Impact of Winter Chickpea Technology in Syria



Ahmed Mazid, Kamil Shideed, Koffi Amegbeto, and Rajendra Malhotra

21 November 2007



Seminar Structure

- Introduction
- Chickpea production status in Syria
- Recommended winter chickpea package in Syria
- Dissemination of winter chickpea
- Objectives and methodology
- Characterization of household assets and wealth index
- Farmers' perception on winter chickpea
- Adoption and diffusion of winter chickpea
- Impact on productivity
- Impact on profitability
- Impact on household income
- Impact on labors
- Water productivity
- Conclusion and recommendations



Introduction

 In Syria, chickpea (*Cicer arietinum L*) traditionally is sown during spring on conserved soil moisture and its productivity is constrained mainly due to terminal drought and vascular wilt.

 The farmers plant chickpea in spring if sufficient rainfall has taken place during winter months to ensure successful spring planting.



Since pressure on land is increasing, the economic benefit can get from spring chickpea is declining relative to other crops in the farming system, therefore, the area and production was not stabile

- Winter-sown chickpea promises to solve many problems through
 - Ascochyta blight resistance
 - Higher yield potential
 - More productive use of land
 - Serve to stabilize chickpea area, and
 - Sustain the farming system

Chickpea Production Status in Syria





Area and Production of Rainfed Chickpea in Syria





Area, Yield, and Production of Chickpea in Syria during (1981 – 2005)

| | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation | C.V% |
|---------------------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|-------------|
| Area Harvested (ha) | 34000 | 108012 | 76865 | 20821 | 27 |
| Yield (Kg/ha) | 382 | 900 | 668 | 127 | 19 |
| Production (MT) | 13000 | 88781 | 52488 | 20035 | 38 |



Estimated the Annual Increase of Chickpea Production, Area, and Yield



| | а | b | R Square | Model Sig. | % annual increase |
|------------|----------|---------|----------|---------------|----------------------|
| Production | -1987268 | 1023.46 | 0.141 | 0.064 | 1.606 |
| Area | -2448017 | 1266.88 | 0.201 | 0.025 | 1.395 |
| Yield | -3382.52 | 2.03 | 0.014 | 0.575 | 0.294 |



Recommended Winter Chickpea Package Components in Syria

- The Main Components:
 - Improved varieties: Ghab 3, Ghab 4, Ghab 5
 - Seed rate: 120 Kg/ha
 - Planting date: First half of January
 - Chemical seeds treatment
 - Protecting spray against fungi during the second half of March
 - Weed control when plant high reach 10 cm
- The Optional Components:
 - Reliable Seed source
 - Using drill for planting
 - Fertilizer rate: 100 Kg/ha of super phosphate
 - Using herbicide before planting
 - Using mechanical weed control
 - Using additional spraying (1-2) times when needed



Dissemination of Winter Chickpea

 ICARDA in collaboration with the Department of Agricultural Extension and General Commission of Scientific Agricultural Research in Syria (GCSAR) have been playing a vital role in dissemination of winter chickpea technology in Syria.

In 2005, ICARDA supplied through Agricultural Extension Directorate about 7.2 tons of seeds of Ghab4 and Ghab5 to farmers

GOSM produced and distributed 575 tons of seeds of Ghab3 to farmers in 2005.







Chickpea Varieties in Syria





 In 2005/06 season, we intend to get information from the farmers regarding the performance of these cultivars in comparison with the traditional spring plantings to have impact analysis of winter chickpea technology and to know the constraints, if any, in adoption of winter chickpea technology for ICARDA back up research.



