International Journal of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research (IJIMR)

ISSN 2456–4567

Effects of Development-Induced Dislocation on Socioeconomic of Rural Communities: The Case of Nashe-Fincaa Dam Project, Ethiopia

Gemechu Bekana Fufa

Assistant Professor of Statistics, Department of Statistics, College of Natural and Computational Science, Wollega University, Nekemte, Ethiopia.

Abstract

Development-induced dislocation could be an opportunity or a challenge for the dislocated people as well as the host community. This study aims to assess the effects of dislocation on socioeconomic of rural community in terms of basic needs for human and education. Random samples of 180 rural communities were selected using multistage random sampling from the study area. Comparisons were made between dislocated and non-dislocated using the hypothesis testing. To assess the impact of dislocation on the educational status of the family, the ratio of children in schools to the total number of school aged children in the family, expressed as percentage. The ability of the household to feed the family was also seen in terms of the frequency of feeding the children and the adult. It was found that non-dislocated community are better off than the dislocated in terms of sending children to school, housing conditions, health condition, probability of survival for future life and ability to finance. The mean difference of family members attending the school, in both non-dislocated and dislocated was not high, shows that the dislocated and non-dislocated were affected as opposed to the general opinion that the dislocated people were highly affected. After all analysis, it can be concluded that dislocation of rural community has high impacts on the socioeconomic status of the households. The results also reveal that the dislocated rural communities were highly affected by communicable and non-communicable diseases. Finally, the results were recommended as the government, heath institution and non-dislocated community should support the dislocated community as they will adapt to the new relocation site.

Keywords: Dislocation, development, rural Community, Socioeconomic, Education, Ethiopia.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of the study

Displacement is described as the dislocation of people from their native place and region. According to Agba, Akpanudoedehe, and Ushie (2010), relocation can be a voluntary or an involuntary act upon people from their place to a new settlement sites or the persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of reasonable purposes.

There are four categories of causes of displacement: natural disaster-induced displacement (NDID); Man-made-disaster-induced displacement (MDID); Conflict-induced displacement (CID); and Development-induced displacement (DID). Internal displacement in Ethiopia has been predominantly characterized by spontaneous, short-term displacement. Spontaneous movements of pastoral communities have been the traditional form of internal and cross-border displacement. This study focused on Conflict-induced Displacement (CID) (Edwards, A. (2016)).

Development-induced displacement (DID) is forcing of communities and individuals out of their homes, often also their homelands, for the purposes of economic development. Across the world approximately 10 to 15 million people are displaced each year due to development related mega projects (Bogumil, 2013).

Development induced displacement was started in Ethiopia during the Imperial regime around the 1960s and 1970s (Habtamu A, 2011), and has been historically associated with development projects, political tragedy, or accomplishment of food security (Terefe, 2012). However, the recent displacement patterns are different from the previous concerns such as resettlement, refugees, returnees and demobilization. Currently, huge domestic human dislocation is taking place in Ethiopia for various reasons including dam constructions for irrigation and hydropower production; urban renewal projects referred as provision of better housing; large scale agriculture investment projects; and conservation of wildlife via national parks (Gemechu B, 2020; Eguavoen and Weyni, 2011; Mesay & Bekure, 2011). Nashe-Ficha'a Dam Project (NFDP) is one of the development projects in Ethiopia. The project is found in Oromia region, 350KM away from Addis Ababa. The project caused the dislocation of people from abay chomen of Horro Guduru Zone, Oromia Region.

1.2.Statement of problems

Displacement is a problem for the country and has high effects on households' living standard (Randell, (2016)). Different studies were discussed on the displacement and dislocation in Ethiopia. Taye D, (2018) was conducted a study on "forced displacement: ethnic Conflict in focus." The result show that as the people were dislocated from their home land, they were affected by different problems like poverty, hung, damage of properties, death of family members and loss of moral value (Gebre, 2008; Tesfa, 2014).

Previous studies that are particularly done in Ethiopia are mostly conducted on urban development-induced dislocation. The nature of life and its challenges in urban areas such as Addis Ababa is quite different from that in rural areas. To date, little research has been conducted on the effects of development-induced dislocation outside of Addis (Randell and Heather, 2016; Terefe, 2012; Desalegn, Karrippia, and Puskur, 2010; Getu and Assefa, 2015; Bikila, 2014).

