frame. The intervals were chosen to ensure an adequate sample size. The sample size for this study was determined by using the formula, as indicated in Bartlett and Higgins (2001). The sample size was calculated by using the formula as follows:

$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$ where, n: designates the sample size.

N: designates total number of households' residents in the sub-urban area of Larena Amba.

e: designates maximum variability or margin of Error = 0.09.

1: designates the probability of the event occurring.

$$n = \frac{5799}{1+5799(0.09)^2} = \frac{5799}{47.97} = 120$$

3.3. Methods of Data Collection

Questionnaire was the principal source of the data gathering tools in this research. Both close and open-ended questions were prepared by the English language and translated to Amharic for the sample respondents aiming for clarity. Then it was accessed to the sampled household by enumerators to gather relevant data.

3.4. Method of Data Analysis

To analyze the residential status of households' in Sodo town, descriptive statistics like, percentages, ratios, mean values, standard deviation, standard error and inferential statistics like t-test and chi-squares were used to analyses the residential status of households through different indicators in the study area.

4. Result and discussion

4.1. Average family size by status of the households' residents

Average family size for the evicted and non-evicted households was indicated in Table1. Accordingly, figure computed indicated that, the average family size of the evicted households was found was 6.873467 person and 6.078286 persons per family member were non-evicted in sub-urban of Sodo town (Table1). This means, the average family size of evicted households were more than the average family size of non-evicted in sub-urban of Sodo. Statistical result

also show that there is significant mean difference (t=2.1899, P=0.0307) between evicted and non-evicted households at 5 percent significance level in in the study area.

Table 1. Average family size by status of the households' residence

Status of residence	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	t -value	P-value
Evicted	6.873467	0. 2318829	2.008165	2.1899	0.0307
Non-evicted	6.078286	0. 1865419	1.103597		

Source: Survey result, 2019

4.2. Average age of households head by status of the household's residence

The average age of evicted household heads were 49.4 year while average ages of non-evicted household heads were 44.3 years in the study area (Table 2). This mean, relative higher average age of household heads was related with evicted household heads in the study area. Statistical result also shows that there was significant mean difference (t=2.6582, P=0.009) between evicted and non-evicted at 1 percent significance level.

Table 2. Average age of households head by status of the household's residence

Status of residence	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	t –value	P-value
Evicted	49.4	1.141202	9.883101	2.6582	0.009
Non-evicted	44.31429	1.361395	8.054124		

Source: Survey result, 2019

4.3. Average dependence ratio by status of the households' residence

Average dependence ratio for the evicted and non-evicted households was indicated in Table 3. Accordingly, figure computed indicated that, the average dependence ratio of the evicted household were 0. 5425666 while non-evicted household were 0. 5767154 (Table3). This means, the average dependence ratio of non-evicted households were more than the average dependence

ratio of evicted. However, there is insignificant mean difference (t=-0.3744, P=0.7088) between evicted and non-evicted households at 5 percent significance level in in the study area.

Table 3. Average dependence ratio by status of the households' residence

Status of residence	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	t -value	P-value
Evicted	0. 5425666	0. 0556632	0.4820576	-0.3744	0.7088
Non-evicted	0. 5767154	0. 0596897	0.353129		

Source: Survey result, 2019

4.4. Saving status of the household residents

Table 4 shows, the relative saving status of evicted and non-evicted households. Highest percent of evicted households (80.43%) was recorded as non-saver than non-evicted households (19.57%) in the study area. On the other hand, the saving status of non-evicted household was greater than evicted household. This showed that there was average dependence ratio difference between evicted and non-evicted. However, there was insignificant statistical difference ($\chi 2$=5.4715, P=0.7019) between evicted and non-evicted household in the study area.

Table 4. Saving status of the household residents

Saving status	Evicted	Non-evicted	$\chi 2$	P-value
No	80.43	19.57	5.4715	0.7019
Yes	59.38	40.63		

Source: Survey result, 2019

4.5. Farm land size by status of the households' residents

Average farm land size for the evicted and non-evicted households was indicated in Table 5. Accordingly, the average farm land sizes of the evicted household were 0.731161 while non-evicted household were 0.425143. This means, the average farm land sizes of evicted households were more than the average farm land sizes of non-evicted. Likely the statistical test also shows

that there is significant mean difference (t=0.3680, P=0.0197) between evicted and non-evicted households at 5 percent significance level in in the study area.

