



FARMER FEEDBACK AND COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE WORKSHOP GUIDE FOR ASSESSING THE PERFORMANCE OF PLANNED COMPARISONS



2018

Anne Kuria, Leigh Winowiecki

with inputs from Esther Kiura, John Nyaga and Christine Magaju

World Agroforestry Centre (ICRAF)

Table of Content

Introduction, purpose and aim of the guide	3
Section A: Farmers' understanding and interpretation of aims of the PCs	4
Section B: Farmers' evaluation of the performance of the various land restoration options.....	4
Section C: Outcome mapping: Impacts of the land restoration options on farmer's livelihoods	4
Section D: Lessons Learnt and Recommendations for Improving the implementation of the various PCs	5
Section E: Needs Assessment.....	5

Suggestion Citation

Kuria, A, Winowiecki, LA, Kiura, E, Nyaga, J, Magaju, C. 2018. FARMER FEEDBACK AND COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE WORKSHOP GUIDE FOR ASSESSING THE PERFORMANCE OF PLANNED COMPARISONS. Nairobi, Kenya. ICRAF. 7 pgs.

Introduction, purpose and aim of the guide

The main objective of this farmer feedback and community of practice workshop guide is to provide community facilitators and enumerators with a check-list of questions that they can use to elicit farmers' feedback on the performance of the various Planned Comparisons (PCs) in terms of what worked and what didn't work (how's and why's); as well as to discuss the potential impacts of the land restoration options on their livelihoods and suggestions on how to improve the performance of the options. This guide will also shed light on the criteria that farmers use to assess the performance of land restoration options, the organizations/ projects implementing the technologies, and also their own self-evaluation. It is expected that discussions originating from this exercise will not only provide insights on how to best improve on the performance of the land restoration options but also enhance the sense of ownership of the technologies by the farmers.

Points to note:

- ✓ Thank the farmer for their time, their participation in the PC and for information and knowledge gained from interacting with them.
- ✓ Explain to the farmer or group of farmers the main objective of the exercise, stressing on the fact that our aim is to learn from them
- ✓ This exercise can be done with a group of farmers or individual farmers. Some questions may appear repetitive, but are meant to triangulate responses from different angles.
- ✓ If on individual farmer interview, the exercise should be undertaken in the field where the actual PCs are. This will enable the enumerator to observe and follow up on aspects that they observe, which the farmer might overlook.
- ✓ The exercises can be combined with other participatory exercises as deemed appropriate such as the Bao game of scoring, ranking exercises, using colored cards etc

This guide is produced within the IFAD-EU funded 'Restoration of degraded land for food security and poverty reduction in East Africa and the Sahel: taking successes in land restoration to scale' project (<http://www.worldagroforestry.org/project/restoration-degraded-land-food-security-and-poverty-reduction-east-africa-and-sahel-taking>).

This guide may be adapted to other projects wishing to elicit farmer feedback on the performance of options.

Section A: Farmers' understanding and interpretation of aims of the PCs

1. Which PC is the farmer involved in?
2. Why did you agree to be part of the PC (What did you expect to achieve)?
3. Have your expectations been met?
4. Give reasons for your answer above.

Section B: Farmers' evaluation of the performance of the various land restoration options

This section will provide us with the criteria that farmers use to assess the success and performance of technologies

5. How would you rate the overall performance of the land restoration option you were involved in?
Key: (VS- Very Successful, S- Successful, N- Neutral, U-Unsuccessful, VU-Very Unsuccessful)
6. Give reasons for your answer?
7. How would you rate the performance of the project?
Key: (VG- Very Good, S- Good, N- Neutral, P-Poor, VP-Very Poor)
8. *Farmer's self assessment-* How do you feel you performed in the implementation of the PC?
Key: (VG- Very Good, G- Good, N- Neutral, P-Poor, VP-Very Poor)
9. Reasons why you chose the answer above?
10. Give reasons for your answer.
11. What practices/options were easy to adhere to? Why?
12. What practices/options did you struggle with? Why?
13. How do you feel the various options you experimented with, within the PCs, performed compared with your farmer practice/control?
Triangulation questions-
14. From your view, what are the advantages of the various options you tried, if any?
15. From your view, what are the disadvantages of the various options you tried, if any?
16. Were there any challenges you encountered that limited your ability to implement the PC successfully?
17. If Yes, which challenge/s, and how did you address those challenges?
18. Did you engage in any modification of any the PCs?
19. If Yes, which modifications or additional practices; and what were the reasons for these practices?

Section C: Outcome mapping: Impacts of the land restoration options on farmer's livelihoods

The responses for the questions below will depend on the nature of option and will be influenced by how long it takes for impacts from the option to be realized.

20. Have you observed any changes in your livelihood that have been brought about by the adoption of the land restoration option?
21. What do you consider has changed in your livelihood with the adoption of the option?
22. Which of those changes do you consider to be positive, and why?
23. Which of those changes do you consider to be negative, and why?
24. Are there changes that have occurred with the adoption of the option that you did not expect or foresee?
25. Were the changes positive or negative for you; and why?

Section D: Lessons Learnt and Recommendations for Improving the implementation of the various PCs

26. What lessons have you learnt from the PC, if any?
27. What lessons do you feel the implementing project should learn from the PC, if any?
28. If any challenges were encountered, what should the project do to address those challenges?
29. Did you share your lessons/experiences with other farmers? Which lessons?
30. Did you learn any lesson from other farmers implementing the same PC?
31. If Yes, on what aspects?
32. Is there anything that you will do differently going forward?
33. Is there anything that the project should do differently going forward?
34. Going forward, are you planning to continue with the PC and/or other land restoration options? Why?

