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Abstract

Looking back to thirteen years of the implementation of National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) programme in Uganda in three phases; 2001, 2002-2010 and 2010 to date, in terms of farmer groups’ participation in decision-making and service delivery on agronomic best practices; my data reveal that farmers’ participation has been on decline due to top-down approach. This research was carried out to evaluate the factors that affected farmers’ participation in planning and implementation of NAADS.

The study was centred on the propositions of the theoretical framework based on New Public Management and Participatory theory with normative considerations that was applicable to farmers’ participations. The data indicated that the participation of farmers has been on decline throughout the phases of implementation as a result of top-down approach of participation. My data reveal that there are many challenges which include not limited to; i) inadequate personnel, majorly extension service providers; ii) Inadequate follow up by the district and sub county officials to ascertain the progress and challenges incurred by farmers on inputs provided; iii) Inputs supplied to farmers are fewer compared to their numbers which is between 15 and 30; iv) Unfavourable weather conditions; V) Continuous changes in NAADS implementation manuals. These challenges were somehow addressed through; i) sensitisation and mobilisation of farmers to own this programme; ii) construction of demonstration sites in almost all sub counties; iii) construction of dams at almost every parish levels by both the government and NGOs to provide water for production during dry spelt

Relevance to Development Studies

The study joins the attempts to analyse incidences in communities particularly the affiliation surrounding participation of local development players and more specifically in the planning and implementation of development programmes say NAADS especially in government with decentralised systems of governance. This is to enables both the government and NGOs to come up with appropriate policy that would create an enabling environment on how to respond to situations that hinders both participation and developmental programmes. This is to help in addressing non-involvement of beneficiaries in policy formulation.

Keywords: Farmer groups, Participation, Contracting, Uganda.
Chapter 1: Introduction

This study examined the participation of small farmer’s groups in the programme of National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) in Uganda. In most developing countries, past efforts in development programmes have had limited success because of lack of sufficient participation by communities in the development process (Brett 2002, MAAIF 2000, World Bank 1994). It is because of this that, since the 1970s to date, many programmes and projects have been introduced and developed with participatory approaches so as to bring the different voices of the people into the development process. NAADS in Uganda is one of such programmes (NAADS 2004).

The core constraint to fostering community participation especially among the rural people has been over-centralization of decision making powers and resources thereby creating a communication gap between the beneficiaries and the development workers. Holmén (2010) asserts that the major problem associated with “participatory” attempt to realize development from below is apparently widespread lack of trust among group members because they cannot own their development activities.

Participation in decision making, planning and implementation of a development programme, consist of many actors that are directly engaged in its promotion, namely; farmers and local government supported by Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), World Bank, and United Nations agencies. It has been realized that due to the ineffectiveness of externally imposed and expert-oriented forms of project planning, management and implementation coupled with top-down approach, major donors and development organizations embarked on participatory approaches purposely to empower local people, capture indigenous people’s knowledge, and ensure sustainability and efficiency of interventions (Cooke and Kothari 2001, Cornwall 2002, Hickey and Mohan 2004, Rudqvist and Woodford-Berger 1996, World Bank 2000, World Bank 1994).

Paul (1987: 2) proposes a framework for analyzing community participation in terms of three dimensions, namely objectives, intensity, and the instruments used to foster it. Paul states that the objectives of community participation as an active process are; (a) empowerment or, (b) building beneficiary capacity, (c) increasing project effectiveness, (d) improving project efficiency, and (e) cost sharing. Hickey and Mohan (2004) point out that participation in development theory and practice has taken different dimensions and approaches over time.

1.1. The Context of the Study

NAADS is a government programme which was introduced to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of agricultural extension services through a participatory bottom-up planning process (Government of Uganda) (GoU 2001). It is implemented by a Secretariat enacted by an act of parliament (NAADS Act 2001) through the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF). It is mandated to develop a demand driven, farmer led agrarian service provision system targeting poor survival agriculturalists, with emphasis on marginalized groups and people with disabilities (Joughin and Kjaer 2010). This
means that services provided are demanded by farmers through collective actions with major considerations of the participation of marginalized groups of population.

The programme is one of the seven operational pillars of the Plan for Modernization of Agriculture (PMA). The term PMA was first coined in President Museveni’s election manifesto of 2001 and later became public policy and programme upon his election as president of Uganda. In addition to NAADS, the other seven pillars of PMA are; research and technology development, rural finance, agro-processing and selling, agrarian learning, maintainable natural resource management and supportive physical infrastructure (GoU 2001). NAADS is an ‘attempt to enhance productivity of smallholders and increase production of marketable farm-products’ (Enzama 2008: 6). Since 2007 Abim has benefited from the active NAADS programme pursued by central government to provide relevant extension services and improved inputs accessible to smallholders to transform subsistence farming into commercialized enterprises (NAADS 2004). Since then no studies has been conducted in Abim to ascertain the level of farmers’ participation in this programme and that is why this research is important.

Benin et al. (2008) claims that when recognizing the importance of many sectoral methods to hastening development and decreasing mass deficiency, the government of Uganda has since 2000 been implementing the PMA as a key strategic enterprise directed at reducing poverty to a level below 28 percent by 2014 (MFPED 2004). The PMA, which emphasizes the revival of farming as an apparatus of growth and development for the economy, is located inside the country’s vision that states, Prosperity for All (PFA) and is supported by the broader Rural Development Strategy (RDS). This attempt to accelerate poverty reduction through agricultural growth is not surprising since agriculture is an important backbone of a great percentage of the people, contributing about one-third to Uganda’s GDP and one-half of trade export earnings, and paying four-fifths of the employed populace (Akram-Lodhi 2008).

Before NAADS, agricultural extension services were carried out by government extension workers based at district and sub county levels. However, Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) (2010) reveals that services were not reaching the beneficiaries at the grass root. The government then through Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) and liberalization of the economy, decided to privatize extension services and this was carried out in phases. In 2001, NAADS was introduced as pilot to five districts of Arua, Kampala, Jinja, Wakiso and Kabale and the second phase was from 2002-2010 in the districts of Mbarara, Mukono, Nebbi, Lira, Apac, Libero, Tororo and Soroti among others and the third phase is 2010 to date. NAADS was adopted as the model for agricultural extension service delivery in Uganda and the program eventually was rolled out to all districts in the second phase 2002-2010. In a number of evaluation and academic papers, the participation of farmers has been described as weak (see MAAIF 2010: 44, Namara 2009: XIV). The weak participation is attributed largely to inadequate capacity to demand for services and lack of commitments by farmers.

Thus, NAADS offers the main institutional framework for farmer participation. In this arrangement the farmers are expected to articulate their interests (in special groups) from village to national levels based on common interests as
a bottom-up approach to policy formulation and demand-driven service delivery. Bottom-up approach here involves decision-making from the grass root level up wards other than top-down. The policy documents therefore clearly articulate the participation of poor farmers in all processes in policy formulation in attempt to reduce poverty.

NAADS programme targets two types of crops and livestock; food security crop which are staple food meant to increase production in the community and income generating crops meant to increase income to farmers. NAADS (2006) implementation modalities report states that the key stakeholders in the implementation of NAADS are the farmers, the service providers, the Local Governments (LGs) and NAADS Secretariat. The report further indicates that NAADS is a government programme implemented through existing LG structures and farmer organizations. Farmers elect their leaders who represent them at the sub-county and district levels to form the Farmer Forum (FF). The Fora are responsible for ensuring that the programme is implemented in accordance with the needs of the farmers and that the funds are used in a transparent way. The farmer organizations work hand in hand with the LGs to implement the Programme together with the Agricultural Advisory Service Providers (AASPs) who are contracted to offer the extension services.

NAADS interventions has five components, namely: (i) advisory services and information to farmers, (ii) mechanized access to farms including to the markets, (iii) quality assurance regulations and procedural checking, (iv) private sector institutional development, and (v) programme management and monitoring (MAAIF 2000). Under component one, for example, the FF contracts private AASPs to train selected farmers in modern production practices of crops, livestock and other enterprises such as apiary and aquaculture. FF is the committee of farmer leaders at sub counties, districts and national levels. Through this element FF also hires AASPs to deliver extension advice and information demanded by the farmer groups (FGs). Under the second component, FF contracts business agencies or individuals to supply and distribute improved inputs like seeds, fertilizer, livestock, poultry, and feeds to beneficiary farmers (Okoboi et al 2013: 4).

In order for all these components to be achieved, NAADS (2010: 10) specifies the following categories of farmers that are supported in order to ensure progression towards commercialization and modernization of production: Food Security Farmer (FSF) at village or household levels. Market-oriented model Farmer (MoF) at parish level and Commercializing model Farmer (CF) at district or sub county level.

A Food Security Farmer should be 18 years and above, a practicing subsistence farmer with access to land or fabrication unit. Specific growers will be nominated through their FGs in the Village Farmer Forum (VFF) to receive food security inputs for multiplication for access by other farmers and for their own home use. These inputs will be repayable 100% of original value in-kind to their FGs to enable other members to benefit as revolving resource. The FSF is responsible for both demonstration of improved farming practices and multiplication of the improved planting or stocking materials for their own use and passes on to other group members through the VFF. The FSF also acts as a
learning center in case of introduction of new technologies\(^1\) and agronomic practices. FSFs are supposed to be supported with a technology worth $38.46 as loan per beneficiary upon identification of the enterprises (NAADS 2010: 10).

Market oriented Farmer is an early adopter or innovator who sets the pace for market orientation by demonstrating to other farmers in the group promising technologies for the priority market oriented enterprises. The farmers should also be involved in other commercial enterprises to promote enterprise mix to minimize risk and to diversify sources of income and the selected MoFs in a parish are entitled to $288.46 or less as loan worth of inputs identified and feeds. The MoFs pays back 70% of the value of the inputs received (in cash) into the group account with an accredited financial institution or formal banks. The duration of paying back the loan depend on the type of inputs provided. A criterion for receiving this support includes a satisfactory evaluation of the performance and repayment of the previous (for the initial year) or current outstanding (for subsequent years) support made to the group (NAADS 2010: 10).

Commercialized Farmer who may be an individual or FG clearly practicing commercial farming through enterprise specialization or enterprise assortment. He or she has established clear linkages to the market and support services like financial institutions, and practices a minimum level of best practices of farming as a business. The CF acts as focal point for learning, quality control, product standardization and bulking for selected commercial enterprises. The CF are farmers willing to deliver technical, selling and commerce services to members of his or her group including sound record keeping. CFs are provided with a cheque worth $769.23 or less as a loan on conditions of handing in the project proposals to the sub county FF executive for approval (NAADS 2010: 10). The CF pays back 70% of the value of the inputs received (in cash) into the group account with an accredited financial institution or sub county account for individuals. The duration of paying back the loan depend on the type of inputs provided (NAADS 2010).

