

Perceived Effectiveness of Training and Visit (T&V) Agricultural Extension Services among Arable Crop Farmers in Ijebu North Local Government Area of Ogun State

MUFUTAU, R.A.¹

Dept. of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye, Ogun State

Corresponding Author: Mufutau R. A.,

Dept. of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye, Ogun State, Email: rafiuadeniyi60@gmail.com; PhoneNo: +2348039431998

EWEBIYI, I.O.²

Dept. of Agricultural Science, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Email address: tayoewebiyi@yahoo.com, Phone No: 08055210068

ADEBANJO, O.A.³

Dept. of Agricultural Science, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Corresponding Author: Mufutau R. A., **Dept. of Agricultural Extension and Rural Sociology, Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago Iwoye, Ogun State, Email: rafiuadeniyi60@gmail.com; PhoneNo: +2348039431998**

Abstract

This study focused on arable crop farmers perceived effectiveness of OGADEP's Training and Visit extension services in Ijebu-North Local Government Area of Ogun state, Nigeria. Multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select 118 respondents for the study. Structured interview scheduled and in-depth interview were used to elicit information from the respondents. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, percentages, and mean while chi-square and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) were used as inferential tools at level of significance. The result revealed that majority (87.6%) of the respondents were within the age bracket of 27-48 years, 54.2 percent were males with 77.1 percent married. Results further revealed that respondents (54.2%) had secondary education, majority (94.1%) had household size of 1-10 members, farming experience of 1-10 years, cultivated 3-4 hectares of land (55.1%) while majority (54.2%) earned income range of ₦30,000 - ₦70,000. Creation of awareness (99.2%), social network with farmers (98.3%), market information and farm demonstration (97.5%) were OGADEP's extension services readily available and accessible to the farmers in the study area. Furthermore, OGADEP's Training and Visit Extension Services was found to be high among 84.9 percent of the respondents. There was significant relationship between farm size ($\chi^2 = 13.842$), education ($\chi^2 = 2.602$), experience ($\chi^2 = 9.243$), income ($r = 0.102$), access ($r = 0.247$), perception ($r = -0.1864$), extension services delivered ($r = -0.349$) and perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extension services. It is therefore recommended that there should be regular exposure of OGADEP's extension workers in communication skills, agricultural technical knowledge, creation of conducive working environment and adequate funding for effective linkage activities through joint priority setting, planning and programming towards enhancing effectiveness of OGADEP's Training and Visit Extension programmes in the study area.

Keywords: *perception, effectiveness and extension.*

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture plays an important role in socio-economic well-being of the people through food production and employment (Yekinni and Afolabi, 2019). Based on its importance, several states in Nigeria including Ogun state have put efforts to improve the sector. Agricultural extension services have an important role in increasing quality of the production. Additionally, they play a vital role in technology transfer and promoting technology development (Ume *et al.*, 2017; Ashraf *et al.*, 2018).

Therefore, the interaction between the extension agents and the farmers and the extent to which farmers perceive extension agents as useful to them is vital to bringing change in agricultural output and could explain the dynamics embedded in advices adopted by farmers in a given locality. The amount or type of useful information disseminated to arable crop farmers could be used to determine the effectiveness of extension agents in transferring knowledge needed by arable crop farmers to improve production (Ashraf *et al.*, 2018).

Accordingly, OGADEP's efforts have been made to provide agricultural extension services to arable crop farmers through provision of input subsidies, training arable crop farmers and provision of advisory services on proper agronomic practices. Despite these efforts, adoption of agronomic practices is still low leading to low productivity (Mohammed, *et al.*, 2015).

This is probably due to the fact that OGADEP's are not effectively transferring knowledge on good agronomic practices in arable crop production. Therefore, more information was required to assess the effectiveness of the extension agents in providing advisory services on proper agronomic practices to arable crop growers (Ashraf *et al.*, 2018).

Generally in Nigeria, the production of food crops was not considered a serious problem before independence and the little support provided by government was directed at export crops, such as cocoa, palm produce, rubber, cotton and groundnut. The first significant indication of food shortages appeared during the first decade of independence. The widening gap between demand and supply of agricultural produce and the rise in food prices and decline in foreign exchange earnings from agricultural exports since the early 1970s bore eloquent testimony to the decrease in agricultural production. The trend continued well into the late '70s and 80s'. Since then Nigerian agriculture has been unable to regain its enviable pre-independence status.

