

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

## الآية

قال تعالى :  
{ لِيَلَافِ قَرِيشٍ<sup>(١)</sup> إِلَافِهِمْ رِحْلَةَ الشَّتَاءِ  
وَالصَّيفِ<sup>(٢)</sup> فَلْيَعْبُدُوا رَبَّ هَذَا الْبَيْتِ<sup>(٣)</sup> الَّذِي  
أَطْعَمَهُمْ مَنْ جُوعٌ وَأَمَّنْهُمْ مَنْ حَوْفٍ<sup>(٤)</sup> }

صدق الله العظيم  
سورة قريش

# DEDICATION

To my mother and the  
soul of my father, to my

**uncle, to my teachers,  
brothers, sisters, friends  
and to every one who  
helped or supported with  
respect and gratitude.**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my Supervisor Abd Elmahmoud Hassan Elshiekh for his help that blended with the sternest, most unremitting vigilance to make this work possible. Also I would like to acknowledge my teacher Omaya Gesm alla and my colleague Musa Hamad Daff alla for their close supervision and assistance with the thesis work without which

this work could not have been possible. Thanks are also due to my brother Mussab Izzeldien and my friend Ahmed Hamdi for his help especially (data analysis).

I want also to thank my teachers:- Bakri, Abu baker Awad Sedeeg, Dr. Fatima, Dr. Alshafaa head of Extension and Rural Development Section of the College of Agricultural Studies (Shambat), Dr. Mohamed Badawee, for their kindness and great advices.

Thanks are also due to all German Agro Action (GAA) colleagues who put an enormous effort to help me specially my friends in Lagawa Locality:- Omer Mohammed Ali, Alhaj, Fatima, Fatouma, Bahga, Fairouz.

Acknowledgement with thanks are also due to all staff of German Agro Action, Community Development Fund (CDF), West Kordofan, Lagawa office for their kindness and help.

## ملخص الدراسة

هدفت هذه الدراسة للتعرف على أثر التدريب على رفع قدرات المبحوثين وتأثير كل ذلك على القدرة لتوفير الأغذية الازمة لحاجة مواطني المنطقة.

وقد تم إجراء هذه الدراسة في محلية لقاوه بولاية جنوب كردفان. وهي تقع في الجزء الغربي من الولاية ذي الطبيعة الجبلية بمساحة تصل إلى 16000 كم<sup>2</sup>. وهذه المحلية تعرف بإنتاجية زراعية عالية وخصوصاً في السهول الواقعة بين الجبال ، بالإضافة للمناطق الرعوية الواسعة. والمنطقة تأثرت بالحرب التي استمرت لما يزيد عن عشرين عاماً، الشئ الذي أدى لعدم إستقرار المواطنين في منطقة واحدة، ونزوحهم للمدن الكبيرة بالولاية. وقد كان هنالك اثر واضح لعدم الإستقرار هذا على توفر الأطعمة الكافية والمناسبة لحاجات المواطنين.

واستخدمت الدراسة منهج المسح الإجتماعي مع الإعتماد لجمع بيانات الدراسة على الإستبانة، الملاحظة والمقابلات كأدوات أولية، مع التقارير والمراجع والبحوث السابقة المتصلة بمجال الدراسة والشبكة العنكبوتية كأدوات ثانوية.

تم تحليل البيانات التي تم الحصول عليها مستخددين الحزم الإحصائية للدراسات الإجتماعية (SPSS) وكذلك مربع كاي وقد خرجت الدراسة بالعديد من النتائج، نذكر بعضها في الآتي:-  
-1 66.7% من المبحوثين رجال.

-2 100% من المبحوثين مستقرين بالمنطقة.

-3 43.3% من المبحوثين يصل متوسط افراد الاسرة لأكثر من 8 افراد.

-4 73.3% من المبحوثين يعتمدون النغير وافراد الاسرة لخدمة مزارعهم.

-5 88.3% من المبحوثين أقرروا بحصولهم علي البذور المحسنة.

-6 70.0% من المبحوثين كان مصدر حصولهم علي البذور المحسنة هي المنظمة الالمانية للعمل بالزراعة((GAA)) ووزارة الزراعة والمنظمات غير الحكومية.

-7 78.3% من المبحوثين يعترفون بأن المنظمة الالمانية للعمل بالزراعة تقوم بدعم جيد.

