

PN-ARR-799 62
9311302
151-38192

PROFILE OF FARMERS IN THE CENTRAL ZONE, TANZANIA
—DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

(VOLUME I)

BY
HARI I. MARHATTA
RICHARD D. ROBBINS
ANWAR S. KHAN
ROBERT MABELE
LUCIAN MSAMBICHAKA

NORTH CAROLINA AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL STATE UNIVERSITY
RURAL DEVELOPMENT 211(D) GRANT
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS & RURAL SOCIOLOGY
GREENSBORO, N. C. 27411

NOVEMBER 1981



RESEARCH REPORT 1

PROFILE OF FARMERS IN THE CENTRAL ZONE, TANZANIA
-- DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS

(Volume I)

By

Hari P. Marhatta
Richard D. Robbins
Anwar S. Khan
Robert Mabele
Lucian Msambichaka

Paper Presented to U.S. AID/Tanzania
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania on November 8, 1981

Dr. Hari . Marhatta, Interim Director, 211(d) Grant and Associate Professor and Dr. Richard D. Robbins, Director, 211(d) Grant and Professor, both from Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, North Carolina A&T State University. Dr. Anwar S. Khan, Professor of Economics, North Carolina A&T State University.

Mr. Robert Mabele, Director and Dr. Lucian Msambichaka, Senior Researcher, Economics Research Bureau, University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express their appreciation to the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology for providing assistance throughout the preparation of this study and to the Economics Research Bureau for facilitating and assisting in this research.

The authors are most appreciative of the computation and programming assistance provided by Dr. Randall P. White, Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Mr. Bill Mock, Computer Center, and Melaku Teshome, graduate assistant. Special gratitude also goes to Sedalia Strickland, Donald Bellamy, Billy Cannon, Willete Horace-Crawford, Norma Marsh-Kasiah, graduate assistants, and Daniel Grant, Research Associate, for their continuous assistance. Special thanks are extended to Dr. Lionel Williamson for his efforts in data collection.

The completion of this publication would not have been possible without the typing assistance provided by Venetia Fisher, project secretary, Jody Wiley, and Talma Troxler.

This material is based upon work supported by the United States Agency for International Development under Contract No. AID/ta-G-1453 authorized under Section 211(d), Title III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. This report represents the opinions of the authors rather than that of the Agency and North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University. The researchers are totally responsible for the factual accuracy of all materials developed in this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Central Zone as a Target Area for Development	2
Objectives	2
Research Procedures	3
Sample Selection	3
II. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS	*
Age	8
Sex of Head of Household	8
Education of Farm Operators Surveyed	9
Dependent Children	9
Years of Farming Experience	14
Planned Expansion of Farm Size	14
Off-Farm Employment by Farm Operators Surveyed	18
Work on Ejama Shambas and Number of Days	18
Buying and Selling of Food Crops	21
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF OWNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT AND ADDITIONS OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS—BY DISTRICTS	24
Ownership of Household Goods	24
Ownership and Improvement of House	27
Additions of Household Goods	27
IV. CHARACTERISTICS OF OWNERSHIP OF FARM EQUIPMENT TOOLS, BUILDINGS AND LIVESTOCK, AND THE USES OF EXTENSION SERVICES AND FARM INPUTS	30
Ownership of Farm Tools and Equipment	30
Farm Building Ownership	30
Use of Extension Service by Farmers—by District	34
Ownership of Livestock	36
Farm Inputs	41
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	44

PROFILE OF FARMERS IN THE CENTRAL ZONE - TANZANIA

INTRODUCTION

The Tanzanian economy is primarily agriculturally based, with 85 percent of the population engaged in agriculture. The importance of agriculture is very profound in that it accounts for 90 percent of the labor force, 40 percent of the gross domestic production, and is a major source of raw materials for domestic manufacturing industries. Furthermore, the bulk of foreign exchange earnings come from the sale of agricultural products, which accounts for almost 80 percent of Tanzania's total exports. Thus, the expansion of agricultural production in Tanzania is a prerequisite for becoming self-sufficient in food, increasing exports earnings, creating employment opportunities, and serving other related development goals.

Tanzania is a developing economy with immediate problems of feeding millions of people and achieving rapid economic growth, simultaneously. In this effort, the government of Tanzania has embarked upon a program for expanding the area for agricultural production, introducing and educating farmers to improved techniques, and providing financial assistance through the Tanzania Rural Development Bank. One of the projects the government has undertaken towards this goal is to develop the long neglected area of the Central Zone. The objective is to transform the less productive areas, with very limited economic activities and sparse population, to the center of

development and thriving agriculture.

The agriculture of Tanzania is characterized by two distinct cropping patterns. First is the commercial farms which produce mainly cash crops such as coffee, tea, cotton, cashew nuts, tobacco, cloves and maize. Second is the small scale farms operated by subsistence farmers who produce mostly food crops such as maize, millet, soybeans, wheat, rice, cassava and bananas. In non-tsetse fly regions, some farmers raise livestock; however, cattle are treated as a source of wealth rather than a source of food.

Tanzanian agriculture has most of the characteristics of primitive agriculture. Farms are usually very small. For example, in 1971-79, the average size of Tanzanian farms was 1 to 2 hectares (3 acres). Furthermore, the majority of the farms were smaller than the average because only 7.6 percent of all farms were larger than 5 hectares (7.5 acres). The average income ranges from a low of 45 Tshs¹ to a high of 2,500 Tshs.

The Central Zone as a Target Area for Development

Slightly over one-fourth of the population live in the Central Zone. This zone includes all of the Dodoma and Singida regions in the Central Plateau, a significant portion of the Iringa region to the south, most of the Morogora, Mwanza and Tabora. This area is a prime target for development for several reasons. First, the poorest of the poor live in this zone. The mean farm income is less than one-fifth of the income in the highest agri-economic zone and less than one-third the income in the next poorest agri-economic zone. Second, the ecology of the zone is threatened. The 3.6 percent growth in population in the Central Zone has led to the concentration of people and their cattle. Land in the zone needs improvement.

¹The exchange rate is about 8.1 Tanzanian shillings for \$1 U.S.

It is characterized by over grazing of livestock, erosion, and areas of saline soil. Third reason is the relocation of capital to Dodoma.

With these conditions a reliable and convenient source of food for the expanding urban population will be required. With poor roads and the lack of other means of transportation, and other very limited infrastructure, it will be extremely costly to import food from the other regions. Increasing productivity of small farmers in this zone will reduce transportation costs and ensure better quality food products.

