

Issues with Quality Assurance in the Implementation of Agricultural Programmes in South Eastern Part of Nigeria

EgboB.N.¹, OnahF.C.², Paradang P.S.³, GoshitB.G.³ & IkehiM.E.^{2*}

¹Department of Agricultural Education, Enugu State College of Education (Technical), Enugu, Enugu State, Nigeria.

²Department of Agricultural Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, 410001, Enugu State, Nigeria.

³Department of Agricultural Science, Federal College of Education, Pankshin, Plateau State, Nigeria
**Michael.ikehi@unn.edu.ng*

Abstract

The study evaluated the challenges and the possible management approaches in the implementation of agricultural education programme in colleges of education. The study adopted survey research design. The population for the study was 88, made up of staff of federal and state colleges of education in the south east of Nigeria. A structured questionnaire that was face validated by three experts was used for data collection. Reliability index of the instrument was 0.87 using Cronbach Alpha method. Exactly 88 copies of the instrument were physically administered on the respondents. Out of the 88 copies of the questionnaire that were administered, 86 (representing 98% retrieval rate) were retrieved and duly completed, thus were used for data analysis. Data collected were analysed using mean and standard deviation to answer research questions while *t*-test statistics was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. Findings of the study revealed that colleges of education are faced with several challenges facing the implementation of programmes such as agricultural education. Findings of the study further revealed suitable management approaches to ensure quality assurance in Colleges of Education.

Keywords: Quality, College, Agricultural Education, Learning, Students, Programmes

Date of Submission: 22-02-2021

Date of acceptance: 07-03-2021

I. Introduction

All over the world, there has been the urge to improve the standard of education in order to meet up with the trending globalization, technological advances and viral economic transitions facing most countries. Formal education from developmental perspective is important in attaining economic growth and technological progress judging by the experience of industrialized nations (Onyeson&Ashibogwo, 2013; Akhuemonkhan, Raimi & Dada, 2014). Tertiary education institutions are charged with admitting and impart the required knowledge, skills and attitudes in the learners for productivity. Such institutions include universities, polytechnics, monotechnics and Colleges of Education. A College of Education (CoE) according to Oye (2007) is an institution mandated to train middle level manpower workforce, potentially for the educational sector. It is a higher instructive institution recognized by law to produce teachers for primary and junior secondary school levels and award the professional teacher's certificate (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, UNESCO, 2016). It is a higher institution of learning with the policies and procedures designed to equip prospective teachers with the knowledge, attitudes, behaviors and skills required to perform given tasks effectively in the classroom, school and wider community (Rosser & Massey, 2013; Goli, 2016). The objectives of colleges of education are translated into school programmes for implementation.

Implementation is the act of carrying out or executing a plan, design, idea, model or policy (Rouse & Ehrens, 2016). It is a specified set of activities designed to put into practice a program of known dimensions (National Implementation Research Network, NIRN, 2016). According to the author, implementation processes are purposeful and are described in sufficient details such that independent observers can detect the presence, strength or weakness of the "specific set of activities", to ensure that its impacts can be measured and felt, such as Agricultural programme. Agricultural education programme is a formal instruction systematically organized for the school learners who are preparing for careers in agriculture (Ben, Tyeopenda&Naswem, 2002). It broadly explains a formal education and instruction scientifically planned for in-school learners and established farmers who are willing and ready to be prepared for careers in agriculture (Umoh-mac 2006). Agricultural programme in CoEs is a body of formal instructions designed to train and provide students with competencies for teaching agriculture in primary and junior secondary schools. In this study agricultural programme in CoEs is a

packaged instruction designed to impart relevant skills and knowledge to learners through formal teaching and learning with specific interest in Agricultural Education. The standards of an institution, particularly the educational institutions are often judged by the quality of programmes offered, quality of staff and students' performance within and outside the school, their relevance in the comity of schools, among other factors. Thus, retaining or raising the standards of the institutions is possible through quality assurance.

Quality assurance is the maintenance of desired level of values or standards in a service or product, especially by means of attention to every stage of the process of production and delivery. Quality assurance is an organisation's guarantee that the product or service it offers meets the accepted standards (Alexander, 2007; Jara, 2007). In the educational sector, quality assurance is the systematic management and assessment procedures adopted by institutions of learning in order to monitor performance against objectives, and to ensure achievement of desired outputs or improvements. Quality assurance encompasses any activity that is concerned with assessing and improving the merit, worth or compliance to given standards of a programme or intervention in teaching and learning (Tuck, 2007; Dabelstein, 2010). In this study, quality assurance is the systematic assessment of teaching and learning, and the processes that support them in CoE where Agricultural Programmes are offered, to ensure that the standards of academic awards meet the expectations set out. It is the systematic way of checking the implementation level of educational programmes for conformity with required national and/or international standards. This is to ensure that the quality of the student learning experience is as expected and improved upon.

