

**FACTORS INFLUENCING SUSTAINABILITY OF MICRO-PROJECTS
UNDER THE DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS
(DADPs): A CASE STUDY OF SONGEA DISTRICT, RUVUMA REGION,
TANZANIA**

ZENNA A. NGONYANI

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE IN
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AND EXTENSION OF SOKOINE
UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE MOROGORO, TANZANIA.**

2013

ABSTRACT

The main objective of the study was to assess factors that influence sustainability of DADPs micro projects in selected villages of Mletele and Mwanamonga in Songea district, Ruvuma region. Specific objectives of the study were to: identify and describe the factors that influence sustainability of DADPs micro projects, assess the perception of farmers on the sustainability of DADPs micro projects and propose sound strategies that will enhance sustainability of DADPs micro projects. A cross sectional design was employed for the study. Stratified random sampling using a table of random numbers was used for the selection of respondents from the sampling frame whereby a sample size of 80 respondents was selected. Data were collected through personal interviews with selected farmers. Findings show that factors influencing sustainability of DADPs micro projects were poor preparation for DADPs, short duration for trainings provided on DADP micro projects, poor follow up of micro projects, lack of competent leaders, and improper group formation. Based on the findings of the study the, following strategies for enhancing sustainability of the DADPs micro projects in Songea district are recommended: Participatory planning should be encouraged in planning of the DADPs, proper farmer group formation should be encouraged, study tours and farmer field days should be adopted as extension methods and FFS should be the basis for agricultural extension methods dissemination.

DECLARATION

I, Zenna Ally Ngonyani, do hereby declare to the Senate of Sokoine University of Agriculture, that this dissertation is my original work and that it has neither been submitted nor being concurrently submitted for degree award in any other institution.

Zenna A. Ngonyani

(MSc AEE Candidate)

Date

The above declaration is confirmed

Prof. D. F. Rutatora

(Supervisor)

Date

COPYRIGHT

No part of this dissertation may be reproduced, stored in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission of the author or Sokoine University of Agriculture in that behalf.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my gratitude to my employer the Songea Municipal Council for financial support and granting me a leave for further studies and my supervisor Prof. Rutatora for his tireless supervision.

Various individuals have contributed towards the completion of this dissertation. I say thanks to you all. Thanks to members of academic staff of the Department of Agricultural Education and Extension of Sokoine University of Agriculture and to fellow course mates for their support and advice.

My great thanks go to villagers of Mletele and Mwanamonga who sacrificed their time to work with me. I have no words to express to Mr. Rungu of Mwanamonga and Mr. Madanganya of Mletele who tirelessly assisted me go through the villages.

I express my thanks to my family and relatives who endured my part time responsibilities as a mother and sister. Thanks to all my children for their tireless endurance of wanting to see the end of this work, although it remains a challenge to them all. They should always aim high achievements no matter what difficult situations and circumstances they may encounter.

Above all, I would like to thank my almighty GOD Subhanah Huwal ta-Allah for granting me health and strength throughout this very long journey.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my late parents Mzee Ally Maulid Gaula and Mama Sharifa Jaffari who laid the foundation of my education. They had unconditional love, but today they could not be here seeing me through this final hurdle.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	II
DECLARATIOIN	III
COPYRIGHT	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	V
DEDICATION.....	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	VII
.....	VII
LIST OF TABLES	X
LIST OF APPENDICES	XI
LIST OF ABBRIVIATIONS	XII
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	6
1.3 JUSTIFICATION	7
1.4 OBJECTIVES	7
1.4.1 GENERAL OBJECTIVE	7
THE GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF THIS STUDY WAS TO ASSESS FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THE SUSTAINABILITY OF DADPs MICRO-PROJECTS IN SELECTED VILLAGES OF MLETELE AND MWANAMONGA IN SONGEA DISTRICT, RUVUMA REGION. .	7
1.4.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES	7
THE SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR THE STUDY WERE TO:	7
1.5 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	8
THIS STUDY WAS LIMITED BY LACK OF FUNDS AND TIME. SINCE THE STUDY WAS CARRIED DURING PEAK PERIODS OF PADDY HARVESTING, INTERVIEWS WERE CARRIED DURING EVENING HOURS WHICH PROLONGED THE RESEARCH PERIOD.	8
CHAPTER TWO	9
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1 OVERVIEW.....	9
2.2 THE CONCEPT OF SUSTAINABILITY.....	9
2.3 FACTORS INFLUENCING SUSTAINABILITY OF MICRO PROJECTS.....	10
2.3.1 PLANNING AND DESIGN	10
2.3.2 PARTICIPATION.....	13
2.3.3 INSTITUTIONAL FACTORS	15
2.4 FARMERS' PERCEPTION ON SUSTAINABILITY OF DADP MICRO PROJECTS.....	18
CHAPTER THREE	20
3.0 METHODOLOGY	20
3.1 OVERVIEW	20
3.2 DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA	20
3.3 RESEARCH DESIGN	22

3.4 STUDY POPULATION	23		
3.5 SAMPLING PROCEDURES AND SAMPLE SIZE	23		
3.5.1 SAMPLING OF VILLAGES	23		
3.5.2 SAMPLING OF RESPONDENTS.....	23		
3.5.3 SAMPLE SIZE	24		
TYPE OF RESPONDENT	NUMBER.....		
	MWANAMONGA	MLETELE	TOTAL.....
DADP FARMERS	40	40	80.....
KEY INFORMANTS	8	8	16.....
TOTAL	48	48	96.....
SOURCE: SURVEY DATA 2010.....			25
3.6 INSTRUMENTATION	26		
3.7 PRE-TESTING	26		
3.8 DATA COLLECTION METHODS	27		
3.8.1 PRIMARY DATA.....	27		
3.8.2 SECONDARY DATA	27		
3.9 DATA ANALYSIS	28		
THE COLLECTED PRIMARY DATA WERE CODED, ENTERED, CLEANED, AND ANALYSED USING THE STATISTICAL PACKAGE FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE (SPSS) PROGRAMME AT SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE (SUA). DATA CLEANING IS PERFORMED THROUGH POSSIBLE- CODE CLEANING AND CONTINGENCY CLEANING. CONTINGENCY CLEANING IS THE PROCESS OF CHECKING THAT ONLY THOSE CASES THAT SHOULD HAVE DATA ON A PARTICULAR VARIABLE DO IN FACT HAVE SUCH DATA. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS SUCH AS FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE WERE CALCULATED TO DETERMINE DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDY VARIABLES AND PRESENTED.....	28		
CHAPTER FOUR	29		
4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	29		
4.1 OVERVIEW	29		
4.2 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS	29		
4.3 FACTORS INFLUENCING SUSTAINABILITY OF DADP MICRO PROJECTS IN MLETELE AND MWANAMONGA VILLAGES OF SONGEA DISTRICT	31		
4.3.1 POOR PREPARATION FOR DADP MICRO PROJECTS	32		
4.3.2 POOR FOLLOW UP OF MICRO PROJECTS (SUPERVISION)	34		
4.3.3 SHORT DURATION FOR DADP TRAININGS	35		
4.3.4 LACK OF COMPETENT LEADERS.....	37		
4.3.5 POOR GROUP FORMATION.....	40		
4.4 PERCEPTION OF RESPONDENTS ON SUSTAINABILITY OF DADP MICRO PROJECTS	43		
4.5 STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING SUSTAINABILITY OF DADPS MICRO PROJECTS	46		
CHAPTER FIVE	48		
5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	48		
5.1 OVERVIEW	48		
5.2 CONCLUSIONS.....	48		
5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	50		
REFERENCES.....	53		

ACT, (2009). AGRICULTURAL COUNCIL OF TANZANIA SHARES EXPERIENCE ON DADPS [HTTP://WWW.ACTANZANIA.ORG/INDEX.PHP?OPTION=COMHTM] SITE VISITED ON 2/10/2009.	53
AUSAID,(2000).PROMOTINGPRACTICALSUSTAINABILITY.[HTTP://WWW.AUSAID.GOV.AU/PUBLICATIONS/PDF/SUSTA INABILITY.PDF]. SITE VISITED ON 20/5/2009.....	53
BABBIE. E.R. (1990). SURVEY RESEARCH METHODS. WADSWORTH PUBLISHING CO, BELMOUNT, CALIFORNIA. 395PP.	53
.....	53
OAKLEY, P. AND MARSDEN, D. (1991). APPROACHES TO PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT	58
INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION, GENEVA. 91PP.	58
APPENDICES.....	63

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: DADPS MICRO PROJECT STATUS IN STUDY AREAS.....	5
TABLE 2: NO OF FARMERS ENGAGED IN DADP MICRO PROJECTS	22
TABLE 3: THE DISTRIBUTION OF ALL RESPONDENTS (N = 96) INVOLVED IN THE STUDY	25
TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS ACCORDING TO SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS (N = 80)	30
TABLE 5: FACTORS INFLUENCING SUSTAINABILITY OF DADP MICRO PROJECTS N =80	31
TABLE 6: RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES ON REASONS FOR POOR PREPARATION N = 80.....	32
TABLE 7: RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES ON HOW THE VADPS WERE FORMULATED N= 80	33
TABLE 8: RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES ON FOLLOW-UPS TO MICRO PROJECTS N= 80.....	35
TABLE 9: RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES ON PARTICIPATION IN ELECTING VILLAGE LEADERS N= 80 .	38
TABLE 10: RESPONDENTS' RESPONSES ON THE TIME OF GROUP FORMATION N= 80	40
TABLE 11: RESPONDENTS RESPONSES FOR PERCEPTION STATEMENTS ON SUSTAINABILITY OF DADP MICRO PROJECTS N= 80.....	46
TABLE 12: RESPONDENTS' PROPOSED STRATEGIES TO ENHANCE SUSTAINABILITY OF DADP MICRO- PROJECTS (N=80)	47

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR RESPONDENTS	63
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION (FGD)	68
APPENDIX 3: OBSERVATION CHECK LIST.....	70
APPENDIX 4: MAP OF SONGEA SHOWING LOCATION OF STUDY AREA–MLETELE AND MWANAMONGA VILLAGES.....	71

