Journal of Resources Development and Management
ISSN 2422-8397 An International Peer-reviewed Journal
Vol.85, 2022

Assessment of Good Governance Principles Implementation in Urban Land Administration: The Case of Bishoftu Town

Ashenafi Bekele Mulatu
College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Department of Development and Environmental Management Studies, University of Gondar, Ethiopia

Abstract
The main objective of the study is to assess implementation of good governance principles in Urban land administration of bishoftu town, to select sample respondents from the total population researcher was use both probability and non probability sampling techniques. The instruments used to collect data from participants for this study were; Questionnaire, Interview and Focused group discussion. Five selected principles of good governance were taken as variables of good governance. Cross sectional research design is applied in this study. To achieve the study objectives, Descriptive and inferential statistical analyses were also carried out. The findings of the study revealed that the existing land administration practice in Bishoftu town can be characterized as it is not participatory as it is expected to be by its citizens. It shows a tendency of biasedness by sex, social group, and land ownership status differences of the general public, in none of all the five indicator parameters of good governance was the existing land administration practice perceived as good or very good by any of the social, economic, demographic groups considered in the study. Even the town's Land development and management office employees characterized it as "satisfactory". "Participation" and "Fairness and Equity" are the most problematic points on which the land administration practice of Bishoftu town is found to be ineffective and inadequately implementing good governance principles to the expectation level of the citizens.
Keywords: Good governance, urban land administration
DOI: 10.7176/JRDM/85-01
Publication date: May 31st 2022

1.1. Back ground of the study

Governance refers to the approach in which power is implemented by governments in managing a country's social, economic, and environmental recourses, in other words it is the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented (Stig, 2009) Good governance in land administration is not a new idea, and essential for both developed and developing countries in many nations, land is a reason for social, ethnic, cultural and religious conflict for many years significant numbers of wars and revolutions have been occurred rights to land, throughout history, virtually all human developments have committed considerable efforts to defining rights to land and in establishing organizations to administer these rights, land administration strategy (Keith , 2007).

Good governance within land administration and land management institutions is necessary for sustainable development both in terms of operational durability, equitable stakeholder involvement and benefits, and consistency in law and policy implementation (Tony and Kate, 2008). land in towns is a major element in urban development, especially while going with land use ,urban planning, taxation and protection basic rights while; insecurity of land tenure is a main bottleneck for urban growth and strictly harsh the source of revenue of poor urban residents (Tukstra , 2012).

United Nations (UN) Feb 2008 defines land administration as "The process of determining, recording and disseminating information about ownership, value and use of land, when implementing land policies." In history, land issues have been an essential factor in Ethiopia's political and economic improvement for example the pre 1974 imperial regime supported a feudal agrarian organization, with major inequities based on ethnic identity and social class exploitation of the landless peasant tenants supported the nobility, government bureaucracy, military, and church (Ayeno, 2009). However, there were regional differences in the level of inequality in general; the population in Amhara and Tigray with their communal or kinship land regimes had comparatively more egalitarian access to land in, than the population in the South; even within these systems, there were significant inequities (Asmelash, 2006)

Land is a very essential resource and a driver of economic growth in Ethiopia but the way it managed and administrated has its own implication on a countries economy ,experts have belief that land is not set to good use in Ethiopia in addition; the country is plagued with corruption that torrent all sectors, including land administration and it is familiar with corruption as well as state detain; there are a number of factors in Ethiopia's present land administration system that can generate possible entry points for corrupt activities occurrence, from this some reasons are: lack of clear policies, weak institutions, lack of transparency, and limited society involvement, and lack of capacity building (Linder, 2014).

The government of Ethiopia designed national programs, policies, and strategies to strengthen and sustain

the country's implementation capacity, which is a key to build on the continuous democratization process; however, the economy has been faced with implementation capacity challenges, in line with the development strategies therefore, the implementation of public Service improvement plan and good governance packages were further enhanced ensuring efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and accountability at all level (MoFED, 2014)

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Good governance at stage of public level depends on state organs and public service organizations to enhance stakeholder's participatin, it also depends on a consistent, transparent, and accountable public administration that guarantees the fairness and effectiveness of decisions and their implementation, the treat to almost all problems that we face in the society such as corruption, inefficiency, and carelessness is to fully adopt and implement the principles of good governance (Fikret, 2015). According to Diana and valukoyte (2012) good governance principle implementation faces lack of a clear strategic visualization, prevailing manifestation of governance conservatism that do not motivate initiatives and challenges in local self government.

In Ethiopia, urban areas are characterize by a variety of land related qualifications with indistinguishable legal standing and high levels of lack of formality with little prospect for formalization unlike the large scale rural program because of the accelerating rapidity of urban migration and population growth, the government takes corrective action through cadastral mapping and regularization ;the regularization process include an assessment of the potential to incorporated different land related documents to set up land use records (World Bank, 2010)

According to Takele (2014) land administration in the Ethiopia city lacks transparency, accountability, equity, efficiency and effectiveness, governance in the city is weak which leads to an abuse land delivery system. According to Ashenafi (2015), urban land administrators and municipality's lacked skilled human resources to attend to land administration, and irregularity on interpreting enacted legislations due to the absence of definite work procedure, capacity building training and proper planning. The previous studies mainly focused on practice, customer's satisfaction and prevalence of good governance. Therefore; to fill the gaps of previous study this research intends to assess the implementation of good governance principle in urban land administration of bishoftu town.

1.3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.3.1. GENERAL OBJECTIVE

The general objective of the study is to assess the implementation of good governance principles in urban land administration of Bishoftu Town.

1.3.2. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The specific objectives of the study include to

1. Examine the activities of residents in implementation of good governace principles of the town land administration
2. Assess the perception of both service users and service providers on the implementation of good governance principles in land administration of bishoftu town.
3. Identify challenges on the implementation of good governance principles in land administration of bishoftu town.
4. Assess overall service delivery in bishoftu town land administration on the implementation of good governance principles.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study has a vital importance by provide valuable information on the implementation of good governance in land administration system of bishoftu town municipality it is paper based relevance to policy makers, and to concerned bodies, it will be suggesting recommendations to the improvement of land administration.

3. Methods

3.1 Research Design

In this study, the researcher used cross sectional research design based on the ground that helps to explain the current status of good governance implementation in land administration of the study area. In addition, cross sectional research design method has an advantageous to collect details of data from many respondents in a short period of time, it helps to investigate what the reality or what actually exist within a situation such as current practices, progresses and situations of different aspects.