Assuring the quality of the implemented programme enforces the adoption of desired standards in the human, material resources and processes of Agricultural programme at Colleges of Education. Reports of the exiting poor performance among the graduate students and the CoE where they are trained indicate issues with quality assurance in the institutions. This study focuses on the issues encountered and strategies for ensuring proper implementation of agricultural programme in CoE in south eastern part of Nigeria. The study specifically addresses the following research questions;

1. identify of the challenges to quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education programme in Colleges of Education.
2. identify the management approaches for quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education programme in Colleges of Education.

Hypotheses

- H₀₁ The mean response of lecturers of federal and state colleges of education on the challenges to quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education do not differ significantly.
- H₀₂ There is no significant difference in the mean responses of lecturers of federal and state colleges of education on the management approaches for quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education.

II. Methodology

The study adopted descriptive survey research design, and was carried out in South-East Nigeria. The area is a geopolitical zone in Nigeria which comprised of five states, which are Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo states. Each of the states in the zone is comprised of various institutions of higher learning including universities, polytechnics, specialized institutions and colleges of education. These institutions are either Federal or State Government owned or privately owned by an individuals or groups. The zone has 12 Colleges of Education of Federal, State and Private ownership (NCCE, 2016) (see appendix B on pg. 118). Out of the 12 Colleges of Education in the zone, but only 7 offer Agricultural Education Programme. The population for the study is 88 made up of academic members of staff of the 7 CoE. The lecturers form part of the input (human resources) and interact with other (material) resources in the teaching and learning processes to achieve desired output (students) in the implementation of Agricultural Education programme. Thus, they are dependable to provide reliable response for achieving the objectives of this study.

A structured questionnaire was used to collect data for the study. The research instrument was subjected to face validation by three experts; two from the Department of Agricultural Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka and one from the Department of Technical and Vocational Education at the Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu. The experts read and corrected the mistakes, ambiguous or wrongly worded statements, missing information and other observed errors. The experts were also asked to make suggestions for the improvement of the instrument. Their corrections and suggestions were used to produce the final copy of the instrument. The reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha reliability method for obtaining the internal consistency of the instrument. Ten copies of the instrument were administered on lecturers at the Department of Technical and Vocational Education at the Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu, who were not part of the study. Out of the 88 copies of the

instrument that were administered, only 86 copies were retrieved and used for data analysis. The completed copies of the instrument were analysed and used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument, which yielded 0.87 reliability index.

The instrument was administered on the respondents by the researchers with the help of five research assistants. A research assistant was assigned to a state while the researchers coordinated the administration of the instruments. The research assistants were instructed on how to administer, moderate the process and collect the copies of the completed instrument. Retrieval of the completed instrument was also done with the help of the research assistants after the administration. Data were collected from the respondents through the administered instrument and were keyed-in into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS- v20.0). The collected data was analyzed using mean (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (SD) to answer research questions and t-test to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The research questions were answered using real limit of numbers as presented below;

Response Option	Value	Real limit of number
Strongly Agree (SA)	4	3.50 – 4.00
Agree (A)	3	2.50 – 3.49
Disagree (D)	2	1.50 – 2.49
Strongly Disagree (SD)	1	0.50 – 1.49

In taking decisions for the research questions, any item with a mean value ranging from 3.50 – 4.00, 2.50 – 3.49 or 1.50 – 2.49 was interpreted as Strongly Agreed, Agreed or Disagreed respectively, while any item with a mean range of 1.50 (0.50 – 1.49) was interpreted as Strongly Disagreed. For the standard deviation, any item with a value less than or equal to 1.96 indicates that the respondents were close to the mean and close in their response. But any item with a standard deviation greater than 1.96 indicates that the respondents were not close to the mean and were far apart in their response. Similarly, a null hypothesis was accepted when the probability value is greater than 0.05 level of significance ($p \geq 0.05$) indicating that there was no significant (NS) difference in the compared means, but was rejected when the probability value is less than 0.05 level of significance ($p < 0.05$) indicating that there was significant difference (S) in the compared means.

