


WORKING PAPER

No. 50 - 10

## Environmental Literacy and NGOs: Experience from the Microcredit Based Social Forestry Program of *Proshika* in Bangladesh

Jahangir Alam Chowdhury



South Asian Network for Development  
and Environmental Economics

August 2010

**Environmental Literacy and NGOs: Experience from  
the Microcredit Based Social Forestry Program  
of *Proshika* in Bangladesh**

Jahangir Alam Chowdhury

*Department of Finance and Center for Microfinance and Development  
University of Dhaka, Bangladesh*

August 2010

South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics (SANDEE)  
PO Box 8975, EPC 1056  
Kathmandu, Nepal

SANDEE Working Paper No. 50 - 10

Published by the South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics (SANDEE)

PO Box 8975, EPC 1056, Kathmandu, Nepal.

Telephone: 977-1-5003222 Fax: 977-1-5003299

SANDEE research reports are the output of research projects supported by the South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics. The reports have been peer reviewed and edited. A summary of the findings of SANDEE reports are also available as SANDEE Policy Briefs.

National Library of Nepal Catalogue Service:

M. Jahangir Alam Chowdhury

Environmental Literacy and NGOs: Experience from the Microcredit Based Social Forestry Program of *Proshika* in Bangladesh

(SANDEE Working Papers, ISSN 1893-1891; 2010- WP 50)

ISBN: 978 - 9937 - 8218 - 9 - 6

Key words:

1. Microcredit
2. Social Forestry
3. Environmental Literacy
4. Trees
5. *Proshika*
6. Bangladesh

The views expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics or its sponsors unless otherwise stated.

## **The South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics**

The South Asian Network for Development and Environmental Economics (SANDEE) is a regional network that brings together analysts from different countries in South Asia to address environment-development problems. SANDEE's activities include research support, training, and information dissemination. Please see [www.sandeeonline.org](http://www.sandeeonline.org) for further information about SANDEE.

SANDEE is financially supported by International Development Research Center (IDRC), The Ford Foundation, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the World Bank and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD). The opinions expressed in this paper are the author's and do not necessarily represent those of SANDEE's donors.

The Working Paper series is based on research funded by SANDEE and supported with technical assistance from network members, SANDEE staff and advisors.

### **Advisor**

Jean-Marie Baland

### **Technical Editor**

Mani Nepal

### **English Editor**

Carmen Wickragamage

Comments should be sent to Jahangir Alam Chowdhury, Department of Finance and Center for Microfinance and Development, University of Dhaka. Email: [mjac@univdhaka.edu](mailto:mjac@univdhaka.edu)



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. <i>PROSHIKA</i> AND THE SOCIAL FORESTRY PROGRAM	2
3. ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY	3
4. ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY SCORE	4
5. SURVEY DESIGN AND DATA	5
6. ESTIMATION STRATEGY	6
7. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	9
7.1 FIRST STAGE REGRESSION	11
7.2 DETERMINANTS OF HOUSEHOLD ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY	11
8. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS	12
9. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	13
REFERENCES	14
ANNEXURE	22

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Social Forestry Program of <i>Proshika</i>	16
Table 2: Sample Distribution	16
Table 3: Distribution of the Responses of Households on Environmental Issues	17
Table 4: Environmental Literacy Score	18
Table 5: Variables Definition and Descriptive Statistics	19
Table 6: Determinants of Household Participation in Social Forestry Projects	20
Table 7: Determinants of the Environmental Literacy Score	21



## Abstract

This study assesses the impact of participation in the social forestry program of *Proshika* on the environmental literacy of participating households in Bangladesh. *Proshika*--a non-governmental organization--has initiated a social forestry program with the twin objectives of improving environmental quality while alleviating poverty. *Proshika* uses microcredit to motivate poor households to participate in its social forestry program. Moreover, participating households receive training on planting trees along with information on other environmental issues. In order to gauge the impact of the program on the environmental literacy of participating households, we calculated an environmental literacy score on the basis of the responses of households to 10 environmental issues. The analysis relies on a household-level survey of 450 households. We use the instrumental variable technique (IV technique) for the analysis of data. The results indicate that participation in the social forestry program of *Proshika* significantly enhances the environmental literacy of participating households. The findings of the study emphasize the importance of initiating more such programs by the government as well as NGOs to enhance people's knowledge on the environment.

**Key Words:** Microcredit, Social Forestry, Environmental Literacy, Trees, *Proshika*, Bangladesh.





# Environmental Literacy and NGOs: Experience from the Microcredit Based Social Forestry Program of *Proshika* in Bangladesh

M. Jahangir Alam Chowdhury

## 1. Introduction

The rapid reduction in forest resources has posed a serious threat to the ecological balance of Bangladesh. Currently, natural forest coverage is at 835,000 hectares (excluding parks and sanctuaries), which accounts for just 5.8 percent of the total land area of Bangladesh. Moreover, the per capita forestland, which was 0.035 hectares per person in 1968-69, is at present less than 0.02 hectares (Huq and Alim, 1995). There is a positive correlation between poverty and deforestation. In Bangladesh, approximately 40% of the population live below the poverty line. Poverty contributes significantly to deforestation as poor households are dependent on local forests for their livelihood and for fuelwood. Firstly, the poor do not have the purchasing power to procure firewood from markets. Secondly, the local forest becomes the main source of income, for a large number of poor households, due to lack of employment opportunities and the lack of capital required to start income generating activities. According to studies, deforestation occurs due to the use of fuelwood, fodder and other forest products by local poor people (WCED, 1987; Timberlake, 1985; Anderson and Fishwick, 1984; IUCN, 1980). Thus, poverty becomes one of the main contributors to deforestation and, consequently, to deterioration of the environment.

It is against this backdrop that some non-government organizations (NGOs) in Bangladesh have come forward to improve the environment while alleviating poverty through social forestry programs. Some of these NGOs such as *Proshika* are using microcredit-small collateral-free loans-to motivate poor households to participate in the social forestry program. Social forestry consists of all programs and activities that involve the community in tree planting starting with tree nursery establishment, tree planting on farms and other categories of land, caring for the trees, and the management and utilization of timber and non-timber forest products for a variety of goods and services. Social forestry programs, which primarily aim at helping small farmers and the landless to meet their consumption and income needs while conserving forest resources, provide training to participants on environment and forestry. The main goals are to induce a large number of poor people to plant trees for their own benefit while making them more environmentally literate.

Using the stated objectives of *Proshika* in implementing social forestry programs as its backdrop, this paper assesses the impact on households' environmental literacy of participation in the microcredit-based social forestry program of *Proshika* in Bangladesh. Due to time and financial constraints, the paper looks at only the success of strip and block plantation programs of *Proshika* in achieving its objectives. We determine the environmental literacy status of a household on the basis of the responses of that household to ten questions. The study compares a group of households that participate in the social forestry program (i.e., program group) with a group of households that do not participate in the social forestry program (i.e., comparison group) in order to assess the impact of social forestry participation on the environmental literacy of participating households. Considering the fact of endogeneity in social forestry program participation, we apply the instrumental variable technique (IV technique) to guard against this

effect. The results indicate that participation in social forestry programs significantly enhances the environmental literacy of participating households.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section two offers a brief discussion of *Proshika* and its social forestry program. Section three outlines the debate so far on environmental literacy. Section four describes the survey design while section five discusses the methodology and the estimation strategy. Section six presents the results while we present conclusions and policy implications in section seven.

## **2. *Proshika* and the Social Forestry Program**

*Proshika*, which is one of the four largest microfinance institutions in Bangladesh, began operations in 1976. It envisages a society that is economically productive and equitable, socially just, environmentally sound, and genuinely democratic. The organization's mission is to conduct both extensive and intensive as well as a participatory process of sustainable development through empowerment of the poor. Empowerment makes the poor functionally literate, enabling them to take better care of their health, to get involved in environmental protection and regeneration, and to get elected to local government bodies and community institutions while giving them better access to public and common property resources. Up to December 2004, *Proshika* had mobilized 2.6 million members throughout the country and disbursed a cumulative amount of Taka 20.6 billion.

Forestry has been a key component of the activities of *Proshika* from the beginning. They divide forestry activities into two parts. The first part, which is the Forest Management Program, supports forest protection in degraded *sal* areas and promotes agro-forestry and woodlots in forest areas. But the extent of involvement of *Proshika* in the first part, comparatively speaking, is small because it is present in only six of the four hundred and eighty two *upazilla*<sup>1</sup> in Bangladesh. Social forestry comes under the second part of their forestry program and the activities under this program are comparatively larger than in the case of the forest management program. Currently, *Proshika* operates this program in 150 *upazilla* in 57 districts of Bangladesh. Under the social forestry program, *Proshika* promotes two types of activities: (i) Strip and Block Plantations (ii) Institutional Plantations.

Under the strip and block plantation program, members of *Proshika* plant trees alongside roads, railways, canals or privately owned land. Before starting a strip and block plantation project, *Proshika* helps members of one or two microcredit program groups to negotiate with the owner of the land, who may be a government agency or a private individual. Members work on the plantation only after completion of these negotiations and legal formalities. The members of the groups that are involved in the plantation then select caretakers who are paid to protect the seedlings for the first two to three years when the seedlings are especially at risk from grazing animals. *Proshika*, thereafter, expects the members to protect the trees from theft and to carry out the required maintenance, especially periodic pruning and thinning. In return, these members are allowed to use the biomass produced from trees. At the end, when the trees reach maturity stage, the members involved cut them down to be sold as timber while they divide up the proceeds that come from the sales in agreed proportions among the parties involved in the particular plantation, with *Proshika* members receiving 60%, the landowner 20%, and *Proshika* 20%.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bangladesh divides every district into several administrative regions; each region is known as *Thana*. Currently, the word *Thana* is replaced by the word *Upazilla*. *Upazilla* means sub-district.