LIST OF ABBRIVIATIONS

A-CBG	Agricultural Capacity Building Grant
ACT	Agricultural Council of Tanzania
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ASDP	Agriculture Sector Development Programme
ASDS	Agricultural Sector Development Strategy
ASLMs	Agricultural Sector Lead Ministries
ASPs	Agricultural Service Providers
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
CCM	<i>Chama cha Mapinduzi</i>
CORDEMA	Client Oriented Research and Development Management Approach
DADPs	District Agricultural Development Plans
DALDO	District Agricultural and Livestock Development Officer
DC	District Council
DED	District Executive Director
DFTs	District Facilitation Teams
FAO	Food Agricultural Organization
FFS	Farmers Field School
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GOT	Government of Tanzania
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development

LGA	Local Government Authority
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAEPII	National Agricultural Extension Programme phase II
NALERP	National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Rehabilitation Project
NBS	National Bureau of Statistics
NGOs	Non- Governmental Organization Management Project
NSC	National Sample Census
O & O D	Obstacles and Opportunity to Development
PFC	Planning and Finance Committee
PMO-RALG	Prime Ministers Office
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
SHERFSP	Southern Highlands Extension Rural Financial Service Project
SNAL	Sokoine National Agricultural Library
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
SUA	Sokoine University of Agriculture
SWAp	Sector Wide Approach
URT	United Republic of Tanzania
VAEOs	Village Agricultural Extension Officers
VADPs	Village Agricultural Development Plans
WADPs	Ward Agricultural Development Plans
WAEO	Ward Extension Officers
WFTs	Ward Facilitation Teams

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Information

Tanzania is a country with over 43 million inhabitants (NBS, 2010) and 77 percent of the population live in rural areas, deriving their livelihoods from agriculture and related activities (URT, 2008). The agricultural sector contributes about 27.8 %.(of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 50 percent of export earnings (NBS.2010). Despite low GDP, the agriculture sector is important to Tanzanian's immediate and long term development goals for reduction of rural poverty and for the overall economic development (URT, 2001).

In order to make the agricultural sector more productive and sustainable, the government of Tanzania (GOT) with the help of the development partners took initiative to start a number of agricultural projects. Among these were National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Rehabilitation Project (NALERP) in 1989, the Southern Highlands Extension and Rural Financial Services Project (SHERFSP) in 1991 and the National Agricultural Extension Project Phase II (NAEP II) which was launched in October 1996 (URT, 2000).

Besides NALERP, SHERFSP and NAEP II achieving their goals of increasing agricultural output and improving the delivery of services to smallholder farmers, sustainability of the micro projects implemented under these projects was jeopardized.

The main factor that led to lack of sustainability of agricultural micro projects was lack of relevancy for the micro projects because the micro projects were more of a supply-driven (imposed from above) as farmers were not involved in planning and design of the micro projects (Esbern, 2004). Lack of farmer involvement in planning and design of micro projects resulted to lack of sustainability (Esbern, 2004).

In 2001, Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) was formulated basically as an implementing framework for the agriculture and livestock policy of 1997 (URT, 2001a). The primary objective of the ASDS is to achieve a sustained growth rate of 5 percent per annum primarily through the transformation from subsistence to commercial agriculture. Operationalization of ASDS was through the Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP) which was developed by the Agricultural Sector Lead Ministries (ASLMs) in 2003 and was later finalized in 2006 and launched by the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania as ASDP Support through Basket Fund.

In order to ensure sustainability of the programme, ASDP had to operate under a sector-wide framework commonly referred to as the Agricultural Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) for overseeing the institutional reforms and investment priorities and sustainability of micro projects in the agricultural sector (Rutatora *et al.*, 2008). The objectives of ASDP are (i) to increase farm productivity, profitability and incomes through better access to and use of agricultural knowledge, technologies and marketing

systems and infrastructure, and (ii) to promote private sector investment through improved regulatory and policy environment.

Implementation of the ASDP is at two levels, the National and the Local levels (that is, local government level). At the LGAs level ASDP is to be based on the District Agricultural Development Plans (DADPs). According to URT (2007) DADPs is the key planning and implementation tool for LGAs resource use in the agricultural sector.

Under DADPs farmers are expected to identify priority agricultural micro-projects through participatory situational analysis carried out during Opportunities and Obstacles to Development (O&OD) planning processes, which lead to preparation of Village Agricultural Development Plans (VADPs) (URT, 2007). Smallholder farmers will select project committees among themselves that will deal with day to day agricultural development issues. VADPs are facilitated by the village extension officers and the village planning and finance committee. VADPs are then consolidated to Ward Agricultural Development Plans (WADPs) and finally to DADPs at district level being facilitated by Ward Facilitation Teams (WFTs) and District Facilitation Teams (DFTs) respectively in collaboration with Agricultural Extension Officers at all levels (URT,2006).

In order to ensure smooth implementation of the activities at all levels there is a well organised institutional set up. At Local level, LGAs will implement their part of the

programme under the leadership of the District Executive Directors (DEDs). Day to day management, facilitation and backstopping will be the responsibility of the District Agricultural and Livestock Development Officer (DALDO) DFTs, WFTs, and micro project committee leaders.

At the regional level Regional Secretariats assist LGAs on preparation of DADPs, quarterly and annual reports, and regular monitoring. At Zonal level, agricultural services primarily research and development services are provided through the Client Oriented Research and Development Management Approach (CORDEMA) (URT, 2006a).

Implementation of DADPs under a pilot plan in Songea district started in 2004/2005 when the villages of Nakahuga, Namatuhi, Subira Mletele and Mwanamonga had irrigation schemes, while Mwanamonga, Subira, Ndilima, Ruvuma, Lizaboni Mgazini, Chipole, Peramiho, Litowa, Matetereka, Matimira, Hanga Ngadinda, and Igawisenga had construction/rehabilitation of cattle dips and slaughter slabs. Over all the carry on of some micro projects is poor an indication that there is no sustainability of the micro projects. Table 1 shows the status of micro projects in the study area.

Table 1: DADPs micro project status in study areas

Ward	Village	Micro project	Status of micro project
Lilambo	Mwanamonga	Irrigation	Not functioning
		Cassava processing	Not functioning
		Cattle dip	Not functioning
		FFS maize plots	Functioning
Mletele	Mletele	Cattle dip	Functioning
		FFS maize plots	Functioning
		Forest tree nursery	Functioning
		Poultry improvement	Functioning
		Pedestrian bridge	Functioning
Mpitimbi	Namatuhi	Irrigation	Not Functioning
		Irrigation	Functioning
		Cassava processing	Functioning
Litisha	Nakahuga	Irrigation	Functioning
		Rice &Maize FFS Plots	Functioning
Subira	Subira	Irrigation	Functioning
		Cattle dip	Not functioning
Ruvuma	Ruvuma Juu	Power tiller	Functioning
	Ruvuma Chini	Pedestrian bridge	Functioning
		Slaughter Slab	Functioning
Kilagano	Mbulani	Poultry improvement	Functioning
	Mgazini	Cattle dip	Functioning

Source: Songea District DADPs 4th Quarter Report, 2009

According to the 4th quarter DADP progressive report (DALDO, 2009) reasons advanced for micro projects that performed relatively well with signs of sustainability were availability of inputs and willingness of farmers to contribute to micro projects activities, whereas reasons advanced for the micro projects performing poorly included lack of income, lack of proper trainings for the micro projects and poor group organization among farmer groups. The fifth joint implementation review (URT, 2010)

argued that sustainability is a function of many things, which includes farmer empowerment and training and sustainability plans.

“As much as the 4th quarter DADP progressive report shows that one of the factors for lack of sustainability of micro projects in Songea has been lack of proper trainings to farmers about their micro projects, suffice to note that there may be factors than the one reported here as there are no rigorous studies that have been done to establish factors responsible for sustainability of micro-projects”. It is from that background, the study was set out to examine the factors that influence sustainability of micro projects under DADP in Songea district Ruvuma region. Specifically under this study sustainability was intended to mean the DADP micro projects that had more than three years and showed good performance at the time of the study.

1.2 Problem Statement

Development partners in collaboration with the Government of Tanzania have accorded high priority to the agricultural sector and have shown commitment to support implementation of ASDP/DADPs. Implementation of ASDP/DADPs through the ASLMs has more than six years. Although efforts have been made since the last six years, sustainability of some micro projects has not shown good improvement. Sustainability according to Rutatora, *et al*, (2008) is an indication of whether the positive effects/impacts will continue after external support has been concluded. It covers aspects related to economic, socio-cultural, financial, institutional, participation,

ownership, gender and appropriate technology. Reports of ASDP performance (2006/2007 -2009/2010) show in Kilimanjaro region, some completed dip tanks are not utilized because of shortage of water. However, as there are no rigorous studies that have been done to establish factors responsible for sustainability of micro-projects in Songea that makes a need to conduct such a study.

1.3 Justification

This study assessed the factors that influence sustainability of DADP micro projects in Songea District. Understanding these factors will be of particular importance for the district officials, policy makers, village leaders, and other agricultural stakeholders and the community who are involved in promoting agricultural development projects including micro projects. The study's findings and recommendations will enrich our understanding of the various dimensions of micro projects sustainability.

1.4 Objectives

1.4.1 General objective

The general objective of this study was to assess factors that influence the sustainability of DADPs micro-projects in selected villages of Mletele and Mwanamonga in Songea district, Ruvuma region.

1.4.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives for the study were to:

1. Identify and describe factors influencing the sustainability of DADP micro projects
2. Assess farmers' perception on the sustainability of DADP micro projects
3. Propose sound strategies that will enhance sustainability of DADPs micro projects

1.5 Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by lack of funds and time. Since the study was carried during peak periods of paddy harvesting, interviews were carried during evening hours which prolonged the research period.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview

Chapter two reviews relevant literature pertaining to the study. The review includes the concept of sustainability, factors influencing sustainability of micro projects such as planning and designing, community participation, institutional factors and perceptions of farmers on sustainability of DADP micro projects. These factors have been singled out because they are supported by most literature (AusAID, 2000, IFAD, 2009 and Farouque and Takeya 2007).