3.2 Research Approach

The study employed mixed research approach which aimed to produce both qualitative and quantitative data.

The quantitative approach like mean standard deviation and percentage were employed to get relevant data from selected respondents regarding the implementation, and challenges of good governance implementation in the study area by using questionnaires. The qualitative approach is useful to understand the perception of respondents about good governance implementation in land administration by using Interview, and Focus Group Discussion (FGD).

3.3 Sampling Techniques and Sampling Size

In this study; to select sample respondents from the total households, the researcher used both probability and non probability sampling techniques. According to 2015/16 plan and Information Office of Bishoftu Town municipality, the total households of a town are 33,568. Bishoftu has fourteen kebeles from this Five kebeles are rural urban kebele of the town. Whereas only 9 kebeles are urban kebeles in a new reform of the town. The researcher selected kebele 2, 5 and 9 by Simple random selection. Totally, there are 3742 households are there in this three selected kebeles. The simple random sampling technique was employed to select the representative of the target population, with 95% confidence level and 5% precision level was used to determine sampling size.

It is calculated by using Yamane formula (1967) sited in masuku (2014)

$n=N/1+N\,(e)^2$

Where: n- is desired sample size

N- Target population of the study

e- Margin of error.

$n=3742/1+3742\,(0.05)^2 = 361$ of the sample size.

Out of 33,568 total households, the researcher selected 3742 households for this study as a sample frame. The proportional of the total sample households were selected randomly on the basis of their number of household within each kebeles. So, total samples as household were 361. Bishoftu town municipality has 147 employees however, department of land administration has 60 employees. From those, the researcher selected 3 higher officials for interview as key informant purposively based on assuming that they know well about the problem. In addition to this, 29 employees were selected by simple Random selection and given questionnaire for them. Totally, 32 simple sizes were selected from land administration institution based on the objectives that are selected to be considered however only 25 questionare returned and analysed.

Table 3.1: Summarize of samples distribution of household of the study area.

Name of kebele	Total household number	Sample size	Percentage (%)	Sampling techniques
kebele 02	1247	120	33	Simple random
kebele 05	1059	102	28	Simple random
kebele 09	1436	139	39	Simple random
Total	3742	361	100	Simple random

Source: the researcher exploitation from city administration (2017)

3.4 Methods of data Collection

Both primary and secondary sources of data were used in this study. Primary data were gathered through, household questionnaire survey, (which were includes close and same open ended questions), focused group discussion and key informant interview. Interviews were conducted with higher land administration officials. Moreover, for issues that require more clarification and exploration of the group, experiences and debates on the topic under the study one Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) which consist 9 members 3 people from each kebele was conducted in this study. Each of them was selected purposively from each kebeles.

Secondary data were obtained from text books, press release, periodicals, journals, newsletters, annual reports, and seminar papers, unpublished materials of relevance to the study, report documents, internet sources, and documents of the municipalities.

3.5 Data Collection Instrument

In conducting this study, the researcher used three data gathering tools. These are questionnaires for beneficiaries and the staff of land development and management and interview guides for leaders of the institution, interviews and FGD for the data collection method of this study consist of two parts. Part one is concerned with the demographic information of respondents including gender, age, educational background, marital status and land occupation. The second part contains questions related with good governance which contains principles or dimensions with their indicators that extracted and adopted from Land Governance Assessment Frameworks. Likert scale was employed for this study in the data collection instrument. Therefore, in this study respondents have been asked to rate each item on a Likert five point scales by assigning a value: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5= strongly agree. In addition to this, there were some close ended questionnaires that interpreted by narration in qualitative parts. Data were collected for about 5 weeks in

February and March of 2017.

3.7. Methods 0f Data Analysis and Presentation

In order to meet the general and specific objectives of the study, both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis were employed. The data collected from primary sources using a variety of methods and techniques were used to be organized, coded, condensed, and analyzed into sub sections based on their similarities. Information that collected through interviews, questionnaire and FGDs were checked and edited to detect errors and omissions.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1. Description on Groups of Participants of the Sociodemographic Characterstics of Respondents

In this study, there are two groups of Participants, namely, residents of Bishoftu town and employees of the town's Land Development and Management Office. They were involved in the study as depicted on table 4.1 below based on the sampling procedure described in the previous chapters. The 390 mixed-type of questionnaires were distributed to selected residents and employees of professional experts of Bishoftu land development and management office. However, only 97% questionnaires were returned and analyzed. Accordingly, based on the descriptive statistical analysis that was made on the response and collected from groups, a total of 378 (97%) respondents, 353 (93.4%) from the residents, and 25 (6.6%) from the employees groups were practically participated in the study from each group respectively.

Table 4.1: Frequency and Percentage of the Two Groups of the Participants Involved in the Study (1=Resident, 2= Employee)

	Group	Frequency	%
Valid	Residents	353	93.4
	Employees	25	6.6
	Total	**378**	**100.0**

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

Table 4.2: Discussion and presentation on demographic data nalysis on the residents group of participants

Number and percentage of residents participants by various demographic variables

Demographic Variable	**Value Label**	**N**	**%**
Sex of respondents	Male	308	87
	Female	45	13
Age of respondents	20-30	47	13
	31-40	120	34
	41-50	87	25
	51-60	63	18
	>60	36	10
Marutal status	Married	302	86
	Divorced	15	4
	Windowed	36	10
Educationalstatus	Illitrate	9	3
	Grade1-8	140	40
	Grade9-12	84	24
	Dipiloma	62	17
	Frist dgree	54	15
	Mastarate dgree	4	1
Land Owener ship	Private	287	81
	Rented (kebele house)	63	18
	Have no land	3	1

Source: Own survey result (March, 2017)

As it is depicted on the above table 4.2, the resident participants of the study were characterized by five types of demographic variables, namely: sex, educational level, marital status, age, and land ownership status. Therefore, out of the overall 353 resident-participants involved in the study, 45 (13%) of them were female, and the remaining 308 (87%) were male. In terms of age, 36 (10%) were with more than 60 years of age, 63 (18%) within the range of 51-60 years of age, 87 (25%) within 41-50, 120 (34%) within 31-40, and 47 (13%) individuals within a range of 20-30 years of age had been involved in the study. Regarding to marital status variable 15 (4%) divorces, 36 (10%) widowed, and 302 (86%) were married participants. In terms of Educational Status, out of 353 total numbers of participants, 9 (3%) were illiterate, 140 (40%) completed 1-8 grade levels, 84

(24%) completed 9-12 grades, 62 (17%) diploma holders, 54 (15%) first degree holders, and the remaining 4 (1%) second degree holders. In terms of land/House Owners ship, 187 (81%) have private land and 63 (18%) are living in kebele house, the rest 3 (1%) have neither their own land nor kebele house they lived in house rent from private owners.

