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ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| **Aims:** Agricultural based projects are key interventions in elevating agricultural sector in less developed countries. These projects aim at strengthening ability of farmers to improve their production potentials and ultimately improve living standard. Despite the importance of these projects, yet there is dearth of information on factors influencing farmers to participate in agricultural based projects in Tanzanian context. Therefore, this paper aimed at bridging information gap on factors influencing farmer participations in donor funded agriculture projects.  **Methodology:** The study used a cross sectional research design. A total of 96 farmers who were beneficiaries of RIPAT project were involved in the study. Primary data were used and collected by survey questionnaire. Collected data were analyzed by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 25).  **Results:** Access to information on agricultural based project like RIPAT has large influence on farmer participations into agricultural based projects. Also, majority of farmers have a perception that donor funded project like RIPAT have positive benefits in their agricultural activities and livelihood at large. Additionally, findings showed that factors which positively influence farmers participation in donor funded agricultural project were; household level of income, limited access to farm inputs, assurance on access to market, perception on project’s fairness and equity, access to technical supports, extension services and innovations. On other hand, findings showed that cultural traditions and norms had no influence on participation in donor funded agricultural based projects.  **Conclusion:** To ensure sustainability of project outcomes, there is a need of looking factors specifically may influence participation of farmers in to a project. |
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1. INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is the backbone of many economies worldwide and is a critical source of food, income and employment for millions of people. In recent years sustainable agriculture has become increasingly important in the global development agenda. Sustainable agriculture practice are estimated to be used on approximately 18% of the worlds agriculture land (FAO, 2018).The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), included a specific target to ensure sustainable food production systems and implement resilient agriculture practices that increase productivity and production . Also, that help to maintain ecosystems which strengthen capacity for adaptation to climate change extreme weather drought flooding and other disasters and that progressively improve land and soil quality (Kimweli, 2013; Pemsl et al., 2022). In Africa sustainable agriculture has been promoted through agricultural based projects as a means to archive food security and poverty reduction while also addressing the challenges of climate change, land degradation and biodiversity loss (Farooq et al., 2022). Despite remarkable efforts of donor funded projects, yet faces numerous challenges which outshines desired objectives (Waititu & Ngali, 2022).

Projects entail the efforts that encompass a number of actions and resources intending to produce certain results while taking into account limitations like time, quality, and cost with the ultimate goal to bring changes to people or area of implementations (Bahadur, 2020). Most of projects are established on behalf of the government as the authorities provide means towards achievements of planned projects’ results. The involvement of the government in projects may be through creating conducive environments for projects’ implementations trough incentives such as; preferential lending, favor in taxation, state orders, leasing, insurance, and financial support (Kholodova & Podgorskaya, 2020). The goal of projects is to promote better practices, to incentivize people on activities, to sensitize people on technological adoptions, to promote improvement in living standard of the people as well as to promote income and food security on agricultural based projects (Mdoe et al., 2022).

Agricultural based projects are efforts that intends to bring changes on agricultural practices from primitive/ business as usual to modern or good agricultural practices (Kitole & Sesabo, 2022). These agricultural based projects are designed to bring improvement in technologies and build capacity to farmers aiming to bring transformation in agricultural systems (Zhou et al., 2022). Most of agricultural based projects are implemented in less developed countries like African Countries. These projects are implemented to promote growth in agriculture which employs about 49 percent of African population but contributes 23 percent to countries gross domestic products (Osabohien et al., 2019). Tanzania as among African countries, has been prone to domestic and foreign funded agricultural based projects aiming to promote sectorial growth and its contribution to the economy. The sector contributes by employing 70 percent of country’s population, 25 percent of foreign exchange, 30 percent to gross domestic products and 65 percent of raw materials to the industries, despite the sector being the backbone of the economy its contribution is low (Mpogole et al., 2020).

Therefore, agricultural based projects are introduced in Tanzania to offset low productivity, to promote quality of agricultural products, improvement in crop farming, animal husbandry and agricultural commercialization (Wineman et al., 2020). Few of implemented agricultural based projects are in Tanzania are Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania (SAGCOT), IFAD initiatives, FAO Initiatives, Bill and Melinda gate foundation initiatives, World Bank initiative, Agricultural and Fisheries Development Programme (AFDP), Expanding Rice Production Project (ERPP), Tanzania Agricultural Inputs Support Project (TAISP), Peace Corps Tanzania Sustainable Agriculture Project (PCTSAP), Adaptation Fund project, Organic Mushroom Production. However, the results of agricultural based projects are not well visible to most of farmers as the production potentials are still low and the sector incubate large population of Tanzanians under poverty line (Kitole & Sesabo, 2022; Mdoe et al., 2022).