To counter the decline of the agricultural sector, the Nigerian government has designed a variety of intervention strategies over the years. The main thrust of these strategies has been two-fold: first, to increase the supply of agricultural produce to satisfy domestic food needs as well as provide surplus for exports; second, to increase the income of farmers.

Agricultural extension is defined as the entire set of organizations that support and facilitate people engaged in agricultural production to solve problems and to obtain information, skills and technologies to improve their livelihoods and well-being. They are provided by a variety of agencies in the public, commercial and voluntary sectors. Agricultural extension is a service to "extend" research-based knowledge to the rural sector, to improve the lives of farmers. It thus included components of technology transfer (Ume *et al.*, 2017), broader rural development goals, management skills and non-formal education. The traditional view of extension in Africa was very much focused on increasing production, improving yields, training arable crop

farmers and transferring technology (Ume *et al.*, 2017). Today's understanding of extension goes beyond technology transfer to facilitation; beyond training to learning and includes assisting arable crop farmers to form groups, dealing with marketing issues and partnering with a broad range of service providers and other agencies (Ashraf *et al.*, 2018).

Over the years several agricultural extension approaches have evolved and one of such approaches is the Training and Visit (T & V) system (Mohammed *et al.*, 2015). Although the T & V system was aimed at overcoming some of the limitations that characterized the conventional extension approach, the system has come under serious criticism by numerous writers in recent time (Chukwu, Nwarieji and Egwuonwu, 2015).

One of the innovations in Nigerian agricultural extension is the Training and Visit (T&V) system of extension. The system was propounded by Daniel Benor and was first developed in the early 1970s. In 1974 the World Bank formally introduced the T & V extension components in the Chambal Irrigation Command, India and the Seyhan Irrigation Project, Turkey. The Training and Visit (T&V) extension system was vigorously introduced to Nigeria in 1986 by the World Bank (1986), as an approach to agricultural extension (Fadiji and Adeniji, 2011).

The system was subsequently adopted with unprecedented enthusiasm and practiced by the Agricultural Development Programmes (ADPs) as a replacement for the earlier conventional approach to extension which has become weak and inefficient. The system was also to strengthen research- extension- linkages by making research findings more relevant to the needs of Nigerian arable crop farmers especially, those practicing subsistence agriculture. The system was designed to facilitate regular training of extension workers in order to enable them deliver recommended technologies on crops, livestock, forestry, etc. to arable crop farmers on a fortnightly basis. According to Fadiji and Adeniji, (2011) the T & V system was used initially for crops but later was adopted for other sub-sectors like live-stock, fisheries and forestry. Ilevbaoje (2004) observed that the main feature of the T & V extension system includes a single line of command and a well-defined geographical boundary of operation for each extension work. Other features of T & V system of extension includes; regular training of extension staff; usually by research institutes, arranged visits by extension agents to contact farmers, provision of feed-back to research institutes on farmers' problems, and a continuous supervision, monitoring and evaluation of extension activities (Fadiji and Adeniji, 2011). T & V system emphasizes simplicity in organization, objective and operations. It has a well-defined organization and mode of operation, provides continuous adjustment to farmers' need.

Results of recent evaluation of the effectiveness of the T&V extension have been mixed. Also, extension service in Nigeria is at the cross-roads, mainly because of the centralization of arable crop farmer-level extension functions in the village extension agents (VEAs) who are expected to be jacks-of-all trades and masters of all. Consequently, this study was undertaken to assess the arable crop farmers' perceived effectiveness of Training and Visit (T&V) extension services of OGADEP in Ijebu North Local Government, Ogun State, Nigeria.

Objectives of the study

The main objective of the study is to assess the arable crop farmers' perceived effectiveness of Training and Visit extension services of OGADEP in Ijebu North Local Government, Ogun State.