Section E: Needs Assessment

35. What skills have you acquired from your participation in this PC, if any?
36. Do you require additional skills to improve the performance of your activities?
37. Do you need any other form of support? Give reasons?
38. Going forward, are there any strategies you are planning to apply to improve the performance of the options compared in the PC?
39. If Yes, why have you not already implemented these strategies?

REFERENCES

- Ajayi, O. C. (2007). User acceptability of sustainable soil fertility technologies: Lessons from farmers' knowledge, attitude and practice in southern Africa. *Journal of sustainable agriculture*, 30(3), 21-40.
- Ashby, J.A., 1990. Evaluating technology with farmers: A handbook. CIAT Publication no. 187. Obtain from CIAT, Apartado Aereo 6713, Cali, Columbia. 95 pp
- Ashby, J.A., T. Garcia, M. Guerrero, C.A. Quiros, J.I. Roa, and J.A. Beltran. 1995. Institutionalizing farmer participation in adaptive technology testing with the CIAL. ODI Agricultural Research and Extension Network Paper No. 57. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute (ODI).
- Bellon, M. R. (2001). Participatory research methods for technology evaluation: A manual for scientists working with farmers. CIMMYT.
- Bellon, M.R., and J.E. Taylor. 1993. "Folk" soil taxonomy and the partial adoption of new seed varieties. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 41: 763-786
- Bentley, J.W. 1994. Facts, fantasies, and failures of farmer participatory research. *Agriculture and Human Values* 11: 140- 150
- CIMMYT Economics Program. 1993. The adoption of agricultural technology: A guide for survey design. Obtain from cimmyt@cgiar.org CIMMYT, Apdo. Postal 6-641, Mexico 6 DF, Mexico 88 pp.
- CIMMYT. 1988. From Agronomic Data to Farmer Recommendations: An Economics Training Manual. Completely revised edition. Mexico, D.F.: CIMMYT
- Coe, R., Sinclair, F., & Barrios, E. (2014). Scaling up agroforestry requires research 'in' rather than 'for' development. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 6, 73-77.
- Edwards, R.J.A. 1987. Farmers' knowledge: Utilization of farmers' soil and land classification in choice and evaluation of trials. Paper presented at the workshop, Farmers and Agricultural Research: Complementary Methods, 26-31 July, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, UK
- Franzel, S., Denning, G. L., Lillesø, J. P. B., & Mercado, A. R. (2004). Scaling up the impact of agroforestry: lessons from three sites in Africa and Asia. *Agroforestry systems*, 61(1), 329-344.
- Franzel, S.C. 1984. Modeling farmers' decisions in a farming system research exercise: The adoption of an improved maize variety in Kirinyaga District, Kenya. *Human Organization* 43: 199- 207
- Gladwin, C.H. 1979. Cognitive strategies and adoption decisions: A case study of nonadoption of an agronomic recommendation. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 28: 155-173
- Kiptot, E., Hebinck, P., Franzel, S., & Richards, P. (2007). Adopters, testers or pseudo-adopters? Dynamics of the use of improved tree fallows by farmers in western Kenya. *Agricultural systems*, 94(2), 509-519.
- Kuria A., Lamond G., Muthuri C., Mukuralinda A. and Sinclair F. (2013). Local knowledge study on the role of trees and associated management on food security in Gishwati, Rwanda- 'ACIAR Trees for Food Security' project

- Meijer, S. S., Catacutan, D., Ajayi, O. C., Sileshi, G. W., & Nieuwenhuis, M. (2015). The role of knowledge, attitudes and perceptions in the uptake of agricultural and agroforestry innovations among smallholder farmers in sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability*, 13(1), 40-54.
- Nyende, P., & Delve, R. J. (2004). Farmer participatory evaluation of legume cover crop and biomass transfer technologies for soil fertility improvement using farmer criteria, preference ranking and logit regression analysis. *Experimental agriculture*, 40(1), 77-88.
- Place, F. 1995. An ex-ante impact analysis of selected agroforestry technologies in the SALWA network. ICRAF. 16 pp.
- Quiros, C. A., Gracia, T., and Ashby, J. 1991. Farmer evaluations of technology: Methodology for open-ended evaluation. Instructional Unit No. 1. Obtain from CIAT (ciat@cgiar.org) Apartado Aereo 6713, Cali, Columbia Cali, Columbia. 91 pp.
- Sinclair, F.L. and Walker, D.H. (1998). Acquiring qualitative knowledge about complex agroecosystems. Part 1: Representation as natural language. *Agricultural Systems*, 56(3): 341-363.
- Smale, M., A. Aguirre, M. Bellon, J. Mendoza, and I. Manuel Rosas. 1999. Farmer Management of Maize Diversity in the Central Valleys of Oaxaca, Mexico: CIMMYT/INIFAP 1998 Baseline Socioeconomic Survey. CIMMYT Economics Working Paper 99-09. Mexico, D.F.: CIMMYT systems, 94(2), 509-519.
- Sperling, L., M.E. Loevinsohn, and B. Ntabomvura. 1993. Rethinking the farmer's role in plant breeding: Local bean experts and on-station selection in Rwanda. *Experimental Agriculture* 29: 509-519
- Tripp, R. 1989. Farmer participation in agricultural research: New directions or old problems? IDS Discussion Paper 226.
- Tripp, R., and J. Woolley. 1989. The Planning Stage of On-Farm Research: Identifying Factors for Experimentation. Mexico, D.F., and Cali, Colombia: CIMMYT and Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical (CIAT)
- Walker, D.H. and Sinclair, F.L. (1998). Acquiring qualitative knowledge about complex agroecosystems. Part 2: formal representation. *Agricultural Systems* 56(3):365-386.