



ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at <http://www.journalijdr.com>

# IJDR

*International Journal of Development Research*

Vol. 10, Issue, 08, pp. 39209-39220, August, 2020

<https://doi.org/10.37118/ijdr.19701.08.2020>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

OPEN ACCESS

## ASSESSMENT OF GOOD GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES IMPLEMENTATION IN URBAN LAND ADMINISTRATION: THE CASE OF BISHOFTU TOWN

**\*Ashenafi Bekele**

Mekdela Amba University, College of Social Science and Humanities, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article History:

Received 20<sup>th</sup> May 2020

Received in revised form

11<sup>th</sup> June 2020

Accepted 01<sup>st</sup> July 2020

Published online 30<sup>st</sup> August 2020

#### Key Words:

Good Governance,

Urban land Administration.

*\*Corresponding author: Ashenafi Bekele*

### ABSTRACT

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

Copyright © 2020, Ashenafi Bekele. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Citation:** Ashenafi Bekele. "Assessment of good governance principles implementation in urban land administration: the case of bishoftu town", *International Journal of Development Research*, 10, (08), 39209-39220

### INTRODUCTION

Governance refers to the approach in which power is implemented by governments in managing a country's social, economic, and environmental recourses, in other words it is the process of decision making and the process by which decisions are implemented (Stig, 2009). Good governance in land administration is not a new idea, and essential for both developed and developing countries in many nations, land is a reason for social, ethnic, cultural and religious conflict for many years significant numbers of wars and revolutions have been occurred rights to land, throughout history, virtually all human developments have committed considerable efforts to defining rights to land and in establishing organizations to administer these rights, land administration strategy (Keith, 2007). Good governance within land administration and land management institutions is necessary for sustainable development both in terms of operational durability, equitable stakeholder involvement and benefits, and consistency in law and policy implementation (Tony and Kate, 2008) land in

towns is a major element in urban development, especially while going with land use, urban planning, taxation and protection basic rights while; insecurity of land tenure is a main bottleneck for urban growth and strictly harsh the source of revenue of poor urban residents (Tukstra, 2012). United Nations (UN) Feb 2008 defines land administration as "The process of determining, recording and disseminating information about ownership, value and use of land, when implementing land policies." In history, land issues have been an essential factor in Ethiopia's political and economic improvement for example the pre 1974 imperial regime supported a feudal agrarian organization, with major inequities based on ethnic identity and social class exploitation of the landless peasant tenants supported the nobility, government bureaucracy, military, and church (Ayeno, 2009). However, there were regional differences in the level of inequality in general; the population in Amhara and Tigray with their communal or kinship land regimes had comparatively more egalitarian access to land in, than the population in the South; even within these systems, there were significant inequities

(Asmelash, 2006). Land is a very essential resource and a driver of economic growth in Ethiopia but the way it managed and administrated has its own implication on a countries economy ,experts have belief that land is not set to good use in Ethiopia in addition; the country is plagued with corruption that torrent all sectors, including land administration and it is familiar with corruption as well as state detain; there are a number of factors in Ethiopia's present land administration system that can generate possible entry points for corrupt activities occurrence, from this some reasons are: lack of clear policies, weak institutions, lack of transparency, and limited society involvement, and lack of capacity building (Linder, 2014). The government of Ethiopia designed national programs, policies, and strategies to strengthen and sustain the country's implementation capacity, which is a key to build on the continuous democratization process; however, the economy has been faced with implementation capacity challenges, in line with the development strategies therefore, the implementation of public Service improvement plan and good governance packages were further enhanced ensuring efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and accountability at all level(MoFED, 2014)