-8 تأثير العوامل الاقتصادية الاجتماعية للدراسة أشار بأن جنس المزارعين يؤثر علي تبني المحاريث المجرورة بالحيوان بشكل ملحوظ، تبعاً لتحليل مربع كاي

- حجم العائلة يؤثر علي المحاريث المجرورة بالحيوان بشكل ملحوظ لمجموعة المستجيبين.
- ليس هناك اختلافات بين عدد العمال القادرين علي العمل وتبني المحاريث المجرورة بالحيوان.
- ليس هناك اختلافات هامة بين جنس المزارعين ومصدر البذور في منطقة الدراسة.

وخرجت الدراسة بتوصيات عديدة هامة نذكر منها الآتي:-

- 1 لا بد من التوافق بين تقديم الخدمات والمعارف الالزمة لها لضمان إستدامة الخدمات.
- 2 توفير الخدمات والأنشطة الزراعية للمواطنين في الوقت المناسب لضمان نجاح برامج المشروع.
- 3 لا بد من تحديد إحتياجات المواطنين من الخدمات والأنشطة المطلوبة قبل بداية المشروع.
- 4 لا بد من اختيار الأنشطة المدروة للدخل المناسب للمواطنين مثل توفير الانعام المحسنة.

## **Abstract**

The main objective of the study is to know the effect of training on the up grading of capabilities of the research population and how far that influences the capacity of citizens to produce food as needed by the people of the area.

This study has been carried out in Lagawa Locality, South Kordofan State. This Locality is in the Western part of the state which is a mountainous of an area 16000Km<sup>2</sup>.

Lagawa is known with high agricultural productivity in the plains between the mountains in addition to rich pastures.

The state is influenced with war that continued for more than twenty years and most of the people migrated to big towns in South Kordofan, which greatly influenced availability of enough food for the people.

Social Survey is used for this study. Data has been collected using primary tools such as questionnaires, observation and interviews in addition to secondary tools such as reference books, previous related research, reports and the internet.

Data has been analysed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Chi- Squire.

The research came out with number of important results, some of which are mentioned below:-

1. 66.7% of research population are males.

2. 100% of the farmer are permanently resident in the area.
3. 43.3% of citizens have an average size of family members of more than 8 persons.
4. 73.3% of farmers depend on Nafeir and family labour for farming.
5. 88.3% of Farmers agreed that they got improved seeds.
6. 70.0% of farmers got improved seeds from GAA, ministry of Agriculture and other NGOs.
7. 78.3% from the research population agreed that GAA gave them a good support.
8. The effect of socio-economic factors of the study indicated that the sex of farmers significantly influence the adoption of animal traction.

According to Chi-Squire Test.

- The size of the family significantly influences the adoption of the animal traction for the respondents group.
- There were no significant differences between the number of capable workers and adoption of animal traction.
- There were no significant differences between the sex of the responded farmers and the source of the seeds in the study area.

The research gave number of important recommendations, some of which are mentioned below:-

1. To make sure of the sustainability of services needed, that knowledge has to be availed at the same time of providing services.
2. To avail services and Agricultural activities in suitable time for the success of the project.
3. Need assessment of services and agricultural activities for citizens should be before starting the project.
4. To choose suitable income – generating projects for citizens like restocking.

## **Glossary**

- **SPLM**:- Sudan Peoples Liberation Movement.
- **SPLA**:- Sudan Peoples Liberation Army
- **JMC**:- Joint Military Commission.
- **CPA**:- Comprehensive Peace Agreement.
- **PRA**:- Participatory Rapid Approach.
- **FAO**:- Food and Agriculture Organization.
- **WHO**:- World Health Organization.
- **USAID**:- United State Of America Agency for International Development.
- **CARE**:- Cooperation for Assistant and Relief Everywhere
- **UNDP**:- United Nation Development Programme.
- **NGOs**:- Non- Governmental Organizations.
- **CBOs**:- Capacity Building Organizations.
- **FSC**:- Food Security Committee.
- **M&E**:- Monitoring and Evaluation.
- **SRS**:- Simple Random Sampling.
- **MDGs**:- Millennium Development Goals.
- **IOM**:- International Organization Migration
- IDPs**:- International Displaced Peoples
- BMZ**:- (German): The Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
- WVI**:- World Vision International
- OFDA**:- Office of the US Foreign Disaster Assistance
- Bag**:- 30 Mallowa

