COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF LAND CONFLICTS IN LIBERIA:

GRAND GEDEH, LOFA AND NIMBA COUNTIES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

THE AUTHOR

Alexandra Hartman is a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science at Yale University. She holds an MA from Yale and a BA from Brown University in International Relations. Her research interests include Middle Eastern and African politics, migration, property rights and informal institutions. She is currently working on a dissertation about access to and conflict over citizenship in the global South. She is also studying peace education and the effects of civil war violence on communities in rural Liberia.

LIST OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

This report is the second in a series of reports published by the NRC about housing, land and property rights, land tenure and land-related conflict in Liberia. Since 2006, the NRC Information, Counseling and Legal Assistance (ICLA) project has assisted individuals and communities in Liberia to resolve land disputes resulting from the 1989–2003 civil conflict. Supporting local stakeholders and institutions to prevent, manage and resolve land conflict is a critical component of the NRC's work in Liberia. The intention of this series of reports is to provide original research and analysis that supports the efforts of the Government of Liberia and civil society organisations to protect and promote housing, land and property rights in Liberia.

LIBERIA REPORT

Source: Norwegian Refugee Council; UN DPKO.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents an analysis of land and property conflicts in rural Liberia, using two recently developed sources of data:

1) qualitative data on land tenure and land conflict in Lofa County collected by the Norwegian Refugee Council's (NRC) Monitoring and Evaluation team; and
2) quantitative baseline survey data on land tenure and land conflict in three rural counties collected by the Yale University / Innovation for Poverty Action evaluation of the Peace Education and Community Empowerment (PEACE) programme in Liberia.

The purpose of this analysis is to examine why and how land conflicts develop and the effectiveness of different dispute resolution methodologies in resolving land conflicts. Insights developed through this analysis will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the NRC's Information, Counseling and Legal Assistance project in Liberia and disseminated to inform the design and development of similar land and property dispute resolution programmes elsewhere in the world.

The analysis proceeds as follows: the next section explains the methodologies used to gather the data analysed in this report. The third section analyses qualitative data gathered as part of an evaluation exercise conducted by the NRC prior to extending its land dispute resolution project into Lofa County. The fourth section analyses the quantitative data collected as part of the PEACE survey, and the final section summarises key conclusions drawn from the analysis.

2. DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

Yale University and Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) Liberia have been engaged by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Peace Building Fund to conduct a randomised impact evaluation of the Peace Education and Community Empowerment (PEACE) programme currently ongoing in parts of rural Liberia. The PEACE data collection project has two objectives:

1) to develop a conflict mapping, forecasting and prevention model using successive rounds of data on conflict in parts of rural Liberia; and
2) to assess if and how programmes that promote community empowerment and peace education actually help communities that have suffered from deadly conflict achieve peace and stability.

It also provides an assessment of land conflicts and how people attempt to resolve and do resolve these conflicts in the three counties included in the survey.

The baseline survey, conducted between February and March 2009, was designed to gauge the incidence and severity of conflict, as well as other social, political, and economic factors that might be correlated with conflict. A follow-up survey is planned for late 2010 following approximately a year and a half of programme implementation, at which time the impact analyses will be conducted.

The evaluation sample includes 4,700 randomly selected community members, 700 leaders and 1,000 designated peace education trainees across 117 treatment communities and 130 control communities. A community is defined as either a quarter of a large town or an entire smaller village. Communities spanned 19 districts across three of Liberia's most conflict-prone counties: Grand Gedeh, Lofa and Nimba. Entire villages composed 195 (78%) of these communities, while the other 52 communities were administrative subdivisions of larger towns, known as quarters.

Communities were selected for the survey through a process of consultation with local stakeholders (including commissioners, chiefs, magistrates and other community leaders) at the district level. The Justice and Peace Commission then created a list of 247 communities that would be eligible for the programme. These communities were included in the baseline survey. The sample of communities included in the survey and in the evaluation is not random, because communities were selected by local stakeholders based on their understanding of which communities most needed peace education. Rather it is a sample of communities which represent communities at risk of violence and conflict as determined by local stakeholders at the district level.

Three survey instruments were used for the baseline: a community survey; a leaders survey; and a peace education trainee survey. While each survey instrument shared some similarities, they addressed different questions. General questions about the community were covered in the leaders survey. More specific questions about conflicts and conflict resolution were addressed in the trainee survey. Community leaders included in the survey consist of the town chief, the youth leader and the 'chairlady'. The trainees who participated in the trainee survey included a female leader, an elder and a problematic person in the community. Community members included in the community survey were selected at random from the community to participate in the survey.

3. QUALITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

As part of the NRC ICLA project's expansion into Lofa County, a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officer equipped with a qualitative interview protocol will collect data on the implementation of the land dispute resolution project as well as on land tenure and land conflict in general. These data will provide insights into why and how land conflicts develop in Lofa County and the effectiveness of ICLA's land dispute resolution methodology in helping local actors to resolve land conflicts.

A field trip to two communities in Lofa County to train the M&E Officer was organised in February 2010. The communities were selected because of their inclusion in the PEACE programme and because they provide helpful examples of typical communities in Lofa, the local land tenure system, and the nature of land conflict.

A draft qualitative interview protocol was used as an interview guide during this field trip[1]. For training purposes, and because the protocol was still under development, interviewers convened focus groups. This allowed multiple researchers to participate in data collection with several key informants in each community. In the future however, the interviews conducted using the NRC M&E interview protocols will focus on one-on-one interviews with key informants.

Researchers took notes during the interviews. After all the interviews in a community were completed, the team found a quiet place to discuss their notes, add details they had forgotten, and write interview observations and basic analysis.

This section includes analysis of the qualitative data collected during the M&E officer training and qualitative protocol development field trip. This analysis focuses on the general lessons learned about land tenure and land conflict in Lofa County, Liberia.