Like many other agricultural based projects implemented in Tanzania, Rural Initiatives for Participatory Agriculture Transformation (RIPAT SUA) project aimed to close the agriculture technology gap as a means of improving livelihoods and self-support among rural small-scale farmers. The project implemented through (i) distribution of appropriate agriculture seeds (beans. banana, maize, potatoes) (ii) Creation of awareness on the aspect savings and lending money through Village Saving and Loan Association (VSLA) and village community bank (VICOBA) (iii) Farmer Training School and livestock keeping (Chicken, Goats, and Pigs). The project was funded by Blue Mass society and implemented by (RECODA) Research Community and Organizational Development in collaboration with Sokoine University of Agriculture. However, there is a dearth of information on factors influencing participation of farmers on agricultural based projects. Therefore, this study aimed to bridge information gap on determinants of farmers’ participation in agricultural projects by using RIPAT project as case study.

**1.1 Conceptual framework**

Participation in agricultural based project is a result of several factors which can be grouped in to background characteristics, economic factors, socio-cultural factors and political factors. However, these factors may be intervened by farmer’s perceptions, attitudes, beliefs and willingness to participate on the agriculture based project as shown on figure 1.

**Background Characteristics**

Age, sex, education, occupation

**Economic Factors**

* Cost associated with participation
* Returns over the participation
* Market demand
* Perception, Attitudes and believes of project
* Willingness to participate in the project

**Farmers Participation in agricultural based projects**

**Socio – Cultural Factors**

* Taboos, customs, beliefs, ethics

/

**Political Factors**

* Policy and regulatory environment

**Figure 1:** Conceptual framework for factors influencing farmers’ participation in agricultural based projects

2. material and methods

**2.1 Study area**

The study was conducted in Magadu ward in Morogoro Municipality. The ward is located along Uluguru slopes found at the coordinate 6°49’20” S, 37°40’0” E. The district was purposively selected because it is one among the wards where the RIPAT project was implemented.

**2.2 Research design**

Cross-sectional research design was used whereby data were collected at a single point in time. The design provided a snapshot of ideas, opinions and information on project inclusion.

**2.3 Data types and source**

The study used primary data which were collected directly from the study area through key informant interviews and survey questionnaires. Structured interview was conducted with ward agricultural officer with an aid of interview schedule. The information collected from key informant were activities performed by RIPAT project, the involvement of farmers on project, outcomes and the sustainability of the outcomes. Survey questionnaire with both open and close - ended questions was used to collect primary data from the study farmers.

**2.4 Sample and selection procedures**

**2.4.1 Sample size determination**

Magadu ward has a total of 10,149 people (NBS, 2022). Since the study didn’t have a proper number of farmers as per human population census conducted October 2022, then the study used a formular developed by Kothari in 2004 to estimate sample size for unknown sampling frame as shown on equation (i).

**Where;**

= 1.96 is the desired confidence level of 95% and value obtained from table

= Proportion of the population has the attribute in question =0.5

= 0.5 {(1 - 0.5) i.e.1 – p}

= Maximum level of committing error in sampling = (0.1) or 10%

**Sample size (n)** = 96

**2.4.2 Sample selection procedures**

Random selection procedures used to select 96 farmers participated in RIPAT project. In addition, purposively sampling was used to ward and key respondents like 1 Ward Agricultural Extension Officer, and 1 project officer.

**2.4.3 Data Analysis**

Collected data were cleaned, coded and analyzed through computer software known as Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). The analyzed data were presented inform tables and figures. Also, the analysis of collected data were aided by descriptive statistics like means and standard deviations.

