KeAi
CHINESE ROOTS
GLOBAL IMPACT

Journal of Digital Economy

AGRICULTURAL MECHANIZATION STRATEGIES AND THE PERFORMANCE OF KAYONZA IRRIGATION AND INTEGRATED WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Mukiza Ephraim[*1], Eugenia Nkechi Irechukwu PhD[2]

[*1]*Mount Kigali University Rwanda, School of Business and Economics*

[2]*Mount Kigali University Rwanda, School of Business and Economics*

Corresponding Author: Mukiza Ephraim

Abstract

The study investigated the impact of agricultural mechanization on the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1) led by Rwanda's Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI). It focused on tractor-based systems, precision agriculture technologies, mechanized irrigation systems, and automated harvesting equipment. Data were collected from 365 respondents using comprehensive questionnaires and interviews. Findings showed strong positive correlations between mechanization strategies and project performance: tractor-based systems (r = 0.521**), precision agriculture technologies (r = 0.641**), mechanized irrigation systems (r = 0.470**), and automated harvesting equipment (r = 0.622**). The regression analysis indicated that 53.9% of the variance in project performance could be explained by these technologies. The study concluded that mechanization significantly enhances agricultural productivity and sustainability in Kayonza District. It highlighted the critical role of precision agriculture and automated harvesting technologies, recommending increased funding, expanded access, optimized tractor use, and reevaluated irrigation systems. For farmers, it suggested participation in training programs, cooperative machinery ownership, regular maintenance, knowledge sharing, and engagement in monitoring and evaluation. These findings provide a foundation for future initiatives to enhance agricultural productivity and sustainability through mechanization

Keywords: *Agricultural, Mechanization Strategies, Irrigation, Integrated Watershed, Project*

1.0 Introduction

In the first half of the 21st century, the world faces significant challenges, including feeding growing populations, alleviating poverty, safeguarding the environment, and addressing climate change. If left unaddressed, these challenges may lead to persistent hunger, economic decline, political instability, and irreversible environmental damage. Approximately 870 million people worldwide suffered from chronic hunger in 2011, while 13% of individuals in the Asia-Pacific region experienced acute hunger between 2010 and 2012. Although this represented an improvement from the early 1990s, by 2012 the Asia-Pacific area was still home to over two-thirds of the world's undernourished population. The agricultural industry is vital to the world's economies because it produces food, jobs, and raw materials for other industries. The growing global population and changing climatic conditions necessitate agricultural practices that improve production, efficiency, and sustainability. The productivity, efficiency, and sustainability of agricultural projects are significantly influenced by the use of agricultural mechanization techniques[1].

Feeding an additional two billion people over the next forty years is one of the biggest challenges of the early 21st century. This has resulted in an unprecedented demand for agricultural products, further exacerbated by rising incomes in the developing world and increased energy needs. Food demand is expected to rise globally by 60% by 2050, requiring farmers to produce as much food in the next forty years as they have over the past thousands of years. These farmers, who constitute more than one-third of the workforce, contribute to 6% of the world's gross domestic product. Intensification of agricultural production involves both increased input consumption and technological advances in response to growing demand. Mechanization plays a crucial role in this process, whether by enabling the planting of additional land or facilitating more intensive farming on existing land, requiring more labor per unit area[2].

Agricultural mechanization has evolved into a cornerstone of modern farming practices worldwide. The adoption of advanced technologies, including precision farming and automated machinery, has significantly impacted the efficiency and output of agricultural projects[3]. In the USA, technological developments have been critical in shaping the mechanization landscape and enhancing agricultural performance. European countries like Germany and the Netherlands have approached agricultural mechanization with a focus on sustainability and precision agriculture, integrating advanced technologies to optimize resource use and reduce environmental impact (Eurostat, 2019). In contrast, Asian countries like China and India exhibit diverse approaches to agricultural mechanization due to variations in landholding patterns, crop types, and economic conditions. China has seen rapid advancements in machinery use, whereas India faces challenges related to small-scale farming practices[1] .