Because of the above reasons, the Tanzanian government and assistance donors, primarily AID, are concerned about the development of the Central Zone. During the next few years, an increasing share of development activities may be placed in this zone. A better understanding of the problems and limitations of farmers in the zone will be important in the planning and development of such activities.

A farm profile study of a portion of the Central Zone is proposed to examine the economic status of small farmers so that there is a better understanding of present farming systems and the problems faced in attempting to increase farm output.

Such a study will provide background data on farm holdings, production practices, conservation practices, and the socio-economic profile of the farmers and villages. With this information, the development strategy of the Central Zone can be planned. Such background data will be useful in planning specific projects for further efforts designed to improve the quality of life of the small farmer in this zone.

Objectives

The overall objective of this study is to provide farm and village profile information to assist in implementing strategies for rural development.

The specific objectives of the study are to: (1) analyze data regarding small farm resources including social-cultural factors, ecological conditions and economic resources, the role of women in management decision making, etc., (2) identify constraints to increase production and income of small farmers, and (3) identify the farming system and its evaluation to determine its strengths as well as its weaknesses.

However, the purpose of this paper is to analyze the socio-economic, household and farm characteristics from the data obtained with the baseline questionnaire administered to 1,412 farmers in the study area.

Research Procedure

The instrument for the collection of data was a modified version of Farm Management Data Analysis, Storage and Retrieval System Survey used by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the U.N.

The data were collected in September and October 1980 by 20 enumerators from the Economics Research Bureau of the University of Dar es Salaam, under the supervision of North Carolina Agricultural & Technical State University and ERB faculty. The questionnaire was administered in Swahili to farmers in 34 villages.

Sample Selection

The population that was sampled was that of farmers within the Central Zone. Within this zone, 10 districts were identified. A selection of three representative districts was made. From each of these districts 10 villages were selected using multistage sampling techniques. Within each of the 30 villages, a minimum of 25 families were selected using random systematic sampling methods. In each village, the farms to be surveyed were systematically drawn from lists prepared by enumerators with the cooperation of village leaders. If a farmer selected in the sample was not reached

during the survey, a replacement was drawn from the list should his absence result in a sample size of less than the minimum of 25 specified, except in cases where this procedure would result in more than 10 percent of the population.

The selection of farmers to be surveyed was done by: first, selecting villages using a proportional sampling technique; second, selecting farmers by using a stratified sampling technique. A list of all villages in the three districts was obtained from the respective District Development Officers (DDO). These village lists contained names of the villages, divisions and/or wards, and population by village. In the Manyoni and Dodoma districts, the number of families were also given. A 10 percent sample with a minimum of 25 farmers per village was the objective. Although a list of farmers in each village was not available, it was assumed that the number of families would approximate the number of farmers because nearly all (98% plus) of the residents of rural villages are farmers. All non-rural towns were eliminated from the list because most of these residents were not farmers.² Also, eliminated were: (1) small villages (below 250 families) where the number of farmers would not have been 25 in the sample; and (2) large farms, estates, parks, etc., where the residents were employed rather than being farmers.

Since the family unit was the basis of selection, the number of families had to be estimated for the Kilosa district. The weighted average of the size of families in Dodoma and Manyoni was determined by summing the total population and dividing by the sum of the total number of families in each district. This estimate (4.59) was used as an estimate of the average size

²This information was determined by personal consultation with the ERB researchers, and the DDO in each district.

in the Kilosa district. This figure was used to determine the number of families in each village of the district. An estimate of the number of farmers was then available for each district.

A total of 30 villages were selected for the survey. The number of villages to be included in each district would be proportional to the estimated number of farmers (e.g. families) in that district, after eliminating the villages with less than 250 farmers, estates, towns, etc. Dodoma with 58,369 farmers (49.1%) had 15 villages, Kilosa with 36.6 percent had 11 villages and Manyoni with 4.3 percent had 4 villages in the survey. Furthermore, it was decided that if none of the four Rift Valley Project villages were included in the sample, these would be added. They were not included and had to be added, making a total of 34 villages surveyed.

When the survey was taken, some of the villages selected in the Dodoma and Kilosa districts had to be changed. In the Kilosa district, two of the villages were not accessible by land rover, even in the dry season. Because of the short term nature of the study, we did not have time to get to the villages on foot and to provide adequate supervision. These villages were replaced by others in the survey, and the list of the villages sampled is presented in Table 1.

Two types of questionnaires were administered in each village - a village questionnaire and a farmer questionnaire. The village leaders were asked to help complete the village questionnaire. This questionnaire was designed to obtain information for village profiles and constraints to production.

The farmer questionnaire was designed to obtain information for farmers profiles and on crop output and input. Upon arrival at the village, the enumerators were to obtain a list of farmers from the village leaders. If a list was not available, they were to compile a list from records and from

Table 1
Estimated Sample Size by Village

DISTRICTS					
Manyoni		Kilosa		Dodoma	
Village	Sample Size	Village	Sample Size	Village**	Sample Size
Heka/Azimio	35	Magole	49	Makanda	64
Gurungu	20	Kitete	21	Nzogole	68
Igwa Madete	32	Gongoni	38	Kisima Chandege	58
Saranda	46	Msolwa	22	Mpalanga	34
Total	133	Luhembe	46	Msisi	57
		Kitange	45	Chipanga B	32
		Ndogoni	22	Zejele	77
		Mbigiri	47	Msanga	74
		Mafera (Meimba)	28	Chifukulo	32
		Vidunda (Twatwatwa)	7	*Bahi Sokoni	55
		Total	325	*Bahi Makula	35
				Kwahemu (Hunekwa)	18
				Mudemu (Lamaiti)	65
				Mbhamantwa (Nghulugano)	99
				Segala (Zajilwa)	64
				Muongano (Handali)	84
				Ikowa (Mlebe)	38
				Total	954

Total Number of Samples: 1412

*Village that are in the Rice Production Pilot project - not a part of the 30 sample villages.

**Villages in parenthesis were villages that replaced sample village in the study.

personal knowledge of the leaders. From the list, every tenth name was selected, at random, to be interviewed. The interviews lasted thirty minutes. The day after the enumerator was placed in the village, the supervisors returned to review completed questionnaires. Where questions arose or problems existed, adjustments were made. Upon completion of the village, the enumerators moved to another village until the district was completed.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS

Age

Table 2 shows the number and percent of farmers in each age group for all three districts, and the survey totals. As indicated in the table the age ranges from 16 to 90 years with the average age being 43.74 years. Also, we see that there is a concentration of farmers in the age groups from 30 to 59 years (62.3%). The age group under 30 accounts for 16.1 percent and the age group over 59 comprises 21.4 percent of the total.