**Mukhamas:-**1 mukhamas = 1.75 feddan

## LIST OF CONTENT

| <b>NO</b> | <b>The Title</b> | <b>Page</b> |
|-----------|------------------|-------------|
|           | Aya              | i           |
|           | Dedication       | ii          |
|           | Acknowledgement  | iii         |
|           | Abstract Arabic  | iv          |
|           | Abstract         | vi          |
|           | Glossary         | viii        |
|           | List of contents | ix          |
|           | List of Tables   | xx          |

### CHAPTER: ONE

|     |                           |   |
|-----|---------------------------|---|
| 1.1 | <b>Introduction</b>       | 1 |
| 1.2 | Objectives of the study   | 3 |
| 1.3 | Importance of the study   | 3 |
| 1.4 | Research problems         | 4 |
| 1.5 | Research questions        | 4 |
| 1.6 | Variables of the study    | 5 |
| 1.7 | Research Hypotheses       | 5 |
| 1.8 | Structure of the research | 5 |
| 1.9 | Definition of terms       | 6 |

### CHAPTER TWO

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

| <b>Section: One</b> |   | 7 |
|---------------------|---|---|
| 2.1                 | South Kordofan State                            | 7 |
| 2.1.1               | Population                                      | 7 |
| 2.1.2               | Most important crops                            | 7 |
| 2.1.3               | Animal resources                                | 7 |
| 2.1.4               | Most important towns                            | 7 |
| 2.1.5               | Localities                                      | 7 |
| 2.1.6               | Agricultural Background in South Kordofan state | 7 |

|                       |   |    |
|-----------------------|---|----|
| 2.1.6.1               | Soil type   | 8  |
| 2.1.7                 | Lagawa Locality   | 9  |
| 2.1.7.1               | Population  | 9  |
| 2.1.7.2               | Returnees   | 9  |
| 2.1.7.3               | Ecological feature  | 10 |
| 2.1.7.4               | Agriculture and Livestock   | 10 |
| 2.1.7.5               | Water sources   | 11 |
| 2.1.7.6               | Poverty line  | 11 |
| 2.1.7.7               | Infrastructures (Road, Trades, & Local markets, Humanitarian support, Conflicts and Awareness on the CPA        | 12 |
| <b>Section: Two</b>   |   | 16 |
| 2.2                   | Definition of food security, food insecurity and effectiveness  | 16 |
| 2.2.1                 | Food security   | 16 |
| 2.2.2                 | Food insecurity   | 16 |
| 2.2.3                 | The definition of the Effectiveness   | 16 |
| 2.2.4                 | Food security Concepts and Information Needs  | 16 |
| 2.2.5                 | Basic element of food security<br>1. food availability, access and utilization                                  | 18 |
| 2.2.6                 | Complementarities and Synergy between food and availability, access and utilization                             | 18 |
| 2.2.7                 | Risks and vulnerability   | 19 |
| <b>Section: Three</b> |   | 21 |
| 2.3                   | Capacity building   | 21 |
| 2.3.1                 | Introduction  | 21 |
| 2.3.2                 | Definition of the capacity building   | 21 |
| 2.3.3                 | Types of capacities food security projects can build in communities   | 22 |
| 2.3.4                 | Analytical and managerial capacities  | 22 |
| 2.3.5                 | General capacities  | 23 |
| 2.3.6                 | Example of how capacity building activities are instrumental to the achievement of project component objectives | 24 |
| 2.3.7                 | Actors involved in creating food security at the community level  | 25 |
| 2.3.8                 | Specific roles of community actors in building community food security  | 26 |