Table 4.3: Discussion and presentation on demographic data analysis on the employee group of participants

Number and percentage of employee participants by various demographic variables			
Demographic Variable	**Value Label**	**N**	**%**
Age categories of Employee respondents	20-25	5	20
	26-30	8	32
	31-35	4	16
	36-40	4	16
	>41	4	16
Educational qualification of Employee catagories	1-12	1	4
	Diploma	5	20
	Degree	16	64
	Masters	3	12
Marital Status of employee	Married	19	76
	Unmarried	6	24
Work Experience of Employee	<1 Year	6	24
	1-5 Year	13	52
	6-10 Year	4	16
	>10 Year	2	8
Sex of Employee respondents	Male	19	76
	Female	6	24
Land (House) Ownership status of the Participants	Have Private Land (House)	16	64
	Rented from Kebele/Government)	6	24
	Rented from Private House Owners	3	12

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

Table 4.3 shows that, the total number of employees represented in the study from the Land Development and Management office of Bishoftu town were 25. The number and percentage of this group of participants that grouped in terms of six types of demographic variables, namely: sex, educational level, work experience, marital status, land Ownership and age. Accordingly, out of the total employee-participants that involved in the study, 6 (24%) of them were females, and the remaining 19 (76%) were males. In terms of age, 5 (20%) were with 20-25 years of age, 8 (32%) with 26-30 years of age, and the remaining 12 employees, 4(16%) in each of the age rages: 31-35, 36-40, and >41. The other grouping variable applied was marital status. Based on this variable, 19 (76%) were married and the remaining 6 (24%) were unmarried. Academically, out of the 25 total number of participants 1 individual (4%) was below 12 grade, 5 (20%) with diploma, 16 (64%) with first degree, and 3 (12%) of them were with second degree. Other variable was the employee work experience. Accordingly, 6 (24%) employees have <1 year work expriace, 13 (52%) were 1-5 year, 4 (16%) were 6-10 year, and 2 (8%) employee were >10 year work experience. In terms of land Owner status, 16 (64%) have private land, 6 (24%) lived in kebele house and the rest 3 (12%) were living in private rent house.

4.2: Separate Analysis and Interpretation on the Response of the Resident Groups Only.

Table 4.4: Frequency Percentage Mean and Standard deviation of responses of residents on the five indicator variables of good governance

Response	Participation		Transparency		Accountability and Responsibility		Equity and Fairness		Efficiency and Effectiveness	
	Mean	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Men**	**S.D**
	2.35	.734	2.35	.744	2.63	.686	2.36	.810	2.42	.719
	Freq.	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq**	**%**
Strongly disagree	30	8.5	28	7.9	5	1.4	33	9.3	20	5.7
Disagree	195	55.2	199	56.4	154	43.6	200	56.7	191	54.1
Neutral	105	29.7	101	28.6	161	45.6	84	23.8	120	34.0
Agree	22	6.2	23	6.5	31	8.8	33	9.3	19	5.4
Strongly Agree	1	.3	2	.6	2	.6	3	.8	3	.8
Total	**353**	**100.0**	**353**	**100.0**	**353**	**100.0**	**353**	**100.0**	**353**	**100.0**

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

The above table 4.4 summarizes frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation of the overall perceived responses of the resident groups of participants in the study, on the five indicators of good governance, namely: participation, transparency, accountability and responsibility, equity and fairness, and effectiveness and efficiency. Accordingly, as compared to the total number of this group of participants (353), the majority (more than half) of the participants responded on four of good governance principles, except the "accountability and responsibility" parameter, that they strongly disagree and disagree on the positively written statements under these five major indicator independent variables of good governance mentioned above. In specific terms, a total of 225 (63.7%) respondents strongly disagree and disagree on that the existing land administration scheme in Bishoftu is generally participatory.

On the other hand, 30 (8.5%) strongly disagree, and 195 (55.2%) disagree.

Similarly, 227 (64.3%) strongly disagree and disagree on that the existing land administration scheme of Bishoftu town is generally transparent. From those 28 (7.9%) Strongly disagree and 199 (56.4) disagree. The finding obtained from open ended questionnaires for residents implies that; the ways of service provision of Bishoftu town land administration is very complicated and have no transparency and fairness.

Besides, the mean and standard deviation results displayed in the above table 4.4 prove the interpretation made above. The mean and standard deviation figures representing the response of the resident group of participants on each indicator variables of good governance, namely: participation (M=2.35, S.D=0.734), transparency (M= 2.35, S.D=0.744), equity and fairness (M= 2.36, S.D=0.810) and effectiveness and efficiency (M= 2.42, S.D=0.719), generally mean can taken as in which existed between "disagree" and "neutral". Except the accountability and responsibility variable with (M= 2.63, S.D=0.686) in which is nearer to "Neutral" in which is different fro other variables. However, to check what causes these lower levels of mean responses on the five indicators of good governance and assurance whether, these responses are true to the overall population or not, inferential statistical analysis procedures were followed using five grouping independent variables, namely: sex, age, educational status, marital status and land ownership status.

With this premise, multivariate and correlation statistical analyses were made within and between the above two groups of variables: five demographic independent and five good governance indicator dependent variables using SPSS (version 20) statistical software as shown on the following consecutive tables.