Farmer's Field Planted by Winter Chickpea Seeds obtained from ICARDA





Objective of the Study

- Document the adoption of winter chickpea in Syria
- Identify both biological and socioeconomics constraints that influence adoption process
- Assess the impact of this technology on rural household's livelihoods in terms of income increase, food security, and labor opportunities by gender



Methodology

- Review the secondary data
- Conduct Rapid Rural Appraisal
- Carry out a formal survey
- Data analysis using descriptive and econometric methods



Training of National Extension and Research Systems in Syria on Implementation of Adoption and Impact Studies





Adoption Indicators

Adoption rate

Represent the percentage of farmers adopting the technology

Degree of adoption

Represent the proportion of land under the new technology

Intensity of adoption
Adoption rate * Degree of adoption





Sample Distribution by Seed Sources and Provinces

| Seed source | Aleppo | ldleb | Hama/El Ghab | Dar'a | Total | % |
|----------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|-------|-------|-----|
| Research & Extension | 30 | 37 | 24 | 30 | 121 | 26 |
| GOSM | 29 | 55 | 16 | 4 | 104 | 22 |
| Research & GOSM | 1 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 3 |
| Other source | 75 | 94 | 37 | 25 | 231 | 49 |
| Total | 135 | 197 | 78 | 60 | 470 | 100 |
| % | 29 | 42 | 17 | 13 | 100 | |

Farmers' perception on winter chickpea





Comparing characteristics of winter chickpea to spring chickpea

- Frost resistance
- Ascochyta resistance
- Drought resistance
- Heat resistance
- Diseases resistance
- Insect resistance
- Yield under marginal conditions
- Earliness of maturity
- Needs more weeding
- Easiness for manual harvest
- Easiness for mechanical harvest

- Easiness for threshing
- Resistance to shattering
- Tillering
- Grain size
- Grain color
- Grain yield
- Straw yield
- Cooking time
- Price of grain
- Price of straw
- Taste
- Consumer demand

Comparing characteristics of winter chickpea to spring chickpea (% of farmers)

| Characteristic | Winter is better | Spring is better | No difference | No idea |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------|
| Frost resistance | 64.2 | 8.3 | 6.1 | 21.3 |
| Ascochyta resistance | 48.9 | 16.9 | 11.4 | 22.8 |
| Yield under marginal conditions | 54.7 | 7.4 | 9.9 | 28 |
| Earliness of maturity | 72.3 | 6.1 | 2.5 | 19 |
| Needs more weeding | 54.6 | 8.7 | 17.9 | 18.9 |
| Easiness for manual harvest | 14 | 44.1 | 21.2 | 20.7 |
| Easiness for mechanical harvest | 71 | 1.8 | 5.6 | 21.5 |
| Grain size | 11 | 69.1 | 4.1 | 15.9 |
| Grain color | 14.5 | 53.7 | 11.9 | 19.9 |
| Grain yield | 66 | 7.9 | 6.1 | 20.1 |
| Price of grain | 14 | 58.4 | 9.2 | 18.4 |

Reasons for not growing winter chickpea in the following year (% of farmers)

| | Zone | | |
|---|------|-----|-------|
| Reasons | 1 | 2 | Total |
| Crop rotation | 47 | 24 | 43 |
| Affected by diseases or aschocyta | 10 | 14 | 11 |
| Low grain yield | 6 | 3 | 6 |
| Bad season, shortage in rainfall | 6 | 28 | 9 |
| No experience in growing it compared to spring variety | 3 | | 3 |
| No guarantee to protect it as it could be stolen at green stage by passing people | 3 | | 3 |
| Availability seeds from formal sector | 6 | 17 | 8 |
| Not accepted for economic reasons (lower market price, high weeding costs) | 18 | 14 | 17 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| N of observation | 162 | 29 | 191 |