All these categories of farmers are provided support at different rates and the inputs provided to them are termed as revolving fund (loan) payable at a certain period of time depending on the type of inputs. This means that at the end of every year or so depending on the type of inputs provided, each beneficiary has to repay the inputs given either in kind or cash worth the value earlier on provided either to the group members especially for FSF or group account for MoF and CF and sometimes to sub county account for individual CF so that the group/ sub county decide who is to benefit next until all members benefits. Repayment criteria has been discussed in chapter four.

1.2. The statement of the problem

MAAIF (2010: 44) observes that, ‘Ugandan farmer institutions (FI) are characterized by a low capacity to fully and effectively perform their roles and to demand better delivery of advisory, research and regulatory services’. This is in line with Joughin and Kjaer (2010) who argue that NAADS will continue but as a

\(^1\) Technology here is referred to as inputs that are procured and supplied to farmer group beneficiaries at different levels that may include and not limited to; seeds, seedlings, crops, livestock, cassava cuttings, fish farming, poultry, ox ploughs, apiary and outputs among others.
weak and expensive shadow of its implementation procedures. Benin et al. (2011) further lamented that contrary to another recent study, the impact of NAADS on farmers’ sense of participation was found to be weak in terms of demanding for extension services from the private sector. Moses (2011), also notes that the participation of the beneficiaries in the NAADS programme has been on decline over the years since the early stages of its implementation in 2001. Holmén (2010: 69), confirms that, farmers’ organizational capacity was found to be less than expected because they end up taking a short cut by claiming the “right” to participate other than being involved in the process of planning and implementation of a programme. This is due to lack of capacity to analyses their problems and skills to design and run the project which led to high number and high extinction rate of FGs (Holmén 2010: 86).

Narayan-Parker and Patel (2000) argue that most of the poor people are generally at the high chance of missing funding that requires group formation because they are rarely organized beyond family and friend networks or to the civil servants and politicians nor to the resources of the government because they lack capacity to participate in group activities.

1.3. Justification

In relation to the implementation framework, the NAADS programme has increasingly become a subject of debate and criticisms among different sections of the public in Uganda. The criticisms have revolved around the manner in which agricultural services are delivered, the procurement process of service providers, and suppliers of agro-inputs/implements, government’s commitment to meet farmers’ needs (selected enterprises), regular unpremeditated changes in the programme implementation model, mismanagement of funds meant for farmers and farmers participation in the implementation among others. Okoboi et al (2013: 4), reveals that NAADS had a great impact on access to advisory services but weak or no impact of participation of farmer groups on the adoption of improved agricultural technologies, practices, and new crops and livestock enterprises.

Whereas the evaluation and academic literature in NAADS have acknowledged the weaknesses of farmer groups performances in terms of participation and demanding for extension services from the providers as discussed above, they have not gone further to investigate the sources and the nature of the weaknesses. This study is aimed at closing the gap of lack of research in Abim district and the causes of the weaknesses of farmer groups’ participation in demanding for extension services from providers.

1.4 Objective of the Study

The general objective of the study is to examine the factors influencing the causes of the weaknesses of farmer groups’ participation in NAADS planning and implementation of activities and to provide recommendations to policy makers.
1.5. The Research Question

The main research question: What are the factors influencing the causes of farmer groups’ weaknesses in the participation of NAADS especially with regard to demanding services from private and government providers in Abim District?

Sub questions

i. What are the characteristics of NAADS group members in terms of gender, age, marginalized groups and their group dynamics, leadership, relationship of leaders with farmer group and enterprise selection criteria?

ii. How and to what extent are the farmers demanding for NAADS services from private providers and are there differences in the levels of participation to demand for services across the three categories of farmers such as FSF, MoF and CF groups?

iii. What are the challenges involved in demanding for extension services from both government and extension service providers?

iv. How are the institutions such as government and farmer groups’ addressing these weaknesses?

1.6. Methodology

The study employed an evaluative research design and case study research. Smith (1981) defines evaluative research as a systematic assessment of the effectiveness of a programme that were design as a tentative solutions to the existing problems. Whereas Yin (2009: 17) suggests that case study research ‘tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions, why they were taken, how they were implemented and with what results’. The evaluative and case study research were employed mainly to evaluate the level of FGs participation in demanding for services from the programme in terms of decisions making and ascertain why the government had implemented NAADS policy that were designed and come up with tentative solutions to existing problems. The evaluative research design was employed to examine the NAADS’ set implementation modalities and what was actually done on the ground while focusing specifically on the participatory approach as stipulated in the NAADS (2001).

The study was qualitative in such a way that data was collected using in-depth interviews with open-ended questions. The findings were largely in form of interview depicting respondents’ expressed views. There was little quantifiable data because most of the information was obtained through semi structured in-depth interviews with the key informants and focused group discussions (FGDs) with semi-structured open ended questions. For purposes of triangulation, some elements of quantitative research was employed for example use of tabulation in data presentation and analysis.

1.6.1. Study area: Abim District

The present study was conducted in Abim District. Abim is located at the north eastern part of Uganda and located in Karamoja Region the then Kotido District in particular and was carved out in July 2006 as a district. It is bordered to the
North by Kotido District, east by Moroto and Amuria Districts; south west by Otuke; and west by Agago district (District Development Plan) (DDP. 2013).

Administratively, Abim district comprises of one county called Labwor County and five (5) Sub Counties plus one town council. Abim town Council, Abim Sub County, Alerak Sub County, Morulem Sub County, Lotuke Sub County and Nyakwae Sub County with thirty five (35) villages/wards (District Development Plan) (DDP 2013). (See map 1. attached).

The dominant land tenure systems include; freehold2, lease3, mailo4 and customary5. Furthermore agriculture stands to be the predominant activity with majorly food crops being cassava, millet, sorghum and maize (DDP 2013).

The rationale for selecting this area of study was based on the reason that it is the researcher’s home district, which made it easier for him to sample the study population and he is conversant with the area population. Also, being a native speaker was an added advantage, as it rendered communication with his respondents easier. Abim benefited from NAADS phase two as per Okoboi et al (2013: 4). The region is characterized as one of the poorest subsistence rural area of Uganda having low capabilities and consequently, low grade of financial supplement. It is an area barren of what Porter (1990) in Enzama (2008) devoid “advanced resources” such as the mineral deposits. Majority of the population is engaged in peasant farming with cottage industries as occasional off-farm survival mechanism for the poor households against economic shocks to which the region is prone.

1.6.2. Selection Techniques

The interviews were carried out with the district and Sub County employed, non employed and elected staff who are directly involved in the implementation of NAADS programme and the service providers who are contracted to provide the extension services together with farmers groups’ who have benefited from NAADS.

The sample size of twenty key respondents were; district NAADS coordinator (DNC), district production officer, district agricultural officer, district community development officer, district veterinary officer, district secretary for

---

2 Freehold involves the holding of registered land in perpetuity or for a period less than perpetuity which may be fixed by a condition that enables the holder to exercise, subject to the law, full powers of ownership of land, including; using and developing the land for any lawful purpose and taking and using any and all produce from the land or selling, leasing, mortgaging or pledging, subdividing creating rights and interests for other people in the land and creating trusts of the land (Land Act 1998:8)

3 Lease - a person or institution can obtain a lease from an owner of freehold, customary or mailo or from the Uganda Land Commission. The grantee of lease is entitled to a certificate of title. Leases of private land often have conditions of use. Owners of freehold land have consideration rights to use or dispose of their land (Uganda 1995 Constitution: 148 and Land Act 1998:8).

4 Mailo is a customary form of freehold. This is the big chunk of land about 9000 square miles that is confined to Buganda (Central) and Bunyoro (Western) which was allocated by the British colonialists to Baganda in exchange of political cooperation and most people occupying mailo are tenants (Uganda Constitution 1995:148 and Land Act 1998:8).

5 Customary tenure is described by the Uganda Constitution (1995:148, Clause 237 sub section 1-5 and Land Act 1998:8) as a ‘system of land tenure regulated by customary rules which are limited in their operation to a particular description or class of persons. It represents the bulk of landholdings between 70%-80% of the land that varies among more than 60 ethnic groups that starts from individual, family or traditional institutions tenure patterns to highly communal systems which is owned in perpetuity’. Out of all these land tenure systems, NAADS is only applicable to customary, freehold and lease tenure systems of land in Uganda because mailo belongs to kingdomship where its somewhat difficult to acquire by farmers.
production, district chairperson of farmer forum and district planner. In total eight (8) respondents at the district level. At sub counties the respondents included; sub county chiefs, sub county NAADS coordinators, agricultural advisory service providers (two per sub county), sub county secretary for production and sub county chairperson farmer forum. In all twelve sub county key informants together with district is twenty (20). This was regarded as researcher’s saturation point. The same sample size which he considered big enough to make the findings representative to the study population.

Here the names of NAADS participating groups was obtained and verified from the official list with District Production officer. Two sub counties was sampled to represent the entire study population in the district. Lotuke and Morulem were the randomly sampled sub counties respectively.

A guiding checklist of in-depth interview guides and also interviews (questions) was used to conduct separate FGDs with NAADS beneficiaries. A feasible number of nine FGDs was conducted (refer to table 2 in chapter 4) and sixteen interviews with key informants (refer to Appendix 1); the selection was based on random sampling of the groups and purposive sampling for the key informants.

1.6.3. Data collection methods and instruments

The study used both the primary data that was obtained from the field together with unpublished NAADS reports and secondary data was obtained from published reports.

Sixteen semi structured in-depth interviews with key informants including NAADS officials, LG and private service providers, observation of FGs meetings and FGDs were used as the instruments to collect data. Recording of the interviews were done during interviews and analyzed later. Approximately each interview took forty minutes. Documentary review and analysis of NAADS unpublished reports also formed part of the data collection methods. Under this method, community participation from the individual and group levels and NAADS Programme-related relevant literature (published and unpublished reports, text books, journals, media, among others) were reviewed.

The justification for the use of these instruments in data collection methods was to minimize the short comings of using only one instrument hence using a variety of instruments to collect data was to utilize the advantages associated with triangulation.

The researcher benefited from the on-site meetings in two ways; by assessing the quality of participation of group members through observation and the recording of selected qualitative information on, for example, who speaks at meetings, does one person or group dominate the discussion, how are decisions made and farmer knowledge on technology adopted as well as awareness of the NAADS programme. Records of the groups were assessed to establish the level of members’ attendance of group activities and capacity of leaders to maintain good records. Before NAADS, I found out that farmers did not know the importance of record keeping which served as a reference guide atleast now most of the FGs have records in place which they normally refer to often though not adequate.
1.6.4. Data presentation and analysis

This process involved onset data recordings during interviews and FGDs based on the four research sub-questions see 1.5.1 above. Findings were reported with supportive quotes during the interviews and FGDs sessions. Analysis of the accumulated mass of detailed information obtained from the field into a comprehensive research report was done using NAADS as the case study. This involved typing and editing, tabulation and interpretation. This was done following the themes of study in each research sub-questions.

