**Table 1: Comparison of family planning across categories of residence, education and wealth**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Kenya | Urban | Rural | No educ/p | Sec/hi | WQ Lowes | WQ Hig |
| Total fertility rate 15-49 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 3 |
| Unmet need FP | 13 | 21 | 22 | 12 | 28 | 12 |
| Met need FP | 38 | 30 | 29 | 39 | 17 | 39 |
| Total demand for FP | 51 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 45 | 51 |
| Demand for FP satisfied | 74 | 58 | 56 | 77 | 37 | 77 |
| FP on the radio -women | 74 | 62 | 59 | 77 | 40 | 76 |
| FP on TV -women | 58 | 23 | 23 | 53 | 8 | 66 |
| FP in newspapers -women | 47 | 24 | 18 | 53 | 10 | 53 |
| FP in none these 3 media -women | 19 | 35 | 38 | 15 | 58 | 15 |
| FP on the radio -men | 74 | 70 | 65 | 79 | 58 | 75 |
| FP on TV-men | 61 | 33 | 30 | 58 | 19 | 64 |
| FP in newspapers- men | 60 | 37 | 28 | 65 | 21 | 63 |
| FP in none of these 3 media -men | 18 | 27 | 32 | 14 | 41 | 16 |

Data source: Demographic Health and Surveys. Note: No educ/p – no education or with primary education. Sec/hi- secondary or higher education. WQ Lowes- lowest wealth quintile. WQ Hig-highest wealth quintile.

**Table 2. Coops in Navakholo & Kakamega C. performance in selected variables between 0-100**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Coops in numbers | Female land rights | Provide water | Cheaper inputs | Cheaper credit | Farmer training | Modern technology | Provide storage |
| 1 | 71 | - | 71 | - | 71 | 71 | 71 |
| 2 | 43 | 71 | 71 | - | 71 | - | 71 |
| 3 | - | 14 | 57 | 14 | 43 | 57 | 57 |
| 5 | 71 | 57 | 29 | 43 | 57 | - | - |
| 6 | 14 | 57 | 14 | 14 | 14 | - | 14 |
| 8 | - | 14 | 71 | 29 | 0 | - | 71 |
| 9 | 71 | 14 | 71 | 14 | 14 | - | - |
| 10 | 57 | 14 | 57 | - | - | - | 14 |
| 11 | 71 | 14 | 71 | 14 | 14 | - | - |
| 12 | 57 | 71 | 14 | 14 | - | - | - |
| 13 | 71 | 14 | 14 | 14 | - | - | - |

**Table 3**. **Levels of crop intensity & number of farmers before & after joining cooperatives**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Levels of crop intensity | crop intensity before coop | crop intensity after coop |
| 1 | 53 | 1 |
| 2 | 68 | 97 |
| 3 | 2 | 23 |

**Table 4. Constraints facing cooperatives from a cooperative leadership point of view**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Problem description |  |  |  |  |  | Mentions (n=13) |
| Lack of funds & access to credit to buy inputs and diversify farming activities | | | | | | 11 |
| Long distance to seasonal water source thus no facilitation for irrigation | | | | |  | 6 |
| Lack of access to technology to improve production & lower costs of production | | | | | | 1 |
| No modern equipment to keep pace with modern technology- process animal feeds | | | | | | 1 |
| Lack of access to inputs due to high prices and distant markets | | | | |  | 1 |
| No livestock as a source of household nutrition and income | | | |  |  | 2 |
| Poor infrastructure to access markets particularly for vegetable and dairy farmers | | | | | | 2 |
| Illiteracy rates among members limit them from keeping up with cooperative activities | | | | | | 1 |
| No extension service to train in sustainable farming | | | |  |  | 1 |
| Do not receive support from either the government or development agencies | | | | | | 13 |
| Youth are not interested in farming | |  |  |  |  | 1 |