During the period from 1976 to 2002, *Proshika* completed 14,671 kilometres of strip plantations with the involvement of 6,729 groups and planted 7.3 million trees (see Table 1). Under the block plantation program, *Proshika* planted some 48.9 million trees on 17,731 hectares of land during the period 1976 to 2002 (see Table 2). *Proshika* was able to involve 8,981 groups of their members in this program.

*Proshika* carries out its institutional plantation program on the campuses of educational institutions with the objective of creating a more pleasant environment for teachers and students. Sometimes *Proshika* implements such projects as part of joint research with universities and research institutes into newly introduced species. During the period 1998 to 2002, *Proshika* brought 562 institutions within its coverage under the institutional plantation program. *Proshika* was able to plant 472,378 seedlings at these institutions during the said period.

### **3. Environmental Literacy**

According to Disinger and Roth (1992), Charles E. Roth was the first to use the term 'environmental literacy' in 1968. However, there is no universally acceptable definition of the term even after 40 years. After reviewing the available literature on environmental literacy, Disinger and Roth (1992) therefore state that environmental literacy is based on an ecological paradigm which includes studies of interrelationships between natural and social systems. They also argue that an environmentally literate person combines knowledge with values that translate into actions. For Creighton and Cortese, environmental literacy is "awareness and understanding of the importance of the natural environment and the effects of human activities on it, as well as an appreciation for the complexity of the interaction" (1992: 19). Studies on environmental literacy linked to education and pedagogy have a tendency to define environmental literacy from the perspective of classroom-based environmental education. For example, Hungerford *et al.* (1980) focus on using environmental education curricula to raise environmental literacy.

Roth (2002) has identified what a person should know and understand in order to be considered environmentally literate: (a) the physical processes that shape the patterns of the Earth's surface; (b) the characteristics and spatial distribution of ecosystems on the earth's surface; (c) the characteristics, distribution and migration of human populations on earth; (d) the patterns and networks of economic, social and political interdependence on earth; (e) the processes, patterns, and functions of human settlement; (f) how human actions modify the physical environment; (g) how physical systems affect human systems; (h) the changes that occur in the perception, use, distribution and importance of resources.

Hares *et al.* (2006) conducted a few case studies in Thailand and Sudan in order to understand the role environmental literacy plays in people's ability to interpret endangered sustainability. They define environmental literacy as the perception of people about their physical environment. According to them, while the environmental literacy of a person is shaped by the personal learning process of that person, that learning process depends on the socio-economic, political, cultural, historical, and ecological circumstances which surround that person. In addition to the personal learning process, individual attributes, for example age and intelligence, also determine the level of environmental literacy. They also argue that environmental literacy is not limited to perceptions of individuals about the environment but also includes corresponding environmental behaviour on the part of those individuals. But environmental literacy may not always ensure optimal or appropriate environmental behavior on the part of individuals. Environmentally literate individuals

may pursue activities that harm the environment for the sake of their livelihoods (Hares *et al.*, 2006). Furthermore, environmental behaviour can be influenced by factors other than environmental literacy. These other factors may lead to behaviors that are harmful to the environment on the part of an individual irrespective of his/her environmental literacy. In a study on environmental literacy of secondary school teachers in Taiwan, environmental literacy variables could explain only 35% of the variations in responsible environmental behavior of secondary school teachers. Other factors shaped the remaining 65% of variations in responsible environmental behavior of secondary school teachers. These other factors may be political, cultural or economic (Hsu and Roth, 1998).

Keller (1985) has found ethnic differences when it comes to knowledge on animals and the natural environment of second to eleventh grade students in the United States while Gifford, Hay and Boros (1982-83) have observed gender differences in environmental knowledge among undergraduate students in the United States. Eagles and Muffitt (1990), on the other hand, have reported that media exposure to environmental issues to have a positive effect on environmental knowledge, awareness, concern and attitudes of sixth to eighth grade students in Canada. They conclude that students who watch films and television on wildlife have a more positive attitude toward animals compared to non-viewers. Fortner and Teates (1980), Alaimo and Doran (1980), Hausbeck *et al.* (1992), and Fortner and Mayer (1983) have reported similar findings in their studies.

The terms "environmental perception" and "environmental knowledge" are closely linked to environmental literacy. Whyte (1977) defines environmental perception as the human awareness and understanding of the environment in a general sense of the term. Gambro and Switzky (1996), who conducted a survey on high school students' environmental knowledge in the United States, define environmental knowledge as the ability of students to understand and evaluate the impact of society on the ecosystem. They found the environmental knowledge of high school students to be extremely elementary with the majority of students lacking in understanding regarding the consequences of environmental problems and their ability to offer solutions to those problems.

But the issue of public concern about environmental issues is gradually gaining more scholarly attention due to increasing awareness about climate change. However, the majority of work on public environmental perception has been done in developed countries (Brechin and Kempton, 1994; White and Hunter, 2005). Considering the increasing dependence on natural resources in the developing countries, it is important to study environmental perception among people in developing countries (High and Shakleton, 2000; Twine *et al.*, 2003). Moreover, not only were all the studies that this paper reviewed conducted in developed countries but they considered the issue of environmental literacy from a pedagogical perspective. There is therefore a gap in the literature with regard to the assessment of the impact of participation in environmental projects, especially in social forestry projects, on the environmental literacy of households. The present study fills this gap by assessing the impact of participation in social forestry projects on the environmental literacy of participating households in the case of Bangladesh.

#### **4. Environmental Literacy Score**

Following Roth (2002), in the present study, we ask households to give their opinion on ten environmental issues as a means of gauging their level of environmental literacy. The ten environmental issues are: (i) I do not believe that human being are polluting the environment;

(ii) Dust, smoke from brick fields, and chemical wastage from factories are polluting the environment; (iii) A portion of the pesticide and fertilizer that we use for agricultural purposes remains in food and it is bad for health; (iv) Environmental degradation, especially arsenic contamination, will create a shortage of drinking water in the near future; (v) The incremental use of pesticide and fertilizer reduces product quality; (vi) Environmental problems resulting from agricultural activities are exaggerated by the media; (vii) The use of pesticide and fertilizer in agriculture is causing ground water pollution; (viii) In spite of limitations, farmers can protect the environment; (ix) The use of pesticide and fertilizer is not harmful to the environment; rather they promote high quality production; (x) The governmental and non-governmental organizations will have to become more active in protecting the environment. These ten issues are related to the issues of (a), (b), (e), (f), (g), and (h) that Roth (2002) mentions in his study that we cited in Section 3 above. We have left out only issues related to (c), which refers to migrations of human populations, and (d), which covers the patterns and networks of economic, social and political interdependence on earth (see Roth 2002) in designing questions to understand the environmental literacy of households in Bangladesh. We have not incorporated point (c) because environmental-disaster-induced migration is not a problem in the survey area. We have left out point (d) because of problems in collecting data on socio-political issues.

We asked the sampled households to give their opinion on a 5-point scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". On the basis of the households' responses to the above mentioned 10 statements, we calculate an environmental literacy score for each household. In the case of an affirmative statement, we award the highest 5 points to a household whose response is "strongly agree" while we award the lowest 1 point to "strongly disagree". In contrast, we award 5 points to "strongly disagree" and 1 point to "strongly agree" in the case of a negative statement. The highest achievable environmental literacy score for a household is 50 while the lowest achievable environmental literacy score is 10.

## 5. Survey Design and Data

We base the analysis reported in this paper on a household-level survey of members of a *Proshika* branch carried out between February and April 2007. The number of households surveyed was 450. We collected the data through face-to-face interviews following a four-stage sampling design. In the first stage, we selected one district, Gazipur, out of the 64 districts in Bangladesh. At the second stage, we selected a branch from the list of branches of *Proshika* in Gazipur. A branch usually consists of some centers, with each center having 30 to 40 members. The selected branch was about 60 km from Dhaka, the capital of Bangladesh. At the third stage, we selected centers from the selected branch. At the fourth and final stage of sampling, we selected individual households. In this randomly selected branch of *Proshika*, the total number of participating households was 6200. Of these 6200 households, only 2100 households participated in social forestry projects. For the purposes of data collection, we divided all the member households of the branch into three categories: (i) households that participated in the microcredit as well as the social forestry program (SF group); (ii) households that participated in the microcredit program but did not participate in the social forestry program (comparison group 1); and (iii) households of new members who had just received their first loan or were awaiting their first loan (comparison group 2) that did not participate in the social forestry program. While we obtained the list of member households from the branch office of *Proshika*, we selected households randomly from the three categories of membership mentioned above. The survey expected 150 questionnaires from each of the three membership categories. However, at some centers, households from the

third category were not available. In case of non-availability of households in the third category of membership, we replaced these households by households from the first and second categories. During the data entry and data cleaning stages, we dropped some observations due to inconsistent responses and missing data which left 420 households in the sample (see Table 2). In the final count, we had 152 households from the social forestry group, 174 households from comparison group 1 (CG1), and 94 households from comparison group 2 (CG2).

Besides information on social forestry and the environment, the survey collected detailed information for all household members on a variety of other factors such as demographic information (age, sex, marital status, etc.) and socio-economic information (education, employment, food consumption, expenditure on health, etc.). We also collected detailed village-level information such as distance to the nearest primary school, secondary school, and market and district headquarters, along with variables describing village infrastructure such as the presence of schools, markets, roads, electricity, etc. Branch officials provided information on the size of the loan received, the date of joining, and other membership characteristics of households.

## 6. Estimation Strategy

Keeping in mind the limitations of the simple comparison method, we used the multivariate analysis technique to assess the impact of participation in the social forestry program of *Proshika* on outcome variables at the household level. The main advantage of this technique, compared to the simple comparison method, is that it allows the study to control those household and village level variables that influence the outcomes. Given the extensive geographic coverage of microcredit in Bangladesh, it is difficult to find a perfect 'control' group that we could be used to estimate the impact of microcredit-based social forestry participation on outcome variables.

