

Case Studies Series

**Three Villages in
Alingar, Laghman:
A Case Study of Rural
Livelihoods**

Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit

Alice Kerr-Wilson and Adam Pain

November 2003



This project is funded by the
European Union

DACAAR

This project has been
prepared in
collaboration with
DACAAR

© 2003 The Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (AREU). All rights reserved.

This publication has been produced with the assistance of the European Union. The contents of this publication is the sole responsibility of AREU and the authors and can in no way be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

About the Authors

Alice Kerr-Wilson has a Masters degree in Gender Analysis in Development from the University of East Anglia, UK. For her Masters she wrote her dissertation on the institutional care experience of HIV positive Nepalese women in Kathmandu. Previously, she has worked in Nepal and Sri Lanka on community based projects in education and health. She currently works for DACAAR as a Livelihoods Researcher.

Adam Pain is a research fellow at the School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia, UK, where he was a faculty member between 1976 and 1987. He has been working in Afghanistan since February 2001 on different projects including helping to establish the AREU livelihoods research project. From 1992 - 2000 he worked in Bhutan for the Ministry of Agriculture as a research adviser and more generally within the Ministry's Policy and Planning division. With support from a Cambridge University research grant, he spent 15 months doing field work for an upcoming book on changing rural livelihoods in Bhutan. Previously, he worked in Sri Lanka and in Southern Africa running a research programme on land and water management under the auspices of the Southern African Centre for the Coordination of Agricultural Research.

About the Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (AREU)

The Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (AREU) is an independent research organisation that conducts and facilitates action-oriented research and learning that informs and influences policy and practice. AREU also actively promotes a culture of research and learning by strengthening analytical capacity in Afghanistan and by creating opportunities for analysis, thought and debate. Fundamental to AREU's vision is that its work should improve Afghan lives. AREU was established by the assistance community working in Afghanistan and has a board of directors with representation from donors, UN and multilateral organisations agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

Current funding for the AREU has been provided by the European Commission (EC), UNAMA and the governments of Sweden and Switzerland. Funding for this study was provided by the European Union.

About the Danish Committee for Aid to Afghan Refugees (DACAAR)

The Danish Committee for Aid to Afghan Refugees (DACAAR) is a humanitarian non-governmental organisation which supports sustainable economic and social recovery in selected project areas in Afghanistan as well as the lasting return of refugees and internally displaced people. To achieve these goals DACAAR works together with local communities, both refugees and those who stayed behind, through its Integrated Agricultural Development, Water Supply, Hygiene and Sanitation and Reconstruction programmes. DACAAR is a consortium of three Danish NGOs; MS-Danish Association for International Development, Danish People's Relief Organisation and The Danish Refugee Council. It was established in 1984 specifically to provide support to Afghan refugees. DACAAR initially provided relief to refugees in Pakistan but since 1989, it has concentrated on rehabilitation and development work inside Afghanistan.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Ahmad Jawad Ghafari for his intelligence, enthusiasm and infinite patience, which have been a constant support throughout this project. It could not have been done without him. The DACAAR field staff in Laghman carried out much of the actual survey and the authors are grateful to them for their time and effort. It was the relationships that the DACAAR staff have established with local people, which enabled the authors to go into the villages and ask the questions in the first place.

The authors would also like to thank Ole Jensen, Kerry-Jane Wilson, Peter Krause and Suzi Chinnery at DACAAR for their insight into working in Afghanistan. At AREU thanks to Tom Muller for his editing of this paper and to those involved in the AREU Rural Livelihoods Monitoring Research Project for stimulating this debate.

Table of Contents


Map	i
Glossary.....	ii
Executive Summary	1
<i>Village Livelihood Strategies and Programming Issues</i>	<i>1</i>
Introduction.....	3
<i>The AREU Rural Livelihoods Monitoring Research Project.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>The Three Villages in Alingar Case Study</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>The Structure of the Paper.....</i>	<i>4</i>
Section I: Introduction to the Villages	5
<i>Summary of Village Contrasts.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>DACAAR Activities in the Three Villages</i>	<i>9</i>
Section II: Household Livelihoods: Evidence from the Sample Households	
.....	10
<i>Household Assets.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>Household Strategies.....</i>	<i>15</i>
Section III: Key Economic Activities and their Implications	20
<i>Farm Based Sources of income.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>The Wood Economy</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Non-farm Labour</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Particularly Vulnerable Groups.....</i>	<i>26</i>
Conclusion: Emerging Livelihood and Programming Issues	27
<i>Emerging Themes</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>Issues for Livelihoods Monitoring.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Issues for Institutional Learning.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Issues for DACAAR Programming.....</i>	<i>28</i>
Appendices.....	32
<i>Appendix 1: Farm Labour Systems, Alingar, Laghman</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Appendix 2: Women's Ownership of Land.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Appendix 3: Pundwachi</i>	<i>34</i>

Tables

Table 1. Main Characteristics of Villages	8
Table 2. DACAAR IAD projects in the three villages surveyed	9
Table 3. Sample frame of households by wealth group and village	10
Table 4. Summary characteristics of sample of households	10
Table 5. Household education and skills.....	11
Table 6. Household physical assets.....	12
Table 7. Household land assets	13
Table 8. Household livestock assets - percent of households owning livestock by livestock species (mean number of livestock owning household)	14
Table 9. Household debts.....	15
Table 10. Key events reported by households (% of total responses)	15
Table 11. Farm based income and production activities by gender	16

Table 12. Village and household grain economies*	17
Table 13. Household income ranked by major sources and amounts (Afs) with standard deviation (SD) for Winter 2001-Autumn 2002	18
Table 14. Household expenditure ranked by major source and amount (Afs with SD) for winter 2001-Autumn 2002	19
Table 15. Rates of pay for farm labour in cash and kind (Source: farmer discussion)	21
Table 16. Sale prices of wood in different locations (Source: wood seller discussion)	23
Table 17. Reported wage rates in Village A and Pakistan (Source: village participants)	25
Table 18. Irrigated grain land ownership (Source: DACAAR database)	33
Table 19. Animals managed by villagers in <i>pundwachi</i>	34

Map



Glossary

Ashar - Communal, usually unpaid, labour;

Asset - Human, social, natural, physical and financial resources. The different types of resources and capabilities individuals can call upon to support their life;

Banda - Mountain hut where families/ individuals may stay during the spring/ summer to graze their animals or to collect grass or wood;

Chowk - Roundabout;

FPO - Field Project Office;

Household - defined as the smallest unit: a man, his wife, their unmarried children and any dependents e.g. widowed mother;

IAD - Integrated Agricultural Development Programme of DACAAR;

Income Portfolio - The diverse sources of income generating activities an individual or household may depend upon, which together make up an income portfolio;

Jerib - 2000 sq metres;

One Man Land or Man - In Laghman this is equivalent to 7kg and a measure of seed applied to one quarter of a jerib;

Pashaie - Afghan ethnic group, living in mountainous areas in eastern Afghanistan, who trace their roots back to Tajikistan and Uzbekistan;

Pashtun - Afghan ethnic group coming mainly from and eastern and southern Afghanistan;

Pashtunwali - Pashtun cultural code of honour;

Piece-work - Where factories out-source work to home-based workers who are paid by the unit;

Remittance - Money sent back to relatives/ friends from individuals working abroad;

Seer - 7kg;

Shura - Village meeting, usually of men and sometimes of village elders;

Standard Deviation - A measure of variability around the mean;

VO - Village Organisation;

Wealth Group (WG) - In Alingar, only three wealth groups were defined in each village, with wealth group one (WGI) being the richest and wealth group (WGIII) the poorest;

Wuliswali - District Administration Centre.

Executive Summary

This paper presents village and household data and findings from research conducted in three villages in Alingar, Laghman, by the Danish Committee for Aid to Afghan Refugees (DACAAR). The paper is part of the Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit's (AREU) Rural Livelihoods Monitoring Research Project, which started in late 2002. The purpose of this paper is to stimulate debate over the nature and diversity of livelihood strategies in rural Afghanistan and NGO responses to those strategies. This paper is not meant to provide all the answers, but rather to highlight programming issues for DACAAR from the data.

The paper begins with a summary of the characteristics of the three villages surveyed including the location, number of households by wealth group, present economic activity, nature of land ownership and usage, water rights, food self-sufficiency and the role of women in each village. A brief description of DACAAR programme activities in the three villages is then provided. The livelihoods monitoring section presents summary survey data from a household sample on assets and debts, economic activities, and income and expenditure at the wealth group and village level. Finally, income-generating activities - farm based sources of income, the wood economy and non-farm labour - are explored in more detail on the village level.

Names of the villages are not given due to issues of confidentiality. Some subjects discussed here may be seen as sensitive issues by villagers and could cause problems for them/ DACAAR if openly presented. Therefore their anonymity is preserved, with villages simply referred to as Village A, B or C.

Village Livelihood Strategies and Programming Issues

Overall, the survey found that rural village and household economies are complex with differences between villages and within villages. The survey also found that non-agricultural activities - farm labour, wood collection and non-farm labour - are essential to village and household livelihood strategies, and raise important programming issues for NGOs.

The survey shows that Village A, which lies on a plain in the main valley, next to the Alingar River, has more assets than the other two villages in terms of land and livestock. Village A also has electricity supplied by two water mills on the Alingar River. Village B, situated on a plain in a side valley and possibly the next wealthiest village, has land and livestock assets, education facilities and valuables which the other two villages do not have - vehicles and radios. Village B, however, has no electricity and higher levels of debt in comparison to the other villages. Village C, located high up a mountain slope and perhaps the poorest village, has fewer land and livestock assets than Village B, less access to education and a poorer skill base than the other villages. In Village C and Village B women do agricultural work and/or collect wood, while in Village A women do not normally do agricultural work.

The different assets of the three villages are a challenge to DACAAR's community development programme. This is because DACAAR's community development programme has a fixed approach and does not take into account the differences between villages, wealth groups, households and individuals which the livelihoods monitoring data highlights. Furthermore, DACAAR's community development

programme has a particular focus on agriculture, while the livelihoods monitoring data shows that the role of agriculture in terms of livelihoods is extremely variable in all three villages. Only in Village A is there a substantial agrarian economy, but it is still supplemented by income from non-farm labour and remittances. In all three villages, alternative livelihood strategies to subsistence farming are essential and include farm-based sources of income, the wood economy and non-farm labour.