**Statement of the Problem:** Good governance at stage of public level depends on state organs and public service organizations to enhance stakeholder's participatin, it also depends on a consistent, transparent, and accountable public administration that guarantees the fairness and effectiveness of decisions and their implementation, the treat to almost all problems that we face in the society such as corruption, inefficiency, and carelessness is to fully adopt and implement the principles of good governance (Fikret, 2015). According to Diana and valukoyte (2012) good governance principle implementation faces lack of a clear strategic visualization, prevailing manifestation of governance conservatism that do not motivate initiatives and challenges in local self government. In Ethiopia, urban areas are characterize by a variety of land related qualificationswith indistinguishable legal standing and high levels of lack of formality with little prospect forformalization unlike the large scale rural program because of the accelerating rapidity of urban migration and population growth, the government takes corrective action through cadastral mapping and regularization ;the regularization process include an assessment of the potential to incorporated different land related documents to set up land use records (World Bank, 2010). According to Takele (2014) land administration in the Ethiopia city lacks transparency, accountability, equity, efficiency and effectiveness, governance in the city is weak which leads to an abuse land delivery system. According to Ashenafi (2015), urban land administrators and municipality's lacked skilled human resources to attend to land administration, and irregularity on interpreting enacted legislations due to the absence of definite work procedure, capacity building training and proper planning.The previous studies mainly focused on practice, customer's satisfaction and prevalence of good governance. Therefore; to fill the gaps of previous study this research intends to assess the implementation of good governance principle in urban land administration of bishoftu town.

### Objectives of the study

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

## SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

### The specific objectives of the study include to

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

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

## METHODS

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

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

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

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

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

Where: n- is desired sample size

N- Target population of the study

e- Margin of error.

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

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

**Methods of data Collection:** Both primary and secondary sources of data were used in this study. Primary data were gathered through, household questionnaire survey, (which were includes close and same open ended questions), focused group discussion and key informant interview. Interviews were conducted with higher land administration officials. Moreover, for issues that require more clarification and exploration of the group, experiences and debates on the topic under the study one Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) which consist 9 members 3 people from each kebele was conducted in this study. Each of them was selected purposively from each kebeles. Secondary data were obtained from text books, press release, periodicals, journals, newsletters, annual reports, and seminar papers, unpublished materials of relevance to the study, report documents, internet sources, and documents of the municipalities.

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

Data were collected for about 5 weeks in February and March of 2017.

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

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Description on Groups of Participants of the Sociodemographic Characteristics of Respondents:** In this study, there are two groups of Participants, namely, residents of Bishoftu town and employees of the town's Land Development and Management Office. They were involved in the study as depicted on table 4.1 below based on the sampling procedure described in the previous chapters.

The 390 mixed-type of questionnaires were distributed to selected residents and employees of professional experts of Bishoftu land development and management office. However, only 97% questionnaires were returned and analyzed. Accordingly, based on the descriptive statistical analysis that was made on the response and collected from groups, a total of 378 (97%) respondents, 353 (93.4%) from the residents, and 25 (6.6%) from the employees groups were practically participated in the study from each group respectively.

As it is depicted on the above table 4.2, the resident participants of the study were characterized by five types of demographic variables, namely: sex, educational level, marital status, age, and land ownership status. Therefore, out of the overall 353 resident-participants involved in the study, 45 (13%) of them were female, and the remaining 308 (87%) were male. In terms of age, 36 (10%) were with more than 60 years of age, 63 (18%) within the range of 51-60 years of age, 87 (25%) within 41-50, 120 (34%) within 31-40, and 47 (13%) individuals within a range of 20-30 years of age had been involved in the study.

Regarding to marital status variable 15 (4%) divorces, 36 (10%) widowed, and 302 (86%) were married participants. In terms of Educational Status, out of 353 total numbers of participants, 9 (3%) were illiterate, 140 (40%) completed 1-8 grade levels, 84 (24%) completed 9-12 grades, 62 (17%) diploma holders, 54 (15%) first degree holders, and the remaining 4 (1%) second degree holders. In terms of land/House Owners ship, 187 (81%) have private land and 63 (18%) are living in kebele house, the rest 3 (1%) have neither their own land nor kebele house they lived in house rent from private owners. Table 4.3 shows that, the total number of employees represented in the study from the Land Development and Management office of Bishoftu town were 25. The number and percentage of this group of participants that grouped in terms of six types of demographic variables, namely: sex, educational level, work experience, marital

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

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

Source: the researcher exploitation from city administration (2017)

