

AGRICULTURE STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT OF THE FARM INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME OF UNIVERSITIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

*Omotesho, K. F.¹, G. B. Adesiji, K. S. Obaniyi² and¹A. F. Akinrinde

Department of Agricultural Extension and Rural Development, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria

²Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension, Landmark University, Omu-Aran, Kwara State, Nigeria

Abstract

The reluctance of Nigerian agriculture graduates to take up careers in agriculture-related enterprises have been blamed on the theoretical nature of the learning experience in the Universities and Colleges of Agriculture in spite of the student internship programme designed to teach practical agricultural skills. This study, therefore, assessed the student internship program in Universities in Kwara State, Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study included investigations into the internship experience of the students, their attitude towards the programme, their assessment of the programme and the challenges they face during the programme. A multi-stage sampling technique produced a total of 130 respondents drawn from Universities across the state. Primary data was collected by using a structured questionnaire. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data collected. The result shows that there was slightly more male (54.6%) agriculture students and the mean age was 23 years. They were largely cosmopolitan (85.4%), and most (70.0%) had practical agriculture experiences prior to the internship programme (70%). However, only about half (49.2%) of the students chose agriculture when seeking admission into the Universities. Poultry-related skills were the most acquired (Weighted Mean Score =1.95) while skill acquisition in agricultural extension, agricultural marketing (Weighted Mean Score =1.5) and apiary (Weighted Mean Score =1.3) were weak. The students rated nine (9) of the twelve (12) parameters set to assess the programme as satisfactory. They were, however, unsatisfied with the grading system adopted to rate students' performance (Weighted Mean Score =1.90), the methods of skill delivery by the facilitators (Weighted Mean Score =1.97) and the attitude of the supervisors to the students (Weighted Mean Score =1.97). The poor transportation system was identified as a major challenge to students. The study concluded that the student internship programme was on the average satisfactory but identified room for improvement. The study recommended a review of the grading system, training of facilitators and the provision of adequate transportation for the students as measures to improve the programme.

Keywords: Student Internship Programme, Attitude, Assessment, Skills and Agriculture Students

Introduction

The state of the Nigerian agriculture reiterate the need for favourable agricultural policies and improved technologies that will guarantee efficient production and progressively transform the nation's agriculture from its current small-scale subsistent levels of production. (Ademola and Agbebaku, 2006). The entrance of technically competent and vocational skilled layers into the agricultural sector of the country will no doubt contribute to the realisation of the millennium development goal of reducing hunger and poverty in the country. The hundreds of agriculture graduates turned out annually by universities in Nigeria could be a formidable force for its drive.

However, the subject of the preparedness of these graduates for agricultural entrepreneurship has been debated. According to Ademola and Agbebaku (2006), if the production end will meet the ever increasing demand for food and raw materials, it is justifiable to query an educational programme which produces graduates of agriculture who can only function either as researchers or technocrats. Post-independence educational system in Nigeria placed emphasis strictly on academic excellence, rather than the acquisition of vocational skills which prepares the individual for a

more useful and fulfilling life (Adesina, 1982, Omoruyi and Osunde 2004). This scenario was permissible until white-collar jobs became so scarce that unemployment became a common phenomenon even among university graduates (Ademola and Agbebaku (2006). Unemployment among youth has attained an embarrassing height and analysts have connected this problem to the high level of vandalism, crime and anti-social acts prevalent in Nigeria (Ladele, 1998). The observed failures of agriculture students to embrace agricultural production related careers led to renewed interest in agricultural education to create agricultural entrepreneurs.

Experiential learning is not a new concept of learning and according to Kolb and Kolb (2005), there is the need to reinforced theory with practice as well as guide all practices with sound theory. Lewis and Williams (1994) noted that, in higher learning situations, experiential learning is conducted in the form of field-based experiences or by crediting of prior learning. Acker (1999) said that students' education should include the development of broad thinking skills to initiate problem-solving skills; and further asserted that students need to examine agriculture from a systems perspective, including social, biological and physical

systems. Navarro (2004) opined that students should learn about, and experience their environment. This experience expected to prepare them to compete in the dynamic workplace typical of agricultural farms. Bruening and Frick (2004) found that most of the today's companies are interested in only graduates with cross-cultural experiences. Inculcating field and practical experiences into institutional programmes are what all schools should engage in so as to enhance the quality of the programmes they offer. With diminishing opportunities for formal employment, educational institutions are being encouraged to provide relevant forms of education designed to promote self-reliance and responsible entrepreneurial capacity for self-employment (Rao, Wright, and Mukherjee, 1990).

