

Effectiveness of Pesticide Safety Training on Farmers' Knowledge and Practices in Vegetable Production: Evidence from Small-Scale Farmers in Kasena Nankana Municipality, Upper East Region of Ghana

Afishata Mohammed Abujaja

Jacob Pwoawuvi

Department of Agricultural and Consumer Sciences Education,
University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana

[Doi:10.19044/esj.2026.v22n30p197](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2026.v22n30p197)

Submitted: 30 June 2026

Accepted: 28 October 2026

Published: 31 October 2026

Copyright 2026 Author(s)

Under Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

OPEN ACCESS

Cite As:

Abujaja, A.M., & Pwoawuvi, J. (2026). *Effectiveness of Pesticide Safety Training on Farmers' Knowledge and Practices in Vegetable Production: Evidence from Small-Scale Farmers in Kasena Nankana Municipality, Upper East Region of Ghana*. European Scientific Journal, ESJ, 22 (30), 197. <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2026.v22n30p197>

Abstract

The current study examined the use of pesticides and their safety practices among smallholder vegetable farmers in the Kassena-Nankana Municipality of the Upper East Region, Ghana. A sample size of 95 vegetable farmers who engaged in dry-season vegetable farming was considered. Data collection was done using an interview guide and a structured questionnaire, and data analysis was done using descriptive statistics, including frequencies, means, and standard deviations. The most cultivated vegetable was pepper (49%), followed by garden eggs (26%) and tomatoes (25%). Generally, 64.2% of farmers claimed that they had taken pesticide safety training in the last two years, whereas 35.8% did not take any pesticide safety training. Of the total farmers who took the training, the majority (83.6%) found the training useful, while 16.4% felt otherwise. Mostly, 54.1% of the training was conducted in farmers' fields, and hence the importance of a practical approach cannot be overstated. Insecticides were the most commonly used pesticides (74.7%), followed by fungicides (15.8%) and herbicides/rodenticides (9.5%). While 58.9% of farmers knew about the health effects of pesticides, 41.1% were ignorant of them. Similarly, 65.3% were unaware of government-banned pesticides,

raising concerns about the potential use of prohibited products. Economic considerations strongly influenced pesticide selection, with 47.4% citing price and 31.6% citing potency. More than half (51.6%) reported not using personal protective equipment (PPE) during pesticide application. The study recommends strengthening continuous, participatory pesticide safety education with particular emphasis on pesticide regulatory knowledge and awareness of government-banned and prohibited pesticides. Given that 65.3% of respondents were unaware of government-banned pesticides, targeted awareness campaigns should clearly communicate which pesticides are banned, the reasons for their prohibition, and the potential health and environmental consequences of their use. Such information should be made accessible through agricultural extension services, community outreach, local-language communication, pictorial materials, demonstrations, and appropriate media channels. In addition, improved access to affordable personal protective equipment (PPE) and stronger collaboration among farmers, agro-input dealers, extension personnel, and regulatory institutions are recommended to promote compliance with pesticide regulations and reduce health and environmental risks associated with unsafe pesticide use.

Keywords: Effectiveness, safety training, pesticide, farmers' knowledge, vegetable production

Introduction

Increased production of crops to satisfy the growing food demand has led to increased demand for pesticides for various agricultural activities such as land clearing, control of pests and diseases and storage. Pesticides are utilised to control weeds, insect pests, and diseases in crop production, including fruit and vegetable farming. Their benefits must be balanced against risks arising from inappropriate selection, handling, application, and disposal (Tudi *et al.*, 2021).

Recent Ghanaian studies document widespread pesticide use in tomato and cocoa production, together with gaps in safe-use practices (Adjei *et al.*, 2024; Boateng *et al.*, 2023). Historically, approximately 21 different types of pesticides were imported into Ghana for agricultural purposes between 1995 and 2000. More recent evidence indicates that pesticide use in Ghana has become considerably more diverse, with studies documenting the use of numerous insecticides, fungicides, and herbicides among farmers. For example, Bandanaa *et al.* (2024) identified 15 insecticides, 8 fungicides, and 6 weedicides used by tomato farmers in the Bono and Ahafo regions, including some products that were not registered for agricultural use in Ghana.

Chemical pesticides remain important inputs in global agriculture, where they are used to control weeds, insects, and crop diseases. Global

agricultural pesticide use reached approximately 3.73 million tonnes of active ingredients in 2023, representing roughly a twofold increase since 1990 (FAO, 2025). In Ghana, recent studies have documented the presence of organochlorine pesticide residues, including DDT and hexachlorocyclohexane (HCH) isomers, in vegetables sold in local markets (*Kumah et al.*, 2023). A systematic review of pesticide residues in Ghanaian foods further reported that 83.3% of the 2,729 food samples examined across the included studies contained detectable pesticide residues, with DDT-related compounds and HCH among the frequently reported organochlorines (*Ahiabor & Donkor*, 2025). These findings highlight concerns regarding pesticide contamination and the need for continued monitoring. Furthermore, research among cocoa farmers in Ghana has identified shortcomings in pesticide application practices, demonstrating that farmers' knowledge does not always translate into appropriate use (Knowledge, perception, and pesticide application practices among smallholder cocoa farmers in four Ghanaian cocoa-growing regions, 2023). Earlier research on pesticide management in Ghana also associated the availability of cheap, mislabelled, and adulterated pesticide products with inadequate farmer knowledge, ineffective regulatory enforcement, and commercial incentives (Pesticide registration, distribution and use practices in Ghana, 2018).

Regardless of the importance of pesticide use in crop production, the increased and inappropriate use and handling have resulted in increased environmental and human health problems. The increased and inappropriate use of pesticides, especially in vegetable farming, in Ghana is a source of concern because most consumers get their vegetables directly from farmers, and these vegetables have not been properly treated. Pesticide exposure remains a public health concern among agricultural workers in Ghana. *Ntow et al.* (2008) detected persistent organochlorine pesticide residues, including DDT-related compounds, in breast milk and serum samples collected from vegetable farmers in Ghana, demonstrating human exposure to these contaminants. More recent research has continued to document concerns about occupational pesticide exposure, unsafe handling practices, and self-reported health symptoms among Ghanaian farmers (A political ecology of farmers' exposure to pesticides in Ghana, 2023; *Norvivor et al.*, 2025). Similarly, *Mattah et al.* (2015) identified shortcomings in the use of personal protective equipment and the disposal of pesticide containers among farmers in the Ashaiman irrigation scheme. These findings underscore the importance of pesticide safety education, appropriate protective equipment, and effective regulatory enforcement. Historical reports also documented suspected pesticide-poisoning deaths in Ghana's Upper East Region in late 2010, reportedly associated with improper pesticide storage and contamination of food stocks (NPAS, 2012, as summarized in the African Development Bank's

pest management report). Seven people in the Northern Region died as a result of eating beans contaminated with atrazine, according to Der et al. (2013). A recent documentary titled 'Poison on The Menu' by Joseph Gakpo of Joy News reveals how the increasing misuse and wrong timing of pesticide use contaminates the food we consume every day (Joynews Doc, 2019).

A survey of Ghanaian farmers showed that a little below fifty percent of farmers had received such training from the Department of Agriculture and the rest from local NGOs (NPAS, 2012). According to Barau and Yelwa (2024), lack of training on the appropriate application of pesticides and non-adherence to good agronomic practices (GAP) expose farmers more to the dangers of pesticides. NPAS (2012) reports that the increased rate of misuse of pesticides with the accompanying problems, is because relevant stakeholders and other agencies have failed to provide the needed education, training and supervision to ensure compliance with safety in pesticide application. Training of farmers in pesticide use is especially important since research findings indicate that most farmers cannot read and write. Notwithstanding the risk that the misuse of pesticides poses to human health and the environment, there is limited research on how relevant and effective the training received is on safe pesticide practices, especially in vegetable farming (Christos and Spyridon, 2017).

The study, in this regard, seeks to examine the relevance and effectiveness of training on farmers' knowledge on pesticides, behavior towards safety and pesticide application practices in vegetable farming. The findings of the research will generate information for designing relevant and effective training programs or policies on safe pesticide use for sustained vegetable production. It is also to create a platform for removing the bottlenecks in the vegetable production sector regarding the use of pesticide.