Thus, conducting a study on development-induced dislocation in rural parts of the country helps to capture the different experiences from resettles with diverse socio-demographic background. So far, the effects of development-induced dislocation in rural areas are not well addressed. Particularly, no study has explored the effects of dislocated people due to Nashe-fincha'a dam project. Thus, this study aims to identify the effects of the dislocated community on the socioeconomic of the rural households.

1.3.Objectives of the study

The main objective of this study is to assess the effects of dislocation on socioeconomic of rural community in terms of basic needs for human and *education*. The specifically, the objectives of this study are as follow:

- *To assess the effects of dislocation on dislocated and non-dislocated community in terms of education.*
- *To analysis the housing conditions of the dislocated and non-dislocated households.*
- *To analysis the survival probability of dislocated and non-dislocated peoples.*

- *To compare the dislocated and non-dislocated of households in terms of living standard and housing condition.*

2. Data and Methodology

2.3. Data Collection Methods

This study was conducted in abay chomen woreda, in Oromia region, where the dislocated of the people were happened (Nashe-Fincha'a). The data were collected from primary source using interview of the dislocated and non-dislocated people, focus group of the people at the site, observation and secondary source namely median, government and non-government report. A number of participants are selected from target population dislocated and non-dislocated people and 180 samples were selected in to the study.

2.2. Methods of data Analysis

The main objective of this study was to assess the effects of dislocation on socioeconomic of rural community. To meet this objective, different comparisons were made between the *dislocated* and *non-dislocated*. To assess the effects of dislocation on the educational status of the family, the researchers were used *the ratio of family members in schools and those who have attended regular schools to the total number of school aged children in the family*, expressed as percentage.

Since a lot of the people lost their land and dislocated from their homes and properties. So, the probability of survival of dislocated people were depends on *non-dislocated, dislocated themselves, local community and government body*. To analysis the probability of survival of dislocated people were seen as the function of non-dislocated (ND), dislocated (DD), local community (LC) and government body (GB). Similarly, the dislocated people were lost their economy and social life because of displacement. So, the socioeconomic status of the dislocated people also depends on the following relations: community-community (CC) relation, community-government (CG) relation, community-economy (CE) relation and community-social (CS) relations.

The researcher classified the households in the study area as *four types of household dislocated pe*ople (*DP), non-dislocated pe*ople (*non-DP), mixed dislocated pe*ople *(wife dislocated), and mixed dislocated pe*ople *(husband dislocated)* were compared on a variety of household level, socio-economic measures: standard of living and ability to provide housing for family members.

The Z- test for the difference between two population means:

Suppose that there are two samples drawn independently from two populations with mean μ_1 and μ_2, respectively. Then, the test about the significance of the difference between the two means takes one of the following forms:

$H_o : \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$ Vs $H_1 : \mu_1 - \mu_2 \neq 0$ (1)

OR

$H_o : \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$ Vs $H_1 : \mu_1 - \mu_2 > 0$ (2)

OR

$H_o : \mu_1 - \mu_2 = 0$ Vs $H_1 : \mu_1 - \mu_2 < 0$ (3)

Where, H_o and H_1 stand for the null and alternative hypotheses, respectively.

The test statistic is then given by:

$$Z = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}}} \quad (4)$$

Where, n_1 is sample size from population1, n_2 is sample size from population2, $\bar{X}_1$ is the mean of the sample taken from population1, $\bar{X}_2$ is the mean of the sample taken from population 2, S_1^2 is the variance of the sample taken from population 1, S_2^2 is the variance of the sample taken from population 2.

For a specified Type I error α, the null hypothesis will be rejected if: $|Z| > Z_{\alpha/2}$, for the first form; $Z > Z_{\alpha}$ for the second form; and $Z < -Z_{\alpha}$ for the third form of the hypothesis. Rejecting the null hypothesis means that there is a significant difference between the means of the two groups.