According to Ogunbameru (1986), agricultural students' internship programme also called Farm Practical Year (FPY) programme is a programme aimed at enabling students to gain knowledge and practical skills through observation and by doing. The Nigerian National Universities Commission (NUC), mandates every University to expose its students of agriculture to farm work in their fourth year (Ademola and Agbebaku, 2006; Odo, 2011). The justification for the

training programme is that it will afford the trainees the opportunity to "learn by doing" by undertaking practical farming activities on both crop and livestock production as well as other aspects of agriculture. Olorunoba, (2008) ascertained that the farm practical programme was an effort to boost the technical know-how of graduates of agriculture in Nigeria. He further stated that it was a unique opportunity to reinforce the application of all the theoretical inputs that have gone the Universities' products. Rather than being theoretical about learning of agriculture, 400 level agriculture students learn through farm practical year programme by actually participating in the agricultural sector at different levels. The provision of the experience is expected to make undergraduate agriculture students favourably disposed to farming.

Experts believe that these experiences promote ownership of knowledge and translate to critical thinking skills (White and Fredericksen, 1998; Bransford *et al.*, 2000). Students participation in farm practical training can also be an effective means of experiential learning and associated skills development (Matter and Steidl, 2000; McCleery *et al.*, 2005). According to Rao *et al.* (1990), Entrepreneurial Skill Programmes are gaining

prominence in the developing nations
efforts towards solving problems
related to under-utilized human
resources and economic decline,
resulting from lack of employment
opportunities in the formal economy.
The Farm Practical Training
programme is fashioned within the
principles of Entrepreneurial Skill
development, (Ademola and
Agbebaku, 2006)

In the original concept of the student
internship programme in many
universities, it was designed that
trainees otherwise known as interns
could be seconded to farms or
agriculture-related industries for a
minimum period of six months during
which university supervisors would
visit to evaluate them. The initial
difficulty in securing placements for all
the students led to the current practice
of engaging trainees in the
university teaching and research farms.
Under this programme, agriculture
students determine how to solve
practical farm problems, gather and
organise farm data or information,
develop and formulate technical
reports. To this end, the roles of
faculties of Agriculture in
producing agricultural graduates for
academic and professional leadership
and management are critical to national

social progress and economic growth
(Amalu, 2006).

Statement of the Research Problem

The National Policies on Education in
Nigeria recognises the relevance of
vocational courses in the educational
curriculum. The National Universities
Commission (NUC) is also firm in its belief
that agricultural training at the universities
should not be geared toward attaining
academic knowledge only but should also
emphasise practical agriculture capable of
developing skills in trainees and leading to
self-employment especially now that the
white collar jobs are not as available as they
used to be (Ademola and Agbebaku,
2006). This is the rationale behind the
compulsory internship programme that has
been built into the curriculum of Nigerian
Universities. One of the desired effects of
this programme is that it will stimulate the
students' interest in agricultural
entrepreneurship as a career thereby raising
production and contributing to food security.

Unfortunately as revealed by various studies,
agricultural entrepreneurship has continued
to remain unpopular among Nigerian youths
including graduates of agriculture many of
whom are found in offices with little or no
relationship with agriculture. In spite of the
high rate of unemployment, they are not
readily interested in farming and other
agricultural activities. There have also been
unfavourable comments from employers
about the quality of graduates especially in

the area of practical application knowledge acquired.

It is possible to blame the poor quality of agriculture graduates and their poor interest in agricultural entrepreneurship on the failure of the student internship programme to produce the expected effect on the students. This failure may also be connected to the attitude of the interns towards the programme. An assessment of the programme will assist in addressing possible causes of failures. Some socio-economic characteristics of the students could influence their attitudes to the programme as well as their assessment of the programmes. Finally, it is possible that interns have to deal with challenges which impeded their complete experience of a productive internship programme. It is against this background that this study carried out an analysis of agriculture students' assessment of the internship programme in universities in Kwara State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study aims to:

1. describe the socio-economic characteristics of agriculture students of universities in Kwara State, Nigeria;
2. investigate the internship experience of the students;
3. examine the attitude of students towards the internship programme;

of 4. analyse agriculture students' perception of the internship programme; and

5. identify the challenges faced by agriculture students during the internship programme.

