities' resource use without removing them from the area is also the form of displacement. Even if communities are allowed to remain within or adjacent to protected areas, the loss of land use rights can produce many of the same risks outlined for displaced people (World Bank, 2004). Richardson (2008) also asserted that almost by definition, protected areas will result in resource restriction to local communities, with the level of restriction varying with the individual characteristics and management of each area.

Different sources have tried to support with data regarding the size of people displaced from their land to protected areas in order to indicate the seriousness of the problem. The number of displaced people (i.e. the physical removal of people from protected areas) living as 'environmental refugees' in Africa alone has been estimated to lie between 14 and 24 Million (Geislaer and de Sousa, 2001). Such displacement is said to be even worse in East Africa. Brockington (1999) noted that eviction of people from their land has been common in East Africa and is central to the region's history this century.

Displacement can lead to diverse socioeconomic problems. According to Richardson (2008) it can bring many socio-economic implications including landlessness; joblessness; homelessness; marginalization; food insecurity; increased morbidity and mortality; loss of access to common property and social disarticulation.

There are also other reasons for which protected areas are opposed in terms of their negative consequences on local people. Lurralde (2010) in his study identified that parks restrict

buildings. He found that people in some protected areas were not allowed to construct houses where extra housing is needed in the area. It is thus noted that in this case, parks may hamper socioeconomic development since they mainly identify building with local development.

Brockington & Igoe (2006) raised the removal of local community from its history, memory and representation, loss of power and control over their environments, the interference of the conservation regulations into their lives in ways over which they had little control. They also protest other impact of protected area which is “the interference of different value systems into local economies, the commodification of wildlife and nature into things which tourists can purchase, but which locals can then no longer afford” (p.2). Brockington (2006) found costs to local communities that range from ill health, guerrilla movements, drug trafficking, to the erosion of local cultures and norms.

However, these negative impacts on local communities are still rarely acknowledged while there remains increased attention for biodiversity conservation and importance of protected areas. Redford & Fearn (2007) argued that current proposals for expanding protected areas often continued to be made without appreciation of impacts on local people or consideration of alternatives. Therefore, impacts of these areas on local community need research and proper responses not only for people’s wellbeing alone but also for the success of conservation works.

Community Participation in Management of Protected Areas

Another important issue to be raised concerning protected areas and local people is community participation in decision making concerning the area. Community participation is an important ingredient for the long term success of the protected areas and their conservation endeavors. One of the reasons behind the involvement of local communities in protected areas planning is the need to ensure that these communities benefit and have a sustainable access to

and use of natural resources (Seymour, 1998). Niedzialkowski (2012) also argued that protected areas should contribute to the socioeconomic development of host communities, and the latter ought to be included in participatory decision making concerning these areas.

The central objective of protected area management in various countries of the world have for long over-looked the role of local people in the conservation process (Essein & Bisong, 2009). The consequences have been the series of conflicts experienced in such areas which tends to undermine the conservation drive not only for the present, but also, for the future generations. Phillips (2003) also noted that earlier, conservation of biodiversity was mainly sought by establishing protected areas through an exclusive, top-down, government-led process. Local communities were not involved in decision making concerning protected areas and were often prohibited from using their territories. This is said to have created negative attitudes in local communities toward protected areas, which hindered their establishment and enlargement (Pretty and Pimbert 1995). They argued that these problems contributed to a shift in protected areas governance that stressed the importance of public participation in decision making.

As indicated in Montreal (1996), it was at the First World Conservation Congress that policies were promoted which recognized the rights of local peoples within protected areas to participate effectively in the managements of protected areas established on their territories or lands and to be consulted on the adoption of any decision affecting their rights and interests over those territories or lands. He noted that community-based approach to conservation is a new phenomenon which was formulated based on the need to integrate local participation efforts in protected areas. Furthermore, community based approach to conservation implies an equal partnership in conservation efforts between local communities and conservation organizations at village, regional, national, or international levels.

Seymour (1998) distinguished between community-based projects that are motivated by external actors and those undertaken by local community actors themselves. Community based efforts are those conceived and initiated by local community members. Such efforts are usually geared towards natural resource use and livelihood security based on conservation. The external actors involve efforts designed and often administered by external entities. According to him, the point of emphasis for external actors is on resource protection and species preservation based on sustainable resource utilization strategies.

Ghai (1994) argued that greater community participation in forest management can contribute to reduce the over-exploitation of forest resources. Besides, he noted that conservation of environmental resources can only succeed if the social factors, which influence people's interaction with the environment, are addressed. These include access to the natural resources, the level of decision making processes and empowerment. Accordingly, these will make communities to consider forests as belonging to them.

Ongugo et.al (2001) focusing on forest protected areas; claimed that government can only succeed in conservation efforts if the local communities are enlightened on the dangers of continued exploitation. There is need for the two groups to work together towards sustainable management of the forest. They suggested that the government should allow limited access to the forest resources and the community should take part in forest development activities such as creation of nurseries and plantations to limit deforestation. It is also imperative that the community shares in the economic benefits that accrue from the forest resource such as tourist proceeds (in the case of national parks) and employment in the forest and the parks to give them a reason to collaborate in the conservation efforts. They should also be provided with different

alternatives such as agricultural and social services, which would enable the communities to respect the forest boundaries.

Essein & Bisong (2009) acknowledged that the realization by many countries of the world that the way forward in the control of conflicts within protected areas, should involve the adoption of measures that seek to integrate the indigenous communities into the conservation scheme, is rapidly gaining momentum. In other words, there is the need to ensure that the bottom-up management approach rather than the top down is practiced within protected areas. The bottom-up management approach will enable the surrounding communities of protected areas to be actively involved in the management and administration of their regions. In addition, they emphasized the need for protected area managers to put in place measures that can aid the communities to enhance their living standards such as improved educational, and infrastructure facilities. They forwarded that alternative development options such as skills acquisition training in tailoring, sustainable farming, carpentry and so on, can provide a background for the shift in dependence from the natural environment to sustainable forms of livelihood development. Philips (2003) also noted that today, it is accepted that a key prerequisite for sustainable management of ecosystem services is governance involving all stakeholders in the decision making.

CHAPTER FOUR

Findings and Discussion

Findings

The findings were mainly obtained from in-depth interview of ten informants and two FGDs. These findings were also supported by the researcher's observation.

Personal background of the participants

The participants consisted of individuals from different age, gender and educational backgrounds. In terms of age category, it consisted of youths, adults and elderly. Out of seven informants selected from the community for in-depth interview, three of them were youths, two adults and the remaining two were elderly. In terms of gender, three informants were females and four of them were males. Out of three informants interviewed from the park administration staff, one was female and two were males. The two FGDs conducted also consisted of both male and females. Out of thirteen participants (six and seven in each FGD), five were females and eight were males.

In terms of educational background, the three informants selected from the park administration have first degree. Coming to participants from the community, three of them have attended primary education; two of them are high school graduates while the remaining two have not attended any formal education.