Factors affecting Productivity of Winter Chickpeas (% of farmers)

| Factor | No affect | Low | Moderate | High |
|----------------------|-----------|------|----------|------|
| Variety | 14.9 | 6.0 | 43.4 | 35.8 |
| Previous crop | 18.0 | 17.4 | 39.6 | 25.0 |
| Time of tillage | 14.9 | 17.4 | 46.5 | 21.2 |
| Equipment of tillage | 18.9 | 15.8 | 45.1 | 20.2 |
| Date of sowing | 4.7 | 5.6 | 39.4 | 50.3 |
| Method of sowing | 14.9 | 13.6 | 43.7 | 27.8 |
| Seed rate | 6.3 | 8.5 | 43.9 | 41.4 |
| Seed treatment | 8.2 | 12.3 | 30.4 | 49.1 |
| P application | 21.5 | 10.9 | 29.3 | 38.3 |
| N application | 35.2 | 22 | 30.6 | 12.2 |
| Insects & diseases | 3.8 | 5.8 | 19.9 | 70.5 |
| Weeds | 2.2 | 5 | 27.1 | 65.6 |
| Ascochyta blight | 4.2 | 8 | 15.7 | 72.2 |
| Method of harvest | 17.3 | 19.2 | 44.2 | 19.2 |

Characterization of household assets and wealth quartiles





Farmers' characteristics by wealth quartiles

| | Wealth quartiles | | | | |
|--|------------------|---------|---------|----------------|--|
| Variables | Lowest 25% | 25%-50% | 50%-75% | Highest 25% | |
| Total holding area | 5.0 | 6.6 | 7.1 | 22.2 | |
| Goat numbers | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 2.2 | |
| Family size | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| Having other skills beside the knowledge in agriculture | 0.03 | 0.17 | 0.38 | 0.42 | |
| People generally trust one another in matters of lending and borrowing | 0.19 | 0.50 | 0.71 | 0.70 | |
| Owned area | 4.4 | 5.8 | 6.2 | 17.6 | |
| Having car | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.12 | 0.26 | |
| Farmer age | 59 | 52 | 48 | 47 | |
| Distance between the house and paved road | 27 | 37 | 73 | 178 | |



Adoption of Winter Chickpea Varieties

| | Adoption degree (% of winter chickpea) | Adoption rate (%) | Adoption intensity (%) |
|------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------------|
| Zone | | | |
| Zone 1 | 65.7 | 64.0 | 42.0 |
| Zone 2 | 65.8 | 72.7 | 47.8 |
| Province | | | |
| Aleppo | 85.6 | 75.0 | 64.2 |
| ldleb | 67.8 | 66.2 | 44.9 |
| Hama/El Ghab | 68.1 | 63.8 | 43.4 |
| Dar'a | 37.8 | 43.6 | 16.5 |
| Wealth quartiles | | | |
| Lowest 25% | 56.6 | 56.5 | 32.0 |
| 25%-50% | 64.7 | 64.6 | 41.8 |
| 50%-75% | 66.0 | 67.5 | 44.5 |
| Highest 25% | 65.7 | 73.3 | 48.1 |
| Total sample | 65.7 | 66.0 | 43.4 |



Adoption Rate of Main Components (% of farmers)

| Component | Zone 1 | Zone 2 | Both zones |
|-------------------|--------|--------|------------|
| N of observations | 253 | 77 | 330 |
| Seed rate | 41.3 | 20.8 | 36.8 |
| Planting date | 54.7 | 42.9 | 52.0 |
| Seed treatment | 49.0 | 63.6 | 52.4 |
| Fungi control | 37.0 | 14.3 | 31.9 |
| Weed control | 67.9 | 41.6 | 62.0 |
| Full package | 1.1 | 0 | 0.9 |



Number of components adopted by farmers

| No of components | Frequency | % |
|------------------|-----------|-------|
| 0 (only variety) | 7 | 2.1 |
| 1 + variety | 64 | 19.4 |
| 2 + variety | 101 | 30.6 |
| 3 + variety | 103 | 31.2 |
| 4 + variety | 52 | 15.8 |
| 5 + variety | 3 | 0.9 |
| Total | 330 | 100.0 |



