

## **PERCEPTIONS OF EXTENSION PERSONNEL REGARDING COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN KHARTOUM STATE, SUDAN**

<sup>1</sup>Essam Eldin Yagoub Dawalbait, <sup>2</sup>Mahmoud Hassan Ibnouf,  
<sup>3</sup>Omer Abdelmaboud Abdalla Abdelmaboud.

<sup>1</sup>Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Wealth and Irrigation, Khartoum State,

<sup>2</sup>College of Community Studies and Rural Development,

<sup>3</sup>University of Bahri, Faculty of Agriculture, Alzaeim Al Azhari University.

### **ABSTRACT**

The main purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions held by extension personnel regarding community participation in extension and rural development programs in Khartoum State, Sudan.

The study was conducted using the descriptive survey method, to describe the characteristics of extension personnel in Khartoum State. The population of the study was the personnel of agricultural extension in Khartoum State, Sudan. The total number of agricultural extension personnel eligible to participate in the study was (95) representing the entire population of the study. The survey instrument was developed by the researchers and used to collect the data. Five-point likert scales were used for the three parts of the questionnaire. The subprogram frequencies were used to analyze means, standard deviations, frequency counts, and percentages of occupational and demographic data. The reliability of the survey instrument was tested and alpha score from 0.73 to 0.89 was obtained for the entire instrument. The main findings of the study were: (1) more than fifty percent of the respondents were females, (2) the majority of the respondents obtained Master's degree, (3) the mean importance rating of six planning activities were all above 4.00, ranging from 4.02 to 4.74; four activities ranging from 3.56 to 3.77, (4) the mean importance rating of seven implementation activities were all above 4.00, ranging from 4.03 to 4.62; two activities ranging from 3.60 to 3.97, and (5) The mean importance rating of four monitoring and evaluation activities were all above 4.00, ranging from 4.15 to 4.51. On the five-point scale used in this study, the findings show that in spite of the number of significant differences identified by the Scheffe tests, the respondents were in general agreement regarding

the importance of community participation in extension and rural development programs in Khartoum State.

**Keywords:** Perceptions, Planning, Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation, Community Participation.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of community participation in development process is essential to the modern development processes. The governments and international community calls for people involvement in development process that direct affect their life. Community may participate in different development activities such as building infrastructures, roads, health services and education development. The concept of community development defines by scholars of development but the core issues related to community participation is the involvement of people/community in development processes.

The term community defined as "the active voluntary engagement of individuals/group of people to change problematic conditions and to influence policies and programs that affect the quality of their life and the life of others" (Gamble & Weil, 1995). The community should be educated and have awareness on the importance of their participation in development of their wellbeing. The community participation must be active involvement of local community in a genuine participation and not mere presence. The local community members must be involved from designing, implementation, monitoring, evaluating and maintain development projects.

Nampila (2005) referred to community participation as a method whereby the residents of a community are given a voice and choice to participate in issues affecting their lives. Theron (2005) asserts that if the process is well managed, the members are likely to take ownership of the projects that are to be implemented. Whether a community participates or not in the developmental initiatives is determined by a variety of factors, the lack of enthusiasm to participate by the community members and lack of faith and trust in local leaders are some of the factors that lead to poor community involvement. As a result people have to work as a community in order to succeed. It has been proven that the synergetic effort of the community can be a massive force and make a huge difference in community development.

Community participation implies consultation and working with and not for people. Citizens will participate and contribute meaningfully to something they feel part of, identify with, and associate with their efforts. Batten (1994) feels strongly about this point and emphasises that for community participation to be meaningful the final decision must be made by people. However, our communities sometimes do not utilize this opportunity efficiently at all points. The planned social change can only be realized through participation of the community in all stages of the

development process. The encouragement of participation of the community in programs to bring about planned social change is the base or prerequisite for the success of the community development process.

While there is a general recognition for the need to understand the perceptions of extension personnel of Khartoum State regarding the community participation in extension and rural development programs, the researchers in reviewing the literature did not find a single study regarding this area. As a result, a number of questions become increasingly relevant.

- What are the major occupational and demographic characteristics of extension personnel in Khartoum State?
- What perceptions do extension personnel have regarding community participation in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation in agricultural extension and rural development programs?

There seems to be a limited amount of current information available which would provide answers to the above mentioned questions which may be of concern to the community participation in agricultural extension and rural development programs. Therefore, this study is needed to attempt to provide some of the answers to these questions.

