

## INTEGRATING AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMMES FOR IMPROVED FOOD PRODUCTIVITY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH AMONG RURAL FARMERS IN BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA

<sup>1</sup>Obele, Igoni Tadie, <sup>2</sup>Newton Adiamologi

<sup>1</sup>Department of Agricultural Education School of Vocational and Technical Education,

<sup>2</sup>Department Of Economics Education School of Arts and Social Sciences,

Isaac Jasper Boro College of Education, Sagbama, Bayelsa State

**Email:** <sup>1</sup>obeleigoni2010@yahoo.com

### ABSTRACT

The study examined how the integration of agricultural education and training programmes would improve food productivity among rural farmers in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. The study was guided by three (3) research questions. It adopted a descriptive survey research design. The target population was all peasant farmers in Bayelsa State. A simple random sampling technique was adopted to select 124 female and 102 male from five local government areas in the State. The instrument for data collection was a self-structured questionnaire designed in a 4-point rating scale of agreement. The instrument was scrutinized by two experts. The reliability of instrument was established using cronbach alpha reliability which yielded an index of 0.88. Data was analyzed using mean and standard deviation with a benchmark mean value of  $\geq 3.00$ . Findings from the study revealed that training programmes such as farmer-to-farmer training, field-school programme and enterprise training would enhance quality of information of farmers thus improving their agricultural productivity, enhance adequate adoption of new farming techniques, enhance smallholder farmers' managerial skills and improves farmers' skills in control of farm diseases. The study therefore recommends that field school approach needs to be studied in depth in different areas of agriculture by extension officers and other stakeholders as it has the potentials for increased production and awareness of agribusiness training should be made to all stakeholders in agriculture from the lowest cadre of both extension and research officers to policy makers.

**Keywords:** Agricultural Education, Training Programmes, Rural Farmers

### INTRODUCTION

Agriculture is the source of food production and income generation for the society. In fact, food security cannot be achieved without proper improvement on the food production sector. However, the use of farm mechanization by peasant farmers is still at low level, as farmers still adopt crude tools to farm (Amadi and Nnodim 2011). In the same vein, Mulugeta (2009) asserted that low income and productivity of rural farmers are mainly associated with poor skilled farmers who still adopt traditional farming practices. Several studies have revealed deficiencies in skills, knowledge and ability among rural farmers (Wheeler, 2007 and 2008). Rural farmers have limited knowledge on best practices for crop production. This could be due largely to lack of information on specific means to achieve it, as there are discussions on the need to increase productivity and sustainability in agriculture globally. Hence, FAO (2014) is of the opinion that empowering rural women and communities through participatory agricultural technology and farmers' innovation would enhance the needed growth in the sector.

The need for improved distribution of knowledge to rural farmers has been identified during a study that was conducted under Soil Fertility Initiative (FAO, 2014). Rural farmers depend on contemporary information to adopt new technologies and improve productivity. However, solving rural women's farming limitations requires participatory approaches that would help them understand their limitations and identify possible solutions to overcome them. Involving

farmers in proffering possible solutions to the problems surrounding their farming system facilitates their complete and easy adaption of improved farming techniques for different farm operations. Consequently, FAO (2014) identified farmers' field school approaches as being very successful for promoting Integrated Pest Management (IPM) through enhancing farmers' understanding of the ecological principles behind the safe and effective management of harmful pest and diseases.

Low agricultural productivity and limited adoption of new agricultural technologies by farmers are challenges Nigeria. In attempt to deal with these issues, the importance of training cannot be underestimated. The skills to improve productivity, increase adaptability to deal with change and crisis, and facilitate the improvement of livelihoods, are paramount in rural areas. These skills have not been well provided, usually because the contextual factors that prevent small farmers from accessing and applying training have not been properly addressed. To reduce poverty and improve socio-economic status of rural farmers in the country where large population depend on agriculture for income, training rural farmers becomes a necessity to improve production skills and boost the economy (Doss, 2008). Unless local agriculture is developed and other income earning opportunities open up, the food security determined by limited production potential will persist (FAO, 2014). This supports the assertion of World Bank (2007) that improving the productivity, profitability, and sustainability of smallholder farming is the main pathway out of poverty, and to achieve this, grassroots farmers training remains the key.

