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Abstract: the main aim of this study is to assess the impact of rapid expansion of Sebeta town on livelihood of farmers living on peri-urban areas. The town is recently expanded over the peripheral areas due to combined factors like potential land in the area in attracting investments activities, proximity to the national market and accessibility for various types of infrastructures. As a result huge hectors of prime agricultural land has been converted to urban land uses and this has various implications on livelihood of peri-urban farmers. A multi-method data collection approach incorporating household survey, key informant interviews and personal observation was used to assess urbanization process of the town and the changing livelihoods. Hence, the result of findings showed that expansion of the town during the last few years made significant impacts on livelihood of farming community on peri-urban area: agricultural land fragmentation, land insecurity, and loss of farmer’s property on the land. On the other hand, the non-farm economic sector developed in the area was not capable to absorb evicted households. In addition, rehabilitation mechanisms used by the town municipality mainly an arrangement of cash compensation was found to be inadequate to replace their resource base, which is land. As a result, most of the families exposed to further economic, social and cultural impoverishment. Therefore, to ensure sustainable urban development, government should make sound planning prior to displacement without treating livelihood of vulnerable groups of people living on peripheral area.
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1. Introduction
Today’s world is rapidly urbanizing, particularly radical urban expansion predicted in developing countries (STEPS, 2009). Although urbanization in developing countries is low, the pace of urbanization is at fastest rate. Approximately 25 percent of Africa’s population lived in towns and cities in 1975. In 2000, 38 percent of the continent’s population lived in urban areas and the proportion is expected to increase to 47% by 2015 and to be doubled by 2050 (A.D.Thou, 2010).

In the process of urbanization, the area where most significant changes occurred is refer as ‘peri-urban’, encompass a fragmented mixing of urban and rural worlds, transforming previously rural livelihoods and reorganizing local and regional food systems. It can be conceptualized as the geographical area or unit that is near or around an urban area; in other words, the outskirts of a city or a town (Musa et al., 2013). Different literatures use a number of alternative terms to describe this geographical area. These include: urban fringe, the periphery, inner rural and rural commuting zone (Nicodemus et al, 2010). Peri-urban areas are zones of transition from rural to urban land uses located between the outer limits of urban and regional centers and the rural environment (Adeboyejo et al., 2007).

The horizontal expansion of urban centers has a great impacts on the peri-urban area ; in terms of changing in land use, new forms of household composition, differential access to urban benefits (such as health infrastructure and employment) and increased pressure on common natural resources (STEPS, 2009). Following outward urban expansion, peri-urban land use pattern would change from the one dominated by agriculture to a multiple landscapes (Adeboyejo et al., 2007). An out ward expansion urban centers often resulted in encroachment of fertile agricultural land in which most farming community depend their livelihood (OUPI, 2008).
In Ethiopia, small urban centers nearby Addis Ababa (the capital of the country) are expanding tremendously over their periphery. This is mainly due to favorable reform in the country in terms economic policy that has created conducive environment for private investments and the proximity of these areas to national market (Addis Ababa). The expansion of these towns created numerous challenges as well as opportunities for surrounding farming communities living in peripheral area. Changes that are considered as opportunities include employment creation, access to urban infrastructures and social services, and urban-rural linkages or trickledown effect of development. However, in Ethiopia urban expansion programmes are neither participatory nor supportive to farmers in periphery, and thus has negative impact on people livelihood where women and youth are the major victims (Fayera, 2005). Rural communities around the city faced the problems of socio-cultural, economic challenges, environmental deterioration and land tenure insecurity. Moreover, the non-farm based economic sector was not developed to absorb displaced farming communities (World Bank, 1993). Therefore, the non-integrative type of urban expansion or development induced displacement has negatively affects those marginalized rural communities and forces them to live in poverty, food insecure and hopelessness.

Sebeta is one of towns among those rapidly expanded urban centers in Ethiopia terms of population and physical size. The population size of the town was estimated is 61,461. The total area that is covered with the current topographic map of the town is estimated to be 7.41 sq Km (CSA, 2010). Sebeta is situated near to Addis Ababa with a distance of 24 Km. Due to its proximity to Addis Ababa and national market, large numbers of people come to the area for residence and investments. Moreover, easy access to infrastructures such as roads and electricity has exhibited an important role in the attraction of private investment in and around the town (OBoFED, 2010). Hence, large tracts of land have been expropriated from local farming community and have been utilized for private investments and urban land use.

