



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The impact of the ICCO-supported PAS project in Kugsabile Upper East Ghana (unpublished)

Dietz, A.J.; Obeng, F.; Geest, K. van der

Citation

Dietz, A. J., Obeng, F., & Geest, K. van der. (2002). *The impact of the ICCO-supported PAS project in Kugsabile Upper East Ghana (unpublished)*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15413>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15413>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Ton Dietz, Francis Obeng, Kees van der Geest and others

Unpublished report

The Impact of the ICCO-supported Presbyterian Agricultural Station in Kugsabile, Upper East Ghana

2002

Part of the Impact Study of Co-financing Organizations

The results of the survey in Kugsabile

48 people have been interviewed in Kugsabile, of 12 different compounds. It was the intention to select households with a long existence and a long memory of changes in the area and of the impact of the Presbyterian (Garu) Agricultural Station (PAS). In each compound a woman of at least 35 years old was the prime informant, next to her husband, one of her grown up children (between 18 and 35 years old) and one of the elderly people living on the same compound (often the father or mother of the husband). Half of the twelve selected families were selected because at least one of their members was a direct beneficiary of the Presbyterian Agricultural Station in Garu; a member of a PAS group. In the other half there were no current members, although one of those households appeared to gain directly as well. For each of these two subgroups an attempt was made to select two households, which locally were regarded as relatively rich; two, which were locally regarded as relatively poor and two in between. Also an attempt was made to include Muslim members of PAS groups, although there are not many, and none of them Busangas.

Of the interviewed wives only one had no 'rivals'. Eight wives had one co-wife; three had two. Of the interviewed husbands the average number of wives was two. The wives who were interviewed had on average 6 children (with a range from 2-13), their husbands had on average 9 children (range 5-16). Half of the young people who were interviewed were married, with on average two children of their own. Of the elderly respondents five were still married and seven were widows or widowers.

The households that were selected happened to be a representation of the ethnic and religious differences in the village: 8 were Kusasi and 4 Busanga. None of the Busanga were member of a PAS group, but two of the Kusasis were neither. In three of the four Busanga compounds all interviewed members were Muslims. In the fourth Busanga compound both husband and wife said they were 'Traditionalists', but their children became Muslims. In the Kusasi group the situation is more complicated. Among the six PAS group beneficiary compounds (all Kusasi), two are Muslim (although one of the interviewed children appeared to be a 'break-away' Presbyterian). They belong to the rich and medium-rich category. In one Kusasi PAS-compound both husband and wife are 'Traditionalists', but their children joined the Presbyterian church. This household belongs to the poor category. In one Kusasi PAS-compound the husband still regards himself to be a 'Traditionalist', but his wife joined the Presbyterians (already in 1972) and their children are Presbyterians as well. Also this household belongs to the poor category. In the two other PAS-compounds all members are Presbyterians. In both cases the husbands joined first (already in 1962, even before they were married) and the wives followed (in 1970 resp. 1980, but that was after their marriage). These households belong to the rich and medium rich category. five interviewed children are

Presbyterians, and one a Muslim. The Muslim child comes from a Traditionalist background. Among the two Kusasi compounds who have never been involved in PAS activities, both husband and wife regard themselves as 'Traditionalists', but their children joined the Presbyterian church. These two households belong to the medium and poor category.

Although in general it can be said that most Busangas are Muslims, our survey group shows that there can be exceptions. And although the large majority of the Kusasis are either Traditionalists or Presbyterians (and most of the children belong to the Church), we do have Muslim compounds in our survey group. The survey group also shows that PAS groups are not completely without Muslims, but we clearly had to look for examples, and all happen to be Kusasis. It is interesting to note that none of the interviewed children stated that they regard themselves as 'Traditionalists' any more. Of the elderly people only one complained about these religious changes ("it destroys our traditions, people become disobedient of the old customs, and they support the lobby for the abolition of the dowry system"). All the others mainly saw advantages ("people become more enlightened, there is more love and care, and there are less conflicts in the households and in society"), although seven elders would regret the disappearance of the dowry system.

