



# **ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES**

**DEPARTMENT OF CIVICS AND ETHICAL EDUCATION**

**Rural Land Disputes and Its Socio-Economic Consequences in Amhara National Regional State: The Case of Andabet *Woreda*, South Gondar Administrative Zone**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Civics and Ethical Education, College of Education and Behavioral Studies, Addis Ababa University, in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Education in Civics and Ethical Education**

**BY: YIHUNIE ASEFA ALEMUE  
ADVISOR DR. TEFERI MEKONNEN**

*AUGUST, 2020E.C*

*ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA*

**APPROVAL PAGE**

The thesis titled **Rural Land Dispute and Its Socio-Economic Consequences in Amhara National Regional State: the Case of Andabet Woreda South Gondar Administrative Zone:** by *Yihunie Asefa* approved for the degree of Master of Art in Civic and Ethical Education.

**APPROVAL BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS**

Tesfay Jimma (Phd)	_____	_____
Internal Examiner	Signature	Date

Alebachew (Phd)	_____	_____
External Examiner	Signature	Date

August 2020

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

## Declaration

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis entitled 'rural land disputes and its socio-economic consequences in Amhara National Regional state: the case of *Andabet Woreda* South Gondar Administrative Zone is my original work. In compliance with internationally accepted practices, I have duly acknowledged and referenced all materials used in this work. I understand that non-adherence to the principles of academic honesty and integrity misrepresentation/fabrication of any idea/data/source will constitute sufficient ground for disciplinary action by the University and can evoke penal action from the sources, which have not been properly, cited or acknowledged.

\_\_\_\_\_ Yihunie Asefa Alemu \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature Student's name Date

This thesis is submitted for examination with my approval as an advisor of the candidate.

\_\_\_\_\_ Teferi Mekonen (PhD) \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature advisor's name Date

## Table of Contents

APPROVAL PAGE .....	I
APPROVAL BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS.....	I
Declaration.....	II
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	VI
<b>Acronym</b> .....	VII
<b>Glossary of Local Terms</b> .....	VIII
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	IX
<b>List of Case Studies</b> .....	X
<b>List of Figures</b> .....	XI
ABSTRACT .....	XII
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b> .....	1
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
<b>1.1. Background of the study</b> .....	1
<b>1.2. Statement of the Problem</b> .....	2
<b>1.4 Research Questions</b> .....	5
<b>1.3 Objective of the study</b> .....	5
<b>1.3.1. General objective</b> .....	5
<b>1.3.2. Specific objectives</b> .....	5
<b>1.5. Significance of the Study</b> .....	6
<b>1.6. Delimitation of the Study</b> .....	6
<b>1.7. Limitation of the Study</b> .....	6

<b>1.8. Organization of the Study .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.1. The Concept of Dispute and Conflict.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2.2. Definitions of Land Disputes.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.3. Types of Land Disputes .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3.1. Land Administration Disputes .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.3.2. Land Tenure/Ownership Disputes .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2.3.3. Disputes over Land Boundaries.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.3.4. Inheritance Disputes .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2.4. Theories on the Causes of Dispute/ Conflict.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.4.1. Social Conflict Theory .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2.4.2. Neo-Malthusian Theory .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>2.4.3. Human Needs Theory .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2.4.4. Economic Theory .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.5. Empirical Literature on the Causes and Consequences of Land Disputes.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.5.1. Causes of Land Disputes .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.5.1.1. Institutional Causes .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>2.5.1.2. Private Causes .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>2.5.2 The Consequences of Land Disputes.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>2.5.2.1 The Consequences of Land Dispute in Ethiopia .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>CHAPTER THREE.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.1. Area of the Study .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.2. Sample Sizes and Sampling Techniques .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.3. Methods of Data Collection.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.3.1. Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.3.2. Key Informant Interview .....</b>	<b>24</b>

3.3.3. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) .....	25
3.3.4. Observation .....	25
3.3.5 Secondary Data .....	25
3.4. Methods of Data Analysis.....	25
3.5. Trustworthiness .....	26
3.6. Ethical considerations .....	26
<b>CHAPTER FOUR .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION .....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents.....	27
4.2. Types of Land Dispute in Andabet <i>Woreda</i> .....	29
4.2.1. Boundary Farmland Dispute .....	31
4.2.2. Farmland Ownership Dispute .....	32
4.2.3. Farmland Inheritance Dispute .....	32
4.2.4. Grazing land Dispute.....	35
4.3. Causes of rural farmland disputes in Andabet <i>Woreda</i> .....	35
4.4. Social Consequences of Rural Farmland Disputes .....	40
4.5. Economic Consequences of Rural Farmland Disputes.....	42
4.5.1. Production Costs' of Farmland Dispute .....	44
<b>CHAPTER FIVE .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>48</b>
5.1. SUMMARY .....	48
5.2. CONCLUSIONS .....	49
5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	49
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>60</b>

## **Acknowledgements**

First, I praise Almighty God who has never been apart from me in all walks of my life. The contribution of many people was enormous for the accomplishment of this paper and thus deserve acknowledgement. I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to my advisor, Dr. Teferi Mekonnen, for his unreserved comments and advices that shaped throughout the end of the thesis.

Next, I to extend my deepest gratitude to my family, especially to my dear brother Getnet Asefa, Belete Asefa, Aklilu Andargie, my lovely wife Zufan Tesfaw with her sister Birtukan Tesfaw, and my father Asefa Alemu, who assisted me with unreserved financial and moral supports.

Finally, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my friends: AdamuNiberet with his wife Metadel Kassa, Abebe Dires, Asaye Lake, Dessalegn Talema, Hile Fentie and student Habtamu Gzachew all have big scarification for my work.

I thank you all!

## Acronym

AWCO	<i>Andabet Woreda</i> Court Office
AWFEO	<i>Andabet Woreda</i> Finance and Economic Office
AWAO	<i>Andabet Woreda</i> Agricultural office
AWRLUEPO	<i>Andabet Woreda</i> Rural Land Usage and Environmental Protection Office
DPA	Development Program Agency
ELAP	Ethiopia Strengthen Land Administration Program
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopian
FGD	Focused Group Discussion
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILC	International Land Coalition
MOA	Minister of Agriculture
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development



## Glossary of Local Terms

*Deboo:-* A team work/cooperation working together through labour exchange and rotating method.

*Ekub:-* Local rotating savings groups.

*Idir:-* A communal self-help organization especially at the time of emergency.

*Kebele:-* The local administrative or sub-unit of the district.

*Mahber:-* A kind of association, which has religious ground; St. Michael and St. Marry for men and women are common in the study area.

*Senbete:-* A religious association which holds every two weeks in rotation.

*Tela:-* A local beer made from barley that fermented with hop.

*Timad:-* A local measurement unit for land that amounts to the size of land that can be ploughed by a pair of oxen in a single day. It is often assumed to amount to a quarter of a hectare.

*Woreda:-* The district-level government.

## List of Tables

<a href="#"><u>Table 4. 2 The Demographic and Social Characteristics of the Respondents</u></a> .....	27
<a href="#"><u>Table 4. 3 Percentage Distribution of the Respondents by the Rural Land holding &amp; Acquisition mechanisms</u></a> .....	29
<a href="#"><u>Table 4. 4 Criminal, Types of farm land &amp; other civil Cases taken to Andabet District Court in the last three years and half</u></a> .....	30
<a href="#"><u>Table 4. 5 Respondents' opinion on the Causes of rural farmland disputes in Andabet woreda</u></a> .....	36
<a href="#"><u>Table 4. 6 Respondents' opinion on the social consequences of rural land disputes</u></a> .....	41
<a href="#"><u>Table 4. 7 Household opinion in the Economic consequences of rural land disputes</u></a> .....	43
<a href="#"><u>Table 4. 8 Households' opinions in the consequences of rural land dispute on agricultural production</u></a> .....	44

## List of Case Studies

<a href="#"><u>Case study 1. boundary farm land dispute over neighbors</u></a> .....	31
<a href="#"><u>Case study 2. Inheritance land dispute with in family</u></a> .....	33
<a href="#"><u>Case study 3. The Farm land dispute over rental cases/breach of agreement</u></a> .....	38
<a href="#"><u>Case study 4. The impacts of farm land dispute in social life</u></a> .....	42

**List of Figures**

[Figure 1. Disputed households with their legal counselor](#) ..... 69

[Figure 2: Disputed households reach their cases in woreda court.](#) ..... 70

## ABSTRACT

*This study is aimed to assess the causes of rural farmland dispute and its socio- economic consequences in Andabet Woreda, South Gondar Administrative Zone, Amhara region. To address this objective of the study, the researcher employed mixed research method with cross sectional survey design. Both primary and secondary data were used. The sources of the primary data were questionnaire filled by 133 sample households, key informants' interview, discussions with focus groups and observation. Secondary data sources include published and unpublished documents, reports and other related materials. The findings of the study reveal that the frequent types of farmland disputes in the study area are boundary dispute, ownership dispute, inheritance disputes and grazing land disputes. The findings also depict that farmland disputes have impeded the social life of the disputant farmers. As per the findings of the study, a farmland dispute terminates the social interaction of the community. Furthermore, the disputed parties are always vulnerable to high financial costs such as court fees, transportation cost, fees for getting legal advices, accommodation costs. Farmland dispute has a negative effect on all aspects of human life.*

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Background of the study

Almost 80 percent of the people live in rural developing world depends on their economy on subsistence agriculture (FAO, 2009). Land as a fundamental resource for the rural area residents to increase their agricultural productivity, importance of existing adequate farmland to satisfy the food staff supply for the world community is unquestionable (Berihu et al., 2015). Therefore, without land availability it is impossible to produce agricultural productivities. Because of this, it is usual that there are land disputes across the world, especially in developing nations where a huge population depends on agriculture for their livelihood (Wehrmann, 2008; Kairaba, 2000).

The social and economic development for most of the African population is relied on the access to land, since the fact that around 60% of the population derives their livelihoods and incomes from farming, livestock production and related activities (Raphale, 2015). Therefore, the importance of land issues to social and economic development like other world in Africa is unquestionable (Odgaard, 2006).

The existing farmland in Sub-Saharan Africa provided to households and communities are critical to food security and income stability of the people (Bob, 2010). However, land is increasingly becoming a source of disputes in Sub-Saharan Africa, where land access had traditionally been characterized as relatively egalitarian (Yamamo and Deninger, 2005). It has shown that local land disputes can erupt into large-scale civil strife and political movements (Andre and Platteau, 1998; Fred-mensah, 1999; &Daudelin, 2002). Some underlying factors, such as population pressure, agricultural commercialization and urbanization, have contributed to the increasing number of land disputes and that have an adverse negative impact on the socio-economic and political conditions of many groups of people (Cotula, Toulmin; Hesse, 2004; van Donge; & 1999; Bob, 2010).

Ethiopia is an agrarian country whose national economy is mainly dependent on rain-fed agriculture and with millions of smallholders (Zerfu, 2010). In the country, where agriculture provides the largest proportion of foreign earnings and employs more than 85 percent of the population, land is a vital resource and driver of economic growth and development (FAO, 2009). Like other African countries, in Ethiopia land is a key asset for rural livelihood and economic development (Nazneen et.al. 2005). Nevertheless, in the country, since long time, there not have been appropriate policies, formally established systems and practices dealing with proper allocations, utilization and management of land. As a result, distribution of land, rights, administration and protection of those rights, establishment and regulation of land use function and other similar activities like land transfer have not been carried out properly (Yigremew, 2002). Farmers are currently facing several challenges of land fragmentation and land degradation, which is resulting in a decline in their agricultural productivity and are threatening their livelihoods. Due to this fact, there are many disputes related to land and other natural resources, particularly in rural communities. This is partly due to the increasing demand on this resource, an outcome of population growth and partly due to continued depilation of these resources in both quantity and quality due to degradation, boundary dispute, inheritance dispute and governance deficits (UNECA, 2011).

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

Disputes over farmland is worldwide have for long been existed (Raphale, 2015). These land disputes has been devastating. Not only has it resulted in the loss of life and destruction of physical, capital, with detrimental implication for growth and socio-economic developments. Moreover, the impacts of land disputes become negativity on global society. For example FAO (2014) in Syria the consequences of land disputes were; environmental degradation, increasing food prices, increasing flux refugees, land and water resource degradation and poverty. Similarly, in Bangladesh it was disclosed that land disputes bring about several consequences like; deforestation, decrease of production, pollution of water resources, slowdown investments, loss of properties and increasing of social and political instability (USAID, 2010). In Kenya, land dispute brought negativities like; thousands of families have been internally displaced, deaths of people, women humiliations and destruction of properties (Kariuki, 2005). In South Sudan, land dispute caused; deaths of people, inhumanity among neighbors, loss in land titles, increasing political and social instabilities (Wehrmann, 2008). The study conducted by Deininger and

Castagnini, (2004) in Uganda also shows that farm land disputes has a negative impact on the productivity of farmers through consuming more time to attempt resolving the land disputes which otherwise could have been used in productive activities and reduces land related investment not only by local farmers but also by outside investor. The finding of Yasmi et al., (2010) in Cambodia indicates that many farmers experienced high costs, both financially and in terms of the time because of farmland disputes. Their research indicates that the community spent more than US\$2,000 during the conflict to cover transportation and accommodation of other necessary expenditures. Furthermore, farmland disputes impede the social relationships in profound ways (Huggins et al., 2005) and a challenge to agricultural productivity (Sovannarith et al., 2001).

Rural land-related disputes have also been a predominant problem in Ethiopia with little concern or intervention by the government. Farm land related disputes in Ethiopia which has resulted in the high levels of household vulnerability such as loss of properties (houses, crops, infrastructure), loss of human life and livestock, social disharmony, migration and /or instability, affects production patterns, loss of social values (customs, traditions, belief) systems (Bogale et al., 2006)). Rural farmland disputes occur in many forms in *Amhara* region. There are disputes between single parties (as for instance boundary disputes between neighbors), inheritance disputes between siblings and disputes over the use of a given piece of land (Wehrmann, 2008). The farmers expend more time in these justice and administrative institutions (Berihu et al., 2015). Due to this, large number of land-related disputes crowds no exception Andabet woreda courts. This is because of massive flux of disputing parties or persons to the courts in case of land. In the woreda courts, woreda land desk administration, local land usage and administration, and local social court, land issue remains continuously crowded enough.