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

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

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

Number and percentage of residents participants by various demographic variables			
Demographic Variable	Value Label	N	%
Sex of respondents	Male	308	87
	Female	45	13
Age of respondents	20-30	47	13
	31-40	120	34
	41-50	87	25
	51-60	63	18
	>60	36	10
Marital status	Married	302	86
	Divorced	15	4
	Windowed	36	10
	Illiterate	9	3
Educational status	Grade1-8	140	40
	Grade9-12	84	24
	Diploma	62	17
	First degree	54	15
	Master degree	4	1
Land Ownership	Private	287	81
	Rented (kebele house)	63	18
	Have no land	3	1

Source: Own survey result (March, 2017)

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

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

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

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

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

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

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

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

Source: Own Survey (March, 20170)

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

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

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

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

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

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

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

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

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Own Survey Result (March, 2017)

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

**Separate Analysis and Interpretation onthe Response ofthe Resident Groups Only:** The above table 4.4 summarizes frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation of the overall perceived responses of the resident groups of participants in the study, on the five indicators of good governance, namely: participation, transparency, accountability and responsibility, equity and fairness, and effectiveness and efficiency. Accordingly, as compared to the total number of this group of participants (353), the majority

(more than half) of the participants responded on four of good governance principles, except the “accountability and responsibility” parameter, that they strongly disagree and disagree on the positively written statements under these five major indicator independent variables of good governance mentioned above. In specific terms, a total of 225 (63.7%) respondents strongly disagree and disagree on that the existing land administration scheme in Bishoftu is generally participatory. On the other hand, 30 (8.5%) strongly disagree, and 195 (55.2%) disagree.

Similarly, 227 (64.3%) strongly disagree and disagree on that the existing land administration scheme of Bishoftu town is generally transparent. From those 28 (7.9%) Strongly disagree and 199 (56.4) disagree. The finding obtained from open ended questionnaires for residents implies that; the ways of service provision of Bishoftu town land administration is very complicated and have no transparency and fairness. Besides, the mean and standard deviation results displayed in the above table 4.4 prove the interpretation made above. The mean and standard deviation figures representing the response of the resident group of participants on each indicator variables of good governance, namely: participation (M=2.35, S.D=0.734), transparency (M= 2.35, S.D=0.744), equity and fairness (M= 2.36, S.D=0.810) and effectiveness and efficiency (M= 2.42, S.D=0.719), generally mean can taken as in which existed between “disagree” and “neutral”. Except the accountability and responsibility variable with (M= 2.63, S.D=0.686) in

which is nearer to “Neutral” in which is different from other variables. However, to check what causes these lower levels of mean responses on the five indicators of good governance and assurance whether, these responses are true to the overall population or not, inferential statistical analysis procedures were followed using five grouping independent variables, namely: sex, age, educational status, marital status and land ownership status. With this premise, multivariate and correlation statistical analyses were made within and between the above two groups of variables: five demographic independent and five good governance indicator dependent variables using SPSS (version 20) statistical software as shown on the following consecutive tables.

**Comparisons among Responses on the Five Indicators of Good Governance Based On Grouping Demographic Variables:** Comparisons among Responses on the Five Indicators of Good Governance based on Grouping Demographic Variables Showing Significant Differences (Sex and Land (House) Ownership Status of the Participants). Based on the mean and standard deviation comparisons made between sex groups (male, and female), and among participants with varying land (house) ownership status (1. participants having private house, 2. participants renting from kebele, and 3. Those renting from private owners), close examination on the above response analysis result on table 4.5, tells two important trends that are worth analyzing further:

- In relative terms, female resident participants exhibited lower mean response than males on the overall land administration practice as well as on each of the five measuring indicator variables used to check their perception on the level of various aspects signaling the prevalence of good governance characterizing the land administration practice in Bishoftu town. This implies that females are less satisfied with the existing land management practice in Bishoftu than men as it is observed from their responses on almost all indicator variables except the “Transparency” variable.
- The mean response of resident participants having no private house (rented from kebele or rented in private owners) based on almost all parameters except on the “Efficiency and Effectiveness” variable reported to have lower satisfaction with the existing land management practice in Bishoftu than private house (land) owners in terms of both the overall land administration practice, as well as on each of the five measuring indicator variables used to check their perceived opinion characterizing the land administration practice in Bishoftu town in terms of good governance measuring indicators.