For almost all in the village Kusaal is the lingua franca. Only a few elderly Busanga only speak Bisa. All other Busanga are at least bilingual. A few Kusasi (one of the interviewed husbands, two of the interviewed wives and four of the interviewed children) also speak Bisa. Among the elderly four have ever stayed outside their home area, in Southern Ghana where they have learned Twi. Of the wives only one speaks Twi, the language of the South, but their husbands have had a much wider exposure to the outside world: four speak Twi and four Haussa. Their children show an even wider experience with migrant labour: ten have worked outside their home area (in the Kumasi and Accra Regions mainly; many of them as farm labourers). Seven speak Twi, three More (the language of Burkina Faso) and one English. Six of these children have stayed outside Ghana for some time (from five months to two years). Most of them have financed these foreign trips themselves. There is no differences in 'external exposure' between children of PAS-households and those who do not have one or more members in a PAS group. However, there is a difference in migrant earnings: on average the annual migrant earnings of a 'PAS-child' were more than 600,000 cedis, of which they gave an average of almost 100,000 cedis to their parents; while the average earnings of a 'non-PAS child' was less than half and they also gave less than 50,000 cedis to their parents. Looking at it the other way around confirms this picture: PAS households were better represented among the six wives and seven husbands who reported that they had received remittances from their children.

None of the elders and none of the wives had had any primary school education, although three PAS members had attended literacy classes. The husbands also had a very meagre education: one had once gone to primary school and one to a Koran school. However, seven of them had ever attended literacy classes. Four households had succeeded to get their children a school diploma: three PAS households had even succeeded to get their children as far as Junior Secondary School. Only one non-PAS household had succeeded to get at least one of their children a Primary School diploma. Out of the twelve households seven had ever contributed to their children's education or still do so: four of the six PAS households and three of the six non-PAS households. However, the average contributions differ widely: from more than 380,000 cedis for PAS households (husbands 350,000; wives 30,000) to less than 50,000 cedis for non-PAS households (husbands 43,000; wives 3,000). One rich PAS

household and one medium PAS household even spent more than one million cedis each on their children's education. None of the poor households (neither in the PAS group nor in the non-PAS group) ever spent money on their children's education, a very worrying situation.

We will now first look at a number of poverty indicators to find out if there are differences between PAS-member households and non-PAS households and what the local overall assessments of rich, moderate and poor mean in terms of these indicators. We will present these findings in three categories (PAS>non-PAS; PAS = non PAS and PAS< non-PAS households). Per category we will start with the highest overall scores, which also show a 'poverty fingerprint' for the village as a whole.

Before doing so, we first have to say that there are a number of indicators in Kugsabile where all interviewed households show a positive response: all husbands still use hoes, but all also use bullocks for ploughing, all have adopted ridging techniques of cultivation, and all have adopted ploughing along the contours, some already a long time ago (the first ones in 1972), others only in the late 1990s. All husbands (and some wives and children) have started onion gardens, which they irrigate by using water from a nearby stream. For other wealth/poverty indicators we can see that the majority of the households do possess certain assets, and for others that only a few examples can be found. For instance: in Kugsabile most husbands now sleep on a 'real bed' (a wooden frame), but in their wives' houses they can hardly be found. As almost all wives share a husband with one or two co-wives they only enjoy a 'nice bed' if they sleep with their husbands, and they go back to their mats if they sleep in their own huts.

Table 1 Poverty indicators

A PAS households have a higher asset level than non-PAS households

Indicator	all	PAS	r	m	p	NON	r	m	p
husband owns bullock cart	11	6	2	2	2	5	2	2	1
husband owns chicken	10	6	2	2	2	4	2	2	0
husband has bed	9	5	2	1	2	4	2	1	1
husband owns plough	9	5	2	2	1	4	2	1	1
husband owns bicycle	9	5	1	2	2	4	2	1	1
child has watch	9	5	2	2	1	4	1	1	2
husband's house has door frame	8	5	2	2	1	3	2	1	0
husband owns goats	7	4	1	2	1	3	2	1	0
husband owns cutlass	7	4	1	1	2	3	1	1	1
child owns poultry	7	4	2	2	0	3	2	1	0
husband owns radio	7	4	1	1	2	3	2	0	1
husband's house has zinc roof	5	3	2	0	1	2	2	0	0
more than one food barn	5	3	1	2	0	2	1	1	0
wife has more animals now than her mother	4	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	1
wife owns pigs	3	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
husband owns pigs	3	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
wife ate three meals yesterday	3	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0
wife has bed and mattress	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
wife's house: blocks used	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
wife owns chicken	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