1.7. Ethical Considerations

The entire research process was conducted with due respect to ethical considerations in research. The researcher obtained the consent of the respondents to participate in the study through oral means. The researcher minded about treating the respondents’ views with utmost confidentiality. In general, a high degree of openness regarding the purpose and the nature of the research was observed by the researcher. The researcher being a resident of the researched area was conscious of his own perspective or views and indicated where appropriate.

1.8. Limitations to the Study

During data collection I encountered three challenges as discussed below; timing respondents. Being a rural based research area, the timing of respondents was a challenge because there was no time convenient to everyone. Respondents were involved in their day-to-day activities such as gardening (harvesting and planting), grazing, purchasing farm implements and marketing their farm produce. Others were attending parties and funerals. The key informants such as NAADS coordinators and extension service providers were on halt due to presidential declaration over NAADS poor performance. The district planner and district production officer were attending meetings on population census and others engaged in field tours. Sparing time and following them wherever they are for an interview was regarded as an inconveniencing and interruption of one’s working schedule. Inadequate personal funds to provide respondents with drinks and refreshment in the field as a token of appreciation for attending to the interview was a challenge. The district NAADS coordinator (DNC) and one of the CF were not able to honour their appointments for in-depth interviews.

However, the researcher was able to approach the respondents wherever they were and through rapport creation process, the researcher explained to them why one’s responses to the study was vital and therefore sparing some little time to adjust and participate in the study was important and desirable. In cases of unadjustable schedules, appointments were secured for the next time and following respondents to their respective places was done. Lunch time and Sundays after service hours were mostly used to meet the respondents as they return from their activities back home. Though NAADS was temporary on halt, this never hindered the researcher from carrying out interviews and FGDs with the sampled respondents.
1.9. The Structure of the Paper

The paper contains five chapters. Chapter one is the introduction and general background of the study. It includes the study problem, justification, research objective and general question/ Sub questions and methodology, methods which were used and practical challenges met in the field during data collection. Chapter two is the review of new public management and participatory theory which provides the framework for theorizing and analyzing the NAADS farmer groups’ participation. Chapter three is Agricultural sector in Uganda, background of NAADS and its institutional structure. Chapter four is how NAADS has engaged farmer Groups’ in decision-making processes. Chapter five is conclusions.
Chapter 2: Review of New Public Management and Participatory theory.

2.1. Introduction

This research was conducted within the framework of new public management (NPM) and participatory theory. The rationale for choosing NPM is based on its principle of privatizing services offered by government to private individuals or companies in order to improve on service delivery, compare cost effectiveness and efficiency between government and private providers. Participatory theory (PT) was as well chosen based on the logic that the programme under evaluation (NAADS) emphasizes bottom up participatory planning which this theory advocate for. This is to ascertain the relevancy of the claims made by the advocates of these theories in the implementation of the NAADS programme. The justification for selecting two theories was to gain adequate explanations of the subject of the study while appreciating the fact that there is no single theory with sufficient explanatory mandate on a given situation.

2.2. New Public Management theory

Manning (2001: 298), referred to NPM theory as ‘getting things done better by privatizing previously publicly provided services’ to private sector, NGOs or individuals. The NPM argument for actions is that service providers should concentrate on efficient production of quality services. NPM seems to represent the idea of arm’s length relation to contracts leading to a single main user who is interested in getting better results by linking principals to their agent. The main aim of NPM as one of the new approaches that have emerged in the 1980s was to improve on service delivery through contractual and attitudinal change for both the service providers and the beneficiaries themselves (Manning 2001). Public expectations motivate governments when binding restrictions on the management that enabled citizens, particularly the poor, to express their preferences or “have their voices heard” and to hold public officials accountable for translating these preferences into results (Manning 2001).

Furthermore, Manning (2001), argues that with regard to contracting out services open competition with private contractors may lead to efficiency and effectiveness to service provision in terms of costs or services pertaining to a particular project or intervention. Contracting out is also assumed to make it easier for a comparison of cost-effectiveness or efficiency between government and private business. It is also held has a mechanism of control because the contract specifies what has to be done and at what price. Contract can be terminated in the situation of performance targets not being achieved or renewal upon meeting the target through tendering. The standards for measuring these results are laid down in a contract document (Van Donge 2002). Likewise, Rouse (1999) added that NPM is concerned with the overall approach taken to establishing and implementing performance and quality systems to achieve results and enhancing the value adding process within the organization by transforming the administrative role into a managerial one to secure more results oriented public services.
According to Hood (1991: 3-4), NPM rose over the past fifteen years as one of the most remarkable global trends in public administration. He assumes that the rise of NPM could rely on; i) the shift toward privatization and quasi-privatization and away from the main government institutions, with renewed emphasis on “subsidiarity” in Service, ii) the development of a more global agenda, progressively concentrated on broad subjects of community administration, policy design, conclusion styles and intergovernmental cooperation, besides the older custom of specific country expert knowledge in public administration provision and iii) the development of computerization, particularly in information technology production and distribution of public services. NPM seen as the only way to correct for the irreversible failures and even ethical economic failure in the “old” public management (Hood 1991). The approach shifted the emphasis from the traditional concerns of political dictators and expert standards to performance and quality service delivery which was judged essentially from the perspective of the customer with its claimed of commitment to social democratic renewal and the participation of citizens as shapers of public services, rather than simply customers (Hood 1991). Hood (1991) ends by elaborating the structure of procedural rules which are designed to prevent favoritism and corruption and to keep arms-length relations between politicians and the entrenched custodians of particular public service in order to achieve trust (Hood 1995).

In support of Hood, Manning and Van Donge; Page (2005), also claims that all the initiatives of NPM seek to improve governmental performance by emphasizing client service, devolution, market instruments, cross functional cooperation, and accountability for results because the governments have given administrators discretion to improve the performance of their agencies while requiring them to measure the results they produce. This view of the NPM a universal new paradigm is consistent with misunderstanding of change in management strategies and problem solving approaches. Page (2005), asserted further by citing that in recent years, human services agencies have emphasized customer service, decentralization, cross-functional collaboration, and accountability for results, all of which are core principles of the NPM. Hence, the reforms offer a rich basis for assessing the champions’ and disbelievers’ views of the origins of the NPM and the process of administrative change.

Contrary to the arguments given in favor of NPM theory, there are other authors that provide criticisms of NPM; Rouse (1999), claimed that contracting out services leads to securing a narrow form of efficiency due to cost savings by contractors that might lead to poor quality service delivery for beneficiaries. This could be based on low trust and expectation that both beneficiaries and contractors to gain at the expense of others. Rouse (1999), goes on to say bribery that is involve in contracting out services for beneficiaries and customers would lead to “democracy deficit”, here democracy is denied. Manning (2001), claimed that NPM was preconceived to be a device for improving efficiency and effectiveness of market to response to customers participation in decision making and demand for service delivery which I anticipate not the case but the findings will prove this true or right in chapter four. In support of Manning, Hood (1995), asserts that NPM has failed to lower cost in its ability to deliver services. Hood further claimed that NPM is just there to promote the career interests of the elites other than for the poor customer.

Dunn and Miller (2007: 347), argue that NPM also assume that ‘citizens and communities are only “clients” who are merely recipients of the services and do
not have the right to actively participate in deciding on what such services are and how they are made'. While Eagle (2005: 32) contends that NPM is ‘inappropriate due to the fact that the two sectors; public and private are derived from and based upon completely different doctrines’.

NPM theory therefore provides the theoretical framework for this research which have been tested in the field basing on the program implementation in terms of contracting out services to private sector or individuals. NPM theory was relevant because it emphasizes contracting out services to private organizations or individuals in order to improve on service delivery which NAADS guidelines also advocated for.

2.3. Theory on participation.

Brett (2003) presents the role of participatory theory in managing development projects and programs in poor countries. He notes that participation has emerged in response to global demands for greater individual and social control over the activities of state and secluded actions, and specifically to the visible letdowns of traditional 'top-down' management systems in less developed countries (LDCs). He points out that participation can succeed for specific kinds of projects and programs in favourable conditions, but is unbecoming for several others. It regularly flops in environments where indigenous conditions make cooperative and collective action very problematic, or where it is influenced by implementing agencies to justify their own actions or poor performance.

Whereas, Cleaver (1999) argues that organizational approaches to institutions contain two strong and conflicting ideas about individual participation. Because of a focus on committee like organizations there is a strong tendency to emphasize participation through democratic representation, and a concentration on the election of representatives. Logically, there is also a strong assumption that meaningful participation in public meetings is evidenced by individual (verbal) contributions and regular attendance to either the group meetings or social gathering.

Oakley (1991: 8), defines Community participation as the process by which persons, families, or groups assume responsibility for their own welfare and develop a capacity to contribute to their own wellbeing together with the community’s development. Furthermore, Zadeh and Ahmad (2009) assert that participation is being involved in the consensus reached, to select a project for the communal, design, implement, accomplish and control it. Its goal is at guaranteeing results that affect the community are promoted.

Sarah (2010), suggests that participation must be seen as political. There are constantly strains underlying problems such as who is involved, how, and on whose terms. While involvement has the potential to challenge patterns of ascendency, it could also be the means through which available power relations are entrenched and reproduced. The fields in which populace assume their interests and judge whether they can express them are not impartial. Participation may take place for a whole range of unfree explanations. It is significant to perceive participation as a lively procedure, then to understand that its own recipe and purpose can become a focus for struggle.

Botes and Van Rensburg (2000), outline some factors that would hinder community participation such as; external and internal. External obstacle refer
to those factors outside the end-beneficiary community that inhibit or prevent true community participation taking place whereas internal obstacles refer to conflicting interest among the groups, custodian by local elites, and alleged lack of public interest. Occasionally even trustworthy community participation is not a warranty that a development initiative will be without serious conflict or will be successful. In some instances all the relevant participants may agree upon the subjects, form, process and product of development, and yet conflict may arise during the implementation phase of a development project and this end up impeding the progress of the project.

Morrish (2011), asserted further by explaining the different forms of participation; Passive participation were people participate by informing them on what is going to happen or what has already happened. Here, the message flows in one direction with little opportunity for adjustments. Participation by questioning and people give answers to questions designed by researchers or project managers. In this case, they do not have the opportunity to influence proceedings as the findings are neither shared nor checked for accuracy. Consultative participation is where people are asked to give their views; the external agents listen to their views and use it to define problem and solutions, although their views may or may not be taken in the final decisions. Participation for material incentives exists when people participate by offering resources such as land or human labour in exchange of food or money. Such people do not have a say in decision making processes and maintaining the activities. Interactive participation is where people participate in drawing up action strategies then the founding of new local groups or the strengthening of existing ones. Groups take control over resources management initiatives. While functional participation exists when people participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives related to the project. Their participation tends to occur at later stages of a project after major decisions have been made. They may become self-dependent but are initially dependent on external facilitators.

