Factors Affecting Rural Women Land Ownership in the Case of Boloso, Sore District, Wolaita Zone, Southern Ethiopia

Admasu Bekele[1]   Zegeye Paulos[2]

1.Boloso Sore District Rural Development and Natural resource office, Wolaita, Ethiopia
2.Department of Economics, Wolaita Sodo University, P.O.Box. 138, Wolaita Sodo, Ethiopia

Abstract

This study analyzed the rural land ownership pattern by women and factors affecting the ownership rural land in the study area. The study used 95 sample households which collected from four kebeles. To attain the stated objectives of the study we used both descriptive and Econometric model analysis i.e. binary logit model. The study investigated the ownership ratio indicating the ratio of number of respondents (Female headed or wife of male headed) having land ownership (lease) right to the total number of respondents interviewed / belonging to a particular sub-group. A total of 95 household heads were considered in this study. Out of which 43 (45%) were female headed and the remaining 52 (55%) were wife of male headed. The Female headed households' ownership of land was 0.62 (62%) and the wife of male headed households' ownership ratio of land was 0.34 (34%). Overall ownership of sampled households was 0.47 (47%). The results demonstrated the limited ownership of land operated by the women households. Almost all the households depended on agriculture, deriving their livelihoods out of the land, without even owning the land. Those who did not own the land in their names were just operating the land accessed through relationship with the owners. Thirty eight percent of female headed households were mere operators without land ownership. As per constitutional law, death of husbands entitles the wives to own the land owned by the deceased husband. The investigation revealed that in practice the law is not put into practice. The binary logit regression result shows that out of 8variables included in this study to determine the influence of explanatory variable on probability of owning and controlling rural land 5 variables were found significant at 1 percent, 5 percent and 10 percent level. Among the significant variables family income, age, marital status/headship and land size positively affect the probability of owning and controlling land by women's. On the other hand family size negatively affects the probability of owning and controlling of rural land by women's.

Keywords : Women land ownership, Binary Logit Model.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of study

The international development community has recognized that agriculture is an engine of growth and poverty reduction in countries where it is the main occupation of the people. The agriculture sector in many developing countries is underperforming in part because women resent a crucial their role as farmers , labors and other activities, almost in everywhere face more severe differences than men in access to land ownership and control. Efforts by national government and the international community to achieve their aim for agricultural progress, economic growth and food security will be encouraged and speeded up it they build on the contribution that women make and take steps to alleviate the differences of land ownership(Appleton,1996).

In many rural areas of the developing world land ownership can be a large determinant of whether or not some lives in property. Lose of land has contributed to conflict with in the country leading to large forced out migration followed by repatriation of country. In fact over increasingly inequitable land distribution are believed to have contributed substantially to the genocide of area (Andre,1997).

Concerning land rights as cotula notes powerful groups and people are in control of vast expenses of land in sub Saharan Africa region while small and power less section of the society are still marginalized and exclude from getting to it. The nature land holding in rural parts of subcontinent seems to be male dominated and the social organization of most groups of people (Cotula (2007).

The issue of women land ownership and control rights in Africa touched by different authors. Land is a crucial to the existence and earning or obtaining the necessities of life. Land can be exploited for variety of purpose (Hanna Jen toft, 1996).

The typical produces of agrarian transformation under which labor has occurred by slowly and heavy gender bias. Because women landownership are often assumed through the security of the often times male house hold some in heritance laws allocated less and to female heirs than male heirs. Ongoing adherence to male dominated traditions of property ownership has generally mean that women cannot take advantage of the wide range of benefit associated take ownership and control of property. According to the land tenure service at FAO, poverty is inversely correlated with household land ownership and direct access to land minimizes women's risk of impoverishment and improvements the physical wellbeing and prospects for children (FAO, 1997).