Historical background of Subba Community and the forest park

Interview with elderly key informants revealed that there are two oral traditions regarding the origin of Subba Community. The first oral tradition reported that an Oromo clan called

Subba moved from around Gindeberet (one of the districts in the current West Shawa Zone) in the sixteenth century due to population increase and shortage of land and settled in the current place. Then, the name of the area is also named after the name of the clan 'Subba'. The second oral tradition assumed that the person called 'Suphaa' first moved and settled in the area with his family and cattle. Then, the area and the community got their name after the person. Subba Lammaffa, which is the focus of the study, is one of the 'gares' under Nanno Subba Kebele Administration. This administration unit has 89 households of which 50 are male headed whereas the remaining 39 are female headed according to data obtained from Nanno Subba Kebele Administration Office.

Even though the origin of the community and the area is traced back to the historical consequences of the 16th century Oromo expansion, the community's composition has been changed from time to time due to flow of different peoples to the area in search for jobs. As my key informants told me while the dominant ethnic group in the area is Oromo, nowadays, the community also consists of other ethnic groups such as Amhara, Gurage, Tigre and Wolaita. Therefore, it is said that the community's composition has been diversified from time to time.

The origin of Subba Sabbata Forest Park is traced back to the reign of Zaryacob in the fifteenth century as noted by key informants. Accordingly, king Zaryacob planted trees bringing them from Debre Libanos (North Shawa). Starting from this time, the area had been used as recreation place for different kings. During the reign of Menelik II, in 1890, a German national called Otto established the Sawmill factory in the area for processing stems as elders recalled. However, Emperor Menelik II later stopped the factory fearing that it might result in further deforestation. It was also said that Emperor Hailesillassie used the area for recreation especially on weekends; still there is a place called 'Ye Janow Marefiya' or the 'place for the Emperor's

rest' in the forest park. Similar visit was also made by Colonel Mengistu Hailemariam many times. The animal museum was constructed during the Derg regime, according to data obtained from Subba Sabbata Forest Administration Office.

Until 2008, Subba Sabbata Forest Park had been administered under the federal government. It was known as Menagasha Subba Natural and Man Made Forest Park. Following the establishment of Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise in 2008, it was transferred to be administered under the enterprise. By joining it with Sabbata Forest Park, Oromia Forest and Wildlife started to administer them under one administrative unit under the name 'Subba Sabbata Forest and Wildlife District'. Subba Sabbata Forest Park is one of the six forest parks under Finfinne branch of Oromia Forest and Wildlife Enterprise. The forest park is rich in different plant and animal species. It covers an area of 11, 980 hectares, as mentioned in the park's profile document.

Benefits of the Forest Park for the Community

Key informant interview with community members and selected staffs of the park administration indicated that there are certain benefits that the local community obtains from Subba Sabbata Forest Park. One of the key informants from the park administration staffs stated that people and park have to operate based on the principle of mutual relation; one should not benefit at the cost of the other; the forest park should benefit the local people and it should be benefited reciprocally. Some of the benefits are obtained 'illegally' by community members according to the views of the park administration. One of the staff members, for instance told me that:

This people are getting benefit from this forest both legally and illegally. Illegally, they are using the forest for making charcoal, grazing and logging so as to use it for sale. The legal benefits are mainly job opportunity, permitted use of forest products, recreation and infrastructural benefits (Key informant Interview April 27, 2013).

Besides these, key informant interview and FGD with community members added three additional benefits: alternative income generation, source of identity and medical purpose. The benefits raised both by staffs and local community members are further presented as follows.

Source of employment

The major advantage that the community is obtaining from Subba Sabbata Forest Park is that it is the source of employment for many members of the community as my key informants from both community members and the park administration acknowledged. Members of the local community are hired in the sawmill factory, nursery, guarding, tour guiding and food preparation.

Currently, there are 69 and 500 permanent and contract workers consisting of individuals from both Subba Lammaffa community and the surrounding areas as well, according to data obtained from a staff of Subba Sabbata Forest Park Administration. He further noted that contract workers are mainly employed in the sawmill factory and nursery; they earn 22 and 16 birr per day respectively. Besides, those who are employed in guarding as contract workers also earn daily income of 16 birr.

Key informants from community members also reported that the forest park is the main source of employment for most of them. For instance, one of my key informants from the community and who is also an employee of the park reported this fact as follows.

I have been an employee as a guard in the forest park for more than twenty years. The salary which I got from the work is crucial for me and my family since there is no other means of getting income here. I have no land to cultivate; I cannot also raise cattle due to lack of grazing land as the area we are residing on is under the forest park's jurisdiction. Therefore, employment in the park as a guard is the means of survival for me and my family (Key informant interview April 20, 2013).

Interview with employees of the sawmill factory and nursery also showed that the forest park has benefited them as the main means of livelihood. However, they mainly complained about the payment which they said is too low and cannot fully support them even for basic needs let alone helping their family members. A guard who is employed as a contract worker asked "what 16 birr per day can do even for a single individual let alone for me who is expected to support a family in today's high cost of living? It cannot even buy a breakfast for me and my family." Besides low payment, workers also indicated that payment delay and seasonal unemployment are also other challenges. While these are problems, they still consider presence of the forest park as an opportunity in terms of job creation considering what might happen if there were no such opportunities. For instance, one of the employees currently working in the nursery told the following during interview.

Actually, the payment is too low, but this itself is great for me when I think what would happen if there is no such opportunity. I quit my education after completing grade eight since I had to go to nearby towns (Holota or Sabbata) for secondary school which I and my family could not afford. There is no other option here which I can look for other than employment as contract worker in the Sawmill or nursery, thus I accept this as a good opportunity (Key informant Interview April 20, 2013).

Preparing food for guests is also another source of employment and income for some local community members, especially females according to data obtained from the park administration. They get such opportunity mainly when guests or tourists come to the area or when there is a meeting or training prepared by the park or an NGO working in the area called Malka Sagni Subba Sabbata.

In contrast, key informants from community indicated that currently there is no such opportunity for local community. A woman said “previously, we used to prepare food for guests or tourists and earn some amount of income; but nowadays we are denied such opportunity; it is left for a woman staff who is already employed there”. One of the discussants also complained about this during FDG with selected community members. The researcher has also witnessed that a woman working as a staff in the reception section was running the cafeteria around the park administration office, during his stay in the study area for data collection.

Individuals from the local community were also assigned as guides when there are tourists to visit the park and its resources according to key informants from the forest park administration. However, currently such activity is being carried out by a professional guide recently employed in the office.

Alternative income generation

As indicated above, low payment and seasonal unemployment are the major challenges that contract workers face under the park administration. Payment delay is also another problem raised by workers.

To cope up with these challenges, they had to resort to other income generating strategies where still the role of the forest is paramount. These strategies are charcoal production, gesho

and khat production, honey production and selling firewood. One of my key informants told that “even though it is prohibited by the park, making charcoal from the forest products and selling firewood helped me survive during seasonal unemployment and salary delay”. Similarly, the researcher has witnessed during his stay in the community while women were carrying firewood to take to a nearby rural town of Asgori, four kilometers away from Subba Lammaffa community.