## **2. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES**

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of extension personnel in Khartoum State regarding community participation in extension and rural development programs. The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To identify selected occupational and demographic characteristics of extension personnel in Khartoum State.
- 2- To determine the importance of community participation in planning phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs as perceived by extension personnel in Khartoum State.
- 3- To determine the importance of community participation in implementation phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs as perceived by extension personnel in Khartoum State.
- 4- To determine the importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs as perceived by extension personnel in Khartoum State.

### **3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES**

This study was conducted using the descriptive survey method. The term "descriptive research" is used to describe characteristics of a population or phenomenon being studied, it does not answer questions about how/when/why the characteristics occurred (Shields and Rangarajan, 2013). These descriptions may be necessary for decision-making or to support broader research objectives. Descriptive research is also used to describe the characteristics of extension personnel, and supply information on the perceptions of the population sample towards the agricultural extension and rural development programs.

### **4. POPULATION AND SAMPLE**

The population of the study was the agricultural extension personnel in the Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Wealth and Irrigation in Khartoum State. The total number of agricultural extension personnel eligible to participate in the study was (95) representing the entire population of the study (administrators, subject matter specialists, & field workers).

### **5. INSTRUMENT**

The survey instrument was developed using the experiences of the researchers, and the literature. The questionnaire was pretested with different extension personnel in an effort to strengthen the survey instrument. The survey instrument covered the following areas or segments: (1) Demographic and occupational characteristics of extension personnel, and (2) Perceptions of the respondents regarding the importance of community participation in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation phases in agricultural extension and rural development programs. Likert-type scales were used as follows: 1 = Not Important, 2 = of Little Importance, 3 = Somewhat Important, 4 = Important, and 5 = Very Important.

Appropriate statistical procedures were employed to analyze and summarize the data. These procedures yielded means, standard deviations, t-tests, and one-way analysis of variance for various information presented in this study.

### **6. RESULTS**

#### **Reliability Tests**

To examine the level of internal consistency and stability of the grouped items in the instrument, Cronbach's alpha procedure was used as a part of the data analysis in reliability tests for perceptions of extension personnel regarding: importance of community participation in planning phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs, importance of community participation in implementation phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs,

and importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs. Results of the reliability tests are presented in Table 1. The alpha coefficient for the entire instrument on the perceptions regarding importance of community participation in program planning was (0.73). The items were divided into five subgroups for further analysis and discussion. The alpha coefficient for the subgroups ranged from (0.73) to (0.89). The coefficient values were deemed to be sufficiently high to proceed with analysis and interpretation.

**Table 1: Results of reliability tests on the survey instrument regarding importance of community participation in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.**

No	Instrument Scale	No of Cases	No of Items in the Scale	Alpha
1	Perceptions of extension personnel regarding the importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs	32.00	11.00	0.73
2	Perceptions of extension personnel regarding the importance of community participation in implementation phase in extension and rural development programs	32.00	10.00	0.79
3	Perceptions of extension personnel regarding the importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in extension and rural development programs	32.00	09.00	0.89

#### Perceptions of Extension Personnel Regarding the Importance of Community Participation in Planning Phase

This section describes the perceptions of extension personnel regarding the importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs. The respondents were asked to rate the importance of selected activities in planning phase. The statements were rated on a five-point scale with 1 indicating a minimum degree of importance and 5 indicating a maximum degree of importance. The planning phase covered eleven activities. Table 2 shows means and standard deviations of perceptions as indicated by extension personnel. Six activities received a rating above 4, four activities received a rating above 3, and only one activity received a rating of 2.92. the highest rated activity was "Community participation in identifying needs and problems" (4.74), followed by "Community participation to identify community resources, facilities, potentials, and services" (4.39), "Community participation to analyze community customs, traditions, and indigenous knowledge" (4.34), "Participation of CBOs and local leaders in program planning phase" (4.33), "Community participation in sorting, and prioritizing needs and problems" (4.32), and "Community participation in formulating broad policies and basis for program planning" (4.02). These activities had less variability with a

standard deviation between 1.30 and 0.55, followed closely by "Community participation in determining program objectives" (3.77), this activity had variability with a standard deviation of 1.18. The two remaining activities were rated between 2.94 and 3.69. These activities had variability with a standard deviation between 1.29 and 1.07.

In summary, on the five-point scale used in this study, the respondents tended to agree with the importance of several activities in planning phase in extension and rural development programs. As a group, they rated most of these activities between 2.94 and 4.74.