2.2 The Concept of Sustainability

Sustainability is a concept that has arisen from the debate on sustainable development, which has its origin from the Brundtland Report of the 1987 (World Bank, 2003). Sustainability is a well-liked term in modern development practices and discourses, and is understood in many ways according to the situation in which it is applied. According to Blewitt (2008) all the definitions have to do with (a) living within limits; (b) understanding interaction among economy, society and environment and (c) equitable distribution of resources. The IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010 (IFAD, 2007) defines sustainability as ensuring that the institutions supported through projects and the benefits realized are maintained and continue after the end of the project. Kajembe *et al.*, (2003) defines sustainability as an overall assessment of the extent to which the

positive changes achieved as a result of project can be expected to last after the project has been terminated. Boydell (1999) is of the opinion that the long term sustainability of micro projects not only depends on communities' active participation in selecting technical options and services, but also end users need to make some responsibility for cost sharing and investment support. According to ASDP/DADP documents sustainability means attainment of a sustained agricultural growth rate of 5 percent per annum (URT, 2006a).

2.3 Factors Influencing Sustainability of Micro Projects

This section explores factors that influence sustainability of micro projects. Studies have shown there are a number of factors that influence sustainability of micro projects. These are broadly categorized as planning and design, institutional, environmental, participation, government policies; donor policies; management and organization; financial; awareness and training; technology; social, gender and culture; economic; household and community resilience and structural change (AusAID, 2000; Asian Development Bank (ADB), 2008 and IFAD, 2009).

2.3.1 Planning and design

Various studies (FAO, 2011; 2005; IFAD, 2009 and Ngailo, 2010) define planning and design as a systematic sequencing and scheduling of tasks comprising a micro project. The studies explain in general that for planning and design to be appropriate all the

steps or stages for planning should be followed. Planning should emphasize on issues of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact.

Relevance refers to whether the objectives are still in keeping with local and national priorities and needs, it is therefore a question of usefulness/realistic. Efficiency refers to what degree the outputs achieved come from the efficient use of financial, human and material resources, whereas effectiveness means the extent to which micro project objectives have been achieved. Impact includes all positive and negative changes and effects (outcomes) caused by the intervention. It takes into account not only needs satisfaction of the primary beneficiaries but also its impact on other groups in society. It concerns long term and sustainable changes introduced by a given intervention in the lives of the beneficiaries.

The important stages for planning include the situational analysis where by a collection of basic information is done, i.e. Socio-economic, institutional and cultural situations. It is followed by problem identification, then objectives setting and later on stakeholder analysis. A reliable stakeholder analysis requires research to provide information about stakeholders. It will typically include a socio-economic assessment to learn about the social, cultural, economic and political conditions of individuals, households groups, communities and organizations, as well as about the power relationships between various stakeholders and stakeholder groups. For the effective planning process, it may be advisable to identify a few individuals who can represent the interests of larger

stakeholder groups. A sound planning process includes also a careful assessment of market opportunities, input and output value chains, and realistic targets in terms of crop intensities and yields. More important it should address key problems.

Planning and design influences sustainability because if it is carried on participatory bases and accurate assessment of social economic and environmental conditions is made, it is hoped that those participating will feel that they are part of the plans and part the micro projects. DADP planning and design according to URT, (2006) was to follow the DADP guidelines which advocated the use of Obstacles and Opportunity to Development (O & OD) planning methodology. Planning starts at village level where VADP are developed which are then consolidated to WADPs and later on to DADPs at district level. Different studies (Concern, 2008; Mattee *et al.*, 2008; Rutatora *et al.*, 2008; ACT, 2009; URT, 2008; 2009; and 2010) reported on the problems that were encountered in the planning and design of DADPs micro projects.

Among the problems was lack of facilitation skills as facilitators had low capacity in facilitating the planning and designing process. Low facilitation resulted to low understanding of the O & OD methodology, which in turn resulted to the DADPs prepared to lack an in depth analysis of the critical issues and alternative agricultural development options. According to Mattee *et al.*, (2008) the planning proves ended up with a list of activities to be implemented without analysis of the context, risk or inter-linkages that were necessary for the success of the activities.

Moreover Rutatora *et al.*, (2008) noted that planning and design was not given due consideration as in some villages, O & OD sometimes interfered with important activities such as planting and/or market days (e.g. in Itiso, Chamwino district, DFT conducted training during the market day when people were already drunk). ASDP performance review for 2006/07-2009/10 is of the opinion that poor planning in relation to inadequate capacity of districts facilitators to carry out comprehensive appraisal and business plan for community investments identified through participatory planning has resulted to structures which are not in operation (URT, 2010).

2.3.2 Participation

The World Bank (2004) defines participation as a process through which stakeholders' influence and share control over development initiatives, and the decisions and resources which affect them. Community participation in a micro project means the contribution of the people in the area of micro project in identifying, characterizing the problem and implementation (Oakley and Marsden, 1991). Community participation leads to project ownership which is of primary importance to sustainability of community micro projects (Uche, *et al.*, 2007).

Kumar (2002) in Haysom (2006) asserts that participation is a key instrument in creating self-reliant and empowered communities, stimulating village-level mechanisms for collective action and decision-making. It is also believed to be instrumental in addressing marginalization and inequity, through elucidating the desires, priorities and

perspectives of different groups within a project area. Participation should be real to lead to ownership and commitments (AusAID, 2000) although FAO, (1996) argues that ownership and commitment are unlikely to be achieved unless they consider that the micro projects would meet their felt needs and they have a stake in the equity.

It is difficult to build ownership because the traditional way of identification/preparation, is carried out against tight deadlines by external planning teams, and has seldom allowed time for real participation. Smallholder farmers' participation in agricultural micro-projects aim at: empowerment; building beneficiary capacity; increasing project effectiveness, improving project efficiency and project cost sharing leading to sustainability of the micro projects.

Implementation of DADP activities advocates the participation of different stakeholder by encouraging more participation of private sector. Private sector agricultural Service Providers (ASPs) are encouraged to be involved in a wide range of services such as research, extension, information/communication, training, technical services including technical/scientific information acquisition and supply, marketing research and adaptive technology testing and transfer (URT,2010).

Though participation is an important component in DADP, its implementation has not been satisfactory. Different reports (ACT, 2009; URT, 2008a; Rutatora *et al.*, 2008) revealed that in some areas private sector service providers were not involved in

planning or implementation of investment projects. The process of developing the VADPs involved a very limited number of stakeholders and was essentially a consultative kind of interaction with WFTs. In some areas communities were persuaded to form groups for the sake of acquiring financial support and not improving the extension services delivery. Other findings that have been noted by URT (2009) points out that although communities are involved in the planning process, the degree of involvement is not yet satisfactory in some districts. For example in Manyoni District Council (DC) communities participation was only at the project identification level during the O&OD stage while in Kongwa DC, some projects in DADPs were not the ones proposed by the community. This shows that the farmers still do not know to what extent they have to participate because in the real sense to make participation more meaningful they are supposed to participate in planning, implementation, funding, monitoring and evaluation of their micro projects.

2.3.3 Institutional factors

Studies conducted by FAO, (2003) categorize institutional factors as governance, markets, contracts, cultural norms, financial matters and informal or formal rules that define rights of access to goods and services, as well as access to the management of a given space or to its natural resources. The institutional factors, which may also influence projects sustainability includes the extension services. Extension services are part of a large organization, normally a Ministry or department of Agriculture. The organizational setting has considerable influence on the way in which the extension

service operates. The Ministry of agriculture use agricultural extension as one of the instrument to promote micro projects sustainability.

Despite the extension service arrangements that are in place Concern Worldwide, (2008), did notice that there were few extension staff in the villages to make DADP activities be carried out as planned and those available according to Rutatora *et al.*, (2008) were found ill-equipped with skills for monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management or managing for results. Trainings that have been provided to DFTs and or WFTs have not been sufficient to enable them perform their duties as required. In some places they claim to have been trained for two days. Coordination still is a problem as some members of DFT or WFT are not directly answerable to DALDO. Hence, it becomes difficult to take immediate action in case of underperformance in DADP activities. Although guidelines of DADP provides for outsourcing of extension activities by the local government authorities limited experience has been gained so far by the LGAs to use government funds for outsourcing. District personnel remain skeptical about the feasibility, convenience and suitability of the approach. To overcome such problems of shortage of working force IFAD (2009) suggested that community-based institutions should be given special consideration because it has been found that strong traditional institutions are typically better able to internalize new approaches and technologies. They are often better equipped to participate in relatively intense project activities in the short-term, as well as to sustain effective practices over the longer term.

In accordance with financial matters as part of institutional factors Binnendijk (1998) is of the opinion that projects implemented by government agencies have reasonable prospects for financial sustainability because such agencies are able to cover recurrent project costs from their budgets. However, experience indicates that the sustainability of such projects has frequently been a problem, especially in situations of fiscal crises and competing demands for public funds or when the implementing ministry has assigned a relatively low priority to the project's maintenance and support. Givewell (2009) suggests that when evaluating an agriculture-focused project, it is appropriate to look for evidence of sustained and meaningful improvements in clients' incomes and standards of living.

According to DADP guidelines (URT, 2006a) ASDP/DADP financing is currently shared among government, development partners and the beneficiaries. Under the cost sharing bases beneficiaries do contribute their share through cash, material or work depending on the nature of the micro project and agreement on the part of the beneficiaries. Different report and studies (Rutatora *et al.*, 2008; URT, 2009, 2011; ACT, 2009) have explained on the problems of funds with regard to DADP activities. Among the problems include late disbursement of funds from PMO-RALG office to LGAs, little amount of money disbursed compared to allocated, poor contribution for agricultural investment on the part of farmer groups and implementation of activities which are below standard that does not hinge on value for money.

2.4 Farmers' Perception on Sustainability of DADP Micro Projects

For the micro projects to be sustainable, it is equally important to consider the perception of smallholder farmers who are the potential implementers of these micro projects. Sosu (2004) observed that farmers' perception is essential for successful development strategies. He further stated that many promising agriculture policies have failed because they were not in line with farmer's needs and perception.