Even though the park administration considered these acts as illegal, participants perceive them as legitimate and good coping strategy. For instance a woman said,

The government itself is destroying the forest; you can move through the forest and look at the amount of trees cut each day by the park administration for processing in the sawmill factory; then it is transported to other areas for sale. Is it illegal if I cut a single tree for charcoal where I have no other options; while the park administration is cutting these trees daily for profit? (Key informant interview April 21, 2013).

Honey production is also another strategy raised by key informants to cope with the difficult life situations. Key informant interview with a staff of Subba Sabbata Forest Park Administration also indicated that the park is helping the local community by distributing modern hives in order to help them raise their income. Key informants from community members noted that they are also getting benefit mainly from khat production and it is a good coping mechanism. One informant, for instance, said “The ‘*khat*’ produced here is popular in the surrounding towns such as Holota and Sabbata. I get good income from it; it is helping me a lot to support my two children attending their education at Sabbata Secondary School”. The

researcher has also observed '*khat*' plants in the backyards of many households during his stay in study the area.

Forest as a source of attachment

Forest for the people of Subba Lammaffa creates great sense of attachment. This sense of attachment towards the forest is highly prevalent among elderly key informants. During key informant interview regarding the benefits of the forest park, one of informants, said the following.

This forest is everything for us; our life is totally dependent on it. We cannot imagine our life independent of this forest. It is a gift that we inherited from our fore fathers which is part of our community identity. It is the only asset we have that makes us known to other areas. We have nothing to pass on to the next generation but this forest (Key informant interview April 21, 2005).

Key informants from the local community recalled some historical incidents in which the community made remarkable efforts to protect the forest which they claim is a legacy passed on to them by their fore fathers. One historical incident was described as follows by one of my key informants.

It was during the time following the dawn fall of the Derg regime. There was instability that time. The park administration staff had stopped the work and left the area. Using this as an opportunity, bandits marched to the area in order to rob the properties of the park administration office and the forest park. We determined from the bottom of our heart to pay any sacrifice including life to protect the park. We thus organized and armed ourselves. The community then fought for fifteen days and protected the park's

properties. We did this because we have taken the tradition and responsibility of protecting this forest from our fathers (Key informant interview April 21, 2013).

The other historical incident was the time when a fire was set to burn the forest from Wachacha Mountain. The local community stopped the fire using all its energy and resources without any support from outside. One key informant recalled “all community members, men and women even including capable children urgently marched to the area to stop the fire; the forest park administration staff did nothing rather than simply observing the fire and the people struggling to stop it at distance”.

The feeling of attachment to the forest in the community is also noticed among discussants from FGD. For instance, one of the discussants in FGD said, “we have strong attachment to the forest which is everything for us; people come to the area from other places for none other than this forest”.

Permitted use of the forest and its products

As key informant interview with the park administration staff revealed, there are certain cases where community members are allowed to use the forest and its products. It is permitted by the park administration to collect firewood from the forest without cutting the standing trees. It is said that there are certain areas of forest permitted for grazing. Another staff member also told that with the park administration’s permission, the community can use the forest to renew their house as it is prohibited to construct additional house in the area. The community is also allowed to use the forest for burial during death. Another benefit raised was providing firewood for local community with little price. In addition, it was noted that charcoal confiscated from illegal users is also presented for community with little price.

However, informants from the community negatively viewed these things and raised them as restriction imposed on them by the park administration not to use the forest they have been protecting for several years for their day to day life.

Recreational benefits of the forest for local community

The importance of forest as a source of recreation for the local community is also acknowledged by the study participants. This view is especially prevalent among youth key informants. One key informant said “there is nowhere to go when we want to refresh ourselves other than moving here and there in the forest and taking its fresh air or taking rest sitting under its shelter; this forest therefore has recreational benefit for us”. Another key informant also noted that he enjoyed when he used to act as a tour guide being assigned by the park administration when people come from other areas to visit the park in addition to the economic benefits he used to get. Key informants also raised that they enjoy the fresh air they get from this forest. A staff key informant in Subba Sabbata Forest Park also mentioned this as one of the benefits that the local community gets from this forest park.

Using plants for medical purpose

Informants from the community also indicated that the forest serves a medical purpose for them. They noted that there are some plant species used as medicines by the community to cure different illnesses. One key informant, for instance, said: “when we get sick, the first thing most us do is using these plants for cure. There are different plant species known by community members mainly whose leaves are used as medicines”.

Costs of the Forest Park on Local Community

Even though there are various benefits that the local community gains from Subba Sabbata Forest Park as indicated above, they also incur costs due to the park's presence. These costs include: dislocation, denial of land use rights, poor infrastructure, and restriction on the use of forest resources and challenges from wild animals.

Displacement

Regarding dislocation of local community from their land, my key informants raised differing experiences during the two regimes (the Derg and EPRDF). There were forced removals of people from their land during the Derg regime in order to expand the park's territory and plant more trees. One of my key informants recalled the experience during the Derg as follows.

Many people were removed from the area and settled in the surrounding peasant associations. Then, the area was included in the boundary of the forest park and trees were planted. The dislocation was forceful; people had no say rather to quickly leave the area as ordered. These people, however, were given enough land for cultivation from the surrounding peasant associations (Key informant Interview April 21, 2013).

Another key informant also told that the size of the community was more than two thousand (2,000) people before dislocation during the Derg. He further added that while most people were removed from the area, the park administration employed most of the remaining community members mainly as guards, in sawmill and nursery both as contract and permanent workers. Being taken off their land, the people thus continued making a living mainly depending on employment options created by the park.

Under the current regime, the forest park did not directly force people to move their houses from the area as key informants from the community and the park administration noted. However, migration of people especially youths from the area is still common. The main causes for migration are restriction on the use of land and forest resources, seasonal unemployment, low payment and poor infrastructure. Since these problems are mainly caused by the forest park and force people to leave the area in search for livelihood, it is said that there is eviction or dislocation of local community due to the park as some of my key informants stated. For instance, one key informant told the situation as follows.

Forced removal of houses like that of the Derg regime does not exist today; but still our children are flowing from this area due to various compelling factors created by the forest park. Here, we cannot use the land for cultivation; it is also difficult to raise cattle as there is restriction on using the land for grazing. We cannot construct additional house here; we cannot also use the forest resources for sale; employment situations are mainly seasonal and the payment is too low when found. Generally, there is only limited opportunity here to make living; thus our children are forced to migrate to nearby towns (Sabbata, Holota and Alamgana) to work as daily laborers in different factories and horticulture projects. Besides, many youths are also hired as daily laborers in the surrounding peasant associations (Key informant interview April 21, 2013).

This idea is also shared by discussants in the FGD. For instance, one of the discussants asked “what is the difference between the Derg and the current regime in the park’s policy regarding dislocating local people?” The only difference is, he added, “today their policy too systematic; they don’t tell us to remove our houses; because they know very well that we will leave the area by our own as it is very difficult to make a living here in this difficult situation”.

