

EFFECTS OF EXTENSION SERVICES ON THE USE OF IMPROVED POST-HARVEST TECHNOLOGIES ON MAIZE

A CASE STUDY OF MUNARYA SUBCOUNTY, KAPCHORWA DISTRICT

BY

KIPTO PRINCE MWANGA

REG.NO: BU/UP/2019/1070

EMAIL: kiptoprince@gmail.com

TELL: +256770979441/+256752361687

A DESERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRIBUSINESS AND EXTENSION AS PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS LEADING TO THE AWARD OF A BACHELOR'S DEGREE IN AGRIBUSINESS

MAY 2023

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this work titled "Effects of extension services on the use of improved postharvest handling technologies on maize- a case study of Munarya sub county, Kapchorwa district" is truly my original work and it has never been submitted in any institution for any academic award.

Student

KIPTO PRINCE MWANGA

Signature.

Date 5th TUNE: 2023.

DEDICATION

I would like to take this opportunity to dedicate this thesis to my beloved parents Mr. Mwanga Michael and Mrs. ChemutaiDoreen, my beloved sisters Yeko Prossy.M, Cherop Favour .M and my siblings for their endless support, spirituallysocially and financially. I also dedicate this dissertation report to my colleagues who have been the greatest pillars to the completion of this research and lastly to the most beloved supervisor Mr. Iisa Augustine for his endless effort in guiding me to complete the research study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Great thanks to God the whole mighty who has given me the gift of life, knowledge and wisdom enabling me to complete this research study. I extend my sincere heartfelt thanks to my supervisor Mr. Iisa Augustine and my fellow colleagues for the continuous support and encouragement till the completion of this research and lastly great thanks to the department of Agribusiness, Busitema University which played a key role in acquisition of the general knowledge and skills in carrying out this study

APPROVAL

This report titled "Effects of extension services on the use of improved post-harvest handling technologies on maize- a case study of Munarya sub county, Kapchorwa district" is submitted by the approval of my supervisor

MR. IISA AUGUSTINE	
Signature. Fluy?	
Date Och Time	2023

Table of Contents

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
APPROVAL	Error! Bookmark not defined.
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Problem statement	2
1.2 objectives	3
1.2.1. General objective	3
1.2.2. Specific objectives	3
1.3. Research questions	4
1.4. Hypotheses	4
1.5. Significance of the study	4
1.6. Justification of the study	4
1.7. Scope of the study	5
1.7.1 Geographical scope	5
1.7.2 Content scope	5
CHAPTER TWO	7
2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.1. Introduction	7
2.2. Maize production in Uganda	7
2.2.1. Constraints of maize production	7
2.3. Post-harvest losses	8
2.3.1. Drying	9
2.3.2. Shelling / threshing	9
2.3.4. Storage	10
2.4. Extension services	12
2.4.1. Relevancy of extension services	12
2.4.2. Empirical studies	12

CHAPTER THREE	14
3.0. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	14
3.1. Introduction	14
3.2. Research Design	14
3.3. Geographical description of the study area	14
3.4. Population description of the study	14
3.5. Sampling strategies	15
3.6. Data sources	16
3.7. Data collection methods	16
3.7.1 Interview method	16
3.7.2 Questionnaire method	16
3.8. Data collection procedure	17
3.8.1 Ethical issues	17
3.8.2 Data management	17
3.9. Data quality control	17
3.9.1 Validity of instruments	17
3.9.2 Reliability of the instruments	18
4.0 Data analysis	18
CHAPTER FOUR	19
4.0. STUDY FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	19
4.1. Introduction	19
4.2 Biodata characteristics of sampled households	19
4.3. Post-harvest handling technologies used by farmers	21
4.4. Extension and support services	24
CHAPTER FIVE	29
5.0 CONCLUSSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	29
5.1 Introduction	29
5.2 Conclusions	29
5.3 Recommendations	30
REFERENCES	31
Appendixes	34
Annandix and	24

T TO	$\mathbf{T} \cap$	100	TI	TITE	DIC
LIS'	LU) K	HIU	TUI	KHO

Figure 1 showing how farmers got the knowledge on the use of the different PHHTs......27

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 characteristics of respondents and methods of data collection used	16
Table 2 social demographic characteristics of sampled households	20
Table 3showing the factors that influenced the use of a given technology	23
Table 4 showing roles played by extension service providers and demo farmers	24
Table 5showing the number of extension and support visits received by farmers	25
Table 6showing the different extension and support services received by farmers	2 <i>6</i>