Even though, these investments play a crucial role in boosting country’s economy and in terms of creating employment opportunities and earning foreign exchange, it resulted in displacement of numerous peasants from their lands and affected their livelihood. In order to mitigate the problem, the town municipality has mainly use cash compensation rehabilitate their livelihood those displaced from their land. However, monetary compensation argued to be not an appropriate and sufficient mechanism to rehabilitate livelihood of evicted households (Feleke, 1999) as most displaced families can be exposed to further social and economic impoverishment. The study is focused on the challenges and opportunities as well as prospects come up as a result of the Sebeta town expansion over periphery areas. It concentrate mainly on determining the cope-up mechanism pursued by evicted household and assess appropriateness of compensation packages pursued by the government to mitigate the problem. Therefore, this research can be expected to have an important role in filling knowledge gap on this area and motivate future researcher. In addition, it serves as input for urban planner for developing participatory and sustainable urban development which integrates all matters of community affected in the process of urbanization.

2. Research Methodology
In order to assess the impacts and prospects of urban expansion on livelihood of farming communities in peri-urban areas of Sebate town, the researcher collected information from primary and secondary data sources. Primarily data were collected through the combination of structured interviews, personal observation and questionnaires. Secondary data were collected from government reports and publication, books, articles, and reports of related institutions.

Survey method is administered to collect information from the target population. Survey questionnaires were prepared to acquire data on socio-economic, demographic dynamics, impacts and coping strategies of target households. According to information obtained from the town municipality and other related sources, there were three major expansion areas where the town expanded intensively and a high number displacement of peri-urban farmers taken place. These are Dima, Selam Delati and
Furi areas. However, the municipality of the town did not know an exact number of peasant household who affected by town expansion. Hence, a total of 60 displaced household was selected purposely from the three major expansion areas.

Key informant interview was carried out with those individual who have wider concept and idea on the issue. Key individuals from: community leader, Kebele administration, experts from the towns Land Administration and Environmental Protection Office and other relevant regional bureaus such as Oromia Urban planning Institute and Oromia Land administration Environmental Protection Office were interviewed. Generally, a total of 20 key informant interviewers were carried out. Primarily data collected from sampled household was processed and analyzed by using the SPSS. Prior to analysis, completed questionnaires were coded, inputted and organized. After the completion of coding, all valid questionnaires were inputted in a coherent format of SPSS database. Finally, survey data were interpreted by using descriptive statistics such as frequency distribution, central tendency and cross-tabulation. Moreover, secondary data obtained from various data sources were organized and analyzed to compliment the survey result.

3. Urbanization of Sebeta Town
Sebeta is one of town in Oromia Special Zone Surrounding Addis Ababa showing tremendous expansion in terms of population and physical size. In 1994 population and housing census, the total population of Sebeta town was 14,076(OUPI, 2008) and the 2007 population and housing census indicated that the population size of the town was 56,131. According to 2010 CSA, population of the town reach to 61,461(CSA did not accounted rural villages administered by municipality). However, the data from the Sebeta town Finance and Economic development Office indicates that population size of town and rural villages recently administrated under the municipality of town is 114,674.

Between 1984 and 1994 the population and Housing Census, the town was growing on the average by 4.11 percent per annum while during 1994-2007 the growth rate has increase to 4.8 percent per annum. This rate further increased to 5.6 per annum during 2007/2008 (OUPI, 2008). Accordingly, on the bases of the current growth population of the town doubles itself in every 12.5 years which is relatively high with the country’s figure of doubling time which is 24 years. Generally, three factors; natural increase, net migration and reclassification contributed for the population increase of the town where net migration takes a lion share (BoFED, 2010).

With regard to migration, the town has experienced serious in-migration due the construction and establishment of new industries and residential houses. Many people came as daily laborers from the surrounding rural and urban areas as employees for the newly established businesses. Moreover, nearness to the capital Addis Ababa motivates many people to settle there for business and residence (BoFED, 2010). As shown in table 2, large numbers of residence of the town are migrants who either move from the rural areas or Addis Ababa as well as other areas. Accordingly, out of the total population of the town, migrants accounted almost near to half (49.1 %) and most of them are migrated from urban areas 59.1% (CSA, 2007).