Farm labour on other people's land takes place in all three villages and labourers are usually from the poorer wealth groups. The importance of farm labour as an income source means that there may be justification for DACAAR providing agricultural inputs to landowners, if these inputs indirectly create jobs for the poorer wealth groups. DACAAR could also look at using the provision of agricultural inputs to ensure fairer working conditions, particularly ensuring parity of pay between men and women for the same work. The involvement of women in farm labour in both Village C and Village B requires DACAAR to re-think its agricultural projects as they are aimed primarily at men. Finally, as farm labourers are often unable to find work during winter, DACAAR could think about establishing a saving scheme or investigate alternative winter employment options.

The collection of wood fuel for sale is another important income-generating activity in all three villages. In Village C women collect wood, while in Village A and Village B women are involved to a lesser degree. In Village C, which is the only village where wood is sold to people outside the village, all wealth groups depend on wood collection and trade as their first source of income. The importance of wood collection and trade in Village C raises a number of issues for DACAAR in terms of programming, including supporting forest management, providing loans for transportation and establishing education courses on the health hazards of collecting wood.

In all three villages, income from non-farm labour is important. Non-farm labour includes both skilled and unskilled labour and takes place both within Afghanistan and abroad. Unskilled labour includes being a guard, plasterer, hotel porter or well digger, while skilled labour mainly refers to masonry and/or carpentry. Skilled labourers are able to earn up to twice as much as unskilled labourers. Female labourers, who go abroad with their families, predominately do factory *piece-work* or pick vegetables on commercial farms and earn even less than unskilled men. In Village A and Village B non-farm labour is the primary source of income for all wealth groups and involves able-bodied men going to work in Pakistan, though some men from Village B journey to Iran. The role of non-farm labour as part of the income portfolio raises possibilities for DACAAR in terms of providing skills training and/or offering information about job opportunities.

Finally, some villagers in each village gain the majority of their income from the sale of raw opium. Exactly what role raw opium plays is unclear as it is a sensitive subject and difficult to discuss.

An overall issue that DACAAR needs to be aware of is the differences between wealth groups within villages. The research shows that the richer wealth groups tend to have greater land resources, more livestock and a greater contribution to the household food economy from farm production. As DACAAR currently has an agricultural focus, it could be argued that the group most benefiting from its projects is the wealthier groups within villages.

Introduction

This paper is a case study of household livelihoods from the villages of Village A, Village B and Village C in Alingar, Laghman. The case study is a collaborative report prepared by the Danish Committee for Aid to Afghan Refugees (DACAAR)¹ and the Afghanistan Research and Evaluation Unit (AREU). The purpose of the report is to stimulate debate over the nature and diversity of livelihood strategies in rural Afghanistan and NGO responses to those strategies. The case study does this by looking at the livelihoods data within the context of DACAAR's current programme activities in the three villages and reflects upon the implications of the data for future programming.

The AREU Rural Livelihoods Monitoring Research Project

In October 2002, AREU began implementing the first phase (18 months) of its three-year Rural Livelihoods Monitoring Research Project with funding from the European Commission. The overall project objective is to contribute to “the empowerment of Afghans to build sustainable livelihoods.” The project is engaging key UN agencies and NGOs to develop monitoring and evaluation systems to support programming activities, providing direction for future programming and improving understanding of Afghan livelihood strategies.

Individual NGOs are responsible for conducting livelihoods surveys at the village and household level and for establishing and maintaining databases and reports on survey results. The NGO partners are responsible for choosing three villages with different economic, social, and political characteristics from areas where they work. Having identified the three villages, the NGOs introduce the survey to the village, meet with groups of men and women from the village to discuss the survey and to prepare a village description. From the village description three wealth groups are identified and 15-20 households judged to fit within the wealth groups in each village. Interviews are then held with a man and women from each household. Data from the household interviews is collated and analysed by the NGO with assistance from AREU. The livelihoods survey is conducted again after a four-month interval.

The Three Villages in Alingar Case Study

The data and findings presented in this case study come from the first survey round carried out in Village A, Village B and Village C. The survey was carried out between January and March 2003 by DACAAR. Initial analysis of the survey data by DACAAR and AREU showed that most households were engaged in a range of production activities beyond agricultural work. The analysis showed that major income sources actually included non-farm labour, wild plants and farm sales.² At first, however, it was not clear who was engaged in these activities, partly as the household sample size from each village was small.

To gain a deeper understanding of the situation the DACAAR team returned to the survey sites for further discussions with the villagers and DACAAR field staff. In each village, discussions were held with two male migrants working abroad, two

¹ As a result of its 2002 Mid Term Review (Pain et al, 2002), DACAAR set up a Rural Livelihoods Unit to collect information and analyse the rural livelihoods of the areas where it works. The DACAAR Rural Livelihoods Unit has conducted research as part of the AREU livelihoods project in Qadis, Pashtun Zarghun, Ghazni and Laghman. The research conducted with AREU contributes to the wider work of this unit.

² These had been defined by AREU as a choice of income sources in Household Format Table 12.

male wood collectors and groups of women. In Village A and Village B the team also interviewed two male farm labourers and two male non-farm labourers working inside Afghanistan.

The Structure of the Paper

This paper begins in Section I with a description of the three villages, looking at their geographical location, main income sources and the role of women. A table is used to illustrate more clearly the main characteristics and differences between the villages. This section also reviews DACAAR's programme activities in the villages. Section II focuses on the household evidence taken from the survey, looking at skills, education levels, assets, debts and income and expenditure at the household, wealth group and village level. Section III further explores the main income generating activities at the village level looking at farm based labour, the wood economy and non-farm labour. In the conclusion, the role of agriculture is discussed in relation to the data collected and key programming issues arising from the data for DACAAR.

Section I: Introduction to the Villages

The three villages are located in the Alingar district of Laghman. Alingar district is an hour and a half drive or 40 kilometres from Mehterlam, the provincial centre, in a north-east direction along the Alingar River valley. On the right of the road rice and wheat fields lead down to the river, while on the left the land becomes progressively more barren. Half way between Alingar district and Mehterlam,³ the mountains become larger and more densely packed and the valley floor narrows to about three kilometres.

Village C

To reach Village C, the first village, you turn left away from the river before reaching the Alingar *wuliswali*⁴ and follow the road eight kilometres up the valley. The road travels past the DACAAR Field Project Office (FPO)⁵ and a clinic under construction by DACAAR and WFP, and ends at a wood bazaar. From the wood bazaar, Village C is a 20 minute walk up a narrow path between terraced fields; it is a beautiful place, about 1450 metres above sea level, where houses jostle against each other on narrow mountain shelves.

Village C is the poorest of the three villages with most households⁶ owning less than a jerib of land, although many households, even landless households, have walnut trees whose nuts and wood they trade. Wheat is the main crop grown in the village, while a little maize is grown when there is enough water in the tributary river.

Village C is a Pashaie village, where young men loll around on the sides of pathways, their eyes rimmed with kohl, hair dyed bright orange with henna. Kalashnikovs decorated with flowers can be seen in the village and highlight the presence of local commanders.⁷ Women with handmade beaded necklaces and brightly coloured, tatty dresses, are seen outside working in the fields and carrying heavy baskets of wood down from mountain forests to the wood bazaar. Gender relations in Village C are different from elsewhere in rural Afghanistan. For example, if a woman leaves her husband for another man, the new man has to pay the husband twice the bride-price paid for the woman in the first place. Women can also move freely within the village from house to house, although women need the permission of male relatives to travel outside the village.

Village A

To reach Village A, the next village, you travel back to the Alingar River and follow the road up to the Alingar *wuliswali*. At the *wuliswali* a narrow bridge leads over the Alingar River. After crossing the river you turn left and drive another 30 minutes over small hills and dry riverbeds to reach the village.⁸

Village A is situated close to the river on the valley floor and only about 1000 metres above sea level. Village A is the wealthiest of the three villages surveyed. It

³ About 20km

⁴ District Administration Centre

⁵ Field Project Office

⁶ *Household* is defined as the smallest unit: a man, his wife, their unmarried children and any dependents e.g. widowed mother.

⁷ There is an insidious gun culture in Laghman. During the survey period, five local men were shot dead near Village A and Village B. Three over a land dispute and two in a game that went tragically wrong. Guns are seen as a status symbol by young men, and old animosities can quickly develop into a shoot-out.

⁸ Or one and a half hours by foot

is also easily accessible as it is next to both the road and the DACAAR FPO. At the entrance to the village there is a small shop owned by one of the more wealthy villagers, while wheat, rice and maize can be seen growing in large parcels of land.⁹ In addition to privately owned land, there is about 200 jeribs of commonly owned pastureland. The land around Village A is irrigated with water from the Alingar River and a tributary stream called Nurullam.¹⁰

Villagers live in compounds, where households from the same family live in separate rooms within the compound. In some families, income and expenditure are shared between all members, whilst in others it is only shared within households. Unlike Village C, the women of Village A belong primarily to the private world of compounds and are responsible for housework and childcare. The men, on the other hand, belong to the public world and are involved in agricultural activities, fishing, running shops and collecting wood. Some men from Village A also migrate to Pakistan for casual labour. It is a predominantly Pashtun village, although there are a few Pashaie households.¹¹

Village B

Village B is on the same side of the river as Village A, but thirty minutes away in the direction of Mehterlam. The village sits on a mountain slope in a side valley called Sangar. The people in the village seem more desperate and unhappy than in the other villages, as the village has been seriously affected by drought. Land in the village is irrigated by spring water and in normal conditions rice, mulberries and apples are grown. However, because of the drought the orchards are bare and there is not enough water to grow much rice.¹² According to the villagers, the lack of water has meant that they have had to grow alternative crops, including cotton and poppy.¹³

Like the other two villages, some men spend long arduous hours going to far away mountains to collect wood, while due to a lack of available work in the village others travel to Pakistan or Iran for casual labour. As a result, the Pakistani rupee supplements the Afghani as the currency for many transactions. Women in Village B do not collect wood, but do take part in agricultural activities alongside their male relatives. Some women also accompany their male relatives to Pakistan and work as agricultural labourers or do *piecework*, such as putting together factory toy cars, at home.

