



## Social Science & Humanities International

(An International Multidisciplinary Journal)

Homepage: [www.sshi.in](http://www.sshi.in)



# Investigating the Impact of Girinka Programme in Nyagatare District of Rwanda

**Mugabe Jean Baptiste**

*Lecturer, East African University –Rwanda.*

---

### KEYWORDS

Girinka program; Nyagatare district, Kugabira, Ubuhake, Rwanda

---

### ARTICLE INFO

**Received:** 15-02-2019

**Revised:** 19-03-2019

**Accepted:** 21-03-2019

---

### CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

**Dr.Mugabe Jean Baptiste**

*Lecturer, East African University –  
Rwanda.*

---

### ABSTRACT

Girinka programme or the “one-cow per poor family” programme is presently being promoted as a poverty reduction approach in Rwanda. As part of efforts to reconstruct Rwanda and nurture a shared national identity, the Government of Rwanda drew on aspects of Rwandan culture and traditional practices to enrich and adapt its development programs to the country’s needs and context. The aim of this study was to investigate and gather information about Girinka Programme in Nyagatare District of Rwanda. In this regard, a group of Girinka beneficiaries were asked their opinions on the impacts and problems of Girinka programme. For the data collection interview method was used and the data obtained was subjected to content analysis via SPSS software package. In present study, it was observed that Girinka programme changed incredibly the living conditions of its beneficiaries living in Nyagatare district.

---

### ABBREVIATIONS

**ANOVA:** Analysis of Variance

**SPSS:** Statistical Package for the Social Sciences

**Introduction:**

Girinka programme or the “one-cow per poor family” programme is presently being promoted as a poverty reduction approach in Rwanda. The word ‘Girinka’ can be translated as ‘may you have a cow’ and describes a centuries old cultural practice in Rwanda whereby a cow was given by one person to another, either as a symbol of respect and gratitude or as a marriage gift. As part of efforts to reconstruct Rwanda and nurture a shared national identity, the Government of Rwanda drew on aspects of Rwandan culture and traditional practices to enrich and adapt its development programs to the country’s needs and context. The result is a set of Home Grown Solutions - culturally owned practices translated into sustainable development programmes. One of these Home Grown Solutions is the One Cow per Poor Family program also known as Girinka program initiated in 2006. The Girinka programme aims to: 1) reduces the country’s chronic child malnutrition rate; 2) Increase household food security; and 3) Generate alternative income for the poor. The aim of this study was to investigate and gather information about Girinka Programme in Nyagatare District of Rwanda. In this regard, a group of Girinka beneficiaries were asked their opinions on the impacts and problems of Girinka programme. For the data collection interview method was used and the data obtained was subjected to content analysis via SPSS software package.

In present study, it was observed that Girinka programme changed incredibly the living conditions of its beneficiaries living in Nyagatare district. The results of the present study based on interviews are described as follows:

**Variations in accessibility, social development, economic development and awareness level with demographic profile Accessibility and Age Group**

**Table-5.51 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-1**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Access ibility	Between Groups	55.004	4	13.751	4.26 7	0.002 *
	Within Groups	1111.685	345	3.222		
	Total	1166.689	349			

**Source: computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.**

**Hypothesis-1:** Level of accessibility among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with age group.

The variations in the level of accessibility between different age groups such as up to the age of 30 years, between the age group of 31 and 40 years, between the age group of 41 and 50 years, between the age group of 51 and 60 years and above the age group of 61 years among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-1,

were taken up and the results are shown in the table-5.51, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results obtained from one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.51, it can be inferred that the F value of 4.267 corresponding to level of accessibility on each different considered age group are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-1 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the level of accessibility among different age group.

**Social development and age group:**

**Hypothesis-2:** Level of social development among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with age group.

group between 31 and 40 years, between 41 and 50 years, between 51 and 60 years and those with age group of 61 years among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-2 were taken up and results are shown in the table-5.52, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. The results obtained from one way ANOVA model it can be inferred that the F value of 7.527 corresponding to level of social development on each different considered age group are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-2 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows significant variations in the level of social development among different age group.