Adoption Rate of Optional Components

| Component | Zone 1 | Zone 2 | Both zones |
|--|--------|--------|------------|
| | | | |
| Reliable seed source | 72.1 | 61.0 | 69.1 |
| Using drill | 64.1 | 57.3 | 62.5 |
| Appling super phosphate fertilizer | 70.3 | 44.2 | 64.2 |
| Appling 100 Kg/ha of super phosphate | 22.5 | 23.3 | 22.7 |
| Using herbicide before planting | 29.2 | 11.7 | 28.2 |
| Using mechanical weed control | 8.7 | 0 | 6.7 |
| Using (2-3) spraying against Ascochyta | 18.9 | 7.8 | 16.4 |



Diffusion of Winter Chickpea Varieties





Logistic Regression Analysis (Logit Model)

- A quantitative relationship between adoption and influencing factors was established to predict whether a farmer will or will not adopt the new technology.
- This relationship can be estimated by using logistic regression model.
- Logit model is a technique that can be used, for estimating the probability of adopting a new technology, given certain conditions.
 - In this analysis, the model uses a series of characteristics of the farm and the farmer to predict the probability of adoption.





Factors influencing adoption of winter chickpea

| Factor | В | S.E. | Sig. | Exp(B) |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------|------|--------|
| Zone | 1.347 | 0.447 | 0.00 | 3.84 |
| Total holding | 0.064 | 0.022 | 0.00 | 1.07 |
| Having irrigation | 0.004 | 0.023 | 0.00 | 1.07 |
| source | -0.877 | 0.317 | 0.01 | 0.42 |
| Farmer's age | 0.037 | 0.012 | 0.00 | 1.04 |
| Chickpea yield in 2005 | 0.001 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Wealth index | 0.685 | 0.341 | 0.04 | 1.98 |
| Participating in field days | 0.724 | 0.377 | 0.05 | 2.06 |
| Constant | -6.535 | 1.188 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Impact on Productivity





Average Chickpea Yields in 2005 Season





Estimated Average Chickpea Yields in Good, Normal, and Bad Seasons



Spring Chickpea

Winter Chickpea


Average Winter Chickpea Yields in 2005 Season





Estimated Multiple Linear Production Function for Chickpea

| Variables | Unstanc Coeffi | lardized cients | Standardized Coefficients | Sig. |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|------|
| | В | Std. Error | Beta | |
| (Constant) | -624.184 | 169.038 | | .000 |
| rainfall rate in 2005 | 2.990 | .271 | .389 | .000 |
| Variety (Dummy) | 379.941 | 60.960 | .233 | .000 |
| Seed rate (kg/ha) | 4.004 | .867 | .158 | .000 |
| Using supp irriga (Dummy) | 379.952 | 104.944 | .125 | .000 |
| Amount of super phosphate (46%) on winter chickpeas | 1.070 | .369 | .108 | .004 |
| Using pest control 1 time | 100.936 | 64.331 | .055 | .117 |
| Using pest control 2 times | 549.896 | 97.016 | .207 | .000 |
| Total labor needed per hectare for chickpea | 5.019 | .836 | .210 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: Grain yields in 2005 Adjusted R Square = 0.456 F(493, 7) = 51.22***



Estimated Cobb-Douglas Production Function

| | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | Sig. |
|--|--------------------------------|------------|------------------------------|------|
| Variables | В | Std. Error | Beta | |
| (Constant) | -2.107 | .559 | | .000 |
| LN Rain | 1.042 | .070 | .508 | .000 |
| LN Seed rate | .565 | .081 | .230 | .000 |
| LN Labor | .066 | .023 | .101 | .003 |
| Variety (Dummy) | .287 | .040 | .249 | .000 |
| Using supplemental irrigation (Dummy) | .322 | .072 | .149 | .000 |
| Using pest control 1 time | .059 | .044 | .045 | .182 |
| Using pest control 2 times | .237 | .066 | .126 | .000 |