Many of the men from all three villages fought with the *mujahideen* against the communists and all of the villages suffered in terms of loss of human life, destruction of homes, the killing of livestock and the plundering of valuables. In 1979, the communists bombed Village A and Village B, destroying houses and killing a number of villagers. Two years later, the communists renewed their offensive, bombing Village C by air and moving tanks into Village A and Village B.¹⁴ In Village

⁹ Compared with the land in Village C.

¹⁰ Different areas of land in Village A suffer from flooding and drought.

¹¹ The Pashaie households come originally from Tajikistan or Uzbekistan and also from Alisheng, a neighbouring district in Laghman. It was unclear from villagers as to whether or not there were really Pashaie people living in the village. One villager said that they were not Pashaie but Pashtuns who could speak Pashaie, yet a field staff member said that they were Pashaie people wanted to pretend they were a part of the Pashtun Mangal tribe (those from Mango) who were very powerful in that area. If they were not Pashaie then how did they learn the language?

¹² Whilst the DACAAR researchers were there they requested us/DACAAR to build production wells for their village.

¹³ These crops do not require so much water.

¹⁴ They did not get as far as Village C with ground troops.

B, to avoid the fighting, many villagers escaped to the mountains and hid in underground caves, while others fled on foot to Pakistan.¹⁵

Summary of Village Contrasts

The three villages surveyed were selected because they differ in terms of their access to water resources, their overall resource base, their major income generating activities, the role of women in the villages, and in terms of their position in relation to the valley floor and slope. The main characteristics of the three villages are contrasted in Table 1, below, in terms of size, the village economy, household wealth rankings, land ownership and food self-sufficiency from household production. The villages are also ethnically different.

All of the information in Table 1 was collected from meetings with village men and women. The meetings were held before any household interviews started. In each village, wealth groups, defined by male villagers, were used to categorise households. Three wealth groups were identified in each village, with wealth group one being the wealthiest. By identifying how many households belong to each wealth group in the village, it was possible to select a representative sample of households for the survey.

¹⁵ Refugees began returning to the villages around 1993.

Three Villages in Alingar, Laghman: A Case Study of Rural Livelihoods

Table 1. Main Characteristics of Villages

	Village A (Mainly Pashtun)	Village B (Pashtun)	Village C (Pashaie)
<i>Location</i>	Near main road, main river valley, plain <i>Friday bazaar:</i> 2 ½ hour walk <i>Primary School:</i> 10 mins walk	Side valley, near road, middle mountain <i>Friday bazaar:</i> 30 mins walk <i>Primary school:</i> 10 mins walk	Side valley, mountainous <i>Friday bazaar:</i> 2 hours walk <i>Mixed primary school:</i> 40 mins walk
<i>Households</i>	112 (3 FHH ¹⁶ , 24 RTN ¹⁷)	107 (25 FHH, 20-25 RTN)	95 (14 FHH, 5 RTN)
<i>Present Economy</i>	Poppy, casual labour in Afghanistan and abroad, wood collection, livestock	Poppy, migration, casual labour, drivers, wood collection, cotton	Poppy, wood collection, migration, farm labour
<i>Wealth Ranking</i>	WG I: 30 - Shop keeping, trade, labour WG II: 40 - Labour, agricultural work, wood collection WG III: 40 - Wood collection, fishing, labour, sharecropping	WG I: 11 - Taxi drivers, trade, shop keeping, migration WG II: 20 - Sharecropping, wood collection, migration, electric mills WG III: 76 - Wood collection, farm labour, jobless	WG I: 5 - Wood trade, shop keeping, farming WG II and III: 90 - Wood Trade & Migration
<i>Land</i>	<i>Landowners:</i> 24 households <i>Sharecroppers:</i> 24 households <i>Landless:</i> 13 households ¹⁸ <i>Rain-fed land:</i> 0 <i>Common land:</i> Pasture, cemetery	<i>Landowners:</i> 95 households <i>Sharecroppers:</i> 30 people ¹⁹ <i>Landless:</i> 10 people <i>Rain-fed land:</i> 0 <i>Common land:</i> Pasture, mosque, mountains, forest, land for building	<i>Landowners:</i> 25 households with more than 1 jerib <i>Sharecroppers:</i> 0 households <i>Landless/ less than 1 jerib:</i> 75 households ²⁰ <i>Rain-fed land:</i> 0 <i>Common land:</i> Pasture, plains, forest
<i>Water Rights</i>	<i>Water sources:</i> 2 rivers <i>Use:</i> Unrestricted	<i>Water sources:</i> Spring and wells <i>Use:</i> If there is enough water after every 6 days people can irrigate their land for 3 hours per jerib. If there is drought then after every 9 days they can irrigate their land.	<i>Water sources:</i> Springs and wells <i>Use:</i> Every 18 days different cycle/ <i>nobad</i> of water, which has a different name. When everyone has taken water for irrigation and one round is completed the next round has another name. However during individual family interviewing some families stated that they get water every 9-28 days
<i>Food Self-Sufficiency (no of months in year)</i>	WG I: 6 months, 1 year if no drought WG II: 3-4 months WG III: They have no land/not food self-sufficient	WG I: 3-4months WG II: 1 month WG III: Never	WG I: Not self-sufficient, 1 year if no drought WG II and WG III: Never food self-sufficient.
<i>Women's Production Activities</i>	Household activities - cheese, embroidery, sewing	Household activities, farming, farm labour, migration (piece work/farm labour)	Household activities, wood collection, farming, farm labour
<i>Problems</i>	Far to forest, health, education, fragmentation of land	Far to forest, health, education, fragmentation of land, weapons, drought	Far to forest, health, education, fragmented and little land, weapons,

¹⁶ FHH - Female Headed Household

¹⁷ RTN - number of households who have returned after being away for more than 1 year

¹⁸ These numbers for land ownership in Village A do not account for the total number of households given.

¹⁹ Here the number given referred to individuals rather than households and in this context probably referred to able bodied men.

²⁰ The villagers' understanding of landless here is unclear. In further discussions it appeared that whilst many households had less than a jerib of land, few had no land at all

DACAAR Activities in the Three Villages

Table 2 shows DACAAR's activities in the three villages up to the present time and can be compared with the village summaries in Table 1. DACAAR's activities should be born in mind when the characteristics of the villages are presented during the course of the paper.

Table 2. DACAAR IAD²¹ projects in the three villages surveyed

PROJECT	Village A	Village B	Village C
Irrigation Structures	8 Field Turnouts	Canal lining 11 field turnouts 1 Siphon	Canal Intake Canal Lining Drinking water supply pipe scheme Field Turnout
Agriculture	2 black cumin growers 4 on-farm trials 14 fruit saplings distributed	1 improved wheat seed grower 2 black cumin growers 1 vegetable nursery 60 fruit saplings	90% coverage with improved wheat seed Women provided vegetable saplings
Women Health Education Courses	Hygiene and Immunisation - 2 courses of each	Hygiene and Immunisation - 2 courses of each	Hygiene and Immunisation - 1 course of each
Forestry	In Alingar District DACAAR has undertaken different activities over the last four years, including establishment of forest nurseries, raising plantations, training the communities, and creating awareness among the people about conservation of natural forests ²²		
Microfinance	\$800 grant over 2 years	\$400 grant	\$300 grant

²¹ IAD stands for Integrated Agricultural Development and refers to DACAAR's community development programme

²² Gohar, Ali (2003) *Forest and Forestry in Jaji and Alingar: The Impact of the IAD Programme on The Sustainability of Natural Forests: DACAAR*

Section II: Household Livelihoods: Evidence from the Sample Households

The purpose of this section is to review the data collected on household assets and strategies both within villages and between the different villages. The data is drawn only from the sample households²³ and Table 3 summarises the sample framework by Village and wealth group.

Table 3. Sample frame of households by wealth group and village

	Village A	Village B	Village C
Wealth Group I (WGI)*	4	2	1
Wealth Group II (WGII)	5	3	13
Wealth Group III (WGIII)	6	10	1
Total No of households	15	15	15

*The definition of wealth group can be found in the glossary.

For the sample households across the three villages, the household size ranges from 2 to 12 people, while the average household size ranges from 5.8 individuals per household in Village C to 7.6 in Village B. In Village C households have on average the least number of children, while overall the ratio of boys to girls averages 1.²⁴

Table 4. Summary characteristics of sample of households

	Village A	Village B	Village C
Average Household Size	7.1	7.6	5.8
Mean no. adults per household	3.2	2.9	3.3
Mean no children per family	3.9	4.7	2.5
% female headed households	6.7	6.7	13.3

Household Assets

Household assets refer to the resources that households own or have access to and include physical, land and livestock assets, debt and education levels and skills.

Household Education and Skills

Table 5 shows that in Village A and Village B all sample households have a member who can read and write, while in Village C 33% of households have no member who is literate. In Village C, all women members of households are illiterate and girls do not attend school. The fact that girls do not attend school in Village C contrasts with the other two villages and may be partly due to the distance of Village C from the primary school.

In terms of skills base, Table 5 shows that the major skills that women have consist of sewing (including embroidery) and tailoring. Moreover, these are skills that most women possess. A minority of men have specific skills, almost exclusively in carpentry and masonry. A few men also have tailoring skills, while one man in Village B weaves gilims and another in Village C can do mechanical work. Village C

²³ The sample size is approximately 15% of all households in each village.

²⁴ The term *children* refers to the number of individuals living in the household at the time of the interview under that age of 16. There may be other offspring living elsewhere.

households have the greatest number of households in which no single adult member has specific skills. Table 5 also suggests that between wealth groups within villages there is no skills difference.