A household's decision to attend a microcredit-based social forestry program is likely to be related to the outcome of interest, which is environmental literacy, in this paper. We estimate the following equation:

$$Y_i = \beta X_i + \gamma SF_i + U_i \quad (1)$$

where  $Y$  is the environmental literacy of households,  $X$  is a vector of some control variables that are assumed to be exogenous (for example, education of the household head, the existence of electricity in the household, etc.), and  $SF$  is social forestry participation while  $u$  is the error term.

The equation given below defines participation in social forestry:

$$SF_i = \delta Z_i + v_i \quad (2)$$

where  $Z$  represents some control variables and  $v$  represents the error term of the model. While we estimate the impact of social forestry participation using the equation (1), we assume that the error terms of equations (1) and (2), i.e.,  $u$  and  $v$ , are not correlated. But these two error terms become correlated if the characteristics of households that influence the social forestry program participation decision also determine the outcome variable, i.e.,  $Y$  in equation (1). In such a situation, the estimation of equation (1) yields a biased estimate of the parameter of interest  $\gamma^2$ .

---

<sup>2</sup> The Wu-Hausman F-test for endogeneity returned a large F-statistics (82.76), indicating that endogeneity is a substantial problem.

Keeping this in mind, we have used the instrumental variable (IV) technique. The IV technique requires at least one variable that is likely to affect the decision to participate in the social forestry program to be incorporated into the model that determines social forestry program participation decision but is unlikely to affect directly the outcome of interest, i.e., environmental literacy (Heckman, 1997). We therefore rewrite the equation (2) under the instrumental variable approach as follows:

$$SF_i = \delta Z_i + \lambda d + v_i \quad (3)$$

where  $d$  is the instrumental variable. In order to obtain consistent estimates, we assume that  $\lambda \neq 0$  and that  $d$  is uncorrelated with  $u$ . Considering the geographical locations of social forestry projects and participating households, the distance of the household from the nearest social forestry project could be a good instrument<sup>3</sup>. But since *Proshika* gives priority, with regard to joining, to the nearest households when they implement a social forestry project on a road in a particular area, this distance does not influence the environmental literacy of households. It is possible that some may confuse the distance of a household from the nearest social forestry project with the distance of that household from the nearest paved road. But the distance of the household from the nearest social forestry project is different from the distance of the household from the nearest paved road. As Table 1 shows, households that participate (SF households) in social forestry projects are on average 0.7 km away from the nearest projects. On the other hand, households that do not participate in social forestry projects (Non-SF households) are 1.7 km away from the nearest social forestry projects. It is evident from the t-test that non-SF households are located at a significant distance from the nearest social forestry projects compared to SF households.

In addition to the IV technique, we compared program households (which participate in the microcredit-based social forestry program of *Proshika*) and comparison households (which are only members of the microcredit program of *Proshika* but do not participate in the social forestry program) in terms of the means and the distribution of the outcome variable, i.e., environmental literacy. The differences in the means and the distribution of environmental literacy between program and comparison households capture the impact of participation in the social forestry program of *Proshika* on environmental literacy at the household level.

Considering the potential endogeneity in the participation of households in microcredit-based social forestry projects, we assess the impact of microcredit-based social forestry participation on environmental literacy using a two-stage regression analysis. The first stage regression (equation 3) models the participation decision of households in social forestry projects (SFORESTRY). This model includes  $X$  in the right hand side of the model as control variables that influence the participation decision of households along with  $Z$  and  $d$ . We predict participation in social forestry projects after running the first stage regression.

In the second stage regression, we use the predicted value (PSFORESTRY) of the participation of a household in a social forestry project from the first stage regression as a regressor. Other regressors are: four dummy variables that are related to the employment status of the household head (LABOUR, BUSINESS, AGRI, and SERVICE); eight variables on the number of members of a household in different age groups (MALE6B, FEMALE6B, MALE625, FEMALE625,

---

<sup>3</sup> The F-statistic of the instrument, that is, the distance of the household from the nearest social forestry project, is 235.45. This result indicates that the above-mentioned instrument is a good instrument.



MALE2660, FEMALE2660, MALE60A and FEMALE60A); two variables related to demographic information on household heads (AGE and MALE); two variables that are associated with the education level of the household head and other members (EDUHEAD and EDUALL); one variable related to the religion of the household (MUSLIM); three variables related to local infrastructure (MARKET, SCHOOL, and ELECTRICITY); and one variable related to the membership duration of households in the microcredit program of *Proshika* (MCDUR)<sup>4</sup>.

We include four dummy variables related to a household head's employment status, LABOUR, BUSINESS, AGRI and SERVICE, considering OTHERS as the base category, in the model to see their impact on the environmental literacy of households. We include these variables in particular to see whether households with heads involved in agriculture are more environmentally literate compared to heads involved in other professions. We expect households whose heads are involved in agriculture to be more environmentally literate than households whose heads are not involved in agriculture because the former are more likely to experience directly the adverse consequences of environmental phenomena than those in non-agricultural occupations. We have incorporated eight variables (MALE6B, FEMALE6B, MALE625, FEMALE625, MALE2660, FEMALE2660, MALE60A and FEMALE60A), related to the size of a household in terms of age and gender, with the objective of examining their impact on the environmental literacy of a household. We include these eight variables given the different impacts of these variables on the welfare and firm and non-firm activities of a household. We include the age of the household head (AGE) in the model to see how it shapes the level of household environmental literacy.

Studies by Gifford, Hay and Boros (1982-83) and Hausbeck, Milbrath and Enright (1992) have found differences between men and women with regard to environmental knowledge. They point out that men have more environmental knowledge than women. Female-headed households tend to be poorer compared to male-headed households. These households are likely to have less access to education and less access to information as they are less likely to own a radio and TV. Since education and access to a radio and TV are likely to influence environmental education positively; we expect female-headed households to be less environmentally literate compared to male headed households. We therefore include a dummy variable on the sex of the household head (MALE=1 if head is male) in the model. Keller (1985) finds ethnic differences when it comes to the knowledge of second to eleventh grade students in the United States on animals and the natural environment. Taking this into consideration, we have included a dummy variable (MUSLIM=1 if the religion is ISLAM) on the religious status of a household in the model. Furthermore, the education level of the head and other members of the household are likely to affect positively the environmental literacy of a household since formal education provides relevant information on the environment. For this reason, we have included two variables on the education of the head and other members of the household (EDUHEAD and EDUALL) as independent variables on the right hand side of the model.

Access to a local market increases the likelihood of having a higher income by a household as this ensures the availability of inputs for production and increases the marketability of produced goods and services. The higher income enhances the entitlement of household members to education and, thus, increases the possibility of being more environmentally literate. The variable (MARKET) that represents access to a local market is incorporated into the model to control for the effect of this variable on the environmental literacy of households. The availability of a

---

<sup>4</sup> We give the detailed labels of these variables in Table 5.

school in a locality ensures better education for members in that locality and increases the probability of people being more environmentally literate as teachers would teach students about environment-related issues in class. Considering the probable effect of the availability of a school (SCHOOL) on the right hand side of the second stage model to control for this effect. The t-test result indicates that new non-social forestry microcredit members (CG2) are significantly more environmentally literate than older non-social forestry microcredit members (CG1). The likely reason for this phenomenon is that new non-social forestry microcredit members are comparatively more dependent on agriculture as is evident from the descriptive results according to which 32% heads of the CG2 households work on their own farm land compared to only 26% heads of the CG1 households. We include membership duration in the microcredit program in the model as an independent variable in order to control for the impact of microcredit program duration on the environmental literacy of households. Since Eagles and Muffitt (1990) have found media exposure to have a positive effect on environmental knowledge, awareness, concern and attitudes of sixth to eighth grade students in Canada, we include an independent variable in the model on the availability of electricity (ELECTRICITY) in the household as a proxy of the household's media exposure. The availability of electricity in a household reflects the higher likelihood of owning a radio and TV by that household.

Since the dependent variable in the second stage regression, that is, the household's environmental literacy score, has count data characteristics, we have applied Poisson regression and negative binomial regression techniques to estimate the determinants of household environmental literacy. We have conducted a test of the over dispersion parameter alpha to examine whether negative binomial regression is a better technique compared to Poisson regression for this model. The test result shows that alpha is significantly different from zero, which indicates that the negative binomial regression is a more appropriate technique for this model. For the purpose of checking the robustness of the results, we report the results of ordinary least squares (OLS) and Tobit regression in addition to the results of the negative binomial regression and Poisson regression.

## **7. Results and Discussion**

Table 3 presents the distribution of the responses of households on the ten environmental issues. It shows that a higher number of social forestry (SF) households give environmentally logical responses compared to non-social forestry (CG) households. The chi-square test results indicate that the distribution of the responses of SF households is significantly different from that of non-social forestry households. These results indicate that, on the whole, participation in the SF program enhances the environmental knowledge of households and enables households to give more environmentally logical responses to the questions related to environment.

Table 4 shows the total environmental literacy score by household groups. It indicates that the average literacy scores of non-social forestry household groups are 28 and 32 for CG1 and CG2 respectively. On the other hand, the average literacy score of the social forestry household group (SF households) is 36. On average, the SF households have a 29% higher environmental literacy score compared to the CG1 households and a 12% higher score compared to the CG2 households. The t-test results indicate that SF households, on average, have a significantly higher environmental literacy score compared to the two non-social forestry household groups (CG1 and CG2). The average literacy score of all non-social forestry households is 29 (after combining the scores for both the groups). This average literacy score of comparison households is 18%

lower than that of social forestry households while the difference is statistically significant. These results illustrate that participation in social forestry projects is likely to enhance the level of environmental literacy of participating households.

