

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE ROLE PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS OF FACILITATORS IN THE SECOND NATIONAL FADAMA DEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN NIGERIA

Shimayohol Daudu and Michael C. Madukwe

Agricultural extension and communication, University of Agriculture, Makurdi

ABSTRACT

The introduction of the Second National Fadama Development (NFDP-II) in Nigeria is to sustainably meet the challenge of information management at the community level. The NFDP-II introduced the facilitation approach where the facilitator is the focal person at the community level. Facilitators have met obstacles in the effective performance of their roles. The study ascertains the perception of stakeholders implementing the NFDP-II on the factors that hinder and those that enhance the role performance effectiveness of facilitators. The study was carried out in the three NFDP-II zones in Nigeria. Multi-stage sampling procedure was applied in the selection of a sample size of 366 respondents comprising 118 facilitators, 236 Fadama users' group members, 6 state project coordinators and 6 state community development officers. Means, standard deviation, exploratory factor analysis, analysis of variance and Post Hoc tests were used to realize the objectives. The results show that the major factors that inhibit facilitators' role performance effectiveness are administrative inertia, inadequate facilitation intensity and poor supervisory function as perceived by facilitators. Administrative ineptitude; inadequate capability and logistic support as perceived by Fadama users groups; poor planning, lack of fortification and inability coverage as perceived by State Fadama Project coordinators; poor projection, inadequate working facilities and inadequate command as perceived by State Community development officers. On the other hand, factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by the stakeholders are: provision of transport facilities, institution of a regular training programme, and transparent recruitment of facilitators. The study recommended provision of adequate transport facilities, and a regular training programme. Also policies to mitigate the identified factors that inhibit the facilitators' role performance effectiveness be implemented.

Keywords: Facilitators, Facilitator's role performance, effectiveness, inhibiting factors, enhancing factors, Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

It is estimated that of the 1.20 billion hungry and poor people in the world over 800 million suffer from chronic under nourishment. Out of these 34 million live in Asia while 186 million live in sub-saharan African. Therefore, the major challenge facing developing countries in the world is the production of sufficient food for its burgeoning population (Nwosu, 2005). This poor trend is evident in all aspects of rural development in the developing countries of the world (Sule, 2006).

In Nigeria, the contribution of Agricultural export has declined sharply since the early 1970's (Vision 2010, Agriculture, 1997). Indeed agricultural exports are negligible and recent trends in export crops have not been impressive (Nigeria Rural Sector Strategy Study, NRSSS, 2001; Central Bank of Nigeria, CBN, 2004; National Planning Commission, 2006).

This has manifested in reduced agricultural productivity and food insufficiency for majority of the nation's teeming population.

Many experts believe that it is a matter of weak linkage between research and extension culminating into weak extension service delivery system. According to Ayoola (2001), previous efforts at agricultural research and development in Nigeria can be delineated into three phases: mechanism for agricultural administration, which connotes successive Nigerian governments' introduction of some policies for agricultural administration in form of agricultural programmes which were often accompanied with diverse institutional evolution. According to Atala (1998), the "top-down" approach characterized these agricultural initiatives.

In terms of the mechanism for agricultural research, the national and international research institutes and universities of agriculture and faculties of agriculture in Nigerian universities have produced many improved technologies for Nigeria's agriculture. Despite the existence of these research outfits and large outlay of research technologies, there has been no significant adoption resulting in the over all impact on food production and food sufficiency (Okwu, 2005). With respect to the mechanism for agricultural extension, organized extension service started in Nigeria in 1954 with the Ministry operated service. This was followed by other approaches including the NFDP-I. Here the extension agent was the officer in direct contact with the farmer. It is noteworthy that all the approaches lacked sustainability. Many scholars suggested the use of facilitation approach (Roling, 1994) to achieve sustainability in extension service delivery (PCU-SPFS/FDC-DAIMINA, 2003).

The Second National Fadama Development Project (NFDP-II) was initiated to address some of the factors that mitigated against the full realization of the potential benefits of agricultural production activities (World Bank, 2003). The project has introduced the user fee approach that could help in promoting pluralistic extension service delivery in developing countries (Umali-Delaing, 1997) with Fadama beneficiaries contributing 10 percent of the cost of the advisory services they receive (International Food Policy Research Institute, IFPRI, 2008). The advisory services are important for implementing the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy Framework which aims to reduce poverty by transforming subsistence agriculture to commercial agriculture (Nigeria National Planning Commission, NNPC, 2006). The sector goals of NFDP-II are to reduce poverty by improving the living conditions of the rural poor; contribute to food security and to increase access to rural infrastructure. The specific objectives of NFDP-II are among others: to establish demand-driven technical assistance and advisory services to resource users (NFDP-II Project Implementation Manual, PIM, (2003).

In the NFDP-II, the facilitator is the link between the Fadama development project management and beneficiaries. Facilitators' main task and responsibilities are: assist beneficiary communities in analyzing their situation and their problems and finding pertinent solutions; assist communities and groups to implement, monitor and evaluate their activities and help local communities and groups and to establish link with other groups and institutions that may be able to support them (Ellis-Jones, Schrittz, Chikkoye, dettans, Karmawa and Adedzwa, 2005). After three years of implementation of the Second National Fadama Development Project preliminary lessons learnt from this project indicate that the quality of facilitation support to the FCAs is low especially in the technical fields. Poor facilitation is manifested in inadequate sensitization of the FCAs, low-level comprehension of the project approach and the associated guidelines by the FCAs and low quality of local development plans (LDPS).

Therefore, in view of the crucial role facilitators have to play in effective implementation of NFDP-II it is necessary to identify obstacles affecting performance of their roles.

Theoretical Consideration

According to Goodman (1992) the social exchange or cost/benefit analysis theory explains group interaction and group effectiveness. According to the theory, social interaction is a series of exchanges that have both costs and benefit. People expend time and energy in social interaction (cost). People also derive benefits from these inter change (joy, affection respects, achievement etc). Consequently, a cost/benefit analysis is essential to understanding social interaction in the social exchange perspective. Individuals understand the cost involved and the benefits that might be derived and decide whether the relationship is profitable (benefit minus cost) from the exchange. If there is no profit the exchange may cease or be terminated and if there is profit, it may be continued.

Thus, the theory of social exchange explains how emotions provided by social exchange develop stronger ties to group or net works. Individuals will attribute the exchange based emotions to social units such as relations, networks or groups to the degree that the exchange brings them together a common endeavour and creates a sense of shared responsibility (Lawler, 2001) will effectiveness of role performance result.