The percent of farmers in each age group varied slightly from district to district with Kilosa having a smaller proportion in the 20 to 29 age group than Dodma and Manyoni. In all districts, about one-fourth of the total farm population was in the 30 to 39 age group.

Sex of Head of Household

As indicated in Table 3, an overwhelming majority of the head of the farm households were males (87.8%). Only 12.2 percent of the farm households surveyed had female heads. There was less than a 2 percent variation in the sex of the head of household from district to district. From this data, there does not appear to be any significant difference in the three districts in regard to the sex of the head of the household.

Table 2

FARMERS AS CLASSIFIED BY AGE GROUPS

AGE GROUPS	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
20-29 (Years)*	38	11.7	170	17.8	20	15.0	288	16.1
30-39 (Years)	82	25.2	232	24.3	30	22.6	344	24.4
40-49 (Years)	78	24.0	208	21.8	23	17.3	309	21.9
50-59 (Years)	49	15.1	158	16.6	22	16.5	229	16.2
60-69 (Years)	42	12.9	88	9.2	19	14.3	149	10.6
70-79 (Years)	17	5.2	37	3.9	4	3.0	58	4.1
80-89 (Years)**	7	2.2	13	1.4	5	3.8	25	1.8
No Response	12	3.7	48	5.0	10	7.5	70	4.9
TOTAL	325	100%	954	100%	133	100%	1,412	100%
Mean	45.30		42.99		45.27		43.74	
Standard Deviation	14.46		14.33		15.51			

*Kilosa one aged 19 years and Dodoma one 16 years and 3 aged 18 and 3 aged 19.

**Dodoma two aged 90 years.

Table 3

NUMBER OF FARMS SURVEYED BY DISTRICTS AND CLASSIFICATION OF HEAD-OF-HOUSEHOLD BY SEX

SEX	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
MALE	289	88.9	832	87.2	119	89.5	1240	87.8
FEMALE	36	11.1	122	12.8	14	10.5	172	12.2
TOTAL:	325	100%	954	100%	133	100%	1412	100%

Education of Farm Operators Surveyed

Table 4 shows the number of years of formal education and the percent of farmers in each group for the three districts and the total survey. As indicated by the table, over 60 percent of the farmers surveyed had less than one year of formal education, and only 6.4 percent had more than six years of formal education. The average education for all farm operators surveyed was only 4.46 years.

There was some variation in the years of formal education from district to district. For example, the Manyoni district had the highest percentage of farm operators with less than one year of formal education (67.7%) compared to Kilosa district (60.9%) and Dodoma district (60.3%). Also we see that the Kilosa district had no farm operators with over 9 years of formal education.

Dependent Children

Table 5 presents the number of dependent children in the Central Zone of Tanzania. It shows that there were 5,172 dependent children, an average of 3.7 children per farmer. More than half (51.2%) of the dependent children were between the ages of 14 and 18 years old with 34.4 percent less than 10 years old and 14.4 percent between 10 and 14 years old.

Manyoni had the largest number of dependent children over 14 years old. While Dodoma had the largest proportion of dependent children less than 10 years old.

In terms of farmers with dependent children, 87 percent of the 1,412 farmers had children between the ages of 14 and 18 years old, 36.4 percent had children between the ages of 10 and 14 and 56.7 percent had children less than 10 years old.

Nearly 88 percent of the farmers in both Kilosa and Dodoma had children in the age group from 14 to 18 years while only 81 percent of Manyoni farmers

Table 4

YEARS OF FORMAL EDUCATION OF FARM OPERATORS SURVEYED

SCHOOLING COMPLETED	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less Than 1 Year*	198	60.9	575	60.3	90	67.7	863	61.1
1-3 Years	44	13.5	176	18.4	18	13.6	238	16.9
4-6 Years	66	20.3	144	15.1	9	6.8	219	15.5
7-9 Years	17	5.2	57	6.0	14	10.6	88	6.2
10-12 Years	--	--	1	.1	1	.8	2	.1
over 13 years	--	--	1	.1	1	.8	2	.1
TOTAL	325	100%	954	100%	133	100%	1412	100%
Mean	4.58		4.41		5.09		4.46	
Standard Deviation	1.63		2.34		2.64		-	

*Includes no formal education

Table 5

NUMBER OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN BY SELECTED AGE GROUPS WITHIN EACH DISTRICT

AGE GROUPS	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less Than 10 Years	395	32.2	1,250	35.4	137	33.5	1,782	34.4
10-14 Years	197	16.0	498	14.0	48	11.7	743	14.4
Greater Than 14 Yrs.	636	51.8	1,787	50.6	224	54.8	2,647	51.2
TOTAL	1228	100%	3,535	100%	409	100%	5,172	100%

had children in the same age group (See Table 6).

The distribution of farmers with children of less than 10 years old and 10 to 14 years old were 55 percent and 42 percent respectively for Kilosa; 59 percent and 36 percent respectively for Dodoma and 47 percent and 24 percent respectively for Manyoni (Table 6).

Years on Present Farm

Over one-half (53.5%) of the farmers surveyed have owned or operated their present farm for less than 11 years. However, the average number of years on the present farm for all the farmers surveyed is 19.84 years (Table 7). This indicates that many farmers have moved from one farm to another in their farming careers because 46.2 percent have more than 10 years farming experience, while only 22.6 percent have less than 11 years experience.

Years of Farming Experience

The majority of the farmers surveyed (68.8%) had less than 30 years of farming experience. Of these, 46.2 percent had between 11 and 30 years experience. Variation in the years of farming experience from district to district does not appear to be very significant. The greatest variation is in the 1 to 10 years of farming group between Dodoma (24.3%) and Manyoni (14.3%). The other years of farming groups the differences from district to district tend to be rather small. The number of farmers with over 40 years experience accounts for only 6.9 percent of the total surveyed (Table 8).

The number of years of farming experience is about what could be expected with the average age of farm operators being 43 years.

