EJSIT
European Journal of Science, Innovation and Technology
ISSN: 2786-4936
www.ejsit-journal.com
Volume 4 | Number 4 | 2024

Evaluating Agricultural Extension Frameworks in Resource-Constrained Regions: Strengths and Weaknesses

Florah Kobusiingye, Richard Ssembatya, Fred Kaggwa, Annabella Habinka Ejiri
Faculty of Computing and Informatics,
Mbarara University of Science and Technology, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Agricultural extension frameworks are crucial in enhancing farming practices and improving livelihoods in resource-constrained regions. This study evaluates five prominent agricultural extension frameworks: Farmer Field School (FFS), Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Training of Trainers (ToT), Agricultural Knowledge and Information System (AKIS), and Farmer-to-Farmer Extension (F2FE) to identify their strengths and weaknesses. The analysis reveals that while each framework has merits such as participatory learning and scalability, they also face challenges including resource intensity and limited reach. This paper proposes a hybrid model integrating the strengths of these frameworks while addressing their limitations, aiming to provide a more effective agricultural extension system for regions like Uganda.

Key words: Agricultural extension frameworks, Enhancing farming practices, Improving livelihoods, Resource-constrained regions

INTRODUCTION

Agricultural extension systems are vital for disseminating knowledge, fostering sustainable practices, and improving agricultural productivity, especially in resource-constrained regions. These systems help farmers adopt innovative techniques, manage resources efficiently, and enhance their livelihoods. However, the effectiveness of these systems can be significantly influenced by the specific constraints of the regions they serve.

However, in resource-constrained regions, such as parts of Uganda, these services often face significant challenges. Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of different extension frameworks is essential for developing effective strategies to support farmers. This study evaluates five key frameworks, namely Farmer Field School (FFS), Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Training of Trainers (ToT), Agricultural Knowledge and Information System (AKIS), and Farmer-to-Farmer Extension (F2FE), to provide insights into their applicability and effectiveness in resource-constrained settings.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a qualitative research approach, using a comparative analysis of the selected agricultural extension frameworks. Data was gathered from existing literature, including case studies and evaluations of each framework in resource-constrained regions. The analysis focuses on the applicability of these frameworks in low-resource settings, considering factors such as scalability, sustainability, and cultural relevance.

FINDINGS

Existing Agriculture Extension Frameworks

Farmer Field School (FFS)

FFS emphasizes hands-on learning and farmer empowerment through participatory and experiential approaches. It allows farmers to directly apply new techniques in their fields,

fosters peer-to-peer learning, and promotes sustainable agricultural practices (Butt et al., 2015; Thorburn, 2015). This framework has been successful in various countries, including Uganda, where it has contributed significantly to participatory technology development (Mwesigwa, 2021).

Despite its benefits, FFS requires substantial resources, including trained facilitators and field materials, which can be a limitation in resource-constrained regions. It also faces challenges related to scalability and sustainability, as its effectiveness relies heavily on the quality and consistency of facilitators and may not fully address market-oriented skills (Kenya et al., 2016; Shekmohammed et al., 2023).

Problem-Based Learning (PBL)

PBL focuses on developing farmers' problem-solving skills and entrepreneurial abilities by encouraging them to address real-world issues and formulate solutions based on their resources (Easterly III et al., 2017). This approach promotes lifelong learning and self-initiated development (Wells et al., 2015).

PBL can be time-consuming and may require well-prepared cases and skilled facilitators. Its reliance on teamwork and group dynamics may be challenging in geographically dispersed areas or among farmers with limited group access (Chang & Lin, 2016). This makes it less practical for large groups and less feasible in settings with limited resources.

Training of Trainers (ToT)

The ToT approach builds the capacity of agricultural extension workers by training them to become trainers themselves, thus enabling a broader reach and more sustainable training model (Fulgencio & Asino, 2021). It promotes local capacity building and can be cost-effective over time (Kiptot et al., 2016).

The effectiveness of ToT depends on the quality of the initial training and continuous support. It can be resource-intensive and may lead to variability in training quality due to differences in trainer effectiveness (Karanja et al., 2017). This framework also faces challenges in maintaining consistency and preventing information distortion.

