

Effectiveness of Community Action Plans on Farmers' Livelihood in the Caprivi Region, Namibia.

KINGSLEY MABUKU KWENANI

Effectiveness of Community Action
Plans on Farmers' Livelihood in the
Caprivi Region, Namibia.

By

Kingsley Mabuku Kwenani

University of Pretoria

2009



The Effectiveness of Community Action Plans on Farmers' Livelihood in
the Caprivi Region, Namibia.

By

Kingsley Mabuku Kwenani

Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Degree of

MInstAgrar: Agricultural Extension

Supervisor: Dr. S.E. Terblanché

Department of Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development

Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

University of Pretoria

2009

DECLARATION

“I declare that this thesis which I am submitting to the University of Pretoria for the Magister Institutionis Agrariae degree represents my own work and has never been submitted by me to any other tertiary Institution for any degree.”

KINGSLEY MABUKU KWENANI

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to many people for making this thesis possible.

My profound gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr. S.E. Terblanché for his untiring support throughout my Masters studies. I would like to acknowledge with thanks his intellectual guidance and importantly the patience he showed throughout the course of my work. His enormous contribution shaped this work to what it is. Acknowledgement goes also to the Department of Statistics (University of Pretoria), in particular, Jaqui Somerville who assisted with data analysis.

My studies were made possible by joint funding from “The STEAR Project” in the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry and The African American Institute through the Ministry of Education, for which I am most grateful. Furthermore, I would like to express my appreciation to Mr. Jack Matanyaire (STEAR), Mrs. MM Kambinda (DEES), Mr. Piet Horn (DEES) for their encouragement and support.

To my family, especially my lovely wife, Estie Kwenani, for her love, strength, motivation and inspiration throughout my studies. I really thank her for understanding. My kids, Phinnie, Kingsley Junior and Arusha, I cannot thank them enough for their support. Thanks also go to my father, Mr. Mixon Kwenani, my late mother, Kanyemba Veronica (Bana Nasilele) Kwenani, my brothers, and sisters for being there at all times.

Finally, I am grateful to God for his guidance and protection during my studies.

ABSTRACT

The Effectiveness of Community Action Plans on Farmer's Livelihood in the Caprivi Region

By

Kingsley Mabuku Kwenani

Supervisor: Dr. S.E. Terblanché

Department: Agricultural Economics, Extension and Rural Development

Degree: M. InstAgrar (Agricultural Extension)

The Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services (DEES) in the Caprivi Region introduced the concept of Community Action Plan (CAP) in 2005 as a tool for implementing the Farming Systems Research and Extension (FSRE) approach. The Directorate's main aim is to have functional Community Action Plans (CAP) in all communities in the Caprivi Region. Although CAP is a useful tool for implementing the FSRE approach in rural communities, not every stakeholder perceives it to be useful. Therefore the purpose of this study is to ascertain the usefulness of Community Action Plans as a strategy to support a bottom up extension approach. Three groups in the Caprivi Region, namely, Extension Staff, Mubiza Community and the Bukalo Community were selected to determine their knowledge and perception of CAP. The Mubiza community implements a Community Action Plan while Bukalo community does not implement a Community Action Plan. Two structured questionnaires were administered to a total of 95 respondents. Of these respondents, twenty two (22) were Extension staff, thirty seven (37) were from the Mubiza community and thirty six (36) were from the Bukalo community.

There were no significant differences occurring between the two communities with regard to independent variables such as gender, age and education level. However, in respect of variables such as contact with extension staff and attendance of extension

meetings there were differences. Clearly Mubiza community respondents had more contact and they attended meetings more often than respondents from Bukalo community. The majority of the Mubiza respondents 91% indicated that they planned their development activities using CAP while 75% of the Bukalo respondents indicated that they have no plans. Respondents from the Mubiza community are significantly more satisfied ($p = < 0.0001$) with the support they received from the Agricultural Extension Technicians than those from Bukalo. The study reveals also that there is significantly more involvement and participation in community development by members of the Mubiza community.

While 92% of respondents from Mubiza community indicated quite clearly that they received appropriate support from the community leaders, only 42% of the respondents from Bukalo community indicated receiving such appropriate support from their leaders. Both, Extension staff and the respondents from the Mubiza Community, perceived the CAP as an effective tool for implementing the FSRE approach and improving the livelihood of communities.



Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	I
ABSTRACT.....	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	IV
LIST OF TABLES.....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VII

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1	DEFINITION OF TERMS	1
1.2	AREA OF STUDY	2
1.3	POPULATION ISSUES.....	3
1.4	HISTORY OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION PROGRAM PLANNING IN CAPRIVI.....	4
1.5	RATIONAL OF THE STUDY.....	6
1.6	STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	6
1.7	THE IDENTIFIED PROBLEM:	7
1.8	PROBLEM CONCEPTUALIZATION.....	7
1.9	OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY	10
1.10	THE HYPOTHESIS.....	10
1.11	RESEARCH QUESTIONS	10

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	INTRODUCTION	12
2.2	THE CONCEPT OF EXTENSION	12
2.3	THE TOP DOWN STRATEGY (TRADITIONAL TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY).....	13
2.4	PARTICIPATORY BOTTOM UP APPROACH	15
2.5	FARMING SYSTEMS RESEARCH AND EXTENSION APPROACH.....	16
2.6	COMMUNITY ACTION PLANS (CAP)	16
2.7	IMPORTANCE OF FORMULATING, IMPLEMENTING AND MANAGING DEVELOPMENT PLANS.....	17
2.8	VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES	18

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	INTRODUCTION	19
3.2	RESEARCH INSTRUMENT	19
3.3	SAMPLING PROCEDURE	19
3.4	DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE.....	20
3.5	DATA ANALYSIS.....	20

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SOCIO ECONOMIC OR INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES EFFECTING THE MUBIZA AND BUKALO COMMUNITIES ADOPTION OF THE CAP STRATEGY

4.1	INTRODUCTION	22
4.2	SOCIO-ECONOMIC VARIABLES (INDEPENDENT) AND DEPENDENT AFFECTING THE ADOPTION OF CAP IN THE MUBIZA AND THE BUKALO COMMUNITIES.	23
4.3	A COMPARISON OF SOCIO ECONOMIC VARIABLES OF THE MUBIZA AND THE BUKALO RESPONDENTS.....	47
4.4	A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE MUBIZA AND THE BUKALO RESPONDENTS' DEPENDENT VARIABLES.....	49

CHAPTER FIVE

INDEPENDENT AND INTERVENING VARIABLES INFLUENCING EXTENSION STAFF BEHAVIOUR.

5.1	INTRODUCTION	51
5.2	INDEPENDENT VARIABLES INFLUENCING EXTENSION STAFF BEHAVIOUR	51
5.3	THE EFFECT OF INTERVENING VARIABLES ON EXTENSION STAFF PERCEPTIONS ON ADOPTION AND NON-ADOPTION OF CAP	52



CHAPTER SIX

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CAP STRATEGY: A COMPARISON BETWEEN EXTENSION STAFF AND MUBIZA COMMUNITY AND BETWEEN MUBIZA COMMUNITY AND BUKALO COMMUNITY

6.1 INTRODUCTION	65
6.2 COMPARISON OF VIEWS OF EXTENSION STAFF AND MUBIZA COMMUNITY REGARDING A CAP	65
6.3 COMPARISON BETWEEN MUBIZA AND A COMMUNITY WITH NO CAP (BUKALO).....	67

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 INTRODUCTION	76
7.2 INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	77
7.3 CONCLUSION	78
7.4 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	81
REFERENCES:.....	82
APPENDIX A: FARMER QUESTIONNAIRE.....	85
APPENDIX B: STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE.....	94

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
TABLE 4.1:	MUBIZA COMMUNITY RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO GENDER.....	23
TABLE 4.2:	MUBIZA RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO HOUSEHOLD HEADS	24
TABLE 4.3	MUBIZA COMMUNITY RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO AGE.....	25
TABLE 4.4:	MUBIZA COMMUNITY RESPONDENTS' EDUCATION LEVELS.....	26
TABLE 4.5:	MUBIZA COMMUNITY RESPONDENTS' FARMING EXPERIENCE	26
TABLE 4.6:	MUBIZA COMMUNITY RESPONDENTS' EXPERIENCE IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	27
TABLE 4.7:	MUBIZA RESPONDENTS' AWARENESS OF THE EXISTENCE AET IN THEIR AREA.....	27
TABLE 4.8:	INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM EXTENSION STAFF	28
TABLE 4.9:	ATTENDANCE OF EXTENSION MEETINGS	29
TABLE 4.10:	LEAFLETS RECEIVED FROM EXTENSION STAFF	29
TABLE 4.11:	AGRICULTURAL INFORMATION RECEIVED THROUGH RADIO	30
TABLE 4.12:	THE TYPE OF SUPPORT PROVIDED BY LEADERS TO THE COMMUNITY	31
TABLE 4.13:	LEADERSHIP STYLES REQUIRED IN THE CAP PROCESS	31
TABLE 4.14:	SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM DEVELOPMENTAL AGENTS DURING THE PLANNING PROCESS.....	32
TABLE 4.15:	REASONS WHY CAP IMPROVES THE COMMUNITY'S LIVELIHOOD	33
TABLE 4.16:	LIVELIHOOD SOURCES BEFORE 1995.....	33
TABLE 4.17:	LIVELIHOOD SOURCES AFTER 1995.....	34
TABLE 4.18:	ROLE PLAYERS IN MUBIZA COMMUNITY	35
TABLE 4.19:	SUPPORT PROVIDED BY ROLE PLAYERS	35
TABLE 4.20:	BUKALO COMMUNITY RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO GENDER.....	36
TABLE 4.21:	BUKALO RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO GENDER OF HOUSEHOLD HEADS	36
TABLE 4.22:	BUKALO RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO AGE.....	37
TABLE 4.23:	BUKALO COMMUNITY RESPONDENTS' EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	37
TABLE 4.24:	BUKALO RESPONDENTS' FARMING EXPERIENCE	38
TABLE 4.25:	BUKALO RESPONDENTS' EXPERIENCE IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.....	38
TABLE 4.26:	AWARENESS OF THE PRESENCE OF THE AET	39
TABLE 4.27:	INFORMATION RECEIVED FROM EXTENSION STAFF	39
TABLE 4.28:	ATTENDANCE OF EXTENSION MEETINGS.....	40
TABLE 4.29:	LEAFLETS RECEIVED FROM EXTENSION.....	40
TABLE 4.30:	INFORMATION RECEIVED BY MEANS OF THE RADIO.....	41

TABLE 4.31: SUPPORT PROVIDED TO THE COMMUNITY BY LEADERS	42
TABLE 4.32: LEADERSHIP STYLE REQUIRED IN THE COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN PROCESS	43
TABLE 4.33: SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM DEVELOPMENT AGENTS DURING THE PLANNING PROCESS	43
TABLE 4.34: CAP'S IMPACT ON THE LIVELIHOOD OF THE COMMUNITY	44
TABLE 4.35: LIVELIHOODS SOURCES BEFORE 1995	44
TABLE 4.36: LIVELIHOODS SOURCES AFTER 1995	45
TABLE 4.37: THE ROLE PLAYERS IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN BUKALO	45
TABLE 4.38: SUPPORT PROVIDED BY ROLE PLAYERS TO BUKALO COMMUNITY	46
TABLE 5.12: EXTENSION STAFF'S VIEW OF ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS TO THE FSRE APPROACH.....	61
TABLE 5.13: EXTENSION STAFF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION AND REASONS OF THE BEST APPROACH IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING	62
TABLE 5.14: EXTENSION STAFF'S VIEWS ON THE SUPPORT THEY HAD RECEIVED FROM COMMUNITY LEADERS	62
TABLE 5.15: EXTENSION STAFF'S VIEWS THE SUPPORT THEY HAD RECEIVED FROM THE VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES .	63
TABLE 5.16: EXTENSION STAFF'S PERCEPTION OF THE VDC'S KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	64
TABLE 6.2: A COMPARISON OF MUBIZA AND BUKALO RESPONDENTS REGARDING PLANNING DEVELOPMENTAL ACTIVITIES	67
TABLE 6.3: A COMPARISON OF SATISFACTION WITH SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM AETs	68
TABLE 6.6: MUBIZA AND BUKALO PERCEPTIONS ON HOW COMMUNITY ACTION PLAN	71
TABLE 6.7: RATING OF COMMUNITY PLANNING PROCESS	71
TABLE 6.8: PERCEPTION OF MUBIZA AND BUKALO COMMUNITIES' INVOLVEMENT IN	72
TABLE 6.9: MUBIZA AND BUKALO RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTION OF THE BEST WAY TO PLAN	73
TABLE 6.10: COMPARISON OF SUPPORT RECEIVED BY MUBIZA AND BUKALO FROM COMMUNITY LEADERS AND THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE VDC	74
TABLE 6.11: COMPARISON OF MUBIZA AND BUKALO RESPONDENTS ON THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF.....	74
TABLE 6.12: FREQUENCY OF LISTENING TO AGRICULTURAL INFORMATION ON RADIO	75

List of Figures

Figure	Description	Page
FIGURE 1:	A CONCEPTUALISATION OF THE PROBLEMS WITH REGARD TO CAP.	9

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Definition of Terms

1.1.1 Effectiveness

According to the Oxford Dictionary effectiveness is derived from the word effective which means something which works well and produces results that were intended. Effectiveness is the degree to which goals are attained (Prokopenko, 1987). Alternatively, effectiveness is a measure of program impact as compared to the intended goals (Bruneau H 1994). For the purpose of this study, effectiveness refers to how Community Action Plans are utilized as a useful tool for improving the livelihood of the community in the Caprivi Region.