Conceptual Framework

The study employed the Health Belief Model (HBM). The HBM is a psychological framework used to predict and explain health behaviors by emphasising individual attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs (Alamer, 2024; Alyafei, 2024). Following its development in the 1950s, the HBM suggests that the individual's tendency to engage in health behavior is determined by four major variables, namely: perceived threat (susceptibility and severity), perceived benefits and barriers, cues to action, and self-efficacy (Alyafei & Raul, 2025). According to the theory, there are six constructs that affect the probability of an individual engaging in preventative or management health practices. In particular, the HBM underlines that people assess threats associated with health and determine what actions to take based on the significance of their goal as well as the chance of reaching this goal. In this way, the HBM can be used for evaluating the efficiency of community-based

programs, education and promotion practices, and prevention of chronic diseases.

In relation to the topic, the concept of pesticide safety training is the independent variable since it acts as a cue to action as well as a modifying variable. The independent variable directly increases the level of farmers' knowledge (level one outcome). Consequently, there is a series of constructs of the HBM associated with the impact of training, namely: perceived susceptibility (the probability of being exposed to pesticides), perceived severity (consequences of pesticides' use and exposure), perceived benefits (advantages of safe practices), and perceived barriers (factors preventing them from following safe practices). Besides, training increases self-efficacy, contributing to people's confidence in performing safety-related practices.

All mentioned perception-based constructs mediate the influence of knowledge on behaviors related to pesticide safety practices (for example, wearing personal protective equipment, correct use of pesticides, proper storage, etc.). The role of socio-demographic variables, such as age, education, and farming experience as well as the size of the farm (the number of acres and employees), is to act as moderating variables. That is, the effectiveness of training affects knowledge and perceptions (which influence safety practices).




Figure 1: Conceptual framework. Source: Adapted from Sung (2021)

Methodology

Study Area

The Upper East Region has fifteen (15) districts, including Kassena-Nankana Municipality. Before the western portion of the district was divided to form Kassena-Nankana District on February 29, 2008, it was part of the then-larger Kassena-Nankana District in 1988. As a result, the remaining portion was renamed Kassena-Nankana East District. On June 28, 2012, it was given municipal assembly status and became Kassena-Nankana Municipal District.

It is roughly located between latitudes 11°10' and 10°3' North and longitudes 10°1' West. Its political capital is Navrongo. The municipality shares boundaries with seven (7) districts and one neighbouring country. It is bounded to the north by Kassena Nankana West District and Burkina Faso, East by Bolgatanga Municipality, West by Builsa South District and Builsa North District, South by West Mamprusi Municipality. The entire land area of the municipality is 767 square kilometers. The vegetation type is Sahel and Sudan savanna, covered with savanna grassland with short trees. It has a total population of 109,944, comprising 51.2% female and 48.8% male (Ghana Statistical Service [GSS], 2021). The average household size is 5.4 (GSS, 2021). The major economic sectors in the municipality include agriculture; wholesale and retail trade, including the repair of motorcycles and vehicles (9.1%); manufacturing (8.8%); education (4.1%); accommodation and food services (2.6%); and construction (1.3%). The majority (82.7%) of households depend on agriculture for their livelihoods. The municipality has one of the biggest irrigation dams (Tono) for dry-season cultivation of rice, maize and vegetables. The majority of the people depend on vegetable farming, especially during the dry season, for income and livelihood. The main vegetables grown are pepper, tomatoes and onions. The target population was mainly all (commercial and smallholder) vegetable farmers in the Kassena Nankana municipality.

Sampling Procedure

Respondents were selected using a multistage sampling technique to facilitate systematic selection and coverage of the study population across different sampling units. This approach is particularly useful when the target population is geographically dispersed, as it allows the researcher to select participants in successive stages while making the sampling process more manageable. However, the representativeness of the final sample depends on the appropriate implementation of the sampling procedure at each stage (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). This procedure uses a combination of sampling procedures and techniques in sampling the population. For the purpose of this research, three (3) steps were used. In the first step, the Upper East Region

was deliberately chosen because of the high production of vegetables. Secondly, Kassena-Nankana Municipality, which is noted for the cultivation of vegetables, was randomly chosen from the several vegetable-producing districts in the Region. Purposive sampling was used to select ten (10) communities in the district that are engaged in vegetable production and have received training. In the final stage, a simple random sampling technique was used to choose ninety-five (95) vegetable producers.

Sample Size

The sample size was determined using Slovin's formula (1960) with an error of 5% and 95% confidence level as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

where: n= sample size; N= total population; e = error margin

$$n = \frac{125}{1 + 125(0.05)^2}$$

n= 95

The researcher then sampled 95 vegetable farmers using a sampling frame of 125 dry season vegetable farmers.

Data Sources

The information obtained included both primary and secondary information for analysis. The primary information was obtained by means of a questionnaire, face-to-face interviews, and key informant interviews. The secondary data was obtained from a review of documentation from MOFA, technical reports, articles, published journals and policy briefs on pesticide use among vegetable farmers.

Data Collection Tools

The data were gathered using the following research instruments: a structured questionnaire and an interview guide to solicit information. Questionnaires are advantageous because they are relatively inexpensive and time-efficient, particularly when respondents provide their responses promptly. However, the use of questionnaires has some limitations. It may be difficult to verify the accuracy of information provided by respondents, particularly when the questions require participants to recall past events or report on their practices. In addition, self-administered questionnaires may be difficult to use with respondents who have limited literacy, necessitating the assistance of trained enumerators and, where necessary, translation into local languages. Such administration may introduce variations in how questions are understood and answered. Questionnaires may also limit opportunities for researchers to probe responses or obtain additional information beyond the questions included in the instrument.

The interview guide helped to elicit information through verbal questioning using a guide. Interviews enabled the researcher to obtain more detailed and comprehensive information because the interviewer could probe respondents' answers, seek clarification, and explore issues in greater depth. The opportunity to probe and clarify responses can enhance the completeness and quality of information obtained from respondents (Knott *et al.*, 2022; Conrad & Schober, 2021). Interviews may also achieve relatively higher response rates than self-administered questionnaires because of the direct interaction between the interviewer and respondent. Despite these advantages, interviews have some limitations. They are relatively time-consuming and may therefore be less suitable for collecting data from a large number of respondents. In addition, interviewer behaviour, question wording, and the manner in which probing is conducted may influence respondents' answers and introduce interviewer bias (Walcott *et al.*, 2024; Conrad & Schober, 2021). Poorly worded or leading questions and inappropriate probing can potentially affect the accuracy and validity of the information collected (National Center for Health Statistics, 2024). Therefore, interviewers need to be adequately trained and should use standardized, neutral questioning and non-directive probing techniques to minimize potential bias.

Data Analysis

The data were organized in Excel and analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. The results were presented using pie charts, bar charts, tables and figures.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the results and discusses the findings of the study in relation to the research objectives. It begins by describing the socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents, thereby providing the contextual background for interpreting subsequent findings. Moreover, the section goes ahead to examine the types of vegetable crops grown; farmers' exposure to pesticide safety training; the knowledge farmers have about the safe use and handling of pesticides; and the way they handle pesticides with regard to mixing, application, storage, and disposal of pesticides. Whenever necessary, the analysis takes into consideration the significance of the findings in terms of pesticide safety, occupational safety, agricultural extension and sustainable vegetable crop production. The results will be compared with previous empirical studies wherever possible.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Farmers

It is necessary to take into consideration the socio-demographic features of farmers when trying to interpret agricultural practices, decision-making, and reactivity to interventions (*Biesheuvel et al., 2021*; Asante et al., 2024). In general, the socio-demographic features can include measures such as age, gender, educational attainment, number of household members, years of experience in agriculture, income, and outreach services. In the current research, the assessment of the socio-demographic features of smallholder farmers will provide some valuable information regarding how personal and household variables could shape the participation of smallholder farmers in the training on safe pesticide use practices.

The socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1. The findings indicate that the study participants comprised both male and female small-scale vegetable farmers, with males constituting the majority (57.9%), while females accounted for 42.1%. This suggests that although vegetable production in the study area is male-dominated, women were also actively engaged in small-scale vegetable farming. Similar gender patterns were reported in agricultural systems where men often dominate commercial farming activities, while women contribute substantially through labour provision, crop management, and other production-related activities (*Quisumbing & Doss, 2021*). Similarly, *Dzobo (2016)*, in a survey examining self-reported symptoms associated with pesticide use among vegetable farmers, reported that the majority (74.4%) of participants were males. More recently, *Odonkor and Odonkor (2026)* found that males accounted for 54.9% of the 1,484 farmers surveyed across three regions of Ghana, suggesting that men continue to represent a substantial proportion of farmer populations, although the proportions vary across study settings and populations. The relatively substantial number (42.1%) of female farmers highlights the need for pesticide safety interventions to be gender-responsive and inclusive.