Farmers training are continues stages of acquiring new innovative skills, attitude and knowledge in the context of improving a vocation that will enhance productivity in agriculture. Farmer training is education that most often takes place outside formal learning institutions (Sajeev, Singha & Venkatasubramanian, 2012). Training according to Otite, and Ogionwo, (2006), is acquisition of the best way of utilizing knowledge and skill in a given field, vocation or profession. Increase in rural farmers' productivity primarily depends on acceptance of technological and cultural changes within the sector. Hence, training becomes a necessary component to boost agricultural productivity. Farmer training is to inculcate the right skills to improve productivity for smallholder farmers. These farmers mostly concentrate on producing staple and cash crops like maize, cassava, sweet potatoes and other farm produce. Oluyemisi, Liverpool, and Tasié, (2013) asserted that farmer's training supports and facilitates rural dwellers who engaged in agricultural production to obtain skills, information and technologies to ensure a positive impact on agricultural productivity. Jane and Macours (2017) asserted that the aim is to lift smallholder farmers out of poverty by boosting their productivity.

Farmer-to-farmer contact plays a key role in inculcating salable skills to peasants. It is an effective means of reducing perceived risks farmers. They are designed to take new innovations out of the 'unreal', scientific realm of the research station and place them firmly within the bounds of a farmer's everyday experience. This technique displays results of adopting a new practice and then to give the farmer an opportunity to practice new methods. According to Mulugeta (2009), Farmer-to-farmer training provide a structure that enables smallholder farmers to share and implement training information among themselves, collectively push for improved method of farming practice and support each other in applying new techniques and technologies. Farmer-to-farmer training has a great benefit in facilitating farmers' access to training and has a direct impact on farmers' ability to utilize skills learned.

Delivering training through other trained rural farmers increase the number of farmers that adopt modern farming practices. Training farmers in "peer learning techniques" according to Kathleen and Chris (2009) improve rural farmer's ability to share information on availability of improved seeds/seedlings, and the appropriate utilization of them. According to Obianefo, Osuafor, and Ng'ombe, (2021), farmer-to-farmer training improves farmers' knowledge, productivity and

revenues. Training is most effective when launched at the local level. Unlike academic researchers, farmers may not be motivated by scientific articles outside of their needs. While technical documents and formal trainings are very useful, learning from the experience of other farmer is a key factor to influence farmers' decisions in trying new farming practices to maximize profit. Connecting with rural farmers who are already incorporating new technologies that increase their yield, provides opportunities for other late adopters to learn and implement a given practice (Katharina, Eric, Mace & Jennifer, 2011).

According to Richardson (2003), rural farmers gain adequate information from on-farm demonstration programme that enhance their production capacities and adoption of modern farm practices. On farm demonstrations, gained the confidence of farmers who toured the farms and leads to successful growth and development of rural farmers' income (Lugar & Harkin, 2001). Farmer Trainers, to train other farmers in their villages on the use of improved feed practices through demonstration plots and lessons. Nnodim and Obele (2018), asserted that on-the-farm visit which is an aspect of extension service enables rural farmers develop several methods of production. Narman (2011) posited that farm demonstration training provide farmers with non-formal knowledge on the use of new production techniques, the economic benefits and financial returns that can be achieved when new techniques are adopted.

