

A Case Study of Metema Resettlement Scheme in Amhara National Regional State

Gerum

Abstract

A good number of the literature on resettlement shows that state-sponsored resettlement in Ethiopia has been implemented since the Imperial regime. It is also confirmed that some of the factors that drive the programme are more or less similar: recurrent famine, drought, food insecurity and population pressure. This qualitative study attempts to look at the impact of the resettlement programme in the livelihoods of the people resettled in Metema *woreda* in 2003, in particular in village six, seven and eight resettlement site. Metema *woreda* is one of the destination sites where the smallholder farmers from different corners of the Region are settled. This study involved fifteen settler respondents in an in-depth interview and five key informants. The livelihood framework was taken as a lens in the thematic analysis of the study. The study found that quite a number of resettlers are changing their livelihoods positively. However, female-headed households it have not benefited sufficiently.

Keywords: Resettlement, livelihoods, livelihood assets

1. Background of the Study

The Amhara National Regional State is located in the northwestern part of Ethiopia. The regional state has 11 administrative zones and more than 100 districts. Metema *woreda* is one of the districts in the regional state which is found in North Gondar Administrative Zone. It is one of the border towns between Ethiopia and Sudan and is located about 900 kilometres northwest of Addis Ababa and 180 kilometres west of Gondar town (IPMS 2005).

Following the recurrent drought and famine and land degradation in the Ethiopian highlands, the government has carried out a resettlement programme as a means of tackling the challenges that the smallholder farmers are facing. Metema *woreda* is one of the destination sites where the smallholder farmers from different corners of the Region are settled. The *woreda* is known for its potential to produce crops such as sesame, sorghum and cotton (Daniel 2008).

This programme is implemented at the regional level to draw on the underlying social capital inherent in shared language, customs, and ethnicity (New Coalition for Food Security in Ethiopia (NCFSE) 2003). The study was conducted in Village six, seven and eight *kebele*, which is one of the resettlement sites in Metema.

The local residents in village six, seven and eight, who are hosting the resettlers, are people originally from Waghimra, Gayint and other parts of the Amhara regional state and they were relocated during the *Derg's* resettlement programme in the 1980s. They are mostly agriculturalists but they also own a large number of cattle. Given the fertile nature of the soil and the relatively untouched natural resources, they are considered self-sufficient throughout the year in terms of food production and therefore they never received food aid (Abraham 2004, 559-60). Thus, about 346 households who were mostly smallholder farmers were settled in village six, seven and eight in the year 2003. This study assesses whether the people relocated from other corners of the Amhara Regional State to Metema are changing their livelihood. It explores the situations of the settlers before and after the resettlement programme in comparative terms.

2. Indication of the Problem

Agricultural development through new settlement is socially the most complex of all development interventions, both to design and to implement. The resettlement programme in Ethiopia is taken as a means of livelihood promotion for the chronically food insecure. Essentially, this programme is a way of facing the root causes of potential famine and part of a strategy of combating excessive land degradation. It is the largest program carried out in the region by the government and was described in the national media as part of the solution to the country's multiple problems (NCFSE 2003).

Tadros (1979:121) explains that, large-scale planning of new settlements is a relatively recent phenomenon in developing countries. Nevertheless, rural households in developing countries are observed to devote a lot of attention to personalized networks, setting up complex, but informal, systems of rights and obligations designed to improve future livelihood security (Berry cited in Ellis 2000, 9). Likewise, most Ethiopian agricultural households have an informal social capital that strengthens the solidarity among them in good and bad times. According to the Department for International Development (DFID 1999), social capital can also be actively, though often unintentionally, destroyed through heavy-handed interventions that impose new social relations without taking into account the strengths of the old. In line with this, the resettlement programme in Metema could involve the creation of new patterns of social interactions and relationships which would affect the livelihood outcomes. In addition, it could be argued that other livelihood resources may have their own impact in realizing the livelihood outcomes.

