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“Growing and raising food crops and animals in an urban setting for the purpose of feeding local populations”

(Goldstein, Bellis, Morse, Myers, & Ura, 2011, p. 4)

- Based on a greater focus on organics, sustainability, and food security
- Addresses food justice, food security, and community resilience
- Challenges include accessing consumers
  - Lack of marketing and processing infrastructure

(McClintock, 2017; Peters, 2010; Rogus & Dimitri, 2014)
### Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>the gap between urban farmers and the Extension service in Arkansas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine</td>
<td>the needs of urban farmers in Arkansas through semi-structured interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>the awareness, perceptions, and barriers of Cooperative Extension agents toward urban agriculture through a survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews with Urban Farmers
A Qualitative Investigation
“A community food system supports farmers and ranchers to sustainably produce a variety of local foods (Production), creates ways to move (Coordination) local foods to the places (Markets) where we live, work, learn, and play so that we value and have access to healthy, fresh food and clean water (Consumption) in our community.”

(Perez, 2016, p. 6)
Steps for CFSD Framework

1. REALIZE the value of community food system development and why community needs change
2. DESCRIBE your community qualities
3. UNDERSTAND the opportunities for change in your community food system
4. ASSESS current activities and interests in developing new practices
5. PLAN for new opportunities for better access to healthy, fresh foods
Needs Assessment

- Provides Extension educators with the ability to learn more about specific community needs
- Involves multiple groups (learners, educators, community members, etc.)
- Forms a baseline to guide future program development

(Schaefer, Huegel, & Mazzotti, 1992; Seevers & Graham, 2012)
Research Questions
for urban farmer interviews

What is the context of urban agriculture in Arkansas?

What research and resources would be most beneficial to Arkansas’ urban farmers?

How can Extension serve Arkansas’ urban farmers regarding resources, training, and technical assistance?
Interview Methods

- Instrument development
- Snowball sampling
- 16 interviews, 1 hour each
Data Analysis

- Transcription of audio files
- Hand-coding with Microsoft Word
- NVivo 10 to develop themes
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ1: What is the context of urban agriculture in Arkansas?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainable practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Small-scale, fewer than 10 acres, diversified, and sustainable farming within city limits that engages with the market, the community, or both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ2: What research and resources would be most beneficial to Arkansas’ urban farmers?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Production systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restrictions and interactions with city, policy, and zoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ 3: How can CES serve Arkansas’ urban farmers regarding resources, training, and technical assistance?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Take advantage and improve reputation of CES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand on points of contact with farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trainings and workshops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

- General needs were identified:
  - Market pricing and strategies
  - Co-ops
  - Access to appropriate equipment for small-scale farms
  - Maintenance/retention of an operational workforce
Conclusions

- What is the reputation of CES with Arkansas urban farmers?
  - Participants had positive perceptions of the helpfulness of CES
  - CES did not have enough resources specific to small-scale, organic-type farms
  - Most participants were open to increased communication and collaboration with CES
Conclusions

- Many participants were unable to articulate beyond their specific needs
  - Did not fully understand the scope of CES resources or did not believe CES resources related to their urban operations
  - Lack of understanding of CES involvement with local food programs
A Survey of County Agricultural Agents

A Quantitative Investigation
Understanding change-oriented activities through social movement literature helps contextualize the nature and limitations of alternative food and agricultural networks (Stevenson et al., 2017)

- **Warrior Work:**
  - Political arm of social change framework, acting as resistance to the dominant system

- **Builder Work:**
  - Reconstruction, and operates to create alternative food systems and models within the economic sector

- **Weaver Work:**
  - Develops linkages between the divergent actors warrior (political) and builder (economic) work
Determine if responses of agents in counties serving predominately metropolitan areas differ significantly from the responses of CEAs in counties serving non-metropolitan areas.

Determine agents' identified barriers and benefits to participating in urban agricultural programs.