4.3. Comparisons among Responses on the Five Indicators of Good Governance Based On Grouping Demographic Variables.

Table 4.5: Comparisons among responses on the five indicators of good governance based on grouping demographic variables of residents groups

Grouping Variable	Sub group	Measure	Indicator					
			Participation	Transparency	Accountability and Responsibility	Equity and Fairness	Effective-ness and Efficiency	Overall Perception on the Implementation of Good Governance
Sex	male	**Mean**	2.40	2.35	2.64	2.40	2.42	**2.4422**
		N	308	308	308	308	308	308
		Std. Deviation	.722	.749	.697	.827	.715	.54160
	female	**Mean**	1.98	2.38	2.62	2.04	2.38	**2.2800**
		N	45	45	45	45	45	45
		Std. Deviation	.723	.716	.614	.601	.747	.42082
	Total	**Mean**	2.35	2.35	2.63	2.36	2.42	**2.4215**
		N	353	353	353	353	353	353
		Std. Deviation	.734	.744	.686	.810	.719	.53000
Land (House) Ownership Status	private	**Mean**	2.44	2.38	2.63	2.39	2.44	**2.4556**
		N	284	284	284	284	284	284
		Std. Deviation	.747	.754	.683	.814	.703	.53737
	Rent from kebele	**Mean**	1.95	2.28	2.66	2.26	2.34	**2.2985**
		N	65	65	65	65	65	65
		Std. Deviation	.543	.673	.691	.776	.776	.47713
	Rent from Private Owners	**Mean**	2.00	2.00	2.25	1.50	2.25	**2.0000**
		N	4	4	4	4	4	4
		Std. Deviation	.000	1.155	.957	.577	.957	.43205
	Total	**Mean**	2.35	2.35	2.63	2.36	2.42	**2.4215**
		N	353	353	353	353	353	353
		Std. Deviation	.734	.744	.686	.810	.719	.53000

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

Comparisons among Responses on the Five Indicators of Good Governance based on Grouping Demographic Variables Showing Significant Differences (Sex and Land (House) Ownership Status of the Participants)

Based on the mean and standard deviation comparisons made between sex groups (male, and female), and among participants with varying land (house) ownership status (1. participants having private house, 2. participants renting from kebele, and 3. Those renting from private owners), close examination on the above response analysis result on table 4.5, tells two important trends that are worth analyzing further:

1. In relative terms, female resident participants exhibited lower mean response than males on the overall land administration practice as well as on each of the five measuring indicator variables used to check their perception on the level of various aspects signaling the prevalence of good governance characterizing the land

administration practice in Bishoftu town. This implies that females are less satisfied with the existing land management practice in Bishoftu than men as it is observed from their responses on almost all indicator variables except the "Transparency" variable.

2.The mean response of resident participants having no private house (rented from kebele or rented in private owners) based on almost all parameters except on the "Efficiency and Effectiveness" variable reported to have lower satisfaction with the existing land management practice in Bishoftu than private house (land) owners in terms of both the overall land administration practice, as well as on each of the five measuring indicator variables used to check their perceived opinion characterizing the land administration practice in Bishoftu town in terms of good governance measuring indicators.

However, to check whether or not these perception differences exhibited due to "sex" and "land ownership status" demographic variables are true to the general population of the study, significance test had to be carried out.

Hence, the next multivariate inferential statistical analysis was made to check the significance and practicality (effect size) levels of the preceding descriptive analysis result displayed between these two demographic variables and the independent good governance indicator variables.

4.4: Multivariate Analysis Result of Overall Perception of the Respondents on the Prevalence of Good Governance

Table 4.6: Multivariate analysis result of overall Perception of the respondents on the Impelementation of good governance in the land administration system of Bishoftu town

	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Sex	Participation	2.355	1	2.355	4.747	**.030**	.014
	Transparency	.084	1	.084	.151	.698	.000
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	.193	1	.193	.371	.543	.001
	Equity and Fairness	6.331	1	6.331	9.913	**.002**	.028
	Accountability and Responsibility	.403	1	.403	.851	.357	.002
Land Ownership status	Participation	4.992	2	2.496	5.031	**.007**	.028
	Transparency	.851	2	.425	.762	.467	.004
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	.871	2	.435	.835	.435	.005
	Equity and Fairness	4.278	2	2.139	3.349	**.036**	.019
	Accountability and Responsibility	.795	2	.398	.839	.433	.005
Sex	Overall Perception on the Imlementation of Good Governance	1.106	1	1.106	4.012	**.046**	.011
Land Ownership status		1.490	2	.745	2.701	.069	.015

Source: Own Survey (March, 20170)

From the above presentation of multivariate statistical analysis result on table 4.6,one can see that "sex" as a source (independent) variable showed significant, P< 0.05 value on : " participation" (F=4.747 , P= .030), "Equity and Fairness" (F=9.913 , P=.002), and " Overall Perception on the Prevalence of Good Governance" (F=4.012, P=0.046) independent variables. Moreover, the effect size (Eta Squared) level of "sex" on these dependent variables, as shown on the table, is computed as: 0.014 (for participation), 0.028 (for Equity and Fairness), and 0.011(for Overall Perception on the Prevalence of Good Governance). Hence, from these significance test results, it can be concluded that the response of differences exhibited between the two sex groups in the resident group of participants is true, the general population only on these specific dependent variables.

However, based on the corresponding effect size (d- values) for each dependent variable computed from sex as a source, the practicality level of the difference on all the three dependent variables can be interpreted as with low effect based on the following Cohen's effect size interpretation rule of thumb. On the other hand, it should be noted that among the total of 353 resident participants involved in the study, the number of females (N=45 or 13%) respondents as compared to the number of males (N=308 or 87%) does not represent the real female to male ratio as indicated in the current population census results both at the national and global levels, which is estimated to be nearly 51% female and 49% male composition. Hence, the effect size score should not be taken for granted to consider the response difference as a source of sex to be practically insignificant.

According to Cohen (1988) the most widely accepted rule of thumb for interpreting effect size: Effect sizes of d < 0.20 are interpreted as insignificant; values of d between 0.20 and 0.50 are interpreted as small

effects; values of d between 0.50 and 0.80 are interpreted as medium effects; and values of d larger than 0.80 are interpreted as large effects.

Similarly, the difference on land (house) ownership status amongst the resident participants as an independent source variable showed significant level of response difference: on the participation" with (F= 5.031, P=.007), and "Equity and Fairness" (F= 3.349, P= .036) good governance indicator independent variables. Thus, the status of residents in terms of land (house) ownership as an independent grouping variable for the whole population of Bishoftu can be taken as true segment of the population on which the land management practice of the town has to give due emphasis to insure fair, equitable and participatory manifestations of good governance on its land management system.

4.5. Separate Analysis and Interpretation on the Response of the Employee Group of Participants Only

Table 4.7: Frequency, percentage, Mean and Standard Deviation of responses of employee on the five indicator variables of good governance discussed as following.