Having discussed a lot more on the theories of NPM and Participatory theory above, I therefore proceed to developing the analytical framework based on the pillars of participation such as trust (majorly derived from social capital) and good leadership that may enable participation to take place in order to realize common interest. These elements are the variables that will allow me come up with my position concerning farmers’ participation on the planning and implementation of the programme under evaluation. The detailed definitions and explanations are here discussed below;
Figure 1: Showing the pillars of participation

![Diagram showing participation, common interest, trust, and good leadership](source: Own construction)

The above can be expressed mathematically as: \( P = f(t, l + c) \) where \( P \) stands for participation, \( f \) is a function of dependent variables; trust \( (t) \), Good leadership \( (l) \) and constant \( (c) \). This then implies that when there is freedom that allows for exercising the rights to elect group leaders without interference from outsiders then the employment of trust to the elected leaders will lead to common interest of the group members but in circumstances that all these variables work in isolation of each other; then participation is hardly realize or almost not realized.

2.4. Trust

According to Sonderskov (2008: 81), ‘trust is the belief that people in general are trust worthy and that most people share the same basic norms as oneself. This differentiates it from its opposite of mistrust but also from particularized trust, where people only trust people they know and not people in general’. Likewise, Koutsou et al. (2014: 205), claimed that ‘social capital is used in different ways and with diverse meanings: the capacity for cooperation, trust and civickness, a particular form of local culture, the network of relations’. This expresses the ability of members of a given place to combine their strengths to work together for common goals, within groups and organizations aiming at development. Within this context, they argue that trust is the mother of actions that can be at the individuals (personal trust) or institutions and organizations. Networks based on trust are dynamic and may lead to collective actions that are able to influence development positively while on the other hand, lack of trust deprives agents of chances to work as a team in the future and to set up a common project at the local level. In contrast, Holmén (2010: 72) argues that ‘mutual distrust may override other considerations’... and collaborations among the groups may fail.

Furthermore, Herman (2004), argues that norms and values are the primary aspect of the attitudinal dimension that could be referred to as obligations, democratic orientations, and levels of tolerance. In situations where trust is much more realized and liable on a resident’s impressions about the cooperative behavior of others, norms guide someone’s behavior irrespective of what others do. Ashforth and Mael (1989), assert that the individual defines him or herself partly in terms of noticeable group memberships. Proof of identity is the insight of oneness to a group, comprising direct or indirect competency of its successes
and failures. Whyte (1989: 41), asserts that ‘a mode of thinking that people engage in when they are deeply involved in a unified group, after the participants’ endeavoring for unanimity overrides their motivation to realistically appraise alternative courses of action’ may lead to trust and common understanding among the group members.

In relation to the claims made by the authors above, I have managed to assume that trust is a precondition for group coexistence and functionality in terms of participation in their day today activities. Basically, in the absent of trust amongst group members and their leaders, such a group may not exist for long but would lead to their collapse because trust that would have worked as a guiding instrument when performing their duty as group is absent. Probably participation here might be distorted.

2.5. Good leadership

Dugan (2006: 335), argues that ‘leadership is a relational, transformative, process oriented, learned, and change directed phenomenon’ that could lead to consciousness of self and commitment of group for common purpose and collaboration. Group identification and favoritism tend to occur in the present of strong leadership or member interdependency, interaction, or cohesion. Although Leonard, L.R., and Williams, B, Rosenbaum (1971), claim that the effectiveness of leadership style depends on the extent to which the group’s task and organization facilitates or inhibits the leader’s ability to exercise inspiration. This then suggests that noble leadership rest on the roles identification between them and the leaders. Yet, Lyne de Ver (2009: 3), claims that ‘leadership in the literature are Western-oriented, universalist or distinctive, and there exist limited commencements which either incorporate a political understanding of leadership as a process or which have developmental salience’. Lyne went further by saying Leadership is a function of needs prevailing and is an affiliation between leader and supporters.

Lewin et al. (1939: 293-294), identifies two types of leadership; Autocratic and democratic. ‘Autocratic leaders’ attempted to: (a) determine the group’s policy, (b) go only one step at a time when giving directions so that the group can be uncertain as to what to do next, (c) structure what each group member would do and with whom, (d) criticize and praise individual members of the group, and … remain aloof from the group. On the other hand, ‘democratic leaders’ attempted to: (a) have the group determine their work policies, (b) explain and provide perspective of work procedures, (e) allow group members to choose between alternative procedures, (d) criticize and praise the group as a whole, and (e) become a group member in spirit.

Hoyt et al (2003: 259), reveal that some leaders who seem quite proficient are incapable to relate their abilities in a particular situation, whereas other leaders who have high levels of leadership effectiveness are successful in the same situation. These high effectiveness leaders may be better equipped to handle demanding situations and may transfer their effectiveness to their followers, resulting in larger group performance. Leadership effectiveness will be positively related to group performance.

Good leadership is one of the contributing factors to adequate participation in the developmental and non developmental activities though not always true
that good leadership is a precondition to participation and the reverse might even be true. In this study, I would therefore go by democratic type of leadership explained by Lewin because this give room for discussions and corrections where things are not going right in the group.
Chapter 3: Over view of Agricultural Sector, NAADS Institutional Structure and Extension Services in Uganda

3.1. Introduction.

NAADS is one of the intervention strategies that reinforces the agricultural sub-sectors of crops, livestock and fisheries. Uganda is one of the countries that rely heavily in agriculture for both domestic and export promotion. This is why it is important to give some brief about agricultural sector in this chapter. This will enable us ascertain the level of participation of farmers in the planning and implementation of NAADS programme as a sub component of agriculture.

‘Agriculture is arguably the most important sector of the Ugandan economy. It contributes up to nearly 20% of GDP and also contribute for 48% of exports and offers a large proportion of the raw materials for industry’ (MAAIF 2010: 16). The sector employs 73% of the populace aged 10 years and older. Agriculture will be the key determinant in the country’s efforts to reduce poverty in the immediate years ahead (MAAIF 2010). This is in support of Joughin and Kjaer (2010: 61), who assert that ‘Agriculture is the single most important source of both growth and poverty reduction in Uganda and in recent years the sector has been at the center of a substantial programme of reforms’.

MAAIF (2010), further argues that agriculture in Uganda did well, growing at an average 3.8%, quicker than population growth at that time. The sector was thus a major contributor to the success of Uganda’s poverty reduction efforts. The World Bank (2007: 2), globally asserts that, ‘Agriculture can work in concert with other sectors to produce quicker development, decrease poverty, and protect the surroundings and it is time to place agriculture back to the center of the development agenda, in a vastly different context of opportunities and challenges’.

3.2. Background of NAADS in Abim District

Uganda adopted the private extension model in the PMA which focuses on deepening decentralization for efficiency in service provision to reduce public sector undertakings and encouraging the role of the private sector, disseminating and production enhancing skills approved, food security tackled through markets, designing and implementation of sex well-adjusted programmes, reinforcement and involvement of participants in the planning and implementation of the programme (NAADS 2001).

In deepening decentralization of PMA, NAADS is one of the core programmes that is decentralized for effectiveness and efficiency in service delivery by the private providers and government. This has already been discussed in detail in chapter one of the context of the study. NAADS advocate for inputs development and linkages with markets by creating a strong relationship amidst the agriculturalists, consultants and academics through agriculturalists and markets where funding is provided to relevant expertise to be able to work with the farmers. Private sector institutional development involves training of the FGs as
per the respective information needs and programme management (NAADS 2001). This is done through contracting out extension services to AASPs who are charged with the responsibility of providing these services to farmers. Therefore, NAADS (2001: 19), gave the following roles of service providers;

i).To advise and deliver information, knowledge and skills to agriculturalists on modernized methods of farming and agricultural development. ii) To advise and provide information to farmers on marketing and trading activities, technology supply, storage and product processing. iii) report to the Sub-County FF Executive Committee on the performance of agriculture in general, and on the performance of the FGs in the specific areas of operation. iv) to arrange and carry out advisory, study and growth backing services in response to the demands of farmers.

The implementation arrangements are made through various institutions namely; MAAIF which has the overall responsibility of the programme with the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic development (MFPED) overseeing it. The Districts and Sub counties hold the responsibility for the support and management, though the basic role is at the proletarian in the form of FGs who are the beneficiaries of the advisory services. The Ministry of Local Government (MoLG) holds the responsibility for the administration of the LGs under which the NAADS District, Sub County, Parish and Village activities take place (NAADS 2001)

The NAADS board has been constituted at the national level and have the role of advising and giving the guidance on the policy, strategy issues, facilitating, supporting and supervision of the NAADS administrative. The NAADS administrative forms the administration of the programme and the members hold the responsibility for planning, directing, supporting and managing the operations in their field of competence. The LGs handle the local administrative and the regulatory aspects and support requirements for NAADS. In each participating District the programme will finance the contracting of a District NAADS coordinator (DNC) for which the Co-coordinator will ensure that there is a smooth operation in the programme. The FIs will be the core of the programme and how effective they are determines the success of the programme and the creation of FGs is to have institutions that can enable farmer empowerment (NAADS 2001).

Having the various institutions, is to ensure that proper coordination of the programme takes place. Though it’s not clear as to what standards are used to determine who performs what task, though the beneficiaries of the programme are brought on board to ensure that they own the programme to facilitate its sustainability. However, the successes of the extensions services are dependent on how well coordinated the above institutions are.
Brief description of the organogram:

i) MFPED is responsible for the transfer of funds to MMAIF. MAAIF is the overall supervisory body of NAADS Board. The Ministry remains accountable to the parliament on matters related to NAADS.

ii) The NAADS Board of Directors; is charged with advising and giving guidance on NAADS policy and strategy at national level as well as supervising and supporting the NAADS Secretariat as the national agency mandated to administer the programme by setting the targets and approving work plans and budget for the organization. The Board is answerable to the Minister responsible for Agriculture.
iii) The NAADS Secretariat is headed by executive director responsible for the day to day running of the institute, administration of funds, assets and the overall affairs of the organization as well as control of the staff of the organization. The secretariat is made up of; finance and administration, planning monitoring and evaluation, technical services, internal audit, youths, women and peoples with disabilities (PWDs) and procurement departments.

iv) NAADS is implemented through district, sub county and parish levels. The LG provides the local administration, regulatory and support services to NAAADS. The parish, sub county and district councils who are elected are responsible for policy assessment of effectiveness and general oversight. Districts are to ensure smooth operations and integration.

v) The national FF and FIs are organs, bodies or entities formed by farmers to champion their cause. The NAADS programme recognizes the roles of FGs, cooperatives and FF at National, District, Sub County and Village levels (VFF, S/C FF, DFF & NFF) as FIs and supported under FI development (FID). The purpose of FGs is to create institutions that will enable farmers to effectively organize, formulate and prioritize their needs. NAADS secretariat is responsible for providing technical guidance and operational oversight, and to facilitate outreach and impact through contract and supervise private professional firms to provide specialized services according to the needs prioritized by farmers.
Figure 3: NAADS District Programme organogram

Source: Own construction.

