

Mekelle University

College OF Law and Governance

Department of Civics and Ethical studies



**Assessment on practice of Good Governance in Land Administration at
Local Level; in Case of Raya Azebo Woreda, Tigray Region, Ethiopia**

MA Thesis

A Thesis Submitted to Department of Civics and Ethical
Studies of Mekelle University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for Degree of Masters of Arts in Civic and Ethics

BY: Abay Abera Abadi

Advisor: Gebru Gebrehiwet (Ass. professor)

August 2025 Mekelle, Ethiopia

Mekelle University
Collage of law and governance

Department of Civics and Ethical Studies



Master Program in Civics and Ethics

**Assessment on practice Good Governance in Land
Administration at local level; in Case of Raya Azebo Woreda,
Tigray Region, Ethiopia**

By: Abay Abera Abadi

Approved by;

Advisor

Signature

Date

Internal examiner

Signature

Date

External examiner

Signature

Date

Statement of Declaration

This is certified that this thesis entitled “Assessment on practice of Good Governance in Land Administration; in case of Raya Azebo Woreda, Tigray Region, Ethiopia” submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Art in Civic and Ethics, Mekelle University, through the department of Civics and Ethical Studies, done by Mr. Abay Abera Abadi ID/NO.CLG/019/2011 is an authentic work carried out by him under my guidance. The matter embodied in this project work has not been submitted earlier for award of any degree or diploma in the best of my knowledge and belief.

Name of the student Abay Abera Signature_____Date_____

Advisor_____ Signature_____Date_____

Acknowledgement

Above all and everything, thanks to God, the Almighty for all the blessing of my life. First of all, I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to my advisor Gebru Gebrehiwet (Assistance professor) who kindly provided me with a great deal of valuable feedback on nearly every aspect of this paper. His devotion for guidance and support helped me in all the time of research and writing of this thesis. Without his encouragement and support, this study would not reach the finish line.

I would like to present my deepest gratitude to woreda Raya Azebo land administration office that support, me free access to inquired data, encouraging me and show the way of doing how to get data.

I want say also thanks my brother Tsgabu Abera (BA), and my friends Matiyos Tesfaye (MA) and Tesfaye Hailu who has helped me for the completion of this work.

List of Acronyms and Initials (Abbreviations)

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AGGN	African Good Governance Network
AU	African Union
CISDL	Centre for International Sustainable Development
Law CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DESA	Department of Economic and Social
Affairs ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
EIO	Ethiopian Institution of the Ombudsman
EPRDF	Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organization
FDRE	Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
GPS	Global Position system
HF	House of Federation
HPR	House of people of Representative
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural
Development LGs	Local Governments
NDESA	Nations Department of Economic and Social
Affairs NGO	Non-Government Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperative and Development
RJGAR	Rwanda Joint Government Assessment Report
SSNPR	Southern Nations Nationalities and Peoples' Region
UN/DESA	United Nations Development of Economics and Social Affairs
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UN-GGIM	United Nations Committee of Experts on Global Geospatial Information Management
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Program me
USAID	United States Agency for International
Development WB	World Bank

Abstract

This study assessed the practice of good governance in land administration in Raya Azebo Woreda, focusing on tabiya War Guba and Kara. Using Yamane's formula, sample of 152 respondent's was selected from total population of 5371, and both quantitatively and qualitatively approaches were employed. Data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, and documents reviews, and analyzed using descriptive statistics and thematic interpretation.

The findings revealed major challenges in transparency, accountability, participation, and rule of law with in the land administration system. While some progress has been made, the majority of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the clarity of regulations, access to information, fairness in handling complaints, and community involvement in decision -making. The study concludes that land administration in Raya Azebo suffers from weak governance practices and recommends strengthening transparency, accountability and community participation, as well as enforcing rule of law to enhance trust and effective in land governance.

Key words

Accountability, Good governance, Governance, Kushet, Tabiya), Transparency and Woreda.

Table of Content

Content	Page
Acknowledgement.....	i
List of Acronyms and Initials (Abbreviations).....	ii
<i>Abstract</i>	iii
Table of Content.....	iv
Chapter one: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background of the study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the problem.....	3
1.3. Research questions.....	5
1.4 Objective of the study.....	5
1.4.1 General objective.....	5
1.4.2. Specific objectives.....	5
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	6
1.6. Scope and limitation of the study.....	6
1.6.1. Scope of the study.....	6
1.6.2.Limitation of the study.....	6
1.7. Organization of the thesis.....	7
Chapter two: Review of Related Literature.....	8
2.1. Basic concepts and Definition of Governance.....	8
2.1.1. Governance.....	8
2.1.2.Good Governance.....	9
2.2. General Overview of Good Governance in Africa.....	10
2.3. Key Principles of good governance.....	11
2.3.1.Accountability.....	12

2.3.2.Effectiveness and Efficiency.....	13
2.3.3.Rule of law.....	14
2.3.4.Control of corruption.....	14
2.3.5.Transparency.....	14

2.3.6.Participation.....	16
2.3.7.Responsiveness.....	16
2.3.8.Inclusiveness and fairness.....	16
2.3.9.Strategic vision.....	17
2.4. Actors of Good Governance.....	17
2.5. Land Administration.....	19
2.6. General Overview of Land Administration in Africa.....	22
2.7. Good governance and Land Administration.....	22
2.8. Good Land Governance Theory.....	23
2.9. Challenges of Good governance in Land Administration.....	26
2.10. Transparency in land administration at local level of government.....	30
2.11. Accountability in Land administration at local level of government.....	31
2.12.1 General Overview of Governance in Ethiopia.....	33
2.12.2.Ethiopia’s Governance Structure post 1991.....	33
2.12. General Overview of Land Governance in Ethiopia.....	35
2.13.Land Governance Structures and Institutional Capacity in Ethiopia (post 1991).....	37
Chapter Three: Methodology of the Study.....	39
3.1. Site selection of the study Area.....	39
3.2. Research strategy and design.....	39
3.3. Data type and Sources.....	40
3.4. Sampling Design, procedures and Frame.....	40
Table 3.1: Sampling frame.....	41
3.6. Data Collection Methods and Instruments.....	42
3.6.1.Questionnaires.....	43
3.6.2.Interview.....	43
3.6.3.Focus group discussion.....	43
3.7. Data processing and analysis.....	44

3.8. Validity, Reliability and Generalizability.....	44
3.9. Confidentiality and Professionalism: Ethical Issues.....	44
Chapter Four.....	45
4.Results and Discussion.....	45
4.2General Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.....	46
4.3Transparency in local land Administration.....	48
4.3.1Clarity of procedures and decisions in land administration.....	48
4.3.2Access of information to public in land Administration.....	50
4.3.3Transparency on distribution and compensation of land in land Administration.....	54
4.3.4The commitment of the office on land administration to ensuring transparency.....	57
4.3. Data recording system in the land Administration.....	59
4.4Accountability in local Land Administration.....	59
4.4.1Upward and Down ward accountability in land Administration.....	59
4.4.2. Capacity and responsibility in land administration.....	63
Chapter Five: Conclusion and Recommendation.....	68
5.1. Conclusion.....	68
5.2. Recommendations.....	70
References.....	74
Appendix A.....	83
Appendix B.....	87
Appendix C.....	88

List of Table

Table3. 1: Sampling frame.....	41
Table4. 1: Respondent's profile based on located area and sex	46
Table4. 2: Respondent's profile classified by Age, Sex and Educational level.....	47
Table4. 3: perception of respondents on clarity of procedures and decisions in land administration.....	48
Table4. 4: Perception of respondents on the accessibility of information to service users.....	50
Table4. 5: perception of respondents on the level availability and use of suggestion box and knowhow of the public.....	53
Table4. 6 .the perception of respondent on the land use.....	54
Table4. 7: perception of respondents on the commitment of the workers of the land administration.....	57
Table4. 8: perception of respondents on the solving public complaints in clear manner.....	58
Table4. 9: perception of respondent on the clarity and completeness recording system of information.....	59
Table4. 10: perception of respondents regarding to assessing and monitoring in the land administration.....	61
Table4. 11: perception of respondents in relation to confidence and professionalism in land administration.....	63
Table4. 12.perception of respondents regarding to decisions and practice of accountability in the land administration.....	65

Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 Background of the study

Good governance is an essential tool to the course of development at all levels of society when it follows the principles such as participation, rule of law, equity, accountability, transparency, consensus, inclusiveness and efficiency (UN-GGIM, 2015). Since the mid-1990s, the agenda of good governance has been in the ascendant in the field of international development. In line with this, good governance has long been a topic of discussion in the international arena, and particularly in the field of development assistance (Commonwealth of Australia, 2000). According to Fekadu (2013) the concept good governance emerged as a development agenda by World Bank in 1989, in Sub-Saharan Africa. In 1992 the Bank defined it as the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country 's economic and social resources for development. According to Scottand Earle (2010) good governance in the developing countries reduces the possibility of corruption and rent seeking and this in turn enables to bring sound development. For this reason, the issues of bad governance in Africa in the early 1990s have attracted many institutions and scholars to find solution for it.

Good local governance is a vital for the central and local governments to apply the vertical accountability (the upward and down ward accountabilities). However, the down ward accountability failed in African countries (Sasaoka, 2005). For that matter bad governance has been identified by international development agencies as a major obstacle to economic growth and to be improved welfare in African countries and these agencies has been putting significant resources behind governance interventions (Lucy and Zeo, 2010).

The 1995 FDRE constitution was started the issue of good governance by introduced the policy of decentralization base on the 12 Ethical principles (Fekadu, 2013). In the current Ethiopia, the federal government does not touch to the individual population at the ground; rather the regional states and other subsequent lower levels of government run the activities in the ground (Bekalu, 2015). This indicates that the responsibility for implementation has shifted from regional governments to Woreda government's (Sasaoka, 2005) but the practice on the ground remains an area of scrutiny. In this regard, this constitution in Article 50 sub article 4 state that:

“State governments should be established at state and other administrative levels that they find necessary and adequate power shall be granted to lowest units of government to enable the people to participate directly in the administration of such units”.

Good governance in land administration is central issue to achieving good governance and sustainable development in developed and developing countries, especially in developing countries because those countries suffered from corruption and rent seeking as far as the existence of poor governance (FAO, 2007 and UN-GGIM, 2015). In most developing countries land administration was undermined by weak governance practices (Burns and Dalrymple, 2008). To alleviate this problem the World Bank continuously supports the land projects throughout the world to ensure long-term stability (Bell, 2007).

In Ethiopia, land administration has been practiced in different regimes. In the period of Haile Selassie, land was subjected to various problems like arbitrary eviction, disputes, endless litigation, and underutilization due to the feudalist administrative system. During the Derg regime, land was a state ownership and blocked the right to transfer. In this regime land administration was characterized by inequality in land redistribution, absence of detailed policies and guidelines for implementations of land related legislations. Those problems led to the practice of arbitrary and inadequate and corruptions like favoritism in the area of land administration by local politicians. This situation was challenged to development of the country (Yigremew, 2002). In the EPRDF government land is the common property of all Nations, Nationalities and peoples of Ethiopia. For that matter, land is not subjected to sale or to other means of exchange (FDRE constitution, 1995). To realize the good land governance, the current government of Ethiopia is offering land available for utilization in both agricultural and industrial investment even the process have problems (Ghirma, 2007). Whereby the 1995 constitution try to resolve the problems faced in the previous regimes. However, the policies and its implementation of land in EPRD F have been challenged by maladministration and political objectivities (USAID, 2004). according to Yigremew (2002) the Tigray Regional government enacts different law on land administration to upgrading good governance in land administration, but the regional government is not effective. In similar condition the Regional government has given power to the local administration to work according to the regional proclamations. However, according to the Raya Azebo Woreda land administration report of 2015, 2016, and 2017 in the

District and Tabiya level the practice of land administration was suffering from the absence of professional experts, poor coordination and decisions and corruption.

This study was concerned with the good governance matter in the local administration regarding to land administration by taking in to account the principles of accountability and transparency since it is difficult to assess all element of good governance.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Good Governance is an effective exercise of power and authority to improve the quality of life of the people and for transformation of the physical environment (Popoola, 2011). Thereby, it is an important precondition for development particularly for the third world countries (Tom, 2007). From this fact various countries which have similar potential resources but have different level of development since they have different level of good governance in practice (Uddin, 2010). As a result of this situation, the development process in different countries particularly the developing countries undermined due to weak governance, which resulting in lack of resources utilization, corruption, rent seeking, shortage of human resource or lack of administrative skills, uncertainty, lack of accountability, responsiveness, participation and transparency (Milunouic, 2010). Those problems in African countries generated with the process of decentralization in the local governments (Liou, 2007 and Popoola, 2011). In line with this, Tom (2007) stated that even though the local government is mandatory need when countries' undertaking different development activities, the practice of good governance at local institutions is low. Mulugeta (2012) also noted that the local government in Ethiopia is characterized by the gap between the theory and implication of good governance due to the existence of knowledge gap with the officials, the experts and the communities.

In relation to the above argument, Meskerem (2007) noted that in most Woredas of Ethiopia, there is no transparency or open discussion on issues affecting the communities. In other words, there are no information flows between different communities due to fear and suspicion. Lack of transparency denied the people from asking their rights and working on activities that they are accountable for. This blocks the society from making the representatives responsible for their deeds and actions as well. This also has a negative implication on monitoring and evaluation of the society's resources which open the door for corruption and misappropriation of scarce resources.

Land administration in developing countries like Ethiopia is challenged by poor coordination, imbalance between national policy and local decision making (Samsudin, 2014), over lapping land regulations, weak institutions, low accountability and transparency, corruption and skill gap (Dinka, 2016 and Cosmas ,2013).

Likewise, the Reports of Raya Azebo Woreda Land administration (2015, 2018 and 2017) asserted that the practices of corruption, rent seeking, land grabbing, illegal land exchange, unclear land redistribution, unclear compensation, lack of access of information, lack of commitment and false data and witness hindered the performance of good land governance.

Different researchers and practitioners 'so far conducted research in relation to good governance. For example, Meskerem (2007) attempted to assess the status of local governance at Woreda/district level in Ethiopia by assumed and generalized all Woredas of the country had approximately the same status in implementation policies and strategies. This was conducted by focusing on the secondary data and discussion with the community during field visits and workshops. Kumera (2006) too, conducted research on decentralized governance and service delivery in Digelu and Tijo Woreda at Arsi zone (Oromia region) in four public institutions (health, water supply, education and rural roads) of the Woreda. Their parameters were not based on the principles accountability and transparency as indicators. Moreover, Belay (2012) conducted research on assessment of governance and administration of Urban Land in Abei Adei and this was conducted at the urban Woreda. Furthermore, Gebreselassie (2011) under took research on the challenges of good governance in local government in Woreda Saesie Tsaeda Emba in three public institutions, which were court office, social court and office of land administration. Fitsum (2013) too, on the assessment of good governance in decentralized governance in Mekelle city in the office of land administration and urban planning and development. Both Gebreselassie and Fitsum emphasized on transparency but not took accountability as indicator in their study. However, this research apart from the above-mentioned researches because it was conducted on the assessment the practice of good governance in Rural Woreda which is Raya Azebo

Woreda by taking the land administration sector as a sample unit and it focused on the principles of accountability and transparency.

Further, the researcher provided the following justifications to conduct this study: Firstly, the gap between the theories and implications of good land governance as shown in the literatures. Secondly, the other researchers did not consider the principle of accountability and transparency in their study jointly. The third justification is due to good land governance in land administration at Woreda level not well studied, particularly in the selected Woreda not yet studied in to account the principle of transparency and accountability. Fourthly, as many literatures pointed out the issue and practice of good governance is more challengeable at the lower tiers of government comparing to the central government specifically Ethiopia. Thus, the researcher initiated and motivated to conduct the research on assessing the practice of good governance regarding to accountability and transparency in Raya Azebo Woreda land administration.

1.3. Research questions

1. To what extent is degree of transparency in Raya Azebo Woreda land administration?
2. What is the level of accountability in Raya Azebo Woreda land administration?
3. What are the possibilities of addressing the obstacles of good governance regarding to accountability and transparency in Raya Azebo Woreda Land Administration office?

1.4 Objective of the study

1.4.1 General objective

The general objective of the study is to assess the practice of good governance regarding to transparency and accountability in Raya Azebo Woreda land administration.

1.4.2. Specific objectives

- To examine the level of transparency in the study area
- To explore the level of accountability in the study area
- To identify the possibilities of addressing the challenges of good governance regarding to accountability and transparency in the studied area.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The study may have the following significances: first, it might show a picture of the level of good governance regarding to accountability and transparency and its role on the local development to the Woreda community. Due to this, the local community stands to fight against causes of bad governance. Second, it could open the door to the administrators and service providers to understand the degree of accountability and transparency in the studied Woreda and thereby it is helpful to tackle the challenges of good governance so as to solve the problems by setting possible solutions. Third, as far as the researcher was not assessing the whole principles of good governance, it can initiate and motivate other researchers to conduct research in the area of good governance. Finally, this study can help to the Federal and Regional governments as well as other policy makers to understand the hindrances of good governance at the district level thereby they stand to rechecking their policy on land good governance.

1.6. Scope and limitation of the study

1.6.1. Scope of the study

Governance matter is a more comprehensive issue. It practiced at global, national, regional and local levels. Theoretically, the scope of the research was delimited to good land governance by incorporating accountability and transparency as indicators. Geographically, it was delimited in Raya Azebo district particularly in War Guba and Kara. Methodological, the researcher took the non-probabilistic sampling technique, from which the purposive and convenience sampling was used. The purposive sampling method was used to select Woreda, Tabiyas, focus group discussion and interview informants while the convenience sample method was used to take sample respondents for questionnaire from the service users. Besides, the research delimited to mixed approach.

1.6.2.Limitation of the study

Theoretically, the research has a limitation in covering the whole principles of good governance because it only took accountability and transparency as indicators. Geographically, the research limited to one Woreda and one sector. Therefore, the finding cannot generalize for the entire institutions of the selected Woreda. Methodologically, the study had drawn sample respondents from two Tabiyas from the total 10 Tabiyas residents so; the study has limited to reflect the exact idea of entire Woreda.

1.7. Organization of the thesis

This study includes five chapters. The first chapter deals with the introduction which consists of the background of the study, statement of the problem, research question, objectives of the study with its general and specific objectives of the study, significance of the study, scope of the study and limitation of the study and Conceptual and Working definition of key terms. The second chapter consists of literature review. The third chapter includes research methodology with site selection of the study area, data types and sources, research strategy and design, sampling design, procedures and frame, data collection methods and data processing and analysis. The fourth chapter deals with data analysis and interpretation. Finally, the last chapter includes conclusion and recommendations.

Chapter two: Review of Related Literature

2.1. Basic concepts and Definition of Governance

2.1.1. Governance

The idea of governance is not a new concept but it is a very old (Kaufmann and Kraay, 2008). The exact term governance extracted from an ancient Greek word, —kebernon, ἡ which means to steer or governing. Governance is using power for steering and ensuring social systems, a process, direction, effectiveness, supervision and accountability of an organization through the mechanisms of directing, controlling, and accounting (Savic, 2006). But, governments, international organizations and scholars have given a subject debates and various interpretations in the matter of governance Since the late 1980s (Sebudubudu,2010) because the evolution of governance manifested by complexity in meaning. The idea of good governance consolidated in donor discourse around 1990, after the end of the cold war (Punyaratabandhu, 2004). The same author notes that the definitions of governance is vary by different organizations or scholars at different time. For instance the World Bank, the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), international development agencies and other multilateral donors provides more complex meanings of governance.

According to World Bank in 2003, governance is the institutional and structural arrangements, decision making processes, policy formulation and implementation capacity, development of personnel, information flows and the nature and style of leadership within a political system. Thus, governance is largely about problem identification and solving economic, administrative and political dimensions (Ogundiya, 2010). Besides, governance is the process of making important decisions by comprising complex mechanisms, processes, relationships, and institutions to articulate interests of citizens and groups and practiced their rights and obligations, and reconciles their differences. It is about the interaction government, social organizations, and citizens in public functions to use public resources and powers exercised for the common good. This includes the process of selecting, monitoring and replacing the capacity of the government to be effective (UN, 2007).

