A FOLLOW UP STUDY ON KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE (KAP) OF RESOURCES FARMERS OF FoSHoL-CARE



Abul Barkat M Bazlur Rahman, Kazi A. Mohib





Dhaka: February 26, 2009

Executive Summary

The CARE Bangladesh shares a long-term vision of sustainable development with the global development community as a development partner in more than 70 countries around the world. CAREs vision is embodied in the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), a set of internationally agreed time-bound goals and targets, for pronounced human development by 2015. FoSHoL project is one of CARE's initiatives to contribute in improvements in the livelihoods of the farmers by increasing the availability and utilization of food by targeted households at High Barind Tract areas covering parts of the 34 upazilas (sub-districts) of the districts of Chapai Nawabganj, Rajshahi, and Naogaon.

The specific objectives of the Follow-up study are to assess the changes that occurred in the KAP of the RFs due to the interventions of FoSHoL- CARE project. Interventions were given to promote Knowledge, Attitude and Practice (KAP) of the Resource Farmers (RF) with regard to crop farming, animal husbandry and poultry farming, building linkages with agencies of innovative technologies such as BARI, DAE, DLS, NGOs, seed and fertilizer dealers and promoting RFs comparative ability in participating in different platforms and ability to take initiatives in introducing new technologies and ideas on agriculture.

Extents of technical knowledge on different dimensions of agricultural production are measured using appropriate tools and yardsticks. It has emerged that the concept of agricultural technology is somewhat known to the folks but practice and dissemination of knowledge still lagging. However, knowledge, dissemination of knowledge and practice levels of different components of different technologies of the RFs are found to be better in endline compared to baseline situation. Resource Farmers' RFs current status of KAP about agricultural technologies was measured on 17 agricultural technologies. These are: balanced fertilizer, urea super granule (USG), modern variety (MV), integrated pest management (IPM), improved seed, line transplanting, ideal seed bed, quality seed production, seed preservation, organic pesticides, inter-cropping, relay cropping, compost, green manure, homestead gardening, livestock rearing, and poultry rearing. Each of the technologies has been treated as a separate issue and each comprises of few indicators. For example, the "balanced fertilizer" comprises of 5 variables (components) namely urea, TSP, MP, Gypsum, indicator and Zinc Sulphate. The knowledge status of an individual RF about balanced fertilizer has been assessed first based on his/her knowledge about each indicator separately and then similar procedure is adopted in estimating status of practice and attitude. Practice means, practicing by the farmer in his/her own enterprise – in other words, practice is treated as one side of attitude. The other side of the attitude is dissemination of knowledge and skill to other farmers.

The RFs knowledge about different service providing GOs and NGOs was good. That had facilitator their service seeking efforts fruitfully. Because of having proper knowledge about different service providers, they have got required support from those organizations. The highest proportion of RFs (96%) is found to have maintained linkages with DAE and 67 percent of RFs are seeking support from DLS.

According to the service providers' opinion, linkage between the RFs and service providers is good. Different service providers are engaged in delivering different types of supports and services to the RFs. This service and support include irrigation, supply of quality seeds, modern technology, technological training, etc. Such support and services could have been maximized if there could exist adequate and regular linkage between the RFs and service providers which could have helped them improving their food security and livelihood.

RFs are intended to disseminate new technology to his/her community farmers. They are the secondary source of new information and new technologies to his/her group farmers. The RFs received new information and new technology from the extension service providers and disseminated those to their group members. The group members were supposed to meet the RFs in the group meeting at a certain interval. It was reported that 43 percent of the RFs met group members fortnightly for technology dissemination while 30 percent met monthly and 27 percent met once in a week for technology dissemination. It appears that there is a provision of group meeting and the group members may use this meeting-platform to seek information about technology and new information from the RFs. The group meeting should be held at a fixed time so that the benefits from RFs presence can be maximized. The RF should have the confidence to do so without depending upon guidance and support from others. We have tried to find out the innovative initiatives that RF have taken. The RFs have categorically replied that they have taken initiatives especially on preparation of ideal seedbed for vegetable cultivation (78%), adapt new technology for rice production (56%), and preservation of seed (21.3%) for use future cultivation.

Their incomes from diverse sources such as agriculture, livestock farming, poultry rearing, fruit and vegetable production, homestead gardening, trees and nurseries, wage laboring, etc has increased during last two and half years. The net annual income of a RF has become doubled over a period of two and half years from the baseline income of taka seventy six thousands.

To strengthen and widen knowledge dissemination efforts on modern agriculture technology among the group farmers and their community fellow farmers, the numbers of RFs should be significantly increased.

More training on different agriculture production technologies should be imparted to the RFs and they should be advised to adopt these technical knowledge's towards realizing the strategy "minimum land for maximum food production" properly. To materialize this strategy the RFs are required to the RFs establish a sound relationship with service providing agencies like DAE, DLS, BADC, NGOs, who are working on agricultural development. Department of Agricultural Extension has the scope to provide appropriate training to RFs on agricultural technology. At the same time, the partner NGOs should identify and select "best practice" inside and outside the project and arrange exposure visit for the resource farmers. A permanent linkage should be established between the partner NGOs and the RFs.