

## AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA : MAXIMIZING NIGERIAN YOUTH POPULATION THROUGH AGROPRENEURSHIP



### Original Research Article

ISSN : 2456-1045 (Online)

(ICV-BM/Impact Value): 63.78

(GIF) Impact Factor: 4.126

Publishing Copyright @ International Journal Foundation

Journal Code: ARJMD/BM/V-26.0/I-1/C-7/JN-2018

Category : BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

Volume : 26.0 / Chapter- VII / Issue -1 (JUNE-2018)

Journal Website: [www.journalresearchijf.com](http://www.journalresearchijf.com)

Paper Received: 01.05.2018

Paper Accepted: 23.06.2018

Date of Publication: 10-07-2018

Page: 28-35



Name of the Author:

**DR. PETER OSITADINMA NDUBUISI**

*Department Of Entrepreneurship Studies, Chukwuemeka  
Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam, Anambra State, Nigeria*

### Citation of the Article

**Ndubuisi P.O. (2018)** *Agricultural Development Management in Nigeria: Maximizing Nigerian youth population through Agropreneurship ; Advance Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Discoveries.26(7)pp. 28-35*

### ABSTRACT

This paper is on agricultural development management: calling on youths to return to the farm with Orumba North L.G.A as the case study. The study adopted a survey approach and a five point likert scale was used to elicit response from 80 respondents that were selected using purposive sampling method. Data gathered was analyzed using simple percentage while hypotheses were tested with the non-parametric chi-square test using the 20.0 version of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). Findings from the study revealed that the contribution of agriculture to the aggregate gross domestic product (GDP) of Nigeria is still at its lowest and though there is a recent call to lure the youths back to farm, failure to provide a friendly business atmosphere for agribusinesses to thrive through functional and supportive policies may have dissuaded the youths from getting involved into agriculture. The researcher therefore concludes that public policy makers in the agriculture sector should develop and implement policies that enhance agribusiness in order to promote youth's participation. It was recommended that to attract youths back to farm, government should provide economic to youth farmers, provide trade policies such as making available high breed seedlings, bumper harvest purchase plan to forestall spoilage and put in place social policies that promotes the perception and image of agriculture.

### KEYWORDS :

Agric Development, Agropreneurship, Entrepreneurship, Youths

## I. INTRODUCTION

In Nigeria today, it is been emphasized that there is a need for a shift from the present mono product based economy (petroleum product) to an economy that is diversified. The return to agriculture that was ignored by past governments at the wake of oil boom is been echoed as the viable route to economic stability and growth. Agriculture from time immemorial has been the bedrock of ancient economies, and the need to join the modern economies of the world as envisioned in the Nigerian government vision 2020 may not be realized if agricultural development remains relegated.

Nigeria is one of the largest countries in Africa, with a total geographical area of 923,768 square kilometres and an estimated population of about 167 million (NBS, 2014). It lies wholly within the tropics along the Gulf of Guinea on the Western Coast of Africa. Nigeria has a highly diversified agro ecological condition which makes possible the production of a wide range of agricultural products. Over the past two decades, agricultural yields have remained the same or worse still declined. Nigeria's agriculture to a large extent still possesses the characteristics of a peasant economy that was prominent in the pre-independence period (Adewumi & Omotosho, 2002). More than 70 per cent of the farming population in Nigeria consists of smallholder farmers, each of whom owns or cultivates less than 5 hectares of farmland (NARP, 1994). Less than 50% of the country's cultivable agricultural land is under cultivation. Even then, smallholder and traditional farmers who use rudimentary production techniques, with resultant low yields, cultivate most of this land. According to W.P.A.Y (2012) "youths" are all people aged 15 to 24 years old and the terms "youth" and "young people" are used interchangeably. Taking understanding of its types, African Union adopts the 15-35 as the age definition of youth. In the context of this study youth referred to all people with the age between 15-35 years who engage themselves in agricultural activities in rural areas.

### Statement of the Problem

The poor participation of youth in agricultural activities in Africa has been a problem to agriculturalist, administrators and agricultural researchers due to the current situation of agriculture production. The integration of youth in agricultural activities is therefore an important factor toward agricultural sector development in many countries. This is because of their innovative behaviour, greater physical strength and a fast rate of learning. However, the quest for white collar job among the youths supported by poor perception of economic opportunities from agriculture, infrastructure deficit, and inconsistent government policies may have dissuaded youths from active participation and seeing the business side in agriculture. The problem of this study therefore is to examine agricultural development management and its attraction to youths as an entrepreneurship initiative.

### Research Objectives

The general objective of this study was to assess agricultural development management: calling on youths to return to the farm. Its Specific objectives include-

- (i) To determine youths participation in agriculture through agribusiness policies
- (ii) To examine the prime factors dissuading youths from participating in agriculture.

### Research Questions

- (i) What are the effects of agribusiness policies on youth's participation in agriculture?

- (ii) What are the prime factors dissuading youths from participating in agriculture?

