



# **Retrospective Accounts of Responses to Drought by Female and Male Heads of Household in Bati and Dessie Zuria Woredas, South Wello and Oromiya Zones:**

## **Preliminary Field Report, 2002**

**M. Priscilla Stone**

Washington University

Report based on fieldwork by:

**M. Priscilla Stone**

and

**Mengistu Dessalegn Debela**

Department of Sociology and Social Administration  
Addis Ababa University

### **BASIS CRSP**

This posting is provided by the BASIS CRSP Management Entity

Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics,

University of Wisconsin-Madison

Tel: (608) 262-5538

Email: [basis-me@facstaff.wisc.edu](mailto:basis-me@facstaff.wisc.edu)

<http://www.basis.wisc.edu>

**January 2003**

**M. Priscilla Stone**  
Washington University  
pstone@artsci.wustl.edu

**BASIS Research Project *Assets, Cycles, and Livelihoods (ACL):  
Addressing Food Security in the Horn of Africa and Central America***  
Institute for Development Research (IDR), Addis Ababa University  
Institute for Development Anthropology (IDA)

BASIS CRSP outputs posted on this website have been formatted to conform with other postings but the contents have not been edited.

This output was made possible in part through support provided by the US Agency for International Development (USAID), under the terms of Grant No. LAG-A-00-96-90016-00, and by funding support from the BASIS Collaborative Research Support Program and its management entity, the Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA. All views, interpretations, recommendations, and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the supporting or cooperating organizations.

Copyright © by author. All rights reserved.

Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for noncommercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

# Contents

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| <b>INTRODUCTION</b>  | <b>1</b>    |
| <b>I. FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS: DEFINITIONAL ISSUES AND COMPARATIVE COPING STRATEGIES</b>  | <b>4</b>    |
| <b>A. Are these truly female- headed households with legal rights to land and control over other assets and independence in decision making?</b> | <b>5</b>    |
| <b>B. How have these female-headed households emerged and how do they persist?</b>   | <b>6</b>    |
| <b>C. Do they pursue different economic strategies than male household heads? Does this change in times of drought?</b>                          | <b>10</b>   |
| <b>II. RESPONSES TO DROUGHT: SOCIAL NETWORKS, RECOVERY STRATEGIES AND POVERTY TRAPS</b>  | <b>13</b>   |
| <b>III. CONCLUSIONS: SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION</b>  | <b>17</b>   |
| <b>REFERENCES CITED</b>  | <b>19</b>   |



## INTRODUCTION

The household survey that has been undertaken by the BASIS research program in Ethiopia, in collaboration with the Institute for Development Research (IDR) at Addis Ababa University, in South Wello and Oromiya zones, Ethiopia is an extremely valuable source of information on the recent experiences of drought and food insecurity, including the severe food crisis of 1999 (see BASIS 2001 for more details). However, fieldwork that explores historical and qualitative information on these topics can also be very illuminating of longer term and more individual processes of crisis and recovery. With this in mind, we designed research to interview a subset of household heads, drawn from the larger sample of 429 households covered in the BASIS household study, about their memories of drought and famine and their personal experiences of and recovery from these traumatic episodes. We also took the opportunity to explore the nature of female-headed households; their persistence and fragility; and the different social resources they mobilize during crisis and post-crisis periods. These female-headed households, often portrayed in the literature as highly “at risk”, may provide particularly telling insights into the dynamics of vulnerability and survival.

Although there have been numerous episodes of drought and hunger in South Wello, many observers consider the drought of 1984-5 (1977 EC) the worst in recent memory (Rahmato 1991:100). As with many serious experiences of drought and famine, the crisis in food production resulted from several seasons of inadequate and/or untimely rains as well as many other structural problems in the supply and availability of food. By the time the relief effort began in 1984, many rural people throughout Wello were already in a precarious situation. Despite the establishment of relief camps by the Ethiopian Red Cross (which housed as many as 33,000 people in tents at some point during this period), minimally many hundreds of thousands died and many million were affected (Rahmato 1991). A recent New York Times article (Marc Lacey, January 5, 2003) reports that one million people died in 1984 and an additional eight million, especially in the north, suffered food shortages. The memories of that crisis remain very acute and retrospective accounts of how individuals and their households responded to and recovered from those shortages provide a rich, historical portrait of the context and consequences of food insecurity during that period.

The causes of the 1984-5 famine have been debated in the literature. There was a measurable drop in agricultural production in the preceding season (1983-4) linked not only to rain failure but to crop pests, land degradation and civil war (Baulch 1987). Derived from Amartya Sen’s models of the causes of the 1972-3 South Wello famine, lack of economic entitlement, the unavailability of food, and some have added the erratic prices for grain, due to poorly integrated markets, have also been implicated (Sen 1981).

While the 1984-5 drought and famine may have been particularly devastating, the people of South Wello continue to deal with periodic, as well as chronic, shortfalls in food supplies. The problems certainly persist to the present day. The World Food Programme (WFP) estimated that in 2002 more than five million needed food aid in Ethiopia. This is in addition to the more than 12 million people who were at risk of starvation in southern Africa. The International Federation of Red Cross (IFRC) stated in its appeal of October 2002 that since the belg rains of 2002 had failed in many parts of the country, including South Wello and other part of the Amhara Region, new interventions including cash-for-work and bulk food were needed (IFRC, 7 October 2002). More recent figures place the number of those at risk for food shortages in 2003 at 11 million or

16 percent of the Ethiopian population (FAO/WFP Report 30 December 2002). If these estimates prove correct, the current year could equal the crisis of 1984-5, although the expectations of famine-related deaths are much lower due to the more timely expected delivery of food aid (Lacey 2003).

“Already in worst affected areas, there are alarming reports of stealing of standing and harvested crops (east Goham and South Wello) and consumption of ... wildfoods such as *kunti* and *burie*. (WFP/FAO p. 29). In South Wello, a survey conducted by CONCERN in August 2002 showed Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates of 13-18 percent. According to WHO/UNICEF standards, a GAM rate of 10 percent is considered serious and above 20 percent as of crisis proportions.

The IFRC attributed the 2002 food shortages to many of the same causal factors that have been cited in the earlier famines of 1972-3 and 1984-5: “In a normal year, households find it difficult to subsist. There are many structural reasons for this including declining land holding size, land infertility, low usage of fertilizer and technology and lack of infrastructure” (IFRC, 7 October 2002). The FAO/WFP recent report on Ethiopia cites the reduction in crop yields as due mostly to the direct effects of poor rainfall, as well as to the indirect effects of the unsatisfactory rainfall on husbandry practices and on reduced expenditure on fertilizer and improved seeds (FAO/WFP Dec. 2003, p. 11). Current price increases have also reduced the ability of farmers to purchase food. The depressed prices for livestock (as much as 50%) is also negatively affecting the farmers of Amhara region, responding to increased animals presented for sale and reduced forage availability.