Governance is the practice of decision-making and the process by which decisions are applied or not (AGGN,2010). Through analysis and understanding of problems by electing and appointing politicians and their senior staff, the making of policy, the process of deliberation and cogitation, the process of exercising and cultivating political judgment, the

making of decisions, and the oversight and scrutiny that other politicians and regulators exercise (Savic, 2006).

Governance is about managing the full array in political, economic and social affairs by shaping the incentives facing individuals and local communities, governance either facilitates or hinders economic development. Due to those situations' governance is the instrument of the effectiveness political, economic and administrative authorities to manage a nation's affairs. It is the/ diverse mechanisms, processes, relationships and institutions by those mechanisms communities benefited because in good governance countries, the working environment is favorable for protection and guarantees of investors (Chaudhry et al, 2009; Popoola, 2011 and IFAD, 1999).

2.1.2. Good Governance

In 1980s, the concept of good governance has attracted the attention of economists, political scientists, lawyers, politicians, national institutions, and institutions of World Bank, IMF and similar others due to these some empirical and theoretical controversies has raised in the issues of good governance (Chaudhry et al, 2009). There by, different researchers have forwarded different explanations about the idea of good governance. Hence, there is no universally agreed or accepted about the meaning and elements of good governance. Due to this, there is a relatively an agreement on definitions and its key components (Liou, 2007).

Good governance is an optimistic aspect of political systems for the WB. It is a normative content and principle to promote the ideas of efficiency, non-corruptibility, responsiveness, participation, transparency, accountability, effectiveness, and equity (Chowdhury and Skarstedt, 2005 and Grindle, 2010). To practice those elements democracy and good governance are mutually co-existing and have symbiotic relationship (Santiso, Nd). According to UNDP (2002) good governance is an instrument to strive for rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, participation, equity, effectiveness and efficiency, accountability, and strategic vision in the exercise of political, economic, and administrative authority (Punyaratabandhu, 2004).

Good governance is the well allocate and manage of resources to solve the problem of society by promoting gender equality, sustains the environment, enables citizens to exercise personal freedoms, and provides tools to reduce poverty, deprivation, fear, and violence (UN, 2007). Thus, good governance is at the heart of sustainable development and the alleviation of poverty because good governance can increase income and spur advances towards the

Millennium Development Goals. Good governance helps to control corruption and rent-seeking, promote competition, diverse media and transparency, and respect human rights (ECA, 2005 and Khan, 2009). On other hands, according to World Bank (2003) cited in Ogundiya (2010) —the consequences of bad governance are: ceaseless religious crisis, persistent ethnic and sectional conflicts, separatist movements and gross social, economic and political instabilities and deepened legitimacy crisis. The bad governance has symptoms like corruption, injustices, inequity, integration crisis, and ethno religious feuds. Thus, bad government is the single and main cause of failure in the developing world. Different scholars so far describe good government and governance as a necessary precondition of economic development (Kurtz and Schrank, 2007).

2.2. General Overview of Good Governance in Africa

In Africa, governance has been debated since the 1960s following the independence of some African countries. Africa, as a continent emerging from the transatlantic slave trade and the colonialism legacy, has been facing governance challenges since the early years of the independence of its countries. In other words, African leaders began working for the development vision of Africa since the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s. They convened to work as a unique and common group to overcome the critical hindrances facing Africa and their fragile states. Some of them met on the conference of Bandoeng on April 1955 where the non-aligned movement was born (Mekolo and Resta, 2005).

Good governance is a system of administration that is democratic, efficient and development-oriented but it has continued illusive in Africa. In Africa, legitimacy has been determined not by democratic processes but mainly by influencing and patron-client relations. From this condition, corruption has been affected the atmosphere of good governance in Africa (Akopari, 2004). To alleviate such problems the African Charter article 12(1) declared to any member of African Union to consolidate good governance through transparent and accountable administration. The Africa charter in article 15 also demonstrated that accountability as a core instrument to increase efficiency and effectiveness resources in the continent (AU, 2007). However, Africa 's crisis was considered as a governance crisis particularly Sub-Saharan Africa in the 1980s (Sebudubudu, 2010).

Even though organizations like the New Partnership for Africa 's Development (NEPAD) and the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) have been supporting to the African in promoting good governance, those countries still face inconsistencies between governance concepts and implementation of good governance strategies. Hence, to improve good

governance requires a high commitment on the part of African governments and their international development partners, the private sector, and civil society (Mekolo and Resta, 2005).

Similarly, the World Bank had originally embarked upon utilizing the concept of governance as it grappled with the conundrum of why aid had failed Africa. It focused inward to the institutions governing the economy and the implementation of structural reform. It found the problem to be Africa's governance that is the management of a country's economic and social resources (Uddin, 2010).

According to WB (2008) cited in Khan and Gray (2010), most countries in Africa perform badly on all of the key areas of concern of the good governance agenda. The World-Wide Governance Indicators (WGI) indicators place the vast majority of African countries in the bottom 50th percentile of their six dimensions of governance meaning that Africa performs worse than any other region, except the former Soviet Union. As a result, transparency International (2008) cited in the same author noted that the Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) produced by Transparency International 30 out of the 47 countries where corruption was measured in Africa were found to have rampant corruption while only three, Botswana, Cape Verde and Mauritius, scored above the global average for corruption.

2.3. Key Principles of good governance

Different organizations and scholars have been identified different principles of good governance. For example, Mutesi (2014) acknowledges the following as main characteristics of good governance: participation, rule of law, transparency, responsiveness, consensus oriented, equity and inclusiveness, effectiveness and efficiency and accountability. Besides, World Bank 1992 identified the following major aspects of good governance: Public sector management, accountability, the legal framework for development (rule of law), information and transparency (Uddin and Joya, 2007). Other related regional banks, such as the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the African Development Bank adopted similar language. The dimensions of good governance as conceived by the World Bank, UNDP, USAID, and other donor agencies, good governance have two major aspects like political and economic. The political dimension can be divided into four key components: government legitimacy; government accountability; government competence; and rule of law (human rights). The economic dimension also includes four elements: public sector management; organizational accountability; rule of law (contracts, property rights); and transparency (includes freedom of information) (Punyaratabandhu, 2004).

UNDP (1997) mention the following good governance 's essential characteristics: Participation, rule of law, transparency, Consensus orientation, responsiveness, equity, Effectiveness and efficiency, accountability and strategic vision. The International Development Association IDA (1998) also describes four pillars of good governance: Accountability, transparency, rule of law, and participation (IFAD, 1999). In line with this, ADB (2010) and Kaufmann et al (2008) describes the six dimensions of governance: voice and accountability, political stability and absence of violence, government

Moreover, the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) in 2000 members identifies elements of good governance as the following: the rule of law; strengthening public sector management, transparency, accountability, predictability and combating corruption. But for the future may add new elements and old ones may drop (Punyaratabandhu, 2004).

The concept and principle of good governance is still a slippery issue to different organizations and scholars as shows in the above mentioned. For the sake of this study, the researcher had selected the follow principle of good governance by accommodating from Mutesi (2014), World Bank, UNDP (1997) and DAC (2000):

2.3.1.Accountability

Accountability is a matter of the held responsible of public officials for their actions(WB, 1992) due to this matter public officials develop the attitude of answerability for their action (Liou,2007) particularly in the area of decision-making by the legislative and administrative (Chowdhury and Skarstedt, 2005). For that matter accountability is a standard of public life, where holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and action thereby it is a mechanism to follow politicians and civil servants responsible for their actions in different forms such as horizontal between governmental bodies, or vertical between government and citizens (RJGAR, 2008). Accountability of public officials may be strengthened through the adoption of effective legislation, the establishment of institutional checks and balances, the establishment of systems providing redress to victims of violations, and the training of State officials on human rights and good governance principles (UN, 2007). In solving problems the degree of accountability measure from international best practices, which are :definite Chain of responsibility, effective control mechanisms; handling the feeling of complaints, public review and scrutiny of actions; commitments to high standards of professional conducts and principles, fairness and competition(Gizachew, n.d). Besides, accountability encourages the line of authority to be clear and always to be one responsible person unambiguously responsible for certain

decisions (Mulugeta, 2012).

Accountability helps to improve the government's legitimacy and resource utilization and ensure the government works in the interest of citizens (Gizachew, n.d). It provides an oversight function in monitoring government performance through ensuring operational independence to ensure appropriate separation of judicial, political and administrative functions during practicing regulation, building integrity and ethical standards within the institutions and strengthening capacity (RJGAR, 2008).

Accountability has a big link which prevents every office and individual official from taking independent actions. But there are several factors and constraints to carry out activities: behind close door decision for several times, variable of leaders to lead the meeting, lack of confidence and competence makes the situation worse., committees with overlapping tasks will be organized, individual responsibilities blurred, problem of assigned responsibility or authority, delegated, problem of arrangement (Mulugeta, 2012). In addition, accountability is undermined by corruption, patronage politics and unaccountable behavior. Another worse case of accountability in less developed countries is the political appointment of local chief executives by central government to ensure that central government loyalists and enforce central government policies (Crook, n. d).

2.3.2.Effectiveness and Efficiency

Effectiveness is the captures perceptions of the quality in public services, in civil service, in the degree of independence from political pressures, in policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government 's commitment to such policies (Mutesi, 2014 and Kaufmann, Kraay, and Mastruzzi, 2008). Besides, Effectiveness refers to implement based a set timeframe and within a framework of definite objectives (Chowdhury and Skarstedt, 2005). It helps to the Processes of institutional results that meet needs (IFAD, 1999).

Efficiency can define as the productive use of resources, which means the ability to do something well or to realize a most wanted product without wasted energy or effort (Gizachew, Nd). In other words, efficiency is the best use of government services to satisfy the citizen needs such as in security, healthcare, and education as well as efficient in production and distribution (UN,2007). In this case, it helps the government to formulate and implement good policies and regulations that allow and promote private sector development through practicing regulatory quality (Mutesi,2014 and Kaufmann, Kraay, and

Mastruzzi,2008). To assure the government efficiency need the best use of resources in the Processes of institutional making (IFAD, 1999).

2.3.3.Rule of law

IFAD (1999) state that rule of law is legal frameworks which help to act fair and enforced impartially, particularly the laws on human rights. In addition, UN (2007) argues that rule of law is a set of institutions, laws and practices that are established to prevent the arbitrary use of power. But they may be violated by corruption and absence of political independence, lack of enough potential, skills and awareness, and lack perform appropriately duties. These problems led to failing to prevent the arbitrary exercise of power.

2.3.4.Control of corruption

Control of corruption is an instrument to prevent the use public power for the sake of private gain, including both petty and grand type of corruption (Mutesi, 2014 and Kaufmann et al, 2008). When the mechanism of controlling corruption is lost, Corruption and rent seeking create opportunities in exploiting public resources by some individuals and groups. Rent seeking and corruption damage accountability, effective democracy and allow the minority to benefit at the expense of the majority (Khan, 2009).

Fighting corruption has a basic value in government improvement by initiating to change legal and policy frameworks for the control and expenditure of public monies and the practices of service delivery. From this understanding fighting corruption is not only an end in itself but it is a means to end Armstrong (2005) quoted in (Gizachew, n.d). Thus, combat corruption need holistic approach through the pillars of effective and transparent systems of public service, enforcing anti-bribery activities and promoting integrity in business operations, and supporting active public participation (ADB, 2010). UN (2007) stated that in fighting corruption, good governance believed on its principles like accountability, transparency and participation are important to create anti-corruption mechanisms which include establishing institutions such as anti-corruption commissions, creating mechanisms of information sharing, and check and balance the public funds and implementation of policies.

2.3.5.Transparency

Transparency is the availability and clarity of information provided to the general public about government activity. Governments must not only provide information but also ensure that as many citizens as possible have access to this information with the goal of increasing citizen participation because lack of transparency creates opportunities for government corruption and reduces public sector efficiency. The issues of transparency are linked with the issue of accountability (UN, 2007). Openness is a mechanism to ensure transparency

through strengthening and liberalizing communication policies to facilitate accessibility of the general public to the decisions (Chowdhury and Skarstedt, 2005). As Armstrong (2005) cited in Gizachew (n.d) transparency refers to unfettered access by the public timely and reliable information on the decisions and performance in the public sector. In addition, according to Liou (2007) transparency is the availability of information to the public and the clarification of government rules, regulations, and decisions.

Regulations and policies can be accepted as legitimate only if they are fundamentally transparent and based on objective criteria. The legitimate policy governments ensure when exist the transparencies in the state actions, the procedures that underpin the carrying out of state actions. Government transparency can evaluate in considering different indicators such as procedures for the appointment and removal of administrator through a Transparent and constitutional process (UN, 2007). Moreover, information and transparency help for improvement in the areas of information on economic efficiency as a means of preventing corruption and publicity available information for policy analysis and debate (World Bank, 1992). Thus, transparency helps to exercise formal monitoring agents, auditors, and the general public which need accurate information to tell if corrupt practices have occurred (ADB, 2010). As OECD (2007) quoted in Gizachew (n.d) transparency is the main effective deterrents of corruption and an instrument to ensure the accountability of public officials 'in their tasks (Gizachew, n.d) there up on transparency helps to build on the free flow of information and to assure transparent decision-making by that means it is an instrument to the effectiveness in resource use and to minimize corruption (IFAD,1999).

As OECD (2007) quoted in Gizachew (n.d) internet or information and communication technologies help to standardize processes, increase transparency and promote integrity in public. Transparency has relevant measures such as keeping complete, adequate, Clear and comprehensive binding and recorded documents and contracts, Publication of annual plans and notices, dissemination of information concerning lists and registering, open and inclusive procedures, prompt disclosure of the results, keeping a complete and an adequate record of the activities.

Mhrtay argued that:

“Greater transparency leading to more complete and symmetric information provides a framework for the population to become informed about their rights, service standards, and performance in service delivery. Moreover, citizens are, thus,

empowered to hold decision-makers responsible and answerable for their actions, which in turn should help to tackle corruption, promote more effective service delivery. However, in some countries although the system is entrenched, it is unlikely to see their applicability due to lack of effective transportation, lack of awareness and the like.”

2.3.6.Participation

Participation is the involvement of citizens in the development process (Liou, 2007). In other words, it needs to involve the general public, civil society, the media, and the private sector in decision making. They are necessary over the long term to combat corruption because they can potentially act as watchdogs and they facilitated decentralization of public service delivery by cooperation with nongovernment organizations (ADB, 2010). All men and women should have a voice in decision-making directly or indirectly (IFAD, 1999).

Good governance open opportunity to participate civil society during the formulation, designs, implementation of program and projects of development strategies and directly affected the communities and groups (IFAD, 1999). Furthermore, Ake (1993) holds the view that the absence of enabling conditions for democratic participation at the grassroots is the greatest obstacle to democracy in Africa, just as the transformation society for the empowerment of ordinary people is the greatest challenge of democratization (AGGN, 2010).

2.3.7.Responsiveness

Responsiveness refers to the demand of emerging from society and help to promote Participatory mechanisms (RJGAR, 2008). When institutions want to apply responsiveness in their work, they should serve to all stakeholders at the allowed deadline (IFAD, 1999). Responsiveness implies the receptiveness of institutions to the needs of their stakeholders. Public sectors should be approachable to their clients and serve them within a reasonable time frame (Fitsum, 2016). It is among the objectives of decentralization to foster greater of the government to the will and interests of citizens through providing services closer to the people. In other words, responsiveness to the people includes different services and demands which cannot be provide by a single service provider (Mulugeta, 2012). Transparency and accountability help to develop more and better government responsiveness (Fagbadebo, 2007).

2.3.8.Inclusiveness and fairness

Inclusiveness is the activities of government employment, institutions and services desirable

to be clear to all individuals and groups in society without discrimination. On the other hands, Fairness is about equality of applying the establishment rules to everyone (RJGAR, 2008). All men and women should have equal opportunity to maintain or improve their well-being and to ensure fairness (IFAD, 1999).

2.3.9.Strategic vision

Strategic vision is the leaders and the public broad and long-term perspective on the areas of good governance such as human development, the social complexities, historical, cultural and service delivery (IFAD, 1999).

2.4. Actors of Good Governance

According to Adejumobi (2006:6):

—There are three main actors in the governance arena. These are the state, civil society (including traditional civil society groups and social movements beyond the NGO phenomenon like labor, students' organizations, rural and community based groups), and the private sector.¶

Moreover, Parigi et al (2004) stated that actors have an essential role to consolidate good governance. Those actors are governments, private sectors, non-governmental and community-based organizations (NGOs/CBOs), media, professional associations and individual citizen. All the actors engaged in the governance process follow well-defined codes of conduct and their public affairs are subject to scrutiny by the public under legally stipulated procedures.

1. The Government: the government is accountable to people and is limited by the law of the land. It can rightly claim to act on the interest of the people. Leadership, therefore, is government's pre-eminent role in consolidating good governance. This leadership helps to ensure an equitable distribution of benefits and to creating an enabling framework for development. The strategy of The government can upgrading good governance through passing laws, reforming the civil service, and promote public awareness on specific issues. When the government is an open, the activities that performed by it is open to public (Parigi et al, 2004).

According to UN-HABITAT and Transparency International (2004)as stated in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (1948), derives the government legitimacy from the will of the people, normally by the constitution and laws. The government can rightly claim to act on behalf of the people when the government is accountable to democratic control, bound by the rule of law and respects universally accepted standards of human rights. It is this legitimacy

that gives government the strength to undertake reforms to quell corruption. Hence, Leadership is government 's (particularly national government 's) pre-eminent role in promoting good governance and in the fight against corruption. The government is responsibility to lead the implementation of required reforms and to scale-up and institutionalize successful initiatives from the local level. Their usual strategies include passing laws, reforming the civil service and public awareness and integrity campaigns.

Furthermore, local government 's legitimacy is based on the same principle as that of national government. Its comparative advantage in the promotion of good governance and in the combat against corruption lies in its proximity to the people. It is better placed than national government to act and understand in the interest of the citizens. In this case, it is greater potential to mobilize a finite number of stakeholders behind a common strategy for enhancing transparency and fighting corruption (UN-HABITAT and Transparency International, 2004).

2. Private Sector: the role of private sector is very important as it is an important means of creating jobs and employment. This situation helps to design the social programmed of benefit citizens. Therefore, the private sector and the government need to work towards in harmony and understanding for providing better opportunities for citizens (Parigi et al, 2004 and UN-HABITAT and Transparency International, 2004).

3. Non-Governmental and Community-based Organizations (NGOs/CBOs): the NGOs and CBOs promote the benefits of citizens, specifically under-represented groups like the women and the poor. In addition, the legitimacy of those organizations are based their objectives which is non profitable. They help to ensure good governance particularly transparency. However, their advocacy role can be undermined by undemocratic internal structures which may create suspicion regarding their motives or their not-for-profit status (Parigi et al, 2004 and UN-HABITAT and Transparency International, 2004).

4. Media: the media have an essential role to play in promoting good governance. They contribute to identifying and exposing corruption as well as to recognize and to capitalize the source of truth. They have an important role to play in reinforcing and building momentum for change by recognizing good practice and highlighting successes in achieving development objectives. Like nongovernmental organizations, however, their credibility may be undermined by unprofessional conduct that leads to questions regarding their bias (Parigi et al, 2004). Besides, the media have an important contribution role to fight corruption and promoting good governance. They have an important role to play in reinforcing and building momentum for change by recognizing good practice and highlighting successes in achieving development objectives. The media have the responsibility to ensure codes of conduct and

training in investigative and ethical journalism (UN-HABITAT and Transparency International, 2004).

5. Professional Associations: the legitimacy of the professional associations is based on the professional standards they profess to uphold. Their responsibility concerning upgrading good governance and fighting corruption is to publish and disseminate their standards and sanction for the violate members (Parigi et al, 2004). Including codes of ethics or anti-corruption clauses in their membership criteria can serve as valuable tools that contribute to creating a culture intolerant of corruption (UN-HABITAT and Transparency International, 2004).