Hypothesis of the Study

The hypothesis is stated thus;

There is no significant relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of respondents and their perception of farm internship programme

Methodology

The Study Area

The study was undertaken in Kwara State, Nigeria. The State is located within the North Central zone of the country, and it lies between latitudes 7°45'N and 9°30'N and longitudes 2°30'E and 6°25'E. It shares boundaries with Oyo, Ondo and Osun to the south, Kebbi and Niger to the north, Kogi to the east and the Republic of Benin on the west side. With an estimated figure of 203,833 farm family, majority of the farm families live in the rural areas (KWADP, 1996). The State is primarily agrarian and is blessed with vast expanse of arable land and rich fertile soils. Major crops cultivated in the State include yam, cassava, rice, maize, sorghum, cowpeas, groundnut, melon, okra, pepper and some leafy vegetables

The four Universities in Kwara State are; University of Ilorin, Kwara State University, Landmark University and Al-Hikman University. Of the four institutions, Al-Hikman University does not offer courses in Agriculture. The University of Ilorin is owned by the Federal Government of Nigeria while Kwara State University is an establishment of the Kwara State government. The other two universities in the State are however private owned.

Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

A multi-stage sampling technique was used in the study. The first stage involved the purposive selection of the University of Ilorin and Landmark University as Al-Hikman University does not offer courses in fields of agriculture and students of Kwara State University were on vacation during the survey. The second stage involved the purposive selection of the 500 level students in both Universities (178 students in Landmark University and 182 in University of Ilorin making a total of 360). This selection again was based on the fact that they had completed the internship programme while in 400 level and would, therefore, be able to respond based on their internship experiences. The final stage involved simple random sampling of 50

percent of the 500 level students in the two selected universities to give a total sample size of 130.

Data Collection and Analytical Technique

The instrument for the collection of primary data used for the study was a structured questionnaire which was designed to elicit information on the students' socio-economic characteristics, their internship experience, attitude towards the programme, assessment of the programme and the constraints they faced on the programme. Descriptive statistics involving the use of frequency counts, percentages and means were used to describe the socio-economic characteristics of the respondents and their internship experience. Four-point Likert scale was used to present the results of the respondents' attitude and assessment of the programme while a 3-point Likert type scale was used to assess the level of severity of the constraints faced by the students during the programme. Twenty statements (14 negative and 6 positive) were posed to the respondents and they were requested to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements. The scale was graduated as follows for the negative statements; Strongly agree =1, Agree=2, Disagree= 3 and Strongly disagree= 4. However, the scoring pattern was reversed for the positive statements. A benchmark of 2 was adopted to connote agreement with any statement for ease of discussion.

Chi-square analysis was used to test the hypothesis of the study.

Results and discussion

Socio-economic Characteristics of Respondents

The summary of selected socio-economic characteristics of the respondents is presented in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, the mean age of the students was 23.4 years. Most (54.6%) of the respondents were male, and 85.45% of the students were of the Yoruba ethnic group and from monogamous families (81.5%). About 75% of the respondents have travelled outside their states of origin. Mean cumulative grade point average (CGPA) was 2.84, and more than half (77.7%) of the students were from middle-class families. Majority (85.4%) of the students resided in urban centres while only 14.6% were from rural settings. While 70% of the students had agricultural experience before internship year while 49.2% of the students choose agriculture as a course of study when seeking admission.

Respondents' Internship Experience

This section discusses the internship experience of the respondents, and this is summarised in Tables 2 and 3. Almost all (97.7%) the respondents had the poultry internship experience and 90% of them worked at the piggery section. A minimum

of 60% of the respondents worked at all the other units: rabbitary (81.5%); agronomy (87.7%); agro-processing (76.9%); and soil management (63.1%) except for agricultural engineering and apiary. Only 28.5% of the students worked at Apiary unit. This result shows that the different aspects of agriculture were not accorded equal attention in the programme. The implication of this is that students are likely to be deficient in practical knowledge of some aspects of their discipline and may not be able to function very well as graduate employees in those aspects that appears neglected.