III. Findings of the study

Table 1; *Mean and Standard Deviation of the challenges to quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education*
N=86

S/N/Item statement	Mean	SD	Remark
1. Lack of definition of quality as it applies to the school	3.00	0.71	A
2. Inexperienced administrators and management staff in carrying out the activities of quality assurance	3.18	0.70	A
3. Poor data gathering leading to poor planning during programme implementation	3.29	0.57	A
4. Poor statement of study and achievement goals in the teaching and learning process	2.86	0.81	A
5. Quality requires intense capital investment which most schools cannot afford	3.02	1.01	A
6. Increase in student numbers without complimenting increase in resources, staff (staff/student ratio) and plants	3.36	0.72	A
7. Poor adherence to acceptable educational practice	2.90	0.80	A
8. Poor quality of academic staff (competency and qualification)	2.79	0.88	A
9. Outdated practices and curriculum	3.08	0.91	A
10. Inadequate instructional materials	3.20	0.74	A
11. Staff resistance to change	2.75	0.89	A
12. Poor communication between staff and management	3.13	0.69	A
13. Poor teacher preparation	3.04	0.86	A
14. Poor staff motivation	3.32	0.64	A
15. Lack of procurement and servicing of equipment	3.29	0.69	A
16. Dilapidated learning environment affecting student and staff motivation	3.24	0.83	A
17. Lack of professional development opportunities for lecturers	3.21	0.82	A
18. Limited information on trends in education	2.89	0.88	A
19. Too much focus on theory teaching with less practical learning	3.55	0.70	SA
20. Inadequate funding of education	3.63	0.65	SA

In Table 1, data available indicated that the respondents agreed to all the listed items as challenges to quality assurance in the implementation of agricultural education programme in colleges of education as their means were more than 2.50. However, the respondents strongly agreed to 2 items (19-20) as the main challenges to quality assurance in the implementation of agricultural education programme in colleges of education, as their means were between 3.50 and 3.61 which fell between 3.50-4.00 real limit numbers. The standard deviation values of all items ranged from 0.57 to 1.01, indicating that the respondents were not far from the mean and from one another in their responses.

Hypothesis 1

H₀₁ The mean response of lecturers of federal and state colleges of education on the challenges to quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education do not differ significantly.

Data for testing hypothesis 3 was presented on Table 2.

Table 2; *t*-test Distribution of Respondents on the Challenges to Quality Assurance in Implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education

S/N	Item Statement	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	Remark
1.	Lack of definition of quality as it applies to the school	0.64	0.53	NS
2.	Inexperienced administrators and management staff in carrying out the activities of quality assurance	0.12	0.91	NS
3.	Poor data gathering leading to poor planning during programme implementation	0.23	0.82	NS
4.	Poor statement of study and achievement goals in the teaching and learning process	0.75	0.46	NS
5.	Quality requires intense capital investment which most schools cannot afford	0.39	0.70	NS
6.	Increase in student numbers without complementing increase in resources, staff (staff/student ratio) and plants	-3.45	0.00	S
7.	Poor adherence to acceptable educational practice	0.61	0.55	NS
8.	Poor quality of academic staff (competency and qualification)	-0.11	0.91	NS
9.	Outdated practices and curriculum	1.13	0.26	NS
10.	Inadequate instructional materials	-0.28	0.78	NS
11.	Staff resistance to change	-0.64	0.53	NS
12.	Poor communication between staff and management	0.31	0.76	NS
13.	Poor teacher preparation	1.91	0.06	NS
14.	Poor staff motivation	0.94	0.35	NS
15.	Lack of procurement and servicing of equipment	1.88	0.06	NS
16.	Dilapidated learning environment affecting student and staff motivation	0.59	0.56	NS
17.	Lack of professional development opportunities for lecturers	1.80	0.08	NS
18.	Limited information on trends in education	0.72	0.47	NS
19.	Too much focus on theory teaching with less practical learning	-0.18	0.85	NS
20.	Inadequate funding of education	-0.37	0.71	NS
Cluster level		0.35	0.52	NS

In Table 2, nineteen items (S/N 1-5 & 7-20) out of the 20 items had Sig. values which were between 0.06 and 0.91. These values were greater than the probability value (p-value*) of 0.05; indicating that there was no significant (NS) difference in the mean ratings of federal and state lecturers of colleges of education on the Challenges to Quality Assurance in Implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education at their respective t-test values. The remaining one item (S/N 6) had p-value of 0.00, which is less than 0.05 (p-value); indicating that there was significant (S) difference in the opinions of the respondents on the item at their respective t-test score. The null hypothesis for the items with no significant (NS) difference in the compared means was accepted but rejected for the remaining item with significant (S) difference in the opinions of the respondents. At the cluster level, Sig. value = 0.52 at t-value = 0.35 while *(p-value) = 0.05. Thus, t-test did not indicate a statistical difference in the opinions of the respondents on the tested items. The null hypothesis (H₀₁) of no significant (NS) difference was upheld as Sig. ≥ *; (0.52 ≥ 0.05).