Table 5. Farm land size by status of the households' residents

Status of residence	Mean	Std. Err.	Std. Dev.	t -value	P-value
Evicted	0.731161	0. 2362248	1.911793	0.3680	0.0197
Non-evicted	0.425143	0. 1379635	0.407811		

Source: Survey result, 2019

4.6. Sex of the household head by status of the households' residents

Table 6 shows the relative sex status of evicted and non-evicted household heads. Highest percent of evicted household heads (68.63%) was recorded as male household heads in the study area. On the other hand, the household headed by male were evicted than female headed household. This showed that there was some difference between evicted and non-evicted between female headed and male headed households. However, there was insignificant statistical difference ($\chi 2$=0.1284, P=0.0.720) between evicted and non-evicted household in the study area.

Table 6. Sex of the household head by status of the households' residents

Sex of household heads	Evicted	Non-evicted	$\chi 2$	P-value
Male	68.63	31.37	0.1284	0.720
Female	62.50	37.50		

Source: Survey result, 2019

5. Conclusion and Recommendation

Based on the analysis of data, the following conclusions were forwarded against identified variables that associated with the status of residents' in the sub urban area of Sodo town. The result revealed that variables like family size, age of household head and farmland size belongs to residents were significantly associated with evicted household residents than non-evicted ones

at 5 percent significant level. However, variables like dependency ratio, saving status of households and sex of household heads were insignificantly associated with residential status of households at 5 percent significant level in the study area. Hence, it was possible to recommend that, the government and non-governmental organization have to give due attention to the households who displaced from their original land due to urban expansion in the study area. In the second place, the municipality should compensate the house holders' financially in a way that they can secure their livelihood permanently. Finally, since majority of the household heads evicted from their residential area and hence, major development projects like industries and hotels should create permanent job opportunities to the householders.

References

Brian, P. G. (2000). The governance of the city: A system at odds with itself. University of New York, pp. 5-6.

Central Statistics Agency (CSA). (2007). National Population Statistics. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, Central Statistical Authority, Addis Ababa.

Jusoh, H., and Rashid, A. A. (2008). Efficiency in Urban Governance towards sustainability and Competitiveness of city: A case of Kuala Lumpur. International Journal of Social, Education , Economics and Management Engineering Vol. 2 (4)

Makinder, O. O. (2012). Urbanization, housing, and environment: Megacities of Africa. *International Journal of Development and Sustainability*.Vol. 1 No.3. ISSN: 2168-8662.

Peng, J.; Xie, P.; Liu, Y.; Ma, J.(2016). Urban thermal environment dynamics and associated landscape pattern factors: A case study in the Beijing metropolitan region. Remote Sens. Environ. 145–155.

Shrestha, M.K.; York, A.M.; Boone, C.G.; Zhang, S. Land fragmentation due to rapid urbanization in the Phoenix Metropolitan Area: Analyzing the spatiotemporal patterns and drivers. Appl. Geogr. 2012, 522–531.

Sodo town Municipality office). Sodo town land inventory.2017.

UNFPA.(2007). State of World Population 2007, Unleashing Potential of Urban Growth.

United Nations. World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights; United Nations: New York, NY, USA, 2014.

Wang, H.; He, Q.; Liu, X.; Zhuang, Y. and Hong, S. Global urbanization research from 1991 to

2009: A systematic research review. Landscape Urban Plan. 2012,104, 299–309.

World Bank. World Bank Data base. Available on line: http://data.world bank.org (accessed on 13 January 2019).

World Bank. (2010). *World bank Data team*. Retrieved November 10, 2019, from data.worldbank.org : https://blogs.worldbank.org

Zhang, S.; Zhang, B.; Zhang, L.; Lu, C.; Cheng, X. Spatiotemporal evolution of urban land uses in modern urbanization of China. Chin. Geogr. Sci. 2010, 20, 132–138.