Denial of land use rights

Denial of land use rights is also another issue hotly raised by the informants during key informant interview and FGD. Informants reported that they cannot use the land on which they are residing for cultivation, grazing and constructing additional house.

Regarding cultivation, the only thing that the residents are doing is that many people own '*khat*' or '*gesho*' plants on small plots of land in their backyard which the park administration however condemns as illegal. There are only certain areas of the forest permitted for grazing, according to key informant interview with staff members and it is prohibited to use outside these areas. The researcher has observed while one of the park administration staff was using video camera for recording cattle grazing in the forest park around the office so as to use as evidence to identify the owner/s. The researcher has also witnessed two guards bringing cattle from the park to certain confinement, looking for them there until the owner comes and takes them after signing an agreement not to release the cattle again in the prohibited areas of the park.

It is prohibited to construct additional house in the area. What is permitted is only to renew the existing one or expand it only if the family size is large through the park administration's permission. In addition, it is also prohibited to use the forest resources for charcoal and sale even though some people reported that they are doing it illegally due to lack of other options to earn income.

With regard to land use rights, what most informants mainly emphasized is that they are not paying tax for the land they are residing on. The people have been constantly requesting to pay tax and given land use certificate. However, they were refused under the reason that the land

is in the territory of the forest park. This created a fear among local people that one day they will be dislocated from the area by the park. One key informant from the community said “this forest is becoming a threat for the community; our life is insecure; because we are afraid that one day we might be forced to leave this area as we are denied to pay tax for the land we are residing on”. Similarly, one of the discussants in the FGD asked “what does their denial to give land use certificate indicate in spite of our continuous request since many years? By this, they are telling us that this land is not ours; so, we are unsure what the future might bring”.

Key informant interview with the park administration also indicated that the people should not be allowed to pay tax on the land which is not theirs. For instance, one staff said the following:

The people are not paying tax because the land is in the territory of the park. The land is not theirs; it belongs to the park; so the tax is being paid by the forest park administration which is the legal owner. Actually, there is no intention from the park administration to dislocate this people. But, I think this is a critical issue that has to be addressed especially by the higher body. Otherwise, I fear that it will cause great conflict between the park and the people (Key informant Interview April 28, 2013).

Another staff who was my key informant, on the other hand, argued that many individuals in the community are employees of the park administration, especially they work as guard. He said “they are staffs like us; many of the houses they reside in are also constructed by the park administration; even I can say that they are beneficiaries. How do they claim ownership of land being employees of the park?” However, key informants from community members claim that the land is theirs. They argued that people did not encroach to the park’s territory rather the park

expanded and confiscated their land; recalling how they lost their land to the forest park during the Derg regime.

Lack of infrastructure

Lack of different infrastructural services is another problem that the researcher observed in the area. The community has no school, clinic or health centre, transportation and electric services. Lack of water and road facility was also raised by informants from the community.

With regard to road infrastructure, there are two roads (one from Subba to Sabbata and the other is from Subba to Holota) which were constructed during the reign of Emperor Hailesillassie following the establishment of the Sawmill factory. There are no other transportation types coming to the area except those for transporting sawmill products and stems to other places and those serving the park administration staff, as my informants told. During his stay in the community, the researcher has also witnessed stems being daily transported from the area. One of my key informants from the community told that “we are suffering due to lack of transportation services even for emergency causes; the existence of the road is nothing for us; its importance is only for the forest park”.

Another infrastructural problem observed in the area was lack of school. There is no school (primary or secondary) in the community. Children of the community had to go to a nearby small town of Asgori for primary school and Holota or Sabbata towns for secondary education. As my key informants recalled, there was a school called Sahlesillassie Primary School established before fifty years in the community. The school was taken to Asgori (a nearby town) before six years ago. According to one of my key informants, the reason given for eviction of the school was absence of play field in the school, difficulty of expanding the school

as the area is under the park's jurisdiction and declining number of population. Another key informant recalled that the communities of the nearby peasant association also complained that they fear to send their children to the school as the area is in the forest. As these are consequences of the forest park, the community argued that the school is taken from them because of the park.

Lack of water was also raised as one of the problems in the area. There is one source of drinking water constructed by the park in the community. During interview with the park administration staff, this was raised as one of the park's benefit for local community. However, the community members argued that it is constructed to water the seedlings as the nursery station is located in the area of the community's residence. To justify this, one key informant said "priority is given for watering seedlings after which the community is allowed to use; usually it stops after watering seedlings is over". She concluded "if they are giving priority for plants when we are thirsty, it is clear indication that construction of the water pipe has nothing to do with benefiting local community".

While the nearby rural communities have got electric services, the Subba community, however, is denied the service as key informants from the community told. They noted that the community has requested the woreda administration for the services many times; but they were denied under the reason that since the area is in the park's territory, they can only get the service under the park's permission.

Declining population size and care for elders

Decline in the size of population was also raised as one of the impacts of the forest park on the local community. Key informants from the community told that there is huge migration of

youths to nearby towns which caused decline of population size in the area. As indicated above, declining population size was also raised as one of the justifications for the eviction of Sailessillassie Primary School from the area to a nearby town called Asgori. This migration is mainly caused due to lack of job in the area, low payment, lack of land and infrastructural services.

According to key informant interview with community members, since youths mainly migrate from the area, the population is becoming predominantly elderly and adults. The researcher himself witnessed that it was so rare to find young members in the community. This migration of youths has left elderly without someone to care for them in the family. Many households consist of only elder husband and wife while children are somewhere else in search for means of livelihood. One elderly key informant told “

I and my wife are living alone. I was a guard in the park and retired eight years ago. We have four children and three of them are daily laborers in Sabbata and Alamgana whereas one is married and resides in Holota. It is very difficult to live as such at this age without someone to provide support when needed. Collecting firewood, taking grain for grinding to a nearby town of Asgori and fetching water are becoming difficult tasks for my wife as she is also getting older (Key informant Interview April 22, 2013).

One of the discussants in the FGD also said “our youths are forced to leave their parents alone here when they should have taken care of them at their old age”. As noted both from FGDs and interview with community members it is inevitable for someone to leave the area as it is also prohibited to construct additional house here in addition to other factors.

Challenges faced from wild animals

Informants from community members also complained that they are facing challenges from wild animals. Prevalence of different wild animals in the area is hindering them from using some coping strategies they want to use to overcome the difficult life situation in the area, as key informants noted. One key informant said, “for instance we want to raise sheep and goats even if there is restriction from the park administration; but it is impossible due to wild animals; let alone this we could not raise hens. Generally, we are in a difficult situation”. In addition to this, they noted that their children are afraid to move alone in the forest and to go to school.

Discussion

In this section, the main findings of the research will be discussed in relation to the findings of previous researchers and the researcher’s personal experiences.

As presented in the finding and description of the study area as well, Subba Lammaffa Community resides on the land which is in the territory of the Subba Sabbata Forest Park. The people claim that both the land and the forest are passed on to them by their fathers and are theirs even though they are denied of this right by the forest park.

