**Tables**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **N** | **%** |
| **Gender**  Male  Female  **Marital Status**  Married  Not married  **Education level**  Upper Primary  >Upper Primary  **Member of farmer organization**  Yes  No | 175  214  325  64  309  80  358  31 | 45  55  84  16  79  21  92  8 |
| **Variable**  **Age**  **Household Size** | **Median value**  43  6 | **Interquartile Range**  15  2 |

**Table 4.1: Demographic characteristics**

Source: Field Survey (2022)

Table 4.2: Farm Characteristics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **N** | **%** |
| **Full-time or part-time farming and their average hectarage of arable land (ha)** | | |
| Full-time | 349 | 19 |
| Hectarage | 0.9 | |
|  | | |
| Part-time | 40 | 11 |
| Hectarage | 0.9 | |
| **Farm enterprises** | | |
| Crop only | 89 | 23 |
| Crop and livestock | 300 | 77 |
| **Farming reasons** | | |
| HH Consumption | 24 | 6 |
| Both Sale & consumption | 365 | 94 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

Table 4.3: Mean total crop produce and livestock sold in 2020/2021 season

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mean total crop produce sold (MK) | 248 856 |
| Mean total livestock sold (MK) | 41 033 |
| **Total (MK)** | **289 889** |

Note: $1=MK799 in 2021 on average

Source: Field Survey (2022)

Table 4.4: Proportion of farmers who experienced food shortages in 2020/2021 and 2019/2020

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Production season** | **With food shortage %** | **Without food shortage %** | **Total** |
| **2020-2021** | 53 | 47 | **100** |
| **2019-2020** | 53 | 47 | **100** |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 4.5: Support services in the area of study**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **N** | **%** |
| **Access to Ministry of Agriculture staff (n=389)** | | |
| Yes | 353 | 91 |
| Not | 36 | 9 |
| **Frequency of access of Ministry of Agriculture staff per year (n=349)** | | |
| > 3 times | 215 | 61 |
| 2-3 times | 62 | 18 |
| Once | 72 | 21 |
| **Access to NGOs (n=389)** | | |
| Yes | 194 | 49 |
| Not | 195 | 51 |
| **Frequency of access to NGO support per year (n=192)** | | |
| > 3 times | 90 | 47 |
| 2-3 times | 61 | 32 |
| Once | 41 | 21 |
| **Access to private companies (n=389)** | | |
| Yes | 56 | 14 |
| Not | 333 | 86 |
| **Frequency of access of private companies support per year (n=56)** | | |
| > 3 times | 23 | 41 |
| 2-3 times | 14 | 25 |
| Once | 19 | 34 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.1: Proportion of farmers that accessed extension service from different sources and the frequency of access (n=389)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Extension services** | **Access to extension services (%)** | **Frequency of extension access per year (%)** | | |
| **Annually** | **Bi-yearly** | **Quarterly** |
| Ministry of Agriculture staff | 91 | 21 | 18 | 61 |
| NGOs | 49 | 21 | 32 | 47 |
| Private companies/agro-dealers | 14 | 34 | 25 | 41 |
| Lead farmer | 73 | 17 | 19 | 64 |
| Traditional leaders | 44 | 21 | 24 | 55 |
| Other government departments | 26 | 33 | 39 | 28 |
| Fellow farmer/friend | 38 | 23 | 22 | 55 |
| Farmer organization | 28 | 33 | 15 | 52 |

Source: Field survey (2022)

**Table 5.2: Extension channels used in Dedza, their prevalence and farmers preference**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Extension channels** | **Farmers that accessed extension through the approach (%)** | **Farmers that ranked it as number one (%)** |
| Field tours | 52 | 43 |
| Individual farm/household visits | 48 | 26 |
| Workshops  Farmer field/business schools | 40  64 | 10  6 |
| Field days | 69 | 4 |
| Presentations during village meeting | 49 | 4 |
| Demonstrations plots | 84 | 3 |
| Agriculture shows/fairs  Publications | 44  28 | 2  2 |
| Lead farmer (F2F) approach | 73 | 1 |
| Electronic media | 39 | 0 |

Source: Field survey (2022)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Extension delivery channels** | **N** | **Perceived effectiveness** | | |
| **Ineffective (%)** | **Marginally (%)** | **Effective (%)** |
| Farmer field/business schools | 9 | 11 | 22 | 67 |
| Demonstrations | 20 | 5 | - | 95 |
| Field days | 20 | 5 | 20 | 75 |
| Field tours | 13 | - | 8 | 92 |
| Agriculture shows/fairs | 11 | 8 | 42 | 50 |
| Presentations during village meetings | 15 | - | 27 | 73 |
| Workshops | 19 | - | 21 | 79 |
| Electronic media | 15 | - | 40 | 60 |
| Publication | 15 | - | 40 | 60 |
| Lead farmer (F2F) approach | 19 | - | 16 | 84 |
| Individual farm/household visits | 19 | - | 16 | 84 |