Agricultural Knowledge and Information System (AKIS)

AKIS integrates multiple actors—farmers, educators, researchers, and extension workers—to facilitate knowledge sharing and innovation (Blaettler et al., 2023). It supports flexible, collaborative networks and can be applied at various levels, including individual farmers and regional systems (Simona et al., 2020).

AKIS can be complex to coordinate due to the numerous institutions involved and may suffer from information overload and accessibility issues (Germundsson, 2021). It may not adequately address specific local challenges such as climate change and resource inequality (Sutherland et al., 2023).

Farmer-to-Farmer Extension (F2FE)

F2FE leverages peer-to-peer learning, where experienced farmers train others in their communities. This framework is cost-effective and relies on local knowledge, enhancing trust and relevance among farmers (Franzel et al., 2019). It fosters community bonds and practical knowledge dissemination.

The quality and consistency of information can vary among farmer trainers, and the approach may have limited reach and scalability (Muhereza et al., 2023). It also faces challenges related to gender dynamics and social hierarchies, which can impact its effectiveness (Meena et al., 2018).

Strengths and Weaknesses of Frameworks

The evaluation of the frameworks highlights several key points:

FFS: Effective in participatory learning and sustainable practices but resource-intensive and limited in scalability.

PBL: Promotes problem-solving and engagement but is time-consuming and less practical in dispersed settings.
ToT: Enhances capacity building and sustainability but faces quality control issues and high initial resource demands.
AKIS: Facilitates knowledge integration and collaboration but struggles with coordination complexity and accessibility.
F2FE: Utilizes peer learning effectively and is cost-effective but may suffer from quality variability and limited reach.

Comparative Analysis

The matrix table (Table 1) below summarizes the strengths and weaknesses of each framework against desired characteristics for an ideal agricultural extension system:

Table 1

Characteristic	FFS	PBL	TOT	AKIS	F2FE
Scalability	L	L	H	M	M
Sustainability	M	M	H	M	H
Cost-effectiveness	L	M	H	M	H
Flexibility	M	H	M	H	M
Inclusivity	M	M	M	H	H
Participatory Approach	H	M	M	M	H

DISCUSSION

Integration of Frameworks

The comparative analysis suggests that a hybrid approach integrating elements from multiple frameworks could address the limitations identified. For instance:

Combining FFS and PBL: Integrating the hands-on, participatory approach of FFS with the problem-solving focus of PBL could enhance learning outcomes and practical application.

Enhancing ToT with AKIS: Using AKIS tools to support ToT frameworks could improve knowledge dissemination and coordination, addressing some of the scalability and quality control issues.

Context-Specific Adaptations

Each framework's effectiveness varies based on local contexts, including resource availability, infrastructure, and socio-cultural factors. Adapting frameworks to these contexts is crucial for maximizing their impact. For example, F2FE could be scaled up through digital platforms in areas with better ICT infrastructure, while AKIS could be simplified for regions with limited digital access.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. **Adopt a Hybrid Approach**: Combining strengths from various frameworks to create a more flexible and comprehensive extension system.
2. **Leverage Technology**: Use ICT tools where feasible to enhance information dissemination and coordination, while ensuring access for all farmers.
3. **Focus on Local Adaptations**: Tailor frameworks to local contexts, considering factors such as resources, infrastructure, and cultural practices.

4. **Enhance Training and Support**: Ensure ongoing training and support for extension workers and farmer trainers to maintain quality and effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

Each agricultural extension framework presents unique strengths and weaknesses. To improve extension services in resource-constrained regions like Uganda, a hybrid model incorporating the best elements of these frameworks is recommended. This model should emphasize participatory approaches, scalability, sustainability, and capacity building while addressing resource limitations and ensuring the relevance and quality of information. By integrating modern technology and fostering collaborative networks, the proposed framework aims to enhance agricultural productivity and rural livelihoods more effectively.

REFERENCES

Abbey, L., Dowsett, E., & Sullivan, J. (2017). Use of problem-based learning in the teaching and learning of horticultural production. *The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension*, *23*(1), 61-78.