Planned Expansion of Farm Size

Potential of increased production in the Central Zone would depend largely upon the expansion of farm size if neither the improved inputs nor

Table 6

NUMBER OF FARMERS WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN BY THEIR AGE GROUPS

AGE GROUPS	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Less Than 10 Years	177	54.5	562	58.9	62	46.6	801	56.7
10 - 14 Years	136	41.8	346	36.3	32	24.1	514	36.4
Greater Than 14 Yrs	284	87.4	838	87.8	107	80.5	1229	87.0

Table 7

YEARS ON PRESENT FARM

YEARS	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTALS	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
< to 10 Years	157	48.3	526	55.1	73	54.8	756	53.5
11-19 Years	23	7.1	48	5.0	09	6.8	80	5.7
20-29 Years	30	9.2	85	8.9	14	10.5	129	9.1
30-39 Years	40	12.3	94	9.9	08	6.0	142	10.1
40-49 Years	26	8.0	62	6.5	10	7.5	98	6.9
50-59 Years	09	2.8	38	4.0	05	3.8	52	3.7
≥ 60 Years	24	7.4	42	4.4	07	5.3	73	5.2
No Response	16	4.9	59	6.2	07	5.3	82	5.8
Total	325	100%	954	100%	133	100%	1412	100%
Mean	20.93		19.64		18.56		19.84	
Standard Deviation	19.81		17.66		18.96		-	

Table 8
NUMBER OF YEARS IN FARMING

YEARS	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%		%	Number	%	Number	%
1 to 10 Years	68	20.9		24.3	19	14.3	319	22.6
11-20 Years	80	24.6	252	26.4	31	23.3	363	25.7
21-30 Years	61	18.8	201	21.1	27	20.3	289	20.5
31-40 Years	41	12.6	84	8.8	15	11.3	140	9.9
41-50 Years	16	4.9	37	3.9	10	7.5	63	4.5
51-60 Years	6	1.9	18	1.9	4	3.0	28	1.9
≥ 61 Years	2	0.6	5	0.5	--	--	7	0.5
No Response	51	15.7	125	13.1	27	20.3	203	14.4
Total	325	100%	954	100%	133	100%	1412	100%
Mean	22.53		21.26		24.49		21.83	
Standard Deviation	14.27		13.33		14.09		-	

the improved technology are utilized. Since neither is likely to occur fast enough, increase in farm size is the only solution. However, only 15 percent of the farmers report an intention to increase the farm size. About two-thirds planned to operate at the same size, and about 3 percent expect to reduce the total size.

Nearly 16 percent of the farmers in Dodoma reported their intention to increase farm size as compared to 15 percent in Kilosa and 5 percent in Manyoni. Over 60 percent of the farmers in each district planned to have the same size and only 8 percent, 1 percent and less than 1 percent of the farmers in Kilosa, Dodoma and Manyoni respectively intend to reduce their farm size.

Off-Farm Employment By Farm Operators Surveyed

As indicated in Table 9, an overwhelming majority of the farmers surveyed (93.7%) did not work off their own farms for wages. Only 6.3 percent of the farmers had wages from off-farm employment. In Kilosa, 10.2 percent of the farmers had income from off-farm employment compared to only 5.1 percent in Dodoma and 5.3 percent in Manyoni. The wages received by the farmers from off-farm employment varied from \$1 to over \$100 as shown in Table 9.

Work on Bjama Shambas and Number of Days Worked

Farmers in Tanzania are required to contribute some time working on the community farms (Bjama Shambas) as indicated in Table 10, 78.2 percent of the farmers in the survey group worked on the community farms. The range was from 67.4 percent in Kilosa to 82.3 percent in Dodoma.

The number of days these farmers spent working on the community farms varied from 1 to 100 days. Table 11 shows the distribution of days worked on the community farms for each of the districts and the total. The largest percentage of farmers who worked on community farms did so for less than 20

Table 9
OFF-FARM EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES FOR FARM OPERATORS SURVEYED - BY DISTRICT

Money Received	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
\$1 to 25(dollars)	7	2.3	11	1.2	-	-	18	1.3
26 to 50(dollars)	2	0.6	8	0.8	4	3.0	14	1.0
51 to 100(dollars)	10	3.1	10	1.0	-	-	20	1.4
over 100(dollars)	14	4.3	20	2.1	3	2.3	37	2.6
No Response	292	89.8	905	94.9	126	94.7	1323	93.7
TOTAL	325	100%	954	100%	153	100%	1412	100%

Table 10
FARMERS REPORTING HAVING WORKED ON COMMUNITY FARMS (Bjamba Shamba)

DISTRICTS	Did You work on Bjamba Shambas (Community Farm)											
	YES		NO		NO RESPONSE		SHARE OUT					
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	IN CASH		IN KIND		NO RESPONSE	
							Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Kilosa	219	67.4	74	22.8	32	9.8	60	18.5	20	6.2	245	75.4
Dodoma	785	82.3	71	7.4	98	10.3	255	26.7	113	11.9	586	61.4
Manyoni	104	78.2	17	12.8	12	9.0	-	-	-	-	133	100%
Total	1108	78.5	162	14.5	142	10.0	315	22.3	133	9.4	964	68.3

Table 11

NUMBERS OF DAYS WORKED ON COMMUNITY FARMS (BJAMBA SHAMBA)

DISTRICTS	Actual Number and Frequency											
	1 to 20 days		21 to 40 days		41 to 60 days		61 to 80 days		81 to 100 days		No Response	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Kilosa	53	16.3	16	5.0	16	5.0	11	3.4	4	1.2	225	69.2
Dodoma	259	27.1	20	2.1	10	1.1	45	4.7	4	0.4	616	64.6
Manyoni	7	5.3	1	0.8	11	8.3	17	12.8	1	0.8	96	72.2
Total	319	22.6	37	2.6	37	2.6	73	5.2	9	0.6	937	66.4

Table 12

NUMBER OF FARMERS REPORTING HAVING BOUGHT OR SOLD SELECTED FOOD CROPS

Selected Crops Bought or Sold	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Rice	19	5.8	10	1.1	1	0.8	30	2.1
Maize	56	17.2	154	16.1	18	13.5	228	16.2
Other	22	6.8	141	14.8	9	6.8	172	12.2
No Response	228	70.2	649	68.0	105	78.9	982	69.5
Total	325	100%	954	100%	133	100%	1412	100%

days per year. Less than 1 percent worked more than 30 days per year on the community farms.

Table 10 indicates that some of the farmers received a share, either in cash or kind, for working on the community farms. In Manyoni, none of the farmers received a share for their work on the community farms. While in Dodoma, 38.6 percent received a share and 24.7 percent in Kilosa.

Buying and Selling of Food Crops

The majority of the farmers do not buy or sell food crops. Apparently they use the food crops which they produce for family consumption. As shown in Table 12, 69.5 percent of the farmers in the survey group did not buy or sell any food crop. Maize was the most commonly traded food crop (16.2%) and rice the least traded (2.1%).