Perception generally refers to how people select, organize and interpret information gained through the senses or experience (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2004). Perceptions are not permanent and are shaped with information. According to Nyanga (2011) perceptions is location specific due to heterogeneity of factors that influence them such as culture, education, gender, age, resource endowments and institutional factors.

Farouque and Takeya (2007) on the other hand argue that perception is a function of personality and culture. Hence, in order to have an understanding of farmer's perception, it is necessary to get information about their personality and culture. Personality is the unique, integrated or organized system of all behaviors of a person. Culture, on the other hand, is that complex whole, which includes knowledge, belief, customs and other capabilities and habits acquired by a person as a member of a society.

Farmers' perception on sustainability of the DADPs will at large depend on how the DADPs have been prepared. Factors like whose original ideas played part in developing

the micro projects, is it the farmers or ideas imposed from top (government), are the farmers implementing what they all agreed upon to implement or there was some sort of force by few powerful farmers (in terms of authority or money)? On the other hand if it appears that the micro projects are their original idea (theirs) do they get all the necessary support to enable them to implement the micro projects?

Farmers will have positive perceptions to sustain the micro projects if they have participated in the planning and designing of the micro projects. Where as if they find that the micro projects they are implementing do not solve their felt needs they will have negative perception towards them. An example was a micro project which was revealed by a study conducted in. The study revealed that farmers were in need of tap water for home use but to their surprise they were given a dip tank for livestock dipping (Rutatora *et al.*, 2008). Under such a situation farmers will automatically have a negative perception to the micro project and this will affect the sustainability of the micro project.

The reviewed literature has given some lights on possible factors that can influence sustainability of micro projects and reasons for positive or negative perceptions of farmers on sustainability of micro projects. In that sense it has shown how the current study will look like.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview

Chapter three presents the methodology used in this study. It covers the description of the study area, the study design, study population, sampling procedures, sample size, data collection methods and data analysis.

3.2 Description of the Study Area

The study was conducted in Songea district (Appendix 3) in the two villages of Mletele, and Mwanamonga. Songea is one of four districts in the Ruvuma region others being Mbinga, Namtumbo and Tunduru. Songea district borders Njombe region and Ulanga districts to the north, Mbinga district to the west, Namtumbo district to the east and Ruvuma River which borders Mozambique to the south. Songea district lies between latitude $9^{\circ} 28'$ and $11^{\circ} 36'$ South of the Equator and between longitude $35^{\circ} 05'$ and $35^{\circ} 40'$ East of Greenwich and lies between altitude of 400 - 1200 meters above sea level (masl) with an area of 17 477 square kilometres (DALDO 2009).

According to National Sample Census (NSC 2012) the district has a population of 377,130 with annual rainfall of between 1000-1200 mm which rains between November and May. High temperatures occur in October, when they reach a maximum of 30°C .

Low temperatures occur in June and July when they reach a minimum of 15⁰C while the mean temperature is 23⁰C.

Songea district with 1,739,000 hectares, 90 percent of the area is arable and employs 95 percent of 377,130 populations for agricultural activities. The district is divided into three agro-ecological zones as follows: High altitude bordering Njombe region and areas of Matogoro Mountains. High altitude zone lies between 800-1200 masl. Crops grown include coffee, round potatoes, wheat, maize and pulses. Animals kept include cattle, goats, pigs and poultry.

Medium altitude with 600-800 masl covers the areas of Ruvuma division and crops grown include tobacco, maize, pulses, rice, sugarcane, cassava, finger millet, sunflower and spices. Low altitude areas with 400-600 masl covering the southern parts of the district including the wards of Ndongosi, Muhukuru and Matumbi. Crops grown include groundnuts, cashew nuts, rice, fruits, pulses and spices. Whereas animals kept include cattle, goats, sheep, pigs and poultry

The selected villages for the study were Mletele and Mwanamonga. These villages were selected because they had a number of micro projects being implemented but some were performing well while other micro projects had poor performance. Mwanamonga had four micro projects which were irrigation, cattle dip, cassava processing and FFS plots for maize. But at the time of research only FFS plots for maize was viable (functioning). Mletele village had six micro projects which were cattle dip, FFS plots

for maize, irrigation, forest tree nursery, pedestrian bridge and improvement of poultry. Out of the six micro projects only one was not viable and that was irrigation (Table 1). Mletele village is located on the north east of the town centre while Mwanamonga is located on the western part of the Songea town centre. Apart from level of performance other data for the selected villages are number of farmer implementing DADPs in the selected villages in relation to shown in Table 2.

Table 2: No of farmers engaged in DADP micro projects

Village	Total farmers	Engaged in DADPs
Mwanamonga	2560	265
Mletele	4015	1400
Total	6575	1665

Source: Songea District Council Profile 2012

3.3 Research Design

This study employed a cross-sectional research design. The cross-sectional design allows data to be collected at one specific point in time from individuals that are selected (Babbie, 1990; Kothari, 2004). It is called cross-sectional because the information about the individuals that is gathered represents what is going on at only one point in time (Chris and Diane 2004)

3.4 Study Population

The population for the study was all DADPs farmer beneficiaries from Mwanamonga and Mletele villages aged 18 years and above, who had been involved in DADPs micro projects for a period of not less than three years prior to the study. A period of three years is important as beneficiaries were expected to have experience with DADPs micro projects and believed could provide information required to accomplish the objectives of the study.

3.5 Sampling Procedures and Sample Size

3.5.1 Sampling of villages

Purposive sampling was used in selecting the villages on the basis of presence of a number of agricultural interventions (micro projects) and their level of performance. Closer proximity, convenience of transport, accessibility also played a significant role in the final selection of the villages.

3.5.2 Sampling of respondents

In each village a register containing a list of farmers implementing DADP micro projects that was available was used to develop a sampling frame. Names of the DADP beneficiaries who had implemented DADP micro projects for three years were arranged alphabetically and assigned with numbers serially. Systematic random sampling procedure was then used to select 80 respondents and 16 leaders who formed the key informant for the Focus Group Discussion (FGD). FGD comprised 3 project committee

members, 2 heads of village hamlets, 2 religious leaders (Muslim and Christian) and 1 political leader (there was only one political party that was Chama cha Mapinduzi-CCM). The FGD thus comprised 8 members for each village. Through systematic random sampling using a random numbers table 40 farmers per village were sampled, giving a sample size of 80 farmers for the two villages. To obtain the required sample size, Bailey (1998) recommends that regardless of the population, a sample size of 30 is the bare minimum for data collection. This study therefore involved a total of 80 DADP farmers, 40 from each selected village. There were also 16 members for the FGDs. Though the numbers of farmers from the two villages differed the same number of respondents was sampled so as to give more chances for Mwanamonga to participate in the study.

3.5.3 Sample size

The sample size was determined using precision criterion determination of the sample size. It was assumed that the dominant characteristics of the study would occur if the confidence interval is set at 5% marginal error and 95% level of confidence.

The following expression is used to estimate the sample.

$$n = \frac{z^2 \cdot pq}{e^2}$$

Where n = Sample size

Z = % point of the standard normal distribution which is 1.96 in this case corresponding to 95% confidence level

$e =$ marginal error which is 5%, $=0.05$

$P =$ expected proportion of the respondents taken as 5%, $=0.05$

$q = 1-p$

According to Kothari (2008) in order to improve the precision in generalizations from the sample, the allowed error for the sample mean should be $\pm 3\%$ of the population mean. Upon substitution in the above formula:

$$n = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times 0.05 (1-0.05)}{(0.03)^2}$$

$$= 202.75$$

$$\approx 203$$

Due to constraints of time and financial resources a sample size of 96 respondents was picked.

Table 3: The distribution of all respondents (N = 96) involved in the study

Type of respondent	Number		
	Mwanamonga	Mletele	Total
DADP farmers	40	40	80
Key informants	8	8	16
Total	48	48	96

Source: Survey data 2010

3.6 Instrumentation

The interview schedule, interview guide and observation checklist were the tools used to collect primary data in this study. Interview schedule with closed and open ended questions were used to solicit information from farmers on the factors influencing sustainability of DADP micro projects with specific reference to Songea district. Interview guide was used during FGD and observation checklist was used for observation.

3.7 Pre-testing

All instruments for data collection were pre-tested. These instruments were the interview schedule, interview guide and observation checklist. The pre testing was done in Lilambo village, which is outside of the study area where 10 DADP farmers were interviewed. The pre testing of the interview schedule helped to determine the validity, reliability and practicality of the instrument prepared (Kothari, 2004). After pre-testing, the instruments were revised to accommodate identified changes and then used for data collection.

The reliability test used was Test-Retest Reliability. Test-Retest reliability refers to the test's consistency among different administrations. To determine the coefficient for this type of reliability, the same test is given to a group of farmers on at least two separate occasions. If the test is reliable, the scores that each farmer receives on the first administration should be similar to the scores on the second. We would expect the

relationship between the first and second administration to be a high positive correlation.

3.8 Data Collection Methods

3.8.1 Primary data

Primary data were collected from 96 respondents by the researcher through face to face interviews using an interview schedule for 80 respondents, interview guide for 16 key informant's (FGD) and observation check-list. Interview schedule with closed and open ended questions was used to solicit information from respondents (Appendix 1). Data collected included socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents (age, sex, marital status, education level and source of income), identification of factors that influence sustainability of DADP micro projects and competencies of micro project committee leaders. The open-ended questions were used for soliciting respondents' views on importance of sustainability of farmer's agricultural micro-projects, perception of farmers on sustainability of DADP micro projects and strategies to be taken to enhance sustainability.

3.8.2 Secondary data

The primary data were complimented by secondary data like the concept of sustainability and factors influencing sustainability that was pertinent to this study. Secondary data involved desk review of existing documents from published and unpublished documents including publications, DADP reports obtained from Songea

district office, Ruvuma Regional Agricultural Secretariats office and Prime Minister's Office. Others were Sokoine National Agricultural Library (SNAL), Sokoine University Agricultural Extension Departmental Library and the websites.