Specific objectives were to:

1. Identify the socio-economic characteristics of respondents in the study area

2. Investigate extension services delivered by T&V of OGADEP in the study area.
3. investigate respondents' access to extensions services of OGADEP delivered this Training and Visit
4. Determine perceived effectiveness of extension services of OGADEP delivered through Training and Visit in the study area.

Research Hypotheses

H01: There is no significant relationship between respondents' socio-economic characteristics and their perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extension services.

H02: There is no significant relationship between respondents' access to extension services delivered and their perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extension services.

METHODOLOGY

Ijebu North Local Government Area in Ogun State, is the study area. It has an area of 967 km² and a population of 284,336 at the 2006 census. The postal code of the area is 120. The local government was established in 1979 and has its headquarters at Ijebu Igbo. It is bounded by Oluyole Local Government of Oyo State in the North, in the West by Ijebu East Local Government, in the south by Ijebu North East, Odogbolu and Ijebu Ode Local Government, and in the East by Ikenne Local Government. The region is partitioned into local wards Atikori, Oke-Agbo, Ojowo/Japara, Oke-Sopen, Ome, Oru-awa-ilaporu, Ajegunle and Ago-Iwoye urban I, Ago-Iwoye urban II, Ako-Onigbagbo Gelete, and Mamu/Ehin-Etiri.

However, Ijebu North is known for her local trade primarily in yams, cassava, corn (maize), palm produce, and oranges; and rubber and timber have become important commercial products of the area. Also majority of inhabitants engage in poultry, piggery and fish production. Agriculture has enhanced food security in the local government and increase the quantity of protein intake of its people. The target population of this research study comprises of contact arable crop farmers of Ogun State Agricultural Development Programme (OGADEP) in Ijebu North Local Government Area, Ogun State. In Ijebu North Local Government, there are two extension blocks namely: Ago-Iwoye and Ijebu-Igbo blocks. Each of these blocks has four extension cells. List of registered arable crop farmers for each cells was collected from OGADEP's zonal office Ijebu ode. From this list, 30% of registered arable crop farmers was randomly selected given a total sample size of 118 respondents for the study. Collected data was analyzed using both descriptive and non-descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics to use are frequency counts, percentage, meanwhile inferential statistics are chi-square and Pearson product Moment Correlation PPMC.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Socio-economic characteristics of respondents

Age: Age distribution of the respondents as presented in Table 1 shows that most (67.0%) were within the age range of 38 -48 years of age. This implies that respondents were in their productive age and have vigor to engage in arable crops production. Age is an important factor when considering farming. It has been argued that age in some instances, could be an entry

Criterion for some livelihood activities. This result is in line with that of Agbarevo and

Benjamin (2013) who carried out similar study in Cross-River state, Nigeria and reported same agedistribution of farmers.

Sex:

The result in Table 1 revealed that majority of the respondents (54.2%) were male while (45.8%) were females. This implies that more males involved in arable crop production in the study area than females. This result is concomitant with Ewebiyi (2014) who reported that arablecrop production in Ogun state is male dominated.

Marital status:

The marital status of respondents as indicated in Table 1 shows that an overwhelming proportion (77.1%) were married, while infinitesimal number of them (4.2%)were single. Obviously, the married farmers have more responsibilities to provide for their families, hence, they are likely to engage in arable crop production as a complimentary activityto meet up with their economic needs. This result is consistent with that of Owolade and Arimi (2012) and Idowu (2002) who reported similar marital distribution of their respondents.

Education:

Table 1 also presents educational attainment of the respondents. Analysis of results revealed that most (54.2%) had secondary education and (38.1%) primary education. This implies that respondent are appreciably literates and this expected to positively influence their perceived effectiveness of training and visit extension services delivery approach by the extension agents in the study area. This result concurred with that of Agbarevo and Benjamin (2013) who also reported moderate literacy level or respondents in cross river state, Nigeria.

Religion:

Respondents' religion affiliation result revealed that most respondents (61.0%) were Christians while (38.1%) were Muslims and (0.8%) were traditionalists. This result connotes thatarable crop production in the study area does not have any religion restriction.

