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Summary

Farm Practical programme addresses the shortcomings in curricular of agricultural graduates enabling them to acquire knowledge and practical skills needed to become proficient in agriculture. The study contributes in providing insights into perceptions of level 400 agricultural students regarding the Farm Practical Year (FPY) programme at the University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria. A total of 261 sample students were selected through stratified sampling procedure from 11 core agricultural departments and administered with pre-tested questionnaire. Results show that the programme provided students with 'hands-on' experience and opportunity to apply theory learnt in classroom to a real-life field situation in which students had to adapt and solve problems on daily basis. Students also felt strongly that the farm practical would contribute to their professional career and employability on graduation. However, certain perceived problems were raised by students such as lack of on-campus accommodation, delay in payment of allowances and paucity of resources. It is recommended that greater efforts are needed to mentor students to take active interest in farm practical while human and material resources strengthened to deliver this mandate.
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Introduction

An attempt to increase the technical know-how of the nation’s university graduates of agriculture necessitated the introduction of the Farm Practical Year (FPY) programme. According to Ogunbameru (1986), this process of gaining knowledge and practical skill through observation and by doing is called internship. In Nigeria, it is mandatory and indeed a policy of the National Universities Commission (NUC) that agricultural undergraduates in the fourth year of the five-year degree be exposed to farm practical year. This was also in line with the NUC Minimum Academic Standards introduced in the late 1980’s that specified the need for Students Industrial Work Experience Scheme (SIWES) for degree programme in agriculture, forestry and other disciplines (Olawoye, 2006). Again, programme of this nature could be valuable in increasing the practical content and skills knowledge of students if delivered in a way that the programme is really designed. Undergraduate agricultural students must determine how to solve farm practical problems, gather and organise farm data or information, develop and formulate technical reports. These practices promote ownership of knowledge and translate into critical thinking skills they need to find out for themselves (Bransford et al., 2000; White and Fredericksen, 1998). Students participation in farm practical can also be an effective means of experiential learning and associated skills development (Matter and Steidl, 2000; Mc Cleery et al., 2005). This is the hallmark of the inquiry approach (Young, 1997).

To this end, the roles of Faculties / Colleges of Agriculture in producing agricultural graduates for academic and professional leadership and management are critical to national social progress and economic growth (Amalu, 2006). But, in recent years, along with a rapid expansion in the number of agricultural faculties / colleges, poor vocational competence and near-zero practical skills in agriculture became evident. This necessitated the Round-Table Conference of Deans of Agriculture of Nigerian universities on Practical Training in June 2006 organised by the Leventis Foundation (Nigeria) Limited, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta and National Universities Commission. However, this situation is not peculiar to Nigerian universities but elsewhere (Warren, 1998; Maguire, 2000; Zinah et al., 2001). In India, the World Bank (1995) observed that there was little emphasis in the curricula on preparing the agricultural graduates for better career in agriculture or agribusiness outside government jobs. In Ghana, Okorley (2001) reported that only 20 per cent of final year university agricultural students surveyed indicated a definite willingness to pursue agribusiness as a self-employment venture because of the poor practical training delivered by the curriculum. Again, Okorley (2001) reported that the Head of Departments of three Faculties of Agriculture in Ghana were of the opinion that the present curricula for teaching agriculture in the universities were not adequate to address the training needs for self-employment in agribusiness. Others have advocated for education that produces university graduates who can create rather than seek employment (Munownenyu, 1999). Consequently, the traditional classroom lecture-based delivery systems provide limited opportunity to acquire the necessary skills and experience to explore careers (Nikolova-Eddins et al., 1997; Mc Lean, 1999; Ryan and Campa, 2000; Boersma et al., 2001; Perry and Smith, 2004).