Research Question 2

What are the management approaches for quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education?

Data for addressing research question 2 is presented in Table 3.

Table 3; *Mean and Standard Deviation of the Management Approaches for Quality Assurance in the Implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education*

N=86

S/N/Item statement	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Creating awareness for quality assurance	3.30 0.65	A
2.	Ensure staff engage appropriately with their students during instruction through provision of adequate instructional materials	3.14 0.56	A
3.	Setting subject benchmark framework to enforce quality	3.14 0.56	A
4.	Involve external stakeholders in evaluations for quality assurance	2.77 0.90	A
5.	Facilitate institutional comparison by providing a common reference point	3.05 0.60	A
6.	Keep school plants at functional level	3.25 0.64	A

7. Provide update library resources	3.48	0.61	A
8. Conduct a workshop for the academic members to familiarize them with the aim of quality assurance	3.43	0.57	A
9. Checking teacher/student ratio for compliance with standard	3.38	0.62	A
10. Collecting data on the indicators of quality and tabulating such against realities in the school	3.14	0.58	A
11. Centrally defining the assessment method (whether it is a written, practical, oral, etc.) to ensure that all candidates are assessed on the same basis	3.37	0.55	A
12. Using more than one assessor to assure quality	3.11	0.69	A
13. Giving a clearer picture to employers of what they can expect from a graduate to assure quality of the products	3.04	0.81	A
14. Set and apply standard recruitment procedure	3.45	0.61	A
15. Motivating staff properly to encourage quality assurance	3.51	0.65	SA
16. Employ only qualified staff to support and prepare programmes	3.52	0.59	SA
17. Ensuring standards in promotion	3.44	0.59	A
18. Provision of fund for school-based activities that will assure quality	3.33	0.73	A
19. Engaging employer feedback during curriculum review	3.08	0.75	A
20. Organizing re-union through alumina service for post-graduate feedback on performance	2.83	0.79	A
21. Continuous skills and academic development through seminars, workshops and special trainings	3.40	0.58	A
22. Providing information to staff and student on trending issues in education and school standard	3.32	0.62	A
23. Participate in policy development for quality assurance in colleges	3.27	0.63	A
24. Evaluate management style through staff and student reports	3.20	0.60	A
25. Update curriculum for relevance of skills and knowledge as in the world of work	3.31	0.73	A
26. Evaluate decision making process in the college	3.24	0.59	A
27. Review teaching and learning process review (assessment)	3.21	0.56	A
28. Ensure accountability report of input against output quality	3.16	0.69	A
29. Review of programme for conformity with ethical and moral norms	3.26	0.64	A
30. Reviewing process and methods to reflect future trend	3.23	0.57	A
31. Adopt a Code of Practice for Quality Assurance	3.18	0.56	A
32. Mapping the standards expected at each level of instruction	3.06	0.73	A
33. Form a task force committee to shoulder the responsibility of monitoring the process of quality	3.16	0.61	A
34. Clarify the responsibilities of departments, schools, faculties, institutes and/or other organisational units as well as institutional leadership, individual staff members and students with respect to quality assurance	3.51	0.57	SA
35. Identify progression and defect routes in the school administration	3.19	0.65	A
36. Internal programme assessment/evaluation for relevance	3.26	0.58	A
37. Internal accreditation of material resources	3.37	0.64	A

In Table 3, data available indicated that the respondents agreed to all the listed items as management approaches for quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education programme in colleges of education as their means were more than 2.50. However, the respondents strongly agreed to 3 items (15, 16 & 34) as important management approaches for quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education challenges to quality assurance in the implementation of agricultural education as their means were between 3.50 and 3.61 which fell between 3.50-4.00 real limit numbers. The standard deviation values of all items ranged from 0.57 to 1.01, indicating that the respondents were not far from the mean and from one another in their responses.

Hypothesis 2

H₀₂ There is no significant difference in the mean responses of lecturers of federal and state colleges of education on the management approaches for quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education.

Data for testing hypothesis 2 is presented in Table 4.