1.1.2 Community Action Plan (CAP)

A Community Action Plan is a facilitative process in which communities take charge of their developmental agendas with support from developmental agents (Matanyaire, Kambinda and Urben, 2003). It is a tool or strategy that helps communities to establish a common vision by understanding their situation, identifying opportunities as well as potential options in order to address priority problems. Communities identify through community action plans their developmental potential and constraints. They then prioritize them. Action plans on how to solve the identified problems are developed and the plans are expected to yield positive outcomes. This process allows the community to own the problems as well as the expected outcomes.

1.1.3 Livelihood

According to Kirsten (2003), livelihood is the interaction between long term strategies and choices made by a household and the coping strategies which they use in responding to short term shocks. Livelihood can be understood as comprising capabilities, assets and activities required by a community as a means for a living (DFID, 1999).

In the light of the two definitions, livelihood is understood in this study; as a dynamic realm that integrates both opportunities and assets available to a community in order for it to achieve desired goals and aspirations.

1.2 Area of study

1.2.1 Location

Caprivi is one of the 13 political regions of Namibia. The region forms the country's finger-like projection in the northeast. It extends Namibia's borders into the centre of southern Africa. It is attached to the rest of the country along a short border. Caprivi is bounded by four countries: Botswana to the south, Angola and Zambia to the north, and Zimbabwe to the east. The region lies about halfway between the equator and the southern tip of the continent and midway between the Atlantic and Indian Oceans..

In broad terms, the region stretches 450km from east to west and ranges from 32 and 100 kilometres in width from north to south. It covers an area of about 20 000 square kilometres, (Mendelsohn and Roberts, 1997). The specific study area is the Mubiza community situated about 25km east of the Caprivi Region's main town, Katima Mulilo. Bukalo community is located about 36km east of Katima Mulilo. Mubiza community utilises a Community Action Plan while Bukalo community does not use an action plan.

1.2.2 Rainfall

The annual rainfall in the area ranges from 500mm to 700mm. In eastern Caprivi, the rainfall is approximately 600-700mm (Starkey, 1992), while in the north-east around

Katima Mulilo, the average total rainfall amounts to less than 700mm and model values are about 550mm per year. In the southern-most parts of the region, rainfall averages are approximately 500 mm and model totals are about 400mm. In the west of Caprivi, average rainfall is approximately 600mm while modal rainfall is about 550mm (Mendelsohn et.al, 1997).

1.2.3 Topography

Topographically, the Caprivi Region is particularly flat without a single recognizable feature of a hill. From the highest areas in the extreme west (about 1100m above sea level) elevations gradually drop to 930 m above sea level near Impalila Island in the east (Mendelsohn and Roberts, 1997). The North-western part is slightly raised. The flat topography combined with the heavy nature of the soil causes poor drainage.

1.2.4 Vegetation

The vegetation in the region is influenced by three main factors: the soil types, flooding and fire. Soil texture, depth, nutrient content, concentrations of salts, and the soil's ability to hold water, affect the types of plants found in the region, their vigour and size. There are six land types in the region that form six broad vegetation communities, namely: open water; floodplains; riverine woodlands; Mopane woodlands; Kalahari woodlands and Impalila woodlands. There is a considerable variation within these categories such that certain plants are abundant and important in one area, but absent in other areas. Trees may be tall and well grown in one area but small and shrubby in another (Mendelsohn and Roberts, 1997).

1.3 Population Issues

1.3.1 Number of farming households

According to the 2001 Namibian Population and Housing Census the total population of the Caprivi Region is 79 852, while the average household size is 4.7. Hence, the number

of households in the region is 16 846. The population comprises of 40 684 females and 39 168 males.

1.3.2 Percentage of urban female households

The Census reveals also that 15 % of the total population lives in the urban area. Approximately 39% of the household heads are female while the rest are male. A significant segment of the population (34%) is in the economic active age group of which 51% are unemployed and the majority of whom are women.

About 47% of households are regarded as poor, spending or using more than 60% of their total income (in cash and kind) on food. This poor group includes the San people, female-headed households and the elderly, people with limited remittances and high dependency ratios, as well as unskilled and unemployed single mothers in Katima urban area. The San lack formal education, are extremely poor and highly vulnerable to all potential hazards (natural and man-made). They are located predominantly in western Caprivi and their access to services is more limited.

1.3.3 Population density

The region's population is young with 39% under 15 years of age. The proportion of the population aged 60 years and above is only 6%, a relatively low percentage. According to the human development indices for the region, life expectancy is 43 years for females and 41 years for males. In the region, adult literacy is 78% while school enrolment is 85.7%. Human Development Index stands at 0.468.

1.4 History of Agricultural extension program planning in Caprivi

1.4.1 Pre-independence

In the late 1980's and early 1990's government's Agricultural Extension Services were focused mainly on providing subsidized agricultural services such as ploughing, farming

input sales, the development and maintenance of farm infrastructure as well as the administration of government programmes such as drought relief and credit schemes. The extension program planning exercise was mainly a top down approach. The achievement of development targets by development agents became more important than meeting the needs of the communities.

1.4.2 At independence

In the 1990s, things began to change with the realization that many of these agricultural extension services were not benefiting the majority of farmers and that they were often best provided by the private sector.

New approaches were introduced and they stressed the provision of advice, information, communication and farmer training services. The objectives of new extension services were to support farmers to develop and adopt improved farming technologies and practices, to organize themselves into self-help groups and to provide better interaction with agricultural markets, services, infrastructure, laws and policies in which they operated. (Rural Extension Material Unit, 1995).

1.4.3 FSRE era

In 1995, the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) adopted the Farming Systems Research and Extension (FSRE) approach. It replaced the top down Transfer of Technology (ToT) approach.

The Namibian Farming Systems Research and Extension approach is a responsive, non-prescriptive, flexible way of providing research and extension support. Hence, it is a farmer participatory approach that is demand driven, dynamic and iterative; inter disciplinary, multi disciplinary and collaborative. The Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry, through the Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services in Caprivi Region, introduced the concept of Community Action Plans (CAP) in 2005 as a strategy for implementing FSRE.

The main aim of the Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services is to have functional Community Action Plans in all communities in the Caprivi Region. A number of developmental priorities have been identified and action plans developed. For example, a seed cooperative was established in the Impalila area. This project gave positive indications regarding the potential of Community Action Plans to produce desired outputs that would contribute towards community development and improve community livelihood in the region.

1.5 Rational of the study

In spite of the Community Action Plan strategy showing distinct advantages, some communities are still lagging behind in utilizing this strategy. The perception among the extension staff of the Ministry of Agriculture and some farmers is that the Transfer of Technology (TOT) approach is better than the FSRE. This may be due to the fact that when the FSRE approach was adopted by the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry in 1995, it experienced limitations during the implementation phase. In order to address these limitations Community Action Plan was introduced.

The justification of this study is to ascertain the effectiveness of the Community Action Plans as a tool in the implementation of the FSRE approach in improving community livelihood as compared to the To T approach.

1.6 Statement of the research problem

The Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services in Caprivi Region introduced the concept of Community Action Plan in 2005 as a tool for implementing the FSRE approach. The ultimate aim is to have functional Community Action Plans in all communities in the Caprivi Region. Although a Community Action Plan is a useful tool for implementing the FSRE approach in rural communities, it is not perceived by all stakeholders as being useful. The purpose of this study is therefore to determine the

usefulness of Community Action Plans as a strategy for supporting a bottom up extension program.

1.7 The Identified Problem:

Are Community Action Plans useful in implementing the Farming Systems Research and Extension approach as well as in improving farmers' livelihoods?

1.8 Problem Conceptualization

In the next figure, (Fig 1), the challenge, namely whether Community Action Plans are effective in implementing the FSRE approach and in improving farmers' livelihood is clearly described. This is achieved by means of a process of problem conceptualisation. According to the process specific attention needs to be given to the following intervening variables:-

- Community **needs** and compatibility of Community action plans with their needs
- **Knowledge** of the communities and staff on CAP
- **Attitude** of communities and staff towards CAP
- **Perception** of communities and staff about CAP
- **Perception** of community leaders about CAP

Some of the perceived advantages of Community Action Plans (CAP) are:-

- Communities are able to identify their own problems and get solutions to their perceived problems
- Communities own their planned activities as they are involved in plenary
- Capacity building is enhanced in the community
- Realistic and achievable activities are planned
- Community action plans improve the livelihoods of farmers
- Communities take charge of their developmental issues

The disadvantages of Community action plans include:

- Poorly developed Community Action Plans which lead to miss-remedial efforts to identified problems;
- Community action plans creating conflicts between leaders and communities, especially where there is a lack of commitment by leaders.

1.9 Objectives of the study

The main objective of this study is to determine the effectiveness of Community Action Plans as tools for implementing a bottom up Extension approach (FSRE) in improving the livelihood of rural communities.

Specific objectives of the study include, to:-

- Investigate the effectiveness of Community Action Plans in Extension planning;
- Investigate community participation and ownership of their development;
- Investigate the roles of community leaders in the community planning process;
- Evaluate the staff's perception of a Community Action Plan as a tool;
- Determine how a community utilizing a CAP and one that does not perceive the value of CAP differ;
- Determine whether Extension staff and a community utilizing CAP perceive the tool as an effective way of improving farmers' livelihoods.

1.10 The hypothesis

The hypothesis to be tested in this study is: A Community Action Plan is an effective tool to improve the livelihood of communities.

1.11 Research questions

The critical questions that are posed in this study include:

- Do community action plans improve community livelihoods?
- Do communities contribute towards the development of these actions plans?
- Is CAP compatible with the community's perceived needs?
- Are community leaders involved in the planning process?
- Is CAP developed in response to a community's priority problems?

- Do communities have full ownership of these plans?
- Does this strategy increase the diversification of income sources in communities?
- Does this strategy assist the community cope with shocks and stress?
- Does this strategy complement social support to livelihoods?
- Does this strategy facilitate a bottom up extension program planning?

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

Several extension approaches are used in program planning today world-wide. These approaches are practiced in different countries, depending on each country's situation, organizational structures and donor funding agencies. These approaches differ from one another in the way they describe how certain issues are dealt with, the prospects and values that are prevailing. Each approach provides a framework within which certain goals are achieved.

In this study two approaches in extension program planning are discussed, namely, the traditional top down strategy (Transfer of Technology) and the participatory bottom up strategy (FSRE).

2.2 The Concept of Extension

There are many definitions of Extension. Virtually all these definitions stress that Extension is an ongoing process which occurs over time and that it is not a once off activity.

According to Bembridge, (1991), Extension is the process of working with rural people in order to improve their standard of living. Therefore, it represents a field of professional education practice that aims at teaching people about new farming ideas in their own context. It equips rural farmers with skills necessary to assess their own farming needs and how to develop leadership and organizational skills. Extension services also enable

rural farmers to acquire skills, knowledge and managerial skills necessary for them to cope with their needs and problems as well as to inspire them to take actions.

The ultimate goal of Extension services is therefore to improve the quality of rural livelihoods and food self sufficiency (Bembridge, 1991).

2.3 The Top down strategy (Traditional Transfer of Technology)

For many years this has been the dominant strategy for extension program planning. The approach is based on the assumption that new agricultural technologies and knowledge are typically developmental and validated by researchers. The task of extension is to promote the adoption by rural farmers of technologies. New agricultural technologies will, in turn, increase productivity. Various types of communication models have been used with this strategy and the focus has been centred on innovators. The belief has been that once the innovators have embraced the new technology, others will follow (Oltheten, 1995). Hence, extension planning has tended to place more emphasis on the targets which the extension agencies want to achieve.

The traditional transfer of technology strategy is based on the assumption that it is the transmission of technology and knowledge from the scientist to the farmers that will trigger development. The approach assumes further that individuals or organizations that have modern knowledge can solve farmers' problems. The emphasis of the approach is on the transfer of technology without due regard to its appropriateness. Focus has then been more on extension teaching. As a result the approach divided farmers into laggards and innovators (Stevens, 2003).

There has been much criticism of this strategy. Writers such as Vanclay and Lawrence (1995) argued that an extension strategy that is based on the top down model is insufficiently critical of the technology that has been developed and is being promoted. In addition, inadequate attention is paid to the long term economic, environmental and social impacts of these technologies.

Röling (1988) argued also that the use of the top down strategy tends to reinforce existing social inequalities within the farming population. It is the producers benefiting from the adoption process who are likely to be better endowed in terms of material, intellectual and social resources.

Chambers (1983) argued that the knowledge, skills and adaptive abilities of farmers are systematically and unjustifiably devalued in an extension program planning that is based on a top down strategy. Russel, Ison, Gamble and Williams (1989) in their critical review of the rural extension theory and practice concluded that farmers have almost fallen short as both competent scientific thinkers and researchers. The consequence of this tendency has been to perpetuate the myth that research is the exclusive domain of professional researchers and that inevitably farmers should be on the receiving end of the researchers' work. The review showed that farmers have a strong desire to participate in setting the research agendas and are increasingly willing to co-research with the scientist.

Although the top down strategies have some advantages, the critical issue is that the driving forces are associated more with the change agents than the recipient of the technology. Extension program planning has become more about achieving the set targets of extension and researchers than resolving problems and meeting needs of the end users.

The TOT model has been the prevalent practice in development and the force behind the spreading of innovations. Again, the assumption is that farmers' problems can be solved by people and institutions that have modern knowledge. Farmers are perceived as the main constraint to the development process and responsible for the mismanagement of their resources rather than as potential initiators of solutions (Hagmann, Chuma, Murwira and Connolly, 1999). On the institutions' side, the approach tends to create a rigid hierarchy which discourages feedback of information. As a result, researchers have worked independently of farmers and Extension workers. This has resulted in a poor understanding of farmers and the opportunities and constraints that they face.

2.4 Participatory bottom up approach

By the 1980s it was realized that most of the technologies that had been developed independently by researchers were inappropriate for smallholder farmers. As a result farmers were seen as partners in research and extension. They became key players in the innovation process. Farmer participatory research became the approach to adapt technologies to farmers' conditions. By the 1990s, technologies were being developed together with farmers (Hagmann et al, 1999).