**Table 5.3: Service providers perception on the effectiveness of extension channels**

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.1: Perceived competence levels of service providers in technical and soft skills**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Service Providers** | **N** | | **Percentage Score (%)** | | | | | |
|  | | **Competent** | | **Marginally compt** | | **Incompetent** | |
| **Tech** | **Soft** | **Tech** | **Soft** | **Tech** | **Soft** | **Tech** | **Soft** |
| **Min of Agriculture** | 350 | 350 | 81 | 69 | 15 | 22 | 4 | 9 |
| **Lead farmer** | 286 | 284 | 75 | 60 | 20 | 31 | 5 | 9 |
| **NGOs** | 193 | 193 | 75 | 67 | 23 | 28 | 2 | 6 |
| **Private Agro-dealers** | 56 | 55 | 64 | 65 | 29 | 29 | 7 | 6 |
| **Traditional leaders** | 182 | 181 | 78 | 66 | 18 | 29 | 3 | 5 |
| **Other govt departments** | 101 | 100 | 80 | 64 | 20 | 26 | 0 | 10 |
| **Fellow farmer/friend** | 146 | 146 | 72 | 69 | 27 | 19 | 1 | 12 |
| **Farmer organization** | 106 | 106 | 66 | 61 | 31 | 31 | 3 | 8 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.2: Proportion of farmers in each category of recommendations application (n=384)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendations applied in the farm** | **N** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| All of them | 114 | 30 | **30** |
| Most of them | 56 | 14 | **44** |
| Half of them | 80 | 21 | **65** |
| A few of them | 97 | 25 | **90** |
| None of them | 37 | 10 | **100** |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.3: Reasons for not implementing extension delivered technologies on the farm (n=258)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reason** | **N** | **%** |
| Did not understand well the recommendation | 152 | **59** |
| Requires inputs I cannot afford | 110 | **43** |
| Requires inputs that were not available locally | 99 | **38** |
| Recommendation was too complicated | 95 | **37** |
| Recommendation was not useful | 71 | **28** |
| Requires a lot of time | 61 | **24** |
| Tried it in the past it did not work | 14 | **5** |
| Other | 15 | **6** |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.4: Farmers' perceived improvements in various aspects of extension benefits (n=389)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benefits** | **N** | **Level of improvement (% score)** | | | | **Total**  **% of n** |
| **None** | **Little** | **Moderate** | **Substantial** |
| Farm productivity | 381 | 7 | 25 | 36 | 30 | 98 |
| Profitability on farm | 382 | 13 | 30 | 38 | 18 | 98 |
| Visibility of extension providers | 381 | 10 | 28 | 36 | 24 | 98 |
| Number & quality of training events | 382 | 13 | 32 | 38 | 17 | 98 |
| Your technical skills to farm | 382 | 7 | 21 | 45 | 24 | 98 |
| Linkages with markets | 381 | 43 | 27 | 24 | 4 | 98 |
| Access to farm inputs | 382 | 35 | 28 | 28 | 7 | 98 |
| Access to institutions for credit | 381 | 56 | 19 | 17 | 7 | 98 |
| Preservation and storage of produce | 382 | 15 | 32 | 35 | 16 | 98 |
| Planning for agricultural production | 381 | 11 | 33 | 36 | 18 | 98 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.5: Change in crop productivity in Dedza from 2019/ 2020 and 2020/2021**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Season** | **Productivity (kg/ha)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Maize** | **Beans** | **Soya** | **G/nuts** | **Rice** | **Irish Potato** | **Sweet Potato** | **Tobac** | **Vegs** | **Casav** | **Other** |
| **2020-2021** | 2254 | 393 | 1208 | 842 | 2359 | 2582 | 4537 | 1180 | 3399 | 2269 | 1317 |
| **2019-2020** | 2077 | 365 | 1168 | 779 | 2184 | 2192 | 3340 | 1431 | 2446 | 2700 | 853 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.6: Change in livestock rearing in Dedza in the last two years of SANE implementation.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Period** | **Type of Livestock** | **Average quantity (heads)** | | | | | | |
| **Cattle** | **Goats** | **Chicken** | **Pigs** | **Rabbits** | **Ducks** | **Others** |
| **2022** | **Quantity (heads)** | 5 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 12 | 6 | 19 |
| **% of rears** | 10 | 42 | 50 | 24 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| **2021** | **Quantity (heads)** | 5 | 6 | 18 | 5 | 13 | 8 | 18 |
| **% of rears** | 10 | 38 | 49 | 22 | 5 | 3 | 6 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.7: Mean annual income from crop sales during 2020/2021 seasons**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Crop** | **Maize** | **Beans** | **Soya** | **G/nuts** | **Irish Potato** | **Mean total value of sale** |
| **Mean values of sale (MK)** | 1 123 593 | 48 128 | 93 466 | 158 198 | 321 890 | **222 948** |
| **Households involved (%)** | 31 | 22 | 50 | 44 | 18 |  |