The structure above focuses on the hierarchy at the District level that is responsible for the implementation of NAADS policy. District Council who are elected by voters are the policy makers and the overseer of the implementation programme of NAADS. CAO is the accounting officer of all the programmes undertaken in the district. District directorate of Production reports to CAO. Directorate of Production supervises the team in ensuring that they implement the activities in the various sectors; Crop, Entomology, Veterinary, Commerce. DNC supervises NAADS activities at the District and Sub County. SCC who is the accounting officer at the Sub County level supervises SNC at Sub county level while in coordination with the rest of the Sectors at the District and Sub County. SNC supervises AASPs to ensure proper implementation of NAADS activities at Sub County, parish and village/farmer levels and report to SCC. AASPs work together with CBFs, PCCs and Farmers at parish and village/field levels.
Table 1: NAADS staffing positions at district and sub county levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>District level</th>
<th>Sub County level</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAADs Coordinators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASPs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Own Construction*
Chapter 4: How NAADS has engaged Farmer Groups’ in decision-making processes.

This chapter presents the findings as per the objectives and research questions stated in chapter one. The findings were generated with the help of the in depth interviews and FGDs to the respondents of NAADS beneficiary farmers and key informants.

4.1. Group dynamics

Group dynamics is the study of group size, composition in terms of gender and the cohesion of the members including norms and values. Group characteristics deals directly with the group composition in terms of gender, youth and marginalized group members.

Table 2: Structure of NAADS Farmer Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Marginalized groups</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Enterprise selection criteria</th>
<th>Farmer Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%age</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: own construction

The table indicates that there are more women (67%) than men (33%) in FGs. This is also a representation of random sampling of respondents used in the study. NAADS (2010), states that females are the core target group under the programme; others being the youth and people with disabilities. But the participation of women and youth might not be effective to a larger extent because most women do not own land. NAADS requires people with land of atleast either customary, freehold or lease land tenure in order to participate in the planning and implementation.

Nonetheless, not ignoring this reason, female respondents noted that some men are not actively involved in NAADS programme activities because some are engaged in what they called more ‘profitable and productive’ income generating activities such as trading, and white collar jobs. But some female respondents refuted the above reason and said that most men are neither engaged in white collar jobs nor income generating activities, but they spend most of their
time in bars drinking alcohol and regard their wives (NAADS beneficiaries) as idlers with time to waste in NAADS activities including meetings and training.

The findings further indicates that most women are for FSF because it is believed that the survival of the households depends solely on women and that is why they go for labour intensive enterprises unlike men that rush for less labour enterprises such as rearing of animals. This therefore portray that men tend to participate more in herding than in garden work which is largely carried out by women. This may relate to the cultural construction of gender roles in the culture of the study area. This is an indication that NAADS seems to be reproducing traditional gender division of labour or discrimination rather than eliminating or reducing them completely. Here most men have decided to leave more women to participate in NAADS other than both of them and this contradicts Zadeh and Ahmad (2009) who emphasizes on consensus building as team in terms of participation.

4.2. Formation of farmers’ groups

The NAADS Programme by principle requires the beneficiaries to form groups through which agricultural and technology inputs are channelled to group members (MAAIF 2010, NAADS 2006). The obvious steps in group formations are; call a meeting, agree on the name of the group and the activities to be carried by the group, elect leaders and set byelaws. Respondents noted that they participated in the formation of farmers’ groups processes.

With the assistance of service providers farmers were voluntarily form or join groups to benefit from enterprise(s) selection. Formation is preceded by community mobilisation carried out by VFF per village. This is done through coming up with names of the group, activities carried, objectives and the goal for which the group is formed for. The names and lists of these groups are submitted to the sub county later together with registration at the sub county for formal operations.

The size of the group membership varies from one group to another but the majority of the groups comprised of members between 15 and 30 in total. A person becomes a member after paying a membership fee of $0.58 or make in kind contribution on whatever other members had agreed upon. For example during field work, I found out that most groups were formed through collection of local flour for preparation of local brew for drinking and some through exchange of their labour for free and maybe for cash between members and non-members. This then implies that NAADS guidelines are not followed sometimes by farmers as seen in this case of group formation.

Every farmers’ group must be registered with the accountant of the sub county upon formation by paying nonrefundable registration fee determined by each particular LGs. The group is also required to open up a bank account in a nearby micro finance institution or formal banks. An annual subscription fee is mandatory by every registered group. This is to ensure group existence while active.

Each new group being formed/existing group must meet the requirements such as; having common interest in farming. This could mean growing a similar crop or rearing a particular category of livestock. The group must also have leadership structure; have a formal physical location; have set rules and procedures
(by laws), evidence of membership register and have held regular meeting(s) evidenced by minutes.

Generally there are various ways involved in group formations. It can be through the initiative of one or two members, exchange of labour among members and nonmembers and payment of membership fees; as confirmed by one of the respondents’ quotation below:

Field interviews indicated that over 90% of the interviewed farmers are satisfied with how they formed their groups. This is supported by one male farmer from Lotuke Sub County who said that:

‘I have the freedom to select on my own which people I should join or who should join me in a group without any outside influence from NAADS officials’.

In a related scenario, a group member said that:

‘… our group started by the collection of local flour by people of common interest for making local brew “marua” for drinking then followed by contribution of $ 0.58 by each member as membership fee and finally turned into village savings and loan association (VSLA), done weekly on Tuesdays from 3:00pm. Exchanging our labour for cash to nonmembers and members and sometimes offer free labour among us members on rotational basis locally termed as “Wang alea”. (Female farmer Ltuke Sub County).

The complaints about group formation in the study area was found to be on very rare cases because about ninety five percent of the groups visited conform to the way they were formed. Formation was done without following NAADS guidelines but through informal way based on trust that they had and this was done through having meetings. The NAADS guideline limits the boundary of group members. They should all come from the same village. I found this is not being followed because group members are from different villages and even different parishes. I realised this was based on the common interest of different farmers coming together and the trust that they had in themselves as a team that allowed them come together as a group to solve their own problems.

The findings also reveal that most of the groups were older than NAADS because they were formed before NAADS was introduce in Abim district and this shows that group formation is not a new subject in Abim. NAADS just came to formalize them in terms of registering with the Sub County which they were not doing by then but some had bank accounts with accredited financial institutions such as Savings and credit cooperative organizations (SACCOs) and formal banks. The aim of having bank accounts was to solicit for help from development partners.

FSF who are considered to be the poor farmers are expected to pay back 100% in kind of what they have received. While MoF and CF are expected to pay only 70% of the inputs they have received. Here I realized FSF are discriminated in terms of payment because I expected them either to pay less than 50% or completely not but here the law is not favouring FSF as a result the gap between the rich and the poor continues to remain elastic. This repayment also have remained thorny since the inception of NAADS in Abim either because of no follow ups or poor enforcement of laws. Nearly all farmers that have benefited from NAADS in all the phases have not made any serious repayment of the loan received and this has made beneficiaries to belief that whatever they receive from NAADS turn into a personal property. I also found out that CFs
technologies are not procured/tendered out for supplies and instead they are given cheque and this may easily lead to the abuse of the loan.

4.3. Leadership structure

All the respondents acknowledged that they participated in the elections of their group leaders and other farmers’ representatives at various levels. Group leadership arrangements consist of the chair person, vice chairperson, secretary, treasurer, security (askaris) and mobilizer. During general meeting, candidate names are proposed, seconded, and members vote by show of hands/lining up behind the candidates. The term of office varies from one group to another but it ranges between 2-4 years, then the new leaders are either elected or former members can still be re-elected for another term and there are no term limits for the executive committees. The other leadership they participated in electing are the CBFs and PCCs.

Some respondents were surprised to be leaders due to cultural barriers especially for women that were barred from becoming leaders or even attending meetings when organized.

This is confirmed by one of the female group members who said:

‘Before NAADS was introduced in 2007, I did not know that I would become a leader one day due to cultural barriers to all women, women were not allowed to be elected to lead men but today I have the testimony to confirm that NAADS have empowered women to be elected leaders and can now lead both men and women and even lead better than men without fear or favour. I have more leadership skills than men though am not educated…/long live NAADS to allow us all women to attain more leadership positions and skills’ (Lotuke Sub County).

Farmers interviewed said that leaders play a big role in as far as group enterprise activities are concerned. Notable roles of group leaders identified were; lobbying for financial support and capacity building from donors, convening and conducting group meetings, representing group members at higher level NAADS meetings at parish, sub county or district levels, solving disputes amongst members, monitoring group enterprise activities and ensuring group unity.

Actually what defeats my reasoning is that term limits is set for every group which is operational and none of the FGs met had implemented this since the formation of their groups. This means that some leaders have over stayed and have developed immunity to the groups and may decide to do things that suit their own feelings since they are overdue for replacement and not shaken and this could probably lead to clientalism (giving material goods in return for electoral support) and nepotism (favouring relatives and friends).

Each member is free to belong to a group which he/she feels comfortable with. This is in line with what participatory theory formulated by Brett (2003) who argues that bottom up decision making process enhances participation of farmers rather than top-down approach and by doing this help eliminate dictatorial leadership in all its forms and supporting personal freedom in making the right choice. The former concerns the nature of the relationship between group leaders and members themselves. The successes of group formation, leadership election and composition were all based on common interest and trust that provided good atmosphere for participation.
4.4. Decision of farmer groups on enterprise selection

NAADS (2006) states that NAADS programme is to empower farmers in enterprise selection. The report further notes that through a participatory process, farmers are guided to select profitable enterprises to be promoted in their groups. These are forwarded to the sub county where FF and technical staff then select the most common enterprises identified by beneficiaries to be supported.

NAADS guidelines (2010) provides that farmers should select the kind of enterprises meant to receive support from NAADS. The process is however guided by criteria such as marketability, higher yields, short term seeds, drought resistant crops and ease of production of the enterprise. After mobilization by the extension workers, farmers assemble in one place and identify the enterprises they believe can receive support from NAADS. This process is guided by the NAADS employee who pushes for the interests of the program. The selected enterprises are then forwarded to the parish level for another vetting process before funding.