Perhaps one of the strongest arguments in the justification for establishing Universities of Agriculture in Nigeria is the need to produce a critical mass of new cadre of agriculturist. The FPY programme presents the university a unique opportunity to reinforce the practical application of all the theoretical inputs that have gone into her products. FPY has been exposing undergraduate agricultural students to all aspects of agricultural production process in crops, livestock, fisheries and forestry. Rather than being theoretical with theories about farming, level 400 agricultural students learn through FPY by actually participating in it. Such knowledge that students discover and build for themselves is also more meaningful and durable (Resnick and Chi, 1988).

At the University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, the FPY programme was initiated in 1992 and designed to provide the chief source of six months practical training for level 400 agricultural students to learn, develop and have hands-on experience needed in today’s changing agriculture. The programme is managed by the University Teaching Farms Management Committee (TEFAMAC) and has trained over 4000 students since inception. It could be assumed that the provision of farm practical would make undergraduate agricultural students favorably disposed to it, hence, the need to clarify this assumption by examining the perceptions of students to it. Furthermore, new educational programme is required to evaluate the effectiveness and areas that need adjustments or improvements. This should provide information vital to an organisation’s survival and prosperity (Bryson, 1988). It is against the backdrop that the study sought to provide answers to the following research questions:

- What are the perceptions of the students regarding farm practical year programme?
- What are the perceptions of students to the severity of problems encountered during the farm practical year programme?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the perceptions of undergraduate agricultural students toward
Farm Practical Year (FPY) programme at the University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria. The specific objectives were to:

- describe the demographic profile of students;
- describe and explore the perception of students to the Farm Practical Year (FPY) programme;
- determine the perception of severity of problems faced by students during the programme.

**Literature review**

Perceptions refer to an individual’s current appraisal of an object or programme (Hinkson and Keith, 2000). Duncan (2004) found that secondary educators either agreed or strongly agreed that the agricultural technology programme curriculum will contribute to a student’s success in the agricultural industry and that the programme offers a valuable education for students. Akinsorotan (2001) viewed it as a sort of psychological reasoning or conclusion drawn from observed phenomena. It is an active cognitive process on one hand, and on the other, a mechanistic system fixed by inherent structure of the nervous system.

Allo and Schwass (1982) found that unless agricultural students have been effectively trained, they may not be able to perform the task that an efficient service will require from them to reach rapid and sustained agricultural growth. Training and transfer of technologies form the core of the process of development and the effectiveness of the agricultural services could be markedly reduced if the quality of agriculturist is poor. It has been observed also that agricultural transformation cannot take place in developing countries unless there is improved technical knowledge in the sector (Nigerian Tribune, 2004). In terms of training, Oloruntoba (2006) reported that this is vital in any organization because it ensures improvement in job behaviours and brings about higher standard of competencies. Prasad (1994) posited that training in general include acquisition of knowledge, skill and attitude, no matter what type of, level or length of training under consideration. This means that, training is not simply restricted to production aspects but an application of knowledge, skill and attitude needed to improve employer’s ability in solving production problem and adopting improved practices and techniques at the field level. Youdeowie and Kwarteng (1995) found that training is useful only when designed to meet training needs, and is offered to people who will benefit from it. Hence, training needs are the competencies that must be acquired by trainees to enable them perform their jobs at the optimal level.

Anyanwu (1997) indicated that the idea of participation in practical work implies that success is ensured where efforts of the apprentice are supplemented or aroused by the direction of authorities involved. Edozien (2002) believed that Nigeria future lies in the participation of youths in agriculture and in the empowerment of youths. In a related issue, Gidden (1997) posits that individual participate in social structures and through their participation produce and reproduce these structures. Agboola (1998) reported that people participate in things that affect them as a basic need for human beings.

**Methodology**

The target population consisted of all 326 FPY students (level 400) listed by the Students Industrial Work Experience Scheme (SIWES) Unit of the university for 2005/2006 session, but, data was received and analysed from sample of 261 students which represented 80 per cent of usable questionnaire. Systematic sampling procedures of a stratified sample were used for the study. The sample was stratified to ensure that all students in the eleven (11) core agricultural departments were included.