However, to check whether or not these perception differences exhibited due to “sex” and “land ownership status” demographic variables are true to the general population of the study, significance test had to be carried out. Hence, the next multivariate inferential statistical analysis was made to check the significance and practicality (effect size) levels of the preceding descriptive analysis result displayed between these two demographic variables and the independent good governance indicator variables.

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

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

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

According to Cohen (1988) the most widely accepted rule of thumb for interpreting effect size: Effect sizes of  $d < 0.20$  are interpreted as insignificant; values of  $d$  between 0.20 and 0.50 are interpreted as small effects; values of  $d$  between 0.50 and 0.80 are interpreted as medium effects; and values of  $d$  larger than 0.80 are interpreted as large effects. Similarly, the difference on land (house) ownership status amongst the resident participants as an independent source variable showed significant level of response difference: on the participation” with ( $F= 5.031, P=.007$ ), and “Equity and Fairness” ( $F= 3.349, P= .036$ ) good governance indicator independent variables. Thus, the status of residents in terms of land (house) ownership as an independent grouping variable for the whole population of Bishoftu can be taken as true segment of the population on which the land management practice of the town has to give due emphasis to insure fair, equitable and participatory manifestations of good governance on its land management system.

**Separate Analysis and Interpretation on the Response of the Employee Group of Participants Only:** The above table 4.7 summarizes frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation of the overall perceived responses of the Employee groups of participants in the study, on the five indicators of good governance, namely: participation, transparency, accountability and responsibility, equity and fairness, and effectiveness and efficiency. Accordingly, as compared to the total number of this group of participants (25), (Less than half) of the participants responded on four of the variables, except the “Transparency” parameter, that 13 (52%) the strongly disagree and disagree on the positively written statements



under these five major indicator dependent variables of good governance mentioned above. In specific terms, a total of 9 (36%) respondents “disagree” and “Neutral” that on the existing land administration scheme in Bishoftu is participatory. The result from the interview with land higher officials also indicates that, there is less Residents “participation” on the updating plans and policies formulation of land administration. Similarly 9 (36%) of the respondents disagree and 12 (48) are “Neutral” on positively written statement that there is accountability and responsibility in Bishoftu town land administration system. According to the interview with land administration, key informant they were believed that there was not well organized supervision in their institution. Moreover, less than half 12 (48%) of them strongly disagree and disagree that the existing land administration scheme in the town is characterized by equity and fairness. Generally, still less than half of the resident group of participants- 11 (44%) responded that they strongly disagree and disagree that the existing land administration system is efficient and effective.

The result obtained from open ended questionnaire from employee side participants; In this view, limitations are mainly associated to land related policy, decision making, problem of recognize key roles, rule, regulation and procedure are lacked public participation. In a general, the key informant of land officials blame society for their unwilling to actively participated in their institutions rule, regulation and procedure progress. They agreed on that society come to their institution only to take service. The mean and standard deviation figures representing the response of the employee group of participants on each indicator variables of good governance, namely: participation ( $m=2.92$ ,  $s.d=0.812$ ), more and more nearer to “neutral” response while accountability and responsibility variable with ( $m= 2.63$ ,  $s.d=0.686$ ). Equity and fairness ( $m= 2.64$ ,  $SD=0.810$ ), almost the same response which lays between disagree and neutral response but more nearer to “neutral” and effectiveness and efficiency ( $m=2.86$ ,  $s.d= 0.802$ ), again transparency ( $m= 2.68$ ,  $SD=0.810$ ) are also lays between disagree and neutral which is nearer to neutral again. A response of employees are generally taken as ranging between disagree and Neutral but nearer to “Neutral” when compared to residents response. Employee mean result is greater than mean of residents.

According to interview with land official key informant the office has formerly put a clear and open service delivery standard concerning each activity for each responsibility. However; most of the key informant believed that there is still a problem on implementation the rule and regulation of land administration. The major challenges raised by most of the key respondents during interview were; include: illegal construction, low commitment of investors in construction at a given time or using the land taken for other purpose, lack of employee’s commitment in their job are among the major challenges faced in their institution. Besides, even though six demographic variables, namely: sex, work experience, age, marital status land ownership status and educational status, as indicated on table 4.8, were considered to analyze differences of responses by employees on the five indicator variables of good governance and the overall practice land management in Bishoftu town, only the difference in terms of land ownership status of the employee respondents is found to exhibit significant difference on two of the five good governance indicator variables as indicated on table 4.8.