The conditions sound depressingly similar to 1984-5 and understanding their causes and patterns take on a particular urgency in times of food crisis. These are exactly the kinds of issues the ACL research program of BASIS is designed to systematically investigate. What can be done to allow these households to face times of drought without enduring major shortfalls in food supply and from a more sustainable and secure base?

Given the project’s interest in how differences in livelihood strategies, market linkages, agro-ecological variation, gender, social capital, and income entitlements may affect people’s experiences of and recovery from episodes of food crisis, this particular fieldwork in May 2002 was designed to elicit the differential experiences of drought and recovery among a sample of households in South Wello and Oromiyo Zones of Amhara Region. These interviews were intended to: 1) complement the quantitative information being collected by the BASIS project household survey; 2) gather more detailed and diachronic information on the differential experience of drought and recovery; and 3) better understand the nature and behavior of female-headed households. Given the high rates of female-headed households in rural Ethiopia, and in South Wello, an understanding of their particular strategies and vulnerabilities is particularly important.

This fieldwork, undertaken by Priscilla Stone and Mengistu Dessalegn, consisted of qualitative and open-ended interviews with a sample of household heads in four kebeles of Bati and Dessie Zuria woredas. This report is based on interviews with 15 household heads in Tebasit and Gerado Kebeles, Dessie Zuria Woreda, and Kamme and Chachato Kebeles, Bati Woreda. These kebeles represent a range of characteristics seen in the overall household survey of 429 households including both Amharic and Oromo communities, highland and lowland sites, differential experiences of major drought episodes, differential economic mixes of remittances,

livestock, cultivation, and other diversification. The households were chosen from the larger-scale household survey to represent a range of income, land holding, and livestock ownership levels. **Tebasit Kebele** is Amharic and a highland (*dega*) area primarily involved in *belg* cultivation of barley. Although they have chronic problems of frost and erratic rainfall, they did not suffer as greatly from the 1977 EC (1984-5) drought that devastated the lower areas of South Wello. They were more severely effected than others, however, by the more recent droughts of 1998-1999 and are subject to chronic problems of land pressure and land fragmentation. **Gerado Kebele** is a midland area (*woina dega*) but has some irrigated land which buffers it, to some extent, from the worst ravages of drought. Those farmers in this community with access to irrigation can intensify their production by double-cropping, especially in years of low rainfall. The farmers in this area did suffer during the 1977 EC (1984-5) famine, plus they were subject to an ultimately unsuccessful farmers' cooperative during the Derg, but they were less affected by the recent drought. **Kamme** and **Chachato Kebeles** in Bati Woreda are lowland (*kola*) and Oromo areas. These areas are not as accessible by road and are prone to drought. They were very hard hit by a series of droughts including the 1977 EC drought, and indeed Bati was a food distribution area during the 1977 EC drought. These kebeles, especially Chachato, exhibit more diversified economic strategies including dependence on remittances from long distance migration to places like Djibouti and Saudi Arabia, as well as more investment in livestock and livestock relationships with the Afar with whom they share a border. All areas have depended on food aid at some point and some households show chronic need.

This report is divided into two main sections, one focusing on female-headed households, the other focusing on memories of the 1984-5 drought. Although the context of these questions will be provided in greater depth below, the structure of our interviews were designed to focus on the following rather specific questions:

### **I. Female-Headed Households - Definitional Issues and Comparative Coping Strategies**

- A. Are these truly female-headed households with legal rights to land and other assets and independence in decision-making?
- B. How have these female-headed households emerged and do they persist through time?
- C. Do they pursue different economic strategies than male household heads? Does this change in times of drought?
  1. Since agriculture in this area requires oxen and male ploughmen, how do these female-headed households cultivate?
  2. How do they gain access to land?
  3. Do they diversify more or in different ways than male household heads?

### **II. Responses to Drought in the Past and Present: Social Networks, Recovery Strategies and Poverty traps**

- A. What was this individual's experience of the 1977 EC drought? What strategies did this individual and/or their household use to survive the drought? Are there kebele-wide patterns in responses to drought? What role did networks of social support play? What role did economic diversification play?

B. What was this individual's experience of recovery from the 1977 EC drought? How important were networks of social support in their recovery? Are there kebele-wide patterns in recovery strategies?

C. Do any of these individual or household histories illustrate patterns of falling into poverty traps or successful reaccumulation?

## **I. FEMALE-HEADED HOUSEHOLDS: DEFINITIONAL ISSUES AND COMPARATIVE COPING STRATEGIES**

There has been much written about the comparatively high rates of female-headed households in rural Ethiopia (Ali Hassen 2000, Dejene Aredo 1994, 1999, Fafchamps and Quisumbing 2000a, 2000b, Yared Amare 1995, Yigremew Adal 2000, Zenebework Tadesse and Yared Amare 2000 to name only a few). Although these works present a nuanced portrait of female-headed households, there remain a number of important and yet unanswered questions about these households and why they exist.

As scholars and aid specialists assess the most vulnerable households in rural Ethiopian communities, their attention is often focused on female-headed households. Although there does seem to be a general consensus that these households headed by women are disproportionately poor and disadvantaged in their access to labor, land and other factors of production, many questions remain about how they emerge, persist, how enduring and independent they may be, and whether they pursue different overall economic strategies than do households headed by males. Given that the plough agriculture of this region requires male labor, the viability and options available to these female-headed households are at question. Part of the purpose of these qualitative interviews was to try to understand whether these households exhibit particular strategies for coping with stresses and managing recovery and whether they are particularly vulnerable to crises in food supply.

Household Data Analyses: Preliminary summary information from our household study provide a valuable context for discussing these individual households (see preliminary tables and data analysis of Tewodaj Mogues in August 2002 and Ragan Petrie in June 22, 2002). These data confirm the general portrait in the literature. The female-headed households in our overall sample of 429 households do have lower average incomes than male-headed households (386 birr vs. 507 birr - see Petrie June 22, 2002). They also have lower per capita incomes (39 birr per dependent vs. 50 birr per dependent) and show lower levels of food self-sufficiency (166 kg of grain per dependent vs. 246 kg. per dependent) (see Mogues August 2002). Furthermore, most female-headed households are in the bottom quartile for farm size (41% of female-headed households own farms of average size of 1.4 timads vs. average land holdings of 2.69 timads; Mogues August 2002) Despite the relative poverty of female-headed households, our data indicate that male-headed households received more food aid (82 vs. 71 kg of food aid recorded in Round 4 data of Nov.-Dec. 2001; See Mogues August 2002).

Female-headed households also own fewer livestock. At the end of 2001, after the 2000 drought, male-headed households owned 4.37 livestock vs. 2.67 owned by female-headed households. Since a team of oxen is needed for cultivation, differences in oxen ownership are significant as well. Overall, households with two or more oxen are much more food self-sufficient than those with 1 or no oxen (893 kg. vs. 276 with no oxen and 616 with 1 oxen). But one should note that

the majority of households, both male and female-headed, in our sample own no oxen (253 households), while 126 households own only one, and only 69 households own two or more.