In Sub-Saharan Africa, agricultural mechanization confronts particular difficulties due to smallholder farming, restricted access to technology, and infrastructure limitations. Nations like Kenya and Nigeria are emphasizing mechanization to enhance agricultural productivity[4]. Rwanda, in particular, is aggressively supporting agricultural mechanization to improve food security and economic development within the East African Community. The Rwandan government has implemented measures to promote the adoption of contemporary farming technologies to achieve sustainable agricultural outcomes[5].

Farming in Rwanda is predominantly subsistence-oriented, posing continual challenges for stakeholders to ensure food security amidst a rapidly growing population. Despite significant strides in overall agricultural production in the past decade, concerns persist regarding operational efficiency, farm productivity, and the well-being of the rural population. Recognizing the need for transformation, the government aimed to modernize 50% of agriculture by 2020, aligning with the

ISSN:2773-0670
VOL 3 (2) 2024

Millennium Development Goals (MDG) and the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD)[6]. To address food security challenges, the focus is on improving crop productivity and expanding cultivated areas. However, heavy reliance on manual labor, particularly the use of hand hoes, limits productivity. Women, who contribute 77% to field operations, face significant constraints. Drawing from experiences in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, leveraging alternative farm power sources like motorized engines and draught animals is seen as pivotal to enhancing labor productivity and cultivating uncultivated lands[7].

Mechanization, coupled with inputs like fertilizers and improved seeds, holds the potential to significantly boost agricultural productivity in Rwanda. Contrary to concerns about labor displacement, mechanization enhances human capacity, ensuring timeliness and efficiency, which are critical for sequential cropping in Rwanda's two-season rainfall pattern. Beyond easing power-intensive tasks, mechanization addresses seasonal labor constraints, compensates for rural youth emigration, and complements human labor. Tractors, power tillers, and animal traction not only enhance on-farm tasks but also support off-farm activities like transportation and agro-processing. Mechanization is therefore a key strategy for elevating agricultural productivity and the national economy. The strategy envisions achieving 25% mechanization by 2015, facilitating access to farm power, technical know-how, and improved agro-processing[8].

2.0 Methods

Research Design

Cross-sectional studies, a type of observational research that looked at data on variables gathered at a certain period in time across a sample population or a designated subset, was the methodology used in this study. Often referred to as prevalence studies, transversal research, or cross-sectional analysis, this method provided a thorough grasp of the complexities of the research subject. The study, which focused on the effects of implementing agricultural mechanization strategies, uses quantitative metrics like frequencies and percentages to give specific insights into how the Kayonza irrigation and integrated watershed management project (KIIWP1), which was overseen by MINAGRI in Rwanda's Eastern Province, was performing at the moment.

Data Gathering Procedures

The study utilized a cross-sectional design to gather data from 365 respondents, who were selected from a target population of 4,170 farmers involved in the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1). The respondents were chosen using stratified and simple random sampling techniques. To collect both primary and secondary data, comprehensive questionnaires and interviews with key stakeholders were employed.

Participants

The intended audience consisted of 4,170 farmers in the Eastern Province of Rwanda who were part of the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1), overseen by the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI). These farmers benefited from agricultural mechanization in their daily farming operations. The study collected data from 365 respondents selected through stratified and simple random sampling techniques from this target population.

Based on the demographic profile of the respondents as shown in Table 1, the 365 respondents show a balanced gender distribution (52.3% male, 47.7% female) and are predominantly middle-aged (58.6% aged 36-45). Marital status varies widely (33.7% married, 27.1% engaged, 17.0% single, 22.2% widowed), reflecting diverse perspectives. Education levels are notable: 52.6% completed secondary education, 34.5% hold a Bachelor's degree, and 12.8% have a Master's degree or higher. The study focused on 4,170 farmers in Rwanda's Eastern Province under the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1) overseen by MINAGRI, examining the impact of agricultural mechanization.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Participants

Gender		**Frequency**	**Percent**
Valid	Male	191	52.3
	Female	174	47.7
	Total	365	100.0
Age		**Frequency**	**Percent**
Valid	26-35 years	126	34.5
	36-45 years	214	58.6
	46-55 years	25	6.8
Marital status		**Frequency**	**Percent**
Valid	Single (never married)	62	17.0
	Engaged to be married	99	27.1
	Married / living together	123	33.7
	Widowed	81	22.2
Education level		**Frequency**	**Percent**
Secondary		192	52.6

Bachelor's level	126	34.5
Master's and above	47	12.8

Ethical Consideration

The study aimed to provide all willing respondents with the opportunity to analyze the data, ensuring careful handling for confidentiality and educational purposes. To uphold ethical standards and maintain confidentiality, the researcher implemented several measures: obtaining written consent from participants, anonymizing data with codes instead of names, securing permission from local authorities prior to field data collection, and adhering strictly to quotation and citation guidelines.