*Mean total produce sold=total crop income/total number of households*

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 5.8: Change in mean annual income from livestock between 2020/2021 and 2019/2020**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Season** | **Livestock mean values of sale (MK)** | | | | | | | |
| **Cattle** | **Goats** | **Chicken** | **Pigs** | **Rabbits** | **Ducks** | **Other** | **Average** |
| **2020/2021** | 245 816 | 55 874 | 13 839 | 98 250 | 9 644 | 15 000 | 32 643 | **65 917** |
| **2019/2020** | 219 559 | 43 481 | 13 662 | 91 093 | 4 852 | 20 333 | 25 561 | **59 792** |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 6.1: Proportion of farmers aware of the existence of agri-stakeholder platforms (n=386)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Awareness of networks by farmers in the district** | **N** | **%** |
| Aware  Not aware | 361  25 | 93  7 |
| **Total** | 386 | 100% |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 6.2: Proportion of farmers who identified each network of stakeholders (n=386)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Networks/platforms** | **N** | **%** |  |
| DAESS (DAECC/DSP/ASP/VSP) platforms | 347 | 90 |  |
| Nutrition platform (NCC) | 217 | 56 |  |
| Local government structure (LGS) platforms | 243 | 63 |  |
| Extension Planning Area offices (EPAs) | 144 | 37 |  |
| Others | 5 | 1 |  |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 6.3: Perceived effectiveness of DAESS platforms in coordinating extension (n=389)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Effective (%)** | **Marginally (%)** | **Ineffective (%)** |
| Reducing conflicting extension messages | 52 | 34 | 12 |
| Identifying and hearing farming needs | 58 | 29 | 10 |
| Finding responses to farming needs | 60 | 26 | 11 |
| Helping service providers share information | 56 | 31 | 10 |
| Helping service providers work together | 60 | 29 | 9 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 6.4: Percentages of farmers participating in the planning of extension support in platforms**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Networks/platforms** | **Farmers that participated (%)** |
| DAESS Platforms (ASP/VAC) | 77 |
| Local government structure (LGS) | 50 |
| Nutrition platforms (caregroups) | 43 |
| Extension planning area offices (EPA) | 34 |
| Others (specify) | 22 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 6.5: Proportion of farmers involved in each level of participation in planning (n=389)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Levels of Participation** | | **N** | **%** |
| 5 | Initiating and working on a project independently (self-mobilisation) | 127 | 33 |
| 4 | Jointly decide about the project objectives with service providers | 166 | 43 |
| 3 | Giving views and opinions openly without restrictions | 240 | 62 |
| 2 | Responding to questions from service providers | 251 | 65 |
| 1 | Informed what the project will do by service providers | 270 | 69 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 6.6: Proportion of farmers who would use a voucher to trade for advices (n=389)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of advices** | **Total** | **%** |
| One  Two  Three | 386  295  140 | 99  76  36 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

**Table 6.7: Proportion of farmers preferring a specific type of advice to trade with a voucher**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of advice** | **N** | **%** |
| Crop production techniques | 203 | 53 |
| Livestock production techniques | 108 | 28 |
| Soil fertility improvement and management | 87 | 22 |
| Good nutrition and food processing | 66 | 17 |
| Crop protection from pest and disease and weeds | 47 | 12 |
| Irrigation farming methods | 46 | 12 |
| Soil and water conservation techniques | 45 | 12 |
| Farming system techniques | 38 | 10 |
| Seed varieties selection | 36 | 9 |
| Linkages and coordination mechanisms | 33 | 8 |
| Ways of accessing cheap farm inputs and livestock breeds | 26 | 7 |
| Forestry and bee keeping | 22 | 6 |
| Veterinary service | 19 | 5 |
| Farm business and produce marketing | 19 | 5 |
| Post-harvest handling techniques | 18 | 5 |
| Farm and household planning | 12 | 3 |
| How to access to financial loans for agriculture enterprise | 9 | 2 |

Source: Field Survey (2022)