The instrument was field tested for content and face validity by panel of expert consisting of faculty members in the Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development. Minor corrections and restructuring of the instrument were made based on the recommendations of the panel of experts. The instrument was pilot tested with 30 undergraduates’ agricultural students at the Olabisi Onabanjo University, Yewa Campus, Ayetoro, Ogun State, Nigeria. Responses were used to improve the content validity of the instrument. The internal consistency reliability estimate of the instrument was calculated using Cronbach’s Coefficient (α=0.75).

Part A of the instrument elicited information on socio-economic profile of the students. These variables were based on personal characteristics that were shown in literatures to be related to perception such as age, gender, cumulative grade point average (CGPA), where accommodated in session, place of domicile and parental occupation. Part B elicited information on perceptions of students to FPY programme. The students were asked to indicate their agreement with 34 statements based on perceptions identified in literatures and through experience. The items were measured using a four point Likert scale type of response ranging from strongly disagree =4 points; disagree=3 points; strongly agree=2 points; agree=1 point. Part C elicited data on the degree of the severity of the problems faced in the FPY programme. The items were also measured on a four point scale type of response ranging from very severe =4 points; severe=3 points, less severe=2 points; not all severe=1 point.

The data collected were analyzed using the SPSS version 11 for both descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics tools used include frequency counts.
Results and discussion

Objective 1: Demographic Profile of students

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the students. The mean age of students was 25.3 years old (SD= 2.44). Majority of the students (98.2%) were between 16 and 25 years old. Most of them were males (60%) and majority (73%) secured accommodation off-campus during the session. Ninety percent had permanent residence in an urban area while only 10 per cent were in rural area. The mean cumulative grade point average (CGPA) was 3.37 (SD=.63) and majority (85.4%) of the students had CGPA of 2.50-4.49 while very few (3.6%) had 4.50 and above. Furthermore, majority (80.9%) also claimed that none of their siblings were studying or had studied agriculture. In terms of parental occupation, half proportions of the students’ parents were civil servants while few engaged in farming. This implied a glowing positive acceptance of agriculture as a course among children of the urban elite.

Objective 2: Perception of students regarding the Farm Practical Year Programme

This section presents the perceptions of students under four sub-heads: perceptions regarding job prospects on graduation, perceptions regarding improved academic performance, perceptions regarding teaching instructions and strategies and perceptions regarding FPY generally.

Perceptions Regarding Job Prospects on Graduation

Table 2 shows students’ perceptions regarding job prospects on graduation. Majority of students agreed strongly with four highest rated statements $M=3.44$, ‘Farm practical experience would enhance employability on graduation’; $M=3.35$, ‘Curriculum in FPY would contribute to my success in agribusiness on graduation’; $M=3.27$, ‘FPY would increase my agribusiness’; and $M=3.26$, ‘FPY offers a valuable hands-on experience for students interested in agribusiness’. The corresponding $t$-values computed were 54.85, 52.38, 63.53 and 55.57. Students however disagreed with the lowest rated statement, $M=2.97$, ‘I will be a better agriculturist in future’. Each of these $t$-values were statistically significant at less than 1% level thus leading us to reject the null hypothesis $H_0$, that is, the mean score of agreement regarding job prospects on graduation was not statistically significant. Therefore, of the six statements, students had the highest perceived levels of increased employability on graduation. The developments are indicative of the potential of FPY to make graduates job creator rather than seekers. It is essential for the students to become problem-solvers and to obtain ‘hands-on’ experience within their profession before graduation (Beer, 1995; Nokolova-Eddins et al., 1997; McLean, 1999; Boersma et al., 2000). Such experience positions students to be more ‘marketable’ upon graduation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (Years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age=25.26; SD=2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Grade Point Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50-2.49</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50-3.49</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50-4.49</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50 and above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean=3.37; SD=.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where accommodated in session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of domicile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibling studying agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil service</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil service</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field survey, 2006

Table 1. Demographic profile of respondents.
Perceptions Regarding Improved Academic Performance