The current federal government of Ethiopia has articulated rural land administration proclamation. Based on federal land administration proclamation, the regional governments have proclaimed land administration proclamations. One of the objectives of the land administration proclamations is settling farmland disputes. Yet, such dispute can erupt into civil strife within the local community. Because of such reluctance by the government in addressing the farmland disputes, both local and national authorities have faced criticisms from the local community as more people continue to lose their income and become poorer due to farming land dispute. In some cases, people have lost their lives in fighting for land, leading to permanent hatred between



individuals or groups in the community. Moreover, managing implication and the impacts of land dispute on the socio-economic development of the people no study has attempted to make an explicit link between land dispute and socio-economic performance in Ethiopia. Therefore, the objective of this paper is to recalling and recommended these issues. However, some studies were carried out in different parts of Ethiopia by different researchers about land resources. For instance Haftom (2011) attempts to show land dispute and its resolution mechanism in Tigray, Birhanu (2009) illustrates the case of land certification and tenure security in Amhara, particularly Libokemkem, Getahun (2008), in his thesis titled as “the effect of land certification on securing land rights in Amhara region”. But in my study area, there is a high economic and social crises in the community like loss of life, termination of social interaction among families, displacement, vulnerability of financial costs such as transportation cost, court fee for councilor and witness and accommodation cost. So as to reduce these problems, the researcher conducted a research on the thesis. Therefore, this study intended to bridge these missing gaps by assessing the causes of rural farmland disputes and its socio-economic consequences in *Andabet woreda* of South Gondar at the three selected *kebeles*.

## **1.4 Research Questions**

Regarding to the problem mentioned above, study tried to answer the following questions.

1. What are the common types of rural farmland disputes in the study area?
2. What are the major causes of rural farmland disputes in the study area?
3. What are the socio-economic consequences of rural farmland disputes in the study area?
4. What is the degree of rural farmland dispute in the study area?

## **1.3 Objective of the study**

### **1.3.1. General objective**

The general objective of this study is to assess the causes of rural farmland dispute and its socio-economic consequences in the study area.

### **1.3.2. Specific objectives**

The specific objectives of this study are attempt to:

- Identify the common types of rural farmland disputes in the study area.
- State the major causes of rural farmland disputes in the study area.
- Analyze the extent of rural farmland dispute in the study area.
- Find the solution of socio-economic consequences of rural farmland disputes in the study area.

### **1.5. Significance of the Study**

The study will be significant from the following points of view. In the first place, it will provide information on the causes and its negative impacts of rural land disputes in the socio-economic development of the study area to concerned government bodies. Second, it is also supposed to serve as a significant and reliable ground for policy makers, legal personnel and other concerned government bodies to motivate, formulating laws related to land and executing these laws. Lastly, it will be as an input for similar in-depth researches to the researcher.

### **1.6. Delimitation of the Study**

Because of several constraints like time, energy and finance, the research is delimited geographically and thematically. Regarding the geographical delimitation, It confined to the Andabet woreda of the South Gondar Zone in Amhara National Regional State. Thematically, it delimited with particular emphasis of the rural farmland disputes and its socio-economic consequences.

### **1.7. Limitation of the Study**

It is important to clearly note major limiting factors, which centrally affected the overall of the study. The major limitation for the study was shortage of adequate secondary sources from the files and reports of concerned offices because the data were not well organized. The other limitation is the pandemic disease of Corona virus which affected the researcher were not move place to place freely to collect necessary data and access of internet service.

### **1.8. Organization of the Study**

This study organized in to five chapters. The first chapter discusses the introduction, which consists of background of the study, statement of the problems, objectives of the study, research questions, significant of the study, delimitation of the study, limitation of the study and organization of the study. The second chapter focuses on reviews of related literature from theoretical and empirical context. The third chapter states about research methods of the study, description of the study area, sample size and techniques, methods of data collection, data analysis techniques, trustworthiness and ethical consideration. Chapter Four provides the results and discussion of the types, causes and socio-economic consequence of farmland disputes in the study areas. Finally, chapter five summarizes the findings of the study, and draw conclusion and recommendation of the study.

## Operational Definition of Key Terms

***Dispute:*** *it is a disagreement between individuals based on interest.*

***Conflict:*** *it is a disagreement between a groups of people based on a certain interest.*

***Land dispute:*** *incompatibility among individuals in case of land issue like boundary, grazing, and inheritance.*

***Socio-economic consequence:*** *it is consequences that indicates both social and economic results whether it is positive or negative effect.*

## CHAPTER TWO

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter explores theoretical and empirical literature, related to the problem of the study. The chapter discusses on concept of dispute and conflict, definition of land disputes, types of land disputes, theoretical literature on the causes of dispute/conflict, causes of land disputes and the consequences of land disputes.

#### 2.1. The Concept of Dispute and Conflict

Various researchers have forwarded different ideas about the disparity between the two terms yet some others employ the terms interchangeably with their difference. For some anthropologists and lawyers, the term conflict and dispute are similar (Block cited in Assefa, 2005). Other scholars also describe that the term conflict and dispute are very interrelated. For instance, Kestner and Ray (2002) state that conflict is the heart of most disputes. Similarly, Tedwell (1998) state that conflicts and disputes are part of the same continuum with the main differentiating factor being that conflicts tend to be of greater intensity than disputes and are less subject to negotiation. From these definitions, it is clear that "a dispute or conflict involves a situation in which the opposing parties feel entitled to something, and they are prepared to enter into a contest in order to obtain or 'win' that to which they feel entitled". This contest may involve more than words and even violent actions. On the other hand, conflict, as defined by sociologists, is a social fact in which at least two parts are involved, with its origins are found either in the differences between their interests or in those between their social position: "the conflict is an inevitable aspect of human interaction, an inevitable consequence between choices and decisions" (Zartman, 1991). In line to this a conflict researchers give reason for the distinctions between the two terms. As Gove (cited in Assefa, 2005) explicates that conflict can be defined as; clash, competition, or mutual interference of opposing or incompatible forces or qualities (as ideas, interests, wills). However, the term dispute defined as verbal controversy, strife by opposing argument or expression of opposing views or claims, which means controversial discussion. Dispute may caused by ordinary facts like disagreements on pay, correcting of children and other matter in common daily life. Such issue could not harm the values and norms of the society, and hence the disagreements are easily negotiated (Jeong, 2000). Similarly, Burton (1990), states the two concepts are distinguished based on time and matters in

contention. Disputes involve issues of short-term disagreement that are relatively easy to resolve. Contrary to this, conflict is long-term, deep-rooted enmity that cannot be negotiated and even difficult for resolution. As it is aforementioned, some legal personnel and conflict researchers use the term without identifying their differences. However, others put boundary between dispute and conflict. In the literature, there is no single agreed explanation on the match and difference between the two terms dispute and conflict. Thus, in this study, used dispute and conflict are interchangeably.

## **2.2. Definitions of Land Disputes**

As it is not easy to distinguish a conflict on farm land from disputes over farmland, trying to differentiate the two every now and then is a matter of indifferent to some land literatures. As we have discussed earlier various authors have suggested debatable concept about the different and similar definitions regarding conflict and dispute. Farmland conflict and farm land dispute also debatable. For example, W. Babette (2008) has land conflict defined as a social fact in which at least two parties are involved. The roots of which are difference in interest over the property right to land; the right to use the land, to manage the land, to generate an income from the land, to exclude others from the land, to transfer it and the right to compensation for it. Similarly, Wehrmann (2005) land conflict defined as a misuse, restriction or dispute over property rights to land. Whereas, land disputes between individuals may or may not reflect some broader group conflict over land. Another author Haftom (2011) suggested that regarding the land conflict. Land Conflict, scope wise can be extended from disagreement to armed confrontations where competing interests and claims have caused or threatened a breakdown in ordinary or even peaceful coexistence, whereas disputes are associated with distinct justiciable issues which require a solution, can be managed and as a matter of fact requires a third party intervention. On the other hand, Bruce (2011) defined land dispute as it is competing or conflicting claims to rights to land by two or more parties, individuals or groups focused on a particular piece of land, and in which the parties have framed claims which can be addressed under existing law. Irrespective of the debates in the name farm land disputes and farmland conflicts are very crucial and have a direct effect on socio-economic development of a country. In this study, used land dispute and conflict are interchangeable.

## 2.3. Types of Land Disputes

Different Scholars described different types of land disputes in different countries. For instance, F. Justine (2015), in many areas land use disputes or conflicts are like in Tanzania where there are some major land use conflicts. The experiences in rural and urban are:

(i) Dispute between residential versus agricultures. Such land use dispute may occur because of population increases in both urban and rural areas. In the urban areas, this may result in boundaries being, extended to include rich agriculture lands on areas. Frides similarly in the rural area increases in population and the consequent increase in house hold generation case increased demand for land for residential house and for agriculture. (ii) Dispute between pastoralists against pastoralist has often interpreted as competition for pasture, (iii) Conflict between open space/ cemeteries and residential areas. Such land use conflict may occur because of population increases in both urban and rural areas. In urban area, increase of population causes increased demand of land for residential house and for agriculture (F. Justine, 2015). Wehrmann (2006) states that a useful way to classify land conflicts is that offered by conflict research which examines conflicts according to the social level at which a conflict takes place: inner-personal, inter-personal, inner-societal/international. While the inner-personal is not relevant to land conflicts, the rest are discernible in the African context.

As far as this, land disputes or conflicts come in many forms. It is important to acknowledge that land disputes are multi-dimensional and multi-type, that there is no single type of land dispute. However, let us further discuss some different types of land disputes, which agreed by many scholars that, the classification of land disputes as follow: land administration disputes, land tenure or ownership disputes and disputes over boundaries (Fonmanu, Ting & Williamson, 2003).

### 2.3.1. Land Administration Disputes

Universally, land administration is understood as the process of determining, recording and disseminating information about ownership, value and use of land and when implementing land management policies (Auzins, 2004). Land administration defined as the regulatory framework, institutional arrangements, systems and processes that encompass the determination, allocation, administration and information concerning land (Solomon & Mansberger, 2003). Land dispute takes place in between customary landowners and government. It may reflect a customary anxiety about the legitimacy of formal institutions; the transfer of land, which often produces no written records or other evidence recognized as such by the formal institutions; a lack of coordination

between administrative bodies; and the expiration of statutory lease agreements (Fonmanu, Ting & Williamson, 2003). Commonly the status of customary land is itself disputed between customary owners, government and foreign investors. After disputes have been, adjudicated further disagreements can develop over the propriety of the decision of a court or other government body relating to customary land, or even the constitutionality of a court relating to customary land. Compulsory acquisition of land by the government to foster urban development, build roads or improve transportation, and for agricultural development or mining and logging projects often leads to fierce conflict with customary landowners, whether over the acquisition itself, or over the amount of compensation that needs to be paid, as well as the nature of the obligation to compensate. These disputes can go back to colonial times when many traditional lands alienated by the colonial powers (Ibid). In other hand, UN-HABITAT (2009) suggested, this land dispute competing claims over land between the state and indigenous communities over land seen as their traditional domain or land grabbing by elites or land invasion by the poor. Disputes may also arise from policies such as land reform or registration (“titling”), nationalization, collectivization or privatization, particularly where poorly conceived, politically contentious or implemented in a faulty, corrupt or incomplete manner. Existing disputes may also be aggravated or new ones sparked by conflict (UN-HABITAT, 2009).

### **2.3.2. Land Tenure/Ownership Disputes**

Land tenure defined as the relationship among people, as an individual and groups, with respect to land and other natural resources. Broadly speaking, land tenure is an aspect of law, which governs the relationship of people to the land, either own or hold (FAO, 2005; UN-HABITAT, 2012). Economic Commission for Africa (2004) states that “land tenure is a social construct that defines the relationship between individuals and groups by which rights and obligations are defined with respect to control and use of land” (ECA, 2004). Land tenure more probably is that aspect of law, which governs the relationship of people to the land they either own or hold. Yigremew (2007), stated that, land tenure is the security of farmers to cultivate a piece of land on a continuous basis, free from imposition, disputes, or approbation from outside sources, as well as the ability to claim returns from input or land improvements while the farmer operates the land and when it is transferred to another holder. However, according to Sackey (2010), this type of dispute happen when two or more people claim the ownership over the same piece of land each claiming to be the rightful. In other hand, Fonmanu, Ting & Williamson (2003), this type of dispute can involves the



use and the denial of use of communally owned land to individuals, rivalries over membership or influence in land owning groups and the distribution of lease revenues for community owned land. In addition, customary tenure leases can clash with Western legal requirements and create further conflict (Ibid). Disagreements can also arise over the use of village or town land by the community or kinship groups and over customary inheritance laws. Other land tenure disputes arise when the principles of tenure, such as priority to older people over younger, senior to junior lines, or males over females, become incompatible. Such is the case when an older person is from a junior line, or when a female has worked more on the land and is older than her brother (Crocombe,1988).

### **2.3.3. Disputes over Land Boundaries**

The definitions of boundaries, particularly where boundary markers traditionally made by using stone heaps or signs on trees, which can be easily shifted, as well as transitions from customary to Western areas or overlapping claims and conflicts (UN-HABITAT, 2009). These arise when community members seek to fulfill their needs for more exclusive demarcation of their rights in land by fencing in properties on customary land. Often-customary rules of tenure and boundaries recorded solely by memory by people whose task it was to recall long and complex lineage and tenure arrangements (Fonmanu, Ting & Williamson, 2003). Similarly, Wehrmann (2008) boundary disputes stated as, between individuals (over private land), between clans (over common property) due to oral tradition and physically unfixed boundaries, between administrative units (villages, communes, municipalities, districts), between private individuals and the state (over private or state land). It is entering one's land without his permission, in this dispute usually out of boundary encroachment due to unclear boundaries of the individual farmers (Sackey, 2010).

### **2.3.4. Inheritance Disputes**

UN-HABITAT (2009) stated that, inheritance dispute is the disagreements over the allocation of rights to land after the death of its recognized owner may exacerbated in settings where polygamy is common or rules regarding inheritance derive from overlapping customary, religious and/or statutory law. It is often a disagreement within a family, within a clan. Inheritance disputes, particularly between brothers, sisters are almost invariably about land and division of existing property. Such disputes are often complicates by the presence of a house or valuable trees or crops on the land, as well as differing claims between siblings as to who gave their deceased parents the most care (Wehrmann, 2008). Other factors further complicate inheritance cases, including oral

agreements over boundaries, or land ownership made by the deceased's relatives or other parties (D. Stein & Suykens, 2014). Generally, we can conclude from the above literature shows land dispute classified in different ways by different scholars.

## **2.4. Theories on the Causes of Dispute/ Conflict**

Different scholars came with different theories and models related to occurring land dispute/ conflict. The causes of land dispute /conflict are numerous and complex. The theories are advanced to simplify the causes by looking at them in categories. The theories explain causes of conflict/dispute include; social conflict theory, neo-Malthus theory, human need theory and economic theory. The central arguments of these theories are discussed in the following section.