Dependent Variable: LN Grain Yield in 2005

Adjusted R Square = 0.484 F(481, 7) = 66.65***



Estimated Cobb-Douglas Production Function by Zones

| | Zon | e 1 | Zone 2 | |
|--|--------------|------|--------------|------|
| Variables | Coefficients | Sig. | Coefficients | Sig. |
| (Constant) | 2.509 | .004 | -6.638 | .000 |
| LN Rain | .590 | .000 | 1.602 | .000 |
| LN Seed rate | .181 | .063 | .858 | .000 |
| LN Labor | .076 | .002 | .063 | .189 |
| Variety (Dummy) | .280 | .000 | .163 | .086 |
| Using supplemental irrigation (Dummy) | .210 | .005 | .649 | .001 |
| Using pest control 1 time | .063 | .175 | .005 | .966 |
| Using pest control 2 times | .277 | .000 | .013 | .960 |
| Adjusted R square | 0.278 | | 0.542 | |

Dependent Variable: LN Grain Yield in 2005



Estimated the Net Impact of Winter Chickpea Variety

• The formula used:

Net impact = $e^x - 1$

x = coefficient related to variety in Cobb-Douglas Model

Spatial distribution of yield gain due to shifting to winter production were:

| • 32.3% | in Zone 1 |
|---------|---------------------|
| • 17.7% | in Zone 2 |
| • 33.2% | on the sample level |

Impact on Profitability





Profitability of Spring and Winter Chickpeas

| | Spring | | | | Winter | |
|------------------------|--------|-------|---------|-------|--------|---------|
| | Zones | | | Zor | nes | |
| Item | 1 | 2 | average | 1 | 2 | average |
| Grain value | 48624 | 26355 | 43465 | 64133 | 39266 | 58701 |
| Straw value | 3482 | 3110 | 3396 | 1980 | 1982 | 1980 |
| Total revenue (SL-ha) | 52106 | 29465 | 46861 | 66113 | 41249 | 60681 |
| Total production costs | 15723 | 14829 | 15603 | 20346 | 13755 | 18906 |
| Net revenue (SL-ha) | 36382 | 14636 | 31258 | 45767 | 27493 | 41775 |



Winter Chickpea Costs (%)



Winter Chickpea

Spring Chickpea



Differences in the Costs between Spring and Winter Chickpea

| | Zon | | |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|---------|
| | 1 | 2 | average |
| Change in total revenue | 14008 | 11784 | 13820 |
| Change in total production costs | 4623 | -1073 | 3303 |
| Change in net revenue (SL-ha) | 9385 | 12857 | 10517 |



Costs and Revenue of Spring and Winter Chickpeas

| | Spring | | | Winter | | |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------|
| | TotalTotalNetRevenueproductirevenue | | Total Revenue | Total producti | Net revenue | |
| Wealth quartiles | | on costs | | | on costs | |
| Lowest 25% | 50288 | 16098 | 34191 | 63122 | 19684 | 43437 |
| 25%-50% | 45689 | 14641 | 31048 | 58074 | 18818 | 39256 |
| 50%-75% | 46079 | 15960 | 30119 | 59935 | 18278 | 41657 |
| Highest 25% | 46458 | 16569 | 29889 | 62404 | 19204 | 43201 |
| Total | 47404 | 15839 | 31565 | 60869 | 18974 | 41895 |

Impact on Household Income





Income Sources





Land Use



Zone 1

Zone 2



Average Annual Household Income



ICARDA

Average Annual Household Income by Wealth Quartiles





Contribution of Chickpea Selling into the Average Household Income (%)

| Group | % |
|---------------------------|-------|
| Growing winter only | 22.8 |
| Growing spring only | 19.2 |
| Growing winter and spring | 21.2 |
| | |
| Lowest 25% | 23.2 |
| 25%-50% | 21.3 |
| 50%-75% | 21.7 |
| Highest 25% | 19.6 |
| Total | 21.7% |