Chambers and Conway say, "A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets and activities required for a means of living" (1991, 6). And a sustainable livelihood approach focuses on the importance of the five capital assets to livelihoods; namely natural, social, physical, human and financial capital.

Moreover, it can be argued that sustainable livelihood would be realized when the vulnerable groups are utilizing the aforementioned resources accordingly. However, a change in any one of these endowments may result in a difference in the livelihood outcomes of the settlers either positively or negatively.

Pankhurst (2004) explains that resettlers will require some starter packets in the beginning and afterwards; it is presumed that the problems will go away. However, the impact after subsequent years has rarely been investigated. Therefore, this study undertaken is interested in analyzing whether the net impact of all livelihood assets are taken into account in the functioning of the programme.

3. Research Objectives

The study aims:

- To identify the contribution of resettlement in changing the livelihood of the people;
- To determine the medium-term effects of resettlement such as whether new livelihood strategies are needed;
- To explore the livelihood priorities of the people.

4. Methodology

The study employs a qualitative method. The primary data was collected using in-depth interview from selected household heads in the resettlement area. Also, discussions were held with key informants such as an officer from the zonal office of food security, the *woreda* agriculture office and development personnel, a *woreda* administrator, a development agent in the *kebele* and an individual who is familiar with the area. The respondents from the different tiers of government were selected on the basis of their perceived understanding of the issues under study and their being closely involved with the activities in the area.

The data collection took a four-week period but prior to engaging in an interview with settler respondents, observation of the area and discussion with the *woreda* officials had been held for the first three days. The study area is selected purposively since the other resettlement sites are said to be inaccessible during the rainy season (the field work period). As a matter of fact, it was not easy to reach even the selected site which was perceived as relatively accessible due to transportation problems.

State-organized resettlement programmes can be successful if they are executed in a very carefully by taking into account a wide range of socio-economic, cultural, institutional and political issues (Pankhurst, as cited in Abraham 2004, 563).

Dessaiegn (2003, 61) suggests that it is worth considering the following scenario for new settlements:

Phase 1: the first 2 to 3 years - a period of adjustment.

Phase 2: the next 3 to 5 years - a period of consolidation. This is the transition stage that will indicate what chances of success the project has.

Phase 3: the next 5 to 8 years - sustainable progress.

In light of the above, fifteen sample household heads who resettled in the area in 2003 have been identified from the selected kebele for an in-depth interview using a simple random sampling technique. The selection of the households was carried out from the list of names in close cooperation with the agricultural extension agent of village six, seven and eight. The participants were limited to fifteen since the saturation of data was reached.

The criteria for choosing the interviewee household heads was based year of resettlement in the area and the household categories as better-off (with some surplus), middle (self sufficient) and poor (food deficit), the classification being from the local community's point of view.

The respondents at household level were selected from each of the three villages under a *kebele*, namely village six, seven and eight resettlement site. They have been interviewed on issues related with the rationale behind their resettlement, access to land and water, access to education and health services, access to physical assets, access to financial capital, and access to social capital in the resettlement area.

Thus, issues such as the rationale behind the programme, the recruitment criteria of the settlers, the kind of support provided to the settlers and the likes were raised during the interview of government officials at the different tiers system.

Similarly, observation of the area was also part of the data collection tool; it has been used to examine the ongoing farming and non-farming activities in the area and to triangulate with the information which was forwarded by the respondents. Furthermore, existing literature on the topic were consulted to substantiate the result.

5. Framework for Analyzing the Data

The study used the framework in Table 1, which was originally designed by DFID in 1999.

Table 1. Vulnerability of livelihood assets, resettlement and livelihood outcomes

<i>Vulnerability</i>	<i>Outcome of shocks</i>	<i>Solution</i>	<i>Livelihood outcomes</i>
Natural capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high level of drought • food insecurity • less access to fertile land 	R E S E T T L E M E N T	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less level of drought • Food security • Improved access to fertile land
Human capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less access to education • Less access to health services 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved access to schools • Improved access to health services
Physical capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less access to production tools • Less access to irrigation canals • Less access to transport 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement in the production tools • Improved access to irrigation canals • Better access to transport
Financial capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less access to cash • Less access to savings and loans 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased income • Improved access to financial services
Social capital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less level of social network 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvement in social network

SOURCE: Adapted from DFID (1999).