Field School training, is based on adult education methods. It is a school without walls that teaches basic agro-ecology and management skills that make farmers to become experts in their own farms. The Farmers' Field-Schools training programme, focuses on learning-by-doing approach that puts farmers at the heart of learning and decision-making around new techniques. This approach integrates multiple components such as sustainable agriculture practices, market engagement and food and nutrition security. Farmers' field school programme is one of the most effective extension programme. Therefore, it requires adequate attention. Farmers'. According to Davis, Ekboir, Mekasha, Ochieng, Spielman and Zerfu (2007), this training, provides rural farmers with management skills and commercial awareness that enables them develop better understanding of market opportunities and how they might be managed. Chipeta, Christoplos and Katz (2008) noted that lack of commercial and market awareness is a major barrier to achieving market success among rural farmers, thus, emphasizing the need for extension or advisory services to be targeted at rural farm holders on marketing and business advice and understanding of agricultural value chains, in addition to technical knowledge. Furthermore, farmers' field programme helps smallholders to adopt progressive production techniques.

According to Farm Business School (FBS, 2020), this method of training builds the knowledge and skills in agricultural practices among farmers. According to Makokha (2020), farmers' field-school method enhances adoption skills among participants thus making them translate these skills and adapt them into their own farms, creating ownership and sustainability of adoption. Furthermore, the facilitators also visit farmers in the field and participate in the farmer's session. This gives the farmers competence of being able to apply what is learned in class.

According to Lugar and Harkin (2011), during farmers' field school rural farmers develop skills on how to identify insects and pest plaguing farmer's plants or animals. Davis (2016) stated that farmers' field school training approach have shown remarkable impacts in terms of pesticide reduction, increases in productivity, knowledge gain among farmers and empowerment. Ebowore (2013) in a study reported that farmers' field school contributed considerably to farmers' knowledge regarding the control of cocoa diseases in Nigeria. In a similar vein, Nathaniels (2015) stated that this training, enhances farmers' sharing of information and knowledge and promoted the development of innovations on cowpea in Zimbabwe. Also, Simpson and Owens (2012) found evidence of some diffusion in an evaluation of farmers' field school experiences in Ghana and Mali, with frequent communication between trainees and other farmers regarding specific agricultural practices.

Engaging peasant farmers in field school programme would make a great impact on the utilization of improved indigenous technology. According to Pontius, Dilts and Bartlett (2012), this approach has a good record in facilitating the emergence of local project initiative. Furthermore, the approach enables farmers develop skills for the application of integrated pest and its management in production agriculture. In similar vein, Keiser, Utzinger and Singer (2012) posited that skills farmers develop in field training include the construction of irrigation and formulation of manure for increased productivity. Farmers' field school programme particularly encourages participants to develop their critical thinking and make sound farm management decisions, resulting in adoption of improved technologies (Mvena, Mattee, Wambura, Mwaseba, Lazaro, Kiranga, & Kilave, 2010). Farmers actively develop interpersonal networks and use these networks for acquiring much of their new knowledge and information. Furthermore, there is a considerable informal knowledge sharing that takes place within a village setting. Participants learn from field school experience and retain most of the basic knowledge they learned in these training. This also offers an opportunity for a closer working relationship between researchers, extension officers and farmers and at the same time gives farmers the opportunity to make an input into the work of researchers.

Agricultural business training helps rural farmers who are smallholders to manage and market their farm produce more effectively and to take advantage of new agricultural opportunities. Farm enterprise training is directed to fit in participants' existing skill levels. Kathleen and Chris (2009) posited that farmers' enterprise training develops farmers' managerial skills and prepare them for risks involved in introducing progressive production technologies. The authors further stated that this training program also help rural farmers diversify their productive activities by branching out into non-farm enterprises which is an important mechanism in reducing susceptibility to crisis and developing a more stable all-year-round income. Miller (2013) asserts that farm enterprise training is particularly valuable in enhancing rural farmers' profit from new identified agribusinesses. In the same vein, Kathleen and Chris (2009) opined that this training support subsistence farmers' quality control, capital management and price awareness in the agricultural markets to maximize profit.