Table 5. Household education and skills

	Village A	Village B	Village C
No men =	20	19	21
No women =	28	23	22
% hholds cannot read or write	0	0	33
% men read or write	44	74	43
% women read or write	11	22	0
% boys at school	83	53	26
% girls at school	60	29	0
% hholds no skills	20	6.7	33
% woman sewing skills	32	60	50
% women tailoring skills	64	69	59
% men tailoring skills	0	5.3	19
% men carpentry skills	15	0	9.5
% men masonry skills	10	10.5	4.8

Household physical assets

Table 6, below, summarises the key household physical assets by village. In relation to the number of rooms, it is important to consider the context. For example, Village C appears to have more rooms per household than the other villages, but this is probably because in Village C a number of households from the same extended family (i.e. father plus married and unmarried sons) tend to live together in one house. This meant when an interviewee in Village C was asked how many rooms he had, he counted the number in the whole house.²⁵ In contrast, extended families in Village B and Village A live together in one compound, but households have separate houses within the compound. When an interviewee from Village B or Village A was asked how many rooms he had, he only counted the number in his own household not the whole compound. Thus, the interviewees in Village C were counting different entities to those in the other two villages.

Additionally, the number of rooms should also be considered in relation to the size of the room and the number of people living in the room. For example, it was found in Village A that wealth group three households tend to have fewer rooms per house²⁶ than wealth groups two and one, and also fewer latrines or private water sources. Such differences did not appear to exist between the wealth groups in Village C and Village B. Village A does, however, have a greater percentage of houses with latrines and electricity supply.

The main drinking water sources for Village A and Village B are largely wells, which are mostly public resources. In Village C drinking water is delivered through taps, installed by DACAAR, each of which is used by groups of households located near the tap.

²⁵ This question was asked to the male interviewees.

²⁶ It should be noted that although there appeared to be less rooms per household in wealth group three in Village A, compared to other wealth groups in the village, we do not know whether there were less rooms in the entire compound, or just in these households.

Table 6. Household physical assets

	Village A	Village B	Village C
- mean rooms per house ²⁷	2.7	3.2	4
- % houses with latrine	47	20	27
- % public water source	80	80	100
- electricity supply	93	0	54

Household land assets

Table 7 shows that households in wealth group one own most of the land in the three villages. The land is generally irrigated for grain production, although a few households in all villages have irrigated orchards or vineyards, but this makes up a small percentage of the overall cultivated area.²⁸ In Village C one household from each of wealth group one and three and 77% of households from wealth group two own walnut trees. Households own between 2 and 25 walnut trees.

In all villages, non-landowning households are only to be found in wealth group two (see column 1 of Table 7). The evidence presented in Table 7 also illustrates that there are five distinct ways in which households have access to or use land. First, there are those households that own and cultivate their own land (see column 2a). This category includes a sub-group of landowners who own and cultivate their land, but also sharecrop out a portion of land. Second, there are households that own land but do not cultivate any of it, sharecropping, renting or mortgaging it out (see column 2b). This happens in all villages: in Village A it is practiced by households from all wealth groups; and in the Village C and Village B by wealth group two households. Third, there are households who both own land and share crop other people's land (see column 3). This practice is found in Village A and Village B villages amongst the poorer wealth groups. Fourth, there are households who own no land but sharecrop land for cultivation (see column 4). Households in wealth group two do this in both Village A and Village B. Lastly, there are five households in total from Village A and Village C that do not own or cultivate land (see column 5). There are two reasons why households may not be cultivating land: i) they have no land or ii) they are sharecropping, mortgaging or renting it out.

²⁷ Number of rooms in which people are living in.

²⁸ Four households in Village B own orchards consisting of either apple or mulberry trees, but due to a shortage of water the orchards are currently bare.

Table 7. Household land assets

	1		2		3	4	5	6
	% hhlds owning and not owning land		% hhlds owning and a) cultivating b) not cultivating land		% hhlds owning and sharecropping land	% hhlds owning no land and sharecropping	% hhlds owning no land and not cultivating land	
	Land	no land	A	b				
Village A								
WG I* (n= 4)	100	0	50	50	0	0	0	3.4 (1.5)
WG II (n= 5)	60	40	60	40	40	20	20	1.8 (1.1)
WG III (n= 6)	100	0	67	33	33	0	0	1.0 (0.8)
								2.5 (1.6) n = 13
Village B								
WG I (n= 2)	100	0	100	0	0	0	0	5.3 (7.1)
WG II (n= 3)	67	33	33	67	0	33	0	1.8 (1.3)
WG III (n= 10)	100	0	100	0	30	0	0	1.4 (0.7)
								2.0 (2.7) n = 12
Village C								
WG I (n= 1)	100	0	100	0	0	0	0	0.8
WG II (n= 13)	77	23	69	31	0	0	23	1.1 (0.9)
WG III (n= 1)	100	0	100	0	0	0	0	0.5

**The definition of wealth group can be found in the glossary.*

In all three villages, households reported multiple owners of land (and of walnut trees in Village C). In Village A for wealth group one, two and three respectively, there are 1.9, 10 and 9.2 owners per jerib; in Village B there are 6, 22 and 10 owners respectively; and for Village C there are 2, 31 and 6 owners respectively. This multiple ownership raises intriguing questions about what land ownership means at the household level and how it is worked out.

Note should also be made of the fact that wealth group one households in Village A and Village B tend to have greater land holdings than the other wealth groups, although this was not the case in Village C. Average land holding size was lower in Village C than in the other two villages, but given the high Standard Deviation (SD) values, differences are not statistically significant.

Also, noteworthy is the fact that about 50% of all reported landowners are female.³⁰ What was reported appears to be the legal position, as females acquire land through inheritance, but what is not clear is the actual reality. Anecdotal evidence indicates that in practice women have little control over the land they own (see Appendix 2).

Household livestock assets

When considering household livestock assets it is important to note that livestock ownership is complex: the nature of people's access to livestock and rights to production change over time and is both current and potential. For example, some households look after other people's pregnant animals until the offspring is born

²⁹ SD = standard deviation, a measure of variability around the mean.

³⁰ Both women and girls.

and then give back the mother but keep the baby. This system is known as *pundwachi* (see Appendix 3).

Table 8 on household livestock assets includes two statistics: 1) the percentage of households that own a given livestock species, and 2) the mean livestock holding of households. The majority of sample households in Village A and Village B own cattle and have 1-2 cattle. There does not appear to be differences in the percentage of cattle owning households or the size of holding between wealth groups. Only five households in Village C own cattle. There is no draught power in Village B and Village C, while only five households in Village A own oxen. About half the households in Village A and Village B own on average 4 sheep or goats. Only two households in Village C own sheep or goats (one household owns 40, the other 1).

Table 8. Household livestock assets - percent of households owning livestock by livestock species (mean number of livestock owning household)

	Village A	Village B	Village C
% hholds with cattle	67 (1.9)	80 (1.6)	33 (1.6)
% hholds with draught power	33 (1)	0	0
% hholds with sheep/goats	33 (2.4)	53 (4.6)	13 (20)
% hholds with donkeys/ horses	60 (1.3)	13 (1)	7 (1)
% hholds with chickens	87 (4.3)	100 (5.3)	33 (1)
% hholds no livestock	0	0	40

The majority of households in Village A and Village B own chickens, while in Village C only five households have chickens and their holdings are small.

Livestock in general was reported as being either owned by the household (i.e. owned jointly between men and women) or by men. Only in the case of chickens were these specifically reported as being owned almost exclusively by women and here ownership appears to be *de facto*, given that they alone look after the chickens.

Other household assets

Information was also collected on household valuables and other assets. Households in both Village A and Village C reported few valuables or assets and little ownership of carpets, gilims, radios or bicycles. In contrast, six households from all wealth groups in Village B own radios, two households own bicycles and two wealth group one households own taxis, although one of these has been brought against a loan. There may be a link between the ownership of assets and income from opium poppy in Village B, but this remains unclear.

Household debts

The final livelihoods dimension to consider is debts, which are in practice negative assets, and have to be understood in relation to specific household asset and income portfolios.³¹ Table 9 summarises the available data on household debts in the three villages. It is clear that the majority of households in all villages have

³¹ An income portfolio refers to the diverse sources of income generating activities that an individual or household may depend upon, which together make up an income portfolio.

some form of debt, mainly in the form of cash. There was no clear pattern in the size of debt in relation to wealth group one. No households in wealth group one in any of the villages reported mortgaging land, while in Village B all the households with mortgaged land are in wealth group three.

Table 9. Household debts

	Village A	Village B	Village C
% hholds with no debts	20	20	20
% hholds with only food debts	6.7	0	0
% hholds with only cash debts	60	80	60
% hholds with food & cash debts	13.3	0	20
Mean value cash debt per cash debt household	24,682 Afs	27,368 Afs	17,250 Afs
% hholds with land in mortgage	27	6.7	13

The majority of debts are taken out to purchase food needs, with the money being borrowed from relatives, friends or shopkeepers. No clear pattern with respect to the size of debt, source of the credit or loan and wealth group was observable.

Household Strategies

Household strategies are the ways in which households deploy assets in order to meet household objectives and are normally based on past experience.

Key events by household

Understanding the past of each household is important. The very simple summary of key events in Table 10 shows that the experience of conflict and the loss that dominates people's memories is a central reference point. The category 'other' predominately includes people leaving or returning to their village, and highlights the importance of migration in people's lives. Note should also be made of life cycle ceremonies - weddings, births, deaths - that feature strongly in people's memories.

Table 10. Key events reported by households (% of total responses)

	Village A	Village B	Village C
Key Events			
Rank 1	Conflict (32)	Conflict (32)	Death (31)
Rank 2	Other (23)	Other (21)	Birth (23)
Rank 3	Death (16)	Death (21)	Wedding (17)
Rank 4	Wedding (12)	Wedding (12)	Other (9)
Rank 5	Birth (12)	Birth (10)	Conflict (5)

The life cycle ceremonies also point to the continuation of normal events including basic daily household activities. For women, daily activities include childcare, caring for the sick, cooking, cleaning, tailoring, and collecting water and other household associated activities. For men, there are less household activities (in Village A for example 44% of all male responses indicated that they were doing nothing in the household at the particular time - compared to 22% of female

responses). Men, nevertheless, reported being involved in childcare, caring for the sick and undertaking household maintenance and cleaning.