5. Findings and Discussion

On the basis of the analytical framework, five categories of assets were examined during the field work in assessing the outcome of the resettlement programme in the study area, namely, natural capital (land, water), human capital (education and health services), financial capital (access to credit and cash), physical capital (livestock, transport, and irrigation canals), and social capital (local social institutions).

5.1. Natural Capital

In subsistence agriculture as in that of the study area, land is the main natural capital. This is substantiated by the fact that nearly all of the respondents consider land as their main asset. Also, the study revealed that the resettlers are living in an area where the size of land owned and cultivated is larger than to what they had before resettlement. In other words, most of the settlers had access to very small land which was also less fertile for crop production before resettlement but in their new village they have about two hectares of land and an additional land rented for cultivation. As one of the key informants argued, “the growing population and degradation of land as a result of intensive farming led a greater number of households in our origin to have inadequate landholdings which in turn adversely affected the agricultural productivity. But, now there is a better access to fertile land and the area is not drought prone as it was in our origin and as a result we have benefited by improving our food security status.” Food security is hence one of the major livelihood priorities of the settlers. Geest and Dietz (2004) attest that rural people who live in areas with better natural resources and climatic condition have a more reliable set of entitlements to livelihoods than those who live in risky environments with poor soils.

On the other hand, it can be argued that the resettlement of people in the area reduces population pressure on the limited resources in the drought-prone areas. This assumption would be realized if resources exist to be allocated to those who are remaining in their land of origin after the implementation of the programme. But, in the case of the study group, they left their land to some of the relatives who are remaining in their place of origin. Therefore, it can be suggested that the reduction in the size of the population would be advantageous only to the resettlers’ relatives irrespective of other members of the population in the area.

Moreover, it has been observed that the land holdings by different categories of people in the resettlement area is not proportional. For example, the size of land per household for the inhabitants in the area is about ten hectares and above, whereas the new settlers received a maximum of two hectares of land per household. As a result, the new settlers are forced to rent additional land from the host population. Hence, it can be claimed that renting in land is a common strategy in the area to have additional farm land for crop production. Alternatively, it can be argued that settlers are not able to obtain access to a proportional size of land though they have a surplus agricultural labor force.

By the same token, it can be suggested that renting out land is a common strategy among the hosts and elderly people in the area who lack labor force. As a result, households with larger land size are in a better position to satisfy their livelihood needs as compared to those having a smaller size of land. Hence, lack or shortage of land is one of the crucial factors behind improving the food security status of many of the households before resettlement. McCann (as cited in Cliffe 2004, 197) affirms that in the highland areas, lack of productive resources such as

land, oxen and forage are the factors that exacerbate vulnerability to famine. Our study revealed that almost all households are engaged in farming as their main occupation and land is the crucial natural resource in the area. In general, it could be argued that not only access to land but also the size of land holding is found to be an indispensable factor in determining the livelihood status of the resettlers.

According to Moser (1998, 10), dissatisfaction with access to and quality of water was universal in all developing country contexts. Likewise, in the study area there are about three bore-hole water facilities although only one of them, which is found around village seven, was functional during the study period. Consequently, a majority of the population depends on Guang River, which is the largest river in the area flowing through the village throughout the year, as the main source of drinking water for themselves and for their livestock. This in turn has brought about water borne diseases to the villagers, as most of the informants reported. Nonetheless, it has been asserted that the availability of water in the new village is better than what was there before relocation, though the aforementioned limitation needs due attention.

5.2. Human Capital

With regard to the educational status of the respondents, it has been revealed that, only one of them has completed primary education while the rest of the respondents did not get the chance to attend even primary school. The reason behind this is lack of educational access in their place of origin and, even if any was available, it was too far away from their neighborhood. This could be one of the reasons why the households are dependent on crop farming as the dominant livelihood activity.