Winter Chickpea Production Disposal





Percentage of Winter Chickpea Production used as Home Consumption

| Wealth quartiles | % of total production |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| Lowest 25% | 1.50% |
| 25%-50% | 0.94% |
| 50%-75% | 1.48% |
| Highest 25% | 0.45% |
| Total | 0.81% |

Impact on Labors





Estimated Number of Labor needed per Hectare for Winter and Spring Chickpea



Spring chickpea

Winter chickpea

Water Productivity

| District | Grain yield (2005) of spring chickpea | Grain yield (2005) of winter chickpeas | Rainfall rate in 2005 (mm) | Water productivity (Spring chickpea) | Water productivity (winter chickpea) |
|-------------|---|---|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| Izaz | 1269 | 1476 | 365.4 | 3.47 | 4.04 |
| Al-Bab | | 1270 | 286.8 | | 4.43 |
| Samaan | 1400 | 2013 | 396.3 | 3.53 | 5.08 |
| Efreen | 950 | 2550 | 385 | 2.47 | 6.62 |
| ldleb | 1765 | 2220 | 413.8 | 4.27 | 5.37 |
| Harem | 1500 | 1771 | 489.3 | 3.07 | 3.62 |
| Ariha | 1250 | 1636 | 549.3 | 2.28 | 2.98 |
| El Ma'arra | 1650 | 1696 | 340.8 | 4.84 | 4.98 |
| El Ghab | 1676 | 2741 | 562.8 | 2.98 | 4.87 |
| Mesiaf | 2000 | | 402.7 | 4.97 | |
| Mhardeh | | 2350 | 478.5 | | 4.91 |
| Jarablos | | 1524 | 283.5 | | 5.37 |
| Dar'a | 803 | 652 | 298.8 | 2.69 | 2.18 |
| Izra' | 563 | 652 | 244.2 | 2.30 | 2.67 |
| El Sanamein | 712 | 1025 | 243.2 | 2.93 | 4.21 |
| Average | 1360 | 1826 | 378.7 | 3.59 | 4.82 |



Conclusion

CARDACIear expansion in winter chickpea

- Most farmers have adopted the recommended package components (more extension is needed)
- Variety is widely adopted compared to other components
- Expansion of winter chickpea in Zone 2 (new area)
- Clear impact of winter chickpea technology in terms of
 - Productivity
 - Profitability
 - Water productivity
 - Poverty reduction



Recommendations

- More investigation and monitoring of winter chickpea planting in Houran area of Syria (Dara' and Sweida) are needed
- Discuss with GCSAR the possibility to conduct onfarm trials on winter chickpea at Hasakeh province
- More focus on extension activities in Zone 2 in:
 - Al Bab, and Jarablus Districts Aleppo
 - Saraqib and Maa'rah Districts Idleb



Thank you for your attention







Lessons Learned



The slowness diffusion of winter chickpeas among farmers may be due to:

- The risk associated by growing the crop and effect of Ascochyta blight.
- Farmers perceive lack of full resistance to Ascochyta, and all winter chickpeas varieties are only tolerant.
- Lack of knowledge among some farmers on winter chickpea technology.
- Not enough knowledge among farmers on the type and quantity of chemical to be used for spraying, and there is no clear Extension Program for pest management on winter chickpea.
- The slowness in diffusion process may also contribute to the failure of winter sowing in some areas in some years due to failure to apply all the package components.



Expansion of winter chickpea cultivation in Syria

- Winter chickpea should be planted in January, unlike the spring chickpea. The criteria used by farmers are different in the two cases.
- The area planted by winter chickpea can be influenced by the following factors:
 - The price of lentil and cumin (substitute crops)
 - Tendency of neighboring farmers to grew the same crop (Dams' agriculture) i.e. when all farmers decide to plant only one crop due to the land property and the small area of each individual farmer (2 km long, 10 m wide), this doesn't allow every farmer to plant different crop.
 - Increase of age of olive trees affect farmers' decision not to plant winter or spring chickpea between the trees.