Purpose and Objective

Facilitators under the NFDP-II are professionals charged with helping the individual beneficiary and FCAs and their constituent FUGs to articulate and prioritize their problems and opportunities so that they can be tackled in order to achieve the goals and objectives of NFDP-II (NFDO, 2004). Many variables influence facilitators' role performance effectiveness this include factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness and those that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness. This study was carried out to ascertain the factors that influence the role performance effectiveness of facilitators in the Second National Fadama Development Project in Nigeria. The specific objectives were to: identify the factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness, determine the factors that enhance facilitators role performance effectiveness; the hypotheses include: there is no significant variation in the perception of facilitators, Fadama users' groups, project coordinators and community development officers on factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness; and there is no significant variation in the perception of facilitators, Fadama users' groups, project coordinators and community development officers on factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study area is Federal Republic of Nigeria. Nigeria is situated in the wet and dry climatic region in West Africa, bordering the Gulf of Guinea, an arm of the Atlantic Ocean, between Benin and Cameroon Republics. It also share borders with Cameroon, Benin, Niger and Chad Republics. It lies between Latitudes 40⁰N and 13⁰ 50`N of the equator and longitudes 13⁰E and 15⁰E of the Greenwich meridian.

The 2006 Nigerian National Population Commission gave the total population of Nigeria as 140,033,542 with an average growth rate of 3.2% and indicating more males (72,709,859) than female (68,293,683) (NPOC, 2006). The major agricultural products include yam, cassava, rice, maize, millet, sorghum, groundnut, cowpea, rubber cocoa, oil palm, cola nut, citnus timber. The livestock products include cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, fish and poultry. Most of the agricultural

produce are consumed within the country. Agricultural exports are negligible and recent trend in exports crops have not been impressive (NRSSS, 2001, CBN, 2004). This is probably because the economy depends heavily on revenue from crude oil while its rural economy is ignored (Wibberley, 2005).

The Environmental impact and social assessment for the NFDP-II report divided Nigeria into three regions based on ecological and social diversity. These are northern, middle and southern regions. The NFDP-II is implemented in the following states: northern states: Bauchi, Borno, Gombe, Jigawa, Katsina, Kaduna and Kebbi States; the middle states: Adamawa, Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, Kogi, Kwara, Taraba, Niger and Plateau States; and southern states: Imo, Lagos, Ogun, and Oyo States (PCU, 2003).

The NFDP-II is sponsored by two donor bodies: the World Bank (12 states) and the African Development Bank, ADB, (6 states). The population of the study consisted of all 605 facilitators, 18 state Fadama Project Coordinators, 18 State Community Development Officers and 18000 members of Fadama Users Groups involved in the implementation of the NFDP-II in Nigeria.

The study sample was made up of stakeholders in the implementation of NFDP-II in Nigeria: facilitators, state Fadama project coordinators, state community development officers and members of the Fadama users groups in the six intervention states selected for the study.

A multistage sampling procedure was used in selecting the respondents. In the first stage of selecting the facilitators, three geographical regions were selected to cut across socio-ecological region as follows: northern, middle and southern regions. Secondly, two states were randomly selected from each of the three regions based on the relative number of states sponsored by the donor institutions as follows: 4 World Bank (WB) and 2 African Development Bank (ADB) sponsored states as follows: Jigawa and Bauchi from Northern Region; plateau and Niger from middle Region; Imo and Oyo States from Southern Region. Thirdly, 2 facilitators were selected from each of the 10 local government areas in each of the six States in each of the three geographical regions of Nigeria involved in the implementation of the NFDP-II by simple random sampling techniques.

A total of 120 facilitators were selected from a list of facilitators provided to the researcher by each of the state Fadama project coordinators. Also all the state NFDP-II coordinators from the six states were purposively selected. Similarly, all the state NFDP-II community development officers (CDOs) from the six selected states were purposively selected and formed part of the sample.

Finally, facilitators take charge of FCAs and their constituent FUGs in each Local Government Area. One key informant, who was an officer of a FUG, from each of any two randomly selected FCAs serviced by the facilitator was purposively selected for indepth interview. Secretaries of the FUGs were purposively selected because they were literate and skilled informants. Overall, a total of 372 respondents selected through multistage random sampling procedure formed the sample size for the study. Table 1 show the valid sample size of the study. However, 366 valid response were used for analysis.

Four sets of detailed validated instruments – structured interview schedule, two structured and one unstructured questionnaire were used to collect primary data. The structured interview schedules were used to collect information from Fadama users' group key informants (officers). The sets of structured questionnaires were used to obtain

information from the NFDP-II facilitators and State CDOs while the unstructured questionnaire was used to collect information from state Fadama project coordinators. Focus group discussions were conducted among respondents in each of the FUGs in each of the states selected for the study in order to obtain indepth information and the response to the issues raised in interview schedule were used as reference materials for discussion. Focus groups were made up of FUG members, FUGs key informant and facilitators selected among the respondents. The interview schedule and questionnaire elicited information to cover the objectives of the study. A pilot test was conducted as part of the instrument validation and to familiarize the research assistants as the research instrument.

Field assistants were engaged in each state and given adequate training for data collection along with the researcher. In order to identify the possible factors that hinders facilitators' role performance effectiveness (objective 1), a four point Likert type scale was used to determine the extent to which a list of statements may act as factor that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness. These possible factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness factors were obtained from related literature on NFDP-II and from interaction with practioners in the NFDP – II. The response options and values assigned were: Not serious =0; some what serious =1; serious =2 and very serious = 3. These scores were used to determine the respondents' level of perception of these factors as factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness.

To determine the factors that enhance facilitators effectiveness (**objective 2**), a four point Likert type scale was used to determine the extent to which a list of statements may pose as factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness. These possible factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness were obtained from practical experience, related literature and preliminary interaction with experts on NFDP-11. The response options and values assigned were: Not at all important = 0; A little important = 1 great importance = 2; and very great importance = 3. These scores were used to determine the respondents' mean score perception of these factors as enhancing facilitators' role performance effectiveness. The mean was determined as follows: The response options and values assigned were: Not at all important = 0; A little important = 1; great importance = 2; and very great importance = 3. The mean importance of a factor as enhancing factor to facilitator's effectiveness was obtained by adding together $0 + 1 + 2 + 3 = 6$ and the sum was later divided by 4 to get a mean score of 1.5. The respondents' mean score ≥ 1.5 was regarded as important and any mean score less than 1.5 was regarded as not important. This cut off point of ≥ 1.5 was used to select statements which were perceived as important factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness.

