

**Evaluation of some training courses in Agricultural Extension Department -
general Directorate of Agriculture in Sulaimani governorate during the period of
1st January 2014 – 1st February 2015 from the trainees point at views**

Mohammed Omer Mohammed Sakina

University of Sulaimani - Faculty of Agricultural Sciences

abwmeer2005@yahoo.com

Abstract

The aim of this investigation was to determine the level of evaluation of some training courses in some disciplines, finding the relationship between the evaluation levels of the training courses as a consequence variables and some independent variable. The research involved 83 trainees with different specializations. They were participated in some training courses carried out in training unit of the Extension department of general Directorate in Sulaimani Agricultural during the period of 1st January 2014 – 1st February 2015. The data was collected throughout personal interviews, using questioners forms prepared for this purpose. To confirm the reliability structure and the contents the form were reviewed by some experts .The validity coefficient of criteria was found by using half separation of Spearman brown equation. The results showed that evaluation level of the training courses respondents was medium tended to rising and the trainers' evaluation occupied the first rank, giving the interesting percent of (58.18%). While the training Evaluation aims occupied last rank, recording the interesting percent (53.18%). The results indicated a significant correlation between each of (academic achievements, participation in specialized training, period and the place of training courses). While non- significant correlation was found between each of the (age, candidate policy, and the number of training courses). The author is recommended to activate the training efforts adopted on the principle of Planning Implementation and good Evaluation. It also recommended the adoption of suitable and logical mechanism in selecting of the candidate to the training courses under the light of their needs and problems during the work, and urging the trainees' participation in drawing the objectives and training topics. The researcher also concerns about all employees, especially those of lower academic degrees, and attempt to organize practical training courses in the work sites or outside the office in the field instead of conventional theoretical courses.

Keywords: training courses, agricultural extension.

Introduction

The Human being development represents the main sector for the overall growths of the developed and developing countries.

Date of research received 8/9/2015 and accepted 1/3/2016

Hence, coping with the new techniques and their utilization by human being is the key of incorporating the new techniques into the society (Al- Abbasi, 1998). The human being is considered as the most important elements of the productivity, as it mainly determines the production power which can exploit other productivity elements to serve the human kind (Taqi *et al.* 1997). To activate the development process of Human kind eligible staff has to be trained to be able in dealing with the new agricultural techniques and persuade the farmers to accept and practice these techniques in their production process for both plant and animal production sectors. Thus, the attention is to increase the agricultural staff being an important element of the whole process for the quality and quantity of human being development, to fulfill the requirements of rural society (Al-Samaraaie, 2002). From the above points the development of agricultural sectors depends on two essential elements. The first is materialist element with the technical developments in the relevant field of agricultural productions, while the second is the human element equipped with abilities and the skills; those enable the producer to utilize the materials elements efficiency to achieve the development (Al-Dawidi, 2003). It has been agreed that the Agricultural developments are focusing basically on the human power and the development of their ability throughout continuous and connected training (Arshidat, 2002). The purpose of training is to build up the human mental abilities and personality behaviors. Such kind of training will allows reforming the personality of trainee. The training is also continues process and the trainees have to develop their ability continuously (Al-Shkawi, 1989). Since the Agricultural extension is a system of renewing the desirable variable behaviors of farmer's society, qualifying and the training process of agricultural staff represents the main factor of succeeding the extensional structure (Al-Samawi, 2004).

As the training courses are known to be the most activities of extensional centers for both trainers and farmers, aiming to improve their professional levels and to achieve a positive developments The extensional centers are concern to conduct is such courses because the training being the main tool to perform the trainer and trainee development as well as the agricultural productions. (Al-Mashhadani, 2006). The training unit at the Agricultural extension division is established to conduct the training courses for the agricultural staff of different disciplines. The training with its different styles being one of the possible activities to develop and activate the information, skills and the attitudes of individuals for different specialist of their actual practices (Abdul- Hussain *et al.* 1997). The training is an important activity to develop human resources. Many researchers have indicated that the training is not fixed in refer. one of the economical and sociological development tools. They also affirmed that what is being spent on the training is represents the investment of human recourses (Ali Abdul- Hussain *et al.* 1997). Many studding confirmed the

