Yechale Degu
Lecture, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Jig Jiga University, Ethiopia

Gizachew Asrat
Researcher, Institute of Foreign Affairs, Ethiopia

Comparative description of asymmetrical patterns of ethnic and national attachment among Amharas and Oromos of Ethiopia

Yechale Degu and Gizachew Asrat

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33545/26646021.2023.v5.i2b.265

Abstract
Multi ethnic states across the board are experiencing social tension as a result of lacking the balance between ethnic group and national attachment. Ethiopia, one of ethnically heterogeneous states in the world, is facing political pressure from the growing ethno-national attachment. This article aims to measure the level of attachment, either to the state or their ethnic in-group, of the two largest ethnic groups in Ethiopia. For this purpose the researcher used mixed approach to research. It found the growing downward trend towards attachment to sub-national elements and distancing from the state among the groups. Relationship exists between an ethnic group of a respondent and attachment proxy variables at 0.01 levels of significance. However, the level of attachment to sub-national or ethnic elements and distancing from the state is not uniform among the Oromos and Amharas.

Keywords: Attachment, Ethiopia, Amhara, Ethnic attachment, national attachment

1. Introduction
Following the end of WWII there has been a striking increase in the formation of new states. In Africa, Asia and Latin America most new states have been formed first through emancipations from colonial rule then through internal political process. In Eastern Europe, Transcaucasia and Central Asia lots of states appeared on the map of the world through fracturing of multi-ethnic states and their replacement with more ethnically homogeneous nations (Sidanius, *et al.* 1997) [22].

The process of state formation and the quest for separate, ethnically homogeneous statehood never ceased worldwide. Common to all these claims and attempts are the presence of asymmetrical pattern of attachment of claimants to their ethnic group and the whole nation. It is possible to foster loyalty and identification with one's own ethnic particularism, at the same time, maintain shared national values and a sense of common national identification. This notion of a positive-sum relationship between one's national and ethnic commitment is, however, absent in some multi ethnic African states (Belachew 2009) [4].

Several ethnically heterogeneous states in Africa such as Ethiopia, Nigeria and Mali are experiencing social tension as a result of lacking the balance between ethnic group attachment and national attachment. It manifested in more positive affective response to one's own ethnic in-group members in comparison to the ethnic out-group/s and the degree of subjects 'willingness to engage in political activity on behalf of their own ethnic group than nationalized political movements. In Ethiopia the attachment of some ethnic groups is strong and all-encompassing and has strong identification with the state. However, some are not strongly identifying themselves with the state. Even for some ethno-nationalists an Ethiopian identity is considered as competing-rival group identity against which they are requesting for independence.

The convergences of factors such as perception of ethnic discrimination and being low in terms of size augment ethnic identification, attachment and consciousness. Ayalon, Rafael and Sharot (1986) [3] argue that it is unlikely to have ethnic groups with significant in size to identify themselves ethnically.

Corresponding Author:
Yechale Degu
Lecture, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Jig Jiga University, Ethiopia

However, unlike to these theoretical dispositions on ethnic identification, mobilization along ethnic lines and attachment to ethnic particularities in Ethiopia are magnified in ethnic plurals such as Amhara and Oromia and while the majority occupants of higher political offices including the prime minister and the deputy prime minister are from these ethnic groups. Oromos have long established ethnic attachment and hence they have decade's old ethnic mobilization. Historically, the identification of Amhara with Ethiopia overrides any other local identities. The Amhara region and areas where Amharas' large in size were a strong hold for pan Ethiopia political movements. However, administrative breakup of the country into ethnic regions since 1991, the recognition of these regional states as homeland by respective ethnic members, expansion of ethnic movements and official recognition of these movements have created fear in non-ethnically oriented people like Amhara. Ethnic assertiveness in Amhara become a quid pro que for similar ethnic movements in other regions. This article aimed at comparing two ethnic groups, Amhara and Oromo, attachment to the whole nation and their ethnic group using methods that measure closeness and distance either to the nation or one's own ethnic group. There are similarities among them in having more than one ethnically oriented political organization. However, they are different in their level of support for pan state political movements.

2. Survey of Conceptual and Empirical Issues
2.1 Asymmetrical Attachment: What it is?
For many attachment researchers like me one of the difficulties is definition of terms, attachment and asymmetry. These terms and phrases do not have a precise and consensually established content and definition throughout the literature. They are more often invoked than described. But the first major step towards their conceptualization so as to create a common understanding and frame of reference for analysis is to define them. It is necessary to define the terms in refers to the purpose of the study before doing the analysis. Moreover, the juxtaposition study of ethnic and state wide attachment like this intrinsically demands terminological clarification.

Attachment is a feeling of membership, inclusion, and commitment to a certain group of people (Davis 1999) [6]. It is a pattern of interaction by which individuals orient themselves in the social world. It refers to the affinity that people have to particular communities, ways of life, sets of beliefs, or practices that play a central role in their self-conception or self-understanding (Eisenberg 2009) [8]. It is something that strengthens one's identity and sense of belonging (Druckman 1994) [7]. Personal sacrifice on behalf of the nation or ethnic particularities used as a component of attachment (Eisenberg 2009) [8]. But attachment is too variable, changing, hybrid and different across groups. In some circumstances the attachment advanced by some groups might be stronger than the attachments advanced by other. If attachments across groups weighed and compared to each other, they are always unbalanced in divided and heterogeneous societies.

Attachment is based on inter subjectivity or the knowledge that one has in mind. The interface between ethnic and national attachment can take either of the following two patterns. First, the degree of attachment to the nation will be equally beneficial from all ethnic groups. Nonetheless, this is unlikely scenario in heterogeneous societies like Ethiopia. Second, one's attachment to the whole nation will be negatively associated with one's ethnic loyalty. Therefore, when the interface between ethnic and national identity prove to be negative, regardless of which ethnic subgroup one is a member of, the greater the loyalty one feels to his/her sub-group, the less loyalty one should feel to the nation as a whole (Sidanius, *et al.* 1997) [22] and vice versa. This is what referred as asymmetrical patterns of attachment between ethnic particularism and the whole nation. Attachment either to the nation or ethnic particularity become asymmetrical when an ethnic group within the state has more or superior affinity to the identities in question/marker-asymmetry than the other ethnic group/group-asymmetry, resulting in an imbalance of attachment.

2.2 Who Favors What: Ethnic or National Attachment
Keller (2005) [11] suggests that members of different ethnic groups have varying levels of identification in their ethnic and vis-a-vis their national identity**.** In these varying levels of attachment the minority communities seemed to favour collective ethnic rights and more incline to their own ethnic groups (Eisenberg 2009) [8]. This is not because they are more authentically collectivist than the majority rather because their ways of life are less secure and they are more worried about the survival of their language and culture. Conversely the majority seemed more individualist and favors national attachment only because it could secure all sorts of collective goods, such as language, recognition as a distinct society, and protection of cherished practices, just by being a demographic majority.

The state is usually the institutional tool in hands of the dominant ethnic group that outnumbers the rest. People who belong to dominant groups, in terms of demographic significance, economic resources they accumulated, political positions they hold and their history, may never experience disadvantage or exclusion on the basis of their identity. This group has the capacity to achieve its own goals while dissolving those of the minority groups that are at numerical disadvantage (Walzer 1996 as cited in Blas 2015) [5]. They may not even view themselves as having a distinctive identity less than the state. Therefore, they are unaware that ethnic identity is the basis upon which they enjoy some of the privileges that they do (Eisenberg 2009) [8].