Farm based activities by gender

Table 11 highlights farm based production and income generation activities that men and women perform.³² The table shows that while women do undertake a wide range of farm based activities, livestock management (in the home) or, in the case of Village C, wood collection are the main activities. It should also be pointed out that while women are shown by the data to be involved in agricultural activities in Village A, this is not the norm in the village.³³ Of the three women involved in crop maintenance in Village A, two of the women are from households without able bodied men; one woman is a widow and another has an injured husband. This suggests that women only take part in agricultural activities in Village A when there is no able bodied men to do so. Men work across a wider range of activities and are less specialised in their work.

In terms of income generating work outside the home, this is mainly the preserve of male members of the household. Casual labour is the most common activity, except for those with specific skills who can obtain more rewarding employment.

Table 11. Farm based income and production activities by gender

	Village A		Village B		Village C	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
Crop Planting	X	X	X	XX	X	X
Crop Maintenance ³⁴	X	X	XX	XX	X	X
Irrigation		XX	X	X		XX
Crop Harvest	X	XX	XX	XX	XX	XX
Crop Process	X	X	X			
Wild Plant Collection	X	X	X	X	XXX	X
Fodder Management	XXX	X	XX	X	XXX	
Livestock Management	XXX	X				
Shepherd		X			X	X
Farm Labour		X	X	X		X
Non-farm labour		X		X		X
Transport					X	X
Other	XXX ³⁵		XX	X		XX

X : less than 10% of positive responses; XX . 10% or more of positive responses; XXX > 25% of positive responses

Village and household grain economies

Already we have evidence from the land data that the role of farm production in household grain supply, and by implication in the portfolio of household activities, varies according to wealth group and village. The data in Table 12 supports this finding.

In terms of differences in the grain economy of villages, Village A produces wheat, rice and maize, which is indicative of its relatively favourable position in the valley floor. Village B appears to produce little grain, which reflects a shift in production

³² Income generating activities for women here are mainly sewing and tailoring and a small amount of selling cheese and/ or yogurt

³³ This was confirmed by both the villagers and DACAAR field staff.

³⁴ Crop maintenance refers predominantly to weeding.

³⁵ Other for women refers mainly to sewing, embroidery and tailoring.

towards opium poppy and cotton. Village C produces wheat and maize, although maize appears to be a relatively small component of the diet.

Table 12. Village and household grain economies*

	% wheat [rice] {maize}inflow from production	% wheat [rice] {maize}inflow from market	% wheat [rice] {maize} inflow from payment in kind	% wheat [rice] outflow sold
<i>Village A</i>				
WG I**	63 [96] {83}	36 [4] {17}	1	3
WG II	16 [18] {26}	18 [56] {63}	67 [25] {11}	31 [16]
WG III	30 [44] (26)	70 [48] {73}	0	0
<i>Village B</i>				
WG I	5	75	0	0
WG II	0	100	0	0
WG III	20	78	0	0
<i>Salab - e-Ulia</i>				
WG I	51 {100}	41 {0}	8	0
WG II	10 {30}	87 {70}	1	0
WG III	21 {14}	79 {86}	0	0

* Household grain economies were constructed on the basis of a simple inflow - outflow balance sheet. **The definition of wealth group can be found in the glossary.

On the wealth group level, no households are self sufficient in grain production and all acquire grain from the market. The proportion of grain coming from farm production is greatest only for wealth group one households in both Village A and Village C. Only wealth group two households from Village A receive a significant proportion of their grain from payment in kind (in this case it appears to be from a Food for Work programme),³⁶ a large proportion of which is sold on the market. Resources to purchase grain from the market tend to come from income generated outside the agricultural sector.

Data on the seasonality of grain supplies is not represented in Table 12, but it is important to note that the aggregated picture for the year hides the fact that many households appear to be selling at some times of the year and buying at others. This behaviour of buying and selling is indicative of pressures on the household cash budget. Of note also is the fact that most households recorded from 3 - 10 % of grain outflow in the form of gifts or donations to the poor.

Sources and amounts of household income

Table 13 highlights how for the majority of households farm produce is not the major income source (only in wealth group one in Village A is the income portfolio comprised almost entirely of agricultural sources). For most households there are multiple income sources in which there is a mix of farm and non-farm based sources. Initial evidence indicates that the income portfolios of households from wealth group two and three in Village B are less diversified than those of the other villages, but this needs to be investigated in more detail. Significantly, in both Village B and Village C the major income sources are from non-agricultural activities; in Village C agriculturally related income is negligible. There is a puzzle over Village B since, if as reported, there has been substantial opium poppy

³⁶ It is unclear why other households in Village A do not have access to the same programme. It is also unclear why the other villages do not have access to payment in kind through a Food for Work programme, particularly as Village C villagers stated that WFP had been working in Village C on a Food for Work programme, while in Village A villagers did not mention this (see Table 1).

cultivation, farm income would normally be much higher. There are two possible explanations: either there has been deliberate under reporting or, more likely, the drought caused a crop failure and thus there was little income to report.

Section III discusses in more detail the nature of the non-farm economy and the role of wild plants, but three points need to be made here with regard to income. First, it was extremely difficult to get accurate figures on income as interviewees often tried to show themselves as poor as possible in the hope that they would get something from DACAAR. Second, the figures on annual income do not include income in kind from farm production (the subsistence component). Thus, what the figures reveal is the greater dependence in Village A of poorer households on cash income sources. There is wide variation (high standard deviations) in household income within wealth groups so differences between wealth groups are not significant. However, note should be made of the higher mean cash income of Village C households compared to the other villages. This probably reflects the greater engagement of Village C households in the non-agricultural cash economy.

The third point, which is not reported in the table, relates to the seasonality of income. In Village A and Village B, wealth group one households obtain over 60% of their income during the winter period (this is related to the timing of farm sales). For households in other wealth groups, the seasonal distribution of income is more even, although it would be interesting to investigate this further looking at the different sources of income at different times of year. For all households in Village C, winter and spring are the periods when the majority of income is received (this may relate to the particular sources of income).

It is important to consider the reported levels of mean income against cash debt levels reported in Table 9, although to be more usefully interpreted a household comparison would be needed.

Table 13. Household income ranked by major sources and amounts (Afs) with standard deviation (SD) for Winter 2001-Autumn 2002

	Ranked Income sources				Mean hhld cash income per year (afs)
	1	2	3	4	
Village A Kala					
WG I*	Farm Sales	Livestock	Farm Labour	Credit	28175 (16377)
WG II	Non-farm labour	Farm Labour	Livestock	Farm Sales	39000 (11598)
WG III	Non-farm labour	Remittance	Farm Labour	Livestock	62350 (79130)
Village mean					45453 (50544)
Village B					
WG I	Non-farm labour	Farm Sales			253250 (122683)
WG II	Non-farm labour	Farm labour	Farm Sales		33500 (13029)
WG III	Non-farm labour	Livestock	Credit	Farm Sales	40870 (25111)
Village mean					67780 (84759)
Salab - e-Ulia					
WG I	Wild plants	Trade & transport	Non-farm labour		17,000
WG II	Wild plants	Trade & transport	Non-farm labour	Livestock	89,676 (214937)
WG III	Wild Plants	Livestock			35,000
Village mean					81187 (200280)

*The definition of wealth group can be found in the glossary.

The sources and amounts of household expenditure

Finally, Table 14 outlines the nature of household expenditure, which is consistent across wealth groups and villages. Expenditure on food and health are the major items of expenditure with the purchase of fuel ranking third in Village A and Village B. It is evident that the reported expenditure figures do not match exactly with the income figures reported in Table 13 (and are most clearly adrift with respect to Village C). Nevertheless, the figures are consistent in their order of magnitude and ranking and there is little point in pursuing apparent surpluses or deficits.

Table 14. Household expenditure ranked by major source and amount (Afs with SD) for winter 2001-Autumn 2002

	Major items of expenditure by rank				Mean hhld expenditure / year(afs)
	1	2	3	4	
Village A					
WG I*	Food	Health	Fuel		26625 (8250)
WG II	Food	Health	Fuel	Education	34400 (8735)
WG III	Food	Health	Fuel	Education	35042 (29340)
Village mean					32583 (18914)
Village B					
WG I	Food	Health	Fuel		285950 (16193)
WG II	Food	Health	Fuel	Farm Inputs	44000 (14204)
WG III	Food	Health	Fuel	Farm Inputs	54775 (30912)
Village mean					83310 (86307)
Salab - e-Ulia					
WG I	Food	Health			11000
WG II	Food	Health	Asset Purchase	Other	29977 (22057)
WG III	Food	Health	Asset Purchase		40000
					29380 (21202)

*The definition of wealth group can be found in the glossary.

Section III: Key Economic Activities and their Implications

Building on the household assets and strategies data, Section III looks more broadly at the key economic activities pursued in all three villages, including farm based activities, the wood economy and non-farm labour. This section highlights how households from all wealth groups have had to develop diverse income sources to supplement or replace agricultural income and subsistence, particularly as no household in any wealth group is food self-sufficient all year round.

Farm Based Sources of income

Farm based sources of income include both farm labour and opium poppy cultivation.

Farm Labour

Farm labour takes place in all three villages and is paid either in cash or kind: in Village A it is a major source of income for all wealth groups; in Village B it is a major source of income for wealth group two; while in Village C it is not a major source of income (refer to Table 13). The following is a description of farm labour practices within the three villages and a brief consideration of their possible implications for DACAAR.

Villagers reported that landowners pay other people to work on their land when they can make a more profitable return from non-farm activities. Wealthy landowners prefer to sharecrop out their land entirely and leave themselves free to pursue other activities all year round.³⁷ Poorer landowners, who are not as sure of outside employment, tend to employ farm labourers on a temporary basis. Given that wealthy landowners prefer to sharecrop out their land and poorer landowners cannot afford farm labour on a permanent basis, it can be assumed that most farm labourers work on middle income sized farms.³⁸

Labourers themselves are mostly able-bodied men, who have small amounts of land, but need a cash income. Labourers tend to work on farms within their own village, but at harvest time they may work on farms as far away as Mehterlam (approximately a 2 hours drive or a days walk). Women of all ages from Village C and older women from Village B also work as farm labourers in their own villages. As farm labour is seasonal, labourers cannot rely on income from this activity alone. Rather farm labour is a component of an overall household income strategy, which might include migration for labour and/or poppy cultivation.