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

**Combined (Both Residents and Employees) Response Analysis Result Presentation and Interpretation:** Here analysis focused on both residents and employee response is analysis and interpreted as follows. The mean and standard deviation of responses by the overall group of participants (both residents and employees) on the majority of good governance indicator variables, can be traced from the above table 4.9, can be interpreted as ranging from between “disagree” and “Neutral” except the “accountability and responsibility” variable which can be interpreted with higher mean when compared to other variables with (Mean 2.65 and SD 0.688). The rest “participation”, “transparency”, and “equity and fairness” have the same mean value with (Mean 2.38 and SD 0.752) in which is nearer to disagree response. However, to check whether or not these low levels of mean and standard deviation results are true to the overall population that this study is representing and measuring the strength of association multivariate and correlation analyses procedure had to be followed as indicated on tables 4.10 and 4.11 of the below.

Based on the above overall combined multivariate statistical analysis computed amongst the three demographic characteristics of the participants, namely, group, Sex, and land ownership status as an independent grouping variables versus five indicator variables of good governance, group difference (1=resident, 2= Employee) showed significant difference in all perceived responses on good governance indicator variables except “Accountability and Responsibility variable” Similarly, the mean response difference on “participation” and “Equity and Fairness” good governance indicator variables as a result of the sex variation exhibited significant level of difference on the response of the respondents on these two indicator dependent variables with  $P\text{-value} < 0.05$ , with ( $F=9.683$ ,  $P=.002$ ) ( $d=0.025$ ), and ( $F=5.090$ ,  $P=.025$ ) ( $d=0.013$ ) values respectively. However, the significant difference exhibited by the sex variable on the separate resident group’s only analysis on the overall implementation of good governance principles is not proved to be significant at this combined group analysis level. Moreover, the difference on the land ownership status of the respondents also showed significant difference on “participation”, “equity and fairness”, and “overall implementation of good governance principles” that were taken as dependent indicator variables as depicted on table 4.10 of the above.

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

1.00- perfect correlation 0.80 to 0.99-very high correlation, 0.60 to 0.79-high correlation, 0.40 to 0.59- moderate correlation ,0.20 to 0.39- low correlation ,0.001 to 0.19- very low correlation. A correlation coefficient is supportive means to review the relationship between two variables with a single number that falls between -1 and +1 (Kothari, 1990). A correlation analysis with Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) was performed on all variables in this study to look at the relationship between good governance variables as independent variables and overall good governance manifestation as dependent variables.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for each relationship between; Groups of the Participant, Status of Land Tenure Ownership, Sex of participants and variables with the overall good governance implementation. The Pearson correlation coefficient show that all the five good governance dimensions and significant demographic variables are significantly, Negatively and positively correlate with overall good governance implementation, Transparency, equity and fearness, Efficiency and Effectiveness, ( $r=0.779$ ), ( $r=0.748$ ), and ( $r=0.709$ ) respectively; have the highest correlation with overall Good Governance Implementation. When the Status of land ownership ( $r= -0.119$ ) has the lowest correlation with overall manifestation of good governance.

### Conclusion and Recommendation

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

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

### Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher found it vital to put ways forward. Accordingly, the study has the following policy recommendations for interventions based on the findings. In order to bring good governance and better land administration system in Bishoftu, the town's administration should focus on making its overall practices more participatory as it expected to be by its citizens without discriminating any of the social, economic and demographic group in it. Fair and equitable resource distribution has to be practiced in Bishoftu town's land administration system, so that good governance can be achieved.