### **2.4.1. Social Conflict Theory**

Social conflict theory is a Marxist based social theory, which argues that individuals and groups (social class) within society interact, based on conflict rather than consensus. Social conflict theory seeks to scientifically explain the general forms of conflict in society in terms of how conflict starts, varies, and the effects it brings. From a Marxist point of view, social class and inequality emerge because the social structure is based on conflict and contradictions. Contradictions in interests and conflict over scarce resources between groups are the foundation of social society (Engels & Marx, 1848). The higher class will try to maintain their privileges, power, status and social position and therefore try to influence politics, education, and other institutions to protect and limit access to their forms of capital and resources. Whereas the lower class, in contradiction to the higher class, has very different interests.

They do not have specific forms of capital that they need to protect. All they are interested in is in gaining access to the resources and capital of the higher class. Karl Marx conceives largely associated conflict with the economic factor i.e., he argues that conflict could be emerged between two groups: between the bourgeoisie (who own the means of production and are powerful) and the proletariat (who are working for their masters bourgeoisie and are less powerful). The dynamic tension between the two classes resulted in the overthrow of dominants by dominated units and the tensions will end up with the formation of a communist system where there is no tension. Dahrendorf (cited in Zinn & Eitzen, 1991). Another Marxist theorist Ralf Dahrendorf added additional ideas and viewed conflict as not only a mere economic factor rather as an ever-present phenomenon, occurs because of other aspects of social organization. Depending on power relation, he divided the

population into haves' and have-not'. In social organization, power is distribute unequally between haves and have-nots, there may have always a situation in every society the haves will be in conflict with the have-nots. Hence, to Dahrendorf (cited in Zinn&Eitzen, 1991), conflict is endemic to social organization. Unlike Marx, Dahrendorf views conflict as an unending class struggle between authority figures and their subordinates that never end, but merely temporarily regulated. He criticized Marx for his mere affirmations of the origin of conflict as the repression of the powerless by powerful and indicating the cures the overthrow of the owner of the means of production by the workers/powerless. Dahrendorf (cited in Henkin& Singleton 1984) proves that conflict caused by many factors, irrespective of the political and economic system. Thus, the special emphasis on the two debates provided the researcher with an interesting theoretical insight for examining the causes for many disputes in societies as individuals strive in getting better life though the available scarce resources, related to the researchers' topic which is to assess the causes of land disputes between farmers in Andabet woreda. Despite the shortcomings of this theory that, it applauds the situation of powerful people to oppress weakened ones, but still the researcher chose it in his study so, as to reveal the truth that everyone has the power and no one is above the power.

#### **2.4.2. Neo-Malthusian Theory**

The development of Neo-Malthusian theorists in the late 1960s and early 1970s, uphold that, rapid population growth will lead to per capital scarcity of natural resources like cropland, and increases the risk of violent conflict over scarce resources. Thomas Malthus (1798), in his theory on population dynamics and its relationship with the availability of resource, conflict occurs due to unbalance relationship between population and resource, world population dramatically increases where as resources degraded. In the words of Tietenberg (1996) when society's demand for resources suddenly exceeds their availability, rather than anticipating a smooth transition to a steady state system will overshoot the resource base precipitating a collapse. Kahl (2002) has further moderated the Neo-Malthusian theory. He argued that conflict might also arise under condition of state exploitation when powerful elites exploit using scarcities and corresponding grievances in order to consolidate power. When the Andabet woreda, land dispute causes; are seen in the lens of this theory, they have some truths with the assumption of the theory. In the history of Ethiopia during feudalism, the rich (the land lords) were using the state institution as an instrument to exploit the poor (tenants). Thus, the resource extraction to small group of elites; who controls the state land, such exploitive system when the tenants were exploited by the land lords in the past (Hussen,

2004). However, the current government stipulated in article 40(3) of the FDRE constitution, nations, nationalities and peoples of Ethiopia along with state are bestowed an ownership right over rural land and other natural resources of the nation. During the transition of feudalism to democratic, and until then, farmers claim to ownership right over rural land. Therefore, this leads to land dispute between farmers.

#### **2.4.3. Human Needs Theory**

According to Mwambashi (2015), the human needs theory was propounded by; Abraham Maslow in 1940s and developed by other people who are John Burton; Manfred Max-Neef; and Marshall Rosenberg. The theory was the impact of the scientists' meeting in Seville in 1986. The Seville manifest convincingly argued that violence was not genetic and that no one is violent by birth, but violence occurs when certain individuals or groups do not see any other way to meet their needs so they need understanding, respect and consideration for their needs. According to Human needs theorists, basic human needs (physical, psychological, social and spiritual) must be fulfilled which are non-negotiable (Burton, 1980). The denial or deprivation of these needs by others, individuals, groups, communities, could affect them, there by leading to conflict (Rosatiet al.1990 cited in Faleti, 2006). Giving access to and preventing access to other amounts to denial of needs, and could make people to resort to violence in order to protect those needs (Faleti, 2006). Scarcity theory linked with resources. According to the theory, resources ready for use to meet necessities and demands, in general perceived to be in short supply. Human beings tend to battle for such scarce resources. Conflict can happen due to rareness of resources. Land is a basic natural resource in rural Andabet woreda. Over the span of human history, man has drawn most of his sustenance and much of his fuel, clothing and shelter from the land. Land has been man's inhabitant and living space; it has been a matter of life and death, of survival or starvation (Matter, 1986). Hence, the researcher to adopt the human needs theory in this study was because it identified the peoples' needs including food, shelter, participation, subsistence and belongingness that as the study concerned in Andabet woreda, and land is one of the scarce resources and the sources of basic needs in the study area. Therefore, farmland dispute between farmers occur as the outcome of peoples' strive to acquire their needs such as land for food, shelter, water and grazing.

#### **2.4.4. Economic Theory**

This theory of conflict expounds the economic under currents in conflict causation. There is considerable interface between politics (power, resources, and value) and scarcity. People seek power because it is a means to an end, more often, economic ends. Communities fight over farmlands, grazing fields, water resources etc. and groups fight government over allocation of resources or revenue. Scarcity, wants, needs, or the fear of scarcity is often a driving force for political power, contention for resource control, and so forth. Conflict is thus not far-fetched in the course of such palpable fear or threat of scarcity. Just as the fear of poverty and deprivation could lead to fraud or corruption; it threat of or real famine, deprivation, mismanagement of scarce resources, could propel conflict over resource control (Folarinnd). Despite the weakness of this theory that it just showed the scarce resource needs, while in reality they not full given to people. In this, theory helps the researcher develop a conceptual framework to illustrate how land disputes emerge and helped the research in coming up with successful outcome in the study. Since, land is an important economic asset and resource of livelihoods in Andabet woreda; it also linked to community identity, history and cultures.

Although all the theories which listed above were related to the study area, they had there own weakness and strength. But in case of andabet woreda, as the researcher conducted a research the Neo-Malthusian theory had best illustration with rural land dispute. More ever, when the population growth increases, the scarcity of farm land also increases. Therefor in case of andabet woreda, the most population make a conflict due to scarcity of farmland. This indicates that, there is imbalance relationship between population number and land supply.

### **2.5. Empirical Literature on the Causes and Consequences of Land Disputes**

#### **2.5.1. Causes of Land Disputes**

Various scholars have investigated the causes of farmland disputes in developing countries. Different factors that contributed land disputes identified by previous empirical research works are discuses in the following.

##### **2.5.1.1. Institutional Causes**

Poor institution as major cause of land disputes includes; dysfunctional land management and problematic governance institutions, including a lack of transparency especially in public land acquisition, weak structures for checking land grabbing, and exclusion of the disadvantaged

(Raphale, 2015). In addition, problems related to nepotism, corruption and the disregard of regulations and unregulated informal land acquisitions tended to disputes (Wehrmann, 2008).

Deininger (2003) revealed that in many African countries, formal institutions for land administration were often simply, superimposed on traditional structures without a clear description of responsibilities and competencies, implying that they lack both outreach and social legitimacy. Furthermore, administrative services tend to be both over-centralized and underdeveloped, with responsibilities often not clearly assigned or overlapping one another, thus impeding co-operation and co-ordination. Many land administration authorities threatened by corruption. Therefore, neither institutions constituting nor those regulating the land market make a substantial contribution to preventing land conflicts. Given their low salaries and an openness of the people working within these institutions to “motivation payments” they instead, contribute to land disputes (Wehrmann, 2008). Similarly, the issue of the role of local government and traditional authorities in relation to land control and use in rural communities is highly contested (Deininger and Castagnini; Mkhabela, 2006). There is particularly uncertainty and lack of clarity about the role of traditional authorities in land reform programmers. Specifically, the role of traditional leaders in relation to administration and control of communal lands has been questioned (Deininger and Castagnini, 2006). For example, Peters (2004) indicates that in Sub-Saharan Africa the image of negotiable and adaptive customary systems of landholding and land use is flawed; instead, exclusions, deepening social divisions and class formation are intensifying land conflicts. Some authors have advocated as, understanding land conflicts/disputes in a pervasive sense would culminate the embodiment of them in political economy and sociology of tenure regimes, i.e. in political and institutional governance arrangement deficit leads to land conflict (J. Daudelin, 2011). Even though a number of institutional theories under various schools of thought seriously question the merit of administering units, there are also theories that vehemently advocate on behalf of administering units as if purposely destined to attain efficient and faire distribution of resources.

The New Haven School of thought for instance advocates for the regulatory and administrative actions to the extent they are capable of bringing about efficiency and justice as Haftom cited in, ( Mrcuno, N. and Medena, S.G, 2011). The Modern republican theory is a theory conceived back in the 1960s propounds the separation of decision making from an individual interest.

In addition, details the content of decision as fruits of farseeing and intelligent individuals pursuing common good, otherwise if the role of these institutions is to complicate and to blur the rights arising out of the lands the level of disputes will increase massively (Ibid pp. 21).

In a marked contrast the school of Public Choice Theory refutes the prophecy of administrating units are for the common good rather they are aimed at guarantying their long political objectives and make a calculated move or invest towards that end than on economically productive action. Similarly, the capture theories reverse the situation of regulation and the relationship between institutions and regulated, hence the problem of agency capture that is the regulated will capture the regulating agencies instead (Kabir.R.1990). Among the general causes of a rural land disputes that have mentioned above in different literatures preponderance of the causes has directly or indirectly a lot to do with institutional causes. Generally, speaking if the cost of production exceeds the benefit of that production then the institution is not running its function at efficient cost. The same can said to such institutions, which fail to bring about the desired outcome of their purpose and aggravate the level of disputes. Apart from the direct costs that the public is incurring to cover the costs of institutionalizing of the agencies, it is also suffering from the uncertainties of the allocation of the rights and duties over the land. Because quite undeniable amount of disputes are attributable to lack of title deed or certificate, even if issued lack of clarity in title deed, inappropriate documentation of the title, and incompleteness of the demarcation in reality. Besides Resource Curse Theory proves how highly valuable resources can negatively affect economic development of a certain nation mainly because of the corrupted administrative system (Haftom, 2011). However, absence of the institutions or the limited role of some institutions is also one of the main factors that aggravate rural land disputes; hence, institutional indispensability will also go without saying in the existence of effective rural land administration.

#### **2.5.1.2. Private Causes**

As with any egoistic behavior, taking advantage of functional deficits for the sake of reckless individual profit maximization based on emotional and material needs, (Wehrmann, 2008).

As cited, Haftom in UchUtey et.al. (2011) causes of the dispute are clashes of interests between the private parties. For instance failing to perform one's own obligation emanates from any kind of undertaking between peasants (Ibid pp.22-23). The institutions may be as good as to issue prompt certificate or to register any private undertaking between peasants or a peasant with an investor, but for various reasons the parties may enter into a dispute (Wehrmann, 2008). Some of the frequent

forms of land dispute arise regarding inherited lands, which are contends, by a person's sister or brother and other family members and usual type of clash involves land that is operated by one family member, but used by other relatives (Haftom, 2011). Besides there are instances where local functionaries described those relatives who come from outside the village demanded relatives to use the land. Subsequent to the cultivation of the land for quite a lot of years, these relatives institute an action on the ground of effective use and productivity of the land (Ibid,pp.23). In addition family base disputes most conspicuously the case of succession, post-divorce and their far reaching implication on the matrimonial relation of the spouses are also causes that can be categorized under private causes of land disputes (Gonfa, 2014). Disputes within a given family may adversely affect that of women in most cases since the application for land certification or the certificate itself excludes them from being registered (Ibid pp.55). Another common instance of which a dispute over land may arise is in situations where rural land serves as collateral (Haftom, 2011). In such cases as the ownership title or the title, which shows the legality of the possession, for countries adhering state ownership of land, remains with the borrower transferring the title deed often times than not is solved with an intervention of third parties (Haftom, 2011).

### **2.5.2 The Consequences of Land Disputes**

All land disputes, no matter how peaceful or violent they are, produce negative consequences for individual people as well as for the entire society. Many families across the world have seen their shelters and homes bulldozed out of existence (Wehrmann, 2008). In many African countries, land disputes have resulted in violent conflicts that have devastated communities, livelihoods and relations as revealed by different research works. In the Darfur of the Sudan for example, the struggle over land, has identified as one of the root causes of the conflict currently raging on (Wehrmann, 2008). In 2000, disaffection over land redistribution in Zimbabwe, which favored commercial white farmers during colonial rule led to government-backed land seizures by black squatters with little regard to due process. Other violent communal clashes involving farmers, pastoralists, and nomads over rights to land and land resources across the continent are well documented (Tsikata and Seini, 2004; Tonah, 2007; Wehrmann, 2008). In Mongolia, land dispute brought some negative consequences to people and properties, those negative consequences include; loss of properties, desire for revenge for those who were defeated, loss of faith between community members and their leaders, fear and discouragement on privatization (Baatar, 2007). In Kenya, land conflicts brought negativities like; thousands of families have been internally



displaced, deaths of people, women humiliations and destruction of properties (Kariuki, 2005). In South Sudan, land conflicts caused; deaths of people, inhumanity among neighbors, loss in land titles, political, social and economic instabilities and environmental degradation (Wehrmann, 2008). Land disputes also increase social and political instability, wherever there occur many multiple sales, evictions, land grabbing, and people lose confidence in the state and start mistrusting each other. Dealing with land disputes therefore also means to re-establishing trust and confidence in public as well as private institution (Mentrup, 2004). Land disputes create insecurity over accessed land and hence impede land improvement, which translates into low agriculture output per hectare (Deininger and Castagnini, 2006). Land dispute, also, limit portfolio choice of crops and reduce social capital. Voors, et al. (2012), in their study of conflicts impact in Burundi, find that households that had land conflicts were doing poorly in the shares of cash crops grown in total production and in measures of social capital than their counterparts without land conflicts. In addition to its effect on the agriculture sector performance and social networks, small-scale land conflicts can escalate into widespread civil strife that may threaten national security.