In terms of value of crops traded, Table 13 indicates the amounts involved was generally very low. Only 19.6 percent of the farmers reported selling or exchanging food crops. Of the farmers who sold food crops, over two-thirds received less than \$50 per year from such sales. Furthermore, only 3 percent of the farmers who sold food crops received more than \$100 annually from their sales.

There was very little variation from district to district in the sale of food crops.

Table 14 shows how the proceeds from the sale of crops was used. The largest number of farmers spent the money which they received for clothing (10.8%). Smaller percentages was used for other purposes as indicated in Table 14.

Table 13

TOTAL VALUE OF FOOD CROPS SOLD OR EXCHANGED

Money Received	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
\$1 to 25 (Dollars)	21	6.5	67	7.0	6	4.5	94	6.7
26 to 50 (Dollars)	19	5.8	60	6.3	7	5.3	86	6.1
51 to 100(Dollars)	14	4.3	35	3.7	4	3.0	53	3.8
over 100 (Dollars)	12	3.7	25	2.6	6	4.5	43	3.0
Did not Sell or exchange	259	79.7	767	80.4	110	82.7	1136	80.4
Total	325	100%	954	100%	133	100%	1412	100%

Table 14

TOTAL NUMBER OF FARMERS REPORTING USE OF MONEY FROM CROP SALES AND THEIR RELATIVE FREQUENCY

DISTRICTS	USE OF MONEY																	
	Repaid Loan		Paid for Labor		Bought Food		Bought Clothes		Bought other Things		Medical Care		Traveled		Savings		Other	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Kilosa	26	8.0	40	12.3	42	12.9	62	19.1	30	9.2	17	5.2	20	6.2	25	7.7	22	6.
Dodoma	30	3.1	16	1.7	54	5.7	85	8.9	89	9.3	30	3.1	15	1.6	12	1.3	7	0.
Manyoni	3	2.3	1	0.8	2	1.5	5	3.8	6	4.5	1	0.8	1	0.8	1	0.8	1	0.
Total	59	4.2	57	4.0	98	6.9	152	10.8	125	8.9	48	3.4	36	2.5	38	2.7	30	2.

CHARACTERISTICS OF OWNERSHIP, IMPROVEMENT, AND ADDITIONS
OF HOUSES AND HOUSEHOLD GOODS - BY DISTRICT

Ownership of Household Goods

The Central Zone of Tanzania has a poor economy and the poorest people in the entire country. Agriculture is the only source of livelihood. Farmers have a subsistence level of living with ownership of very few goods and properties. Since people start buying and accumulating goods and properties when their wealth increases, evaluation of the level of wealth accumulation of the people in the Central Zone can be made by analyzing the ownership of selected household goods, farm equipment and other properties.

Table 15 shows the ownership of selected household goods in each of the three districts. Overall, no more than 41 percent of the farmers possessed any of the household goods listed. The possession varied from a low of about 1 percent of the farmers owning sewing machines to nearly 41 percent owning torches, teacups, special clothing (mostly school dress) and forks and spoons.

In general, expensive items such as sewing machines, clocks, and wrist watches are owned by fewer than 7 percent of the farmers. The only exception to this is in the ownership of bicycles as nearly 30 percent of them reported owning a bike. The lack of public transportation and the long travel distances necessitate the purchase of a bicycle and most of them buy bicycles even at the cost of depleting savings or buying other goods.

Of the three districts, the farmers in Kilosa own goods in the largest proportion while those in Manyoni the least proportion. For example, 50 to 71 percent of the farmers in Kilosa own teacups, forks, spoons, special clothing, and teapots as compared to about 15 to 36 percent of Manyoni farmers owning the same items. The ownership of these goods in Dodoma was reported by 22 to 36 percent of the farmers.

Table 15

FARMERS REPORTING OWNERSHIP OF SELECTED HOUSEHOLD ITEMS

ITEMS	DISTRICTS															
	KILOSA				DODOMA				MANYONI				TOTAL			
	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE
	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number
Teapot	163	50.2	114	48	209	21.9	549	196	20	15.0	73	40	392	27.8	736	284
Teacups	232	71.4	71	22	305	32.0	472	177	30	22.6	69	34	567	40.2	612	233
Forks & Spoons	211	64.9	87	27	295	30.9	479	180	34	25.6	66	33	540	38.2	632	240
Kerosene Latern -	100	30.8	170	55	119	12.5	627	208	13	9.8	74	46	232	16.4	871	309
Umbrella	36	11.1	219	70	41	4.3	697	216	3	2.3	80	50	80	5.7	996	336
Shoes	146	44.9	128	51	268	28.1	511	175	31	23.3	73	29	445	31.5	712	255
Torch	151	46.5	125	49	377	39.5	427	150	46	34.6	53	34	574	40.7	605	233
WristWatch	54	10.5	224	67	60	6.3	679	215	3	2.3	80	50	97	6.9	983	332
Radio	140	43.1	145	40	194	20.3	571	189	34	25.6	61	38	368	26.1	777	267
Special Clothes	173	53.2	104	48	340	35.6	459	155	48	36.1	57	28	561	39.7	620	231
Bicycle	141	43.4	140	44	223	23.4	528	203	35	26.3	67	31	399	28.3	735	278

Continued on next page

Table 15 (cont'd)

ITEMS	KILOSA				DODOMA				MANYONI				TOTAL			
	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE
	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number
Clock	13	4.0	238	74	10	1.0	719	225	1	0.8	82	50	24	1.7	1039	349
Iron Bed	85	26.2	180	60	114	11.9	624	216	10	7.5	76	47	209	14.8	880	323
Sewing Machine	7	2.2	243	75	8	0.8	718	228	--	--	82	51	15	1.1	1043	354

Table 16
FARMERS REPORTING HOUSES AND TYPES OF HOME IMPROVEMENTS

DISTRICTS	HOUSE				CEMENT FLOOR				BRICK WALLS				GLASS WINDOWS			
	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE	YES		NO	NO RESPONSE
	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number	Number	%	Number	Number
KILOSA	314	96.6	4	7	17	5.2	235	73	5	1.5	243	77	6	1.8	244	75
DODOMA	915	95.9	19	20	16	1.7	713	225	2	0.2	72	226	3	0.3	727	224
MANYONI	130	97.7	3	--	--	--	83	50	--	--	83	50	--	--	83	50
TOTAL	1359	96.2	26	27	33	2.3	1031	348	7	0.5	1052	353	9	0.6	1054	349

Teacups, torches and special clothes were owned by the majority of the farmers in Kilosa, Dodoma and Manyoni respectively while no one owned sewing machines in Manyoni and less than 3 percent of the farmers in Kilosa and Dodoma owned sewing machines.