wife owns guinea fowls	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
wife owns sheep	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total scores	121	74	26	30	18	47	24	13	10
other indicators									
av. Income child 2001 (x 10,000 cedis)	53	66	87	80	30	41	63	32	28
land ownership in acres									
husbands 1990	5.7	8.2	13.5	7.0	4.0	3.3	4.0	1.3	4.5
husbands 2001	6.4	9.3	14.0	6.5	5.5	3.5	5.5	1.5	3.5
wives 1990	1.3	2.0	1.5	2.3	2.0	0.6	0.5	0.4	1.0
wives 2001	1.7	2.2	1.6	2.5	2.5	1.2	1.0	0.5	2.0
garden ownership in acres									
husbands 1990	0.7	0.8	0.6	1.5	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.4	1.0
husbands 2001	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.5	0.5	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.8
wives 1990	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.0
wives 2001	0.5	0.6	0.1	1.0	0.8	0.4	0.8	0.5	0.0

B No differences between PAS and NON-PAS households

Indicator	All	PAS	r	m	p	NON	r	m	p
husband owns cattle	10	5	2	2	1	5	2	2	1
child owns bicycle	10	5	2	2	1	5	2	1	2
wife's house has door frame	8	4	2	2	0	4	2	1	1
husband owns guinea fowls	8	4	2	1	1	4	2	2	0
child owns goats	8	4	2	2	0	4	2	1	1
husband owns econ. trees	8	4	1	2	1	4	1	1	2
husbands have more cloth now than 10 years before	8	4	1	1	2	4	2	2	0
husband has mattress	6	3	2	1	0	3	2	1	0
wife's house has zinc roof	4	2	1	1	0	2	2	0	0
husband's house: blocks used	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
Sub-total scores	72	36	15	15	6	36	17	11	9

C NON-PAS households have higher asset levels than PAS households

husband yesterday had >1 meals	11	5	2	2	1	6	2	2	2
husband's floor is plastered	9	4	2	2	0	5	2	2	1
husband owns wrist watch	6	2	1	1	0	4	2	1	1
wives have > 2 bowls	5	2	1	0	1	3	2	1	0
husband owns donkeys	4	1	1	0	0	3	2	1	0
2001 harvest could feed household for > 5 months	4	1	1	0	0	3	2	0	1
child owns cattle	4	1	1	0	0	3	0	2	1
husband owns donkey cart	3	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0
child owns donkey	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
sub-total scores	47	17	10	5	2	30	14	10	4
other indicators									
wives' average number of bowls	2.4	1.7	2.5	0.5	2.0	3.0	4.5	2.5	2.0

husbands' expenditure on health in 2001 (x 10,000 cedis)	4	2	4	3	1	5	16	1	0
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	---	---

Total wealth scores

	Rich	Medium	Poor	Total
Beneficiaries	49	48	25	122
Non-Beneficiaries	54	33	21	109
All	113	81	46	231

As has been explained before, households have been selected as 'rich', 'medium' and 'poor' based on local overall judgements of their 'wealth appearance'. Also all variables used to indicate wealth/poverty levels have been based on local judgements about what it is that makes people relatively rich or poor. We can now see that 'rich households' indeed have a higher score on the total set of indicators than 'medium households' and much higher than 'poor households'. If we combine this information with the information about households' membership of PAS groups, we see the same overall picture: both for beneficiaries and for non-beneficiaries 'rich' households are better off than 'medium' households and much better off than 'poor' households. The overall difference between beneficiary households and non-beneficiary households is 11% (122 points versus 109). However, for the rich households we see an inverse situation: the rich non-beneficiary households have a better score, although slightly. For the poor households the scores for the beneficiary group are a bit better than those for the non-beneficiary group. The big difference exists in the group of households which are locally regarded as 'average'. For these households membership of a PAS group gives them a much better score compared to non member households. Of course nothing can be said yet about impact as the scores are a 'poverty fingerprint' of the situation in 2001 and do not yet say anything about causes and effects. We should therefore move to the second part of the analysis.