With respect to age, the largest (35.8%) proportion of respondents were between 29 and 39 years, followed by those aged 40–50 years (28.4%) and 18–28 years (23.8%). Farmers aged 50 years and above constituted the smallest group (12.0%). Younger and middle-aged farmers are generally more receptive to agricultural innovations and training programmes than older farmers, who may be more inclined to rely on established farming practices (*Asravor et al., 2024*; *Ayisi et al., 2022*). Since men constitute the majority, they are likely to be the primary decision-makers and pesticide applicators, meaning training programs may predominantly reach and influence male farmers. Nonetheless, the very high rate of female engagement (42.1%) suggests that under-targeting or excluding women could severely reduce the overall efficacy of such treatments.

Regarding household membership, more than half (51.6%) of the respondents belonged to households with one to five members, while 37.9% reported household sizes of six to ten members. Only 10.5% of households had over ten people. Smaller sizes of the households might reduce the amount of family labor available for cultivation of vegetables by smallholder farmers, thereby forcing them to hire labor for pesticide application and other labor-intensive work. Household size is an important socio-economic factor in smallholder agriculture because family labour contributes substantially to farming activities, including pesticide mixing, loading, application, and post-application tasks. The availability of household labour may therefore influence how agricultural and pesticide-related activities are organised, although the specific roles undertaken by family members may vary across farming households (Damalas & Koutroubas, 2017; Tennhardt et al., 2024). In consequence, both the farmers and the household members could be exposed to the dangers of pesticides as a result of participation in farm work or indirect exposure from contaminated clothes, equipment, and sprayed fields.

With regard to the educational background of the respondents, low levels of educational attainment were found. While 48.4% of the respondents did not have any form of formal education, 21.1% had acquired basic education. Of the total respondents, 17.9% had obtained secondary/technical education, while only 12.6% were at the tertiary level of education. The results of previous research conducted by *Abimbola et al. (2024)* and *Natukunda (2014)* showed that 81.2% of the farmers had formal education. More recent studies among Ghanaian tomato farmers have similarly documented educational attainment among respondents, although the proportion varies across farming communities and study populations (Bandanaa et al., 2024; Odonkor & Odonkor, 2026). Farmers' educational attainment can influence their knowledge of pesticide safety and their ability to understand and follow label instructions and hazard warnings. Recent evidence indicates that higher educational attainment is associated with better safety-related knowledge and that limited literacy can hinder farmers' understanding of pesticide labels (Ahmadipour & Nakhei, 2024; Tayea, 2023). Previous literature has shown that as compared to farmers who lack formal education, those who have formal education are found to have higher knowledge of the health effects of the use of unsafe pesticides (*Keleb et al., 2024; Desye et al., 2017*). However, from the results of this study, it is evident that although some of the farmers received formal education, many of them (21.1%) had only primary education. Therefore, some of the farmers might lack literacy skills, and this would make it difficult for them to be able to read and understand the pesticide labels, which are mostly written in the English language. Consequently, there is a need to make the labels simpler through the use of symbols and other pictures that can relay the safety message regardless of the level of literacy.

Additionally, the pesticide safety training should use practical means and demonstrations in local languages.

The farm sizes from which the respondents are drawn reveal that most (51.6%) of them have farm sizes between 3 and 4 acres, while 6.3% of them farm on farm sizes of 4 acres and above. This is an indication that most of the respondents are smallholder farmers. The smallholder farmers mostly depend on family labor and have few financial resources at hand, which could limit their ability to purchase appropriate protective clothing, improved pesticide spraying technology and training (Ansah & Skevas, 2024; *Knowledge, perception, and pesticide application practices among smallholder cocoa farmers in Ghana*, 2023). This could make them vulnerable to pesticide poisoning, hence necessitating pesticide safety interventions.

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Farmers

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	55	57.9
	Female	40	42.1
Age	18-28	23	23.8
	29-39	34	35.8
	40-50	27	28.4
	50+	11	12.0
Household membership	1-5	49	51.6
	6-10	36	37.9
	10+	10	10.5
Educational status	No formal education	46	48.4
	Basic	20	21.1
	Secondary/Technical	17	17.9
	Tertiary	12	12.6
Farm size	1-3	41	43.2
	3-4	49	51.6
	4+	5	6.3

Source: The Study, 2021. Types of Vegetable Crops


An analysis of the kinds of vegetable crops that farmers grow becomes important in analyzing the level of exposure to agricultural risks. Different kinds of vegetables have different agronomic needs, pest and disease susceptibility, and dependence on chemical inputs such as pesticides (Collier, 2023; Zhang *et al.*, 2024). In this regard, farmers' crop choice can determine their choice of pesticide, the frequency of use, and adherence to safety measures during application (Damalas & Koutroubas, 2016; Adjei *et al.*, 2024). The identification of main kinds of vegetable crops grown by farmers becomes a crucial point in understanding farmers' behavior regarding pesticide use and the related risks associated with exposure to the chemicals (Mbatchou *et al.*, 2024; Bandanaa *et al.*, 2024). It becomes important to know the farmers' profiles regarding their crop production in order to develop educational programs aimed at promoting the proper use of pesticides among them (Adjei

et al., 2024; *Hyde-Cooper et al.*, 2024). Since vegetable crops differ in their sensitivity to pests and diseases, different amounts of pesticides are required to control them (Collier, 2023; *Zhang et al.*, 2024).

From Figure 2, the most commonly grown vegetable crop among the farmer respondents is pepper, which constitutes 49%, while garden eggs constitute 26% and tomatoes constitute 25%. In conclusion, this implies that the production of pepper dominates the activity of vegetable farming in the study area. As such, the behavior of pesticide use among the farmers is bound to be influenced greatly by the cultivation of pepper because of its prevalence in the farming system. The kind of vegetable crop is an important factor that influences the use of pesticides because vegetables have varying degrees of susceptibility to pests and diseases (Collier, 2023; *Zhang et al.*, 2024).

Another crop cultivated by respondents is pepper. It is a crop that is very susceptible to several pests and diseases, such as aphids, thrips, fruit borers, fungi and others. Repeated applications of pesticides may be required to protect the yield and quality of pepper. However, the frequency of pesticide application should depend on pest pressure, the effectiveness of the treatment, and recommended label instructions (*Adom et al.*, 2024; *Nketiah et al.*, 2023). This implies that farmers involved in the cultivation of pepper have higher chances of pesticide exposure because of the increased applications compared to farmers growing crops that are not demanding in pest control. Farmers growing vegetables whose cultivation involves high pest control applications, like pepper, will interact with pesticide-related information sources frequently, which may affect their knowledge about proper use of pesticides (*Adjei et al.*, 2024; *Desye et al.*, 2024). Therefore, intervention programs on pesticide safety in relation to specific crops remain very important in ensuring that farmers apply proper methods of pesticide handling and protection. A crop-specific approach to education regarding pesticides is consistent with previous research where farmers' pesticide handling was influenced by crop, pest, production intensity and number of chemical applications (*Bandanaa et al.*, 2024; *Adjei et al.*, 2024). There is enough evidence indicating that pesticide knowledge of farmers and their safe practices can be enhanced by training and extension services (*Desye et al.*, 2024; *Bandanaa et al.*, 2024).

Figure 2: Respondents and Crop Type



Source: The Study, 2021

Farmers' Access to Training on Safe Application of Pesticide

Pesticide safety training emerges as an important determinant of sustainable pesticide management by farmers. Pesticide safety training helps farmers develop vital skills and knowledge on how to safely handle pesticides, how to appropriately apply and dispose of them, how to accurately determine the doses of pesticides used, use of personal protective equipment and other aspects that contribute to minimizing any negative impacts of pesticides (Ahmadipour & Nakhei, 2024; Desye *et al.*, 2024). Therefore, the examination of farmers' access to training programs aimed at teaching safe use of pesticides becomes very important when it comes to determining the impacts of education on pesticide-use practices. Lack of access to training services can result in the development of knowledge deficiencies, unsafe pesticide-handling practices and increased exposure levels in small-scale vegetable farmers. Effective access to training services helps farmers become more aware and comply with the safety recommendations (Hyde-Cooper *et al.*, 2024; Otoo *et al.*, 2024). Therefore, the analysis of the farmers' exposure to training related to pesticide safety provides many insights into the connection between the process of knowledge acquisition and the outcomes in terms of pesticide safety. The above-mentioned statement can be supported by findings from previous studies showing that farmers' training could have a significant impact on the increase of pesticide knowledge and influence decisions in a safe direction (Möhring *et al.*, 2020; Osei *et al.*, 2021). For instance, Goeb *et al.* (2021) found that the training of lead farmers helped to boost farmers' knowledge and made them more likely to demand the use of safer pesticides despite the fact that the analysis was conducted with the use of only one source of information.