Household size:

The result of analysis of the respondents' household size in Table 1 also revealed that majority (94.1%) had household size of 1-10 members this result implies that respondents had a family large household size and they may likely make use of them on their farm labour. This result is in tandem with that of Ewebiyi (2014) who also reported large household size among male households in Southwest, Nigeria.

Farming Experience:

With regards the farming experience of the respondents, most of them (63.6%) had 1-10 years farming. This result implies that respondents in the study area are experience farmers. This is expected to impact positively on level of respondents towardsincreased income and improved well-beings.

Farm size:

Result of analysis in Table 1 as regard farm size of the respondents also revealed thatmost (55.1%) cultivated 3-4 hectares of land and (30.5%) cultivated 1-2 hectares of land. This result implies that respondents are small scale farmers and this may favourably influence them toseek support town extension agents daring training and visit. This result is in agreement with Iwuchukwu, Eke and Nwobodo (2019) that carried out similar study in Enugu state, Nigeria and reported small scale farming among their respondents.

Income:

On earned income of respondents, the result shows that most (54.2%) earned income range of ₦30,000 - ₦70,000 annually this result agrees with Agoro (2019) who also reported lowincome among organic vegetable farmers in Yewa North Local Government area of Ogun state, Nigeria. The implication of this result is that arable crop farmers in the study area are lowincome earners. This may influence them to be willing to increase their productivity, seeking relevant and support from extension agents during training and visit.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of the respondents

Variables	Frequency	percentage	mean
Age			
27-37years	22	18.6	42.6
38-48 years	79	67.0	
49-59 years	16	13.6	
60 years and above	1	0.8	
Sex			
Male	64	54.2	
Female	54	45.8	
Marital status			
Married	91	77.1	
Single	5	4.2	
Separated	10	8.5	
Divorced	5	4.2	
Widow	3	2.5	
Widower	4	3.4	
Education			
Primary education	45	38.1	
Secondary education	64	54.2	
Tertiary education	9	7.6	
Farm experience			
1-5 years	39	33.1	
6-10 years	36	30.5	
11-15 years	32	27.1	
16-20 years	11	9.3	
Religion			
Christianity	72	61.0	
	45	38.1	
Islam			
Traditional	1	0.8	

Income

30,000-50,000	26	22.0	₦70,372.9
50,001-70,000	38	32.2	
70,001-90,000	34	28.8	
90,001-100,000	20	17.0	

Household size

1-5	75	63.6
6-10	36	30.5
11-15	4	3.4

Farm size

1-2 hectares	36	30.5
3-4 hectares	65	55.1
5-6 hectares	17	14.4

Source: field survey, 2019.

4.3 Available extension services to respondents

The result of available extension services to respondents in Table 2 revealed that most respondents 99.2%, 98.3%, 97.5% affirmed that creating awareness of extension services, social network for farmers, credit procurement and organization of audio visual shows as readily available extension services. The result further showed that 96.6%, 84.7% and 72.0% acclaimed information on market facilities, advisory facilities and method demonstration are moderately available. This result implies that most of the needed extension services are readily available to farmers in the study area through training and visit of OGADEP.

Table 2: Available extension services delivered to respondents

Extension services	deliveredavailable	Low available	Not
	Hi		
ghavailable			
Creating awareness of extension services	117(99.2)	1(0.8)	0(0.0)
Training and visit to farmers	84(71.2)	34(28.8)	0(0.0)
Holding schedule meetings	84(71.2)	34(28.8)	0(0.0)
Farmers training programmes	21(17.8)	97(82.2)	0(0.0)
Advisory facilities	18(15.3)	100(84.7)	0(0.0)
Marketing facilities	4(3.4)	114(96.6)	0(0.0)
Organization of field days	31(26.3)	87(73.7)	0(0.0)
Organization of method demonstration	33(28.0)	85(72.0)	0(0.0)
Cooperative facilities	54(45.8)	64(54.2)	0(0.0)
Organization of result demonstration	114(96.6)	4(3.4)	0(0.0)
Credit facilities procurement	115(97.5)	4(2.5)	0(0.0)
Organization of audio visual shows	115(97.5)	4(2.5)	0(0.0)
Social network for farmers	116(98.3)	2(1.7)	0(0.0)
Appropriate methods of fertilizer application	85(72.0)	33(28.0)	0(0.0)
Appropriate methods of agro-chemicals application	116(98.3)	2(1.7)	0(0.0)
Treatment of planting materials	85(72.0)	33(28.0)	0(0.0)
Processing of facilities	117(99.2)	1(0.8)	0(0.0)
Storage facilities	117(99.2)	1(0.8)	0(0.0)

Procurement of planting materials	113(95.8)	5(4.2)	0(0.0)
Provision of marketing information	12(10.2)	106(89.8)	0(0.0)

Source: Field survey, 2019.