On the other hand, reclassification where horizontal expansion of the town made encroachment of rural villages into urban settlement contributes in increasing of the population of the town Horizontal expansion of the town during the last few years contributed encroachment rural villages and made to administer under the town municipally. For instance, from 2007 onwards a total population of 37,452 peasant farmers from 6 rural villages was engulfed under the town municipality. During the last few years, the town has been expanded physically towards an already vacant land and peasant agricultural land holdings. In 1994 population and housing census, the total area covered by topographic map of the town was 2.1 sq Km. Currently the figure is more than tripled and the total area that is covered by topographic map of the town is 7.41 sq Km (CSA, 2010).

The main feature for the physical expansion of the town is contributed by its high potential in attracting investment activities and nearness to the capital (Addis Ababa) which motivates many people to settle there for business and residence. The investment attraction potentials of the town
include: Its proximity to national market and potential land, easy access to infrastructures, minerals identified and existence of many quarry sites in and around the town, and expectation of future expansion of the town, etc (OUPI, 2008). Moreover, cheap land lease price combined with proximity to the national markets offers a high potential for attracting various types of investments to the area.

Fig.2 Map of Study Area

4. Results and Findings
4.2 Impact Sebeta Town Expansion on Peri-urban area
4.2.1 Declining of Agricultural Land and other assets
Due to the area’s proximity to the national markets and cheaper land price relative to Addis Ababa, the town has become huge potential for attracting investment activities. Moreover, in ward migration of people from other areas and Addis Ababa for permanent and temporary residence leads to expansion of the town. As a result, large tracts of peasant agricultural lands at peri-urban area were widely converted to urban land uses such as residential, industrial, and commercial agricultural activities. The survey result showed that average land holding of sample household is the lowest to survive their life. Hence, some households particularly, youth are employed themselves as casual daily laborer and low income earning activities to compliment their agricultural income. Farmers who posses relatively enough capital usually rent agricultural land from other nearby area in order to secure their livelihood. However, currently the cost of land is rising which cannot be afforded by most of the poor household. Other also engages in traditional share cropping practice.

As shown in table 4.2, 50 percent of sample household possess and operated on agricultural land size less than 1 hectare and only 4.5 percent of them hold land size above 3 hectares. On the other hand, 26.7 percent of sample household were land less and earn their livelihood by engaging in off-farm activities. This indicates that the average land holding of sample household is the lowest to sustain their livelihood from agriculture. As landholding declines, per capita food production and farm income also decline, indicating that extremely small-sized farms cannot be made productive even with improved technology (Samuel, 2006). This has in turn has a negative implication to attain food security in the area.

Table1. Size of land holding for sample household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm size in Hectare</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 0.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5-1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Landless** 16 26.7

**Total** 60 100.0

Source: Survey data, 2011
On the other hand, farmer’s assets including livestock, trees, houses, and various materials which have a great role to construct their livelihood are affected due to expropriation of land for urban expansion. Even this asset is not properly considered during compensation payment and not based on the current market value.

### 4.2.3 Impact on Land Tenure
Land tenure system has a great importance in increasing the productivity that accrues from the land resources. However, transformation of agricultural land for housing and urban development in peri-urban and urban areas creates upward pressures insecurity for those who depends their livelihood on the farm land (ECA, 2006). In addition, various complex and poorly legal land allocation and registration procedures practiced by LDC cities fosters another tenure insecurity among urban and peri-urban farmers and finally leads to food insecurity (Olofin et al., 2000).

Evidences from key informants show that, there is serious land tenure insecurity among most farmers in peri-urban areas of Sebata town. Due to this, particularly farmers who possess farm land and located near to the town, sell their agricultural land with low price with an expectation that their land is likely expropriated by municipality. Hence, many farmers become landlessness and engage in low income earning activities mostly in daily labour.