The Regression Analysis

A linear regression equation of the a dependent variable Y on k independent variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_k$ is given by

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \ldots\ldots\ldots + \beta_k X_k + \varepsilon \quad (5)$$

Where $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_k$ are the slopes (the change in Y for the unit change in the explanatory/ independent variable X_i), β_0 is the value of Y when all explanatory/independent variables assumes zero value ε is the random term. After fitting a linear regression model by estimating the coefficients, we have to test whether the coefficients are statistically significant. This can be done either by testing the overall significance of the model or by testing the significance of the individual coefficients.

Logistic Regression Analysis

Logistic regression is a popular modeling approach when the dependent variable is dichotomous or polytomous. This model allows one to predict the log odds of outcomes of a dependent variable from a set of variables that may be continuous, discrete, categorical, or a mix of any of these. Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000) have described logistic regression focusing on its theoretical and applied aspect. In this study, for identifying the determinants of inflation we were compute a dichotomous variable indicating whether there is inflation or Otherwise.

$$PS = \begin{cases} 1, Displaced\ people \\ 0, other\ wise \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Where PS denotes population status.

In logistic regression analysis, it is assumed that the explanatory variables affect the response through a suitable transformation of the probability of the success. This transformation is a suitable link function of *P*, and is called the logit-link, which is defined as:

$$logit\ (P) = \ln\left(\frac{P}{1-P}\right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_1 + \ldots + \beta_p X_p \quad (7)$$

Where β_0, β_1, $\beta_2, \ldots \beta_p$ are the model parameters and $X_1, \ldots, X_p$ will the predictor/independent chosen variables. The transformed variable denoted by logit (*P*) is the log-odds and is related to the explanatory variables as in equation (7).

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. The Impact of dislocation on the Educational Status of the family.

The percentage of family members was taken to compare the educational statuses of the dislocated *and non-dislocated*. The result shows that there are 105 dislocated and 75 non-dislocated having students in the school. The mean percentage of students who attending the schools at the time of the survey was found to be 66.75% and 33.25% for the non-dislocated and displaced, respectively as shown in *table 3.1* below.

Table 3.1: Comparison of the average percentage of family members who attending the school.

People classification	Sample Size	Mean	Stand. deviation	Percentage
Non-dislocated	75	36.25	41.44	66.75%
dislocated	105	30.766	35.54	33.25%

To test the significance of this difference we used the one tailed test. The calculated Z calculated was found to be Z_c = -1.96. This value is less than the corresponding tabulated value, -1.64, at α = 0.05. Thus, we reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the mean of students attending the schools between the *dislocated and non-dislocated* and conclude that the percentage is higher in the dislocated group. As we can see from table 3.1, the mean difference of family members attending the school, in both dislocated and non-dislocated, was not high (36.25) and 30.766 for dislocated and non-dislocated people respectively).

From above results, the mean average of family members of dislocated people who attending the school were lower than that non-dislocated person. This attempt was also made to determine other factors contributing to the variation in the percentage of school aged family members sent to schools. Regression analysis using the method of ordinary least square yielded the following results.

Table 3.2: Coefficients of multiple regressions, assuming E as response variable

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	*23.75*	2.237	-	32.010	*.000*		
Area of farm land (X_1)	*2.201*	.280	.003	24.120	*.000*	*0.958*	*1.343*
Number of cows (X_2)	*5.410*	.500	.012	1.003	*.001*	*0.962*	*1.04*
Economic level (X_3)	*2.332*	.077	-.021	-8.720	*.004*	*0.982*	*1.41*
Fathers education (X_4)	*2.870*	.089	.028	6.118	*.004*	*0.782*	*0.98*
Total no. of children (X_5)	*0.129*	.045	.051	1.9273	.054	*0.7671*	*1.347*
Mothers education (X_6)	*2.067*	.086	-.315	-24.019	.000	*0.721*	*1.02*
Employment status (X_7)	*-1.466*	.321	.284	12.060	.060	*0.472*	*1.00*
Age of student (X_8)	0.024	.055	.006	.437	.662	*0.142*	*0.765*
Housing Condition (X_9)	-.322	.051	-.088	-.297	.003	*0.7674*	*1.01*
No. of Sheep & Goats (X_{10})	.250	.124	-.010	-.832	.406	*0.7673*	*1.02*

***Dependent Variable**: E (the number of family members who ever reached school).*

The linear regression equation characterizing the effect of Area of farm land, father's education, mother's education, number of cows, economic level of households, housing condition and number of sheep and goats on the mean total number of school aged children expressed as percentage of this analysis. From above SPSS output of *table 3.2,* we can write the equation of linear regression as follow:

$E = 23.75 + 2.2X_1 + 5.4X_2 + 2.3X_3 + 3.7X_4 + 2.3X_6 + 1.5X_9 + 2.20X_{10}$ (8)

Equation (8) shows that as the area of farm land increases by 1 timad, the percentage of children sent to school increases by 2.2. As the number of cows' increases, the percentage of children sent to school also increases. In similar ways, as the economic level of the family increases by 1 unit, the percentage of children sent school increases by 2.3, as the father's education increases by 1 year, the percentage of children sent school increases by 3.7, as the mother's education increases by 1 year, the percentage of children sent to school increases by 2.3. Similarly, housing condition and number of sheep and goats positively determine the mean of sending the children to the school. Other variable like total number of children, employment status and student age were found to be insignificant in determining the dependent variable under consideration (*table 3.2)*.

To analysis the economic level of community in the study area, the researcher classified the population as dislocated and non-dislocated and economic level as low, middle and high. The result of the survey show that the economic level of the dislocated and non-dislocated people were almost equal, low (52.25%), middle (36.22%) and (10.53%) for non-dislocated and low (58.55%), middle (33.42%) and (8.08%) for dislocated people. The dislocated' people suffered a lot from diseases, food shortages and humanitarian aid couldn't reach them because of new residential site.

3.2. Impacts of dislocation on the survival of dislocated people.

As it was done for other variables, determination of the factors contributing to the probability of survival of dislocated people as one of the strategies or the sole strategy in times of food of shortfalls or any problems/ was done using the logistic regression analysis. The survival status of the dislocated people were depends on non-dislocated (ND), dislocated (DD), local community (LC) and government body (GB), was considered as explanatory variables. The backward conditional variable selection method yielded the following result.

Table 3.3: The back ward elimination of all variables**,** assuming, S_{ad} as dependent variable.

							95.0% C.I.for EXP(B)	
Model	*B*	S.E.	Wald	Df	*Sig.*	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
ND	*0.762***	.026	20.002	1	*0.000*	.932	.904	.961
DD	*2.87***	0.001	0.264	1	*0.001*	0.031	.000	.
LC	*6.43***	.008	.062	1	*.0.000*	1.000	.985	1.015
GB	*0.500*	.004	.051	1	*0.2501*	.999	.991	1.008
(Constant)	*- 2.095*	6.083	.119	1	*0.7312*	8.127		

*Log-likelihood = 22.736** , Probability = 0.0000.*

*Note: ** and * indicates that the coefficients are significant at 5% and 10% Levels of significant*

Where, S_{ad} = probability of survival.

The empirical result shows that, all the coefficients are significantly different from zero at 5% level of significance. The variables/predictors non-dislocated (ND), dislocated (DD), local community (LC) and government body (GB) have wald value of greater than zero (*see Table 3.3*), which confirms their positive relation with the probability of survival. From above *table 3.3,* we can write the fitted model as:

$F_{ad} = -1.3 + 0.762ND + 2.87DD + 6.43LC + 0.61GB$ (9)

As it can be seen from equation (9), the probability of survival of dislocated people increases by 0.762 with the unit increase in the support of non-dislocated, by 2.87 with the unit increase in the dislocated and by 0.61 with

the unit increase in the government body; and increases by 6.43 with the increase the unit in the local community. The implication may be that dislocated people can be supported by non-dislocated, themselves, local communities and government body to survive. This implies the non-displacer, local community and government body also sharing the problems of the dislocated people by supporting them. It shows that, as the support of dislocated people by supporters (non-displacer, local community and government body) increases, the economic level of the community become decline; displacement had a positive impact on the economic level of the local community and government body.

3.3. Impacts of dislocation on the health condition and social relation of dislocated people.

The health condition of the dislocated people at different sites was surveyed. The results from survey show that, out of the total dislocated people more than half (43.12%) were patients, suffered by diseases and food shortages. The dislocated people were living with together closely; using common eating and drinking materials, shows the transmission of communicable diseases were high among the dislocated people.