Table 3 reveals that students acquired skill most in raising poultry to table size and vaccination of animals ($M=1.946$, $S.D.=0.227$) while they acquire least skills in beekeeping ($M=1.315$, $S.D.=0.466$) and hatching ($M=1.277$, $S.D.=0.449$). It is also important to note that skill acquisition in fields of agricultural extension and marketing were also rated low among the respondents (1.5 for both). Again, this finding reveals a wide variation in the extent to which students acquire practical skills among the different fields of agriculture. It is not surprising that a comparison of the results in Tables 2 and 3 shows that the aspects of agriculture in which the students had the least experiences were largely the ones in which they acquired the least level of skills.

Attitude of Respondents to the Student Internship Programme

The attitude of students towards the student internship programme is discussed in this section. Tables 4 and 5 presents the results.

As shown in Table 4, students agreed to the following statement, farm intership programme uses students as labourers, students should be allowed to do their internship programme outside the school farm, farm units are too far, students go to the school farm because of attendance and mark, I should be compensated with some of the farm produce I cultivated, the programme is too stressful, I had many first time experiences during the proramme, the programme should be full time practicals and not combined with lectures, farm internship programme should be made compulsory, I enjoyed the farm internship programme, the programme is very relevant to my attainment of B Agriculture Degree, the programme is a form of experiential learning so it should be encouraged.

However, students disagree with the following statements; students hire labourers to do their work on the farm, I see the programme as a waste of time, farm internship programme is too tedious, the programme is too costly, I did not learn anything new during the programme, I did not enjoy the farm internship programme, supervisors

don't come to the farm. Table 4 reveals the summary of responses to the different statements. It shows that the respondents agreed with all the six positive statement from the WMS which was clearly above 2. Also, the respondents were in disagreement with 14 negative statements on the programme. However, Eight negative statements had WMS above 2 indicating the students' agreement with those negative statements.

Assessment of the Student Internship Programme

The result of an investigation into students' assessment of the internship programme is discussed in this section while Table 5 presents a summary of the findings.

From Table 5, students were satisfied with the following; Number of unit of credit attached to the programme (WMS=2.18), level of punctuality of supervisors (WMS=2.02), Level of attendance of supervisors (WMS=2.15), the content of the programme (WMS=2.06), time devoted to the programme i.e duration (WMS=2.14), Supervisors knowledge of skills to be imparted (WMS=2.11), Relevance of knowledge imparted to degree in view (WMS=2.12), Extent to which internship experience positively

influenced students towards agripreneurship (WMS=2.10), Supervisors responses to questions from students (WMS=2.05). However, they were unsatisfied with the grading system adopted for the programme (WMS=1.90), Knowledge and skill delivery methods used by supervisors (WMS=1.97) and Supervisors attitude towards students (WMS=1.97). In all, the students were satisfied with nine of twelve parameters used for the assessment of the programme. This findings show that the dissatisfiers of the students had to do with the handling of the programme which if improved upon, could impact positively on the students attitude toward the programme.

Table 6 shows that the most severe of the challenge faced by respondents during student internship programme was transportation to the farm (MS= 3.08). This was followed by inadequacy of amenities such as water and electricity (MS= 2.87) and non-availability of improved technology (MS= 2.86). Other challenges indicated include Inadequacy of fund (MS= 2.6), Inadequacy of farm implements (MS= 2.59), poor soil (MS= 2.27), Poor attitude of students towards the programme (MS= 2.21), Exploitation by instructors (MS= 2.19), Non

availability of market for produce (MS= 2.18), Inadequacy of agrochemicals (MS= 2.06), Inadequacy of viable seed (MS= 1.95). The least of the possible challenges indicated was Inexperienced instructors (MS= 1.82)

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant relationship between the socio-economic characteristics of respondents and their assessment of farm internship programme