Ethnic minorities and majorities might have pan ethnic political organizations in some ways; however they differ in the degree of attachment they have for the state. A pro ethnic identity claims can be generated by both, usually, nonetheless, it is by the minorities against the majorities and dominant ethnic groups that claim to own and guard the state. The tendency to perceive the in-group as more prototypical of the super ordinate category than an out-group is more pronounced for majority- than for minority-group members (Waldzus, *et al.* 2004) [23].

Majority and minority ethnic groups have "differential attachment" in that ethnic minorities are more powerful in their attachment to particularistic ethnic objectives and ethnic majorities are less powerful in their attachment to pan ethnic political programs and more favour political programs for the state/nation. However, there is a contradiction in Ethiopia for this theoretical and most of often empirical truth. Ethnic majorities are more resistant and hostile to the state wide political programs than many of

ethnic minorities. For instance the degree of pan ethnicity in Oromos is incompatible with the place which the ethnic group occupies in the country as a largest, not majority, ethnic group. If we take the last Ethiopian census as trustworthy the Oromo should be an ethnic category that promotes Ethiopaness.

There is no single, self-evident and permanent majority in Ethiopia which could be obtained through simple arithmetic calculations. Ethnically speaking there is no majority ethnic group in Ethiopia. In the country there are only minorities of different sizes. The Oromo are the largest ethnic group in Ethiopia. The Oromo involves a far greater part of Ethiopian population (Merera 2000) [16]. But, if largeness taken as being a majority, as it did now in Ethiopia among the Oromos, it is sobering to see the Oromos attached to their ethnic group more than the state where they are "the majority".

2.3 Perspective on Ethnic and National Attachment

Throughout the world in heterogeneous states there are several distinct dimensions of attachment to the whole nation and ethnic particularities. There are roughly four general perspectives in the analysis of the nature of attachment that people have for their ethnic group and the whole nation. These are:

- The melting pot perspective.
- The multicultural or ethnic pluralism perspective.
- The group dominance/social dominance perspective.
- Self-categorization/in-group projection model.

Melting Pot Perspective

Within the perspective of melting pot, one's ethnic background and attachment to it is regarded as largely irrelevant to one's attachment to the wider nation. This model predicts that in societies that are actually functioning as melting pot, ethnic particularism either completely irrelevant or one's national attachment is equal for all ethnic groups (Sidanius, *et al*. 1997) [22]. For this model the degree of attachment to the nation is same across all ethnic groups. However, this is unlikely scenario in Ethiopia and other multi ethnic states.

Multicultural or Ethnic Pluralism Perspective

Another alternative perspective is ethnic pluralism. Although there are some variations in defining ethnic pluralism in a precise manner among the proponents of this perspective, they argue that individuals can simultaneously maintain a positive commitment both to an ethnic particularism and larger political community. These dual commitments can be seen as complementary loyalties, where commitment to one ethnic identity in fact helps to cement and reinforce commitment to the national identity. This model predicts that attachment to one's ethnic identity would not be inconsistent with one's attachment to the nation as a whole. As De la Garza *et al*. (1996) [8] suggest the positive commitment to one's ethnic group could be used as a means of increasing one's engagement in and commitment to the larger polity.

This model implies that there is a positive relationship between one's attachment to the nation as a whole and one's attachment to one's ethnic background. This positive relationship would apply to members of all ethnic groups and not just to members of dominant groups alone. Again this analysis has no application in Ethiopia where some saw

Ethiopian identity as rival group identity against which they advocate ethno national identity.

Group or Social Dominance Approach

In the vast majority of cases, for contingent historical reasons, the actually existing multinational states were not formed by consensus of different ethnic groups, but by choice of a single dominant ethnic group. An ethnic group within a multiethnic state become dominant because of its demographic weigh or as it is the one that integrates most of the country (Moulines 2001 as cited in Blas 2015) [5]. This approach argues that multiethnic states usually come into being as a result of the conquest and leadership of one ethnic group over another (Sidanius, et el., 1997) [22]. Likewise empire building in Ethiopia follows the classic pattern of expansion from a dynamic core province, Shoa, one of Abyssinian provinces. It was Shoa Amhara that planted the seeds for the development of an Ethiopian Empire into an Ethiopian State (Markakis 2011) [14]. This group comes to regard itself as having ownership of the nation and its symbols (Huynh, Devos and Attman 2015) [10].

As a result of the dominant groups' role as a 'creator or unifier' of the state the group regards itself as having preeminent ownership of the nation. This perspective implies that national identity, or a sense of common belonging to the nation as a whole, will be more strong and positive with members of dominant ethnic groups and less strong with members of subordinate groups in terms of their demographic weight or their limited historical role. For instance in multi-ethnic states such as United States, Israel and Ethiopia members of the dominant ethnic group, namely, Euro-Americans, Jews and Amharas, feel greater ownership and attachment to the nation than members of other ethnic groups, and also manifest a stronger positive relationship between ethnic and national attachment than members of subordinate groups.

In Israel given the long and bitter history of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the subordinate position of Israeli Arabs within Israel society, the interface between ethnic and national attachment is asymmetrical for Jews and Arabs (Lawson, 1975 a cited in Huynh, Devos and Attman 2015) [10]. In America African-Americans are placed at lower levels of attachment than Euro Americans and all other groups (Sidanius, *et al*. 1997) [22]. For this perspective European Americans enjoy a greater sense of "Americanness," and ethnic minority-group members such as Hispanics and Americans of Asian origin distanced from American common identity (Huynh, Devos and Attman 2015) [10]. In Ethiopia Amhara ethnic group was the spearhead in the centralization and unification of the modern Ethiopian state. For this reason, despite current changes, shared linguistic and cultural communication was not essential to preserve social order and effective interaction in Amhara.

However, this is not without reasons. Among others the definitive concept of an American, Israeli and Ethiopian cultural identity was based on whiteness, Jewishness and Amharaness respectively. Whiteness in America, Jewishness in Israel and Amharaness in Ethiopia are the cornerstone of the country's cultural norms. An American cultural identity is based on the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century settlers who founded American society (Pinder 2010) [19]. Likewise Ethiopian and Israeli cultural identity is based on the identity of founders of respective states. The emergence of

Ethiopian cultural identity as Amharaness crystallized fairly in Ethiopia's history with the founders are, for the most part, came from the Amharic speaking provinces. The Amhara had enjoyed primacy in state-building since the ascent of the Shewan king, Menelik, to the Ethiopian throne in 1889 (Alemseged 2004) [1]. Individuals from this ethnic group were regarded as the midwives of the Ethiopian state.

Because of the historical role that Amharas played the values, institutions, and culture of the early Amhara Arms men shaped the foundations of the development of Ethiopian cultural identity. In this case Ethiopia is not an exception. Plus if we take the contested Ethiopian census result as true the Amharas are demographically the second largest ethnic group. Both history and population density gave Amhara the status that Jews in Israel and Euro-Americans in America enjoying. Thus, within the group dominance perspective, the following two types of asymmetry apply: first, the degree of attachment to the nation is stronger for members of dominant groups than subordinate groups; second, the correlation between one's attachment to one's ethnic group and one's attachment to the nation as a whole is more positive for people within dominant groups than for people within subordinate groups.