Expansion of winter chickpea cultivation in Syria (Continue)

- The importance of winter chickpea has been increased in the fertile land of Zone 2 in both Aleppo and Idleb provinces in the last 5 years.
- Chickpea area in AI Ghab region is relatively limited, and doesn't exceed 500 ha per year, mostly in winter chickpea. Many farmers harvest the chickpea while still in the green stage in early May and sell it for 3000-4000SL/dunum. Then farmers plant summer crops such as cotton or sugar beet, which increase the household income in the average by 25000 SL.
- Chickpea is planted in 25000 ha in Dar'a province, yet the adoption of winter chickpea varieties are still limited.
 More Extension activity is needed at that area.



The Wealth Index

- Wealth index, based on the status of household assets, was used for ranking the households in the sample.
- In the wealth ranking, variables important in distinguishing households from each other were identified by Principal Components Analysis.
- Wealth quartiles have been used to explore patterns of income distribution in household



a. Natural Capital

| Total holding area (ha) | 10.7 |
|--|---------------------------|
| Total Owned area (ha) | 8.8 |
| Having irrigated land (%) | 36 |
| Using the water resource for irrigating chickpea (%) | 8.5 |
| Having sheep and/or goats | 20% of farmers (25 heads) |
| Having cattle | 10% of farmers (3 heads) |
| Distance between the house and paved road (m) | 83 |



b. Physical Capital (% of farmers)

| Having a tractor | 32 |
|------------------------|----|
| Having a well | 29 |
| Having agri. equipment | 25 |
| Having shop | 15 |
| Having car | 11 |
| Having pickup/lorry | 20 |
| Having motorcycle | 32 |
| Having a bus | 2 |



c. Social Capital (% of farmers)

| Cooperative availability in the village | 95 |
|---|----|
| Cooperative membership | 45 |
| Perception of household member to be active in any collective action in the community | |
| - Leader | 6 |
| -Very active | 25 |
| -Somewhat active | 63 |
| -Not active | 6 |
| People generally trust one another in matters of lending and borrowing | 51 |



d. Human Capital

| Family size (person) | 9 |
|--|----|
| Experience in Agriculture (year) | 25 |
| Having other skills (%) | 25 |
| Having work opportunities outside the area (%) | 21 |
| Farmers' education (%) | |
| - illiterate | 6 |
| - read and write | 27 |
| - preliminary | 26 |
| - secondary | 22 |
| - university | 19 |



e. Financial Capital

| % of off-farm income | 12 |
|--|---------------------|
| % of income from chickpea | 21 |
| Average annual income | 403000 SL/household |
| Saving money last year (%) | 29 |
| Using credit for farm needs (%) | 19 |
| Classification of the livelihoods by farmers' perception (%) | |
| - very poor | 1 |
| - Poor | 13 |
| - moderately well-off | 67 |
| - well off | 19 |



Created Wealth Index

- The wealth index was created using Factor Analysis, a statistical technique similar to Principal Components Analysis. These analyses have the common objective of reducing the relationships between many interrelated variables to a small number of factors.
- However, the primary purpose of factor analysis is to describe the relationships among the many variables in terms of a few underlying but unobservable factors; several original variables are combined into a few derived variables.



Variable included in Factor Analysis

- Total holding area
- Goat numbers
- Family size
- Having other skills beside the knowledge in agriculture
- People generally trust one another in matters of lending and borrowing
- Owned area
- Having car
- Farmer age
- Distance between the house and paved road


In calculating the wealth index, the coefficients of variables estimated by factor analysis were multiplied by standardized values of the respective variables for each factor (X_i)

 Household-specific wealth indices were constructed from scores obtained from factor analysis, according to:

 $X^* = W_1X_1 + W_2X_2 + W_3X_3 + ... + W_nX_n$

where

- X* is the score for each household.
- X_i is the value of factor i and has a zero mean and standard deviation equal to 1.
- w_i is weight, which is specified for the maximum variance of factor i