---

1   Please see Annex for the draft qualitative protocol.

LIBERIA REPORT

3.1 ANALYSIS OF DATA COLLECTED IN COMMUNITY A

During the interview conducted in Community A, several interesting themes regarding land tenure and conflict emerged. The first concerned a recent inheritance dispute, which required the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) to prevent the situation from escalating to serious violence. The town leadership reported that a brother and sister had inherited land, which the brother decided to develop. When he began building on the land, his sister became abusive and violent to such an extent that the town authorities sought UNMIL's intervention. The town leadership further explained that this was not the first time outside actors had intervened in this particular conflict. In fact, the case had been taken to court in a neighbouring town and had been decided against the sister. Despite the ruling, the sister continued to be violent and abusive towards her brother because of the unresolved dispute over the property.

This narrative illustrates two important characteristics of land conflict in Lofa County, which are also evident in the results of the quantitative survey discussed below. First, that a land conflict may become so vigorously contested that community or local authorities conclude that it has escalated beyond their control and invite the intervention of outside actors. Second, formal remedies, such as the courts, may not conclusively resolve land conflicts. Further research is required to explore whether other alternative dispute resolution systems can provide more durable solutions to conflicts.

Second, the interview covered the land tenure system in Community A. Respondents in the focus group stated that there were few if any individual property rights in Community A, that there were no title deeds or official documents for property and a traditional landlord allocated land[2]. When specifically asked about the allocation of land to minority groups, an elder in the focus group responded that strangers could have access to land and even plant tree crops if the strangers became 'like us', if a stranger was 'the same like myself, if [he] marry my daughter' and 'loves us' and didn't 'make land palava'. Finally, the respondents stated that Community A had a title deed for the land it currently occupied, which was written during the time of the 'first president of Liberia', but they lost the deed during the civil crisis.

The system of land allocation in Community A, particularly the seemingly idiosyncratic method by which 'strangers' can acquire land, and the fact that no documentary land titles were evident suggests that a customary land tenure system prevails in the community.

The reference to a title deed for Community A raises further questions. It is not clear if a deed granting title to the community exists, or if all, or part, of the land the leaders of Community A assume to control is in fact public land.

Finally, the qualitative data also included a narrative about a piece of land adjoining Community A which had been given to one of the Senators from Lofa County. According to the respondents, the residents of Community A had 'given' the land to the Senator through a verbal agreement, but the specific boundaries of the parcel had not been demarcated beyond natural landmarks.

This information highlights a potential source of conflict in Community A and in Lofa County in general. Outsiders with knowledge of the formal land tenure systems can take advantage of communities relying on informal institutions. Although there is currently no conflict over this land, the allocation of land to outsiders may be a source of conflict in the future.

---

2   When asked about tribal certificates, which are formal endorsements of issued by tribal authorities, the respondents stated that there were no tribal certificates or deeds either (there appeared to some confusion about what a tribal document would do, and how it would be different from a government-issued deed).

3.2 ANALYSIS OF DATA COLLECTED IN COMMUNITY B

During the interviews in Community B, a discussion of land allocation mechanisms suggested two important points about land tenure in Community B and in Lofa County more generally. First, during the focus group with the town chief, the chief stated categorically that there was no formal land ownership in Community B. All land is allocated via customary norms, rules and processes, most typically by asking the relevant town or quarter chief for permission to farm a plot. When asked about the use of title deeds, land surveys or other mechanisms of formal land tenure, the chief replied that no individual in Community B owned land formally in the town. The town chief said, 'It is good to have a land that does not belong to you'.

As in Community A, customary land tenure institutions dominate in Community B. The town leadership seemed particularly sceptical about the introduction of land surveys, title deeds or an acquisition system that commoditised land. The chief appeared concerned that if land in Community B could be purchased, this would bring conflict between those who had the means to purchase land and those who did not. The chief agreed that if the NRC came to Community B and provided more information about the formal land tenure institutions emerging in Liberia, the citizens of the town might be open to changes, but he remained doubtful about whether formalisation could be conducted peacefully[3].

Finally, the issue of live trees came up and in particular whether planting live trees was a way of securing access to land. While the town leadership stated that no one in Community B owned land, they also stated that if a person planted live trees on a plot, they had a right to the plot for four years. It was not entirely clear from the conversation who has the right to plant live trees in the first place or what happens after four years, but the use of live trees as markers of tenure and the legal status of such a marker remains an important question for further research in land tenure in Lofa County.

---

3 For a detailed analysis of the interactions between formal, customary and informal tenure systems in Liberia, see the NRC's report, 'Confusions and palava: the logic of land encroachment in Lofa County, Liberia' available at: http://www.nrc.no/?did=9481900

4. QUANTITATIVE DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 LAND CONFLICT IN GRAND GEDEH, LOFA AND NIMBA COUNTIES

General data on land conflict come from the community dataset of the Yale/IPA baseline survey. In each of the tables for each variable, the mean (or average) percentage of respondents that responded affirmatively to the question is shown in addition to the standard deviation, which measures the variability of the data points (a higher standard deviation signals more variation data)[4].

Table 1 provides information on respondents' land holdings and boundary markers, and on whether they are involved in land conflicts. The highest number of respondents reporting conflicts is in Nimba County, followed by Lofa and Grand Gedeh. 'Other' dispute over land is the most frequently reported type of dispute (25% in Nimba County). These include disputes over inheritance and renting land. Men report involvement in land disputes more frequently than women (Table 2).

Data from the leaders survey provides information on community leaders' views about issues such as the formal justice system and how important land conflict is for their community. Table 3 shows how frequently community leaders report members of their communities bringing cases to the magistrates or paramount chiefs (in both cases, slightly less than two in the month prior to the survey). Leaders also answered questions on the relative importance of different kinds of conflicts in their communities. In Grand Gedeh, 8% of leaders suggest conflict over land was the most significant conflict in their communities, compared with 35% in Lofa County and 23% in Nimba County.