3.0 Results

To conduct the study, 365 respondents were given questionnaires. The descriptive statistics provide an overview of the effects of various agricultural technologies on KIIWP1 performance indicators. Key metrics such as fuel efficiency, field coverage, soil disturbance, irrigation coverage, reduced manual labor, crop yields, planting and harvesting cycles, and precision in farm operations showed significant improvements. The analysis highlights that mechanized irrigation systems, automated harvesting equipment, tractor-based systems, and precision agriculture technologies collectively enhance the efficiency and sustainability of agricultural operations in the Kayonza District.

The impact of tractor-based systems on the performance of KIIWP1 led by MINAGRI in the Eastern Province of Rwanda;

Using a variety of measures, the effectiveness of the MINAGRI-led Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1) in Rwanda's Eastern Province was evaluated in relation to tractor-based systems. The outcomes, which are compiled in Table 4.8, show notable improvements in a number of areas. The average score across all criteria was 4.48, showing that respondents were generally in agreement on the positive benefits of these technologies. According to the research, tractor-based systems have significantly improved agricultural productivity, precision in farming operations, soil erosion reduction, agricultural area expansion, farm profitability, food security, field coverage, soil disturbance, crop yields, planting and harvesting cycles, labour dependency, and irrigation coverage.

Table 2:Descriptive Statistics on the Impact of Tractor-Based Systems on KIIWP1

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Fuel Efficiency	365	4.515	0.76166	-1.627	2.57

Field Coverage	365	4.433	0.91328	-1.856	3.351
Soil Disturbance	365	4.441	0.95501	-1.876	3.024
Increased Land Preparation Efficiency	365	4.4	0.9659	-1.719	2.52
Enhanced Irrigation Coverage	365	4.321	1.11864	-1.735	2.118
Reduced Manual Labor Dependency	365	4.469	0.92119	-2.017	3.918
Improved Crop Yields	365	4.504	0.93357	-2.141	4.204
Faster Planting and Harvesting Cycles	365	4.57	0.71765	-1.884	4.017
Greater Precision in Farm Operations	365	4.515	0.80036	-2.07	5.093
Minimized Soil Erosion	365	4.548	0.77815	-2.042	4.681
Expanded Agricultural Area	365	4.532	0.82357	-1.852	3.11
Enhanced Farm Profitability	365	4.534	0.81	-1.827	2.939
Enhanced Food Security	365	4.455	0.9236	-2.034	4.191
Overall Average	**365**	**4.48**	**0.87866**	**-1.898462**	**3.51815**

Source: *Primary Data (2024)*

Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for metrics such as fuel efficiency, field coverage, soil disturbance, and land preparation efficiency, reflecting respondents' views on the impact of tractor-based systems.

Fuel efficiency scored a mean of 4.515 (SD: 0.76166), with negative skewness (-1.627) and high kurtosis (2.570), indicating high ratings. Field coverage had a mean of 4.433 (SD: 0.91328), negative skewness (-1.856), and kurtosis (3.351), showing significant improvements. Soil disturbance scored 4.441 (SD: 0.95501), with negative skewness (-1.876) and kurtosis (3.024).

Land preparation efficiency scored 4.400 (SD: 0.96590), with negative skewness (-1.719) and kurtosis (2.520), indicating high ratings. Enhanced irrigation coverage scored 4.321 (SD: 1.11864), with negative skewness (-1.735) and kurtosis (2.118). Reduced manual labor dependency had a mean of 4.469 (SD: 0.92119), with negative skewness (-2.017) and kurtosis (3.918).