**Economic Development and age group:**

**Hypothesis-3:** Level of economic development among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with age group.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social Development	Between Groups	576.877	4	144.219	7.527	0.000*
	Within Groups	6610.083	345	19.160		
	Total	7186.960	349			

**Source: computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.**

The variations in the level of social development between different age groups such as up to age group of 30 years, age

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic Development	Between Groups	485.919	4	121.480	9.091	0.000*
	Within Groups	4610.035	345	13.362		
	Total	5095.954	349			

**Source: computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.**

The variations in the level of economic development between various age groups

such as up to the age group of 30 years, between the age group of 31 - 40 years, between age group of 41 -50 years, between 51 - 60 years and above the age group of 61 years among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-3, were taken up and the results are shown in the table-5.53, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the above results , it can be inferred that the F value of 9.091 corresponding to level of economic development on each different considered age group are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-3 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the level of economic development among different age group.

**Awareness Level and age group:**

**Table-5.54 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-4**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Awareness	Between Groups	51.082	4	12.771	2.658	0.033*
	Within Groups	1657.846	345	4.805		
	Total	1708.929	349			
<b>Source: Computed from primary data; * Significant at 5 percent level.</b>						

**Hypothesis-4:** Awareness level among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with age group.

The variations in the awareness level between different age groups such as those with age group 30 years, between the age group of 31-40 years, between the age group 41 - 50 years, between the age group of 51 - 60 years and above the age group of 61 years among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-4, taken up and its results are shown in the table-5.54, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.54, it can be inferred that the F value of 2.658 corresponding to level of awareness on each different considered age group are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-4 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the level of economic development among different age group.

**Accessibility and marital status:**

**Table-5.55 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-5**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accessibility	Between Groups	108.483	3	36.161	11.824	0.000*
	Within Groups	1058.205	346	3.058		
	Total	1166.689	349			
<b>Source: Computed from primary data; * Significant at 5 percent level.</b>						

**Hypothesis-5:** Level of accessibility among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with marital status.

The disparity in the level of accessibility between different marital status such as married, widow/widower, separated/divorced and unmarried among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-5, taken up and its results are shown in the table-5.55, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.55, it can be inferred that the F value of 11.824 corresponding to level of accessibility on each different considered marital status are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-5 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the level of accessibility among different marital status.

**Social development and marital status:**

**Hypothesis-6:** Level of social development among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with marital status.

The variations in the level of social development between different marital status such as married, widow/widower, separated/divorced and unmarried among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-6 were taken up and the results are shown in the table-5.56, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.56, it can be inferred that the F value of 48.685 corresponding to level of social development on each different considered marital status are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-6 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the level of social development among different marital status.

**Economic development and marital status:**

**Table-5.56 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-6**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social Development	Between Groups	2133.280	3	711.093	48.685	0.000*
	Within Groups	5053.680	346	14.606		
	Total	7186.960	349			

Source: Computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.

**Table-5.57 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-7**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic development	Between Groups	132.660	3	44.220	3.083	0.027*
	Within Groups	4963.295	346	14.345		
	Total	5095.954	349			

Source: Computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.

**Hypothesis-7:** Level of economic development among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with marital status.

The variations in the level of economic development between different marital status such as married, widow/widower, separated/divorced and unmarried among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-7, taken up and its results are shown in the table-5.57, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.57, it can be inferred that the F value of 3.083 corresponding to level of economic development on each different considered marital status are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-7 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the level of economic development among different marital status.

**Awareness level and marital status:**

**Table-5.58 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-8**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Awareness	Between Groups	739.340	3	246.447	87.945	0.000*
	Within Groups	969.588	346	2.802		
	Total	1708.929	349			

**Source: Computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.**

**Hypothesis-8:** Awareness level among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with marital status.

The variations in the awareness level between different marital status such as married, widow/widower, separated/divorced and unmarried among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-8, taken up and its results are shown in the table-5.58, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.58, it can be inferred that the F value of 87.945 corresponding to awareness level on each different considered marital status are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-8 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the awareness level among different marital status.

**Accessibility and occupation status:**

**Table-5.59 of ANOVA for hypothesis-9**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Accessibility	Between Groups	34.084	3	11.361	3.471	0.016*
	Within Groups	1132.604	346	3.273		
	Total	1166.689	349			

**Source: Computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.**

**Hypothesis-9:** Level of accessibility among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with occupational status.