linear relationship between the active participation of individuals in the training activities and their works performance (Nielz krez owfist, 1986). The importance of the training for the workers, in the agricultural extension sectors, is being in the point of their ability to join the information centers of the municipality and the rural groups those benefitted from the Agricultural extension services. This can be achieved via raising their knowledge abilities, activating and renewing their professional experiences (Al-Saidi, 2006). From this point of view, the extensional organization has increased the training investment from its budget practicing several efforts and experiences in the program preparation and implementation. The money spent in the training investments considered as an input of the extensional organization. Hence, the benefit, the outcomes of this project and the performance of production development levels have to be evaluated to determine the effect of inputs on the incomes achievement (Al-Mashhadani, 2006). Despite the training being is an active way to achieve efficient functions, its effect will not be accurate if there is no progress to evaluate the outcome. It has been mentioned that there is no possibility to judge the range of the training program benefit and its action without a reasonable evaluation. This evaluation cannot be investigated in the absent of clear principles and evaluation standards (Swaelim, 1998).

Therefore, support and development of the extensional courses, the power points of such training will be evaluated by the training unit of agricultural extension department of Sulaimani Governorate, It is an important process through which to identify, the weak points and other problems so be overcome. From here came the idea of this study to evaluate the training courses considering the trainees' point of view and perspective as they are being the most active participators of these courses and who are capable of objective evaluation of here. Following these facts we emanate a research topic to answer the following research problems:

- 1- What is the state of some training courses held at Agricultural Extension Department in Sulaimani governorate for the period of 1st Jan 2014- 1st Feb 2015 in the view of some disciplinary estimation from the trainers point of views discussion of evaluation process benefits?
- 2- What is the state of some training courses held at agricultural extension department in Sulaimani governorate for the period of 1st Jan 2014- 1st Feb 2015 in the view of all disciplinary estimation trainers?
- 3- What is the relationship between the estimation of training courses and some independent variable such as age, academic achievements, participation in the specialist training, number of training courses, period and the holding place in training courses.

Materials and methods

To achieve the aims of the study a questionnaire form was designed which includes two main parts:

First part: Included a number of questions related to the independent variables such as age, academic achievements, candidate to the training courses, participation in the specialist training courses, number of training courses, period and place of holding the training courses. These factors were determined and fixed after reviewing the literatures and some studies related to the study subject, in addition to the comment and the perspectives of some specialist in the Agricultural extension filed and they are listed as follows (*):

These variables were measured as follows:

- 1- The Age: was measured according to the number of years.
- 2- Academic achievements: It measured by giving the grades of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 according to the degree level obtained (intermediate, high school, diploma, bachelor and higher education), respectively.
- 3- Candidate to the training course: It was measured by giving the digit numbers of 1, 2 and 3 depends on the perspective of the trainee to way of participation in the training, including self desire, by the administrator and as a promotion requirement, respectively.
- 4- Participation in the specific training course: means by that relating the trainer academic specialist with training course. It was measured by giving the digit number of 2 and 1 according to the degree of relatedness of the trainer specialist and the course subject for related to the course subject and non-related to the course subject, respectively.
- 5- Number of training courses: It was measured by the number of training course participated by the trainee during the period of 1st Jan 2014 – 1st Feb 2015.
- 6- Duration of the training course: it was measured by the number of training days participated by trainee.

* The names of specialists:

- Dr. Sahhhab Aid Yosif, professor in Agricultural extension
- Dr. Abid Ali Hassan, Assistant professor in Agricultural extension
- Dr. Najmadien Abdullah, professor in Agricultural extension
- Dr. Sabir Bakir Mustaffa, Assistant professor in the measuring and evaluation
- Dr. Tahir Muhammed Laiq, Lecturer in Agricultural extension
- Mr. Dara Abdulrahman Salih, Lecturer in Agricultural extension
- Mr. Hashim saeed murad, lecturer in agricultural extension

7- Place of the training course: It was measured by giving the digit number of 1, 2 and 3 according to the place of holding the course in the department, inside and outside the department and outside of the department, respectively.

Second part: Estimation fields of the training courses:

This part includes six fields for the estimation (aims of the training courses, trainers, training contents, methods and training tools, training environment and the training results). To evaluate each field the following categories numbers of 10, 8, 9, 8, 10 and 8, respectively, giving the total of 53 items number of estimation the training course. These items were arranged and purified depends on the literatures , and views the specialist perspectives in the training subjects and depends also on the previous investigations on the entire subjects. Five choices were designed to each items as an indicator to determine the level of the items achievement. The choices of achievement levels were weak, fair, good, very good and excellent were detected with the numbers of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, respectively. Table 1 shows the determination of training evaluation levels by collecting the numbers of evaluation items that determined to be 53- 265.