The barriers which prevent resources often include inadequate legal standards and in effective

implementation at national and local levels as well as discriminatory cultural attitudes and practices at the institutional and community level. In many communities gender disparities with regard to land and other productive resources are to assumption that men as head of house hold control and manage land – implicitly reflecting ideas that women are in capable of managing productive resource. Such as land effectively, that productive resources given to women are lost to another family in the event marriage, divorce and that men will provide for women's financial security challenging these discriminatory ideas is critical. (pradeep panda and B. Agarwal,2005)

1.2. Objective of the study
1.2.1 General objective
The general objective of the study was to assess the rural land ownership and control pattern by womens in Boloso Sore district in wolaita zone, southern Ethiopia. The study is based on the following Specific Objective

➢ To asses rural land ownership and control pattern by women in the study area..
➢ To investigate the constraints and challenges faced by women in ownership and control of rural land.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
2.1. Description of the study area
Boloso sore woreda is located in wolaita in southern Nation Nationalities peoples regional state (SNNPRs).Which one of the 12 districts in Wolaita Zone. It is bordered with kambata Tambaro zone in the north, Damot sore woreda in the south, Boloso Bombe woreda in the west and Badawacho woreda of Hadiya Zone in the east,(BSWARD office 2014).

The woreda is classified as Woyna Dega which covers 86% of total area and the remaining 14% is Dega. Altitude in the woreda ranges between 1800 and 2190 meter sea level. Rainfall occurs in two distinct rainy season, 'kiremit' rains occurring in summer (roughly June, July and August) and Belg rains occurring in spring (roughly the mid Feb to Mid may period).Mean annual rainfall in the area varies between 1298mm and 1659mm average temperature varies between 15^0c and 25.9^0c (CSA 2007).

As to the 2007 estimated total population of the woreda is 196,614 of 96,341 are males and 100,273 female with the density 637 persons per seq, of km. this makes the woreda second densely populated woreda in the zone and 92% of its total population lives in rural area(Ibid).

2.2 Sample Size Determination:
In order to decide the sample size that represents this population a mathematical formula suggested by (Yamane, 1967) was employed as presented below:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where n= is the sample size

N= Total number of household size

e= margin of error (10 %)

Therefore, applying the population size to the formula, the following sample size is obtained:

N= 1754 / (1+1754) X (0.1)2

= 95

The sample size was 95 and drawn from the selected Kebeles on the basis of sample size proportionate to the population of each kabele.

2.3. Data analysis
Both descriptive and econometric method of data analysis was employed in this study to attain the study objectives.

2.3.1 Economic analysis
To identify the determinants that influence the household practice of land ownership and control activity of influenced area, the binary logistic regression analysis was employed. It was selected because of the model relevance to deal with dependent variable that is dichotomous.The mathematical transformation (log transformation) is needed to normalize the distribution.

The logit method gives parameter estimates that are asymptotically efficient, and consistent. Indeed, the logit approach is known to produce statistically sound results (Gujarati & porter, 2009) the probability of womens' owning and controlling of rural land.

we specified the logit model for probability of owning and controlling rural land by women's and factors that determine the ownership and control practice in the study area as follows:-

The probability of owning and controlling rural land (an event occurring) as the form:

$$Pr(y = 1/x) = Pr(Y = 1) = \frac{e^{zi}}{1 + e^{zi}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-zi}} - - - - - - - - - - - (3.8)$$

$$z = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + - - - - + \beta_k x_k + \varepsilon - - - - - - - - - - - - - (3.9)$$

Note: - the error term ε also follows logistic distribution

For a non-event (not owning and controlling) cumulative logistic distribution, representing the probability is just $(1-p_i)$ i.e.

$$1 - pr(y = 1/x) = = \frac{e^{-zi}}{1 + e^{-zi}} - (3.10)$$

Therefore, by dividing equation (3.8) by equation (3.10) we can result in the odds-ratio in binary response, which is as stated below:

$$\frac{pr(y = 1/x)}{[1 - pr(y = 1/x)]} = \frac{P(Y = 1)}{1 - P(Y = 1)} = \frac{\frac{1}{1 + e^{-zi}}}{\frac{e^{-zi}}{1 + e^{-zi}}} = \frac{1}{e^{-zi}} = e^{zi} - - - - - (3.11)$$

Equation (3.11) is simply the odd-ratio in favor of women owning and controlling rural land. This is the ratio of the poverty that a woman will own and control land to the probability that it will not own and control land.