Response	Participation		Transparency		Accountability and Responsibility		Equity and Fairness		Efficiency and Effectivness	
	Mean	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**	**Mean**	**S.D**
	2.92	.812	2.68	1.069	2.80	.707	2.64	.810	2.68	.802
	Freq.	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**	**Freq.**	**%**
Strongly disagree	-	-	2	8	-	-	1	4	1	4
Disagree	9	36	11	44	9	36	11	44	10	40
Neutral	9	36	7	28	12	48	9	36	10	40
Agree	7	28	3	12	4	16	4	16	4	16
Strongly Disagree	-	-	2	8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	**25**	**100**	**25**	**100**	**25**	**100**	**25**	**100**	**25**	**100**

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

The above table 4.7 summarizes frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation of the overall perceived responses of the Employee groups of participants in the study, on the five indicators of good governance, namely: participation, transparency, accountability and responsibility, equity and fairness, and effectiveness and efficiency. Accordingly, as compared to the total number of this group of participants (25), (Less than half) of the participants responded on four of the variables, except the "Transparency" parameter, that 13 (52%) the strongly disagree and disagree on the positively written statements under these five major indicator dependent variables of good governance mentioned above. In specific terms, a total of 9 (36%) respondents "disagree" and" Neutral" that on the existing land administration scheme in Bishoftu is participatory.

The result from the interview with land higher officials also indicates that, there is less Residents "participation" on the updating plans and policies formulation of land administration.Similarly 9 (36%) of the respondents disagree and 12 (48) are "Neutral" on positively written statenmet that there is accountablty and responsibility in bishoftu town land administration system.According to the interview with land administration, key informant they were believed that there was not well organized super-vision in their institution. Moreover, less than half 12 (48%) of them strongly disagree and disagree that the existing land administration scheme in the town is characterized by equity and fairness. Generally, still less than half of the resident group of participants- 11 (44%) responded that they strongly disagree and disagree that the existing land administration system is efficient and effective.

The result obtained from open ended questionnaire from employee side participants; In this view, limitations are mainly associated to land related policy, decision making, problem of recognize key roles, rule, regulation and procedure are lacked public participation. In a general, the key informant of land officials blame society for their unwilling to actively participated in their institutions rule, regulation and procedure progress. They agreed on that society come to their institution only to take service.

The mean and standard deviation figures representing the response of the employee group of participants on each indicator variables of good governance, namely: participation (m=2.92, s.d=0.812), more and more nearer tp "neutral" response while accountability and responsibility variable with (m= 2.63, s.d=0.686).Equity and fairness (m= 2.64, SD=0.810), almost the same response wich lays between disagree and neutral response but more nearer to "neutral" and effectiveness and efficiency (m=2.86, s.d= 0.802), again transparency (m= 2.68, SD=0.810) are also lays between disagree and neutral wich is nearer to neutral again. a response of employees are generally taken as ranging between disagree and Neutral but nearer to "Neutral" when compared to residents response. Employee mean result is greater than mean of residents.

According to interview with land official key informant the office has formerly put a clear and open service

delivery standard concerning each activity for each responsibility. However; most of the key informant believed that there is still a problem on implementation the rule and regulation of land administration. The major challenges raised by most of the key respondents during interview were; include: illegal construction, low commitment of investors in construction at a given time or using the land taken for other purpose, lack of employee's commitment in their job are among the major challenges faced in their institution.

Table 4.8: Presentation on the significance level of responses on the five indicators of good governance based on grouping demographic variables of responses by Employees

Variables			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Efficiency and Effectiveness * Land (House) Ownership of the Participant	Between Groups	(Combined)	3.690	2	1.845	3.454	**.050**
	Within Groups		11.750	22	.534		
	Total		15.440	24			
Trancparency * Land (House) Ownership of the Participant	Between Groups	(Combined)	.048	2	.024	.038	.864
	Within Groups		11.464	22	.486		
	Total		11.944	24			
Accountability and Responsibility* Land (House) Ownership of the Participant	Between Groups	(Combined)	.063	2	.031	.058	.944
	Within Groups		11.938	22	.543		
	Total		12.000	24			
Equity and Fairness * Land (House) Ownership of the Participant	Between Groups	(Combined)	4.823	2	2.411	4.850	**.018**
	Within Groups		10.938	22	.497		
	Total		15.760	24			
Participation * Land (House) Ownership of the Participant	Between Groups	(Combined)	.236	2	.118	.166	.848
	Within Groups		15.604	22	.709		
	Total		15.840	24			
overall good governance characteristics * Land (House) Ownership of the Participant	Between Groups	(Combined)	.623	2	.311	.574	.572
	Within Groups		11.937	22	.543		
	Total		12.560	24			

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

Besides, even though six demographic variables, namely: sex, work experience, age, marital status land ownership status and educational status, as indicated on table 4.8, were considered to analyze differences of responses by employees on the five indicator variables of good governance and the overall practice land management in Bishoftu town, only the difference in terms of land ownership status of the employee respondents is found to exhibit significant difference on two of the five good governance indicator variables as indicated on table 4.8

These indicator variables include: "Efficiency and Effectiveness" with (F=3.454, P=0.050), and "Equity and Fairness" with (F= 4.850, P= 0.018).

4.6. Combined (Both Residents and Employees) Response Analysis Result Presentation and Interpretation

Here analysis focused on both residents and employee response is analysis and interpreted as follows.

Table 4.9: Mean and Standard Deviation of responses by both residents and employees on the five indicator variables of good governance

Variable	Mean	S.D	N
Participation	2.38	.752	378
Transparency	2.38	.772	378
Accountability and Responsibility	2.65	.688	378
Equity and Fairness	2.38	.812	378
Effectiveness and Efficiency	2.43	.726	378
Overall Implementation of Good Governance	2.44	.550	378

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

The mean and standard deviation of responses by the overall group of participants (both residents and employees) on the majority of good governance indicator variables, can be traced from the above table 4.9, can be interpreted as ranging from between "disagree" and "Neutraal" except the "accountability and responsibility"

variable which can be interpreted with higher mean when compared to other variables with (Mean 2.65 and SD 0.688).

The rest" participation","taransparency",and "equity and fairness" have the same mean value with (Mean 2.38 and SD 0.752) in wich is nearer to disagree response . However, to check whether or not these low levels of mean and standard deviation results are true to the overall population that this study is representing and measuring the strength of association multivariate and correlation analyses procedure had to be followed as indicated on tables 4.10 and 4.11 of the below.