3.9 Data Analysis

The collected primary data were coded, entered, cleaned, and analysed using the statistical package for social science (SPSS) programme at Sokoine University of agriculture (SUA). Data cleaning is performed through possible- code cleaning and contingency cleaning. Contingency cleaning is the process of checking that only those cases that should have data on a particular variable do in fact have such data. Descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage were calculated to determine distribution of the study variables and presented.

Perception was analysed using perception statements which were developed for the aim of assessing respondent's perception. Respondents showed their perception by agreeing or disagreeing with the statements using the words Yes and No. Seven statements were developed to get the perception of farmers on sustainability of DADPs micro projects. The yes were regarded as positive perceptions on that statement which influence sustainability, while no answers indicated negative perception to the statement which also has a negative impact on sustainability of DADP micro projects.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview

This chapter presents the study findings. It is divided into five main sections. Section one presents the overview, section two presents the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents, while section three covers factors influencing sustainability of DADPs micro projects. Section four presents perception of farmers on sustainability of DADP micro projects and section five presents strategies proposed to enhance sustainability of DADP micro projects.

4.2 Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

This section discusses socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. The respondents for this study were 80 DADP farmers and 16 village leaders from Mletele and Mwanamonga villages. Characteristics that were covered included age, sex, marital status, education level and source of income. Why only these?

Table 4 shows that majority of farmers (43.8%) were aged between 41 and 50 years, 63.8% were males and 71.2% were married. Data also show that majority of farmers (93.8%) have attained primary education and 77.5% depended on crop farming as their source of income.

Table 4: Distribution of respondents according to socio-demographic characteristics (N = 80)

Category	Frequency	Percent
Age (years)		
18-30	10	12.5
31-40	21	26.2
41-50	35	43.8
51-60	9	11.3
Over 60	5	6.2
Total	80	100.0
Sex		
Female	29	36.2
Male	51	63.8
Total	80	100.0
Marital status		
Married	57	71.3
Single	14	17.5
Widow	9	11.2
Total	80	100.0
Level of education		
Primary	75	93.8
Secondary	4	5.0
Above secondary	1	1.2
Total	80	100.0
Source of income		
Crop farming	62	77.5
Livestock	12	15.0
Petty business	5	6.3
Salary	1	1.2
Total	80	100.0

4.3 Factors Influencing Sustainability of DADP Micro projects in Mletele and Mwanamonga Villages of Songea District

This study assessed the factors that influence sustainability of micro projects in Songea district. This section describes the factors that influence sustainability of DADPs micro projects. Respondents were asked to identify the factors that influence sustainability of DADP micro projects in their areas. The identified factors were poor preparation for DADP micro projects, short duration for trainings on micro projects, poor follow up for micro projects, poor group formation which resulted to group disintegration, lack of competent leaders, and high prices of agricultural inputs. More probing one of the respondents commented “Leaders who do not make follow up on village micro projects are not competent” Table 5 below presents the factors influencing sustainability of DADP micro projects.

Table 5: Factors Influencing Sustainability of DADP Micro projects N =80

Factors	Frequency	Percentages
Poor preparation for DADP micro projects	22	27.5
Short duration for DADP trainings	10	12.5
Poor follow up for micro projects	20	25.0
Poor group formation	7	8.75
Lack of competent leaders	13	16.25
High prices of agricultural inputs	8	10.0
Total	80	100.0

The findings in Table 5 reveal that 22 respondents (27.5%) were of the opinion that there was poor preparation for DADP micro projects while 7 respondents (8.75%) contend that there was poor group formation which resulted to group disintegrations.

4.3.1 Poor preparation for DADP micro projects

Implementation of DADP micro projects requires prior preparation of the implementers so that they understand thoroughly what all is about and how they can go about implementing the activities for better outcome. The fact that 22 respondents out of 80 identified poor preparations denotes why most of the micro projects especially in Mwanamonga village (Table 1) were not functioning at the time of the study. To substantiate the issue of poor preparation respondents were asked to mention at least four factors of poor preparation. Respondents mentioned (1) Lack of participatory rural appraisal (PRA) being conducted in their villages, (2) Few staff at LGA level (3) Delay in disbursing fund where a micro project has been approved and (4) Unreliable markets for their produce.

Table 6 shows respondents' responses on their understanding on the poor preparation of village agricultural micro projects.

Table 6: Respondents' responses on reasons for poor preparation N = 80

Reasons	Frequency	Percentage
Lack of participatory appraisal	15	18.75
Few staff at LGA level	10	12.5
Delays in disbursing fund	8	10.0
Unreliable markets for produce	47	58.75
Total	80	100.0

Respondents responses on their understanding why there was poor preparation shows that (Table 6) majority (58.75%) mentioned lack of markets for their produce is because through DADPs they have managed to increase production of some products like milk, paddy, maize and other crops through FFS trainings but only to find getting low prices because there is no market arrangements. Few respondents (10.0%) mentioned delays in disbursing fund. This reason was mentioned by very few is because according to their understanding is not a problem, what matters is for them to get funds even if at off season.

On further probing about poor preparation of the DADPs micro projects respondents were asked if there was poor preparation how did they get the micro projects they were implementing? Responses were as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Respondents' responses on how the VADPs were formulated N= 80

VADP formulation	Frequency	Percentage
During village assembly meeting	11	13.75
During O & OD	6	7.5
During group meetings	63	78.75
Total	80	100.0

Findings show that there were three ways for micro project formulation which were through village assembly meeting, through O & OD and through group meetings. The

study revealed that majority 78.75% of respondents was through group meetings. When VAEO was asked to explain on the findings he agreed that more often O & OD is not carried out because of late disbursement of funds. Under that situation different groups who propose to have a micro project send their request directly to WAEO who compiles ward development projects ready to be sent to the district where they are screened and compiled. The results are enough indication that O & OD methodology which is a planning tool advocated to be used by LGAs is known by very few farmers. The findings are in line with the findings by Mattee *et al.*, and Rutatora *et al.*, (2008).

4.3.2 Poor follow up of micro projects (Supervision)

Follow up for micro projects, according to Ngailo (2010) is the regular purposeful observation and recording of activities taking place in a micro project. It is a way in which micro projects are measured, managed and kept on track according to plans. It involves the collection, analysis, communication and use of information about micro projects progress. Among the factors which were mentioned by respondents to influence sustainability of DADP micro projects was poor follow up of the DADP micro project which was mentioned by 20 (25.0%) respondents. Even the key informants through discussion revealed the same. On further probing 56 (70.0%) of respondents disclosed that there was no follow up and only 6 (7.5%) of respondents said there was follow up.

The fact that majority were of the opinion that DADPs micro projects have no follow up implies there is no adherence to follow up of micro projects and it can be taken for

granted why many of the micro projects in Mwanamonga were not functioning and not sustainable. The findings are in line with findings by Rutatora *et al.*, (2008) when he reported that “in respect to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) as well as reporting capacity the VAEO and farmers including their leadership do not have enough skills in M & E as a result that task is not performed”. Table 8 below shows responses of follow up of the micro projects.

Table 8: Respondents’ responses on follow-ups to micro projects N= 80

Follow-ups	Frequency	Percentage
There is follow-ups	6	7.5
There is no follow- ups	56	70.0
I do not know	18	22.5
Total	80	100.0

4.3.3 Short duration for DADP trainings

According to AusAID (2000) the provision of appropriate training for identified target groups like communities is often a key strategy for achieving sustainable benefits. To improve the prospects for sustainability trainings for a particular micro projects should be provided before the implementation of the micro project. Among the factors that influence sustainability of micro projects, short duration for DADP training was mentioned by 10 respondents (12.5%). The respondent went further to explain that “Under DADPs getting training in order to have good implementation with the micro

projects is not mandatory as some groups were implementing DADPs without getting training”.

Other respondents from Mletele village contented that if training is provided it is in a rush manner 2-3 hours. They were given training on how to improve local chicken using an improved cockerel. The lessons learned were types of feeds, housing and disease treatment. There was no teaching material provided instead they were told every farmer has to come with an exercise book for writing. The training combined seven groups with 100 farmers that there was very little time spent for sharing farmer’s experience. The findings agree with findings by Rutatora *et al.*, (2008) when he reported that the training provided was rather loaded in terms of number of modules to be covered in too short a time covering a range of 3-5 days. The nature of training provided was assessed as instruction giving or lecturing and never took into consideration issues revolving around adult learning principles which focus on effective facilitation and iterative learning. Other groups like cattle dip farmers have not received training since the start of the DADPs.

According to DADP guidelines farmer empowerment will take the form of sensitization, training, networking and participation in technology development and testing which was to take part through the Agricultural Capacity Building Grant (A-CBG) (URT, 2006). DFTs and WFTs according to DADP guidelines were supposed to empower farmers through training in different fields. The study by ACT, (2009); URT,

(2009, 2010); and Rutatora *et al.*, (2008) reported that the WFT and DFT were lacking skills for participatory planning and technology development because the training provided to them was not well thought-out or logically planned following the principles of adult learning. That means what they deliver to farmers is not sufficient. This shows that in the study area training which was provided to farmer groups could not enable farmers to sustain their micro projects.

4.3.4 Lack of competent leaders

DADP guidelines advocate that the village communities are the main implementing agents for the DADPs. They will implement under the supervision of the planning and finance committee (PFC) and the project committees which is responsible for day-to-day management of the project activities, including reporting progress on project activities to village council on monthly basis (URT, 2006). With that obligation village leaders are supposed to be very competent to enable perform their duties. From the study lack of competent leaders was mentioned by 13 respondents (16.25%). Respondents were further asked if they participated in electing their village leaders including micro project committee leaders who were in position. Table 9 below show the responses for respondents' participation in village elections.

Table 9: Respondents' responses on participation in electing village leaders N= 80

Have you participated in village elections?	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	58	72.5
No	17	21.25
I do not remember	5	6.25
Total	80	100.0

Results on Table 9 show that majority of the respondents 58 (72.5%) did participate in electing their leaders in different posts and 5 (6.25%) could not remember if they participated. An informal discussion with other farmers and community development officer on why people complain that their leaders are not competent while they have participated in electing them revealed that because leadership posts in villages are not salary employment those who are competent with some knowledge of leadership do not volunteer to be elected as they find it is a wastage of time. Others said that those who are competent when they fill the forms so that they can be elected their forms are either hidden and their names are not returned for elections. That means those responsible to arrange for elections in these villages do it purposely for their own benefit.