Hagmann, Chuma, Murwira, Connolly and Ficarelli (2002) posited that farm enterprise training is an avenue for rural farmers to have direct linkages to needed markets, and empowers them to interact with market intermediaries on fair terms. Farm enterprise training ensures both financial management and marketing is directly relevant to the rural farmers who are the participants and also enhance their skills in making good decision in their agribusiness. Smallholder farmers not only acquire technical skills to improve farm productivity, but they also get equipped with the skills to negotiate rapidly changing agricultural markets, and adapt their productive activities in response to the new niches that it creates (Hagmann et al, 2002).

Despite the low levels of agricultural productivity, farmers seem not to adopt new agricultural technologies. One possible reason for limited technology adoption is that farmers find it difficult to learn about new technologies on their own. Government's investment in agricultural extension services to share information about new agricultural technologies with farmers, have not also yielded the needed results. Also, traditional farming practices have not consistently had an impact on farmers' behaviors and tend not to improve smallholder farmers productivity and income hence, the need to train rural farmers and encourage them to consider adopting improved farming practices that support production to increase the supply of food and improve economic livelihood of the Bayelsans.

To achieve this, the study is set out to access how integration of agricultural education and training programmes would improve food productivity and Economic status among rural farmers in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to: Determine how farmer-to-farmer contact programme would enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural

farmers in Bayelsa State. Examine how farmers' field-school programme would enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State. Ascertain how farm business training would enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State.

### Research Questions

Based on the purpose of the study, the following research questions were formulated

1. How would farmer-to-farmer contact programme enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State?
2. How would farmers' field-school programme enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State?
3. How would farm business training would enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State?

### METHODOLOGY

The study was conducted in Bayelsa State. Bayelsa is a state in southern part of Nigeria. The state is located in the core of the Niger Delta region. The state shares a boundary with Rivers State to the east and Delta State to the west, with the waters of the Atlantic Ocean dominating its southern borders. The state is comprised of 8 Local Government Areas which include Ekeremor, Kolokuma/Opokuma, Yenagoa, Nembe, Ogbia, Sagbama, Brass and Southern Ijaw with its capital town being Yenagoa. The state has several oil wells. However, agricultural activities constitute the main occupation of the dwellers, especially in the rural areas. The study was a descriptive survey research design. The population for the study is 3948 which comprise of all rural farmers in the 8 LGAs in Bayelsa State. This figure is from the 2012 farmer's census of the Bayelsa State Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (MANR/BYS, farmer's census (2012). The sample size of 528 farmers were selected using multi-stage sampling technique. Firstly, the study was clustered into 3 senatorial districts Bayelsa State. Secondly, the study randomly sampled 2 local government areas from each senatorial districts making a total of 6 LGAs. Kolokuma and Yenagoa LGAs were randomly selected from Bayelsa central senatorial district, Nembe and Ogbia LGAs were selected from Bayelsa east senatorial district while Sagbama and Ekeremor LGAs were selected from Bayelsa west senatorial district. Thirdly, 88 respondents (38 male and 50 female) were randomly selected from each local government areas selected for the study, giving a total sample of 528 rural farmers for the study. The instrument for data collection was a self-structured questionnaire designed in a 4-point rating scale of agreement with a criterion mean of 2.50. The benchmark for agreed was mean  $\geq 2.50$ . Thus, any mean less than 2.50 were regarded as disagreed. The instrument was used to elicit information on each research question posed for the study. The instrument was face and content validated. The reliability of the instrument was established using Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient method which yielded a reliability index of 0.76. To analysis the data, mean and standard deviation were used.

### RESULTS

**Research Question 1:**How would farmer-to-farmer contact programme enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State?