Table 4.10: Multivariate analysis on Significance Levels Group, Sex, and Land Ownership Status Variation of the General Group versus Response Variations on Indicator Variables of Good Governance

Source	Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Group of Participant	Participation	11.454	1	11.454	22.569	**.000**	.057
	Transparency	2.688	1	2.688	4.550	**.034**	.012
	Accountability and Responsibility	.660	1	.660	1.389	.239	.004
	Equity and Fairness	3.326	1	3.326	5.225	**.023**	.014
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	2.155	1	2.155	4.128	**.043**	.011
	Overall Implementation of Good Governance	3.551	1	3.551	12.23	**.001**	.032
Sex	Participation	4.914	1	4.914	9.683	**.002**	.025
	Transparency	.439	1	.439	.743	.389	.002
	Accountability and Responsibility	.013	1	.013	.026	.871	.000
	Equity and Fairness	3.240	1	3.240	5.090	**.025**	.013
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	.001	1	.001	.002	.966	.000
	Overall Implementation of Good Governance	.418	1	.418	1.438	.231	.004
Land (house) Ownership Status	Participation	9.983	1	9.983	19.671	**.000**	.050
	Transparency	.897	1	.897	1.519	.218	.004
	Accountability and Responsibility	.050	1	.050	.106	.745	.000
	Equity and Fairness	4.944	1	4.944	7.768	**.006**	.020
	Effectiveness and Efficiency	2.004	1	2.004	3.840	.051	.010
	Overall Implementation of Good Governance	2.193	1	2.193	7.56	**.006**	.020

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

Based on the above overall combined multivariate statistical analysis computed amongst the three demographic characteristics of the participants, namely, group, Sex, and land ownership status as an independent grouping variables versus five indicator variables of good governance, group difference (1=resident, 2= Employee) showed significant difference in all perceived responses on good governance indicator variables except "Accountability and Responsibility variable"

Similarly, the mean response difference on "participation" and " Equity and Fairness" good governance indicator variables as a result of the sex variation exhibited significant level of difference on the response of the respondents on these two indicator dependent variables with P-value < 0.05, with (F=9.683, P=.002) (d=0.025), and (F=5.090, P=..025) (d=0.013) values respectively. However, the significant difference exhibited by the sex variable on the separate resident group's only analysis on the overall implementation of good governance principles is not proved to be significant at this combined group analysis level.

Moreover, the difference on the land ownership status of the respondents also showed significant difference on "participation", "equity and fairness", and "overall implementation of good governance principles" that were taken as dependent indicator variables as depicted on table 4.10 of the above.

Taking the corresponding significance and correlation coefficient figures that the "overall manifestation of good governance" and the five specific indicator variables in to consideration in the next table 4.11, they all can be interpreted as with high level of correlation and highest level of significance based on the following Evans's criteria of interpreting correlation that can even be true at 99% confidence level. This proves that the instrument used to evaluate the implementation of good governance principles in the land administration system of Bishoftu town can be taken as a good measuring framework.(Evans , 1996) criteria for interpreting correlation coefficients:

1.00- perfect correlation
0.80 to 0.99-very high correlation
0.60 to 0.79-high correlation
0.40 to 0.59- moderate correlation
0.20 to 0.39- low correlation
0.001 to 0.19- very low correlation.

Table 4.11: Correlation between differences on demographic characteristics on both groups and their response on indicator variables of good governance

Group of the Participant 1=Resident, 2= Employee	Pearson Correlation	1	.148**	.082	.190**	.105*	.060	.087	.090	.153**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.004	.112	.000	.041	.246	.092	.079	.003
Status of Land Tenure Owner ship: 1=Having Private land(house) 2=Rented from Kebele House 3=Rented from Private Owners	Pearson Correlation	.148**	1	.076	-.196**	-.044	-.007	-.134**	-.086	-.119*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004		.139	.000	.391	.888	.009	.094	.021
Sex 1= male, 2= female	Pearson Correlation	.082	.076	1	-.150**	.049	.012	-.116*	-.001	-.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.112	.139		.003	.346	.814	.024	.979	.270
Participation	Pearson Correlation	.190**	-.196**	-.150**	1	.482**	.274**	.311**	.267**	.639**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.003		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
Transparency	Pearson Correlation	.105*	-.044	.049	.482**	1	.491**	.422**	.442**	.779**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041	.391	.346	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
Accountability and Responsibility	Pearson Correlation	.060	-.007	.012	.274**	.491**	1	.419**	.394**	.703**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.246	.888	.814	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
Equity and Fairness	Pearson Correlation	.087	-.134**	-.116*	.311**	.422**	.419**	1	.519**	.748**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.092	.009	.024	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
Effectiveness and Efficiency	Pearson Correlation	.090	-.086	-.001	.267**	.442**	.394**	.519**	1	.709**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.079	.094	.979	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
Overall Implementat of Good Governance	Pearson Correlation	.153**	-.119*	-.057	.639**	.779**	.703**	.748**	.709**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.021	.270	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	378	378	378	378	378	378	378	378	378

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

A correlation coefficient is supportive means to review the relationship between two variables with a single number that falls between -1 and +1 (Kothari, 1990) A correlation analysis with Pearson´s correlation coefficient (r) was performed on all variables in this study to look at the relationship between good governance variables as indipendet variables and overall good governance manifestation as depenedt variables**.**

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for each relationship between; Groups of the Participant, Status of Land Tenure Owner ship, Sex of participants and variables with the overall good governance implementation.The Pearson correlation coefficient show that all the five good governance dimensions and significant demographic variables are significantly, Negetivily and positively correlate with overall good governance implementation, Transparency, equity and fearness , Efficiency and Effectiviness,(r=.779), (r=.748), and (r=.709) respectively; have the highest correlation with overall Good Governance Implementation. When the Status of land ownership (r= -.119) has the lowest correlation with overall manifestation of good governance.

5. Conclusion and Recomendation

This research tried to assess urban land administration system of bishoftu town from the perspective of good governance principles implementation. The existing land administration practice in Bishoftu town can be characterized as it is not participatory as it is expected to be by its citizens. It shows a tendency of biasedness by sex, social group, and land ownership status differences of the general public. In none of all the five indicator parameters of good governance, the existing land administration Implementation in Bishoftu town not perceived as good by any of the social, economic, demographic groups considered in the study. Even the town's Land Development and Management Office employees characterized it as "satisfactory."

"Participation" and "Fairness and Equity" are the most problematic points on which the land administration practice of Bishoftu town is found to be ineffective and insufficiently implementing good governance principles to the expectation level of the citizens. The instrument used to evaluate the implementation of good governance principles in the land administration system of Bishoftu town can be taken as a good measuring framework.