On further probing respondents were asked what was their expectation from their leaders if their leaders were competent? The answers were that they expected competent leaders to be responsible, make follow up to the activities carried out in the village,

convene village meetings give reports of activities and were not extravagant. According to Hind and Arnold (2012) define responsible leadership as leadership that demonstrates an awareness and consideration of the consequences of actions for all stakeholders, as well as actively influencing those stakeholders to move towards more sustainable practices and processes.

Rios, (2007) define competency as an underlying characteristic of an individual that contributes to job or role performance and to organizational success. Competencies extend beyond the basic knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to perform a specific job to those that contribute to success in multiple jobs, job categories or the entire organization. Rios, (2007) has categorized competency of leadership into (1) leader of self- this understands self and others, articulate own values and priorities, understands individuals role and acts with integrity (demonstrate honest). (2) Leader as relation ship builder- this value diversity, communicates effectively, build trust by respect, valuing others and creating transparency.

Relating farmers' expectation of who was a competent leader and definitions of leadership and competency provided, the researcher is convinced that farmers in the study area know what is meant by a competent leader. They select incompetent leaders to my opinion is because they have not been empowered to articulate demand for good services including good leaders.

4.3.5 Poor group formation

DADP guidelines advocate micro projects to be implemented by groups and or the whole community. It was expected that to have active farmer groups, support of farmer group formation by local government personnel was necessary as directed by DADP guidelines (URT, 2006).

Among the factors mentioned by respondents that influence sustainability of DADP micro projects was poor group formation. Seven respondents (8.75%) mentioned that there was poor group formation during the implementation of DADP micro projects in the study areas. Respondents were further asked to identify when their groups were formed. Table 10 shows the respondents responses on time for group formation for their groups.

Table 10: Respondents' responses on the time of group formation N= 80

Time of group formation		Frequency
Percentage		
Group formed before DADP	14	17.5
Group formed during start of DADP	66	82.5
Total	80	100.0

From Table 10, the study found that majority of respondents 66 (82.5. %) revealed that their groups were formed during the start of the DADP micro projects, while 14 (17.5%) of respondents revealed that their groups were formed before the start of DADP micro projects. The finding conquers the findings by IFAD, (2007) in Wolter, (2008) that the funds of Irish Aid were strictly earmarked for the training of women. But the implementation was delayed since women's groups first needed to be formed. On further probing during group discussion it was revealed that some groups were formed after being initiated by the village chairwoman the case of cassava processing of Mwanamonga village. A group has to be organized and after the processing machines were purchased there was misunderstanding among the group as to where the machines should be kept and that resulted to the micro project activities to be halted.

Informal discussion with community development officer as to why the DADP farmer groups formed recently some have already disintegrated? The explanations provided were that some groups in the villages were formed under pressure so as to tap the DADP micro projects (funds) a finding also observed by Rutatora *et al.*, (2008) that some groups were formed for the purpose of getting money and such groups will not be sustainable when DADP get phased out. Members of the groups missed the criteria for group sustainability which according to IFAD, (2000) include:

(1) **Basic group characteristics.** They include: relatively small numbers of members, homogeneous membership, rotating leadership responsibilities, continuity of the same

members in the group, and application of established rules for group operation. (2) **Group cohesiveness.** Cohesiveness is an important factor in the effective operation and survival of such informal groups. To some extent this is a function of the way the group is set up but can also develop or erode over time. (3) **Training for sustainability.** Groups are to be provided with considerable training. A special module, called the "sustainability module", is to be included in the group training programme to make members aware of the factors affecting sustainability. Other training to be provided to the groups, is book keeping, group organization and management, (4) **Transparent group management and operations.** Group activities need to be transparent in order to contribute to group cohesiveness and sustainability. As everywhere else where money is involved, there are instances where suspicion of corruption threatens to break up groups. (5) **Regular meetings.** The timing, frequency and venue of meetings are also factors in attendance, and in sustainability. Most groups apparently prefer to meet in the late evening after some normal work. Usually groups meet once a week or once a fortnight, and sometimes once a month. The weekly meetings are desirable to maintain a feeling of continuity.

Findings from URT, (2009) contend that there are other DADP farmer groups which are sustainable giving an example of dairy goat production group in Msimba village (Kilosa District) which has remained together for over 10 years. When DADPs came the group was strengthened through use of FFS. The fact that some respondents mentioned poor group formation has a negative bearing on the sustainability of the DADP micro

projects because if the groups of people implementing the micro projects become disintegrated, automatically the micro projects will not be sustainable.

4.4 Perception of Respondents on Sustainability of DADP Micro projects

Since DADP programme was new it was necessary to determine the farmers' perception towards the micro projects and their experiences with the new programme. Perception generally refers to how people select, organize and interpret information gained through the senses or experience (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2004). According to Nyanga (2011) perceptions are events that can happen and are location specific due to heterogeneity of factors that influence them such as culture, education, gender, age, resource endowments and institutional factors.

In answers to the assessment on perceptions of farmers on sustainability of DADP micro projects respondents were asked seven perception statements to assess their perception towards sustainability of DADP micro-projects. Having a positive or negative perception towards a statement would influence either negatively or positively the sustainability of DADP micro-projects. The statements were picked from the literature on factors influencing sustainability of micro projects and their relevancy and validity were checked during the pretesting of the instrument.

In answer to the question as to whether the DADP programme was important (Table 11) majority 76 (95%) of the farmers claimed the programme to be important and 4 (5%)

said it was not important. The results show that farmers in the study area had implemented other programmes before and are open to new programme, the DADPs. The importance of DADP was that it had new methods of planning that was participatory which gave chance for them to plan and implement micro projects that were to their real need. This indicates that the farmers might be receptive to sustainability of the micro projects.

The rest of the perception statements, respondents showed negative perception on them. The fact that the rest of the statement showed negative perception indicates that the farmers' had either inadequate knowledge or were not aware with DADP implementation, participatory planning, their general understanding about DADPs, follow up of DADP micro projects, the truth about report on DADPs and about new technologies accompanied by DADPs micro projects. These may be the reasons among others for this kind of perception.

The implication is that the farmers do not have enough knowledge about the DADPs. They do not have adequate knowledge and awareness on DADPs because they often do receive insufficient technical support from the government extension workers due to low capability of the extension staff (DFTs & WFTs) for that matter to manage the DADP activities like participatory planning, micro project follow up and introduction of new technologies. The DFTs and WFTs tend to have low knowledge because the

regional secretariats that are to give support (backstopping) of activities at local government level themselves have little capacity to deliver.

The overall observed scores for farmers' perception ranged from positive to negative. Out of seven statements, only one statement showed positive perception indicating positive sustainability of DADP micro projects. The rest of the six statements the respondents showed the negative perception.

During field surveys, it was observed that a significant proportion of farmers in the study areas had inadequate information concerning DADPs. Despite the fact that the ministries under ASLMs were jointly implementing the ASDP/DADPs activities since 2006/2007, all categories of farmers could not be reached so that they all could get sufficient information about ASDP/DADPs by that time of study resulting to negative perception indicating negative sustainability of the micro projects under DADPs.

Table 11: Respondents responses for perception statements on sustainability of DADP micro projects N= 80.

Perception statements	Frequency	Percentage
The DADPs programme is important		
Yes	76	95.00
No	4	5.00
Implementation of DADPs is good		
Yes	36	45.00
No	44	55.00
Implementation of DADPs is participatory		
Yes	33	41.25
No	47	58.75
My understanding about DADPs is good		
Yes	22	27.50
No	58	72.50
Follow up for DADPs micro projects is good		
Yes	26	32.50
No	54	67.50
Reports given about DADPs are true		
Yes	30	37.50
No	50	62.50
DADP activities has brought new technologies		
Yes	12	15.00
No	68	85.00

4.5 Strategies for Enhancing Sustainability of DADPs Micro Projects

Respondents were asked to propose sound strategies that will enhance sustainability of DADPs micro projects.

Table 12 shows that majority 65 (81.25%) of respondents proposed that study tours and farmer field days should be adopted as extension methods while the minority 11 (13.75%) proposed that DADPs should be prepared following guidelines if micro projects are to be sustainable.

Table 12: Respondents' proposed strategies to enhance sustainability of DADP micro-projects (N=80)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Strategies for enhancing sustainability		
DADPs should be prepared following guidelines	11	13.75
Duration of training for DADP micro-projects should be increased from one day to four days	35	43.75
There should be close supervision for micro projects	27	33.75
Village leaders should be competent	15	18.75
Prices of inputs should be reduced	22	27.5
Participatory planning should be encouraged in planning of the DADPs	46	57.5
There should be technology development in DADPs	12	15.0
On farm trials should be practised	40	50.0
Study tours and farmer field days should be adopted as extension methods	65	81.25
FFS should be the basis for agricultural extension methods dissemination	60	75.0

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Overview

This chapter gives a summary of the major findings and recommendations based on the study findings.

This study was conducted at Mwanamonga and Mletele as the selected villages in Songea District with the aim of determining the factors influencing sustainability of DADP micro projects under DADPs. To achieve the main objective three specific objectives were investigated. These objectives were as follow: firstly to identify and describe the factors that influence sustainability of DADPs micro projects. Secondly, to assess the farmers perception on sustainability of DADP micro projects and thirdly to propose sound strategies that will enhance sustainability of DADP micro projects.

5.2 Conclusions

The study found out that in the selected villages the factors that influenced sustainability of DADP micro projects were, poor preparation of the DADP micro projects, short duration for trainings provided for DADP micro projects, poor follow up for micro projects, poor farmer group formation, and lack of competent village leaders including committee micro project leaders. The DADPs were not prepared as directed under the DADP guidelines as many steps for DADP preparation were either skipped or

implemented substandard. For example the guideline insists on carrying out participatory PRA to have the base information for the villages, an activity most skipped or done in a rush manner resulting to missing the basic information that could help good planning for DADP micro projects and be sustainable.