Similarly, Pimbert & Pretty (1995) stated that most of the world’s protected areas already had people living in them, or at least had people with legitimate historical claims to the land. The people used to live there for many years; even some trace their settlement in the area to the 16th century historical Oromo expansion whereas there are also others who came to the area in search for jobs. In terms of ethnic identity, the community is diversified. This supports Coad et.al (2008) finding which stated that communities around protected areas often consist of multiple ethnic groups. While many people were dislocated and settled in the surrounding

peasant associations during the Derg regime, the community under study was included in the park administration. Even though the park expanded its territory and the people were confiscated their land, they still claim that the land is theirs.

Impacts of Subba Sabbata Forest Park on Local Community

Protected areas have both benefits and costs, simply to mean positive and negative impacts, for people living within or surrounding their territories. Effects of protected areas, as described in Brockington & Igoe (2006) are diverse which can mainly be categorized as ‘good’ or ‘bad. The findings obtained from the study also revealed both benefits and costs of Subba Sabbata Forest Park on the local community.

Benefits of the Forest Park for Local Community

Brockington & Igoe(2006) asserted that consequences of protected areas are part of a whole variety of social, economic and political consequences many of which are more positive. Protected areas should contribute for socio-economic development of the local community. Ensuring local people’s benefit is also very crucial for success of the park’s conservation effort. McNeely (1995) noted that when placed in the proper context; protected areas can make significant contributions to human welfare. A study conducted by Redford and Fearn (2007) on protected areas and human livelihoods also argued that protected areas must provide livelihood opportunities for the people living in and around them.

The findings also revealed that there are some benefits that the local community is obtaining from Subba Sabbata Forest Park. Some benefits are obtained ‘illegally’ and are thus incompatible with the park’s conservation endeavors while others are supportive to them. The benefits include: source of employment, alternative income generation and diversifying the local

economy, permitted use of forest products, infrastructure, source of community identity, recreation and medical purpose.

It is however, important to notice that there were difference of opinions sometimes even contrasting between informants from the community and the park administration regarding benefits obtained from the park. For instance, permitted use of forest products and infrastructural benefits were raised by the park administration staffs whereas informants from the community hardly acknowledged them; even raised them among negative impacts of the forest park on them.

Source of employment

Employment creation is one of the benefits of protected areas for local community. Brockington & Igoe (2006) noted that protected areas provide employment and income nationally and locally. Coad et.al (2008) also indicated that forest parks serve as source of income and employment opportunities. Consistent to these views, job opportunity is the main benefit that the local community obtains from Subba Sabbata Forest Park. Many members of the community are employed both as permanent and contract workers. Many of these options (for instance guarding and nursery) are supportive to the park's conservation efforts while there are also individuals employed in the sawmill factory. Similarly, Redford and Fearn (2007) suggested that if designed and managed properly, opportunities created for local community can be compatible with goals of environmental services protection and biodiversity conservation. Ongugo et.al (2001) also argued that the community should take part in forest development activities such as creation of nurseries and plantations to limit deforestation.

Previously, members of the community used to be benefited from tourism acting as tour guides and preparing food for guests. However, nowadays, they reported that they are denied of such opportunities. The activities are currently carried out by some staff members themselves. In both key informant interviews and FGDs, participants have complained this with great emphasis. Such exclusion of local community makes the people to have negative attitude towards the park and undermine its conservation efforts. In their study on Livelihoods, Natural Resource Entitlements and Protected Areas, Ongugo et.al (2001) argued that attempts to protect forest reserves and national parks through exclusion have often led to local people developing hostile attitudes towards forests and wildlife.

Permitted use of the forest and its products

Regarding permitted use of forest products, key informants from the park administration mentioned that allowing certain areas of the of the forest for grazing, using the forest to renew or expand their houses under the park's permission, collecting firewood without cutting trees, getting firewood for sale with low price and permitted use during burial. Similarly, Richardson (2008) suggested that the government should allow limited access to the forest resources.

In contrast, informants from the community complained this as restrictions put on them by the park administration not to use resources of the environment as they used to do in the past. Coad et.al (2008) noted that the establishment of forested protected areas can place restrictions on the use of resources within large areas of forest that had been freely available to local and indigenous communities. Informants from local community claimed that it is their right to use the forest but without causing deforestation as the environment belongs to them, they and their fathers played crucial role in sustaining the forest and also they incurred the costs of

conservation. Therefore, they consider these things not as benefit that the park administration gives them rather as their right. Furthermore, sale of firewood to the locals for cheap price, which the park administration appreciates, was what informants from the local community criticized that it should not appear to them for sale.

Alternative income generation and diversifying the local economy

The forest park is also important for alternative income generation and diversifying the local economy. As presented in the finding, low payment, seasonal unemployment and payment delay were the main problems in relation to job opportunities under the park administration. The local people still has to rely on their environment, the forest park, in order to cop up these problems. These coping mechanisms include: charcoal production, selling firewood, '*khat*' and '*gesho*' production. Even though such activities are prohibited by the forest park, people still continued to rely on them due to lack of other options. Some even consider such acts not as illegal; rather as legitimate coping strategies in the absence of other alternative opportunities.

Generating income from honey production is also another strategy. The park administration has also shown support by giving modern hives for local community since raising the people's income keeps them from cutting trees. Providing such supports is very important as it makes people have positive attitude towards the park and support its conservation efforts.

While these are coping strategies for the people, they also serve the role of diversifying the local economy. Diversification refers to opening up several opportunities for a specific community. Andrew (2009) contends that local livelihoods may be enhanced by diversifying sources of assets, or switching livelihood strategies to a singular but rewarding activity.

Forest as a source of attachment

Not all my key informants from the community claimed that cutting trees for charcoal or firewood for sale as legitimate. It is also interesting to hear that other key informants considered that the forest is part of their community identity. They consider the forest as a resource that makes the community known to other peoples and a heritage they took from their fathers. Such individuals have great feeling of belongingness towards the forest and feel the responsibility of passing on it to the next generation. Therefore, it is possible to say that forest for Subba Lammaffa community is not only the source of livelihood; it is also a source of attachment.

The existence of such individuals is an asset for the park's conservation effort. It is the responsibility of the park administration to use these individuals in order to create the same feeling of belongingness in other members of the community. However, this alone cannot make a difference; it should be a duty of the park to work on livelihood opportunities for the community in order to deter poverty induced deforestation.

Medical purpose

As presented in the finding, the local community widely uses different plant species for medical purpose indicating that the forest has a medical value for them. Similarly, using traditional medicine, especially different parts of plants to cure illness is common especially in rural Ethiopia. Desalegn (2008) indicated that the overwhelming majority of the rural population of Ethiopia, about 80 percent, depends on herbal medicine. World Bank (2010) also stated that natural ecosystems more generally, and protected areas specifically serves various benefits; of which provision of medicinal plants is one.