Table 4; *t-test Distribution of Respondents on the management approaches for Quality Assurance in Implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education*

S/N	Item Statements	t	Sig. (2-tailed)	R
1.	Creating awareness for quality assurance	3.28	0.00	S
2.	Ensure staff engage appropriately with their students during instruction through provision of adequate instructional materials	1.34	0.19	NS
3.	Setting subject benchmark framework to enforce quality	0.12	0.91	NS
4.	Involve external stakeholders in evaluations for quality assurance	3.59	0.00	S
5.	Facilitate institutional comparison by providing a common reference point	2.95	0.00	S
6.	Keep school plants at functional level	0.53	0.60	NS
7.	Provide update library resources	2.83	0.01	S
8.	Conduct a workshop for the academic members to familiarize them with the aim of quality assurance	3.85	0.00	S
9.	Checking teacher/student ratio for compliance with standard	-1.70	0.09	NS
10.	Collecting data on the indicators of quality and tabulating such against realities in the school	1.29	0.20	NS
11.	Centrally defining the assessment method (whether it is a written, practical, oral, etc.) to ensure that all candidates are assessed on the same basis	0.85	0.40	NS

12.	Using more than one assessor to assure quality	2.08	0.04	S
13.	Giving a clearer picture to employers of what they can expect from a graduate to assure quality of the products	3.62	0.00	S
14.	Set and apply standard recruitment procedure	-2.07	0.04	S
15.	Motivating staff properly to encourage quality assurance	-0.22	0.82	NS
16.	Employ only qualified staff to support and prepare programmes	1.05	0.30	NS
17.	Ensuring standards in promotion	1.25	0.22	NS
18.	Provision of fund for school-based activities that will assure quality	1.89	0.06	NS
19.	Engaging employer feedback during curriculum review	3.03	0.00	S
20.	Organizing re-union through alumina service for post-graduate feedback on performance	4.09	0.00	S
21.	Continuous skills and academic development through seminars, workshops and special trainings	2.47	0.02	S
22.	Providing information to staff and student on trending issues in education and school standard	1.34	0.19	NS
23.	Participate in policy development for quality assurance in colleges	1.54	0.13	NS
24.	Evaluate management style through staff and student reports	1.57	0.12	NS
25.	Update curriculum for relevance of skills and knowledge as in the world of work	0.09	0.93	NS
26.	Evaluate decision making process in the college	1.21	0.23	NS
27.	Review teaching and learning process review (assessment)	2.26	0.03	S
28.	Ensure accountability report of input against output quality	3.80	0.00	S
29.	Review of programme for conformity with ethical and moral norms	1.01	0.31	NS
30.	Reviewing process and methods to reflect future trend	3.80	0.00	S
31.	Adopt a Code of Practice for Quality Assurance	1.79	0.08	NS
32.	Mapping the standards expected at each level of instruction	1.18	0.24	NS
33.	Form a task force committee to shoulder the responsibility of monitoring the process of quality	2.58	0.01	S
34.	Clarify the responsibilities of departments, schools, faculties, institutes and/or other organisational units as well as institutional leadership, individual staff members and students with respect to quality assurance	-1.06	0.29	NS
35.	Identify progression and defect routes in the school administration	2.82	0.01	S
36.	Internal programme assessment/evaluation for relevance	3.24	0.00	S
37.	Internal accreditation of material resources	3.03	0.00	S
Cluster level		1.79	0.17	NS

In Table 4, nineteen items (S/N 2, 3, 6, 9-11, 15-18, 22-26, 29, 31, 32 & 34) out of the 37 items had Sig. values which were between 0.06 and 0.91. These values were greater than the probability value (p-value*) of 0.05; indicating that there was no significant (NS) difference in the mean ratings of federal and state lecturers of colleges of education on the management approaches to Quality Assurance in Implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education at their respective t-test values. The remaining eighteen items (S/N 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12-14, 19-21, 27, 28, 30, 33, 35-37) had p-value which were between 0.00-0.04, which were less than 0.05 (p-value); indicating that there was significant (S) difference in the opinions of the respondents on the items at their respective t-test scores. The null hypothesis for the items with no significant (NS) difference in the compared means was accepted but rejected for the remaining item with significant (S) difference in the opinions of the respondents. At the cluster level, Sig. value = 0.17 at t-value = 1.79 while *(p-value) = 0.05. Thus, t-test did not indicate a statistical difference in the opinions of the respondents on the tested items. The null hypothesis (H_{05}) of no significant (NS) difference was upheld as Sig. \geq *; (0.17 \geq 0.05).