6. The Individual Citizen: no good governance operation can succeed without committed individuals. While the rights of individuals are widely discussed when it comes to matter of corruption, they also have a responsibility to upgrading good governance through informed the individual citizens to actively participate in the decisions that affect their lives. They need Integrity to ensure good governance (UN-HABITAT and Transparency International, 2004). Hence, good governance requires that all the actors engaged in the governance process follow well-defined codes of conduct and their public affairs are subject to scrutiny by the public under legally stipulated procedures (Parigi et al, 2004).

2.5. Land Administration

Land is a finite resource and competition for it is intensifying because of rapid urbanization, growing populations, economic development, persistent insecurity of food, water and energy, and the effects of conflicts and disasters. Changes in land use affect the economy, society and ecology of the areas around cities and the division between urban and rural area is diminishing. These areas are today interconnected by flows of goods, money, resources and people. Climate change and different land-use patterns also affect rural areas, including farmland, dry- lands, wetlands and forests (UN-GGIM, 2015).

Land is the major assets in any economy. In most countries, land accounts for between half to three-quarters of national wealth. It is a fundamental factor for agriculture production and is thus directly linked to food security. Land is an important foundation for social and economic development since the government gain income. It also Secures land rights particularly relevant to vulnerable groups such as the poor, women and indigenous groups. Therefore, many countries have great difficulty to control demands of competent. Likewise, land has

been a cause of social, ethnic, cultural and religious conflict and many wars and revolutions have been fought over the rights to land (Bell, 2007). According to Groenendijk et al (2013) land has been very essential for development, agriculture, pasture, forestry, industry, infrastructure, urbanization, biodiversity, customary rights, ecological and environmental protection. Lantmäteriverket (2008) notes that land is a real property and the primary component of most people's wealth there by it needs an administration system called land administration. Mwangi and Nyika (2010) also notes that access to land and other natural resources is essential for the livelihood of people in any country because such access help to create stable and secure if it provides an opportunity for economic growth and acts as a vehicle for investment. Land management is regarding with the stewardship or custodianship of land both for the present and future generations. Thus, land has incorporated the idea of sustainable development.

Land administration system is defined as the activities that relate to organizing land tenure, land value, land use, and land development (Bennett & Alemie, 2015). Similarly UN-GGIM (2015) land administration defined as:

“Land administration, as defined by the UNECE, is the “processes of determining, recording and disseminating information about the tenure, value and use of land when implementing land management policies”. The land administration system is a basic foundation for the spatial enablement of a society and is considered to include land registration, cadastral surveying and mapping, fiscal, legal and multi-purpose cadastres and land information systems.”

According Samsudin et al (2014) land administration systems are vary from country to country but they do emphasis on similar fundamental function of the systematic organizing and official recording of land tenure. The land administration systems need efficient and effective policy implementation to satisfy to the public needs such as in social, economic, and global environmental issues. This implies that land administration can ensure best practice of land policies, land management and land reform in the basic infrastructures by providing information about land. Thus, Land administration is considered as a tool to operate land policy instruments. Groenendijk et al (2013) also claims that land administration is essential for sustainable development in a country determine by historical, economic and social background.

The arrangements of land administration are usually influenced by national culture like decentralization and centralization system. When a country follows the system of decentralization, it transfers land administration operational functions to the local or departmental level and requires that delegation is made between governmental levels (Samsudin et al, 2014). In the current time, many countries use decentralization as a tool of land administration implementation in most countries because land records are usually kept at the local land office level such as cadastral maps, land registration documentation and land tax records. And also, the local land office usually works closely with the elected local authority which is responsible for land use, development and environmental management (Williamson, 2000).

Land administration need the demands of strong public sector and administrative institutions through transparent, predictable and accountable to the people as well as legal and regulatory frameworks that encourage and protect the land users with secure access and user rights to ensure the institutional effectiveness and efficiency. But, current land institutions and practices are strongly embedded in the history and culture of African countries. Land administration institutions are tasked with judicial, regulatory, fiscal, cadastral and conflict resolution functions. On the other hand, the land administration institutions unable to success their tasks and functions due to weak technical and human capacities, rent seeking, and corruption as well as political patronage. The main reason to aggravate corruption in land administration is the perception and consideration of land as a primary source of wealth, often becomes the trading medium and motivation for political issues, economic and power gains, and self-fulfilling interests (Dinka, 2016).

According to UN-GGIM (2015) land administration, whether formal or informal, comprises an extensive range of systems and processes to administer the followings:

Land rights: the allocation of rights in land; the delimitation of boundaries of parcels for which the rights are allocated; the transfer from one party to another through sale, lease, loan, gift or inheritance; and the adjudication of doubts and disputes regarding rights and parcel boundaries.

Land-use regulation: land-use planning and enforcement and the adjudication of land use conflicts.

Land valuation and taxation: the gathering of revenues through forms of land valuation and taxation, and the adjudication of land valuation and taxation disputes.

2.6. General Overview of Land Administration in Africa

Throughout the world, land-related development cooperation has given attention to integrating governance principles and safeguards into the design, implementation and impact monitoring of land administration and management projects. Although land administration have been universally accepted as the basis for economic and social development, recent privatization of land, liberalization of land markets, and increasing demand and competition for land, have in many developing countries led to greater tenure insecurity, enrichment of the wealthy and powerful, and the further deprivation of the poor (Bell, 2007). In Africa, land administration particularly during the colonial time, the colonial government used land as a tool to ease its own administration and winning influence over the colony. This influence perpetuated over long period of time (Groenendijk et al, 2013).

Bell (2007) claimed that developing countries has been affected by poor land governance such as illegal grabbing, bribery and corruption, specifically in the sub-Saharan Africa. Moreover, contested access to land and natural resources has been a factor underlying causes of bad governance in many African countries. In many fragile States of Sub-Saharan Africa, skewed access and inequitable distribution of natural resources have been used by rebel groups for territorial disputes and power challenges. (UN- HABITAT, 2008) argued that For people living in Sub-Saharan African countries, land or natural resources is seen as a crucial element of cultural identity

2.7. Good governance and Land Administration

Land administration has its own principles which derived from the principles of good governance. Among the principles of good governance in land administration are efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, predictability, integrity, accountability, public participation, equity, fairness, impartiality, legal security and rule of the law and participation. Good land administration via using those principles lead toward balancing social, economic and environmental issues. From this fact, Sound land administration is an important condition to ensure good governance and sustainable development (Samsudin et al, 2014). Hence, good land governance is highly relevant to the agendas of all countries, whether they are considered to be developed or developing (Bell, 2007).

On the other hand, weak governance affects the poor in particular and may leave them marginalized and outside the law, which led to the prevalence of inefficiencies in public land

management, overlapping land regulations, weak institutions, limited accountability, and incomplete property registration systems. Those problems open fertile environment for petty corruption and grand misuse of public scarce resources. Besides, weak land governance provides the political elites and government officials with a means to seek illegal gratification (bribes) in return for their services such as land leasing to investors. From those facts, land administration frequently described as one of the most corrupt sectors in public administration (Samsudin et al, 2014).

The main reason for these public officials as well as the society considered the land as the main and direct source of wealth. This clearly showed that they use land for motivation of political issues, economic and power gains, and self-fulfilling interests. Different empirical cases in land record high profile corruption cases for example, found in the land sector in Kenya, Indonesia, India, China, Tanzania and Cambodia (FAO, 2007)). Moreover, according Subedi (2009) weak land governance has several negative consequences such as poverty and social exclusion, constraints on economic development, environmental degradation, reduction on public revenue, tenure insecurity, land disputes, weak land and credit market, negative social behavior and abuse of compulsory purchase.

2.8. Good Land Governance Theory

Good governance in land administration cannot strictly be differentiated from other sectors. However, while there are many institutions and scholars promoting good land governance in their works, there are three distinctive frameworks specifically developed for good governance in land administration. The frameworks include the UN- HABIBAT, World Bank and FAO good governance principles on land administration (Cosmas, 2013 and Dinka, 2016).

A. The UN-HABITAT Good Land Governance Framework: The first framework was developed by UN-HABITAT in 1999 and compiled later in 2004. Based on Amartya Sen's concept of development as freedom, the UN-HABITAT developed five good governance principles in land administration. The principles are effectiveness, equity, accountability, participation and security (UN-HABITAT, 2004).

B. World Bank Good Land Governance Framework: The second framework found was from the World Bank. On instruction by the World Bank Burns and Dalrymple developed a

Conceptual Framework for good land governance with eight (8) principles in 2008 (Burns and Dalrymple, 2008). The principles include fairness and equity, market justified land management control, transparency, good land information, clear procedure in land disposition, recognition of social land rights, and market-based valuation of land and good land disputes settlement system (Cosmas, 2013)

C. FAO Good Land Administration Framework: The third framework was devised by the FAO in 2007. The FAO

developed twelve (12) good governance principles including efficiency, responsiveness, competence, transparency, consistency, accountability, equality, sustainability, participation, security, integrity of land officials, and locally responsive land administration system (FAO, 2007).

Based on the above three frameworks of good governance, Bell (2007) can summarize the following principles of good governance for land administration:

Efficiency and Effectiveness: Regarding the quality of processes for managing land while making the best use of it to meet user needs (service levels and costs) without wastage. Generally, socio-political conditions, such as political will and commitment, the rule of law, regulatory quality and political determine the effectiveness and efficiency on land administration (Bell, 2007). Some indicators of efficiency and effectiveness include customer satisfaction; risk of bribery, competency, land conflict resolution mechanisms, land registration systems and time, cost and clarity of procedures to access land, availability of a single agency and —one stop shop offices, plus the separation of front and back office (Dinka, 2016).

Transparency, consistency, and predictability: Transparency means freely available and reliable and accessible information related to land administration decisions and their enforcement are made honestly and fairly by institutions mandated for the same. The indicators of transparency include the following indicators: clarity of land delivery processes, clarity and accessibility of the laws and rules regulating land delivery, as well as free flow of and accessible land market information to all (Dinka, 2016).

Transparent recruitment of staff and transparent service standards and costs of services will contribute to higher efficiency, accountability, fairness and confidence in agency integrity. Because of this, transparency is an importance matter to improve the sharing of information

both within the agency and between the agency and clients thereby reduce rent-seeking opportunities in service provision (Bell, 2007). Burns and Dalrymple (2008) contended that when service users have information about land related issues they get the opportunity to discuss with land officials and also can participate in the process of decision making and implementation to promote their rights. Besides, if the process of land related service is transparent the chance practice of corruption will be reduced.

Integrity and accountability: Accountability is about the answerability of institutions or/and servants for their actions and resulting consequences in implementing land policies. The indicators of accountability include: the mechanism of reporting, mechanisms of declaration of financial statements, mechanisms for questioning and appeal mechanisms for conflict resolution (Dinka, 2016). Accountability in land administration can be improved through the implementation of uniform service standards that are monitored, codes of conduct for staff (as well as mechanisms of sanction) and incentives such as awards for outstanding employees (Bell, 2007). FAO (2007) argued that the absence clear mandate that should take the responsibility and perform the activities in the land administration public institution, they will not have enough consciousness to take the initiative. Likewise, when land service users are treated unequally, the responsible body has to be accountable for the wrong decisions.

Civic engagement and public participation: Client orientation and responsiveness in land administration can be achieved through improved access to information, customer surveys to measure customers' satisfaction and hotlines to enable customers to report corruption and misconduct (Bell, 2007). Participation is the act of engagement of stakeholders at various levels in decision making processes regarding land issues that affect their interest. The indicators of participation include: the extent of involvement of community members in the land delivery processes, plan preparation, policy decision, and the implementation of laws and regulations (Dinka, 2016).

Subsidiary, autonomy and de-politicization: Increasing the autonomy of local land administration, while introducing checks and balances at the national level, can improve services and reduce corruption (Bell, 2007).

Equity, fairness and impartiality: All people should have the same access to service and receive the same service standards independent of their political or economic status the introduction of Counter offices and a numbering system for customers' arrival (—first come first served) may achieve this objective (Bell, 2007) . In other words, those systems are

essential to providing equal opportunity for all to access land and land information without legal impediment or procedural difficulties. The indicators of equity include: equitable access to land and land information as well as fair compensation (Dinka, 2016)

Legal security and rule of law: Good governance in land administration requires a consistent and coherent legal framework, a fair and transparent judiciary and general prevalence of the rule of law to protect property rights. These principles would generally apply to overall civil service good governance (Bell, 2007).

2.9. Challenges of Good governance in Land Administration

In many developing countries, land administration reform is being undertaken to ensure good governance in land administration. However, the lack of technical and management capacity the problems of good governance not solve thereby they need assistance from development partners through grants for technical assistance to support capacity building and training. Another frequently encountered challenge is inadequate resourcing to government land administration agencies. These challenges are consistent faced in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (Bell, 2007).

Land administration in both developed and least developed countries have been challenged by different factors. The major challenges of good governance in relation to land administration are corruption, rent seeking, lack of commitment of officials and experts and absence of mechanism to make municipal official accountable for their misdeeds. In addition, the fact that they give primacy to show political loyalty to their bosses other than discharging their duties in the most effective manner is also anchoring effective land administration. Moreover, lack of resources, scarcity of qualified or competent staff, weak institutional capacity and a lack of necessary infrastructure are also additional factors that limit effective land management (Dinka, 2016).

However, land administration use supportive technical solutions for supporting land administration such as increasing the accessible, affordable and appropriate information about land to solve problems caused by corruption and lack of law and order, lack of confidence of the private sector, and under-utilization of land and other barriers of land administration. Thus, the quality of the land administration system is depending on the quality of the civil service and the legal and institutional frameworks (Bell, 2007). Generally, the following are the main militating factors:

1. Corruption: Corruption in land administration is not unique phenomenon to the developing world because it has been seen in many developed countries, where civil service remuneration is often very reasonable. Besides, corruption in land administration of the developing countries more likely to be concerned with circumventing government land planning regulations to enable certain types of development to proceed, rather than the payments of informal fees on a transactional basis. However, in developing countries, corruption is often common place in day-to-day transactions when people are required to pay informal fees for transfer and registration of property rights. In addition, corruption committed in the illegal access of state land or land grabbing, which have adversely impact the environment, for natural resource exploitation or to usurp the rights of indigenous peoples (Bell, 2007).

Weldeabrha (2017) identified the key areas of corruption in the local land sector in Ethiopia are; Capture of assets by the elite and senior officials; in the implementation of land policy and laws which include institutionalization of informal fees, Willingness of officials to defraud or respond to bribes or nepotism and issuance of forged land documents are mentioned as common manifestation. According to Bell (2007) failure in governance does not mean that corruption has occurred. Conversely, success in governance may not mean that corruption does not exist. Failures in governance may be due to any number of other causes including laws which may be poorly designed or implemented, inconsistent or outdated, inappropriate policies and procedures, complex institutional structures, where mandates are unclear, overlapping or duplicated incorrect or inadequate information, especially spatial data, to support decision making and inadequate civil service resources.

Local good governance affected a wide range perception of corruption, parochialism, discrimination, lack of transparency and accountability in Woreda government. Likewise, the Woreda land administration is described by weak interaction between people and leaders, absence of checking and controlling mechanisms and discriminatory treatment (Weldeabrha, 2017). In generally, Mwangi and Nyika (2010) describe the two forms of corruption that touch on land administrative processes, namely, state capture and administrative corruption.

A. State capture: State captures corruption committed in land resources by certain groups of people like politicians, leaders and cartels. These hold the state at ransom and are common in cases of land grabbing, approvals of irregular schemes amongst others (Mwangi and Nyika,

2010). This type of corruption commonly committed in the land sector by elites and senior officials in Ethiopia (Weldeabrha, 2017).

B. Administrative corruption: Administrative corruption often perpetuated by staff and employees and commonly characterized by loss/manipulation of records, absence from work, abuse of office, rudeness to customers and demands for kickbacks in exchange of service (Mwangi and Nyika, 2010). FAO (2007) describes this kind of corruption most rampant problem in local government land administration. The relation between weak governance and administrative corruption is described by bribery, fraud, nepotism and favoritism, misconduct in public office and employment of facilitators. Weldeabrha (2017) also notes that those types of corruption frequently shadow due to the absence of clarity information and decision.

2. Lack of qualified or competent staff: Lack of qualified and competent staff in land administration consider as a main challenge to developing countries to efficient implementation of the land administration programs due to the high payments and better facilities offered by the private sector and the para-statal organizations. The land administration sector poorly paid to the +workers. Because of this, they commit corruption (Groenendijk et al, 2013).

In Ethiopia, the regional and lower-level governments do not have the capacity to efficiently and effectively implement the land administration responsibilities due to the lack of trained staff about the utilization resources. This problem is exacerbated by a desire to decentralize land administration to the Kebele and sub-Kebele levels. While such decentralization is a commendable objective, there is a great fear of overextending the ability of the administration to deliver the desired level of services to the public (USAID, 2004). Besides, the low level of compensation/ formal payment/ salary aggravates to failures in attracts and retains qualified personnel 's in the local government offices (Weldeabrha, 2017). In this regard, in many developing countries, where land administration reform practiced to solve problems of land administration such as related with technical and management capacity but not address due to insufficient qualified staff and the absence of translated rules and regulations in to local languages (FAO, 2007).

3. Inadequate of institutional capacity: Bell (2007) notes that different countries seek to reform land administration systems to ensure effectiveness and efficiency but faced hindrances such as lack of comprehensive and complete dates to make sound decision. This showed that lack of accessible complete data continues to be a major impediment to the

public administration of land. The inaccessibility of data faced due to the poor computerization of land information.

In Ethiopia, Regional governments do not appear to have adequately thought through monitoring and evaluating to the process of land administration by measuring impacts, review and modify existing administrative procedures, and develop new policy reform measures. There was no evidence of any mechanism to monitor the impact of land administration on changing land use, changing cropping patterns, investment in land, or the reduction in property disputes. There is no indication that there has been (nor is there planned) any effort to undertake socioeconomic surveys to determine if tenure security has been increased as a result of the certification programs (USAID, 2004).

Mwangi and Nyika (2010) notes that the failure institutional capacity leads to the loss of documented manual information to reach the public. Mhrtay (2014) also notes that monitoring and evaluating has been remained weak and reactive in most local governments in land administration due to executed by unqualified and incompetent individuals.

4. Unpaid local land judges and administrators: In developing countries, informal fees in the day –to- day activities like for transfer and registration of property rights are main causes of corruption (Bell, 2007). The arbitrary fees for workers of land administration is lagged behind to matter of the development because those workers not motivated to performing task rather they focus on rent seeking activities (Mwangi and Nyika, 2010).

Land administrators and land judges at local level are unpaid or unsalaried. As a result, the land administrators and land judges at Tabiya level are in different cases calculate informal payments or bribes from the local people. Due to these cases, the local people develop public mistrust and ethically degraded on the administrators and judges. This affects the commitment of the employees in one side and it fails to attract better people to the office for free if not they are confident to get engaged in illegal returns for the services that are going to provide. It is to this end that many of people involving Tabiya level land administration issues are among the most illegitimate, incapable, morally degraded, and in most cases with corrupt behavior. This is due to the absence of willingness from those who are professionally capable and socially legitimate to handle social and legal issues (Weldeabrha, 2017). Besides, according to Tigistu (2011) cited in Mhrtay (2014) the village land committees in Ethiopia are working voluntarily without any remuneration, making their sustainable operation questionable. Thus, the existence of such system by local governments can ensure good

governance by motivating the good performers in one way and punishing the bad performers in the other way.

5. Imbalance of upward and down ward accountability: Local administrators are highly accountable to their superiors and unwilling to the local people 's interest. The main reason is to escape from demotion and to success in promotion by their boss in a sense to build loyalty to their superiors (Weldeabrha, 2017).

6. Complexity in the processes: Complexity in the process breed uncertainty, increases costs and encourages fraud. Among which the system of delayed bureaucratic processes in land and development applications, leading indeterminable completion time and costs. This encourages the growth of informal land markets with major losses of revenue to the government (Mwangi and Nyika, 2010). The lack of understanding the process in land administration creates opportunity to maladministration such as a plot of land to be registered by more than one name (Zemenu, 2012). This situation most of the time shadow because of inefficient evidenced by the indeterminate length of time. It takes to complete the transactions and the number of stages a transaction has to go through (Mwangi and Nyika, 2010). Bureaucratic complexities and procedures affect the timely and quality delivery of services for a citizen and the civil society and also it generating corruption, led to injustice and favoritism (Singh, n.d).