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

PHL Post-Harvest Losses

PHHTs Post-Harvest Handling Technologies

PHHS Post-Harvest Handling and Storage

PHT Post-Harvest Technologies

NAADs National Agricultural Advisory services

APHLIS African Post-Harvest Losses Information System

AGRA Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa

FOA Food and Agriculture Organisation

MM Millimetres

UBOS Uganda Bureau of statistics

MT/HA Metric tons / Hectare

ACDP Agriculture Cluster Development Project

MAAIF Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries

SPSS Statistical Packages for social Scientists

ABSTRACT

High PHL have constrained maize production after Harvesting which is mainly caused by the different PHHTs used and these are either the traditional PHHTs or the improved PHHHTs. This study aimed to determine the effects of extension services on the use of the improved PHHTs in Munarya subcounty, Kapchorwa district. The improved PHHTs are associated with minimized PHL. Cross-sectional data was collected from 75 randomly sampled farmers, 2 extension service providers and 3 maize buyers/ demo farmers that were selected purposively. Prepared structured questionnaires were filled by the help of selected enumerators who were trained. Tarpaulins, shelling machines, sacks, plastic silos and traditional crib were the most used improved PHHTs. Farmers gave different reasons for their choice of a given technology and some of the reasons included, ease to use, accessibility in shops and efficiency and the cost of the technology. Extension and support services contributed positively to the use of the different improved PHHTs such as tarpaulins and sacks that were received as subsidy's under ACDP and farmers had severalcontacts with extension stuffs and these involved training on the use of the improved PHHTs. Finally the study recommended the government to increase on the extension stuff at the subcounty because most farmers weren't able to receive extension due to the limited stuff, access to credit facilities was also one of the main issues recommended that had an impact on the limited use of the improved PHHTs because most farmers were unable to own the improved PHHTs due to their expensive nature and in the near future this will increase the use of the improved PHHTs hence minimizing PHL ,minimizing food insecurity and also improving the standards ofliving ofthe farmers

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Maize was introduced in Uganda in 1861 and by 1900 it was an established cropBalirwa, 1992 and has since become a major part of the farming system ranking first in importance among the main cereal crops (maize ,finger millet , sorghum, rice , pearl millet and wheat) in that order as grown in the country . Maize is believed to have originated from Central America; a region which was dominated by 2 wild maize Teosinte and Zea Mexicana. An archaeological study of the bat caves in New Mexico revealed corncobs that were 5,600 years old by radiocarbon determination and most historians believe that corn was domesticated in the Tehuacana Valley of MexicoBalungi, 2016.

The cereal is planted on about 887,000 hectares (ha), which is 13% of total area planted with crops and produces an estimated 1,272 thousand tons annually UBOS, 2010. About 55% of the maize is produced in Eastern Uganda, with Kapchorwa District as one of the leading producers Mwebaze et al., 2011. According to UBOS, 2020 Maize production in Uganda declined from 2,866 thousand tons In 2016 to 2,483 thousand tons in 2017 and several factors were attributed to this however such as fluctuating prices, the prevalence of pests, diseases such as the army warm and the very high post-harvest losses that are in most cases less considered as a major issue in terms of decline in maize production and this happens at farm level.

Maize production is constrained by high post-harvest losses especially at farm level, in Uganda aggregating losses across thousands of individual farmers indicates that national maize losses are about 15% of annual productionMwebaze & Mugisha, 2011 and in general cereals post-harvest loses can reach up to 50% annuallyKiaya, 2014 to a greater extend this is attributed to the adoption rate of improved post-harvest technologies amongst farmers. The post-harvest loses on maize may affect either the quality or size of the grains and these occur along the different stages such as threshing, storage,drying,transportation, packaging and other post-harvest handling processes.