### 4.2.4 Access to Urban Infrastructures and Social Services
One of the positive sides of peri-urbanisms is linked with proximity and accessibility of area for strong urban influence such as access to markets, social services and urban job opportunities (DFDI, 2008). With regard to the study area, farmers in peri-urban area Sebeta town has got and opportunity to access infrastructures and social services such as electricity, school, health centers, water supply, urban markets, telephone and other. For instance about 61.7 % of sample household has access electricity.

Easy access to nearby urban market is another main economic advantage for peri-urban farmers in order to sell their agricultural product with sound price. However, this is not the case for farmers of peri-urban areas of Sebata town. Farmers are continuously producing subsistence crops with in small plot of lands that left after land grabbing. It is difficult for those farmers to meet their own family’s consumption from limited land and supply for market. Although proximity to the town benefits the people in easily accessing financial institutions, there was lack of awareness and a high collateral requirement by credit and saving institutions which prohibited farmers to take this advantage of it. As shown in table 2, low percentage of sample household (18 %) benefited from credit facilities available on the area.

#### Table 2. Access of urban infrastructure and social service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Services</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to electricity</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to road</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to pure water</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to schools</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to telephone</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to markets</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to credit facility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, 2011

### 4.3 Expansion of Sebeta Town and change in livelihood of people in peri-urban area
Farmers in peri-urban areas of Sebata town diversify their livelihood by engaging in various off-farm activities to cope-up with the decline of farming land over the time. In the study area, livelihood diversification is mainly determined by size of land, education, age and skill of individual’s possess. Depending on the survey result, the researcher determined about five types of livelihood strategies
where most evicted farmers engage in. These are: daily labor, trade, informal employment, producing high value of crops and animal fatting and Industrial employment.

As shown in graph 2 and table 3, daily labor is the dominant employment categories that people in the area widely participate and earn their livelihood. About 28 % of sample households engage in this employment category. Farmers on the area are widely employing themselves in casual works such as flower farm, quarry, buildings, etc. This type of employment does not require any skill and training. The youth with the age of 20s to 30s widely participate in this employment category. However, these household are the poorest one as their earning falls bottom in relative to the others. Most of the youth in the area are employed in flower farm as daily labor. According to information obtained from the respondents engaged in this sector, flower farms operated in the area employ the local people with low payments (on average 15 birr per day). Trade is the second livelihood strategies (22%) for the sampled communities living in peri-urban interface of Sebata town. It is the type of petty trading where peri-urban farmers bring agricultural and non-agricultural products and sell to the town. Moreover, women are widely involved in local alcohol making and selling to earn their livelihood.

Informal employment category is also another livelihood diversification for some people on the area where 17% of sample households engage in this sector. Informal employment in this study refers to people recruit themselves in the form of carpenter, builder, and various types of handcrafts. Most people in this type of employment category enhance these skills from their previous family members or local neighborhood rather than capacitate by formal education and training. It is not a secured employment type. Most of the individuals who engage in these employment type as a par timer. However, people who possess limited agricultural land and landless take the job permanently. Producing high value crops and animal fatting is another livelihood strategies perused by few households (8%) in peri-urban area in order to mitigate the risk of urban expansion. Few farmers in study area have been started in producing high value crops such as oil seed (Nug), Cash crops including ‘Chat’ and others. Others engage in practicing animal fatting and sell in high price.

Most of the respondents who did not diversity their livelihood strategies are old aged and households who have relatively enough agricultural land and widely practice farming. Hence, land size has a crucial role in determining diversification of livelihood for farmers living on peri-urban areas of Sebata. However, this finding is contrary to the finding of peri-urban areas of other countries. For example, the study from peri-urban areas of Nyahururu, Kenya revealed that the larger the household’s land ownership, the more the diversification particularly in crops and the higher the annual household income (Nicodemus et al, 2010).