Self-Categorization or In-Group Projection Model
This model accounts the role of in-group and out-group perceptions in explaining the relative exclusion of certain ethnic groups from a super ordinate national identity. The model starts with an assumption that social groups are attached in reference to a higher level super ordinate national identity (Weber, Mummendey and Waldzus 2002) [24]. If any group of people defines super ordinate identity of a nation in terms of its in-group characteristics or attributes, then develop a perception of prototype super ordinate identity based on its in-group attributes (Huynh, Devos and Attman 2015) [10]. An ethnic group that imagines, real or not, the prototype super ordinate identity of a nation in terms of its own in-group characteristics attach to the nation/state. Other ethnic groups that evaluate themselves as out-group based on this prototype tend see as not fitting the super ordinate identity of the nation incline towards particularistic attachments against the national attachment.

Perceiving one's group as less prototypical of the super ordinate national identity accounts negative emotional reactions, unfavorable behavioral intentions and attachment toward the nation (Kessler, *et al*. 2010) [12]. Pinder (2010) [19] stated that racialized ethnic groups in America are not included in American cultural identity in the same way that whites are. Euro-Americans exhibit a strong in-group proto typicality effect than other Americans. In contrast Asian and Latino Americans sustain the opposite perception given socio structural realities and display in-group proto typicality effects to a smaller extent. Due to these reasons Euro-Americans perceive themselves as more prototypically American than Asian and Latino Americans. The latter two groups as measured based on the attachment they have based on in-group projection they are less "American" than European Americans (Huynh, Devos and Attman 2015) [10].

In Israel the European Jews, who are closely associated with the dominant culture, feel no distinct ethnic identification, whereas the Middle Eastern Jews emphasize their ethnic identifications (Ayalon, Rafael and Sharot 1986) [3]. According to these scholars, the European Jews since they have higher association with the dominant culture in Israel

exhibit lower ethnic identification than the Middle Eastern Jews. In Ethiopia the national identity is constructed based on the identity of empire/state builders. As a result the descendants of the empire builder have a higher in-group proto typicality effect than other groups. Ethnic groups who are not descendants of the empire builder's interlink-ethiopianess as Amhran-Tigreness. Due to this they developed a lesser proto typical effect to the national identity.

General Conceptual Framework
We are not just social animals as described by Aristotle. We are social animals with inseparable local identities. Therefore, we are not just citizens of a given state but we are also Tigres, Amharas, Oromos and Somalis. We all have ascribed local identities rooted to our cultural group, but the level of attachment to these ascribed identities greatly vary across groups. Attachment to local identities is not universal phenomenon. It is common in multiethnic states throughout the world to found an ethnic group that work for the state and against the state. For instance, in Ethiopia according to scholars such as Merera (2000) [16] (L. Smith (2007) [21] and Markakis (2011) [14] there are ethnic groups dedicated for the state, want to join another state and aspire to build its own independent state. Since all ethnic groups do not necessarily pursue ethno nationalist objectives and attach to particular ethnic objectives it is impossible to have a sequential nexus between ethnic group and ethno national attachment.

Out of the four perspectives, melting pot perspective, multicultural or ethnic pluralism perspective, group or social dominance and social-categorization or in-group projection models, that explain about the potential pattern of ethnic and national attachment, this article is informed or guided by the group or social dominance and social-categorization or in-group projection models. The former perspective implies that national identity, or a sense of common belonging to the nation as a whole, will be more strong and positive with members of dominant ethnic groups and less strong with members of subordinate groups in terms of their demographic weight or their limited historical role. The later argues social groups are attached in reference to the super ordinate national identity. An ethnic group that defines the super ordinate national identity in terms of its own in-group characteristics attach to the state and ethnic groups who less associated with the dominant prototypical culture exhibit lower level of attachment to the state. It is these two theories of attachment guide the analysis of the article.

3. Research Design and Methods
3.1 Philosophical Foundations of the Study
Ethiopia has been experiencing encouragement of ethnic groups to display their distinctiveness, internal homogeneity, and cultural autonomy through distinctive dress and other practices. The state after 1991 has partly played a great role in shaping pan ethnic identity, just as it has a role in shaping identities based on class, nationality/Ethiopianess and gender before 1991. Institutions are better designed to accommodate pan ethnic rather than pan state claims. Ethnic identities and practices important to it arise as a kind of strategy to organize a way of life by orienting people in their social context, improve their sense of self, and act as a means of resisting or counteracting oppression. However, this state sponsored

promotion of ethnic identity was based on the natural realities of being a member of an ethnic group.

Fundamental change in the relationships between peoples and state in Ethiopia, therefore, grounded from the natural reality of being a member to an ethnic group but manipulated artificially for political objectives. These objectives take an extraordinary variety of forms such as the demands for secession, irredentism, autonomy and the need for ethnic recognition. The assessment of ethnic groups' attachment to the state can be made qualitatively based on the interpretations of the political programs of political parties affiliated in the ethnic groups and comparison of ethnic claims.

The article, therefore, assumes that being Amhara or Oromo could be a primordial or natural reality; their existence is supernaturally mediated but attachment to these primordial realities is the result of rational calculation of actors. It exists not independently from the knowledge of an agent. In line with this assumption Negal (1994) [21] argues that whether ethnic divisions are built upon visible biological differences among populations or rest upon invisible cultural and ideational distinctions, the boundaries around and the meanings attached to ethnic groups are pure social constructions. Stephenson (1953) [28] added that attachment cannot be defined with reference to a mental state or metaphysical construct, but as the communication of viewpoints. This article is, therefore, guided by both foundationalist and anti foundationalist ontological positions. The epistemological positions taken and methodological construction made are based on these ontological assumptions.

Assessments of the patterns of attachment in multi ethnic states should not be made at all with the qualitative interpretation of party programs alone. Attachment is a behavioral manifestation of subjectivity; it can be observed and measured through research methods as those used in studies of objective phenomenon (Davis 1999) [6]. Therefore, the epistemological position of the researcher is realist and an interpretivist. This happens since the patterns of attachment are not easily studied on the basis of objective quantitative calculations alone. Sometimes the qualitative interpretation of the phenomenon could be desired.

3.2 Model and Approach of the Study
In Ethiopia identification to the ethnic group become common to all ethnic groups. However, support for it is different across ethnic groups. Observational results are on the ground about the asymmetry of attachment in Ethiopia; however, to remedy this observational result the author examines it through an application of statistical model and direct/indirect measures of asymmetry. This model is capable of revealing who prefers what. In order to reflect on the nature of attachment in Ethiopia and does comparison among ethnic groups the author used ethnic groups as a point of analysis.

The study measured variations in identification based on some interrelated factors through a model called attachment model. The model used as a framework for the interpretation of empirical evidence. It also summarizes the theoretical logic, the presence of the bivariate relationship between pan ethnic identity and national attachment. This make the model not case specific and in fact can be used for other similar studies. The model can reveal the nature of attachment using a data through software called SPSS.

$$Y = \alpha + aX_i + \mu \qquad (1)$$

Where
- Y is attachment.
- α is a constant.
- X_i ethnic background of the respondent.
- μ is an error term which shows the influence of factors other than an ethnic background on attachment.
- a is a coefficient that show the strength of attachment of an ethnic group.