On the availability of farmer training on the safe use of pesticides, the study found that 64.2% of farmers had undergone training on pesticide safety within the last two years, while 35.8% of the farmers had not undergone any training on pesticide safety for the past two years. This is presented in Table 2. This suggests that despite the majority of farmers having undergone some level of training on pesticide safety, a considerable number of farmers did not receive any pesticide safety training. Limited access to training on pesticide safety by a considerable number of farmers increases the probability of unsafe pesticide usage, such as improper mixing, dosing, the improper use of personal protective equipment, and improper disposal of pesticide bottles. Contrary to this finding, a study of rural market-gardening farmers in Zimbabwe found that only 25.2% of respondents had received formal training in the safe use of pesticides, highlighting gaps in access to pesticide-safety education and agricultural extension services (Zimba & Zimudzi, 2016). Unsafe handling of pesticides was due to limited training, including improper protective measures and disposal of the pesticides.

On the training sources, most (72.1%) farmers were reported to get pesticide safety training from the Department of Agriculture and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), while 27.9% got their training from other sources. Nonetheless, it is important to think about issues such as quality of training, relevance of the issue taught, frequency of training, and means of knowledge delivery since they play an instrumental role in determining how effective the training will be. Practical and relevant training on the issue of interest is the kind that improves farmers' knowledge on pesticide safety and management practices. This is similar to what was found by Goeb and Lupi (2021), who observed that interventions such as training have a significant effect on farmers' knowledge and awareness of pesticide management practices.

In addition, the findings have shown that the most prevalent location where pesticide safety training was provided was the fields (54.1%), followed by demonstrations in plots (24.6%), and the MOFA premises (21.3%). The choice of field training indicates the necessity of using practical methods for the diffusion of agricultural information. Field demonstration training is considered an effective method since it helps farmers learn through experience by giving them an opportunity to better understand the application of pesticides and safety guidelines while working in a field environment (Ssekkadde *et al.*, 2025; Abujaja & Pwoawuvi, 2026).

On the part of frequency of training received, the majority (85.2%) of farmers reported receiving training once or twice, while only 14.8% had received training three times. This implies that pesticide safety education may not be provided regularly enough to ensure continuous reinforcement of recommended practices. Since pesticide use decisions are influenced by

changing production conditions, pest pressures, and availability of new pesticide products, periodic training and follow-up extension support are necessary to sustain safe pesticide practices among farmers (*Bandanaa et al., 2024*).

With regard to the areas covered during training, most (60.7%) farmers received training on pesticide application, followed by the use of protective clothing (21.3%), disposal of pesticide containers (13.1%), and timing of pesticide application (4.9%). The emphasis on pesticide application indicates that training programmes primarily focus on technical ability to apply chemicals. However, the relatively lower attention given to protective equipment use and container disposal is of concern because these aspects are essential components of reducing pesticide exposure and environmental contamination. These aspects are equally important because inadequate personal protection and improper disposal practices contribute substantially to pesticide exposure among farmers and environmental contamination (*Kangavari et al., 2024; Sharma et al., 2019*).

The results further show that 83.6% of the respondents perceived the pesticide safety training received as relevant, indicating that the training contributed to changes in their pesticide application practices, including the use of protective equipment, appropriate timing of pesticide application, and safe disposal of pesticide containers. Some of the farmers believed that their involvement in the training program resulted in high crop productivity, meaning that there is a possibility for pesticide safety training to benefit both farmers' health and productivity. Recent evidence indicates that pesticide-safety education can improve farmers' use of personal protective equipment and reduce pesticide exposure. A 2026 randomized controlled trial in Uganda found that training increased PPE use, with additional improvements when training was supplemented by behaviour-change text messages (*Ssekkadde et al., 2026*). Furthermore, a 2025 trial found that pesticide-safety education reduced exposure intensity, while the combination of education and text messages reduced self-reported pesticide-poisoning symptoms (*Ssekkadde et al., 2025*). Matthews (2008) suggested that effective pesticide-management training can improve farmers' decision-making regarding pesticide selection and crop protection. More recent empirical evidence indicates that targeted agricultural training can contribute to increased crop productivity. For example, *Kangogo et al. (2024)* reported a 14% increase in potato yield among farmers who participated in positive-selection training in Malawi, while *Tambo et al. (2023)* found that access to pest-risk information was associated with improved pest-management practices and an approximately 4% increase in maize yield in Ghana.

Nevertheless, 16.4% of the respondents considered the training to be unhelpful owing to the lack of any visible change in terms of their use of

pesticides. This suggests that attendance in training programs does not always translate into a change in behavior; the success of training might depend on other aspects like the quality of training itself, the relevance of the content, frequency of follow-ups, provision of protective clothing as recommended, and the farmers' ability to apply the knowledge gained from training. This is consistent with what was found by *Feder et al. (2004)* whose study showed that attendance in Farmer Field Schools (FFS) did not necessarily bring about any improvements in the practices of farming as long as there was limited institutional and environmental support for adoption. More recent research similarly indicates that the effectiveness of FFS depends on programme design, implementation quality, and the institutional support available to farmers to adopt and sustain recommended practices (*Bakker et al., 2021; Waddington et al., 2014*). Therefore, pesticide safety training will continue to be an important tool for improving farmers' practices; however, additional actions are needed.

Table 2: Farmers' Access to Training on Safe Application of Pesticide

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Received training in the last two years	Yes	61	64.2
	No	34	35.8
Source of training	Department of Agriculture / NGOs	44	72.1
	Others	17	27.9
Training location	Farmers' field	33	54.1
	Demonstration plot	15	24.6
	MOFA premises (seminar)	13	21.3
Frequency of training received	Once or twice	52	85.2
	Thrice	9	14.8
Area of training	Pesticide application	37	60.7
	Protective clothing	13	21.3
	Disposal of containers	8	13.1
	Timing of application	3	4.9
Perceived relevance of training	Relevant (changed practices, increased yield)	51	83.6
	Not relevant (no change noticed)	10	16.4

Source: The Study, 2021

Farmers' Knowledge on the Use of Pesticides

Evaluating farmers' knowledge about pesticide usage is very important since the ability to choose, handle, apply, store, and dispose of pesticides safely depends on such knowledge. Knowledge about pesticide usage is an important part of the safety of pesticides, as it forms the basis for rational decision-making and may affect attitudes of farmers. In the context of this research, the evaluation of farmers' knowledge about pesticide safety was especially important for the estimation of the efficiency of pesticide safety training. Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents by knowledge about pesticide usage.

Table 3: Farmers' Knowledge on the Use of Pesticides

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Knowledge on Pesticide Use	Yes	39	41.1
	No	56	58.9
Major pesticide used	Insecticide	71	74.7
	Fungicide	15	15.8
	Herbicide/Rodenticide	9	9.5
Awareness on Pesticides Banned by the Government	Yes	33	34.7
	No	62	65.3
Knowledge of the Health Effects of Pesticides	Yes	56	58.9
	No	39	41.1
Knowledge of the Environmental Effects of Pesticides	Loss of soil fertility	54	56.9
	Air pollution	39	41.0
	Contamination of	2	2.1
	underground water		

Source: The Study, 2021

It is clear from the findings that most (58.9%) respondents had inadequate knowledge on pesticide usage, while 41.1% had adequate knowledge. This result shows a significant knowledge deficit among the farmers on proper usage of pesticides. With inadequate knowledge, farmers are likely to make errors in pesticide choice, dosage, misuse, storage, and disposal. The findings thus highlight the importance of increased pesticide safety education, especially for vegetable farmers. The relatively low level of farmers displaying sufficient knowledge may be attributed to differences in educational attainment and availability of agricultural extension services. Other studies have also found that educational attainment of farmers can play a role in their ability to access, understand, and use information related to the safety of pesticides. *Karunamoorthi et al. (2012)* highlighted the relationship between farmers' educational status and pesticide-management outcomes. More recent research also demonstrates that farmers' ability to interpret pesticide labels is important for safe pesticide use. For example, *Winkler et al. (2026)* found that targeted training improved farmers' comprehension of pesticide hazard pictograms and adherence to recommended dosage instructions. In addition, literacy and educational skills can influence farmers' ability to access, understand, and apply agricultural information in practice. These findings highlight the need to provide pesticide-safety information in accessible formats that accommodate farmers with different literacy levels.