Describe agents' self-reported ability to advise and assist urban farmers.

Describe agents' perceptions of urban agriculture.

Research Objectives for Extension agent survey
Survey Methods

- **Instrument development:**
  - Informed through qualitative interview data
  - Face and content validity supported by expert review (Agricultural Education, Communications, and Natural Resources)

- **Survey constructs:**
  - Perceptions
  - Awareness
  - Ability
  - Barriers

- Likert-type scale

- Pre-test with think-aloud questioning and pilot test
Data Analysis

57% RESPONSE RATE

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS TO ESTABLISH FREQUENCIES, MEANS, AND PERCENTAGES FOR EACH OBJECTIVE

Kruskal-Wallis (One-Way ANOVA) TEST TO COMPARE GROUPS
Results and Conclusions

Agents in less populous regions of Arkansas have differing perceptions and knowledge of urban farming.

Definition of urban farming in Arkansas developed in previous study was supported by these findings:

- 56% agreed with “small-scale, fewer than 10 acres, diversified, and sustainable farming within city limits that engages with the market, the community, or both”
- 65% agreed with “farming in and around urban areas”
- 60% agreed with “farming within city limits”
- 72% agreed with “farming that involves community”
Results and Conclusions

Participants described medium-to-low levels of sustainable practice usage in their counties:
- Contradicts the previous study
- Indicates high use of sustainable practices among urban farmers in the Northwest and Central regions of Arkansas

Observable benefits:
- Increased access to healthy food
- Urban agriculture can enhance community food security (Rogus & Dimitri, 2014)
**Results and Conclusions**

- **74.0%** believed “CES is a valuable resource for urban farmers”, but **62.0%** agreed “CES should provide more urban agriculture resources”
- Preferred program types by agents and urban farmers: face-to-face communication and on-site farm demonstrations
- **71.9%** indicated they were “not knowledgeable at all” or “slightly knowledgeable” about urban farming
- **40.3%** of participants indicated that they were “confident” or “very confident” of their ability to assist urban agricultural clients

**Assisting Urban Agricultural Clients**

**Future research**

- Investigate why agents report little knowledge of urban agriculture but higher confidence in assisting urban farmers
Results and Conclusions

Assisting Urban Agricultural Clients

42.1% disagreed that it is difficult to assist urban farmers

Potential for increased collaboration between CES and urban farmers

50% agreed that “there is not enough need for it in my county”

66.6% of participants were from counties with populations 50,000 or below

May be an indicator of how the rurality of a state affects urban farming growth
Conclusions for the Mixed-Method Approach

What did we learn from the overall investigation?
Needs assessments allow trust building between CES and these populations. Increases the visibility and knowledge of CES. Could encourage increased participation and use of CES programs and resources.

Bridges populations that have not traditionally worked together.

Relationships between CES and alternative food systems should be categorized by cooperation, dialogue, and co-learning (Reynolds, 2011). Needs assessments are a unique tool that allows the integration of all three concepts.
Implications for Practice

- Understanding the perceptions and knowledge of agricultural agents regarding urban and sustainable agriculture
  - Growing aspect of the agricultural sector, often populated in Arkansas by people with non-traditional agricultural backgrounds
    - May not understand all services and resources available through CES
  - Understanding the baseline data of perceptions, knowledge, and barriers of CEAs will help with future programming in urban, sustainable agriculture
Other states are encouraged to conduct mixed-methods needs assessments with urban or sustainable producers and the county agents who could potentially provide them with information and resources.

Needs assessments provide CES with valuable information

Determine a local definition of urban farming to guide future program development
Curricular Applications

- Currently working with Arkansas Extension Specialists to develop a local foods curriculum and training for Arkansas Extension agents.

- College curriculum is mainly focused on traditional agriculture.
  - Curriculum appropriate for non-traditional agriculture students to prevent barriers between conventional and sustainable agriculturalists in the field.
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