Kariuki (2005) stresses that land disputes affect different groups in different ways like having a stronger impact on the livelihood of the poor than that of the rich, but they also impact differently on men and women, urban and rural populations, farmers and pastoralists, groups such as squatters, ethnic minorities or orphans being extremely marginalized. There are many rural land-related disputes, the social stability in the society is affect, as the land-related disputes undermine trust and enhance fear and suspicion, often between people who used to be close, such as neighbors or family members. The violent conflicts, or merely the fear of being the target of such a conflict, may have traumatizing effects upon the involved people (Wehrmann, 2008).

#### **2.5.2.1 The Consequences of Land Dispute in Ethiopia**

Land disputes have negative effects on individual households as well as on the nation's economy. Farm land related disputes in Ethiopia which has resulted in the high levels of household vulnerability such as loss of properties (houses, crops, infrastructure), loss of human life and livestock, social disharmony, migration and /or instability, affects production patterns, loss of social values (customs, traditions, belief) systems (Bogale et al., 2006)). Wehrmann (2008) observes that whenever there is a land dispute, someone suffers economic consequences. In extreme but not rare situations, people find themselves landless and/or without shelter. Land dispute leads to, slow down investment, can result in the loss of property for a conflict party and reduce tax income (land

tax, trade/commercial tax) for the state or municipality (Wehrmann, 2008). Sekeris (2010) Farm land dispute is not only affecting farmers' income but also misfortune the whole development of a country. Whenever there is farmland dispute among farmers it is obvious that their agricultural productivity decreases from time to time that is a threat for their livelihood. Because, of agricultural productivities hampered highly and shrink by the farmland dispute. Farmers are exposed to different unnecessary expenditures in time of accusation because of land dispute. They should be cover legal counselor costs, transport costs, personal living costs, material costs and others that weaken their income. Even though farmers spend all these costs to win their case, sometimes they can be losers, which demoralize them in addition of their cost crisis (Berihu et al, 2015). People therefore need to spend a lot of time and money on searching for information and monitoring agreements/contracts. This means that land disputes are associated with high transaction and agency costs or *vice versa*, that (relatively) high transaction and agency costs indicate a high probability of land disputes. Disputes over the use of land generally have a negative impact on the poor or on the natural or building environment. They either decrease quality of life for parts of society or, if they are addresses and ameliorated, contributes to additional state expenditures and therefore have an impact on the national wealth (Ibid). Moreover, rural land disputes adversely affect the different social activities in Ethiopia. These social activities such as; Equib, Edir, Mahber, Zikir, intermarriage, organized labor etc are the common social activities of the community (Berihu et al, 2015). These social activities have contribution for consolidation of the community and cooperative work since it considered as a source of social capital. Thus, the social activities have been given due emphasis for a long period and they have religious and cultural aspect in the study area. The social condition of rural community is highly interrelated with their economic conditions because the community depends on the agricultural productivity to make social and religious feast and ceremonies like marriage, Mahber and other social activities. Thus, the farmland disputes poison these social activities through declining the agricultural productivities of farmers. In addition, the social organizations like religious association (Mahber), social association (Iddir) and labor organization (Debo) are highly affected by the farmers land conflict. Moreover, the kinship relation, become hostile because of farmland conflict and relatives' relationships highly affected by it and encountered by tension (Berihu et al, 2015).

## CHAPTER THREE

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Area of the Study

Andabet *Woreda* is one of the eleven *woredas* of South Gondar administrative Zone, Amhara National Regional State. Astronomically, it is located between 11° 10'-11° 30' North latitude and 37° 45' - 38° 00' East longitude. The *woreda* is divided into 26 *kebeles* (2 urban and 24 rural). It is bordered in North by *Estie woreda*, in South by *Huleteju Ensie woreda of East Gojjam*, in West by *Dera woreda* and in East by *Estie woreda*. It is located 148-kilo meter far from *Bahir Dar*, the capital of *Amhara* national regional state and 91 kilometer far from *Debre Tabor*, the capital of South Gondar zone.

Topographically, the altitude of *Andabet Woreda* ranges from 1500 to 2300 meter above mean sea level. A large area (43.47%) is plateau and followed by plain (35.74%). The remaining parts of the *woreda* are valleys and others (11.3%) Since the *woreda* has a wide range of altitude and diversified relief structure, there is spatial and seasonal variation of temperature and rainfall. The annual range of temperature of the *woreda* ranges from 11-25.5<sup>0</sup> Celsius and the annual rainfall ranges between 673.2-1538.1mm (AWRLUEPO, 2020).

According to AWFE0 (2020), the total population of the *woreda* was 154,797 with the growth rate of 2.85 % per annum. Out of the total population, 129,383 engaged in agriculture and the remaining population engaged in non-agricultural sector. From total population, 51.2 percent were males and 48.8 were females. This shows there was balanced sex ratio even males are slightly greater than females. The *woreda* has a total area of 7968.66 hectare. This area of land used for different activities. The average land holding size of households is 1.4 hectare. From the total area of the *woreda*, 73.9% of used for crop production, 16% for grazing land, 3.6% for settlements, 2.24% for forests and 4.3% is used for other purposes (AWRLUEPO, 2020 annual report).

#### 3.1. Design of the study

This study expected to through inquire and/ or investigate “the socio- economic consequence of rural land disputes in Andabet *woreda* south Gondar administrative zone. So, to achieve its

objective or goal the researcher followed both qualitative and quantitative research design in the study area.

## Population of the Study

### 3.2. Sample Sizes and Sampling Techniques

*Andabet woreda* is selected purposefully from eleven Woreda of south Gondar administrative zone as a study area and the three study kebeles were selected by simple random sampling from 24 rural kebeles. Which means the researcher used both probability and non-probability sampling technique. Because of the following reason, that were reasons for selection of the study area was Firstly, the researcher observed frequently land related disputes in this *woreda*. Secondly, there are limited studies related to rural land disputes in this *woreda*.

Thirdly, the researcher has familiarity with the *woreda*'s culture and local language; hence, there is not communication barrier with sample key informants. Therefore the researcher was used random sampling and selected 133 respondents from 4184 total population. In this *woreda*, there are 24 rural *kebeles* and 2 urban *kebeles*. Due to financial and time constraints, the researcher was unable to take all *kebeles* as a sample.

Cochran (1977) suggests that the sample size should be calculated a representative sample proportions. Accordingly, the researcher selected 3 rural *kebeles* randomly from the total rural kebele of the *woreda*, such as *Semet Sholay* (1738 population), *Adama* (1092 population) and *Atsede-Mariam* (1354 population) and the key informants were selected 133 by proportionality from each three selected kebele. These kebele administrations were selected randomly because of the existence of serious problem. According to the *woreda* court office (2020), the total land related disputant in these three selected rural kebele administrations was 533 from year 2017-2019/20 half years. Out of these, 201 were in *Semet Sholay*, 135 were in *Adama* and 198 were in *Atsede-Mariam* *kebeles*. Complete coverage of this population was not possible due to financial and time constraints. The above 133 respondents were selected by using Cochran (1977) equation.

$$\text{i.e } n = \frac{N \cdot e^2 \cdot pq}{1 + e^2 \cdot pq} \quad \text{or} \quad n = 1 + \frac{\frac{no}{n-1}}{N}$$

### 3.3. Methods of Data Collection

Important data for this study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data source; was employed to gather first-hand information to achieve the objectives of the research, this data obtained from respondents through questionnaire, interview and focus group discussions. Secondary source; was also considered for gathering certain secondary information in order to consolidate the first-hand information by reviewing documents.

#### 3.3.1. Questionnaire

The quantitative data for the study was mainly, obtained through a household survey. It was conducted using standard questionnaire. The survey questionnaire was purposely steered towards acquiring a wide range of information that addresses the set of research objectives. The questionnaire consisted of a mixture of closed and open-ended items. The issues included four enumerators who are familiar with the local area, were engaged in the collection of the data-using questionnaire. The enumerators were trainees to perform this assignment and were carefully selected among those who had experience in data collection. The training of enumerators allowed them to understand the pertinence of this survey and the implication of each question in this survey. The questionnaire was completed by visiting the farm households around their homestead and by meeting with them in the farm fields. The heads of the households were interviewees, for they have a major role in decision making on farming activities and have better knowledge of land management technologies. The survey work of the enumerators was regularly monitored. Moreover, the survey work was evaluated by re-interviewing some of the households surveyed by enumerators to confirm the reliability of the collected data.

#### 3.3.2. Key Informant Interview

In-depth interview was employed with intention of getting richer information from the key informants. In-depth interviews were conducted with key informants such as; *woreda* land desk administration office head, *woreda* court and justice administration office head, three *kebele* land use and administration experts, *woreda* rural development and agricultural office head, legal counselors & *woreda* police administration office inspector and six farmers who experienced land dispute and conflict mediators committee. A checklist of open-ended questions comprising different issues was used to guide interviews. Mobile surveys were used to record the key informant interviews.

### **3.3.3. Focus Group Discussion (FGD)**

In addition to survey questionnaire and In-depth interview, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) was employs to increase the reliability of data collected by other methods. Three –focus group discussions were organizes from these, three-sample *kebele* land administrations and. The number of participants in each focus group was range from three to five persons. The participants of the *kebele* focus group discussions were disputed household heads, community elders, local land conflict mediators; local land boundary differentiates committee and religious representatives.

### **3.3.4. Observation**

The researcher has, used field observation to collect available data from the study areas' societies pertaining to the causes of farmland disputes and its socio-economic affairs by attending physically. In addition, this is the action or process of carefully watching or observing the study areas' overall activities as well. An observation is something that we have learned by seeing or observe something and thinking about the realty and it believed to be reliable than the rest of the instruments. The researcher has observed the studied area two times and the debate of the accused and accuser person in order to make sure about something or someone from the regular court in woreda and social court in the kebele, usually because of watching how they behave. Moreover, observation makes the researcher the ability to pay a lot of attention to things and to notice more about them than most people do and gather the socio-economic and political interactions of people and their day-to-day activities in general.

### **3.3.5 Secondary Data**

Documents and reports available in the *woreda* rural land usage and administration office, woreda police and security office and woreda court office was reviewed in order to recognize the number of rural land disputes reached there and identify the main causes. To articulate the problems, journals-articles and related researches with the study were again analyzed. These secondary data were organized through mobile survey and by distributing questioner to key informants.

## **3.4. Methods of Data Analysis**

The method of data analysis is determined by the methods of data collection employed and types of data collected. In this study, the quantitative data from the questionnaires; analyzed by using SPSS version20 software mainly using descriptive statistical method by percent. On the other hand, the qualitative data from obtained through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), interviews and

observation are described qualitatively in sentence form and as well as narration in order to triangulate its validity and reliability with the quantitative data set. General speaking, the researcher analyzed the data using qualitative and quantitative data analyzed methods.

### **3.5. Trustworthiness**

To address issues of validity and reliability, the survey data collected triangulated with interview and focus group discussion. All of survey questionnaire, observation, interview and focus group discussions examined in relation to what has written about the issue under investigation by different researches and analysis of documents.

### **3.6. Ethical considerations**

The study has give much emphasize to ethical conducts when dealing with the research participants and the researcher has made attempt to develop a sense of trust. The research participants informed that they had the right to withdraw from the study because the consent was gained through genuinely. Moreover, the researcher was informed research participants that all personal information they gave kept confidential and that their names was not be disclosed to maintain confidentiality of information throughout the phase of research work.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 4.1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The demographic and social characteristics of the respondent's households were summarized in table 4.1. In terms of sex, the data indicates that (86.5%) of the respondent households were male headed and (13.5%) were female headed as could be seen in the summary table 4.1. This implies that more male than female respondents took part in the study.

**Table 4.1 The Demographic and Social Characteristics of the Respondents**

N° Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent
1. Sex	Male	113	86.5
	Female	18	13.5
	Total	133	100
2. Age	18-25	14	10.5
	26-33	67	50.4
	34-40	37	27.8
	41 above	15	11.3
	Total	133	100
3. Marital status	Married	99	74.4
	Single	8	6.0
	Divorce	17	12.8
	Widow	9	6.8
	Total	133	100
4. Number of family	1-3	41	30.8
	4-6	71	53.4
	7 and Above	21	15.8
	Total	133	100
5. Level of education	Illiterate	88	66.2
	1-4	30	22.6



Above 5	15	11.3
Total	133	100

Source: Own Survey, 2020

The summary table 4.1, presents that the majority of (50.4%) the respondents aged were from 26-33, (27.8%) of the respondents were aged from 34-40, (11.3%) of the respondents were from age 41 and above, while the minority of the respondents (10.5%) were 18-25 aged. The findings show that most of the respondents belonged to age group of 26 to 33 years.

Regarding to marital status, the findings in table 4.1 show that the majority of (74.4%) respondents were married, (12.4%) of respondents were divorced, (6.8%) of respondents were widowed, and while the minority of (6.0%) respondents were single. Therefor the married respondents have high interest than widowed, divorce and single respondents.

Concerning the family size, the majority of (53.8%) respondents had 4-6 family members, (30.8%) of respondents had from 1-3 family members and (15%) of respondents had from seven and above family members. The findings depict that the majority of the respondents belonged to had four to six family members. Having large family is significant factor to rural land disputes among farmers as reported by Berihu et al. (2015).

Concerning the educational status of the respondents, the majority of (66.2%) of the respondents were illiterate, (22.6%) of the respondents had reached 1-4 grade level of education, while (11.3%) of respondents were completed primary education. The findings depict that the majority of the respondents were not sufficiently educated. The proportion of illiterate households, relative to their youngness is quite larger. This shows that the illiterate respondents have high demand of land and they are exposed to conflict.

**Table 4.2 Percentage Distribution of the Respondents by the Rural Land holding & Acquisition mechanisms**

N <sup>o</sup>	Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent
1	Farmland size	<1hectare	82	61.7
		1-1.5 hectare	27	30.3
		1.6-2.00 hectares	14	10.5
		above 2.00 hectares	10	7.5
		Total	133	100.0
2	Means of land acquiring	inheritance only	25	18.8
		land redistribution	19	14.3
		Gift only	31	23.3
		inheritance and redistribution	58	43.6
		Total	133	100.0

Source: Own Survey, 2020

Percentage Distribution of the Respondents by the Rural Land holding & Acquisition mechanisms with Regard to farmland holding size of the respondent in table 4.2, the majority of the respondents (61.7%) owned less than 1hectares of land. 30.3% of the respondents had 1-1.5 hectares of land. 10.5% of the respondents had 1.6-2 hectares land while the minorities of (7.5%) respondents had 2 hectares land and above. The findings of this the farmland size were few farmers had maximum size of land than the rest of the people. Because of, farmers, who were committees during land distribution, have owned maximum farmland as well and they have small family number.