As the top down extension strategy in program planning was being heavily criticized, participatory agricultural extension program planning was adopted. It consists of a basket of approaches that involve "outsider" facilitators working closely with local communities. The farmers take on a more active and participatory role than in conventional extension. The approach described in the following sections and elsewhere in this study is part of this strategy.

The communities are encouraged to identify their agricultural problems, prioritize them and seek solutions. Participatory extension approach aims at strengthening the community's ability to carry out these activities with limited assistance from outsiders. Extension services plan their program using the information from the communities. This strategy helps in:

- Building the capacity of local institutions to plan and manage their own development.
- Conducting research and extension using a participatory technology development process, which develops technologies that fit the diverse and complex farming system of smallholder farmers.

While there are many different approaches to participatory extension program planning, this study focuses on the Community Action Plan that is identified as a tool for implementing the Farming Systems Research and Extension (FSRE) approach in the Caprivi region.

2.5 Farming Systems Research and Extension Approach

As noted earlier on, this is a responsive, non-prescriptive, flexible way of providing research and extension support to farmers. It is demand driven, dynamic, and iterative; inter disciplinary, multi disciplinary and collaborative.

The approach places the farmers and their needs at the centre and planning evolves slowly during the process. The approach is also based on:

- First hand understanding of the farmers' situation and,
- Combined efforts of scientist from a number of disciplines who analyses the farm as a system rather than isolating its individual components (Bembridge, 1991).

2.6 Community Action Plans (CAP)

A Community Action Plan is a process that involves determining what is to be done, who is going to do it, how will it be done and when should it be done. It is an effective and empowering strategy for developing rural areas. It is important to realize that CAP is a process in which a learning phase should be allowed. The success of a community in adopting this innovation depends on the commitment and inclusion of tangible activities that make meaningful contribution to farmers' livelihood (Matanyaire et al, 2003). As a tool and strategy CAP allows communities to draft and implement their preferred socio economic development agenda with support from developmental agents. The strategy enables true community participation and ownership of the resultant agenda and its outcomes (Matanyaire et al, 2003).

2.7 Importance of formulating, implementing and managing development plans.

Planning is one of the most basic management functions of a community. It determines how the community manages and carries out their activities (Bembridge, 1991). Planning functions in communities have some important goals and these are:

- Helping the community to succeed and be effective in meeting their needs;
- Providing direction for stakeholders working in the community, and
- Supporting farmers to cope with change and assist in performing other functions in the community (Bembridge, 1991).

According to Perret (2003), local planning should involve local role players in the mobilization of resources for the future. Local planning takes place in the context of an administration entity. Its application usually corresponds to the lowest level of the administrative delimitation which is managed by a more or less autonomous local public organization. A local plan strives to create conditions that are conducive for the community to negotiate with local role players for the necessary support required to realize their plans and programs (Perret, 2003).

Local action plans should go hand in hand with the multi sectoral approach of development. This implies that these local action plans should not only be limited to agriculture alone, but that they should include all local developmental agendas within the community. That entails looking at all priority problems within the community.

The issues that need to be thoroughly examined, when developing Community Action Plans, with facilitation support from development agents include:

- a) Socio-economic analysis;
- b) Sustainability considerations of every possible activity option that improves livelihood;
- c) Developmental challenges or problems facing community members;
- d) Opportunities for improving community livelihoods and,

- e) Affordability and compatibility of preferred / prioritized activities that ultimately constitute the CAP, (Matanyaire et al, 2003).

An important aspect is that CAP contains realistic and achievable activities that depend on inputs from the community. The main objective of Community Action Plans is to improve the livelihoods of the community within the context of their vulnerability. It also makes it possible to identify within the communities the different local players who are involved and indicate clearly the type of support they require from supporting institutions (Matanyaire et al, 2003).

2.8 Village Development Committees

The Namibian Government adopted the Decentralization Policy. The main objective of this policy is to ensure economic, cultural and social economic development. This is achieved by providing people at grass root level the opportunity to participate in their own decision making and practice external democracy, as a right based on national ideas and values.

In pursuance of the objectives of decentralization and in order to achieve effective coordination of planning and development of the villages, Village Development Committees (VDC) were then established in every village by the Ministry of Regional Local Government Housing and Rural Development (Decentralization Policy in Namibia, 1998). A VDC is a locally based committee which oversees developmental agendas in a village. The main functions of a VDC is to facilitate the establishment of community based management information systems, to identify assets and evaluate community needs or problems that need to be considered for development proposals to succeed, to resolve problems identified at local levels, to initiate, encourage, support and participate in community self help projects and to monitor the delivery of services within its area and report to regional councils (Decentralization Policy in Namibia, 1998).

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology that has been employed in the investigation of the effectiveness of Community Action Plans in improving farmers' livelihoods in Caprivi Region, Namibia. The discussion focuses on the research instrument, sampling procedure, data to be collected, data collection procedure, and data analysis.

3.2 Research instrument

In terms of research design, a survey was used in conducting this study. Questionnaires were used to collect data. Personal interviews were used also for collecting data. The questionnaires were based on the conceptualization of the problem. The types of questions used included factual questions that requested objective information about the respondent, such as their social background or related personal data (sex, age, marital status etc.). Structured questions that indicated a range of possible answers were used. Contingency, scaled questions and unstructured questions were also used (Appendix A and B).

3.3 Sampling procedure

Two communities that were selected for this study are the Mubiza and Bukalo. These communities were selected due to their proximity to each other and the similarity of type of resources that they have. Mubiza community was selected because it utilizes an action plan and while the Bukalo community has not adopted an action plan yet. This selection was made after some critical consultations with the Extension Staff of the Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services and also after looking at the level of community participation in development.

A sample size of 50 community members was initially planned to be selected from each community for interviewing. However, this sample could not be attained due to the fact that most community members were busy with other social issues such as funerals, church activities and illness in the communities. A total of 37 respondents from Mubiza community participated while 36 respondents were from Bukalo community making a total of 73 respondents all together. A total of 25 field Extension staff members of the Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services are working in the area, however only 22 staff members were interviewed. Three (3) Extension staff members were not available.

3.4 Data collection procedure

The researcher interviewed community members with the assistance of two enumerators. Extension Staff of the Directorate of Extension were provided with their own questionnaire for them to complete. Secondary data was obtained from different literature resources.

3.5 Data Analysis

The unstructured questions were coded first for easy analysis. Data entry was captured using Microsoft Excel. Analysis of qualitative and quantitative data was carried out using SAS. Statistical analysis for descriptive statistics i.e. frequencies and percentages of responses were used to summarize the responses. Contingency tables were used to investigate while the Chi-square statistic was applied to test for associations between the responses to certain questions and the group to which the respondent belonged (i.e. CAP, NOCAP or STAFF). SAS v8.2 statistical software was applied for this purpose. Wilcoxon rank-sum test was also used to test the difference between the respondents of Mubiza and Bukalo communities and between Extension staff and the Mubiza community. This test is a non-parametric equivalent of two sample test. The Kruskal-Wallis statistic test

was used to test for differences in the responses of respondents from different groups. The BMDP release 7.1 statistical software was used.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SOCIO ECONOMIC OR INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT VARIABLES EFFECTING THE MUBIZA AND BUKALO COMMUNITIES ADOPTION OF THE CAP STRATEGY.

4.1 Introduction

The non adoption of an innovation can be traced back to two basic causes. The causes are either that the individual is incapable or unwilling to adopt. According to Düvel (1991) this phenomenon can be linked directly to a lack of need or a person's perception and knowledge. Düvel continues saying that specific innovations are not compatible with the individuals' need, if they are not perceived as need related nor provide means of achieving it. Therefore adoption behaviour is positively related to the need compatibility and corresponding production efficiency. Thus it should be understood that the adoption of a Community Action Plan innovation is related to the realization of one's need and therefore indirectly leading towards realization of another need.

This Chapter gives an overview of the findings of the study regarding:

- Demographic and socio economic characteristics or independent variables of the Mubiza and Bukalo communities, the possible effects that these variables could have on the implementation of CAP;
- The perceptions and knowledge of a community applying CAP regarding the effectiveness of the Community Action Plan as a tool to improve livelihoods;
- The perceptions and knowledge of a community that does not apply CAP regarding the effectiveness of the Community Action Plan as a tool to improve livelihoods;
- The differences in perceptions and knowledge between a community utilizing CAP and one that does not utilize CAP regarding the effectiveness of Community Action Plan as a tool to improve livelihoods,.

4.2 Socio-economic (independent) and dependent affecting the adoption of CAP in the Mubiza and the Bukalo communities.

Data was collected from a total of 73 respondents. Out of this total, 37 respondents were from Mubiza community, a community applying a Community Action Plan, while 36 respondents were from Bukalo, a community that does not apply a Community Action Plan. Independent variables such as gender, age, household head, levels of education, farming experience, community development experience are discussed. The independent variables are separately discussed to determine their influence on the community's behaviour and adoption of the Community Action Plan as a tool in improving community livelihoods. Dependent variables include communication, farmer extension contact, leaflets and radio. They play also a role in people's behaviour.

4.2.1 The socio economic variables affecting Mubiza community

4.2.1.1 Gender

In Table 4.1, respondents of Mubiza, a community which utilizes CAP, are presented according to gender.

Table 4.1: Mubiza community respondents according to gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	9	24.32
Female	28	75.68
Total	37	100

According to the table, 76% of the respondents were female and 24% males. This indicates that in the Mubiza community the majority of people involved in community development are female. This implies that when extension personnel are dealing with this community, they should be quite aware of the cultural values associated with dealing with female farmers in the community. In order to fully engage the community in

developmental issues extension personnel should be aware of the activity clock of the communities.

4.2.1.2 Household heads

In the next table respondents from Mubiza community are shown according to household heads.

Table 4.2: Mubiza respondents according to household heads

Household head	Frequency	Percentage
De jure head	18	48.65
De Factor head	19	51.35
Total	37	100

The results of the study point to no significant difference between the two types of household heads. Households led by females (de factor) were 51%, while 49% were male (De jure). This figure differs slightly with the 2001 Namibia Population Census. In the census 59% of the population were male and 41% female. Considering that more females are involved in development in the Mubiza community as indicated (in Table 4.1) the decision making process within the community should therefore be quicker. It will be easier to implement community action plans as most of the households are female and usually present.

4.2.1.3 Age Category

An overview of the age categories of the Mubiza community is summarized in Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3 Mubiza community respondents according to age

Age category	Frequency	Percentage
15-30	4	10.81
31-45	7	18.92
46-60	16	43.24
>60	10	27.03
Total	37	100

The majority of respondents (70%) fall within the 46-60 years (and older) age bracket while only 30% of the respondents are younger than 46 years of age. This is a clear indication that there are significantly more elderly people involved in community activities as compared to the younger age group. Therefore, it is important for extension staff to involve more young people in community planning processes for continuity and the sustainable implementation of Community Action Plans.

4.2.1.4 Education level of respondents

Education is one of the critical elements with regard to the adoption of recommended technologies. It forms part of the attributes of knowledge. As a result, a literate community can make better informed decisions in terms of adopting new technologies. In Table 4.4, below, is an overview of the Mubiza community respondents according to their level of education.

Table 4.4: Mubiza community respondents' education levels

Education levels categories	Frequency	Percentage
No school	10	27.03
Part primary	15	40.54
Part secondary	10	27.03
Secondary +	2	5.40
Total	37	100

Most of the respondents (73%) received some formal education and can be regarded as literate, while 27% of the respondents did not have any formal education and could be classified as illiterate.

4.2.1.5 Farming experience

Farming experience can play an important role in farmers' adoption and non-adoption of new technologies. In the next table respondents from the Mubiza Community reveal their years of experience.

Table 4.5: Mubiza community respondents' farming experience

Farming experience category	Frequency	Percentage
<1 year	2	5.40
2-5 years	6	16.22
6-10 years	12	32.43
>10 years	17	45.95
Total	37	100

The study shows that the majority of the respondents (78%) have been involved in farming activities for at least 6 years and longer.

4.2.1.6 Involvement in Community Development

Data in Table 4.6 discloses the respondents' years of experience in community development.

Table 4.6: Mubiza community respondents' experience in community development

Years of experience in community development	Frequency	Percentage
<1 year	3	8.11
2-5 years	12	32.43
6-10 years	9	24.32
>10 years	13	35.14
Total	37	100

The majority of respondents (59%) have six (6) years and more experience in community development activities.

4.2.1.7 Extension delivery in the Mubiza Community

Respondents were requested to indicate if there is an Agricultural Extension Technician (AET) in the community. The results are shown in the table below.

Table 4.7: Mubiza respondents' awareness of the existence AET in their area

Availability of Agricultural Extension Technician in your area	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	37	100
No	0	0
Total	37	100

The question aims at indicating the familiarization of or awareness of the community of the availability of extension services in the community. All respondents, overwhelmingly, disclosed that they were knowledgeable of an Agricultural Extension Technician working in the area.

4.2.1.8 Getting information from Extension staff

In the next table respondents from the Mubiza community divulged the extent to which they have met and received information from the AET.

Table 4.8: Information received from Extension staff

Information from Extension staff	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	1	2.7
Never	23	62.16
1-3 times/month	13	35.14
>3 times/month	0	0
Total	37	100

According to the table above, the majority of the respondents of the Mubiza community (65%) had never met the Extension staff to secure information. This is in total contrast to the results shown in Table 4.7 where 100% of the respondents indicated that they knew their AET.

4.2.1.9 Attendance of extension meetings

The main aim of extension meetings is to share knowledge on the new technologies and indigenous knowledge. This question is a follow up from the previous question and it seeks to understand the community's attendance of meetings. In the following table, respondents indicate the number of extension meetings they had attended.