When we take the natural logarisim of odd-ratio of equation (3.11) will result in logit model as we can see below

$$Li = ln\left(\frac{P(Y=1)}{1-P(Y=1)}\right) = Zi = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \beta_4 x_4 + \beta_5 x_5 + \beta_6 x_6 + \beta_7 x_7 + \beta_8 x_8 - -(3.12)$$

$$\boldsymbol{Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Ag + \beta_2 FS + \beta_3 FHH + \beta_3 Edu + \beta_4 LS + \beta_5 Income + \beta_6 AccFin + \beta_7 Awerne + \varepsilon_i - - - - - - (3.13)}$$

Therefore $Y_i = 1$ if women owning and controlling land and $= 0$ if women is not owning and controlling land, β_i is regression parameters, ε_i is the error term and the explanatory variables will be defined under the variable description section. The regression was estimated by Maximum likelihood technique.

Definition of variable

No	Independent variables	Variable types	Units of measurement	Expected relationship with department variables
1	Age of respondents	Continuous	Year	+
2	Head status	Dummy	0x1	+
3	Education status of respondents	Dummy	0x1	+
4	Family size	Continuous	0x1	-/+
5	Land size	Continuous	Hectare	+
6	Access to financial service	Dummy	0x1	+
7	Family income	Continuous	Birr	+
8	Awareness gap	Dummy	0x1	-

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the main findings of the study rural land ownership and control pattern by women and their constraints and challenges in ownership and control. In the beginning the descriptive analysis are presented and followed by binary logit regression analysis.

3.1. Descriptive Results

3.1.1. Socio-demographic characteristics of households

As we can see in table 3.1.1 below a total of 95 household heads were considered in this study. Out of which 43 (45%) were female headed and the remaining 52 (55%) were wife of male headed. The Female headed households ownership and control ratio of land was 27(28.4%) and 16(16.8%) respectively and the wife of male headed households ownership and control ratio of land was 18(18.9) and 34(35.7%) respectively. Overall ownership and control ratio of sampled households shows that 45(47.35%) ownership and 50(52.65%) control ratio.

Table 3.1.1 Category of respondents   n = 95

Respondents	Freq	%	Ownership ratio	Control ratio
Female headed	43	45%	27(28.4%)	16(16.8%)
Wife of male headed	52	55%	18(18.9)	34(35.7%)
Overall	95	100%	45(47.35%)	50(52.65%)

Source: own computed survey result, 2017

Education level of woman's

Educational status of the household head was also an important element in women's ownership and control of land practices. The survey result revealed that 52.6 percent of the sampled households never attended schooling, while the remaining 47.4 percent were literate at different levels of school. Among the literate respondents, about (41.4%) attended school below grade eight and 6 percent attended above grade nine up to twelve. Therefore the result of this study shows that when peoples are educated more they understand better about their right and responsibility and enjoy better ownership and control of rural land than those who were not educated.

Table 3.1.2 Educational status   n = 95

Educational stat	Female Headed		Wife of male headed		Total		Female Headed		Wife of male headed	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Ownership	Control	Ownership	Control
Can't read and write	18	19.1%	32	34%	50	52.6%	12(12.6%)	6(6.3%)	12(12.6%)	20(21%)
Only read/write	4	4%	10	10.5%	14	15%	4(4.2%)	0%	4(4.2%)	6(6.3%)
1-4	11	11.4%	8	8.5%	19	20%	7(7.4%)	4(4.2%)	4(4.2%)	4(4.2%)
5-8	6	6.3%	0	0	6	6.4%	4(4.2%)	2(2.1%)	0%	0%
8-9	4	4.2%	0	0	4	4%	2(2.1%)	2(2.1%)	0%	0%
11-12	0	0%	2	2%	2	2%	0%	0%	0	2(2.1%)
Total	43	45%	52	55%	95	100%	29(30.5%)	14(14.7%)	20(21%)	32(33.7%)

Source: own computed survey result, 2017

Land size

The study recorded the land holding pattern of the respondent households and the results are displayed in Table 3.1.3. The average size of landholdings for all the households put together in the study area was 0.312 hectares. There was a significant range of landholdings per household, with the minimum being 0.05 hectare and the maximum area household owned being 1.25 hectares.