This study is an attempt to show the asymmetrical patterns of attachment in Ethiopia based on the explanatory role of variables and through a series of statistical cross tabulation tests. Comparisons among ethnic groups, inter group differences towards attachment measured in terms of ideological positions/support for ethnic politics, the flag preference, preferences for ethnic claims prevailed in Ethiopia and disintegrative constitutional articles. The author used survey, longitudinal data i.e. election results, experimental and comparative approach to uncover the types of attachment that would be found in four selected ethnic groups.

Sampling Techniques and Procedures
Methodologically, this article is based on sample survey and employed a three stage sampling procedure. Sampling units such as the state, Ethiopia, the first stage and ethnic groups such as Amhara and Oromo, the second stage are selected purposively but not without reasons. Ethiopia is selected since the researcher is Ethiopian, therefore, I know well the extent how the problem is entrenched and individuals with whom an interview conducted, questionnaires distributed and literatures quite important to this article are with my own reach. The two ethnic groups are selected because though Ethiopia is a multi-ethnic polity with an estimated more than 80 ethnic groups, it is these ethnic groups that shape the country's politics. They are selected since these ethnic groups have political significance based on numerical value, degree of political participations and location in Ethiopia. The third stage is individuals, to whom the questionnaire distributed, are randomly determined. This study is greatly relied on individuals' response to measure the nature of attachment and compare it with other ethnic groups preferred inclination. These individuals are randomly determined and proportionately allocated to the respective districts of sampled ethnic group regions.

Sample Size Determination
This article applies a formula, the one developed by Cochran (1963) [6], which usually used for dichotomous response categories and random sampling techniques. The researcher calculated the necessary sample size for a combination of levels of precision/e, confidence/z, and variability/p & q through the equation found below.

$$n_0 = Z^2 pq/e^2 \text{ or } p(100-p)z^2/e^2$$

Where
- n_0 is the sample size,
- Z is the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area α at the tails (1 - α equals the desired confidence level, e.g., 95%). The value for Z is found in statistical

tables which contain the area under the normal curve.
- e is the desired level of precision,
- p is the estimated proportion of an attribute that is present in the population, and
- q is 1-p.

Proportionate stratified sample were drawn from the three ethnic groups. The sample size is determined based on same level of variability/difference in attachment/ i.e. p = 50% and q = 50% for each sub- groups in Amahara and Oromia. The following table shows the sample size for each ethnic group at a given level of precision, confidence and variability.

Table 1: Sample Size

No	Ethnic Group	Confidence/Z	Precision/e	Variability		Sample Size $n_0 = Z^2pq/e^2$
				p	**q**	
1	Amhara	95%	5%	50%	50%	384
2	Oromo	95%	5%	50%	50%	384
	Total 768					

Analysis Strategy

To generalize about the pattern of attachment in Ethiopia, the study employed comparative analysis of four selected ethnic groups as the units of comparison through regression tests. Comparisons bring out contrasts among ethnic groups attachment to the state or ethnic kin flock. Regression analysis will reveal the relative importance of the independent variables, ethnic origin (Amhara and Oromo) on the dependent variables, specific ethnic and broad national identifications (Ayalon, Rafael and Sharot 1986) [3]. The comparative analysis in this dissertation proceed through identifying attributes that ethnic groups have in common as far as attachment is concerned; this approach is what John Stuart Mill as cited in Scokpol (1979) [25] called the "Method of Agreement" and through enumerating attributes absent in the ethnic groups mobilization; this procedure labelled as the "Method of Difference". Therefore, there article combines these two comparative logics together.

The article is based on cross-ethnic data that captured from individual responses at one point in time. But identities are formed in response to the specific context of one's surrounding social environment and interactions with others. To properly explain the formation of ethnic group attachment a single cross ethnic analysis could not be enough. To assess claims regarding declining attachment to Ethiopia, the article used voting patterns, in two national elections, of the two ethnic groups in order to do a longitudinal analysis. Therefore, a time series data from Ethiopian National Electoral Board about ethnic electoral behavior used and long-term follow-up studies also done.

If attachment to Ethiopia is declining across ethnic groups, then one would expect to see evidence of such decline in the longitudinal data. A positive relationship between ethnic origin and pan ethnicity and high levels of ethnic political mobilization interpreted as "the ethnic group is attached to its own ethnic particularity" and "the ethnic group is distanced from the state‖; a negative relationship means pan nationality". This so because of the bivariate relationship found between pan ethnic identity and national attachment.

Discussion of Results

The political record of the last five decades in Ethiopia was one of trauma and pain brought about by these ethnic demands that propagated few over the many. In Ethiopia it is witnessed a fundamental change in the relationship between peoples of different ethnic origin and state. This relationship is taking an extraordinary variety of forms: the demand for secession (Oromia), quest for more regional autonomy and the need for recognition of ethnic status or ethnic corporatism (Amhara). The political record of the last five decades in Ethiopia was one of trauma and pain brought about by these ethnic demands that propagates few over the many. The struggle to be recognized as Ethiopian faced a conflicted ways of thinking and it is difficult to think about a conscious "Ethiopian We". This raised a debate that involves whether different ethnic groups share a common Ethiopian attachment or emphasize their ethnic attachment as separate from an Ethiopian common identity.

The important point is that both attachments are at play in Ethiopia with different proportions across ethnic groups. Ethiopia can best be comprehended as the interpenetration of two attachments: (1) society involved in ethnically focused political participation; and (2) a society involved so aggressively for the promotion of the state. The presence of these possible patterns of attachment raises questions about with whom ethnic groups identify themselves. The coefficients from statistical manipulation or the analysis of the survey data shows differences among ethnic groups in attachment to the state and particularistic ethnic categories. It shows the presence of distancing from the state and attachment to ethnic particularities as manifested in proxy variables used in this article below. The picture that emerges is the steady advance of attachment towards ethnicity in all groups. A statistically significant downward trend towards an attachment to own ethnic groups had been observed. Therefore, the forecasted asymmetry of attachment had been proved in Ethiopia through the sample test of the research population.

However, within this overall picture there are significant variations among ethnic groups. There is an interethnic as well as intraethnic variation in attachment for both categories. The difference in attachment to the state and ethnic particularities in Ethiopia is found to be a function of individuals' ethnic background. In other words the ethnic background of respondent and the four attachment proxy variables are statistically significant at 0.01 levels of significance as indicated in the table below.

Table 2: Chi- Square Test

| | Proxy Variables | | | | | | | | |
| | Internal Colonialism | | Article 39 | | Desired Political Orientation | | Symbols/Flags | | Ethnic Claims | |
	DF	Sig.	DF	Sig.	DF	Sig.	DF	Sig.	DF	Sig.
Pearson Chi square	20	.000	20	.000	20	.000	20	.000	20	.000
Likelihood ratio	20	.000	20	.000	20	.000	20	.000	20	.000

Type of Attachments at Play in Ethiopia

Attachment in Ethiopia can be subdivided into three sometimes overlapping and non-overlapping types. The first is powerful and found to be a destructive one for national integration, attachment to ethnic particularities. It has been manifested both in political party programs and political mobilization of the mass. Almost all, more than 90%, of the political parties registered at the National Electoral Board of Ethiopia are meant to be for a single ethnic group. The people, too, mobilize so easily in support of pan ethnic political groupings. The second is constructive and the one suggested as essential for nation building, pan state attachment. This attachment type is an alternative that offers the opportunity to be successful and authentic for nation building and way of being a state. The third is, dominant in history and some want it to reappear again to counter the forces of destructive ethnic attachment is an attachment to geography i.e. provincialism in Amhara and Oromia. Despite the availability of all the three types of attachment in Ethiopia, the attachments that are widely observed and contradicted with one another are ethnic and national attachments. From this overall picture ethno-national attachments have become continuously important for the last half century in Ethiopia but with a clear ethnic pattern.