|                             |  |    |
|-----------------------------|--|----|
| 2.3.9                       | Local food security or development committees  | 30 |
| 2.3.10                      | Households and individuals   | 31 |
| 2.3.11                      | Addressing food security at multiple levels  | 33 |
| 2.3.12                      | Major World food Conferences World food summit,13-<br>17 November 1996,Rome,Italy<br>Summit on food security in Africa - Summit on Food<br>Security in Africa- Abuja, Nigeria 04-07 December<br>2006 | 34 |
| <b>Section: Four</b>        |  | 38 |
| 2.4                         | Introduction about German Agro Action(GAA)   | 38 |
| 2.4.1                       | Who is GAA?  | 38 |
| 2.4.2                       | Aim  | 38 |
| 2.4.3                       | Establishment  | 38 |
| 2.4.4                       | Donors   | 38 |
| 2.4.5                       | Mandate  | 38 |
| 2.4.6                       | GAA Project in the World   | 39 |
| 2.4.7                       | Ongoing Project in Sudan   | 39 |
| 2.4.8                       | German Agro Action in the Sudan  | 39 |
| 2.4.9                       | Logic of the projects  | 40 |
| 2.4.10                      | Style of working together  | 40 |
| 2.4.11                      | Capacities buildings trainings done by German Agro<br>Action (GAA) (2005-2007)   | 40 |
| 2.4.12                      | Comparative survey 2008 to Base line study 2004-<br>Impact of SDN1031BMZ 2004 Project Activities   | 41 |
| 2.4.13                      | Main Finding   | 44 |
| 2.4.14                      | Rural Development: General Overview<br>1-Concepts, Definition and Arguments<br>2- Rural Development Definition   | 45 |
| <b>CHAPTER THREE</b>        |  |    |
| <b>Research Methodology</b> |  |    |
| 3.1                         | Background of the study area   | 47 |
| 3.2                         | Population   | 48 |
| 3.3                         | Sample Size  | 48 |
| 3.4                         | Methods of data collection<br>1-Primary sources  | 48 |

|     |                     |    |
|-----|---------------------|----|
|     | 2-Secondary sources |    |
| 3.5 | Data analysis       | 48 |

| <b>CHAPTER FOUR</b>                            |   |    |
|--|---|----|
| <b>Analysis, Discussion and Interpretation</b> |   |    |
| 4.1  | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Sex of the farmer                       | 49 |
| 4.2  | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Status of residence                     | 49 |
| 4.3  | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Size of the family(Person)              | 50 |
| 4.4  | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Number of capable workers(Person)       | 50 |
| 4.5  | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Number of disabled individual workers   | 51 |
| 4.6  | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Type of labour used during farming      | 51 |
| 4.7  | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Village received seeds this year (2008) | 52 |
| 4.8  | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: in suitable time                | 52 |
| 4.9  | If not: what suitable time  | 53 |
| 4.10   | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Did you get any of what was distributed | 53 |
| 4.11   | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: plant it                        | 54 |
| 4.12   | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If plant: it enough                     | 54 |
| 4.13   | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Source of seeds                         | 55 |
| 4.14   | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Seeds variety                           | 56 |
| 4.15   | Frequency distribution and percentage of the  | 57 |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
|      | respondents by If improved: what the variety   |    |
| 4.16 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Food crop produced in the village                        | 58 |
| 4.17 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Major livestock in the village                           | 59 |
| 4.18 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Major vegetables produced in village                     | 60 |
| 4.19 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by What time you do cultivated vegetable?                   | 61 |
| 4.20 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Fertile farmland   | 62 |
| 4.21 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Extension agent(CAEW) visit HH                           | 63 |
| 4.22 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Get from the Extension service                           | 64 |
| 4.23 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Use Animal traction                                      | 65 |
| 4.24 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If use animal traction: How much benefit                 | 65 |
| 4.25 | Type of Animal traction used in the village  | 66 |
| 4.26 | If don't use Animal traction: Why?   | 67 |
| 4.27 | Prefer cultivating by tractor or plough  | 68 |
| 4.28 | If by tractor: Why?  | 68 |
| 4.29 | If by plough: Why?   | 69 |
| 4.30 | Other uses of plough   | 70 |
| 4.31 | Present water available  | 70 |
| 4.32 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The effects of water technical training                  | 71 |
| 4.33 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The effects of scarcity water technique                  | 72 |
| 4.34 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The role of GAA for water supply                         | 73 |
| 4.35 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by How many water sources have been before GAA intervention | 73 |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| 4.36 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by How many water sources are after GAA intervention   | 75 |
| 4.37 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The main source of water  | 76 |
| 4.38 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Water services provided by GAA  | 78 |
| 4.39 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by GAA implemented road activities   | 78 |
| 4.40 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: Type of activities  | 79 |
| 4.41 | The main activities through which people make a living  | 79 |
| 4.42 | Differences between men and women in terms of making a living   | 80 |
| 4.43 | If yes: what differences  | 81 |
| 4.44 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Role have been played by GAA  | 82 |
| 4.45 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The impact of GAA Lagawa intervention   | 84 |
| 4.46 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Change happened on your livelihood due to the GAA   | 84 |
| 4.47 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The source of support   | 85 |
| 4.48 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Form of support   | 85 |
| 4.49 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The kind of support the Frequency distribution and percentage household expect from supporters during the hard time | 86 |
| 4.50 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The level or degree of the effect of the capacity building in this village after GAA intervention as general        | 87 |
| 4.51 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The household receive income or commodity transfers   | 87 |