Ownership and Improvement of House

So far as the ownership of the house is concerned, over 96 percent of the farmers in the Central Zone own their own house. Almost 98 percent of Manyoni farmers own the house followed by 97 percent of Kilosa and 96 percent of Dodoma farmers.

However, most of the houses are of minimal standards with very few extras. Only 2.3 percent of the farmers have a house with a cement floor, less than 1 percent had brick walls or glass windows in their houses. (See Table 16). About 2 percent had burnt brick while 10 percent had tin (bati) on their houses. Nearly 61 percent of the farmers had mud house/brick walls.

Additions of Household Goods

Table 17 shows the addition of household goods in the last twelve months. Farmers have bought radios, bicycles, new clothes, tin (Bati), watches, torches, shoes, metal beds, school clothes, medicine and have even bought livestock and paid bride price. The most frequently bought item was clothing, including school clothing, as 52 percent of the farmers reported doing so. While less than 1 percent of the farmers bought a watch.

Table 16 (cont'd)

FARMERS REPORTING HOUSES AND TYPES OF HOME IMPROVEMENTS

DISTRICTS	BURNT BRICK				MUD HOUSE BRICK WALLS				BATI			
	YES		NO	NO	YES		NO	NO	YES		NO	NO
	Number	%	Number	RESPONSE	Number	%	Number	RESPONSE	Number	%	Number	RESPONSE
KILOSA	16	4.9	231	78	185	56.9	90	50	80	24.6	68	177
DODOMA	6	0.6	723	225	577	60.5	231	146	52	5.5	442	460
MANYONI	1	0.8	83	49	92	59.2	36	5	9	6.8	75	49
TOTAL	23	1.6	1037	352	854	60.5	357	201	141	10.0	585	686

Table 17

GOODS BOUGHT BY FARMERS IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

ITEMS PURCHASED	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	% of Total Farmers
Radio	39	12.0	43	4.5	8	6.0	90	6.4
Bicycle	33	10.2	39	4.1	7	5.3	79	5.6
New clothes	139	42.8	321	33.6	52	39.1	512	36.3
Bati	16	5.0	3	0.3	-	-	19	1.3
Watch	5	1.5	8	0.8	-	-	13	0.9
Torch	35	10.8	81	8.5	16	12.0	132	9.3
Shoes	53	16.0	77	8.1	8	6.0	138	9.8
Livestock	6	1.8	15	1.6	2	1.5	23	1.6
Metal Bed	41	12.6	38	4.0	2	1.5	81	5.7
School Clothes	74	22.8	133	13.9	21	15.8	228	16.1
Medicine	28	8.6	35	3.7	2	1.5	65	4.6
Bride Price	17	5.2	11	1.2	-	-	28	2.0
Total Number of Farmers	325		954		133		1,412	

CHARACTERISTICS OF OWNERSHIP OF FARM EQUIPMENT, TOOLS, BUILDINGS
AND LIVESTOCK, AND THE USES OF EXTENSION SERVICES AND FARM INPUTS

Ownership of Farm Tools and Equipments

The agriculture in many of the developing countries is primitive because of small scale farms, low productivity, lack of the use of improved technology and very limited use of any purchased inputs. Even farm equipments and tools are few and consist only of some basic items which are either manually operated or animal drawn.

The farmers in the Central Zone of Tanzania are no exception and their possession of farm equipment and tools show this. Almost all of the farmers have hoes, and about three-fourths of them own axes and sickles. (See Table 18). On the other hand, only 1 percent of the farmers own either an ox plow or tractor. Likewise, only 2.5 percent own forks, 1.5 percent own rakes and 1.2 percent own wheelbarrows and ox carts. The use of either an ox plow or tractor is very limited as Tanzanian farmers don't like to use oxen, and tractors are very expensive. Only five farmers in Kilosa and one percent in Dodoma reported owning a tractor and ox plows were owned by about two farmers in each of the three districts.

The majority of the farmers in each of the districts owned hoes and axes, while an ox plow was the least owned item.

Farm Building Ownership

Table 19 presents the number of farm buildings--livestock, machines, storage and cattle poles available in all three districts. The most common type of farm building owned was cattle poles, a very simple type of structure used to feed livestock. Of the farmers surveyed, 18 percent had cattle poles on their farms. In contrast, less than 6 percent of the farmers had a livestock house and a very small number of farmers (about one-half

Table 18

FARMERS REPORTING OWNERSHIP OF SELECTED FARM TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT

TOOLS AND EQUIPMENT	DISTRICTS															
	KILOSA				DODOMA				MANYONI				TOTAL			
	YES		NO		YES		NO		YES		NO		YES		NO	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
Shovel	103	31.7	222	68.3	361	37.8	593	62.2	39	29.3	94	70.7	503	35.6	909	64.4
Fork	15	4.6	310	95.4	18	1.9	936	98.1	2	1.5	131	98.5	35	2.5	1377	97.5
Sickle	142	43.7	183	56.3	768	80.5	186	19.5	102	76.7	31	23.3	1012	71.7	400	28.3
Wheel Barrow	5	1.5	320	98.5	11	1.2	943	98.8	1	0.8	132	99.2	17	1.2	1395	98.8
Tractor	5	1.5	320	98.5	3	0.3	951	99.7	--	--	133	100	8	0.6	1404	99.4
Axe	273	84.0	52	16.0	789	82.7	165	17.3	114	85.7	19	14.3	176	83.3	236	16.7
Ox Plow	1	0.3	324	99.7	2	0.2	952	99.8	2	1.5	131	98.5	5	0.4	1407	99.6
Ox Cart	--	--	325	100	16	1.7	938	98.3	1	0.8	132	99.2	17	1.2	1395	98.8
Bush Knife	148	45.5	177	54.5	128	13.4	826	86.6	10	7.5	123	92.5	286	20.3	1126	79.7
Hoe	311	95.7	14	4.3	931	97.6	23	2.4	131	98.5	2	1.5	1373	97.2	39	2.8
Rake	11	3.4	314	96.6	10	1.0	944	99.0	--	--	133	100	21	1.5	1391	98.5
Machette	257	79.1	68	20.9	322	33.8	632	66.0	51	38.3	82	61.7	630	44.6	782	55.4