Table 4.9: Attendance of Extension meetings

Meetings attendance	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	0	0
Once	1	2.7
> 2	36	97.3
Total	37	100

The majority of the Mubiza community respondents (97%) had attended more than two meetings in the past. Again, this contrasts with the findings in Table (4.8) where 65% respondents indicated they have never met the EAT.

4.2.1.10 Leaflets received from Extension staff.

Print media is one of the important tools in information dissemination in a community, especially where the majority of the community members are literate. Respondents were asked if they had received leaflets from Extension staff in the past. The results are presented in the next table.

Table 4.10: Leaflets received from Extension staff

Received leaflets from Extension	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	2	5.41
Yes	16	43.24
No	19	51.35
Total	37	100

Over 51% of the Mubiza community respondents claimed that they had not received any leaflets, while 43% reported that they had received leaflets. 6% were uncertain about the question. Considering that 73% of the respondents are regarded as literate (as indicated in Table 4.4), it is important for Extension staff to increase information dissemination through leaflets.

4.2.1.11 Agricultural information received through the radio

The radio is an effective communication tool for information dissemination. The local station in the Caprivi Region has provided air time for agricultural related programs which could be fully utilized in terms of transferring agricultural information to more communities in the Region. In Table 4.11 respondents from the Mubiza community show the number of times that they had received agricultural information through listening to radio programs.

Table 4.11: Agricultural information received through radio

Received radio messages	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	1	2.70
Never	1	2.70
Once a week	24	64.87
Once a month	11	29.73
Total	37	100

The majority of respondents (95%) indicated that they had received agricultural information once a week and at least once a month through listening to the radio. This is a positive sign because the radio is one of the important communication media that is used to disseminate agricultural messages to rural communities.

4.2.2 The dependent variables affecting Mubiza community

4.2.2.1 Support provided by local leaders

Leadership support is important in community development, especially for purposes of monitoring and providing advice to the community. In the next table respondents revealed the type of support received from their leaders.

Table 4.12: The type of support provided by leaders to the community

Type of support provided by leaders	Frequency	Percentage
Support not applicable	2	5.41
Support somewhat applicable	1	2.70
Support are applicable	34	91.89
Total	37	100

The majority of respondents (92%) conceded that leaders had provided advice, guidance, and encouragement to communities to be committed and had motivated the communities to implement their planned activities.

4.2.2.2 Leadership style

The successful implementation of Community Action Plans in a community requires a high level of leadership and one that exercises a leadership style that is supportive of the smooth implementation of CAP. The Mubiza respondents highlighted the type of leadership style required for effective implementation of CAP.

Table 4.13: Leadership styles required in the CAP process

Leadership style required for CAP process	Frequency	Percentage
Autocratic leadership style	3	8.11
Democratic leadership style	34	91.89
Laissez-fare leadership style	0	0
Do not know	0	0
Total	37	100

The majority of the respondents (92%) indicated that a democratic leadership style is required for the successful implementation of the Community Action Plan and only 8.11% opted for an autocratic leadership style. This is a clear indication that during the planning process and implementation phase there is a need for an environment where community members can freely participate and communicate with their leaders.

4.2.2.3 Support received from development agents

Development agents play an important role in community development. The support they provide to the community is crucial to the successful the implementation of CAP. In the table below, the responses regarding the support that the community received from development agents during their planning process is illustrated.

Table 4.14: Support received from developmental agents during the planning process

Support received from development agents during planning process	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	35	94.6
No	1	2.7
Do not know	1	2.7
Total	37	100

Out of the 37 respondents involved in the survey, 35 (95. %) indicated that they had received support from development agents. Only one respondent indicated that there had been no support while the other respondent was uncertain about the development agents' support.

4.2.2.4 CAP's impact on livelihoods

The Mubiza respondents were also asked if CAP improved their livelihood. A follow up question was posed to the respondents to provide reasons for their answer. Below is their response to the question.

Table 4.15: Reasons why CAP improves the community’s livelihood

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
Not applicable	9	24.32
Reasons somewhat applicable	8	21.63
Reasons applicable	20	54.05
Total	37	100

The majority (54%) responded that communities were able to work together as a unit. Community Action Plans enable government agencies to give attention to community problems. Eight (8) of the respondents’ reasons were somehow applicable and nine highlighted that reasons provided were not applicable.

4.2.2.5 Livelihoods sources before 1995

The Mubiza respondents were asked to select the sources of livelihood available to them before 1995. The results are presented below.

Table 4.16: Livelihood sources before 1995

Livelihood sources before 1995	Frequency	Percent
Reasons are not applicable	3	8.11
Reasons somewhat applicable	1	2.7
Reasons are applicable	33	89.19
Total	37	100

The majority (89%) of the respondents indicated that their livelihood sources were mainly crop farming, livestock farming and poultry farming.

4.2.2.6 Livelihood sources after 1995

The Mubiza respondents were then requested to select their current livelihood sources. The results are presented in the next table.

Table 4.17: Livelihood sources after 1995

Livelihood sources currently now	Frequency	Percentage
Reasons are not applicable	1	2.70
Reasons somewhat applicable	0	0
Reasons are applicable	36	97.3
Total	37	100

The respondents were asked to indicate sources of livelihood since they started Community Action Planning. The majority of respondents (97%) indicated that they are now involved in:

- seed production,
- crop farming,
- livestock farming,
- resource conservation monitoring,
- vegetable gardening,
- meat trading,
- selling fire wood,
- hammer mill business and,
- training farmers on draft animal power as a business.

This list indicates that there has been an increase in the number of sources from which the community is deriving its livelihood in comparison to the sources before the introduction of the Community Action Plans.

4.2.2.7 Role players in the community

Role players have an important part to play in the community in terms of providing assistance. In the following table the Mubiza community response identified the role players in their area.

Table 4.18: Role players in Mubiza Community

Role players in the community development	Frequency	Percentage
None	3	8.11
Don't know	1	2.70
Role players identified	33	89.19
Total	37	100

Most of the Mubiza Community respondents (89%) highlighted that the role players in community development were the traditional leaders, community based organizations, government institutions (Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education and The Regional Council), and non-governmental organization such as Namibia Red Cross and Africare.

4.2.2.8 Support provided by role players

The Mubiza respondents were asked to indicate what support does the role players provide to the community. The results are indicated in the next table.

Table 4.19: Support provided by role players

Support provided by role players	Frequency	Percentage
Support not applicable	4	10.81
Don't know	0	0
Applicable support	33	89.19
Total	37	100

A total of 33 respondents indicated that role players assist communities in income generating activities. Traditional leaders provide law and order while other organizations, involved in the communities, provided social services.

4.2.3 Independent Variables affecting the Bukalo Community

4.2.3.1 Gender

The table below shows the gender profile of the respondents from the Bukalo community that participated in the survey.

Table 4.20: Bukalo community respondents according to gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	13	36.11
Female	23	63.89
Total	36	100

The majority of the respondents (64%) are female and only 36% male. This outcome confirmed the 2001 Namibia Population Census which revealed that there are more females than males in Namibia. It also indicates that more females are involved in community activities.

4.2.3.2 Household heads

The next question asked respondents from the Bukalo community to indicate the gender of the household heads.

Table 4.21: Bukalo respondents according to gender of household heads

Household head	Frequency	Percentage
De jure head	18	50
De Factor head	16	44.44
Other	2	5.56
Total	36	100

The survey revealed that 50% of the households were male and 44% were female while 6% were not sure as to where they belong. This situation influences the decision making. Usually most male heads are away working in cities or searching for employment. If a

decision has to be taken consultations need to be done with the household head and this delays the decision making process.

4.2.3.3 Age Category

An overview of the age of the Bukalo community respondents is presented in Table 4.22 below.

Table 4.22: Bukalo respondents according to age

Age category	Frequency	Percentage
15-30	4	11.11
31-45	8	22.22
46-60	7	19.44
>60	17	47.22
Total	36	100

According to the table above, the majority of the respondents (67%) fall within the category of 46 -60 years of age and older while 33% fall within the category of 15 years to 45 years of age. This is a clear indication that elderly people in the Bukalo community are involved in the agricultural activities.

4.2.3.4 Education level

This question sought information regarding level of education of the respondents of the Bukalo community

Table 4.23: Bukalo community respondents' educational level

Education level	Frequency	Percentage
No school	14	38.89
Part primary	9	25
Part secondary	10	27.78
Secondary +	3	8.33
Total	36	100

The majority of respondents (61%) had received some formal education and can be regarded as literate while 39% of the respondents did not have any formal education.

4.2.3.5 Farming experience

Farming experience can play an important role in farmers' adoption or non-adoption of new technologies. In the next table respondents from the Bukalo community indicated their years of experience.

Table 4.24: Bukalo respondents' farming experience

Farming Experience	Frequency	Percentage
<1 year	1	2.78
2-5 years	4	11.11
6-10 years	5	13.89
>10 years	26	72.22
Total	36	100

The study reveals that the majority of the respondents (86%) have been involved in farming for at least six (6) years and more.

4.2.3.6 Involvement in community development

The respondents from the Bukalo community were requested also to indicate the number of years they had been involved in community development. The results are indicated in the next table.

Table 4.25: Bukalo respondents' experience in community development

Experience in community development	Frequency	Percentage
<1 year	3	8.33
2-5 years	6	16.67
6-10 years	10	27.78
>10 years	13	36.11
Not applicable	4	11.11
Total	36	100

The majority of respondents have been involved in community development activities that vary from less than a year to more than ten years. An interesting finding is that 11% of respondents have never been involved in community development activities.

4.2.3.7 Farmer extension contact in Bukalo community

Respondents were requested to indicate if there is an Agricultural Extension Technician (AET) in the community. The results are indicated in the table below.

Table 4.26: Awareness of the presence of the AET

Availability of AET	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	21	58.34
No	12	33.33
Do not know	3	8.33
Total	36	100

Most respondents of the Bukalo community (58%) indicated that there is no AET or do not know if there is an AET in their region and they have no contact with Extension Staff.

4.2.3.8 Getting Information from Extension staff

In this question respondents from the Bukalo community were requested to show the extent to which they had met and sourced information from the AET.

Table 4.27: Information received from Extension staff

Frequency of information from Extension staff	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	3	8.33
Never	15	41.67
1-3 times/month	12	33.33
>3 times/month	6	16.67
Total	36	100

The results indicate that the community is equally divided. While 50% had received information from Extension staff the other 50% indicated that they had not received any information from Extension Staff.

4.2.3.9 Attending extension meetings

The next table indicates the extent to which community members have attended extension meetings.

Table 4.28: Attendance of extension meetings

Meetings attendance	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	15	41.67
Once	11	30.56
> 2	10	27.78
Total	36	100

The study revealed that the majority of respondents (58%) had attended extension meetings while the other 42% indicated that they had not attended any meetings in the past.

4.2.3.10 Leaflets received from Extension staff

Respondents were asked if they had received leaflets from Extension staff in the past. The results are presented in Table 4.29 below.

Table 4.29: Leaflets received from Extension

Received leaflets from extension	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	2	5.55
Yes	11	30.56
No	23	63.89
Total	36	100

In response, 31% indicated that they had received leaflets from Extension staff and 69% of the respondents indicated that they had not received leaflets from Extension staff or could not recall receiving any leaflets.

4.2.3.11 Agricultural information on radio

The radio is one of the important mass communication media used to disseminate agricultural messages to communities. The extent to which respondents from Bukalo community had received agricultural messages on the radio is presented in the next table.

Table 4.30: Information received by means of the radio

Agricultural information received on the radio	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	0	0
Never	3	8.33
Once a week	18	50.00
Once a month	15	41.67
Total	36	100

According to the table above, an overwhelming number of the respondents 92% indicated that they had received Agricultural Extension Information on radio. Only 8% indicated that they had not received any information through the radio.

4.2.4 The dependent variables of the Bukalo community

4.2.4.1 Support provided by local leaders

Leadership support is important in community development, especially for monitoring, providing advice and managing the process of community development. In the next table the Bukalo community highlighted the type of support they had received from their leaders.

Table 4.31: Support provided to the community by leaders

Type of support received from local leaders	Frequency	Percentage
Support not applicable	21	58.33
Support somehow applicable		
Applicable support	15	41.67
Total	36	100

Approximately 58% of respondents were not sure if the support provided by the local leaders during community planning was applicable. Only 42% of the Bukalo respondents indicated that community leaders provided advice and guidance, shared information with the community about development and arranged community meetings.

4.2.4.2 Leadership style

The implementation of Community Action Plans in a community requires a high level of leadership. What is needed is a participatory leadership style for effective implementation of the CAP. In the next table the Bukalo community respondents indicated the type of leadership style they felt was required for effective implementation of the CAP.

Table 4.32: Leadership style required in the Community Action Plan process

Required leadership style for CAP implementation	Frequency	Percentage
Autocratic leadership style	0	0
Democratic leadership style	26	72.22
Laissezfaire leadership style	0	0
Combination of Autocratic and Democratic	2	5.56
Do not know	8	22.22
Total	36	100

The majority, of the respondents 72% indicated that a democratic leadership style is required for the effective implementation of the Community Action Plan and only 8 % indicated that an autocratic leadership style is required.

4.2.4.3 Support received from development agents

Development agents play an important role in community development. Hence, the support they provide to the community is crucial to the successful implementation of CAP. The Bukalo respondents indicated the support they received from development agents during their planning process.

Table 4.33: Support received from development agents during the planning process

Received support from developmental agents during the planning process	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	11	30.56
No	19	52.78
Do not know	6	16.67
Total	36	100

Only 31% of the respondents had received support from developmental agents, while 53% mentioned that they had not received any support from developmental agents. 17% did not know of any support received from developmental agents.

4.2.4.4 Reasons given for role the CAP played in improving livelihoods

The Bukalo respondents were also asked if CAP improved their livelihoods. Below is their response to the question.