3. results and discussion

3.1 RESULTS

**3.1.1 Demographic characteristics of the respondents**

**3.1.1.1 Age of the respondents**

Study’s results shows that majority of participants of RIPAT projects were elders aged 36 to 53 years accounting about 54.2% of the study’s sample followed by youth aged 18 to 35 years equivalent to 29.25% and elders aged 54 years and above equals to 16.75% of the study’s sample (Table 1). This shows that most of elders are interested in participating in agricultural based projects which aims to promote their abilities to engage in agricultural activities.

**3.1.1.2 Gender of the respondents**

Results shows that female (57.3%) had more participations on RIPAT project than male (42.7%). This indicates that female had higher likelihood of participating on agricultural based projects like RIPAT project which supports farmers who face challenges in their activities such as limited access to resources, farm inputs, information and agricultural markets (Table 1).

**3.1.1.3 Marital status** **of the respondents**

Study’s findings (Table 1) indicates that majority of participants of RIPAT project were married (81.3%) followed by participants who were single (9.4%) while other statuses were divorced (6.3%) and widowed (3.1%). The number of married participants is large due to the nature of the project as aimed to promote nutritional status of the households, hence ended up with high number married participants than other marital statuses.

**3.1.1.4 Education level of the respondents**

Majority of participants of RIPAT project had primary education level (76%) followed by secondary education level (12.5%) while other education levels were no formal education (8.3%), college education level (2.1%) and University level (1%). This shows that most of people involving in farming in the study area have only basic or primary education level which set up a basic level for just reading and writing (Table 1).

**3.1.1.5 Occupation of the respondents**

Findings (Table 1) shows crop farming (100%) is the main activity for most of participants of RIPAT project. Despite crop farming being the main economic activity, participants also engages in other activities like livestock keeping (12.5%), petty business (6.3%), and artesian (4.2%). High representations of the crop farmers is due to the nature of the project which aimed to promote households’ nutrition through supporting agricultural activities.

**Table 1:** Demographic characteristic of the respondents (n = 96)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable (s)** | **Description** | | **Frequency** | | **Percent (%)** | |
| **Age category** | 18 - 35 | | 28 | | 29.1 | |
|  | 36 - 53 | | 52 | | 54.2 | |
|  | 54 and above | | 16 | | 16.7 | |
|  | **Total** | | **96** | | **100** | |
| **Gender** | Male | | 41 | | 42.7 | |
| Female | | 55 | | 57.3 | |
|  | **Total** | | **96** | | **100** | |
| **Marital status** | Single | | 9 | | 9.4 | |
| Married | | 78 | | 81.3 | |
| Divorced | | 6 | | 6.3 | |
| Widowed | | 3 | | 3.1 | |
|  | **Total** | | **96** | | **100** | |
| **Education level** | None | | 8 | | 8.3 | |
| Primary | | 73 | | 76.0 | |
| Secondary | | 12 | | 12.5 | |
| College | | 2 | | 2.1 | |
| University | | 1 | | 1.0 | |
|  | **Total** | | **96** | | **100** | |
| **Main occupation** | Farmers |  | | 96 | | 100 |
| Livestock keeping |  | | 12 | | 12.5 |
| Business |  | | 6 | | 6.3 |
| Artesian |  | | 4 | | 4.2 |
| **Total** |  | | **96** | | **100** |

**3.1.2 Participation and perception of the benefits of RIPAT project**

**3.1.2.1 Motivation for participation on RIPAT project**

Access to information (52.1%) was a major motivational factor used by farmers to participate in RIPAT project. Followed by the need to access improved markets (16.7%), the need to have strong networking (15.6%), needs to learn better farm practices (13.5%). Lastly, it was reported that farmers participated in RIPAT project because of the need to access to credits (10.4%) table 2. This is also supported by project officer who reported that;

*“Our project aimed at increasing productivity of farmers, access to finance and linking them with markets” (Project officer, 2024).*

**Table 2:** Motivation for participation on RIPAT project (n = 96)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Motivation** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| Access to information | 50 | 52.1 |
| Need to learn better agricultural practice | 13 | 13.5 |
| Access to Improved market | 16 | 16.7 |
| Networking | 15 | 15.6 |
| Need to access to credits | 10 | 10.4 |

**3.1.2.2 Perceptions on the benefits of RIPAT project**

Majority of farmers (78.1%) realised that their participation on RIPAT project had good/ excellent/ positive benefits on their lives. About 13.5% were neutral on realizing the benefits on their participation in RIPAT project. Also, 7.3% of study’s respondents didn’t realised much benefits on their participation in the project and 1% of the study’s respondents didn’t realize any benefits from the project (Figure 2). This is supported by statements from Ward Agricultural Officer who said that,