7. Excessive politicization of local bureaucracy and lack of actors: The lack of actors interplay in the local land administration including absence of vibrant local neutral civil society organizations, passive local councils, poor check and balance system between the organs of local governments. Besides, the key position of local public sectors is controlled by party loyalty rather than professional criteria (Weldeabrha, 2017). Besides, the political administrators follow the principle of rule by law (Singh, n.d).

2.10. Transparency in land administration at local level of government

Transparency is widely recognized as a core principle of good governance. It means sharing information and acting in an open manner. Free access to information is a main component to ensure transparency which is essential for controlling corruption in public life when the access of information available is time line, relevant, accurate and complete for it to be used effectively (Parigi et al, 2004). Transparent systems have clear procedures for public decision-making and open channels of communication between stakeholders and officials, and make a wide range of information available Transparency allows stakeholders to gather

information that may be critical to uncovering abuses and defending their interests. Thus, by promoting better access to information for all stakeholders, transparency strengthens the accountability of all actors to local development goals as well as to other actors and stakeholders (UN-HABITAT, 2004)

Transparency in land administration means the freely available and accessible information in the land management decisions and their enforcement are made honestly and fairly by institutions mandated for the same. Transparency includes the following indicators: clarity of land delivery processes, clarity and accessibility of the laws and rules regulating land delivery, as well as free flow of and accessible land market information to all (Dinka, 2016).

Land administration is often characterized by bureaucratic and political corruption in many developing countries due to the absence of transparency and accountability of local institutions. And also the system of open access of information failed may be due to the lack of professionals that can handle all the land issues with efficiency or else a deliberate hiding of rules and regulations there by convenient for manipulation using the low awareness of the ordinary people. In other words, the service providers not provide the standardized procedures for determination, recording, and dissemination of information about the land (Weldeabrha, 2017). The level of transparency particularly clarity and accessibility regarding newly enacted land laws, proclamations and directives due to poor computerized records and registration system. From this reason, absence of equitable distribution of land, high practice of corruption, low level of efficiency and effectiveness, low satisfaction and etc. (Dinka, 2016).

2.11. Accountability in Land administration at local level of government

Accountability and governance are flip sides of the same coin because it helps to reflect lawfully policies and procedures to best interests of the stakeholders according to the particular governance arrangement. It can implement by various mechanisms such as transparency initiatives and inspection panels—to hold themselves accountable for their actions (Carrington et al, 2008). From this reason, accountability can be defined as the answerability of institutions or/and servants for their actions and decision and resulting consequences in implementing land policies. Accountability has the following indicators: the mechanism of reporting, mechanisms of declaration of financial statements, mechanisms for questioning and appeal mechanisms for conflict resolution (Dinka, 2016).

Accountability in land administration is a significant thing such as; government mandate

assigning unambiguous institutional responsibility for the land administration service; services provided with appropriate oversight by central authority and the community in a manner that builds community trust; land administration mechanisms operate in a transparent and predictable manner (Weldeabrha, 2017).

Accountability in local land administration also deal with the Woreda planning of land use, redistribution protection and regulation issues, and from decentralizing rationale point of view, it is as to whether the service providers can be held accountable to the people (Abrham, 2014). But the issue of accountability is among the major challenges of good governance in local land administration by born problems like corruption and rent seeking, lack of commitment of officials and experts and absence of mechanism to make municipal official accountable for their misdeeds (Dinka, 2016).

There are many forms of accountability for the sake of this paper, the researcher will see the down ward and upward accountabilities.

A. Down wards accountability or social accountability: It is an important aspect of accountability in local land administration to the service provisions for the general population because local government close to the local community which ensure when the Community members have the ability and opportunity to demand accountability and the LGs should have the means and incentives to respond to citizen request for accountability and improved service delivery. And also when this type of accountability properly applied in line with this the benefits of administrative decentralization may increase (Abrham, 2014). Theoretically, both the representatives and the service providers are accountable down to the people if not the later is accountable to the former but the reality on the ground is, the reverse is true. In other words, while information flows downward, accountability goes up ward. According to these, councils and serviced providers in Woreda governments so far are accountable to the upper authorities than their constituents and their clients (Dinka, 2016).

The concept of down ward accountability is similar with social accountability which seems to focus on the role of stakeholders such as civil society, government and the private sector in order to realize the goal of good governance in land administration (UN HABITAT, 2004). Downward accountability requires suitable environment for local elected leaders to act independently even at the existence of contradiction with their party that constrains to act as per the demands of the local population (Yilmaz et al, 2010). The same authors argue that the local leadership would be influenced by factors like, the institutional arrangements for separation of power among the three branches of government, the election

laws and the electoral system and the existence and functioning of a party system.

B. Upward accountability: Upward accountable is the local government to higher levels of government (Abraham, 2014). The Ethiopia local governance widely acknowledges that there are serious capacity and commitment limitations under local leadership and most of the time experts and political appointees used local office as a transition for other better positions and serve their superior's interest. Worse of all however, local leaders give priority to fulfilling the wishes of their superiors. Only positive reports and successes that strengthen their positions are passed upwards. This is one reason why the central leaders of the ruling party EPRDF remain ignorant to respond to the voice of the local people. Accordingly, local leaders are reluctant to serve and help the local people knowing that they cannot account them leave alone to dethrone from their positions (Weldeabrha, 2017).

2.12.1 General Overview of Governance in Ethiopia

Ethiopia had a decentralized governance system throughout much of its existence as a state. This decentralized system was manifested by the co-existence of triple authorities (three level of authority): Autonomous king, provincial and local nobilities. The triple authorities exercised powers within their area while at the same time recognizing the imperial throne as the central authority. Scholars maintain that the colossal size of the country, its rugged and broken landscape, the economic and cultural diversity of its people, and the absence of a modern ways of communication were the root causes of the decentralized system and structure. In the second half of the 19th century, however, Emperor Tewodros II (1855-1868) established the centralization process in motion by bringing an end to the autonomy of regional and local nobilities. This process of expansion and the centralization was pursued vigorously by Emperor Menelik's II in which he created the countries current boundary (Zemelak, 2009).

During Haile Selassie I regime, Ethiopia had two major reforms of local government structure which was before and after the Italian occupation period. Concerning their function and responsibility, there was no major difference between the two reforms. Besides, Before the Italian occupation, the number and function of local governments were different when compared with Menelik 's reign. After the 1974, Dreg made a little modification in the imperial structure of local administration (Ebert, 2010).

2.12.2.Ethiopia's Governance Structure post 1991

In 1991, the ethnic based on the armed groups controlled power and established a transitional

government. Ethiopia 's power structure was completely changed from its long history of unitary form of government to a federal type. The 1995 FDRE constitution choosing a unique form of federalism, which is an ethnic federalism to promote the right of self-determination of nations, nationalities and peoples living in the country. The country contending developmental state ideology to join middle-income countries within a short period time (Bekalu,2015).

The FDRE Constitution describes the federal government and nine regional states in Amharic known as —Killill. The central government and nine regional states power and function clearly defined in the constitution which sets the responsibilities relating to important political, economic and social matters. The two tiers have vested with exclusive and shared powers to apply the main principle of federalism are the existence of _shared and self-rule. But the constitution has been silent on the structure of state governments. The FDRE constitution leaves the regional structure or matters to state constitutions. The FDRE constitution delimited regional states based on the —settlement patterns, language, identity and the consent of the peoples concerned. The nine member states of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia have equal rights and powers. Besides, each nation, nationalities and peoples, which lives under the regional state, have the right to create their own states at any time (Bekalu, 2015).

The Ethiopian decentralization has legally and clearly established in the 1995 Constitution. There are five major layers or levels of government in the current Ethiopia. Ethiopia 's decentralization has taken place in two phases since the 1990s. The first phase of decentralization, the 1990s, was from the center to the regional states focused on the features of stability and ethnic federalism as the central issues. The second phase of decentralization (Woreda decentralization), the early 2000s, that devolved power to the district level. The Woreda decentralization was directed more at the goals of development and democracy (along with a political economy calculus on the part of the center). Both the two waves of decentralization practiced in the current government of Ethiopia (USAID, 2010).

2.12. General Overview of Land Governance in Ethiopia

Land has enormous socio-economic significance as a key productive asset and source of income. In Ethiopia, as elsewhere in the world, this enormous socio-economic significance stems from the fact that land is a source of wealth, economic growth, employment and a source of basic survival of the majority of the population (Yusuf et al, 2009). In the country history, Institutions and individuals that controlled land have played a significant. Three regimes in Ethiopia were distinguished in relation to the land governance policy and changes (Berhanu and Feyera, 2005). Land administration system in Ethiopia has undergone dramatic shifts from feudalistic systems under the monarchy of Emperor Haile Selassie (1930-1974) to socialist land policies under the Dreg military government (1974-1991), to the current system under the Ethiopian People 's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) who took control in 1991.

In imperial regime, the nature of the land tenure arrangement comprises private, state, Churchland, kinship, communal and other forms. The system of government made extensive land grants to members of the royal family, the loyal members of the nobilities, members of the armed forces and police, top government officials and civil servants and notable business man (Yigremew, 2002). The imperial regime practiced eviction of a large number of peasants, the spread of tenancy, emergency of landlordism and the displacement of pastoralists. In addition, the most typical problem in this regime includes institutional inadequacy and the land owned by the land lords was underutilized. These were the most important obstacle in the development of the country in general (Yigremew, 2002 and Melkamu and Shewakena, 2010). In this regime, land was subjected to numerous disputes and endless litigations. Under this system land was sold and exchanged, but given all the land was originally state property and that private holders had no absolute rights, it was different from the western concept of free hold system The land governance system of the imperial regime was largely considered as hindrance to the country 's development in general. It was mad most important cause of political grievances that led to overthrow of the regime Institutional inadequacy-lack of necessary frame work, absolute arbitrary control of land rights, and lack of land administration organizations, unchecked and exploitive tenancy, tenure insecurity like arbitrary eviction (Yigremew, 2002).

After failed the feudal system, the socialist government was confiscated the excessive controlled land and distributed to the land less tenants. The socialist government abolished or ending a feudal order and the corresponding land tenure system that had existed for years.

But during the socialist era land tenure were highly insecure as the arbitrary evictions by government posted a serious threat and many lands were severely underutilized. The system did not encourage private investors and land holders to develop their land parcel due to the threat of evictions and insecurity land tenure (Yusuf et al, 2009)

Dreg made all lands as state property and individual were given free access to land in the form of usufruct rights but not alienable by ways of sale, exchange, or mortgage. It abolished the land lord- tenant relations and the political as well as economic power of the landed class. However, the governance system suffered from lack of detailed provisions of land administration, lack of adequate institutional framework (both in terms of legislations and organizations), periodic land redistributions, peasant arbitrary evictions in the name of rural development programs and by local authorities and even political cadres. Like what happened during the imperial regime, access to land used to be a mechanism of reward to those supporters of the regime and its arbitrary administration has led to corruption and favoritism at the local level. As the result of all those it remained one of the causes of the country 's development problems in general (Yigremew, 2002).

The current Federal Constitution provides for the public ownership. This has left peoples under uncertain about their rights. In Ethiopia; all land is under public/state ownership. While land is not subject to sale or other means of exchange, the government does recognize use rights and holdings. On the other hand, Ethiopia 's federal structure gives its regions a lot of autonomy, which, in turn, has led to a coexistence of different laws and institutions with unclear responsibilities at different levels (Dinka, 2016).

The constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) under article 40 (3) states the type of landholding as:

“The right to ownership of rural land and urban land, as well as of all natural resources is exclusively vested in the state and the peoples of Ethiopia. Land is a common property of the nations, nationalities and peoples of Ethiopia. Land is a common property of the Nations, Nationalities and Peoples of Ethiopia and shall not be subjected to sale or other means of exchange.”

Land administration has now been a de-concentrated function of regional government and its control has become more directly under political bodies than technical ministers. As per the delegation of the authority of land administration to the regions, regional government enact different laws on land administration, land utilization, taxation, and other related policies. For instance, Tigray regional government has promulgated Rural land use law in 1999 on proclamation No. 23/89 (Yigremew, 2002)

2.13.Land Governance Structures and Institutional Capacity in Ethiopia (post 1991)

In Ethiopia, the responsibility for land administration has been delegated to regional governments. In this level, the institutional structures differ among the four regional governments which are Tigray, Oromia, Amhara and SNNPR because each region adopting a different approach to their land administration structures. In accordance with the regional government have the right to adopt proclamations to describe the principles of land use and obligations of landholders for appropriate land use practices. However, the proclamation was not sufficient to administer the land. From this reason undertake little evidence about the development of specific policies and guidelines for appropriate land use and land management by the regional governments (USAID, 2004).

Even though the current Ethiopian state structure recognizes Woreda as the basic units of planning and political administration, in practice fail due to the shortage of capacity and similar related problems. The less institutionalization and capacity limitations of public institutions at the local level led to violations of law. Besides, the Woredas has found that local land governance structures and institutions are weak in terms of the coverage, and capability to reach and serve the community. Those conditions are mechanisms to weak, ineffective, nonresponsive, corrupt, not transparent and bias in land administration (Weldeabrha, 2017). However, in line with the federal proclamation, the regional government of Tigray in its proclamation number (239/2006) set the organizational structure of the land administration to run smoothly the different tasks at the in the different level of this public institutions and finally to ensure good governance and development. Accordingly, the above-mentioned proclamation the Organizational structure of rural land administration at Woreda level described as follow.

A. Woreda Land Desk: Woreda desk is the office established at the Woreda level to execute the duties and responsibilities of Environmental Protection Rural Land Administration and Land Use Agency (Regional state Tigray Proclamation number 239/2006). The district level officers have responsibility to confirming and certifying the documents, to employed temporary and permanent employees to register the field data on field sheets. But the land administration public sector suffered from lack of documentation facilities such as computers, skilled staff and office space. From those reasons this level of public institution the updating of collected information is limited due to the poor recording and keeping of certification documents which come from all Keble; weak communication channel between the Keble and

the district office experts, the inaccessible for information to the public in order to solve problems on time (Zemenu,2012)

B. Tabiya land committee: The land administration committees are established at Tabiya and Kushet level. To establish those committee at Keble and sub-Keble level, the land administration committee appointed by the Tabiya council according to the recommendation of the Tabiya administrator while the Kushet committees of land administration are elected directly by the village people. At Tabiya as well as Kushet has five members of the committee in line with this at least the two must women from the total five (Regional state Tigray Proclamation number 239/2006).

The committees at Keble and sub-Keble level have different responsibilities such as to identify and register the boundary, communal, governmental, institution and private land to ensure good governance in land administration at the ground level in line with the proclamation239/2006.However, they are not success to their responsibilities due to change the committee frequently, lack an interest in the process, lack of commitment, seek personal advantage and prioritize personal relationships. These practices are aggravated due to the absence of incentive mechanisms (for instance. salary, per diem and training) for serving on this committee while the committee members are like other ordinary people depending on agriculture for their livelihoods. Hence, they devote much of their time to their personal activities instead of getting involved in the process. Besides, they, not get supplementary training that allows them to address the land related issue comprehensively (Zemenu, 2012).

According to the Tigray proclamation number 239/2006, both the Tabiya and Kushet land administration committees have the following responsibilities and duties: creating land use awareness to the people; giving administration solution to raised grievance on land issues; practicing decision of the Woreda land desk and land court; Working on registration and land ownership with collaboration of concerned bodies; Conducting land distribution, recording, and keeping land information as per the rural land proclamation; and Recording and controlling free land, which are available both at Tabiya and village level.

Chapter Three: Methodology of the Study

3.1. Site selection of the study Area

The research was conducted in Raya Azebo Woreda, which consist of 10Tabiyas. The researcher selected Raya Azebo Woreda purposively for the very reason that the researcher not faced challenges of communication in the research process with the local people and service providers because the researcher was born in that place. Thus, the Woreda was more convenient for the researcher since the researcher was familiar with the place. Moreover, no research was conducted related to good land governance in this Woreda. The area of good governance was selected because it is a burning issue at the current time particularly at local government. Likewise, the land sector that the researcher selected from among the Woreda public sectors because in the land administration there were service providers and administrators frequently accused related to land corruption as comparing to other public sectors. It also includes more service users than the other public sectors

3.2. Research strategy and design

The research strategies which used in this study were both qualitative and quantitative research methods. Even though qualitative method was used in a larger degree, both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used to reduce the draw backs of single approach. The researcher has used the qualitative research method in advance because this research method helped to interpret for better understanding of the real situation and the implications of quantitative data (Kothari, 2004), in which the data was arranged in the form of table, frequency, and percentage. The researcher also used the qualitative research method to explore, understand and interpret the complex concept in effective manners from respondent 's point of view, attitudes and behaviors. On the other hand, the researcher used the quantitative research method to organize the idea of respondents or data obtained in the form of table, frequency and percentage. Therefore, the researcher employed both the qualitative and the quantitative research strategies to carry out the research according to situation and result of the problem. Thus, both approaches are not mutual exclusive.

At the end, the study was both exploratory and descriptive for the reason that no research was conducted before in this public sector where by it was completely about the practice of good governance from the respondents 'point of view.

3.3. Data type and Sources

The researcher used both qualitative data and quantitative data. In line with this, the researcher used both primary and secondary sources of data for the successful accomplishment of this study. The primary data was gathered by semi-structured interview, semi-structured questionnaire and focusing group discussion from the service users and providers of the land administration of Raya Azebo Woreda. On the other hand, the secondary data was collected from reports of the Woreda, local, regional, national and international government and organizations, research papers, journal and articles to understand the clear theoretical and conceptual understanding the back ground as well as the existed situation of land good governance particularly in the light of the principles of accountability and transparency.

3.4. Sampling Design, procedures and Frame

The researcher used non-probabilistic sampling techniques as a result of predominantly a qualitative data type as well as data sources in conducting the research study. Bordens and Abbott (2011) contended that non probabilistic sampling techniques is essential in qualitative research to use the respondents according to their necessity in large number of target population in the dispersed geographical area. From the types of non-probabilistic sampling techniques, purposive and convenience sampling were employed to select sample of respondents. The purposive sampling procedure is essential to obtain credible evidence or information from the experts directly by identifying the person with the information and subject matter (Kothari, 2004). Hence, purposive sampling technique was used to select the focused group and interview of respondents. On the other hand, the convenience sampling is an essential sampling procedure to gather the available or close hand information from the convenient people to test or measure validation rather than obtaining generalizable inferences (Ibid). Besides, it helps to run the research activities and to reduce the more cost. As a result, the researcher used convenience sampling to employ the sample of households from the purposively selected Tabiyas and their respective Kushet or Kebeles to the questionnaire respondents because it is difficult to distribute questionnaires to the whole populations to be

studied. The questionnaires were distributed by four teachers of Mokhni Secondary school and four Agricultural experts because the distance between selected sampling Tabiyas is too large to manage and difficult to do alone. To undertake this task the researcher had informed to the enumerator before they begun distributing the questionnaires to mastering the process of the activities.

Moreover, the Woreda land administration sector, Tabiyas and Ketenas or kushets were selected purposively for the research. The land administration under the study Woreda was selected in preferring from the other public sectors because it includes more amounts of service users and the frequency of the accused administrators and service providers in land corruption in relation to other public sectors. Moreover, no research was conducted related to good governance in this Woreda. Then, the researcher selected the two Tabiyas from 10 on account of the practice of land corruption and mal administration and maladministration.

Table3. 1: Sampling frame

Selected Tabiya	Total population of selected Tabiya		Total no of house hold of selected Tabiya			Total no sample of res pendent			
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
War Guba	3618	6138	9756	786	1337	2123	22	38	60
Kara	9041	5900	14941	1965	1283	3248	56	36	92
			24697			5371			

Source: Office of statics Raya Azebo Woreda (2017)

The service providers and service users of Raya Azebo Woreda was considered as the target population of the study from the purposively selected four Tabiya as sample. To carry out this study the researcher used 152 sample respondents from the selected Tabiyas and their respective Kebele or Kushet. The researcher used this sample size by considering the budget and time allocate for the research because as sample size increases it needs more enough time to meet with the respondents and difficult to cover the area to be studied and the population size of the residents.