Using the data collected from the dislocated people, the socioeconomic status of the dislocated people was depends on the relations: community-community (CC) relation, community-government (CG) relation, community-economy (CE) relation and community-social (CS) relations. Hence, the dislocated communities were loss cultural, social relation, separated from their relatives and the government support them rather than asking income like; land rental, tax, etc. These reveal that the social and economic levels of the community as well as the country were decrease

3.4. Impacts of dislocation on living standard and housing condition of dislocated people

The reported standard of living differed across the four types of households. As shown in table 3.4, the proportion of households that reported a low standard of living ('poor' or ' very poor') was highest among dislocated households (35 percent), followed by mixed households with a dislocated husband (31 per cent), mixed households with a dislocated wife (28 percent), and finally non-dislocated house-holds (21 percent). A logistic model accounting for household size, the gender, age and years of schooling of the head of household showed that the odds of reporting a low standard of living were almost twice as high among dislocated households as among non-dislocated ones (odds ratio = 1.92, $p < 0.05$) (see Table 3.4). There was no statistically significant difference between any other combinations of household types in the odds of reporting a low standard of living. In addition, the odds of reporting a low standard of living were positively associated with household size (odds ratio =1.34, $p < 0.05$) and negatively associated with both years of schooling (odds ratio = 0.76, $P < 0.01$) and age of the head of household (odds ratio = 0.89, $P < 0.05$).

Table 3.4: Household standard of living and Housing condition

Types of household	Low Standard of living (% poor & very poor)	Odds Ratio	Ability to provide house (%)	Odds Ratio
Dislocated	35	1.92	50	0.7
Mixed, dislocated male	31	1.6	50	0.6
Mixed, dislocated female	28	0.9	64	1.34
Non-dislocated	21	Ref.	61	Ref.
Age	-	0.89	-	1.03
Gender (Ref. male)	-	1.5	-	0.3
Year of schooling	-	0.76	-	1.34
Size of household	-	1.34	-	0.94
Constant	-	2.2	-	0.13

Notes: *Ref. refers to the reference category. n/a refers to non-applicable. Age, gender, and years of schooling refer to the head of household.*

In addition, relative to their non-dislocated counterparts, dislocated households housing and type of house were considered. The study considered the having/not having their own house as well as roofing, wall, floor, to assess the housing conditions of the people (see table 3.5).

Table 3.5: Distribution of household by housing condition, where they live at the study time.

	Owner of house		**Roofing Material**		
Types of household	***Their own house (%)***	***Not their own (%)***	***Grass (%)***	***Plastic (%)***	***Iron sheet (%)***
Dislocated	6.45	95.45	13.20	43.34	38.27
Mixed, dislocated male	27.35	72.65	26.65	18.25	54.10
Mixed,dislocated female	27.35	68.55	31.23	18.12	51.35
Non-dislocated	72.67	12.35	28.65	3.25	63.23

As we can see from table 3.5, on average living in their own house for dislocated households were smaller (6.45%) than that of non-dislocated ones (72.67%) and only 6.45% of dislocated households, those had other house at different town, were living in their own house at study time. Most of the dislocated households were living in plastic roofing house (47.34%) and non-dislocated household were living in iron sheet roofing (63.23%). In addition, the mixed dislocated households those living in their own house (27.35% for male dislocated and 27.35% for female dislocated) were lower than that of non-dislocated (72.67%).

4. Conclusions

4.1. Conclusion and Recommendations

The main objective of this study was to assess the effects of dislocation on socioeconomic of rural community in terms of basic needs for human and *education*. The results of the analysis showed that the non-dislocated people were better off than the dislocated in their abilities to send children to school, own houses roofed with corrugated iron sheet, living standard and ability to finance the family in times of food shortage.

The number of oxen, area of farm land, fathers education, mother education, economic level of family, number of goats and sheep and housing condition were positively affected the percentage of children to be sent to school. The probability of survival of dislocated was positively determined by the support from non-dislocated, local community and government body. This reveals that, the economic level of the community, the investment by government and were decreases, since the limited economy of the community were consumed by a lot of dislocated people. In addition, dislocated people were highly affected by the communicable and non-communicable diseases and suffering by hunger.