Costs of the Forest Park on the Local Community

While protected areas have great importance for maintaining the ecosystem at national and global level, it is said that the costs are mainly incurred by the local people who rely on the resources of the environment for their livelihood. The findings revealed that dislocation, lack of infrastructure, denial of land use rights, restriction on the use of forest resources, declining community size and challenges from wild animals are the costs that the community is incurring due to the forest park. In contrast, Coad et.al (2008) argued that conservation measures should at least do no harm.

Most of these negative effects were raised by informants from the community while informants from the park administration staff mainly inclined towards emphasizing the benefits. This inclination towards the benefits rather than the costs they pose on the local community is consistent with Richard (2008)'s argument which stated that effectiveness of protected areas has long been examined in terms of their capacity to safeguard biodiversity and reduce deforestation and only relatively recently have any social impacts of conservation initiatives come under examination. There is also another contradiction between the views of staffs and community. For instance, while informants from the community raised poor infrastructure as one of the negative effects of the forest park, the park administration claimed that it has made the community beneficiary of different infrastructural facilities; such as road and drinking water.

Displacement

Displacement is often referred to as a forced removal of people from their land. There is also another aspect of displacement as discussed in the literature. Coad et.al (2008) noted that conservation displacement comprises two processes. These are: the forced removal of people

from their homes and economic displacement, the exclusion of people from particular areas in their pursuit of a livelihood. It is further stated that, exclusion from economic activity which does not lead to moving house still displaces that activity elsewhere. World Bank (2002) also included loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether or not the affected persons must move to another location as a form of displacement.

Both types of displacement have been evident in the study area. The first type, which is physical removal of houses, was witnessed during the Derg regime. Following the expansion of the park's territory, many people were forced to leave the area and settled in the surrounding peasant associations. Nowadays, however, the second type of displacement or economic displacement characterizes the nature of displacement underway in the study area. People are not directly forced to move their houses or leave the area; but lack of job; denial to use land for construction, cultivation and grazing, low payment and poor infrastructure force the community to move out in search for livelihood opportunities in the nearby towns. Especially, youth migration is much common in the study area. If a person cannot construct a house to leave independently from family, if he/she is not allowed to cultivate the land and other employment opportunities are also restricted, leaving the area becomes inevitable. Even if the person might not be directly told to leave the area; the result still becomes the same with forced dislocation.

Denial of land use rights

The community claimed that the land had been theirs for many years; they inherited it from their fathers. In the first place, they are denied to pay tax and have land use certificate for the land they are currently residing on. This implied that the land is not legally theirs. The situation does not stop on denial of ownership, it also goes that they are denied to construct

additional houses, cultivate and use the land for grazing. A person is only allowed to renew his previous house on the same plot of land or to expand it based on the park's permission.

These findings support West et.al (2006)'s view that creation of protected areas alters land-use rights in general. Specifically, Lurralde (2010) emphasized that parks restrict buildings. Similar to the findings of this study, his research revealed that people in some protected areas were not allowed to construct houses where extra housing is needed in the area. He further noted that in this case, parks may hamper socioeconomic development since building is sometimes identified with local development.

Except that many households have '*khat*' and '*gesho*' plants in their backyard, it is prohibited to use the land for cultivation. The land which they had been using for cultivation was taken away from them during the park's expansion in the Derg regime. Even there is constant pressure from the park administration not to plant '*khat*' and '*gesho*' on the same argument that the land belongs to the park. . Similarly, West et.al (2006) indicated criminalization of native peoples because of their land-use practices; people's access and use is restricted through legislation, enforcement, and privatization.

These restrictions on local community seem intentional and systematic to see the area in the park's territory free of human settlement in the long run. Even though key informant interview with the park administration staff indicated that there is no intention to dislocate the people; members of the community are leaving the area in search for livelihood. This intention is also becoming successful in that majority of youths have already left the area; adults and elders constitute the dominant demographic figure. It was reported that some houses had already been closed following deaths of elder husbands and wives. Therefore, this suggests that the area would be free of human settlement in the long run.

Poor infrastructures

Coad et.al (2008) referred provision of local amenities as one of the benefits of protected areas for local communities. In contrast, the community under study is suffering from lack of different infrastructures such as schools, health institutions, electricity, transportation and pure water. As presented in the finding section, the school which existed for long in the community was evicted and built in the nearby area for the main reason that the area is located in the territory under jurisdiction of the forest park. While the surrounding peasant associations have currently got electricity, the study community however didn't get the service until this research was conducted.

This made the community to have negative attitude towards the park. They feel neglected comparing themselves with the surrounding communities living outside the park. This seemed to have been further exacerbated by the absence of discussion between the park administration and the community. The community had been raising various questions for years each time discussion held, while they found no response yet. Constantly escaping from discussing with the community on part of the park administration might be in fear of possible challenges from the community due to their failure to address repeatedly raised community's demands. It might be due to this reason that most staff refused the researcher's invitation to participate in FGD with community members. Lack of infrastructure is also one of the reasons, even if not the main, for youths to leave the area.

Declining population size and care for elders

Youth migration is the cause for declining population size in the community. This migration is caused by the pushing factors in the area (seasonal unemployment, low payment,

denial of land use rights and lack of infrastructures). This migration has adverse impact on care for elders. In our country, children are the main social insurance for parents; especially in the absence of other social security options. This is mainly the case in rural communities. Elders need care and protection from their children or other immediate figure at this critical stage. In Subba Lammaffa Community many elders, however, are left alone without care and support from their children due to migration of youths.

Challenges encountered from wild animals

Wild animals also pose another challenge to local communities living adjacent to or within the forest territory. The damage they pose to crops and human life are the main challenges local people face from wild animals (Brockington, 2006). In the study area there is no human life loss resulted from wild animals; but since the area is in the forest, children fear to make movements and sometimes to go to school alone. Another challenge is that guerrillas made raising hens, sheep and goats impossible which would have helped the community members to raise their income.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusion and Implications

Summary and Conclusion

Protected areas had been given emphasis mainly in terms of their importance for conserving the world ecosystem and it is only recently that impacts of these areas on local community began to be acknowledged. The purpose of this study is to examine costs and benefits of protected areas on local community with particular focus on Subba Sabbata Forest Park.

The findings revealed that Subba Sabbata Forest Park has both benefits and costs for local community. The benefits include: source of employment, alternative income generation, source of community identity, permitted use of the forest and its products, recreational benefits and medical purpose.

Employment opportunity was found to be the main benefit that the community obtains from the forest park. Local people are employed in different sectors such as guard, nursery and sawmill factory both as temporary and permanent workers. Employment in the park is the main means of livelihood for the people. This is mainly because other income generating mechanisms such as farming and raising cattle which are the main means of livelihood for most rural communities are restricted in the study area since the community is residing in the territory legally owned by forest park.

The nature of the work under the forest park is mainly seasonal. Therefore, seasonal unemployment is one of the problems. Besides, as indicated in the finding, low payment and

delay of payment are the other problems workers mainly suffer from. Participants reported using different alternative income generating mechanisms such as selling charcoal and firewood, 'gesho' and 'khat' production and honey production to cope up with these difficulties. Whereas many of these activities are prohibited and considered illegal by the park, most informants from the local community consider them as legitimate and good coping strategies in the absence of other options.