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.52 | Frequency distributed and percentage of the respondents by Concrete and practical things that can be done to assist households with their means of livelihood | 88  |
| 4.53 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Type of Animal are owned  | 89  |
| 4.54 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Received goats from GAA   | 90  |
| 4.55 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: how do you evaluate the impact  | 90  |
| 4.56 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Kind of development change could you estimate due to GAA intervention                             | 91  |
| 4.57 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Small Project provided by GAA   | 91  |
| 4.58 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The main reason for conflict  | 92  |
| 4.59 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by How much conflict affects development?  | 93  |
| 4.60 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by How much conflict affects agricultural production?  | 93  |
| 4.61 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by NGOs, Local government, Native administration support coexistence                                 | 94  |
| 4.62 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: how can they support it?  | 95  |
| 4.63 | Frequency distribution and percentage of respondents by Sorghum Cultivated area / Mukhamas  | 96  |
| 4.64 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Sorghum Crop yield / Bag  | 97  |
| 4.65 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Millet Cultivated area / Mukhamas   | 98  |
| 4.66 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Millet Crop yield / Bag   | 99  |
| 4.67 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the  | 100 |

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
|      | respondents by Sesame Cultivated area / Mukhamas  |     |
| 4.68 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Sesame Crop yield / Bag                   | 101 |
| 4.69 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Groundnuts Cultivated area / Mukhamas     | 102 |
| 4.70 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Groundnuts Crop yield / Bag               | 103 |
| 4.71 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Maize Cultivated area / Mukhamas          | 104 |
| 4.72 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Maize Crop yield / Bag                    | 105 |
| 4.73 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Cowpeas Cultivated area / Mukhamas        | 106 |
| 4.74 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Cowpeas Crop yield / Bag                  | 107 |
| 4.75 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Vegetables Cultivated area / Mukhamas     | 108 |
| 4.76 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Vegetables Crop yield / Bag               | 109 |
| 4.77 | Chi-square test for Sex of the farmers and adoption of Animal traction techniques.                    | 110 |
| 4.78 | Chi-square test for Size of the family and adoption of Animal traction techniques.                    | 111 |
| 4.79 | Chi-square test for Number of capable workers and adoption of Animal traction techniques. (cross tab) | 112 |
| 4.80 | Chi-square test for Sex and the Source of seeds   | 113 |

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations.

|                   |                     |     |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----|
| 5.1               | Summary of Findings | 114 |
| 5.2               | Conclusions         | 119 |
| 5.3               | Recommendations     | 120 |
|                   | References          | 123 |
| <b>Appendices</b> |                     |     |
|                   | Questionnaire       | 125 |

|  |   |     |
|--|---|-----|
|  | Map of Cattle Route in Lagawa Locality                | 134 |
|  | Map of South Kordofan – Lagawa<br>GAA activities 2009 | 135 |
|  | Infrastructure in Lagawa Locality                     | 136 |