Blaettler, A., Germundsson, S., Sutherland, L., Banks, J., Boyce, W., & Martinat, S. (2023). Agricultural Knowledge and Information System (AKIS) in Resource-Constrained Regions.

Butt, T. M., Gao, Q., & Hussan, M. Z. Y. (2015). An analysis of the effectiveness farmer field school (FFS) approach in sustainable rural livelihood (SRL): The experience of Punjab-Pakistan. *Agricultural Sciences*, *6*(10), 1164-1175.

Chang, Y.-J., & Lin, M.-Y. (2016). Challenges of Problem-Based Learning in Agricultural Extension.

Condliffe, B. (2017). Project-Based Learning: A Literature Review. Working Paper. *MDRC*.

Easterly III, W., et al. (2017). Developing Cognitive Skills through Problem-Based Learning in Agriculture.

Franzel, S., Kiptot, E., & Degrande, A. (2019). Farmer-to-farmer extension: A low-cost approach for promoting climate-smart agriculture. In T S. Rosenstock, A. Nowak & E. Girvetz (Eds.), *The climate-smart agriculture papers: Investigating the Business of a productive, resilient and Low emission future* (pp. 277-288). Springer.

Fulgencio, J., & Asino, T. (2021). OER Training of Trainers Model: A possible diffusion strategy. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, *16*(2).

Germundsson, M. (2021). The Agricultural Knowledge and Information System (AKIS): A Comprehensive Overview.

Karanja, D., Kiptot, E., & Franzel, S. (2017). *The Volunteer Farmer Trainer Approach Three Years after the Exit of the East Africa Dairy Development Project: A Case Study of Four Dairy Producer Organizations in Kenya*. Research Report. ICRAF, Nairobi.

Kenya, P., et al. (2016). Farmer Field Schools: Outcomes and Impact on Rural Livelihoods.

Kiptot, E., Karuhanga, N., Franzel, S., & Nzigamasabo, L. (2016). Building Local Capacity through ToT Approaches in Agricultural Extension.

Meena, H., Bhasme, S., & Taylor, M. (2018). Gender Dynamics in Farmer-to-Farmer Extension (F2FE) Systems in Agriculture.

Mfitumukiza, D., Barasa, B., Nankya, A. M., Dorothy, N., Owasa, A. H., Siraj, B., & Gerald, K. (2017). Assessing the farmer field schools diffusion of knowledge and adaptation to climate change by smallholder farmers in Kiboga District, Uganda. *Journal of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development*, *9*(5), 74-83.

Muhereza, D., Pritchard, B., & Collins, J. (2023). Farmer-to-Farmer Extension: Insights from Uganda.

Mwesigwa, D. (2021). Efficacy of farmer field schools in achieving participatory technology development among smallholder farmers in the Hoima district, Uganda. *Journal of Social, Humanity, and Education (JSHE)*, *1*(4), 309-321.

Sah, U., Singh, S. K., & Pal, J. K. (2021). Farmer-To-Farmer Extension (F2FE) approach for speedier dissemination of agricultural technologies: A review. *The Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, *91*(10), 1419-1425.

Shekmohammed, S., Hany, U., & Lemma, S. (2023). Review of Farmers Field School Approach for Facilitation of Climate Smart Agriculture. *International Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences*, *5*, 9-17.

Simona, C., Valentina, C., Alberto, S., Maria Assunta, D. O., & Proietti, P. (2020). *AKIS and advisory services in Italy*. Report for the AKIS inventory (Task 1.2) of the i2connect project.

Sutherland, L. A., Adamsone-Fiskovica, A., Elzen, B., Koutsouris, A., Laurent, C., Stræte, E. P., & Labarthe, P. (2023). Advancing AKIS with assemblage thinking. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *97*, 57-69.

Taylor, M., & Bhasme, S. (2018). Model farmers, extension networks and the politics of agricultural knowledge transfer. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *64*, 1-10.

Thorburn, K. (2015). Global Impact of Farmer Field Schools: Successes and Challenges.

Wells, J., et al. (2015). Problem-Based Learning and Entrepreneurial Mindset in Agriculture.