The Project's impact

For the interviewed households in Kugsabile PAS is the only relevant NGO, and more important than any of the government agencies. Out of the twelve husbands seven were in households which did experience a direct impact of PAS and five of them did get personal assistance from PAS: they got new crop varieties (5), training (3), pigs (1) and water (1). Of the men two were current members of PAS men groups and one of a mixed group. Six of their wives were members of PAS (women) groups. Three of their children were also members. One of them got a credit through PAS, two got training. The wives never got any assistance from central government agencies. Two wives ever got assistance from the District Assembly. Among the husbands two ever got assistance from a central government department (MOFA and the department of Co-operatives) and four from the District Assembly. Three of their children ever got a credit from a government agency.

We will now study the differences between PAS and NON-PAS households in use of services or in activities. We will do so by again using the same three categories, and an ordering from high overall scores to low ones. In some cases we will add a further specification based on rich/medium/poor households.

Table 2

A: PAS households benefit(ed) more or follow advice more

Indicator	All	PAS group members	Non-PAS group members
NATURAL			
husbands ever planted trees	11	6	5
husbands: grass bunding	11	6	5
husbands: composting	10	6	4
wives sow on ridge	10	6	4
wives have dry season garden	9	5	4
wives plough along contour	9	5	4
wives ridge along contour	9	6	3
wives practice grass bunding	8	5	3
husbands cultivate groundnuts	7	4	3
children use cow dung	7	5	2
children use compost	7	4	3
wives practice gully control	7	4	3
wives practice stone bunding	6	4	2
husbands stone bunding	5	4	1
wives practice composting	5	3	2
wives use goat manure	5	3	2
wives make use of veterinary services	4	4	0
wives use sheep manure	3	3	0
husbands use pig manure	3	2	1
husbands received pigs from PAS	2	2	0
agr yields have improved	2	2	0
wives use pig manure	2	2	0
PHYSICAL			
husbands: gully control	11	6	5
husbands stone bunding	5	4	1
HUMAN			
wives immunised children	10	6 (2 2 2)	4 (2 1 1)
wives ever visited by PAS	7	6 (2 2 2)	1 (1 0 0)
husbands got agricultural training	7	6 (2 2 2)	1 (0 0 1)
husbands ever visited by PAS	6	5 (2 2 2)	1 (0 0 1)
wives were trained on gender	5	4 (2 1 1)	1 (1 0 0)
wives trained in health care	5	5 (2 2 1)	0
husbands were trained on gender	4	4 (1 2 1)	0
husbands ever visited by MOFA	4	4 (2 2 0)	0
wives got agricultural training	4	4 (2 2 0)	0
wives trained in income generating activities	3	3 (1 1 1)	0
husbands farms used as demo plot	3	3 (2 1 0)	0
husbands trained in income	2	2 (2 0 0)	0

generating activities			
husbands got exposure tour	2	2 (1 1 0)	0
SOCIAL			
wives ever got assistance from PAS	6	5 (1 2 1)	1 (1 0 0)
wife related to political relative	6	4	0
husbands ever got assistance from PAS	5	5 (2 2 1)	0
husband related to political relative	4	4	0
husband belongs to Tindana's family	3	2	1
households still get assistance from PAS	3	3 (2 1 0)	0
wife is member of school committee	1	1	0
child got assistance from PAS	3	3 (1 1 1)	0
ECONOMIC			
wives: standard of living has improved last ten years	11	6 (2 2 2)	5 (2 1 2)
husband benefits from dry season gardens	11	6	5
husbands: standard of living has improved last ten years	9	5 (2 2 1)	4 (1 1 2)
husband benefits from crop sales	7	4	3
husband benefits from livestock sales	7	5	2
husband gets remittance from child(ren)	7	4 (0 2 2)	3 (1 1 1)
wife gets remittance from child(ren)	6	4 (1 2 1)	2 (0 1 1)
wife benefits from crop sales	6	4	2
wife belongs to PAS savings group	5	5 (2 2 1)	0
husband ever received loan	4	4 (2 1 1)	0
wife benefits from livestock sales	3	2	1
wife pays for veterinary services to PAS	3	3 (1 1 1)	0
wife ever received loan	3	3 (1 2 0)	0
child got credit from government or Distr. Ass.	3	2	1
wife has personal savings account	2	2 (1 1 0)	0
husband is member of savings group	2	2 (1 1 0)	0
husband is member of economic group	2	2	0
household ever got assistance from political relative	2	2	0
wife is member of econ. group	1	1	0