Data on property and land conflict across trainees interviewed for the PEACE survey demonstrates similarities between property ownership in Lofa and Nimba counties, and some differences with Grand Gedeh. Table 4 shows that more respondents report involvement in conflict over land as a result of land taken from them during the war, than involvement in a dispute over boundaries or other disputes. Around 10% of trainee respondents reported involvement in a land dispute. Respondents in Lofa County report the highest levels of conflict over land as a result of accusations that land had been taken during the civil crisis. About 70% of respondents, across the three counties, state that they have a boundary marker on their property (the type of boundary marker is unspecified).

---

4   Specifically, the standard deviation is the square root of the variance of the data. A high standard deviation indicates a relatively high level of variation in responses to the survey questions and a low standard deviation indicates a relatively low level of variation in responses.

4.2 CONFLICTS RELATED TO LAND TAKEN DURING THE LIBERIAN CIVIL CRISIS

Respondents in Lofa County who stated that they had land taken from them during the civil crisis were divided evenly between those claiming a loss of farm land and those claiming a loss of town land (Table 5). In over half the cases, Lofa County respondents stated that the other party to the conflict was a member of their own ethnic group (referred to as tribes in the survey questions, the word commonly used in Liberian English to describe ethnic groups), while in 32% of cases the other party to the conflict was from a different ethnic group. This was the highest percentage of inter-ethnic conflicts reported across the three counties.

Respondents used a wide range of strategies to solve their conflicts over land under dispute as a result of the war. In Lofa, 60% of respondents went to a 'town headman's' court[5], 51% went to the town elders or a chief, 35% asked for their family's intervention and 30% decided to seek the intervention of the paramount chief to attempt to resolve this kind of conflict (Table 6). By comparison, few respondents reported using the formal legal system (the local town court, or the magistrates' court). It is perhaps also worth noting that Lofa is the only county where respondents suggested that they went to religious leaders for help to resolve these kinds of conflicts.

In terms of successful resolutions, 35% of respondents in Lofa County with a conflict reported that the town 'headman's court' had successfully resolved it (Table 7). While 14% of respondents reported that their conflict had been successfully resolved by the paramount chief, only 3% of respondents reported that their case had been resolved by a local court. Respondents in Grand Gedeh reported much higher levels of success resolving their conflicts with the help of town elders and chiefs compared with Lofa or Nimba counties, and respondents in Nimba County reported a lower rate of conflict resolution in general.

Finally, 54% of respondents in Lofa County who reported having a land conflict in the first place stated that they were satisfied with the progress that had been made in resolving the conflict, compared with 30% in Nimba County and 60% in Grand Gedeh (Table 8). While respondents in Grand Gedeh reported no abuse relating to disputes over land taken during the civil crisis, around 50% of respondents with conflicts in Lofa and Nimba reported some kind of abuse and at least 40% of respondents in all counties reported violence relating to their conflict.

---

5 A quick note about the different conflict resolution strategies covered in the Yale/IPA PEACE programme survey. In particular, two different strategies potentially overlap and require clarification. The first is the town elders/chief. Town elders/chief represent the first authorities to whom people present disputes. Town headman court, a non-standard, but all encompassing term, was used to capture survey respondents who brought conflicts to a more formal authority structure within the town, either the traditional custodian of the town, or another local authority figure(s) occupying a customary role outside the hierarchy of the chiefs.

4.3 CONFLICTS RELATED TO BOUNDARY DISPUTES

According to data collected in the Yale/IPA PEACE trainee survey, on average, respondents report that boundary disputes (which also cover disputes over brushing, or the clearing of land prior to putting it into productive use) involve almost five lots of land (Table 9). Compared with Nimba and Grand Gedeh, boundary disputes have a higher chance of occurring over land within a community (as opposed to farm land). According to respondents in Lofa, conflicts are more likely to be with members of different ethnic groups than conflicts over land taken during the war. In Lofa, 40% of boundary conflicts are inter-ethnic, compared with 4% in Nimba and 17% in Grand Gedeh.

Similar to disputes over land as a result of the civil crisis, respondents stated that they had tried many types of interventions to resolve their boundary conflicts. In Lofa, 72% of respondents with a boundary conflict stated that they went to the town elders or the chief to resolve it – compared with 67% of respondents with a boundary conflict in Grand Gedeh and 56% in Nimba (Table 10). Respondents also reported going to a town headman's court (48%) or taking their case to a town development committee (24%).

About half of respondents with a boundary conflict reported their conflict had been resolved (Table 11). Of respondents with a conflict in Lofa, 33% reported that the town headman's court had resolved it (compared with none in Grand Gedeh and 19% in Nimba County).

Satisfaction with the progress of a conflict's resolution was somewhat higher than actual rates of resolution in Lofa, with 64% of respondents with conflicts reporting satisfaction, while only 52% of respondents actually reported that their conflict had been resolved (Tables 11 and 12). Around 40% of respondents with boundary conflicts reported abuse, insults and violence related to the dispute (compared with at least 50% of the respondents with boundary conflicts in Grand Gedeh and about 35% of respondents in Nimba).

4.4 CONFLICTS RELATED TO OTHER LAND DISPUTES

The baseline survey also collected data from PEACE programme trainees on whether they were involved in other kinds of land conflicts (separate from conflicts over land as a result of the war or boundary disputes). These conflicts included disputes over inheriting or renting land. Seven per cent of respondents stated that they had been involved in this kind of conflict. Most of these conflicts are with members of the same ethnic group (65% in Lofa) and most are over farmland (Table 13). However, because the reported number of these kinds of conflicts is small, it is difficult to generalise across the counties. It is evident, however, that land conflict can breed other forms of civil disputes and violence.