### REFERENCES

- Abdellatif, A. M. 2003. 3. Good Governance and Its Relationship to Democracy and Economic Development, (May), 1–27.
- Abrham Daniel. 2014. *The Challenges and Opportunities of Good Governance in Ghana*, Addis Ababa University. Addis Ababa University.
- Adane Bekele. 2013. *The Challenges of good governance in africa :the case of Keniya*. Addis Ababa University.
- AGGN, Re. and P. C. of the. 2010. *Addressing Good Governance In Africa A Discussion Paper. A Discussions paper*. AGGN Research and Publication committee. Retrieved from WWW.aggn.org
- Alemie, B. K., Zevenbergen, J., & Bennett, R. 2011. Assessing Land Governance in Ethiopian Cities 2002-2011. Lessons for the Implementation of the 2011 Urban Land Management Policy Assessing Land Governance in Ethiopian Cities (2002-2011): Lessons for the Implementation of the 2011 Urban Land Management Policy, (May 2015), 17–21.
- Ambaye, D. W. 2012. Land Rights in Ethiopia : Ownership, equity, and liberty in land use rights Land Rights in Ethiopia : ownership, equity, and liberty in land use rights, (May), 6–10.
- Aneley, A. 2006. Land administration decision Makers meetings (Windhoek, 7-8 December 2006).
- Anjum, R. S. C. and A. 2008. Final Draft - Demand for Good Governance Stocktaking Report, August. Retrieved from pubrights@worldbank.org.
- Arora, D. 2013. Good Governance : A Study of the Concept in Indian Context Origin of the Concept of Good Governance Meaning of Good Governance, 371, 1–16.
- Ashenafi Aimro. 2015. *The assessment on urban governance practice in land administration of Addis Ababa:the case of yeka sub-city*. Addis Ababa University.
- Asmelash, W. 2006. *The effect of land reform on peasant social organization :the study of villaage level dyanmics of central tigray,1974-1994-Antropology*. Addis ababa University.
- Ayeno, M. 2009. *Agrerian law and development in Ethiopia Submitted for LL.m dgree*. Harvard university, Cambridge, ma.
- Bang, H., & Esmark, A. 2013. A systems theory of Good Governance, Deleuze 1995, 1–35.
- Blatter, J. 2012. Department of Political Science Forms of Political Governance : Theoretical Foundations and Ideal Types Forms of Political Governance : Theoretical Foundations and Ideal Types, 94.
- Bosselmann, Klaus, R. E. and P. T. 2008. *Governance for sustainability issues, challenges, successes. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland. xvi+260pp*. medienHaus Plump, 53619 Rheinbreitbach, Germany. Retrieved from www.iucn.org/publications
- Burlington. 2004. *Ethiopia Land Policy and Administration Assessment*.
- C.R.Kothari. 1990. *Research Methodology*. new delli: New age international Plimited publishers. Retrieved from www.newagepublishers.com
- Carlos Juiz, Carlos Guerrero, I. L. 2014. Implementing good governance Principles for the Public Sector in information technology governance frame work, 2014 January, 9–27.
- Carothers, T., & Gramont, D. De. 2011. Aiding Governance in Progress Amid Uncertainties Aiding Governance in