**Table 2: Means, standard deviations, and rankings regarding level of importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs as perceived by extension personnel (N=95).**

Rank	Activities	Valid Cases	Mean	S.D
1	Community participation in identifying needs and problems.	95	4.74	0.55
2	Community participation to identify community resources, facilities, potentials, and services.	95	4.39	0.78
3	Community participation to analyze community customs, traditions, and indigenous knowledge.	95	4.34	0.89
4	Participation of CBOs and local leaders in program planning phase.	95	4.33	0.87
5	Community participation in sorting, and prioritizing needs and problems.	95	4.32	0.93
6	Community participation in formulating broad policies and basis for program planning.	95	4.02	1.30
7	Community participation in determining program objectives.	95	3.77	1.18
8	Community participation in preparing and organizing for program planning.	95	3.69	1.07
9	Community participation in preparing the calendar of work.	95	3.62	1.13
10	Community participation in developing a plan of work.	95	3.56	1.14
11	Community participation in writing the program document.	95	2.94	1.29

The respondents were very similar in their perceptions regarding the level of importance of community participation in planning phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs when they were grouped and compared, based on selected demographic and occupational variables, for example (years of working experience, job grade, and current job). Table 3 presents the outcomes of the one-way analysis of variance on the level of perceptions regarding importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by years of working experience. Three significant differences were found. The results of Scheffé tests at the 0.05 level indicated that the first significant difference was found in group 1 (4 or less) at level 0.03 concerning the statement: "Community participation in sorting, and prioritizing needs and problems". The second significant difference was found in group 2(5 to 9) at level 0.04 concerning the statement: "Community participation to analyze community customs, traditions, and indigenous knowledge". The third significant difference was found in group 5 (25 or over) at level 0.04 concerning the statement: "Community participation in preparing the calendar of work". The remaining activities were rated similarly by all groups.

**Table 3: Perceptions regarding importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by years of experience (N=95).**

No	Activities	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4		Group 5		F. ratio	F. prob
		4 or less		5 – 9		10 – 19		20 – 24		25 or <			
		V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean		
			S.D		S.D		S.D		S.D		S.D		
1	Community participation in formulating broad policies and basis for program planning	25	4.44	32	4.13	14	3.21	4	3.75	20	3.95	2.23	0.07
			1.00		1.26		1.58		1.89		1.19		
2	Community participation to identify community resources, facilities, potentials, and services	25	4.40	32	4.47	14	4.07	4	4.50	20	4.45	0.72	0.58
			0.65		0.72		1.07		0.58		0.83		
3	Community participation to analyze community customs, traditions,	25	4.36	32	4.59	14	3.71	4	4.00	20	4.40	2.71*	0.04

	and indigenous knowledge		0.86		0.56		1.33		0.82		0.88		
4	Participation of CBOs and local leaders in program planning phase	25	4.36	32	4.56	14	3.79	4	4.25	20	4.30	2.06	0.09
			0.76		0.67		1.12		0.50		1.03		
5	Community participation in preparing and organizing for program planning	25	3.80	32	3.69	14	3.21	4	4.00	20	3.85	0.95	0.44
			0.96		1.06		1.31		0.82		1.09		
6	Community participation in identifying needs and problems	25	4.76	32	4.84	14	4.71	4	4.50	20	4.60	0.81	0.52
			0.52		0.45		0.61		0.58		0.68		
7	Community participation in sorting, and prioritizing needs and problems	25	4.52	32	4.50	14	3.64	4	4.50	20	4.20	2.79*	0.03
			0.77		0.76		1.15		1.00		1.01		
8	Community participation in determining program objectives	25	3.92	32	4.00	14	3.14	4	3.50	20	3.70	1.49	0.21
			1.08		1.05		1.29		1.00		1.38		
9	Community participation in developing a plan of work	25	3.32	32	3.81	14	3.21	4	3.00	20	3.80	1.49	0.21
			1.11		1.00		1.31		1.41		1.15		
10	Community participation in preparing the calendar of work	25	3.32	32	3.66	14	3.36	4	3.00	20	4.25	2.66*	0.04
			1.11		1.07		1.34		1.15		0.91		
11	Community participation in writing the program document	25	3.04	32	3.19	14	2.14	4	2.75	20	3.00	1.77	0.14
			1.27		1.20		1.29		1.26		1.34		

\* The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level

\*\* The mean difference is significant at 0.01 level



Table 4 presents the results of the one-way analysis of variance on the level of perceptions regarding importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by job grade. The findings indicated that four significant differences were found in the level of importance regarding program planning. All the differences were detected at the 0.01 level, group 3 (7 to 9) concerning the statements: "Community participation in sorting, and prioritizing needs and problems" and "Community participation in formulating broad policies and basis for program planning", group 4(10 to 14) concerning the statement: "Participation of CBOs and local leaders in program planning phase", and group 2 (3 to 5) concerning the statement: "Community participation in preparing the calendar of work". The remaining activities were rated similarly by all groups.