Labourers are paid in cash or kind, according to the agricultural activity they are taking part in, e.g. harvesting or ploughing. Typically, the landowner will divide one jerib of land into four sections and as each of these four sections will use one man/ seer (7kg) of seed they are known as *one man land*.³⁹ The labourer will then be paid according to the activity he/she is doing. It appears women get paid less than men, though exactly how much is unclear. The rates are shown in Table 15 below, and may fluctuate according to location, grain and supply and demand.

³⁷ For example businesses or shops in Karachi.

³⁸ This hypothesis was confirmed by men in Village A who said that landowners with land from 2 jeribs and above contracted farm labourers.

³⁹ Man here refers to the amount rather than to a human being.

Also refer to the diagram in Appendix 1, which further explains the farm labour system in Alingar, Laghman.

Table 15. Rates of pay for farm labour in cash and kind (Source: farmer discussion)

Crop	Process	Village A	Village B	Village C
Wheat	Ploughing	1-1 ½ seer per ¼ jerib	200 Rps (143 Afs) per day/ 3-4 seer	1 seer per ¼ jerib
	Weeding		150 Rps (107 Afs) per day	1 seer per ¼ jerib
	Harvesting	1/10 th total threshed wheat	1/13 th total threshed wheat	1 seer per ¼ jerib
Rice	Planting	120 Afs per day/ 1/10 th harvested rice		
Poppy	Planting	200-250 Afs per day		
	Weeding		200 Rps (143 Afs) per day	

Not all farm labour is paid: there is a system of communal unpaid labour known as *Ashar*. *Ashar* is an exchange system, where if one man works for another, the other is expected to reciprocate and work for the first man at a later stage. It is more common than paid farm labour and the landowner does not provide a wage, only meals for the labourers.

Opium Poppy Cultivation

The fall of the Taliban precipitated a shift in the rural power base towards local commanders and paved the way for an expansion of opium poppy cultivation.

In all three villages, there are some villagers gaining the majority of their income from the sale of raw opium. Most farmers claim they would prefer not to grow poppy, but state that the returns are just too high to ignore. Exactly what part the sale and trade of raw opium plays in livelihood strategies is unclear. This is due partly to the sensitivity of the subject and the difficulty in discussing it with villagers.

Sale of raw opium would come under *Farm Sales*, a prevalent income source in almost all wealth groups in both Village A and Village B (see Table 13). Income from opium poppy cultivation was not recorded in Village C, as opium poppy cultivation only started this year and was outside the data collection period.

In Village C and Village B, interviewers observed poppy cultivation and harvesting, and one man from Village C reported trading opium. Some villagers in Village B, afraid of retribution from DACAAR, grow poppies in neighbouring villages where DACAAR does not work. Poppy cultivation in Village A is less in evidence, although one interviewer reported seeing it and labour rates for planting poppy in Village A were quoted (see Table 3).

A DACAAR staff member reported that people from Jalalabad rent land in Laghman to grow poppy, as the government eradication programme is less likely to be implemented in such mountainous regions. DACAAR staff have also reported that traders from Nangarhar and Laghman go to the Shomali to encourage farmers to

grow poppy.⁴⁰ The traders supposedly bring the seed and indicate they will purchase the raw product.

All of the other livelihood sources, farm and non-farm labour, have to be seen in the context of poppy cultivation. Even though the price of opium has dropped since the fall of the Taliban,⁴¹ due to a flooding of the market, 1 kg of raw opium in Mehterlam still sells for between 10 000 Rps (\$175)⁴² and 15-18 000 Rps (\$263-316).⁴³ When this is compared to the amount that wood is sold for (17-30 Afs/ \$0.33-0.64 per 7 kg), it is an enormous incentive to grow poppies.

It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss what opportunities there are for DACAAR to work with the villages on addressing the growing and cultivation of poppies. What is important is that it is creating a serious challenge to DACAAR's work, and will continue to do so, particularly if rural people start to move away from other livelihood strategies that DACAAR could more easily support.

The Wood Economy

The wood economy is what makes up the *Wild Plants* and *Trade and Transport* income sources so dominant in Village C (see Table 13). The other villages also collect and sell wood but to a lesser extent.

Wood is collected from evergreen mountain forests, accessible only by foot. The most valuable wood is dry, dead wood and is often far from the villages.⁴⁴ Collectors from Village C travel three hours to reach the dry wood, whilst those from Village A and Village B travel for seven and nine hours respectively. In the case of the second two villages, villagers leave their houses in the middle of the night and reach the forest the next morning. Many villagers make this journey every other day.

According to villagers from Village B and Village C, wood collection has been going on for several generations. In Village C it is now greater than ever, due to population increase and fragmentation of land. With 200-250 seers (1400 - 1750 kg) wood collected and sold by each village every day, the future of the forests is in question. The villagers say they are trying to preserve the nearer, wet wood forests for the future, but just how long before the dry wood runs out is unknown.⁴⁵

The sex and age of the collectors differ dramatically between the villages. In Village C, it is predominantly young and middle aged women that collect and carry the 8-9 seer (56-63 kg) baskets of wood. Collecting wood is a strenuous and difficult task, which many men said they would rather avoid, preferring to find

⁴⁰ Peter Krause (DACAAR Public Information Unit) in conversation with young Afghan man working with a commander, Shomali plains.

⁴¹ From 2000-2001 1 kg of raw opium could be sold for up to 50 000 Rps.

⁴² Ole Jensen (DACAAR Livelihoods Advisor) in conversation with villagers, Sangar, Laghman.

⁴³ DACAAR staff member Alingar.

⁴⁴ According to a DACAAR study by Michael Allen (*Feasibility Studies on Social and Economic Aspects of Agricultural Production*, 1999) the Village C village shura made a decision in around 1996-7 that villagers were not allowed to collect fresh wood in order to preserve the forest. However when we visited the village no-one mentioned this.

⁴⁵ Since this data was collected, DACAAR hired a forestry consultant to investigate forest issues in several districts. The consultant reported in August 2003 that a resident of village near to Village C persuaded the shuras to impose a ban on the cutting of trees for sale. The five shuras formed a Qumi Shura, which included ten representatives (2 members from each of the five shuras) and decided to ban the cutting of forests to earn money. The Qumi Shura fixed a penalty of Rps 2,000 per tree if someone cuts a tree for making money. If the ban is applied it will be fascinating to see what alternative income generating activities villagers diversify into by the third round of monitoring.

easier work in Pakistan.⁴⁶ Older women tend not to go as they can send their daughters/daughters-in-law instead of going themselves.⁴⁷ While women collect wood for firewood, chopping it up in the forest, male collectors⁴⁸ are likely to collect larger pieces of timber used to make windows and doors. Some women carry wood for other people from the village to the wood bazaar, for which they are paid 1 Afs per seer carried. During the spring, whole households may migrate to the mountains for 5-20 days and stay in huts called *bandas* to collect wood and fodder. When they have collected enough, they return to the village and later go back to collect the wood and fodder in stages. Usually there is no problem of stealing and sometimes other villagers help them carry the wood down to the village.

In the other two villages it is the men who collect wood. The men of Village A claimed that although it is mainly men with little land, larger landowners also go when they need ready cash. In Village B many of the collectors are 15-16 year old adolescents who are heads of households as their fathers have been killed in fighting. They say that they are too young to get work as labourers and therefore have to collect wood. In Village B female relatives help carry the wood once the men return to the outskirts of the village. This is not the case in Village A however.

A few landowners from each of the villages have donkeys that can carry 6-8 seers wood.⁴⁹ Despite the obvious advantage of being able to alleviate the burden of carrying wood, donkeys cannot always negotiate mountain slopes and must wait at the bottom.⁵⁰

Trading systems also differ between the villages. In Village A and Village B, outside traders are banned which allows the villagers to regulate and maintain prices at affordable levels. Villagers from Village C sell wood in Mehterlam and also to outside traders. From the wood bazaar, near Village C, to Mehterlam it costs 2 Afs per seer of wood to transport by truck.

Table 16, below, illustrates the trading routes for wood collected by each village and the price of wood at each location. In the summer in Village A, there are less people collecting wood as many of them are involved in agricultural work and there is less need for wood for heating.⁵¹ Altogether, there is less wood in the market in summer and consequently the price is higher than in winter.

Table 16. Sale prices of wood in different locations (Source: wood seller discussion)

Village	Sale Price in New Afs		
	Village	Wood Bazaar	Mehterlam
Village A	Summer - 30		
	Winter - 20		
Village B	Dry - 25		
	Wet - 17		
Village C	Dry - 19	Dry - 20	25-30
	Wet - 18	Wet - 19	

⁴⁶ Many men are also afraid to go to the mountains fearing attack from people they are in disputes with. The men claimed that women would not get shot as all the other wood collectors were their relatives, though it surely follows that these are exactly the people the men are afraid of.

⁴⁷ However women with very young children do not like to leave them behind, so do not go.

⁴⁸ The men are supposedly poor men who have no enmity with other villagers.

⁴⁹ They have to be landowners who can grow plants to use as fodder for the donkeys.

⁵⁰ This was the case with the donkeys going to the Village A forest.

⁵¹ It is not clear whether this refers to wet or dry wood.

Promoting the wood economy is a controversial environmental issue, which needs to be tied to a forest management programme to avoid destroying the forests completely. There are also several health concerns, including the dangers faced by pregnant women carrying wood and accidents involving cutting tools.⁵² However, where such a large proportion of people's income is derived from this economic activity, programmes focussed on the promotion of people's livelihoods cannot ignore this important income strategy.

Non-farm Labour

Villagers are involved in non-farm labour in their own villages, in other parts of Afghanistan and abroad.

Afghanistan

In all the villages men said there were more opportunities for work in Pakistan and Iran than in Afghanistan, however, the situation may be changing, as men, particularly from Village A, are increasingly able to find work in Kabul and Jalalabad. In households where there is only one adult male,⁵³ working in Kabul or Jalalabad is preferable as the male can avoid spending so much time away from home as well as reducing the journey cost.