In terms of classification of pesticides, insecticides formed the largest proportion, accounting for 74.7%, while fungicides accounted for 15.8% and herbicides/rodenticides 9.5%. It should be mentioned that the predominance of use of insecticides is alarming because the excessive use and misuse of insecticides may result in the increased exposure of farmers to dangerous chemicals. The alarming situation is that 65.3% of farmers do not have

knowledge about pesticides banned by the government, and only 34.7% are aware of them. Such a low percentage of awareness is alarming because there might be a danger of farmers buying and using those pesticides that have been banned.

From the results, it can be stated that 58.9% of the respondents had information on health effects resulting from exposure to pesticides, while 41.1% did not have this information. In the case of environmental effects, 56.9% identified loss of soil fertility, 41.0% mentioned air pollution, and 2.1% identified contamination of underground water as effects of pesticide use. The interesting thing about this is that there is a clear difference between the knowledge of farmers and their practices of using pesticides. While a majority of the farmers had knowledge about the effects of pesticides on both health and the environment, this knowledge was not reflected in their practices of using pesticides. This finding is consistent with *Oesterlund et al. (2014)*, who reported that Ugandan smallholder farmers could recognize the health risks associated with pesticides while continuing to engage in unsafe handling practices. Similarly, a recent randomized controlled trial in Uganda found that pesticide-safety training improved farmers' knowledge and reduced pesticide exposure, but did not significantly improve overall pesticide-handling practice scores. These findings demonstrate that awareness of pesticide hazards does not necessarily translate into safe practices, highlighting the need for practical, behaviour-focused training and continued support (*Oesterlund et al., 2014; Ssekkadde et al., 2025*).

The Knowledge-Attitude-Practice (KAP) framework, which recognizes that knowledge is an essential precursor to changing behavior but does not necessarily lead to correct practices, could be considered for this study. Although farmers are aware of the dangers associated with pesticide use, they may still practice inappropriately because of economic reasons, lack of access to personal protective equipment (PPE), lack of availability of safer pesticides, ease, habit, or lack of practical skills. The same point was made by Matthews (2008), who emphasized the need for practical and situational responses to pesticide safety and not only information about the matter. More recent evidence reinforces this perspective, showing that pesticide-safety education may improve knowledge without necessarily producing significant changes in practice, thereby highlighting the need for context-specific, behaviour-focused interventions and continued support (*Ssekkadde et al., 2025*). These results may also be understood from the perspective of the Health Belief Model (HBM). Under this model, mere knowledge of health risk does not lead to behavior change if the person does not feel that he/she is susceptible to the risk; finds the threat serious; thinks that the suggested preventive measure is useful; and the barriers to undertaking the prevention are not significant. Thus, although farmers may be aware that pesticides have negative

health consequences, they may not feel personally vulnerable enough to use personal protective equipment (PPE) or follow other safety measures.

Farmers' Practices Related to Safe Pesticide Use

The farmers' pesticide application behaviors constitute an important metric regarding the link between awareness and actual safe behaviors. The examination of pesticide choice, sources of pesticides, use of PPEs, and obstacles to wearing PPEs provides insights into the factors that influence the farmers' pesticide exposure. This is because there is no automatic association between hazard awareness and compliance with safety recommendations. Table 4 presents the farmers' behavior in terms of safe pesticide use.

Table 4: Farmers' Behavioural Practices in Safe Pesticide Use

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Factors influencing choice of pesticide	Price of product	45	47.4
	Potency of pesticide	30	31.6
	Recommendation by someone	20	21.1
Source of pesticide purchase	Agro-input dealers	82	86.3
	Open market	13	13.7
Usage of personal protective equipment (PPE)	Yes	46	48.4
	No	49	51.6
Type of personal protective equipment (PPE) used	Overall	20	21.1
	Gloves	19	20.0
	Face mask	6	6.3
	Goggles, boots, trousers, respirator	1	1.1
Reasons for non-use of PPE	Financial constraints	29	30.5
	Uncomfortable to use	13	13.7
	Not considered necessary	7	7.4

Source: The Study, 2021

The results suggest that economic considerations, particularly pesticide cost, were among the most commonly reported factors influencing farmers' pesticide selection. Specifically, 47.4% of participants identified pesticide price as an influencing factor, compared with 31.6% who considered effectiveness and 21.1% who relied on recommendations from others. This finding is consistent with recent evidence indicating that economic and market-related considerations can influence farmers' pesticide-use decisions and preferences (2024). Evidence from Ghana similarly highlights the role of socioeconomic constraints, including input and labour costs, in shaping agrochemical-use practices. Recent studies support the relevance of economic and market-related factors in pesticide-use decisions. In Ghana, *Adjei et al.* (2024) reported that pesticide availability, perceived cheapness, and rapid knockdown effects were among the considerations associated with pesticide-

use patterns among tomato farmers in the Bono East Region. Their findings further showed that farmers commonly based pesticide application on the appearance of pests, diseases, and crop damage, while several socioeconomic and institutional factors influenced pesticide use.

The relatively high importance attributed to price may reflect the financial constraints faced by smallholder farmers, for whom the affordability of agricultural inputs is an important consideration in farm-management decisions. Thus, pesticide cost may influence product selection based on perceived economic benefits and affordability. Although the present study does not establish that farmers deliberately prioritize cost over efficacy, the emphasis on price may have implications for pesticide safety if affordability limits access to more effective or safer products. These findings highlight the importance of considering economic factors alongside farmers' knowledge and perceptions when addressing pesticide-selection practices and occupational safety.

The present findings differ from those of Plianbangchang, Jetiyanon, and Wittaya-Arekul (2009), who emphasized that pesticide selection should primarily be guided by the pest or disease affecting the crop. This difference may reflect variations in farmers' access to technical information, extension services, and reliable advice on pesticide selection. Current FAO guidance similarly emphasizes that crop-protection decisions should be guided by accurate identification of the target pest or disease, crop-specific requirements, and the suitability of available control methods, rather than pesticide selection alone. This approach promotes integrated pest management and reduces unnecessary pesticide use and associated risks (FAO, 2022, 2024). In the present study, only 31.6% of respondents identified pesticide effectiveness as a factor influencing their choice, while 21.1% relied on recommendations from other individuals. This suggests that technical considerations may not consistently guide pesticide-selection decisions. However, these findings should not be interpreted as evidence that farmers used counterfeit or highly toxic pesticides, as the study did not directly assess the authenticity, formulation, or toxicity of the products used.

The source of pesticide purchase provides an additional perspective on farmers' pesticide-use behaviour. A large majority (86.3%) of respondents reported purchasing pesticides from agro-input dealers, compared with 13.7% who purchased them from open markets. The dominance of agro-input dealers may provide an opportunity for strengthening pesticide safety interventions because these outlets can serve as important points for disseminating information on appropriate pesticide selection, dosage, application procedures, and safety precautions. However, the effectiveness of this approach depends on the knowledge and capacity of agro-input dealers to provide accurate and responsible guidance. Strengthening collaboration

between agricultural extension personnel, regulatory authorities, and agro-input dealers could therefore improve the quality of pesticide-related information available to farmers at the point of purchase.

With respect to the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), slightly more than half (51.6%) of the respondents reported that they did not use PPE when applying pesticides, whereas 48.4% indicated that they used PPE. This finding indicates that slightly more than half of the farmers were not consistently adopting this important protective measure. The relatively low level of PPE use is concerning because direct contact with pesticide formulations during mixing, loading, and application can increase the risk of occupational exposure. The finding also demonstrates that awareness of pesticide-related health effects, reported by 58.9% of respondents in Table 3, did not necessarily translate into the adoption of protective behaviour. This knowledge–practice gap is an important finding of the study.