Table 1: Evaluation standards of the training courses

Evaluation standard	Achievement level				
	Weak	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5

The first draft of questionnaire was shown to a group of specialist in the fields of agricultural extension, psychology, measuring and evaluation. Depends on their views the items were reformatted. The reliability of content had been measured by comparing the standards with the evaluation items according to the results of related studies. It also measured by the determination of relative significant of all evaluation training courses depends on the hypothesis of some experts.

Reliability: The reliability of test was measured during the exploratory sampling of 30 examine, using half splitting method throughout finding the correlation factor between individual and dual items. To find the test fixture the equation of Spearman Brown prediction formula was used, the results are as in Table 2.

Table 2: Test Reliability

No.	Evaluation area	Correlation factor (Pearson)	Reliability coefficient (Spearman brown)
1	Aims of the training	0.8704	0.9307
2	The trainers	0.887	0.9401
3	Training content	0.8709	0.9309
4	Methods and training Aids	0.9074	0.9514
5	Training environment	0.8884	0.9409
6	Training results	0.9136	0.9548

It is appear from the table above that all the areas had mean values above than 70% which is indicating the high fixation ratio. After data collection they were arranged and ordered before analyzing with SPSS application. The statistical methods used in the analysis were repetitions, percentage, arithmetic means, standard deviation, simple correlation coefficient (Pearson), Spearman Brown prediction formula and T test.

Results and discussion

First: Evaluation of some training courses held at the Agricultural Extension department in Sulaimani governorate for the period of 1st Jan 2014- 1st Feb 2015 from the trainees point of view for all evaluation fields. The aim was obtained from the following sub-ordinary objectives:

1- Determination of the evaluation level for some training courses at evaluation fields in general: The distribution of evaluation level for some training courses was performed into three items, at the Agricultural Extension department- General Agriculture directorate in Sulaimani governorate. The standard deviation of 33.96 was summated with the arithmetic mean (164.06). Then, the standard deviation was subtracted from the arithmetic mean to obtain the range of mean category of 130-198. The category of weak evaluation ranged 108-129 degree, while the high evaluation item ranged 199- 260 degree as described in Table 3.

Table 3: Evaluation level of the training courses for all items from the trainees point of view

Training evaluation level	Number of trainees	Percentage	Mean of the evaluation value
Weak evaluation (108-129)	12	%14.46	122.25
Middle evaluation(130-198)	56	%67.47	157.98
High evaluation (199-260)	15	%18.07	220.20
Total	83	%100	

Standard deviation= 33.96 arithmetic means= 146.06

It is appearing from Table 3 that the evaluation of nearly 86% of the trainees for the training courses was middle toward high. This value is promising as indicating the comprehensive plan and a good performance of the efforts had been put forth by the staff of training unit at the Agricultural extension department during their organizing of training courses.

2- Determination of the evaluation level for some training courses at each area of evaluation fields:

3- The evaluation fields were arranged according the level of their achieving. It is appeared that the trainees' evaluation was rated the first rank with the arithmetic mean value of 3.34 and the importance percentage of 66.89%. These results are referred to the scientific and practical ability of trainers in delivering the target subject as most of them were in academic at the University and they have Training experiences and Previous teaching. While the evaluation of training course aims was occupied the lowest ranking with the arithmetic means of 2.65 and the important percentage of 53.18%. The unsatisfied aims of the course might be refer to the reason that the trainers were not participated actively in the strategic of the aims or the aims might be unclear and cannot fulfill the training requirements (Table 4).

Table 4: Evaluation level of the training courses for all evaluation categories

No.	Evaluation field	Order	Arithmetic mean *	Important percentage
1	Evolution Trainers	1	3.34	66.89%
2	Evaluation of training environment	2	2.97	59.44%
3	Evaluation of training results	3	2.90	58.00%
4	Evaluation of training content	4	2.82	56.59%
5	Evaluation of methods and training tools	5	2.70	54.00%
6	Aims of training courses	6	2.65	53.18%

*; maximum value= 5

Second: Finding the relationship between the evaluation of training courses and some independent variables such as the age, academic achievement, specialization, candidate to the training course and participating in the training course.

Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine the relation between the evaluation levels of training courses, from the trainers point of views (as a followed variable), and some independent variables. To determine the significant of correlation relation between constant and followed variables T-test was followed.

1- **The age:** the result indicated the range of 26-62 years for the ages, and divided into three categories. Pearson equation of simple correlation coefficient was used

to find the relation between the age and evaluation level. The degree of significant for the correlated values was estimated using t- test equation. Table 5 shows that the calculated t-value was 1.688, while the table t-value was 1.988 . Since the calculated t-value was less than the table value, so the correlation is not significant between the age and the evaluation level. Meaning that the age is not affecting the evaluation level and most of the researchers are in agreement to train either young or old people.

- 2- **The academic achievement:** the results showed that most of the trainees were qualified university degree. To find the relation between the academic achievement and the level of evaluation simple correlation coefficient was determined and t- test equation was also used to detect the level of significant. It is appeared from Table 5 that the calculated t-value was 2.091, being more than the value of table t-value (1.988). The result indicated the presence of significant correlation between the academic achievement and the evaluation level. It is confirming the effect of academic levels significantly on the level of evaluation, as those having the higher academic degree have pre knowledge and some background regards these issues. While those are in lower academic level are less expert and these topics will be new for them.
- 3- **Candidate to the training course:** Depends on the results obtained most of the trainers for the courses were nominated by the administration. Means that they are shortlisted by the higher authority administration, while few of them were candidate as promotion requirement. To determine the correlation between the candidate to the training courses and the evaluation levels Pearson correlation coefficient was utilized, and to determine the significant level of correlation t- equation was followed. From Table 5 it is appear that calculated t-value was 0.546 while the table value was much higher (1.988). Thus, the result indicates non-significant correlation between the way of nomination for the training courses and the evaluation level. This result will affirm that the candidate variation had no effect on the evaluation level.
- 4- **The participating in the specialist course:** The results indicated that most of the trainers are participated in the specialist courses. To find the relation between the participation in specialist courses and the evaluation level Pearson correlation coefficient was used and t-test equation was used to indicate the significance of the relation. It is appearing from Table 5 that the calculated t-value was 2.095 while the table value of t- test was 1.988 . Due to the reason that the calculated t-value is bigger than the table value, the significant relationship between the participation in the specialist training courses and the evaluation level was affirmed. This result confirming that the participation in the specialist training course will affect positively the evaluation level as the trainers have an idea on the

course subject and it is easy for them to understand the course and their candidate was depends on their requirements and problems during their participation .

- 5- **Number of training courses:** The results showed that most of the trainees were participated in a single training course and a few of them were participated in four training courses, while those participated in three courses had a high evaluation. Also Pearson correlation coefficient was followed to find the relationship between number of training courses and the evaluation level. To determine the level of significant for the correlated values t- test equation was used. Table 5 indicated that the calculated t-value was 1.519 , while the table value showed 1.988. This result indicated non-significant correlation between the number of training courses and the evaluation level. It is clear from the result that number of training course is not that important to come out with the good evaluation, but the training contents is more important. This is might be refer to the reason that the training courses been participated by the trainees are far away from their specialist or the increasing of training courses had increased and complicated the subjects caused them to be difficult to cope with all of these interacted subjects.
- 6- **The period of training course:** It is appeared from the result that most of the trainees had 5-7 days of training courses. Depends on the results obtained from Simple correlation coefficient using Pearson correlation coefficient, the results of t-table (3.459) was bigger than t-table (2.636). this result means presence of high correlation between the period of training courses and the evaluation level. The results obtained describe that the good evaluation came from the higher period of the courses. The best explanation for this relation is that those participated in the longer period of training courses were able to collect a good adequate information on the courses subjects, as they were investigated all subject sides and they has a reasonable time for the practical and field works during the training course.
- 7- **The place of holding the training course:** The results showed that most of tents in the training courses were from the agricultural extension department. The correlation between the place of holding the training courses and the evolution level was investigated using Pearson equation for correlation coefficient; t-test equation was also followed to conduct the level of significant. As the t- table value (3.378) was more than t-table (2.636), the significant correlation was obtained between the place of holding the courses and evaluation level of the training. The results indicated that holding the training courses outside the agricultural extension department will be much better from those held inside the department. It means that theoretical and training only are not the learning tool as the practical and field works are necessary for the comprehensive and beneficial training courses.