Table 4.34: CAP’s impact on the livelihood of the community

Reasons why CAP improve livelihoods	Frequency	Percentage
Not applicable	35	97.22
Reasons are somewhat applicable	0	0
Reasons are applicable	1	2.78
Total	36	100

Only one respondent indicated that the Community Action Plan assisted the community in planning their activities. The majority of the respondents (97%) did not perceive any reason that indicated the role of CAP improved their community’s livelihood. It is however important to note that they have not been exposed to the CAP, this reaction was therefore expected.

4.2.4.5 Livelihood Sources before 1995

The Bukalo respondents were then requested to list the livelihood sources they were engaged in before 1995. The results are presented in the next table.

Table 4.35: Livelihoods sources before 1995

Livelihood sources before 1995	Frequency	Percent
No livelihood sources	4	11.11
Livelihood sources somewhat applicable	0	0
Real livelihood sources	32	88.89
Total	36	100

The majority of the respondents (89%) were involved in crop farming, livestock farming, small business, making yokes and selling, basket weaving and selling and also vegetable production. Only (4) four respondents indicated that they had no livelihood sources.

4.2.4.6 Livelihood sources after 1995

The Bukalo respondents were asked to indicate the sources of their livelihood that they are currently involved in. The results are presented in the next table.

Table 4.36: Livelihoods sources after 1995

Livelihood sources currently after 1995	Frequency	Percentage
No livelihood sources	0	0
Livelihood sources somewhat applicable	0	0
Real livelihood sources	36	100
Total	36	100

All the respondents indicated that they were now involved in additional sources of livelihood such as:-

- Crop farming,
- Livestock farming,
- Small business,
- Selling and buying individually from each other,
- Basket weaving and selling,
- Vegetable production,
- Casual work and pension payments.

4.2.4.7 Role players in the community

Role players play an important part in the community in terms of providing assistance to the community. In the next table the Bukalo community respondents identified the role of players in their area.

Table 4.37: The role players in community development in Bukalo

Role players in the community	Frequency	Percentage
None	11	30.56
Don't know	0	0
Identified role players	25	69.44
Total	36	100

Only 31% respondents mentioned that there were no role players in their communities, while 69 % (the majority) of the respondents mentioned that there are role players in the community. These role players are the traditional leaders, village development committees, Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Council, Hospitals, Ministry of Gender and Child Welfare and the Ministry of Education.

4.2.4.8 Support provided by role players

The Bukalo respondents were asked also to support the role players provided to the community. The support is indicated in the next table.

Table 4.38: Support provided by role players to Bukalo community

Type of support provided by role players	Frequency	Percent
Not applicable	12	33.33
Don't know	2	5.56
Reasons are applicable	22	61.11
Total	36	100

About 61% of respondents indicated that traditional leaders ensured law and order in the community; The Ministry of Agriculture provided training on farming aspects in the community, while The Regional Council provided drought food relief. The Ministry of Gender and Child Welfare supported orphans in the community whereas The Ministry of Education provided education to children in the communities As hospitals provided health services to the communities and The Village development Committee provided guidance in all the developmental issues of the community.

4.3 A comparison of socio economic variables of the Mubiza and the Bukalo respondents

4.3.1 Gender

Based on Table 4.1 and Table 4.20 there is approximately 12% more females from the Mubiza community (76%) involved in community activities than the Bukalo community (64%).

4.3.2 Household head.

The results of Table 4.2 and Table 4.21 show that the majority of the Mubiza households (51%) are female as compared to the 44% of the Bukalo. This indicates that decision making is easier in the Mubiza community since most households are available. They do not have to wait for their spouse to make decisions.

4.3.3 Age category

Table 4.3 compared to Table 4.22 shows that there are significantly more respondents (20%) that are older than 60 years from the Bukalo (47%) community as compared to 27% of the Mubiza respondents.

4.3.4 Education level

In terms of educational level Table 4.4 and Table 4.23 show that there is a 15% difference between the Mubiza respondents (27%) and the Bukalo (39%) respondents this indicates differences in literacy levels.

4.3.5 Farming experience

Farming experience plays a role in the adoption and non adoption of new technologies. The results in Table 4.5 and Table 4.24 indicate that the majority of the Bukalo respondents (72%) have been involved in farming more than 10 years as compared to the 46% of the Mubiza community.

4.3.6 Extension contact (agent) knowledge

Table 4.7 and Table 4.26 show that there is a 42% significant difference in favour of the Mubiza (100%) respondents with regard to extension contact.

4.3.7 Attending meetings

Extension meetings are one of the major platforms where knowledge, new technology and indigenous knowledge is shared between the communities and Extension staff. The results in Table 4.9 and Table 4.28 reveal that all the respondents of Mubiza community (100%) attended meetings against only 58% of the Bukalo respondents. This shows that there is a significant difference of 42% in favour of the Mubiza respondents.

4.4 A comparison between the Mubiza and the Bukalo respondents' dependent variables

A comparison of the dependent variables was made between the Mubiza and the Bukalo respondents. These variables include the support received from local leaders, required leadership, role players in the community, support provided by role players and from the development agents.

4.4.1 Support provided by local leaders

Leadership support is important in community development, especially when monitoring, providing advice and managing the process of community development. Table 4.12 and Table 4.31 show that there is a significant difference (50%) between the Mubiza (92%) respondents and the Bukalo (42%) respondents regarding the support received from the local leaders. A majority of the Bukalo respondents (58%) indicated that they are not sure nor aware of the support provided by local leaders.

4.4.2 Leadership style

A participatory (democratic) leadership style is desired for effective implementation of Community Action Plans. A comparison of the two respondent groups (Table 4.13 and Table 4.32) on the required leadership style indicate that there is a 20% difference between the Mubiza respondents (92%) and the Bukalo respondents (72%), in favour of a community that utilises CAP.

4.4.3 Support received from development agents

Development agents also play also an important role in community development. The support they provide to the community is crucial support in the implementation of Community Action Plans. According to the result in Table 4.14 and Table 4.33 there is a 64% significant difference between the Mubiza respondents (95%) and the Bukalo respondents (31%) on the support that they received from development agents. A total of 69% of the Bukalo respondents indicated that they had not received support from development agents.

4.3.4 Role players in the community

Role players in the community play an important part in their developmental efforts through the provision of assistance to the community. The result in Table 4.18 and 4.37 show that the Mubiza community is far more engaged in community activity than Bukalo (89, 19% against 69, 44%).

4.3.5 Support provided by role players

A comparison of Table 4.19 and Table 4.38 reveals that the Mubiza community received 27% more support from the role players than the Bukalo community.

CHAPTER FIVE

INDEPENDENT AND INTERVENING VARIABLES INFLUENCING EXTENSION STAFF BEHAVIOUR.

5.1 Introduction

This Chapter provides an overview of findings of the study with regard to:

- The Socio economic or independent variables influencing the behaviour of Extension staff,
- The Extension staff's perception and their knowledge regarding Community Action Plans as a tool for improving community livelihood.

5.2 Independent variables influencing Extension Staff behaviour

In all, 19 male Extension staff members and only three (3) female Extension staff participated in the study. A total of 17 staff members had six (6) or more years of experience while only five (5) Extension staff members had between less than a year to five (5) years of experience. The majority (15) of the staff members had attained a three year Diploma in Agriculture, five (5) had three years and an additional qualification. Only two (2) staff members had attained a two-year Diploma in Agriculture qualification. The majority of staff members (19) are Senior Agricultural Extension Technicians; while two are Agricultural Extension Technicians and one, a trainee Agricultural Extension Technician.

5.3 The effect of the intervening variables on Extension Staff perceptions on adoption and non-adoption of CAP

5.3.1 Extension approach preferred by Extension staff

The two major approaches that are being used are the ToT and FSRE. This question seeks to have an understanding of staff's perception of the approaches used in extension. The result is illustrated in the next table.

Table 5.1: Extension staff choice of extension approach

Staff perception	Frequency	Percentage
Transfer of technology	0	0
FSRE approach	7	31.82
Combination of the two approaches	15	68.18
Total	22	100

The above findings indicate that the majority of Extension staff members (68%) favour the use of a combination of the Transfer of Technology and the Farming System Research and Extension approaches. Approximately 32% favour the FSRE. There is also a strong opinion (68%) among Extension staff that both approaches can and should play a role in community development activities in their area of responsibility.

5.3.2 Rating of the Agricultural Extension Approach

The FSRE approach is a responsive, non-prescriptive, flexible way of providing research and extension support to farmers. It is demand-driven, dynamic, iterative inter disciplinary, multi disciplinary and collaborative (Bembridge, 1991). In the next table Extension staff rated (according to their knowledge), on a scale of one to five, the (FSRE) approach. The results are illustrated below.

Table 5.2: Extension staff rating (knowledge) of the agricultural extension approach

Rating of Extension approach scale; 1 to 5	Frequency	Percentage
1. Very poor	0	-
2. Poor	1	4.55
3. Reasonable	10	45.45
4. Good	7	31.82
5. Very good	4	18.18
Total	22	100

According to Table 5.2 above, a sizeable number of Extension staff respondents (45%) indicated that the FSRE approach is a reasonable and effective approach while 32% rated the approach as good. 18% rated the approach very good. Only one Extension staff respondent indicated that the approach was poor. The importance of this outcome is that FSRE as an approach is perceived by 95% the Extension staff as at least reasonable to very good.

5.3.3 Rating the use of CAP strategy as a tool for implementing FSRE

A Community Action Plan is an effective and empowering strategy for development in rural areas. As noted earlier on, a Community Action Plan is a process for which a learning phase should be allowed (Matanyaire et al, 2003). This tool was introduced to enhance implementation of the FSRE approach. In the next table Extension staff rated CAP as a strategy to implement FSRE.

Table 5.3: Extension Staff rating of CAP as a strategy for implementing FSRE

Ratings of the CAP as strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Very poor	0	0
Poor	4	18.18
Reasonable	6	27.27
Good	7	31.82
Very good	5	22.73
Total	22	100

According to the survey 23% rated the strategy as very good, whereas 32% rated it good and 27% rated the strategy as reasonable. Only 18% rated the use of the community action plan as poor. The result clearly indicates that 82% of the Extension staff perceived CAP strategy as positive. Therefore for the successful implementation of the FSRE approach, the use of the CAP strategy needs to be actively promoted.

5.3.4 Opinion (attitude) of staff towards CAP as an effective tool for improving the livelihood of the community

The question seeks to establish the Extension staff's attitude towards CAP as an effective strategy for improving the community's livelihood. The results are indicated in the next table.

Table 5.4: Extension staff's attitude towards CAP as an effective tool for improving community livelihoods

Staff attitude on the effectiveness of CAP	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	20	90.91
No	2	9.09
Do not know	0	0
Total	22	100

According to the findings, 91% of the Extension staff respondents indicated clearly that CAP is an effective tool to improve the livelihoods of the community. Therefore, the CAP should be introduced and implemented in all the communities to improve livelihoods within those communities.

5.3.5 Extension Staff opinions on CAP potential to improve community livelihood

Extension staff was requested to provide specific reasons to substantiate their opinion about CAP as an effective tool to improve community livelihoods. The data is presented in Table 5.5.

Table 5.5: Extension staff view on CAP’s potential to improve community development

Respondents opinion and reasons provided	Frequency	Percentage
Not applicable	3	13.64
Somewhat applicable	6	27.27
Applicable	13	59.09
Total	22	100

The majority (59%) of the respondents were of the opinion that a Community Action Plan is an effective tool in improving community livelihoods. It is suitable because:-

- Community understands CAP and members can develop their own development agendas,
- Community action plans assist farmers in identifying their problems and possible means to solve them,
- Community identifies their resources and the resources are mobilized, coordinated and prioritised, and
- The process enables and addresses community based needs.

About 27% of respondents indicated that a Community Action Plan is only somewhat an effective tool for improving community livelihoods. They felt so because:-

- Farmers are reluctant to take ownership of their activities, and
- Farmers are not willing to work in groups.

Only 14% of the Extension staff respondents were uncertain about the question.

5.3.6 Shortcomings of the CAP strategy

Extension staff respondents were required, based on their perception, knowledge and experience, to indicate the shortcomings of CAP strategy. The results are presented in the table below.

Table 5.6 Shortcomings of CAP as perceived by Extension staff

Shortcomings of the CAP strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Reasons are not applicable	5	22.73
Reasons are somewhat applicable	4	18.18
Reasons are applicable	13	59.09
Total	22	100

The majority of Extension staff respondents (77%) involved in the survey identified some of the shortcomings of the strategy as follows:

- Communities still want to plan community development individually,
- Lack of cooperation between the community members,
- Poor understanding of CAP,
- Poor objectives which lead to misinterpretation of the whole concept,
- Lack of motivation among farmers ,
- The approach requires farmers to have some level of literacy and yet most farmers are illiterate,
- Planned activities are not achieved due to poor planning,
- CAP process is difficult for farmers to follow,
- CAP depends on good leadership (if the leadership is poor then the process collapses) and
- Poor support from stakeholders.

Approximately 23% of the Extension staff respondents were not aware of any shortcomings of CAP.

Based on the list of shortcomings identified, there is a need for Extension staff to address these issues together with the community and the stakeholders to ensure that there is maximum participation in the planning process.

5.3.7 Advantages of the CAP strategy

The Extension staff was also requested to identify the advantages of CAP. The advantages are below.

Table 5.7: Extension staff's perception of the advantages of CAP

Advantages of the CAP strategy	Frequency	Percentage
Advantages are not applicable	4	18.18
Advantages are somewhat applicable	4	18.18
Advantages are applicable	14	63.64
Total	22	100

The majority of Extension staff members (64%) indicated that some of the advantages of CAP are:-

- CAP encourages team work in the community,
- It empowers the community,
- It motivates the community to plan their own activities,
- Community identifies and utilizes their own resources,
- It serves as the guiding tool for the community on developmental activities, and
- It embraces actors from a range of disciplines and builds on local strength to address community needs and constraints.