Among farmers who reported using PPE, overalls were the most commonly reported protective item (21.1%), followed by gloves (20.0%) and face masks (6.3%). Only 1.1% of the respondents claimed to use goggles, boots, trousers, and respirators at the same time. The trend observed shows that use of PPE was partial, since very few farmers used the complete set of PPEs. Though use of different pieces of PPE can offer some level of safety, it does not guarantee complete reduction of exposure through all possible modes. Appropriate use of personal protective equipment (PPE), combined with safe pesticide-handling procedures and proper personal hygiene, can reduce farmers' exposure to pesticides and help prevent pesticide-related health effects (World Health Organization & Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2020; Kangavari et al., 2024). The findings therefore point not only to a need to increase PPE adoption but also to improve farmers' understanding of the appropriate types and combinations of protective equipment required during different pesticide-handling activities.

Financial constraints were the most frequently reported reason for not using PPE. Specifically, 30.5% of the respondents identified financial limitations, while 13.7% considered PPE uncomfortable and 7.4% did not consider PPE necessary. These findings indicate that non-adoption of PPE is influenced by both structural and behavioural factors. The prominence of financial constraints suggests that simply educating farmers about the importance of PPE may not be sufficient if appropriate protective equipment is unaffordable or difficult to obtain. Similarly, perceptions of discomfort may discourage farmers from using protective equipment, particularly under hot field conditions. The proportion who did not consider PPE necessary also suggests that some farmers may underestimate their susceptibility to pesticide exposure despite being aware of its potential health effects.

Overall, the findings demonstrate a gap between farmers' awareness of pesticide-related risks and adherence to recommended safety measures. Pesticide selection was primarily cost-driven, and more than half of participants reported no use of personal protective equipment (PPE) during application. Among PPE users, protection was often incomplete, with only individual items used rather than the full recommended set. These findings suggest that pesticide-safety practices are influenced by factors beyond knowledge, including economic and practical constraints.

This result fits the Knowledge-Attitude-Practice model because while knowledge acts as the base for safe practice, it does not necessarily ensure safe practice. However, the findings could be seen using the Health Belief Model, focusing on perceived susceptibility and perceived barriers. Farmers who perceive themselves to be at considerable risk of being affected by pesticides may be willing to use PPEs. On the other hand, farmers who think they are at little risk or who consider the PPEs expensive and uncomfortable may not want to use the PPEs. Therefore, intervention strategies aimed at promoting safe practice in relation to pesticides need to take care of both these issues.

Limitations of the study

The relatively small sample size may have limited the statistical precision and generalizability of the findings. Therefore, the results should be interpreted within the context of the study population and setting. Future studies should employ larger and more representative samples to improve the reliability, precision, and generalizability of the findings.

Conclusion

From the research findings, it is clear that there are certain gaps in relation to the safe application of pesticides by the vegetable farmers in the Kassena-Nankana municipality. Some of the farmers exhibited certain awareness in regard to the dangers posed by the use of pesticides both on the health front and in the environment, while others had certain gaps in terms of their knowledge about pesticides and the environment in general. There exists a clear disparity between knowledge and practice. The decisions made by the farmers on the choice of pesticides were mainly influenced by economic reasons, like the cost of pesticide products, while more than half of the participants indicated that they do not use personal protective equipment (PPEs) when applying pesticides. Economic limitations, discomfort, and the belief that PPEs are unnecessary have been cited as major obstacles to the use of PPEs. All these suggest that there exist many other factors that influence the hazardous use of pesticides.

Also, it is evident that there are benefits of pesticide safety training in terms of safety practices among farmers. Therefore, there is a need to improve

the effectiveness of training programs that go beyond just providing information by including demonstrations on the right way of choosing the type of pesticides, their doses, proper application, storage and disposal of pesticides, as well as PPE.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. It would be important to strengthen pesticide safety education and certification programmes. The Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA), through its agricultural extension services and in collaboration with the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) and the Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate (PPRSD), should strengthen and institutionalise pesticide safety education and certification programmes for farmers. These programmes should improve farmers' knowledge of pesticide selection, safe application, handling, storage, and disposal, and should include practical training on the correct selection, use, maintenance, and storage of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), as well as the potential health consequences of inadequate protection.
2. Adopt participatory and accessible risk-communication approaches. MoFA and Agricultural Extension Agencies (AEAs) should develop pesticide-safety communication materials that are appropriate for farmers with different levels of literacy. Information should be communicated through pictorial materials, demonstrations, symbols, practical field exercises, farmer meetings, and communication in relevant local languages. These approaches should be used to communicate information on pesticide hazards, safe-use practices, product labels, PPE requirements, and the risks associated with banned, restricted, or unregistered pesticides.
3. Improve farmers' access to affordable and appropriate PPE. MoFA, farmer-based organisations, agro-input dealers, development partners, and relevant government agencies should explore mechanisms for improving farmers' access to affordable, appropriate, and user-friendly PPE. Possible measures include targeted subsidies, group purchasing arrangements, and partnerships with farmer organisations and suppliers. Access initiatives should be accompanied by practical training on the correct selection, use, maintenance, cleaning, and storage of PPE to ensure that equipment provided to farmers is used effectively.
4. Strengthen regulatory monitoring and enforcement of pesticide distribution and use. The Environmental Protection Authority (EPA),

under the Environmental Protection Act, 2025 (Act 1124), in collaboration with the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA), particularly the Plant Protection and Regulatory Services Directorate (PPRSD), should strengthen routine monitoring and enforcement of pesticide distribution, sale, and use in vegetable-growing communities. Particular attention should be given to the inspection of agro-input dealers and the identification and removal of banned, restricted, suspended, or otherwise unauthorised pesticide products from the market. Farmers and agro-input dealers should also have access to an up-to-date and readily understandable list of authorised, restricted, and banned pesticides. The authors should refer specifically to Ghana's Revised Register of Pesticides, including the Banned Pesticides section, as the regulatory reference for identifying prohibited products.

5. Strengthen the capacity and accountability of agro-input dealers. Given the important role of agro-input dealers as a source of pesticides and pesticide-related information, PPRSD, in collaboration with the EPA and relevant agricultural authorities, should strengthen the training, licensing, inspection, and supervision of agro-input dealers. Dealers should be equipped to provide farmers with accurate information on pesticide selection, dosage, application, storage, PPE requirements, and potential health risks. Regulatory authorities should ensure that dealers stock and promote only pesticides that are legally registered and authorised for use in Ghana and should take appropriate enforcement action where banned, restricted, suspended, or otherwise unauthorised products are offered for sale.
6. It would be essential to adopt a more integrated approach to improving pesticide safety practices. Interventions should address the multiple factors influencing farmers' pesticide-use behaviour rather than focusing solely on knowledge provision. Agricultural policies and programmes should integrate continuous training, agricultural extension support, behavioural-change strategies, and measures that address economic barriers to safe pesticide use. Particular attention should be given to helping farmers make pesticide-selection decisions based on pest and disease conditions, recommended products, safety considerations, and appropriate application requirements rather than price alone.
7. Future studies should consider conducting quantitative research in the same region using larger and more representative samples. Increasing the sample size would provide more stable estimates of variability and improve the precision and reliability of population estimates, thereby strengthening the generalizability of the findings.

Acknowledgement

We are truly grateful to the farmers who took part in this study for their efforts and contributions to the success of this research. The contribution made by them through sharing their knowledge and experience played an important role in completing this research successfully. We are thankful for their cooperation and assistance during data collection.

Conflict of Interest: The authors reported no conflict of interest.

Data Availability: All data are included in the content of the paper.

Funding Statement: The authors did not obtain any funding for this research.

Declaration for Human Participants: For this research, no ethical clearance was required because of the low-risk nature of the investigation, which did not involve clinical procedures and treatments but involved voluntary interviews and surveys. Nonetheless, this research always complied with the ethical principles of informed consent, confidentiality, and anonymity.