**Table 1:** Mean Responses on how farmer-to-farmer contact programme enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State

S/N	Statements	Women (N=300)			Men (N=228)		
		$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Decision	$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Decision
1.	Farmer to farmer training would enhance quality of information among farmers thus improving their agricultural productivity	3.51	0.86	Agreed	3.32	0.53	Agreed
2.	Engaging farmers in peer-to-peer training would enhance adequate adoption of new farming techniques	3.23	0.77	Agreed	3.19	0.57	Agreed
3.	The programme would increase farmers utilization of improved seeds/seedlings	3.82	0.63	Agreed	3.73	0.52	Agreed
4.	Improves farmers' innovative skills	3.33	0.92	Agreed	3.18	0.55	Agreed
5.	Contact-farmers enhances farmers' knowledge on crop production	3.08	0.67	Agreed	3.39	0.97	Agreed
6.	Fastens rural farmers' adoption of modern farm practice	3.43	0.75	Agreed	3.31	0.66	Agreed
7.	The activities in this method of training would encourage rural farmers to press to identify improved method of farming practice	3.96	0.64	Agreed	3.61	0.72	Agreed
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>Agreed</b>
	<i>Source: Field work 2022</i>						

Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation of respondents on how farmer-to-farmer contact enhances agricultural productivity of rural farmers in Bayelsa State. The respondents agreed that farmer to farmer contact enhances quality of information of farmers thus improving their agricultural productivity (3.51 & 3.432), engaging farmers in peer-to-peer training would enhance adequate adoption of new farming techniques (3.23 & 3.19) and that the programme would increase farmers utilization of improved seeds/seedlings (3.82 & 3.73). The table also revealed that the respondents agreed that farmer-to-farmer would improve farmers' innovative skills (3.33 & 3.18), farmer-to-farmer training programmes would enhance farmers' knowledge on livestock productivity (3.08 & 3.39), fastens rural farmers' adoption of modern farm practice (3.43 & 3.31) and would also encourage rural farmers to press to identify improved method of farming practice (3.96 & 3.61).

**Research Question 2:** How would field-school programme enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State?

**Table 2:** Mean Responses on how field-school programme enhances agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State

S/N	Statements	Women (N=300)			Men (N=228)		
		$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Decision	$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Decision
1.	Enhances smallholder farmers' managerial skills	3.21	0.76	Agreed	3.41	0.69	Agreed
2.	Improves farmers skills in control of farm diseases	3.12	0.87	Agreed	3.31	0.61	Agreed
3.	Enables rural farmers' develop good decision-making skills in farm enterprise	3.32	0.68	Agreed	3.54	0.93	Agreed
4.	Develops farmers knowledge on new production techniques	3.45	0.91	Agreed	3.56	0.78	Agreed

5.	Inculcate skills to identify food crop diseases	3.34	0.70	Agreed	3.42	0.52	Agreed
6.	Provides adequate information needed to enhance production capacities	3.01	0.60	Agreed	3.15	0.66	Agreed
7.	Enhance rural farmers' adoption of modern farm practices	3.66	0.64	Agreed	3.41	0.72	Agreed
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>Agreed</b>

**Source:** Field work 2022

Table 2 shows the mean and standard deviation of respondents on how field school would enhance rural farmers' agricultural productivity in Bayelsa State. The respondents agreed that field school programme enhance smallholder farmers' managerial skills (3.21 & 3.41), improves farmers skills in control of farm diseases (3.12 & 3.31), enables rural farmers' develop good decision-making skills in farm enterprise (3.32 & 3.54) and develops farmers knowledge on new production techniques (3.45 & 3.56). The table also revealed that farmers' field school programme inculcate farmers with the needed skills to identify food crop diseases (3.34 & 3.42), provides adequate information needed to enhance production capacities (3.01 & 3.15) and enhance rural farmers' adoption of modern farm practices (3.66 & 3.41).

**Research Question 3:** How would farm business training enhance agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Rivers State?