IV. Discussion of Findings

In education, the scale of challenges related to quality assurance has been overwhelming, and disproportionate to the number of resources available to address them adequately and sustainably. Findings of the study revealed the following as the challenges encountered in ensure quality in college of education; focusing much on theory teaching with less practical learning, inadequate funding of education, poor planning during programme implementation, staff resistance to change, poor quality of academic staff, poor staff motivation, lack of adherence to acceptable educational practice, poor teacher preparation and inadequate development of lecturers, lack of definition of quality as it applies to the school, and poor statement of study and achievement goals in the teaching and learning process among others. These findings align with those of Ayeni and Afolabi (2012), Nguyen (2012), O'Mahony and Garavan (2012), Igu, Ogba and Igwe (2014), Nje (2015), Pongo, Asare and Abdul-Fatahi (2015), Adebule and Ayooola, (2016), and Anane and Addaney (2016). Nguyen (2012) in his study outlined the obstacles to the successful implementation of programmes in schools of higher learning to include lack of quality innovations; staff resistance to change because of a lack of awareness and change culture, difficulty in defining what quality is; lacking purpose and unclear added value concept, poor communication between staff and management. In the findings of Nje (2015), it was revealed that lack of procurement and servicing of equipment in Colleges of Education could retard the implementation of Agricultural Education programme in the colleges.

Similarly, Igu, Ogba and Igwe (2014) revealed that poor teacher preparation and inadequate development of lecturers hinders effective implementation of educational programmes in schools. Adebule and

Ayoola (2016) revealed that the inadequacy of classroom and other school plants are critical challenges in the implementation of programmes. It is believed that well equipped laboratories, libraries, and subject rooms are needed for effective teaching and learning, and lack of it is sure to affect the success of the implementation of agricultural programmes in institutions of learning such as colleges of education. Pongo, Asare and Abdul-Fatahi (2015) in their study indicate that poor entry qualification, poor program/curriculum planning review, population explosion and overcrowded lecture halls, poorly equipped libraries, and lack of well-equipped laboratories are among the major challenges facing programme implementation. O'Mahony and Garavan (2012) revealed that the notions of what constitutes quality in institutions of higher learning, and conflict between quality for accountability and quality of learning affects quality assurance. Ayeni and Afolabi (2012) reported the challenges to quality assurance in institutions of learning to include inadequate provision of instructional materials and facilities for the teaching-learning activities, inadequate planning and delivery of lessons by teachers, lack of proper monitoring and evaluation of students' learning; and inadequate provision of training facilities to develop teachers for professional growth and increased productivity. Anane and Addaney (2016) revealed that not properly defining the goals and objectives of the unit, not properly defining a quality assurance unit's responsibilities and quality of staff affects quality teaching and learning.

There was no significant difference in the mean response of lecturers of federal and state colleges of education on the challenges to quality assurance in the implementation of Agricultural Education Programme in Colleges of Education as indicated by the t-test value of the tested hypothesis. Any observed difference is not statistical and not a true difference.

Findings of the study indicate that the management approaches for quality in the implementation of agricultural programme in colleges of education include motivating staff properly to encourage quality assurance, employing only qualified staff to support and prepare programme options, clarifying the responsibilities of departments, schools, faculties, institutes and/or other organisational units as well as institutional leadership, individual staff towards quality assurance, identifying process and progress defect routes in the school administration, provision of adequate material and personnel resources, fund quality assurance programmes, providing staff development packages, updating curriculum etc. In similar findings, European Occupational Standards for Golf (EUOG, 2012) indicate that assuring quality in programme implementation requires critical focus on the qualification of instructional professionals and unify method of employment. European Commission (EC, 2018) revealed that for quality in programme implementation, it is important to note that when appraisals stress improvement, and are not linked to promotions or incentive awards, teachers are more likely to be open about their challenges and perceived development needs. The agency recommended that appraisal frameworks should be linked to school priorities for development plans to strengthen opportunities for collective professional learning within a school. Faller (2018) revealed that addressing some of the challenges in programme implementation and quality assurance, there is need for collaboration and sharing of resources among units in and between institutions. Like the findings of this study, Pongo, Asare and Abdul-Fatahi (2015) revealed that the perception of quality in higher education institutions requires investing adequately in important inputs, human, and physical resources. The number and quality of staff are considered as important input elements in programme implementation in institutions of higher learning.