Table 19

THE OWNERSHIP OF FARM BUILDINGS BY FARMERS SURVEYED-BY DISTRICT

DISTRICT	BUILDING TYPE											
	LIVESTOCK HOUSE						MACHINE HOUSE					
	YES		NO		NO RESPONSE		YES		NO		NO RESPONSE	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
KILOSA	34	10.5	202	62.2	89	27.3	3	0.9	206	63.4	116	35.7
DODOMA	44	4.6	597	62.6	313	32.8	2	0.2	625	65.5	327	34.3
MANYONI	3	2.3	112	84.2	18	13.5	--	--	113	85.0	20	15.0
TOTAL	81	5.7	911	64.5	420	29.7	5	0.4	944	66.9	463	32.8

Table 19 (cont'd)

DISTRICTS	BUILDING TYPE											
	STORAGE HOUSE						CATTLE POLES					
	YES		NO		NO RESPONSE		YES		NO		NO RESPONSE	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
KILOSA	136	41.8	114	35.1	75	23.1	23	7.1	166	51.1	136	41.8
DODOMA	480	50.3	261	27.4	213	22.3	223	23.4	459	48.1	272	28.5
MANYONI	63	47.3	65	48.9	5	3.8	13	9.8	90	67.7	30	22.6
TOTAL	679	48.1	440	31.2	293	20.8	259	18.3	715	50.6	438	31.0

of one percent) had a machine house to store machines. The fewer number of machine houses is a direct result of the low number of machines or tractors that are in use in the Central Zone.

Although 48 percent of the farmers reported having a storage house, it might have been a limited storage facility at home rather than a separate storage facility.

Dodoma farmers had the most cattle poles followed by Manyoni and Kilosa farmers. So far as the livestock and machine houses are concerned, farmers of Kilosa had a larger proportion than those in Dodoma or Manyoni.

Use Of Extension Services By Farmers - By District

One of the outstanding features of any successful agricultural economy is the introduction and use of extension service in communicating better technology to the farmers. Extension agents serve the farming community by demonstrating new methods of farming, assisting and advising farmers in increasing the output and transferring the results of research to farms in a usable form.

To evaluate the extent of extension services in Tanzania several questions were asked to respondents and the results indicate that overall the services were very limited. Only 15 percent of the farmers reported a visit by an extension agent (Byana Shamba) during the last 12 months and less than one percent reported a visit within the last month, about 6 percent reported a visit in the last 1 to 6 months and slightly over 9 percent within the last 6 to 12 months. (See Table 20).

The visits by the extension agents were acknowledged most in Manyoni where 56 percent of the farmers reported such visits, in contrast to only 9 and 16 percent of the farmers in Dodoma and Kilosa respectively.

In each category--less than one month, 1 to 6 months and 6 to 12 months, farmers in Manyoni reported the greatest number of visits, followed by

Table 20

LAST FARM VISIT BY EXTENSION AGENTS (BWANA SHAMBA)

NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE LAST VISIT

DISTRICTS	Less Than one Month		1 to 6 Months		6 to 12 Months		NO RESPONSE		TOTALS	
	Number of Farmers	%	Number of Farmers	%	Number of Farmers	%	Number of Farmers	%	Number of Farmers	%
KILOSA	2	0.6	26	8.0	25	7.7	272	83.7	325	100
DODOMA	4	0.4	25	2.6	61	6.4	864	90.6	954	100
MANYONI	2	1.5	26	19.5	47	35.3	58	43.6	133	100
TOTALS	8	0.6	77	5.5	133	9.4	1194	84.6	1412	100

Kilosa and Dodoma.

Table 21 presents these farmers' participation in extension service activities. Only 16 percent of the farmers reported talking with Bjana Shawa rarely or often (or occasionally) and nearly 55 percent had never talked with the agents. Likewise, only 11 percent had ever attended farm demonstrations and visited demonstration plots and about 15 percent had ever attended extension meetings. Furthermore, only 31 percent reported listening to extension agent for livestock (Mkulima wa Kisasa).

Ownership of Livestock

The analysis of the ownership of livestock shows that it is surely not the most important enterprise in the Central Zone of Tanzania. In contrast to the number of farmers growing crops, the farmers raising livestock are fewer and except for a few farmers, livestock enterprises is just a supplementary enterprise operated mainly for side income or for using spare time.

Except for poultry which is owned by nearly 60 percent of the farmers, no more than twenty-six percent of the farmers own any of the other livestock listed, (See Table 22). The farmers surveyed reported owning 8,305 poultry; 7,537 cattle; 4,762 goats; 1,694 oxen; 420 donkeys and 1,205 other animals.

In terms of number owned, poultry is the most important livestock in the Central Zone. However, in terms of value, this may not be the case. As indicated in Table 22, poultry is owned by a larger percentage of the farmers in all districts. Large livestock, such as goats, cattle, donkeys and oxen are owned by relatively a small percentage of the farmers surveyed. This is due primarily to the cost of such animals in relation to the incomes of farmers in the study area.

Table 21

SHAMBA ACTIVITIES---PARTICIPATION

DISTRICTS	ACTIVITIES															
	TALKED WITH BWANA SHAMBA								ATTENDED FARM DEMONSTRATION							
	NEVER		RARELY		OFTEN OR OCCASIONALLY		NO RESPONSE		NEVER		RARELY		OFTEN OR OCCASIONALLY		NO RESPONSE	
Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
Kilosa	196	60.3	41	12.6	11	3.4	77	23.7	200	61.5	25	7.7	6	1.8	94	28.9
Dodoma	506	53.0	97	10.2	14	1.5	337	35.3	517	54.2	84	8.8	6	0.6	347	36.4
Manyoni	69	51.9	55	41.4	8	6.0	1	0.8	93	69.9	35	26.3	2	1.5	3	2.3
Total	771	54.6	193	13.7	33	2.3	415	29.4	810	57.4	144	10.2	14	1.0	444	31.4

Table 21 (cont'd)

SHAMBA ACTIVITIES---PARTICIPATION

DISTRICTS	ACTIVITIES															
	ATTENDED MEETINGS OF BWANA SHAMBA								VISITED DEMONSTRATION PLOTS							
	NEVER		RARELY		OFTEN OR OCCASIONALLY		NO RESPONSE		NEVER		RARELY		OFTEN OR OCCASIONALLY		NO RESPONSE	
Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
KILOSA	190	58.5	36	11.1	10	3.1	89	27.4	200	61.5	24	7.4	11	3.4	90	27.7
DODOMA	509	53.4	88	9.2	14	1.5	343	36.0	523	54.8	86	9.0	8	0.8	337	35.3
MANYONI	71	53.4	53	39.8	6	4.5	3	2.3	106	79.7	23	17.3	1	0.8	3	2.3
TOTAL	770	54.5	177	12.5	30	2.1	435	31.0	829	58.7	133	9.4	20	1.4	430	30.5