*“Now days, farmers are ambitious on participating in agricultural based projects. Farmers realize more positive benefits and those who are reluctant, they learn from their fellow who influences them to participate”* *(Ward Agricultural Officer, 2024).*

**Figure 2:** Perception on the benefits of RIPAT project to farmers (n = 96)

**3.1.3 Economic factors that influence farmers’ participation on agriculture based projects.**

**3.1.3.1 Level of household income in relation to participation on RIPAT project**

Level of household income found to be a significant factor that influence farmers to participate in agricultural based projects. This is evidenced by the study’s findings whereby 58.3% agreed, 27.1% strong agreed and 8.3% partly agreed and disagreed that household income influences their participations on the projects (Table 3). Therefore, farmers decide to participate in agricultural based projects expecting to be supported financially in accessing farm inputs, access vital information, access to market and get soft loans.

**3.1.3.2 Cost of inputs in relation to the participation of RIPAT project**

Study’s findings showed that cost of farming inputs like seeds, fertilizers, herbicides, pesticides and implements contribute on farmer’s decision on participation on agricultural based projects as it was reported by 65.7% of the study’s respondents. On other hand 15.6% of the respondents were neutral as agreeing and disagreeing at the same time while 18.8% disagreed that cost of inputs has nothing to do on decisions to participate on RIPAT project (Table 3). This means that when agricultural based project aims to support farmers’ cost of inputs provide higher chance of farmers to participate.

**3.1.3.3 Access to market in relation to farmer’s participation on RIPAT project**

Access to market was among factors important to farmers on participation of RIPAT project. The project offered room to widen access to market through increased production potentials, increased quality of produced goods and access to market information as was reported by 85.4% of the study’s respondents. Additionally, some respondents (3.1%) were reluctant to this factors as were neutral meaning on one side access to market is an important factors while on other side the factors is not that much important on making decisions whether to participate or not (Table 3). This is also supported by ward agricultural officer and beneficiary.

*“Comparing before and after the project,* *I can say wellbeing of farmers has improved (Ward Agricultural Officer, 2024). “Joining the project changed my life, I wasn’t able to pay school fees and buy scholastic materials for my children. But RIPAT project trained me good agronomic practices which in turn increased yield for my crops. For now, I can pay school fees, scholastic materials for my children, I can handle costs for food. Sales of my produce has enabled me to build my own house” (RIPAT beneficiary, 2024).*

**Table 3:** Economic factors influencing farmers’ participation on RIPAT project (n = 96)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response (s)** | **Frequency** | **Percent (%)** |
| Does farmer income level influence farmer participation in RIPAT project | Strong agree | 26 | 27.1 |
| Agree | 56 | 58.3 |
| Neutral | 8 | 8.3 |
| Disagree | 6 | 6.3 |
| Do you think cost of inputs can influence farmer participation in RIPAT project | Strong agree | 21 | 21.9 |
| Agree | 42 | 43.8 |
| Neutral | 15 | 15.6 |
| Disagree | 18 | 18.8 |
| Does market access and prices affect farmer participation in RIPAT project | Strong agree | 43 | 44.8 |
| Agree | 50 | 52.1 |
| Neutral | 3 | 3.1 |

**3.1.4 Social- cultural factor that influence farmer’s participation on RIPAT project.**

Findings (Table 4) showed that 39.6% of farmers were neutral as if norms and values influenced their participation in RIPAT project. About 25% of farmers showed that traditional norms and values influence had low influence on their participations, same as 8.3% of farmers who showed that traditions and norms had very low influence on their participation on RIPAT project. On other hand, 22.9% of farmers reported that traditions and norms had high influence on their participation on RIPAT project. About, 4.2% reported tradition and norms had high influence on their participation on RIPAT project.