According to Machumu and Kisanga (2014) and Swanzy and Potts (2017) the success of quality assurance in education requires the adoption of a well-planned and coherent curriculum design and review processes. In agreement with the findings of this study, Lee and Dziuban (2012) revealed that the optimal mechanisms to support programme implementation include development, training and upgrading of staff, research, and funding opportunities. The authors further stated that quality assurance can be improved upon by making provision for learning facilities and equipment, adequate staffing which will provide the framework within which teachers' workload can be reduced to enhance efficiency and quality. The authors further stated that there is need to improve teachers' remuneration beyond what it is presently, as high wages may tend to produce commitment and efficiency. In a similar finding, Adegbesan (2011) indicated that clarity of purposes, adequate follow-ups, feedback linked to action, constant monitoring, supervision, inspection, evaluation and quality control are reliable approaches to achieving quality programme implementation. Like Adegbesan (2011), Machumu and Kisanga (2014) revealed that any discussion on quality assurance in higher education should start with highlighting what "quality" means to the institution and the stakeholders. In their study, O'Mahony and Garavan (2012) revealed that stakeholder involvement in quality implementation process, and consistent communication of institution's mission statement defining quality values and expectations are vital approaches to quality in programme implementation. In a similar study, Ayeni and Afolabi (2012) revealed that assuring quality in programme implementation involve formulating aims and goals of programme in a thoughtful manner, regular curriculum revisions, teaching methodology and assessment methods review, and staff development.

Findings of the study revealed that there was no significant difference in the mean responses of lecturers of federal and state colleges of education on the management approaches for quality assurance in the

implementation of Agricultural Education programme in colleges of education as indicated by the t-test value. Any observed difference is not statistical but could occurred by mere chance or due to sampling error.

V. Conclusions

Quality assurance has been the focus of most institutions of higher learning. It is often believed that an institution that assures quality in input and process ensures quality in product. The challenges reported in this study account for the setbacks in achieving quality in the implemented agricultural education programmes in colleges of education in southeast of Nigeria. These challenges ranging from issues in human and material resources and managerial/administrative are serious enough to reveal the defects in the quality of graduates from the colleges of education. The existence of these daunting challenges justifies the reports of poor performance among the graduates of these institutions, as hitches in the input and process of any reforming outfit whether focused on human or material is bound to have defects in the products. These challenges require serious attention from the college administrators, teachers, students, parents, employers, government and every other stakeholder to overcome and ensure smooth implementation of agricultural education programme in the colleges. The required attentions are captured in the findings of this study on the approaches for quality assurance in the implementation of agricultural education programme in colleges of education. The study has identified the required mechanisms to assure quality in the implementation of agricultural programmes in agricultural education. These requirements are meant to initiate and sustain quality and relevance of the implemented programmes.

Implication of the Study

The implications of the study are important for both policy and practice. Considering the continuous changing operational environment of colleges of education, information upon which critical decision making should be anchored is essential. This study provides useful information in assuring quality. The study reveals the quality assurance issues in the implementation of agricultural education programmes in colleges of education while the suggested approaches point to important actions that can be adopted in order to attain quality educational outcomes. Human and material resources management in colleges of education need to be viewed by all managers of higher education as a strategic aspect that if managed well can enhance quality. As higher educational institutions continue to change owing to the changing environment in which they operate, knowing the required mechanisms in managing the various resources becomes essential. This calls for deliberate efforts of the stakeholders to study the required mechanisms and imbed such approaches in the planning, leading, staffing and control of resources for effective and efficient teaching and learning in colleges. By policy implication, the findings of this study reveal the strategic approaches that can be incorporated into frameworks and made into benchmarks for guiding or enforcing quality in programme implementation and ensuring accountability in the practices of the relevant stakeholders in the administration of colleges of education. The adoption or neglect of management approaches as discussed in this study could be a predictor of the presence or absence of quality in the implementation of programmes in colleges of education.

Reference

- [1]. Adebule, S. O. & Ayoola, O. O. (2016). Impact of instructional materials on students' academic performance in mathematics in secondary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Research Journal of Educational Studies and Review*, 2, 1-4.
- [2]. Adegbesan, S.O. (2011). Establishing quality assurance in Nigerian education system: Implication for educational managers. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(2), 147-151.
- [3]. Akhuesonkhan, I., Raimi L. & Dada, J. O. (2014). Impact of quality assurance on technical vocational education and training in Nigeria. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (5), 1-25.
- [4]. Alexander, J. (2007). Quality assurance (QA). Retrieved 20th May, 2020 from <http://searchsoftwarequality.techtarget.com/definition/quality-assurance>
- [5]. Anane, G.K. & Addaney, M. (2016). Managing Quality Assurance in Higher Education: The Case of the University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(22) 41-46
- [6]. Ayeni, A.J. & Afolabi, E.R.I. (2012). Teachers' instructional task performance and quality assurance of students' learning outcomes in Nigerian secondary schools. *International Journal of Research Studies in Educational Technology*, 1(1), 33-42. DOI: 10.5861/ijrset.2012.v1i1.47
- [7]. Ayeni, A.J. & Afolabi, E.R.I. (2012). Teachers' instructional task performance and quality assurance of students' learning outcomes in Nigerian secondary schools. *International Journal of Research Studies in Educational Technology*, 1(1), 33-42. DOI: 10.5861/ijrset.2012.v1i1.47
- [8]. Ben, C. B. Tyopenda, N. K. & Naswem, R. A. (2002). Vocational education and students industrial work experience scheme (SIWES): A guide for students on SIWES. Bauchi: League of Researchers in Nigeria.
- [9]. Dabelstein, N. (2010). Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management. OECD Publications, Paris. Available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>
- [10]. European Commission. (2018). Quality assurance for school development; Guiding principles for policy development on quality assurance in school education. Output of the ET2020 Working Group Schools 2016-18. B-1049 Brussels
- [11]. European Occupational Standards for Golf. (2012). Quality Assurance Strategies and Guidelines for Vocational Education and Training in Golf in Europe. Lifelong Learning Programme. www.golf-stand.eu