The sample size was developed by using the simplified Yamane 's formula (1967:886) cited in Israel (1992) and Amugune (2014) contended that the formula can help to calculate the

sample size if the target population are homogeneous. Hence, current samples have homogenous character. The researcher used eight percent (8%) level of significance or precision to conduct the research in the selected sample Tabiyas and their respective Kebele or Kushet in the land administration of the selected public institution of the Woreda because it is possible for social science to use the level of significance from one percent (1%) to ten percent (10%). The number of respondents from the four selected Tabiyas was taken by proportionate sampling technique in considering the households Tabiyas. The level of significance and sampling technique was also used researchers like Gebreselassie (2011) in SaesieTsaedamba Woreda and Fitsum (2013) in Mekelle municipality. In this case the researcher believed that this sample size was representative in the qualitative research type.

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

$$N=5371, e=8\%; n=152$$

Where, n=sample size (number of respondents); N=total population

e=level of significance (precision)

3.6. Data Collection Methods and Instruments

The researcher used the service providers and service users of the land administration of the Raya Azeb Woreda as the target population of the study because the research was conducted in the scope of this Woreda land administration. Thereby, service providers and service users have down ward and upward interaction regarding to the delivery of service in the land administration. From these target population, the researcher used three data gathering tools. These were questionnaires and focus group discussion for service users and interview for service providers and administrators of the land administration, people representatives and grievance receiver of the Woreda. The main rationality to use those three instruments of data collection was to ensure the validity of the data. With regard to this, Creswell (2003) notes

that considering multiple sources of information, methods and techniques helps to ensure substantiate the data and information using a triangulation process for their maximum validity and reliability.

3.6.1.Questionnaires

The researcher used semi structured questionnaires because such kind of questionnaire provides opportunities to the respondents to express their perception, feeling, attitude and understanding regarding to the land administration. The questionnaires were distributed in Tabiya war Guba from kishet Adi mokoni and Kara from kushet warabaye. From those far proximate Tabiya and Kushet the data was collected by assigning teachers of Mokoni high school and Agricultural experts. The questionnaire was administered in local languages so that the respondents could be understood easily.

3.6.2.Interview

Interview was also employed to gather information one from each Tabiya service provider and two from the Woreda land administrator since the Woreda land administrator could have collection of more information than the Tabiyas 'land administration. Furthermore, the researcher took two interviewees from people representatives and grievance receiver of the Woreda to increase accuracy. Hence, eight individuals were used to undertake the study because the researcher considered these individuals as source of unknown facts via face-to-face contact so as to collect or extract the inner feelings of the interviewees and then to acquire valuable information. The other main reason is to know the possible views and reactions of different persons in different situations for the same issues in the comprehensive and detail manner. It also helps for cross checking the response of the questionnaire. In line with this, Dawson (2007) contended that semi-structure interview is the most common type of interview employed in qualitative social research. Thus, the researcher used semi structured interview schedule to get enough information from the respondents. It was designed based on local language to create good communication between the researcher and the interviewed individuals in short period of time.

3.6.3.Focus group discussion

Moreover, the researcher used the focus group discussion as source of information to support and clarify the above two data collecting instruments. This assists for depth identification, articulation and analysis problems. It was conducted on each selected Tabiyas by forming four groups consisting of five individuals. The researcher took one participant from each

group of women association, youth, peasants, merchants and civil servants by taking into account of education level, gender and age level to get all-inclusive respondents. Hence, the researcher used the focus group discussion to cross-check and triangulates the data collected from multiple sources. In this respect, the data triangulations were used to solve the limitations and biases that come from employing single method and thereafter increasing the reliability and validity of the finding. To this end, the researcher was as a facilitator at the occasion of the focused group discussions.

3.7. Data processing and analysis

After collecting the data, the researcher edited manually at home. Thereafter, the same data were summarized and rearranged then the researcher attempted to organize the data in to descriptive form. Qualitative approach was used to grasp the view of respondents concerning with the degree of transparency and accountability from the interviews, FGDs, and open-end questionnaires. Thus, the qualitative data was analyzed by making use of descriptions and interpretations. Besides, percentage and tables were analyzed through quantitative method. In line with this, the researcher used. Therefore, quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis were used.

3.8. Validity, Reliability and Generalizability

To guarantee the credibility, reliability and Generalizability of the findings and conclusions of this research, the researcher taken necessary steps and tools.

3.9. Confidentiality and Professionalism: Ethical Issues

The researcher considered different ethical issues when conducting this research. Among those ethical issues confidentiality was get top priority. Besides, the researcher used admission letter and student identification card to introduce himself as a student researcher in the application. Thereafter, the researcher relaxed the respondents in order to free to give the necessary information. To ensure the principle of confidentiality, the researcher explained idetail to the participants the principles of confidentiality, anonymity and voluntary participation as well as told them the use of the data for only academic purpose

Chapter Four

4.Results and Discussion

This analysis part includes three parts. The first part concerned with back ground information of the respondents. The study is all inclusive in which respondents from sexes, educational level and age level were entertained from the sample Tabiya. The second part concerned with the perception of respondents on transparency of the land administration to the public in the Tabiya. This part includes clarity of rules, regulation and decision making, openness information to the public, accesses of information regarding to laws, rules, regulations, proclamations, and policies and the awareness of the public. This part also includes about the availability of data, the land distribution, and the issues of compensation and challenges of transparency. Besides, it also includes the role of public institution and the mechanisms to address the challenges of transparency. The third part concerned with the perception of respondents on the accountability of the land administration office to the public in both Tabiya. This part includes issues like upward and downward accountability, commitment, capacity and power, practice of decentralization, and level of accountability, corruption, discrimination and challenges and mechanism of accountability.

One hundred fifty-two household service users were participated to assess the practice of good governance in land administration in both Tabiyas. From the 152 distributed questionnaires, 152 of them were collected, because the researcher well informed to the enumerators about the mechanisms of distributing and collecting of questionnaires, the value of respondents and questionnaires in line errors and significance and punctuality. Besides, the researcher has controlled the data collection by close supervision of the researcher. Furthermore; the researcher distributed 21 questionnaires to pre-test the questionnaires language, clarity, and attraction in the light of respondents.

The general characteristics of the respondents were analyzed based on their age, sex, and educational status and settlement sites. This chapter analyzes and discusses the major findings of the research based on the data collected using questionnaire, interview and focus group discussions. The data related to transparency and accountability was analyzed quantitatively to the quantitative questionnaires from the sampled respondents and qualitatively from the interview and focused group discussions. Therefore, tables, average and percentages were widely employed.

NB: FR= Frequency, PRT= Percentage, SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, UC= Uncertain, DA=Disagree, SA=Strongly Disagree, Q= question

4.2 General Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The main attention of the research is to assess the practice of good governance in land administration in Raya Azebo Woreda by taking two Tabiyas as samples which are war Guba and Kara. The demographic characteristics of the respondents include their ages, sex and educational level as well as settlements sites. Those are analyzed as following in the two tables.

Table4. 1: Respondent's profile based on located area and sex

Tabiya	Sex						
	Male			Female		Total	
War Guba		FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT
		22	14	38	25	60	39
Kara		56	36	36	24	92	61

Source: own field survey, 2017

Table 4.1 mainly concerned with the distribution of areas and sex of the sample respondents. Accordingly, the majority of the potential respondents were males. Moreover, in both Tabiyas sample respondents, it was dominated by male respondents. When compare the disparity between male and female respondents in both Tabiyas were greater in the Kara tabiya since in this area the head of the house hold highly controlled by the male sex. From this fact, the researcher concluded that more ratio female respondents included in the War Guba than Kara.

Table4. 2: Respondent's profile classified by Age, Sex and Educational level

Age	Sex	Educational level												Total	
		Illiterate		1-4		5 -8		9 -12		Certificate and Diploma		Degree &above			
		FR	PRT	F	PRT	F	PRT	F	PRT	F	PRT	F	PRT	FR	PRT
18-24	M	1	0.65	3	1.97	2	1.31	8	5.26	10	6.57	3	1.97	26	17.10
	F	1	0.65	2	1.31	1	0.65	4	2.63	5	3.28	1	0.65	14	9.21
25-40	M	4	2.63	7	4.60	2	1.31	4	2.63	11	7.23	7	4.60	35	23.02
	F	1	0.65	2	1.31	2	1.31	3	1.97	4	2.63	4	2.63	16	10.52
41-60	M	3	1.97	1	7.23	1	0.65	2	1.31	8	5.26	4	2.63	29	19.07
	F	2	1.31	4	2.63	1	0.65	2	1.31	3	1.97	2	1.31	14	9.21
>60	M	3	1.97	2	1.31	1	0.65	2	1.31	3	1.97	1	0.65	12	7.89
	F	2	1.31	1	0.65	0	0	1	0.65	2	1.31	1	0.65	7	4.60
Total	M	11	7.23	23	15.13	6	3.94	16	10.52	32	21.05	15	9.86	103	67.76
	F	6	3.94	9	5.92	4	2.63	10	6.57	14	9.21	8	5.26	51	33.55

Source: my own field survey, 2017

Table 4.2. mainly concerned with the issues of education level and age of the respondents. Regarding to age, the larger percent of respondents occur in the age of 25-40 which showed that

the greatest the sample of the research is the most productive group of the society.

Regarding to the educational level, the overwhelming majority were literate who lies from grade one up to degree and above but had variation between the intervals in their educational level. Therefore, the samples respondents included from all educational levels, to have inclusive and fair distributions.

respondents. Regarding to age, the larger percent of respondents occur in the age of 25-40 which showed that the greatest the sample of the research is the most productive group of the society.

Regarding to the educational level, the overwhelming majority were literate who lies from grade one up to degree and above but had variation between the intervals in their educational level. Therefore, the samples respondents included from all educational levels, to have inclusive and fair distributions.

4.3 Transparency in local land Administration

4.3.1 Clarity of procedures and decisions in land administration

Table 4. 3: perception of respondents on clarity of procedures and decisions in land administration

	SA		A		UC		DA		SDA		Total	
	FR	PR T	FR	PRT	F R	PR T	FR	PR T	FR	PR T	F R	PRT
Q1	Rules of the land administration office are clear to service users											
War Guba	7	4.60	6	3.94	11	8.55	58	38.15	70	46.05	152	100
Kara	6	3.94	14	9.21	15	9.86	97	63.81	20	13.15	152	100
Q2	Do you think that decisions are open to the public											
War Guba	4	2.63	8	5.26	19	12.5	56	36.84	65	42.76	152	100
Kara	5	3.28	8	5.26	22	14.47	30	20.15	87	57.23	152	100
Q2	Decision made based on clear rules and regulations											
War Guba	5	3.28	14	9.21	12	7.89	46	30.26	75	49.34	152	100
Kara	7	40.60	10	6.57	56	36.84	61	40.13	18	11.84	152	100

Source: my own, 2017

As indicated in table 4.3, respondents were asked to rate the extent they agree and disagree on the clarity of rules and procedures of land administration office. According to the majority respondents,

the rules and procedures of the land administration in both Tabiyas was not clear. To support this, the key informants of the interview note that the service users commonly said the land administration of the Tabiyas have no open and clear rules and regulation rather they work arbitrarily. Therefore, the rules and procedures that follow both tabiyas of land administration office were in the absence of clarity to the service users.

In line with this, according to Dinka et al (2016) the act of decision making is challenged by the top-down approach, not bottom up and lack of consideration to the what resident's knowledge of proclamations, directives and charters. For that matter, the absence of clarity the rules and procedures were parts the selected Woreda land administration.

The second question in table 4.3 deals with openness in decision making to the public, which builds loyalty, trust, participation, and confidence of the public on the day-to-day performance of the government in service delivery. It can also prevent discrimination and corruption in institutional activities. Accordingly, as it could be show in the above table 3, regarding to openness of decision to the public, from the table it can be inferred that the majority of respondents confirmed with lack of openness in decision making to the public for both tabiyas of land administration.

In support of this, according to the open-ended question, the service providers and administrators did not initiate to have open decisions to the service users because they favored for the rich to gain benefits like bribe and to get help during hardship and for their relatives. Indeed, from among the respondent say "they accomplish their task on the bases of the status of the client rather than the law". On account of this thing, they don't bother to the principle of transparency in the land administration and they discriminate to the poor. This fact tells us that the trust and confidence of the service user was very poor on the service providers in the processes of decision making. When this condition exists between service users and service providers, it can erode the value of transparency, confidence; loyalty and trust in the public institution particularly in the land administration of Tabiyas at all. Moreover, this kind of atmosphere exposed to the acts of corruption and discrimination. In line with this, according to the interviewee, the decision of public officials was not open to the stakeholders and service users by different cases like carelessness, lack of capacity and unwillingness. Besides, when the decision making was not based on evidence or without law, the public officials show over confidence to unquestionable power by create pressure to the stake holders and service users. These problems practiced excessively in both Tabiya because the Tabiya land administration did not worry to the non-confidence of the public.

In parallel with the above, Fitsum (2016) found that that land administration committee was not transparent for their decisions. The lack of transparent and clarity decision by the respective authorities was part for lagging behind strive for consolidating (upgrading) good governance.

Similarly, the respondents were also asked regarding to the clarity of rules and regulation in decision making. Accordingly, the largest percentage of respondent response lie within disagree side especially in the Tabiya level land administration, majority of the respondents totally denied to the consideration of rule and regulation in making decision. This showed that decisions were practiced without clear rules and regulations. To back up this, an interview was made with key informants of Tabiya and Woreda. Accordingly, in the Woreda level land administration try to make decisions based on proclamation. On the other hand, In the Tabiya land administration makes decision based on arbitrary manner, due to knowledge gap to the rules and regulation and disregarding to the public power since they have no salary.

4.3.2 Access of information to public in land Administration

Table 4. 4: Perception of respondents on the accessibility of information to service users

Questions		SA	A	UC	DA	SDA	Total
1.The Tabiya Plans and reports are easily reached to the community	FR	4	7	5	103	33	152
	PR T	2.63	4.60	3.28	67.76	21.71	100
2.The Tabiya arrange meeting to the community to discuss and reflect their opinions	FR	9	36	13	52	42	152
	PR T	5.92	23.68	8.55	34.21	27.63	100
3.The Tabiya reach timely information to the public related with the law, regulation and policies of land administration	FR	11	5	14	36	86	152
	PR T	7.23	3.28	9.21	23.6 8	56.57	100
4.Does the Tabiya service providers make clear about the new land law, rules, regulations, proclamations and policies to the public before implementing	FR	12	28	22	44	46	152
	PR T	7.89	18.42	14.47	28.94	30.26	100
5. Does the community have awareness on the laws, rules and regulation regarding to land administration?	FR	21	23	25	40	43	152
	PR T	13.81	15.13	16.44	26.31	28.28	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

In the first question table 4.4 about, the majority of the respondents were reported that the Tabiyas Plans and reports were not easily reached to the access of plans and reports to the community.

In line with this response responded by key informants of the questionnaire, according to almost all key informant of the interviewee, the Tabiyas can use as introduction at the end of the achievements to service providers regardless of its applicability for the sake of writing reports in symbolic way and no matter to create understanding the reports and plans on the mind of the service users. The main reason to such kind of inaccessibility is the absence of willingness and commitment in the service providers and administrators who did not think to the long consequences of information proof in the aspect of good governances. In parallel to this, the focused group participants described it that as weak side of the land administration for all level. Furthermore, the current result was supported by other scholars. For example, Meskerem (2007) argued that the kebele leaders in each Woreda workout the kebele plans. Thereafter, they send to the Woredas, which the plans consolidated the plans. The consolidated plans are them send to regions. This indicated that the community do not know and participate in arranging priorities, Thus, transparency lacking.

Moreover, the report of 2016 and 2017 of the Woreda land administration indicated that the mismatching between the plan and its implementation, because the annual plan was prepared in exaggerated without understanding problems or issues so as to show difficult to success in practice and write a false report. So, implied that the service users did not get enough access of reports and plans about the performance or activities. The service providers too, did not bother to the feedback that came from service users about the plans and report the land administration in order to modify them.

Regarding to the arrangements of meetings to the community to discuss and reflect their opinions by the Woreda, On the account of the above numerical expressions, majority them replied that the Woreda land administration had not arrangement of enough meetings to the community. This showed that the Woreda administration had no care for the community regarding to their feeling and reflections.

Current result was supported by other scholars, for example, Gebreselassie (2011), noticed that conferences or meetings held and raised exceptional and crucial problems, but the discussion handled not in the line of the service users rather for formality only and not solved the raised issues as problem. Moreover, Meskerem (2007) argued that even if the government calls meeting, the communities were not interested to discussion with the government officials because of the biased idea that the government will not consider their opinions. Due to this situation, they prefer to silent especially for the matters related to the politics and governance.

Similarly, to this, the focus group respondents believed that even though the Woreda did not have arranged meetings to the public, the Tabiya administration conduct meeting sometimes, but they conduct the meeting for the sake of reporting and it is nominal. They believed that there was no

leader and service provider committed to solve problems in public meeting rather they simply talk over regardless of the next implementation.

The third question in table 4.4 is regarding to the availability of information on the necessary time to the public or service users related with the law, proclamations, directives, regulations and policies of land administration by the Woreda. Accordingly, the respondent's point of view showed that as the public did not get the access of laws, proclamations, directives, regulations and policies of land administrations.

Those respondents in the open ending question stated that the service providers of the Tabiya and even the Woreda did not know the land laws, proclamations, directives, regulations, and policies in theory and their procedural implementation well. They said that they implemented those land matters by cheating and arbitrarily, unsupported agreement or negotiation with residents by the violation of the law. The other main reason is attached to the Woreda council which had a responsibility to deliver the proclamation to the public but they remain poor in terms of delivery and follow up availability of them in the community. In that respect, the key informants of the interview stated that the people suffer from lack of access of information. Besides, they reported as it was too difficult to reach to the whole service users. Among the key informant of the interviewee at Woreda level said that the land administration had no mandatory to address the proclamation to every individual and to aware the community by arranging meeting alone to the land issues to the service users. But on the contrary, officials said the people had the right to read and ask when faced vague in any circumstance as well as the service users have the right to buy from the Tabiya and Woreda council. Whereas other informants also said that the main problem was not attached to the access of proclamation rather the absence of self-initiation, self-motivation, self-confidence, and poor academic back ground not only in the service users but also in the service providers. For that reason, the service users, the service provides and administrators of the Tabiya and Woreda had not common understanding about the general way of communication and understanding about how to building awareness in the general public.

Parallel to the above idea, Nigussie (2016) found in his study as the service users and service providers did not have awareness on land proclamation, rules, laws and regulations due to lack of clear, prompt and accessible information which are derived from lack of capacity and absence of political commitment in higher officials. Furthermore, Mhrtay (2014) too, stated that service users of land administration did not know the rights and duties when use and owning of land because they did not know the laws and regulation. In addition, Fitsum (2016) noted that information was not freely and directly accessible to the community members and the general public.

But, Article 43 sub-Article 2 the 1995 Ethiopia constitution clearly stated all Nation, Nationality

and peoples of the country have the right to obtain access of laws, rules and laws of the country. Therefore; We can conclude from the above discussion, the Woreda land administration was very poor in access of information to the public about the law, proclamations, directives, regulation and policies of land. These caused misunderstanding between service providers with the proclamation and service users regarding to about the mechanism in creating awareness due to low potential of service providers and low political commitment of the leaders.