Respondents' access to available extension services

Result of analysis in Table 3 revealed that most respondents 97.5%, 95.8%, 94.9% and 92.4% attested to the fact that they have access to creating of awareness of extension services, storage facilities treatment of planting materials, method demonstration and farmers training programmes as extension services in the study area. The implication of this result is that most of the available extension services are also accessible to farmers and this is expected to influence their cooperation with extension agents during training and visit.

Table 3: Respondents' access to extension services

Extension services delivered	High access	Low access	Not accessible
Creating awareness of extension services	115(97.5)	3(2.5)	0(0.0)
Training and visit to farmers	75(63.6)	43(36.4)	0(0.0)
Holding schedule meetings	76(64.4)	42(35.6)	0(0.0)
Farmers training programmes	109(92.4)	9(7.6)	0(0.0)
Advisory facilities	48(40.7)	70(59.3)	0(0.0)
Marketing facilities	82(69.5)	36(30.5)	0(0.0)
Organization of field days	110(93.2)	8(6.8)	0(0.0)
Organization of method demonstration	110(93.2)	8(6.8)	0(0.0)
Cooperative facilities	80(67.8)	38(32.2)	0(0.0)
Organization of result demonstration	114(96.6)	4(3.4)	0(0.0)
Credit facilities procurement	82(69.5)	36(30.5)	0(0.0)
Organization of audio visual shows	109(92.4)	9(7.6)	0(0.0)
Social network for farmers	108(91.5)	10(8.5)	0(0.0)
Appropriate methods of facilities application	80(67.8)	38(32.2)	0(0.0)
Appropriate methods of agro-chemicals application	115(97.5)	3(2.5)	0(0.0)
Treatment of planting materials	112(94.9)	6(5.1)	0(0.0)
Processing of facilities	112(94.9)	6(5.1)	0(0.0)
Storage facilities	113(95.8)	5(4.2)	0(0.0)
Procurement of planting materials	72(61.0)	46(39.0)	0(0.0)

Source: Field survey, 2019.

4.6 Perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extension services.

The result of analysis as regards perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extensionservices indicated in Table 4a revealed that most respondents 97.5%, 96.6%, 92.4% and 90.7% perceived OGADEP training and visit extension services of awareness creation, market information, methods of agro-chemicals applications treatment of planting materials and storage facilities as highly effective. The result further revealed that holding of schedule meetings(88.1%) and social network for farmers (60.0) perceived moderately effective among the farmers. Respondents' categorization based on their perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extension services in Table 4b clearly showed that majority (84.9%) perceived

the training and visit extension services high effective. This result is not consistent with that of Yekinni and Afolabi (2019) in Oyo state where they reported that training and visit method of extension communication was moderately effective. Implication of this result is that respondents stand to gain a lot of benefits from the training and visit of OGADEP that will boost their productivity, increased income and improved well-being.