Table 5 shows the environmental literacy score of households by sex of the household head. Female-headed households have an average environmental literacy score of 33 while the score of male households is 32. But the difference between female-headed households and male-headed households in terms of environmental literacy is not statistically significant. This result indicates that female-headed households are likely to have a slightly better knowledge about their surrounding environment compared to male-headed households. This finding contradicts the findings of Gifford, Hay and Boros (1982-83) and Hausbeck, Milbrath and Enright (1992) who found men to be more environmentally knowledgeable than women.

We expect education to have a positive impact on environmental literacy as education helps individuals to learn more about the environment. Table 6 illustrates the environmental literacy score of households by the literacy status of the household head. We define literacy as the ability of a person to read and write. The results indicate that households with literate heads have a 2 points higher environmental literacy score on average than households with illiterate heads. The average environmental literacy score of households with literate household heads is 33 while the same score for households with illiterate heads is 31. The t-test result indicates that households with literate heads have a significantly higher environmental literacy score compared to households with illiterate household heads. These results show education to have a positive impact on the environmental literacy of households.

Table 7 gives the environmental literacy score of households by religion. The average environmental literacy score of Hindu households is 34 while the average environmental literacy score of Muslim households is 30. It shows that households that identify themselves as Hindu, though a minority in Bangladesh, have significantly higher environmental literacy scores compared to households that identify themselves as Muslim, which represent the majority. One reason might be that Hindu households are more educated and therefore more knowledgeable about the environment compared to Muslim households. This finding is similar to that of Keller (1985) who reported ethnic differences in knowledge when it comes to animals and the natural environment among second to eleventh grade students in the United States.

The availability of electricity in a household increases the probability of the household owning a radio and television. Access to radio and television enables household members to watch environment-related programs on television and to listen to environmental programs on radio, both of which would enhance the environmental knowledge of household members. The results on Table 8 show that households with electricity have a slightly higher average environmental literacy score compared to those households without access to electricity. The average environmental literacy score of households with electricity is 32 whereas the average environmental literacy score of households without electricity is 30. The difference in the environmental literacy score of households with and without electricity is statistically significant. This result confirms the findings of Eagles and Muffitt (1990) and Fortner and Teates (1980). Eagles and Muffitt (1990) found that watching films and television significantly enhanced the positive attitudes of children in grades six to eight in Canada towards animals. Fortner and Teates (1980) found that the knowledge of individuals on the oceans was directly affected by the number of Cousteau programs that they had watched on television.

## 7.1 First Stage Regression

In the first stage regression, we used the probit model since the dependent variable (SFORESTRY) is a binary variable where a household takes the value of 1 if it participates in a social forestry project and 0 otherwise. The results on Table 6 show that the instrumental variable SFDISTANCE, i.e., the distance of a household from the nearest social forestry project, negatively determines the decision of a household to participate in a social forestry project. This result indicates that an increase in the distance of a household from the nearest social forestry project reduces the probability of that household joining a social forestry project. The coefficient of the instrumental variable is statistically significant and the F statistics (F statistics = 235.45) indicate that it is significantly different from zero ( $\lambda \neq 0$ ). These results indicate that the probability of joining a social forestry project by a household reduces by 51% if the distance of that household from the nearest social forestry project goes up by 1 kilometre. This result demonstrates that the ability of the instrument to predict the participation of households in social forestry projects is quite good.

## 7.2 Determinants of Household Environmental Literacy

Table 7 gives the determinants of the household environmental literacy score. As mentioned in Section 6, the most appropriate technique for estimating the determinants of household environmental literacy is the negative binomial regression. Table 7 also presents the results of the ordinary least squares regression, the Tobit regression, and the Poisson regression in addition to the results of the negative binomial regression. The results from the negative binomial regression indicate that five variables significantly determine the household environmental literacy score. These variables are: the predicated value of social forestry participation from the first stage regression (PSFORESTRY), education of the household head (EDUHEAD), existence of a school in the village (SCHOOL), availability of electricity in the village (ELECTRICITY), and microcredit program membership duration (MCDUR). These results are quite robust because in the other three models too these five variables are statistically significant with the same signs.

Predictably, participation in the social forestry program of *Proshika* (PSFORESTRY) appears significant and positive for the environmental literacy score. This means that participating households are more environmentally literate compared to non-participating households, the probable reason being that participating households receive training from *Proshika* on social forestry and environmental issues which would make them more environmentally literate. This result confirms that participation of households in the social forestry projects of *Proshika* significantly enhances the environmental literacy of households.

The level of education of the household head (EDUHEAD) is significant in terms of the environmental literacy score of households. Education influences the environmental literacy score positively and significantly. In fact, the environmental literacy score of the household rises with the educational level of the household head. Similarly, the education level of all members in the household except the household head (EDUALL) also positively influences the environmental literacy scores of households. But it is not statistically significant. The existence of a school in the locality (SCHOOL) also significantly and positively determines household environmental literacy. The average level of household environmental literacy goes up with the existence of a school in the locality, the likely reason being that the availability of a school in the locality increases the likelihood of local people receiving a formal education at school. These results are logical and expected. Studies have shown that education enhances people's awareness about the environment

since school textbooks contain information about the environment while a literate person also acquires the ability to read newspapers and magazines which carry articles on the environment.

The availability of electricity (ELECTRICITY) in a household is a significant positive determinant of the environmental literacy score of that household. Electricity increases the probability of owning a radio and television by that household. The ownership of radio and television, in turn, gives a household access to better information on the environment. In Bangladesh, radio stations and television channels broadcast programs on the environment on a regular basis in order to make people more aware of environmental issues. Perhaps due to this reason, the existence of electricity in a household significantly increases the environmental score of that household. The dummy variable on the sex of the household head (MALE=1 if household head is male) negatively determines the environmental literacy of households. This means that households with male heads are likely to have a lower environmental literacy score compared to households whose heads are female. But it is not statistically significant. Similarly, the dummy variable on the religious status of a household (MUSLIM=1 if the household identifies itself as Muslim) is a negative determinant of the household's environmental literacy. Households that are Muslim are likely to have a lower environmental literacy score compared to households that identify themselves as Hindu. Like the variable on the sex of the household head, this variable too is statistically insignificant.

The duration of membership of a household (MCDUR) in the microcredit program of *Proshika* significantly and negatively determines the environmental literacy of that household. This result shows new microcredit program households to be more environmentally literate than older microcredit program households, the likely reason being that new microcredit program households are more dependent on agriculture compared to older microcredit program households. The descriptive statistics indicate more heads of new microcredit program households to be employed in the agriculture sector compared to heads of older microcredit program households. The involvement in agriculture makes them more environmentally literate compared to older microcredit program households because agriculture-dependent households have to contend with the negative fall-outs of environmental changes on a more immediate basis than non-agriculture households.

## **8. Conclusions and Policy Implications**

The rapid reduction in forest resources has created serious ecological threats in Bangladesh. The per capita forestland has come down to less than 0.02 hectares from 0.035 hectares per person in 1968-69. Taking into consideration the massive deforestation in Bangladesh as well as the negative consequences of climate change, it is important for policy makers and non-government organizations (NGOs) to undertake projects that motivate people to plant more trees and to conserve existing forest land. It is also important for policy makers and the NGOs to ensure that people become more knowledgeable about environmental issues and the negative fall-outs of adverse environmental changes such as global warming and climate change. *Proshika*, an NGO in Bangladesh, has initiated its social forestry project with the objective of improving the environment while alleviating poverty, which is one major cause of deforestation. The main goal is to encourage poor people to plant trees for their own benefit. Besides encouraging participating households to join tree planting projects, *Proshika* provides training to these households about the environment and the importance of planting trees for the purpose of deriving both economic and environmental benefits. Therefore, it is only natural that participating households would have a better knowledge on the environment than non-participating households. It is against this backdrop that the present

study has evaluated the impact on the environmental literacy of households of participation in the social forestry projects of *Proshika*.

We have defined environmental literacy as knowledge and understanding among individuals about the factors and issues related to environment and how environmental factors affect the quality of life of individuals. We have calculated an environmental literacy score on the basis of the responses of households to ten environmental issues on a 5-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" for every responding household. The highest achievable environmental literacy score is 50 and the lowest achievable environmental literacy score is 10 for each participating household.

We base the analysis on a household-level survey of 450 households. Considering the fact of endogeneity in program participation, we used the instrumental variable (IV) technique to achieve the objectives of the study. Considering the count data characteristics of environmental literacy, we considered negative binomial regression to be the appropriate technique for assessing the impact on the environmental literacy of households of participation in the social forestry projects of *Proshika*. The results indicate that participation in the social forestry program of *Proshika* significantly enhances the environmental literacy of participating households. These findings demonstrate the importance of policy makers and NGOs initiating more environment-related projects like social forestry to make people more literate about the environment. Besides initiating such projects, the government must take steps to increase the access of people to education and to the media, such as radio and TV, as these appear to be significant positive determinants of the environmental literacy of households.

## **9. Acknowledgements**

I wish to acknowledge the financial support provided by the South Asian Network of Development and Environmental Economics (SANDEE) for this study. I would like to thank Professor Karl Goran-Maler, Professor Partha Dasgupta, Professor M. N. Murty, Professor E. Somanathan, Dr. Priya Shyamsundar, Professor Enamul Haque, Dr. Subhrendu Pattanayak, Dr. Jean-Marie Baland, Dr. Pranab Mukhopadhyay and Dr. S. Madheswaran for their valuable comments on different draft versions of this paper during the various Research and Training workshops of SANDEE. I would also like to thank Dr. Mani Nepal and the anonymous referees for their valuable comments on the various final versions of this paper. The administrative assistance of Ms. Kavita Shrestha, Ms. Anuradha Kafle and Ms. Krisha Shrestha of the SANDEE secretariat is also gratefully acknowledged. It goes without saying that all shortcomings remain my own responsibility.