Field interviews show that nearly 40% of the farmers’ respondents were not satisfied with the selection process of enterprises under NAADS and this has contributed negatively to the owning of this programme. This is said well by a respondent below;

A female group member had to say this concerning enterprise selection:

“We do not have the right to make our own selection of the enterprises we needed most because the district together with sub county team come along with a long list of enterprises already developed by the NAADS secretariat for us to make choices out of them and this does not allow us to freely decide on what we need. We do not call this enterprise selection but making choices instead from the already prepared menu by the said technocrats’ (Morulem Sub County).

The NAADS female extension worker on the other hand have a contrary view upon being interviewed:

‘NAADS aims at increasing household incomes of the farmers and the list provided works as a guiding tool to farmers for proper decision making for better yields as “commodity approach” (genetically improved/cross breed seeds) than the local types of the enterprises that some farmers continuously demand… farmers still reject these “commodity approach” and make their selections, e.g. local goats are not in this list but it has been supported quite long now due to farmers' demand’ (lotuke sub county).

Key respondents said that FG members participate in selecting the enterprises from the available enterprise lists which have already been prepared by the NAADS secretariat and also opt outside the provided list when they want. In both Sub counties of Lotuke and Morulem, the selected enterprises included crops such Beans K620, K131, K132 plus others, livestock, ox-ploughs and apiary.

The technical planning committee (TPC) at the sub county acts as technical advisors to the farmers on which enterprises to undertake. They consists of, the

---

6 K is actually a botanical name given to bean seeds that have been improved either through cross breed or genetically from research institute called Kawanda.
SCC, secretary for production, Sub County Chairperson, AASPs for both animals and crops and the NAADS coordinator. This committee together with the FF selects the enterprises for each financial year on the basis of geographical and climatic conditions that would favour the selected enterprises.

However, the majority of respondents expressed lack of information about the criteria followed in the process of selecting enterprises in the sub county. Most of them feel they are not empowered to select their own enterprises. They said that they are engaged in some group enterprises because they have no alternative. Some of them applied for enterprises of their preference, for example hybrid cattle keeping and tree planting, but for several years they have not been considered for funding among the selected enterprises in the sub county. This is an indication of bureaucratic kind of leadership that contravene Brett (2003) bottom-up approach in decision-making and Zadeh and Ahmad (2009) consensus building because majority of farmers were not directly involved in selecting enterprises.

4.5. Contracting out NAADS services

The procurement of inputs are expected to start with advertisement, purchase of bidding documents, opening, evaluation and award of contracts and signing agreement with contractors.

NAADS (2010) mandates the beneficiaries to come up with the procurement committee from themselves to facilitate the procurement process. The members should include; chairperson, secretary and treasurer. Beneficiary farmers then have/were trained and well informed that the procurement process should be participatory and involve beneficiary farmers at each successive stage as much as possible.

The guidelines further indicate that one is selected as lead farmer to receive the inputs and implements because he/she belongs to a certain farmers’ group. The recipient pays back some amount of money or in kind to other group members through the group or bank account after a specified period of time depending on the types of technology provided.

During FGDs the respondents were not conversant with these guidelines. They were not all aware of how much they will pay back to the group and for how long. Surprisingly, others claimed that what they received is personal property and has nothing to do with other group members because they are the ones bearing the burden of paying co-funding and paying back the ‘loan’. They had even informed group members not to tamper with whatever they have received, which created fear, tension and skirmish among group members.

Even some members of the procurement committee confirmed these testimonies and complained about lack of transparency in the procurement and supply processes. The procurement committees expected to participate in designing the bidding documents which they were not involved as indicated below;

One of the female procurement committees said this during the interview:

‘I was elected the chairperson procurement committee and hoping to participate in preparing bidding documents for the procurement and supply of the technologies identified by the NAADS beneficiary farmers and how it could be made more transparent and in a participatory manner. But I was shocked to
receive a bidding document from the SNC to sign without being involved in designing/preparation processes of the bidding documents. I refused and reported to the sub county FF chairperson for further advice and only to be told just sign because you do not have the capacity to design these documents. This make me conclude that procurement is not done by us the beneficiaries but by the technical people at the sub county’ (Lotuke Sub County).

Contrary to this, during interview a male key informant said this:

‘Am not afraid to say that farmers have been cheated heavily by contractors because they agree on a very small portion of the inputs to be provided to them by the contractors. This leads me to say that “can a monkey burn its own forest since it is an apartment entity”? Skirmish of interest leads to farmers being cheated’ (Government staff district level).

One of the areas where 85% of the respondents stated and branded ‘denial of the right to participate’ was the procurement process.

It should be noted that the problems surrounding the procurement and supply process under NAADS contradict the claims of NPM theorists such as Hood (1991 & 1995) who argues that contracting out enables open competition among private contractors to supply good quality items. The findings indicated this in the opposite because farmers have been cheated through bribery and receiving poor quality items. Contracting out is also erroneously assumed to make it easier for a comparison of cost effectiveness or efficiency between government and private business which is not the case.

Manning (2001) added that NPM is all about getting things done better by privatizing previously publicly provided services’ to private sector, NGOs or individuals. The NPM argument for actions is that service providers should concentrate on efficient production of quality services.

Interestingly, these results proves that the claims made by NPM theorists are contradicted by the findings of this study, particularly in the area of procurement and supply of goods and services to beneficiary FGs. This was found to have been abused by both the suppliers and beneficiaries through connivance that ended up in cheating the end users (beneficiaries) by receiving poor quality and inadequate technologies from suppliers. This, however, indicates that procurement manual should be revised to the level that farmers understand its content to avoid connivance. It is also an indication that the contractors who are presumed to be elites takes the advantage of the poor farmers through bribery and manipulation to achieve their interest at the expense of poor farmers.

4.6. Participation in performance evaluation of NAADS programme by farmer groups.

Some respondents said that as members of groups they participate in the monitoring of group initiatives. This is done through group garden trips by visiting fellow group members who are engaged in NAADS enterprises. The monitoring exercise centers on the performance and progress of group enterprises. They look at how the activities are progressing, difficulties and challenges faced by group members, and advise accordingly. Other respondents said that sometimes they make rotational monthly meetings accommodated by a group member. Members use this opportunity to visit the host member’s activity site to evaluate
the progress and advise consequently. Nevertheless, this exercise differs from one FG to another; therefore, it is not cross-cutting in all FGs. The exercise is also not constant but it is planned for only twice a year. FGs expected monitoring to be done continuously without consideration cost implications as said below;

During the FGDS a male member confirmed this:

‘the monitoring which is done twice a year is inadequate compared to what we do with these enterprises from distribution to harvest/storage because there are other enterprises that requires continuous follow up by the technical people… fish farming and poultry is labour intensive’. (Lotuke Sub County).

In a similar scenario, one of the service providers countered the response by saying this:

‘Monitoring and evaluation is only done twice a year due to budget constraints but individual monitoring and evaluation can be even on daily basis depending on what someone wants to find out… people who are supposed to carry out joint monitoring are many in number and this requires much funds, hence I encourage individual farmer monitoring’! (Female key informant Lotuke Sub County).

4.7. Access of agricultural services

Farmers’ respondents were asked in the FGDS to identify how and by what ways or from which sources they receive NAADS information. The data obtained as farmers’ responses was processed into a chart shown below:

**Figure 4: NAADS information Sources**

![Chart showing NAADS information sources](chart.png)

*Source: Own construction*

As per the figure above, the majority of the information is got from NGOs other than the extension workers who are recruited on contract basis to provide the extension services to farmers in terms of training on best agronomic practices which they do not offer and this can lead me to ask why are these people then
contracted besides failing to meet the terms of references spelt out in their contract documents? Can this really lead farmers somewhere? Certainly no because NGOs do this at their own discretion and may decide to call it off anytime hence farmers are then the losers and yet AASPs have been contracted to offer this advisory services frequently and earns monthly salary without even missing a month.

Radio spot messages became number two due to many FM radio stations that offer the similar messages regularly. Farmers added that radio messages are so brief and they cannot again ask the questions for clarifications because most of them do not have or cannot afford phones. When they get opportunity, the airtime is expensive for them to pay for in their mobile phones to seek for clarifications on the message passed for the few that might be in possession of phones.

Fellow farmers became number three simply because many NGOs offer advisory services to various groups they support them with inputs. In turn when they are back to their respective groups and places they tend to compare notes on the topics covered by different development partners and by doing this they keep sharing the knowledge and skills acquired for the benefit of those ones that never got the opportunity for such trainings. Though this kind of information may not hold water for long because they can easily forget or misinterpret the information given to them correctly at a later time but somehow is assisting farmers.

Extension service providers came last based on the reasons that they only provide advice during distributions of goods and services to farmer beneficiaries and never follow them up to their respective places to ascertain on the progress and challenges these farmer beneficiaries are faced with.

FGs expected much of the extension services to come from AASPs but this has not been the case due to various opinions of FGs as said below;

During FGDS, one female farmer said this:

‘We are very grateful to some NGOs for the continuous support they are offering on agronomic practices to farmers generally other than NAADS FGs beneficiaries only… and yet the contracted service providers are just scooping salaries for no work done. These service providers only offer instructions other than trainings during the distribution of procured technologies on how to plant seeds and take care of the livestock. This does not indicate seriousness by service providers (Lotuke Sub County).

In the same scenario during FGDS another male member expressed this:

‘… before I joined NAADS, I did not know how to plant seeds in lines and was majorly dealing with the traditional methods of showing seeds using my hands to spread them which was giving me poor harvest and yields. But now am in position to have good harvest and high yield crops. This is due to continuous attendance to group meetings and advisory services received from the NGOs, fellow farmers and listening to radio programmes which gave me this knowledge’ (Lotuke Sub County).

A female extension worker of NAADS interviewed said that; NAADS is distorting the extension services because it facilitates extension to inputs provided to NAADS beneficiaries only and neglect other crops being grown by the farmers which are not under NAADS. Extension workers accepted that NAADS
gave them motorcycles, at least one per Sub County, to be used by three staff at Sub County but does not allocate a corresponding adequate amount of funds for the operations, maintenance and follow up of these farmers in their respective fields (Lotuke Sub County).

As was noted further by extension workers, the NAADS secretariat continues to provide new implementation guidelines every year for the last three years, the latest being 2010 while the 2014 guideline is expected soon following the Presidents message a few months ago expressing change of NAADS management from civilian to army for immediate results and impact. Contracted workers further said that they do get information and concerns raised by farmers but because they are working under supervision and guidelines, it is hard to offer instant response and support to farmers due to bureaucracy in the top management. This affects their own participation in the program because they have minimal authority in their work. As one said; ‘we are field workers not office workers but surprisingly we are becoming office workers unknowingly’.