Table 4a: Perceived effectiveness of extension services

Extension services delivered	High effective	Low effective	Not effective
Creating awareness of extension services	117(99.1)	1(0.8)	1(0.8)
Training and visit to farmers	115(97.5)	2(1.7)	1(0.8)
Holding schedule meetings	14(11.8)	104(88.1)	0(0.0)
Farmers training programmes	75(63.6)	43(36.4)	0(0.0)
Advisory facilities	115(97.5)	3(2.5)	0(0.0)
Marketing facilities	115(97.5)	3(2.5)	0(0.0)
Organization of field days	103(87.3)	15(12.7)	0(0.0)
Organization of method demonstration	116(98.3)	2(2.5)	0(0.0)
Cooperative facilities	115(97.5)	3(2.5)	0(0.0)
Organization of result demonstration	114(96.6)	4(3.3)	0(0.0)
Credit facilities procurement	114(96.6)	4(3.3)	0(0.0)
Organization of audio visual shows	105(89.0)	12(10.1)	0(0.0)
Social network for farmers	52(44.1)	65(60.0)	0(0.0)
Appropriate methods of fertilizer application	113(95.8)	5(4.2)	0(0.0)
appropriate methods of agro-chemicals	114(96.6)	4(3.3)	0(0.0)
Treatment of planting materials	114(96.6)	4(3.3)	0(0.0)
Processing of facilities	109(92.4)	9(7.6)	0(0.0)
Storage facilities	107(90.7)	11(9.3)	0(0.0)
Procurement of planting materials	11(94.1)	7(5.9)	0(0.0)
Provision of marketing information	110(93.2)	8(6.7)	0(0.0)

Source: field survey, 2019.

Table 4b: Categorization of respondents of based effectiveness of extension services

	Frequency	percentage	mean	Sd	min.	max
Low	18	15.1	37.5	2.1	20	39
High	100	84.9				
Total	118	100				

Source: field survey, 2019

4.7 Hypotheses testing

Chi-square analysis of the relationship between respondents’ socio-economic characteristics and perception of OGADEP training and visit extension services.

Result in Table 5a shows that among the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents farm size ($\chi^2 = 13.842$, $p=0.008$), education ($\chi^2 = 2.602$, $p= 0.026$), experience ($\chi^2 = 9.243$, $p= 0.016$) and income ($r= 0.102$, $p= 0.022$) were significantly related to perception of training and visit of OGADEP in the study area. The result further showed that sex ($\chi^2 = 0.154$, $p= 0.926$) marital status ($\chi^2 = 6.767$, $p= 0.149$), household size ($\chi^2 = 1.617$, $p= 0.951$), age ($r= 0.092$, $p= 0.322$) in Table 5b are not significantly related to respondents’ perception of OGADEP training and visit extension services in the study area. The result implies that perception of OGADEP training and visit of extension services in the study area among arable crop framers is a function of farm size. Therefore farm size is a determinant of respondents’ perceived effectiveness.

Table 5a: Chi-square analysis of relationship between respondents’ socio-economic characteristics and their perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extension services

Variables	chi-square	p-value	decision
Sex	0.154	0.926	Not significant
Marital status	6.603	0.762	Not significant
Religion	6.767	0.149	Not significant
Education	2.602	0.026	Significant
Household size	1.617	0.951	Not significant
Experience	9.243	0.016	Significant
Farm size	13.842	0.008	Significant

Source: field survey, 2019

Table 5b: PPMC analysis showing relationship between age, income and respondents’ perception of OGADEP training and visit

Variable	r-value	p-value	Decision
Age	0.092	0.322	Not significant
Income	0.102	0.022	Significant

Source: field survey, 2019.

PPMC result showing relationship between access, perception, extension services delivered and perceived effectiveness

Results of analysis in Table 6 tested with the aid of Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) revealed that access ($r=0.247$, $p=0.007$), perception ($r=-0.186$, $p= 0.044$), extension services delivered ($r=0.349$, $p= 0.000$) were significant related to perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extension services among arable crop farmers in the study area. This result implies that perceived effectiveness of training and visit of extension services is a function of availability, accessibility and respondents’ perception, therefore, the aforementioned variables are determinants.

Table 6: PPMC result showing relationship between access, perception, extension services delivered and perceived effectiveness

Variables	r – value	p- value	decision
Access	0.247	0.007	significant
Perception	-0.186	0.044	significant
Extension services delivered	0.349	0.000	significant

Source: field survey, 2019.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The following conclusion are drawn from the empirical findings of this study

Respondents are predominantly males with appreciably level of education. They were in their productive years with fairly large household size of 1-10 members. Awareness of training and visit, social network for farmers, market information, result and method demonstrations are OGADEP extension services that are readily available and accessible to farmers. Perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit of arable crop framers was high among majority (84.9%). Perceived effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit extension services depend on farm size, education, experience, income, access, perception and extension services delivered.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are put forward based on the finding of the study in order to improve effectiveness of OGADEP training and visit of extension services in the study area among arable crop farmers towards higher productivity, increased income and improved well – being