To test for variation in stakeholders' perception of facilitators, FUGs, state Fadama project coordinators and state Fadama II CDOs on factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness. (**Hypothesis 1**), the statement already used to ascertain their perception on factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness were used again.

Finally, to test for variation in perception of facilitators, FUGs, State Project Coordinators and CDOs on factors that enhance facilitators role performance effectiveness (**hypothesis 2**), the statement already used to ascertain their perception of factors enhancing facilitators' role performance effectiveness were also used.

Also perception of factors that hinder NFDP II facilitators role performance effectiveness (objective 1) were analyzed by use of mean statistic and factor analysis technique. Factor analysis is a statistical technique used for a large number of variables to establish whether there is a tendency for groups of them to be inter- related. The exploratory factors analysis techniques using principal factor model with varimax rotation was employed on the items. The factor loadings under

factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness represented a correlation of the variable to the identified factor and has the same interpretation that any correlation has. Kaiser criterion using factor loading above 0.30 or above was adopted in grouping the hindering variables into major factors that hinder naming and interpreting the factors that hinder NFDPII facilitator's role performance effectiveness; and identification of factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness (**Objective 2**) was analyzed by use of mean, standard deviation and ranking.

Research **hypothesis 1** (There is no significant variation in the perception of factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness among the facilitators, FUGs, SFPCs and CDOS) was tested by the use of the analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Research **hypothesis 2** (There is no significant variation in the perception of factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness among the facilitators, FUGs, SFPCOs and CDOs) was also tested by the use of analysis of variance (ANOVA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by facilitators

Data on possible factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness were collected from facilitators.

Results show that three major factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by facilitators were isolated using factor analyses technique. Based on the item loadings factor 1, 2 and 3 were named administrative inertia, inadequate facilitation intensity and poor supervisory function (Table 1).

Administrative inertia was defined as inability of management to take appropriate decision at appropriate time to achieve adequate implementation of the project. The specific issues that define administrative inertia (factor 1) include: lack of adequate delegation of authority to facilitators (0.65), lack of baseline survey before project take off of project (0.70), lack of commitment by stakeholders (0.67), non involvement of cooperative officers to check the books of FUGs (0.67), absence of adequate communication education (0.71), lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms sub-project proposals developed (0.78), absence of information dissemination programme (0.76), absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level (0.75), lack of training programme for facilitators (0.81), poor screening of service providers (0.70), lack of transparency in recruitment of facilitators (0.74), and time devoted to the training of facilitators is inadequate (0.67).

On the other hand, factor 2, lack of facilitation intensity was defined as lack of those things that can bring practical ability to the effective role performance of facilitators. Items which loaded high in this regard (**factor 2**) include: excessive work load for facilitators in terms of number of FUGs handled (0.48), largeness of area of coverage (0.58), lack of quality control support (-0.36), and lack of working equipment in terms of number of audio-visuals to be handled (0.34). While items that loaded on poor supervisory function (**factor 3**) defined as lack of facilities to enable effective supervision of activities to enhance the role performance effectiveness of the facilitators. Items which loaded high on this major factor were absence of adequate transport facilities for facilitators (0.40), low – level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators (0.44) and lack of role for ADPs to supervise facilitators (-0.58).

Table 1: Rotated matrix of factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by facilitators (n = 118)

Hindering variable	factors		
	1	2	3
Lack of adequate delegation of authority to facilitators	0.65	0.02	-0.07
Absence of adequate transport facilities for facilitators	0.60	-0.10	0.40
Lack of baseline survey before take off of project	0.70	-0.17	0.01
Lack of commitment by stakeholders	0.67	0.09	0.00
Non involvement of cooperative officers to check the books of FUGs	0.67	0.09	0.00
Absence of adequate communication education	0.71	-0.19	0.27
Excessive work load for facilitators in terms of number of FUGs handled	0.57	0.48	0.17
Lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms of sub-project proposals developed	0.78	-0.07	-0.07
Absence of information dissemination programme	0.76	0.34	0.21
Absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level	0.75	0.09	0.03
Largeness of area of coverage	0.35	0.58	0.36
Lack of training programme for facilitators	0.81	0.08	0.04
Low level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators	0.72	0.05	0.44
Poor screening of service providers	0.70	0.23	0.01
Lack of quality control support	0.67	-0.36	-0.21
Lack of role for ADPs to supervise facilitators	0.40	0.48	-0.58
Lack of transparency in recruitment of facilitators	0.74	-0.09	-0.23
Time devoted to the training of facilitators is inadequate	0.67	0.22	0.09
Lack of working equipment in terms of number of audio-visuals to be handled	0.45	0.34	0.12

Scale: very serious = 3, serious = 2; some what serious = 1 and not serious = 0

Field data 2007

Key: Factor 1 = Administrative inertia;
 2 = inadequate facilitation intensity and
 3 = Poor supervisory function

Factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by Fadama users groups

Data of factor analysis carried out to ascertain the major factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by Fadama users groups identified three important factors. Based on the items loadings factors 1, 2 and 3 were named administrative ineptitude, inadequate capability of NFDP-II and absence of logistic support respectively (Table 2)

The specific issues that define administrative ineptitude (factor 1) include: lack of adequate delegation of authority to facilitators (0.70), absence of adequate communication education (0.60), lack of base-line survey before take off of project (0.72), lack of information and skill to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms of sub-project proposals developed (0.72) absence of information dissemination programme (0.71), absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level (0.61); low-level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators (0.72), time devoted to training of facilitators is inadequate (0.53) and non-involvement of cooperative officers to check the FCA books (0.43).

On the other hand, inadequate capability of NFDP-II (factor 2) was defined by the following items loadings; lack of working equipment in terms of number of audiovisuals to be handled (0.80) largeness of area of coverage (0.69), lack of training programme for facilitators (0.43) and excessive workload for facilitators in terms of number of FCAs handled. (0.76). While items which posted high loadings under absence of logistic support (factor 3) were absence of adequate transport facilities for facilitators (0.42), lack of commitment by stakeholders (0.73) and lack of role for ADPs to supervise facilitators (-0.78).

A further consideration of the major factors will enable us appreciate the synergy of the items resulting in the nomenclature of the hindering factors. Under administrative ineptitude defined as lapses in the administration of facilitators which ought to have been taken care of by good planning and proactive administrative design. Under this hindering factor: delegation of authority, communication, base-line survey, information, integrity, comprehension of project approach, screening quality control, transparency on recruitment, training, checking of books are all administrative functions which management should have had a prior consideration and necessary safe guard for effective implementation for the facilitation support.