Table4. 5: perception of respondents on the level availability and use of suggestion box and knowhow of the public

Tabiya	Yes		No		Total	
	1.The land administration office has suggestion box to handling grievances					
	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT
War Guba	32	21.05	120	78.94	152	100
Kara	40	26.31	112	73.68	152	100
	2. Do you know the articles and sub articles of the proclamation clearly					
War Guba	44	28.94	108	71.05	152	100
Kara	36	23.68	116	76.31	152	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

According to table 4.5., it could be concluded that suggestion box was available in both Tabiyas. In similar way a study conducted by Yilmaz and Venugopal (2008) contended that a number of Woredas particularly in Oromia and Tigray had suggestion boxes and feedback forms in the administration offices. Fitsum (2013) also stated that even though the land administration offices had suggestion box, no one checked what exist in the suggestion box and it had no role to the public, hence it was stamp rubber. In the same vein almost the focus group discussion claimed that the suggestion box of the land administration at both Tabiya were set for external evaluation. Table 4.5 (number 2), respondents were asked regarding to their knowledge on the articles and sub articles of the land proclamation. For that matter, the majority of the respondents reported as they did not have knowledge about those issues. As forwarded in the open-end question, the main reason to low awareness of the community on the article and sub-article of the land proclamation was the absence of information sources. These challenges raised knowledge gap among the service providers, administrators and councils at all level. From those reason, the documents of the proclamation only left at office level free from availability in the ground. There up on, the community remained passive in so far as the service users did not have attention to know the article and sub article of the proclamation, rather they needed know after they were

unjustified by the service providers. As far as the above discussion the awareness of the service users or the public was only too low, since the subjects did not have access of information.

4.3.3 Transparency on distribution and compensation of land in land Administration

Table 4. 6 .the perception of respondent on the land use

TABIYA	SA		A		UC		DA		SDA		Total	
	1.Land is given for investment in clear and open manner											
	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	F R	PRT	PR	PRT
War Guba	10	6.57	50	32.89	21	13.81	11	7.23	60	39.47	152	100
Kara	2	1.31	16	10.52	41	26.97	17	11.18	76	50	152	100
Q2	2.The compensation practice related to land is open											
War Guba	10	6.57	21	13.81	34	22.32	46	30.26	41	26.97	152	100
Kara	12	7.89	18	11.84	25	16.44	30	19.73	66	43.42	152	100
Q3	3.Do you think that the Tibia service providers ignore to expose illegal control of land?											
War Guba	65	42.76	34	22.36	15	9.86	22	14.47	16	10.52	152	100
Kara	66	43.42	30	19.73	12	7.89	25	16.44	19	12.5	152	100
Q4	4. Do you think that the land distribution is based on the transparency manner to the people?											
War Guba	4	2.63	30	19.73	16	10.52	65	42.76	37	24.34	152	100
Kara	7	4.60	26	17.10	14	9.21	70	46.05	35	23.02	152	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

As table above (table 4.6) indicated, the largest percentage of respondents implied that land investment was practiced in the absence of openness and clarity. However, the proclamation No.239/2006 NEGARIT GAZETA of Tigray regional state article 20 sub article 1 and 2 noted that the land designed to provide for investment should be investigated to check whether reserved

or not. Thereafter, the government should communicate and discussed with the residents about the land which reserved in land bank to provide for what kind of investment and its land size. Indeed, those laws were meaningless in practice. Hence, the Woreda land administration did not clearly identify the necessary land for investment. There up on, problems faced like conflict between the investors and the local community due to give land for investment near to religious institution and home of residents, overlapping with new settlement. In parallel to this, the respondent in the open-end question and focus group discussion argued that land was not provided for investors on time and clearly because the administrators and service providers were need bribe. Because of this, the delivered service was delay and unclear. Besides, the absence of common understanding regarding for the land decision either for investment or individual settlement. In this matter, the Woreda gave the land for investment but the land already given for individual residents to new settlement. In this case, land investment in this selected Woreda was not carried out in open and clear manner rather it was characterized by corruption and cheating.

The second question raised to the respondents was whether there was or not open practice of compensation related to land in both the Tabiya land administration. Accordingly, as it could be observed from table 4.6 (above), there was no transparent practice of land compensation. According to the forwarded open-end question, the practice of compensation in the land administration was a mechanism to exercise rent seeking by violating rules and regulations to run unbalance compensation. They probed that if the person has smooth contact with the compensation committee, he/she could get excessive payment or otherwise. The committee need shared from the compensated money which they receive in a very systematic way by cooperate the committee themselves. The unbalanced compensation was practiced by hide documents and procrastinate decision in order to fatigue the service users.

Therefore, from the above facts it could be summarized that the compensation committee was not working effectively to ensure the process of transparency in compensations.

In table 4.6 above (question number 3) also respondents were asked regarding to ignoring to expose the illegal control of land by the service providers of the Tabiya. Accordingly, the Tabiya service providers did not expose the activities of land grabbing rather they aggravate the problem. To support this, the interviewed key informants, focused group discussion, the open-end question and the document (2015 and 2106 reports) in parallel mentioned the disregard to expose the illegal control lands particularly in War Guba and Kara. According to the key informants of the interviewees, this situation had been done seriously in those two mentioned Tabiyas. They added that the residents had no shame at all because they needed and practiced more than two times compensation for the same land, even though the government gave two chances to the land holders or owner either total leave with compensation or survive in remain land with partial

compensation. Furthermore, the respondents said that the individual residents chose the first one and later they return back to control it illegally where the land at that time had no service providers and resident exposed the evil action.

However, the proclamation number 456/2005 Federal Democracy of Ethiopia Rural Land Administration and Land Use Proclamation when any person violates the proclamation, regulations and directives there up on punished by criminal law. But, still according to the 2016 report of the Woreda Land administration the land grabbing spread out because of the absence of documented data in both Tabiya and Woreda, lack of complete reports to the Woreda and Tabiya council people representative regarding to the land re-distribution, unable to give resettlement to youth based on proclamations ,directives and regulations and the absence of including the Tabiya and Woreda Council of people representative with their stamps in decision of land redistribution. As a result of this, land grabbing was bottle neck in the Woreda due to poor checking, controlling and following up of the land administrators and service providers at all levels especially at Tabiya and Village.

The last question in table 4.6 above, concerning with the distribution of the land to the residents and transparency, the researcher understand that the land was not distributed transparently to the residents. Furthermore, the respondents reasoned out about that the land distribution was conducted based on the secret for the sake of bribe (give and take) and personal benefit. Hence, they gave priority to them self and their families and relatives. From this, it could be argued that there was not transparency in the land distribution in the study area.

In parallel with the above, the key informants of the interviewees pointed out that a lot of land were existed without legal ownership but those lands used by some individuals who were not asked by the Kushet and Tabiya land administration. There by, the key interviewees argued that no one stand to ensure equality and transparency through using the procedural mechanisms such as checking, assessing, evaluating and monitoring to the distribution rather they cooperate to cheat and corrupt. From this fact, the distribution of land particularly in the rural area is unfair and non-transparency.

4.3.4The commitment of the office on land administration to ensuring transparency

Table4. 7: perception of respondents on the commitment of the workers of the land administration

Variable		SA	A	UC	DA	SDA	Total
1)The Tabiya leaders are committed to assess the land administration in the Ground	FR	6	3	3	26	114	152
	PR T	3.94	1.97	1.97	17.10	75	100
2)Tabiya Service providers have enough known how about rules, regulations, directives and proclamation of land administration	FR	0	1	6	34	111	152
	PR T	0	0.65	3.94	22.36	73.02	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

Table 4.7 (above) viewed that the commitment of the Woreda leaders to the practice of land administration in the ground level, the majority of respondents replied that agree and disagree on the forwarded question. Similarly, the key informants of the interviewees stated that the Woreda land administrators and service providers only went to the ground level after certain problems were happened, the need was only for the fact of reports. Likewise, the focused group discussion participants argued that the Woreda leaders were not interested to check and control the faults of the Tabiya and Village land administrators because all of them had linked relationship to conduct corruption. Therefore, the Woreda leaders had not interested to assess the land administration in the ground rather they need only reports without checking its reliabilities.

In line with the data, since 2006 annual reports and the 2008 assessment Anticorruption and Ethical commission of Tigray showed that the poor commitment of the Woreda administrators and service providers to assess and evaluate to the Tabiya and Village activities had a problematical issue to consolidate the matter of good governance in land administration. For those reasons, the Woreda leaders have low motivation, commitment, integrity and initiation to assess the condition of land administration in Tabiya and village. Further, current result was supported by other scholars. For example, there seemed that there was lack of commitment to facilitate the implementation of good governance due to the process of decentralization; which faced Ethiopia (Meskerem, 2007).

The second question deal with knowhow of Tabiya service providers regarding to rules, regulations, directives and proclamation of land. Accordingly, the service providers had no awareness about the land related laws. Indeed, in similar consensus that was gained from the forwarded open-end question, focus group discussion and interview indicated that samples strongly stressed to the existence of poor qualification of the workers of land administration in both Tabiya and village levels. As majority of the workers were not able to read and write

enough. To support this, the reports of 2016 and 2017 of the selected Woreda land administration described the poor knowledge of the service provider considered as the challenge of good governance in land administration. Meskerem (2007 too, the required skilled man power in Ethiopian Woredas and Kebeles were unsolved yet (Meskerem, 2007).

From this it could be understood that the Tabiya service providers did not have enough awareness regarding to land rules, regulations, directives, proclamation and policies. In this case, they were challenged in communication with the service users.

Table4. 8: perception of respondents on the solving public complaints in clear manner

TABI YA	Do you think that the grievance of complaints solves based on the clear rule and regulation?										Total	
	SA		A		UC		DA		SDA			
	FR	PRT	F R	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT
War Guba	2	1.31	6	3.94	27	17.76	93	61.18	24	15.78	152	100
Kara	8	6.4	21	13.81	34	22.36	70	46.05	19	12.5	152	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

According table 4.8 (above) it was possible to conclude that the majority of the respondents disappointed to both Tabiyas to the statement. Similarly, the focused group discussion of the respondents stated that the grievance of the clients did not get a clear decision due to the absence of documented evidence for the subsequent cases and lack of self-confidence in the decision as well as the rent seeking behaviors. Thereby, the respondents (focused group discussion) said that the grievances of the clients either delay or remain unsolved particularly in the Woreda level, because of this; the service users were not satisfied. Furthermore, flow of information or transparency and accountability were very low in Ethiopia Woredas which intern a raised complaint mechanism and then hamper organizations governances thoroughly (Meskerem, 2007).

4.3. Data recording system in the land Administration

Table4. 9: perception of respondent on the clarity and completeness recording system of information

TABIYA	The office of land administration keeps a clear comprehensive document related to land issues											
	SA		A		UC		DA		SDA		Total	
	FR	PRT	F R	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT
War Guba	5	3.28	12	7.89	23	15.13	40	26.31	72	47.36	152	100
Kara	8	5.26	18	11.84	36	23.68	51	40.8	39	25.65	152	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

The respondents were asked regarding to whether the office of land administration keep or not clear and comprehensive documents related to land issues. As a result, the largest percentages of respondent lie between disagree and strongly disagree. This showed that data were not properly kept in this public institution.

To back up this, an interview was made with key informants of Tabiyas concerning with the availability of documents in the land administration. Accordingly, when the service users ask certain files, they did not get enough documented data. The interviewed claimed that the service providers were not good at keeping the file in clear and definite shelf because the service providers had poor potential about documentation system. The interruption of electric power was another challenge to set and search data in the computer. They noted that the poor documentation system has perpetuated problem. As a result of this, the service providers and the administrators failed the Woreda particularly in the land administration for the purpose of illegally control land and cheat of land compensation practices. Thus, the key informants noted that those problems did not solve and difficult to solve even for the future because one problem creates other problem.

4.4 Accountability in local Land Administration

4.4.1 Upward and Down ward accountability in land Administration

Respondents were asked their perceptions on the accountability of land administrators and service providers to the public in the down ward way. Accordingly, 3(1.97%) and 5(3.28%) respondents replied strongly agree and agree while 102 (67.10%) and 36 (23.68%) of the respondents replied disagree and strongly disagree respectively on the down ward accountability of the Tabiya war Guba land administrators and service providers to the public. The rest of the respondents 6(3.94%) did not decide on the issue of down ward accountability. The same respondents also gave their perception on the down ward accountability for the Kara land administration as shown in the table 13, accordingly 1 (0.65%) and 6(3.94%) of the respondents replied strongly agree and agree while 62 (40.78%) and 76 (50%) replied disagree and strongly disagree respectively.

The remaining, about 7 (4.60%) of the respondents unable to decide about the downward accountability of the Woreda administrators and service providers to the people. Thus, administrators and service providers of the selected public institution were not accountable to the public at all levels.

However, according to Proclamation No.239/2006 NEGARIT GAZETA of Tigray, the Tabiya land administration committees are responsible for Tabiya administration and for the Woreda Land Desk since they are appointed by Tabiya council with the recommendation of Chief Tabiya executive. While the Village land administration committees are responsible for the people who elect and Tabiya committee land administration as the committee was elected directly by the residents of the concerned village. Even though the proclamation more or less set the upward and downward accountability, in practice the downward accountability was almost demolished. In this regard, focused group participants point out that the decision of the administrators and service providers exercised in the interest of core public officials rather than the will of people.

In line with the above idea, Weldeabirha (2017) also argued that good governance was challenged by imbalance between upward and downward accountability, whereby local administrators were highly responsible to their superiors and unwilling to the local people interest. Likewise, the key informants of the interview noted that the administrators were disregarding to the will of the people and rules and regulation rather they gave attention to the upward accountability irrationally for the sake of survival and position. Furthermore, Yilmaz and Venugopal (2008) stated that in Ethiopia local governments exercised a high degree of upward accountability mechanisms without the ensuring discretion and downward accountability mechanisms. Due to this situation, most decisions and laws and planning are top down approach. Thus, the result showed that accountability in land administration was paralyzed more than its half side particularly to the downward side. In addition to this, Abraham (2011) noted that the absence political culture in community, people, or local government is caused to the absence downwards accountability in the Woreda government.

Table4. 10: perception of respondents regarding to assessing and monitoring in the land administration

Quotations		SA	A	UC	DA	SDA	Total
1) Do you think that the Tabiya land administration promotes culture of accountability?	FR	12	14	2	55	69	152
	PRT	7.89	9.21	1.31	36.18	45.39	100
2)Your Tabiya a takes measurement when its workers are not abided by its rules and regulations	FR	6	16	39	57	34	152
	PRT	3.94	10.52	25.65	37..5	22.36	100
3) Does the Tabiya cross check the service runs whether these officials are working effectively or not?	FR	4	8	16	49	75	152
	PRT	2.63	5.26	10.52	32.23	49.34	100
4) Do the Tabiya service providers follow the decisions higher authorized body?	FR	10	60	30	42	10	152
	PRT	6.57	39.47	19.73	27.63	6.57	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

With reference to table 4.10 number 1, respondents were asked the extent of their agreement on the role of the Tabiya's land administration to promote the culture of accountability. As shown the result in the above table, the public institution had no contribution to consolidate to upgrading the culture of accountability. In support of the above idea, according to the document analysis of the Woreda land administration (Report since 2015), although the Woreda has been some model workers, in generally the Woreda was lagged behind to consolidate the culture of accountability to the general public particularly for the youth because the people saw the frequently arrested workers of land administration. In this respect, the open-end question, interview, and focus group discussion showed that promotion of accountability was no longer practice therein due to corruption, rent seeking and poor initiative, knowhow, free flow of information and commitment. To back up this, Abraham (2011) argued that lack of legal institutional framework, lack of clear intergovernmental relation, lack of political commitment and shortage of skilled man power are among the cause of good governance particularly the principle of accountability. Therefore, the researcher concluded that the land administration was senseless in creating awareness to general public or mass regarding to the issue of accountability.

As depicted in table 4.10, the second question, respondents were asked regarding to whether the Woreda take measure or not when the workers were not abiding by rules and regulations.

The results of the survey indicated that to some extent respondents argued that as they had not information about Woreda taking measurement when its workers were not abided by its rules and regulations. This showed that the practice of penalty was not announced to the public.

In line with this, the focus group discussion respondents noted that in fact punishment did not create structural solution but the Woreda was not monitored and supported enough as far as its power and function herein. Adding to this, the majority of key informant's response this matter as the drawback of the Woreda since this controlling mechanism destroyed due to relativism, locality and carelessness.

In relation to the above, as depicted in table 4.10 (the third question) respondents were asked to reflect their view on the cross checking the Woreda for the effective activities of the officials. Accordingly, by considering the above table the researcher concluded that activates of the different levels of the service users and service providers did not monitoring and cross checking. The current result was supported by other scholars, for instance, Meskerem (2007), contended that weak Checking, controlling and monitoring power or activities in local government of Ethiopia were common as hindrance of good governance. Likewise, Abraham (2011) in his study point out that weak coordination due the absence commitment and poor skill man power are the causes insufficient monitoring and cross checking the activities of government officials.

Furthermore, almost all the focus group participants and key informants of the interview confirmed with the insufficient supervising, controlling, checking and coordinating of the Woreda land administration to the Tabiya and village land administration committee performance. The Woreda land administration only needed reports regardless of its reliability. For instance, the land distribution in war Guba and land compensation and grabbing in Kara were committed without knowledge of Woreda land administration. From this fact, it could be concluded that the cross-checking system of the Woreda was underneath or not worth enough.

The last question in table 4.10, respondents also was asked to check the acceptance of decision of higher bodies by the Tabiya service providers. The result of the table indicated that the majority of the respondents agreed the acceptance of the decision of the higher bodies by the Tabiya service providers. But in contrast, the respondents in the focus group discussion argued that the Tabiya service providers only followed the decisions of the higher body for the sake of survival

and position as well as to escape from political suspecting. The current result was supported by other researchers like Abraham (2011) contended that the upward accountability of Woreda government practiced because the strong interference from regional organs and officials.

4.4.2. Capacity and responsibility in land administration

Table4. 11: perception of respondents in relation to confidence and professionalism in land administration

	SA		A		UC		DA		SDA		Total	
TABIY A	1. Have the Leaders and service providers confidence to discharge their responsibility Effectively											
	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	FR	PRT	PR	PRT	PR	PRT
War Guba	4	2.63	3	1.97	7	4.60	36	23.68	102	67.10	152	100
Kara	2	1.31	12	7.89	20	13.15	96	63.15	21	13.81	152	100
Q2	Do you think that the administrator and service providers of your Tabiya? exercised legitimate decision											
War Guba	6	3.94	7	4.60	22	14.47	58	38.15	59	38.81	152	100
Kara	2	1.31	31	20.39	18	11.84	35	23.02	46	30.26	152	100
Q3	Have the leader and service providers commitment to high standards or principles of professional conducts											
War Guba	1	0.65	3	1.97	4	2.63	90	59.21	54	35.52	152	100
Kara	11	7.23	22	14.42	17	11.18	53	34.86	49	32.23	152	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

In table 4.11 question number 1, respondents were asked on the confidence of the leaders and service providers in discharging responsibility effectively but the majority of the respondents were rejected to it in both Tabiyas. In this case, the performance of leaders and service providers regarding to the potential to discharging their tasks.

In relation to this survey, the focus group respondents and key informants of the interview noted

that all except few of land administration workers had no confidence due to knowledge gap related with land policy, proclamation, directive and regulations. In other words, the land administration office did not match to the concept of the right person in the right position. Because of this, the service providers and administrators were felt inferiority of complexity and

sense of fragility. Besides, the land administration reports of (2015 and 2016) described the poor confidence was caused by lack of self-learning, network discussion, and sharing experience, professional expert and low academic grades. From those reasons, responsibility no longer done effectively there in since the bold knowledge gap in the all levels of land administration particularly in the Tabiya land administration.

Similarly, Abraham (2011) contended that Local governments were severe potential difficulties in relation to administrative and technical implementation of their responsibilities for the satisfaction of the community. In this regard, the lack of capacity constrained in discharging the power and functions assigned to them by the constitution and other laws

In line with the above idea in table 4.11 in the second question, respondents were also asked on the matter of exercising legitimate power particularly in decisions of the administrators and service providers of both levels. As it was shown in the above table, the service providers and administrators did not exercise sound decision. According to the response of the respondents in the open-ended questionnaire, the administrators and service providers didn't exercise the legitimate power in decision making due to poor knowledge and skill about land laws and their responsibility. Likewise, they claimed that the service providers and administrators abuse their power to overcome the personal benefit over common good such as revenge, corruption and rent seeking due to the absence of checking and controlling from higher body and grass root. In line with this, they also argued that the legitimate decision was diminishing by the intervention of the local party leaders such as the Woreda and Tabiya chief executive.