These summary data also show some interesting contrasts in the behavior of male and female-headed households. At the lowest middle income levels, female-headed households exhibit considerable diversification of income sources (including income from grain sales, livestock sales, remittances, wages, self-employment, in-kind income) compared to male household heads in the same income strata who are much more dependent on the two sources of income of livestock and grain sales. At the upper income levels, the differences between male and female households largely disappear (Petrie June 22, 2002). We will explore the issue of diversification in greater detail below.

The Incidence of Female-Headed Households: It is thought that the overall proportion of rural female-headed households in Ethiopia is increasing (Adal 2001). Dessalegn (1994:5) estimates that 20-25% of membership in peasant associations is now female, an increase from previous levels of 10-15%. This larger percentage is similar to the overall percentage of female heads of household in the BASIS household survey of 24%, ranging from as low as 14% in Bati to as high as 33% in Legambo. Although most of the kebele included in this report do not in general exhibit such high rates (16% in Chachato are female heads, 12.5% in Kamme, 12.5% in Tebasit, and 23% in Gerado) the rates are still significant. The occurrence of female heads of household cannot be explained in simple gender imbalance terms. There are somewhat more women than men in our survey but the differences cannot account for 24% female heads (48% of our sample is male, and 52% female although this includes children). Interestingly, only 68.5% of all household heads are married, whether male or female. A further 8.3% are single, 8% divorced, 12.3% widowed. Despite the fact that our interviewees assured us that unmarried males found it virtually impossible to run a household by themselves--whereas it is possible for unmarried females – there seem to be a surprisingly high number of unmarried male heads. Although 85% of household members are nuclear family, the remaining 15% are extended kin and non-relatives (grandchildren, parents, nephews and nieces) (South Wello Round One Inventory Tables)

### **A. Are these truly female- headed households with legal rights to land and control over other assets and independence in decision making?**

As we began our interviewing of female heads of households, we were struck by the variety of their life histories as well as the diversity of their economic strategies and social ties within their communities in the present day. Some women, who are considered heads of households, may be married and embedded in a husband's household, but continue to own land and pay taxes on that land from a previous marriage or inheritance. Their experience is obviously quite different from women who are managing almost completely on their own, running independent farming or trading enterprises, and functioning as the sole source of support for children and other dependents.

This range of variation led us to question how unitary a category female-headed household might be. This is a particularly interesting question because it considers the possibility that this high percentage of female heads reported in our larger household sample may mask considerable and significant variation in household organization and independence. Perhaps these women are regularly linked to other households in important social or economic ties? Perhaps we need a more flexible and dynamic definition of what a household or a household head might be? One

example may illustrate the importance of this inquiry. It is possible that there may be an advantage for larger, perhaps polygynous households, to establish smaller, quasi-independent “sub-households” for purposes of land ownership, taxation or food aid. Similarly, might a divorced daughter returning home with her children to her father’s kebele impose less of a drain on her natal household by setting up a quasi-independent household, with diversified trading activities, and with its own claim to food aid and perhaps land in redistribution? We were told that food aid is generally allocated on the basis of four person households and that households that are any bigger than this are still only eligible for the allocation for four people. Similarly, if the land tax is graduated (i.e. the rate is higher with larger landholdings, personal communication, Yigremew Adal) would not there be an advantage to establish nominally-independent landowning households? Is it completely a coincidence that the average household size in our entire BASIS sample is a relatively small 5.03?

Although it is highly unlikely that these people, whose family and economic circumstances are often complex and changeable, are this strategic, this line of inquiry can still lead us to pose some very interesting questions about household definition and boundaries. Although we should consider these questions for all households, the answers are particularly interesting in the case of female-headed households that do not, after all, fit the normative model of ideal household type in these areas. Are these women heads of truly independent households or not?

In fact of the eight female heads we interviewed, only two women have been truly on their own with dependents for a sustained period (see below). Most of these female heads were linked and partially sustained by close ties of marriage, kinship or more informal social relationships with other households or individuals. These same kinds of links, of course, also sustain male-headed households, especially in the early stages of their developmental cycle. We nonetheless believe that, even if many of these women are married or assisted by another male, most (as many as 6 out of the 8) remain the primary economic decision maker for her own land if not the household as a whole, or at least hold significant joint economic decision making power. These points will be explored more fully below.

## **B. How have these female-headed households emerged and how do they persist?**

If the norm is for male-headed households, why are almost 1/4 of all rural households headed by women? Most of these women became female heads following divorce or widowhood. Although remarriage is an option for many women, if they are of advanced age, with elderly dependents (like a mother) or grown or growing children (especially sons) they may not have to or be able to remarry. This social category of single, once-married woman with children allows considerable independence and authority over farm-level decisions.

These particular case studies illustrate various ways women may become head of household. Although all had been married, with their marriages ended by divorce or death of their spouse, some had remarried one or more times, some had returned to a natal household with a father or brother to provide the male agricultural labor, while others managed on their own until their sons could fill that role. A number of women remarry quite quickly (within a few years) after the first divorce (Interviewees 1, 2, 4, 8, 15). Many women remarry more than once, and may establish a permanent residence in which they stay despite remarriage (Interviewee 2). This would be

especially the case for the second wife of a polygynous man whose first wife, and primary residence, is elsewhere. Some women do not remarry, especially if they are of advanced age.

These women have pursued a number of different economic and social strategies through time. In cases of early divorce, they typically return to their father or mother's house (Interviewees 2, 4, 8, 15) and resume dependence on their natal households. Eventually, some decide to diversify into such activities as selling tea or other beverages (Interviewees 2 and 8), trade (Interviewees 2 and 4), or migration (Interviewees 8,10,15). All are involved in some agriculture, whether they cultivate land they may have received at divorce (Interviewee 4) or from the death of their father (Interviewee 8). Some of this diversification is drought-induced, such as sale of firewood (Interviewee 15) or sending children off to wage labor migration (Interviewee 15) but some persists past the time of great stress and proves to be particularly helpful in surviving the next drought (Interviewee 2). Some of this diversification may persist despite remarriage (Interviewees 8,2) and this independent source of income may well make it easier for these women to move in and out of a solitary head status. There is some tax advantage to retaining two registered land owners within one household, as well as some potential advantage in food aid allocations (Interviewee 1 continued receiving aid as a household head after her marriage<sup>1</sup>).

Those few women who seem to be "true" household heads do indeed seem to be more isolated from social networks of support but they also show signs of more diversification and self-sufficiency (Interviewee 4 traded, Interviewee 2 trades and sells tea, Interviewee 8 sells drinks). Although Interviewees 2 and 8 are now married, they have spent times as self-sufficient single parents. Interviewee 4 says she has renounced marriage and has been on her own for at least four years. When she became sick with TB three years ago, she felt very isolated, begging people to foster her children (one daughter in Addis, one son is herding for another household). She told us "my children ate my bones." Her movement is restricted as sole caretaker of her children (although male household heads also mention that children and marriage restrict their migration). Interviewee 15 receives remittances from her three daughters in Djibouti, but is restricted in her movements by her elderly mother, grandchild and nephew and locally is dependent on neighbors for help.