B: PAS members experience same benefits as non-PAS members

Indicator	All	PAS group members	Non-PAS group members
wives use bullock plough	10	5	5
wife benefits from dry season sales	6	3	3

from garden			
husband leader in the village	4	2	2
wives ever planted trees	2	1	1
husbands plough groundnut vines into soil	2	1	1
husband has personal savings account	2	1 (1 0 0)	1 (1 0 0)
husband benefits from fruit sales	2	1	1
wife member of water committee	2	1	1

C: PAS members < non-PAS members

Indicator	All	PAS group members	Non-PAS group members
husbands use cow dung	11	5	6
wives: water quality improved	10	4	6
husbands use fowl droppings	9	4	5
wives use cow dung	7	3	4
husbands use goat/sheep manure	7	3	4
children use grass bunds	4	1	3
husbands use donkey manure	4	1	3
children use stone bunds	3	0	3
husbands: soil fertility has improved last ten years	3	1	2
wife is member of unit committee	1	0	1

If we compare the group of beneficiary households and the group of non-beneficiary households we can conclude that overall there are much higher scores for beneficiary households (a total score of 285 points versus 147 points). Also it is evident that there are many more indicators for which beneficiary households show a better score than non-beneficiary households. For all we also give the scores for rich, medium and poor households. The beneficiary households show an impressive performance compared to the non-beneficiary ones. We will again look at the differences between rich, medium and poor households. Although poor households show less impact of the activities of change agencies (in which PAS plays such a dominant role in the village), the difference with medium and poor households is not so big. The impact cuts across wealth differences. Only in the economic domain the impact on poor households is clearly less compared to medium and rich households.

Table 3 The impact of interventions: PAS beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, and wealth categories; scores on selected indicators

	Rich	Medium	Poor	Total
beneficiaries	43	42	24	109
non-beneficiaries	10	5	9	24
total	53	47	33	133

After this more quantitative approach, it is good to hear the opinion of the elderly people who have been interviewed as part of the survey. They still compare the situation today with the situation before the drought of the early 1980s. They are convinced that the food situation in the past (that is: in the 1960s and 70s) was better, that the number of meals per day has gone down for many people, and that the environment has changed considerably: in the past there were more trees, many dawadawa and sheanut trees have died, most wildlife became extinct and there is less livestock today than before 1975, less livestock feed and more livestock disease threats. Many streams and rivers dry up during the dry season unlike in the past. However, the quality of the water has much improved and water-borne diseases are hardly a problem anymore. Communication with the outside world has much improved as well. The social and political role of the elders has been taken over to a large degree by churches, NGOs and also by some government agencies. Children are more closer to their parents nowadays and the role of the elderly in giving advice to the youth has mostly been taken over by peers. Many elders, although not belonging to a church themselves, generally regard the church's role as very commendable, both as 'development agent', and as a teacher and conflict 'manager'. They have experienced the growing roles of NGOs like PAS as a positive development and as more important for village-level changes than the activities of state agencies.

We can now finalise the analysis by adding a 'historical' analysis of changes and change agents for each of the twelve households.

Table 4 Time-specific information for the interviewed households

nr	number of household interview
cat	wealth category of household (rich, medium, poor)
hb yr	husband born in year 19xx
nr w	husband's number of wives
nr ch	husband's number of children
nr ot	husband takes care of x others as well on his compound
h ed	husband has received formal education or not
wb yr	interviewed wife is born in 19xx
1w 2w	interviewed wife is first or second/third wife
yr ma	wife married in 19xx
her	husband's ethnicity (kusasi or busanga) and religion (Muslim, Presbyterian, Traditional)
wer	wife's religion (same)
cr	children's religion (same)
ei h	year when husband started to invest in children's education
ei w	year in which wife started to contribute to children's education costs
w hs	wife started to have 'modern' house (either zinc roof or/and blocks) in 19xx
Ph me	year PAS group membership started for husband
Pw me	year PAS group membership started for wife
Ph at	year husband got PAS agricultural training
Pw at	year wife got PAS agricultural training
Ph sg	year husband became member of PAS savings group
Pw sg	same for wives
Ph ln	year husband received loan from or through PAS (/BESSFA)
Pw ln	same for wives