**Table 4: Perceptions regarding importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by job grade (N=95).**

No	Activities	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4		F. ratio	F. prob
		1-2		3-5		7-9		10-14			
		V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean		
			S.D		S.D		S.D		S.D		
1	Community participation in formulating broad policies and basis for program planning	2	2.00	27	3.59	64	4.30	2	3.00	4.42**	0.01
			0.00		1.47		1.08		2.83		
2	Community participation to identify community resources, facilities, potentials, and services	2	4.50	27	4.30	64	4.41	2	5.00	0.56	0.64
			0.71		0.91		0.73		0.00		
3	Community participation to analyze community customs, traditions, and indigenous knowledge	2	4.50	27	4.11	64	4.42	2	4.50	0.81	0.49
			0.71		1.12		0.79		0.71		
4	Participation of CBOs and local leaders in program planning phase	2	2.50	27	4.19	64	4.44	2	4.50	3.89**	0.01
			2.12		0.92		0.75		0.71		
5	Community participation in preparing and organizing for program planning	2	3.50	27	3.78	64	3.67	2	3.50	0.11	0.96
			0.71		1.09		1.10		0.71		
6	Community participation in identifying	2	5.00	27	4.63	64	4.77	2	5.00	0.70	0.56

	needs and problems		0.00		0.69		0.50		0.00		
7	Community participation in sorting, and prioritizing needs and problems	2	3.00	27	4.22	64	4.41	2	4.00	4.42**	0.01
			1.41		1.05		0.83		1.41		
8	Community participation in determining program objectives	2	2.50	27	3.74	64	3.83	2	3.50	0.56	0.64
			0.71		1.23		1.15		2.12		
9	Community participation in developing a plan of work	2	3.00	27	3.74	64	3.48	2	4.00	0.81	0.49
			1.41		1.06		1.17		1.41		
10	Community participation in preparing the calendar of work	2	3.50	27	3.70	64	3.61	2	3.00	3.89**	0.01
			0.71		1.23		1.11		1.41		
11	Community participation in writing the program document	2	2.00	27	2.74	64	3.03	2	3.50	0.11	0.96
			1.41		1.26		1.31		0.71		

\* The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level

\*\* The mean difference is significant at 0.01 level

Table 5 shows the results of one-way analysis of variance on the level of perceptions regarding importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by current job. Only one significant difference was found in the level of perceptions. The results of Scheffé tests indicated that the significant difference at (0.01 level). It was concluded that group 2 (subject matter specialists) rated the activity "Community participation in formulating broad policies and basis for program planning" higher than the other groups (administrators and field workers) respectively. The remaining activities were rated similarly as evidenced by no significant differences (at the 0.05 level) by all groups.

**Table 5: Perceptions regarding importance of community participation in planning phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by current job (N=95).**

No	Activities	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		F. ratio	F. prob
		Administrative		S.M.S		Field Workers			
		V.C	Mean	V. C	Mean	V. C	Mean		
			S.D		S.D		S.D		
1	Community participation in formulating broad policies and basis for program planning	46	3.48	6	4.30	43	3.00	4.95**	0.01
			1.48		1.08		2.83		
2	Community participation to identify community resources, facilities, potentials, and services	46	4.31	6	4.41	43	5.00	0.78	0.46
			0.89		0.73		0.00		
3	Community participation to analyze community customs, traditions, and indigenous knowledge	46	4.14	6	4.42	43	4.50	1.04	0.36
			1.09		0.79		0.71		
4	Participation of CBOs and local leaders in program planning phase	46	4.07	6	4.44	43	4.50	1.87	0.16
			1.07		0.75		0.71		
5	Community participation in preparing and organizing for program planning	46	3.76	6	3.67	43	3.50	0.10	0.91
			1.06		1.10		0.71		
6	Community participation in identifying needs and problems	46	4.66	6	4.77	43	5.00	0.63	0.53
			0.67		0.50		0.00		
7	Community participation in sorting, and prioritizing needs and problems	46	4.14	6	4.41	43	4.00	0.96	0.39
			1.09		0.83		1.41		
8	Community participation in determining program objectives	46	3.66	6	3.83	43	3.50	0.26	0.77
			1.23		1.15		2.12		
9	Community participation in developing a plan of work	46	3.69	6	3.48	43	4.00	0.48	0.62