Table 2: Rotated matrix of factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by Fadama users groups (n = 236).

Inhibiting Variables	Factors		
	1	2	3
			0.00
Lack of adequate delegation of authority to facilitators	0.74	0.10	
Absence of adequate transport for facilitators	0.52	0.08	- 0.42
Non involvement of cooperative officers to check the books of FUGs	0.85	0.09	0.73
Lack of commitment by stakeholders of FCA	0.32	- 0.41	0.55
Absence of adequate communication education	0.60	0.18	0.15
Lack of baseline survey before take off of project	0.74	-0.05	0.13
Excessive workload for facilitators in terms of number of FUGs handled	0.22	0.76	-0.04
Lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FUGs in terms of sub-project proposal developed	0.72	0.11	0.17
Absence of information dissemination programme	0.71	0.22	-0.05
Absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level	0.62	0.24	0.18
Largeness of area of coverage	0.14	0.69	0.00
Lack of training programme for facilitators	0.58	0.43	0.02
Low level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators	0.58	0.27	0.26
Poor screening of service providers	0.72	0.12	0.15
Lack of quality control support	0.60	0.27	0.20
Lack of role for ADPs to supervise facilitators	0.14	- 0.14	0.78
Lack of transparent recruitment of facilitators	0.72	0.07	0.10
Time devoted to training of facilitators is inadequate	0.53	- 0.26	0.23
Lack of working equipment in terms of number of audio-visuals handled	0.10	0.80	0.04

Scale: very serious=3; serious=2; somewhat serious=1; and not serious =0

Field data:2007 Key: Factor

1 = Administrative ineptitude

2 = Inadequate capability of NFDP-II, and

3= Absence of logistic support.

On the other hand, inadequate capability of NFDPII factor, defined as the command that Fadama II organizations have over physical, financial and human resources enabling it serve its clients, FUGs, (Misra, 1997). Inadequate capability is manifested in lack of adequate equipment to conduct audio-visual on a wide scale, lack of institution of a training programme and excessive workload for the facilitator, putting more pressure on the facilitators' ability to reach all the areas under his jurisdiction. In the Nigerian situation where the FUGs members may be literate only in the mother tongue, inadequate capability of audiovisuals may pose as a serious hindrance to facilitators' role performance effectiveness.

Finally, absence of logistic support (**factor 3**) highlights the individual items that x-ray logistic support defined as administrative design to improve the practical handling of details of the implementation of a programme.

Factors that Hinder Facilitators' Role Performance Effectiveness as Perceived by State Fadama-II Project Coordinators.

Data of factor analysis carried out to isolate the major factors hindering facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by state Fadama project coordinators arrived at three major factors. Based on the item loadings factors 1, 2 and 3 were named poor planning, lack of facilitation and lack of adequate coverage (Table 3).

Poor planning was defined as lapses in project implementation occasioned by inept scheme for carrying out the implementation. The specific issues that define poor planning (factor 1) include: lack of baseline survey before project take off (0.92), lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms of subproject proposals developed (0.90), absence of information dissemination programme (0.98), absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level (0.66), lack of training programme for facilitators (0.76), low level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators (0.74), poor screening of service providers (0.78), lack of quality control support (0.88), lack of role for ADPs to supervise facilitators (0.92) and lack of transparency in the recruitment of facilitators (0.91).

Factor 2 named lack of fortification and defined as absence of the necessary services to empower the agent to effectively perform his role.

Items which posted high loadings in this regard include lack of adequate delegation of authority to facilitators (0.60), absence of adequate transport facilities to facilitators (0.79), non involvement cooperative officer to check the books of FCAs (0.91), and absence of adequate communication education (0.75). Finally, factor 3 inadequate coverage defined as the paucity of intensity of number and quality of facilitators. The specific issues defining this factor include largeness of area of coverage (-0.51), time devoted to the training of facilitators is inadequate (0.80) and lack of working equipment in terms of number of audio-visual to be handled (0.95).

Table 3: Rotated matrix of factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by state Fadama project coordinators (n=6).

Hindering variable	Factors		
	1	2	3
Lack of adequate delegation of authority to facilitators	0.60	0.52	-0.52
Absence of adequate transport facilities for facilitators	0.15	0.79	-0.20
Lack of commitment by stakeholders	-0.43	0.89	0.05
Non involvement of cooperative officers to check the books of FUGs	-1.04	0.91	0.37
Absence of adequate communication education	-0.43	0.75	-0.45
Lack of baseline survey before project take off	0.92	0.18	0.09
Excessive work load for facilitators in terms of numbers of FUGs handled	0.69	0.33	0.28
Lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms of sub-project proposals developed	0.90	0.25	-0.04
Absence of information dissemination programme	0.98	0.16	-0.14
Absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level	0.66	-0.69	0.03
Largeness of area of coverage	0.56	-0.64	-0.51
Lack of training programme for facilitators	0.76	0.58	0.24
Low level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators	0.74	-0.09	-0.24
Poor screening of service providers	0.78	0.31	0.00
Lack of quality control support	0.88	-0.10	0.24
Lack of role for ADPs to supervise facilitators	0.92	0.18	-0.09
Lack of transparency in recruitment of facilitators	0.91	0.21	0.26
Time devoted to the training of facilitators is inadequate	0.00	0.03	0.64
Lack of working equipment in terms of number of audio-visuals to be handled	0.16	-0.19	0.95

Scale: very serious = 3; serious = 2; some what serious = 1 and not serious = 0

Field Data 2007 Key: Factor 1 = Poor Planning

2 = lack of fortification

3 = Inadequate coverage.

Factors that Hinder Facilitators' Role Performance Effectiveness as Perceived by State community Development Officers

Results of factor analysis carried out to ascertain the major factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by the state community development officers identified three major factors. Based on the item loadings factor, 1, 2 and 3 were named poor projection, inadequate working facilities and inadequate command respectively (Table 4).

Poor projection is defined as incompetence arising from poor planning of the time phase plan for implementation of the project. The specific issues in factor 1 include lack of adequate delegation authority to facilitators (0.74), lack of commitment by stakeholders (0.73), non involvement of FUGs (0.82), excessive workload for facilitators in terms of number of FUGs handled (0.92), lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms of sub-project proposals developed, (0.92), absence of information dissemination programme (0.69), absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level (0.81), low level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators (0.92), poor screening of service providers (0.81), lack of role for ADPs to service facilitators (0.84), lack of transparency in the recruitment of facilitators (0.88) and time devoted to the training of facilitators is inadequate (-0.92).