## References

- Alaimo, S.J. and R.L. Doran (1980), 'Students' perception of environmental problems and sources of environmental information', *The Journal of Environmental Education* 12(1): 17-21.
- Anderson, D. and R. Fishwick (1984), 'Fuelwood consumption and deforestation in African countries: a review', World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 704, World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- Brechin, S.R. and W Kempton (1994), 'Global environmentalism: a challenge to the postmaterialism thesis?' *Social Science Quarterly* 75: 245-269.
- Creighton, S.H. and A.D. Cortese (1992), 'Environmental literacy and action at Tufts University', in D. J. Eagan and D.W. Orr (eds.), *The Campus and Environmental Responsibility*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Disinger, J.F. and C.E. Roth (1992), *Environmental Literacy*, ERIC/CSMEE Digest, Available at: <http://www.ericse.org/digests/dse92-1.html> [accessed on October 16, 2001]
- Eagles, P.F.J. and S. Miffitt (1990), 'An analysis of children's attitudes toward animals', *The Journal of Environmental Education* 21(3): 4144.
- Fortner, R.W. and V.J. Mayer (1983), 'Ohio students' knowledge and attitudes about the oceans and Great Lakes', *Ohio Journal of Science* 83(S): 218-224.
- Fortner, R.W. and T.G. Teates (1980), 'Baseline studies for marine education: Experiences related to marine knowledge and attitudes', *The Journal of Environmental Education* 11(4): 1-19.
- Gifford, R., R. Hay and K. Boros (1982-1983), 'Individual differences in environmental attitudes', *The Journal of Environmental Education* 14(2): 19-23.
- Gambro, John S. and H.N. Switzky (1996), A national survey of high school students' environmental knowledge, *Journal of Environmental Education* 27(3): 28-33.
- Hares, M., A. Eskonheimo, T. Myllyntaus and O. Luukkanenet (2006), 'Environmental literacy in interpreting endangered sustainability case studies from Thailand and the Sudan', *Geoforum* 37: 128-44.
- Hausbeck, K. W., L.W. Milbrath and S.M. Enright (1992), Environmental knowledge, awareness, and concern among 11th-grade students: New York State', *The Journal of Environmental Education* 24(1): 27-34.
- Heckman, J. (1997), 'Instrumental Variables: a study of implicit behavior assumptions used in making program evaluation', *Journal of Human Resources* 32 (3): 441-61.
- High, C. and C.M. Shackleton (2000), 'The comparative value of wild and domestic plants in home gardens of a South African rural village', *Agroforestry Systems* 48(2):141-156.

Hungerford, H.R., R.B. Peyton and R.J. Wilke (1980), 'Goals for curriculum development in environmental education', *The Journal of Environmental Education* 11(3): 42-47.

Huq, M.F. and A. Alim. (1995), *Social forestry in Bangladesh: state of art study*, BRAC-Winrock International Agroforestry and Participatory Forestry Research and Training Support Program, Dhaka.

Hsu, S. and R. Roth. (1998), 'An assessment of environmental literacy and analysis of predictors of responsible environmental behavior held by secondary teachers in the Hualien area of Taiwan', *Environmental Education Research* 4(3): 229-249.

IUCN (1980), *World conservation strategy: living resource conservation for sustainable development*, New York: International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Available at: <http://data.iucn.org/dbtw-wpd/edocs/WCS-004.pdf>, [accessed on August 12, 2010].

Kellert, S.R. (1985), 'Attitudes toward animals: age-related development among children', *The Journal of Environmental Education* 16(3): 29-39.

Roth, C.E. (2002), *A questioning framework for shaping environmental literacy*, Earthlore Associates, Available at: [www.antiochne.edu/anei/download/82\\_questioning.pdf](http://www.antiochne.edu/anei/download/82_questioning.pdf), [accessed on March 13, 2009]

Timberlake, L. (1985), *Africa in Crisis: the Causes and Cures of Environmental Bankruptcy*, Earthscan: London.

Twine, W., D. Moshe, T. Netshiluvhi and V. Siphugu (2003), 'Consumption and direct-use values of savanna bio-resources used by rural households in Mametja, a semi-arid area of Limpopo Province, South Africa', *South African Journal of Science* 99 (Sept/Oct): 467-473.

White, M.J. and L.M. Hunter (2005), *Public perception of environmental issues in a developing setting*, Working Paper EB2005-0003, Institute of Behavioral Science, University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder, USA.

Whyte, A.V.T. (1977), *Field methods in guidelines for field studies in environmental perception*, MAB, Technical Notes 5, UNESCO, France.

WCED (1987), *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press: Oxford.



## LIST of TABLES

Table 1: Social Forestry Program of *Proshika*

Types of Plantation	Period	No. of Seedlings Planted	Area	No. of Groups /Institutions Involved
Strip	1976 - 2002	7, 346, 269	14, 671 kilometres	6,729 Groups
Block	1976 - 2002	48,915,016	17,731 hectares	8,981 Groups
Institutional	1998 - 2002	472,378	-	552 Institutions

Source: Annual reports of Proshika

Table 2: Sample Distribution

Household Groups	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
SFG	152	36.19	36.19
CG1	174	41.43	77.62
CG2	94	22.38	100.00
Total	420	100.00	

Source: Field survey, 2007

SFG = Social Forestry Group; CG1 = Comparison Group 1, households (HHs) with *Proshika* membership more than 1 year belong to this group; CG2 = Comparison Group 2, new member households belong to this group.

Table 3: Distribution of the Responses of Households on Environmental Issues (%)

Environmental Issues	Groups	Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Chi Square
I do not believe that human being are polluting the environment	SF	16.56	21.85	1.99	25.83	33.71	144.29*
	Non SF	36.02	9.96	39.85	9.58	4.60	
Dust, smoke from brick fields, and chemical wastage from factories are polluting the environment	SF	58.94	36.42	1.32	2.65	0.66	65.26*
	Non SF	25.29	42.91	1.15	11.88	18.77	
A portion of the pesticide and fertilizer that we use for agricultural purposes remains in food and it is bad for health	SF	49.67	38.41	5.30	5.30	1.32	76.60*
	Non SF	16.86	33.72	16.48	13.41	19.54	
Environmental degradation, especially arsenic contamination, will create a shortage of drinking water in the near future	SF	56.95	32.45	4.64	4.64	1.32	56.39*
	Non SF	29.12	28.35	5.75	16.86	19.92	
The incremental use of pesticide and fertilizer reduces the product quality	SF	44.37	33.77	6.62	11.92	3.31	56.93*
	Non SF	19.16	24.90	20.69	14.56	20.69	
Environmental problems resulting from agricultural activities are exaggerated by the media	SF	11.26	15.89	25.17	14.57	33.11	94.17*
	Non SF	32.18	35.25	18.77	10.73	3.07	
The use of pesticide and fertilizer in agriculture is causing ground water pollution	SF	52.32	35.76	5.30	3.97	2.65	78.86*
	Non SF	16.48	36.40	9.58	17.24	20.31	
In spite of limitations, farmers can protect the environment	SF	48.34	29.14	12.58	7.95	1.99	68.14*
	Non SF	15.71	29.89	16.86	16.09	21.46	
The use of pesticide and fertilizer is not harmful to the environment; rather they promote high quality production	SF	9.27	24.50	12.58	18.54	35.10	76.55*
	Non SF	28.35	38.31	15.33	12.64	5.36	
The governmental and non-governmental organizations will have to become more active in protecting the environment	SF	68.21	27.81	0.00	3.31	0.66	67.54*
	Non SF	37.55	22.22	8.43	14.56	17.24	

Source: Field survey, 2007; \* Significant at 1% level.

Table 4: Environmental Literacy Score  
(by Social Forestry Participation and other Household Characteristics)

Classification Criteria	Household Groups	No. of Obs	Mean	Std. Dev	t-test	
					T	Pr(T>  t )
SF participation	CG1	173	27.77	6.85	11.72	0.0000
	SFG	150	35.70	5.01		
SF participation	CG2	87	31.94	3.37	6.23	0.0000
	SFG	150	35.70	5.01		
SF participation	CG1 & CG2	260	29.17	6.22	10.96	0.0000
	SFG	150	35.70	5.01		
HH head's sex	Female	23	32.78	7.49	0.91	0.3630
	Male	387	31.48	6.55		
HH head's literacy	Literate	230	32.49	6.31	3.28	0.0011
	Illiterate	180	30.36	6.79		
HH's religion	Hindu	15	35.38	8.41	2.30	0.0222
	Muslim	395	31.41	6.50		
HH's access to electricity	Without Electricity	69	29.72	6.09	2.54	0.0113
	With Electricity	341	31.92	6.65		

Source: Field survey, 2007; SFG = Social Forestry Group; CG1 = Comparison Group 1, households (HHs) with *Proshika* membership more than 1 year belong to this group; CG2 = Comparison Group 2, new member households belong to this group.

