

When the proportion of land cultivated by each farmer is calculated, a somewhat different picture of land use appears. The average proportion of land cultivated by the 40 farmers was 53 percent. The difference between the percent of all land under cultivation (37%) and the average percent of farm holdings under cultivation (53%) is due to the presence of a few large holdings which had relatively little cultivation. Table 2 presents a frequency distribution and percentage of the farmers in our sample that were cultivating different proportions of their land.

Table 2. Distribution of Farmers by Proportion of Total Land Cultivated

<u>Proportion of Land Cultivated</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
0-.25	3	8
.26-.50	16	40
.51-.75	13	33
.76-1.00	8	20
Total	<u>40</u>	<u>100</u>

Although there seems to be enough land to continue a fallow rotation system of farming, when the land available to each farmer is considered the majority of the farmers are approaching the limit whereby land is not sufficient to permit this practice to continue. Undoubtedly, increases in population in the area threaten the continuation of this farming practice and the implications for the continued agricultural potential of the area are ominous. FAO has suggested that the ideal fallowing system would be to maintain 4/5 of the arable land in Acacia tree fallow while only 1/5 is cultivated. Therefore, present fallowing practices are grossly inadequate.

Another important factor in land-use is land rental, which is quite prevalent. Overall, 234 mukhammas were rented-in, which represents 32 percent of all cultivated land. Of the 40 farmers surveyed, 15 rented-in land (38%). These 15 farmers rented an average of 15.6 mukhammas, or 65 percent of the land they cultivated.

It seems that the better-off farmers were doing most of the renting. Of the 15 farmers who were renting-in land, 9 were cultivating more than 15 mukhammas. In fact, 68% of all the rental land (158 of 234 mukhammas) was by 6 farmers who were cultivating 21 mukhammas or more. The reason for the concentration of rental land in larger operations is because these farmers can afford to hire the necessary labor to expand their cultivation. The cost of rental arrangements is relatively low and is not the main reason why poor farmers do not rent-in more land. Instead, access to labor is the key constraint to the amount of land which a farmer cultivates. Because poor farmers can't afford to hire additional labor, they don't expand their cultivation through renting.

So far, we have identified three types of rental arrangements. These are fuṭra, ijar/dugundi and mukṭuu9iya. Fuṭra, which is the most common arrangement, is a yearly rent paid to the landowner in the form of 10 percent of the total crop produced. For instance, if the renter produces