Although huge number of industries is operating in the area, they create little in creation of employment opportunities for local people. Information from the local authorities also confirmed this as most of industries operating in the area employ human resource from other areas, mostly from Addis Ababa. This is due to absence of human resources with the required level of skill and education from local community.
3.4 Types of Compensation Packages Pursued and procedures followed

According to information obtained from key informants from Sebeta town Land Administration and Environmental protection Bureau, mainly four compensation packages are widely available for those farmers lost their land for urban development and private investments. Cash is the most widely used compensation package available for household who lost land and other assets on land. Individual farmers who lost the land can obtain an amount of money of his annual average earning during the last five years from the land multiplying with ten (10) years. The second compensation option is providing residence land in town. Farmer who lost his residence land can get land in urban area in his name and for each of his family. The third is Employment Creation. Relevant line government offices of the town like the town’s Micro and Small Scale Enterprise, social affair, and Land Administration and Environmental protection offices are the responsible institutions to rehabilitate the livelihood of evicted farmers. They have to organize evicted farmers, give skill development training and appropriate working area. Finally, special consideration is given for the local farmers who have minimum capital set for investment activities. This includes prior condition is given by allotting the land for investment.

However, information from informant interviews and survey revealed that only the first two of compensation packages are considered there (cash compensation and provision of residence land) for evicted families. The other compensation packages has not yet put into practice and implemented by any of concerned government bodies.

3.4.2 Assessment of appropriateness Compensation Packages and principle

Farmers who lost their land to investors and new settlers, complained about low compensation and lack of other economic options to make a living. They were not satisfied with the current compensation because it is not enough to re-establish their economic base, which is land. According to the respondents, prior to dislocation, people from the government bodies came and convince the people by telling them as there are various compensation packages to establish their livelihood. However, they did not get any skill development training.

On the other hand, most farmers spent their compensation money mostly on consumption rather than investment.

Table 4. Use of Compensation Money by Sample Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Expenditure with compensation money</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spending in every day needs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructing and renovating houses</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investing on agricultural activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, 2011

Table 4 shows the use of compensation money by sample households. Generally farmers who obtained compensation money spent it on every day needs, constructing and renovating houses and investing on agricultural activities. Most (45%) farmers spend their compensation money on daily consumption. Some respondents put their money in bank and draw to purchase consumption goods including grain in the period where their yearly production in shortage. The other 40% of sample house hold spent their compensation money on constructing corrugated iron roofing and renovating the old one. The rest of them (15%) spent their money by investing in agricultural activities such as buying improved crops and fertilizer, buying improved livestock and rent land from other farmers to increase their agriculture production.

4. Conclusion

This study was undertaken in peri-urban area of Sebata town where large numbers dwellers are farmers with rural back ground. The objective of study was to assess impact of Sebeta town expansion on livelihood of farmers over peripheral area. Accordingly, the town was expanding in all direction over the surrounding areas that were previously agricultural land, forest and green lands. The horizontal expansion of the town exacerbated marginalized farmers who depends their livelihood
mainly on agriculture by conversion of huge prime agriculture lands and declining of agriculture production from year to year. For instance, about 50% of sample households possess agricultural land size below one Hectare. The average land holding of sample household is the lowest to sustain their livelihood. Due to this, farmers diversify their livelihood by engaging in various form of income earning activities. Depending on the survey result, the researcher determined about five types of livelihood strategies. These includes: daily labor, trade, informal employment, producing high value of crops and animal fattening and Industrial employment. Daily labor is the dominant livelihood strategies and employment in industries takes least coping up mechanisms. Factors like land size, age, sex and education level has critical role for the families living in peri-urban area of Sebata town in determining their livelihood diversification and to cope-up an impact of rapid expansion of the town. Family’s with relatively high land size is made little livelihood diversification relative to low land holdings and non farm land. Old age people were the least one in terms of changing and diversifying their livelihood. Although high numbers of industries located and operated in the area, they did not capable to absorb local communities. This is because local people lack skill and education that required by these industries. Hence, most of industries operated in the area employed human resource from other areas and mostly from nearby Addis Ababa (the capital of the Country).

Finally, assessment was made on the type of compensation mechanisms perused by municipality and its appropriateness to rehabilitate the livelihood of evicted households. The rehabilitation mechanisms used by the town municipality mainly an arrangement of cash compensation for an evicted household was found to be inadequate to replace their resource base that is, land. On the other hand, most household who received compensation money spent on consumption rather than investment. Therefore, to ensure sustainable urban development, government should make careful planning prior to displacement. Appropriate compensation package that could replace the resource base of evicted households should be pursued. Before displacement, livelihood initiative like skill development, training and awareness should be given for families on pri-urban areas to enhance them diversify their livelihood.
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