When we look in the table 4.2, the findings reveal that how to acquiring the farmland. The most important mechanism of acquiring farmland was inheritance and redistribution, where (43.6%) of respondents reported that their current holdings were acquired in that way. The second major way of land acquiring was only gift accounted (23.3%), the other respondents followed by inheritance only which accounted (18.8%) and land redistribution accounted only (14.3%) of the respondents.

#### **4.2. Types of Land Dispute in Andabet Woreda**

This section highlights some land disputes most common in the *woreda*. Across the research sites, land is repeatedly, described as a highly contentious resource. According to the data collected from

Andabet *woreda* court’s annual report, in the last three and half years, criminal, land related, and other civil cases were the major dispute that occurred frequently in the district. Table 4.3 shows the cases and the magnitudes of disputes. As presented in the table, land related cases of dispute are typically complex in the study area. Over all disputes reached to the *woreda* court, in the last three and half years were 12242. From these cases 2680 (21.89%) of cases were land related disputes. The most frequent disputes were boundary dispute which accounted an average in three and half years (23.05%), inheritance dispute which accounted an average in three and half years (20.37%), overlapping ownership accounted an average in three and half years (20.18%) followed by grazing an average accounted in three and half years (10.74%), and other land related case weights (25.63%).

**Table 4.3 Criminal, Types of farm land & other civil Cases taken to Andabet District Court in the last three years and half**

N <sup>o</sup>	Cases	2017	2018	2019	2019/20	Total
1	Criminal	283	296	327	238	1144
2	Types of farm land Disputes	1007	647	805	221	2680
	Boundary	279	122	164	53	618
	Inheritance	248	130	134	34	546
	Overlapping ownership	214	143	142	42	541
	Grazing	130	77	54	27	288
	Other land disputes	136	175	311	65	687
3	Other civil cases	2150	2875	2502	891	8418
	All disputes	4447	4465	4439	1571	12242

Source; AWCO, report 2017, 2018, 2019, and mid 2020.

Similarly, the data obtained from interview and FGD revealed that the most frequent type of land dispute in the study is dispute between individuals and families related to boundary, inheritance and claims of ownership among family members. The prevalence as well as the complexity of land related dispute in the district varies in terms of agro-ecology (highland) and (lowland). As reported

by the participants of focus group discussions, in the following pages, attempts have made to highlight how the most prevalent land related disputes such as boundary dispute, inheritance dispute, claims of ownership dispute and grazing land disputes are the interpersonal dispute in the context of Andabet *woreda*.

#### 4.2.1. Boundary Farmland Dispute

Disputes related to boundaries are common in the *woreda*. The dispute is serious, between farmers who shared common boundary. Respondents also noted a number of boundary disputes occurring when individuals attempt to enlarge their own plots. The common means of demarcate boundary of farmland in the area putting stones and grass strips. However, those instruments are easily removable. This creates conducive opportunity for those farmers who want to expand their own farmland at the expense of their neighbors and this could inevitably leads to dispute.

Regarding to this problem interviewed from one of the disputed household reported as:

*"When you lose your parents, your elderly neighbors want to say the children do not know the boundary of the land"* (Source, disputed household interviewed in May 2020).

Additionally, information obtained from other interviewed disputed household regard to boundary dispute among neighboring plots as follow the case study:

##### Case study 1. boundary farm land dispute over neighbors

*Ato Mihret Wubant and Mengist Wondemagegn are relative men. They live in Atsede Mariam kebele as a neighbor manner. Their farmlands have common boundary. Once upon a time, they fought each other on the demarcation of land boundary. Due to this reason, Mengist Wondemagegn harmed Ato Mihret Wubante on his part of the body. Accordingly, AtoMihretWubant opened a complaint with Mengist Wondemagegn at Andabe tworeda court. The court decided on Mengist Wondemagegn and sentenced him two years prison. Mengist's children and his parent they complained to high courts. They continued complains for several months and finally they hide themselves in a narrow road until Ato Mihret come. As soon as he comes, they get out and killed him by hard stick and using an'axe at 4:00 o'clock local time on December 20/04/09 E.C.(source interviewed April2020 E.C).*



As we have seen in the above case study, a land dispute brings loss of human life and injury, and imprisonment. Youth who participate in land disputes, killed, injured, or imprisoned and displaced in the study area.

#### **4.2.2. Farmland Ownership Dispute**

Respondents' note that disputes also often related to ownership of plots. The frequency of such disputes varies greatly by location. When compared to highland, the dispute over ownership right of particular farmland is the most serious problem in lowland area, where land is fertile and relatively unoccupied. The need for acquiring ownership right of new parcel of farmland typically results in increased competition between the people. This can see from two different perspectives in the context of Andabet woreda. On one hand, those people who occupied considerable amount of farmland in highland during the past regimes are involving in active competition to have extra ownership right over another plot of land. This is because; first, the productivity as well as the fertility of previously used land is decreasing due to repeatedly farming and overgrazing. This in turn obliged farmers to use the high amount of chemical fertilizers. The diminishing fertility of land and increasing cost of fertilizer forced the 'land owners' to look for virgin lands and obtain its ownership right by plowing illegally. This creates a competition over access to ownership right of encroached farmland in lowland which inevitable type of dispute. On the other hand, young households, who did not get access to a piece of land, are struggling to get some parcels of farmland. However, there is no recent or new land distribution in rural in the study area in particular and Amhara Region in general. Even, the recent rural land measurement and approval of land use right by giving identity card (*land tenure certification card*) to those occupying land did not help the young generation. As a result, newly married couples and jobless people who returned from school and who want to participate in agricultural activities are landless. As the data gained from FGD, large number of youth households encroached communal lands in lowland areas of the *woreda* because; land is relatively unoccupied, fertile and productive.

#### **4.2.3. Farmland Inheritance Dispute**

The land inheritance dispute is the other land related dispute in the study area. According to key informants, the most complex and prevalent disputes over inheritance usually happen among family members, especially when parents dies without handing over his land to any of the family members.

This type of disputes becomes multifarious if the father is polygamous. In this case, dispute may takes place between the widows, their brother in-law, children, and their stepmother, or between stepbrothers. Additionally, the data gained from the focus group discussion participants from elders describe as:

*Farmland has being the source of dispute among children. If a father/mother has many children and be deciding to inherit his/her, land for his/her single child (inheritor). The non-inheritor children claim property (assets) from their parents or there is no fair distribution of resources from parent to child. Due to this reason the non-inheritors decided to damage either their parents or inheritor.*

As we understand from the above statement; disputes over resource inheritance can also takes place between brothers when the elder and younger brothers are not satisfied with fair distribution of land and other properties handed over to them by their family. It can also arise between children and stepmothers, especially, when the stepmothers are denies the right over the resource they inherited from their husbands. Moreover, the case story related to this problem interviewed from disputed household key informants has taken.

*Case study 2. Inheritance land dispute with in family*

*AtoKassayeTegegn is 32 years old. He lived in Semate Sholaykebele. He was one of the disputed households. Kassaye started telling his short story from his childhood ... My mother name was W/roKebebush Belay. She had two children namely KassayeTegegne and MeleseTegegne who are the elder and younger respectively. I lived in neighbor of my mother and I have been engaged in agriculture. My brother also worked as a teacher in the town. After in certain years ago, we disagreed because of different reasons. After a month, my mother inherited all her farmland and other properties to Melese. Because of this decision, the dispute has aggravated between me, and my mother, due to unfair decision of the arbitrator. After a year ago, my mother passed away. Then, my brother teacher Melese inherited all properties. However, I forwarded complains against teacher Melese. Since I am a farmer, the land must be gave for me but not for Melese because he worked in a governmental institution, then I forwarded complains in Andabetworeda court. The woreda court is received complains and sorted the information in detail. The court and*

*the woreda land administration discussed the issue and then the court decided based on their regulation. The court approved that the case neither brother nor me did not have the farmland because you had farmland in your own name. Your brother also worked in governmental institution. Therefore, the land directly must give to those who had not a farmland. By this case, still we are in disputing. (Source interviewed households, April 2020 E.C).*

From the above case, it is possible to understand the existence of unfair inheritance system or disfavored among family members in terms of land acquisition through inheritance. The habit of farmers in the study area gives inheritance right from parent to child through informal or customary way. As interviewed from the woreda regular court judge on the major type of land related disputes reflect that inheritance is the sever challenge that cases threat to rural community, because of customary inheritance ways preceding application to the formal court system.

In other hand, most FGD informants illustrates dispute between girls and their families over inheritance of resources, especially land is an emerging issue in the study area. This is mainly due to the contradiction between current government's women inheritance right and the customary women inheritance right practiced in the society since a long time. Culturally, girls did not have the right to inherit land. Because it believed that; first, girls go away from their families' land through marriage, second, if a girl given a land, she will bring a man who is out of the family to the land through marriage. Therefore, the father does not hand over land to his girl. Even if the father wants to include her in the inheritance of his land, her brothers may not agree or allow her to establish her own family and live on that land. Yet, the 1995 constitution of FDRE (Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia) article 35, sub-article 7 grants women equal rights with men with respect to the use, transfer, administer, and control of land and they shall also enjoy equal treatment in the inheritance of property. Because of this constitutional right, girls (women) are becoming more conscious on how to claim land from their families. Therefore, the contradiction between government law and customary practices leads girls and their families to have divergent position and consequently to disputes. This problem happens in the case of not only land inheritance but also other resources such as livestock, house and other materials.

#### **4.2.4. Grazing land Dispute**

This type of dispute is also common in the study area. As the researcher obtained information from interviewee dispute over grazing land happens in the situation when those who suffer from shortage of grazing land intentionally graze their livestock over someone's land. This usually takes place in secret, in the absence of evidence. The favorable events people use are on the occasion such as market days, wedding days, burial/ funeral/ days, at night and the like. The dispute case through such types of act cannot take to the formal institution, as the case has no evidence. Additionally, the researcher data gained from one of the FGD participants from elders. His response was as follows:

*There are different types of farmland dispute in the study area. From these, grazing land is common types of land dispute, many people do not have land specially grazing land for their cattle. Because of grazing land, many people get in to dispute to protect his/her land to taken by another body (source elders participant in FGD ,May2020).*

In addition, data gained from key informants, *Andabet woreda* Agriculture and Rural Development Office head reveals that land disputes include the use of other's grazing land dishonestly, the dispute over the use of communal grazing and forest land, displacement, remove of boundary marks and claim of land ownership. Undue land measurement and registration that pushed land related disputes to take the front position out of the stated economic reasons.

#### **4.3. Causes of rural farmland disputes in Andabet Woreda**

In this study, an attempt to make to identify the causes of rural farmland disputes in *Andabet woreda*. Regarding this item, there were five alternatives to measure a scale from strongly agree (1), agree (2), (3) Partially agree, disagree (4) and strongly disagree (5) are employed. The result presented below on table 4.4.



**Table 4.4 Respondents' opinion on the Causes of rural farmland disputes in Andabet woreda**

Causes of farmland Dispute		Responses											
		SA		A		PA		DA		SDA			
Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%	Fr	%
1.Scarcity of farm land		96	72.2	24	18.0	10	7.5	3	2.3	-	-		
2.Absence of land Ownership													
C certificate				27	20.3	24	18.0	26	19.5	51	38.3	5	3.8
3. Overlapping ownership		17	12.8	45	38.3	19	14.3	22	16.5	30	22.6		
4.Divorce				24	18.0	49	36.8	30	22.6	25	18.8	5	3.8
5.High demand of land		84	63.2	24	18.0	8	6.0	17	12.8	-	-		
6.Fragmented of land		27	68	51.1	18	13.5	18	13.5	19	14.3	10	7.5	
7.boundary problem		86	64.7	26	19.5	12	9.0	7	5.3	2	1.5		
8 Inheritance problem		60	45.1	40	30.1	22	16.5	7	5.3	4	3.0		
9. drainage problem	54	40.6		38	28.6	28	21.1	9	6.8	4	3.0		
10. Rental problem		61	45.9	50	37.6	11	8.3	10	7.5	1	0.8		
11. grazing land		91	68.4	30	22.6	7	5.3	2	1.5	3	2.3		

Source: Own survey, 2020

N.B: Fr= frequency, %= percent, SA= Strongly agree, A= Agree, PA= Partially Agree, DA= Disagree, SDA= Strongly disagree.

With regard to scarcity of farmland in table 4.4, (72.2%) of respondents were strongly agreed and (18.0%) of respondents were agreed and (7.5%) of respondents were partially agreed so, scarcity of farmland is one of the factors for rural land disputes. In the opposite side,(3.2%) of respondents were disagreed.

In the extent of the demand of farm land in table 4.4, (63.2%) of respondents were strongly agreed and (18.0%) of respondents were agreed and (6.0%) of respondents were partially agreed, as the present of high demand of land or the increment of the value of land between farmers is a factor for

land disputes. In the contrary way, (12.8%) of respondents were disagreed. Therefore, it is major cause for rural land disputes.

With regard to fragmented of land between families and others from the household, (51.1%) of respondents were strongly agreed and (18.3%) of household respondents were agreed and partially agreed, fragmented of land among family during the time of inheritance/gift from father/mother to child. In the contrary way, (14.3%) of respondents were disagreed and (7.5%) of household respondents were strongly disagreed. Therefore, it is also a major cause for rural farmland disputes.

With regard to drainage in table 4.4, (40.6%) of household respondents were strongly agreed and (28.6%) of household respondents were agreed, drainage is one of the major causes of rural land disputes in Andabet *woreda*. In the contrary way, (6.8%) of the household respondents were disagreed and (3.0%) of respondents were strongly disagreed, it is a common factor to accelerate rural land disputes, Therefore, it is major cause for rural farmland disputes. In line to this Berihuet. al. (2015) in the same finding reported as drainage is one of the major causes of rural land dispute. In addition to survey study, interview from *kebeles* land administration experts states that drainage is more significant than other causes of land dispute, but it is seasonal during summer, and irrigation in winter season.

Concerning the rent land problem in table 4.4, (45.9%) of household respondents were strongly agreed and (37.6%) of respondents were agreed and (8.3%) of the respondent households were partially agreed, rental land is a factor that accelerate to rural land disputes among farmers in the *woreda*. In the opposite way, (7.5%) of the respondents were disagreed and (0.8%) of the respondents were strongly disagreed, Therefore, it is another cause for rural farmland disputes.