Subba Sabbata Forest Park serves not only as a source of livelihood, but it is also a source of community identity. The findings revealed that the participants, especially elders suggested that the forest park is a resource that makes the community known to other peoples and is also a property they inherited from their fathers.

Regarding permitted use of forest products, collecting firewood without cutting trees, using the forest to renew or expand houses under the park's permission, allowing certain areas of the forest for grazing, getting firewood and confiscated charcoal for sale with little price and permitted use of trees for burial during death are mentioned. While these benefits are raised by the park administration staff, informants from the local community, however, raised these as restrictions put on them by the park not to use the resources of their environment. Thus, it is taken as negative impact by the local community.

There are also costs that the local community incurs due to the forest park. These costs or negative impacts are dislocation, denial of land ownership and use rights, lack of infrastructures, declining population size and care for elders and challenges faced from wild animals.

The two aspects of dislocation, forced removal of houses and economic displacement have been witnessed in the study area. The first occurred during the Derg regime as many people

were forced to leave the area and settle in the surrounding peasant associations as a result of the park's expansion. Nowadays, people are not forced to move their houses like during the Derg; but lack of livelihood options in the area, restrictions to use the land for constructing additional houses, cultivation, grazing and lack of infrastructures makes the people; especially youths to migrate from the area to nearby urban areas.

The findings indicated that local community has no land use rights. Firstly, they are not paying tax and have no land use certificate. This makes them feel insecure thinking that one day the park administration might dislocate them as the land is not legally theirs. Secondly, they are also not allowed to construct additional house and cannot use the land for cultivation.

Large migration of youths from the area has resulted in sharp decline of the population size and predominance of elderly in the community. As youths mainly leave the area in search for jobs, the elderly members are left without social protection, as children are the main social insurance in Ethiopia, especially in rural areas. Lack of infrastructure is also another problem. The community suffers due to lack of different infrastructural facilities such as school, clinic, transportation and pure water.

Generally, costs on local community are multifaceted with economic, social and political dimensions. In economic terms, people are denied access to means of livelihood and environmental resources including land. Politically, they are marginalized in that they are denied to participate and make decisions on matters concerning their environment and their lives. They are also not beneficiaries of development processes compared to neighboring rural communities which make them feel marginalized and neglected. The community is also powerless as they have lost their land, which is the most valuable asset especially in rural areas, to the forest park.

Migration of youths also creates various social problems such as social disintegration and lack of support for elderly parents.

Implications for Social Work

This issue is one of the areas which need advocacy, one of the roles of social workers. As social workers, we should advocate for the benefit of the entire nation and the study community as well. The forest park is essential for the well being of the country and the community under study as well. On the other hand, it is worthwhile to consider its negative impacts on the lives of the community.

Therefore, the direction of advocacy has to be on maximizing the community's benefits while still supporting the park's conservation endeavor. This can be through giving priority for the local community on job opportunities created by the park as they shoulder the costs than other surrounding communities. The other option can be giving compensation or resettling the community in other areas where they can get land for cultivation. This however, should be made through discussion with the community. The community should not be imposed and forced from above to leave the area rather they should be allowed to give informed decision.

Community Social Work is one of the core focuses of the discipline. We study community by placing it in its physical and social environment. This reminds us person-in- environment perspective of Social Work. Environment can affect people's lives either positively or negatively. The forest park is both an opportunity and challenge for Subba Lammaffa Community. Therefore, it is important to focus on maximizing the community's benefits in a way it supports conservation.

The lives of many elders in the study area who have been left without social insurance because of migration of their children to nearby urban areas in search of means of livelihood also attract the social workers' intervention. Many elders were found to feel loneliness and helplessness for the fact that no-one is there to give them immediate support at this critical age. As elderly are one of the marginalized groups and focus area of Social Work education, it is our responsibility to assess the problems of these groups and take proper intervention measures.

Finally, another important Social Work concept in relation to this study is client participation. Individuals, groups or communities should be allowed to make informed decisions on matters affecting their lives. With regard to the community under study, this becomes possible if the park administration encourages different discussions with the community and consults them on different issues that affect the people and the park. However, the finding revealed that such discussion between the community and the forest park is absent which broadens the gap between the two.

Implications for research

This study focused only on Subba Lammaffa Community who lives in the territory under the jurisdiction of the forest park. It didn't include other communities residing adjacent to the park on which the presence of the park might have effects (negative or positive). Therefore, other researchers are encouraged to undertake study on the surrounding communities in order to understand differences and similarities in terms of impacts when people reside in the park's territory or adjacent to it. Besides, similar studies are recommended on the area as only little is known about impacts of protected areas on local people in Ethiopia.

Implications for practice and Policy

Conservation of biodiversity, especially forest resources has got great concern in Ethiopia as elsewhere in the world. However, impacts of areas reserved for conservation on local communities received relatively lesser attention. This study, therefore, serves as an input for Subba Sabbata Forest Park to come up with proper strategies so as to enhance the local people's benefit from the park. It can also serve similar purpose for other organizations working on conservation to work with the local communities so as to ensure better reciprocal benefits. It can also inform the country's policy on addressing local communities' needs in addition to conservation efforts.

References

Abiy Zegeye, Alemayehu Worku, Daniel Tefera, Melese Getu & Yilma Sileshi (2009).

Introduction to Research Methods: Preparatory module for Addis Ababa University

Graduate programs. Graduate Studies and Research Office. Addis Ababa University

Andrew, E & Bisong, F. (2009). *Conflicts, conservation and natural resource use in protected*

area systems: An analysis of recurrent Issues. European Journal of Scientific Research

Animut Bekele & Bekabil Fufa (2007). *Park with people conservation strategy: Local*

residents willingness to pay and expected net losses in Ethiopia. Amahara National

Regional Agriculture Institute.

Berg, L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (4th ed.). California State

University, Long Beach

Brockington, D. (1999). *Conservation, displacement and livelihoods. The consequences of the*

eviction for pastoralists moved from the Mkomazi Game Reserve, Tanzania

Brockington, D & Igoe, J. (2006). *Eviction for Conservation: A global overview. Institute for*

Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, UK, Department of

Anthropology, University Of Colorado, Denver.

Coad, L., Campbell, A., Miles, L & Humphries, K. (2008). *The costs and benefits of forest*

protected areas for local livelihoods: A review of the current literature. The United

Nations Environment Program World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC).