So, again, of the eight female heads, only two are truly on their own with dependents. Most are linked through bonds of marriage (category 1) or motherhood or other kinship links (category 2) to resident males, who are often male heads of household. The women continue to be registered as female heads of household because of land ownership and separate payment of tax. Some women, however, do seem to be truly on their own and have adopted a more or less permanent female head status marked by a high dependency ratio and the unlikelihood of remarriage (category 3).

Of these eight women:

**Category 1 (married women):**

- One respondent has remarried (Interviewee 1) after 15 years of being a widow but she is still considered a household head because she continues to cultivate her former husband's land and continues to pay tax and receive food aid as a registered and separate head from her new husband. In the last round of data collection in the BASIS household study, he was added to

---

<sup>1</sup> Not all food aid allocations are on a per head basis

her household. (She is still the primary decision maker on her own farm - since her current husband is elderly she may assume management of the entire operation in a few years)

- another has remarried (Interviewee 2) for the fourth time and has lived in her own house throughout the last two marriages (both as the second wife in a polygynous union). She has been largely self-supporting through trade and cultivation of her daughter's land and has spent several long periods as a single, self-supporting mother. (She is still head of her own household with some subsidies from her new husband).
- another (Interviewee 8) is married to her fourth husband. Although she has been married to him for 19 years, he had, until this year, lived primarily in another kebele where he owned land. As an only child, she inherited land from her father in this kebele. She is registered as a household head and pays taxes. She has supported herself throughout her marriages with a diversified strategy including selling alcohol and tea, and migrating for wage labor. (Although a recently merged household, she could and has been self-supporting).

### **Category 2 (mother of resident male):**

- another (Interviewee 6) although widowed lives with her married son and his wife and children. Both she and the son are registered as household heads, but she is elderly and more or less his dependent at this point. The son, for example, has assumed her kire (funeral association) dues. (She is not the primary decision maker).
- another (Interviewee 10) was widowed ten years ago with four children. Her son has taken over the major farmwork, ploughing and participating in labor groups, although she is still the household head. (I believe she still is the primary decision maker in this household still).
- another (Interviewee 13) has been widowed for five years and left with seven children. Her eldest son is now about 20 years old and he can plough the land. He is not married and lives with her but pays the taxes. She has 2 children in Djibouti. (She is the primary decision maker).

### **Category 3 (solitary female head):**

- one woman (Interviewee 4) was married twice but divorced her last husband in 1987 or 1988 and has not remarried and says she does not intend to. She is on her own, cultivating a plot of land she received at divorce, doing some trading (although sick in the last three years), hiring her son out as a herder, and sending a daughter to Addis. (The only decision maker)
- another (Interviewee 15) was widowed in 1984-85 and moved back with her three children to live with her mother (mother widowed around the same time). Brother had been farming for them until he left for Djibouti about 5 years ago and did not return. All three of her daughters in Djibouti and sending home remittances. (The only decision maker)

Even though only two could be considered “true” female household heads in the sense of self-supporting and fully independent in a persistent way. Many of these women, nonetheless, have spent periods of their adult lives as single largely self-supporting household heads with dependent children (see discussion of diversification below).

The status of female head of household seems to be an impermanent and variable one that women typically move in and out of, perhaps several times during their adult lives, and shows considerable variation in degrees of independence and self-sufficiency. A recently widowed woman with small children might be largely dependent on other households for male agricultural labor, and may also be constrained from diversifying into trade or migration by childcare

responsibilities. A widow with a newly-grown son heads a household that functions quite like a male-headed household in terms of labor and livestock acquisition, although she may persist as the household head and manager of farm decisions. A woman who has been divorced several times may own an independent residence, manage a farm or other diversified economic portfolio, so as to make remarriage an additional, rather than necessary part of her subsistence.

Summary: These women pursued a number of strategies that changed through time, depending on their age, their dependency ratios, the likelihood of remarriage, as well as the overall economic health of their communities. Many women initially returned to their fathers for a period, either then remarrying or setting up an independent household unit and diversifying (selling tea or other beverages, trading, migrating for wages, sending children off to wage labor migration). These forms of diversification seem especially critical to female heads of household who may be disadvantaged in the agricultural sphere (see below) and these diverse, if small, economic activities allow them more flexibility to move in and out of a solitary head status than might agriculture or herding.

Given this dynamism and diversity, it is difficult to isolate a class of female heads that demonstrates a set of persistent and enduring characteristics. This does not seem to be a coherent or consistent, and certainly not a homogeneous, social category. In fact, given their impermanence, how porous their economic boundaries are, and their fluid membership, one might in fact question whether many of these are discrete households at all (especially those in category 1) beyond the fact that the woman is a registered PA member. We might want to think, instead, of female heads as in a continuous gradient from dependent wife or mother to independent household head with everything in between marked by impermanent and variable bundles of attributes that women may display at different points in their life cycle.

Despite these caveats, I believe that the overall percentage of female heads, as currently measured, will remain relatively stable, although the actual women occupying that position may well change from one year to the next, or one census to the next, and the nature of their status of female head may vary significantly. Although several people claimed that divorce was less common than in the past, and everyone was sure that polygyny rates had decreased which, if true, would make remarriage more difficult, multiple re-marriages still seem to be the norm rather than the exception. It is possible that the definition of marriage is changing (Abate, pers. com.) and that women, such as Interviewee 2, who have been in a series of polygynous unions, may occupy a more informal status as second wife than might have been the norm in the past. How “marriage” is defined, and whether the norms governing marital unions are changing, would be a very interesting study (note: our interviews included questions about changes in brideprice and marriage arrangements, but this information is not yet analyzed). Given the economic incentives favoring smaller households (both in terms of food aid and the threats of land redistribution), there are likely to be considerable links, both emotionally and economically, between nominally independent households, whether the women consider themselves married or not.

These female heads do report depending on the assistance of relatives and neighbors when they need it, although the importance of these networks of assistance also holds for male heads of households. We did observe that those few women who seem to be true and persistent household heads do indeed seem to be the most isolated from social networks of support.

Given the impression in the literature that female-headed households are a creation of hard times and desertion, we were curious to elicit marital histories to test this assumption. Although it seems true that some of their marriages weakened and sometimes ended during times of stress (see Interview 2), other women reported forming new marital alliances even during droughts or had marriages which persisted despite extreme hardships, separation and stress. None of the women we interviewed had been abandoned. While female heads of households may face particularly daunting challenges, they clearly meet them with a number of economic and social coping strategies adapted to their fluid place in rural Ethiopian society.