*During selection of project beneficiaries we do not consider their traditions, culture, language and norms. Rather we respect these values by abiding to them (Project officer, 2024).*

**Table 4:** Social- cultural factor that influence farmer’s participation on RIPAT project (n = 96)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response (s)** | **Frequency** | **Percent (%)** |
| How community traditional norms and values influence farmers’ participation in RIPAT project | Very low | 8 | 8.3 |
| Low | 24 | 25.0 |
| Moderate | 38 | 39.6 |
| High | 22 | 22.9 |
| Very high | 4 | 4.2 |
| How does cultural traditions and practices impact farmer participation in RIPAT project | Very low | 7 | 7.3 |
| Low | 8 | 8.3 |
| Moderate | 22 | 22.9 |
| High | 52 | 54.2 |
| Very high | 7 | 7.3 |
| How does the perception of fairness and equity influence farmer participation in RIPAT project | Very low | 4 | 4.2 |
| Moderate | 20 | 20.8 |
| High | 56 | 58.3 |
| Very high | 16 | 16.7 |

**3.1.5 Influence of gender roles and norms on famers’ participation in RIPAT project**

Findings shows that gender roles and norms influences participation of farmers on RIPAT project as was reported by 66% of the study’s respondents. On other hand 34% respondents reported that gender roles and norms doesn’t have influence on farmers’ participation on agricultural based projects (Figure 3).

**Figure 3:** Influence of gender roles and norms on famers’ participation in RIPAT project (n = 96)

**3.1.6 Technical factors that influence farmer’s participation on RIPAT project**

Findings (Table 5) showed that 72.9% of farmers agreed that access to technical supports and extension services largely influence farmer’s participation in agricultural based projects while 27.1% disagreed. This mean that whenever farmers have reliable technical assistance and are sure enough to get assistance from expertise of agriculture, then significantly triggers their willingness to participate in the project. Also, results indicated that 50% of farmers showed the influence of technical assistance and access to extension services on their participation on agriculture based projects. About 29.2% of farmers showed that access to technical and extension services moderately influences their participation. While 25% of the respondents showed that access to technical support and extension services has small effects on their participation to the project. Additionally, findings showed that 95.8% of farmers agreed that adoption of technology significantly influences improvement in crop production while 4.2% disagreed. Similarly, 69.8% of farmers reported that adoption of improved agricultural technologies largely influence increase in farmers income, 28.1% were neutral and 2.1% disagreed.

**Table 5:** Technical factors that influence farmer’s participation on RIPAT project (n = 96)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Response (s)** | **Frequency** | **Percent (%)** |
| Does technical support and extension services contribute to farmers' participation in agricultural based projects | Yes | 70 | 72.9 |
| No | 26 | 27.1 |
| How technical support and extension services contribute to farmers' participation in agricultural based projects | Very good | 14 | 14.6 |
| Good | 30 | 31.3 |
| Moderate | 28 | 29.2 |
| Low | 24 | 25.0 |
| Does technology adoption influencing farmers to improve their production | Strong agree | 43 | 44.8 |
| Agree | 49 | 51.0 |
| Neutral | 1 | 1.0 |
| Disagree | 1 | 1.0 |
| Strong disagree | 2 | 2.1 |
| How does adoption rate of new technology influence farmers income | Very low | 2 | 2.1 |
| Moderate | 27 | 28.1 |
| High | 41 | 42.7 |
| Very high | 26 | 27.1 |

**3.1.7 Farmers' perception on innovations as influence in participation on RIPAT project**

Study’s findings (Figure 4) showed that 98% of respondents showed that whenever farmers perceive that the end results of the project brings new innovations greatly influence their participations. Contrarily, 2% of the study’s respondents showed that innovations of the project has no any influence on farmer’s participations.

**Figure 4:** Attitude on innovations as influence in participation on RIPAT project (n = 96)

**3.2 DISCUSSIONS**

The study aimed at determining factors which influence participation of farmers in agricultural based projects in Tanzania. Results showed that most of farmers who participated in RIPAT project were adults whose age belonged in to working group. This implied that large proportion of the farmers were energetic enough to be involved in RIPAT project and being able to be catalysts for dissemination of the learnt skills and knowledge. Also, most of farmers were female showing that agriculture in the study area is highly dominated by women. On top of that, majority of farmers were married with farming as primary occupation. Furthermore, results showed that large proportion of farmers in the study area had primary education level. This indicated that farmers had elementary education level which vital for reading and writing. This aligns with Aman et al., (2024) who also found that majority of farmers participated in agricultural based projects were married female with adult age and had primary education level. However, the study by Fredrick & Ahmad, (2023) in Tanzania, showed that in most of livestock based projects, male dominate the participations than female. This indicates that crop farming is highly dominated by female while livestock keeping is dominated by male.