Most historians agree that the beginning of ethno nationalism in Ethiopia traced back to the mid of the twentieth century. Before these periods Ethiopian identity has been satisfying individual demand for attachment. The ideological trope that has appeared during the mid-twentieth century had tremendously influenced the current generations' pattern of attachments. The former generation of Ethiopian elite found their model for political action in the movements for national liberation in the former Soviet Union member states and countries under European colonialism.

It is out-dated and has become less important in many ethno-nationalist struggles throughout the world such as Basque, Quebec and Scottish ethno nationalist movements. However, this survey exhibits that this model is still important, the prime factor today for association and there is rampant mass public support for it in Ethiopia. It is manifested in street political demonstrations, election results and now the survey from this research show the declining attachment from the state and growing allegiance to sub-state elements. But this growing detachment from the state and attachment to one's own ethnic group had an ethnic pattern. Ethnic groups vary in terms of the birth, claim and nature of their ethnic consciousness.

The pro Oromo movements that had laid the foundation for the Oromo Liberation Fron/OLF led struggle for self-determination had started during the 1960s by the Bale peasants and Macha-Tulama Self-Help Association (Asafa 2004) [2]. The rebellion from Bale and movement by Mecha-Tulema had foiled through military and political means respectively. However, these two movements were replaced by more radical and militant ethno national movements in the next decade. Assafa (2004) [2] said the birth of the OLF

in the early 1970s was a result of accumulated political processes happening to Bale peasants and the association. Ethno-national attachment and movement for political targets in Oromia had a pre- Derg pedigree. The Oromos became ethno nationalists almost in the same period with the introduction of an ideology itself. The Amharas are going down towards ethnocentric orientations but it's a very recent origin.

The Amhara elite, the creators and masters of the Ethiopian state until losing power to the TPLF in 1991, were the major forces in denouncing the TPLF federal policy as the one leading the state towards disintegration are now become pan ethnic and asking for the autonomy of the Amhara people (Lencho 2004) [6]. However, unlike the ethno-national movements in Oromia, mobilization along ethnic lines and attachment to it in Amhara had started during the early 1990s and increased in form and content during the last four years. Therefore, in terms of birth the Amhara-ethno nationalism is young and recent. Despite these differences they have similar structural trends. Grossly they are passing through nearly similar morphological stages.

Structurally the ethnic movements in the sampled groups, due to different reasons, had moved into three partially similar stages that is mobilization, demobilization and remobilization. These movements are constantly undergoing reinvention to pass through stages. The cause of self-determination in Oromia, as a component of the broader ethno nationalist agenda, is tied in part to the armed separatist movement OLF that formed in the post imperial periods. These movements have been active during the 1960s, 70s and in the next two decades. But attitudes toward self-determination have cooled in these ethnic groups due to different reasons. The transition to democracy through regional autonomy had stabilized the quest for independent statehood Oromia.

In Amhara and Oromia, unavailability of broad popular and intellectual support and the provision of regional autonomy respectively had forced the ethno national movement towards demobilization. However, these have been changed recently in almost all ethnic groups. The Amharas in response to ethno nationalist movements in neighbouring regions are giving political and military training for young adults. As one informant notes "there is an active ethnic mobilization in Amhara to preserve the Ethiopian state from disintegration and save Amhara from extinction". One ethnic group stands at the worry of the other ethnic group.

Disintegrative Constitutional Clauses and Internal Colonialism

The interpretation of the internal conditions of some ethnic groups in terms of internal colonization arguments was one of the driving forces to ethnic mobilization in history. However, the survey data shows it is still in place. For instance, around 53.2% Oromos consider their own country, Ethiopia as a colonizing state. Besides this 67.5% of the respondents want to keep the constitutional clause "self-determination up to secession" and 81.5% backed the

making of an independent state of their own. This is so in a time when the Oromos are dominant in the state's political apparatus. But, 87.3%, 57.8% and 60.9% of the respondents from Amhara do not consider the country as a colonizing state, they also want the disintegrative constitutional clause erased and argued Amhara ethno-nationalism should not go too far to the extent of leaving the federal Ethiopia respectively.

Political attitudes such as consideration of the country as a colonial state and the desire to leave the Ethiopian union are never changed while there is an accommodation of different ethnic groups through the federal arrangement. Those who consider Ethiopia as a colonial empire see the exercise of the federal state as yet another colonial trick and advocate "decolonization" instead. They are apparently living in part of the territory of the state but they do not acknowledge the sovereignty of the state. This development in Ethiopia contradicts an important prediction of the internal colonial thesis, namely that ethno nationalist mobilization is caused by segmentation in a cultural division of labor and softened when there is an accommodation (Meadwell 1993) [15]. Therefore, in Ethiopia still the perception of internal colonization is not doomed which is one of the symptoms for the asymmetric pattern of attachment inclined towards ethnic-in-group.

Little is gained, however, from viewing ethno nationalist politics in Ethiopia through the too narrow optic of internal colonization. This approach to ethnic mobilization fails to account for two central features of ethno nationalism: the current revival of Amhara nationalism: Amharas are the alleged colonizers along with Ethiopia according to many pan ethnic political organizations; and the perception of colonization is continued by the ethnic members of the power holders and comparatively advanced regions. The ethno nationalist movements in Tigray and Oromia are the most powerful movements in the developed part of the country as measures in terms of investment and infrastructure. Therefore, it is found that an assumption an internal condition as colonization is a political strategy than the result of the political and economic situations of the respective people.

Examination of statements given by key informants and participants in the questionnaire reveal that commitment to the existence of the state is different in two sampled groups. The hypothetical destruction of the state had created despair; consider it as self-destruction among 76.7% of the Amhara, of the 58.7% Oromo respondents.

Table 2: Cross-tabulation of ethnic background of the respondent and perception on the disintegrative constitutional clause/article 39 and internal colonialism

Ethnic Background of a Respondent	Disintegrative Constitutional Clause/Article 39			Perception of Internal Colonialism	
	Maintained	Erased	Indifferent	Yes	No
Amhara % within Ethnic Background	18.4%	63.7%	17.9%	12.7%	87.3%
Oromo % within Ethnic Background	67.5%	25.4%	7.1%	53.2%	46.8%

4.1. Desired Political Orientation

The survey respondents had let to distinguish between their feelings of closeness to ethnicity or the state. A comparison made between the choices of identity labels among respondents to the set of response categories. The table below contains ethnic consciousness with descriptive representation manipulation. It presents the bivariate cross-tabulations of the differences in closeness toward in-groups and state by ethnic group. The differences is quantitatively apparent between sampled ethnic groups in terms of the extent to which they report their ethnic being a factor in their ideas about politics. Oromos (59%) indicated that they are very close to their own particular in-group than Amhars (17.1 %). Conversely, a higher percentage of Amhars (82.9 %) indicate that they are very close to Ethiopia than other two ethnic groups Oromos (41%).