**Table 3:** Mean Responses on how farm business training enhances agricultural productivity and economic status of rural farmers in Bayelsa State

S/N	Statements	Women (N=300)			Men (N=228)		
		$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Decision	$\bar{X}_1$	SD	Decision
1.	Participation of rural farmers in enterprise training would develop their managerial skills in agribusinesses	3.31	0.72	Agreed	3.20	0.86	Agreed
2.	It will give peasant farmers the opportunity to develop risk management skills for a successful farm enterprise	3.12	0.64	Agreed	3.11	0.81	Agreed
3.	The activities would give subsistence farmers' the insight in agricultural markets	3.87	0.65	Agreed	3.23	0.49	Agreed
4.	Equip farmers with the skills to adapt to rapid change in agricultural markets	3.33	0.58	Agreed	3.46	0.71	Agreed
5.	Increase rural farmers' profit in new identified agribusinesses	3.11	0.66	Agreed	3.33	0.60	Agreed
6.	Farmers enterprise training would develop farmers' innovativeness in marketing of farm produce	3.39	0.72	Agreed	3.49	0.75	Agreed
7.	Farm business training would directly links rural farmers to needed markets opportunities	3.56	0.74	Agreed	3.81	0.75	Agreed
	<b>Grand Mean</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>Agreed</b>

**Source:** Field work 2022

Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviation of respondents on how farm business training would enhance agricultural productivity of rural farmers in Bayelsa State. The respondents agreed that participation of rural farmers in agribusiness training would develop their managerial skills in agribusinesses (3.31 & 3.20), It will give peasant farmers the opportunity to develop risk

management skills for a successful farm enterprise (3.12 & 3.11), The activities would give subsistence farmers' the insight in agricultural markets (3.87 & 3.23) and equip farmers with the skills to adapt to rapid change in agricultural markets (3.33 & 3.46). The table also revealed that farm enterprise training increases rural farmers' profit in new identified agribusinesses (3.11 & 3.33), would develop farmers' innovativeness in marketing of farm produce (3.39 & 3.49) and would directly links rural farmers to needed markets opportunities (3.56 & 3.81).

## DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

From research question 1, the study indicated that farmer-to-farmer contact enhances quality of information of farmers thus improving their agricultural productivity, engaging farmers in peer-to-peer training would enhance adequate adoption of new farming techniques and that the programme would increase farmers' utilization of improved seeds/seedlings. From this section, the study also revealed that farmer-to-farmer contact improve farmers' innovative skills, help them enhance their knowledge on livestock productivity, fastens their adoption of modern farm practice and encourage them to press to identify improved method of farming practice. The findings are in corroboration with Jeremie (2017) who affirms that farmer-to-farmer training improves farmers' knowledge, productivity and revenues. The finding is also buttressed by Katharina et al., (2011) who in a study on farmers training ascertained that connecting farmers to agricultural programmes enables them incorporate new technologies to increase yield and provides opportunities for other late adopters to implement new learned farming practices. The From research question 2, the study indicated that field school programme enhance smallholder farmers' managerial skills, improves farmers skills in control of farm diseases, enables rural farmers' develop good decision-making skills in farm enterprise and develops farmers knowledge on new production techniques. The finding is in line with the assertion of Lugar and Harkin (2011) that rural farmers develop skills on identification of insects and pest plaguing farmer's plants or animals through their engagement in farmers' training. The study also revealed that field school programme inculcate farmers with the needed skills to identify food crop diseases, provides adequate information needed to enhance production capacities and enhance rural farmers' adoption of modern farm practices. The finding is in agreement with Farm Business School (FBS, 2020) that field school method of training builds the knowledge and skills in agricultural practices among farmers. In similar line, the finding is in corroboration with Makokha (2020) who posited that farmers' field-school method enhances adoption skills among participants thus making them translate these skills and adapt it into their own fields, creating ownership and sustainability of adoption.