## List of Tables

| <b>NO</b> | <b>The Title</b>  | <b>Page</b> |
|-----------|---|-------------|
| 1.1       | Lagawa Locality Population  | 1           |
| 1.2       | The dependant and Independents Variables  | 5           |
| 3.1       | Villages Name of the study population   | 48          |
| 4.1       | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Sex of the farmer                       | 49          |
| 4.2       | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Status of residence                     | 49          |
| 4.4       | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Size of the family(Person)              | 50          |
| 4.5       | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Number of capable workers(Person)       | 50          |
| 4.6       | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Number of disabled individual workers   | 51          |
| 4.7       | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Type of labour used during farming      | 51          |
| 4.8       | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Village received seeds this year(2008)  | 52          |
| 4.9       | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: in suitable time                | 52          |
| 4.10      | If not: what suitable time  | 53          |
| 4.11      | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Did you get any of what was distributed | 53          |
| 4.12      | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: plant it                        | 54          |
| 4.13      | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If plant: it enough                     | 54          |
| 4.14      | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Source of seeds                         | 55          |
| 4.15      | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Seeds variety                           | 56          |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| 4.16 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If improved: what the variety                            | 57 |
| 4.17 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Food crop produced in the village                        | 58 |
| 4.18 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Major livestock in the village                           | 59 |
| 4.19 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Major vegetables produced in village                     | 60 |
| 4.20 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by What time you do cultivated vegetable?                   | 61 |
| 4.21 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Fertile farmland   | 62 |
| 4.22 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Extension agent(CAEW) visit HH                           | 63 |
| 4.23 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Get from the Extension service                           | 64 |
| 4.24 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Use Animal traction                                      | 65 |
| 4.25 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If use animal traction: How much benefit                 | 65 |
| 4.26 | Type of Animal traction used in the village  | 66 |
| 4.27 | If don't use Animal traction: Why?   | 67 |
| 4.28 | Prefer cultivating by tractor or plough  | 68 |
| 4.29 | If by tractor: Why?  | 68 |
| 4.30 | If by plough: Why?   | 69 |
| 4.31 | Other uses of plough   | 70 |
| 4.32 | Present water available  | 70 |
| 4.34 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The effects of water technical training                  | 71 |
| 4.35 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The effects of scarcity water technique                  | 72 |
| 4.36 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The role of GAA for water supply                         | 73 |
| 4.37 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by How many water sources have been before GAA intervention | 73 |
| 4.38 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by  | 75 |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
|      | How many water sources are after GAA intervention   |    |
| 4.39 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The main source of water  | 76 |
| 4.40 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Water services provided by GAA  | 78 |
| 4.41 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by GAA implemented road activities   | 78 |
| 4.42 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: Type of activities  | 79 |
| 4.43 | The main activities through which people make a living  | 79 |
| 4.44 | Differences between men and women in terms of making a living   | 80 |
| 4.45 | If yes: what differences  | 81 |
| 4.46 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Role have been played by GAA  | 82 |
| 4.47 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The impact of GAA Lagawa intervention   | 84 |
| 4.48 | Frequency distribution and percentage for the respondents by Change happened on your livelihood due to the GAA  | 84 |
| 4.49 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The source of support   | 85 |
| 4.50 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Form of support   | 85 |
| 4.51 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The kind of support the Frequency distribution and percentage household expect from supporters during the hard time | 86 |
| 4.52 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The level or degree of the effect of the capacity building in this village after GAA                                | 87 |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
|      | intervention as general   |    |
| 4.53 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The household receive income or commodity transfers   | 87 |
| 4.54 | Frequency distributed and percentage of the respondents by Concrete and practical things that can be done to assist households with their means of livelihood | 88 |
| 4.55 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Type of Animal are owned  | 89 |
| 4.56 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Received goats from GAA   | 90 |
| 4.57 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: how do you evaluate the impact  | 90 |
| 4.58 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Kind of development change could you estimate due to GAA intervention                             | 91 |
| 4.59 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Small Project provided by GAA   | 91 |
| 4.60 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by The main reason for conflict  | 92 |
| 4.61 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by How much conflict affects development?  | 93 |
| 4.62 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by How much conflict affects agricultural production?  | 93 |
| 4.63 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by NGOs, Local government, Native administration support coexistence                                 | 94 |
| 4.64 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by If yes: how can they support it?  | 95 |
| 4.65 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Sorghum Cultivated area / Mukhamas  | 96 |
| 4.66 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the  | 97 |

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
|      | respondents by Sorghum Crop yield / Bag   |     |
| 4.67 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Millet Cultivated area / Mukhamas         | 98  |
| 4.68 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Millet Crop yield / Bag                   | 99  |
| 4.69 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Sesame Cultivated area / Mukhamas         | 100 |
| 4.70 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Sesame Crop yield / Bag                   | 101 |
| 4.71 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Groundnuts Cultivated area / Mukhamas     | 102 |
| 4.72 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Groundnuts Crop yield / Bag               | 103 |
| 4.73 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Maize Cultivated area / Mukhamas          | 104 |
| 4.74 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Maize Crop yield / Bag                    | 105 |
| 4.75 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Cowpeas Cultivated area / Mukhamas        | 106 |
| 4.76 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Cowpeas Crop yield / Bag                  | 107 |
| 4.77 | Frequency distribution and percentage of the respondents by Vegetables Cultivated area / Mukhamas     | 108 |
| 4.78 | Frequency distribution and percentage of respondents by Vegetables Crop yield / Bag                   | 109 |
| 4.79 | Chi-square test for Sex of the farmers and adoption of Animal traction technique.                     | 110 |
| 4.80 | Chi-square test for Size of the family and adoption of Animal traction techniques.                    | 111 |
| 4.81 | Chi-square test for Number of capable workers and adoption of Animal traction techniques. (cross tab) | 112 |