			1.07		1.17		1.41		
10	Community participation in preparing the calendar of work	46	3.69	6	3.61	43	3.00	0.35	0.70
			1.20		1.11		1.41		
11	Community participation in writing the program document	46	2.69	6	3.03	43	3.50	0.90	0.41
			1.26		1.31		0.71		

\* The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level

\*\* The mean difference is significant at 0.01 level

### **Perceptions of extension personnel regarding the importance of community participation in implementation phase**

This section describes the perceptions of extension personnel regarding the importance of community participation in implementation phase in extension and rural development programs. The respondents were asked to rate the perceptions of selected activities in implementation phase. The activities were rated on a five-point scale where 1 indicated a minimum degree of importance and 5 indicated a maximum degree of importance.

Table 6 shows means and standard deviations regarding importance of community participation in implementation phase in extension and rural development programs. The data indicated that the statements: "Participation of local leaders and CBOs in program implementation" were rated highest in perceptions (4.62), and "Community participation in execution of demonstration fields and capacity building programs" (4.46) as the second highest in perceptions. The statements: "Community participation for the best possible use (rational) of available resources for program implementation", "Community participation in all stages of program implementation", "Community participation for cooperation and coordination among relevant agencies in program implementation", "Community involvement for disseminating program information using local mass media", and "Community participation in field visits, and activities follow-up" were rated (4.40), (4.21), (4.19), (4.12), and (4.03) respectively as the highest in perceptions. The three remaining activities were rated between 3.97 and 2.86.

In summary, on the five-point scale used in this study, the respondents tended to confirm that the seven activities are important. As a group, they rated these activities a rating of 4 or above, while the remaining activities their importance ranged between (some what important to little importance) with rating from 3.97 to 2.86.

**Table 6: Means, standard deviations, and rankings regarding importance of community participation in implementation phase in extension and rural development programs as perceived by extension personnel (N=95).**

No	Activities	Valid Cases	Mean	S.D
1	Participation of local leaders and CBOs in program implementation	95	4.62	0.57
2	Community participation in execution of demonstration fields and capacity building programs	95	4.46	0.80
3	Community participation for the best possible use (rational) of available resources for program implementation	95	4.40	0.84
4	Community participation in all stages of program implementation	95	4.21	0.98
5	Community participation for cooperation and coordination among relevant agencies in program implementation	95	4.19	0.93
6	Community involvement for disseminating program information using local mass media	95	4.12	1.03
7	Community participation in field visits, and activities follow-up	95	4.03	0.98
8	Community participation to introduce their views, and critique during implementation phases	95	3.97	1.17
9	Community involvement to make adjustments in implementation phase to achieve the desired program results	95	3.60	1.15
10	Community participation in preparing implementation progress report to steering committee	95	2.86	1.15

The respondents were very similar in their perceptions regarding the level of importance of community participation in implementation phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs when they were grouped and compared based on selected demographic and occupational variables, for example (job grade and current job). The one-way test results in table 7 showed that there was a significant differences between the perceptions of extension personnel regarding importance of community participation in implementation phase when are grouped by job grade. Only two significant differences were found in the level of importance concerning program implementation. The results of Scheffé tests at the 0.05 level, indicated that

the first significant difference at (0.01 level), was found in group 2 (3-5), the respondents rated the statement: "Community involvement for disseminating program information using local mass media" significantly higher than other groups. The second significant difference was found between group 1 (1-2) and group 4 (10-14), the data show that respondents in groups one and four rated the activity: "Community involvement to make adjustments in implementation phase to achieve the desired program results" significantly lower in importance.

Table 8 shows the results of one-way analysis of variance on the level of perceptions regarding the importance of community participation in implementation phase when extension personnel are grouped by current job. Only two significant differences were found in the level of importance concerning program implementation. The results of Scheffé tests at the 0.05 level, indicated that the first significant difference at (0.00 level), was found in group 3 (field workers), the respondents rated the statement "Community involvement for disseminating program information using local mass media" significantly lower in importance than other groups. The second significant difference was also found in group 3, concerning the statement "Community involvement to make adjustments in implementation phase to achieve the desired program results", as a lower in importance. The remaining activities were rated similarly (as evidenced by no significant differences at the 0.05 level) by all jobs. The findings suggest that, for the most part, there are no significant differences in the level of importance of program implementation.