In terms of feelings of closeness to members of one's own ethnic group more than the half of Oromos respond affirmatively or consider them ethnically when they are think of politics. The vast proportion of members of this ethnic group says that their identity is important to their political organization. In contrast, 17.1 percent of the respondents of Amhara say that being Amhara is "not important" to their political identity. The proportion of Amhara respondents who say ethnicity is important to them in their political consciousness is much smaller. Though Amharas have a stronger ethnic consciousness these days compared to their past, they have less ethnic consciousness and more consciousness towards the state than other two ethnic groups.

The many of ethnic Amhara elites opposes the proliferation pan-Amhara political organizations and spends their entire political life advocating unity and Ethiopianess. A similar opposition appears among the Oromos and Somalis, but it is not as solid, outspoken and does not have a mass political base in the community as the one in Amhara. For Amharas Ethiopianess appears to be inseparable elements as much Amharaness, but Oromos and Somalis dissociates the nation/the state and their ethno nationalist movement. Within Amhara, the state has become so closely linked with their ethno nationalism.

Table 3: Cross-tabulation of ethnic background and ethnic differences in perceived closeness to in-groups and state

Ethnic Background of a Respondent	Preferred Identity Label		
	Ethiopian	Tigre/Amhara/Oromo/Somali	Total
Amhara % within Ethnic Background	82.9%	17.1%	100%
Oromo % within Ethnic Background	41.0%	59.0%	100%

4.2. Attachment to the Symbols

Symbols of national identity are important for national cohesion, but in fragmented countries one cannot expect them to be strong enough to generate a deep emotional commitment. Flag is viewed as the most important contentious issue particularly during the EPRDF [1] rein in

---

[1] Ethiopian People Revolutionary Democratic Front

Ethiopia. Numerous flags appear to represent different ethnic groups. The people are greatly polarized and the attachment of groups towards the state or ethnicity can be measured based on flag preference. There is a difference among groups over the type of flag they prefer to be with a clear ethnic pattern. The Amharas are broadly unaware of the color of their regional flag and prefer to wave the national flag (old and new), the Oromo public is divided on the flag issue between the OLF's and the regional states. By

no means the one dressing the state's flag and regional or other flags be equally attached. Detachment from the national symbol is so apparent in Oromia (52.1% and 20.4% of them prefers the OLF and regional state's flag respectively or 72.5% of them are detached from the national flag of the country). An ethnic group that attached to the state with the measures of flag preference is the Amhara ethnic group that is 86.1% of them prefer the new and old national flag of the state.

Table 4: Cross-tabulation of ethnic background of respondents and preferred symbol/flag that represents most

Ethnic Background of a Respondent	Party Flag	Regional Flag	Three colored national flag	Stared three colored national flag
Amhara % within Ethnic Background	1.3%	12.7%	75.6%	75.6%
Oromo % within Ethnic Background	52.1%	20.4%	11.1%	16.4%

Variation in Ethnic Claims

Political elites from the sampled ethnic group raised different ethnic claim and did an age old struggle to achieve them. What was unknown is the amount of support they have from the people they deemed to represent for the claim they want to achieve. Secessionism, irredentism, autonomy and ethnic corporatism are some of these claims propagated by the elites of respective ethnic groups. There is a variation and parallelism among groups in a type of claim provided to the mass. An ethnic group that wants question of irredentism and secession needs to be treated separately from the ethnic group that aspires autonomy and ethnic corporatism. Claims for separate statehood, at least in history, had resided within the ethnic struggles of the Oromos/OLF.

Many people with Oromo background see Ethiopia as an obstacle of their dream of being independent. They consider Ethiopia as imperialist nation against which ethnic groups should unite to repulse Abyssinian/Ethiopian colonialism. For instance Asafa (2004) [2], the well-meaning Oromo scholar, suggest that the future of the colonized peoples would be better served if they pool their resources toward the attainment of self-determination. The belief in these groups is that absolute self-rule/administration can best be exercised when either Ethiopia is reconstructed in a manner that awards more autonomy to ethnic regions some call these groups as a confederalist, or they declare independent statehood.

Nonetheless, because of the unwillingness of the Ethiopian government to negotiate over the issue of independence, they pretend to accept autonomy through federation as the next-best option. But even recently they are putting enormous political pressure to maximize this autonomy to get as close to independence as possible. Unlike to the theoretical prediction "greater autonomy given erodes the secessionist sentiment of aspirant" (Grotenhuis ND), in Ethiopia autonomy given for groups through federation fuel

their ambition to govern themselves through arrangements that gives more autonomy. Relative regional autonomy given through federalism never increased their sentiment towards the state.

An ethnic group is not a nation, but it can engage in a struggle for being a nation through a claim of statehood. Oromos ethnic group seeking to become a nation/or state of their own. The case in two ethnic groups is distinguished by the combination of popular support for ethno nationalism and the desire to translate it into a political independence. Around 41.3% of the respondents from Oromia support secessionism as a political project. By contrast, Amhara ethno nationalism had risen recently more aggressively demanding the "ethnic" status for their group in Tigray, Benishanguel Gumuz, Oromia and SNNP i.e. ethnic corporatism while there has been a consistent demand for equity for decades of Ethiopia's ethnic politics that branded them an oppressor. Moreover, they want to alter the regional boundaries to create the region that include their members unlawfully carved out and reside in neighboring regions i.e. indoor irredentism. Despite ethnic claims are on the rise in Amhara the overall trend among politicians and people of Amhara seems to be toward greater tolerance, interdependence and political integration. Amharas' has broad support for organizing along ethnic lines but the popular attitude makes it difficult for ethno nationalist leaders in Amhara to aspire political independence.

There is striking parallelism among groups in having number of pro ethnic political parties. Amharas had more than one pan ethnic political organizations like Oromos but unlike to them they are and they always are (According to informants) without the demand for an independent statehood and Ethiopian constitute to be their nationality. The survey data do not provide a consistent empirical rationale for the prediction that these individuals will be supporters of separatism.

Table 5: Cross-tabulation of ethnic background of respondents and preferred ethnic claims that resided in Ethiopia

Ethnic Background of a Respondent	Ethnic Claims				
	Secessionism	Autonomy	Irredentism	Hegemonism	Ethnic Corporatism
Amhara % within Ethnic Background	8.5%	31.9%	0.3%	7.8%	51.6%
Oromo % within Ethnic Background	41.3%	54.5%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%

Attachment as Manifested in the Election: A Cross Ethnic and Longitudinal Description

In a political market driven by politicians grown in pan

ethnic political situations, the cultivation of political support through the emphasizing to an ethnic group becomes common and creates unthoughtful, eager and consistent

consumers (Adams 1999). People want to support political parties that appear to represent their ethnic group's best interest and increase the proportion of members of their ethnic group of origin that propagate they want to be (Medrano 1998) [2]. Therefore, one of undoubtedly the most impressive measures of attachment to the state or ethnic particularity is the political support that ethnic groups give to political parties that are oriented to the state and ethnicity over the years. The nature and degree of attachment of an ethnic group can be known with the group's propensity to support political parties with the national or ethnic agenda. The analysis of electoral statistics of the 2005 and 2021 Ethiopian national election is made to establish a relationship between an identity of individual and preferred attachment.

The comparative look at the 2005 and 2021 Ethiopian national election results shows the declining ties of ethnic groups from the state towards their own ethnic group. Election results indicate that the relationship between pan ethnic political parties and support for them was generally weaker among Amharas than among Oromos and Somalis. The great majority of electorates in Oromia and Somali provide their vote to the parties regionally specific and ethnically oriented. Moreover, these regions are entirely occupied by pan ethnic political organizations and pan state parties are not around for electoral competitions. The Somali region is predominantly dominated by ethnic parties and seems not conducive for pro-state parties to compete there. Casting of vote in these regions is still done within the frame of ethnic interest that had discouraged pan-state political parties from going there. The availability of these levers provided incentives for the formation of a single province-oriented ethnic party in these regions. Elections in these regions emphasize ethnonational issues and their results are discussed mostly within the ethnic context.