The result of the chi-square analysis in Table 7 shows the existence of significant relationship between the respondents' age ($X^2=70.092$, $p<0.01$), family type ($X^2=51.723$, $p<0.01$), ethnicity ($X^2=159.892$, $p<0.01$), cosmopoliteness ($X^2=126.031$, $p<0.01$), financial background ($X^2=122.323$, $p<0.01$), environmental background ($X^2=65.108$, $p<0.01$), prior experience in agriculture ($X^2=20.800$, $p<0.01$) and their assessment of the student internship programme while the gender was not significant ($X^2=1.108$, $p>0.01$). This implies that the students' rating of the student internship programme was significantly influenced by their age, cosmopoliteness, possession of prior experience in farming, environmental and financial backgrounds. These factors can all be linked with level of awareness and exposure.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The study concluded that the agriculture students' assessment of the student internship programme in Kwara State, Nigeria was on the average, satisfactory. The attitude of the students to the programme was also considerably positive. Students' experience and skill acquisition in apiculture, agricultural engineering, extension and marketing was however poor. The study also concluded that there were a number of challenges to the students' participation in the programme, chief among which was transportation. Finally, the study concluded that age, family type, ethnicity, cosmopolitaness, financial background, environmental background, and prior experience in agriculture were the socio-economic characteristics of students that had significant relationship with their assessment of the student internship programme.

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are put forward;

1. Organizers of the student internship programmes in universities in Kwara State should pay particular attention to the identified units in which skill acquisition has been reported to be low. These include; apiculture, agricultural

engineering, agricultural extension and agricultural marketing

2. Universities should ensure an adequate transport system for students on internship to ensure their prompt attendance in the programme
3. The current system for grading student on internship programme should be revised for possible improvement.
4. Facilitators and supervisors should be trained on the various skill delivery methods that could enhance their performances.

References

- Acker, D. G., (1999). Improving the quality of higher education in agriculture globally in the 21st century: Constraints and opportunities. *Journal of Int. Agric, Extension Education*, 2: 47-53
- Ladele, A. A. and O.M. Agbebaku (2006). Analysis of Entrepreneurial Skills Development through Farm Practical Training Programmes of University of Ibadan and University of Agriculture, Abeokuta. *Journal of Agricultural Extension* Vol. 9, 2006.

- Adesina, S. (1982): Planning an Educational Development in Nigeria; Ibadan Board Publications Ltd.
- Amalu, U.C. (2006). Finding solutions to the problem of low academic and professional standards of graduates of agriculture in Nigeria. *Invited paper at the Roundtable of Deans of Agriculture of Nigerian Universities on Practical Training held at the Senate Chamber, University of Agriculture, Abeokuta.*
- Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L. and R. Cocking (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind experience and school. *National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.*
- Bruening, T. H., Frick, M. (2004) Evaluation of selected courses intended to Internationalize the curriculum in the College of Agriculture, Montana State University. *Journal of international Agricultural and Extension Education*, 11(1): 17-24.
- Kolb, A. Y., and Kolb, D. A. (2005). Learning styles and learning spaces: Enhancing experiential learning in higher education. *Acad. Manage. Learn. Educ.*, 4(2): 193-212.
- Ladele, A. A. (1998): Strategies to Integrate Youths in Agricultural development in Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural and Rural Management. Vols 3&4 No 3 Pp 70-76.*
- Lewis, L. H., and Williams, C. J. (1994) in Jackson, L. and Caffarella, R. S. (Eds). *Experiential Learning: A New Approach* Pp5-16. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass
- Matter, W. J. and R.J. Steidl (2000). University undergraduate curricula in wildlife: Beyond 2000. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28: 503-507.
- McCleery, R.A., R.R. Lopez, L.A. Harveson, N.J. Silvy, and R.D. Slack (2005). Integrating on-campus wildlife research projects into the wildlife curriculum. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 33: 802-809.
- National Universities Commission (1989): *Approved Minimum Academic Standards in Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries and Home Economics for all Nigerian Universities*, NUC, Lagos, Nigeria.
- Navarro, M. (2004). Faculty perspectives on strategies to internationalize the undergraduate agricultural curriculum. *Proceedings of*

ie 20th Annual Association of
International Agriculture and
Extension Education Conference, pp.
95-306.

ido, J. C. (2011), Assessment of Farm
Year Programme of the University of
Nigeria, Nsukka and Michael Okpara
University of Agriculture, Umudike,
Journal of Agricultural Extension. Vol.
5 (2), December, 2011.