**Table 7: Perceptions regarding importance of community participation in implementation phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by job grade (N=95).**

No	Activities	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4		F. ratio	F. prob
		1-2		3-5		7-9		10-14			
		V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean	V.C	Mean		
			S.D		S.D		S.D		S.D		
1	Community participation in all stages of program implementation	2	4.50	27	4.22	64	4.20	2	4.00	0.09	0.97
			0.71		1.12		0.95		0.00		
2	Participation of local leaders and CBOs in program implementation	2	4.50	27	4.74	64	4.56	2	5.00	0.95	0.42
			0.71		0.53		0.59		0.00		
3	Community participation for	2	4.00	27	4.22	64	4.16	2	5.00	0.57	0.64

	cooperation and coordination among relevant agencies in program implementation		0.00		0.89		0.96		0.00		
4	Community participation to introduce their views, and critique during implementation phases	2	4.00	27	4.37	64	3.81	2	3.50	1.57	0.20
			1.41		0.97		1.21		2.12		
5	Community participation in field visits, and activities follow-up	2	4.00	27	4.22	64	3.97	2	3.50	0.61	0.61
			1.41		0.89		1.02		0.71		
6	Community participation in execution of demonstration fields and capacity building programs	2	5.00	27	4.52	64	4.45	2	3.50	1.34	0.27
			0.00		0.64		0.82		2.12		
7	Community participation for the best possible use (rational) of available resources for program implementation	2	3.50	27	4.48	64	4.42	2	3.50	1.65	0.18
			0.71		0.89		0.81		0.71		
8	Community involvement to make adjustments in implementation phase to achieve the desired program results	2	2.50	27	3.81	64	3.61	2	1.50	3.37*	0.02
			0.71		1.14		1.11		0.71		
9	Community participation in preparing implementation progress report to steering committee	2	2.00	27	3.00	64	2.86	2	2.00	0.87	0.46
			0.00		1.24		1.14		0.00		
10	Community involvement for disseminating program information using local mass media	2	3.50	27	4.44	64	4.06	2	2.00	4.47**	0.01
			0.71		0.64		1.08		1.41		

\* The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level

\*\* The mean difference is significant at 0.01 level

**Table 8: Perceptions regarding importance of community participation in implementation phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by current job (N=95).**

No	Activities	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		F. ratio	F. prob
		Administrative		S.M.S		Field workers			
		Mean		Mean		Mean			
		V.C	S.D	V.C	S.D	V. C	S.D		
1	Community participation in all stages of program implementation	46	4.24	6	4.20	43	4.00	0.06	0.94
			1.09		0.95		0.00		
2	Participation of local leaders and CBOs in program implementation	46	4.72	6	4.56	43	5.00	1.27	0.29
			0.53		0.59		0.00		
3	Community participation for cooperation and coordination among relevant agencies in program implementation	46	4.21	6	4.16	43	5.00	0.81	0.45
			0.86		0.96		0.00		
4	Community participation to introduce their views, and critique during implementation phases	46	4.34	6	3.81	43	3.50	2.29	0.11
			0.97		1.21		2.12		
5	Community participation in field visits, and activities follow-up	46	4.21	6	3.97	43	3.50	0.88	0.42
			0.90		1.02		0.71		
6	Community participation in execution of demonstration fields and capacity building programs	46	4.55	6	4.45	43	3.50	1.67	0.19
			0.63		0.82		2.12		
7	Community participation for the best possible use (rational) of available resources for program implementation	46	4.41	6	4.42	43	3.50	1.17	0.32
			0.91		0.81		0.71		
8	Community involvement to make adjustments in implementation phase to achieve the desired program results	46	3.72	6	3.61	43	1.50	3.69*	0.03
			1.16		1.11		0.71		



9	Community participation in preparing implementation progress report to steering committee	46	2.93	6	2.86	43	2.00	0.61	0.55
			1.22		1.14		0.00		
10	Community involvement for disseminating program information using local mass media	46	4.38	6	4.06	43	2.00	5.79 **	0.00
			0.68		1.08		1.41		

### **Perceptions of extension personnel regarding the importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase**

This section describes the perceptions of extension personnel regarding the importance of community participation in implementation phase in extension and rural development programs. The respondents were asked to rate the importance of ten selected activities in monitoring and evaluation phase in extension and rural development programs. The statements were rated on a five-point scale where 1 indicated a minimum degree of importance and 5 indicated a maximum degree of importance.