Few respondents report taking 'other' disputes to an official local court – only 5% of respondents with this type of conflict in Lofa County went to a local court (Table 14). In Lofa, many respondents turned to family members for help resolving these kinds of conflicts, while in Grand Gedeh and Nimba counties, respondents reported going to elders or chiefs in higher numbers than in Lofa County.

On average, just under 50% of respondents report that their 'other' land conflict has been resolved (Table 15). The most common type of resolution in Lofa and Nimba counties was through the town headman's court, whereas in Grand Gedeh respondents reported that the paramount chief's court or the town elders or chief had been able to resolve their conflict.

Although it is difficult to generalise given the small sample size, about 50% of respondents report satisfaction with the progress of their conflict (Table 16). While there is little violence or abuse reported in Grand Gedeh related to 'other' land conflicts, respondents in Lofa and Nimba report that in around 40% of cases, abuse and insults or violence take place as a result of these kinds of conflicts.

4.5 CONFLICTS RELATED TO ACCUSATIONS OF TAKING LAND

One section of the Yale/IPA PEACE trainee survey asked respondents whether they themselves had been accused of taking land. Only about 2% of respondents (16 people) admitted that someone had accused them in a land conflict (Table 1). This includes four respondents in Lofa County. Because the sample size is so small, it is difficult to generalise about trends across counties for respondents who say they have been accused in a land conflict. In addition, given the number of respondents who say they are involved in a conflict, it appears that respondents were reluctant to admit being a party accused of wrongdoing in a land conflict.

4.6 ANALYSIS OF DATA ON LAND CONFLICT

The data on land conflict collected in the Yale/IPA baseline survey suggest several interesting patterns in both disputes over land and how residents of the three counties manage and resolve conflict. However, interpretation of the data relies on qualitative field work and knowledge of the field sites. Given that the field work has only just begun, analysis can only be preliminary at this stage.

The qualitative data collected thus far suggest that informal institutions allocate land and resolve land conflict in Lofa County. The data also suggest that conflicts escalate and require outside (UNMIL) intervention. The use of titles, deeds, demarcations and other formal features of land tenure appeared low.

While community members report fairly high rates of success in solving land conflict, across different land disputes, around 40% of community members report tension, assault or even violence as a result of conflict. The examples provided in the qualitative data further underline this point. Further research is required in order to understand which disputes escalate or are more prone to violence. The relatively high reported levels of violence resulting from land conflicts suggest there is a need for conflict resolution methods that provide durable solutions and that reduce violent escalation of conflict.

From the quantitative data, across many of the measures of conflict and also dispute resolution patterns, Grand Gedeh County stood out as reporting lower levels of conflict. As a result of the small number of respondents who reported conflicts, it is difficult to generalise how people attempt to solve their conflicts, and how conflicts are actually resolved in Grand Gedeh. However, in general, it appears that formal courts are used less frequently in Grand Gedeh than in other counties (although in all counties, traditional or alternative systems of justice are common).

This highlights a broader point, namely the strong differences in reported levels of conflict, types of conflict and strategies of conflict resolution across the three counties. The difference between the counties suggests: that there may be strong variation in land tenure institutions in use across Liberia; that the confidence that community members have in these institutions may vary; and that the way in which interventions, such as the NRC's ICLA programme, affect communities may vary as well. This has important implications for the process of land reform, currently ongoing.

The data suggest that unlike Nimba and Grand Gedeh counties, conflicts as a result of land taken during the civil crisis cross ethnic group lines to a significant extent in Lofa County. The data on conflicts over boundaries and brushing also suggest that a substantial number of these conflicts also cross ethnic lines. This may reflect both the experiences that people had during the war in Lofa and continuing tensions between ethnic groups. It is important to note that not all inter-ethnic conflicts are the same. While some conflicts between different tribes do signal larger political cleavages at the county level, others do not. In particular, qualitative work suggests that conflict between members of the Lorma and Mandingo ethnic groups in Lofa is an important subset of inter-ethnic conflict and may differ than other kinds of inter-ethnic disputes. Conflict between these groups may be linked to the traditional land allocation and conflict resolution mechanisms where strangers in a community have a specific set of rights, different from other community members.

Across all three counties, the data strongly suggest that non-formal conflict resolution mechanisms are the most important way that people resolve conflicts. Few respondents report taking their dispute to a local statutory court or to a magistrates' court across the whole sample. For example, when asked about 'other' conflicts over land, 85% of respondents stated that they went to family members, town chiefs or elders to resolve their conflicts instead of going to the local court system.

Finally, the analysis of survey data by gender suggests that women report having access to less land then men, that they are less likely to report boundary markers on the property they use and less likely to report disputes over land. Legal reforms which give women the right to inherit property have widespread implications for women's property rights. These laws have yet to be implemented, but these data suggest that implementation could have an important impact both on women's land ownership and levels of conflict as well as traditional gender roles in rural communities.

5. CONCLUSION

This report provides both qualitative and quantitative data on conflict over land, and on attempts to resolve – and resolutions of – land disputes in Lofa, Nimba and Grand Gedeh counties. The data are drawn from the Yale/IPA PEACE baseline survey and from the first round of qualitative field work conducted under the auspices of the monitoring and evaluation component of the NRC's ICLA project.

Data from the Yale/IPA PEACE baseline survey suggest that the incidence of land conflict is fairly high across the three counties. In general, community members tend to choose informal institutions rather than state courts to resolve their disputes and an important percentage of respondents report tension and even violence as a result of their conflicts.

Qualitative work in Lofa County fills in this picture of property rights and conflict over land in Lofa County. Although the data described here are specific to two communities, they suggest that traditional institutions, including the ways that land is allocated and the ways that communities incorporate outsiders (strangers), remain strong. Conflicts over land often occur between members of different ethnic groups, which suggest that inter-ethnic tensions play a role in shaping conflict in Lofa. These data also suggest that land conflicts can be difficult to resolve and can escalate beyond the control of community leaders.