On the other hand factor 2, inadequate working facilities defined as the necessary machines, equipment, or ideas needed to carry the facilitation activity is manifested by high loadings in: absence of adequate transport facilities for facilitators (-0.77), lack of quality control support (0.85) and lack of working equipment in terms of number of audio-visuals to be handled while factor 3, inadequate command defined as insufficient or inadequacy of staff to carry out the facilitation function was indicated by high loads in terms of: largeness of area of coverage (0.60), lack of training programme for facilitators (-0.42) and lack of baseline survey before project take off (-0.53).

A consideration of the underlying issues articulated by these factors is pertinent. This factor is represented by lack of adequate delegation of authority for facilitation. On the other hand issues that articulate factor 2 include: absence of adequate transport means assigned to facilitators. Similarly lack of working equipment in terms of number of audio-visuals to be handled is a factor limiting audio visual usage.

Thus, inadequate extension coverage is a serious hindrance to facilitators' performance effectiveness.

Table 4: Rotated matrix of factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by state community development officers (n = 6)

Hindering variable	Factors		
	1	2	3
Lack of adequate delegation of authority to facilitators	0.74	-0.53	-0.04
Absence of adequate transport facilities for facilitators	0.60	-0.77	0.19
Lack of commitment by stakeholders	0.73	-0.29	0.40
Non involvement of cooperative officers to check the books of FUGs	0.83	-0.47	0.23
Absence of adequate communication education	0.87	0.31	0.24
Lack of baseline survey before project take off	0.67	-0.52	-0.53
Excessive work load for facilitators in terms of number of FUGs handled	0.92	-0.38	-0.03
Lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms of sub-project proposals developed	0.92	0.32	0.20
Absence of information dissemination programme	0.69	0.48	0.54
Absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level	0.81	-0.02	-0.37
Largeness of area of coverage	0.57	0.39	-0.60
Lack of training programme for facilitators	0.48	0.32	-0.42
Low level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators	0.92	0.23	0.16
Poor screening of service providers	0.81	0.14	0.51
Lack of quality control support	0.22	0.85	-0.05
Lack of role for ADPs to supervise facilitators	0.84	0.37	-0.09
Lack of transparency in recruitment of facilitators	0.88	0.39	-0.21
Time devoted to the training of facilitators is inadequate	-0.92	0.03	0.30
Lack of working equipment in terms of number of audio-visuals to be handled	-0.60	0.38	0.17

Scale: very serious = 3, serious = 2; some what serious = 1 and not serious = 0

Field data 2007

Key: Factor 1 = Poor projection

2 = Inadequate working facilities and

3 = Inadequate command.

Factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness as perceived by facilitators, FUGs, SFPCs and CDOs.

Mean scores, standard deviations, and ranks of perception of NFDP – II facilitators, Fadama users groups, state Fadama project coordinators and community development officers on factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness were determined.

Data in Table 5 show the mean scores and standard deviations of NFDP II facilitators, Fadama users groups, state coordinators and community development officer on their perception of factors enhancing facilitators' role performance effectiveness. The results revealed that of all the 14 items investigated all respondents agreed that 13 of the items were serious enhancing factors while only one item i.e. create provision for ADP staff supervision of facilitators ($\bar{x} = 1.31$) was regarded as not an important factors that enhance factor to facilitators' role performance effectiveness by all the respondents.

The data reveal that according to the NFDP – II facilitators the following factors were regarded as important enhancing factors; provision of transport facility to facilitators ($\bar{x} = 2.89$), transparent recruitment of facilitators ($\bar{x} = 2.56$), institution of a training programme ($\bar{x} = 2.64$); adequate remuneration for facilitators ($\bar{x} = 2.61$).

The data also reveal that the NFDP – II Fadama users groups noted that for facilitators to perform their roles effectively there should be provision of transport facility to facilitators ($\bar{x} = 2.86$), provision of communication equipment e.g. G.S.M phones. ($\bar{x} = 2.65$), provision of cooperative officers to check the books of FUGs ($\bar{x} = 1.74$), absence of conflict among Fadama users ($\bar{x} = 2.26$), provision of regular training of facilitators ($\bar{x} = 2.51$), and presence of good working relationship between facilitators and their clientele ($\bar{x} = 2.69$). The data also show that NFDP – II state Fadama Project coordinators perceived that for facilitators to perform their roles effectively, the following factors were serious: provision of transport facility to facilitators ($\bar{x} = 2.83$), transparent recruitment of facilitators ($\bar{x} = 2.83$), institution of a training programme ($\bar{x} = 2.66$), adequate remuneration for facilitators ($\bar{x} = 2.66$).

While NFDP – II community development officers respondents stated that the following facilitating factors were imperative and serious for facilitators role performance effectiveness: provision of transport facility to facilitators ($\bar{x} = 3.00$), transparent recruitment of facilitators ($\bar{x} = 3.00$), recruitment of facilitators with B.Sc./HND in agricultural extension/social science ($\bar{x} = 2.83$), provision of communication equipment of GSM phones ($\bar{x} = 2.83$),

Also data in Table 5 show that the standard deviations from the mean for all the statements were less than 1.00 which indicates that the respondents individual scores as regards their perception on factors enhancing facilitators' role performance effectiveness did not differ much from the mean score in the distribution.

The results in Table 5 show that the facilitator stated that the three most important factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness were in order of highest rank: Provision of transport facility to facilitators, provision of regular training of facilitators and presence of good working relation between facilitators and their clientele respectively. Also the NFDP – II Fadama users groups perceived the following as the three most important enhancing factors in order of

important ranking; provision of transport facility for facilitators, presence of good working relationship between facilitators and their clientele and provision of communication equipment such as GSM phone.

On the other hand the NFDP – II state coordinators perceived the three most important facilitators’ effectiveness in descending order as provision of transport facility for facilitators, transparent recruitment of facilitators and institution of a training programme for facilitators. While NFDP – II community development officers perceived the following enhancing factors for facilitators’ role performance effectiveness in order of ranking as provision of transport facility for facilitators, transparent recruitment of facilitators and provision of communication equipment such as GSM phones to facilitators respectively. Finally the overall mean score of the three most important factors that enhance facilitators role performance effectiveness as perceived by all the respondents were in descending order of ranking provision of transport facility for facilitators, transparent recruitment of facilitators and institution of a training programme for facilitators. This implies that respondents perceived 13 out of the 14 listed items in Table 5 as important factors necessary to improve and promote facilitators performance effectiveness. Specifically, all the respondents perceived provision of transport facility to facilitators as the most serious facilitating factor to facilitators’ role performance effectiveness. The issue of means of mobility to facilitators is of crucial importance to the role performance effectiveness of facilitators as clearly stated by all the respondents. Facilitators require means of mobility to reach the disparately located FUGs under him in his regular and systematic meetings.