Improved crop yields scored 4.504 (SD: 0.93357), with negative skewness (-2.141) and kurtosis (4.204). Quicker planting and harvesting cycles had a mean of 4.570 (SD: 0.71765), with negative skewness (-1.884) and kurtosis (4.017). Precision in agricultural operations scored 4.515 (SD: 0.80036), with negative skewness (-2.070) and kurtosis (5.093).

Overall, the high average score of 4.48 (SD: 0.87866), with consistent negative skewness (-1.898462) and positive kurtosis (3.51815), indicates that respondents view tractor-based systems as significantly enhancing the performance and sustainability of the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project.

The precision agriculture technologies influenced the performance of KIIWP1 led by MINAGRI in the Eastern Province of Rwanda;

The results of this section's analysis show how MINAGRI's Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1) in Rwanda's Eastern Province has performed in relation to precision agriculture technologies. Descriptive statistics, such as the mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis for different metrics, are shown in Table 3. These measurements address a number of important topics, including resource utilisation efficiency, sensor integration, GPS accuracy, and data analytics capability. The data provides insights into the effectiveness and benefits of precision agriculture technology in improving the agricultural performance and sustainability of the project, as it reflects respondents' assessments of how these technologies impact these elements.

Table 3:Descriptive Statistics on Impact of Precision Agriculture Technologies on KIIWP1;

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
GPS Accuracy	365	4.512	0.83072	-2.063	4.644
Sensor Integration	365	4.512	0.83731	-1.959	3.777
Data Analytics Capability	365	4.529	0.80682	-2.003	4.241
Increased Efficiency in Resource Utilization	365	4.493	0.9306	-2.222	4.888
Improved Crop Yields	365	4.543	0.78899	-1.997	4.158
Enhanced Soil Health Management	365	4.488	0.92165	-2.007	3.708
Reduction in Input Costs	365	4.556	0.80537	-1.945	3.574
Minimized Environmental Impact	365	4.562	0.78422	-1.941	3.564
Enhanced Decision-Making	365	4.488	0.90359	-2.176	4.939
Improved Water Management Practices	365	4.532	0.81011	-1.942	3.709
Enhanced Crop Monitoring and Management	365	4.48	0.89119	-1.987	3.967
Increased Adoption of Sustainable Practices	365	4.471	0.85316	-1.978	4.299
Improved Overall Productivity	365	4.474	0.90936	-2.027	3.972

Overall Average	**365**	**4.511**	**0.851776**	**-2.019**	**4.11077**

Source: *Primary Data (2024)*

According to an analysis, respondents' opinions of the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1) in Rwanda's Eastern Province have significantly improved due to precision agriculture technologies. Table 3 provides descriptive statistics for several indicators to evaluate these technologies' impact. Respondents highly valued GPS accuracy (mean score 4.512, skewness -2.063, kurtosis 4.644), sensor integration (mean score 4.512, skewness -1.959, kurtosis 3.777), and data analytics capability (mean score 4.529, skewness -2.003, kurtosis 4.241).

Increased efficiency in resource utilization received a mean score of 4.493, with strong agreement (skewness -2.222, kurtosis 4.888). Improved crop yields were rated highly (mean score 4.543, skewness -1.997, kurtosis 4.158), as was enhanced soil health management (mean score 4.488, skewness -2.007, kurtosis 3.708). Reduction in input costs (mean score 4.556, skewness -1.945, kurtosis 3.574) and minimized environmental impact (mean score 4.562, skewness -1.941, kurtosis 3.564) were also highly valued.

Overall, the average score of 4.511, with a standard deviation of 0.851776, skewness of -2.019, and kurtosis of 4.11077, suggests a very positive perception of precision agriculture technologies. The consistently high scores indicate broad consensus on their benefits, showing strong agreement on their positive effects. Interviewees stated that these technologies have revolutionized farming practices by enabling precise management of inputs and leveraging data-driven insights. They have enhanced crop yields, minimized environmental impacts, and improved overall farm management practices, transforming traditional farming in the Kayonza District.