### **C. Do they pursue different economic strategies than male household heads? Does this change in times of drought?**

1. Since agriculture in this area requires **oxen and male ploughmen**, how do these female-headed households cultivate? The literature widely discusses the difficulties faced by female heads of household given the taboo against women ploughing in these areas and their lack of oxen ownership (see, for example, Ali 2000). Female heads of household may be more likely to sharecrop their fields out to male farmers with their own oxen, reducing their harvests by 50%. To accommodate the lack of male labor for ploughing, and the fact that many of them do not own two oxen, these female heads we interviewed do employ a wide range of different strategies to secure access to these assets. Male heads often do as well, or at least move through such a stage in the early formation of their marital household or after drought. Out of 15 interviews, we recorded 9 different ways to get a field ploughed only one of which involves owning two oxen. These include:

- a. Own two oxen, provide own ploughing labor (Interviewee 13's son ploughs).
- b. Own one oxen, match it with the one oxen of another (*macamada*). Provide own ploughing labor. Have the obligation to loan your oxen for use on your partner's field (Interviewees 10, 15 before her brother's death). If not, may have to pay the owner of the second oxen some grain (Interview ee10).
- c. Own no oxen but hire someone with a team of two oxen to plough your field. Reported as fee of 3-4 birr a day by one female head (Interviewee 1 before her daughter married).
- d. Own no oxen but ask neighbors or relatives for help. You are then obligated to assist them on their farm when they need help (Interviewee 4)
- e. Same as (d) but get help from two households (oxen from one and ploughing labor from another)
- f. Sharecrop out. The sharecropper provides the oxen, labor and seed and receives half the harvest (60% in Chachato), crop residue and grass (Interviewees 1,15 since her brother's death)
- g. Landowner provides seed and gets full harvest, while oxen owner provides oxen and labor and gets crop residue and grasses (Interviewees 2, 4, 8)
- h. Borrow oxen, you provide the labor and the oxen owner gets the crop residue and grasses (Interviewees 6's son ploughs)
- i. Two farmers, neither with any oxen, each borrow one ox and pair them as in (b). At harvest, each ox owner is given 2 quintals of grain by the ox borrower (Interviewee 14 in Chachato)

Note that both male as well as female heads reported a range of these strategies (see below under recovery from drought). Although male heads especially may aspire to own two oxen, many, due to youth, drought or land scarcity, may depend on other ways to get their fields ploughed. These strategies are not specific to female heads and the lack of oxen is a problem that is widely shared.

Interestingly, only two of these female-headed households needed to resort to sharecropping their land out. It is possible that increasing land shortage in these areas, especially shortage of pastureland, may have shifted some of the power in negotiating favorable terms of renting or borrowing cattle to the landowner. Although ownership of a team of oxen is clearly the ideal (and households owning oxen are more food secure) with increasing land pressure and fragmentation, it may become less common through time. These accommodations of female-headed households, culturally and economically unlikely to own a team of oxen, may ultimately become the standard. Alternative investments, such as outmigration, may also become more attractive as pasture and farmland become scarcer. The 2003 experience of drought with major livestock losses, due to lack of forage and water supplies, may underscore this further. The recent WFP/FAO report suggests that non-planting in 2003 in some limited areas may have been due to a lack of time to prepare land properly, or even at all, due to the pressure on animals for sharing or hire (p. 10). (Note: They suggest introduction of diesel-powered hand tractors.)

2) Land ownership by Ethiopian women is often cited as distinctive in the African context and distinguishes Ethiopia from most African societies. Many have argued that security of tenure is key to ensuring improvements and investments in the land. Since land in most African countries is owned by men, even though women may perform the bulk of the agricultural work, women have limited access to credit to allow improvements which might result in productivity gains (see Dina Kraft report of the U.N. Summit on Sustainable Development, August 29, 2002, AP). Ethiopian women, who are by law, given equal rights in land to men, should be in a relatively advantaged position.

While certainly preferable to alienation from land ownership, it is not clear that the legal rights in land always in practice empowers women nor gives them enduring and equal rights. The general practice in these regions of kebele exogamy (marrying outside your kebele) and patrilocal residence (living in your husband's kebele) makes it difficult for non-resident daughters to mobilize their rights of inheritance in their father's land, even if those are acknowledged. Similarly, divorced women often remarry into a different neighborhood and forfeit a potential divorce settlement.

Indeed although all of these female heads were **land owners** (caveat for Interview 2 - see below) and women's rights in land seems universally acknowledged, these female heads generally seem to have less land and less ability to maintain rights in land than male heads. Only those who are widowed and inherit the full portion of their deceased husband's land seem to have equal shares as male heads. Those who are divorced seem to control smaller farms than their male counterparts.

The mode of acquisition thus affects women's control of land. Women may inherit land from their father (Interviewee 8 as an only child), but will only be able to claim that land if divorced or widowed and have returned to their father's kebele (Interviewee 15), if they inherit it as a child (Interviewee 2's daughter), or if they are married into the same kebele as their father. Interviewee 8 has been able to keep cultivating her father's land since her husband is atypically in uxorilocal residence (living in his wife's natal kebele). Women may be able to claim some of

the marital household's land at divorce, especially if they were figured into the land redistribution equation, but to use this land they must stay in the same kebele. If widowed, they can stay and cultivate their husband's land, but they will only be able to keep control of that land if they do not remarry (Interviewees 4, 6, 10, 13) or remarry within the kebele (Interviewee 1). Overall, those who are widowed and stay on their deceased husband's farm seem in the strongest position to maintain control over the total acreage (although even there, they may suffer in land redistribution since their household now has one less person - Interviewee 1). Those who are divorced may be in a precarious position to obtain or retain rights in land, whether from the former husband or father. Interviewee 2, for instance, cultivates the land of her daughter who has migrated to Addis. The daughter inherited this land from her deceased father, whom Interviewee 2 had divorced.

Male household heads acquire land primarily by inheriting it from their fathers after his death or by being given a portion of their father's land at marriage. Others gained some land in redistribution, although a few lost land during redistribution. Male access to and control over land seems more straightforward and less contested.

3. Do they diversify more or in different ways than male household heads? Female heads seem to demonstrate a fair degree of **economic diversification**, perhaps more persistently than their male counterparts, branching out from farming into trading, food selling, and so on. Although several felt that female heads were at a disadvantage in migrating because their movements are constrained by child and elder care responsibilities (Interviewees 15 and 4), a number of women had left the area at some point in their adult life (Interviewees 8, 10). Locally, these women were involved in trading (Interviewees 4, 2), food and drink selling (Interviewees 8, 2), firewood selling (Interviewees 13, 15), and sponsoring and sending children to long-distance migration to Addis, Djibouti and Saudi Arabia, as well as Southern Ethiopia (Interviewees 2, 4, 13, 15, 8). Wives within male household may also diversify (Interviewees 9's wife in Tebasit sells drinks). In his September 2002 report, Castro notes that food-selling and small-scale trading may attract women to peri-urban centers in these rural areas, which certainly seemed the case in several of our interviews (especially Interviewees 2, 8 and 9).

Men show some experimentation in diversification (see below) especially in response to drought or other difficulties on the farm and are more likely to be involved in seasonal wage labor migration than women.

While one might hypothesize that female heads of households adopt a more diversified economic portfolio because they are more entrepreneurial and prone, by their "abnormal" social position, to be willing to experiment outside the agricultural norms of crop production and animal rearing, the fact remains that the returns on petty trading and tea selling are very small and they likely turn to these activities out of necessity rather than from profit maximization. Nonetheless, these "occupations", however marginal, may well buffer them somewhat better from the worse effects of erratic rainfall than the almost complete reliance of male heads of households on farming. Their investment in long-distance migration seems especially important and deserves closer scrutiny.