5.1 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher found it vital to put ways forward. Accordingly, the study has the following policy recommendations for interventions based on the findings.

In order to bring good governance and better land administration system in Bishoftu, the town's administration should focus on making its overall practices more participatory as it expected to be by its citizens without discriminating any of the social, economic and demographic group in it. Fair and equitable resource distribution has to be practiced in Bishoftu town's land administration system, so that good governance can be achieved.

REFERENCE

Abdellatif, A. M. (2003). 3 . Good Governance and Its Relationship to Democracy and Economic Development, (May), 1–27.

Abrham Daniel. (2014). *The Challenges and Opportunities of Goood Govrnance in Ghana,Addis Ababa University*. Addis Ababa Univeristy.

Adane Bekele. (2013). *The Chaleenges of good governance in africa :the case of Keniya*. Addis Ababa University.

AGGN, Re. and P. C. of the. (2010). *Addressing Good Governance In Africa A Discussion Paper*. *A Discussions paper*. AGGN Research and Puplication committee. Retrieved from WWW.aggn.org

Alemie, B. K., Zevenbergen, J., & Bennett, R. (2011). Assessing Land Governance in Ethiopian Cities (2002-2011): Lessons for the Implementation of the 2011 Urban Land Management Policy Assessing Land Governance in Ethiopian Cities (2002-2011): Lessons for the Implementation of the 2011 Urban Land Management Policy, (May 2015), 17–21.

Ambaye, D. W. (2012). Land Rights in Ethiopia : Ownership , equity , and liberty in land use rights Land Rights in Ethiopia : ownership , equity , and liberty in land use rights, (May), 6–10.

Aneley, A. (2006). Land adminstrationt decision Makers meetings (Windhoek,7-8 December 2006).

Anjum, R. S. C. and A. (2008). Final Draft - Demand for Good Governance Stocktaking Report, (August). Retrieved from pubrights@worldbank.org.

Arora, D. (2013). Good Governance : A Study of the Concept in Indian Context Origin of the Concept of Good Governance Meaning of Good Governance, *37*(1), 1–16.

Ashenafi Aimro. (2015). *The assessment on urban governance practice in land administration of Addis Ababa:the case of yeka sub-city*. Addis Ababa University.

Asmelash, W. (2006). *The effect of land reform on peasant social organization :the studay of villaage level dyanmics of centeral tigray,1974-1994-Antropology*. Addis ababa Unversity.

Ayeno, M. (2009). *Agrerian law and development in Ethiopia Submitted for LL.m dgree*. Harvard university,Cambridge,ma.

Bang, H., & Esmark, A. (2013). A systems theory of Good Governance, (Deleuze 1995), 1–35.

Blatter, J. (2012). Department of Political Science Forms of Political Governance : Theoretical Foundations and Ideal Types Forms of Political Governance : Theoretical Foundations and Ideal Types, *94*.

Bosselmann, Klaus, R. E. and P. T. (2008). *Governance for sustainability issues, challenges,successes. IUCN,Gland,Switzerland.xvi+260pp*. medienHaus Plump,53619 Rheinbreitbach,Germany. Retrieved from www.iucn.org/publications

Burlington. (2004). *Ethiopia Land Policy and Administration Assessment*.

C.R.Kothari. (1990). *Research Methodology*. new delli: New age international(P)limited publishers. Retrieved from www.newagepublishers.com

CarlosJuiz, Carlos Guerrero, I. L. (2014). Implementing good governance Principles for the Public Sector in information technology governance frame work, *2014*(January), 9–27.

Carothers, T., & Gramont, D. De. (2011). Aiding Governance in Progress Amid Uncertainties Aiding Governance in Developing Countries Progress Amid Uncertainties, (November), 1–35.
Chowdhury, N. C. E. S. (2005). *Draft working paper The Principle of Good Governance*.
CIPFA. (2007). Delivering good governance in local government, *48*(Framework), 2.
Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education*. (S. published in U. and Canada, Ed.) (2007th ed.). London and New york.
Consultancy, M. (2010). Guidelines for support to land policy design and land policy reform, (November).
Devas, N. (2004). *Urban Governance , Voice and Poverty in the Developing World*. London.sterling, VA: Earthscn Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/22882
Diana saparniene, I. V. (2012). *Implementation of Good Governance principle in local self- government : Case of siauliai city*. siauliai university.
Downer, A. (2000). *Governance Guiding principles Good governance : guiding principles for implimentation.*
Dr.Wael Zakout, Dr.Babette Wehrmann, D. mika-P. (2006). Good Governance in Land Administration Principles and Good Practices.
Dubois, H. F. W., Lapenta, A., Mucciarone, M. A., Neilson, J., Abu Bakar, N. B., Saleh, Z., … Mi. (2013). *What is the Policy Pr. Evaluation*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399713513140
Economic Comission for Africa. (2005). *Striving for good governance in Africa:Synopsisof the 205 african governance report prepared for the African Development ForumIV*.
Esayas, E. (2013). Urban Planning and land mangement challenges in Emerging towns of Ethiopia:The Case of Arba Minch, 340–348. https://doi.org/10.4090/juee.2013.v7n2.340348
Evans J.D.(1996). (1996). *Straightforward stastics for the behavioral sciences. pacific Grove,CA:books/cole publishing.*
FAO. (2007). *Good governance in land tenure and adminstration* (2008 and 2). rome,Italy.
Fikret Toksoz. (2015). *Good governance Improving quality of Life*. Retrieved from http://br.correct.go.th/eduweb/index.php/eduessay/50-general-essay/118-good-governance.html
Gebreal, W. (1997). Urban land information system the benfits and the strategies, 1–3.
George, M. (2007). *The Challenges and Constraints of Introducing Participatory Budgeting as a Tool for Resource Mobilization and Allocation and Realizing Good Governance in Africa*.
J., C. (1988). *Stastical power analysis for the behavioral Sciences*. (L. E. Associates., Ed.) (2nd editio). hillsadale: NJ.
J.M.Lusugga kironde. (2009). *Improving Land Sector Governance in Africa : The Case of Tanzania, papare for the workshops land Governance of the MDGs: Responding to New challenges washington march 9-10 2009*. washingtojn DC. https://doi.org/k
John Graham, Bruce Amos, T. P. (2003). *Principles for Good Governance in the 21st Century policy Brief No.15*. Retrieved from www.iog.ca/policy briefs.
Katsamunska, P. (2000). The Concept of Governance and Public Governance Theories, 133–141.
Kaufmann, D. (2006). *Governance Indicators : Where Are We , Where Should We Be Going ?*
Kaufmann, D., Recanatini, F., & Biletsky, S. (2002). *Assessing Governance The world Bank*. Retrieved from http//www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance
Keith Clifford .BELL, U. (2007). *Good Governance in Land Administration*. worldbank,East pacificregion 1818 h street. Retrieved from Good governance in Land Administration
King, M. (2014). *International frame work:good governance in the public Sector*.
Klaus. (2012). *The Land Governance Assessment Framework Identifiying and Monitoring Good practice in the land sector*. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from www.World Bank .0rg
Klaus Deininger, Harries Selod, A. B. (2012). *Identifiying and Monitoring Good Governance pratice in the Land Sector*.
Lantmateriverket(swedish national land servey). (2008). Lantmateriverket(sweedish national land servey Land administration – why, (February). Retrieved from Sida@sida.se,ww.sida.se
Linder, S. (2014). Ethiopia : Overview of corruption in land administration, (June).
Mabesa, M. J., & Whittal, J. (2013). Governance in Land Administration Systems : a comparative analysis of the former (LSPP) and current (LAA) land administration systems of Lesotho, 1–12. Retrieved from mmjeanett3@gmail.com, Jennifer.Whittal@uct.ac.za
Mackey, A., Gass, S. M., & Erlbaum, N. J. L. (2005). Second Language Research, Methodology and Design, *9*(3), 3–4.
Mansberger, R., Navratil, G., Muggenhuber, G., Twaroch, C., Good, I., & Landadministration, D. (2012). Is Good Governance in Land Administration Measurable and Comparable ?, *63*(1).
Mardiasmo, Diaswati and barnes, paul, H.and sakuri, Y. (2008). *Implementation of Good Governance by Regional Governments in Indonesia : The Challenges in Brown,Kerry A and Mandell, Myrna and furneaux.* Retrieved from d.mardiasmo@qut.edu.au