4.8. Capacity to demand for extension services by the three categories of farmers groups’

Across all the interviews, with different farmer categories, I found out that there is no differences in capacity in demanding for extension services from private providers and all the responses were very similar and almost the same. Nearly all farmer categories did not consider demanding for extension services from service providers a good move due to challenges they incur in managing their enterprises as confirmed below;

A male CF said this:

‘I was supplied with cassava cuttings as the inputs in 2012 and I only got the advice from the service providers during collection time and I felt that there is no need to invite the service providers because they do not even come and if they do they demand for fuel refund from me. No need to demand for extension services’. (Lotuke Sub County)

In a related scenario a female MoF said this:

‘I was really very disappointed when I invited one of the service providers to come and treat my goat from running stomach sickness. The service provider never responded to rescue my situation and at the end of the day I lost my goat just because of carelessness from service providers. Am the loser since there is no replacement and this people never come when invited unless you promised some airtime. Of course this is bribery’. (Morulem Sub County).

During FGDs a female FSF said this:

‘Am receiving very little inputs that does not require extension services. A bag of groundnuts is a small input that I can do without the assistance from service providers because I do not have money to refund with the fuel for the motor cycle or pay for drug of the service provider when he/she comes to help. I better wait for the time they are going to provide free general services if at all it’s going to be there or not’ (Morulem Sub County).

Generally speaking the findings showed that there are challenges encountered by all these farmer categories when it comes to demand for extension services
from the providers and this creates no different in capacities amongst these farmer categories.

When I relate this to analytical framework, I found out that farmers had already lost trust on these service providers due to what they expect after paying a visit. This therefore hinders participation in demanding for services and also contradict NPM theory that advocate for better service delivery and contracting out extension services. Therefore both the two theories have been denied basing on the fact that services demanded are not provided, poor quality inputs supplied to farmers by contractors which is in line with what Botes and Van Rensburg (2000) gave as factors hindering participation in terms of internal and external factors.

4.9. Challenges faced by beneficiaries in the planning and implementation of NAADS

This section will focus on the challenges encountered by farmers in relation to the farmer needs, how the challenges are related to the farmer needs, what extension methods are used in responding to these challenges either by the government departments or NGOs.

During the field visits farmers enumerated many constraints to their participation in the planning and implementation of NAADS. These challenges are categorized into four thematic areas:

4.9.1. Inputs

1. The inputs supplied to FGs are much fewer in number compare to their numbers because groups are between 15-30 members. Atleast a member is selected every year to benefit from NAADS from FGs and this is not realistic enough as confirmed below;

A female group member confirmed this:

‘I am the only beneficiary this year from my group and yet we are 35 members in total. I was given a local she goat as an enterprise to keep for a duration of one year on the assumption that it will bear a kid for other member(s) to benefit until all this members benefit from this only goat. Is this realistic enough to us farmers? I do not believe in this unless NAADS is there to be seen as a mirage’ (Lotuke Sub County).

2. Late delivery of inputs or supply of wet seeds that will not germinate when planted. Most of the technologies are either delivered very late or sometimes of poor quality.

‘I am a beneficiary of cassava cuttings this year and we had agreed for the cuttings to be supplied in April to be planted using the first rains but to the contrary I received the cuttings in June even at the time when there was no rain and these cuttings ended up drying and used as fire wood not again as seeds and this has really demoralized me’ (Male farmer Morulem Sub County).

4.9.2. Trainings and backstopping of the farmers

1. There is lack of follow ups by both the sub county and district officials to ascertain the progress of these enterprises distributed to farmers. AASPs are said
to be reluctant to follow up these technologies with farmers to provide advisory services.

‘We expected service providers to constantly visit us to provide the technical advices concerning these enterprises but to our dismay, they only come when they are monitoring or when we invite them to assess the conditions of these enterprises. This has made many of us to be reluctant and negligent on enterprise management’ (female farmer Lotuke Sub County).

2. Inadequate staff majorly service providers. 12 AASPs were expected to be contracted to offer advisory services in all these six sub counties/town council. But five are missing which could be one of the contributing factors in the weakness in service delivery and demand.

A male production staff confirm by saying this during an interview:

‘MAAIF for long has not restructured staff unlike other departments which have done almost three times by now and this has contributed to low adoptability of modern farming by farmers. Likewise to AASPs when adverts was made, not all posts attracted applicants but we ended up only attracting seven out of twelve and this is still a challenge to us and farmers because we have tried on several occasions to call for applications but no response. We are yet to seek alternatives from secretariat’. (District level).

3. Inadequate capacity on the management of the inputs supplied to farmers. Farmers are believed to have low/no capacity to manage these technologies without technical assistance from service providers.

A female group member said this:

‘I am a primary four leaver who does not know how to read and write well and I have been supplied with beans k131 to be planted in lines and rows. I do not know how to estimate the distance in between lines and how many seeds are to be dropped in the holes. At the end of it all I ended up scattering these seeds due to inadequate/lack of capacity on modern farming’ (Morulem Sub County).

4. Lack of market for the product of these enterprises. Some committed farmers always produce for both market and domestic purposes but they are faced with inadequate/no market to sell their products.

‘I am a farmer dealing with apiary (bee keeping) based on the information that the government have ready markets for this product of mine but this has not been the case, had it not been because of Aridland development programme (ADP) NGO who managed to provide markets for this, I was just going to consume it locally and I would have benefited nothing. Can you imagine the valuable technologies we waste that could have helped us farmers adequately’? (Male farmer Lotuke Sub County).

**4.9.3. Agronomic practices**

1. Lack of mechanized agriculture in order to open more fertile farm land (acreage). Nearly all farmers still employ traditional methods of farming such as use of hand hoes that cannot help them open up fertile large land.

‘I happened to have benefited from an oxen this year and the aim of NAADS is to open up large farm land. In order for me to meet the target of NAADS, I needed a complete pair of oxen that would allow me to open more land. Maybe
if possible NAADS should begin hiring for us tractors to open up more fertile land using this loan they give us’ (Male farmer Lotuke Sub County).

4.9.4. Inadequate adoptability of NAADS inputs to unpredictable weather conditions

1. Unreliable weather conditions in terms of heavy rainfall, floods, prolonged drought have made farmers to be confused on how to adjust to such situations. Farmers used to believe in their traditional planting procedures which has been distorted away by global warming maybe as said below;

One female farmer said this:

‘We used to have our own local planting calendar seasons but this has not worked for the last three years now because rainfall patterns have changed completely. Sometimes too much and sometimes not there for longer period. For example we used to plant millet always in March with the first rain and groundnuts in April but this has completely been distorted due to unpredicted weather conditions’ (Morulem Sub County).

2. Continuous outbreak of diseases and pests. This has become almost a routine in the study area because all the FGDS and key informants met mentioned at least this as a big threat to farmers.

‘I know very well that NAADS has privatized veterinary services for example treatment of animals is at the individual levels. Poor me who can’t even afford two meals a day, how then can I be in position to acquire the necessary drugs for the animals and maybe insecticides too? This is the same as requesting the blind person to lead the seeing which is impossible’. (Male farmer Lotuke Sub County).

4.10. Strategies of NAADS secretariat and government in addressing farmer group challenges

During the FGDs and interviews with both the farmers and the key informants, the following were the intervention strategies enumerated:

A female key informant said this:

‘The government is responding to lack of mechanised agriculture and inadequate inputs by providing tractor schemes (ploughing for the needy people) and supply of inputs to subsidised NAADS and this is not necessarily for the beneficiaries of NAADS only but also for non NAADS group members. The logic here is to fight or reduced food insecurity in the communities’ (Lotuke Sub County).

Contrary to the key informant, a female farmer during FGDs said this:

‘I agree that government send these tractors to the district then finally to the sub counties with the short term seeds. The contrary part of it is the selection criteria of the beneficiaries for these inputs and tractor services is not very clear. Tractors also has conditions that the poor people like me cannot afford for example removing the stamps together with the roots. This requires money to hire the labour to do the needful which I do not have and at the end of it all some of us barter or sell off this opportunities to the rich people who can afford the removable of stamps’ (Lotuke Sub County).
In analysing these different views and thoughts, I realised that involvement in the identification of the beneficiaries was not transparent enough because majority of the people were not involved in the selection processes and this means that, to some extent some leaders are not trusted. Bringing in participatory theory which advocate for bottom up planning by the farmers have not been utilised. Farmers decided to mistrust their leaders due to their poor leadership style that does not incorporate democracy in decision making. The leaders ended up misusing their office they had for either personal gains or greed.

I also realised that some farmers especially leaders are always found of denying receipt of information concerning developmental programmes say for the selection of the beneficiaries for tractors and seeds from the office of the prime minister to subsidise NAADS yet they know that this a routine programme carried out by the government annually.

The other response that was identified by both the key informants and FGDs was continuous sensitisation and mobilisation of farmers on the mitigation measures on the challenges which has been identified for proper management and owning of the projects.

During the interview, a female service provider said this:

‘I do always organise for the trainings of the farmers on best agronomic practices and copies of my plan given to FGs and my immediate supervisors. When time comes for me to go for the trainings, I send reminder messages to the farmers but only end up getting either few or nobody waiting to listen to my training. Because I do not provide allowances after the trainings like other NGOs do to farmers and this has completely spoiled our farmers. The obvious question that farmers express before the start of the training, is there allowance? The local name for it is “OJP”. This contributed a lot to our failures in providing extension services to farmers’ (Lotuke Sub county).

During FGDs a female farmer confirmed this:

‘… I do accept that NGOs gives us money after the trainings at their own initiative without us demanding for it and this has been a routine for quite sometimes now which is very difficult to scrap it in one or two days but needs sometimes. We also feel that government should copy the same style of the NGOs’ (Morulem Sub County).

The training that is meant to improve the knowledge of farmers is being denied by farmers themselves because they demand for allowance after training and this shows mistrust and lack of common interest among the group members and their leaders. As a result poor quality service provision to beneficiaries which is contrary to NPM theory that advocates for quality services is surfacing here.

This is where the role of NPM that emphasises on quality service is very important in the sense that farmers are supposed to be provided with what they deserve but if this is not followed then the concepts of trust and good leadership that would lead to common interest of both the beneficiaries and the providers not being practiced. The findings shows that participation sometimes become problematic in situations where there is bureaucratic type of leadership style. Because when decisions are made on behalf of the participants other than involving them it may result into disagreement due to the absent of common interest and trust that would have helped to mediate thus participation is hindered.
Drawing further from interviews and FGDs data, I found out that what Holmen (2010) identifies as the problems encountered by farmers in chapter one is true but there are other factors too that contributed to farmers weaknesses in planning, designing and implementation of the programme. There is inadequate AASPs contracted to offer extension services to farmers. Out of 12 that were expected to be contracted only 7 are available to offer services and this created a big gap between service provision and providers. Certainly, almost all farmers are illiterate because they do not know how to read and write and yet NAADS requires some elementary knowledge on literacy and numeracy. This affects NAADS in terms of planning and implementation procedures.