Table 3.1.3 Land holding   (n = 95)

Land Holding (Hectare)	Female Headed		Wife of Male Headed		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
0 – 0.25	29	67.44	29	30.5	58	61.05
0.25 – 0.5	7	16.27	9	9.5	16	16.84
0.51 – 0.75	4	9.30	7	7.5	11	11.57
0.75 – 1	2	4.65	5	5.5	7	7.36
>1	1	2.32	2	2	3	3.15
Total	43	100.00	52	100.00	95	100.00
Mean	0.353 hectare		0.273 hectare		t test = 2.12**	
Max	1.25		1.00		1.25	
Min	0.062		0.05		0.05	

**Significant at <5 % probability Source: Field survey, 2017

As can be seen in Table 3.1.3,compared to wife of male headed households (55.76%), more number of female headed households (67.44 %) had smaller size of land (ranging from 0.05-0.25 ha). The average female headed land holdings per household was 0.353 ha, with the maximum being 1.25 ha, while the average of wife of male headed land holdings was 0.273 ha, with maximum being 1 ha. The average size of land holding of wife of male headed households was less than the female headed households. The difference between these two categories of households in terms of average holding was significantly different as per the t-test employed for the purpose

3.2. Econometric Model Analysis

3.2.1. Factors affecting women land ownership –Logit Regression Results

In order to identify factors determining the rural land ownership and control by women, Logistic regression was employed. There are two dependent variables namely ownership and control. Therefore two regression models one for ownership (probability of owning land by rural women).There were eight (8) independent variables tried to fit the models.

Multicollinearity test

Multicollineartiy is a situation where explanatory variable are highly correlated. This occurs when two or more predictors in the model are correlated and provide redundant information about the response (Gujarti, 1999; Baker, 2006). *Variable inflation factors (VIF)* it was used to test the existence of multicollineartiy among the continuous variables. STATA11 version was used to compute VIF. The test indicated that VIF for continuous variables was below the threshold level and *Contingency coefficient (CC):* this was used to check multicollineartiy between discrete variables. The value ranges between 0 and 1, with 0 indicating no association between the variables and value close to 1 indicating a high degree of association between variables (Gujarati, 2004). STATA 11 was used to compute CC. The CC for the discrete variables was below the threshold 0.75 and indicates no serious multicollineartiy among dummy variables

Before estimating the model, the explanatory variables in the fitted model was evaluated for their joint significance in affecting the ownerships of rural separate model and by women's using Wald test. The Wald test which follows a chi square distribution with 8df was 191.92, where the null hypothesis of all regression coefficients are equal to zero can be rejected at 1 percent significance level. Thus, the explanatory variables have joint power in affecting the land ownership of women's in the study area. This result is also supported by the high pseudo R2 (0.7234)

The estimation result of the model is presented in the following Table 3.2.1

Table 3.2.1 logistic regression

Dependant variable: Probability of owning and controlling rural land by women				
Variable	**Coefficient**	**Std. Err.**	**Z**	**P>|z|**
Household age	**-0.42**	**0.13**	**- 3.19**	**0.001***
Family size	**-0 .83**	**0.21**	**-3.94**	**0.001***
Headship (FHH =1)	**1.64**	**0.80**	**2.05**	**0.008***
Education/Literacy	**0.08**	**0.37**	**0.23**	**0.459**
land Size	**3.55**	**0.95**	**3.71**	**0.000***
Family income	**0.05**	**0.02**	**1.99**	**0.051***
Access to finance	**1.31**	**0.78**	**1.67**	**0.368**
Awareness	**- 0.37**	**0.20**	**-1.41**	**0.630**
Cons	**-1.70**	**3.15**	**-0.54**	**0.658**
LR chi2 (8) = 191.92 **Prob> chi2 = 0.0000** **Pseudo R2 = 0.7234** **Log likelihood = -39.124736**				

NB: * significant at 1%, ** significant at % and * significant at 10%**
Source: Survey result using STATA, 2017

In logistic regression analysis out of 8explanatory variables included in this study, 5 of the variables were related to the probability of owning land by women were: age, family income, and headship status and land size.