TABLES

TABLE 1 | LAND DATA COMMUNITY SURVEY

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
# of plots owned in town[6]	15 [226]	25 [482]	2 [18]	22 [79]
# of rice tins planted on land	5 [8]	3 [3]	6 [11]	5 [6]
Land has boundary markers	68% [.47]	79% [.41]	53% [.50]	77% [.42]
Do you grow crops?	64% [.48]	64% [.48]	68% [.47]	60% [.49]
Have you been involved in conflict over land taken during the war?	10% [.30]	6% [.23]	8% [.28]	14% [.35]
Have you been involved in a boundary conflict?	11% [.31]	6% [.23]	8% [.27]	17% [.37]
Have you been involved in other conflict over land or buildings?	20% [.40]	9% [.29]	19% [.40]	25% [.43]
Have you been accused in a land conflict?	6% [.25]	2% [.15]	4% [.21]	11% [.31]
Observations	4,736	981	1,792	1,905

Mean /[Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

6 The high standard deviation for the number of plots is a result of the high variation in the number of plots that people reported owning in town.

TABLE 2 | LAND DATA BY GENDER

Variable	Full sample	Men	Women
# of plots owned in town	15 [226]	21 [300]	7 [47]
# of rice tins planted on land	5 [8]	5 [10]	4 [4]
Land has boundary markers	68% [.47]	73% [.44]	62% [.49]
Do you grow crops?	64% [.48]	66% [.47]	62% [.49]
Have you been involved in conflict over land taken during the war?	10% [.30]	12% [.32]	8% [.27]
Have you been involved in a boundary conflict?	11% [.31]	14% [.34]	7% [.26]
Have you been involved in other conflict over land or buildings?	20% [.40]	21% [.31]	18% [.38]
Have you been accused in a land conflict?	6% [.25]	8% [.27]	4% [.21]
Observations	4,736	2,632	2,045

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

TABLE 3 | LAND DATA LEADERS SURVEY

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Number of people without farmland	40 [228]	25 [162]	8 [55]	78 [330]
Frequency of police visits in 2008	2.57 [1.51]	2.67 [1.62]	2.90 [1.46]	2.20 [1.41]
Frequency of NGO visits in 2008	2.94 [1.10]	2.84 [1.11]	3.29 [1.05]	2.67 [1.06]
Cases taken to police in 2008	2.26 [5.92]	2.77 [9.68]	2.15 [5.14]	2.11 [3.72]
Cases taken to magistrates in 2008	1.84 [5.79]	3.07 [11.08]	0.89 [3.00]	2.10 [3.17]
Cases taken to paramount chief in 2008	1.51 [4.48]	2.72 [8.54]	0.91 [1.75]	1.46 [2.92]
Number of volunteer police in town	1.91 [4.11]	2.13 [4.22]	0.28 [1.01]	3.33 [5.18]
Number of volunteer teachers in town	3.04 [4.19]	2.30 [1.99]	3.25 [3.14]	3.21 [5.60]
Most significant conflict: land	24% [.43]	8% [.27]	35% [.48]	23% [.42]
Second most significant conflict: land	17% [.38]	22% [.42]	5% [.22]	26% [.44]
Observations	959	197	367	391

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

TABLE 4 | LAND DATA TRAINEE SURVEY

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Land has boundary markers	72% [.45]	67% [.47]	77% [.42]	70% [.46]
# of plots owned in town	5 [74]	2 [3]	3 [7]	9 [117]
Have you been involved in conflict over land taken during the war?	10% [.31]	3% [.19]	13% [.34]	11% [.32]
Have you been involved in a boundary conflict?	8% [.27]	4% [.20]	9% [.29]	9% [.29]
Have you been involved in other conflict over land or buildings?	7% [.25]	3% [.19]	7% [.26]	7% [.26]
Have you been accused in a land conflict?	2% [.15]	1% [.08]	1% [.12]	4% [.19]
Observations	725	147	280	293

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

TABLE 5 | LAND TAKEN DURING THE WAR

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Amount of land taken in land conflict (lots)	25 [113]	1 [0]	38 [140]	3 [1]
Farm land was taken	63% [.49]	20% [.45]	51% [.51]	82% [.40]
Town land was taken	37% [.49]	80% [.45]	49% [.51]	18% [.40]
Land conflict was with a family member	19% [.39]	20% [.45]	16% [.37]	21% [.42]
Land conflict was with member of different tribe	21% [.41]	0% [0]	32% [.48]	12% [.33]
Land conflict was with member of same tribe	60% [.49]	80% [.45]	52% [.51]	67% [.48]
Observations	75	5	37	33

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

TABLE 6 | ATTEMPTS TO SOLVE CONFLICT OVER LAND TAKEN DURING THE WAR*

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Went to local court to resolve land conflict	9% [.29]	0% [0]	8% [.28]	12% [.33]
Went to magistrates' court to resolve land conflict	7% [.25]	0% [0]	11% [.31]	3% [.17]
Went to police to resolve land conflict	3% [.16]	0% [0]	5% [.23]	0% [0]
Went to paramount chief's court to resolve land conflict	23% [.42]	0% [0]	30% [.46]	18% [.39]
Went to section chief's court to resolve land conflict	8% [.27]	20% [.45]	8% [.28]	6% [.24]
Went to town headman's court to resolve land conflict	45% [.50]	20% [.45]	62% [.49]	30% [.47]
Went to family to resolve land conflict	23% [.42]	0% [0]	35% [.48]	12% [.33]
Went to NGO to resolve land conflict	8% [.27]	0% [0]	14% [.35]	3% [.17]
Went to religious leaders to resolve land conflict	5% [.23]	0% [0]	11% [.31]	0% [0]
Went to town elders/chief to resolve land conflict	53% [.50]	80% [.45]	51% [.51]	52% [.51]
Didn't go to anyone to resolve land conflict	8% [.27]	0% [0]	3% [.16]	15% [.36]
Went to other to resolve land conflict	16% [.37]	60% [.55]	3% [.16]	24% [.44]
Went to town development committee to resolve land conflict	9% [.29]	0% [0]	11% [.31]	9% [.29]
Observations	75	5	37	33

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

* Respondents can list as many different answers as are relevant to their situation.