With regard to assessment on farmers' perception on sustainability of DADP micro projects, study pointed out that a significant proportion of farmers in the study areas had inadequate information concerning DADPs although the programme was being implemented in the study areas. The farmers perceived themselves as having either a low knowledge or low awareness of the DADP. The situation was exacerbated by the extension professionals who had no capacity to develop, plan and implement the DADP activities.

The respondents had negative perception to six developed statements out of seven which describes the poor implementation of the DADPs in terms of participation, micro projects follow up, reports on DADP, new technology development under DADP and as a whole their understanding about the DADPs. Respondents were found to have positive perception on the statement saying DADPs programme was important because they had hopes if DADP could be implemented according to what the documents (guideline) stipulates they could benefit by having needy micro projects that they could implement and be able to sustain.

The proposed strategies of the study were participatory planning should be encouraged in planning of the DADPs, proper farmer group formation should be encouraged, FFS should be the basis for agricultural extension methods dissemination and DADPs should be prepared following guidelines meaning have to follow the stipulated steps for implementation of the DADPS.

5.3 Recommendations

Recommendations are made based on the study findings as follows; The results show that, the sustainability of DADPs micro projects is influenced by a number of factors which have been identified as: poor preparation of the DADPs, trainings of DADPs are given short time, there is poor supervision of the micro projects, lack of competent village leaders including micro projects committee leaders, and improper farmer group formation. Recommendations are made to the farmers when forming groups they should follow the criteria for group formation. LGA extension workers should be well prepared in terms of skills and knowledge when providing extension services to farmers. Researchers have to put more emphasis on technology development so that farmers get new technologies to work better and improve agriculture. Policy makers and administrators have to put more emphasis on addressing why participatory planning is important.

- (i) Special attention should be focused on the development of farmers' skills for participatory planning, and micro projects monitoring. The extension

workers of the on-going DADPs project have to work jointly with NGO and other stakeholder who have capacity to implement extension services in respective LGAs as guided by the DADP guidelines.

- (ii) Initiatives should be taken to increase the farmers' knowledge and perception about DADPs for the sustainability of the micro projects implemented in the study areas.

FFS should be encouraged to be used as means of disseminating extension packages and farmers in the study areas should form groups under proper criteria so that the groups can be sustainable.

- (iii) There should be capacity building to strengthen knowledge and skills of farmers and government officials on regular bases

With regard to farmer perception the study findings show that majority of respondents 76 (95%) had positive perceptions on the statement which state that the DADPs programme is important. The study findings also show that respondents had negative perception on the statements which show that the reports given about DADPs are true, their understanding about DADPs is good, follow up for DADP micro projects is good and implementation of DADPs is good. The recommendation put forward is that since negative perception has a negative influence on sustainability of DADPs micro projects, efforts must be made by all stakeholders to embark on removing the negative perception that may cause negative sustainability of DADPs micro projects It is important therefore to provide true DADP reports which shows evidence in order to convince the farmers

about the DADPs activities. More over, more training should be provided to farmer on what DADP is to make more understanding about DADP activities and there should be regular follow up for DADP micro projects.

Likewise, where respondents have shown positive perception, effort should be made by all stakeholders of DADPs to maintain farmers' positive perceptions by improving the factors which have positive influence on sustainability of DADP micro projects.

REFERENCES

ACT, (2009). Agricultural Council of Tanzania shares experience on DADPs

[<http://www.actanzania.org/index.php?option=>

[com](http://www.actanzania.org/index.php?option=com)htm] site visited on 2/10/2009.

ADB, (2008). *Best Practices in Irrigation and Drainage*. Learning from

Successful Projects

Arnold, Smit and Hind, Patricia (2012). Enabling Sustainability through Responsible

Leadership[http://web.up.ac.za/sitefiles/file/2012_alcrl_Enabling%20Sus%20t

[hrough%20RL%20action%20research%20with%20SME%20-](http://web.up.ac.za/sitefiles/file/2012_alcrl_Enabling%20Sus%20through%20RL%20action%20research%20with%20SME%20-%20Prof%20Arnold.pdf)

[%20Prof%20Arnold.pdf](http://web.up.ac.za/sitefiles/file/2012_alcrl_Enabling%20Sus%20through%20RL%20action%20research%20with%20SME%20-%20Prof%20Arnold.pdf)] site visited on 9/9/2013.

AusAID,(2000).PromotingPracticalSustainability.[<http://www.ausaid.gov.au/public>

[ations/pdf/sustainability.pdf](http://www.ausaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/sustainability.pdf)]. Site visited on 20/5/2009.

Babbie. E.R. (1990). *Survey Research Methods*. Wadsworth Publishing Co,

Belmount, California. 395pp.

Binnendijk Annette (1998). *Result Based Management in the Development Co-*

operation Agencies: A Review Of Experience. Background Report.

<http://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation> of

developmentprogrammes/1886527.pdf.

Blewitt, J. (2008). *Understanding Sustainable Development*. Earthscan Ltd, London. 228pp.

Boydell, R. A. (1999). Making rural water supply and sanitation projects sustainable. *Journal of Appropriate Technologies for Water Supply and Sanitation* 18 (1): 2-4.

Concern World Wide, (2008). *Responding to the Needs of Marginal Farmers: A Review of Selected District Agricultural Development Plans in Tanzania*. [http://www.agricultureandfoodfordevelopment.org/Tanzania_full%20report.pdf]sitevisit on 10/3/2009.

Chris Olsen and Diane Marie (2004). *Cross-Sectional Study Design and Data Analysis*[http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/yes/4297_MODULE_05.pdf]Site visited on 5/9/2013.

DALDO, (2009). *Songea District Council Profile 2009*.15pp.

Encyclopaedia Britannica, (2004). *Perception*.

[<http://www.britannica.com/search?query=perception&ct=&fuzzy=N>]site visited on 20/2/2010.

Esbern, Hansen, (2004). *Concepts and Experiences with Demand Driven Advisory Services*. In: Review of Recent Literature with Examples from Tanzania. *DIIS Working Paper no 2004/7* [[http://www.sec2.isn.ch/serviceengine/files/Concepts Experiences Advisory pdf](http://www.sec2.isn.ch/serviceengine/files/Concepts%20Experiences%20Advisory.pdf)] Site visited on 20/8/2011

FAO, (1996). Guidelines for Planning Irrigation and Drainage Investment Projects. FAO Investment Centre Technical paper N. 11.

FAO, (2003). Working with Local Institutions to Support Sustainable Livelihoods. [<http://www.fao.org/docrep/006/y5083e/y5083e00.htm>] Site visited on 20/03/2011

FAO, (2011). *Planning and Implementation of Marine Protected Areas and Fisheries Fisheries Management*. FAO Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries No. 4, *Suppl. 4*.

Farouque, Golam and Takeya, Hiroyuki (2007). *Farmers' Perception of Integrated Soil Fertility and Nutrient Management for Sustainable Crop production: A study of rural areas in Bangladesh*. *Journal of agricultural education* 48 (3): 111-122.

Givewell, (2009). Agriculture charity evaluation: Incomes boosted are not the same as lives changed [<http://blong.givewell.org/2009/10/2/agriculture-charity-evaluation-incomes>] (site visited on 15/8/2012).

Haysom, Alexia (2006). A Study of the Factors Affecting Sustainability of Rural Water Supplies in Tanzania. [http://www.wateraid.org/documents/plugin_documents/functionality_and_sustainability_study_by_alexia_haysom.pdf] Site visited on 10/3/2011.

IFAD, (2000). India - *Lessons on sustainability of women's group from Tamil Nadu* [http://www.ifad.org/gender/learning/project/part/in_tamil2.htm] site visited on 10/09/2013.

IFAD, (2007). IFAD Strategic Framework 2007-2010. [<http://www.ifad.org/strategic>] Site visited on 15/10/2011

IFAD, (2009). Sustainability of Rural Development Projects. Best practices and lessons learned by IFAD in Asia. Viet Nam Case Study. Decentralized Programme for Rural Poverty Reduction in Ha Giang and Quang Binh Provinces [<http://www.ifad.org/operations/projects/regions/pi/casestudies/vietnam.pdf>] Site visited on 2/11/2011.

Kajembe, G.C; Gamasa, D. M.; Kaale, B. K. (2003). Africare/Tanzania. *Participatory Evaluation Report for the Ugala Community Conservation Project, Tabora, Tanzania. Draft 53pp.*

- Kothari,C.R (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (2nd Ed). New Age International Publishers Ltd., New Delhi, 401pp.
- Kothari,C.R (2008). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (3rd Ed). New Age International Publishers Ltd., New Delhi, 385pp
- Mattee, A. Z.; Ngetti M. S. and Rwambali, E. G. (2008). *The Performance of Extension Services Delivery under ASDP: A case study of Kilosa and Kilombero Districts*. Sokoine University of Agriculture. A Final Report Submitted to Embassy of Ireland. pp 17.
- NBS, (2010). *National Sample Census of Agriculture Preliminary* www.nbs.go.tz/sensa2012/index.php[Site visited on 16/12/2012.
- Ngailo, L. N. (2010). *Project Planning and Management. A Logical Frame Work Approach*. 2nd Edition. RenNic's Bookshop(P) Box 7775 Moshi, Tanzania.195pp.
- Nyanga, H. ; Fred H. Johsen; Ben B. Aune; Kallinda, H. (2011). *Smallholder Farmer Perception of Climate Change and Conservation Agriculture: Evidence from Zambia*. *Journal of Sustainable Development* 4(4): 73-85
[<http://www.ccsenet.org/jsd>] Site visited on 12/7/2011.

Oakley, P. and Marsden, D. (1991). *Approaches to Participation in Development*
International Labour Organisation, Geneva. 91pp.

Rios, Anita, (2007). *Using Leadership Competencies*.

[http://www.hr.mnscu.edu/training_and_development/documents] site
visited on 05/09/2013.

Rutatora, D. F.; Busindi I.M.; Rwenyagira, B.W.; Kajugusi, A. and. Makonta, C.
(2008).