These findings contrasts with that of Amalu (1998) that the problem of mobility in most ADPs were more of lack of spare parts and fuel and poor maintenance of available vehicles/motor cycles than that of shortage or lack of mobility itself. However, the overwhelming expression of the need for provision of transport facility to facilitators is indicative of a dearth of this crucial factor, means of transport, to facilitators in the NFDP – II. Therefore, facilitators should be provided with means of transport to elicit effective role performance effectiveness.

Also respondents agreed that there is a need to institute a training programme for facilitators to enhance their role. This may not be unconnected with the general dissatisfaction with the role performance effectiveness of the NFDP – II facilitators.

Also, respondents perceived that transparent recruitment of facilitators was the next most important facilitating factor to facilitator’s role performance effectiveness. This is probably because corruption is rife in Nigeria. Highly placed officials could circumvention the recruitment process and get their relations selected even though they possess qualifications alien to the facilitation job as evidenced in the fact that a good number of facilitators had qualifications which were classified as “Others” which may probably be graduates of history or such unrelated qualifications.

Table 5: Mean scores, standard deviations and rank of perception of NFDP-II facilitators, Fadama users groups, state Fadama project coordinators and community development officers on factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness.

Enhancing factors	NFDP – II facilitators mean n = 118	NFDP – II Fadama users group mean n = 236	NFDP – state NFDP – II coordinators mean n = 6	NFDP – II State community development officer mean N = 6	Grand mean	Rank
Provision of transport facility for facilitators facility	2.89 (0.14)	2.86 (0.42)	2.83 (0.37)	3.00 (0.37)	2.90*	1
Transparent recruitment of facilitators	2.56 (0.38)	2.37 (0.42)	3.00 (0.00)	2.83 (0.37)	2.69*	3
Institution of training programme	2.64 (0.24)	2.36 (0.54)	2.66 (0.37)	2.33 (0.50)	2.75*	2
Create provision for ADP Staff supervision of facilitators	1.48 (0.74)	1.43 (0.76)	1.00 (0.00)	1.33 (0.81)	1.31	14
Adequate remuneration for facilitators	2.61 (0.30)	2.34 (0.54)	2.66 (0.47)	2.33 (0.74)	2.49*	8
Recruitment of adequate number of facilitators for effective coverage.	2.50 (0.43)	2.23 (0.70)	2.50 (0.47)	2.66 (0.47)	2.47*	9
Recruitment of facilitators with B.Sc./HND in Agricultural extension/social science.	12.33 (0.56)	2.24 (0.86)	2.66 (0.57)	2.83 (0.47)	2.52*	7
Provision of communication equipment e.g. GSM phones	2.54 (0.44)	2.65 (0.45)	2.16 (0.47)	2.83 (0.37)	2.55*	6
Provision of cooperative officers to check the books of FUGs	1.50 (0.91)	1.74 (0.51)	1.83 (0.47)	2.00 (0.47)	1.77*	13
Absence of conflict among Fadama users	2.30 (0.61)	2.26 (0.88)	2.33 (0.74)	2.83 (0.47)	2.43*	10
Provision for regular training of facilitators	2.74 (0.56)	2.51 (0.66)	2.66 (0.50)	2.83 (0.57)	2.69*	3
Recruitment of candidates who had lived in the rural areas before or had rural upbringing background	1.94 (0.75)	2.07 (0.88)	2.33 (0.47)	2.66 (0.46)	2.25*	11
Presence of role clarity	2.27 (0.51)	2.18 (0.98)	2.00 (0.47)	2.16 (0.47)	2.15*	12
Presence of good working relationship between facilitators and their clientele	2.73 (0.24)	2.69 (0.60)	2.66 (0.37)	2.16 (0.47)	2.56*	5
Mean	2.36	2.28	2.36	2.49	2.37	
Cutoff point	≥ 1.5					

Scale: To a very great importance =3; To a great importance =2; To a little importance = 1 and not at all important = 0

Field data 2007 Figures in parentheses = standard deviations
*important factor

Variation in stakeholders' perception of factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness (Hypothesis 1)

Over all the one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) (Table 6) shows that there is significant variation ($P \leq 0.05$) in perception of the factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness: as perceived by the stakeholders ($F = 11.05$, $P \leq 0.05$). This implies that the four categories of respondents do not hold the same opinion as regards these factors.

The results of this study presented in Table 18 reveal that, there was a significant variation ($F = 11.03$, $P \leq 0.05$) between the total mean perception of stakeholders (facilitators, FUGs, SFPC and CDOS) implementating of NFDP – II in Nigeria on factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness. This implies that the four categories of respondents do not hold the same opinion as regards these factors. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 6: One way ANOVA on variation in perception of the factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness among stakeholders implementing the NFDP-II in Nigeria (n = 366)

S/N	hindering factor	Mean (\bar{x}) Facilitator	Mean (\bar{x}) FUG	Mean (\bar{x}) SFPC	Mean (\bar{x}) SCDO	F
1	Excessive work load for facilitators in terms of number of FCAs handled	2.80 (0.83)	2.10 (0.89)	1.33 (1.03)	2.33 (0.82)	1.67
2	Absence of transport facilities for facilitators	2.58 (0.86)	2.54 (0.82)	1.83 (1.47)	2.50 (1.22)	1.49
3	Lack of working equipment in terms of teaching aids	2.07 (0.89)	2.06 (0.86)	1.17 (0.75)	1.83 (0.75)	2.20
4	Largeness of area of coverage by facilitators	2.17 (0.86)	2.15 (0.85)	1.33 (0.82)	2.00 (1.10)	1.88
5	Lack of training programme for facilitators in the NFDP – II	2.24 (1.02)	2.21 (0.95)	1.5 (1.38)	1.50 (1.22)	2.10
6	Lack of transparency in recruitment of facilitators	1.66 (1.07)	1.73 (1.01)	2.00 (1.10)	2.33 (0.82)	0.00
7	Low comprehension of the project approach by facilitators	1.76 (1.03)	1.76 (1.03)	1.17 (1.17)	1.83 (0.98)	0.67
8	Lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms of subproject proposals development	1.92 (1.10)	1.91 (1.11)	1.33 (1.37)	1.67 (1.17)	1.39
9	Time devoted to training of facilitators is inadequate	2.10 (0.94)	1.96 (0.85)	1.50 (1.38)	1.67 (1.21)	1.88
10	Lack of commitment by beneficiaries	2.09 (0.92)	1.99 (0.97)	1.67 (0.82)	1.83 (0.75)	0.61
11	Lack of prior screening of service provided	2.03 (0.86)	2.00 (0.92)	1.67 (0.82)	1.67 (0.82)	0.61
12	Lack of quality control support	1.90 (0.90)	1.83 (0.88)	1.17 (1.17)	2.00 (0.63)	1.40
13	Absence of communication exception	1.93 (0.99)	1.88 (0.96)	1.50 (1.05)	1.83 (0.75)	0.42
14	Absence of information dissemination programme	1.82 (1.13)	1.89 (0.95)	1.33 (1.21)	1.67 (0.82)	0.73
15	Absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level	2.21 (0.83)	2.03 (0.97)	1.83 (1.17)	2.33 (0.82)	1.30
16	Lack of baseline survey before take off of the project	1.91 (0.91)	1.89 (1.03)	1.50 (1.64)	2.17 (0.93)	0.48
17	Lack of adequate delegation of authority to facilitators	1.86 (0.97)	1.86 (0.97)	0.67 (0.82)	1.67 (0.82)	3.04*
18	Non involvement of cooperative officers to check the books of FCAs	1.22 (1.03)	1.30 (1.00)	1.50 (1.04)	1.67 (1.03)	0.56
19	Lack of role for ADPs to supervise the facilitators	0.95 (1.00)	1.57 (1.18)	0.33 (0.52)	1.17 (0.75)	9.61*
Summary of ANOVA					11.03*	