According to Moser (1998, 9), human capital development is highly related to provision of economic and social infrastructure. The availability of social services such as education means that people can gain skills and knowledge, while economic infrastructure such as water and transport, together with health care, ensure that they used their skills and knowledge productively.

In this regard, in village six, seven, and eight, there are two primary schools. Most of the informants reported that they were not in a position to send their children to school due to poverty and inaccessibility of the school in the neighborhood before resettlement, but now they are sending them to school. On the other hand, those who are having deficit could not make it. For instance, one of the widow informants argued that, "Since I am not in a position to fulfill the educational expenses of my child, I am not sending him to school." This suggests that availability of school in the vicinity is not a sufficient condition to send children to school.

Likewise, in terms of infrastructure there is one health center in the *kebele* but the problem is unavailability of basic health services (for instance, medication and skilled medical assistance) when a household member gets ill and needs

treatment. And, if the worst comes, the only option they have is to move to Metema hospital, which is almost 40 kilometers away from the village. The problem is exacerbated by lack of transport to get to the hospital. Due to this, many of the respondents preferred to state no access to health centers in the area. One of the key informants remembered that, “on our arrival at the site in 2003, there was a serious health crises associated mainly with malaria, which not only claimed the lives of some of the resettlers but also led others to return to their original place in fear of the disease and the challenge of adapting to the new environment. Thus, following this crisis, the health service was improved for a while but again it has declined to its present condition”. This would in turn affect the capability of the people to carry out activities in a productive way during seasons of peak labor requirement and the non-agricultural seasons too.

Hence, most of the respondents prefer their original place in terms of the availability of better health service though it was far away from the village where they were living. This suggests that what has been set as one of the key principles of the programme in NCFSE (2003), that is, the establishment of services that are more or less similar with those at their place of origin, is only partially put in place. In this regard, it can be argued that there would be a better human capital in the village for the future as far as access to education is concerned. In contrast, labour productivity could be a challenge due to less access to health facilities and that would be a big loss in human capital for the future to sustain their livelihoods.

5.3. Financial Capital

In the study area the dominant financial institution that provides credit service to farmers is the Amhara Credit and Savings Institution (ACSI), which is under the regional government. In addition, there are local money lenders who provide loans; these people are mainly from the host population. It is obvious that availability of access to credit could have its own contribution in solving the financial constraint of farmers.

Since ACSI follows a group lending strategy; farmers are expected to form a group of five to seven people with a promise of sharing each other’s risk to get the loan. According to one of the key informants; though ACSI does not require collateral from the farmers, the poorest people such as female-headed households are excluded by the relatively better-off individuals during group formation to minimize risk. This could indicate how inaccessibility to one of the productive assets in turn affects the other.

It has been claimed that access to credit service in the resettlement area is better than what existed before the resettlement. For example, on average, an individual in the group can get a loan of about 3000 *birr*. The reason behind this is that, there is a better probability of repaying the loan in the new village due to cash crop production in the area. However, in the past few years, before resettlement, all of the sample households did not have access to credit service

since they were dependent on food aid in the safety net programme. As discussed by Filmon (2009, 147), widows prefer to have access to credit to increase cash income or to grow crops of their choice. However, it has been noticed that female-headed households in the study area do not access credit for fear of risks, apart from the exclusion mentioned earlier. This could have its own impact on their present livelihood status which is lower than that of the male counterparts.

Furthermore, it has been suggested that the credit service is provided to farmers when the farming season is approaching, particularly in April and May, which is the time of a high demand for agricultural inputs. Although the credit offered is seasonal and limited in its amount, it benefits the settlers as far as the farming activity is concerned. But it could also be argued that its seasonality deters them from engaging in other livelihood diversification strategies such as livestock production, which is a common practice in the area. Besides, the credit service by ACSI fails to consider borrowing on an individual basis even for those who are relatively better-off. As a result, none of the informants are able to take a loan on an individual basis though they want to do so. However, there is a possibility to take a loan individually from local money lenders, but the interest rate is very high, which makes it very challenging.