Furthermore, the reports of 2015 and 2016 of the Woreda land administration the attitudes of locality, rent seeking, relativism and friendship administration were among the seeds to the practice of illegitimate decision in this public sector. As far as the above statistically and qualitative discussion, the researcher concluded that there is no fair decision owing to knowledge gap in land laws, public interest and political versus administrative issues.

In the last question the respondents were asked to forward the feeling concerned with the commitment of service providers and administrators to the high standard or principles of

professional conducts. Accordingly, the largest percentage of the respondents were covered between disagree and strongly disagree professional commitment of them. To back up this, almost all the focus group and interviewed respondents said that the commitment of the service providers and administrators to follow the principles of professional conducts were comedown because of weak incentives, civic mind, confidence, motivation and the like. From here, the researcher concluded that commitment in this public institution was at go off stage.

Table4. 12.perception of respondents regarding to decisions and practice of accountability in the land administration

Questions		SA	A	UC	DA	SDA	Total
1) Do you believe decentralized local go variances is an obstacle to the practice of accountability in your Tabiya?	FR	61	51	24	10	6	152
	PRT	40.13	33.55	15,78 8	6.57	3.94	100
2) Decision making process is independent from political criteria	FR	2	4	20	61	65	152
	PRT	1.31	2.63	13.15	40.13	42.76	100
3) Is there land conflicts occur due to poor decision of service providers?	FR	64	67	14	5	2	152
	PRT	42.10	44.07	9.21	3.28	1.31	100

Source: my own field survey, 2017

Concerning the obstacle of decentralized local land governance in exercising accountability respondents were asked. From the above survey, more than 70% of respondents were not confirmed to the contribution of decentralization in ensuring accountability in the local land administration. To back up this, the result in the open-end questionnaire showed that decentralized administration as a way to open the door for the practice of locality, cheating, relativism and poor check and balance. Moreover, due to the system decentralization the local positions were occupied by unskilled personnel. But the respondents did not deny the theoretical advantages of the decentralized administration system. In line with this concept, Mulugeta (2012) found in his study the Ethiopia decentralization was characterized by top-down police of implementation, poor commitment of local administration and low implementation capacity and negligence. Furthermore, Abraham (2011) revealed that decentralization process in the local government is challenged by series capacity problems in preparing plan and implement responsibilities as well as the local administrators and service providers do not know their detail

the legal mandates, responsibilities and authorities. Hence, they fail to ensure the effective supervision, reporting, monitoring and evaluation between the local governments.

To back up the above arguments, the focus group discussion respondents noted that the existence of decentralized administration herein simply because the federal structure Ethiopia include the Woreda as a main vehicle but in practice it is nominal since the government did not employ professional experts. Whereby, decentralization in this public sector holdup the status of accountability since powers or positions takeover by political criteria and personal closeness in the selected public institution. From this, the researcher perceived that the system of decentralization did not exercise in this public institution. In this case, it is an obstacle to carry out the principle of accountability in effective manner.

The second question in table 4.12 deal with the independent decision-making process particularly from the political aspects was asked respondents. Accordingly, the researcher concluded that political influence had in the land administration sector. To back up this, most of the key interviewed informants argued that political intervention was common in land case decision. In this regard, when the decision was done without the consent of the local party leaders', leads to perpetuated conflict and faced tortures for the professional experts. For instance, this case applied in war Guba town in deciding the issue of freehold land or old existing land without considering the directive of the free holding land by choice political measurements for the sake of short-term acceptance. But later the problem was birth conflict between the professional experts and political administrators. Finally, the professional experts of the sector win because the decision was not based on the law. The same political intervention also was faced in Wrguba where the Tabiya administrator, the Tabiya manager and contractor were agreed for shift investment land to individual resettlement in order to create political acceptance and to collect rent seeking.

Yilmaz and Venugopal (2008), supported the above current result, argued that lack of separation of executive and legislature together with the lack of political competition increasing to weak accountability at local level. Thus, the land administration of this Woreda was faced confusion between the administrative and political aspect of decisions. This implied that there were unclear responsibilities and powers in the selected Woreda land administration.

The last question is about whether occurred or not land conflict due to poor decisions of the service providers. As a result, the majority of the respondents said that replied strongly agree and agree due to these poor decisions of service providers and administrators led to land conflict

in this area. To back up this, according to the finding of the focus group discussion, land conflict was frequently faced particularly in the Tabiyas resettlement aspect. In this regard more than one individual got settlement at the same land due to the absence of specific map and certificate in the land administration. The land conflict also was created between individuals and investors because of the misconception of Woreda and Tabiya land administration decisions.

Equivalent with the finding of the focus group respondents, Ashenafi (2013) found that uncertainty of boundaries or allocation of the same piece of land to more than one individual was a main source of conflict. This kind of conflict also occurs owing to improper documentations,

absence of immediate data available, weak transparency and accountability and manipulation of customary law. In line with this, among the key informants of the interview claimed that the service providers and administrators of land administration particularly the Tabiya frequently decided doubtful issues by partly without investigation the conflict cases thereupon the level of the conflict escalated by far.

However, the proclamation No.239/2006 article 34 sub article 2 (b) NEGARIT GAZETA of Tigray prohibited giving final decision without checking and listening the conflicting issues between and /or parties. From this reason, the researcher concluded that the partiality decision, misconception between stake holders and absence available data go far the conflict herein.

Chapter Five: Conclusion and Recommendation

5.1. Conclusion

With regarding to transparency, the finding showed that the community had lack of awareness and access of information about land laws, rules, regulations, directives, proclamations, plans, reports and decisions. Hence, the service users due to the poor capacity of the administrators and service providers in creating effective communication among them where in challenge. As a result, the service users had no knowledge what was expected from them in the realm of service provision. This has a great obstacle on the process of implementations.

This study also revealed that the Woreda office did not carry out discussion to create knowhow on public by arranging time schedule in conducting meeting about the land issues and its structural procedures. The main reason was the land administration office did not have integrity, capacity and commitment rather the service providers and administrators of the Woreda land administration were corrupters and rent seekers. In contrary, the study indicated that suggestion boxes were available to handle grievances and to get feedback from service users. This showed that the positive step forward of the selected public institution especially at Woreda level but it was for the sake of superficial.

The study showed that there were no open decision-making procedures, especially in relation to land compensation and distribution in the selected public institution. This was worse in Tabiya than Woreda level, and this led to over crowdedness of complaints to service providers and administrators hierarchically under the study area. However, they could not get solutions for, because the service providers and administrators were engaged with lack of shouldering responsibilities, blurred actions and responsibilities of respective authorities, fragmented and arbitrary decisions.

Furthermore, the study indicated that the data recording system in the selected land administration offices was remained weak even though the Woreda Desk (land administration) used Computerized system of recording data which deteriorate by poor human skill and interruption of electric power. In addition, the recorded files in the hard copy were in old and shabby documents or torn out and lost. Those atmospheres hamper to the clarity of documented information to the service users. The absence of clear documented datum opens the room for discrimination and corruption under the study area. To sum up, the level of transparency in the land administration

under the study area remained at very low level.

With regard to accountability, the study showed that the selected public institution did not exercise legitimate and sound decision since the service providers and administrators had poor knowledge, low confidence, rent seeking behavior, insufficient supervision, controlling, checking and coordination, sense locality and relativism. On the other hands, the absence of right position by the right person and political intervention to the technical matters were challenges of accountability. Rather corruption was developed at all levels widely. The service providers and administrators were full of greedy attitudes, lack of monitoring and checking and lack of coordination. They also used false data, file, stamps, and witness as well as missed documents as mechanisms to cheating. In this case, they used corruption as a means of direct wealth. In fact, they were committed with different types of corruption, but nepotism and bribe were dominantly practiced, By which they discriminated to the poor and marginalized section of society. From those reasons, the client's satisfaction was very low. In addition, appellants were dissatisfied due to the acts of inequality, frustration, systematic torturing and postpone cases as well as the absence of formal written evidence to appealing. To this end, culture of accountability in land administration under the study area was very low.

Furthermore, even though the rural land proclamation of Tigray Regional State clearly stated that the down ward and upward accountability of any public officials land administration, the study showed that accountability in the land administration of the selected Woreda relatively exercise upward either to the party leader or the boss for the sake of survival and to escape from political suspecting. Because of this, they were not effective in their task. In contrast to this, down ward accountability under the study area was neglected, due to the service users and administrators disregard to the public interest, rules and regulations. Likewise, the higher body had poor cross checking and taking measurements in the subsequent levels of land administration through monitoring, supervising and coordinating. From those reason problems frequently committed such as in land distribution, compensation and grabbing.

Generally, the study showed that there was no good governance particularly in the perspective of transparency and accountability in the local land administration public sector. Lack of commitments, inadequate knowledge or awareness and confidence, corruption, lack of open decision, inaccessibility of information, weak coordination and monitoring, blurred responsibility and discrimination were among the bottleneck of good land governance in Hintalo Wajerat Woreda Land Administration.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the research and conclusions, the researcher has forwarded recommendations and policy implementations to various levels of decision makers and potential researchers.

- The result showed that the majority of the communities were suffering from the absence of access information in the issues of land administration. From this fact, the councils of Woreda and Tabiya should work corporately with the Tabiya administrators and managers to deliver land proclamation, regulations and directives to Tabiya land administrators and judges as well as the community. They should inform to the community where and how they can get the necessary materials at public meetings, religious days and in the grievance expression days of the complaints. Indeed, to avoid such kind problem, the office should create awareness and culture of reading on the community via putting land books, laws, regulations, proclamations, directives and policies as well as reports and plans of land administration in public library or Mini library in each office of land administration. Moreover, the service providers and administrators should discuss with the service user and other stakeholders by arranging periodic meetings regarding to land laws and their implementations in order to strengthening good communication and building capacity of the service providers and service users or stakeholders. These all can help to enhance clear images among service providers and users.
- The result showed that the Woreda land administration was lagged behind to consolidate the culture of accountability due to disregarding to the will of the people and rules and regulations, poor commitment and frequently arrest individuals due to corruption. Therefore, the Woreda land administration should create awareness about the values of downward accountability as well as the mechanisms to ensure it to the service providers and administrators through providing manuals, sharing inter and intra Woreda experiences. Moreover, the Woreda administration should order for the Woreda land administration to strengthen the mechanisms of supervising, controlling, checking, and coordinating to the Tabiya and Village land administration committee performance. This activity can also avoid land grabbing and unfair land compensation as well as ensuring the reliability of reports.
- The study revealed that the service providers and administrators of the land administration had no confidence to discharging their responsibilities and to make legitimate decisions because they felt inferiority of complexity and sense of fragility which are caused by the knowledge gap

related with land policy, proclamation, directive and regulation. To avoid thus, The Woreda should preserve skillful and knowledgeable professional workers by providing long- and short-term training to empower and build the capacity of service provider. Likewise, the Woreda land administration should be strengthen the programs of network discussion and sharing experience.

➤ The duties of the service providers and administrators of the land administration at all level were not well defined in clear way. Accordingly, the Woreda administration and the Woreda land Desk should discuss the proclamations, regulations and directives to clearly set the roles and functions from Woreda to Kushet level. They should also make necessary efforts to create knowledge to Tabiya land committees, and stakeholders by creating vertical and horizontal coordination frame work to avoid the overlapping and neglected roles in the land administration, and shoulder responsibilities for duties or actions.

➤ The study indicated Corruption was as a main obstacle of good governance in the land administration. Therefore, the regional government of Tigray and Federal anticorruption commission should create awareness on the public for the evils of corruption and how to control the power of public officials by opening public discussion and giving short term training to the public at different rounds. Then create aggressive mobilizing forces as watchdogs to fight corruption through monitoring, checking and exposing corrupters as well as give necessary protection and incentives for whistle blowers.

➤ The study indicated that Suggestion box nominally available in the offices of land administration. Thus, the office of land administration should use the suggestion box to collect feed backs from service users by identifying the feeling of the service users every week by establishing rotating committee. Finally, the committee should report the original feed back to the Woreda administration and then arrange open discussion with the public regarding the issues. Moreover, the feed backs use as input in decisions makings like in the realm of service provision and complain solving mechanisms.

➤ The Woreda administration should modify the Woreda 's grievance recipient office to oversee its principles in practice. This helps to ensure its goals with the participation of all concerned stake holders in decision making and service delivery to eliminate maladministration by strengthening the mechanisms of checking and controlling decision of public officials in the references of good governance principles. The grievance recipient office also should determine the existence of free flow of information to the Community. Furthermore, it can develop the attitudes of civic disposition and civic commitment in the mind of service users and providers of land administration to apply the principles of good governance in a high level of commitment, dignity, and honesty in all aspects of work to achieve sustainable progress.

- The Woreda land desk should properly use the newly established government teams like network, and development team to discuss and reflect the ideas of the constituent in every local area about the conflict and grievances raised regarding to the land laws, rules and regulations and information flow with a strong follow up. Eventually, if the community is informed about the land issues, it is helpful to avert or avoid the perception of favoritism and locality.
- The study indicated that conflicts or disagreements were faced in the selected Woreda due to lack of specific border demarcations and the absence owned individuals' clear evidences like certificate. From this fact, the Woreda land administration should consolidate the modern and scientific international cadastral system by GPS to set the definite boarder of all owners. The Woreda land administration should also provide to the land owners the maps and certificate in their hand to assure the clarity in preventing and solving boarder land conflict. This also can avoid the overlapping investors and individual resettlement on the same land.
- Moreover, the study demonstrated that there were problems when land transfer from rural land administration to town land administration due to lack of enough and clear documents which condition birth problems like land grappling, blurred procedure or arbitrariness and corruption related with land compensation particularly around War Guba and Kara. Therefore, the Woreda land desk and Tabiya land administrations should keep clear and comprehensive evidence about the rural and town lands of the Woreda existence situations. In addition, the Woreda should arrange short term training regarding to data recording. Furthermore, the Woreda 's electric power problem should be solved in order to proper set and search the data in the computer.
- The Woreda land administration should create panel discussions with the lawyers, politicians and civic teachers to conceptualize the principles, values and experiences of good governance in international, national, and local arena in consideration the land laws, rules, regulations, directives and proclamations. The land administration should also create strong communication with the representatives of mass associations like youth, women and peasant associations to understand the general perception and satisfaction of the community in the procedures and implementations of land proclamations, regulations and directives in the ground.
- The study indicated that the practice of compensation was acted against to the public and the government. In this respect, the administrators and service providers with some individual resident overwhelming corruption, discrimination and biased in the process of compensation via ignoring the rules and regulations of the land particularly Tabiya. Mainly, the regional government and anti-corruption and Ethical Commission of Tigray should check and control when the land is expropriated from individual's residents for the purpose of public good.

Thereafter, they should follow and monitor the process of compensation.

➤ Furthermore, according to the key informants of interview and focus group discussion particularly War Guba and Kara, political intervention practiced to administrative decisions. Therefore, the Woreda administration should demarcate the political and administrative areas of decisions. In other words, the Woreda administration should check whether the political administrators break or not to the principles of the land proclamations, regulations and directives when making decision.

➤ Little research had been done on the area of good governance at the local level. From those previously conducted studies, the researcher stand to add little progress in upgrading good governance especially in Raya Azebo Woreda land administration in the issues accountability and transparency. The researcher should also use this preliminary research as an attractive for other potential researchers to conduct research works in considering not only the two selected principles but also the other principles of good governance.

References

- Abraham, A. A., (2014) —Delaying the Delayed! Ethiopia, the Quest for Social-Accountability of Local Governments' Service Provision, International Journal of Novel Research in Humanity and Social Sciences Vol. 1, Issue 2, pp: (21-32), Month: November-December 2014.
- Abraham, G.G., (2011) —Assessment on the Implementation of Woreda Decentralization in Gambella Regional state: the Case of Abobo and Lare Woredas', MA thesis, School of Graduate Studies Center for Regional and Local Development Studies, Addis Ababa University
- Adejumobi, S., (2006) Governance and Poverty Reduction in Africa: A Critique of the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), Presented to the Inter-Regional Conference on Social Policy and Welfare Regimes in Comparative Perspectives in U.S.A from April 20-22, 2006.
- AGGN, (2010) Addressing Good Governance In Africa, A Discussion Paper at the 1st 2010 AGGN Seminar held on 21st- 27 of March, in Bonn, Germany.
- Akokpari, J.K., (2004) —The AU, NEPAD and the Promotion of Good Governance in Africa, Nordic Journal of African Studies 13(3): 243–263 (2004).
- Amugune B.K, (2014) Sample Size Determination and Sampling Techniques, Mental Health Workshop, 15TH October 2014.
- Ashenafi, G.N., (2013) —Local Governance in Rural Land Conflict Management: The case of Ganta Afeshum wereda, Eastern Zone of Tigray', MA thesis, Department of management, Mekelle university.
- Asian Development Bank (2010) Governance and Anticorruption in Project Design.
- AU (2007) African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance, the Eighth Ordinary Session of the Assembly, Held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 30 January 2007.
- Bekalu, M., (2015) —The move towards the developmental state in FDRE: The role of intergovernmental relation (IGR) for its implementation preserving the autonomy of regional states', MA thesis, Faculty of Law, Addis Ababa University.
- Belay (2012) Assessment of Good Governance and Administration of Urban Land of Abi Adi Town, Tigray Regional State, Ethiopia.
- Bell, K.C., (2007) —Good Governance in Land Administration, FIG Working Week, Hong Kong, China SAR, May 13-17, 2007.
- Berhanu, A. and Feyera, A., (2005) Land registration in Amhara Region, Ethiopian. Russell

- press, Nottingham, UK.
- Bogale, A. Taeb, M., and Endo (2006) —Land ownership and conflict over the use of resources: Implication for house hold vulnerability in Eastern Ethiopia, *Journal of Ecological economics*, 58, pp. 134-145.
- Bordens, K.S. and Abbott.B.B, (2008) *Research Design and Methods: process and Approach* (8th ed.), New York: McGraw-hill.
- Burns,T., and Dalrymple, K .,(2008) Conceptual Framework for Governance in Land Administration, paper prepared for and presented at the FIG Working Week in Stockholm, Sweden 14-19 June 2008.
- Carrington, W., Debusse, J. and Lee, H., (2008), *The Theory of Governance & Accountability*. The University of Iowa Center for International Finance and Development May 2008.
- Chaudhry, I.S., Malik, S., Khan, K.N and Rasool, S., (2009) Factors Affecting Good Governance in Pakistan: An Empirical Analysis, *European Journal of Scientific Research* ISSN 1450-216X Vol.35 No.3 (2009), pp.337-346
- Cheema, G.S. and Maguire, L., (n.d) *Democracy, Governance and Development: A Conceptual Framework*.
- Chowdhury and Skarstedt, C.E.,(2005) *The Principle of Good Governance: A Legal Working Paper in the CISDL —Recent Developments in International Law Related to Sustainable Development* II Series ,March 2005 ,Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Commonwealth of Australia (2000) *Good governance: Guiding principles for implementation* the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), Canberra (place).
- Cosmas, T.M., (2013) *‘Towards Good Land Governance in Tanzania? The Case of Urban Mbeya’*, MA thesis, Institution of Social Study, Nether land.
- Creswell, J., (2003) *Research Design: Qualitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, London: Sage.
- Crook, R., (n.d) *Decentralization and Good Governance* (pp.400-433), published by Forum of Federations.
- Daniel, K. and Kraay, A. (2008). *Government indicators: where are we, where should we be going?*, *The World Bank Research Observer*, vol. 23, no. 1 (Spring 2008) ,Oxford University Press
- Dawson(2007) *Practical Guide to research Methodology*
- Deininger, K., Selod, H., and Burns, T., (n.d.) *Using the land governance assessment framework (LGAF): lessons and next steps*.
- Dessalegn, R., Akalewold, B., Yoseph, E., (2008). *CSOs/NGOs IN Ethiopia: Partners in*

- Development and Good Governance, A Report Prepared for the Ad Hoc CSO/NGO Task Force, Addis Ababa.
- Dinka, T., Girma, D. & Ermias, A., (2016) —An Assessment of the Challenges and Prospects of Good Urban Governance Practice in the Land Administration System: Case of Shambu Town, Oromia Region, Ethiopia, Journal of Good Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa (JGGSDA), Vol. 3, No 3, December, 2016.
- Ebert, F.S., (2010) _Anthology of Research and an Anthology of Peace and Security_, Research Institute for Peace and Security Studies, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Economic Commission for Africa (2005), _Striving for Good Governance in Africa_, Synopsis of the 2005 African Governance Report Prepared for the African Development Forum IV, published in the first African Governance Reporting 2005.
- EIO (2012) The First & Historic East African Ombudsman Regional Forum, V o l u m e 2 Issue 2 Ma r - A p r 2 0 1 2, Addis Ababa.
- Endo, V., (2008) Governance in Land Administration: Peru Case Study, Workshop on Governance and Corruption in Land and Natural Resource Tenure, 13th International Anti-Corruption Conference Athens, Greece 30 October – 2November 2008.
- Ethiopia Country Report (2014) The period from 31 January 2011 to 31 January 2013.
- Fagbadebo, O., (2007). —Corruption, Governance and Political Instability in Nigeria—, African Journal of Political Science and International Relations Vol. 1 (2), pp. 028-037, November 2007.
- FAO (2007) Good Governance in land Tenure and administration vol.9. Food and Agricultural Organization UN (FAO).www.fao.org/docrep/010/a1179e/a1179e00.htm
- FDRE (1995) The Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. Proclamation No.1/1995. Addis Abeba, Ethiopia.
- FDRE Negarit Gazeta (2005) Federal Democratic of Ethiopia Rural Land Administration and Land Use, Proclamation 456/2005 , 11th year No.44, Addis Abeba-15th July, Ethiopia.
- Fitsum, A., (2013) _Assessment of Good governance in Decentralized city Administration: Case o f Mekelle Municipality_, MA thesis, Department of Management, Mekelle University.
- Fitsum, W. A., (2016) —Assessment of Responsiveness and Transparency: The case of Mekelle, Journal of Civil and Legal Science 2016, 5:3.
- Frey, K. (2008), Development good governance and local democracy, (2008) 2(2) 39-73.