Field data 2007

Key

* Significant ($P \leq 0.05$).

FUG = Fadama users group

SFPC = State Fadama II project co-ordinators

SCDO = State community development officer

STD = Standard deviation values in parentheses

Table 7: One way analysis of variance for perception scores of four stakeholders (Facilitators, FUGs SFPCs & CDOs) implementing the NFDP-II in Nigeria on factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness (n=366)

Source of variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean square	F	Significance Level
Perception scores for four stakeholders (Facilitators, FUGs SFPCs & CDOs) implementing the NFDP-II in Nigeria on factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness	4.16	3	1.39	11.03	0.00*

* Significant at $P \leq 0.05$.

Variation in stakeholders' perception of factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness (Hypothesis 2).

A one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the variation in stakeholders perception. The results in (Table 8) show that there was no significant variation ($P \leq 0.05$) in all stakeholders' perception of factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness ($F = 0.58, P \leq 0.05$). This implies that the four categories of respondents hold the same view as regard these factors.

The results of this study presented in Table 9 show that there was no significant variation ($F=0.58, p \leq 0.05$) between the total mean perception of stakeholders (facilitators, FUGs, SFPC and CDOs) implementing the NFDP-II in Nigeria on factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness. The implication of this finding is that the four categories of respondents hold the same view as regards these factors. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted ($p \leq 0.05$).

Table 8: One way ANOVA on variation in perception of the factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness among the stakeholders implementing the NFDP-II (n = 366).

S/N	Enhancing factors	Mean (\bar{x}) Facilitator	Mean (\bar{x}) FUG	Mean (\bar{x}) SFPC	Mean (\bar{x}) SCDO	F
1	Provision of transport facility to facilitators	2.89 (0.14)	2.86 (0.14)	2.83 (0.37)	3.00 (0.37)	0.51
2	Transparent recruitment of facilitators	2.56 (0.38)	2.37 (0.42)	2.83 (0.10)	3.00 (0.37)	4.57*
3	Institution of a regular training programme	2.64 (0.24)	2.36 (0.54)	2.66 (0.37)	2.33 (0.50)	4.87*
4	Create provision for ADP supervision of facilitators	1.48 (0.74)	1.43 (0.76)	1.0 (0.00)	1.33 (0.83)	2.35
5	Adequate remuneration for facilitators	2.61 (0.30)	2.34 (0.76)	2.66 (0.47)	2.33 (0.74)	4.43*
6	Recruitment of adequate number of facilitators for effective coverage	2.50 (0.43)	2.24 (0.70)	2.50 (0.47)	2.66 (0.47)	4.11*
7	Recruitment of facilitators with B.Sc./HND in agricultural extension/social studies	2.33 (0.36)	2.65 (0.45)	2.66 (0.57)	2.83 (0.37)	1.15
8	Provision of communication equipment of GSM phones	2.54 (0.44)	1.74 (0.51)	2.16 (0.47)	2.83 (0.37)	1.85
9	Provision of cooperative officers to check the books of FUG	1.50 (0.91)	2.26 (0.88)	1.83 (0.47)	2.00 (0.47)	0.17
10	Absence of conflict among Fadama users	2.30 (0.61)	2.51 (0.66)	2.33 (0.74)	2.83 (0.47)	0.65
11	Provision for regular training of facilitators	2.74 (0.56)	2.07 (0.88)	2.66 (0.50)	2.83 (0.57)	3.83
12	Recruitment of candidates who had lived in the rural areas before or had rural upbringing background	1.94 (0.75)	2.18 (0.98)	2.33 (0.47)	2.66 (0.46)	1.42
13	Presence of role clarity	2.27 (0.51)	2.18 (0.98)	2.00 (0.47)	2.16 (0.47)	0.67
14	Presence of good working relationship between facilitators and their clients	2.73 (0.24)	2.69 (0.60)	2.66 (0.37)	2.16 (0.47)	0.14
Summary of ANOVA						0.58

Field data 2007

* Significant at $P \leq 0.05$.

FUG = Fadama users groups

SFPC = State Fadama project co-ordinator

SCDO = State community development officers

Values in parentheses = standard deviation

Table 9: One way analysis of variance for perception scores of four stakeholders (facilitators, FUGs, SFPCs and CDOs) implementing the NFDP-II in Nigeria on factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness (n = 366).

Source of Variation	Sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance Level
Perception scores for four stakeholders (Facilitators, FUGs, SFPCOs and CDOs) implementing NFDP-II in Nigeria on factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness	0.34	3	0.12	0.58	0.63

* Significant at $P \leq 0.05$.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study examined the factors that influence the role performance effectiveness of facilitators in NFDP-II. Several factors that hinder NFDP-II facilitators role performance effectiveness as agreed by respondents were: excessive work load for facilitators in terms of number of FCAs handled; lack of working equipment in terms of training aids; largeness of area of coverage, lack of training programme for facilitators in the national Fadama – II development project; lack of transparency in recruitment of facilitators, low level comprehension of the project approach by facilitators, lack of information and skills to impart knowledge to FCAs in terms of sub-project proposals developed, time devolved to training of facilitators is inadequate. Others included: lack of commitment by beneficiaries, lack of prior screening of service providers, lack of quality control support; absence of communication education, absence of information discrimination programme, absence of mechanism to ensure integrity of fund flow at the community level. Lack of base line survey before take off of project and none involvement of cooperative officers to check the books of FUGs. However, in the final analysis these four categories of respondents do not hold the same opinion as regards these factors.