## Hypotheses

**H<sub>01</sub>:** Agribusiness policies do not have significant effect on youth's participation in agriculture.

**H<sub>02</sub>:** there are no prime factors dissuading youths from participating in agriculture.

## II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURES

### Agriculture

Agriculture is an essential industry for many nations. In the western world, the share of agriculture in total Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is less than 4% but nearly 50% of the worldwide agricultural trade is conducted by these (developed) countries. This is amplified in the European Union's (EU's) low dependence on agriculture but with a large budget to subsidize agricultural products (Bertow and Schultheis, 2007). The reverse is true in developing countries where there is mostly high dependence on agriculture and a marginal budget that does not allow large spending. In the world, agriculture's share of contribution to employment is 35% compared to 86.8% in Africa according International Labour Organization (2010) and this makes agriculture the basic sector of Africa's economy on which majority of the people depends for their livelihood. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the population is predominantly rural and agriculture remains the main occupation. Unfortunately, agricultural growth in sub-Saharan Africa still lags behind that of the population culminating in the continuous food importation. Thus, poverty and food insecurity remain widespread in Sub-Saharan Africa. Domestic food markets are not given the needed attention as a potential engine of agricultural growth. This is demonstrated in high national import dependence which is the major cause of food insecurity among farmers especially in Nigeria.

### Global Efforts at Agricultural Development

Three-quarters of the world's poorest people get their food and income through farming of small plots of land, and most of them do this under difficult conditions. They grow diversity of local crops so as to avoid risk and also have to deal with other influencing factors such as diseases, pests, and drought, as well as unproductive soil. Government policies which ought to create the enabling environment for this group of people, do not adequately serve their interests. Women and especially the youth are the majority of this group of farmers who do most of the farming, but often with limited support. High rates of rural-urban migration, high levels of youth unemployment, ageing farmer populations and increasing dependence on imported food are concerns for agricultural development especially in the developing countries (FAO, 2009).

Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) which is a framework set up by African Union's (AU's) and the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) programme is mandated to raise the amount and quality of food produced in Africa; that is, secure supply of food for families, communities and countries as well as making export more profitable. This framework also embraces the principles of aids effectiveness as declared in Paris in 2005; this has been endorsed by the Group of 8 (G8) and thus pledged to provide resources either in kind, financial or technical support to CAADP (GIZ and ODI, 2011). This effort as intended is laudable but is never explicit as to how this secure supply of food could be arrived at. Also, it failed to spell out the productive target in terms of age for this venture and these have culminated to no conducive environment being spelt out for the achievement of the set goal by the framework.

Donor support to Africa's agricultural development efforts has been tremendous. For instance, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) has been involved with funding agricultural and rural development in developing countries, especially in Africa. It has been estimated that by the end of 2003, African countries had received loans from IFAD totaling approximately USD 3.6 billion which is the largest share (52%) of IFAD annual lending for the financing of 317 projects in 51 countries (IFAD, 2004). In making progress in poverty reduction, countries must have a sizeable rural component to their economy since it is only by this that it would appear that much of this progress is occurring through improvements of various sorts in the agricultural sector, such as a strengthening of world market agricultural prices for the countries' exports. Additionally, not only are many agricultural products important as exports for developing countries, but world agricultural markets have a reputation for instability and sometimes-difficult terms of trade (Barichello, 2004) and these are greatly influenced by both internal and external policies. In addition to its productive role of providing food, clothing, fuel, and housing for a growing world population, agricultural development is a vital and high-impact source of poverty reduction. The agricultural sector is not only the driver of developing nation's economy but also the means of livelihood for the majority of the people in these nations. It is also seen as a source of environmental problems and a contributor to global warming, water scarcity and pollution, and land degradation even though it has the potential as an environmental services source (FAO, 2010).

Most rural development programmes today pay very little attention, if at all, to agriculture because it is not perceived as a viable engine of growth. For instance, as the numbers of farms and farmers have dwindled especially at least in view of the last 50 years, U.S. rural development policy has focused less on farming and natural resource extraction and more on those elements that address the causes and outcomes of poverty, such as jobs, housing, health care, and infrastructure etc according to (Clancy et al., 2003). In recent years, agricultural growth in Ghana has been more rapid, an average annual rate of 5.5% compared to 5.2% for the economy as a whole with the crop production subsector expanding more steadily between 1995 and 2006; but the human resource in the agricultural production and post-production activities who are the youths are yet to be attracted through increased access to financial and mechanised services, technology, and land in addition to government facilitating the mentoring of the youth by established agribusinesses, especially those engaged in high value markets (FASDEP II, 2007). While accelerated growth will allow Ghana to meet its goal, the poverty rate in the North of Ghana will still remain at 35% in 2015 among small farmers (Future agricultures consortium, 2009) and this can only be worked out if in accelerating growth in the North, greater attention is given to activities that benefit majority of farmers. Traditionally, the roles of agriculture has been the provision of food security, supply of raw materials for industry, creation of employment and generation of foreign exchange earnings has been of late recognized that agriculture has a greater impact on poverty reduction than other sectors in addition to social stabilisation, buffer during economic shocks, support to environmental sustainability, and cultural values associated with it (farming) (FASDEP II, 2007).