Table 9 shows means and standard deviations regarding importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in extension and rural development programs. The data indicated that the statements: "Beneficiaries involvement in providing learned lessons and offers recommendations for improvement" were rated highest in perceptions (4.51) and "Involve beneficiaries to evaluate community satisfaction about program" (4.43) as the second highest in perceptions. The statements: "Community involvement in program monitoring and evaluation to secure transparency and clarification of program objectives", and "Community involvement in exploring the program objectives were achieved or not" were rated (4.22), (4.15) respectively as the highest in perceptions. The five remaining activities were rated between 2.70 and 3.45.

**Table 9: Means, standard deviations, and rankings regarding importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in extension and rural development programs as perceived by extension personnel (N=95).**

<b>N o</b>	<b>Activities</b>	<b>Valid Cases</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>S.D</b>
1	Beneficiaries involvement in providing learned lessons and offers recommendations for improvement	95	4.51	0.74
2	Involve beneficiaries to evaluate community satisfaction about program	95	4.43	0.71
3	Community involvement in program monitoring and evaluation to secure transparency and clarification of program objectives	95	4.22	0.89
4	Community involvement in exploring the program objectives were achieved or not	95	4.15	0.98
5	Community involvement to measure project outcomes and compare with program objectives.	95	3.45	1.29
6	Community participation in order to translates objectives into performance indicators and set target	95	3.44	1.15
7	Community inclusion to present final program results to steering committee	95	3.28	1.26
8	Community participation to determine mechanisms, indicators, standards, and criteria of monitoring & evaluation in advance	95	3.20	1.34
9	Community participation in the final reports writing	95	2.70	1.26

The respondents were very similar in their perceptions regarding the level of importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs when they were grouped and compared based on selected demographic and occupational variables, for example (job grade and current job). Table 10 shows the results of the one-way analysis of variance on the level of perceptions of the respondents regarding the importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by job grade. Only one significant difference were found on the level of importance concerning program monitoring and evaluation.

The results of Scheffé tests at the 0.05 level, indicated that the significant difference at (0.04 level), was found in group 4 (10-14), the respondents rated the statement: "Community inclusion to present final program results to steering committee" significantly lower in importance than other statements.

The one-way test results in table 11, showed that there was a significant difference between the perceptions of respondents regarding the importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in extension and rural development programs when are grouped by current job. Only one significant difference were found on the level of importance concerning program monitoring and evaluation. The results of Scheffé tests at the 0.05 level, indicated that the significant difference at (0.03 level), was found in the group three (field workers), the respondents rated the statement: "Community inclusion to present final program results to steering committee" significantly lower in importance than other statements.

**Table 10: Perceptions regarding importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by job grade (N=95).**

No	Activities	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4		F. ratio	F. prob
		1-2		3-5		7-9		10-14			
		v.C	Mean	v.C	Mean	v.C	Mean	v.C	Mean		
			S.D		S.D		S.D		S.D		
1	Community participation to determine mechanisms, indicators, standards, and criteria of monitoring & evaluation in advance	2	2.00	27	3.59	64	3.11	2	2.00	2.00	0.12
			1.51		1.15		1.39		1.51		
2	Community involvement to measure project outcomes and compare with program objectives	2	1.50	27	3.52	64	3.53	2	2.00	2.58	0.06
			0.71		1.19		1.31		1.51		
3	Community involvement in program monitoring and evaluation to secure transparency and clarification of program objectives	2	3.00	27	4.48	64	4.14	2	4.50	2.37	0.08
			1.41		0.58		0.97		0.71		

4	Community involvement in exploring the program objectives were achieved or not	2	4.00	27	4.33	64	4.11	2	3.00	1.30	0.28
			1.15		1.04		0.94		1.41		
5	Community participation in order to translates objectives into performance indicators and set target	2	3.00	27	3.59	64	3.42	2	2.50	0.71	0.55
			1.41		1.15		1.11		0.71		
6	Community inclusion to present final program results to steering committee	2	2.50	27	3.48	64	3.30	2	1.00	2.83*	0.04
			0.71		1.25		1.23		1.81		
7	Beneficiaries involvement in providing learned lessons and offers recommendations for improvement	2	5.00	27	4.41	64	4.52	2	5.00	0.75	0.53
			0.00		0.80		0.73		0.00		
8	Involve beneficiaries to evaluate community satisfaction about program	2	4.00	27	4.56	64	4.39	2	4.50	0.59	0.62
			1.15		0.58		0.77		0.71		
9	Community participation in the final reports writing	2	1.50	27	2.74	64	2.75	2	2.00	0.85	0.47
			0.71		1.13		1.33		1.51		

\* The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level

\*\* The mean difference is significant at 0.01 level

**Table 11. Perceptions regarding importance of community participation in monitoring and evaluation phase in extension and rural development programs when extension personnel are grouped by current job (N=95).**