However, 36% respondents were not certain and reasons provided were either only somewhat or not applicable.

5.3.8 Reasons for not using CAP in implementing FSRE approach

The Extension respondents were required to give reasons as to why they do not use the strategy in implementing the FSRE approach. The results are as follows.

Table 5.8: The reasons why Extension staff do not use CAP

Category of reasons	Frequency	Percentage
No reasons	9	40.91
Reasons are somewhat applicable	2	9.09
Reasons are applicable	11	50
Total	22	100

The majority of staff members 59% indicated the following reasons for not using the strategy:-

- Majority farmers do not want to work as a team,
- Lack of cooperation among farmers,
- Limited financial resources (budget),
- Poor coordination among stakeholders,
- Poor understanding by community leaders,
- AETs are not sure of the effectiveness of CAP process, and
- The FSRE approach is not well understood by staff and there is lack of skills i.e. subject matter specialists.

However, 41% Extension staff respondents indicated that there is nothing that prevents them from using the strategy.

5.3.9 Extension staff satisfaction with the support they provide to communities on CAP

Extension staff respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with the kind of support that they are providing to the communities to facilitate the adoption of CAP. The results are illustrated in the next table.

Table 5.9: Extension staff satisfaction with support provided to communities in the CAP process

Category of satisfaction	Frequency	Percentage
Do not know	1	4.54
Not satisfied	8	36.36
Satisfied	12	54.55
Very satisfied	1	4.55
Total `	22	100

The majority of the Extension staff respondents (55%) were satisfied with the support that they were providing while 5% were very satisfied. A total of 40% Extension staff respondents however were not satisfied because they were experiencing constrains in implementation. The main constraint was the lack of financial resources. There is a huge need for improvement in this respect and possible actions are:

- a) To ensure sufficient financial resources are secured.
- b) To investigate possible ways and means of ensuring participation by all stakeholders involved and adoption of a collaborative plan to reduce the financial burden on one stakeholder.

5.3.10 Extension staff attitude towards the role CAP plays in improving the livelihood of communities

Extension staff's attitude regarding the role that CAP plays in improving the livelihood of the community was the next important aspect to be addressed by the respondents. The results are indicated in the next table.

Table 5.10: Extension staff’s opinion on the role a Community Action Plan plays to improve the livelihood of a community

Improving communities livelihoods	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	15	68.18
No	4	18.18
Do not know	3	13.64
Total	22	100

The majority of the Extension staff respondents (68%) indicated that the Community Action Plan did improve the livelihood of the community. About 18% of the Extension staff indicated that CAP had not improved community livelihood, while 14% were uncertain about the whole concept.

5.3.11 Extension staff’s reasons why CAP improves the livelihood of the community

Reasons provided by the Extension staff respondents on how CAP can improve the livelihood of the community are presented in the next table.

Table 5.11: Extension Staff’s reasons for strengthening the potential of CAP as a tool to improve livelihood of communities

Category of reasons to improve CAP	Frequency	Percentage
Reasons are not applicable	5	22.73
Reasons are somewhat applicable	6	27.27
Reasons are applicable	11	50.00
Total	22	100

Most of the Extension staff respondents (77%) were of the opinion that community action plans improve a community’s livelihood. This can be achieved when:-

- Communities start working together and benefit from implementing some income generating activities,
- CAP is derived from farmers’ problems and therefore provides solutions to these problems and improves livelihood,

- Community utilizing CAP has showed some level of progress and improvements and strategies that address the real needs of the farmers.

Respondents who felt that CAP does not improve communities' livelihood constituted 23%. They felt so because:-

- CAPs are not always followed, and
- Communities implementing CAP do not implement planned activities.

5.3.12 Activities of Extension staff regarding the Farming Systems Research and Extension Approach

An extension approach or an extension program can only be successful if the planned activities have been implemented effectively. In the next table the activities implemented by Extension staff using the FSRE approach are presented. The activities have been categorised as indicated below.

Table 5.12: Extension staff's view of essential elements to the FSRE approach

Staff activities implemented	Frequency	Percentage
Activities are not applicable	3	13.64
Activities are somewhat applicable	6	27.27
Activities are applicable	13	59.09
Total	22	100

The following activities were implemented by 86% of the Extension staff respondents:-

- Provide advice to farmers
- Interaction with farmers
- Community mobilization
- Facilitations of communities planning, and
- Assistance in developing the communities' own developmental agendas.

Only 14% Extension staff respondents were uncertain and they disclosed that activities were not applicable.

5.3.13 The best approach (combination of ToT and FSRE) in community development and planning

Extension staffs were required to indicate and provide reasons why a combination of the ToT and FSRE approach is the best in community development planning. The results are presented in the table below.

Table 5.13: Extension Staff respondents’ perception and reasons of the best approach in community development and planning

Staff perception on best approach in community development and planning	Frequency	Percentage
Reasons are not applicable	8	36.36
Reasons are somewhat applicable	4	18.18
Reasons are applicable	10	45.45
Total	22	100

Findings reveal that 64% of the Extension staff respondents provided recommended that the best approach to be used in community development and planning, is a combination of Transfer of Technology (ToT) and Farming Systems Research and Extension (FSRE) approach using Community Action Plans. Only 36% respondents indicated that they did not know which approach is the best.

5.3.14 Support received by Extension staff from community leaders

Community leaders are crucial role players in the implementation of the Community Action Plan strategy and therefore Extension staff respondents were asked whether they had received sufficient support from community leaders. The results are indicated below.

Table 5.14: Extension staff’s views on the support they had received from community leaders

Support received from community leaders	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	16	72.73
No	6	27.27
Total	22	100

The majority of Extension staff (73%) indicated that they had received adequate support from community leaders and only 27% had not received support from community leaders. There is according to the above data a clear indication that there is a relatively good relationship between the Extension staff and community leaders with regard to the implementation of the CAP.

5.3.15 Support received from the Village Development Committee (VDC)

Village Development Committees (VDC) plays also an important role in the implementation of Community Action Plans, specifically in terms of monitoring the planned activities and also providing guidance to the community. The support Extension staff received from VDCs is presented below.

Table 5.15: Extension staff's views the support they had received from the Village Development Committees

Support received from VDC	Frequency	Percentage
No support	5	22.72
To some extent	16	72.73
Full support	1	4.55
Total	22	100

Only one (1) respondent had received full support from the VDC. The majority of the Extension staff respondents (73%) indicated that the support they had received from the VDCs was only to some extent but not fully supportive. 23% indicated that they had not received any support from the VDC. In relation to the support received from community leaders there is definitely room for improvement

5.3.16 Village Development Committees' knowledge of their roles and responsibility.

It is essential aspect that VDC members should know clearly the roles that they ought to play and their responsibilities towards improving the livelihood of the community. In the

next table the extent to which the VDC know their role and responsibilities, as perceived by Extension staff respondents is presented.

Table 5.16: Extension staff’s perception of the VDC’s knowledge of their roles and responsibilities

Staff perception on VDC knowing their roles and responsibilities	Frequency	Percentage
Uncertain	7	31.82
No	8	36.36
Yes	7	31.82
Total	22	100

78% of Extension staff indicated that the VDCs do not know their roles and responsibilities and are uncertain of their roles and responsibilities. Only 32% of the Extension staff respondents indicated that the VDCs do know their responsibilities and the roles they need to play in community development activities.

This is an indication that Extension staff respondents are somehow divided, and there is a clear need to involve the VDCs in the planning of CAPs so that clear roles and responsibilities are properly explained to the VDCs. There is therefore an urgent need to ensure that every VDC member understands his/her role and responsibilities with regard to community development activities and with regard to the extension approach implemented by Extension staff. Extension staff should accept the challenge to discuss and explain the role and responsibilities of VDC members with them and to strengthen their relationship.

CHAPTER SIX

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE CAP STRATEGY: A COMPARISON BETWEEN EXTENSION STAFF AND MUBIZA COMMUNITY AND BETWEEN MUBIZA COMMUNITY AND BUKALO COMMUNITY

6.1 Introduction

This Chapter compares the perceptions, attitude and knowledge of the Extension staff respondents with those of the Mubiza community with regard to CAP and its effectiveness and potential for improving community livelihood. It compares also the perceptions, attitude and knowledge of the Mubiza and Bukalo respondents' regarding the role that CAP plays in improving the livelihood of the community.

6.2 Comparison of views of Extension Staff and Mubiza community regarding a CAP

The critical factors indicated in the table below, have been identified as indicator of the role that CAP plays in development plans. The difference in perceptions between Extension staff and Mubiza community pertaining to the above critical factors is presented in the next table.

Table 6.1: A comparison of perceptions between Extension staff and Mubiza community respondents' regarding some critical factors of effectiveness

Critical factors of effectiveness:	Category	Mubiza respondents (N=37)		Extension Staff respondents (N=22)		P
		Freq	Percent	Freq	Percent	
CAP improves way things are done	Yes	29	78.4	20	90.9	0.2943
Satisfaction with the CAP support	Satisfied	34	91.9	13	59.1	0.0055 *
Rating of the CAP management procedure	Adequate	27	73.0	13	59.1	0.3880
CAP improves community's livelihoods	Yes	29	78.4	15	68.2	0.5374
* = Significant on the 1% level Results of Fisher's Exact Test for a 2x2 contingency table for Mubiza community vs. Extension Staff						

According to the above table a significant difference ($p=0.005$) occurs with regard to respondents' satisfaction with CAP support. 91% of the Mubiza respondents, compared to 59% of the Extension respondents indicated their satisfaction. This is a clear indication that the Mubiza respondents are significantly more satisfied with the CAP support than the Extension staff.

Although no significant difference occurs with regard to the other critical factor, the following results are noticeable:

- Extension staff respondents (91%) are noticeably more convinced that CAP improves the way things are done than the Mubiza respondents (78%);
- With regard to the rating of CAP management procedure, the Mubiza respondents (73%) showed more satisfaction than the Extension staff (59%);
- A slight difference occurs (not significant $P=0.537$) between the two groups of respondents in favour of the Mubiza community (78%) with regard to the role

that CAP plays to improve the livelihood of the community. This is a very important finding. The majority of respondents from both groups indicated clearly that CAP does improve the livelihoods of a community.

6.3 Comparison between Mubiza and a community with no CAP (Bukalo)

The following critical factors have been identified as indicators of the role that CAP plays in development plans. The difference in perception, attitude and knowledge of the Mubiza respondents as compared to those of the Bukalo community with regard to the critical factors is presented in the following tables.

6.3.1 Planning of development activities

Planning is one of the critical parts of community development since it is where the community determines as to how they will manage, and carry out their activities. In the next table a comparison is made between the Mubiza respondents and the Bukalo respondents with regard to their planning of development activities.

Table 6.2: A comparison of Mubiza and Bukalo respondents regarding planning developmental activities

Planning of activities	CAP	No CAP
Through CAP process and with agents	34 (91.89%)	9 (25.00%)
No plans	3 (8.11%)	27 (75.00%)

Likelihood Ratio Chi – Square $p = <0.0001$ significance

The result shows that, the majority of the Mubiza respondents (92%) (Applying Community Action Plans) plan their activities with the assistance of CAP and with the support from agents. The majority of the Bukalo respondents (75%) do not have plans. The results of the likelihood Ratio Chi-Square ($p = <0.0001$) shows that there is a highly significant difference between the Mubiza community and the Bukalo respondents who

have not been introduced to a Community Action Plan. The latter clearly indicate that they do not have development plans.

6.3.2 Farmer satisfaction

A comparison was done to establish the level of satisfaction between the two respondents groups in terms of the support they received from the AETs in respect of CAP. The results are presented in the next table.

Table 6.3: A comparison of satisfaction with support received from AETs

Farmer satisfaction	CAP (37)	No CAP (36)
Don't know and never received support	2(5.41%)	28 (77.78%)
Unsatisfied	1 (2.70%)	3 (8.33%)
Satisfied	34 (91.89%)	5 (13.89%)
Total	37 (100%)	36 (100%)

Likelihood Ratio Chi – Square $p = <0.0001$ significance

The table above reveals that 92% of the Mubiza respondents were satisfied with the support they received from developmental agents, while 78% the Bukalo respondents did not receive support.

The results of (Chi-Square = 52.1204; $p = <0.0001$) show that there is a highly significant difference, in favour of the community with a CAP, between the respondents with a Community Action Plan and those without a CAP. Those with a CAP are overwhelmingly more satisfied with the support received from the AETs than the community without a CAP. There is therefore sufficient evidence that Agricultural Extension Technicians sufficiently support communities with a CAP. The problem however is that it seems as if AETs do not support communities without a CAP an aspect that needs urgent attention from the Division of Extension and Engineering Services.

6.3.3 Rating of usefulness of support from CAP management procedure

A comparison of the Mubiza and Bukalo respondents' perceptions on the usefulness of the support they received, the advantages and disadvantages of the CAP and the rating of the CAP management procedure is presented in the next table.

Table 6.4: A comparison of respondents' perception of the usefulness of the support provided by development agents and the rating of CAP management procedure

Variable	CAP-Mubiza	No CAP-Bukalo
Usefulness of support provided by development agents	95% respondents rated the support useful	72% of respondents did not receive support
Advantages of CAP	78% Provided reasons which were applicable	83% reasons were not applicable
Disadvantages of CAP	78% Provided reasons which were applicable	83% reasons were not applicable
Rating of CAP management procedure	73% of respondents rated their CAP management procedure as adequate	100% respondents indicated that they do not know

According to the Chi-square test a significant difference ($p = < 0.01$) occurred between the respondents with a CAP and respondents without a CAP, in favour of the community with a CAP with regard to the four variables indicated in the above table. These results however were expected to be in favour of the community with a CAP. The positive perception and experience of the role of CAP as a tool in implementing the FSRE approach, again underlining the urgent need to implement CAP in all the communities in the Caprivi Region.