The effects of Mechanized irrigation systems on the performance of KIIWP1 led by MINAGRI in the Eastern Province of Rwanda;
This section assessed how the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1), overseen by the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) in Rwanda's Eastern Province, performed in relation to mechanised irrigation systems. The conclusions, which are based on respondents' impressions, offer information on a range of performance indicators associated with the use of automated irrigation systems. The metrics' descriptive statistics are displayed in the table below, emphasising the systems' perceived influence and efficacy in raising agricultural output and efficiency.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics on the Impact of Mechanized Irrigation Systems on KIIWP1

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Water Distribution Uniformity	365	4.529	0.85637	-2.227	5.282
Energy Efficiency	365	4.416	0.93864	-1.56	1.384
Irrigation Scheduling Precision	365	4.573	0.75105	-2.127	5.13
Increased Water Efficiency	365	4.562	0.83182	-2.486	6.903
Improved Crop Yields	365	4.559	0.78093	-2.215	5.492
Reduced Labor Requirements	365	4.537	0.84961	-2.305	5.714
Enhanced Irrigation Scheduling	365	4.608	0.69728	-1.834	2.891
Minimized Water Wastage	365	4.63	0.68954	-1.942	3.314
Improved Land Productivity	365	4.57	0.81448	-2.62	8.011
Enhanced Soil Moisture Management	365	4.573	0.73254	-1.961	3.984
Increased Agricultural Area	365	4.534	0.75379	-1.665	2.466
Improved Resilience to Drought	365	4.556	0.74881	-1.831	3.429
Enhanced Overall Farm Profitability	365	4.562	0.77008	-2.077	4.865
Overall Average	**365**	**4.554**	**0.785765**	**-2.065385**	**4.52808**

Source: Primary Data (2024)

Mechanized irrigation systems have significantly benefited the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1) in Rwanda's Eastern Province, managed by MINAGRI. Table 4 displays descriptive data detailing their impact. Respondents rated uniform water distribution highly, with a mean score of 4.529 and a strong consensus indicated by skewness (-2.227) and kurtosis (5.282). Energy efficiency received a mean score of 4.416, showing slightly broader opinions (skewness -1.56, kurtosis 1.384). Precision in irrigation scheduling was highly valued (mean 4.573, skewness -2.127, kurtosis 5.13). Increased water efficiency was crucial (mean 4.562, skewness -2.486, kurtosis 6.903), as was enhanced crop yields (mean 4.559, skewness -2.215, kurtosis 5.492) and reduced labor requirements (mean 4.537, skewness -2.305, kurtosis 5.714). Overall, respondents rated mechanized systems positively (mean 4.554, standard deviation 0.786), indicating their significant impact on KIIWP1's performance. These systems improve water management, reduce wastage, and enhance productivity, despite challenges like initial costs and logistical issues with power and water access in hilly terrain.

Automated harvesting equipment affects KIIWP1's performance in Rwanda's Eastern Province, under MINAGRI's leadership;

The purpose of this section is to evaluate how the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1), which is overseen by the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) in Rwanda's Eastern Province, is performing in relation to automated harvesting equipment. The results shown in the table below provide a thorough statistical study of several indicators pertaining to the deployment and use of automated harvesting equipment, emphasizing the technology's efficiency in raising agricultural output and streamlining operations.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics on the Impact of Automated Harvesting Equipment on KIIWP1;

Metric	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Harvesting Speed	365	4.526	0.79318	-1.83	3.194
Crop Damage Prevention	365	4.526	0.79318	-2.162	5.609
Sorting and Grading Efficiency	365	4.512	0.75081	-1.824	4.019
Increased Harvesting Efficiency	365	4.463	0.82999	-1.911	4.192
Reduced Labor Dependency During Harvest	365	4.49	0.77958	-1.805	3.689
Faster Completion of Harvest Cycles	365	4.46	0.78214	-1.911	4.932
Improved Crop Quality Due to Timely Harvest	365	4.504	0.81072	-2.066	4.988
Minimized Post-Harvest Losses	365	4.518	0.75435	-1.914	4.406
Enhanced Overall Farm Productivity	365	4.493	0.76896	-1.69	3.023
Reduced Operational Costs	365	4.46	0.82654	-1.795	3.564
Increased Capacity for Large-Scale Harvest	365	4.51	0.81405	-1.736	2.64
Improved Safety for Farm Workers	365	4.51	0.79008	-1.578	1.716
Enhanced Profitability of Agricultural Projects	365	4.482	0.93046	-2.252	5.23
Overall Average	**365**	**4.497**	**0.801849**	**-1.882615**	**3.93862**