Table 21 (cont'd)

SHAMBA ACTIVITIES---PARTICIPATION

DISTRICTS	ACTIVITIES							
	LISTEN TO EXTENSION AGENTS FOR LIVESTOCK (MKULIMA WA KIASASA)							
	NEVER		RARELY		OFTEN OR OCCASIONALLY		NO RESPONSE	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
KILOSA	128	39.4	72	22.2	62	19.1	63	19.4
DODOMA	428	44.9	172	18.0	83	8.7	271	28.4
MANYONI	78	58.6	34	25.6	18	13.5	3	2.3
TOTAL	634	44.9	278	19.7	163	11.5	337	23.9

Table 22

LIVESTOCK OWNED AS REPORTED BY FARMERS SURVEYED

LIVESTOCK	DISTRICTS											
	KILOSA			DODOMA			MANYONI			TOTAL		
	Total Number of Animals	Farmers Reporting		Total Number of Animals	Farmers Reporting		Total Number of Animals	Farmers Reporting		Total Number of Animals	Farmers Reporting	
		Number	%									
OX	340	32	9.8	1297	218	22.9	57	22	17.0	1694	272	19.3
CATTLE	2054	30	9.2	5108	244	25.6	375	28	21.0	7537	302	21.4
GOATS	760	54	16.6	3776	301	31.6	226	25	19.0	4762	380	26.9
DONKEYS	131	16	4.9	279	64	6.7	10	01	.8	420	81	5.7
POULTRY	2496	241	74.2	5206	539	56.5	603	62	47.0	8305	842	59.6
OTHER	615	53	16.3	564	98	10.3	26	03	2.3	1205	154	10.9

Farm Inputs

Tanzanian farmers rely on their own source, to a very large extent, for agricultural input. They use their own seeds, and animal manure is used for fertilizer. The use of farm inputs from off-farm sources is almost nonexistent. This is due mainly to the lack of adequate credit, the unavailability of such inputs and the lack of knowledge about improved inputs.

As indicated in Table 23, about three-fourths of the farmers surveyed did not use any of the inputs listed which came from off-farm sources. For the farmers who did use inputs from off-farm sources, the major sources were: National Milling Corporation (NMC), Tanzanian Rural Development Bank (TRDB), Tanzanian Cotton Authority (TCA), and the Village. According to the data (Table 23) the TRDB has not reached very many of the farmers in the Central Zone. The use of improved seeds, fertilizer, and insecticides, thus far, has been very limited, even with the efforts of the TRDB.

Although there were some variation from district to district in the use of improved off-farm inputs, the overall use of such inputs was so limited that differences are of little importance. In other words, to increase production there needs to be great increases in the use of improved off-farm inputs in all districts.

As in the case of improved off-farm inputs, the use of credit is very low. As indicated in Table 24, 83.6 percent of the farmers surveyed did not use credit. Of the farmers who did use credit, Table 24 shows the sources and Table 25, the amount of money received from credit. Overall the use of credit is not very important and the variations from district to district is insignificant.

Table 23

SOURCE AND AVAILABILITY OF SELECTED FARM INPUTS BY DISTRICTS

DISTRICTS	SOURCE														
	National Milling Corporation			Tanzania Rural Development Bank			Tanzania Cotton Authority			Village			Other		
	Ferti- lizer	Insecti- cides	Improved Seed	Ferti- lizer	Insecti- cides	Improved Seed	Ferti- lizer	Insecti- cides	Improved Seed	Ferti- lizer	Insecti- cides	Improved Seed	Ferti- lizer	Insecti- cides	Impro- seed
KILOSA	3	-	2	1	2	2	-	1	2	3	13	16	21	29	22
DODOMA	2	-	2	-	4	8	-	1	-	196	27	50	101	82	81
MANYONI	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	2	-	10	12	10
TOTAL	6	-	5	1	6	10	-	2	2	214	42	66	132	123	113
% OF TOTAL	0.4	-	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.7	-	0.1	0.1	15.2	3.0	4.7	9.4	8.7	8.0

DISTRICTS	AVAILABILITY											
	NOT AVAILABLE			NOT ENOUGH			DON'T USE			NO RESPONSE		
	Ferti- lizer	Insecti- cides	Improved Seed									
Kilosa	35	29	31	1	-	1	81	72	81	180	179	168
Dodoma	109	123	108	-	1	3	203	239	257	338	477	445
Manyoni	1	2	-	-	-	-	59	71	74	47	46	48
Total	145	154	139	1	1	4	348	382	412	565	702	661
% of Total	10.2	10.9	9.8	0.1	0.1	0.3	24.7	27.1	29.2	40.0	49.7	46.8

Table 24
SOURCE OF MONEY FOR INPUTS - NUMBER AND FREQUENCY

DISTRICTS	SOURCES									
	Self-finance or friend		Tanzania Rural Dev. Bank or other Bank		Village		Other		No Response	
	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total	Number	% of Total
KILOSA	250	76.9	3	0.9	8	2.5	11	3.4	53	16.3
DODOMA	809	84.8	4	0.4	20	2.1	13	1.4	103	11.3
MANYONI	122	91.7	-	-	-	-	1	0.8	10	7.5
TOTAL	1181	83.6	7	0.5	28	2.0	25	1.8	171	12.5

Table 25
ACTUAL MONEY RECEIVED

Money Received	DISTRICTS							
	KILOSA		DODOMA		MANYONI		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
\$1 to 25	61	18.8	201	21.1	21	15.8	283	20.0
26 to 50	12	3.7	20	2.1	1	0.3	33	2.0
51 to 100	4	1.2	12	1.3	-	-	16	1.0
over 100	4	1.2	6	0.6	-	-	10	1.0
No Response	244	75.1	715	74.9	111	83.5	1070	76.0
Total	325	100	954	100	133	100	1412	100

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper has been to present a preliminary farm profile of Tanzanian farmers in the Central Zone based on the survey conducted in September and October of 1980. This preliminary descriptive analysis of the data collected will be useful in developing strategies for rural development programs in Tanzania.

The results from the thirty-one villages, from the three districts surveyed, cover a total of 1,412 farmers. From this sample the general condition of Tanzanian agriculture can be determined. Furthermore, this profile of Tanzanian farmers will assist in developing programs aimed at improving Tanzanian agricultural output. Once the present farm situation in Tanzania is assessed, programs to improve the situation can be undertaken. Without the foregoing baseline data, it would be difficult to implement beneficial rural development programs. With the socio-economic, household and farm characteristics of Tanzanian farmers assessed, rural development programs that will be effective can be undertaken.