The variations in the level of accessibility between different occupation status such farmer, salaried, self employed and unemployed among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-9, taken up and its results are shown in the table-5.59, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.59, it can be inferred that the F value of 3.471 corresponding to level of accessibility on each different considered occupation status are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-9 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the level of accessibility among different occupation status.

**Social development and occupation status:**

**Hypothesis-10:** Level of social development among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with occupational status.

The difference in the level of social development between different occupation status such as farmer, salaried, self employed and unemployed among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-10, taken up and its results are shown in the table-5.60, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.60, it can be inferred that the F value of 6.144 corresponding to level of social development on each different considered occupation status are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-10 is rejected at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there exist significant variations in the level of social development among different occupation status.

**Economic development and occupation status:**

**Table-5.60 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-10**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Social Development	Between Groups	363.483	3	121.161	6.144	0.000*
	Within Groups	6823.477	346	19.721		
	Total	7186.960	349			

Source: Computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.

**Table-5.61 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-11**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Economic Development	Between Groups	83.606	3	27.869	1.924	0.125
	Within Groups	5012.348	346	14.487		
	Total	5095.954	349			

Source: computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.

**Hypothesis-11:** Level of economic development among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with occupational status.

The variations in the level of economic development between different occupation status including farmer, salaried, self-employed and unemployed among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-11 were taken up and its results are shown in the table-5.61, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.61, it can be inferred that the F value of 1.924 corresponding to level of economic development on each different considered occupation status are not found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-11 is accepted at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there is no significant variation in the level of economic development among different occupation status.

**Awareness and occupation status:**

**Table-5.62 Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-12**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Awareness	Between Groups	29.294	3	9.765	2.012	0.112
	Within Groups	1679.634	346	4.854		
	Total	1708.929	349			

**Source: Computed from primary data; \* Significant at 5 percent level.**

**Hypothesis-12:** Awareness level among Girinka beneficiaries does not vary with occupational status.

The variations in the awareness level between different occupation status such as those who are farmer, those who are salaried, those who are self-employed and those who are unemployed among the Girinka beneficiaries are defined in hypothesis-12, taken up and its results are shown in the table-5.62, as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized. From the results of this one way ANOVA model shown in table-5.62, it can be inferred that the F value of 2.012 corresponding to awareness level on each different considered occupation status are not found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence, hypothesis-12 is accepted at 5 percent level of significance. The result clearly shows that there is no significant variation in the awareness level among different occupation status.

**Conclusion:**

The information procured from respondents (Girinka-beneficiaries) of Girinka programme also known as ‘One cow per poor programme’ is a multi-purpose programme introduced by government of Rwanda, on one side it is a social programme with aim of fighting malnutrition, promoting social cohesion among Rwandans, accessing to health services, change in social status, accessing education, percolate to shelter and participation in decision making by ordinary



people in the village. On the other side, Girinka programme is an economic programme which promotes income generation, agriculture development and increase job opportunities to the member of Rwandan society. Girinka programme if well implemented can improve positively the living conditions of poor people in Rwandan and other countries as well due to its multi-purpose ways of solving socio-economic problems of poor people in rural area.

5. Assessing Girinka Programme (2006-2016), Citizen perspectives: report by Rwanda Government

### References:

1. One cow per poor family: effects on consumption and crop production in Rwanda report by; Pia Nilsson Mikaela Backman Lina Bjerke Aristide Maniriho, The Royal Institute of technology Centre of Excellence for Science and Innovation Studies (CESIS) October, 2017.
2. An assessment of the girinka (one cow per poor family) Program and poverty alleviation in rwanda A case study of bugesera district: Thesis report by Vincent kayigema.
3. Gender assessment of dairy value chains: evidence from Rwanda; report by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, 2017.
4. Mazimpaka, Eugene, et al. "Current status of cattle production system in Nyagatare District-Rwanda." Tropical animal health and production 49.8 (2017): 1645-1656.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License.

© Copyright 2016-2019 Dar Publishers. All rights reserved.