Source: *Primary Data (2024)*

Table 5 displays descriptive statistics revealing insights into the impact of automated harvesting equipment on KIIWP1. Respondents perceived the equipment positively across various metrics: mean harvesting speed of 4.526 with a standard deviation of 0.79318, indicating consistent views; 4.526 for preventing crop damage with similar consistency; 4.512 for sorting and grading efficiency, showing some variability; 4.463 for increased harvesting efficiency with minor variability; 4.490 for reduced labor dependency; 4.460 for quicker harvest cycles, showing slight variability; 4.504 for improved crop quality; 4.518 for reducing post-harvest losses; 4.493 for increasing farm output; 4.460 for decreasing operational expenses; 4.510 for enabling large-scale harvesting; and 4.510 for enhancing worker safety. Overall perception averaged 4.497 with a standard deviation of 0.801849, indicating a generally positive sentiment. Respondents expected enhanced efficiency, productivity, and profitability due to automated equipment, aligning with improved agricultural practices in the Kayonza District, particularly in reducing labor costs, enhancing safety, and maintaining quality standards for competitive markets.

Indicators of performance of KIIWP1 led by MINAGRI in the Eastern Province of Rwanda;

The analysis investigates into the performance indicators of KIIWP1 under the leadership of MINAGRI in the Eastern Province of Rwanda. Table 6 provides descriptive statistics showing various metrics crucial for assessing the effectiveness and impact of the project. These metrics encompass diverse dimensions ranging from agricultural productivity to socio-economic and environmental factors.

Table 6:Descriptive Statistics on the Performance Indicators of KIIWP1

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
Crop Yield	365	4.501	0.73239	-1.566	2.528
Resource Use Efficiency	365	4.603	0.65758	-1.812	3.793
Economic Viability	365	4.419	1.03093	-1.983	3.251
Environmental Impact	365	4.548	0.82277	-2.148	4.95
Social and Community Impact	365	4.46	1.01726	-2.104	3.753
Land Productivity	365	4.589	0.7602	-2.398	6.99
Water Usage Efficiency	365	4.444	1.04316	-2.135	3.841
Adoption of Modern Farming Technologies	365	4.463	0.77875	-1.508	2.047
Soil Health and Fertility	365	4.564	0.69483	-1.64	2.687

Agricultural Income and Profitability	365	4.392	1.02036	-1.889	2.983
Farmer Livelihoods	365	4.559	0.79832	-2.1	4.787
Environmental Sustainability	365	4.449	1.00317	-2.044	3.604
Crop Diversity	365	4.548	0.82277	-2.327	6.162
Food Security	365	4.438	1.05854	-2.08	3.516
Overall Average	**365**	**4.498**	**0.88528**	**-2.012923**	**4.028**

Source: *Primary Data (2024)*

Table 6 presents descriptive statistics crucial for assessing the project's impact across various dimensions. Mean scores indicate positive perceptions of KIIWP1's effectiveness: 4.501 for crop yield, 4.603 for resource utilization efficiency, and 4.419 for economic viability. Environmental impact scored 4.548, social/community impact 4.46, land productivity 4.589, water use efficiency 4.444, adoption of new farming techniques 4.463, soil fertility 4.564, agricultural revenue/profitability 4.392, farmer livelihoods 4.559, environmental sustainability 4.449, and food security 4.438.

Overall, the project received an average perception score of 4.498, reflecting generally positive assessments across metrics. These results highlight KIIWP1's significant contribution to agricultural sustainability and development in Rwanda's Eastern Province, particularly through the adoption of advanced agricultural technologies like precision farming, automated harvesting, and mechanized irrigation. These innovations have not only enhanced resilience and production but also fostered environmental preservation and profitability.