Respondents however agreed that provision of transport facility to facilitators, recruitment of facilitators with BSc/HND in Agricultural Extension/Social Sciences, provision of communication equipment e.g. GSM, provision of cooperative officers to check the books of FUG, absence of conflict among Fadama users, provision for regular training of facilitators, recruitment of candidates who had lived in the rural areas before or had rural upbringing background, presence of role clarity, and presence of good working relationship between facilitators and their clients are factors that enhance role performance effectiveness of facilitators. Therefore, management may utilize the agreed upon factors to enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness. Over all the four categories of respondents hold the same view that they perceived the identified factors as factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness.

The major factors were identified by facilitators that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness were: administrative inertia, inadequate facilitation intensity and poor supervisory function.

Also major factors identified by Fadama users groups as factors that hinder the role performance effectiveness of facilitators in the NFDP-II in Nigeria were administrative ineptitude, inadequate facilitation capability of NFDP-II and absence of logistic support.

Also the major factors were isolated by state Fadama Project Coordinators as hindering facilitators' role performance effectiveness were: poor planning, lack of fortification and inadequate coverage. Also, major factors were identified by community development officers as hindering facilitators' role performance effectiveness were: poor projection, inadequate working facilities and inadequate command.

It is recommended that Stakeholders should utilize the factors that hinder and those that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness determined in the study to ensure the role performance effectiveness of facilitators.

Policy should be formulated and implemented by stakeholders in the NFDP-II to utilize the factors that enhance facilitators' role performance effectiveness agreed upon by all the respondents. Similarly, proactive measures in form of policy option should be taken to mitigate the identified factors that hinder facilitators' role performance effectiveness. This will enable the facilitators' to perform their roles effectively resulting in the overall effective implementation of the project.

REFERENCES

- Atala, T.K. 1998. Empowerment for community and rural development. In: T. Arokoyo, (ed). *The changing roles of agricultural extension (for teachers of extension at the sub degree level)*. National work shop, Zaria June 22-26, 1998, CTA/ DAC – ABU.
- Ayoola, G.B.2001. *Essays on the agricultural economy. a book of readings on agricultural policy and administration in Nigeria*. Vol. 1, Ibadan, Nigeria TMA publishers.
- Central Bank of Nigeria, CBN, 2004. Central Bank of Nigeria Annual Report and Statement of Accounts for the year ended 31st December, 2004. Lagos, Nigeria.
- Ellis-Jones, J.; Schultz S.; Chikoye D.; de Haan N, Karmawa P., and Adedzwa D., 2005. *Participatory research and extension approaches: a guide for researchers and extension workers for involving farmers in research and development*. International Institute for Tropical Agriculture, Ibadan, Nigeria and Silsoe Research Institute, U.K. 52pp.
- Goodman, N. 1992. Harper Collins College of Outline Introduction to Sociology. New York. Collins Publishers inc.
- IFPRI, International Food policy research institute (2008) Impacts of a pro-poor Community-Driven Development Project in Nigeria. IFPRI Discussion Paper 00756, Washington, IFPRI.
- Landsman, M.J. 2001. Commitment in public child welfare. *Social service review*, 75(3): 387 – 419.
- NFDO, National Fadama Development Office, (2004). *Facilitators project implementation manual*. Project coordinating unit, Abuja.
- NNPC, Nigerian, National Planning Commission 2006. Economic performance review. Abuja. National planning commission.
- NPOC, National Population Commission (2006). Nigeria population census provisional result, 2006.
- Nigeria Rural Sector Strategy Study, NRSSS. 2001. *Nigeria rural sector strategy study*. June 2001.

- Nwosu, K. I. 2005 Agricultural rebirth for improved production in Nigeria. Proceeding of the 39th Annual Conference of the Agric Society of Nigeria. Held at University of Benin, Nigeria October, 9th – 13th pp. xviii – xxiii
- Okwu, J.O. 2005. An Evaluation of use and effects of mass media and interpersonal communication channels in agricultural technology transfer in Benue state. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Agric. Extension and Communication. University of Agriculture, Makurdi.
- PCU-SPFS, IFDC-DAIMINA 2003. World Bank/ADP jointly sponsored fadama II. *agric. business newsletter* Vol. 1 No. 2, Sept. Pp 1 – 12 (6). A Joint Publication of Project Coordinating Unit - Special Programme for Food Security, (SPFS). International Centre for Soil Fertility and Agricultural Development (IFDC). Developing Agric. Input markets in Nigeria (DAIMINA).
- Project Implementation Manual, PIM, 2003 Annex. The national fadama-II project implementation manual, Abuja, Nigeria. Project Coordinating Unit (PCU).
- Roling, N. 1994. Facilitating sustainable agriculture: Turning policy models upside down. In Scoones T. and Thompson, J. *Beyond Farmer first*. International Institute for Environment and Development. Intermediate Technology Publications Ltd., London, UK pp. 205 – 248.
- Sule, J. Y. 2006. *Rural development in perspective*. Ikorodu Lagos, DIOLUS Communication, pp. 27-29.
- Umali-Deilinger, O. 1997. Public and private agricultural extension: Partners or rivals? World Bank Research Observer 12 (2): 205 – 224.
- Vision 2010, Agriculture 1997. Vision 2010: Final report on the sub-committee on agricultural economics sector, June 1997.
- Wikipedia 2000. The economy of Nigeria (online) Available at <http://www.wikipedia.org/wiki/economy-of-nig>.
- Wibberley J. E. 2005. Oil and agriculture: Frameworks and farmers for food security. Annual Lecture, as Visiting Professor, Centre for Food and Agricultural Strategy (CEFAS) University of Agriculture Makurdi, held at the University Auditorium UAM, on 22nd, on November 2005 P. 1 of 12.
- World Bank 2003. Second national fadama development project: *Project appraisal Document*. Electronic MS. The World Bank.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS:

Shimayohol Daudu is affiliated with the Department of Agricultural extension and communication, University of Agriculture, Makurdi.

Michael C. Madukwe Daudu is affiliated with the Department of Agricultural extension and communication, University of Agriculture, Makurdi.