3.2.2. Marginal Effect for Logit Regression

Since the logit model we employed for regression analysis is not linear, the marginal effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable is not constant but it depends on the value of the independent variables. Thus, marginal effects can be a means for summarizing how change in a response is related to change in a covariate. For categorical variables, the effects of discrete changes are computed, i.e., the marginal effects for categorical variables show how P(Y = 1) is predicted to change as Xk changes from 0 to 1 holding all other Xs equal.

Whereas for continuous independent variables, the marginal effect measures the instantaneous rate of change, i.e. it was computed for a variable while all other variables are held constant that means in this study change in the probability of owning a land with a unit change in continuous independent variable.Thus, opposed to linear regression case, it is not possible to interpret the estimated parameters as the effect of the independent variable up on owning land. However, it is possible to compute the marginal effects in terms of values of explanatory variables. The results are shown in Table 3.2.2

Table 3.2.2 Marginal effect for logit regression.

Dependant variable: Probability of owning rural land by women				
Variable	**Dy/dx**	**Std. Err.**	**z**	**P>|z|**
Household age	**0.082**	**0.02**	**3.13**	**0.002***
Family size	**-0 .320**	**0.07**	**-4.47**	**0.001***
Headship/Marital Sta*	**0.182**	**0.08**	**2.13**	**0.032****
Education/Literacy	**0.004**	**0.01**	**0.65**	**0.954**
land size	**0.417**	**0.08**	**4.80**	**0.000***
family income	**0.093**	**0.03**	**2.72**	**0.085***
Access to finance *	**0.233**	**0.21**	**1.11**	**0.338**
Awareness	**- 0.006**	**0.06**	**-1.20**	**0.722**

(*) dy/dx is for discrete change of dummy variable from 0 to 1, y= Pr (Prob. Owning land) (predict) = . 67468601
 NB: * significant at 1%, ** significant at % and * significant at 10%**
Source: Survey result using STATA, 2017

From the marginal effect result it is seen that, among all explanatory variables included in the model, five variables were found to be significant in affecting the probability of the women owning rural land. These

included household head age, family size, land size, headship status, and family income. Among the significant variables family income, age, headship/marital status and land size positively affect the probability of the owning land by women. On the other hand family size negatively affects the probability of owning of rural land by women.

The size of house hold

The size of house hold was found negative in this finding and the coefficient is statistically different from zero at 1percent significance level. Holding all other variables constant at their mean values, as it was expected that household family size increase by one individual, the probability of a women owning and controlling land decrease at about 32.0%. This is attributed due to the fact that fixed land holding with increasing number of family lead to decreased average owning share of women's.

Household age

Household age positively related with owning and control of land and coefficient was significant with 1 percent level. Other things remain constant, as women's age increases by one unit, probability of owning and controlling decrease by 8.2 percent. This was because when women's become older they may be neglected from different responsibility in rural area that make them participate less in things that can enhance the ownership right of land at community level as well as in kebele level. .

Family income

The income of family was positively related to the probability of owning and controlling practice of land by women's and coefficient was different from zero with 10 percent significant level. As it was hypothesized holding other variables constant as family income increase by a unit probability of owning and controlling practice increase by 9.3 percent. This is because when income of people increases they may be engaged in different activity that has a great contribution to hold property including land.

Land Size

Land leasing of the household positively related and significantly affect the probability of owning land. The marginal effect result shows that as land leasing increase by a unit probability of owning land increase by 41.7 percent, other variables remain constant. Household size engaged in agricultural labor force and measured by hectare. Household with land leasing in agricultural force have more labor force practicing land ownership and control.

4.   CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION
4.1 CONCLUSION

This study analyzed the rural land ownership pattern by women and factors affecting the ownership rural land in the study area. The study used 95 sample households which collected fromfour kebeles. To attain the stated objectives of the study we used both descriptive and Econometric model analysis i.e. binary logit model.

The study investigated the ownership ratio indicating the ratio of number of respondents (Female headed or wife of male headed) having land ownership (lease) right to the total number of respondents interviewed / belonging to a particular sub-group.