References:

1. Abimbola, M. E., Adebayo, O. A., & Ojo, O. O. (2024). Effect of educational level on the technical efficiency of poultry farmers in Oyo State, Nigeria. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*, 21(1), 2296–2305. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.21.1.0229>
2. Abujaja, A. M., & Pwoawuvi, J. (2026). Effectiveness of pesticide safety training on farmers' knowledge and practices in vegetable production: Evidence from small-scale farmers in Kasena Nankana Municipality, Upper East Region of Ghana. *European Scientific Journal*, 57, 26. <https://ejournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/21493>
3. Adjei, R. R., Kyere, E., Ibrahim, N., Boateng, A. S., Asomah, S., Asomaning, S. K., & Adarkwah, C. (2024). Pattern of pesticide usage among tomato farmers for sustainable production in the Bono East Region, Ghana. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, 10(1), Article 2307128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311932.2024.2307128>
4. Adom, M., Fening, K. O., Billah, M. K., Aigbedion-Atalor, P. O., & Wilson, D. D. (2024). Efficacy of selected biopesticides on key pests of chilli pepper for increased productivity in Ghana. *Crop Protection*, 176, Article 106497. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2023.106497>
5. Ahmadipour, H., & Nakhei, Z. (2024). The effect of education on safe use of pesticides based on the health belief model. *BMC Research Notes*, 17, Article 134. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-024-06797-6>

6. Ahiabor, W. K., & Donkor, E. S. (2025). Pesticide residues in foods in Ghana: A systematic review. *Health Science Reports*, 8(12), e71559.
7. Alamer, A. S. (2024). Behavior changes theories and models within health belief model research: A five-decade holistic bibliometric analysis. *Cureus*, 16(6), e63143. <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.63143>
8. Alyafei, A., & Easton-Carr, R. (2024). The health belief model of behavior change. In *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK606120/>
9. Ansah, M. O., & Skevas, T. (2024). Adoption and intensity of use of personal protective equipment by agricultural pesticide handlers: Empirical evidence from Peruvian agriculture. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 446, Article 141433. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2024.141433>
10. Asante, B. O., Ma, W., Prah, S. (2024). Farmers' adoption of multiple climate-smart agricultural technologies in Ghana: Determinants and impacts on maize yields and net farm income. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 29, Article 16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11027-024-10114-8>
11. Asravor, J., Tsiboe, F., Asravor, R. K., Wiredu, A. N., & Zeller, M. (2024). Technology and managerial performance of farm operators by age in Ghana. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 61(3), 279–303. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11123-023-00679-y>
12. Ayisi, D. N., Kozári, J., & Krisztina, T. (2022). Do smallholder farmers belong to the same adopter category? An assessment of smallholder farmers innovation adopter categories in Ghana. *Heliyon*, 8(8), e10421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e10421>
13. Bakker, T., Dugué, P., & de Tourdonnet, S. (2021). Assessing the effects of Farmer Field Schools on farmers' trajectories of change in practices. *Agronomy for Sustainable Development*, 41, Article 18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13593-021-00667-2>
14. Bandanaa, J., Bosomtwe, A., Danson-Anokye, A., Adjei, E., Bissah, M., & Kotey, D. A. (2024). Determinants of pesticides use among tomato farmers in the Bono and Ahafo regions of Ghana. *Scientific Reports*, 14, Article 5484. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-55169-4>
15. Barau, A. A., & Yelwa, F. J. (2024). Knowledge, perception and utilisation of pesticides among crop farmers in Northwest, Nigeria. *Journal of Agriculture and Environment*, 20(2), 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.4314/jagrenv.v20i2.7>
16. Biesheuvel, M. M., Santman-Berends, I. M. G. A., Barkema, H. W., Ritter, C., Berezowski, J., Guelbenzu, M., & Kaler, J. (2021). Understanding farmers' behavior and their decision-making process in

- the context of cattle diseases: A review of theories and approaches. *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*, 8, Article 687699. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2021.687699>
17. Boateng, K. O., Dankyi, E., Amponsah, I. K., Awudzi, G. K., Amponsah, E., & Darko, G. (2023). Knowledge, perception, and pesticide application practices among smallholder cocoa farmers in four Ghanaian cocoa-growing regions. *Toxicology Reports*, 10, 46–55. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.toxrep.2022.12.008>
 18. Collier, R. (2023). Pest insect management in vegetable crops grown outdoors in northern Europe: Approaches at the bottom of the IPM pyramid. *Frontiers in Horticulture*, 2, Article 1159375. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhort.2023.1159375>
 19. Conrad, F. G., & Schober, M. F. (2021). Clarifying question meaning in standardized interviews can improve data quality even though wording may change: A review of the evidence. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 24(2), 203–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1824627>
 20. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
 21. Damalas, C. A., & Koutroubas, S. D. (2016). Farmers' exposure to pesticides: Toxicity types and ways of prevention. *Toxics*, 4(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics4010001>
 22. Damalas, C. A., & Koutroubas, S. D. (2017). Farmers' training on pesticide use is associated with elevated safety behavior. *Toxics*, 5(3), Article 19. <https://doi.org/10.3390/toxics5030019>
 23. Der, E., Ziem, J. B., Sagoe, K., Gyasi, R. K., & Anim, J. J. (2013). Acute atrazine food poisoning in Shaibupe: A farming community in Northern Ghana. *World Journal of Medical and Surgical Case Reports*, 2, 90–94.
 24. Desye, B., Tesfaye, A. H., Daba, C., Alemseged, E. A., Angaw, Y., Ebrahim, A. M., Natnael, T., Hassen, S., & Woretaw, L. (2024). Pesticide safe use practice and acute health symptoms, and associated factors among farmers in developing countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis of an epidemiological evidence. *BMC Public Health*, 24, Article 3313. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-20817-x>
 25. Dzobo, A. (2016). *Knowledge, practices and self-reported symptoms of pesticides use among vegetable farmers: A cross-sectional study in Offinso North* [Research report, University of Ghana]. University of Ghana repository. <http://ugspace.ug.edu.gh>
 26. Feder, G., Murgai, R., & Quizon, J. B. (2004). Sending farmers back to school: The impact of farmer field schools in Indonesia. *Applied*

- Economic Perspectives and Policy*, 26(1), 45–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9353.2003.00161.x>
27. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2022). *Keeping plants, people and the planet healthy with sustainable pest and pesticide management*. FAO. [Publication URL to be verified.]
 28. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2024). *Integrated pest management*. FAO. [Specific publication URL to be verified.]
 29. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, & World Health Organization. (2025). *Report of the 17th FAO/WHO Joint Meeting on Pesticide Management: Rome, Italy and online, 8–11 October 2024*. FAO and WHO. <https://doi.org/10.4060/cd5049en>
 30. Ghana Statistical Service. (2021). *Ghana 2021 population and housing census: General report volume 3A—Population of regions and districts*. Ghana Statistical Service.
 31. Goeb, J., & Lupi, F. (2021). Showing pesticides’ true colors: The effects of a farmer-to-farmer training program on pesticide knowledge. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 279, Article 111821. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2020.111821>
 32. Goeb, J., Smart, J., Snyder, J., & Tschirley, D. (2021). *Information, pesticide safety behaviors, and toxicity risk perceptions: Evidence from Zambia and Mozambique* (IFPRI Discussion Paper 2118). International Food Policy Research Institute. <https://doi.org/10.2499/p15738coll2.135883>
 33. Green, J. P., Tonidandel, S., & Cortina, J. M. (2016). Getting through the gate: Statistical and methodological issues raised in the reviewing process. *Organizational Research Methods*, 19(3), 402–432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428116631417>
 34. Hyde-Cooper, W., Tham-Agyekum, E. K., Bakang, J.-E. A., Ntem, S., Ankuyi, F., & Mohammed, R. (2024). Cocoa farmer’s use of approved pesticides and compliance with safety standards in Obuasi Municipality, Ghana. *International Journal on Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.46676/ij-fanres.v5i2.312>
 35. JoyNews. (2019, June 14). Agric ministry triggers interventions to contain reemerging Fall Army Worms. *MyJoyOnline*. <https://www.myjoyonline.com/agric-ministry-triggers-interventions-to-contain-reemerging-fall-army-worms/>
 36. Kangavari, M., Sarvi, M., Afshari, M., & Maleki, S. (2024). Understanding determinants related to farmers’ protective measures towards pesticide exposure: A systematic review. *PLOS ONE*, 19(2), Article e0298450. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0298450>