gunbamieru, O. B. (1986).
Extension internship: A pre-requisite
for students' degree. *Journal of
Extension Systems*, June, 2: 69-71.
<http://www.jesonline.org/1986jun.htm>

loruntoḡa, A. (2008) Agricultural
students' Perceptions of Farm Practical
Year Programme at University of
Ibeokuta, Nigeria. *Agricultural
Inspectus Scientificus*, 73(4): 245-
52.

moruyi, F.E.O and A.U Osunde,
(2004): Evaluating the Effectiveness of
National Youth Employment
and Vocational Skill Acquisition
Programme in Mid-Western Nigeria.

ao, T.V., Wright, C. and H.
Iukherjee (1990): Designing
Entrepreneurial Skills Development
Programme. London, Commonwealth
Secretariat.

White, B.Y. and J.R. Fredericksen
(1998). Inquiry, modeling, and
metacognition: Making science
accessible to all students. *Cognition
and Instruction* 16: 3-118.

Table 1: Socio-economic characteristics of respondents
N=130

Variables	Frequency	Percentages	Mean	SD
Age (in years)				
<20	5	3.8		
20-23	71	54.6	23.40	2.85
>23	54	41.5		
Gender				
Male	71	54.6		
Female	59	45.4		
Family type				
Monogamous	106	81.5		
Polygamous	24	18.5		
Ethnic Background				
Yoruba	111	85.4		
Igbo	15	11.5		
Hausa	4	3.1		
Farthest Distance Travelled				
Within the state				
Outside the state	19	14.6		
Outside the country	98	75.4		
	13	10.0		
Cumulative Grade Point Average				
1.5-2.49	2	1.5		
2.5-3.49	42	32.3	2.84	0.75
3.5-4.49	61	46.9		
4.5 and above	25	19.2		
Financial Background				
Affluent	27	20.8		
Middle class	101	77.7		
Low income	2	1.5		

Geographical Background		
Urban	111	85.4
Rural	19	14.6
Prior farming experience		
Yes	91	70.0
Agricultural science as Course choice		
Yes	64	49.2

Source: Field Survey, 2016

Table 2: Percentage Distribution of Respondents based on Units Worked in during Internship N=130

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Units worked in during internship programme (multiple responses)		
Soil and Land Management	82	63.1
Agromony	114	87.7
Poultry	127	97.7
Rabbitary	106	81.5
cattle Keeping	104	80.0
Apiary	37	28.5
Piggery	117	90.0
Agric engineering	77	59.2
Agric processing	100	76.9

Source: Field Survey 2016

Table 3: Distribution of Students by Skills Acquired during Student Internship Programme

UNITS	MEAN	S.D	RANK
Raising of poultry to table size	1.946	0.227	1 st
Vaccination of animals	1.946	0.227	1 st
Weeding	1.939	0.241	2 nd
Brooding of poultry	1.908	0.291	3 rd

Omotesho, K. F., Adesiji, G. B., Obaniyi, K. S. AGRICULTURE STUDENTS ASSESSMENT
OF THE FARM INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME OF
UNIVERSITIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA
And Akinrinde, A. F.

Cultivation of vegetables	1.908	0.291	3 rd
Harvesting of agricultural produce	1.900	0.301	4 th
Application of fertilizer	1.900	0.301	4 th
Watering	1.892	0.311	5 th
Planting depth	1.862	0.347	6 th
Intra and inter spacing	1.854	0.355	7 th
Land preparation	1.831	0.376	8 th
Application of manure	1.831	0.376	8 th
Mixed cropping	1.623	0.423	9 th
Processing of agricultural produce	1.739	0.441	10 th
Rabbit rearing	1.669	0.472	11 th
Mixed farming	1.623	0.486	12 th
attle rearing	1.615	0.488	13 th
Marketing	1.523	0.501	14 th
Extension services	1.500	0.502	15 th
Tractor driving	1.439	0.498	16 th
Apiary	1.315	0.466	17 th
Hatchin	1.277	0.449	18 th