TABLE 7 | RESOLUTION OF CONFLICT OVER LAND TAKEN DURING THE WAR*

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Land conflict was resolved	53% [.50]	60% [.55]	59% [.50]	45% [.51]
Land conflict resolved by local court	3% [.16]	0% [0]	3% [.16]	3% [.17]
Land conflict resolved by other	8% [.27]	40% [.55]	3% [.16]	9% [.29]
Land conflict resolved by paramount chief's court	8% [.27]	0% [0]	14% [.35]	3% [.17]
Land conflict resolved by police	21% [.41]	0% [0]	32% [.48]	12% [.33]
Land conflict resolved by section chief's court	1% [.12]	0% [0]	0% [0]	3% [.17]
Land conflict resolved by town headman's court	3% [.46]	0% [.45]	5% [.48]	0% [.45]
Land conflict resolved by family	1% [.12]	0% [0]	0% [0]	3% [.17]
Land conflict resolved by town elders/chief	5% [.23]	40% [.55]	0% [0]	6% [.24]
Observations	75	5	37	33

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

* Respondents can list as many different answers as are relevant to their situation.

TABLE 8 | OTHER INFORMATION ON CONFLICT OVER LAND TAKEN DURING THE WAR

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Satisfied with progress of land conflict?	44% [.50]	60% [.55]	54% [.51]	30% [.47]
Has there been abuse or insults related to this land matter?	51% [.50]	0% [0]	51% [.51]	58% [.50]
Has there been violence related to this land matter?	51% [.50]	40% [.55]	51% [.51]	52% [.51]
Does someone currently occupy this land?	67% [.48]	40% [.55]	73% [.45]	64% [.49]
Observations	75	5	37	33

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

TABLE 9 | INFORMATION ON BOUNDARY CONFLICTS

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Amount of land taken in boundary conflict (lots)	5w [6]	1 [.]	6 [7]	5 [5]
Boundary conflict over farm land	71% [.46]	83% [.41]	60% [.5]	78% [.42]
Boundary conflict over town land	29% [.46]	17% [.41]	40% [.50]	22% [.42]
Boundary marked on the land	85% [.36]	100% [0]	93% [.26]	76% [.44]
Boundary conflict was with a family member	14% [.35]	33% [.52]	4% [.20]	19% [.40]
Boundary conflict was with member of different tribe	21% [.41]	17% [.41]	40% [.50]	4% [.19]
Boundary conflict was with member of same tribe	66% [.48]	50% [.55]	56% [.51]	78% [.42]
Observations	58	6	25	27

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

TABLE 10 | ATTEMPTS TO RESOLVE CONFLICT OVER BOUNDARIES*

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Went to local court to resolve boundary conflict	12% [.33]	33% [.53]	8% [.28	11% [.32]
Went to magistrates' court to resolve boundary conflict	16% [.37]	50% [.55]	4% [.2]	19% [.40]
Went to other to resolve boundary conflict	28% [.45]	33% [.52]	8% [.28]	44% [.51]
Went to paramount chief's court to resolve boundary conflict	17% [.38]	33% [.52]	28% [.46]	4% [.19]
Went to police to resolve boundary conflict	9% [.28]	33% [.52]	12% [.33]	0% [0]
Went to section chief's court to resolve boundary conflict	16% [.37]	17% [.41]	24% [.44]	7% [.27]
Went to town headman's court to resolve boundary conflict	40% [.49]	33% [.51]	48% [.51]	33% [.48]
Went to family to resolve boundary conflict	16% [.37]	0% [0]	24% [.44]	11% [.32]
Went to NGO to resolve boundary conflict	2% [.13]	0% [0]	4% [.20]	0% [0]
Went to no one to resolve boundary conflict	5% [.22]	0% [0]	0% [0]	11% [.32]
Went to religious leaders to resolve boundary conflict	14% [.35]	17% [.41]	16% [.37]	11% [.32]
Went to town elders/chief to resolve boundary conflict	64% [.49]	67% [.52]	72% [.46]	56% [.51]
Went to development committee to resolve boundary conflict	16% [.37]	17% [.41]	24% [.44]	7% [.27]
Went to Zoe to resolve boundary conflict**	2% [.13]	0% [0]	4% [.20]	0% [0]
Observations	58	6	25	27

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

* Respondents can list as many different answers as are relevant to their situation.

** A Zoe is a person responsible for customary rituals.

TABLE 11 | RESOLUTION OF BOUNDARY CONFLICT*

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Boundary conflict was resolved	48% [.50]	50% [.55]	52% [.51]	44% [.51]
Boundary conflict resolved by magistrates' court	3% [.18]	17% [.41]	0% [0]	4% [.19]
Boundary conflict resolved by other	14% [.35]	33% [.52]	4% [.2]	19% [.40]
Boundary conflict resolved by section chief's court	7% [.25]	0% [0]	12% [.33]	4% [.19]
Boundary conflict resolved by town headman's court	22% [.42]	0% [0]	32% [.48]	19% [.40]
Boundary conflict resolved by Zoe**	2% [.13]	0% [0]	4% [.20]	0% [0]
Boundary conflict resolved by town elders/chief	10% [.31]	17% [.41]	4% [.20]	15% [.36]
Observations	58	6	25	27

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

* Respondents can list as many different answers as are relevant to their situation.