NPM is mistakenly believed that any government service provisions could be run like a business. Of course business target is profits maximization other than service provisions. When you compare NPM and participation by beneficiaries you will realised that participation is suppressed because NPM is mainly run by elites at the expense of the poor which neglects accountability, the separation of power and administration that might lead to contradictions in service delivery in trying to run the government like a business entity.

NPM believes that competition would lead to the lowering of cost in the delivery of services to the community but this has been discovered to be the opposite during data collection. Instead it generated more problems other than solving the existing ones. For instance if competition lower cost for services to be delivered what about value for money and quality of services? This could make me suggest that NPM alone cannot fulfil the service provision obligations unless a variety of methods are employed as appropriate in service delivery.

NPM has undoubtedly left its mark with small scale farmers in terms of privatizing and contracting out services to be provided to them by either individuals or companies however, NPM is not so much applicable to the country like Uganda where there is too much political interference in decision-making but NPM is a good theory to be applied in countries where political maturity is reached.

In a nutshell service providers have failed to comply with NPM and PT that advocates for quality service, contracting services, efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery and consensus building that resulted into mistrust and lack of common interest due to poor leadership style that ended into inadequate participation by FGs in decision-making.
Chapter 5: Conclusions

In summary, this research was mainly focused on examining the factors influencing the causes of the weaknesses of FGs in decision-making during the planning and implementation of NAADs as a case study. This was carried out on the notion of NPM and Participatory theory in conjunctions with the pillars of participation; trust and good leadership that would lead to common interest of FGs. The data collected was mainly qualitative through FGDs and interviews with FGs and key informants at district and sub county levels.

From research question one I realized that majority group members are more dominated by women. This could be based on the cultural gender roles that women are more of garden work than men because men are more of herding in the study area. Consequently marginalized group members were more of men than women. Active men are either in herding, drinking of local alcohol or engaged in some other business profitable to them than gardening. This can portray to us that men are sometimes not committed in undertaking labour intensive projects as seen in chapter four above. The process of group formation were based on the common interest of the different people that decides to come together as group members and this was done willingly though others could have been induced to join the particular group. Group leadership were elected by group members based on common interest and trust that they had in themselves. All group members participated in the election of their leaders either by saw of hands or lining behind the nominated candidates. This shows democracy and collective actions by groups’. Enterprise selection criteria have not been so much decided by FGs due to the menu already prepared by NAADS secretariat. This portrays top-down approach other than bottom-up approach in decision making.

From research question two I discovered that the demand for extension services by FGs were made through phone calls for those who had the opportunity, letter writing and physical visits to service providers. I discovered that services never followed FGs demand from extension service providers due to lack of follow ups and this has lowered the morale of FGs in demand for extension services. NGOs have been the major service providers to FGs other than AASPs who are contracted purposely for service provision. This could be on the basis that NGOs are more of results of the activities than government.

From research questions three and four I realized that the main challenges faced by FGs in demanding for extension services were inadequate service providers, unreliable weather conditions and few inputs supplied to FGs among others throughout the district. The response of government towards some of these problems faced by FGs have been top-down approach which have not yielded much positive results. FGs should have been on the forefront to suggest the appropriate solutions to their problems since they are the ones who are directly affected by these problems.

From the above findings I can summarized that participation existed in the three phases of the NAADS programme implementation; 2001, 2002-2010 and 2010 to date but has been on decline. One of the attributing factors to the decline
of participation by farmers is the presidential decree which call NAADS on halt\(^7\) some few months ago on the decision to shift the management of NAADS to the army. Procedures and scope of participation by the beneficiary farmers included selecting enterprises, forming farmers’ groups, electing group leaders and their representatives, attending training, and group meetings and these were based on trust, good leadership and common interest amongst the farmer groups.

However, this participation was and is still mostly felt at the farmers’ group level as major decisions are made by higher NAADS programme implementation authorities. It is clear that there would be much more benefits accruing from the programme if the beneficiaries were fully participating in the decision making regarding the programme planning, and implementation most especially in developing the manual. The number of beneficiaries per parish each financial year which is regarded to be very small and on decrease compared to the total number of farmers in the parishes. This leaves majority of the farmers idle, discouraged and not interested in participating in NAADS programme activities.

NAADS had been and is still belief to continue employing top-down approach policy formulation and implementation that either never involved farmers adequately or involve at a minimal level in the formulation of its policy. Because of this farmers tend to ignore participation in the implementation of some development programme that tends to portray inadequate ownership.

Finally, for the last thirteen years of NAADS existent as somewhat portrayed inadequate/lack of involvement of communities in developing objectives against which results would be assessed because communities are seen as beneficiaries of NAADS. In fact, beneficiaries are the citizens that have the right to participate in the formulating and designing of policy for a particular service delivery say NAADS as the case in point.

\(^7\) NAADS was called on halt by the president late August this year based on the reports presented before parliament by the auditor general for unaccounted for funds of NAADS about 11 billion Uganda shillings in Kampala district alone (NTV Uganda News at 9:00 pm 2014)
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Lists of key informants at district and sub county levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Awor Sylvia Night</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Senior Probation and Social Welfare Officer and Ag. District CDO</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Work and Social Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ogwang Jino</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Senior Entomologists and Ag. District Production officer</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Botany and Geology, Post graduate PPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ojok Anjello Kenneth</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Senior Animal Husbandry officer and Ag. District Agricultural officer</td>
<td>Diploma in general Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Owilli James Opatong</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>District Chairperson FF</td>
<td>Primary lever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dr. Okengo Oscar</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>District Veterinary officer</td>
<td>Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ochan David</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td>Bachelor of Development Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ocheng Caroline (Mrs)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>District Secretary for Production and Environment</td>
<td>Senior two lever</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub County level Key informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Educational level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Okoth Terence</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>Diploma in Animal Husbandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Okwange Bosco</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chairperson FF</td>
<td>East Africa Certificate of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Asio Sarah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AASPS- Livestock</td>
<td>Diploma in Animal Production and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Obura Clement Boniface</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>AASPs- Crop</td>
<td>Diploma in crop Production and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eriaku Gelas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Secretary production and environment</td>
<td>Senior three lever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ogwang Bismark</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chairperson FF</td>
<td>Senior three level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Achieng Juliet</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>Bachelor of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Angeo Lucy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SNC</td>
<td>Diploma in Animal Production and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Awilli Janet</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Secretary production and Environment</td>
<td>Primary lever</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own Construction
Appendix 2: Interview guides for FGDs

Focus group discussion guide for the Farmer groups (Food Security Farmers, Market Oriented Farmers & Commercialised Farmers)

Groups’ formation

Name of the group…………………………..Category…………..year of formation………

1. How are the farmer groups organized?
2. What is the composition of your group members? (No. of women, men and their ages, education level, employment status & the disadvantage people)
3. How are participants within the farmer groups determined and by who?
4. What are the activities your group is doing besides NAADS?

Service provision and decision making

5. What farmer needs are farmer groups faced with?
6. How do the farmer groups solve the farmer needs/search for advice?
7. What extension teaching methods are used to deliver the advice and how interactive are they?
8. How is the advice provided to the farmer groups meeting the farmers’ needs demanded?
9. How did the leadership structure come into existence? (Elected or appointed and by who, level of trust, education level may be) and change over time before and now?
10. As a group, can you in any way influence the way NAADS programme is conducted at your local level and how? Change over time?
11. Which gender is mostly active in the farmer group activities and why?
12. Who are the different stakeholders in Farmer group development activities? (Private, individual and government service providers).
13. How do the farmer groups influence decision making process in the area of planning and enterprise selections? Change over time?
14. How do the farmer groups share information within the Farmer group regarding Development activities?
15. What role do the farmer groups play in the implementation of the Farmer group Development activities? (training & enterprise identification) change over time?
16. How do you rate the performance of NAADS programme in this area and why? (1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very good, 5-Excellent).
17. What challenges do you encounter as a group in the planning and implementation of NAADS?
18. How well do NAADS programme managers respond to your demands/challenges? (1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very good, 5-Excellent)
19. How best can these challenges be address? Or what else should be done?

Contracting Out and Provision of Agricultural Services

20. Which organization(s) or individual(s) provide (s) Agricultural Services to you on behalf of NAADS?
21. Who has the mandate or authority to identify and contract out Agricultural Services such as trainings and technologies to your organization or you as an individual?

22. Which kind of agricultural services are offered to you by this organization or individual and how often is done?

23. How satisfied are you with the agricultural services offered by these organizations or individuals? (1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very good, 5-Excellent)
Appendix 3: Interview Guides for Key Informants at District and Sub County

SECTION A

Name
Gender
Age
Residence
Level of education
Employment status

SECTION B

Service providers
1. What position do you hold in the NAADS programme and since when have you held it?
2. How did you happened to be a member of NAADS management body? (Appointed, elected & by who)
3. Which role do you play in the NAADS programme implementation? Change over time? - before and now?
4. In your capacity how well have you been able to ensure that the agricultural extension services in terms of farmer groups participation (planning, implementation) is improved?

Groups’ formation and decision making processes
5. How are farmers’ groups organized structurally? (FSF, MOF & CF)
6. What do you see as their main roles? (FSF, MOF & CF)
7. How effective are these groups (FSF, MOF & CF) in performing their roles? Change over time?
8. How do farmers demand for extension services from both private and government providers? (FSF, MOF & CF)
9. How is contracting out business done and who does it? (through written agreements or contracts with performance targets)
10. Do farmers participate in any way in designing/setting up the contracting out arrangements? (Contract documents and workplan) change over time?
11. What mechanism is in place to ensure that the trainings under farmer groups are responding to real needs (needs diagnostic done)?

Service provision
12. Which enterprises (seeds, birds, animals, citrus, fish farming, etc) are supported by NAADS programme in this area and why?
13. Who determines which enterprises are to be provided to NAADS farmer groups in a given area? (Government, Private/Individual organisations, Farmers).
14. How work plans and budgets are developed (processes and procedures)?
15. Which organizations or individuals are contracted to offer agricultural services to the farmers in this area and for what purposes?
16. How do you rate (1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very good, 5-Excellent) the performance of contracted organizations and individuals in offering agricultural services in this area and why?

17. Who is responsible for monitoring and evaluation of NAADS programme at the local level and how is it done?

18. How is NAADS Programme beneficiaries’ participation in planning and implementation enhanced or stifled in this area? Change over time?

19. What challenges / problems do you think NAADS programme beneficiary farmer groups’ face in this area? Change over time?

20. How does the institutions respond to these problems?

21. How do you rate the performance of NAADS programme in this area and why? (1-Poor, 2-Fair, 3-Good, 4-Very good, 5-Excellent).

22. How have you been able to ensure that gender equality (Equal opportunity to women and men) is promoted in the farmer groups activities in terms of formal positions? Change over time? - before and now.