

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract in English	v
Abstract in Thai	vii
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xii
List of Figures	xiii
Abbreviations	xiv
CHAPTER I Introduction	
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Rationale	3
1.3 Objectives	4
1.4 Usefulness of the study	5
CHAPTER II Literature Review	
2.1 Integrated Pest Management	6
2.2 Chronology of farmer field school	10
2.3 Limitation of farmer field school	12
2.4 Farmer field school approach	12
2.5 Farmers' training	18
CHAPTER III Research Methods	
3.1 Scope and limitation of the study	21
3.2 Selection of farmer respondent	21
3.3 Data collection	22
3.3.1 Secondary data	22
3.3.2 Primary data	22
3.3.2.1 Household survey	23
3.3.2.2 Key informant interview	24
3.4 Data analysis	24

CHAPTER IV	General Profile and Production System of the Study Area	
4.1	Agro-ecological feature	26
4.2	Demographic setting	27
4.3	Socioeconomic setting	27
4.3.1	Land use	27
4.3.2	Income sources	29
4.3.3	Utilization of income	30
4.4	Vegetable production	30
4.4.1	Cabbage production	31
4.4.2	Cropping pattern	32
4.4.3	Farmers' practices	33
4.4.4	Constraint in farmers' practices	36
CHAPTER V	Farmer Field School	
5.1	Typical IPM farmer field school	39
5.2	Key process of farmer field school	41
5.2.1	Planning	41
5.2.2	The learning cycle-observation, analysis and action	41
5.2.3	Developing agro-ecological knowledge	42
5.2.4	Developing capacity for collective action	43
5.2.5	Motivation and sustaining interest	43
5.2.6	Facilitation	43
5.3	Characteristics of the farmer field school approach	44
5.3.1	Farmers as expert	44
5.3.2	The field is the primary learning material	44
5.3.3	Extension worker as facilitator not teacher	45
5.3.4	Curriculum is integrated	45
5.3.5	Training follows the seasonal cycle	45
5.3.6	Regular group meetings	46
5.3.7	Learning materials are learner generated	46
5.3.8	Group dynamics/team building	46
5.4	FFS curriculum	46

CHAPTER VI	Assessment of FFS Approach for IPM	
6.1	Farmers' profile on accessing to the IPM program	50
6.1.1	Respondent features	51
6.1.2	IPM farmers' setting	53
6.2	Effectiveness of IPM practice on cabbage production	53
6.2.1	Productivity	53
6.2.2	Profitability	57
6.3	Implementation of IPM practices	59
6.4	Effectiveness of farmer field school approach	62
6.4.1	Farmers' knowledge of natural enemies, pests and diseases	62
6.4.2	The use of fertilizers	65
6.4.3	The use of pesticides	67
6.4.4	Advantages and disadvantages of farmer field school	69
6.4.5	Effectiveness of farmer field school approach for IPM practices	74
6.5	Potential for diffusion of IPM program	75
CHAPTER VII	Conclusion and Recommendations	
7.1	Conclusion	78
7.2	Recommendations	80
	References	83
	Appendices	91
	Curriculum vitae	97

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page
1. Indicative numbers from member countries of FAO community IPM program in Asia implementing IPM field schools (through 2000)	15
2. TOT and FFS compared according to key dimension	17
3. Distribution of sample size	22
4. Composition household head by gender	27
5. Land use information of Samraong commune	28
6. Source of annual income in both villages	29
7. Farmer field school curriculum on cabbage	47
8. Farmer access to IPM program at Samraong commune	51
9. Educational status and farm experiences of the sampled farmers	52
10. Cabbage field size	52
11. Average productivity of cabbage among the three groups of farmer	54
12. Worksheet for deriving average unit productivity values of inputs use on cabbage production per hectare of IPM farmer	55
13. Worksheet for deriving average unit productivity values of inputs use on cabbage production per hectare of non-IPM farmer-1	56
14. Worksheet for deriving average unit productivity values of inputs use on cabbage production per hectare of non-IPM farmer-2	57
15. Average profitability of cabbage production among the three groups	58
16. Summary of the acceptability index value of IPM practices	61
17. Percentage of farmer who could identify natural enemies	63
18. Percentage of farmer who could identify insect pests	64
19. Percentage of farmer who could identify diseases	65
20. The stage of fertilizer application of IPM farmer	66
21. Advantages of farmer field school for IPM program	70
22. Disadvantage of farmer field school for IPM program	73
23. Discussion result of workshop by IPM staff and IPM farmers	75
24. Factors for dissemination of IPM program by IPM staff and IPM farmers	76
25. Potential factors for dissemination of IPM program by non-IPM farmer-2	77

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures	Page
1. Conceptual framework of the study	20
2. Distribution of rainfall and temperature by month in Siem Reap province	26
3. Percentage of land used for different purposes in Samraong commune	28
4. Utilization of farmers' income	30
5. Cropping pattern in Samraong commune	32
6. Productivity of cabbage in different farms	55
7. Profitability of cabbage production in different farms	58
8. Average in different fertilizers used by farmer groups in cabbage production (kg/ha/yr)	66
9. Type of pesticides used by farmer groups	69
10. Lesson learned by participation in farmer field school training	72
11. Effectiveness of FFS approach for IPM practice on cabbage production	74

ABBREVIATIONS

AVRDC	Asian Vegetables Research Development Center
AusAID	The Australian Government's overseas aid program
CEDAC	Cambodian Center for Study and Development in Agriculture
DAALI	Department of Agronomy and Agricultural Land Improvement
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
EJF	Environmental Justice Foundation
EU	European Union
FFS	Farmer Field School
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
ICM	Integrated Crop Management
IDRC	International Development Research Center
IPC	Integrated Pest Control
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IPPM	Integrated Plant Production Management
IRRI	International Rice Research Institute
KKVRC	Kbal Kor Vegetable Research Station
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Cambodia
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
ToT	Training of trainers
TOT	Transfer of Technology
UNDP	United Nation Development Program
UPWARD	Users' Perspectives With Agricultural Research and Development
WBG	World Bank Group
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organization
R	Riel, Cambodian currency (1US\$= 4,065 R)