*An Assessment of the Agricultural Services (Research and Extension) Delivery
under ASDP* (Final Report). Agricultural Sector Development Programme
(ASDP): Third Joint Implementation Review. Ministry of Agriculture, Food
Security and Cooperatives. United Republic of Tanzania. 80pp.

Sosu, E. M. (2004). *Farmers' Knowledge and Perception towards a Sustainable
Adoption of Sugar Beet in Kenya*. A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment for
the Award of a Master of Science Degree in Environmental Science at Lund
University, Sweden. [[http://www.lumes.lu.se/database/alumni/03.04/theses/sosu
_edward.pdf](http://www.lumes.lu.se/database/alumni/03.04/theses/sosu_edward.pdf)] Site visited on 15/2 2009.

- UNDP, (2000). *Planning for and monitoring of project sustainability: a guideline on concepts, issues and tools*. [<http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/khan.htm>] Site visited on 20/5/2010.
- URT, (2001). Rural Development Strategy. Main Report Final Prime Minister's Office 19th December 2001 [<http://www.tzonline.policies.htm>]. Site visited on 20/2/2009.
- URT, (2001a). Agricultural Sector Development Strategy. October 2001. [<http://www.tzonline.org/policies.htm>].
- URT (2000). *The need for Agricultural Extension Reform. Volume. 1. Review of Literature*. Task Force on Agricultural Extension Reform. MAC-EFU, Dar es Salaam, July 2000. 106 pp.
- URT (2006). Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). Guidelines for District Agricultural Development Planning and Implementation May, 2006 Dar es Salaam 30 pp.
- URT (2006a). Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). Support Through Basket Fund. Government Programme Document 25th May , 2006. 103.
- URT, (2007). Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). Support Through Basket Fund. Government Programme Document [<http://www.fao.org/>]

righttofood/inaction/countrylist/Tanzania/Tanzania_ASDP_Government Programme Document pdf] Site visited on 10/10/2009.

URT, (2008) United Republic of Tanzania. Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). *Aide Memoire for the Third Joint Implementation Review 18/09/2008-21/10/2008*[[http://www.agriculture.go.tz/attachedwebpages/ASDP/Documents/Implementation_status/Aide Memoire for the Third Joint Implementation Rev](http://www.agriculture.go.tz/attachedwebpages/ASDP/Documents/Implementation_status/Aide_Memoire_for_the_Third_Joint_Implementation_Rev)] Site visited on 12/12/2010.

URT, (2008a). *Agriculture Sector Review and Public Expenditure Review 2008/09 November 2008*. [<http://kilimo.go.tz/publications/English%20Review%20sector%20Public%20Expenditure%20Review%20200809.pdf>] Site visited on 06/07/2013

URT, (2009). Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). *Aide Memoire for the Fourth Joint Implementation Review 28/9/2009 -28/10/2009 November 2009*[www.agriculture.go.tz/attached%2520web%2520pages/ASDP/Documents/Implementation%2520sta] site visited on 20/8/2011.

URT, (2010). Agricultural Sector Development Programme (ASDP). *Performance Review(2006/07_2009/10)*. [<http://www.agriculture.go.tz/attached%20web%20>

[pages/ASDP/Progress%20Reports/ASDP%20Performance%20Report%202006-2010.pdf](#) .] Site visited on 03/05/2010

URT, (2012). Population and Housing Census. *Population Distributioin by Administrative Areas*. [www.wavuti..com/uploads/3/7/6/census March 2013]
Site visited on 30/06/2013

Wolter, Denis (2008).Tanzania -*The challenge of Moving from Subsistence to Profit*
[http://www.oecd.org/dev/40534097.pdf] site visited on 03/05/2010.

World Bank, (2003). *Assessing Sustainability*.
[[http://www.anguaconsult.co.uk/uploads/pdfs/WBAssessing Sustainability.pdf](http://www.anguaconsult.co.uk/uploads/pdfs/WBAssessingSustainability.pdf)] Site visited on 28/5/2011

World Bank, (2004). *The Returns to Participation in the Non-farm Sector in Rural Rwanda*. Policy Research Working Paper 3462 December 2004. 32pp
[http://books.google.co.tz/books?id=2VLeWqUaBTo&pg=PA1&lpg=PA1&dq=world+bank+2004++farmers+participation&source=bl&ots=] Site visited on 11/7/2013

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Interview Schedule for respondents

TITLE: FACTORS INFLUENCING SUSTAINABILITY OF MICRO-PROJECTS UNDER DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS (DADP) SONGEA DISTRICT, RUVUMA REGION, TANZANIA

INTRODUCTION:

Dear respondents, you have been selected randomly to participate in the study. The aim of this study is to get views as participants of DADP about DADP micro projects. Findings of the study will be useful for drawing recommendations to Songea district management on how best to sustain micro projects. The information will be treated confidential. I kindly request your cooperation.

SECTION A: General Information

Name of respondent.....

District..... Ward... .. Village Date

Household characteristics

Please put a tick [] for the right answer

1. How old are you?

1 18-30 years []

2 31-40 years []

3 41-50 years []

4 51-60years []

5 Above 60 []

2. What is your sex?

- 1. Male []
- 2. Female []

3. What is your marital status?

- 1. Single
- 2. Married []
- 3. Widowed []

4. What is your education level?

- 1. No formal education []
- 2. Primary school []
- 3. Secondary school []
- 4. Above secondary school []

5. What is your main source of income?

.....

6. What are the four major crops you grow (Mention in order of importance)

- (1) (2)
- (3) (4).....

7. What are the major four challenges facing the crops

- 1
- 2.....
- 3

8. Which major three livestock do you keep?

No	Livestock type	Breed	Number
1			
2			
3			

9. What are the major four challenges facing the livestock?

- 1..... 2.....
- 3..... 4.....

10. What efforts are taken to solve the problems facing the micro projects?

- 1.....
- 2.....
- 3.....

B. Factors influencing sustainability of DADP projects micro

11 What do you understand by planning

12. Do you have village agricultural development plans?

13. How do you plan and design your micro projects?

14. Did you participate in planning of your micro projects?

.....

15. Have you incorporated your agricultural problems in your VADPs?

If not why?.....

16. What do you think could be the improvement to micro project planning and designing?

.....

17. Is there any prior assessment done for the capacity for one to implement the micro project?

- 1. Yes []
- 2. No []
- 3. I do not know []

18. Do you see problems related to designing of the micro projects?

- 1. Yes (if yes go to 17) []
- 2. No (if no go to 18) []

19. Which problems are associated with designing of the micro projects?

- 1

2.

3.

18. Does the village Agricultural development plans (VADP) address priority of the community?

1. Yes []

2. No (Why?) []

.....
.....

19. What do you see as the hindrance to DADP micro project implementation?

1.....

2.....

3.....

20. How often do you make supervision to the projects?

21. Is the training provided sufficient t?

1. Yes (How?)

.....
.....

2. No (Why?)

.....
.....
.....

Institutional factors

22. Are there any formal and informal community organizations in the village that collaborate with the DADPs micro projects and other village development activities?

1. Yes []

2. No []

3. I don't know []

If yes what are they?

1.

2.

23. Are the leaders of projects capable of their work?

1. Yes []

2. No []

24. If no explain/give reasons (Mention)

25. Are you aware of the Ward and District facilitation teams?

1. Yes []

2. No []

What do you think are their main roles?

.....

26. Do they have capacity in planning, implementation and supervision of the DADP micro projects?

1. Yes []

2. No (Why?) []

27. Do you think their participation can enhance micro projects sustainability?

1. Yes (how?) []

.....

2. No (why?) []

.....

28. Are you aware of any Ward Resource Development centre in this Ward /Village?

1. Yes. []

2. No []

29. How are your groups formed?

Explain

30. How often do you meet in your group to discuss the progress of your micro project?

1. Once/month []

2. Twice /month []

3. Others (specify) []

31. Has the project has a supervision plan?

1. Yes []
2. No []
- 32. Do you think the project is beneficial to the community?**
1. Yes []
2. No (why?) []

.....

Farmer's perception on the sustainability of micro projects

33. What is your perception about this project?

34. In the following statements state your agreement or disagreements with regard to perception on sustainability of DADP micro projects

Perception statements	Frequency	Percentage
The DADPs programme is important		
Yes		
No		
Implementation of DADPs is good		
Yes		
No		
Implementation of DADPs is participatory		
Yes		
No		
My understanding about DADPs is good		
Yes		
No		
Follow up for DADPs micro projects is good		
Yes		
No		
Reports given about DADPs are true		
Yes		
No		
DADP activities has brought new technologies		
Yes		
No		

35. What strategies could be employed in order to enhance sustainability of the micro projects?...

Appendix 2: Interview Guide for Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

INTRODUCTION

Dear respondents, you have been chosen among the stake holders in the district to provide information related to micro-projects which are under District Agricultural Development Plans (DADP). Findings of the study will be useful for drawing recommendations to Songea district management on how best to sustain micro projects. The information will be treated confidential. I kindly request your cooperation.

1. Which are the common agricultural problems in the council?
2. What is the importance of village agricultural plans?
3. How do you prepare your village agricultural development plans?.....
.....
4. What exactly do you do in your village according to the village plans?
.....
5. Can you tell the difference between now and previous activities?
6. Are the DADP micro projects of any importance to you?
7. Do you face problems with the implementation of the micro projects?
8. On your opinion how can they be implemented much better?
9. From your opinion do you think farmers have benefited from the micro projects?
10. What is your opinion on the trainings provided byDADP officials.....
11. What is the perception of the community on the micro projects as a whole?
12. Do you have any suggestions for strategies to be taken to enhance sustainability of the DADP micro projects?

Appendix 3: Observation Check List

Things to observe during the study

Name of observer.....

Time of observation.....

1. Attendance register for group members at work
2. Behaviour at work
3. Time to report at work
4. Division of labour at work
5. Time for b/fast, lunch and dinner
6. A common place to meet or different places
7. Opinions of others valued?
8. Types of micro projects around
9. Quality of materials used
10. Eager to learn?

Appendix 4: Map of Songea Showing Location of Study Area—Mletele and Mwanamonga villages