- Gebreselassie K.H., (2011) _Challenges of Good Governance in Local Government: The case of SaesieTsaedamba Woreda, Tigray Region, Ethiopia', MA thesis, Department of Management, Mekelle University.
- Ghirma (2007) On Good Governance & the misconceptions thereof
- Gizachew, A., (n.d.) Efficiency, Accountability and Transparency in Public Procurement: The level of Compliance in Africa (Ethiopian case) Part six.
- Gray, H.S and Khan, M.H., (2010) Good Governance and Growth in Africa: What can we learn from Tanzania? (In Padayachee, Vishnu, (ed.) thePolitical Economy of Africa, London: Routledge, 2010. pp. 339-356.)
- Grindle, (2010). Good Governance: The Inflation of an Idea, Faculty Research Working Paper Series, and Harvard Kennedy School.
- Grindle, M.S., (2007) Going Local: Decentralization, Democratization, and The promise of good governance, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Groenendijk, L., Hagenima, F., Lengoiboni, M., Hussen, S. Musinguzi, M., Ndjovu, C. C. And Wayumba, C. ,(2013) Land Administration Academic Education in Eastern Africa.
- Hadingham, T., (2003). _Decentralization and Development Planning: Some Practical Considerations.'
- .
- IFAC (2013) Good governance in public sector: consultation Draft for International Framework.
- IFAD (1999) Good Governance: an Overview, Executive Board – Sixty-Seventh Session, 8-9 September 1999, Rome.
- IMF (1997) The Role of the IMF in Governance Issues: Guidance Note (Approved by the IMF Executive Board, July 25, 1997), Washington, D.C. 20431, And U.S.A: IMF.
- Israel, G.D., (1992) Sampling the Evidence of Extension Program Impact (Determining Sample Size). Program Evaluation and organizational Development, IFAS, University of Florida, PEOD-5, October.

- Kumera, K.T., (2006) —Decentralized governance and service delivery, A case study of Digelu and Tijo Woreda of Arsi Zone in Oromia Region, MA thesis ,Institute of Regional and Local Development Studies (RLDS), Addis Ababa University.
- Lantmäteriverket (2008) Land administration— why, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency.
- Liou, K.T., (2007) Applying good governance concept to promote local economic development: contribution and challenge, International Journal of Economic Development Volume nine, numbers 1 & 2, pp. 1-31 2007.
- Lucy, E. and Zeo, S., (2010) Assessing the evidence of the Impact of Governance on Development outcomes and poverty reduction.
- Manasan, R., G., Gonzal, E.T. and Gaffud, R.B., (1999) —Indicators of good governance: developing an index of governance quality at the LGU levels, journal of Philippine development number 48, volume xxvi, No.2, second semester 1999.
- Marcus J. Kurtz and Schrank, A., (2007) —Growth and Governance: Models, Measures, and Mechanisms, The Journal of Politics, Vol. 69, No. 2, May 2007, pp. 538–554.
- Mekolo, A. and Resta, V., (2005) Governance Progress in Africa: Challenges and Trends, Division for Public Administration and Development Management(DPADM Discussion paper November 2005), United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
- Melkamu, B. and Shewaken, A, (2010) Facing the challenges in building Sustainable Land Administration Capacity in Ethiopia. .FIG Congress, Sydney, Australia.
- Meskerem, S, (2007) _Status of local governance at Woreda/District level in Ethiopia_, Written for the 4th international conference on Ethiopian studies, organized by Western Michigan

University.

- Mhrtay, A. T., (2014) _Assessment on Performance Good in Land Administration at Local Level: The Case of Naeder Adet Woreda, Tigray Region, Ethiopia', MA thesis, Department of management, Mekelle University.
- Mhrtay, A., (2015) —The Performance of Good Governance on Land Administration at Local/Woreda Level: The Case of Naeder Adet Woreda, Tigray Region, Ethiopia, Academic Research Journal Vol. 3(9), pp. 376-385, September 2015.
- Milunouic, N-R, (2010) The African Governance crisis: Do public sector reforms in Africa Inhibit Economic Development?
- Muhammad (2006) Ethiopia. The performance of Woreda decentralization program in Amhara national regional state.
- Mulugeta, D.G., (2012) _Decentralization in Ethiopia: Concept and Process, the Case of Dendi District, West Shoa Zone of Oromia_, Dr.rer. Pol. Degree Dissertation, Faculty of Spatial Planning, Technische University Dortmund, Dortmund, GERMANY.
- Mutesi, F., (2014) A views point Remand's Governance.
- Mwangi, W., & Nyika, D., (2010) The impacts of poor Governance on Land Development Applications Processes, Nairobi, 46th ISOCARP Congress 2010.
- Negalegn, M. B., (2010) _An Assessment of the Current status of Decentralized Governance and Self-administration in Amhara National Regional state: Case study on Awi Nationality Administrative Zone', MA thesis, Facility of Business and Economics, Addis Ababa university.
- Nigussie, M., (2016) _Application of Good Governance Principles and Management in Addis Ababa Challenges in Yeka Sub City', MA thesis, Department of Public Administrations and Development Management, Addis Ababa University.
- Ogundiya, I.S., (2010) —Democracy and good governance: Nigeria's dilemmall, African Journal of Political Science and International Relations Vol. 4(6), pp. 201-208, June 2010.
- Parigi, V.K., Geeta, P., and Kailasa, R., (2004) Ushering in Transparency for Good Governance, Center for Good Governance, Hyderabad.
- Popoola, F., (2011) —Governance crisis in Nigeria: An empirical analysis of co-production as Panacea for service delivery, International Journal of Business and Social Science Vol. 2 No. 16, September 2011.
- Punyaratabandhu, S., (2004) Commitment to Good governance, Development, and Poverty reduction: Methodological issues in the Evaluation of Progress at National and Local levels, A Paper Prepared for the Sixth Session of the Committee on Development Policy,

- March 29 – April 2, 2004, National Institute of Development Administration, Bangkok, Thailand.
- Rwanda Joint Governance Assessment report (2008), Final Approved Version – 8 October 2008.
- Samsudin, S., Lay-Cheng, J., and McCluskey, W., (2014) Decentralization and Good Governance in Land Administration Systems.
- Santiso, C., (n.d) Governance Conditionality and the Reform of Multilateral Development Finance: The Role of the Group of Eight, G8 Governance, and Number7.
- Sasaoka, J., (2005) Institution Building for Poverty Reduction and Local Governance: The Cases of Tanzania, Ethiopia and Kenya. April 2005, No.13 GRIPS Development Forum Discussion Paper.
- Savic, D., (2006) E-governance: Theoretical foundation and practical implementations.
- Scott, Z. and Earle, L., (2010) ‘Assessing the Evidence of the Impact of Governance on Development Outcomes and Poverty Reduction’, International Development Department, University of Birmingham.
- Sebudubudu, D., (2010) —The impact of good governance on development and poverty in Africa: Botswana-A relatively successful African, African Journal of Political Science and International Relations Vol. 4(7), pp. 249-262, October 2010.
- Singh, B.P., (n.d) The Challenge of Good Governance in India: Need for Innovative Approaches.
- Stimson, (2015) Confronting the Crisis of Global Governance Report of the Commission on Global Security, Justice and Governance June 2015, The Netherlands and Washington, DC.
- Subedi, G., (2009) ‘Good Land Governance in Nepal’. Ministry of General Administration, Nepal. Year, Issue, Kathmandu.
- Tegegne G.E& Kassahun, B., (2006) Decentralization in Ethiopia, Addis Ababa University.
- Tegegne Gebre-Egziabher (n.d) Decentralization in Ethiopia, Institute of Regional and Local Development Studies, Addis Ababa University.
- Tesfaye, F.M.,(2007) Anti-corruption Efforts in Ethiopia
- Tigray National Regional state Negarit Gazeta (2006) Rural Land Use and Administration, Proclamation No 239/2006, Year 21, no 1 Mekelle, Ethiopia.
- Tigray Regional Government Anti-Corruption and Ethical commission (2008) Manual Material on investigation of Gerebsegen land compensation, Mekelle, Ethiopia
- Transparency International (2007), Transparency in Land Administration: A Capacity Building Agenda for Africa. Expert Group Meeting on Transparency in Land Administration, Nairobi, Kenya.

- Uddin, A., (2010) —Impact of Good Governance on Development in Bangladesh, MA thesis, Institute of Society and Globalization Roskilde University, Roskilde, Denmark.
- UDDIN, M.J., and JOYA, L.A., (2007) —Development Through Good Governance: Lessons for Developing Countries, Asian Affairs, Vol. 29, No. 3:1-28, July-September 2007.
- UN (2007) Good Governance Practices for the Protection of Human Rights, New-York and Geneva: UN Publication.
- UNDP (1994) Good Governance and Sustainable Human Development. Geneva: UNDP.
- UNDP (2006) Governance For the Future: Democracy and Development in the Least Developed Countries.
- UN-GGIM (2015) The Application of Geospatial Information Land Administration and Management.
- UN-HABITAT and Transparency International, (2004) Tools to Support Transparency in Local Governance, Nairobi, UN-Habitat.
- United Nations (2007) Public Governance Indicators: A Literature Review, New York: UN.
- United Nations committee of experts on Global geospatial information management (UNCEGGIM), (2015) The application of geospatial information. Land administration and management, UN-GGIM Version 3.1.
- USAID (2002) Rwanda Democracy and Governance Assessment, Washington, DC.
- USAID (2004) Ethiopia Land Policy and Administration Assessment.
- USAID (2008) Corporate Governance for Emerging Markets, Washington, DC: the Center for International Private Enterprise.
- USAID (2010) Comparative Assessment of Decentralization in Africa: Ethiopia Desk Study. Report prepared for the United States Agency for International Development, Task Order 15, Completed between May 1 and September 27, 2010 and Approved JULY 2010.
- WB (2006) Public Sector Governance and Accountability Series: Local Governance in Developing Countries, Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Weldeabrha, N., (2017) —Decentralized Good Governance in Rural Land Administration, International Journal of Engineering Development and Research Volume 5, Issue 2, pp132-142.
- Williamson, L.P., (2000) Best Practices for Land Administration Systems in Developing Countries, International Conference on Land Policy Reform , Jakarta, 25-27 July 2000.
- Yigremew, A., (2002) Review of land holding system and policies in Ethiopia under different regimes, Ethiopia economic policy research center institute, Work paper No 5/2002.
- Yilmaz, S. and Venugopal, V.(2008) *Local Government Discretion and Accountability in Ethiopia, the WB*

- Yusuf, B., Sileshi, T, and Admit Z., (2009) Land lease policy in Addis Ababa. Addis Ababa chamber of commerce and sartorial associations, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- Zemelak, A (2008) Local government in Ethiopia: Adequate Empowerment? LL.M Degree, Faculty of law, University of Western Cape.
- Zemenu, D. G., (2012) _Thesis Report on Land Tenure Security and Certification in Northern Ethiopia: The Case of Amharic Region', Wageningen University.

Appendix A
Mekelle University
College of Law and Governance Department of Civics and
Ethical Education

Dear respondents

The objective of the study is to collect reliable data related to good governance in land administration of Woreda Raya Azebo. To conduct this study, participation of the service providers and users have a great role to assess the critical agendas of good governance of the Woreda particularly in the issues of accountability and transparency by the researcher . Therefore, your participation and responses will have interesting contribution for purpose of the research in order to improve performance of good governance in the Woreda and to recommending policies concerning to governance matter. This study is conducting for partial fulfillment of the requirement for MA degree in Civic and Ethics.

Questionnaires

The main intention of this questionnaire is to assess good governance in land administration in Raya Azebo Woreda. To success the research must need your reasonable, genuine view, frank opinion, and timely response. Moreover, your opinion must be free from any Personality because such kind of information of helpful to address the governance issues. Therefore, you're kindly requested to extend your cooperation by giving relevant information and filling the following questionnaire. The questionnaire includes three parts. The first part is about the individual characteristic of the respondent. The second and third parts are about issues of good governance in land administration mainly focused on accountability and transparency in the selected Woreda and Tabiyas respectively.

General Guidelines to dear respondents

You should be following the instruction provided for each part by give value to the questionnaire. The study is free from any religious or political stand from the fact that your answer must be based on objective manner. Moreover, there is no need writing name at the questionnaire because

the researcher only needs the data regardless the name of the respondent. The researcher maintains the principles of confidentiality, Also the researcher expects from you the fulfilling your responses on the space provided by putting circle (0).

A. back ground of respondents

1. Sex: A. Male B. Female
2. Age: A. 18-24 B .25-40 C.41-60 D. 60-80
3. Education level
- A. Never enrolled in school B. Grade 1 to 6 C. Grade 7 to 8
- D. Grade 9 to12 E. Certificate to Diploma F. Degree and above

Part one: Questionnaires regarding to Transparency in Tabiya Land Administration office

1. Rules and procedures of the office are clear.
A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. disagree E. strongly disagree
 2. Do you think that the decision is open to the public?
A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
 3. Does the community have awareness on the laws, rules and regulation regarding to land administration? A. strongly agrees B. Agree C. Disagree D. Strongly disagree
 4. Decisions made based unclear rules and regulations
A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
 5. Do you think that the grievance of complaints solves based on the clear rule and regulation law? A. strongly agree B. Agree C. strongly disagree D. uncertain E. Disagree
 6. Does the service provider make clear about the new land law, rules, regulations, proclamations and policies to the public before implementing?
A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
 7. If your answer question number 6 is strongly disagreed, how did they implement the new policies or programs practiced in the ground?
-

8. The Tabiya service providers have enough know how about the rule, regulation, directives and proclamation of land administration?
A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
 9. Do you think that the land distribution is based on the transparency manner to the people?
A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
 10. If your answer question number 10 is strongly disagreed, why?
-

11. Your Tabiya office of land administration have suggestion box to handling grievances?
A. yes B. No
12. The Tabiya Land offices keep clear comprehensive documents related to land issues A. strongly agrees B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
14. Are there challenges to the prevalence transparency in your Tabiya land administration? If yes, list the possible challenges? A. Yes B. No
-

15. In your Tabiya Land is given for investment in clear and open manner
A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagrees
16. In Tabiya level the compensation practice is open
A. strongly agrees B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
17. If your answer for question no 18 is strongly disagree or disagree, why?
-

18. Do you think that the Tabiya service providers ignore to expose illegal control of land?
A. strongly agrees B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
19. Do you know the articles and sub articles of the proclamation clearly
A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree?

Part two: Questionnaires regarding to Accountability in Tabiya Land Administration office

1. Do you think that the service providers and administrators Exercised legitimate power? A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. Strongly disagree
2. If your answer for question no 1 is strongly disagree or disagree. Clarify your justification
-

3. Administers and service providers are accountable for actions and decisions to the public? A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
4. Do the service providers solve the public complaints by follow the clear rules and regulation?
A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
5. What is the level of satisfaction of the service users by the decisions of the office?

- A. Highly satisfied B. satisfied C. Somehow satisfied D. dissatisfied E. Highly dissatisfied
6. Have the Leaders and service provider's confidence to charge their responsibility effectively
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
7. Have the leader and service provider's commitment to high standards for professional conducts and principles
- A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
8. Do you think that the service providers and leader commit corruption?
- A. yes B. no
9. If you believe there is corruption what is the degree of corruption?
- A. Very high B. High c. I cannot decide D. Low E. Very low
10. If you believe there is corruption, relatively highly committed type of corruption
- A. Nepotism B. Bribe C. Cheating D. Embezzlement E. abuse of power F. other
11. If your answer question 8 yes, where is corruption high when you compare between the Tabiya and Woreda administration? Clarify your answer by justification
- A. In Woreda B. in Tabiya

-
12. Do you think that the administrators and service providers are free from biases?
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Disagree C. Uncertain D. strongly disagree
13. Are there challenges to the prevalence accountability in your Tabiya land administration? If yes, list the possible challenges? A. Yes B. No

-
14. What do you think the role of your Tabiya to consolidating accountability in land administration?

-
15. Is there land conflicts occur due to poor decision of service providers?
- A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. strongly disagree
16. Do the service providers follow the decisions higher authorized body?
- A. strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree E. Strongly disagree
17. Do you have an opportunity to appeal to higher body when you are unsatisfied by the land administration office?
- A. Strongly agree B. Agree C. Uncertain D. Disagree D. Strongly disagree

Appendix B

Mekelle University College of Law and Governance Department of Civics and Ethical Education

Interview Guide

Interview guide for the service providers and administrators in the issues of good governance (accountability and transparency) in Woreda RayaAzebo land administration

1. What is the condition of good governance in your Tabiyas land administration? Please explain
2. What do you think are the major governance problems of your Tabiya land administration? Please explain
- 3 What are the main factors that can determine to make decisions in the land administration?
4. Have complete and adequate records data regarded to land issues? Please explain
5. Do you believe the service users have enough access of information about the declaration, rules, policies, procedures, principles and standards of land? Please explain
6. How can you evaluate your Tabiya land administration in terms of accountability and transparency? Why?
7. What do you think are the major obstacles of accountability and transparency in land administration? Please explain your justification
8. What are the contributions of your office to improve accountability and transparency in land administration? Please explain
9. Are the decisions of public officials open to the stake holders? Please how?
10. Do you know arrested administrators or service providers due to land related corruption? Please clarify

Appendix C
Mekelle University
College of Law and Governance Department of Civics and
Ethical Education

Focused Group Discussion

Good morning/Afternoon! Welcome to our group discussion.

I am Abay Abera and I came from Adigudom preparatory School

Now, we discuss about issues of good governance in land administration particularly regarding to accountability and transparency in RayaAzebo Woreda. Regardless right and wrong answer all questions need clearly and critically explain from daily experience. The purpose of the research is for academic purpose only due to this you should be point out your view without any doubt or fear. Your name will not be recorded because it is relevant for the study.

- 1). Are there challenges of good governance in your Tabiya land administration? Please explain
- 2) How do you minimize the obstacles of good governance in land administration?
Please explain?
3. What is the satisfaction of the society by the day-to-day activities of the service providers of land administration? Please explain
4. What are the main factors determining good governance in your Tabiya? Please explain
5. What do you think are the major factors or restraints of transparency and accountability in office of land administration? Please explain
6. Is there effort done by your Tabiya and Woreda administration to promote the practice of good governance in the land administration? Please explain