** A Zoe is a person responsible for customary rituals.

TABLE 12 | OTHER INFORMATION ON BOUNDARY CONFLICTS

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Satisfied with progress of this boundaries dispute?	56% [.50]	50% [.55]	64% [.49]	50% [.51]
Has there been abuse or insults related to this boundaries dispute?	40% [.50]	67% [.52]	40% [.50]	35% [.49]
Has there been violence related to this boundaries dispute?	40% [.50]	50% [.55]	44% [.51]	35% [.49]
Observations	58	6	25	27

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

TABLE 13 | INFORMATION ON OTHER LAND CONFLICTS

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Amount of land taken in other conflict (rice tins)	34 [31.18]	15 [11.48]	38 [22.18]	36 [38.31]
Other conflict over farm land	80% [.40]	100% [0]	65% [.49]	90% [.30]
Other conflict over town land	20% [.40]	0% [0]	35% [.49]	10% [.30]
Other conflict was with a family member	30% [.47]	40% [.55]	15% [.37]	43% [.51]
Other conflict was with member of different tribe	11% [.31]	0% [0]	20% [.41]	5% [.22]
Other conflict was with member of same tribe	59% [.50]	60% [.55]	65% [.49]	52% [.51]
Observations	50	5	20	21

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

TABLE 14 | ATTEMPTS TO RESOLVE OTHER LAND CONFLICTS*

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Went to local court to resolve other conflict	4% [.21]	20% [.45]	5% [.22]	0% [0]
Went to magistrates' court to resolve other conflict	11% [.31]	20% [.45]	10% [.31]	10% [.30]
Went to other to resolve other conflict	22% [.42]	40% [.54]	15% [.37]	24% [.44]
Went to paramount chief's court to resolve other conflict	20% [.40]	40% [.55]	25% [.44]	10% [.30]
Went to section chief's court to resolve other conflict	22% [.42]	20% [.45]	25% [.44]	19% [.40]
Went to town headman's court to resolve other conflict	37% [.49]	0% [0]	50% [.51]	33% [.48]
Went to Zoe to resolve other conflict	2% [.15]	0% [0]	5% [.22]	0% [0]
Went to family to resolve other conflict	24% [.43]	0% [0]	50% [.51]	5% [.22]
Went to no one to resolve other conflict	2% [.15]	0% [0]	0% [0]	5% [.22]
Went to religious leaders to resolve other conflict	11% [.31]	20% [.45]	10% [.31]	10% [.30]
Went to elders/chief to resolve other conflict	48% [.51]	80% [.45]	35% [.49]	52% [.51]
Went to development committee to resolve other conflict	17% [.39]	20% [.45]	10% [.31]	24% [.44]
Observations	50	5	20	21

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

* Respondents can list as many different answers as are relevant to their situation.

TABLE 15 | RESOLUTION OF OTHER LAND CONFLICTS*

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Other conflict was resolved	46% [.50]	40% [.55]	50% [.51]	43% [.51]
Other conflict resolved by paramount chief's court	7% [.25]	20% [.45]	10% [.31]	0% [0]
Other conflict resolved by other	9% [.29]	20% [.45]	5% [.22]	10% [.30]
Other conflict resolved by town headman's court	30% [.47]	0% [0]	35% [.49]	33% [.48]
Other conflict resolved by family	2% [.15]	0% [0]	5% [.22]	0% [0]
Other conflict resolved by town elders/chief	4% [.21]	20% [.45]	0% [0]	5% [.22]
Observations	50	5	20	21

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

* Respondents can list as many different answers as are relevant to their situation.

TABLE 16 | ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON OTHER LAND CONFLICTS

Variable	Full sample	Grand Gedeh	Lofa	Nimba
Satisfied with progress of other dispute?	50% [.51]	40% [.55]	55% [.51]	48% [.51]
Has there been abuse or insults related to this other dispute?	43% [.50]	0% [0]	45% [.51]	52% [.51]
Has there been violence related to this other dispute?	41% [.50]	0% [0]	45% [.51]	48% [.51]
Observations	50	5	20	21

Mean / [Standard Deviation]

Source: Blair, Robert, Chris Blattman, and Alexandra Hartman. 2010. "Addendum to Baseline Survey Summary: Local Conflicts and Conflict Resolution," Innovations for Poverty Action. Memo, August 11, 2010.

ANNEX

DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR COMMUNITY VISITS, ICLA M&E

FIELD VISIT FEBRUARY 2010

Protocol for Community Observation

DOMAIN TOPIC 1: APPEARANCE OF COMMUNITY
- What does the community look like?
- What are the materials of the roofs of the houses?
- How much livestock is present?
- How many people come to greet you when you arrive?
- What, if any, are the differences between the community that you are observing and the other parts of the village (if this is a specific quarter or section of the community)?

DOMAIN TOPIC 2: LOCATION/ISOLATION OF THE VILLAGE
- How difficult is the trip to the village?
- How long does it take to travel to the village from the district headquarters?
- Is this trip different in the wet/dry season?
- Does the village have a restaurant or a guesthouse?

DOMAIN TOPIC 3: LEADERSHIP AND EVENTS IN THE COMMUNITY
- Are people friendly/hostile/indifferent?
- Which senior members of the community do you meet? (chief, clan chief, assistant town chief etc.)?
- How open are they to the research? What, if any, are the issues that they raise?
- Do you hear of any big events recently taking place in the village?
- Do they mention any important events that took place in the community during the war? If so what? How do you think these events might impact the training?

COMMUNITY LEADER AND COMMUNITY MEMBER INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS

INDIVIDUAL IN THE VILLAGE / SOCIAL DYNAMICS IN VILLAGE
Categories: identity of the person in village hierarchy, relationship between tribes in village, structure of village hierarchy, groups in the village, citizenship

Leading question: I want to know about this village and I am a stranger here. Can you tell me about what you do here in the village on a typical day? For example, can you tell me what you did yesterday from when you woke up in the morning until you went to sleep at night?