With regards to cash income, nearly all of the respondents confirmed that there is a significant difference in the level of their annual income after resettlement although there is a disparity in the amount of income earned by each of the households. This is mainly related to the type of crop they produce. The resettlers used to produce some crops which were not enough for consumption either; as a result they were not able to sell crop and earn annual cash income. However, in the new village, almost all of the informants are in a position to have their own annual income. The main reason behind this is that the production of cash crops such as sesame and cotton, and sorghum mainly for consumption.

As has been mentioned earlier, there is a gap in the annual cash income amongst the resettlers. It should also be noted that from among the respondents, only two of them are better-off, eight of them are in the middle and five of them are poor. This illustrates that the resettlement programme suffices the livelihood status of most of the sample respondents though some of them have failed to do so.

In the light of what is experienced by the settlers, it can be argued that factors that resulted in differences in their livelihood status could be associated with the size of land owned for farming and the capability of the settlers to involve in activities other than farming. In other words, most of the farmers who belong to the so-called middle and one from the better-off did work as a laborer in their leisure time in the private farms that are found in the surrounding. This helped them to earn additional income. However, none of the households who belong to the category of the poor engaged in such an activity. Likewise, all of the members in the group that are categorized as middle and better-off received two hectares of land at the beginning of their settlement; in contrast only one of the farmers from

the poor groups received two hectares of land. Thus, it seems that these are some of the factors which resulted in inequality in their livelihood status. In this regard, Chambers and Conway (1991, 5) argue that equity in assets and access are preconditions for gaining adequate and decent livelihoods.

5.4. Physical Capital

Since agriculture is the main activity in the resettlement area, owning animals, oxen, is important for production. Households without oxen face difficulties in farming their land. Messay (2008) claims that oxen ownership plays a significant role in improving the food security status of the resettlers.

As can be seen in Table 2, most of the respondents have access to oxen. Two households from the so-called middle category and one household from the better-off had received an ox each during their arrival at the resettlement site as part of a starter package. The remaining twelve households received 120 birr each, instead of an ox, which was actually repaid as rental for an ox's labour to plough the farm. In relation to this, from the poor household groups, no one received an ox.

On the other hand, having an ox at the beginning is not a sufficient condition to belong to the middle or better-off group. This necessitates a search for other factors that resulted in the difference. Some of the respondents say that working as a laborer in their leisure time at large private farms in the neighborhood has contributed to the increase in their income and enabled them to buy oxen.

Also, despite the fact that there are a number of livestock in the area, there is no veterinary centre to treat them. Likewise, nearly all of the respondents confirmed that Guang River, which flows throughout the year in the village, made irrigation possible in the resettlement area. This helped some households to earn additional income by producing fruits and vegetables for the market. However, to benefit from the irrigation scheme one needs to have either a motor pump to draw the water, which is costly for almost all of them individually, or pay money to groups who bought the motor pump on credit.

To access the market, the resettlers have to travel on foot to the nearest small town called Kokit, which is about 10-15 kilo meters away from their village. Meanwhile, to sell their produces in the market those who have *caro* can load on it; otherwise they are expected to pay some 20-30 *birr* per quintal to the owners of the *caro*. Alternatively, sometimes they sell their products through a cooperative in their village, but since the cooperative does not give the money in time they prefer to travel for about one and half hours on foot to the market. Furthermore, all-weather roads are available though access to public transport has not been put in place so far. Nevertheless, access to the market and availability of a road in the new village are relatively better than before the before resettlement.

The settlers did not acquire additional knowledge in relation to using new production tools, i.e., they are working their farm activity as before. This could be because of the size of the landholding, which is not more than two hectares.

Dessaiegn (2003, 44) argues that, such kind of practice is an oversimplification of the goal of resettlement into a transfer of farmers to a new surrounding which does not involve agricultural skills, habits and environmental knowledge.