It was found that access to information played a significant role in motivating farmers to participate agricultural based project. Whenever a farmer get information on existence of agricultural projects in their areas, gives a room to decide whether to participate or not. Limited access to information on the existence of the project in their areas hinders decision making on the participations. Results showed that majority of farmers realized positive benefits in participating on RIPAT project. But, few farmers were neutral as to whether realized benefits or not. Few farmers didn’t realize benefits in participating in the project. Despite few farmers who reported they have benefited less from the project, yet majority of farmers showed that the project have positive benefits to participants. The project increased production potential of farmers which ultimately increases household nutritional status. Those who didn’t realize benefits from the projects were due to misconducts and mismatch between project outputs and expectations of the farmers. This aligns with, Mdee et al., (2021) who reported that corruptions and misconducts of project implementers in Africa, results in to poor performance of the projects. This lead to mismatch between what was desired by the project and its end results. Meaning that farmers may not benefit with results of from the implementation of agricultural based projects. The same was reported by Jeremiah et al., (2023) who showed that despite the project being implemented to several farmers, but some saw the benefits of project implementation while other didn’t realise the benefits. Also, aligns with Clief et al., (2021) who showed that whenever project beneficiaries realize that project outcomes yield lower benefits than what they expected, then it weaken their participations.

Level of income of household was found to be an important factor influencing participation of farmers in to RIPAT project. Household with low income had higher chance of participating in the project than those with high income. This is due to expectations of households with low income to get assistance from the project such as access to farm inputs, financial and technical assistances which is easily accessible to households with higher income as also reported by Fredrick & Ahmad, (2023). Also, results showed that access to improved markets and access to market information greatly influence decision of farmers to participate in RIPAT project. Most of farmers in the study area are located in to remote areas mainly hillside of mount Uluguru. The area is inaccessible due to morphological factors. Therefore, implementation of RIPAT project in the study area was highly linked in to promotion of access to improved markets and reliable market information. Contrary, the study findings revealed that social cultural values and traditional norms had no influence on participation of a farmer in to RIPAT project. This implied that all traditional values in the study area were not highly considered by farmers for their participation in to the project. This was due to match of the project ethical values to those existing in the study area. This align with Giliberto & Labadi, (2022) who reported that traditions, customs and practices on his study area was an important aspect in perpetuation the project. If the project ethical values differs with local ethical values then may be results in to project failure. Also, results showed that farmers in the study area valued project sense of equity and fairness. Before joining the project. Majority of farmers reported that they took in to account as to how RIPAT project had no favoritism to its beneficiaries. Each and every farmer were treated equally. Therefore, this influenced farmers’ participation in the project.

4. Conclusion and recommendations

**4.1 CONCLUSION**

The study comes in to the conclusion that, there are numerous factors that needs to be taken in to account by implementers so as to influence farmers’ participation in to agricultural based projects. Considering these factors before and during implementation of the project may influence a full participation of the farmers and guarantee sustainability of project outcomes. Also, awareness creations is critically needed by project beneficiaries so as to break all negativities and myth about agricultural based projects. As much farmers understand what exactly the project intend to achieve, it reduce attitude, perception, myth, negativities and behavioural constraints about the project. Contrary, when farmers have low awareness on what the project want to achieve, leads to misconceptions and negative perceptions on the project. Ultimately, leads to failure of agricultural based projects.

**4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on study findings, it is therefore recommended that;

1. Implementers of agricultural based projects need to clearly understand the needs of farmers when planning and implementing the project. When objectives of the project aligns with the needs of farmers, it help to influence participation of farmers in to the project.
2. Establishment of timely monitoring and evaluations of the project implementations. This may help to fast track the effects of implemented project to the local communities.
3. Awareness creation to farmers before and during the implementation of the project on what exactly the project intend to achieve. This may help to reduce inconveniences which reduce likelihood for sustainability of the project’s outcomes.
4. Effective inclusion of project beneficiaries in to all steps. This will enhance farmers’ ownership to the project which may guarantee sustainability of project outcomes.
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