6.3.4 The efficiency of development planning and understanding of CAP

The respondents rated their development planning efficiency and understanding of Community Action Plan and the results are presented in Table 6.5.

Table 6.5: Efficiency rating of Mubiza and Bukalo respondents of development planning and understanding of CAP

Community Category	Variable	Mean (Me)	Median	Standard Deviation	P value
With CAP (n=37)	Rate own development planning efficiency (5 point scale)	4.16	4.0	0.83	<0.0001*
	Understanding of community action planning (4 point scale)	2.72	3.0	0.73	
NOCAP (n=36)	Rate own development planning efficiency (5 point scale)	2.36	2.0	1.25	<0.0001*
	Understanding of community action planning (4 point scale)	1.16	1.0	0.44	

* Significance on the 1% level

According to Table 6.5 the Mubiza respondents rated, using the Wilcoxon rank sum test, their development planning efficiency as good (Me = 4.16). Bukalo respondents rated it poor (Me = 2.36). The difference between the two communities is highly significant. Pertaining to the understanding of CAP, Mubiza respondents displayed a good understanding (Me=2.72) of Community Action Plan compared to the Bukalo respondents (Me = 1.16) indicating that they actually have no idea of CAP. The difference again is highly significant.

6.3.5 The role that CAP plays in improving the way communities carry out their developmental activities

A Community Action Plan is a process whereby communities determine what needs to be done; who is going to do it, how it should be done and when should be done. A comparison of the respondents from the Mubiza and Bukalo is presented below.

Table 6.6: Mubiza and Bukalo perceptions on how Community Action Plan improves the way communities' carryout development activities

Development activities improves	CAP	No CAP
Yes	29 (78.38%)	1 (2.78%)
No/don't know/no CAP	8 (21.62)	35 (97.22%)

Likelihood Ratio Chi – Square $p = <0.0001$ significance

According to Table 6.6 above, the majority of the Mubiza respondents (78%) indicated that Community Action Plans helped them to improve the way they implement their development activities. The majority of the Bukalo respondents (97%) indicated that there was no improvement. The results of likelihood Ratio Chi-Square ($X^2 = 51.0993$; $p = <0.0001$) display a highly significant difference between the community with a CAP and the community without a CAP, in favour of the community with a CAP.

6.3.6 The community planning process

The Mubiza and Bukalo communities rated their own community planning process using a 5-point Likert scale. A comparison of the results is presented in the next table.

Table 6.7: Rating of community planning process

Variable	Farmer Category	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	P value
Rating of the community planning process – 5-point scale	With CAP (n=37)	3.94	4.00	0.94	<0.0001*
	NOCAP (n=36)	2.27	2.0	1.05	<0.0001*

Wilcoxon rank sum test

* Significance on the 1% level

Based on the Wilcoxon rank sum test, Table 6.7 discloses that, the Mubiza respondents rated their community planning process as good (Me=3.94), while the Bukalo respondents rated it poor (Me=2.27). The results of Wilcoxon rank sum test indicate a highly significant ($p < 0.0001$) difference between the Mubiza respondents and the Bukalo respondents, in favour of the community with a CAP.

6.3.7 Community involvement in Planning

The involvement of the community in the planning of development activities is crucial for the successful implementation of the plans. The results as indicated by respondents from the Mubiza community and Bukalo communities with regard to their involvement in planning, local leaders' involvement in planning; reasons for not having a CAP and the extent of participation are presented in the next table.

Table 6.8: Perception of Mubiza and Bukalo Communities' involvement in planning

Variable	CAP- Mubiza respondents	No CAP- Bukalo respondents
Respondents <u>involvement</u> in development planning	100% Involvement planning	52% Involvement planning
Local leaders <u>involvement</u> in the planning process	95% respondents indicated that leaders are involved in planning process	55% respondents indicated that leaders are not involved in the planning process
<u>Reasons</u> for not having a CAP	97% respondents indicated that nothing is preventing them from having a CAP	78% respondents provided reasons that are applicable for not having a CAP
The extent of <u>participation</u> in community development programs	81% respondents indicated that they participate fully in community development programs	64% respondents indicated that they partially participate in community development programs

Applying the Chi-square test significant difference was shown between the two communities with regard to all four variables and in favour of the Mubiza community which has CAP.

6.3.8 Best way of planning community development activities

Both the Mubiza and the Bukalo communities were asked to indicate the best way to plan community development activities and the results are presented in the next table.

Table 6.9: Mubiza and Bukalo respondents' perception of the best way to plan community development activities

Planning activities	CAP	No CAP
Don't know	6 (16%)	9 (25%)
Reasons are applicable	31 (84%)	27 (75%)

Likelihood Ratio Chi – Square $p = <0.3519$ no significance

Table 6.9 shows that the respondents' views regarding the best way of planning community development. The results of likelihood Ratio Chi-Square ($p = <0.3519$) indicate that there is no significant difference between the two communities. The findings pave the way for the implementation of CAP as a tool to support the FSRE approach to communities not involved in the process yet.

6.3.9 Support received from community leaders and the role and responsibilities of Village Development Committee

A comparison is made between the Mubiza respondents and the Bukalo respondents in their response with regard to the support they received from the community leaders and the roles and responsibilities of the Village Development Community (VDC). The results are presented in the next table.

Table 6.10: Comparison of support received by Mubiza and Bukalo from community leaders and the role and responsibilities of the VDC

Variable	Mubiza Respondents (CAP)	Bukalo respondents (NoCAP)
Support received from community leaders	92% - respondents indicated adequate support received from community leaders	61%- respondents indicated adequate support received from community leaders
VDC know their roles and responsibilities	81% respondents indicated that the VDC knows their roles and responsibilities	83%) respondents indicated VDC does not know their roles and responsibilities.

Table 6.10 shows that the majority of the Mubiza respondents (92%) received adequate support from the community leaders, while 61% of the Bukalo respondents indicated that they had received similar adequate support from the community leaders. This support ranged from providing advice and making sure that culture is restored and maintained in the community. On the role and responsibilities of VDCs 81% of the Mubiza respondents indicated that the VDC did know their role and responsibilities while 83% of the Bukalo respondents held the same view. A clear and significant difference again in favour of the community with a CAP.

6.3.10 Availability of Extension staff in the areas

Both the Mubiza and the Bukalo communities were asked to indicate if there is an Agricultural Extension Technician in the area and the number of times they had attended extension meetings. The results are presented in the next table.

Table 6.11: Comparison of Mubiza and Bukalo respondents on their knowledge of the AET in their area and attendance of extension meetings

Variable	CAP	No CAP
Agricultural Extension Technician present in the area	Yes: 100% respondents	Yes: 58% respondents
Number of times attending Extension meetings	97% attended more than 2 meetings	42% respondents attending extension meetings once.

All the respondent of the Mubiza community were aware of the presence of an Agricultural Extension Technician in the area, against 58% of the Bukalo respondents. Similarly the Majority of the Mubiza respondents (97%) attended more than two extension meetings while only 42% of the Bukalo respondents had attended one extension meeting only. According to the Chi-square test these differences are significantly ($p, = < 0.01$) in favour of the Mubiza community.

6.3.11 Information on radio

The radio is an effective communication tool for information dissemination. The comparison between the Mubiza and the Bukalo respondents with regard to how often they listened to agricultural information on the radio is presented in the next table.

Table 6.12: Frequency of listening to agricultural information on radio

Variable	CAP	No CAP
Do not know and never	2 (5%)	3 (8%)
Once a week	24 (65%)	18 (50%)
Once a month	11 (30%)	15 (42%)

Likelihood Ratio Chi – Square $p = < 0.4348$ no significance

Both the Mubiza and the Bukalo respondents often hear information on radio. The results of the likelihood Ratio Chi-Square ($p = < 0.4348$) show that there is no significant difference between the two communities when it comes to listening and receiving agricultural information on the radio. The radio can therefore be affectively used as a communication channel to communicate with communities and specifically with regard to the extension program being implemented through the FSRE approach.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Introduction

The Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services in the Caprivi Region introduced the concept of community action planning as a tool in implementing the FSRE approach. The main aim is to have functional Community Action Plans in all communities in the Caprivi Region. Community Action Plan was viewed as a useful tool for implementing the FSRE approach in rural communities by the Directorate. However not all role players perceive it to be useful. The purpose of this study is to determine the usefulness of Community Action Plans as a strategy for bottom up extension program planning process. The following objectives were formulated for this study:-

- To investigate the effectiveness of Community Action Plans in Extension planning,
- To investigate community participation and ownership of their developmental agendas,
- To investigate the roles of community leaders in the community planning process,
- To evaluate the staff's perception on the Community Action Plan as a tool,
- To determine if the community with a CAP and a community without a CAP perceive the value of CAP different and
- To determine if Extension staff and community with CAP perceive the CAP as a tool to improve their livelihoods of the community differently.

The hypothesis formulated is:

A Community Action Plans is an effective tool to improve the livelihood of communities.

The study was conducted in the Caprivi Region in Namibia specifically among two communities, namely Mubiza community which adopted CAP and the Bukalo which had

not adopted CAP as well as among the Extension Staff working in the region. The Data was collected as from May 2007 to July 2007.

7.2 Independent variables

The findings are that there is no significant difference between the two communities, namely Mubiza, which applies CAP and Bukalo which does not with regard to gender, household head, age, education level and farming experience. However, it was very clear that, with regard to gender, there are more female members than males in both communities. With regard to age, again more elderly people (46>) are involved in developmental issues in these two communities.

The study also revealed that there was a significant difference between the two respondent groups in respect of the following independent variables:

- Extension contact
Mubiza (CAP) – 100%
Bukalo– 58%
- Extension meetings attended
Mubiza (CAP) – 100%
Bukalo– 58%

7.3 Conclusion

7.3.1 Effectiveness of Community Action Plans in Extension planning

The majority of the Mubiza community (91%) plan their development activities with the assistance of CAP while the majority of the Bukalo (75% do not have plans). This difference is highly significant ($p < 0.0001$) and is in favour of Mubiza a community that has been introduced to CAP.

A significant difference (Chi-square=52.104; $p < 0.0001$) also occurs between the two communities with regard to their satisfaction with the support received from AETs during the CAP process. The Mubiza community had 92% versus 14% for Bukalo community (Table 6.3).

In rating the efficiency of development planning the Mubiza community rated their development planning (Me=4.16) significantly higher ($p < 0.0001$) than the Bukalo community (Me=2.836). There is clear evidence that CAP played an important role in the effectiveness of the extension planning process.

7.3.2 Community participation and ownership of the developmental agendas

The objective was to determine community participation in community planning and their ownership of plans. The study indicates that 100% of the Mubiza respondents are participating and involved in the planning process, compared to 52% of the Bukalo who are participating in community developmental planning. This difference is highly significant ($p < 0.0001$)

The study reveals also that 81% of the Mubiza respondents (Table 6.8) participate fully in community programs whereas 64% of the Bukalo respondents participate partially in community development programs. According to the findings above, the community utilizing CAP participates significantly more in community development as compared to the community without a CAP.

7.3.3 Roles of community leaders in the community planning process

A total of 92% of the Mubiza (CAP) respondents indicated that the support community leaders provided was applicable while only 42% gave a similar response. With regard to local leaders' involvement in the planning process, 95% of the respondents from a community with a CAP against only 45% Bukalo respondents indicated that local leaders are involved.

7.3.4 Staff's perception of the Community Action Plan

According to the study the majority of Extension staff members (82%) perceived CAP as a useful tool in implementing the Farming Systems Research and Extension approach while only 18% of Extension staff perceived it as poor. This finding is further supported by the result that majority of Extension staff (91%) perceived CAP as an effective tool to improve community livelihoods.

7.3.5 The value of CAP as perceived by the communities

In Table 6.6, the majority of the Mubiza respondents (78%) indicated that Community Action Plans helped them to improve the way they implemented their development activities, while the majority (97%) of the Bukalo respondents indicated that there was no improvement. The results of likelihood Ratio Chi-Square ($X^2 = 51.0993$; $p = <0.0001$) display a highly significant difference between the community with a CAP and the community without a CAP in favour of the community with a CAP.

However, there was no significant difference ($p = <0.3519$) between the two community respondents of Mubiza and Bukalo communities on the best way of planning community development (Table 6.9). The two communities seem to agree on the best way of planning community development, therefore paving the way for the implementation of CAP as a tool to support the FSRE approach to communities not yet involved in the process.

7.3.6 Perceptions of CAP as a tool for improving the livelihoods of communities

According to the findings (Table 6.1) a significant difference ($P=0.005$) occurs with regard to respondents' satisfaction with CAP support. A total of 91% of the Mubiza respondents, compared to 59% of the Extension staff respondents indicated their satisfaction. This is a clear indication that the Mubiza respondents are significantly more satisfied with the CAP support than the Extension staff.

With regard to the other critical factors, the following results are noticeable and an indication that both Extension staff and Mubiza respondents perceive the CAP as a valuable tool to improve the livelihoods of communities:

- Extension staff respondents (91%) are noticeably more convinced that the CAP strategy improves the way things are done than the Mubiza respondents (78%).
- With regard to the rating of the CAP management procedure, the Mubiza respondents (73%) are more satisfied than the Extension staff (59%).
- A slight difference occurred (not significant: $p=0.537$) between the two groups of respondents in favour of the Mubiza community (78%) with regards to the role that the CAP plays in improving the livelihood of the community.

Pertaining to CAP improving community livelihoods the study findings (Table 6.6) reveal that, the majority of the Mubiza respondents (78% were helped by CAP to improve the way they implemented their development activities, while the majority of the Bukalo respondents (97%) felt that there was no improvement. The results of likelihood Ratio Chi-Square ($X^2 = 51.0993$, $p = <0.0001$) display a highly significant difference between the community with a CAP and the community without a CAP in favour of the community with a CAP.