Table 5: Numbers, percentages and correlations between the evaluation level and the independent variables

factors	categories	Number of trainees	Percentage	Means and the evaluation values	Correlation	t-value
The age	26-36	44	53.01%	169.06	-0.184	-1.688 s.n
	37-47	23	27.71%	163.82		
	48 -58	14	16.87%	152.33		
	59-69	2	2.41%	130.5		
Academic achievement	Post graduate	17	20.48%	147.47	0.226	2.089 *
	Diploma	11	13.25%	168.27		
	Bachelor	55	66.27%	168.23		
Candidate to the course	According to my choice	17	20.48%	165.52	-0.0606	0.546 s.n
	By the administration	63	75.90%	164.56		
	promotion requirement	3	3.62%	150		
participating in the specialist course	Non-specialist courses	20	24.10%	150.55	0.225	2.081 *
	specialist courses	63	75.90%	168.34		
Number of courses	1	56	67.47%	160.41	0.166	1.519 s.n
	2	16	19.28%	167		
	3	6	7.23%	183		
	4	5	6.02%	172.8		
Period of training course	2-4	14	16.87%	147.14	0.359	3.459 **
	5-7	44	53.01%	159.55		
	8-10	10	12.05%	159.84		
	11 -13	15	18.07%	182.66		
The place of holding the course	In the department	32	38.55%	151.13	0.351	3.378 **
	Inside and outside the department	23	27.71%	164.68		
	Outside the department	18	33.74%	181.11		

*: Significant correlation at the level (0.05).

**.: significant correlation at the level (0.01).

s.n: Non significant correlation.

Conclusions

- 1- The study results described that 86% of the trainees had a medium to the training courses tending to the rise at the training unit in Agricultural training department of directorate of agriculture in Sulaimani governorate. We conclude from that the efforts of training unit in agricultural extension department have safe planning and performance in holding the training course.
- 2- The field of trainers' evaluation occupied the first rank according to its achievement. We are conclude from that the training unit was able to select the staff and specialist, those having an experience (lecturers and other academic staff) in the universities, precisely in a logical and scientific way. While the Aims of training courses was occupied the lowest rank, concluding that the aims might be unclear or they are not fulfill the needs and the problems of the trainees, or their problems were not taken in consideration in the structuring the aims of training courses.

Recommendations

- 1- The training unit of the agricultural extension department has to focus on the activating the training efforts according to the scientific principles of planning, implementation and the evaluation
- 2- Building the safe way for the candidate process for the training courses and taking in consideration the training requirements and the problem they are facing during the work.
- 3- More contribution of the trainees in the aim drawing and the course subjects, unless to be convenience and parallel to their personal and scientific abilities.
- 4- More attention to the workers regardless to their ages or positions.
- 5- Focusing on the participating the people with lower degrees of diploma and high school in the training courses.
- 6- Holding the specialist training course for those who working in different disciplinary
- 7- Focusing on the practical sides of the training more than theoretical and holding the training outside the department and in the site of problems.

References

1. Al-Abbasi, Amil Fadel 1998: The study of the needs of employees in Nainawa, governorate, some knowledge and experience guidance, unpublished Ph.D thesis, college of Agriculture and Forestry, Mosul University, p. 9. (In Arabic).