In addition to survey study, the researcher obtained information from interviewed disputed household in the case of breach of agreement as follow as a case study.

Regard to grazing land, (64.4%) respondents were strongly agreed and (22.6%) of respondents were agreed and (5.3%) of the household respondents were partially agreed on the severity of grazing land disputes were a causes of rural land disputes between farmers specially in summer session. In the contrary way, (1.5%) of respondents were disagreed and (2.3%) of respondents were strongly disagreed. therefore shortage grazing land is another factors that affect the farmers relation.

In addition to survey study, the researcher data gained from interview and focus group discussion reveal that the scarcity of farmland occurs due to the increasing of population growth. Land is the most important resource on which the livelihood of the rural community is highly dependent. One of the factors that results a pressure on this basic resource is high population growth. In Ethiopia land dispute could be aggravated among other things, by population pressure and increasing land scarcity (Dessalegn, 2004). This is because, if the rural population livelihood rely only on land and have no or little income from other non-farm activities, the struggle to access and control land increases and could be a threat to tenure security. The similar findings were reports by, Berihu et al. (2015) that population pressure is one of the major causes of land conflict in farming livelihood. Literature review assessed for this study shows that, the development of Neo-Malthusian theorists in the late 1960s and early 1970s, uphold that, rapid population growth will lead to per capita scarcity of natural resources such as cropland, freshwater, forests, and fisheries, increases the risk of violent conflict over scarce resources.

*Case study 3. The Farm land dispute over rental cases/breach of agreement*

*My name is Temesgenwalle. I am a 45 years old. I have 7 children and the resident of SemetSholaykebele of AndabetWoreda. In 2017, I bought one-fourth hectare farmland from mogesKindu by signing the formal agreement in the name of renting land for two years term. In 2019, as the term of agreement completed, he claimed the right to use the land. I begged him and re-rented the land by adding much more money without any formal agreement. In 2020, we did the same thing but with informal agreement in the name of renting. Starting from the first sale up to this year 2020, I was using the land for farming and grazing purpose. However, from this year onwards I built a house on it. Breaching the agreement, he again asked me to leave the land warning him that he would sue him at the court. I need to buy the same land for the third time in 2020 because I have no other option. As he took the money, he accused me at the court claiming the ownership right over the land by presenting their renting agreement paper as evidence. Accordingly, the court gave verdict that I should destroy my house and leave the land. Then, I was force to leave the land and settled in other place.*

*Then, I was asked to local common arbitration in order to negotiate, the arbitrator accepted my idea and mediates the two disputant individuals by means of, I replace other fertile land to him but my land is two times greater than him land. However, I still memorize he took double land; by this case still we have no good relation. (Source: from Interview, May, 2020 E.C).*

Temesgen's statement shows that land rent by the cause of breach agreement also causes of land dispute among farmers, it leads to also affray among individuals.

Furthermore, all the focus group discussions agreed and listed all the causes find by the survey. Drainage problem, divorce, scarcity of farm land, high demand of land, fragmented of land and population pressure are the most common causes of farm land disputes for the focus group discussants. Drainage is a seasonal major cause of farmland disputes because in the summer season large number of farmers become to farmland disputes because of, they need channels for exit water from their plots. In summer season, a farmland dispute caused by drainage is serious. Farmers divert the direction of the drainage, which comes to their plot in order to protect from erosion. Since many other plots compound the plots, the drainage overflow to the neighbor plots and dispute occur between/ among farmers. In addition to the above causes, FGD said that irrigation is one of the major factor of rural farm land disputes in the study area, but it is in winter season large number of farmers those who have farm land around to river and tributaries need to water for winter production. This is due primarily to the fact that a number of canals have multiple entry and exit points for water. This allows for many opportunities for residents to divert water, which may cause a dispute.

In addition to the causes, almost all FGDs said that land administration problems have a great role to worsen farmland disputes. There are two offices, which see land cases in the kebele level. The first is local land usage and administration responsible to distribute land of deceased and government employees to landless or young citizens and other land administration issues. The second is rural land tribunals responsible to solve farmland related disputes (social court). These local offices working days, two days per week, these two days based on religious holiday unless they did not get in to office and they provide service without salary. Because of that, they are not

committed and not work effectively in the given two days. Therefore, the local farming communities are not getting sufficient service from these office and they enforce to go *woreda* court and *woreda* land administration office. In addition to that, the local responsible offices like social court have knowledge gap to administer and solve disputes based on the rules and policies because they are not professionals and well educated. Furthermore, the community has no knowledge on the national and regional rural land proclamations. The data gained from the interviewee also supports this idea. The interviewee from the local land usage and administration said that they have salary and they are government employs and try to address different problems with the community regarding the land but the local land tribunals are wasting their time tired without any payment. Therefore, they are coming to office in religious holiday like *Saint Marry, mikael, balegzihber*. Thus, the land issues of farmers, which come to the local land administration and rural land tribunals, delay to get decision. Therefore, poor land administration is also another causes that accelerate farmland dispute in Andabet *woreda*.

#### **4.4. Social Consequences of Rural Farmland Disputes**

Dispute on farmland is not only affecting the economic cost of the community but also it affects the social life of the community. Data gained from all the methods point out that there are a lot of formal and informal social organizations and associations. Among them the social associations like *Iddir*, cooperative union, labor organizations like *Debo*, and saving organizations like *Iqub*, religious association like *Mahber, Zikir, Senbeteetc*, and administrative association have been mentioned. There are also other social relations with in the community like intermarriage and supporting individuals in time of trouble.

With regard to traditional saving association in table 4.5, (29.5%), of household respondents agreed land dispute weaken family tie. (25 %) of respondents agreed on rural land disputes reducing tem work or work together, *debo*, and withdrawal from different social institutions like *Idder, Equb* and *Mahiber* are (24%) of the respondent household respondents were agreed. In another way, (5.3%) of household respondents and (2.3%) of respondents were partially in reducing inter-marriage among community and loss of life respectively.

**Table 4.5 Respondents' opinion on the social consequences of rural land disputes**

No.	Social cost of land dispute	Frequency	%
1	Withdraw from iddir and ekub	32	24.2
2	Weaken family ties	39	29.5
3	Reducing teamwork/debo/working together	34	25.8
4	Withdraw from the members of religious institution (senbet and mehaber)	17	12.9
5	Reducing inter-marriaging among communities	7	5.3
6	Loss of human life	3	2.3

Source: Own Survey, 2020

As presented in table 4.5, respondents were asking to put their idea land dispute create social disharmony/weaken family ties, reducing team work like *debo*(working together), it has adverse effects in religious association like *senbet*, *mahber*, and affect inter-marriage in the community. The respondents were side farm land disputes were not stopped in the above mentioned problems but it leads the loss of human life and damage of the part of human body, when occurs fighting among farmers.

Furthermore, all the focus group discussions and the interviewee agreed and listed all the social consequences find by the survey study. The focus group discussions and the interviewee indicates that relationships of mutual social support are a critical component of farming livelihood in rural society, there is good social interaction in the community if there is no land dispute. There are different mechanisms of social support help them during the time of emergency and wedding and enhance their cooperation includes resource exchanges, labor and draft power donations, grain and cash loans, shared animal breeding, rotating credit groups, as well as emotional support. They are based on social networks consisting of kinship and community relations. Farmers reinforce these networks through various social activities and associations, which take the form of social visits, feasts and religious and burial associations. There is good interaction among individuals who have not any farmland disputes, although such activities decline in time of land disputes. The dispute may be easy or latent but if it is land related issue the social interaction of the disputants deteriorate from time to time and the incidence of their dispute stay for long period of time. Disputed households especially find it difficult to maintain participation in different social activities like

religious associations (*Senbet, Maheber, Zeker, Degesetc*) and saving and credit groups (*Equb, Ider, Arata or debt*).

Interviewee responses of *Ato Asmare* described the variety of social activities and their variable intensity in relation to the general social interactions facing the community.

Case study 4. The impacts of farm land dispute in social life

*Social interactions in our kebele have declined from time to time because of farmland disputes. For example, I was a member of equb group, iddir and senbetes. Currently, I am not a member of any indigenous social groups. Feasts for wedding celebrations have also declined substantially, often limited to signing ceremonies. We used to have large feasts for Easter, slaughtering sheep and preparing a number of pots of tella. We also visited relatives and stayed with them for up to a week, bringing them slaughtering sheep, all these social activities becomes at risk now a time. for instance last Easter, I remained at home only with my children. I never invite with brothers and sisters because of we are in dispute by piece of land when divided our parent land.*

*(Source interviewee household, May, 2020 E.C).*

Asmare's statements show that the social interaction among the community in the study area in the absence of farmland dispute is strong. However, the social interaction and social organization of the community gets worse in the existence of farmland dispute between/ among farmers. This indicates that farmland dispute obstruct the social interactions of the community.

#### **4.5. Economic Consequences of Rural Farmland Disputes**

Dispute over farmland has a lot of economic crisis like money and time wastage on the farmers. Though the economic consequences of land dispute limit growth and constrain economic opportunity, perpetuating the conditions that drive many of these disputes.

Table 4.6 shows all the farmland disputes, and how it affects personal income of the individuals of the economic costs.

In line to transportation costs in table 4.6, (35.3%) of household respondents were expense for transportation less than 5000 birr, (36.8%) of household respondents were expense for

transportation in range 500-2000 birr, and (27.8%) of the minority household respondents were expense for transportation more than 2000 birr and above. Therefore, the finding depicts that land disputes have adversely affected on individual income and it becomes unexpected financial expenditure. Similar finding research conducted in Cambodia the community estimates that more than US\$2,000 was spend during the conflict to cover transportation and accommodation other expenditures (Yasmi et al., 2010).

**Table 4.6 Household opinion in the Economic consequences of rural land disputes**

N <sup>o</sup>	Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percent
1	transportation costs	< 500 birr	47	35.3
		500-2000 birr	49	36.8
		Above 2000 birr	37	27.8
		Total	133	100.0
2	Accommodation costs	<500 birr	19	14.3
		500-2000 birr	100	75.2
		> 2000 birr	14	10.5
		Total	133	100.0
3	fees for legal counselor	<500	34	25.6
		500-200 birr	81	60.9
		Above 2000 birr	18	13.5
		Total	133	100.0
4	Other costs	< 300 birr	26	19.5
		400- 1000 birr	97	72.9
		Above 1000 birr	90	62.5
		Total	133	100.0

Source: own survey, 2020



Regard to accommodation costs of the dispute in order to resolve in table 4.6, (75.2%) of household respondents were expenses range between 500-2000 birr, (14.3%) of household respondents were expenses were less than 500 birr. The findings depict that the farmers affected by such kind of unexpected extravagance.

Table 4.6 shows that regard to fees for legal consoler (60.9%) of household respondents were expense were expense in range between 500-200 birr for legal consoler during the dispute, (25.6%) of household respondents were expense less than 500 birr, (13.5%) of household respondents were expense were more than 2000 birr expense for legal consoler. The findings reveal that the majority farmers have limited legal knowledge; due to this, the farmers are vulnerable for such expenditure.

The last but not the least in table 4.6, more than half or (72.9%) of household respondents were expenses for other costs in range between 400-100 birr, (62%) of household respondents were expenses were above 1000 birr and (19.5%) of household respondents were expenses less than 300 birr.

Similarly, information obtained from key informants, land dispute becomes negative economic consequences on disputed farmers as well as the country at large like, transport cost, material cost, time waste, fees for legal counselor, bed and food cost, giving money for judges and witness as a bribe in order to get decision. The cases stay in process long time in the court to get decision. As a result, farm household respondents waste their time in unproductive activities, which can produce a lot of productive activity if used the time effectively. Most FGD discussant told me, in average estimably, one farm land disputed for land dispute case reached to the court 10 to 15 times per a year and expend for one case estimably from 2000- 3500 birr.

#### **4.5.1. Production Costs' of Farmland Dispute**

Land dispute is not only affect personal income but also a hinder for agricultural productions all over the farmers as well.

The table shows that (56.3%) of household respondents were agreed, (27.8%) of household respondents were strongly agreed, the land in disputes remain out of cultivated until it get decision. On the contrary (10.4%) of household respondents were disagreed, (3.5%) of household respondents were strongly disagreed, and (2.1%) of household respondents were undecided.

**Table 4.7 Households' opinions in the consequences of rural land dispute on agricultural production.**

Effects	SA		A		UND		DA		SDA	
	F r	%	F r	%	F r	%	F r	%	F r	%
Land could not cultivated until it get decision	5	4	5	3	1	9.	9	6.	5	3.8
The rate of fertilizers applied in disputed land decreases	6	2.	0	7.	3	8		8		
Farmers do not invest on soil conservation	4	3	5	4	1	1	1	8.	2	1.5
The crop grown on plot is not harvested on time	8	6.	4	0.	8	3.	1	3		
		1		6		5				
	5	3	5	4	1	1	6	4.	2	1.5
	0	7.	8	3.	7	2.		5		
		6		6		8				
	5	3	6	5	9	6.	2	1.	1	.8
	2	9.	9	1.		8		5		
		1		9						

Source: Own Survey, 2020

N.B: SA= strongly agree, A= agree, UND= undecided, DA= disagree, SDA= strongly disagree.

When we see in table 4.7, (42.1%) of household respondents were strongly agreed, (37.6%) of household respondents were agreed, land dispute reduce the cultivations of farmland until it get decision. In other hand (9.8%) of household respondents were undecided, (3.8%) of household respondents were strongly disagreed, and (6.8%) of household respondents were disagreed.

With regard the fertilizers applied in disputed land decreases 40.6% of respondent were agreed, 36.1% of respondents were strongly agreed, 13.5% of respondents were undecided, on contrary of this 8.3% of household respondents were disagreed and 1.5% of respondent were strongly disagreed

With regard to invest soil fertility in table 4.7, (43.6%) of household respondents were agreed, (37.6%) of household respondents were strongly agreed, the effect of land dispute becomes unwillingness of farmers to invest soil fertility. In contrary way, (12.8%) of household respondents

were undecided, (4.5%) of household respondents were disagreed, and (1.5%) of household respondents were strongly disagree.

Lastly, (51.9%) of household respondents were agreed, (39.1%) of household respondents were strongly agreed to the idea of the plot is not weeded/ harvested on time by the case of land dispute, (6.8%) of household respondents were undecided, (1.5%) of household respondents were disagreed, and (0.8%) of household respondents were strongly disagreed.