- [12]. Faller, J.M.V. (2018). Quality Assurance Implementation, Management Practices, and Staff Performance in the Technical Colleges of the Sultanate of Oman: Inputs for a Quality Intervention Program. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 7(2), 49-60. Doi: 10.2478/ajis-2018-0046
- [13]. Goli, S. (2016). What is a College of Education? Retrieved 5th August, 2020 from <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/college>
- [14]. Igu, N. C. N., Ogba, F. N., & Igwe, I. O. (2014). Effects of instructional materials on students' achievement in social studies in lower basic education in Nigeria. *Proceedings of the International Conference on 21st Century Education at Dubai Knowledge Village*, 2, 37-44.
- [15]. Jara, M. (2007). Assuring and enhancing the quality of online courses: exploring internal mechanisms in higher education institutions in England. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Institute of Education, University of London
- [16]. Lee, J., & Dziuban, C. (2012). Using quality assurance strategies for online programs. *Educational Technology Review*, [Online serial], 10(2), 69-78.
- [17]. Machumu, H. J. & Kisanga, S. H. (2014). Quality assurance practices in higher education institutions: Lesson from Africa. *Journal of Education and Practice* 5(16), 144-156
- [18]. National Implementation Research Network (2016). Implementation. FPG Child Development Institute, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Retrieved 10th June, 2020, from <http://nim.fpg.unc.edu/learn-implementation/implementation-defined>
- [19]. Nguyen, T. (2012). Internal quality assurance in Vietnam's higher education: the influence by international projects. A Master Thesis in Education Science and Technology, Track of Educational Management, Evaluation and Assessment. University of Twente.
- [20]. Nje, M. A. (2015). Evaluation of agricultural education programme in colleges of education in South-South geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Unpublished thesis submitted at the Department of Agricultural Education, Faculty of Vocational Teacher Education University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- [21]. O'Mahony, K. & Garavan, T.N. (2012). Implementing a quality management framework in a higher education organization. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 20(2) 184 – 200. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09684881211219767>
- [22]. Onyesom, M. & Ashibogwu, N. K. (2013). Towards quality assurance in business education in Nigeria: Constraints and Control. *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 5(3), 306-312.
- [23]. Oye, I. O. (2007). Challenges of teacher education in Nigeria: the university of Lagos experience. Paper presented at the second regional research seminar for Africa, Accra, Ghana from 22-24th March, 2007.
- [24]. Pongo N. A., Asare, T.O. & Abdul-Fatahi, I. (2015). Evaluation of the Challenges of 21st Century on Quality Assurance of Higher Fashion Education in Ghana. *Arts and Design Studies*, 29, 18-28
- [25]. Rosser, A. & Massey, B. (2013). Educational leadership: The power of oneself. Peter Lang Pub.
- [26]. Rouse, M. & Ehrens, T. (2016). Implementation. Retrieved 10th June, 2020, from <http://searchcrm.techtarget.com/definition/implementation>
- [27]. Swanzy, P. & Potts, A. (2017). Quality Assurance Strategies in Higher Education: The Case of Ghanaian Polytechnics. *Education Research and perspectives*, 44, 100-127
- [28]. Tuck, R. (2007). An introductory guide to national qualifications frameworks: conceptual and practical issues for policy makers. Skills and Employability Department. International Labour Office (ILO). eLabour Office.
- [29]. Umoh-Mac (2006). Handbook on youth organizations in Agricultural Education. Abuja: Hil-venture.
- [30]. United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization. (UNESCO, 2016). Quality assurance. Retrieved 20th May, 2020, from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/strengthening-education-systems/higher-education/quality-assurance/>

Egbo B.N, et. al. "Issues with Quality Assurance in the Implementation of Agricultural Programmes In South Eastern Part of Nigeria." *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 11(2), (2021): pp. 44-52