1. There should be regular exposure or training of extension workers of OGADEP in communication skills and agricultural technical knowledge to keep them up dated and avoid in competence in services delivery during training and visit.
2. Extension administrators of OGADEP should create conducive environment as well as make fund available for the extension agents so that there can be effective linkage activities through joint priority settings, planning and programming.
3. Farmers should be educated on how to use extension effectiveness indicators to assess effectiveness instead of relying solely on rate of adoption.
4. Extension agents of OGADEP that are well trained and willing to relate friendly with ruralites, particularly farmers should be allowed to involved in training and visit extension services delivery in the study area. This will go a long in combating challenging situations and a lot of skills required for training and visit in rural area.

References

- Agbarevo, M. and N. Benjamin (2013) Farmers’ perception of effectiveness of agricultural extension delivery in cross-River state, Nigeria, *Journal of Agriculture and veterinary services*, 2(6), 1-7.
- Agoro. O.I. (219) Knowledge and adoption of organic Agriculture among vegetable farmers in Yewa North Local Government Area of Ogun state, Nigeria, unpublished B.sc. project, Department of Agricultural Science, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, Ogun state, Nigeria, 38-42pp.

- Ashraf. E, H.K. Sharjeel, R. Babar, M. Junaid, Q. Iqbal, R. Rasheed and N. Fatima (2018). Perceptions of extension field staff regarding technology transfer through different extension approaches. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*, 34(2), 291-300.
- Chukwu, A. O. ; Nwarieji, F. E. ; Egwuonwu, H. A. (2015) Evaluation of Training and Visit extension system in improving extension agents skills and farmers productivity in Imo state, Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture and Biosciences*, 4(3)130-133.
- Ewebiyi, I.O. (2014) Livelihood diversification among rural households in southwest Nigeria, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Agricultural extension and rural development, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria. 57-61
- Fadiji, T.O and Adeniji, O. B. (2011). Problems and prospects of organization and administration of agricultural extension in Nigeria: A Critical review. *Continental J. Agricultural Economics*, 5(2), 31 –39.
- Idowu. O.R. (2002) Farmers’ information seeking and utilization pattern on seeds and agro-chemicals in Lagos and Ogun state, Nigeria, Unpublished B.sc. project, Department of Agricultural Extension and rural Development University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.17
- Iwuchukwu, J.C, Eke, O. G. and Nwobodo, C.E (2019) perception of extension Personnel on suitability and Benefits of using social media in communicating Agricultural information in Enugu state, Nigeria, *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 23 (3): 14-36
- Mohammed, U., Olaleye R.S., Umar I.S., Ndanitsa M.A. and Jibrin S, (2015). Farmers Assessment of the Training and Visit Extension System in Niger State: Evidence from Fadama II & III in Mokwa Local Government Area of Niger State, Nigeria, *International Journal of Sustainable Agricultural Research*, 2(4), 111-119.
- Owolade, E.O. and Arimi K. (2012). Information seeking behavior and Utilization among snail farmers in Oyo state, Nigeria: Implications for Sustainable Animal Production, *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Extension*, 19 (3): 36-54.
- Ukajejofo, R.U. and Qijie, G. (2013) Effect of Extension programs on Adoption of improved farm practices by farmers in Adana, Southern Turkey, *Journal of Biology, agriculture and Health care*, 3 (15) 17-23.
- Ume, S.I., Eluwa, A.N., Okoro G.O and Silo. B.J. (2017). Adoption of Improved Crop Production Technology by Agricultural Development Programme (ADP) Contact Farmers in Anambra State, Nigeria: A Training and Visit (T&V) System Approach. *International Journal of Innovations in Agricultural Sciences*, 1 (2), 72–82.
- Yekinni, O.T. and Afolabi, C.O. (2019) farmers’ Assessment of the Effectiveness of Extension Communication Methods in Ogbomoso Agricultural Zone of Oyo state, Nigeria, *Journal of Agricultural Extension*, 23 (2): 126-133.