The findings reveal that the aspects of the severe downward mobility caused by dislocation: the loss of land, loss of properties, loss of privacy due to loss house and moral damage caused by forcing people to leave their homes and communities. The dislocated people were enforced to leave their home and properties, and they had relocated at new residential site. Hence, the communities were supporting some of basic needs, the dislocated people are unmet in basic needs, health service was rarely met and shelters were in difficult ways.

Comparing the four types of households on a variety of socio-economic indicators showed that, compared with non-dislocated households, dislocated ones suffered higher levels of poverty, lower ability to provide residential units study time, lived in plastic house, and were less likely to own a their house.

4.2. Recommendations

Based on the result the following recommendations were forwarded:

- The government should be giving attention for the communities before desiding the dislocation and relocation to new residential site.
- The government, heath institution and non-dislocated community should support the dislocated community and try to stop or reduce the displacement for further.

Acknowledgement

The authors gratefully acknowledged the anonymous reviewers for their contributions towards this work.

Reference

1. Bikila Ayele (2014). The Impacts of Development-Induced Displacement and Relocation on the Livelihoods of Households in Dukem Area; Addis Ababa University (unpublished).
2. Bogumil, Terminski (2013). Development-Induced Displacement and Resettlement:Theoretical Frameworks and Current Challenges, Geneva.
3. Dessalegn Molla Ketema, Ranjan S.Karrippai, and Ranjitha Puskur(2010). Women's Social Networks in Resettlement areas: the Case of Metema Resettlement Site, Ethiopia, Africa's Social Development Review.
4. Eguavoen, Irit and Weyni Tesfai (2011). Rebuilding livelihoods after dam-induced relocation in Koga, Blue Nile basin, Ethiopia: ZEF Working Paper 83. Bonn.
5. Gebre Yntiso (2008), Urban Development and Displacement in Addis Ababa: The Impact of Resettlement Projects on Low-Income Households; Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review, Volume 24, Number 2, June 2008, pp. 53-77 (Article), Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa.
6. Gemechu Bekana, 2020. "Impacts of Displacement on Socio-economic status of Local Community in the Western Ethiopia: Empirical Evidence from Survey Data," Research Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry, 12 (1), 0975.
7. Getu Ambaye and Assefa Abeliene (2015). Development-Induced Displacement and Its Impacts on the Livelihoods of Poor Urban Households in Bahir Dar, North Western Ethiopia; AHMR, Vol.1 No3, September- December, 2015.
8. Habtamu Atelaw (2011). The Livelihoods of Displaced People In Addis Ababa: The Case Of People Relocated From Arat Kilo Area: Addis Ababa University (unpublished).
9. Hosmer, D.W. and Lemeshow, S. (2000). Applied Logistic Regression, John Wliey & Son, Inc.
10. Mesay Mulugeta and Bekure Woldesemait (2011),The Impact of Resettlement Schemes Networks in Resettlement areas: the Case of Metema Resettlement Site, Ethiopia, Africa's Social Development Review. On Land-Use/Land-Cover Changes in Ethiopia: A case Study from Nono Resettlement Sites, Central Ethiopia: Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa (volume 13, No. 2, 2011 ISSN: 1520-5509) Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Clarion, Pennsylvania.
11. Ogaboh, Akpanudoedehe, and J. J. Ushie, E. M. (2010). Socio-economic and cultural impacts of resettlement on Bakassi people of cross river state, Nigeria: Studies in sociology of science Vol.1 No.2, 2010, pp. 50-62.
12. Randell, Heather. 2016. The short-term impacts of development-induced displacement on wealth and subjective well-being in the world, World Development 87: 385– 400.
13. Taye D, (2018), "Forced displacement: Hidden Stories and needs of internally dislocated persons in the easter and western Ethiopia", social work.
14. Terefe Zeleke (2012). Resettlement And Sustainable Food Security: A Comparative Study Of Inter-Zonal And Intra-Zonal Resettlement Schemes And Host Communities In Dawuro Zone, Southern Nations,

Nationalities And Peoples Region, Ethiopia; Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa (Volume 14, No.2, 2012) ISSN: 1520-5509, Clarion University of Pennsylvania, Clarion, Pennsylvania.

15. Tesfa, T. G. (2014). The Effect of Development Induced Displacement on Relocated Household: The case of Addis Ababa: International Institute of social Studies.