Table 3 shows students’ perceptions regarding improved academic performance. Majority of the students strongly agreed with three highest rated statements, M=3.38, ‘Combination of lectures and practical had exposed students to real problems on the field’; M=3.34, ‘FPY increased transferability of theory learnt in class to practical situation on the field’; and M=3.33, ‘FPY will enhance my overall GPA’. The corresponding t-values computed were 58.23, 50.39 and 49.48. Students agreed with three other statements with mean values of 3.00 to 3.08. However, students strongly disagreed with the lowest rated statements M=1.81, ‘FPY decreased transferability of theory learned in class to practical on the field’, M=1.82, ‘the programme would not bridge the skill gap in field practical’. Each of the t-values were statistically significant at 1% level thus leading us to reject the null hypothesis H₀₂, that is, the mean score of perceptions regarding improved academic performance was not statistically significant. Hence, of the nine statements, majority of the students had the highest perceived levels of FPY on their academic performance. Lindner and Dooley (2002) also found that performance requires application of related knowledge and helps make possible the acquisition of new knowledge.

Perceptions Regarding Teaching Instructions and Strategies

Table 4 shows perceptions regarding teaching instructions and strategies. Students agreed strongly with one highest rated statement M=3.21, ‘FPY instructors made adequate planning and informed decisions regarding the programme’. Students strongly favoured university teaching farm experience, M=3.18, ‘Now that we have started, my perception of FPY is positive’. Students agreed with three other statements with mean values of 3.00 to 3.05. However, students strongly disagreed with the lowest rated statement M=2.30, ‘Students did not preferred outside the university exposure’. The corresponding t-value computed was 46.88. Students also agreed with three other statements with mean values of
3.05-3.18. However, the students disagreed with the lowest rated statement, ‘My parents do not prefer outside the university exposure’. The corresponding t-value computed was 28.32. The t-value was statistically significant at less than 1% level thus leading us to reject the null hypothesis H03, that is, the mean score of perceptions regarding teaching instructions and strategies was not statistically significant.

Perceptions of Students Regarding FPY Generally

Table 5 shows students perceptions regarding the FPY generally. Students agreed strongly with two highest rated statements M=3.33, ‘FPY experience was a worthwhile venture’ and M=3.25, ‘My parents impression of FPY was positive’. The corresponding t-values were 51.41 and 46.45. Students also agreed with three other statements with mean values 3.03 to 3.18. However, students strongly disagreed with the lowest rated statement, M=1.82, ‘My parents impression of FPY was negative’. The corresponding t-value computed was 24.44. The t-value was statistically significant at less than 1% level thus leading us to reject the null hypothesis H04, meaning that the mean score of perceptions regarding FPY generally was not statistically significant. This corroborated the submission by Millenbah and Millspaugh (2003) that the intensive field experience was a strategy to gain the necessary skills and experience.

Objective 3: Perceptions of severity of problems faced by students during FPY

The result presented in Table 6 showed the perception of problems faced by students in the practical programme. These appeared to be the major causes of dissatisfaction among students. Crucial among these problems is inadequate on-campus accommodation during FPY as perceived by most of the students (62.7%). Students (63.9%) also indicated a very severe delay in the payment of allowances. Majority of the students (80%) also perceived the paucity of resources such as agricultural inputs as serious problem mitigating FPY programme.