Similarly, data obtained from focus group discussion and interviews, land dispute has a significant effect on agricultural production. Both results from individual and focus group discussion pointed out that the victims of land dispute suffered reduced production. This is mainly due to reduced capital investment and time wastage. Since rural community, rely on their produce mainly for home consumption, reduced production result into food scarcity/insecurity. The victims of land dispute are therefore vulnerable to malnutrition, as result on inadequate food. Auma (2016) Similar finding research conducted in Uganda are known to affect women and children most and is a main factor for 60% death of children under five years of age (USAID, 2010). More so, in the course of conflict resolution, the victims have to spent money or saving which reduces the capital investment. Sometime, as was pointed out during the interview, they failed to pay for family needs such as school fees for their children and some foodstuffs. Reduced production also undermines potential for future growth (Deininger & Castagnini, 2005). Generally, land disputes decline agricultural production in different ways as data obtained from key informants. First, similar to the survey study the plots remain out of plough until it gets decision. Moreover, to decide on cases it takes a lot of time as demonstrated earlier. As a result, the plots stay without use or supply agricultural yield for long time. Second, farmers are not interested to use fertilizer for the plot in conflict because farmers have a threat that tomorrow this land may give to the antagonist. Third, farmers do not conserve the land in dispute unlike other plots because they do not want to waste time and effort on the land that they are not sure to have ownership on it. Lastly, the plot may not show, weeded and harvested on time because farmers waste their time in the *woreda* court and local land administration.

The result of this is poor harvest and reduced income.

*"One of the interviewed respondents reported as: losing his crops at harvest time in the whole field because he was not able to harvest on time by the cause of land dispute". Another reported his money has been stuck on a construction project for over three years due to conflict when the house construction was nearing completion.*

As we understand from the above statement farmland dispute also loss of capital investment: Due to expenses involves in conflict resolution process, the victims lose most of their stocks and income, which takes long time to recover. It is even worse for a party who borrows money and at the end loses the case. This findings similar, with a recent study by Deininger and Castagnini (2004) in Uganda that suggests a 5 to 11 percent productivity loss due to land dispute.

## CHAPTER FIVE SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 5.1. SUMMARY

The main purpose of this study is to assess the causes of rural farmland dispute and its socio-economic consequences, Amhara National Regional State *Andabet Woreda*. The data was collect by using both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. The quantitative data collected via questionnaire from 133 simple randomly selected households. On the other hand, the qualitative data collected via observation, interview and FGDs. Descriptive statistics like percentage and frequency was using to analyze the quantitative data and the qualitative data was analyze by organizing in themes. Based on the analysis made, major findings of the study were shows as follows.

The trend of land dispute in Andabet woreda has been increasing from time to time. According to the findings of the study, the frequent types of land disputes are boundary farmland dispute, ownership farmland dispute, inheritance farmland dispute and grazing land disputes. The major causes of the farmland dispute are drainage problem, divorce between husband and wife, the existence of scarcity of farmland, the presence of high demand of land, irrigation related or drainage, fragmented of land between the families. Moreover, rental land is also the minor causes of the land dispute in the study area. The findings reveal that land dispute is one of the challenges of social interaction. Mutual social support is a critical component of farming livelihood in rural society. However, the dispute may be easy or latent but if it is land related issue the social interaction of the disputants deteriorate from time to time and the incidence of their dispute stay for long period of time. Disputed households find it difficult to maintain participation in different social activities like religious associations (*Senbet, Maheber, Zeker, Degesetc*) and saving and credit associations (*Equb, Ider, Arata or debt*).

The findings from survey respondents and qualitative data revealed that land dispute is not bringing the only social crisis of farmers, but also they are vulnerable to different unnecessary expenditures. They have spent a lot of money for lawyers fee, transport costs, accommodations, material costs, bribe given to judges or other concerned officials and the like. Even though they spent all these expenditure, sometimes they can be losers, which demoralize them in addition of their cost crisis.

Land disputes also caused for decline agricultural production in different ways as data obtained from key informants. First, the plots remain idle until it gets decision. Second, farmers reduce the rate of fertilizer. Third, farmers do not conserve the land in dispute unlike other plots because they do not want to waste time and effort on the land that they are not sure to have ownership on it.

## 5.2. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study the following conclusions are drawn.

- The intensity of rural disputes is high and has exacerbated over time.
- The common types of land disputes that usually takes place in the *woreda* are boundary demarcated, inheritance, over lapping ownership right and grazing land disputes. The scarcity of farmland, the land administration problem, abuse of power, fragmented of farmland, drainage, divorce and lack of awareness worsens the farmland dispute.
- The disputants exposes to different economic costs and social costs. Farmers expected to pay a lot of money for all the necessary things in time of resolution when their cases reach to the *woreda* court. As a result, farmland disputes directly or indirectly enervation the economy of farmers through wasting their time and money. The overall social interactions of the disputants are also disturbed. A Land dispute has not only negative effects on the production of farmers but also hampers local and national development by mainly affecting rural agricultural productivity at large.
- There is a high economic and social crisis in the community like loss of life, termination of social interaction among families, displacement, vulnerability of financial costs such as transportation cost, court fee for councilor and witness and accommodation cost.
- When the accused and the accuser conflict each other, they lead to many challenges. For example, they do not harvest their crops and plough their farmland currently. Meaning that they are exposed to great famine and poverty.

## 5.3. RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings above, the researcher was in position to make the following recommendations, which will help in widening the view of solving the problem of land dispute, which affect people and the economy of the country in general. Here are researcher's scholastic recommendations: In addition to certifying land ownership, it is better to delineate farmland boundaries by using like GPS and GIS / satellite navigation system, Land administration officials and experts better to work based on rule and regulation rather than private interest and reduce

complains. The government should create awareness of landholders on land use and administration proclamation of the region. Moreover, the *woreda* desk should protect the farmlands, which are grabbing by the farmers illegally. Alternative livelihood strategies should be promoted particularly for those whose farmland is small and landless households, there should be a strong and committed local conflict mediators and well organized land administration committee. Incentives for the local committees spend for the work is beneficial. Employees at kebele levels should be also encouraged through various means to improve their service deliveries, enacting good land laws is not enough to result in fair and efficient land administration. There is need for a long-term vision of creating such a system. Adequate institutional situation is a key factor for the land administration system, the government should stretch awareness for rural community about the women's have equal inheritance right with men. Findings reflect that the practice of inheritance is not fair between men and women in the community, as a researcher, it is better to have fixed rural land proclamation and it must have industry explanation. If it is so, there is low land dispute between communities or individuals.

## REFERENCES

- Aaker D.V. Kumar V. & Day G.S. (2002). *Marketing Research (7<sup>th</sup>ed.)*. New Delhi.
- AberaWondafrash (2008). *Views of rural people on land registration and taxation in North Shoa Zone, Amhara region Ethiopia: the case of the kewot district*. MS thesis in land management. Royal institute of technology, Stockholm, Sweden.
- African Development Outlook (2011). *Ethiopia Social Context and Human Resource Development*. OECD.
- Allan .N. (2011). *Land use plan and farmers, pastoralists' conflict in Mvomero District: Its implication on household food production*, Morogoro, Tanzania.
- Andre, C. & J.P. Platteau. (1998). “*Land relations under unbearable stress: Rwanda*
- Assefa, Abebe. (2005). *Indigenous mechanisms for prevention of Conflict: The Experience of the Oromo*. Proceedings of the Second National Workshop of Ethiopian Chapter of, Pp 50- 76. Addis Ababa: OSSREA.
- Auzins, A. (2004) Institutional arrangement: A Gate towards Sustainable Land Use. *Nordic Journal of Surveying and Real Estate Research*.

- Awakul, P. & Ogunlana, S.O.(2002). *The effect of attitudinal differences on interface conflict on large construction projects: The case of the Pak Mun Dam project*. Environmental Impact Assessment Review, 22(4): 311–335.
- Berhanu, A & Fayera, A. (2005). *Land Registration in Amhara Region*, Ethiopia. Research Report 3.SOS Sahel, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Berhanu, A. (2004). Escaping Ethiopia's Poverty Trap: The Case for a Second Agrarian. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 42 (3), pp. 313-342.
- Berihu et al. (2015). “Farm land conflict and its socio-economic consequences in Tigray , Ethiopia.” *International Journal of Africa and Asian Studies* An International pre-reviewed journal Vol. 9, 2015. On June 15, 2015, from: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>
- Bernard, Russel H.(1994). *Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Second Edition. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Birhanu Adugna (2009). *The effects of rural land certification on land tenure security: a case study in libokemkem woreda Amhara region* Addis Abeba University, Ethiopia
- Bloor, Michael & Fiona, Wood. (2006). *Key Words in Qualitative Methods: A Vocabulary of Research Concepts*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Bob, U. (2010). *Land-Related Conflicts in Sub-Saharan Africa*. African Journal on Conflict Resolution, 10 (2)
- Bogale, A.M, Taeb & M. Endo (2006). *Land ownership and conflicts over the use of resources: Implications for household vulnerability in eastern Ethiopia*. Ecological economics, 58.pp. 134-145.
- Boone, C. (2014). *Property and political order: land rights and the structure of conflict in Africa*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press
- Boulle, L. (2005). *Mediation: principles, process, practice*, 2nd edn, LexisNexis Butterworths, Chatswood, N.S.W.
- Burton, John ed. (1990). *Conflict: Human Needs Theory*, London: Macmillan.



Christiane; Gerstter; Timokaphengst& others (2011).*An Assessment of The effects of land ownership and grab on development*, European parliament, Belgium.

Cochran, (1977) “importance of the size of sample and it is determination in the context of data related to the school of Guwahati” University Mathematics association V.12.2012

Collins. S. D. (2009). *Managing Conflict at work place*, 2nd Ed, South western. CENGAGE Learning series.

Coser, Lewis, Ralf Dahrendorf& Randall Collins ( 2006). *Conflict and Critical Theories.Allan (Social)*. vol, 07.pp. 211-241

Cotula, L., C. Toulmin, & C. Hesse. (2004). *Land Tenure and Administration in Africa: Lessons of Experience and Emerging Issues*, International Institute for Environment and Development, London.

Creswell, J.W. (1994). *Research Design: qualitative and quantitative approach*. Sage publication; Thousandcaks, CA.

Creswell, John. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Approaches*. Second Edition.Thousan Oaks: Sage Publications.

Crocombe, RG. (1988). *Land Courts*, in G Powles& M Pulea (eds), *Pacific courts and legal systems*, University of the South Pacific ; Clayton Faculty of Law, Monash University, Suva, Fiji, p. 376p.

Dahrendorf, R. (1988). “*The Modern Social Conflict*”, University of California Press: Berkely and Los Angeles.

Danielle S. (2014). *Conflict research group*, Ghent university (LSE) Bert Suykens.

Daudeline, J. (2002). “*Land as a source of conflict and in post conflict settlement*”, World Bank regional work shop on land issues in Africa and the middle east, April 29-may 2,2002, kampala, Uganda

- Deininger, K. (2003). *Land Policies for Growth and Poverty Reduction: A World Bank Policy Research Report*, Oxford and New York: World Bank and Oxford University Press.
- Deininger, K., and Castagnini R.(2005). “*Incidence and impact of land conflict in Uganda,*” *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, forthcoming.
- DessalegnRahmato (2004). *Searching for tenure security? The land system on new policy initiative in Ethiopia*. Discussion paper No. 12. Forum for social study, Addis Ababa.
- Druckman, D, Cheldelin, S & Fast, L. (2003).*Conflict: from analysis to intervention*, Continuum, London.
- Emeka, E. O. (2005). Climate change, population drift and violent conflict over land resources in north eastern Nigeria. In: *Proceedings of the Human security and climate change workshop*. (Edited by Holman, F. *et al*), 21-23 June 2005, Oslo,Norway. 27 - 59pp.
- Evance, A. (2010). Resource Scarcity, *Climate Change and the Risk of Violent Conflict*.Center on International Cooperation. New York University
- FAO (2005).*Acces to Rural Land and Land Administration after Violent Conflicts*, Rome, Italy.
- FAO/UNIDO (2009).*Agro- industries for development*; Rome.
- FDRE (1995). The Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia : Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Fobih, D. (2004). *The Significance of Secure Access to Land for the Livelihoods and Food Security of Africa’s Farmers and Urban Poor*. Land in Africa Market Asset or Secure Livelihood? Proceedings and SummeryOf Conclusions from the Land in Africa Conference Held in London November 8-9. IIED
- Folarin,(nd). *Types and Causes of Conflict*.ota: Nigeria.

- Fonmanu, KR, Ting, L & Williamson, IP (2003). *Dispute Resolution for Customary Lands: Some Lessons from Fiji*, Survey Review, vol. 37, no. 289, pp. 177-89.
- Francis.J. (2015). *Assessment of land use conflicts in Tanzania: case study of songambele and Mkoka villages in kongwa district, dodoma region*. Tanzania.
- Fred-Mensah, B.K. (1999). "Capturing ambiguities: communal conflict management alternative in Ghana," World Development, vol. 27 (6): 951-965.
- Gay, L. R. (1987). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. 3rd ed., Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company 15.
- Gerring, John (2007). *Case Study Research: Principles and Practices*, Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Gertrude Sackey (2010). *Investigating Justice system in land conflict resolution: A case study of Kinondoni Municipality, Tanzania*.
- Getahun (2006). *Information system for land administration; experiences in Amhara region*. In Solomon Bekure et.al (eds.), Standardization of rural land registration and cadastral surveying methodologies: Experiences in Ethiopia. Proceedings of national conference, ELTP, Addis Ababa. pp299-314.
- GonfaEbsa (2014). *Customary Conflict Resolution among The Haro Limmu Oromo Of Northwest Wollaga*, Addis Abeba University. Ethiopia.
- Hancock, Dawson R. & Bob, Algozzine .(2006). "Doing Case Study Research: A Practical Guide for Beginning Researchers." *Published by Teachers College Press*, 1234 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY 10027
- Herrera, A, et al.(2006). *Land Tenure alternative conflict management*. FAO Land Tenure Manuals 2, Rome, FAO.
- Huggins, C., Musahara, H., Kamungi, P.M., Oketch, J.S. and Vlassenroot, K. (2005). *Conflict in the Great Lakes Region – How Is It Linked With Land and Migration?* Paper No. 92, Natural resources perspectives, London, ODI.