The election results show that Oromos and Somalis feel satisfied to ethnic political parties when compared to how Amhars feel about pan Amhara political parties. Amharas were without a political party that advocates their own cause specifically in past elections. But in the recent election the party called National Movement of Amhara/NAMA was an active player in Amhara areas. However, even during this time the people had elected the trans-ethnic political party, Prosperity Party, headed by an Oromo from Jimma. The triumph of the Prosperity Party in Amhara within the presence of pro-ethnic political parties shows the pro-state position of the people. However, some favors for the pro-ethnic party called NAMA signifies the pro-ethnic moves of the Amhara. The election results from Amhara show the complex political situation in the region.

Most Amharas are concerned with the survival and well-being of the state and they have supported it both politically and economically. The breakdown of the 2005 election showed an enormous affinity towards Ethiopia as indicated in the election result. The combined score shows that the vast majority of electorates in the Amhara express favourable feelings towards pro-state political parties. However, a significant percentage of electorates in Oromia and Somali areas prefer to cast their vote to pro ethnic political associations. But the reality can shift with time and context. The patterns vary somewhat over time, but the essential contours of the relationship emerge in both

elections.

Asymmetry of Attachment among Groups: The Balance Sheet

The nation is not merely a positive manifestation of pride and solidarity; it is just as likely to be associated with conflict, pain, and despair (Davis 1999) [6]. Attachment cannot be held by contract and remain fixed throughout the period. The significance of a shared ethnic origin for political associations varies from place to place and group to group. It can vary at a time and over time. It is assumed to change over time as a result of presumed interaction among groups (Posner 2004) [24]. Dissimilarity and fluctuations of attachment for different denominations are common in countries where there are sects. Attachment in multiethnic nations can expand to include pan-national boundaries or can contract in ways that defy the state in favor of culturally distinct elements of groups (Okamoto, 2003) [22]. It is not restricted to a sole emphasis on ethnic origin or the state. Given the diversity of the country, Ethiopia, asymmetrical pattern of national and ethnic attachment is expected if not avoidable.

The finding indicates the level of closeness of two ethnic groups toward the state and ethnic ingroup. It offers insight about perceived patterns of attachment. In a survey plenty of evidence found for the claims of detachment from the state and attachment to own ethnic in-group in Ethiopia. Dissimilar trends with respect to closeness are found among respondents who identify with different denominations. Therefore, it is important to distinguish ethnic differences among a population, such as differences in language or culture, from ethnic mobilization. The former are potential bases for the latter. Linguistic, religious, somatic, or cultural differences are the building blocks for ethnic group formation; however, their simple presence does not guarantee mobilization (Negal and Olzak 1982) [17]. It is found that an ethnic group of the respondent is correlated with the proxy independent variables. The result reveals the significant relationship between an ethnic identity of an individual and preferred attachment pattern. While ethnic mobilizations across all four ethnic groups are similar, their attachment to the state and respective ethnic groups varies across them.

The analysis shows the significant growing trend towards the sub-national elements or popular support for an ethnic movement has increased. However, there is an apparent variation among the sampled ethnic groups over the proxy variables. The strong agreement displayed by the respondents from Oromo toward the proxy variables such as article 39, hypothetical disintegration of the state, political association in ethnic line and the desire to leave the federal Ethiopia might suggest the alienation of these ethnic groups toward political tribalism. They are more supportive to revolutionary ethnic claims such as more autonomy and secession or the creation of the sovereign state of Oromia than Amharas who prefers ethnic corporatism. Therefore, they express comparatively lower levels of attachment to the state. The study reveals that Oromos are strongly attached to their in-group than Amhara.

The widely shared view is that these days Amharas have become increasingly distant from the state. Relative to their own history they are detached themselves from pan state movements due to concern about potential loss of their own distinct identity. In a survey they do not dismiss their

---

2 Southern Nations, Nationalities and Peoples

desired political association with their own in-group, but not to the level of political tribalism that dismisses their pro-state attachment in politics they build it for centuries. The process of ethno-genesis, the process of defining ethnic identity, is now under way in Amhara as manifested in the formation of pan ethnic groups and popular demonstrations for Amhara causes. However, seen from the angels of Oromos, the Amhara ethnic group is apolitical ethnicity or does not reflect the more proactive form of ethnic attachment. It is found that the overall level of attachment among Amharas has not declined in a manner it is in other three sampled ethnic groups. Instead it has fluctuated between an attachment for the state and in-group.

The vast majority of Amharas see themselves as pro-Ethiopia. They feel that Ethiopia is symbolically belongs to them, or should. As one interviewee remarked in this study, "since the establishment of the central government of the country and since modern times or even before, the Amharas have assumed or consistently held highly favorable feelings toward the state". They retain a sense of attachment to and identification with Ethiopia more than the remaining three sampled ethnic groups. The data derived from the questionnaires are failed to produce any trace of the pro ethnic attachment among them as much in others. This can be the result of the Ethiopianization of the Amhara people during the last successive regimes with the active role played by elites of similar background. Therefore, ethno nationalism in Amhara is a personal experience and an element of self-identification than the character of the people as a group. It is important to draw a distinction between the Amhara ethno nationalist movement and the people of Amhara.

Even if an Amhara ethnic consciousness can be found, it is not function as group identity like Oromos. Ethnic consciousness for Amhara exists as a more latent identity compared to Oromos. This leads to conclude that at the aggregate level Amharas' attachment to the state has remained more or less steady, although there are indications of a downward trend in recent years. This is due to the reason that Amharas' do not have the memory of conquest and occupation that motivates Oromos for an independent statehood. Nor is the history of Amhara in Ethiopia marked by a lengthy period of repression like the Tigres, Oromos and Somalis claim to suffered. Moreover, the Ethiopian central government is consolidated by the earlier military and political campaigns of the Amharas so they are carriers of this historical burden. The result seems to be that the Amhara support for independent statehood non-existent. This suggests a very different picture than the common assertion about Amharas' that their relations with the state are strained. However, the Amharas are already occupied the more extreme position on the issue of regional territorial change in a manner that bring their members in adjacent regions towards single Amhara regional administration.

In comparison with Amharas, the other three ethnic groups have recourse to ethnic backgrounds. They feel close to their own ethnic in-group and demonstrate pan-ethnic links. The former speaks for the interests of the country as a whole, and the later views of their in-group. Unlike the Amharas, where pan state political movements have grown rapidly, the political movements in the other sampled groups are defined by mobilization along ethnic lines. Ethno-political discourse has gained currency among the three ethnic groups and tribal politicians have hardened their base

more than in Amhara. The Amharas have experienced the forced obliteration of attachment to the state or whose ties with Ethiopia were wrested from them through different political interventions that has not been part of the historical experience of other ethnic groups. Of course all of sampled ethnic groups were suffered from imposed forms of ethnic attachment, for the longer periods of time Amharas are able to counter it by claiming attachment to the state.