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS:
- Was yesterday a normal day for you? Why or why not?
- OK, can you tell me more about what activity you spend the most time doing / how you make money (most likely farming / small business)?
- In addition to what you told me, on some days do you attend group meetings? If yes, what groups are you a member of?
- Why do you belong to_____ group? Did you decide to become a member of this group? Why or why not?
- Do you know anyone who doesn't belong to any groups or doesn't help with the community work? What do you think of people who do not participate? Is there a penalty for not participating in community work?
- Can you tell me about money collection for community projects in this community [bridge building]? Do you feel this process is fair/transparent? Is there any penalty for not participating?
- How many quarters are in this town? What are the names of the quarters? How were these quarters established / what is the story of their origin? Which quarter does the present chief come from? Did the chief of this town before the war come from this quarter?
- How many language groups / tribes in this town? Can you give the names of the tribes/language groups? Which tribe owns this town / established this town? Is there any tribe/clan / language group that used to be many in this town but is no longer many or there are no more in this town?
- Can you tell me about an excluded group [tribe] in this community [preface this with the fact that all communities have excluded groups]? Does this group have a leader? Who is this leader and how did they reach this position?
- Can you tell me about someone who is not a citizen in this community? Why not? What is their story? [If respondent suggests that there are no non-citizens, ask whether there are any Fula traders and whether they are citizens.]

LEADERSHIP

Categories: who are the people of authority and how did they reach that position, what are the different types of local authority?

Leading question: who is leader of this village?

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS:
- How did this person become leader of this community?
- Was this process the same before the war? Who were those involved in this process? Were the women and children involved selecting the chief? How long did the process take to select the chief? Are you satisfied with the way the town chief is selected? What is the process for changing the town chief? What happens if someone disagrees about the person selected for town chief, what can they do? Was there ever a time when the community was unsatisfied with the town chief?
- Who is paramount chief? Who is the clan chief? Do these people reside in the town? What district is the town currently in? Do you think this town should be in a different district? Why or why not?
- Is there anyone here in the village that people have a lot of respect for but who is not a chief or a group leader? Can you describe this person? How did they gain the respect of the community?
- Is there a traditional or cultural leader in this community that people here go to for advice? What is the last kind of confusion/question/issue that you heard someone took to the Zoe for help?

Who are the religious leaders in this community? How long have they been leaders? How did they become leaders?

CONFLICT IN THE VILLAGE

Categories: needs of the village, problems/confusion/conflict in the village, conflict resolution in the village

Leading question: can you give me an example about a successful project the community worked on together? If not, why not?

Then: how can people work together on a community project?

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS:
- So it seems like these things were successful. I know that all towns have confusions or palavas, can you tell me about the most recent one here? Can you tell me more about what happened?
- How was this confusion resolved? Who resolved the confusion?
- Typically, who resolves a conflict like that? [or provide example here, like between husband and young wife]
- Can you tell me about a time when _____conflict resolution didn't work? What did people do?
- If the above has focused on traditional/community efforts, ask what was the last conflict you heard about where the police/magistrate/court was involved? Can you tell me that story?
- Can you tell me about the last time there was a conflict between this village and another village? How was that conflict resolved?
- Can you tell me about the last time there was confusion with a stranger?
- Can you tell me about the last cultural conflict / land conflict / violent conflict in this village? [might insert question about conflict between religious institutions and cultural practices here]
- Have you ever had to pay money in order to end a conflict /confusion/problem/palava between yourself and someone else, or someone in your family and another party? If so, how much? Is this typical? If not, do you know of anyone who has had to pay money? If so, how much? Is this typical?
- Is there any other kind of confusion in the village?
- What do you think will be the cause of any future confusion in this village?

'LAND BUSINESS'

Categories: structure of property rights, conflict over land, conflict resolution, local land authorities, ownership of land, strangers and land

Lead question: can you tell me the story of who owns this place and when and how they came here and came to own it?

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS:
- If someone from this place wants land, how do they get it?
  - Is there a traditional person in this town who is responsible for deciding who gets land? Who is this person? How did they get that responsibility?
- Are there any other groups that make farms here besides people who come from that custodian tribe?
- If I am a stranger here, how can I get land to make a farm?
- Was this the same before the war?
- What kind of farms do those people make?
  - If only rice farms, ask about tree crops.
  - If includes tree crops, ask how this came to pass.
- If I am from the custodian tribe, can I give my land to my sons when I die?
  - Can I give my land to my wife? Can I give my land to my daughters?
- Are there any women in the community that own land? Can you tell me their story?
- Can you tell me the story of the most recent land business in the town?
  - Who were the people involved in the land business? What was the problem between them? Was this a problem for a long time? What about their families before the war, did they have a problem?
  - How is this land business being resolved? Was this the only attempt to solve it? [Get details on all attempts to resolve land business]
- Can you tell me the story of another incidence of land business in this town?
- Does anyone in this town have a title deed for their property?
- Has anyone in this town bought land from anyone else for cash money?
- Has anyone in this town had their land surveyed?
- Can you give me an example of a boundary marker that people in this town use?

OBSERVATION OF THE INTERVIEW

FOLLOWING EACH INTERVIEW, WHETHER COMMUNITY MEMBER, TRAINEE, LEADER OR DISTRICT LEADER, NOTE THE FOLLOWING:
- Where is the conversation taking place?
- How many people are present during the conversation?
- What is the language of the conversation?
- How long does the conversation take?
- What is the attitude of the interviewee?
- What question do they show the most interest in?
- What is the most difficult question for them to answer?
- Are there any questions that they don't understand, that make the interview more difficult?
- Is there any question they want to evade?
- Is there any evidence of why this might be?
- How do you think this interview could have been improved?