The concern for the high PHL prompted the Government of Uganda and development partners to launch intervention programs to minimize losses through improved PHT. During 1996 to 2002,

REFERENCES

- AGRA. (2013). Africa Agriculture Status Report. Nucl. Phys., 13(1), 104–116.
- Balirwa, E. K. (1992). Maize research and production in uganda.
- Balungi, B. (2016). Post-harvest handling technologies and maize farmers 'income in mid-west uganda, masindi and kiryandongo districts.
- Costa, S. J. (2015). Taking it to scale: *Post-Harvest Loss Eradication in Uganda 2014 2015.* WFP, December.
- Harding, T., & Whitehead, D. (2013). Analysing data in qualitative research. Methods and Appraisal for Evidence-Based Practice, 193(5), 141–160.
- Jaspreet Aulakh, A. R. (2013). Post-Harvest Food Losses Estimation -Development Consistent Methodology, 2050, 1–34.
- Jonathan Kaminski, L. C. (2014). Post-Harvest Loss in Sub-Saharan Africa What Do Farmers Say?
- Kiaya, V. (2014). Post-harvest losses and strategies to reduce them acf,.
- Kugyendaira Edwin. (2017). Factors Affecting Maize Production among the People in Kyegegwa District.
- Livingstone, M. J. (2010). Determinants of Maize Production in Uganda(a case study of Baitambogwe sub-county in Mayuge district)
- Matos, P., & Elkhidir. (2016). Logistics Capacity Development: Post-Harvest Food Loss Reduction in Uganda through improved Storage and Handling at the start of the Supply Chain. *Standard Project Report 2016*.
- Menya. (2010). Effect of agricultural inputs and extension services on household crop production

- in Uganda.
- Midamba, D. C., & Kizito, O. (2022). Determinants of access to trainings on post harvest loss management among maize farmers in Uganda: logi. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 10(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2022.2148359
- Mildred B, M. G. (2016). Uganda's Agricultural Extension Systems: How appropriate is the Single Spine Structure? 16.
- Musinguzi, I. (n.d.). The impact of access to agricultural services on maize productivity in Uganda. *1*–38.
- Mutungi, C., Abass, A., Fischer, G., & Kotu, B. (2022). Improved technologies for reducing post-harvest losses. In Sustainable Agricultural Intensification: *A Handbook for Practitioners in East and Southern Africa* (pp. 91–105). CAB International. https://doi.org/10.1079/9781800621602.0007
- Mwebaze, P., & Mugisha, J. (2011). Adoption, utilisation and economic impacts of improved post-harvest technologies in maize production in Kapchorwa District, Uganda. *Int.J. Postharvest Technology and Innovation*, 2(3), 301–327. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPTI.2011.043328
- Ngowi, E. R., & Selejio, O. (2019). Post-harvest Loss and Adoption of Improved Post-harvest Storage Technologies by Smallholder Maize Farmers in Tanzania. *African Journal of Economic Review*, 249–267.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2017). Chapter 4. Research Design and Methodology. *Leadership and Management in Universities*, 2003, 67–95. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110853681-006
- Sebaggala, R., & Matovu, F. (2020). Effects of Agricultural Extension Services on Farm Productivity in Uganda Effects of Agricultural Extension Services on Farm Productivity in Uganda.
- Shee, Apurba, sarah Mayanja, Eria simba, T. anya stathers. (2019). Determinants of postharvest losses along smallholder producers maize and Sweetpotato value chains : an ordered Probit analysis.

- Shukla, S. (2020). Concept of population and sample. June.
- Singano, C. D., Mvumi, B. M., & Stathers, T. E. (2019). Effectiveness of grain storage facilities and protectants in controlling stored-maize insect pests in a climate-risk prone area of Shire Valley, Southern Malawi. *Journal of Stored Products Research*, 83, 130–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jspr.2019.06.007
- Singh, A. S., & Masuku, M. (2014). Sampling Techniques and Determination of Sample Size in Applied Statistics: an overview. (Issue November)
- Suleiman, R. A., & Rosentrater, K. A. (2022). Grain storage in developing countries. *Storage of Cereal Grains and Their Products*, 113–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-812758-2.00018-0
- Tefera, T., & Abass, A. (2012). Improved postharvest technologies for promoting food storage, processing, and household nutrition in Tanzania. *International Institute of Tropical Agriculture*, *October*, 1–19. www.africarising.net
- UBOS. (2018). Annual Agricultural Survey 2018 Statistical Release (p. 4).
- UBOS. (2020). Uganda bureau of statistics2020 Statistical Abstract. *Ubos*, *1*, 303. http://www.ubos.org/onlinefiles/uploads/ubos/pdf documents/abstracts/Statistical Abstract 2013.pdf
- Urassa. (2015). Factors influencing maize crop production at household levels: A case of Rukwa Region in the southern highlands of Tanzania. *African Journal of Agricultural Research*, 10(10), 1097–1106. https://doi.org/10.5897/ajar2014.9262