Convention on Biological Diversity (2008). *Protected areas in today's World: their Values and*

benefits for the welfare of the planet. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological

Diversity. ISBN: 92-9225-082-5

- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Research design qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches second edition*
- Darlington, Y. & Scott, D. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice stories from the field*. Crows Nest NSW 2065. Australia
- Dawson, C. (2009). *Introduction to research methods: A practical guide for anyone undertaking a research project, fourth edition*. Spring Hill House, United Kingdom
- Durban World Parks Congress (2004). *Protected areas program: the international journal for protected area managers, vol.14, number 2*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland
- Ezzy, D. (2002). *Qualitative analysis: practice and innovation*. National Library of Australia
- Flick, U., Kordorff, V.E. & Steinke, I. (2004). *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications Ltd, London
- Ferraro, P.J. (2008). *Economics and conservation in the tropics: A strategic dialogue*. Georgia State University.
- Getachew Godana (2007). *Do people and culture matter in the conservation of natural resources? A study of impacts of conservation policies in Nechsar National Park and Yayo Forest in Iluabba bora zone*. Unpublished thesis. Addis Ababa University, School of Graduate Studies.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Real world research: Case study research methods*. Wellington House 125 Strand, London
- Giuliani, A. (2007). *Assessing the human impact of protected areas: Working draft*. IIED and UNEP-WCMC
- Kai, S. & Brockington, D. (2004). *The social impacts of protected areas: A proposal for a web*

- based learning resource*. First Global workshop (World Conservation Congress, Bangkok).
- Lurralde, M. (2010). *Socioeconomic impacts of national parks: A case study from the North East of England*. Regional Studies Association Annual International Conference
- Mack, N. (2005). *Qualitative research methods: A data collector's field guide*. Family Health International, USAID.
- Marvasti, B. A. (2004). *Qualitative research in Sociology: An introduction*. Sage Publications, London
- McNeely, J. A. (1993). *Protected areas for the twenty-first century: Working to provide benefits for society*. Retrieved from, <http://www.fao.org/docrep/v2900e/v2900e03.htm>, January 25, 2013
- Mekbeb Tessema, Zelealem Ashenafi, Robert, J. L & Williams, N.L. (2007). *Community attitudes towards wildlife conservation in Ethiopia*. George Wright Society Conference
- Maykut, P & Morehouse, R. (2005). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. The Falmer Press. Washington DC
- Niedziałkowski, K. J, Paavola & Jędrzejewska, B. (2012). *Participation and protected areas governance: the impact of changing influence of local authorities on the conservation of the Białowieża Primeval Forest, Poland*. Ecology and Society. Retrieved from <Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.5751/Es-04461-170102>, December 24, 2012
- Ongugo, P., Njuguna, J., Obonyo. E & Sigu, G. (2002). *Livelihoods, natural resource entitlements and protected areas: the case of Mt. Elgon Forest in Kenya*. Kenya IFRI Collaborative Research Centre.
- Vol.25 No.1 (2009), pp.118-129. EuroJournals Publishing, Inc. 2009

- Phillip, A. (2003). *Turning ideas on their head: The new paradigm for protected areas*. IUCN
World Commission on Protected Areas
- Pimbert, M & Pretty, J. N. (1995). *Parks, people and professionals: Putting 'participation' into protected area management*. Discussion Paper No 57, February 1995. United Nations
Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva
- Redford, K.H & Fearn, E. (2007). *Protected areas and human livelihoods: Working paper*.
Kent Redford, Wildlife Conservation Society Institute
- Richardson (2008). *The potential costs and benefits of protected areas*. Retrieved from
lauren.coad@unep-wcmc.org, December 24, 2012.
- Saalismaa, N. (2000). *Local people and protected areas: A case study from Mirafior, Nicaragua*. Master's Thesis in Environmental Protection, University of Helsinki
Department of Limnology and Environmental Protection
- Sapsford, R. & Jupp, V. (2006). *Data collection and analysis, second edition*. Sage
Publications in Associations with Open Universities, London
- West, P., Igoe, J. & Brockington, D. (2006). *Parks and peoples: The social impact of protected areas*. Department of Anthropology, University of Colorado, Denver, Colorado
- World Bank (2010). *Paluing protected areas*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and
Development, Washington D.C. 20433 U.S.A.
- Yin, R.K. (2003). *Case study research and design methods, third edition. Applied social science method series vol.5*. Sage Publications, New Delhi, India

Annexes

Consent Form

My name is Bayissa Kisi. I am a master's student at Addis Ababa University, School of Social Work. I am doing my thesis on "Protected Areas and Local Community: Assessment of Costs, Benefits and Local People's Participation in Protected Area Management" as a partial fulfillment of the requirement for my MSW. First of all, I would like to thank you for taking your time to participate in this interview. Your response plays a paramount role for the completion of the research I am undertaking.

The interview may take an hour or more. I also need to remind you that additional interview could be conducted whenever necessary. Your names will not be mentioned in any part of the research paper. The time and place of interview will be arranged according to your convenience. It is also important to get assured that you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time or even not to respond to one or more of the interviews. This study is academic one and the information you give will be shared with my advisor and members of the school. I appreciate your cooperation to participate in my study.

Thank you

Name of Participant _____

Signature _____

Date _____

Place _____

Guiding questions for key informant interview (from community members)

1. How the area got its name?
2. When and how the forest park established?
3. Did the people reside in the area before the emergence of the park?
4. Is there displacement of people from the area as a result the park?
5. Is there restriction on uses of land for cultivation, grazing or construction?
6. Can the local community use forest resources for fuel, construction of houses, sale or other purposes?
7. Is there any compensation or alternative opportunity for local community as a result negative consequences resulted due to the park's presence? What are these?
8. Are there other benefits that the local community gains from the forest park, such as employment, infrastructure, income sharing from tourism or logging, or benefit from conserving forest?
9. How these benefits are allocated among different parts of the community?
10. Is the community allowed to freely make movements in the forest park?
11. What are the roles of local community in forest conservation?
12. Is the community involved in decision making regarding the park or any measure taken by the park that affect their life? Difference in gender, age, social status in this regard.
13. Does the park management take into account local opinions regarding conservation and management of protected areas?
14. What does the relation between the community and the park administration look like?
15. What efforts are being done to build positive relationship between the local community and the forest park?

Guiding questions for staffs

1. What are the benefits that the local community gets from the forest park?
2. Are there some negative consequences that the community faces due to the park?
What are these? How the park administration works to address them?
3. What is your policy regarding interaction of the park with the local community?
4. How you are working with the community? Do you involve community participation in different affairs that concern the park and their interest? In what way? Which section of the community you highly work with (elders, youths, and women)? Why?
5. What are the interests that the community mainly raises?
6. Did you notice any conflicts of interests between the park and local community?
What are these conflicts and how you tried to address them?
7. Are there other problems you face while working with the community? What are these?

Guiding questions for FGD

1. Is the community really benefiting from the forest park or the negative consequences it incurs outweighs? Why?
2. Can we say that the park is a source of threat or an asset for the community? Justify with reasonable explanations.
3. To what extent the community is participating in the affairs of the park and the park's decision that affect their life?

Observation guides

1. The natural environment
2. Housing conditions
3. Socio-economic activities of the community
4. Infrastructural facilities (roads, schools, health centers, drinking water ,etc)
5. Presence of land for cultivation, grazing, construction of houses

Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other university, and that all the sources of materials used for the research project have been duly acknowledged.

Student Name	Signature	Date
Bayissa Kisi	_____	June, 2013
Advisor's Name		
Fikadu Adugna	_____	June, 2013