- Developing Countries Progress Amid Uncertainties, November, 1–35.
- Chowdhury, N. C. E. S. 2005. *Draft working paper The Principle of Good Governance*.
- CIPFA. 2007. Delivering good governance in local government, 48Framework, 2.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. 2000. *Research Methods in Education*. S. published in U. and Canada, Ed. 2007th ed.. London and New York.
- Consultancy, M. 2010. Guidelines for support to land policy design and land policy reform, November.
- Devas, N. 2004. *Urban Governance, Voice and Poverty in the Developing World*. London, VA: Earthscan Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/22882>
- Diana saparniene, I. V. 2012. *Implementation of Good Governance principle in local self- government : Case of siauliai city*. siauliai university.
- Downer, A. 2000. *Governance Guiding principles Good governance : guiding principles for implimentation*.
- Dr.Wael Zakout, Dr.Babette Wehrmann, D. mika-P. 2006. Good Governance in Land Administration Principles and Good Practices.
- Dubois, H. F. W., Lapenta, A., Mucciarone, M. A., Neilson, J., Abu Bakar, N. B., Saleh, Z., ... Mi. 2013. *What is the Policy Pr. Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095399713513140>
- Economic Commission for Africa. 2005. *Striving for good governance in Africa:Synopsisof the 205 african governance report prepared for the African Development ForumIV*.
- Esayas, E. 2013. Urban Planning and land mangement challenges in Emerging towns of Ethiopia:The Case of Arba Minch, 340–348. <https://doi.org/10.4090/juee.2013.v7n2.340348>
- Evans J.D.1996. 1996. *Straightforward stastics for the behavioral sciences*. pacific Grove,CA:books/cole publishing.
- FAO. 2007. *Good governance in land tenure and adminstration* 2008 and 2. rome, Italy.
- Fikret Toksoz. 2015. *Good governance Improving quality of Life*. Retrieved from <http://br.correct.go.th/eduweb/index.php/eduessay/50-general-essay/118-good-governance.html>
- Gebreal, W. 1997. Urban land information system the benefits and the strategies, 1–3.
- George, M. 2007. *The Challenges and Constraints of Introducing Participatory Budgeting as a Tool for Resource Mobilization and Allocation and Realizing Good Governance in Africa*.
- J., C. 1988. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral Sciences*. L. E. Associates., Ed. 2nd editio. hillsdale: NJ.
- J.M.Lusugga kironde. 2009. *Improving Land Sector Governance in Africa : The Case of Tanzania, papare for the workshops land Governance of the MDGs: Responding to New challenges washington march 9-10 2009*. washington DC. <https://doi.org/k>
- John Graham, Bruce Amos, T. P. 2003. *Principles for Good Governance in the 21st Century policy Brief No.15*. Retrieved from [www.iog.ca/policy/briefs](http://www.iog.ca/policy/briefs).
- Katsamunsk, P. 2000. The Concept of Governance and Public Governance Theories, 133–141.
- Kaufmann, D. 2006. *Governance Indicators : Where Are We , Where Should We Be Going ?*
- Kaufmann, D., Recanatini, F., & Biletsky, S. 2002. *Assessing Governance The world Bank*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance>
- Keith Clifford .BELL, U. 2007. *Good Governance in Land Administration*. worldbank,East pacificregion 1818 h street. Retrieved from Good governance in Land Administration
- King, M. 2014. *International frame work:good governance in the public Sector*.
- Klaus. 2012. *The Land Governance Assessment Framework Identifying and Monitoring Good practice in the land sector*. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from [www.World Bank .Org](http://www.World Bank .Org)
- Klaus Deininger, Harries Selod, A. B. 2012. *Identifying and Monitoring Good Governance pratice in the Land Sector*.
- Lantmateriverketswedish national land servey. 2008. Lantmateriverketsweedish national land servey Land administration – why, February. Retrieved from [Sida@sida.se](mailto:Sida@sida.se), [ww.sida.se](http://www.sida.se)
- Linder, S. 2014. Ethiopia : Overview of corruption in land administration, June.
- Mabesa, M. J., & Whittal, J. 2013. Governance in Land Administration Systems : a comparative analysis of the former LSPP and current LAA land administration systems of Lesotho, 1–12. Retrieved from [mmjeanett3@gmail.com](mailto:mmjeanett3@gmail.com), [Jennifer.Whittal@uct.ac.za](mailto:Jennifer.Whittal@uct.ac.za)
- Mackey, A., Gass, S. M., & Erlbaum, N. J. L. 2005. Second Language Research, Methodology and Design, 93, 3–4.
- Mansberger, R., Navratil, G., Muggenhuber, G., Twaroch, C., Good, I., & Landadministration, D. 2012. Is Good Governance in Land Administration Measurable and Comparable ?, 631.
- Mardiasmo, Diaswati and barnes, paul, H.and sakuri, Y. 2008. *Implementation of Good Governance by Regional Governments in Indonesia : The Challenges in Brown,Kerry A and Mandell, Myrna and furneaux*. Retrieved from [d.mardiasmo@qut.edu.au](mailto:d.mardiasmo@qut.edu.au)
- Masuku, M. B. 2014. Samling Techniques and determination of sample size in applied statistics Research: an overview, *IJ11*, 1–22. Retrieved from <http://ijecm.co.uk/>
- Melese, N. 2016. *Application of good governance principles for urban development and management in Addis Ababa city ADminstration:The practices and challenges in Yeka Sub -cij*. Addis ababa university.
- Meskerem Shifera. 2007. stutas of good governance at worda/district level in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa.
- Mhrtay Adisalem. 2015. The Performance of Good Governance on Land Administration at Local / Woreda Level : The Case of Naeder Adet Woreda , Tigry Region, ethiopia, 3September, 376–385. <https://doi.org/10.14662/IJPSD2015.046>
- MoFED. 2014. The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Growth and Transformation Plan GTP Draft Ministry of Finance and Economic Development MoFED , September 2010.
- Niclo Maldonaldo. 2010. The world Bank Evolving Good Governance and its impacton Human Rights.
- O’ Leary Zina. 2004. *The Essential Guide to doing research*. London: Oliver’s Yard. <https://doi.org/ISBN0761941983>
- Ogundiya, Ilufoye S. 2010. Democracy and good governance : Nigeria’ s dilemma, *4June*, 201–208. Retrieved from African Journal of Political Science and International relations Vol.46,pp.201-208,June2010 Available online at <http://www.Academic Journals>