Summary: While the definition, and boundaries, of female-headed households may be considerably more fluid than we had originally presumed, these types of households are not only common in these rural areas but show a high degree of persistence through time. Whether truly self-supporting or not, these women and their households offer not only a refuge for their own

and other's children and extended family, but secure a place for the next generation, whether through their control of land or their efforts to educate or prepare their children for migration. Sometimes the more vulnerable members of society, given their disadvantaged access to the normal means of production, may function as small-scale pioneers in alternative economic strategies and are worthy of our close attention.

## **II. RESPONSES TO DROUGHT: SOCIAL NETWORKS, RECOVERY STRATEGIES AND POVERTY TRAPS**

These interviews also were designed to explore, more generally, the historical experiences of drought and stories of recovery. We began by asking what experience this person, and their household, had of the 1977 EC drought and recovery from it. This proved to be a very successful starting point since everyone we interviewed had very distinct memories of that time and the deprivations that occurred. We do need to be aware, as noted by Castro in his report of September 2002, that people may discuss severe episodes of hunger and food security in “general terms” rather than specific memories of the 1977 EC famine. Despite this important caveat, the primary goal was to chronicle as best we could how they and their household coped with the loss of harvest and livestock during this particular drought and how they re-established themselves after the drought was over. This would not only give the project some historical context in which to interpret the more recent drought experiences, but also allow us to follow the recovery stories through time. This allowed us to gather more general information on land acquisition, livestock purchases and sales, and diversification, through time and during periods of stress. We also inquired about labor groups, other forms of aid and cooperation, as well as networks of support. We must remember that our samples are biased by the fact that these are all households or individuals who “succeeded” in the sense that they survived, did not permanently migrate out of the area, and retained land ownership. It would be revealing to interview individuals who were members of households that “failed” in one way or another.

The 1977 EC drought was particularly severe in most of South Wello and prompted a major international relief effort. Although the highland areas, such as Tebasit, were not as severely affected as the lowland regions during this particular drought, everyone felt the effects to some extent. Initially, food aid was only distributed in food camps that were established in the area and we were told about the camps at Gerado and Bati, both close to the areas we were interviewing. A number of people recounted stories of having applied to enter the camps but having been refused since they were not considered needy enough. Others remembered avoiding the camps for fear of disease and death or resettlement. After the first year, some of our respondents remembered the food aid being available on the farm and the camps dispersing. Many areas have been receiving food aid, either in the form of relief or Food for Work ever since, although not always predictably, not to the entire population of the kebele, and not always the full allocation. Long-term dependence on food relief is certainly an issue that deserves further inquiry, given added urgency by the current crisis. How much or little have things changed in the intervening 19 years?

Beyond filling in a picture of responses to an extreme shock, this approach also allowed us to better understand more general processes of land acquisition (and loss), livestock purchases and sales, choices about migration, and importance of food aid across households and through time. We also inquired about labor groups, other forms of aid and cooperation, as well as networks of

support. Although this approach cannot provide the breadth or the detail of an exhaustive household survey, it is ideally suited to uncovering some of the dynamics and range of possibilities available to these individuals and households.

A. What was this individual's experience of the 1977 EC drought? What strategies did this individual and/or household use to survive the drought? Are there kebele-wide patterns in responses to drought? What role did networks of social support play? What role did economic diversification play?

1. The 1977 EC drought was a universally painful memory (although not as extreme in Tebasit) that provoked a wide range of coping strategies, adapted to the particular conditions of the kebele and the individual. Most exhibited classic responses to harvest failure of **livestock selling** (some reduced to no livestock or 1-2 animals through selling, slaughter, or death of livestock), **outmigration** by some of the household for wage labor (Interviewee 13 of Chachato sent two children to Djibouti), dependence on **remittances** (Interviewee 11's family in Djibouti and Awash area sending money), and **diversification** into activities like charcoal and firewood selling (Interviewees 10, 13, 15). Everyone survived the drought through livestock sales, purchase of grains, etc. and, eventually, government aid. Although food camps were established, some were refused entry while others avoided entry due to fear of disease. Many had access to this aid indirectly by visiting relatives in the camps or selling or trading firewood for food in the camps.

2. Although the experience of drought is highly individual, there are noticeable **community-wide patterns**. For example, the farmers of Chachato, in general, responded to the 1977 EC drought by combining firewood and charcoal selling with outmigration to Djibouti or Saudi Arabia. The various influences on community patterns include: a) historical specifics (e.g. a farmer cooperative in Gerado dispossessed farmers of land and oxen but allowed Interviewee 5 to engage in long-distance trade); b) ecological variation (e.g. wooded areas in Bati allowed for firewood and charcoal selling); c) differing agricultural practices (e.g. irrigation in Gerado buffers some farmers); d) climatic differences (e.g. 1977 EC drought did not affect the highlands as much as the lowlands); e) community-wide patterns of livestock investment (e.g. more overall dependence on livestock in Chachato); f) traditions of long-distance wage labor migration (Chachato), and; g) histories of land redistribution and fragmentation (e.g. Tebasit's smaller land holdings have perhaps forced farmers into more diversification?).

The role of food aid in mitigating the effects of drought is interesting and may affect different households differently. Tebasit as a highland, belt area, for example, was not as badly affected by the 77 EC drought and although they did have shortfall of harvests for the first year, they generally did better the second. They were treated as a refuge area for relations from harder hit areas (see Interviewee 3). Tebasit generally found the more recent drought 1999-2000 much worse although its impact was mitigated by **food aid** (Interviewees 3, 2). Indeed for some in Tebasit, the 77 EC drought remains the most difficult due to the lack of food aid at that time (Interviewee 9).

3. Despite some movement for assistance from harder hit to lesser-affected areas, we saw no evidence of any dramatic change in the operation of **networks of social support** during the drought. While some reported the 77 EC as a time when relations became more strained since people had nothing to give (Interview 4), others remembered it as a time when people were more willing and able to help others than today when everyone is impoverished, while still others

reported relatively normal patterns of mutual help from neighbors and relatives. Interviewee 3 of Tebasit remembered people seeking and receiving help in the highland areas during 77 EC drought, while Interviewee 5 of Gerado reports those from rainfed areas coming to those with irrigated fields in Gerado for assistance. Some stayed for a month or two, others for up to a year, contributing to the farming enterprise when possible. Interviewee 8's in-laws came to Tebasit during most recent drought (1990 EC) and returned home once aid began to be distributed there.

4. Overall, **times of great stress are potentially periods of great, albeit forced, innovation and diversification.** Some strategies, such as firewood and charcoal selling, are not necessarily sustainable or ecologically desirable, but others, like trade and migration, may establish more long-term possibilities. Leaving the rural area for the short or long-term not only allows the possibility of remittances, but also relieves the subsistence burden on the farm at least during the crisis (Interviewee 4 went to sister in Addis and brought home money; Interviewee 10 went to father's sister in Djibouti). Other responses, such as eating wild foods and eating less desirable grains, were also reported.