37. Kangogo, E., Otieno, D. J., Okello, J., Mwenye, O., & Kapalasa, E. (2024). Impact of farmer training on potato yield: A case of smallholder potato farmers in Malawi. *Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems*, 8, Article 1496064. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2024.1496064>
38. Karunamoorthi, K., Mohammed, M., & Wassie, F. (2012). Knowledge and practices of farmers with reference to pesticide management: Implications on human health. *Archives of Environmental & Occupational Health*, 67(2), 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19338244.2011.598891>
39. Keleb, A., Ademas, A., Abebe, M., Berihun, G., Desye, B., & Bezie, A. E. (2024). Knowledge of health risks, safety practices, acute pesticide poisoning, and associated factors among farmers in rural irrigation areas of northeastern Ethiopia. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12, Article 1474487. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1474487>
40. Knott, E., Rao, A. H., Summers, K., & Teeger, C. (2022). Interviews in the social sciences. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers*, 2, Article 73. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-022-00150-6>
41. Kumah, E. K., Arah, I. K., Anku, E. K., Akuaku, J., & Aidoo, M. K. (2023). Determination of levels of organochlorine pesticide residues in some common grown and consumed vegetables purchased from Ho Municipal markets, Ghana. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, 9(1), Article 2191810. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311932.2023.2191810>
42. Mattah, M. M., Mattah, P. A. D., & Futagbi, G. (2015). Pesticide application among farmers in the catchment of Ashaiman irrigation scheme of Ghana: Health implications. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2015, Article 547272. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/547272>
43. Matthews, G. A. (2008). Attitudes and behaviours regarding use of crop protection products—A survey of more than 8500 smallholders in 26 countries. *Crop Protection*, 27(3–5), 834–846. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2007.10.013>
44. Mbatchou, V. C., Yunusah, O. D., & Iddrisu, U. F. (2024). Effects of pesticide residues on the growth and yield of vegetables at Navrongo of Ghana. *CABI Agriculture and Bioscience*, 5, Article 51. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43170-024-00252-z>
45. Möhring, N., Wuepper, D., Musa, T., & Finger, R. (2020). Why farmers deviate from recommended pesticide timing: The role of uncertainty and information. *Pest Management Science*, 76(8), 2787–2798. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.5826>

46. National Center for Health Statistics. (2024, April 16). *Question evaluation*. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ccqder/question-evaluation/index.html>
47. Natukunda, Y. (2014). *Factors that influence profitability of poultry farming enterprises in Kira Town Council, Wakiso District–Uganda* [Master’s dissertation, Uganda Management Institute]. Uganda Management Institute Institutional Repository. [Repository URL to be verified.]
48. Nketiah, V., Ofosu-Anim, J., Cornelius, E. W., Kotey, D. A., & Tetteh, R. (2023). Response of pepper (*Capsicum annum* L.) to preemergence application of oxadiargyl and pendimethalin. *Journal of Agriculture and Food Research*, 14, Article 100865. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jafr.2023.100865>
49. Norvivor, F. A., Peprah, E. K., Danso, D., & Konutse, O. W. (2025). Occupational pesticide exposure and safety assessment among farmers in Hohoe municipality: An ethnographic qualitative study. *PLOS ONE*, 20(12), Article e0337693. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0337693>
50. Northern Presbyterian Agricultural Services and Partners. (2012). *Ghana’s pesticide crisis: The need for further government action*. <https://curtisresearch.org/wp-content/uploads/NPAS.Pesticides-Report.-Final.-17-April-2012.pdf>
51. Ntow, W. J., Tagoe, L. M., Drechsel, P., Kelderman, P., Gijzen, H. J., & Nyarko, E. (2008). Accumulation of persistent organochlorine contaminants in milk and serum of farmers from Ghana. *Environmental Research*, 106(1), 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2007.05.020>
52. Oesterlund, A. H., Thomsen, J. F., Sekimpi, D. K., Maziina, J., Racheal, A., & Jørs, E. (2014). Pesticide knowledge, practice and attitude and how it affects the health of small-scale farmers in Uganda: A cross-sectional study. *African Health Sciences*, 14(2), 420–433. <https://doi.org/10.4314/ahs.v14i2.19>
53. Odonkor, F. C., & Odonkor, S. T. (2026). Ghanaian farmers’ perspectives on pesticides: Balancing use and environmental sustainability. *Crop Protection*, 201, Article 107458. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cropro.2025.107458>
54. Osei, B. M., & Boadu, V. G. (2021). Assessment of farmer’s usage of pesticides on cocoa farms at Sefwi Wiawso District in the Western Region of Ghana. *Global Journal of Agricultural Research*, 9(2), 1–13. [No DOI assigned.]
55. Otoo, J., Musah, R., Olita, T., Ireland, K. B., & Zerihun, A. (2024). Knowledge and perception of cereal farmers and extension agents on

- fungicide use in northern Ghana. *Pest Management Science*, 80(9), 4207–4215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ps.8124>
56. Plianbangchang, P., Jetiyanon, K., & Wittaya-Areekul, S. (2009). Pesticide use patterns among small-scale farmers: A case study from Phitsanulok, Thailand. *The Southeast Asian Journal of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*, 40(2), 401–410. [DOI supplied in the original list should be verified against the article.]
57. Quisumbing, A. R., & Doss, C. R. (2021). Gender in agriculture and food systems. In C. B. Barrett & D. R. Just (Eds.), *Handbook of agricultural economics* (Vol. 5, pp. 4481–4549). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.hesagr.2021.10.009>
58. Sharma, D. R., Thapa, R. B., Manandhar, H. K., Shrestha, S. M., & Pradhan, S. B. (2019). Use of pesticides in Nepal and impacts on human health and environment. *The Journal of Agriculture and Environment*, 14, 1–10.
59. Ssekkadde, P. (2025). Educational intervention effects on pesticide-related knowledge, attitudes, practices, exposure, and health among Ugandan smallholder farmers: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2025.1608952>
60. Ssekkadde, P., Jonitz, V. M. J., Atuhaire, A., Brugger, C., Dalvie, M. A., Rother, H.-A., Rösli, M., Inauen, J., & Fuhrmann, S. (2026). Behavior changes through educational interventions and text messaging to improve personal protective equipment use during pesticide handling among smallholder farmers in Uganda: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 400, Article 128760. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2026.128760>
61. Sung, H., Ferlay, J., Siegel, R. L., Laversanne, M., Soerjomataram, I., Jemal, A., & Bray, F. (2021). Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*, 71(3), 209–249. <https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21660>
62. Tambo, J. A., Mbugua, F., Duah, S. A., Oppong-Mensah, B., Ocloo, C. Y., & Williams, F. (2023). Pest risk information, agricultural outcomes and food security: Evidence from Ghana. *Food Security*, 15(6), 1667–1683. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-023-01398-w>
63. Tayea, W. (2023). Farmers' understanding on pesticide safety labels in Wolaita Zone, Southern Ethiopia. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/27658511.2023.2275713>. [Volume, issue, and article number should be confirmed from the publisher.]
64. Tennhardt, L. M., Lazzarini, G. A., Schader, C., Martin, K. (2024). The role of household labour for sustainable intensification in smallholder

- systems: A case study in cocoa farming systems. *Regional Environmental Change*, 24, Article 83. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-024-02243-2>
65. Tudi, M., Daniel Ruan, H., Wang, L., Lyu, J., Sadler, R., Connell, D., Chu, C., & Phung, D. T. (2021). Agriculture development, pesticide application and its impact on the environment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(3), Article 1112. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031112>
66. Waddington, H., Snilstveit, B., Hombrados, J. G., Vojtkova, M., Phillips, D., Davies, P., & White, H. (2014). Farmer field schools for improving farming practices and farmer outcomes in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2014.6>
67. Walcott, R., Cohen, I., & Ferris, D. (2024). When who matters: Interviewer effects and survey modality. *Evaluation Review*, 48(6), 1024–1049. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X231221303>
68. Winkler, M. S. (2026). Assessing the effect of a two-day training on understanding and use of pesticide label pictograms and safety information: A cluster randomized controlled trial among Ugandan smallholder farmers. *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment: An International Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10807039.2026.2627216>
69. World Health Organization, & Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2020). *Guidelines for personal protection when handling and applying pesticides: International Code of Conduct on Pesticide Management*. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240000223>
70. Zhang, Y., Bedoussac, L., Zhang, C., Cong, W.-F., Guinet, M., Nandillon, R., & Munier-Jolain, N. (2024). Pesticide use is affected more by crop species than by crop diversity at the cropping system level. *European Journal of Agronomy*, 159, Article 127263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2024.127263>
71. Zimba, M., & Zimudzi, C. (2016). Pesticide management practices among rural market gardening farmers near Harare, Zimbabwe. *South African Journal of Science*, 112(9–10), Article 2015-0443. <https://doi.org/10.17159/sajs.2016/20150443>