- Prof. Stig Enemark. 2009. *Land Administration Systems-managing rights restrictions and Responsibilities in Land administration*. Aalborg University, Denmark. Retrieved from enemark@land.aau.dk
- Qian, L. 2014. *Evaluating land administration system from the perspective of good governance: a case study of informal settlement in Kahthmandu vally: Enschede, The Netherlands*.
- Raiu, V. 2013. An Ontology of Good Governance . A Political Theory Approach.
- Seth asiama, S. H. 2013. Tools to support transparency in land administration.
- Shimelis Kassa Kebede. 2015. Democracy and Good Governance post 1991 in Ethiopia, 3April, 174–182. <https://doi.org/10.14662/IJPSD2015.026>
- Takele Necha Sungena. 2014. Strengthening Good Governance in Urban Land Management in Ethiopia A Case-study of Hawassa, 415, 96–108.
- Tewodros abuhay M. 2015. Assessing the prevalence of good governance in public sectors in Gedeo Zone : Case of Yirga Cheffe town administration , Ethiopia, 3June, 5–6.
- Thomas Cosmas Munzerere. 2013. *Towards good land governace in Tanzania; The Case Of Urban Mbeya*. Hague ,the Netherlands.
- Tony burns and Kate Dalrymple. 2008. *Conceptual Framework for Governance in Land Administration 1*. Stockholm, Sweden.
- Tukstra, Jan, R. S. 2012. Sustaining Urban Land Information : a frame work based on experiences in post Conflict and Developing Countreis, 1-27. Retrieved from ww.gltn.net
- Uggpoe. 2006. Urban Good Governance Package of Ethiopia Summary of Principles and Sub-Programs. *Urban Development Policy of the FDRE*, 1–4.
- UN-Habitat. 2004. Urban Governance Index Conceptual Foundation and Field Test Report. Nairobi Kenya.
- Victor Endo. 2008. 13th International anti corruption conference. In *governance in land administration peru case study*. Greece ,Athens.
- Wagener, H. 2011. How does good governance come about? on evaluation of institutions, 44.
- Williamson, I., Enemark, S., Wallace, J., & Rajabifard, A. 2008. Understanding land administration. In *Land administration frame work* pp. 1–11. Kuala lumpur, Malaysia. Retrieved from [ianpw@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:ianpw@unimelb.edu.au)
- www.iso.org/iso/home.html
- Yirga, K. 2010. *Assessment of the Prevalence of Good Governance In The Public Sector : the Case of Public Institutions in Debre Statement of Declaration*. mekele university.
- Z. Dorneyi. 2007. Research in applied Linguistics. In *san francisco state U. Priyanvada Abeywickrama Ed.* p. 336. New York.
- Zarfu Hailu. 2016. Using LGAF as an Input into ongoing and future law Revision :Lessons from Ethiopia.
- Zimmermann, W. n.d.. Effective and Transparent Management of Public Land Experiences , Guiding Principles and Tools for Implementation. In I. International Seminar on State and Public Land Management in Verona Ed., *september, 2008* pp. 1–17.

\*\*\*\*\*