No	Activities	Administrative		S.M.S		Field Workers		F. ratio	F. prob
		v.C	Mean	v.C	Mean	v.C	Mean		
			S.D		S.D		S.D		
1	Community participation to determine mechanisms, indicators, standards, and criteria of monitoring & evaluation in advance	46	3.48	6	3.11	43	2.00	1.61	0.21
			1.18		1.39		1.51		

2	Community involvement to measure project outcomes and compare with program objectives	46	3.38	6	3.53	43	2.00	1.44	0.24
			1.27		1.31		1.51		
3	Community involvement in program monitoring and evaluation to secure transparency and clarification of program objectives	46	4.38	6	4.14	43	4.50	0.82	0.45
			0.68		0.97		0.71		
4	Community involvement in exploring the program objectives were achieved or not	46	4.31	6	4.11	43	3.00	1.86	0.16
			1.00		0.94		1.41		
5	Community participation in order to translates objectives into performance indicators and set target	46	3.55	6	3.42	43	2.50	0.82	0.45
			1.24		1.11		0.71		
6	Community inclusion to present final program results to steering committee	46	3.41	6	3.30	43	1.00	3.63*	0.03
			1.24		1.23		1.81		
7	Beneficiaries involvement in providing learned lessons and offers recommendations for improvement	46	4.45	6	4.52	43	5.00	0.53	0.59
			0.78		0.73		0.00		
8	Involve beneficiaries to evaluate community satisfaction about program	46	4.52	6	4.39	43	4.50	0.32	0.73
			0.57		0.77		0.71		
9	Community participation in the final reports writing	46	2.66	6	2.75	43	2.00	0.37	0.69
			1.14		1.33		1.51		

\* The mean difference is significant at 0.05 level

\*\* The mean difference is significant at 0.01 level

## 7. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The researchers recognize the need to initiate and establish general conclusions and recommendations to serve as a basis for developing an ideal framework for community participation in planning phase of extension and rural development programs. A review of the findings of this study resulted in the following conclusions:

1. The mean importance rating of six planning activities were all above 4.00, ranging from 4.02 to 4.74. Four activities ranging from 3.56 to 3.77. While one activity rated 2.94. The two activity items rated most important, in descending order were: "Community participation in identifying needs and problems" (4.74), and "Community participation to identify community resources, facilities, potentials, and services" (4.39). On the five-

point scale used in this study, the respondents tended to agree with the importance of the majority of activities in the program planning phase.

2. The respondents were very similar in their perceptions regarding the level of importance of community participation in planning phase in agricultural extension and rural development programs when they were grouped and compared, based on selected demographic and occupational variables.
3. One significant difference was found when the respondents were grouped by age and current job, two differences were found when the respondents were grouped by gender, three differences were found when the respondents were grouped by years of experience, and four significant differences were found when the respondents were grouped by job grade.

Based on the findings, and the conclusions drawn, the following recommendations are made:

1. Because most of the significant differences in the ratings of the perceptions regarding importance of community participation in program planning phase were attributed to the difference of job grade, it is recommended that the administrators of the State Ministry of Agriculture should provide training to agricultural extension personnel in order to improve their knowledge and skills to secure their routinely promotion to the higher grade in order to insure the job satisfaction of extension personnel.
2. Because the statements of "Participation of local leaders and CBOs in program implementation" and "Community participation in execution of demonstration fields and capacity building programs" rated the highest in importance. Training programs should be conducted for agricultural extension personnel on how to involve local leaders and CBOs. Involvement should also be made available for community in execution of demonstration fields and capacity building programs to secure their contribution in agricultural extension programs.
3. The results of this study should be shared with extension administrators, community leaders, CBOs, and individuals for better improvement of extension and rural development programs in Khartoum State.

## REFERENCES

- Batten, T.R. (1994), The Major Issues and Future Direction of Community. Community Development Journal, Vol.9.No.3, pp96-103.

- Gamble, D., & Weil, M. (1995), Citizen Participation. In Encyclopedia of Social Work, 19th Edition (pp. 483-494). Washington, DC: NASW press.
- Nampila, T. (2005), Assessing community participation–the Huidare informal settlement. University of Stellenbosch.
- Shields, Patricia, and Rangarajan, Nandhini. (2013), A Playbook for Research Methods: Integrating Conceptual Frameworks and Project Management Skills, New Forums Press Stillwater, OK.
- Theron, F. ( 2005), Public Participation as a Micro-level Development Strategy. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.