Students also claimed that, apart from doing mundane tasks, the programme was laborious and led to drudgery. They were subjected to the use of local farm implements including hoes and cutlasses on the allocated plots. They also claimed that their output from such plots were valued and seldom adequately rewarded. Inadequate vehicles for transporting students to and from extension villages and farms was a moderately severe problems as claimed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Perceptions of Students to FPY Programme Generally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPY experience is a worthwhile venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parent’s impression of FPY was positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer group interactions during FPY is a worthwhile experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I made a right decision to enrol in agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FPY was an eye-opener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My enthusiasm about FPY before we started was negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The FPY was a good programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPY duration should be reviewed downwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPY was a time-waster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPY duration was quite right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents perception of FPY was negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert-scale type: 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3 = agree and 4 = strongly agree; M=Mean; SD = Standard Deviation; p=Sig. (2-tailed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Perceptions of severity of problems faced by students during FPY (n=261)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Not living on the campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of inputs and other operating supplies to do adequate practical job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of safety ware exposes students to danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inadequate instructors to cope with teaching supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Delayed in payment of allowances is demoralising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inadequate government subvention is lowering the quality of the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Inadequate vehicle dedicated to conveying students to and from extension villages and demonstration farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Methods used in teaching practical was laborious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teachers failed to use combination of instructional strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Uncertainty in weather condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likert-scale type: 1= not severe, 2= less severe, 3 = severe, and 4 = very severe.
by more than half (54.7%) of the students. According to
ethical consideration, institutions have a responsibility to
ensure the safety of all those associated with the farm prac-
tical. However, majority of the students (72.8%) claimed
that lack of safety ware exposes them to danger during the
FPY. But uncertainty in weather condition was not regard-
ed as a problem by the majority of the students (82.7%).
However, most of the students (68.1%) felt that inadequate
subvention from government was not affecting the qual-
ity of the programme. It should be noted that the task of
an instructor is not only to know what skill the learners
must acquire, but also the process by which the skills are
acquired. But, majority of the students (81%) felt that fail-
ure of instructors to use different instructional methods
was a very severe problem in the FPY. Finally, inadequate
instructors to cope with teaching and supervision of field
practical were perceived as a very severe to severe prob-
lems by majority (80%) of the students.

**Conclusion and recommendations**

Employers of labour nowadays demand that graduates
of agriculture be well-grounded in practical content. The
Farm Practical Year programme provided students with
'hands-on' experience and opportunity to apply theory
learnt in classroom to a real-life field situation in which
students had to adapt and solve problems on daily basis.
Students were generally consistent and tend to agree in
their perceptions regarding the Farm Practical Year pro-
grame.

Students had also benefited both theoretically in the
classroom instructions as well as technically in the field.
This implies that the Farm Practical Year had proved to be
a novel programme availing opportunity for undergradu-
ate agricultural students to gain practical skills supple-
mented by theoretical knowledge in agriculture. This no
doubt would enhance employability or self-employment
in agribusiness on graduation. In order to make the pro-
grame relevant and increase the quality of teaching, in-
structors should avail themselves of modern techniques in
agriculture. Furthermore, students should be exposed to
private farms outside the university as a way of strength-
ening knowledge and skills in modern agriculture.

Findings of this study also indicate that the programme
has beneficial outcomes despite certain perceived problems
by students. As noted earlier, the severity of problems
faced during FPY calls for adoption of a re-newed stra-
gy to re-orientate resources and deliver the programme.
This becomes necessary since the programme was based
on the premise that a combination of factors comprising
the right technology, access to physical inputs, adequate
instructors and enabling environment are essential to get
the programme moving and facilitate learning among stu-
dents. Learning is the mental activity by means of which
knowledge and skills, habits, attitudes and ideals are ac-
quired, retained and utilized resulting in the progressive,
adaptation, modification of conduct and behaviour.

In general, University must ensure that proper percep-
tion, appropriate attitude and right teaching / communi-
cation behaviour are acquired through sound practical
agricultural training. To this end, there is a need to put
in place adequate resources and learning environment
for the field-based practical. University should also show
more concern with the welfare of students and staff at large
including mental, physical health and safety, and take all
possible precautions to avoid incidental injury. Mentoring
is an excellent means for students to receive technical and
psychosocial support students could benefit from various
mentoring relationships. Consequently, mentoring of stu-
dents which is an essential aspect of career development
should be encouraged by the university not only in the
FPY but throughout students’ career.

Finally, in future longitudinal studies should be con-
ducted to verify these findings as new entrants join the
programme and as university achieved or failed to achieve
the strategic objectives in ensuring that the University
Teaching Farms Management Committee (TEFAMAC) is
fulfilling its mission.
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