Table 2. Livestock ownership of sample households

Wealth status of households	Number of oxen owned		Number of goats and other livestock owned	
	Before resettlement	After resettlement	Before resettlement	After resettlement
Poor	0	0	0	0-2
Middle	0	2-4	0	8-10
Better-off	0	6-8	0	14-20

SOURCE: Own field work (2010)

5.5. Social Capital

The extent to which a community can be considered an asset that reduces vulnerability or increases opportunities depends on its “stock” of social capital (Moser 1998, 13). In line with this argument, the study attempted to go through the existing local institutions in the area. Woldesellassie (2002, 50) defines local social institutions as: “structures that have been serving rural communities for longer periods, passing from one generation to the other and through which local peoples’ indigenous knowledge is manifested.” In connection with this, it has been observed that the prominent local institutions in the study area which have a significant role in maintaining the social fabric are church groups such as *senbete* and *mahber* and labour exchange mechanisms like *debo* or *wobera*.

Membership in either of the church groups is open to everyone as long as the person is in a position to provide some food and drink for the members when his/her turn is due on Sundays (*senbete*) or commemoration day of their patron saint (*mahber*). Apart from the spiritual festivity and extending the social network, being a member of a *senbete* could also help the member to borrow some amount of money, which is collected from the members as a monthly fee, from the *senbete*, while being a member of *mahber* has a spiritual goal in addition to social network formation. Therefore, households that are participating in these groups have social networks to call upon each other for help when they are in need.

All of the sample households, except the poor households, participate in both associations. It has been suggested that the reason behind the isolation of the poor households is their inability to afford the costs for the social events. This supports the statement that access to one capital would have its own impact on other

capitals. This in turn enables us to answer one of Scoones' (1998) asset-base analysis question of regarding the linkage between different types of capital.

Debo or *wobera* is a labour exchange strategy in which nearly all of the respondent households are participating. It is also a common phenomenon in their place of origin. In this labour exchange mechanism, a farmer harvests the crop with the contribution of friends, neighbors or relatives in group so that in return this farmer will do the same when called upon.

Nevertheless, as has been argued by one of the key informants, to work in *debo* or *wobera* has began to decline as time advances. This is because the expensiveness of labour in the study area has led farmers to work as a laborer in large private farms in their leisure time. This could be considered as an asset trade-off activity just as social capital is traded for financial capital.

Furthermore, drinking coffee together with neighbors is a very common practice in the study area as an information sharing strategy and trust building mechanism. It was confirmed by all of the households that this is one of the social network maintaining mechanisms between neighbors not only in their new village but also back in their original place.

It can be pointed out that the above-mentioned social networks are maintained in the area due to a cultural background shared between the resettlers and the hosts. Moreover, this is reinforced by their living around their close relatives and that helped them to share some costs in time of desperate need and to feel at home by avoiding homesickness.

5.6. Whose Decision Was That?

It has been confirmed by one of the government officials, who has been working in the programme right from the inception, that "the government had put the issue of partnership with different stakeholders, especially with NGOs and donors, in its programme. However, this was not implemented because of the disagreement between them on the initial condition of the resettlement sites. That is to say, the government has decided to implement the programme on the so-called minimum infrastructure; that is, by establishing infrastructure at least similar to that in their original area and afterwards to relocate people. The approach put forward by NGOs and donor agencies was to implement the relocation gradually after putting in place a better service in the different resettlement sites. But, since the government was ambitious to relocate about 2.2 million people all over the country within three years, their proposal was neglected. Hence, the scheme has been implemented only with the government's budget and without other organizations' involvement."

Thus, the reason behind the gap in infrastructure such as water, human and animal health services, and other packages that could be an input for off-farm activities in the area as was set in the programme, is a result of a hasty decision by the government. This is in line with de Wet's (2004) 'in adequate inputs'

approach: one of the reasons why things in resettlement go wrong is due to lack of incorporating proper inputs into the program.