Within the village, if there is a lot of work, the employers come to the labourers and offer them work, otherwise they have to look for it themselves. In other cities, the labourers have to look for work on their own. Usually, if villagers go to Kabul or Jalalabad they will stay away for one month at a time. For unskilled labourers the types of jobs available include digging wells and carrying stones. A skilled mason earns almost twice that of an unskilled labourer (see table 17) and on average can save 2-3,000 Afs per month and up to 5-6,000 Afs.

Abroad

The typical migrant from the three villages is a 14-50 year old male, from a poorer household, who goes to work in Karachi as an unskilled labourer. He spends 2000-2500 Rps on transport alone to get there and earns between 2000-3600 Rps per month. He stays for around one year and if he is able to save money sends remittances home every 2-7 months. Although he faces difficulties finding a job and being away from his family, he also enjoys the higher standard of living found in Karachi.

There are 1-2 men per household from Village C, 1-3 men per household from Village B and 20-25 men in total from Village A who migrate every year, though not all to Pakistan. All men from Village A migrate to Karachi, but in the other villages there are also those who risk the longer and more dangerous journey to Iran, hoping to find higher wages, which are sometimes twice as high as those in Pakistan. To get to Iran, they pay smugglers up to 15,000 Afs to drive them over the border at night in pickup trucks, packed with other Afghans, with no guarantee

⁵² 'There are no data to indicate the full impact of this activity on female health, but it would be reasonable to assume a negative effect on female life-expectancy, on the quality and quantity of breast milk for infant nutrition, and maybe on foetal growth' (Allen, M. (1999) *Feasibility Studies on Social and Economic Aspects of Agricultural Production*).

⁵³ For cultural reasons it is the men, particularly in Pashtun villages such as Village A, who are considered able to look after the household.

of getting to their destination at all or alive. In Iranian cities they wait around *chowks* or crossroads for labour recruiters to approach them and offer them jobs, sometimes having to pay policemen bribes not to report them to the authorities.

The type of work available in Pakistan and Iran includes both unskilled labour (hotel and farm work, employment on building sites and as *chowkidars*)⁵⁴ and skilled labour (activities such as masonry and making metal rods for cement reinforcement). Wealthy families may have shops or businesses in Karachi or Lahore. Sometimes groups of men from the same village go and work at the same site, informing other villagers when jobs are available. However, on the whole each time villagers migrate to Pakistan or Iran they have to search for new jobs. Some employers, such as hotels, provide extras including accommodation, food and clothing, while others provide only food or nothing at all.

There are villagers who are unable to afford to regularly go back to the village, usually because they have high debts to repay and therefore have little disposable income, and thus take their whole families with them. In Village B around 8-10 households take their families with them when they migrate. Sometimes the women are able to work, doing piece work such as making factory toy cars or farm labour. Families left behind in the village have to wait for remittances sent via other village men returning from abroad. To survive they get goods on credit from the local shop, which they pay back once they receive money.⁵⁵ Sometimes they receive nothing and rumours circulate of young men not working or gambling their wages away.⁵⁶ In Village B families communicate with their male relatives via a Sat phone owned by one of the villagers. For this, they pay \$2.5 a minute to call out and 10 Rps per minute to receive a call.

Table 17, below, illustrates the types of non-farm labour that villagers are involved in both in Afghanistan and Karachi and the wages they receive from each. Wages for those in Iran were reported to be up to twice as high as those in Pakistan.

Table 17. Reported wage rates in Village A and Pakistan (Source: village participants)

UNSKILLED	Village A	Pakistan
General	120 Afs per day	1500-2000 Rps (1071- 1428 Afs) per month
Digging wells		Dug in 10 by 5m blocks. Paid 2500-3000 Rps (1786 - 2143 Afs) per metre, plus breakfast and lunch
Bringing stones		130 Rps per day, plus breakfast and lunch
Hotel porter		2000 Rps (1428 Afs) per month
Plasterer		120 Rps (86 Afs) per day
Chowkidar		3000 Rps (2143 Afs) per month
Fishing	Village A: 45 Afs per kg Mehterlam: 200-250 Afs per kg	
Shopkeeper	Makes 20 % profit	

SKILLED	Village A	Pakistan
Masonry	200-300 Afs per day	5000-6000 Rps (3571-4286 Afs) per month

⁵⁴ Guard.

⁵⁵ Usually they use the whole remittance they receive in paying back the shopkeeper so are unable to save.

⁵⁶ In informal discussions with women in Herat Province, some women said that their husbands had migrated to Iran some years ago and they had not received anything from them or heard from them since.

WOMEN	Village A	Pakistan
Farm Labour		20 Rps (14 Afs) per day plus tomatoes

While there continues to be a lack of job opportunities in Afghanistan, male villagers will individually or with their families seek work abroad. In pursuing this income strategy, they face difficulties travelling abroad, finding jobs and earning enough money to send back home. Organisations interested in supporting economic migration could, amongst others, try to reduce the cost and danger of the journey, improve the skill base of the migrants and/or improve the livelihoods of families left behind.

Particularly Vulnerable Groups

So far this section has looked at various income sources and livelihood strategies pursued by different households. However, it should be stressed that there may be groups who, due to a lack in particular assets, skills and/or education cannot diversify their livelihood strategies and may be especially vulnerable. Vulnerable groups may include IDPs from different areas of Afghanistan living in the villages, households without an able-bodied adult male, such as widow headed households with no sons over 16, and households with no skill, no land and no education base. For example, the survey found that there are four female headed households (three widow and one where the male head had a mental illness) and that all of these are from the lower wealth groups, even though some of them are supported by adult male relatives.

A challenge for DACAAR is to devise a system, such as a village profile, whereby these vulnerable groups, their needs and opportunities for working with them are identified from the start of projects in a particular village. At present the DACAAR strategy has not addressed the needs of vulnerable groups and DACAAR staff have not been able to target these groups.

Conclusion: Emerging Livelihood and Programming Issues

This paper presents and analyses preliminary data on the village and wealth group level to identify household livelihood asset bases and strategies.⁵⁷ From the data and analysis a number of key issues need to be highlighted, particularly as the issues raise programming opportunities and questions for DACAAR. Before highlighting the key issues and programming implications of this case study, it is necessary to consider two central questions. Firstly, to what extent and in what ways are the villages of Village C, Village B and Village A different. And, secondly, to what extent are there important differences between household wealth groups within villages.

On the first question, the household evidence presented in this case study supports the differences between villages which were reported in the village characterisation in Table 1. All the evidence on land owning, livestock, grain economies and income sources point to three rather different village level economies. For Village A, probably the richest village of the three, located in the valley floor, there is a substantial agrarian economy, supplemented with non-farm labour and remittances. In the case of Village B, possibly ranked second in terms of wealth and in an intermediate position with respect to natural resources, the economy is more mixed and diversified out of agriculture. For Village C, the agrarian component of the economy is marginal at best and most income sources are decidedly not based around agriculture.

With respect to the reported differences between households from the different wealth groups, the evidence supports that these differences do exist, although they may not be that major. Wealth group one households tend to have greater land resources, more livestock and a greater contribution to the household food economy from farm production. But the fact remains that none of the households are currently grain self sufficient and all require a diverse income portfolio, even if richer households are less dependent on non-farm income sources.

Emerging Themes

Village and household economies are complex and it is clear that despite the fact that households live in a rural context, the role of agriculture in their livelihoods is very variable and for many not a major or even significant component of their livelihood strategies. There are important differences between households within villages in terms of their asset bases and livelihood strategies. At the village level, even for villages that are geographically close, the structure of the village economy can be very different. While this analysis has given some indication of the gendered basis of ownership of assets and the different economic role of women and men there is much that we still do not understand.

It is important to recognise the diverse asset bases and variable income portfolios i.e. that households have a range of income sources many of which have a seasonal dimension. We know little of the independence or inter-dependence of these sources or the implications of this for household strategies.

⁵⁷ A deeper investigation of the data set would require a household level of analysis integrating asset bases and strategies by household in order to gain a composite picture that would capture strategy and assets in relation to household size and dependency ratios. That is an analysis for the future.

Issues for Livelihoods Monitoring

Given the significance of the non-farm component to the well-being of the household and village economies, it is clear that monitoring needs to include much more than the state of agricultural production. The role of markets for specific commodities - fuel and walnuts in the case of Village C - and migrant labour need to be more closely monitored and understood in relation to their effects on household income streams.

At a more specific level, livelihood monitoring must pay particular attention to changes at the household level in assets (which assets are being drawn down on or being built up) and income portfolios (proportions, amounts) if changes in household economic 'health' are to be detected. These changes could either be improving (as may be evidenced by decline in debt, or asset improvement, or income improvements or reduction in amounts spent on health for example), unchanging or deteriorating. Changes in economic 'health' will need to be considered at the household, wealth group and village level. The second and third rounds of the AREU Livelihoods Monitoring Project, carried out with partner NGOs, will be able to shed more light on these changes. This should lead to a better understanding of the way in which agency interventions contribute - or do not - to livelihood improvements and, if so, how and for which households.

Issues for Institutional Learning

This paper has demonstrated the importance of the wood economy and non-farm labour abroad for villagers in Village C. However, this is not the first time that these issues have been highlighted in a DACAAR study. A previous report on the *Social and Economic Aspects of Agricultural Production* prepared in 1999 pointed out the importance of the wood economy and migration to villagers' income portfolios.⁵⁸ Despite these findings DACAAR continued to focus on agriculture. This may suggest that DACAAR has been unable to respond to analysis in a constructive manner or to build learning into its programmes and projects. DACAAR hopes in the future to have better monitoring and evaluation systems, involving analysis of rural livelihood strategies at the appropriate micro level, to be able to more dynamically inform programming.

Issues for DACAAR Programming

At present DACAAR IAD⁵⁹ projects focus on agricultural production with dissemination of wheat seeds and saplings, and building irrigation channels the main activities (see Table 2).

There is no doubt that it will be difficult to change the focus of a programme as large as IAD, with all the training, administrative work and redirection of funds that this would entail. Yet if DACAAR is committed to giving priority to rural vulnerable families,⁶⁰ DACAAR needs to not only understand, but also engage with the livelihood strategies pursued by the target group and recognise that poor villagers have diverse asset bases and variable income portfolios.