The diversification of the female heads of households is described above. Men's off-farm experiences are also quite diverse and not all drought-induced. A number of male heads reported regular seasonal wage labor (Interviewee 3 performs agricultural labor during slack periods, Interviewee 11 worked construction in Samara) especially before marriage and fatherhood. Others are trading in goats or sheep (Interviewees 7, 14). Some left to avoid the military draft during the Derg (Interviewee 5 picked and traded coffee). Some drought-induced diversification included selling charcoal (Interviewee 14), working in food camps (Interviewee 12) and migrating for wage labor (Interviewee 3 also said he performed agricultural wage labor in response to the 1999-2000 drought). Some efforts at diversification were squashed by drought (Interviewee 9 sold his sewing machine and never bought it again) or by lack of success (Interviewee 5). The husband of Interviewee 8 has persisted with his second hand clothing business despite the depressing economic effects of the droughts and was able to begin restocking his livestock losses with proceeds of trading almost immediately. It should be noted that the returns on much of this diversification are very small. Interview 3 report being paid only 4 *birr* a day for ploughing in the Jemma region.

**B. What was this individual's experience of recovery from the 1977 EC drought?** How important were networks of social support in their recovery? Are there kebele-wide patterns in recovery strategies? How important were networks of social support in their recovery? Are there kebele-wide patterns in recovery strategies?

1. **Recovery stories are less diverse** and exhibit a strong impulse to return to "normal" as quickly as possible. Although some diversification persists, others disappear for good. Some households do seem to recover more quickly than others, often assisted by off-farm income, but recurrent droughts or other shocks may well depress the ability to recover over time.

In the immediate aftermath of the drought, although they may be handicapped by loss of livestock, most replant in the next season with purchased or saved seeds. A few farmers, who suffered the loss of their oxen during the drought, may have had to initially sharecrop out (Interviewee 11). More commonly, they first acquired a single ox and practiced *macamada* (Interviewees 3, 5, 7). While some are still borrowing oxen (Interviewee 3), others have acquired two oxen (Interviewees 14, 12, 11, 9) and may even be sharecropping in (Interviewee 12).

2. **Some households do seem to recover more quickly** than others, although the impact of successive droughts may be very debilitating. Someone like Interviewee 7 was able to restock in the next year following the losses of the 77 EC drought, but suffered significant losses again in the more recent drought despite a government animal feed program. The couple in interview 8 was able to rebuild their herds quite quickly with the help of his clothing and her food trade. Some practices, such as shareherding or hiring a child out as a herder, are very slow and labor-intensive methods of building up herds, practiced primarily by the very poor (Interviewee 4).

Some who recovered relatively quickly from the 1977 EC drought (Interviewee 3's family was able to replace a bull the following year) may be struggling today through other setbacks, such as the death of a father. Others took many years to restock, moving through phases of sharecropping out until they had adequate labor or oxen to cultivate themselves (Interviewee 11 in Kamme only bought an ox a year ago, Interviewee 14 only began recouping livestock losses 12 years after the end of the drought). Others began slowly and very incrementally to rebuild herds (Interviewee 13 was not able to start re-buying livestock for 3 years and then with some remittances and sale of maize, slowly started buying goats, then calves.) The ultimate goal of rebuilding lost herds never seems in doubt; it seems only a question of how long, with how many setbacks, this recovery will take.

3. **Networks of support** are complex and it would be well worth doing more interviewing on this topic. Most people when questioned about whom they seek help or advice from, respond that it could be a relative, a friend or a neighbor, depending on what they need. Based on these interviews, however, the primary sources of assistance, whether labor, advice, money or food, are **relatives**. For example, although Interviewee 3 said he goes to whomever he feels can help with a particular problem, he borrows his oxen from a relative. Men, who remain in their natal kebele, have access to their paternal relatives for assistance. Women who are widowed may also call on their husband's relations for help (Interviewees 13, 1). Both men and women also frequently mention maternal relatives (Interviewees 8, 5) as sources of help. Sibling groups seem to cooperate with remittances as well as labor and agricultural assistance (Interviewee 14).

Perhaps significant is the fact that the female heads who are more independent, say they are mostly dependent on neighbors for help (Interviewees 2, 4, 10, 15).

No individual can always depend on relations, especially in times of crisis. Some people reported the extenuating of family ties during periods of scarcity either through loss of relatives at this time, or the dissolution of marriages due to food scarcity (Interviewees 2 and 8 both told us they left their second husband during this drought). Those women who were female heads at this time were not necessarily worse off than others (Interview 1 was a female head but was living in the least effected kebele of Tebasit), although our sample is very small on this point.

Community institutions such as **kire** do certainly mobilize resources at times of death, but these seem to operate quite universally and without biases towards the particularly needy or solitary. Similarly, the **agricultural labor groups** (debo or wenfel) seem to work very pragmatically - called when needed and where needed, and not mobilized to accommodate particular labor inequities. If this pragmatic approach prevails, then the smaller farmers and farms (especially the female heads of household) would have little call on this labor.

**C. Do any of these individual or household histories illustrate patterns of falling into poverty traps or successful re-accumulation?**

1. Although we saw evidence of **chronic poverty**, it was **not clear that this was specifically drought-induced** (Interviews 3, 4, 10). In some cases, the more severe problems seem to be extreme land fragmentation and small overall farm size (Tebasit), marginal cultivation potential (Chachato), and personal tragedies of sickness (Interviewee 4) or death of family (Interviewee 4). Some farmers seem to suffer chronic shortfalls, making up the difference with remittances or wage labor migration. For others “every year is drought year for me” (Interview 4).

2. For most farmers, **each year may bring a change of fortunes**, either for the better or worse. Interviewee 1 may have seemed a poor female household head when first interviewed by the BASIS project, but she is now remarried to a husband with more than adequate land and livestock holdings. While Interviewee 7 is a respected head of the Tebasit kire, his livestock losses over two drought periods have driven him to virtually start from scratch in rebuilding his herds. There was no evidence among these 15 households of people or households who never recovered nor any that had greatly prospered in a sustained way. To be so dependent on rainfed agriculture seems to virtually ensure livelihoods that fluctuate with the rains and rarely offer the opportunity for households to prosper in any sustained way

### **III. CONCLUSIONS: SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION**

Perhaps most striking about the voices we heard in these qualitative interviews, of male and female heads of households alike, is their shared determination to keep scraping by perched on their small plots of land and gathering their livestock around them at night, while hoping for a better life for their children. When we asked them about their hopes for their children’s future, only a few wanted them to remain on the farm and cited aspirations such as government employment in Dessie. Yet, we know that off-farm employment opportunities are extremely limited in South Wello and that entrepreneurial activity from the farm, whether trading, small business or wage labor, is on a very small scale and for very low returns. Programs which evaluate possibilities of rural industrialization, credit for small business generation and targeted education programs would all seem relevant to extension planning.