Moreover, there are seemingly contradictory stance and ethnic claims that shows the extent of asymmetry of attachment among groups further. The Tigre, Oromo and Somali ethno national movements had moved many steps beyond their counterpart in Amhara. The former three ethnic groups had ethnic separatist claims with the objective of making an independent state of their own but the later one had ethnic corporatist claim. Asafa (2004) [2] commented that despite the slowness of military success, the OLF is enjoying the support of the majority of the Oromo people without having to modify its program of creating independent Oromia. Support to these organizations show increased levels of emotional attachment of these people to their in-group.

The finding provides a consistent support for the claim that "there is asymmetrical pattern of ethnic and national attachment among respondents of different ethnic background". This suggests Ethiopia is in the midst of shift in attachment towards narrower identities replacing the one we had with the state. As indicated in the tables above the Amharas and Oromos are closest to their own in-group. However, the same result indicates the asymmetry of attachment of these groups for the state and in-group. They are not equally attached for both patterns of preferred labels. The attachment varies with an ethnic background of the person in question. Identities of the respondent have associations with the proxy variables that deemed to measure attachment. It is found that there are two publics in Ethiopia, one civic and the other is primordial or communal or ethnic.

Conclusion

It is claimed that the world is arrived at a post ethnic era where ethnicities are little import.

However, unlike to this hopeful claims consciousness along ethnic line today is the strongest single factor in the multi ethnic states. In these state, everywhere in the world, the issue of the relationship between peoples and their states has become part of domestic political agendas. The issue of attachment of groups is quite important for the multi-ethnic states where ethnic groups have a territorial identity like Ethiopia. The most striking conclusion drawn from the data in this study is that the attitudes of ethnic groups towards the state have not been remarkably stable and consistent.

The overall level of attachment to the state of Ethiopia has declined but not symmetric across sample ethnic groups. Attachment to particular ethnic groups seen as defensive strategy designed to maintain contact with rejecting the parent state. However, there are ethnic groups who are not tied to their primary identity or not support mobilizations along this identity and not be part of the ethnic movement. Since ethnic groups differ according to proxy variables, it would seem reasonable to think that some groups have a pro-state attachment than others. The Amhara is a trans-ethnic community compared to the Oromos. Essentially Amhara came under extraordinary pressures from aged pan

ethnic movements in Oromia and elsewhere to mobilize along the ethnic line. The Amharas pan state stance did declined if it is impossible to say it did collapsed, opening the way to the transition to pan ethnic objectives. Such a comparison would necessarily be tentative, as opposed to conclusive. The bonds between the state and ethnic groups must not be taken for granted rather should be closely guarded and cultivated.

References

1. Alemseged Abbay. Diversity and State building in Ethiopia. African Affairs. Oxford University Press on Behalf of The Royal African Society. 2004;103(413):593-614.
2. Asafa Jalata. The Process of State Formation in the Horn of Africa. Tylor & Francis Group; c2004.
3. Ayalon, Hannah, Eliezer Ben-Rafael, Stephen Sharot. The Costs and Benefits of Ethnic Identification. The British Journal of Sociology, Wiley on Behalf of the London School of Economics and Political Science. 1986;37(4):550-568.
4. Belachew Gebrewold. Ethiopian Nationalism: An Ideology to Transcend All Odds. Institute of African Affairs at GIGA, Hamburg: Germany. 2009;44(1):2997.
5. Blas Asier. The Spanish State's Response to Ethno-Cultural Diversity in Spain. In Peoples, Identities and Regions: Spain, Russia and The Challenges of the Multi Ethnic States, by Marina Martynova, David Peterson, Roman Ignatiev and Nerea Madariaga. Moscow: Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology Russian Academy of Science; c2015.
6. Cochran WG. Sampling Techniques 2nd ed. John Wiley and Sons; c1963.
7. Davis Thomas C. Revisiting Group Attachment: Ethnic and National Identity. Political Psychology International Society of Political Psychology; c1999. p. 25-47.
8. De la Garza, Rodolfo, DeSipio, Louis. Ethnic Ironies: Latino Politics, Westview; c1996.
9. Druckman D. Nationalism, Patriotism and Group Loyalty: A Social Psychological Perspective. Mershon International Studies; c1994.
10. Eisenberg, Avigaili. Reasons for Identity: A Normative Guide to the Political and Legal Assessment of Identity Claims. Oxford: Oxford University Press; c2009.
11. Grotenhuis Rene. (ND). A Program for Nation Building in Fragile State. Amsterdam University Press, ND.
12. Huynh Que-Lam, Thierry Devos, Hannah R. Attman. Boundaries of American Identity: Relations between Ethnic Group Prototypicality and Policy Attitudes. Political Psychology. International Society of Political Psychology. 2015;36(4):449-468.
13. Keller EJ. Making and Remaking State and Nation in Ethiopia. Boulder Co: Lynne Reinner Publisher; c2005.
14. Kessler T. Intergroup Projection, Group Based Emotions and Prejudice against Immigrants. European Journal of Social Psychology. 2010;40:985-997.
15. Kish, Leslie. Survey Sampling. John Wiley New York; c1965.
16. Leta L. What is Next in the Horn of Africa? Reconsidering the State and Self Determination. In State Crises, Globalization and National Movements in North East Africa, by Jaleta Asafa. London: Tylor & Francis Group; c2004.
17. John M. Ethiopia: The last Two Frontiers. Eastern Africa Series; c2011.
18. Hudson M. The Politics of Nationalism in Quebec. World Politics, Cambridge University Press. 1993;45(2):203-241.
19. Gudina M. Ethiopia: Competing Ethnic Nationalisms and the Quest for Democracy, 1960-2000. The Hague The Netherlands; c2000.
20. Negal, Joane, Susan Olzak. Ethnic Mobilization inn New and Old States: An Extension of the Competition Model. Social Problems. 1982;30:127-139.
21. Negal, Joan. Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture. Social Forces. 1994;41:152-176.
22. Okamato D. Towards A Theory of Pan Ethnicity: Exploring Asian American Collective Action. American Sociological Review. 2003;68:811-824.
23. Pinder, Sherrow O. The Politics of Race and Ethnicity in the United States: Americanization, De-Americanization, and Racialized Ethnic Groups. Palgrave Macmillan; c2010.
24. Posner, Daniel N. Measuring Ethnic Fractionalization in Africa. American Journal of Political Science. Midwest Political Science Association. 2004;48(4):849-863.
25. Scokpol, Teda. States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russian and China. Cambridge Unversity Press Cambridge; c1979.
26. Smith, Lahra. Voting for an Ethnic Identity: Procedural and Institutional Responses to Ethnic Conflict in Ethiopia. The Journal of Modern African Studies, Cambridge University Press. 2007;45(4):565-594.
27. Sidanius Jim, Seymour Feshbach, Shana Levin, Felica Pratto, et al. The Interface between Ethnic and National Attachment: Ethnic pluralism or Ethnic Dominance. Public Opinion Quarterly; c1997.
28. Stephenson W. The Study of Behavior: Q-Techniques and Its Methodologies. University of Chocago Press Chiago; c1953.
29. Waldzus S, Mummendey A, Wenzel M, Boettcher F. Groups Diverging Views about their Prototypicality. British Journal of Social Psychology. 2004;43:385-400.
30. Weber U, Mummendey A, Waldzus S. Perceived Legitimacy of Intergroup Status Differences: Its Prediction by Relative Intergroup Prototypicality. European Journal of Social Psychology. 2002;32:449-470.