- HussenJemma (2004). *The Politics of Land Tenure in Ethiopian History*. Norway: Norway University,
- IFAD, (2008). *Improving access to land and tenure security*; Rome
- Islam.S, Moula.G&Islam.M. (2015). *Land right, Land disputes and Land administration in Bangladesh: A critical study*. Beijing law review,6,193-198. onseptember 23, 2015. <http://dx.org/10.4236/bIr.2015.36019>
- Jeong, Ho-Won. (2000). *Peace and Conflict Studies: An Introduction*. Institute for Conflict Analysis and Resolution. Aldershot: Ashgate USA.
- John W. Bruce; (2011). *Land and conflict prevention*; university of Essex colchester, united kingdom  
John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kahl, C. H. (2002). Demographic Change, Natural Resources and Violence. *Journal of International Affairs* 56(1) pp 257-282.
- Kariuki, J. W. (2005). *The Impacts of Land Conflicts on Women's Livelihoods: The Case of Nakuru District, Kenya*. Unpublished Master's Thesis at the Centre of Land Management and Land Tenure, TechnischeUniversitätMünchen.
- Kumar, S.Y. (2006). *Fundamental of Research methodology and statistics*. New Deli: New Age International (p)Ltd
- Marx, K. & F. Engels. (1848). *Manifest der KommunistischenPartei*. Londen: J.E. Burghard.  
Mbwambo.H.A, Barongo M.F &Makuru N. (2011). *Research Methodology: A Simplified Guide for Students in Social Science*, Mzumbe Book Project.
- Matter A.S. (1986) *Land use*, John Wiley and Sons Inc, New York, USA.
- Nazneen et al (2005). Can land registration serve poor and marginalized groups? Summary report. *Securing land rights in Africa*, iied. Russelppress, Nottingham, UK.110
- Odgaard, R.( 2006). *Land rights and land conflicts in Africa: The Tanzania case*. Copenhagen, Danish Institute for International Studies.

- Oladele O.T. & Oladele O.I. (2011). *Effect of Pastoralist-Farmers Conflict on Access to Resources in Savanna Area*. *Journal of Life Science* 8(2): 616-621
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. & Leech N.L (2004), *Enhancing the Interpretation of “Significant” + Findings: The Role of Mixed Methods Research: The Qualitative Report* Volume 9 Number 770792 available at: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR94/onwuegbuzie.pdf> (Accessed on 12 February 2015).
- Owens, L.K. (2002). Introduction to Survey research design. SPL Fall 2002 seminar series, Retrieved from <http://www.srl.uic.edu/seminar/intro/introsrmpdf>.
- Powles, G (1993). *Tonga*, in MA Ntunmy & AH Angelo (eds), *South Pacific Islands legal systems*, University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu, p. 660 p.
- Raphael. M. (2015). *Assessing The Impact of Land conflict Between Farmers and Pastoralist in Tanzania; A case of Ulanga district*. Tanzania.
- Saraha Auma (2016). *Land conflict, Gender and Agricultural production*. A case of Apac district, Northern Uganda.
- Sekeris, P. (2010). *Land Inequality and Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa*. *Journal of Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy*, 16 (2), Pp. 1-18.
- Sovannarith, S., Sopheap, R., Utey, U., Rathmony, S., Ballard, B. & Acharya, S. (2001). *Social Assessment of Land in Cambodia: A Field Study — Working Paper 20*.
- Stringer, Ernest T. (2007). *Action Research* Third Edition. New Delhi: SAGE Publications
- Swanstrom, Niklas L.P. & Weissmann, Mikael S. (2005). *Conflict, Conflict Prevention, Conflict Management and Beyond: A Conceptual exploration*. A Concept Paper. Sweden: Central Asia- Caucasus Institute and Silk Road Studies Program.
- Tidwell, A. (1998). *Conflict Resolved*. Great Britain: Biddles Ltd.
- Tietenburg, T. (4<sup>th</sup> Ed). (1996). *Environmental and Natural Resources Economics*, Harpercollins College Publishers, pp 352.

- Tillet, G. (1991). *Conflict and its Resolution*. In *HRM 540 Theory of Conflict Resolution: Study Guide Module 2*, (1998) Charles Sturt University.
- Tillett, G. (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). (1999). *Resolving conflict: a practical approach*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- Tonah, S. (ed), (2007): *Ethnicity, conflict and consensus in Ghana*. Woeli publishing services, Accra, Ghana. Pp. 240-260.
- Tor, B.A., Abdallah, J.M. & Maganga, F.P. (2009). The Kilosa Killings: Political Ecology of a Farmer–Herder Conflict in Tanzania. *Journal of Development and Change* 40(3): 423 – 445. Organization, vol. 34 (1): 1-47. April 29-May 2, 2002, Kampala, Uganda.
- Tsikata, D. & Seini, W. (2004). *Identities, Inequalities and Conflicts in Ghana*. CRISE Working Paper 5. Accessed from: [www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper5.pdf](http://www.crise.ox.ac.uk/pubs/workingpaper5.pdf). 2/4/2009.
- UNDP (2011). Human Development Report 2011. *Sustainability and Equity: A Better Future for All*. Explanatory Note On 2011 HDR Composite Indices. Ethiopia
- UNECA (2012). *Natural resources and conflict management: The case of Land*. In collaboration with land policy initiative. p.o.Box 3001. Addis Abeba. Ethiopia
- UN-HABITAT (2009). *Land and Conflict: A Handbook for Humanitarians*. Global Land Tool Network. New York. USAID (2005). *Toolkit on Land and Violent Conflict*.
- Ury, W, Brett, JM & Goldberg, SB (1993). *Getting disputes resolved: designing systems to cut the costs of conflict*, Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Mass.
- USAID (2005). *Toolkit on Land and Violent Conflict*. Available at [http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/crosscutting\\_programs/conflict/publications/toolkits.html](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/crosscutting_programs/conflict/publications/toolkits.html). Accessed: 15/11/2011 11:35
- Van Donge, J.K. (1999). “*Law and order as a development issue: land conflicts and the creation of social order in Southern Malawi*,” *Journal of Development Studies*, vol. 36 (2): 373-399.

- Von Uexkull, N. (2016). *Flight, Fight or Farm Agricultural Dependence and Participation in Land-related Conflict*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Voors, M. J., Nillesen & Soest, D. P. (2012). Violent Conflict and Behavior: A Field Experiment in Burundi. *American Economic Review*, 102(2), 941-964.
- Wehrmann, B. (2005). *Urban and Per-urban Land Conflicts in Developing Countries*
- Wehrmann, B. (2006). *Solving land conflict in Africa*. Available from: <http://www.gim-international.com/issues/articles/id655>
- [Solving Land Conflict in Africa.html](http://www.gim-international.com/issues/articles/id655) [Accessed 20 July 2008].
- Wehrmann, B., (2008). *Land conflicts: A practical guide to dealing with land disputes*. Handbook, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ), Eschborn, Germany.
- Wertheim, E., Love, A., Peck., C & Littlefield, L. (1998). *Skills for Resolving Conflict*. Victoria: Eruditions.
- Yamano, T. & Deininger, K. (2005). *Land Conflicts in Kenya: Causes, Impacts, and Resolutions*. FASID , Discussion Paper 2005-12-002
- Yasmi, Y., Kelley, L. and Enters, T. (2010). *Conflict over forests and land in Asia*. Impacts, causes and management. The center for people and forest.
- Yigremew Adal (2002). *Land administration and management of communal land resources in the post Derg period: A case study in two rural kebeles in North West Ethiopia*. In Workneh Negatu and Yigremew Adal (eds.) proceedings of the workshop on some aspects of rural land tenure in Ethiopia: Access, use and transfer, IDR/AAU.
- Yihun belay Teshome (2010). *The Causes and Types of Conflict, and the Different Indigenous conflict Management Institutions among the Oromo of Arsi Robe District*. MA Thesis in Indigenous and Cultural Studies. Addis Ababa University.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods (3rd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.  
([www.wikihow.com](http://www.wikihow.com).....Research and Review).

Zartman, I.M. (1991). *Conflict Reduction: Prevention, Management and Resolution*, Washington, pp. 229.

Zerfu (2010). *Land registration and certification*: Amhara National Regional State in Ethiopia.

Zwan, J.V.D. (2011). The Need for Conflict-Sensitive Land Policy and Land Governance in Africa. IFP Regional Cooperation Cluster, Initiative for Peace Building.



## APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Survey Questionnaires

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONAL AND BEHAVIORAL STUDIES**

**Department of Civic and Ethical Education**

**Post graduate summer program in civic and ethical education**

**Questionnaires to be filled by Sample household heads.**

**Dear Respondents:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect primary data on rural land disputes and its socio-economic consequences in Andabet *woreda*. To this end, your genuine cooperation in completing this questionnaire has paramount importance. Since your response will be kept confidential, please feel free to answer all items frankly as much as possible.

**Thank you in advance!!**

#### **General Direction**

1. Do not write your name.
2. Please, follow the instruction when filling the questionnaire.
3. For items that require put your answer in space provided.

**This questionnaire has seven parts.**

#### **Part-1 Background Information**

1	Name of Woreda	
2	Name of Kebele	
3	Name of Enumerator	
4	Date of Time begins	

5	Date of Time ends	
---	-------------------	--

**Part 2: Demographic and Social characteristics of respondents.**

Please circle for the appropriate option you agreed on for close-ended questions.

1. Sex of Households	2. Age of households in year	3. Level of education	4. Number of family member	5. Marital status
1. Male 2. Female	1. 18-29 2. 30-39 3. 40-49 4. above 49	1. Illiterate 2. Grade 1-4 3. Grade 5 and above	1. 1-3 2. 4-6 3. above 6	1. Single 2. Married 3. Divorce 4. Widowed

**Part 3: The Nature of Land Holding and Acquisition System**

Please circle for the following questions you agreed on for close-ended and write on the blank space for open-ended questions.

1 How many hectares of farmland do you have?

1. < 1 hectare    2. 1-1.5 hectare    3. 1.6-2.00 hectare    4. Above 2.00 hectare

2 How did you acquire the land? By

1 Inheritance only    2. Redistribute Under government only.    3. Gift only

4. Both inheritance & Redistribution under Government

3 What is/was the type of land dispute? 1. Boundary    2. Ownership

3. Inheritance

4 Other specifies type of disputes.....

#### Part 4: Causes of rural farm land disputes

In your kebele there has been rural farm land disputes related to different causes. By taking the existing situation in to consideration, indicate your feelings by putting (√) mark in one of the five alternatives.

1. Strongly agree

4. Disagree

2. Agree

3 Undecided

5. Strongly disagree

No	Related causes	Degree of agreement				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Scarce of farm land related					
2	Absence of ownership land certificate					
3	Divorce					
4	High demand of land					
5	Fragmented of land					
6	Drainage					
7	Overlapping ownership					
8	Fragmented of land					
9	Boundary problem					
10	Inheritance problem					
11	Rental problem					

12	Other specifies cause.....					
----	----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

**Part 5: Social costs of Farm Land Disputes**

5.1. Please, respond to the following question. By taking the existing situation in to consideration, indicate your feelings by putting (√) mark in one of the five alternatives.

- 1. Strongly agree      4. Disagree
- 2. Agree              5. Strongly disagree
- 3. Undecided

No	Social costs	Degree of agreement				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Withdraw from Iddr and Equb					
2	Weaken family ties					
3	Reducing team work/debo/working together					
4	Withdraw from the members of religious institutions					

	(senbet&mahber)					
5	Reducing intermarriage among community					
6	Loose of human life/killing one another/fighting					
7	Any other specifies consequences.....					

**Part-6 Economic costs of farm land disputes**

1. How much has it costs spend for transport?

1. Less than 500 birr    2. 500-2000 birr    3. Above 2000 birr

2. How much has it costs spend for accommodation?

1. Less than 500 birr    2.500-2000 birr    3. Above 2000 birr

3. How much, has it costs fees for legal counselor?

1. None    2. Less than 500 birr    3. 500-2000 birr    4. Above 2000 birr

4. How much has it costs spend for others?

1. Less than 300 birr    2. 400-1000 birr    3. Above 1000 birr

## Production cost of farmland disputes

Please respond to the following question. By taking the existing situation in to consideration, indicate your feelings by putting (√) mark in one of the five alternatives.

1. Strongly agree                      4. Disagree  
 2. Agree                                  5. Strongly disagree  
 3. Undecided

N o	Effects	Degree of agreement				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Land could not cultivated until it get decision					
2	The rate of fertilizers applied in disputed land decreases					
3	Farmers do not invest on soil conservation					
4	The crop grown on plot is not harvested on time					
5	Any other specifies consequences..... .....					

## **APPENDIX B: Interviews Guiding Questions**

1. Have you observed the land related disputes among individual farmers in your locality?
2. Which types of land disputes are common in this locality?
3. What are the root causes or factors for these farm land related disputes?
4. Which causes are the most serious and frequently occurred? Why?
5. What do you perceive the consequences of rural farmland dispute in your locality?
6. Dose farmland disputes affect social organization and their interaction. How is affect?
7. How farmland disputes affect personal income & economic development in your locality?
8. What are the impacts of rural land dispute in agricultural production?
9. From your own view, how do you evaluate the intensity/magnitude of farmland dispute over the years?
10. To what extent, the dispute is arising or decline.

## **APPENDIX C: Observation Guiding Questions**

1. How many people can you see to fight land related issue?
2. How many time do you do you give your witness for rural land dispute affairs?
3. Which institution is good to give persuasive judgment, local court or regular court?
4. Do you think is their special judgment local court from regular court?
5. How many people can you mediate on land related issue?

## **APPENDIX D: Focus Group Discussion Guiding Questions for key informants**

1. Have you observed the land disputes among individual farmers in your locality?
2. What are the common types & causes of farmland disputes in your local community?
3. Which causes are the most serious and frequently occurred? Why?

4. What do you perceive the consequences of rural farmland disputes in your kebele?
5. How farmland disputes affect social organization and their interaction in your kebele?
6. How farmland disputes affect personal income & economic development in your community?
7. What are the impacts of rural farmland dispute in agricultural production? How it affect?
8. From your own view, how do you evaluate the intensity/magnitude of farmland dispute over the years? To what extent the dispute is arise or decline?
9. What do you recommended to reduce the frequency of farmland related disputes?

## **Appendix E: List of Key Informants, Interview and FGD Participants**

### **1. Interview participants**

N <sup>o</sup>	Informants	N <sup>o</sup> of interviews	Responsibility	Place of interview
1	Woreda land desk administration office	1	Office head	Andabet
2	Woreda court and justice administration office	1	Office head	Andabet
3	Kebele land use and administration	3	Expert	Kebele
4	Woreda rural development and agriculture administration office	1	Office head	Andabet
5	Legal counselors	1	Expert	Andabet
6	Woreda police administration office	1	Inspector	Andabet
7	Disputed households	6	Family head	Kebele
8	Total	14		



## 2 FGD participants

No	Informants	No participant	Place of discussion
1	Disputed household heads	3	Kebele
2	Community elders	3	Kebele
3	Local land conflict mediators	3	Kebele
4	Local land administration committees	3	Kebele
5	Religious representatives	3	Kebele



Figure 1: Disputed households with their legal counselor



Figure 2: Disputed households reach their cases in woreda court.