Table 5: Variables Definition and Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Definition	Mean	Standard Deviation
SFORESTRY	Dummy for the Social Forestry (SF) Participation, 1 if the household participates in the SF project, 0 otherwise	0.36	-
ENVSCORE	Total household environmental score	30.29	6.29
SFDISTANCE	Distance to the nearest social forestry project (kilometres) from the house	1.28	0.96
MUSLIM	Dummy for the religion of the household, 1 if the household is Muslim, 0 if the household is Hindu	0.96	
MARKET	Distance of the household from the nearest market (kilometres)	0.65	0.59
SCHOOL	Distance of the household from the primary school (kilometres)	0.48	0.41
ELECTRICITY	Dummy for the availability of electricity in the village; 1 if the village has electricity, 0 otherwise	0.83	-
MALE	Dummy for the sex of the household head; 1 if head is a male, 0 otherwise	0.95	0.23
EDUHEAD	Total years of schooling of the household head	3.75	4.19
AGE	Age of the household head (in months)	543.08	150.55
LABOUR	Dummy for the employment of the household head - daily labour, 1 if head is a daily labourer, 0 otherwise	0.14	-
BUSINESS	Dummy for the employment of the household head - business, 1 if head is a businessmen, 0 otherwise	0.23	-
AGRI	Dummy for the employment of the household head, 1 if head is a farmer, 0 otherwise	0.35	-
SERVICE	Dummy for the employment of the household head - service, 1 if head is a service holder, 0 otherwise	0.12	-
MALE6B	Total male household members in the age category of 6 below	0.17	0.42
FEMALE6B	Total female household members in the age category of 6 below	0.14	0.38
MALE625	Total household male members in the age category of 6 to 25	1.07	0.95
FEMALE625	Total household female members in the age category of 6 to 25	1.02	0.95
MALE2660	Total household male members in the age category of 26 to 60	1.02	0.72
FEMALE2660	Total household female members in the age category of 26 to 60	0.79	0.62
MALE60A	Total household male members in the age category of 60 above	0.06	0.24
FEMALE60A	Total household female members in the age category of 60 above	0.01	0.11
EDUALL	Total years of schooling of all household members except the household head	14.13	11.74
MCDUR	Duration of membership in the social forestry program (in months)	3.98	6.22

Source: Field survey, 2007

Table 6: Determinants of Household Participation in Social Forestry Projects (probit)

Variables	coefficient	SE	dy/dx
	(1)	(2)	(3)
SFDISTANCE	-1.913***	(0.170)	-0.507
MUSLIM	-1.084**	(0.544)	-0.383
MARKET	0.0514	(0.187)	0.014
SCHOOL	-0.451	(0.281)	-0.120
ELECTRICITY	-0.443*	(0.257)	-0.132
AGE	0.00145*	(0.0008)	0.0004
MALE	-0.236	(0.519)	-0.068
EDUHEAD	0.00833	(0.0292)	0.002
LABOUR	0.404	(0.379)	0.120
BUSINESS	0.0136	(0.324)	0.004
AGRI	0.358	(0.313)	0.099
SERVICE	-0.0943	(0.403)	-0.024
EDUALL	-0.0229*	(0.014)	-0.006
MALE6B	-0.136	(0.229)	-0.036
FEMALE6B	-0.00606	(0.258)	-0.002
MALE625	0.0316	(0.122)	0.008
FEMALE625	0.369***	(0.126)	0.098
MALE2660	0.0616	(0.162)	0.016
FEMALE2660	0.187	(0.202)	0.050
MALE60A	0.323	(0.439)	0.086
FEMALE60A	0.362	(0.909)	0.110
MCDUR	0.00491***	(0.001)	0.001
Constant	1.459*	(0.886)	
<b>Log likelihood</b>	<b>322.04</b>		
<b>Pseudo R2</b>	<b>0.5936</b>		
<b>Obs</b>	<b>412</b>		

Standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

Table 7: Determinants of the Environmental Literacy Score

Variables	Coefficients		SE		Coefficients		SE		Coefficients		SE	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)				
PSFORESTRY	9.460***	(0.952)	9.437***	(0.931)	0.301***	(0.029)	0.302***	(0.030)				
MUSLIM	-1.427	(1.596)	-1.439	(1.561)	-0.0359	(0.046)	-0.0359	(0.047)				
MARKET	0.0871	(0.567)	0.0937	(0.555)	0.00208	(0.017)	0.00208	(0.017)				
SCHOOL	1.444*	(0.826)	1.470*	(0.809)	0.0464*	(0.025)	0.0464*	(0.026)				
ELECTRICITY	2.816***	(0.809)	2.806***	(0.791)	0.0910***	(0.025)	0.0911***	(0.026)				
AGE	0.00320	(0.003)	0.00305	(0.003)	9.97e-05	(7.9e-05)	9.98e-05	(7.8e-05)				
MALE	-2.172	(1.481)	-2.216	(1.449)	-0.0689	(0.045)	-0.0690	(0.045)				
EDUHEAD	0.216**	(0.088)	0.214**	(0.086)	0.00681**	(0.003)	0.00684**	(0.003)				
LABOUR	0.751	(1.112)	0.739	(1.088)	0.0229	(0.034)	0.0230	(0.034)				
BUSINESS	0.676	(0.968)	0.637	(0.947)	0.0227	(0.030)	0.0228	(0.030)				
AGRI	0.442	(0.956)	0.449	(0.935)	0.0144	(0.030)	0.0146	(0.030)				
SERVICE	1.002	(1.146)	1.011	(1.121)	0.0338	(0.035)	0.0337	(0.035)				
EDUALL	0.0410	(0.041)	0.0405	(0.040)	0.00132	(0.001)	0.00131	(0.001)				
MAL6EB	0.651	(0.728)	0.685	(0.713)	0.0212	(0.022)	0.0211	(0.023)				
FEMALE6B	0.334	(0.791)	0.343	(0.774)	0.0113	(0.024)	0.0112	(0.024)				
MALE625	-0.00251	(0.366)	-0.00378	(0.358)	8.13e-05	(0.011)	0.000111	(0.011)				
FEMALE625	-0.00138	(0.390)	0.00167	(0.382)	-0.000123	(0.012)	-3.30e-05	(0.012)				
MAL62660	-0.753	(0.510)	-0.738	(0.499)	-0.0243	(0.016)	-0.0242	(0.016)				
FEMALE2660	-0.413	(0.596)	-0.373	(0.583)	-0.0132	(0.018)	-0.0131	(0.018)				
MALE60A	-1.988	(1.447)	-1.943	(1.415)	-0.0639	(0.044)	-0.0639	(0.045)				
FEMALE60A	-0.109	(2.588)	-0.0945	(2.531)	-0.00258	(0.080)	-0.00241	(0.080)				
MCDUR	-0.0196***	(0.004)	-0.0194***	(0.003)	-0.000639***	(0.0001)	-0.000641***	(0.0001)				
Constant	28.04***	(2.718)	28.12***	(2.659)	3.326***	(0.0814)	3.326***	(0.082)				
Log likelihood			<b>-1284.0458</b>		<b>-1296.9876</b>		<b>-1296.9278</b>					
R2/Pseudo R2	<b>0.267</b>		<b>0.0462</b>		<b>0.0651</b>		<b>0.0459</b>					
Obs	<b>408</b>		<b>408</b>		<b>408</b>		<b>408</b>					

Standard errors in parentheses. OLS=Ordinary Least Square, Poisson=Poisson Regression and NBReg=Negative Binomial Regression. \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1

**Annexure**

**University of Dhaka  
Center for Microfinance and Development**

**Study on  
Micro-Credit Based Social Forestry in Bangladesh**

**Questionnaire**

Questionnaire ID	
------------------	--

# Study on Micro-Credit Based Social Forestry in Bangladesh

ID

Name of the Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_.

Village Name: \_\_\_\_\_.

Thana: \_\_\_\_\_.

District: \_\_\_\_\_.

Name of the Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of the Interview: \_\_\_\_\_.

Religion(code): \_\_\_\_\_.

Code: 1=Islam, 2=Hindu and 3=Others

## 1.8. Local Information:

	Have?Code: 1 = Yes, 2 = No		Distance from the Household	
	Code	Yes/No Code	Code	Distance (in km)
Market	V18A01		V18B01	
Pitched road	V18A02		V18B02	
Primary School	V18A03		V18B03	
School	V18A04		V18B04	
College	V18A05		V18B05	
Madrassa (Religious School)	V18A06		V18B06	
Bank	V18A07		V18B07	
Hospital	V18A08		V18B08	
Shop	V18A09		V18B09	
Thana Headquarter	V18A10	-	V18B10	
Deep Tube-well	V18A11		V18B11	
Electricity	V18A12		V18B12	
Maktab (Informal School)	V18A13		V18B13	
School of NGOs	V18A14		V18B14	
District Headquarter	V18A15	-	V18B15	
India-Bangladesh Boarder	V18A16	-	V18B16	
Dhaka	V18A17	-	V18A17	



**2.1 General information about the NGO membership of the respondent (Male):**

Serial No.	Name	Status Code	Sex	Age			Education (total years)	Current status (code)	Information about Child			Institution (code)
				Year	Months	Total Months			Number of children		Age of the eldest child	
								Boy	Girl			
V2MSL		V2MHS	V2SX	V2MAG			V2MEDU	V2MM	-	-	-	V2MINS
									-	-	-	
									-	-	-	
									-	-	-	
									-	-	-	
									-	-	-	
									-	-	-	
									-	-	-	
									-	-	-	

2.1.1. General information about the NGO membership of the respondent (Female):

Serial No.	Name	Status Code	Sex	Age			Education (total years)	Marital status (code)			Information about Child			Institution (code)
				Year	Months	Total Months		Current status (code)	Husband (Code)	Age of husband	Number of children		Age of the youngest child	
V2FSL		V2FHS	V2SX	V2FAG		V2FEDU	V2FM	V2FHU	V2FHA	V2FCM	V2FCF	V2FCY	V2FINS	

**-Household Status (code):** 1 = Household head, 2= Wife of household head 3= programme member, 4 = general member-**Sex Code:** 1 = Male and 0 = Female-**Education=** Total how many years has the person studied?