Ph as year husband received other (financial or material) assistance from PAS
 Pw as same for wives
 vh M year the husband's farm was visited by a person from the Ministry of Food and Agriculture
 vw M same for wife's field
 gar h year the husband started a garden (for onion cultivation mainly)
 gar w year the wife started a garden
 gs h year the husband started to adopt making grass strips on his fields
 gb w year the wife started to adopt making grass strips resp. stone bunds on her fields
 sb h year the husband started to adopt making stone bunds on his fields
 cp h year the husband started to use compost on his fields
 cp w year the wife started to use compost on her fields
 pc h year the husband started to plough along the contours
 pc w first year the wife's field was ploughed along the contours

nr	cat	hb	nr	nr	nr	h	wb	1w	yr	her	wer	cr	ei	ei	Ph	Pw	Ph	Pw
		yr	w	ch	oth	ed	yr	2w	ma				h	w	me	me	at	at
1	PR	51	2	9	0	+	56	1	75	km	km	m	84	97	90	87	98	87
2		26	2	7	1	(+)	36	1	57	kp62	kp70	p	72	72	72	98	82	87
3	PM	35	1	13	1		51	1	62	kp62	kp80	p	87	87	72	87	-	87
4		59	2	9	0		56	2	82	km	km7	m	92	00	97	92	+	99
5	PP	41	2	7	1		55	2	77	kt	kt	p	-	-	99	99	-	-
6		31	2	9	1		56	2	75	kt	kp72	p	-	-	-	93	-	-
7	NR	55	3	13	15		60	2	85	bm	bm	m	92	-	-	-	-	-
8		55	3	16	?		56	1	72	bm	bm	m	87	97	-	(+)	-	-
9	NM	41	1	5	0	(+)	47	1	64	bt	bt	m	-	-	-	-	-	-
10		56	1	5	0		61	2	81	kt	kt	p	95	98	-	-	-	-
11	NP	41	2	9	1		46	2	71	kt	kt	p	-	-	-	-	-	-
12		36	3	9	1		46	2	75	bm	bm	m	-	-	-	-	-	-
nr	cat	Ph	Pw	Ph	Pw	Ph	Pw	vh	vw	gar	gar w	gs	gb	sb	cp	cp	pc	pc
		sg	sg	ln	ln	as	as	M	M	h		h	w	h	h	w	h	w
1	PR	82	86	+	98	-	88	99	01	62	97	97	87	99	99	98	+	99
2		80	86	01	-	80	-	62	-	80	-	82	-	92	82	-	72	72
3	PM	95	87	93	92	-	87	95	-	87	67	95	98	93	92	98	92	98
4		-	93	-	99	92	98	90	01	87	93	97	99	-	?	99	97	-
5	PP	97	99	-	-	-	-	-	-	57	92	99	99	99	00	-	+	-
6		-	92	97	-	-	93	+	-	70	97	88	01/	-	88	-	+	00
7	NR	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72	97	97	98	97	97	-	97	-
8		-	98	-	-	-	-	-	-	80	95	82	-	-	87	-	87	-
9	NM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	92	92	00	92/	-	97	99	+	-
10		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	84	99	97	-	-	-	99	92	-
11	NP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	82	-	96	99/	-	98	-	87	99
12		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	92	-	-	-	-	-	-	72	75