Masuku, M. B. (2014). Samling Techniques and determination of sample size in applied statistics Research: an overview, *II*(11), 1–22. Retrieved from http://ijecm.co.uk/

Melese, N. (2016). *Application of good governence principles for urban development and management in Addis Ababa city ADminstration:The practices and challenges in Yeka Sub -ciy*. Addis ababa university.

Meskerem Shifera. (2007). stutas of good governance at woreda/destrict level in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.

Mhrtay Adisalem. (2015). The Performance of Good Governance on Land Administration at Local / Woreda Level : The Case of Naeder Adet Woreda , Tigry Region, ethiopia, *3*(September), 376–385. https://doi.org/10.14662/IJPSD2015.046

MoFED. (2014). The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) Draft Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED), (September 2010).

Niclo Maldonaldo. (2010). The world Bank Evolving Good Governance and its impacton Human Rights.

O' Leary Zina. (2004). *The Essential Guide to doing research*. Londan: Oliver's Yard. https://doi.org/ISBN0761941983

Ogundiya, llufoye S. (2010). Democracy and good governance : Nigeria ' s dilemma, *4*(June), 201–208. Retrieved from African Journal of Political Science and International relations Vol.4(6),pp.2o1-208,June2010 Available online at http://www.Academic Journals

Prof.Stig Enemark. (2009). *Land Administration Systems-managing rights restrctions and Resposibilities in Land adminstration*. Aalborrg University,Denmark. Retrieved from enemark@land.aau.dk

Qian, L. (2014). *Evaluating land adminstration system from the perspective of good governance: a case study of informal settellement in Kahthmandu vally:Enschede, The Netherlands.*

Raiu, V. (2013). An Ontology of Good Governance . A Political Theory Approach.

Seth asiama, S. H. (2013). Tools to support transparenccy in land adminstration.

Shimelis Kassa Kebede. (2015). Democracy and Good Governance post 1991 in Ethiopia, *3*(April), 174–182. https://doi.org/10.14662/IJPSD2015.026

Takele Necha Sungena. (2014). Strengthening Good Governance in Urban Land Management in Ethiopia A Case-study of Hawassa, *4*(15), 96–108.

Tewodros abuhay M. (2015). Assessing the prevalence of good governance in public sectors in Gedeo Zone : Case of Yirga Cheffe town administration , Ethiopia, *3*(June), 5–6.

Thomas Cosmas Munzerere. (2013). *Towards good land governace in Tanzania;The Case Of Urban Mbeya*. Hague ,the Nethrlands.

Tony burns and Kate Dalrymple. (2008). *Conceptual Framework for Governance in Land Administration 1*. Stockholm,Sweden.

Tukstra, Jan, R. S. (2012). Sustaining Urban Land Information : a frame work based on experiences in post Conflict and Developing Countreis, *1-27*. Retrieved from ww.gltn.net

UGGPOE. (2006). Urban Good Governance Package of Ethiopia Summary of Principles and Sub-Programs. *Urban Development Policy of the FDRE*, 1–4.

UN-Habitat. (2004). Urban Governance Index Conceptual Foundation and Field Test Report. Nairobi Kenya.

Victor Endo. (2008). 13th Internetional anti corruption conference. In *governance in land administration peru case study*. Greece ,Athens.

Wagener, H. (2011). How does good governance come about? on evaluation of institutions, *4*(4).

Williamson, I., Enemark, S., Wallace, J., & Rajabifard, A. (2008). Understanding land administration. In *Land administration frame work* (pp. 1–11). Kuala lumpur,Malaysia. Retrieved from ianpw@unimelb.edu.au

www.iso.org/iso/home.html

Yirga, K. (2010). *Assessment of the Prevalence of Good Governance In The Public Sector : the Case of Public Institutions in Debre Statement of Declaration*. mekele university.

Z.Dornyei. (2007). Research in applied Linguistcs. In san francisco state U. Priyanvada Abeywickerama (Ed.) (p. 336). New York.

Zarfu Hailu. (2016). Using LGAF as an Input into ongoing and future law Revision :Lessons from Ethiopia.

Zimmermannn, W. (n.d.). Effective and Transparent Management of Public Land Experiences , Guiding Principles and Tools for Implementation. In I. International Seminar on State and Public Land Management in Verona (Ed.), *september,2008* (pp. 1–17).