There was no significant difference between the respondents of Mubiza and Bukalo communities with regard to their livelihood sources before 1995. After 1995 livelihood resources increased from only three to nine within the Mubiza community. Both the Extension staff (68%) and Mubiza respondents (78%) agreed that the CAP did improve the livelihood of a community (Table 6.1).

7.4 Recommendations

The following recommendations are put forward based on the findings of the study. These recommendations could be used to improve the implementation of the FSRE approach through the Community Action Plan strategy.

- It is clear that both Extension staff and the Mubiza respondents agree that a Community Action Plan is an empowering tool for effective implementation of the Farming Systems Research and Extension (FSRE) approach. It is imperative for developmental agents to utilize the strategy and assist the communities in establishing functional Community Action plans for the implementation of the FSRE approach.
- The importance of community participation and the role that community leaders play in the planning process cannot be overestimated and Agricultural Extension Technicians need to ensure that real participation takes place and that community leaders participate and support the process.
- Extension staff perceives CAP as an effective tool for implementing FSRE approach and further support of Extension staff by the Directorate is essential to ensure the effective implementation of the FSRE approach.

Finally the study was conducted only in the Caprivi Region where the CAP strategy was initially introduced. It is therefore recommended that similar studies be extended to other Regions within the country to establish the effectiveness of the CAP in other Regions.

REFERENCES:

BEMBRIDGE, T.J., 1991. The Practice of Agricultural Extension. A Training Manual. Development Bank of South Africa. Halfway House.

BRUNEAU, HILARION,. 1994 Managing Financial Resources-Principles and Recommendations for Agricultural Research Managers. The Hague: International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR).

CHAMBERS, R., 1983. Rural development: putting the last first. London: Longman.

MINISTRY OF REGIONAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND HOUSING, 1998. Decentralization in Namibia. The Policy, Its Development and Implementation Book 2. Namibia.

DEPARTMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (DFID), 1999. Sustainable Livelihood Guidance Sheet.

HAGMANN, J., CHUMA, E., MURWIRA, K. M. & CONNOLLY, M., July 1999. Putting Process Into Practice: Operationalising Participatory Extension. Agricultural Research & Extension Network. AgREN.

KIRSTEN, J., 2003. Rural Livelihoods. In: D'Heese L & Kirsten J. Rural Development Focusing on Small Scale Agriculture in Southern Africa. University of Pretoria. South Africa.

MATANYAIRE, J.C, KAMBINDA, M.N. & URBEN, R., 2003. Guidelines for Facilitating Communities to produce and manage implementation of Action Plans. Namibia.

- MATANYAIRE, J.C., 2003. Facilitation Reference Manual. Namibia.
- MENDELSON, J. & ROBERTS, C., 1997. An Environmental Profile and Atlas of Caprivi, Directorate of Environment and Tourism, Namibia.
- NATIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION, 2003. 2001 Population and Housing Census Caprivi Region, Basic Analysis with Highlights, Windhoek, Namibia.
- OLTHETEN, T., 1995. Participatory approaches to planning for community forestry: results and lesson from case studies conducted in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Forestry, trees and people Phase II working paper No.2. FAO, Rome.
- PERRET, S., 2003. Methodologies for Rural Development. In: D'Hease L & Kirsten J. Rural Development focusing on small scale Agriculture in southern Africa. University of Pretoria. South Africa.
- PROKOPENKO, J., 1987. Productivity Management: A Practical Handbook Geneva International Labour Office.
- RÖLING, N., 1988. Extension science: information systems in rural development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- RURAL EXTENSION MATERIAL UNIT, 1995. Extension staff Handbook Volume 1, Extension Principles and Practice. Namibia.
- RUSSELL, D.B., ISON, R.L., GAMBLE, D.R. & WILLIAMS, R.K., 1989. A critical review of rural extension theory and practice. Richmond, NSW: Faculty of Agriculture and Rural Development, University of Western Sydney – Hawkesbury.
- STARKEY, P., 1992. Animal power in Namibia: Present status and programme requirements. DfID/MAWRD.

STEVENS, J.B., 2003. Principles and Approaches of Development and Extension. Training Material. University of Pretoria. South Africa.

VANCLAY, F. & LAWRENCE, G., 1995. The Environmental Imperative: Ecosocial Concerns for Australian Agriculture. Central Queensland University Press, Rockhampton.



APPENDIX A: FARMER QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Questionnaire Information

1.	Enumerator..... Ward..... Questionnaire No:	Date..... Village.....	Office use only 1. <input type="checkbox"/>
----	---	-------------------------------	---

B. Farmer Type

2.	2.1 Gender of respondent: 2.1 Male <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Female <input type="checkbox"/> 2	2.2 Respondent is: 2.2 De jure head <input type="checkbox"/> 1 De factor head <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Other (what) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 5	2.1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2.2 <input type="checkbox"/>
3.	Age of: 3.1 Respondent 15-30 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 31-45 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 46-60 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 >60 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Exact age of respondent:	Education of 3.2 Respondent No school <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Part primary <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Part secondary <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Secondary + <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Exact Education of respondent:	3.1 <input type="checkbox"/> 3.2 <input type="checkbox"/>



<p>3.3 How long have you been involved in i) farming and ii) community development?</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;"></th> <th style="width: 35%; text-align: center;">i)</th> <th style="width: 35%; text-align: center;">ii)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><1 year</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2-5 years</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6-10 years</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>>10 years</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Exact years of experience: ...i).....</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ii).....</p>		i)	ii)	<1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	2-5 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	6-10 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	>10 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<p>3.3</p> <p>i) <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>ii) <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	i)	ii)														
<1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1														
2-5 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2														
6-10 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3														
>10 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4														

C. Farmer Extension Contact

4.	<p>4.1 Is there any Agricultural Extension Technician in your area?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p>	<p>4.2. How often did you meet and get information from Extension staff?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Never <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>1-3 times/month <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>> 3 times/month <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p>	<p>4.1. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4.2. <input type="checkbox"/></p>
4.	<p>4.3. How many times did you attend extension meetings in the past?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Once <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p>	<p>4.4. Have you ever received any leaflets from extension staff in the past?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>If yes, mention one leaflet:</p>	<p>4.3. <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>4.4. <input type="checkbox"/></p>



4.	4.5. How often do you hear agricultural information on the radio?	4.5. <input type="checkbox"/>
	Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Never <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Once a week <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Once a month <input type="checkbox"/> 4	

D. Extension Impact (CAP Technology)

5.	5.1 How do you plan your developmental activities?	5.2. How do you rate your own developmental planning efficiency on the scale of 1 to 5 below	5.1. <input type="checkbox"/>
	Through CAP process <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Through agents' plans <input type="checkbox"/> 2 No plans <input type="checkbox"/> 3 None of the above <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Very poor <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Poor <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Reasonable <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Very good <input type="checkbox"/> 5	5.2 <input type="checkbox"/>
5.	5.3. What is the best way of planning community development activities?		5.3 <input type="checkbox"/>
	AET with community participation <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Communities plan development without support <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Planning by AETs only <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
6.	Are you involved in the planning of community development?		6 <input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1 No <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 3		



7.	<p>How do you rate your community planning process?</p> <p>Very poor <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Poor <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Reasonable <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Good <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p> <p>Very good <input type="checkbox"/> 5</p>	7. <input type="checkbox"/>
8.	<p>What is your understanding of CAP?</p> <p>No idea <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Some how understand <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Good understanding <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Very good <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p>	8. <input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>9.1. Are the local leaders involved in the planning process?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p>	9.1. <input type="checkbox"/>
9.	<p>9.2. If yes, what type of support do they provide?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	9.2. <input type="checkbox"/>



	<p>9.3. What type of leadership style is required in the CAP process?</p> <p>Autocratic leadership style <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Democratic leadership style <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Lazy fare leadership style <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Combination of Autocratic and Democratic <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 5</p>	9.3. <input type="checkbox"/>
10	<p>Did you receive any support from developmental agents during the planning process?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p>	10. <input type="checkbox"/>
11	<p>How useful is the support provided by developmental agents?</p> <p>No support provided <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Not useful <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Useful <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Very useful <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p>	11. <input type="checkbox"/>
12	<p>How satisfied are you with the support provided to you by AET on the CAP process?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Never received support <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Not satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p> <p>Very satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> 5</p>	12. <input type="checkbox"/>



	<p>13.1. Does the community action plans help you to improve the way you do things?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p>	13.1. <input type="checkbox"/>
13	<p>13.2. If yes in which way? (give reasons)</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	13.2. <input type="checkbox"/>
14	<p>What were your livelihood sources before 1995?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	14. <input type="checkbox"/>
15	<p>What are your livelihood sources currently now?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	15. <input type="checkbox"/>



	<p>16.1. Who are the role players in community development in your area?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	16.1. <input type="checkbox"/>
16	<p>16.2. What type of support do these role players provide in your area?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	16.2. <input type="checkbox"/>
17	<p>In your opinion what are the advantages of having a community action plan?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	17. <input type="checkbox"/>
18	<p>What are the disadvantages of a community action plan in the community?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	18 <input type="checkbox"/>



19.	What prevents you from having a community action plan? 	19. <input type="checkbox"/>
20	What will you say is the best way of planning community development? 	20. <input type="checkbox"/>
21	Do you as community member receive adequate support from community leaders? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1 No <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Please motivate your answer: 	21. <input type="checkbox"/>
22	What support did you receive from the Village Development Committee? No support <input type="checkbox"/> 1 To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Full support <input type="checkbox"/> 3	22. <input type="checkbox"/>



23	<p>Does the Village development committee know their roles and responsibilities?</p> <p>Uncertain <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Please explain your answer:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	23. <input type="checkbox"/>
24	<p>To what extent do you participate in community program?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Do not participate at all <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Participate to some extent <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Participate fully <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p>	24. <input type="checkbox"/>
25	<p>How would you rate the CAP management procedure?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Inadequate (not sufficient) <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Moderately <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Absolute adequately <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p> <p>Please explain your answer:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	25. <input type="checkbox"/>



APPENDIX B: STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE COMPLETED BY AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION STAFF

1.	Staff Name:	Date.....	Office use only 1. <input type="checkbox"/>
	ADC (ward):	Questionnaire No:	
2.	2.1 Gender of respondent: Male <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Female <input type="checkbox"/> 2	2.2 Years of service: <1 year <input type="checkbox"/> 1 1-5 years <input type="checkbox"/> 2 6-10 years <input type="checkbox"/> 3 >10 years <input type="checkbox"/> 4	2.1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2.2 <input type="checkbox"/>
3.	3.1 Highest Qualification: Two year Agric Diploma <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Three year Agric Diploma <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Three year plus additional <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Other <input type="checkbox"/> 4	3.2 Present Rank AET <input type="checkbox"/> 1 SAET <input type="checkbox"/> 2 AEO <input type="checkbox"/> 3 CAET <input type="checkbox"/> 4	3.1 <input type="checkbox"/> 3.2 <input type="checkbox"/>



4.	<p>4.1 Which approach do you favour or prefer?</p> <p>Transfer of Technology (ToT) <input type="checkbox"/> 1 FSRE approach <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Combination of the two above <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Other (name)</p>	<p>4.2. How do you rate the approach used in Agricultural Extension on the scale of 1 to 5 below</p> <p>Very poor <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Poor <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Reasonable <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Very good <input type="checkbox"/> 5</p>	4.1 <input type="checkbox"/> 4.2 <input type="checkbox"/>
4.	<p>4.3. How do you rate the use of the CAP strategy in implementing the FSRE approach on the scale below?</p> <p>Very poor <input type="checkbox"/> 1 Poor <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Reasonable <input type="checkbox"/> 3 Good <input type="checkbox"/> 4 Very good <input type="checkbox"/> 5</p> <p>Explain your answer:</p>	4.3 <input type="checkbox"/>	



5.	<p>5.1. In your opinion is CAP strategy an effective tool in improving community livelihoods?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1 No <input type="checkbox"/> 2 Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p>	5.1. <input type="checkbox"/>
	<p>5.2. If yes or no please provide reasons for your answer?</p> <p>.....</p>	5.2. <input type="checkbox"/>
6	<p>What are the shortcomings of the CAP strategy?</p> <p>.....</p>	6. <input type="checkbox"/>
7	<p>What are the advantages of CAP strategies?</p> <p>.....</p>	7. <input type="checkbox"/>
8	<p>What prevents you from using the CAP strategy in implementing the FSRE approach?</p> <p>.....</p>	8. <input type="checkbox"/>



9.	<p>How satisfied are you with the support you provide to communities on the CAP process?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Not satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Very satisfied <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p>	9. <input type="checkbox"/>
10	<p>In your opinion is community action plans improving community's livelihoods?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p>	10. <input type="checkbox"/>
11	<p>If yes or no in which way? (give reasons)</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	11. <input type="checkbox"/>
12	<p>What are your activities with regards to the FRSE approach?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	12. <input type="checkbox"/>



13	<p>What will you suggest is the best approach in community development and planning?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	13. <input type="checkbox"/>
14	<p>Do you as development agent (extension worker) receive adequate support from community leaders?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Please motivate your answer:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	14. <input type="checkbox"/>
15	<p>What support did you receive from the Village Development Committee?</p> <p>No support <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Full support <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p>	15. <input type="checkbox"/>



16	<p>Does the Village development committee know their roles and responsibilities?</p> <p>Uncertain <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Please explain your answer:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	16. <input type="checkbox"/>
17	<p>To what extent do communities participate in the program?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Do not participate at all <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Participate to some extent <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Participate fully <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p>	17. <input type="checkbox"/>
18	<p>How would you rate the CAP management procedure?</p> <p>Do not know <input type="checkbox"/> 1</p> <p>Inadequate (not sufficient) <input type="checkbox"/> 2</p> <p>Moderately <input type="checkbox"/> 3</p> <p>Absolute adequately <input type="checkbox"/> 4</p> <p>Please explain your answer:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	18. <input type="checkbox"/>