Having said this, the study also found that in principle the settlers were voluntarily being relocated, following the advocacy of the programme in their place of origin. However, as most of the households asserted, they were not clear enough regarding the conditions they would face and are disappointed about unfulfilled promises. In line with this, one of the informants said that,

During the advocacy of the programme they were telling us that if we went to the resettlement area, we would be offered a considerable amount of money and an ox per household and then within a short period of time we could buy a house in town and the likes. Thus, I was easily convinced by these words and subsequently I got divorced with my husband because of a disagreement on the issue. Actually, he tried to convince me to stay there but it was all my fault and now I live with regret.

Cliffe (2004) attests that in the 1980s resettlement programme of the country, farmers were told about the ideal life which they would encounter.

Likewise, in some cases dissatisfaction with the conditions they faced, for example, the difficulty in adapting to the new environment due to its high temperature and the prevalence of malaria, in addition to the aforementioned unrealized expectations, led some of their fellows to leave the area to return to their place of origin. Here, it can be argued that ensuring mobility right and land security in their place of origin for three years in the programme helped them to return home based on the principle of voluntarism. On the other hand, it could also be argued that the principle of voluntarism had been violated by government officials during the advocacy session by providing unreliable information to the resettlers.

Following Scudder' (1991, 154), categorization of different types of settlement/resettlement on the basis of the type of settler and the nature of the involvement of the sponsoring agency, the Metema resettlement scheme was government organized/sponsored since the government intervened in the selection of project sites and settlers. On the other hand, it could also be argued that the scheme has an element of being compulsory. Pankhurst (2004) attests that in times of desperate condition such as famine, people express a 'willingness' to resettle; however this is not necessarily a genuine consent but rather prompted by lack of an alternative.

6. Conclusion

In light of the above, the study revealed that resettlers from Sekota woreda were among the few who were selected for settling in village six, seven and eight resettlement site. And smallholder agriculture, which is dependent on rain as in other parts of Ethiopia, is dominant in the area. Also, land is one of the key

resources though the resettlers did not acquire enough size of land that can absorb the household labor as a whole. This is substantiated by the fact that an issue related with land size has forced the resettlers to rent additional land from the host population to ensure the food sufficiency of their family members. This demonstrates that the size of land in the area is a very crucial factor as far as the issue of livelihood security is concerned. It has also been noted that female-headed households are not changing their livelihood positively as compared to the male counterparts; this could be associated with the unfair allocation of land between them in the area.

In addition, it has been suggested that in the study area the host and the resettlers are living peacefully. The difference in the size of land holding between the host and the resettlers is one of the reasons behind the existing stable socio economic relation in the area apart from the shared common values and norms. On the other hand, as time advances the second generation resettlers would also be in need of land as is common in other parts of the highland areas of the country. Presumably this could become another source of conflict in the area that would put the programme in question.

In summary, the attachment between the settlers and hosts, the availability of access, the suitability of the land in the resettlement area for producing both consumption and cash crops, the provision of some starter packages that helped them to own some assets which they didn't have before, the availability of access to market to sell their produce, access to credit service despite its limitation and seasonality, and access to irrigation scheme could be considered as some of the factors that contributed to the improvement of the livelihood outcomes of most of the households.

In contrast, the following could be considered as weaknesses of the programme: neglecting the principle of partnership in the implementation of the programme which would have helped to maximize the pool of resources, the unreliable information given about the programme before resettlement, poor access to health services, little access to drinking water, unfair treatment of female-headed households in the land allocation process, lack of access to transport and giving little attention to none or off-farm activities. In general, it would be possible to say that the resettlement programme has brought its own contributions to improving the livelihoods most of the resettled farmers. However, it did not sufficiently benefit the female-headed target groups in particular.

7. Recommendations

The participation of various actors in local development such as the government, NGOs and the private sector is required to improve the gaps in the basic infrastructure and to encourage the farmers to engage in additional activities other than farming. For example, through the collaboration of the aforementioned stakeholders, small-scale enterprises can be set up to process local products and

adding value to it can be taken as a strategy in supplementing the livelihoods of the settlers in the long run. Similarly, a prompt action has to be taken by the government and concerned NGOs to fill the gaps that are observed in access to health facilities and basic services like water.