Source: Field Survey, 2016

Table 4: Attitudes of Students towards Farm Internship Programme

S/ N	ATTITUD ES	S.A F(%)	A F(%)	D F(%)	S.D F(%)	SCO RE	WM S	REMAR K
1	program used students as labourers	59 (45.4)	37 (28.5)	25 (19.2)	9 (6.9)	244	1.88	AGREED
2	programm e should be done outside the school	62 (47.7)	40 (30.8)	21 (16.2)	7 (5.4)	233	1.79	AGREED

Omotesho, K. F., Adesiji, G. B., Obanlyi, K. S. AGRICULTURE STUDENTS ASSESSMENT
 OF THE FARM INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME OF
 UNIVERSITIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

	farm							
3	Farm units are too far from academic area	57 (43.8)	42 (32.3)	24 (18.5)	7 (5.4)	241	1.85	AGREED
4	Students attend only for attendance and mark	62(47.7)	38(29.2)	23(17.7)	7(5.4)	235	1.80	AGREED
5	Students should be allowed to hire labourers to do their work on farm	13(10)	39(30)	44(33.8)	34(26.2)	359	2.76	DISAGREED
6	Program is a waste of time	13(10)	10(7.7)	48(36.9)	59(45.4)	413	3.17	DISAGREED
7	It is too tedious	28(21.5)	62(47.7)	32(24.6)	8(6.2)	280	2.15	DISAGREED
8	students should be paid for work done on the farm during the programme	49(37.7)	48(36.9)	21(16.2)	12(9.2)	256	1.97	AGREED
9	students should be compensated with farm produce that I	70(53.8)	44(33.8)	10(7.7)	6(4.6)	212	1.63	AGREED

	cultivated							
10	The programme is too costly	20(15.4)	44(33.8)	53(40.8)	13(10)	319	2.45	DISAGREED
11	The programme is too stressful	44(33.8)	55(42.3)	25(19.2)	6(4.6)	253	1.94	AGREED
12	Students did not learn anything new	8(6.2)	11(8.5)	49(37.7)	62(47.7)	425	3.27	DISAGREED
13	Students did not enjoy the programme	5(3.8)	17(13.1)	53(40.8)	55(42.3)	418	3.21	DISAGREED
14	Supervisors are not regular on farm	7(5.4)	13(10)	60(46.2)	50(38.5)	413	3.18	DISAGREED
15	The student had many first time experiences during the programme	31(23.8)	52(40)	29(22.3)	18(13.8)	356	2.74	AGREED
16	The programme should be full time practical	70(53.8)	29(22.3)	17(13.1)	14(10.8)	415	3.19	AGREED

Omotesho, K. F., Adesiji, G. B., Obaniyi, K. S. AGRICULTURE STUDENTS ASSESSMENT
And Akinrinde, A. F. OF THE FARM INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME OF
UNIVERSITIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

	and not combined with lecture							
17	It is okay to make the farm internship programm e compulsor y	53(40. 8)	51(39. 2)	18(13. 8)	8(6.2)	409	3.15	AGREED
18	Students were satisfied with farm internship programm e	37(28. 5)	63(48. 5)	23(17. 7)	7(5.4)	390	3.00	AGREED
19	It is relevant to the attainment of B. Agric	69(53. 1)	45(34. 6)	8(6.2)	8(6.2)	435	3.35	AGREED
20	It is a form of experientia l learning, so it should be encourage d	78(60)	36(27. 7)	6(4.6)	10(7.7)	442	3.4	AGREED

Source: Field Survey, 2016

Table 5: Assessment of Agriculture Students Internship Programme

Omotesho, K. F., Adesiji, G. B., Obaniyi, K. S. AGRICULTURE STUDENTS ASSESSMENT
OF THE FARM INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME OF
UNIVERSITIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