From a total of 95 household heads were considered in this study, 43 (45%) were female headed and the remaining 52 (55%) were wife of male headed. The Female headed households' ownership of land was 0.62 (62%) and the wife of male headed households' ownership ratio of land was 0.34 (34%). Overall ownership of sampled households was 0.47 (47%). The ownership here means the lease right to operate from the government that can be transferred to legal heirs.

The results demonstrated the limited ownership of land operated by the women households. Almost all the households depended on agriculture, deriving their livelihoods out of the land, without even owning the land. Those who did not own the land in their names were just operating the land accessed through relationship with the owners. Thirty eight percent of female headed households were mere operators without land ownership. As per constitutional law, death of husbands entitles the wives to own the land owned by the deceased husband. The investigation revealed that in practice the law is not put into practice.

The binary logit regression result shows that out of 8 variables included in this study to determine the influence of explanatory variable on probability of owning and controlling rural land 5 variables were found significant at 1 percent, 5 percent and 10 percent level. Among the significant variables family income, age, marital status/headship and land size positively affect the probability of owning and controlling land by women's. On the other hand family size negatively affects the probability of owning and controlling of rural land by women's.

4.2.   Policy Implications

Following the results from descriptive and econometric analysis, the following policy implications were forwarded as alternatives for owning and controlling of rural land by women's in the study area.

This study clearly points out existence of disparity in ownership over rural land in the study area.

Contributing factors to ownership and control of land can be achieved by reviewing the regional rural land policy, establishing autonomous land administration institution, mainstreaming gender in the land administration system, carrying out advocacy and awareness creation activities on women's land rights, establishing strong women's organizations, networking and experience sharing, initiating women's involvement in community activities and decision-making, introducing female friendly plough technology and by carrying out further research in the subject area.

Gaps within the awareness of land administration policy and implementation made evident in this study should be addressed by implementing rural land policy that explicitly focusing on issues and women's right towards land. This will avoid ambiguities and enhance better understanding and interpretation of the law. Therefore, implementation of land policy in a gender sensitive manner to address existing gaps and factors that retarded women's equal access to and control over land should be closely investigated by government.

Since family size was one of the determining factors for probability of ownership and control of rural land in the study area. Government and stockholders should have to give attention to reduce the increasing population number (increasing family size) it can be achieved by giving proper awareness creation about family planning activities, health and education services.

Gender mainstreaming strategy should be applied in the land administration system in order to address women specific needs, to initiate their equal participation in the process and to ensure women's equal benefit from the system.

Promoting women's equal access to ownership and control over land requires addressing socio-economic issues particularly customs and traditions that affect realization of women's equal rights to land. Therefore the regional land administration system should design strategies to address these issues through advocacy and awareness creation programmers to change community attitudes and practices.

REFERENCE

Abdulia and Antwi, (2005) traditional land holding institution and individual ownership of land rights in sub-Saharan Africa. World review of science, technology and sustainable development 2(314): 302-319.

Almaz (2007), women access to and control over land in the administration system MA thesis Addis Ababa university, Addis Ababa Ethiopia.

Andre (1997).Land Regulation Under unbearable stress Ruwanda Caught in the Malthusian Trap.Journal of Human Behavior and organization.

Appleton S. (1996). Women headed household and household welfare vol. 24(12) 1811-1827.

Appleton, S. (1996), women head household sand household welfare. An empirical destruction   for Uganda.World development, vol. 24(12).1811-1827.

Bruco and shemmigot-Adholla, (1994) searching for land tenure security in Africa.   Dubuque,   Iowa, Kendall/hunt publishing company.

Central Statistics Agency (2008) Summary and Statistical report of the 2007 population and housing cenuses, FDRE, population census commission Addis Ababa.

Colchester (1993) common property resource and the environmental context.Economic and political weekly.

Cotula, Lorenzo (2007) chnges in customary "Land tenure system in Africa.

Creswell, S. (2003), Research design qualitative, quantitative and mixed approaches thousand Oaks, CA-sage publication, Inc.

CSA, (2005) Central Statistical Agency of Ethiopia Annal Statistical report Addis Ababa.