From research question 3, the study indicated that participation of rural farmers in agricultural business training would develop their managerial skills in agribusinesses, give peasant farmers the opportunity to develop risk management skills for a successful farm enterprise, give subsistence farmers' the insight in agricultural markets and equip farmers with the skills to adapt to rapid change in agricultural markets. The findings are in agreement with Kathleen and Chris (2009) who in their study concluded that farmers' enterprise training develops farmers' managerial skills and prepare them for risks involved in introducing progressive production technologies. Finally, findings from the study also indicates that farm enterprise training would without doubt increase rural farmers' profit in new identified agribusinesses, develop farmers' innovativeness in marketing of farm produce and would directly links rural farmers to needed markets opportunities. The findings are in tandem with The finding corroborates with Hagmann et al., (2002) who posited that farm enterprise training is an avenue for rural farmers to have direct linkages to needed markets, and empowers them to interact with market intermediaries on fair terms. The finding is also buttressed by Miller (2013) who confirmed that farm enterprise training is particularly valuable in enhancing rural farmers' profit from new identified agribusinesses.

## CONCLUSION

From the background and findings, the study therefore deduced that farmer's training is an aspect of vocational training that needs an immense attention. These approaches have great potential for enhancing the adoption of technologies by farmers and will without doubt have direct impact on increase in food production, income generation thus sustaining the rural livelihoods and the nation at large.

It is therefore important that the Field School approach needs to be studied in depth across different areas of agriculture by extension officers and other stakeholders as it has the potentials for increased production. Also, awareness of agribusiness training should be made to all stakeholders in agriculture from the lowest cadre of both extension and research officers to policy makers. This would help sensitize them on key attributes of this approach for proper implementation. Finally, during these training, farmers should be allowed to use their own farm as a demonstration site. This will enable them gain access to the profit and encourage full participation among other rural adopters.

## REFERENCE

- Amadi, N.S & Nnodim, A.U. (2011). Needs for curriculum innovation in agricultural education and mechanization in schools and colleges. *Research in Curriculum Studies*, 6(2) 199-207
- Bayelsa State Ministry of Agriculture and Natural Resources (2012) (MANR/BYS), farmer's census.
- Chipeta S, Christoplos I, Katz E (2008). Common Framework on Market-Oriented Agricultural Advisory Services. Wageningen, Netherlands: Neuchâtel Group.
- Davis K, Ekboir J, Mekasha W, Ochieng C, Spielman D, Zerfu E (2007). Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training in Sub-Saharan Africa from an Innovations Systems Perspective. Discussion Paper 00736. Washington: IFRPI.
- Davis, K. (2006). Farmer field schools: A boom or bust for extension in Africa? *Journal of International and Agricultural Extension Education*, 13(1): 91 – 97.
- Davis, K., Nkonya, E., Kato, E., Mekonnen, D.A., Odendo, M., Miiro, R. & Nkuba, J. (2010). Impact of farmer field schools on agricultural productivity and poverty in East Africa. IFPRI Discussion Paper 00992. International Food and Policy Research Institute, USA.
- Doss, J.T. (2008). "Handbook of Vegetable Preservation and Processing" in Y. H. Hui, Sue Ghazala, Dee M. Graham, K. D. Murrell, and Wai-Kit (eds) Nip CRC Press.
- Ebewore, S.O. (2013). The role of farmer field school in training in improving farmers' knowledge of selected cocoa cultivation practices in Edo state, Nigeria. *Journal of Natural Science Research*, 3(1): 41-50.
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2014). Soil productivity improvement programme through farmer field schools. Annual report of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nation.
- Hagmann, J., Chuma, E., Murwira, K., Connolly, M. & Ficarelli, F. (2002) Success factors in integrated natural resource management R&D: lessons from practice. *Ecology and Society*, 29 (2).
- Jane, K Macours, M (2017). The Impact of Farmer-to-Farmer Training on Agricultural Productivity in Uganda.
- Katharina U., Eric L.M., Mace, V & Jennifer H, (2011). Conducting Farm-Based Trainings on How to Enhance On-Farm Ecosystem Services Inspiring the Farm Community to Adopt New Practice.
- Kathleen C & Chris G (2009). Training for Rural Development: Agricultural and Enterprise Skills for Women Smallholders. Produced by: City& Guilds Centre for Skills Development, 24-30 West Smithfield, London, EC1A 9DD. Editor: Sara Clay