This general issue of why these farmers of South Wello seem stuck in a perennial state of food insecurity and potential crisis, and what might be done to reduce this vulnerability, can be examined from a number of different, more specific, points of view. Combining the qualitative interviews with analysis of our large quantitative database, we could well explore in publication or policy-directed report:

1) the delivery and role of food aid in rural livelihoods. We know that there is chronic dependence on food aid by many of these communities and individual households, yet we also know, from our interviews and surveys, that this food aid can be highly unpredictable in timing and amounts. The point would not be to try to uncover flaws in the food aid system, but to consider how food aid fits in with the mix of economic strategies pursued by various kinds of households. What kinds of patterns might we find in diversification and

food aid? Does food aid encourage the persistence of marginally-sustaining households? Do female-headed households depend disproportionately on food aid (although we know that these households receive less aid on average), and so on?

2) the relative importance of non-farm income to different kinds of households in our study. We have information from our qualitative interviews that female-heads of household seem more apt to diversify, but can we specify this general pattern more precisely? Are these women in certain communities, which offer peri-urban or urban residence and employment possibilities, for instance? What other opportunities exist? We also heard that the developmental cycle of households may well affect diversification (that young people are more likely to migrate, but that livestock trading is more likely undertaken by established householders). Are there certain sets of social and economic characteristics of individuals or their households or communities more likely to spawn off-farm activity? Although our larger household survey uncovered very small amounts of non-farm income, these trends, however small, are worth exploring with added data from the qualitative interviews.

3) the security of land tenure and patterns of land ownership. This would be especially interesting to examine from a gendered point of view. We know from our interviews that women seem to have trouble retaining control over land that may be legally their due at divorce. How significant a constraint is this on their mobility and economic strategies? What changes might we be seeing in land tenure security by gender given the evidence of increasing land fragmentation and land pressure given scarcity of pastureland. Is negotiating power shifting to the landowner in sharecropping arrangements? Is there variety by ecological zone in these patterns of land use and renting? What kinds of investments do we see in land (fertilizer use, tree planting, etc.)? We have considerable data relating to these questions in our household survey that could be profitably analyzed in light of the trends we noted in our qualitative interviews.

4) the importance of oxen ownership in food security. Although we know that the households in our sample that own two oxen are more food secure than those that do not, is there a causal relationship or are these generally better endowed households to begin with? Given the great variety of ways we have found that landowners can borrow or rent oxen, or sharecrop out, to gain access to the labor of oxen, and also given the very small size of farms overall, is the investment in oxen always the best use of scarce funds? By analyzing the other endowments of oxen-owning households (access to labor, land, other livestock), and comparing these to the overall economic portrait of non-oxen owning households, we may gain a better sense of their contribution to as well as possible drain on rural households.

5) a comparison of strategies in responding to drought and recovery used by male and female heads, or perhaps more affluent and less affluent households,. We know from our interviews that women and children, for example, were more prone to enter food camps during the food crisis of 1977 EC and men were more prone to emigrate (see Castro September 2002 report). We also got the sense that more affluent households are more prone to re-acquire livestock and full-fledged farming operations more quickly (and perhaps too quickly) than are less affluent households. Can we make comparisons that document different strategies of recovery and how they correspond to overall asset endowments and economic portfolios?

6) a thorough analysis of female-headed households to try to pinpoint both their potential disadvantages and advantages in access to land, food aid, labor, and non-farm income. Are these necessarily “at risk” households or do they represent, at least in some cases, a rational response to the tax, food aid, and land ownership policies of rural kebeles? Do they have a higher propensity to send off members to long-distance migration and what role do remittances play? Do peri-urban trading activities represent a small, yet adequate, buffer for these households in times of food scarcity? What is the nature of their ties to other households or individuals and do

these represent crucial and regular sources of income or emergency help in times of crisis? Relevant here will be a discussion of changing expectations of marriage and divorce (including issues like polygyny and bridewealth) to establish some of the reasons why one quarter of our households overall are female-headed as well as a discussion of decision-making within different kinds of households (male or female headed).

## REFERENCES CITED

- Ali Hassen. 2000. Female-Headed Household Vulnerability and their Participation in EGS: A Case Study of Two Peasant Associations in Mekdela Werea, South Wello. MA thesis. School of Graduate Studies, Addis Ababa University.
- Bob Baulch. 1987. Entitlements and the Wello Famine of 1982-5. *Disasters*. November 3.
- Dejene Aredo. 1994. Female-Headed Farm Households in Two Contrasting Regions in Ethiopia: Access to and Management of Resources. *Ethiopian Journal of Development Research*. 16(1) 1-13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999 "The Role of Women in Rural Development in Ethiopia." In Tegegne Ge bre Egziabher et al. (eds.) *Aspects of Rural Development Issues in Ethiopia*. Proceedings of a Workshop on the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Institute of Development Research. Nov. 26-28, 1998, pp. 329-353.
- Desselagn Rahmato. 1991. *Famine and Survival Strategies: A Case Study from Northeast Ethiopia*. Scandanavian Institute of Africa Studies: Uppsala.
- Fafchamps, Marce and Agnes Quisumbing. 2000a. "Assets at Marriage in Rural Ethiopia." Paper presented at the International Workshop on Strengthening Development Policy by Looking within the Household: New Evidence on Assets and Outcomes in Rural Ethiopian Households. Organized by IFPRI, Addis Ababa University, Dept. of Economics, ILRI. Addis Ababa, December 14, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000b "Control and Ownership of Assets within Rural Ethiopian Households." Paper presented at the International Workshop on Strengthening Development Policy by Looking within the Household: New Evidence on Assets and Outcomes in Rural Ethiopian Households. Organized by IFPRI, Addis Ababa University, Dept. of Economics, ILRI. Addis Ababa, December 14, 2000.
- FAO/WFP. 2002. Special Report: FAO/WFP Crop and Food Supply Assessment. Mission to Ethiopia. 30 December 2002. See <http://www.fao.org>.
- IFRC. 7 Oct. 2002. Ethiopia: Improving Food Security. Preliminary Appeal No: 28/02. See [www.reliefweb.int](http://www.reliefweb.int).
- Kraft, Dina. 2002. U.N. Summit Focuses on Women Farmers. AP news. See <http://wire.ap.org/APnews>.
- Lacey, Mark. 2003. Drought in Ethiopia Presages Possible Famine. *New York Times*, January 5, 2003.
- Sen, Amartya. 1981. *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlement and Deprivation*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

- Yared Amare. 1995. "Land Distribution and its Implications for Peasant Differentiation in Wogda, Northern Shewa." In *Ethiopian Journal of Development Research*. Vol. 17(1): 1-22.
- Yigremew Adal. 2001. "Land Redistribution and Female-Headed Households: A study of Two Rural Communities in Northwest Ethiopia." Forum for Social Studies Discussion Paper No. 5. November.
- Zenebework Tadesse and Yared Amare. 2000. "Women's Land Rights in Ethiopia." In *Birchi: The Journal of Ethiopian Women Lawyers Association*. Vol. 1(1) summer: 25-51.