A sequential analysis of the time-specific data in the interviews of husbands and wives shows a complicated picture. Membership of PAS groups started for the first time in 1972, by the two household in which the husband had converted to Christianity ten years before. In both households the wife joined much later, and also much later than her conversion to Christianity. One of these two households (nr 2) is the first one where both parents started to invest in their children's education, in the year the husband joined a PAS group. It is also the first household to get agricultural training, the husband in 1982 and the wife in 1987. They were the pioneers in joining savings groups set up by PAS, and the husband received a loan and other assistance through PAS (but: not the wife!). It is interesting to note that this household was the only one where the husband's farm had ever been visited by a person from the Ministry, before the 1990s (already in 1962). In terms of agricultural innovations this household was a pioneer in ploughing along the contours (1972), in using compost and making grass strips (both: 1982) and in making stone bunds on the husband's farm (1992). The household was not the first to start an onion garden (in 1980; while since 1957 four other men had started a garden) and the wife still does not have her own garden, as one of the few wives in the village. The fact that she only joined a PAS group very late (in 1998) shows a profile of some reluctance on her side. In this household it was the husband who was the pioneer in many changes. The second Presbyterian pioneer household (nr 3) has a more active and more autonomous wife: she joined a PAS group later than her husband, but already in 1987, when women's groups were started. She succeeded to get individual assistance and even a loan through PAS. She was also the pioneer in getting her own garden (already in 1967; long before any of the other women, who only started after 1992). In the technical adoptions the husband is mostly among the pioneers (around 1992); the wife follows only in 1998. The husband's farm got some attention from MOFA (but only in 1995); they never visited the wife's fields.

In 1982 the third household in our survey group (nr 1) started to get involved in PAS. First the husband and later the wife became involved in one of the PAS savings groups (and during that time the husband also started to invest in his children's education), but being a Muslim Kusasi family it lasted until 1987 before they actively joined a multi-purpose PAS group. The wife took the lead in getting agricultural training and other PAS assistance (in 1987/88) and even got a loan (in 1998). Both the husband's and the wife's fields were visited by MOFA, but only in 1999-2001. The wife was the pioneer among the women in the village in making grass strips and stone bunds on her fields (in 1987), upon adoption of the PAS group membership and the agricultural training. In the late 1990s this household also adopted all the other technical innovations which were propagated by PAS. But this household had already been one of the very early pioneers in gardens (in 1962, the second one in the village).

The other Kusasi Muslim household in our group of PAS members (nr 4) only joined in 1992, and mainly through the activities of the wife. The wife was also the first among the Muslim wives in the survey group to start her own garden (in 1993). The husband did receive some attention from MOFA (in 1990) before either of them joined PAS. They were late and not complete adopters of the technical innovations stimulated by PAS.

In 1992 the fifth household in our survey group joined PAS activities (nr 6). Here the wife is an early convert to Presbyterianism (already in 1972) but her husband refused to give up his Traditional beliefs. Only the wife joined PAS, first a savings' group, soon afterwards a multipurpose group. She also got PAS financial assistance. But interestingly: the husband got a loan (in 1997)! Although traditional in his religious orientation, the husband is not traditional in agriculture. He started a garden in 1970, and was among the early adopters of some of the technical innovations (1988, so before his wife joined PAS). His wife was much

later or did not adopt at all. This household never invested any money in their children's education.

In 1997 a household joined PAS where both the husband and the wife were 'Traditionalists' (nr 5). The husband first joined a savings' group and in 1999 both husband and wife joined a multipurpose group. It was also the year in which they started to adopt some of the technical innovations, stimulated by PAS. Interestingly, this household was the pioneer in starting a garden (already in 1957) and the wife was the one to lead the explosion of gardens for women, after 1992. However, they never invested in the education of their children.

Finally, in 1998 a first Busanga Muslim household started to become a bit involved in a PAS savings' group (nr 8), but they cannot be regarded as a PAS household yet. Among the Busangas it is the household pioneering in gardens (1980), grass strips (1982), and compost (1987), without any direct relationship with either PAS or MOFA. They were also the first to invest in their children's education (1987; the wife joining in 1997, the only one among the Busanga wives) All other Busanga households were much later or did not adopt at all (with one strange exception: a Busanga household which were among the first to plough along the contours, already in 1972; however, this household (nr 12) further belongs to the most traditional and poorest members of the village. The two Kusasi 'Traditionalists' among the non-PAS households (nr 10 and 11), show a late - and reluctant - start of adopting education and agricultural innovations.

The twelve household stories do not provide a 100% proof of the hypothesis "first households joined PAS and then they started to adopt innovations", but they do show that overall PAS has had an important influence on the village population and it is likely that after 1995 the example of the PAS households began to be followed by many more households. The gender-sensitive approach (after 1987, and certainly the last few years) and attempts to reach beyond the Presbyterian community (first signs in 1987, clear attempts after 1992) begin to bear fruits. Kugsabile has changed quite considerably and positively, and PAS can be regarded as the catalyst of many of these changes.