ASSESSMENT	VD F(%)	D F(%)	S F(%)	VS F(%)	SCORE	WM S	REMARK
Number of unit of credit Attached to the programme	20(15.4)	75(57.7)	26(20)	9(6.9)	284	2.18	S
The programme grading system	37(28.5)	73(56.2)	16(12.3)	4(3.1)	247	1.9	U
Level of punctuality of supervisors	25(19.2)	80(61.5)	23(17.7)	2(1.5)	262	2.02	S
Level of attendance of supervisors	19(14.6)	80(61.5)	23(17.7)	8(6.2)	280	2.15	S
The content of the programme	15(11.5)	93(71.5)	21(16.2)	1(0.8)	268	2.06	S
Time devoted to the programme i.e duration	18(13.8)	80(61.5)	28(21.5)	4(3.1)	278	2.14	S
Supervisors knowledge of skills to be imparted	14(10.8)	89(68.5)	25(19.2)	2(1.5)	275	2.11	S
Knowledge and skill delivery methods used by supervisors.	28(21.5)	82(63.1)	16(12.3)	4(3.1)	256	1.97	U
Relevance of knowledge imparted to degree in view	16(12.3)	86(66.2)	24(18.5)	4(3.1)	276	2.12	S

Extent to which internship experience positively influenced students towards agripreneurship	21(16.2)	79(60.8)	25(19.2)	5(3.8)	274	2.10	S
Supervisors attitude towards students	26(20)	85(65.4)	16(12.3)	3(2.3)	256	1.97	U
Supervisors responses to questions from students	18(13.8)	90(69.2)	19(14.6)	3(2.3)	267	2.05	S

Source: Field Survey, 2016. VD = Very Dissatisfied, D= Dissatisfied, S= Satisfied, VS= Very Satisfied, U=Unssatisfied, WMS= Weighted Mean Score (Benchmark: WMS below 2 = Unssatisfied, WMS above 2 = Satisfied)

Table 6: Challenges Faced by Respondents during the Student Internship Programme

Challenges	V.S F(%)	S F(%)	L.S F(%)	N F(%)	Score	MS	Rank
Transportation to farm	65(50)	31(23.8)	14(10.8)	20(15.4)	401	3.08	1 st
Inadequacy of amenities	52(40)	34(26.2)	19(14.6)	25(19.2)	373	2.87	2 nd
Non availability of improved technology	43(33.1)	39(30)	35(26.9)	13(10)	372	2.86	3 rd

Omotesho, K. F., Adesiji, G. B., Obanlyi, K. S. AGRICULTURE STUDENTS ASSESSMENT
And Akinrinde, A. F. OF THE FARM INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME OF
UNIVERSITIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA

Inadequacy of fund	34(26.2)	41(31.5)	24(18.5)	31(23.8)	338	2.6	4 th
Inadequacy of farm implements	31(23.8)	37(28.5)	40(30.8)	22(16.9)	337	2.59	5 th
Poor soil	22(16.9)	23(17.7)	53(40.8)	32(24.6)	295	2.27	6 th
Poor attitude of students towards the programme	13(10)	30(23.1)	58(44.6)	29(22.3)	287	2.21	7 th
Exploitation by instructors	25(19.2)	21(16.2)	38(29.2)	46(35.4)	285	2.19	8 th
Non availability of market for produce	21(16.2)	25(19.2)	41(31.5)	43(33.1)	284	2.18	9 th
Inadequacy of agrochemicals	16(12.3)	25(19.2)	40(30.8)	49(37.7)	268	2.06	10 th
Inadequacy of viable seed	15(11.5)	18(13.8)	43(33.1)	54(41.5)	254	1.95	11 th
Inexperienced instructors	12(9.2)	14(10.8)	43(33.1)	61(46.9)	237	1.82	12 th

Source: Field Survey, 2016

V.S= Very Severe, S= Severe, L.S=

Less Severe, N= Not a challenge, MS=Mean Score

Table 7: Relationship between Selected Socio-economic Characteristics and Assessment of the Student Internship Programme

Omotesho, K. F., Adestji, G. B., Obanlyi, K. S. AGRICULTURE STUDENTS ASSESSMENT
OF THE FARM INTERNSHIP PROGRAMME OF
UNIVERSITIES IN KWARA STATE, NIGERIA
And Aknrinde, A. F.

Variable	X ² (chi-square)	Df	p-value	Decision
Age	70.092	2	0.001	Significant
Gender	1.108	1	0.293	Not significant
Family type	51.723	1	0.000	Significant
Ethnicity	159.892	3	0.000	Significant
Cosmopolitaness	126.031	1	0.000	Significant
Financial background	122.323	2	0.001	Significant
Environmental background	65.108	1	0.000	Significant
Prior experience in agriculture	20.800	1	0.000	Significant

Source: Field Survey, 2016