From the data and analysis presented in this paper, it is possible to identify options that DACAAR needs to consider to improve the way it supports and works with

⁵⁸ Allen, M. (1999) *Feasibility Studies on the Social and Economic Aspects of Agricultural Production*.

⁵⁹ Integrated Agricultural Development Programme.

⁶⁰ As decided at the DACAAR LFA workshop August 2003.

vulnerable groups. Given time and monetary constraints, the challenge for DACAAR is to determine which areas to prioritise.

Agriculture

Limitation of agricultural investment - DACAAR needs to be cautious about investment in agriculture, as although many rural villagers perceive themselves as farmers, in reality they are involved in more diverse livelihood strategies than purely farming. The data has shown that it is the richer wealth groups who own the largest areas of land and derive a larger part of their income from the land. The poorer wealth groups may indirectly benefit from agricultural projects distributing improved wheat seed, if they are sharecropping land or cultivating their own small holdings, but the greater benefit will go to the richer wealth groups. Unlike the richer wealth groups, the poorer wealth groups do not tend to invest in improving the production capacity of their land, but use it as collateral in times of need by mortgaging it out in order to get a loan.

Inclusion of Women - The data has shown that in some villages, such as Village C, women are involved in agricultural activities. At present DACAAR has no agricultural activity with women. It may be that women have a particular understanding of agricultural work or undertake particular activities that could be developed through agriculture extension practices aimed at women.

Farm Labour

Focus on agriculture may indirectly benefit the poor - Many of the poorer households interviewed gained an income from working on other people's land and there might be an opportunity for DACAAR to work with people engaged in farm labour activities. Also, if there are a substantial number of people working as farm labourers, DACAAR's continued work in agriculture could be providing an indirect benefit to the poorer wealth groups.

Alternative livelihood sources over winter months - As many of those who depend on farm labour for the majority of their income are jobless in the winter months, DACAAR could think about exploring alternative livelihood sources and/or encourage savings (possibly via loans) over these jobless periods.

Fair Wages - Ideally, DACAAR should also try to ensure fair pay for the labourers, including making sure that women are paid the same as men for the same amount and type of labour. However, the reality of actually carrying this out may be hard, when there are so many in need of work and ready to accept poor wages.

Wood Economy

Forest Management Programme - DACAAR should encourage reforestation and, in order to save the villagers time and energy, replant trees close to the villages. It has been noted in the data that in Village C almost every household has walnut trees. DACAAR could promote the cultivation of walnuts and/or assist the village to diversify into other economically valuable tree species.

Education Programmes - In order to prevent deforestation, education programmes could be run for the local shura, women's groups and in schools. These programmes could also cover health related issues, such as back problems occurring from

carrying heavy loads of wood and the particular dangers for pregnant women from bearing heavy loads.

Loans - Donkeys to transport wood in mountain areas and trucks to carry wood to the local market could enable villagers to convey larger quantities of wood. Transportation loans could be given to villagers to allow them to invest in these.

Skill training - If villagers can be taught how to make items out of wood in the villages themselves, then they may be able to make more money, if there is a market available for their products.

Childcare system - Some women commented that they did not go to collect wood as they had children to look after. DACAAR could set up a childcare system to allow women to take part in income generating activities without having to worry about their children.

Non-farm Labour

Skills - The data presented in this paper highlighted that some men have carpentry and masonry skill, and that men with such skills such can earn double the amount that non-skilled labourers do. The skills of villagers should be built on by engaging those with skills to train others. Women have limited skills (sewing and tailoring) with questionable use in the market place and need more diverse and marketable skills. A better understanding is needed of the possibilities for women to earn an income. At present woman working as farm labourers are paid $\frac{1}{4}$ man. Special attention needs to be paid to Village C where no single adult reported a particular skill.

Information Sharing and support - A migrants' association could be set up whereby migrants share information about jobs available, which jobs offer which benefits and also explain the problems and difficulties faced when migrating.

Transportation - At present a lot of money is spent on the journey to the country of work, costs could be cut through providing loans so that associations of migrant villagers could group together to purchase or rent their own transportation.

Remittances - For some villagers it is difficult to send remittances home. DACAAR could look into facilitating the return of remittances and also possible methods of saving remittances.

Assistance for those left behind - DACAAR could look at the particular situation of households left behind, some of which may be particularly vulnerable as they have lost an able-bodied male. Additionally, DACAAR could look at improving families' ability to communicate with migrants.

Particularly Vulnerable Groups

Make sure represented in decision-making - Often in large meetings such as the village organisation meeting, poorer groups may be present, though afraid to speak out due to intimidation by more powerful groups or because they see themselves as unable to contribute because they are illiterate or lacking in skills or assets. DACAAR should try to ensure that their views are vocalised during such occasions and their needs considered.

Small enterprises


Some groups may be particularly vulnerable as they do not have the cash backing, skills or knowledge to start up any businesses of their own. DACAAR should therefore try to identify income generating projects with them and provide them with the training and loans needed to engage in such activities.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Farm Labour Systems, Alingar, Laghman

According to discussions with villagers in Village C and Village A, richer landowners, i.e. those in wealth group one, do not tend to employ farm labourers to work on their land. Instead, they prefer to sharecrop it out so that they can be free all year round to pursue more profitable activities elsewhere. Wealth group three landowners, on the other hand, are not able to afford to pay farm labourers, either in cash or kind, so where they are unable to cultivate the land themselves⁶¹ they will also sharecrop it out.⁶² Middle income landowners, wealth group two households, are shown to sharecrop out (see Table 7) but are also reported to employ farm labour.

For farm labour in this region, the landowner divides up each jerib of his/ her land into four. All of these pieces, each $\frac{1}{4}$ jerib, is sown with 1 man of seed and is known as *one man land*. Labourers are paid according to the number of one man land plots they have worked on, the agricultural processes they have been involved in and the location of the land. They may also be paid by the day and payment for either system may either be in cash or kind. For example, a farm labourer ploughing wheat in Village A will get 1-1 $\frac{1}{2}$ seers of wheat per one man land plot, whilst a man weeding wheat in Village B is paid 150 Rps per day. Payment may also fluctuate according to the season depending on supply and demand. As farm labourers are only employed for particular agricultural processes, the middle income landowner is then able to cultivate his/her land at times when he/she has no other work to do. If opportunities arise, such as masonry jobs for a few months in Jalalabad, then he/she can employ farm labourers to work during this time. During times of intensive work, such as harvesting, the landowner may employ more labourers than at other times.



⁶¹ Perhaps due to disability, lack of adult male labour power.

⁶² Though sometimes these may be to their own family members.

Appendix 2: Women’s Ownership of Land

Table 18. Irrigated grain land ownership (Source: DACAAR database)

Household Code	Village	No. of individuals in Household					No. of individuals who own irrigated Grain Land		
		Men	Women	Boys	Girls	Total	Male	Women	Total
1000	Village C	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	2
1019	Village A	2	2	5	2	11	15	13	28
1032	Village B	2	2	3	5	12	5	7	12

The data above is taken from Table 6a of the DACAAR database for Alingar. Three households are shown, one from each village, to illustrate the way in which the men interviewed for this question answered questions in relation to land ownership. Only ownership of *irrigated grain* is given, but the answers were similar in relation to other types of land.

Without exception, the male interviewees stated that land is owned by all members of the household: men, women, boys and girls. Additionally, as we can see from the household in Village A, land is sometimes owned by a larger group, probably including members of the extended family.

However, when a select group of men from Village C, and a mixed group of men and women from Village B, were questioned further as to what this *ownership* actually means, and whether women were able to make decisions about their land and conduct transactions on their own, the reality was different. In Village C they stated that women were unable to make decisions concerning the land and that when a father died his daughters did not get any of it. In Village B the mixed group commented that although a woman inherits a third of her father’s land, which is understood to be consistent with *Sharia* law, she is expected to give it to her brother or a male relative if she gets married and leaves her natal household.⁶³ It would be considered socially inappropriate for her to demand her share of land; it would be seen as an affront to her family and she would risk being ostracised by them and possibly the whole village.

Therefore, at least in these villages,⁶⁴ it appears that the *de jure* and *de facto* positions of women’s ownership of land are different. The *de jure* position is that women do own land, whilst the *de facto* position is that they rarely exercise their right to land as they stand to lose too much if they do so. Due to certain cultural norms, women’s rights and access to land, even those according to *Sharia* law, are being denied.

⁶³ Her brother would inherit 2/3rds.

⁶⁴ Anecdotal evidence from DACAAR field staff in Herat suggests that in major Afghan cities such as Herat and Kabul women do in fact inherit land.

Appendix 3: Pundwachi

As mentioned in Section II, livestock ownership in Alingar is complex and when considering the importance of livestock assets, it should be remembered that ownership is often fluid and there is a large degree of transfer of animals between households. As can be seen from Table 19 around 26-33 % of interviewed households in all three surveyed villages managed a range of livestock, predominantly cows, under a system called *pundwachi*. In this practice, the owner of a pregnant female animal gives it to another person, who looks after it until it gives birth. The second person will take care of both the mother and its offspring for around the next six months. Afterwards the mother will be returned to the previous owner and the second person takes ownership of the offspring. The majority of households practicing *pundwachi* are in the wealth groups two and three, which suggests an unwillingness on the part of these households to invest cash in buying livestock. What this table does not show is which households are giving livestock to other households and why. One probability would be that it is those who have too many livestock or too little labour or fodder to be able to manage them on their own.

Table 19. Animals managed by villagers in *pundwachi*

Household Code	Village	WG*	Animal
1001	Village C	WG I	1 cow
1002	Village C	WG III	1 cow
1006	Village C	WG II	4 cows and 20 goats
1007	Village C	WG II	1 cow
1014	Village C	WG II	1 cow
1017	Village A	WG I	1 cow and 2 turkeys
1019	Village A	WG II	1 chicken
1024	Village A	WG III	2 cows
1026	Village A	WG III	1 cow
1032	Village B	WG III	1 cow
1033	Village B	WG III	His wife brought a cow from her father's house in <i>pundwachi</i>
1034	Village B	WG III	1 cow
1044	Village B	WG II	1 cow