**-Marital status**

**-Current status code:** 1 = Married and 2 = Unmarried, 3 = Divorcee and 4 = Wife/husband died

**- Husband? Code:** 1 = Yes, 0 = No

**- Institution Code:** 1 = General educational Institution, 2 = Madrasa, 3 = NGO school/Maktab

### General Information about the members:

Member of the family	Status of employment after membership		Status of employment before membership	
	Employment Code	Occupation Code	Employment Code	Occupation Code
Head of the household	V22AHHE	V22AHHO	V22BHHE	V22BHHO
Member of the NGO	V22APME	V22PMO	V22BPME	V22BPMO
Husband/ Wife of the member of the NGO	V22APSE	V22APSO	V22BPSE	V22BPSO

Employment code: 1 = Service, 2 = Self-employment, 3 = Unemployed, 99 = Not applicable, (0-15 year old)  
Occupation Code: 1 = Day-labor, 2 = Business, 3 = Cultivation, 4 = Service holder, 5 = Others

### Information about Participating in the microcredit project of the NGO

	Months	Years		Total months
When did you become member?			V231	
When did you get first loan?			V232	
2.3.3 What is the amount of last loan (in Taka)?			V233	
2.3.4 Apart from you is anyone else from your family a member of this NGO? Code: 1= Yes and 0= No			V234	
Apart from you, how many members of your family take loan from different NGOs?			V235	
How much loan has been taken by these family members (in Taka)?			V236	

### 3.0. Assets and liabilities

#### Agricultural Assets (Before Membership):

	Currently Owned		Share Cropped		Lease/Rent	
	Size	Value	Size	Value	Size	Value
Irrigated	V311L1A	V311L1P	V311L3A	V311L3P	V311L5A	V311L5P
Non Irrigated	V311L2A	V311L2P	V311L4A	V311L4P	V311L6A	V311L6P

### Agricultural Assets (Current Position):

	Currently Owned		Share Cropped		Lease/Rent	
	Size	Value	Size	Value	Size	Value
Irrigated	V312L1A	V312L1P	V312L3A	V312L3P	V312L5A	V312L5P
Non Irrigated	V312L2A	V312L2P	V312L4A	V312L4P	V312L6A	V312L6P

### 3.2. Assets and Liabilities: Other Assets:

Assets Description	During membership	
		Present Value
1. Productive Assets	V3210	
1.1. Large Farm Animals (owned or Shared)	V3211	
1.2. Fruit Gardens	V3212	
1.3. Building, Machinery and Equipment (used/ not used)	V3213	
1.4. Fishing Boat and/or Engine and Net	V3214	
1.5. Stalls or store(overall valuation of the present goods)	V3215	
1.6. Any other Productive Assets (see the descriptions and code below the table)		
2. House Assets	V3220	
2.1. House Plot	V3221	
2.2. House	V3222	
2.3. Major Consumer Goods (Especially Vehicles from House Index)	V3223	
3. Financial Assets	V3230	
3.1. Life insurance policy	V3231	
3.2 Savings (Programme)	V3232	
3.3. Savings (Non-programme)	V3233	
3.4 Jewelry/Gold	V3234	
3.5. Any other non-productive Assets(see the descriptions and code below the table)		

Code

**-Other productive assets:** 1= Trees, 2= providing loan, 3= Rickshaw/Van, 4= Boat, 5=Tubewell, 6= Deep tubewell, 7=Fishing net, 8= paddy threshing machine (diesel), 9= Paddy threshing machine (electricity), 10=Handloom, 11=Plough, 12=Ladder, 13=Power tiller, 14= Saw 15= duck/hen, 16= others

**-Other unproductive assets:** 1=Radio/ television, 2=Cycle, 3= Motorcycle

### 3.3 Assets and Liabilities: Liabilities

	Present Value
<b>Liabilities</b>	V330
1. Debts with Financial Institutions	V331
2. Debts with Informal Money lenders	V332
3 Large Debts with Friends, Relatives (Cash or Kinds)	V333
4. Debts with Suppliers / Wholesalers	V334
5. Any Other Financial Obligation That Can Be Financially Valued	

### 3.4 Assets: Estimated market value of house

V34	
-----	--

### 3.5 Assets and Liabilities: Sources of Capital of business

Sources	Before Membership Amount of Capital		Current Position Amount of Capital	
Own Source	V35A1		V35B1	
External Sources	V35A2		V35B2	

## 4.0. Income and Consumption:

### 4.1.1. Income in last 1 year

Sources of Income	Production Cost	Quantity		Value		Total Production	Income
Paddy/Wheat							
Lentils							
Vegetables							
Milk							
Egg							
Fish							
Poultry							
Cattle							
Other Agri-products							
<b>Total</b>						V411	

#### 4.1.2. Others Income

Sources of Income		Income in last 1 year
Daily Labour/Rickshaw pulling		
Salary		
Income from Shop		
Business		
Remittance from other family members		
Others		
Total	V412	

#### 4.1.3 Profit gained from the investment of microcredit:

	During last one month		During last one year	
Income from microcredit	V413M		V413Y	

4.1.4 When income is low, it is rational to buy food for the family by loan, do you agree? Code: 1= Yes and 0= No

V414	
------	--

4.1.5. Is your current income consistent with your expectation?

V415	
------	--

Code: 1=more than expectation, 2= consistent with expectation, 3= less than expectation

#### 4.2 Income and expenditure: expenditure

##### 4.2.1. Number of household members took meal in last 24 hours

Member	Below 10 years		Equal to or more than 10 years	
	Total numbers		Total numbers	
Female	V421AF		V421BF	
Male	V421AM		V421BM	

4.2.2. Quantity and value of food consumption in last one week:

Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)			Total Taka
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift	
<b>Rice Related</b>					<b>C10</b>
Rice					C11
Flour					C12
Muri/chira/khoi					C13
Shemai/shuji					C14
Bread/ Loaf					C15
Biscuit					C16
Others(Please mention)					
<b>Lentiles Related</b>					<b>C20</b>
Kheshari					C21
Mashur					C22
Mug/Kalai					C23
Motor/Boot					C24
Others(Please mention)					
<b>Fish:</b>					<b>C30</b>
Big Fish					C31
Medium fish					C32
Small Fish					C33
Dried Fish					C34
Sea Fish					C35
<b>Egg:</b>					<b>C40</b>
Hen/Duck					C41
<b>Meat:</b>					<b>C50</b>
Beef					C51
Mutton/Lamb					C52
Chicken/Duck					C53
Others(Please mention)					

Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)		
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift
<b>Vegetables</b>				
Aubergine				
Kumra				
Lau				
Potato				
Kachu/Kachur Lati				
Karala				
Patal				
Chichinga/jhinga				
Dhundul				
Green Banana				
Sweet Potato				
Cauliflower				
Bhada Kafi				
Barbati				
Tomato				
Tharash				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Spinach</b>				
Lal Shak				
Pui Shak				
Kachu Shak				
Lau Shak				
Kumra Shak				
Mula Shak				
Palon Shak				
Data Shak				
Pachmishali Shak				
Others(Please mention)				

	Total Taka
<b>C60</b>	
C61	
C62	
C63	
C64	
C65	
C66	
C67	
C68	
<b>C69</b>	
C70	
C71	
C72	
C73	
C74	
C75	
C76	
<b>C80</b>	
C81	
C82	
C83	
C84	
C85	
C86	
C87	
C88	
C89	



Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)		
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift
<b>Milk</b>				
Liquid /Packet milk (cow, goat, buffalo)				
Powder Milk				
Casein/Curd				
Butter milk				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Sweetmeat</b>				
Roshgolla/Kalajam				
Jilapi/Amriti/Kunda				
Badasha/Kadma				
Sugar/Gur/Misri				
Ice-cream				
Gaja/Khaja				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Oil</b>				
Mustard Oil				
Soybean				
Ghee/Dalda				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Spices</b>				
Green Chili				
Dried Chili				
Onions				
Garlic				
Turmeric				
Salt				
Others(Please mention)				

	Total Taka
<b>C100</b>	
C101	
C102	
C103	
C104	
<b>C110</b>	
C111	
<b>C112</b>	
C113	
C114	
C115	
C116	
<b>C120</b>	
C121	
C122	
C123	
<b>C130</b>	
C131	
C132	
C133	
C134	
C135	
C136	

Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)		
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift
<b>Fruit</b>				
Coconut				
Banana				
Papaya				
Guava				
Pineapple				
Boroi, tamarind				
Hog-plum/ kamranga				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Drinks</b>				
Tea				
Coke/Pepsi				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Battle Leaves/Tobacco</b>				
Battle Leaves				
Tobacco Leaves				
Tobacco Leaves				
Tamak				
Gul				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Other expenditure</b>				
Puri/ Piazu				
Curd/ Sandesh				
Battle leaf/ Cigarette				
Chanachur/ Nut				
Tea/ Biscuit				
Goja				
Other expenditure (transport)				
Food expenses in restaurant				
Others(Please mention)				

	Total Taka
<b>C140</b>	
C141	
C142	
C143	
C144	
C145	
C146	
C147	
<b>C150</b>	
C151	
C152	
<b>C160</b>	
C161	
C162	
C163	
C164	
C165	
<b>C170</b>	
C171	
C172	
C173	
C174	
C175	
C176	
C177	
C178	

Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)		
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift
<b>Fuel/Electricity(For the last one month)</b>				
Firewood				
Ghuta/Ghushi				
Tush/Vhushi				
Patkathi				
Kerosene				
Khar (paddy/ Wheat/ others)				
Leaves				
Firebox				
Candle				
Gas (natural/ non-natural)				
Electricity				
Coal (of any type)				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Cosmetics and others</b>				
Bath Soap				
Washing Soap/Powder/Soda				
Cream (of any type)				
Powder				
Perfume				
Shampoo				
Toothpowder/ Paste				
Haircut				
Comb /Hair Brush				
Hair Oil (Coconut oil etc.)				
Bangles / Lace/ Tip				
Others(Please mention)				

	Total Taka
<b>C200</b>	
C201	
C202	
C203	
C204	
C205	
C206	
C207	
C208	
C209	
C210	
C211	
C212	
<b>C220</b>	
C221	
C222	
C223	
C224	
C225	
C226	
C227	
C228	
C229	
C230	
C231	

Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)		
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift
<b>Clothing</b>				
<b>Female/Girl</b>				
Sharee				
Blouse				
Petticoat				
Shallower				
Kamij				
Orghna				
Frok				
Pant				
Gengi				
Shawl/Chadar				
Sweater/cardigan				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Male/Boy</b>				
Lungi				
Shirt				
Pant				
Punjabi				
Pyjama				
Gangi/ T-shirt				
Under Pants				
Shawl/Chadar/Muffler				
Sweater/Jacket				
Half Pant				
Others(Please mention)				

	Total Taka
<b>C300</b>	
C301	
C302	
C303	
C304	
C305	
C306	
C307	
C308	
C309	
C310	
C311	
<b>C320</b>	
C321	
C322	
C323	
C324	
C325	
C326	
C327	
C328	
C329	
C330	

Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)		
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift
<b>Other clothes etc.</b>				
Gamcha				
Bed Cover				
Pillow Cover				
Table Cloth				
Curtain (window, door)				
Mosquito Net				
Quilt				
Mattress				
Pillow				
Katha				
Kambal				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Shoe/Sandal (Purchase and repair etc)</b>				
Shoe				
Sandal (Skin)				
Sandal (Rubber)				
Kharam				
Shoe Polish				
Repairing expenses				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Furniture</b>				
Bedstead				
Table/Chair/Dressing Table/Tool				
Almari/Book shelf/meatshelf				
Floor Mattress				
Others(Please mention)				

	Total Taka
<b>C340</b>	
C341	
C342	
C343	
C344	
C345	
C346	
C347	
C348	
C349	
C350	
C351	
<b>C360</b>	
C361	
C362	
C363	
C364	
C365	
C366	
<b>C370</b>	
C371	
C372	
C373	
C374	

Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)		
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift
<b>Cooking Materials</b>				
Kerosine stove				
Cooking Pots (clay)				
Cooking Pots (ceramic)				
Glass, plate, others				
Spoon, Khunti, Knife, spade				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Leisure, Education and others</b>				
Radio				
Cassette Player				
T.V.				
Video				
Battery				
Maintenance expenses				
Repairing expenses				
Story books/ Newspaper/ Magazine etc.				
Cinema/ Jatra				
Games/club membership/toys				
Photography				
Laundry expenses				
Others(Please mention)				
<b>Other Households Materials</b>				
Trunk/Suit-case				
Lamp				
Sewing Machine				
Ironic goods (spade, Shovel etc.)				
Others(Please mention)				

	Total Taka
<b>C400</b>	
C401	
C402	
C403	
C404	
C405	
<b>C410</b>	
C411	
C412	
C413	
C414	
C415	
C416	
C417	
C418	
C419	
C420	
C421	
C422	
<b>C430</b>	
C431	
C432	
C433	
C434	

Items	Quantity	Price according to sources(Taka)		
		Purchase	Own Production	Gift
<b>Personal Materials</b>				
Umbrella				
Watch/ Table clock/ Wall clock)				
Hand Bag (Male/Female)				
Glasses				
Gas lighter/ Torchlight				
Ornaments (gold, silver etc )				
Others(Please mention)				

	Total Taka
<b>C440</b>	
C441	
C442	
C443	
C444	
C445	
C446	

<b>Items (For the last 12 months)</b>		Total expenditure
<b>Expenditure Related to dwelling Houses</b>	<b>C500</b>	
Construction of Dwelling Houses	C501	
Repair of Dwelling Houses	C502	
Repair of Furniture	C503	
Others(Please mention)		
<b>Tax/Interest Payments</b>	<b>C510</b>	
Interest	C511	
Union Parisad Tax	C512	
Penalty	C513	
Remittance to Others Family Members	C514	
Others(Please mention)		
<b>Education</b>	<b>C520</b>	
Tuition Fees (School , College and University)	C521	
Tutor	C522	
Education Materials : Books/notebooks/pen-pencil/ink/Paper etc	C523	
Others(Please mention)	V3234	
<b>Medical Expenditure</b>	<b>C530</b>	
Medical Expenditure	C531	
Medicine Cost	C532	
Other Medical Expenditure, test etc		
<b>Other Expenditure</b>	<b>C540</b>	
Legal Costs	C541	
Religious Festivals (Qurbani, Milad, etc.)	C542	
Donation	C543	
Social Festivals (Sunnat-E-Khatna, Annaproshan, Death Anniversary)	C544	
Others(Please mention)		



5.1 **Information regarding poverty:** V51

Do you consider your family as poor

**Code:** 1= Yes and 0= No

5.2 If yes, Could you please mention which of the following categories is appropriate for your family? V52

**Code:** 1= Moderately Poor and 0= Extremely Poor

5.3 Did you consider your family as a poor before the membership? V53

**Code:** 1= Yes and 0= No

5.4 If yes, could you please mention which of the following categories was appropriate for your family before the membership? V54

**Code:** 1= Moderately Poor and 0= Extremely Poor

5.5 Do you think that the total income of your family members has increased after becoming a member of the NGO? V55

**Code:** 1= Yes and 0= No

5.6 Could you survive or earn enough income for survival of your family members, if the microcredit service is stopped at this moment? V56

**Code:** 1= Yes and 0= No

### 6.1 Please mention uses of loans provided by NGO?

Loans	Purpose mentioned in the loan application form		Actual Use	
1 <sup>st</sup> Loan	V61A1	<input type="text"/>	V61A2	<input type="text"/>
<b>Last Loan</b>	V61B1	<input type="text"/>	V61B2	<input type="text"/>

**Code:** 1= micro-enterprise, 2= Agriculture, 3= Seed, 4= Irrigation, 5= Fishery, 6= Cattle, 7=Cottage industry, 8=Poultry, 9= Land buying/ Mortgage, 10= Social Deforestation, 11= Habitation, 12= Education expenses of children, 13= Sending foreign or city, 14= Social program, 15=Repayment of other loan, 16= Medical expenses, 17=Others

7.1. Is income from investment of microcredit enough to repay loans? V71

**Code:** 1= Yes and 0= No

7.2. After membership, did you sell any asset to repay loans? V72

**Code:** 1= Yes and 0= No

### Social Forestry

10.1 Distance of the household from the nearest social forestry project. V101

10.2 Is your household a member of the social forestry project (Code)? V102

**Code:** 1= Yes and 0= No

10.3. If yes, how many years have you been participating in social deforestation project? V103

#### 10.4. Income from social deforestation

Income from social deforestation	Revenue (taka)	Expenditure				Net earning
		Own expenses (taka)	Total hours	Taka	Total expenditure (taka)	
Earnings before selling trees						V104A
Proceeds from selling trees						V104B

#### Tree related information:

11.1. With the exception of social deforestation by the NGO, how many trees did you plant in the last one year?

V111	<input type="text"/>
------	----------------------

11.2. Land types?

Code: 1= Own land, 2=Public, 3=Mortgage,4=Share cropping, 5=Others

V112	<input type="text"/>
------	----------------------

11.3. Sources of plants:

Code: 1=Own purchase, 2= Government, 3= NGO, 4= Others

V113	<input type="text"/>
------	----------------------

#### General attitude towards environment:

Issues	Code					
	2	1	0	1	2	
I do not believe in the fact that men are polluting the environment	2	1	0	1	2	V1201
Dust, sand, smoke emitted from brick-field and chemicals from mills and factories are polluting the environment continuously	2	1	0	1	2	V1202
Enormous climatic changes are taking place due to lack of consciousness among general mass	2	1	0	1	2	V1203
Uses of insecticides and fertilizer are not detrimental for the environment	2	1	0	1	2	V1204
A portion of used insecticides and fertilizer in the land remains in crops, fruits and vegetables and that is injurious for us	2	1	0	1	2	V1205
Environment pollution, particularly because of Arsenic there will be a scarcity of pure drinking water very soon	2	1	0	1	2	V1206

Code (left to right): 2= strongly agree, 1= Agree, 0= neutral, 1= Disagree, 2= Strongly disagree

**13. Attitude towards environment as a Farmer:**

Issues	Code					V1301	
	2	1	0	1	2		
Modern agricultural system is damaging environmental balance and resources of forests	2	1	0	1	2	V1301	
Increasing use of fertilizer and insecticides is reducing general productivity of land	2	1	0	1	2	V1302	
Gradual increase of use in fertilizer and insecticides is reducing the quality of crops	2	1	0	1	2	V1303	
Uses of chemical fertilizer and insecticides in cultivation are creating adverse effect on nature	2	1	0	1	2	V1304	
The media is exaggerating the fact that environment pollution is the result of modern agricultural system	2	1	0	1	2	V1305	
Underground water is getting polluted day by day as a result of using insecticides and fertilizer	2	1	0	1	2	V1306	
In spite of limitations only farmers can keep the balance of environment	2	1	0	1	2	V1307	
Application of insecticides and fertilizer is not creating any adverse effect, rather it is helping in more quality production	2	1	0	1	2	V1308	
Application of chemical fertilizer in land is acceptable as long as it is generating more income than expense	2	1	0	1	2	V1309	
Both government and private organizations should take more effective steps to keep environmental balance	2	1	0	1	2	V1310	

**Code (left to right):** 2= strongly agree, 1= Agree, 0= neutral, 1= Disagree, 2= Strongly disagree



South Asian Network for Development  
and Environmental Economics

SANDEE  
PO Box 8975 EPC 1056  
Kathmandu, Nepal

Tel: 977-1-5003222  
Fax: 977-1-5003299  
E-mail: [info@sandeeonline.org](mailto:info@sandeeonline.org)  
Website: [www.sandeeonline.org](http://www.sandeeonline.org)



## SANDEE Sponsors

ICIMOD



Norad



Sida

Swedish International Development  
Cooperation Agency

IDRC  CRDI

International Development  
Research Centre

Centre de recherches pour le  
développement international



This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons  
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs  
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>