Likewise, giving the attention to the issue raised by female-headed households in the area such as, follow-up on the tasks that are carried out by the local government at grass-root level would be paramount. In this regard, re-visiting the land allocation with special reference to female-headed households by the woreda land administration office could be a good strategy to improve their livelihood in the long run. Moreover, to improve the livelihood outcomes through livelihood diversification mechanism, the financial service provided by ACSI has to be strengthened with additional modalities in its short-term plan.

Further, while implementing such a program in the future, if any, considering the number of people to be relocated in line with the available resources in the receiving area and working together with different stakeholders would be an advantage. This mitigates the negative impact on the host population's livelihoods and promotes peaceful relationship between the host and the settlers. In addition, it can alleviate the gap in the basic infrastructure.

Finally, it is suggested that further research be carried out on those resettlers who returned to their place of origin.

References

- Abraham Sewunet. 2004. Intra-regional voluntary resettlement in Amhara Region: A possible way out of the chronic food trap? In *People, space and the State: Migration, resettlement and displacement in Ethiopia*, edited by A. Pankhurst and F. Piguet, 555-64. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Chambers, R. and R. Conway. 1992. Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st Century. IDS Discussion Paper, No. 296.
- Cliffe, L. 2004. International and Ethiopian resettlement experiences: Lessons for planning in Oromia Region. In *People, space and the State: Migration, resettlement and displacement in Ethiopia*, edited by A. Pankhurst and F. Piguet, 191-218. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Daniel, Tadesse. 2008. Access and utilization of agricultural information by resettler farming households: The case of Metema Woreda, North Gondar, Ethiopia. MA thesis, Haramaya University, Dire Dawa.
- Department for International Development (DfID). 1999. Sustainable livelihoods guidance sheets. Accessed 12 May 2010. <http://www.nssd.net/pdf/sectiont.pdf>.

- Dessaiegn Rahmato. 2003. Resettlement in Ethiopia: The tragedy of population relocation in the 1980s. FSS Discussion Paper No.11. Addis Ababa: Forum for Social Studies.
- Ellis, F. 2000. *Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Filmon, Hadaro. 2009. Vulnerable widows and drought relief in Ethiopia: Gidicho Community, Southwest Ethiopia. PhD dissertation, International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University of Rotterdam, The Hague.
- Geest, V.K. and T. Dietz. 2004. A literature survey about risk and vulnerability in drylands, with a focus on the Sahel. In *The impact of climate change on drylands: with a focus on West Africa*, edited by A.J. Dietz, R. Ruben and A. Verhagen, 117-46. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- IPMS. 2005. Metema pilot learning: Site diagnosis and program design.
- Moser, O.N.C. 1998. The Asset Vulnerability Framework: Reassessing urban poverty reduction strategies. *World Development*, Vol.26, No.1: 1-19.
- New Coalition for Food Security in Ethiopia (NCFSE). 2003. Voluntary resettlement programme: Access to improved land. Volume 2. Addis Ababa.
- Pankhurst, A. 2004. Longer term implications of resettlement in Ethiopia. In *People, space and the State: Migration, resettlement and displacement in Ethiopia*, edited by A. Pankhurst and F. Piguet, 112-32. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Scoones, I. 1998. Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis. IDS Working Paper, No. 72.
- Scudder, T. 1991. A sociological framework for the analysis of new land settlements. In *Putting people first: Sociological variables in rural development*, edited by M. Cerena. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tadros, H.R. 1979. The human aspects of rural resettlement schemes in Egypt. In *Anthropology and Social change in Rural Areas*, edited by B. Berdichewsky. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Wolde-Selassie Abutte. 2002. Gumuz and highland resettlers: Differing strategies of livelihood and ethnic relations in Metekel, Northwestern Ethiopia. PhD dissertation, University of Gottingen.