2. Al-dawidi, Salah Jassim Al-Amin 2003: The educational and training requirements for farmers in Tamim governorate in the use and maintenance of the central sprinkler and its relationship with some variables irrigation systems, MS.C Thesis, college of Agriculture and Forestry, Mosul University. (In Arabic).
3. Al-Mashhadani, Mithal Abdul-Latif 2006: Building a model for the mechanism of in-service training evaluation for extension workers in Iraq technicians, Ph.D thesis, coolege of Agriculture, University of Baghdad, Iraq. (In Arabic).
4. Al-Samarraie Abdullah Ahmed (Dr)2002: Agricultural training priorities over the next three years, the paper presented at a workshop of the Arab Organization for Agricultural Development, the Arab League, Oman, 2002. (In Arabic).
5. Al-samawi, Ahmed Abdul-Wali 2004: The impact of training on the field indicative transactions post-harvest knowledge in agricultural extension workers in the area of Wadi Zabid , Damascus University of Agricultural Sciences Journal, Volume 20, Issue (2). (In Arabic).
6. Al-Saidi Abdul-Jabbar 2006: Building a model for the training of new agricultural extension workers in the central region, unpublished PhD thesis, college of Agriculture, University of Baghdad, p. 3. (In Arabic).
7. Al-shakawi, Abdul-Rahman1989: Management training for development: study of the management training program in the UK, Institute of Public Administration, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. (In Arabic).
8. Arshidat ,Qasim Mamdouh 2002: Determine the training needs in the field of agriculture,in Arab countries, paper presented at the workshop of the Arab Organization for Agricultural Development, the Arab League, Oman, p. 3. (In Arabic).
9. Nielz Krez Owfiset1986: Advances steps of education for engineers, UNESCO, p. 23).
10. Taqi, Ali Abd ,Ali Abdul-Hussein and Mustafa Mahmoud Helmi (doctors)1997: Training - planning, design, implementation,1, Kuwait, the Public Authority for Applied Education and Training, system. (In Arabic).
11. Swaelim, Mohammad Nasim Ali1998: Planning and Evaluation in Agricultural Extension, presses Cairo, Egypt. (In Arabic).

12. Interview with Mr. Marivan Rostam Fattah 2015: Administrator of Planning unit in the Agricultural Extension Department.
13. Interview with Mr. Mohamed Ali Darwesh 2015 : Administrator of Training Unit in the Agricultural Extension Department.

تقويم بعض الدورات التدريبية المقامة في قسم الإرشاد الزراعي التابع للمديرية العامة للزراعة في محافظة السليمانية للفترة ما بين 2014/1/1 ولغاية 2015/2/1 من وجهة نظر المتدربين

محمد عمر محمد سكيينة

جامعة السليمانية - فاكلتي العلوم الزراعية

abwmeer2005@yahoo.com

الخلاصة

استهدف البحث تحديد مستوى تقويم بعض الدورات التدريبية في بعض مجالات التقويم ثم إيجاد العلاقة بين مستوى تقويم الدورات التدريبية كمتغير تابع وبعض المتغيرات المستقلة، وشمل البحث (83) متدرباً من ذوي الشهادات والاختصاصات المختلفة ممن شاركوا في بعض الدورات التدريبية المقامة في وحدة التدريب التابعة لقسم الإرشاد الزراعي في المديرية العامة للزراعة في محافظة السليمانية للفترة ما بين 2014/1/1 ولغاية 2015/2/1، وتم جمع البيانات من خلال المقابلة الشخصية وبواسطة استمارة استبيان خاصة أعدت لهذا الغرض، عرضت الاستمارة على مجموعة من الخبراء والأساتذة لتحقيق الصدق الظاهري والمحتوى، تم إيجاد معامل ثبات المقياس بطريقة التجزئة النصفية واستخدام معادلة Spearman Brown. أظهرت النتائج أن مستوى تقويم المبحوثين للدورات التدريبية كان متوسط يميل إلى الارتفاع، وان مجال تقويم المدربين احتلت المرتبة الأولى وكان أهميتها النسبية 66.89% بينما احتلت تقويم الأهداف التدريب المرتبة الأخيرة وكان أهميتها النسبية 53.18%، وأوضحت النتائج وجود علاقة ارتباطية معنوية بين كل من (التحصيل الدراسي، الاشتراك في دورة تخصصية، مدة الدورة التدريبية، مكان انعقاد الدورة التدريبية)، وعدم وجود علاقة ارتباطية معنوية بين كل من (العمر، الترشح للدورة التدريبية، وعدد الدورات التدريبية). أوصى الباحث بالعمل على تنشيط جهود التدريب المبني على أسس التخطيط والتنفيذ والتقويم السليمة، وبناء آلية سليمة ومنطقية لكيفية الترشح للدورات التدريبية وعلى ضوء الاحتياجات التدريبية والمشاكل التي يواجهونها المتدربين أثناء العمل، ومشاركة المتدربين في رسم الأهداف ومواضيع الدورة، والاهتمام بكافة الموظفين وخصوصاً الشهادات الدراسية الأدنى، وإقامة الدورات في مكان العمل أو خارج القسم بشكل ميداني وعملي والابتعاد عن الجانب النظري.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الدورات التدريبية و الإرشاد الزراعي.