Davision (1998) Land and women's agricultural production the content in agriculture women and land the African experience west view press, Boulder and London.

Deere and Doss, (2006) gender and land distribution in paraguay, peru and Brazil a study undertakn for the world Bank.

Deere, Carmen Diana, cherly 2(2008) gender and the distribution of wealth in developing countries in Davies james B. personal wealth from a global perspectives oxford New York oxford University press (UNN-WIDER) pp. 353-372.

Deininger et al in Press(2007) Rural Land certificate in Ethiopia process, initial impact and implication for other African Countries Retrived on April 15 from http://econpapers repec.org/paper/wbkwbrwps/4218.htm.

EEA/EEPRI, (2002) – Ethiopian Economic Association land Tenure and Agriculture Development in Ethiopia. Research Report by Ethiopian Economic Assiociation. Ethiopian Econonmic policy Research Institute v(EEA/EEPRI). Addis Ababa.

ELTAP, (2006) – standardization of Rural Land Registration and cadastral surveying methodologies Experience in Ethiopia. Ethiopia Land Tunre and Administration program(ELTAP) proceeding of National conference,20 -24 march 2006, AddisAbaba.

Eyasu Elias, (2007) Farmers perception of soil fertility change and management. Institute for Sustainable Development and SOS Sahel International (UK).

FAO (2016) Gender and right, understanding complexities adjusting polices, FAO Economic and social perspectives policy brief No 8.

FAO, (1997) women and food security. FAO focus

FAO,(1998). Geneder issue in land Tenure. Paper presented at the High level consultation on Rural women and information food and Agriculture organization of the United Nation FAO 4-6 October Rome

FDRE(2000) – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopian Family law of the federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia proclamation No.213/2000.Federal NegaritGazeta 1/1992, Addis Abab.

FDRE(2002) – Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Rural land Administration and use proclamation No. 456/2005. The Federal NegaritGazeta 11th year No44,Addis Ababa.

Gawaya, R, (20080 Investing in women farmers to eliminate food security in south Africa, Gender and developemt vol. 16. No 1

HaderaTesfaye, 92002). Women and land right in ethiopia eastern Africa sub-regional support intiative for the advancement of women.

Haile Gabriel, (2000) Theriring informal land markets and patterns of entitlement redistribution among peasant household, pp, 67-86.

Hana S. and Jontoft (1996).Human use of natural environment an overview of social and economic dimensions.

Hoben Allan, (1973) Land tenure among the Amhara of Ethiopia the dynamics of agnatic Desent, university of Chicago press, Chicago and London.

Meinzhen, Dick, Ruth s;Brown(Augest.1997). Gender, property ,rights and natural resource, world development Elsevien/ 25(8)1303 – 1315

MilhionTadesse and BeleyKassa, 2004 Factor influencing soil conservation measures in southern Ethiopia Journal of agricultural and rural development in the tropics and sub tropics volume 105,No,1:49 -62.

Mulat.et al (1998) agricultural market performance and determinants of fertilizer in Ethiopia working paper 10 grain market research project Addis Ababa.

OAU, (2003) organization of African Union, Human and people's Rights on the Rights of women in Africa African commission on human and people's Right protocol to the African charter. The 2nd ordinary session of the

S. wanmali, 1991 – land tenure and agricultural development on Eastern province. A study of small holder farmers in Eastern province washing ton DC.

SNNPR,(2007) SNNPR Rural land Administration and use proclamation No. 110/2007. SNNPR NegaritGazeta 13/10 Hawassa.

Tesfaye and Beshah,(2002) – Understanding Farmers Explaining soil and water conservation in kono,Wolita and Wollo, Ethiopian. Wageningen university and research center.

UDHR(2007) Universal declaration of human Rights General Assembly resolution 217 A(III) Retrieved Peb 10, 2007

UN/DESA/DAW(1995) United Nation Devision for the advisement of women department of Economic and social Affirms; Fourth World confirance on women Bejing 1995-retribed on Jan10, 2007 from http://www.UN.org

World Bank(2007). Ethiopia Accelerating Equitable growth country Economic memorandum part Thematic chapters, poverty. Reduction and Economic management unit. Report No. 3866[2].