4.0 Discussions

The evaluation of tractor-based systems in Rwanda's Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1) shows significant improvements in performance indicators. Studies in neighboring countries and hilly terrains demonstrate similar benefits, such as enhanced productivity and reduced labor dependency. Smith et al. (2018) and Patel & Kumar (2020) support these findings, highlighting the positive impact of tractors on agricultural outcomes in various settings. Precision agriculture technologies also received positive feedback in KIIWP1, enhancing productivity through GPS accuracy and real-time monitoring. Studies by Nguyen et al. (2019) and Li & Zhang (2020) in Southeast Asia and China respectively, echo these benefits, emphasizing improved efficiency and sustainable practices. Mechanized irrigation systems in KIIWP1 have shown mixed results, with studies by Chen et al. (2018) and Smith & Johnson (2019) in Sub-Saharan Africa demonstrating positive impacts on water efficiency and crop yield, despite challenges in terrain and infrastructure.

Automated harvesting equipment in KIIWP1 has been praised for increasing harvesting speed and quality, aligning with findings from Garcia et al. (2020) and Li & Wang (2019), which emphasize improved productivity and profitability in developing regions. Overall, the statistical analysis supports the effectiveness of these technologies, highlighting strong correlations and predictive power in enhancing agricultural outcomes. Recommendations include increased investment in precision agriculture, subsidies for technology adoption, and collaborative training programs to optimize benefits across diverse agricultural landscapes. These findings underscore the universal applicability of mechanization technologies in improving agricultural sustainability and productivity.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The study concludes that the Kayonza Irrigation and Integrated Watershed Management Project (KIIWP1), overseen by MINAGRI in Rwanda's Eastern Province, significantly improves performance through agricultural mechanization. Employing rigorous cross-sectional investigations and SPSS IBM 23.0 analysis, the study highlights the substantial impact of various mechanization technologies. Tractor-based systems, precision agriculture, mechanized irrigation, and automated harvesting equipment all correlate positively with project outcomes, with precision agriculture and automated harvesting showing the strongest effects. Statistical analysis, including correlation coefficients and multiple linear regression, underscores mechanization's significant influence, explaining 53.9% of project variance.

The study's findings suggest targeted investments in precision agriculture and automated harvesting to enhance project sustainability. Recommendations include prioritizing funding for precision agriculture technologies like GPS-guided machinery and promoting access to automated harvesting equipment through subsidies and maintenance support. Policy makers should optimize tractor use through cooperative ownership models and enhance mechanized irrigation systems through pilot projects and comprehensive training.

For farmers, engaging in training programs, adopting cooperative ownership for machinery, and prioritizing maintenance are crucial. Knowledge sharing and participation in monitoring efforts can further improve mechanization's impact on agricultural projects in the Kayonza District.

Acknowledgment

The researcher extends heartfelt gratitude to Dr. Eugenia Nkechi Irechukwu for her unwavering encouragement, inspiration, and extensive research knowledge. Her invaluable support and guidance were instrumental in the completion of this final paper. This work would not have been possible without her contributions.

References

[1] FAO, *Agricultural mechanization and sustainable agrifood system transformation in the Global South*. FAO, 2022. doi: 10.4060/cc2625en.

[2] G. Hallett, Y. Hayami, and V. W. Rutton, ‘Agricultural Development: An International Perspective.’, *Econ. J.*, vol. 82, no. 326, p. 792, Jun. 1972, doi: 10.2307/2230054.

[3] USDA, 'Precision Agriculture in the Digital Era: Recent Adoption on U.S. Farms', *USDA*, 2023.

[4] World Bank, 'Publication: An Incomplete Transition: Overcoming the Legacy of Exclusion in South Africa', *World Bank Group*, 2019, [Online]. Available: https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/entities/publication/5d561739-23f4-58ec-bdf5-339671217347

[5] RAB, 'RAB Strategic Plan', *RAB*, 2020, [Online]. Available: https://faolex.fao.org/docs/pdf/rwa206947.pdf

[6] Saleh M. Nsouli, '4 The New Partnership for Africa's Development: Opportunities and Challenges', *Int. Monet. Fund*, 2021.

[7] Mrema, Bake, and Kahan, 'Agricultural Mechanization in Sub-Saharan Africa: Time for a new look', *Semantic Sch.*, 2018, [Online]. Available: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Agricultural-mechanization-in-sub-Saharan-Africa%3A-a-Mrema-Baker/a016fe135f050066ca251e4e4ea8e027ba0074e5

[8] National Agricultural Survey, 'Sustainable Agricultural Mechanization', p. 2018.