- Keiser J, Utzinger J & Singer BH (2012). The potential of intermittent irrigation for increasing rice yields, lowering water consumption, reducing methane emissions, and controlling malaria in African rice fields. *J Am Mosq Control Assoc.*, 18: 329-340.
- Lugar, R & Harkin, T., (2001). Objectives for the new farm bill. United States Senate. [on-line] available: [http://www.senate.gov/~agriculture/Press/2001\\_Press/01925b.htm](http://www.senate.gov/~agriculture/Press/2001_Press/01925b.htm).
- Makokha, D. W (2020). Farmers Field School Extension Methodology Characteristics. *Journal of forestry*, 4, (4) 21-34
- Mulugeta, T. (2009). Developing integrated soil fertility management, *Agricultural Systems*, 73: 57–81.
- Mvena, Z. S. K., Mattee, A. Z, Wambura, R. M, Mwaseba, D. L. Lazaro, E. A. Kiranga, E. D. & Kilave, D. M. (2010). Farmer Field Schools as a Springboard for Enhanced Uptake of New Agricultural Technologies: Lessons for Tanzania. *Tanzania Journal of Agricultural Sciences* (2013) Vol. 12 No. 1, 43-51
- Narman, A, (2011) Education, training and agricultural development in Zimbabwe. Paris: UNESCO.
- Nathaniels, N, Q.R. (2005). Cowpea, farmer field schools and farmer-to-farmer extension: A Benin case study. *Agricultural Research & Extension Network (Agren)*, Network Paper No. 148.
- Ndlovu, T, (2015) Farmer participation: A drive towards sustainable agricultural production in Makwe irrigation scheme, Zimbabwe. *Global Science Research Journal*, ISSN: 2408-5480 Vol.3 (9), pp. 308-320, October, 2015
- Nnodim, A. U. & Obele, I. T. (2018). Influence of traditional beliefs on agricultural activities of women in Ogbia Local Government Area of Bayelsa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of social sciences and humanities*, 5(7), 48-90.
- Obianefo, C. A., Osafor, O. & Ng'ombe, J. N. (2021). On the challenges faced by female members of agricultural cooperatives in southeast Nigeria. *Academic Journal*, 13(2), 94-106. <https://doi.org/>
- Oluyemisi, K., Liverpool, A., & Tasie, A. (2013). A review of literature on agricultural productivity, social capital and food security in Nigeria. *International food policy research institute Publication NSSP working paper*.
- Otite, O. & Ogionwo, W. (2006). *Sociology and applied theory*. Malt-house Press Ltd. Lagos. Nigeria. Technical centre for agriculture and rural cooperation (CTA). The economic role of women in agriculture and rural development. Promoting income-generating activities. Report of a seminar, Athens, Greece.
- Pontius J.C, Dilts D.R & Bartlett A (2012). Ten years of IPM training in Asia: From Farmer Field School to community IPM, Bangkok: FAO
- Richardson J.G. (2003). On-Farm Demonstrations: Consideration Factors for their Success and Viability as an Extension Teaching Tool. *South African Journal of Agricultural Extension Service* 32 (2) 12-28
- Sajeev, M. V., Singha, A.K. & Venkatasubramanian, V (2012). Training Needs of Farmers and Rural Youth: An Analysis of Manipur State, India. *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 3(2): 103-112
- Simpson, B. & Owens, M. (2002). Farmer field schools and the future of agricultural extension in Africa. *Sustainable Development Dimension*, Sustainable Development Department, FAO
- Wheeler, S. (2007). Views of Australian agricultural professionals towards modern biotechnology and organic agriculture: A comparison. *Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture* 47-120.
- Wheeler, S. (2008). What influences agricultural news towards organic agriculture?" *Ecological Economics* 65 PP 145-154