#### **Agricultural Development Policies: The Nigerian Experience**

The need for active government intervention in the Agricultural sector through reform programs was informed by the dearth and neglect of Agriculture in Nigeria, due majorly to the rising fortunes in crude oil in the early 70's. Until then, Nigeria had a very robust agricultural sector with self-sufficiency in food production and minimal imports of processed food for the elites; farmers produced enough food

crops to feed the population and foreign exchange receipts from exported crops was used to finance government expenditure in education, health, construction and finance, etc. The northern region (including the middle belt) was largely exporting cotton, hides and groundnuts; the South West region specialized in cocoa, while the South East region (including the present South-South region) was a major exporter of rubber and palm produce. Government focused on research, extension services, marketing and pricing of export crops.

The period 1970-85 witnessed more direct government intervention in agriculture in the face of the noticeable decline in agriculture performance. A variety of policies were introduced. Macroeconomic policies became expansionary, including direct government involvement in agricultural production; incentives were introduced, including low tariffs on agricultural inputs. The period witnessed the establishment of many new agricultural institutions and programmes. Notable were the marketing board system which was reformed in 1973 and 1967/77 due to mounting criticisms against the inefficiencies and abuses that characterized the operations of the boards (Olomola & Akande, 1990). Nigerian Agricultural and Co-operative Bank (NACB) later followed in 1973 and the Agricultural Credit Guarantee Scheme Fund (ACGSF) in 1978, which were established to provide agricultural finance. During this period, world Bank-assisted ADPs were introduced in a number of states. The programmes were designed to provide an integrated approach to agricultural and rural development. River Basin Development Authorities were also established to provide all-year-round water through irrigation to farmers. More research institutes were established during this period. In anticipation of the increased agricultural output arising from these projects and Operation Feed the Nation (OFN), there was a reorganization of marketing boards, which gave rise to the grain boards.

However, the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) policy of 1986 began the era of liberalization of Nigeria Agricultural exports, including the scrapping of commodity boards and deregulation of the entire economy. During the period 1986-99, which combines SAP and post-SAP era, market-oriented and not so market-oriented agricultural development policies and programmes were introduced. River Basin Authorities were restructured from 21 to 11; the DFRRI was established, as well as the National Agricultural Insurance Corporation and Peoples' Bank. Farm input supply policy was actively pursued during this period. Trade liberalization was an important aspect of SAP. Abolition of import and export licensing and exchange control measures took place. With these reforms, export earners became entitled to 100 per cent of their foreign exchange earnings provided these were kept in a domiciliary account. Thus, agricultural producers had an incentive to boost their exports. The Nigerian Export-Import Bank (NEXIM) grew out of the Export Incentive and Miscellaneous Decree of 1986 and Nigerian Export Credit Guarantee and Insurance Corporation in 1988 and commenced operations in 1991. The focus was to provide refinancing and discounting facilities to commercial and merchant banks to encourage them to provide credit and risk-bearing facilities in support of exports. Perhaps the most visible and pervasive policy under SAP is the naira exchange rate devaluation. The rate, which was 0.639 naira to the US dollar in 1981 and 0.9996 naira in 1985, averaged 3.32 naira in 1986. By 1992, it had fallen to 19.66 naira and to 91.83 naira in 1999.

The current democratic era that begun in 1999 gave rise to yet new Agricultural policy reforms such as, National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), National Agricultural Policy (NAP) and Rural Sector Strategy (RSS), 2004. The overall strategic objective of the NEEDS and NAP is to diversify the productive base from oil and to promote market-oriented and private sector-driven economic development with strong local participation. Specifically, it

sought to achieve a minimum annual growth rate target of 6% for the agricultural sector in the first instance and attain a minimum agricultural exports of \$3 billion per annum from the Cassava initiative alone, and drastically reduce food imports to 5% from the present 14.5%. It also targeted increasing cultivable arable land by 10% per annum and foster implementation of private sector participation through incentives schemes to achieve agricultural production sustainability. The strategies to achieving the NEEDS Agriculture objectives include such programs as the presidential initiatives on chosen competitive commodities and taking advantage of concession arrangements in bilateral and multilateral agreements (WTO, EU-ACP, US-AGAO, and ECOWAS). Others include strengthening agricultural research, training and extension institutions and frameworks. It also sought a sustainable development of a private sector-led input supply and distribution system; an integrated agriculture led rural development and the growth of agricultural credit access window for farmers, while NAP aims at laying a solid foundation for sustainable growth in agricultural productivity.

### Constraints to Nigerian Youths Participation in Agropreneurship

Despite attempts made by the Government, NGOs and private institutions to encourage youth participation in agriculture, the efforts have not reflected in the age distribution of the farming population. This could be as a result of constraints faced by young farmers and thus, making it very difficult to engage agricultural activities. Most of the youths do not perceive agriculture as a lucrative business. Chikezie (2012) noted that the youth who have the energy to take up agricultural production do not believe or have the knowledge that agricultural production can really be a profitable venture. Thus, there is the urgent need to really educate them on the prospects associated with farming. Agribusiness management training should therefore feature prominently in youth in agriculture programmes. According to Muhammad-Lawal *et al* (2009), though youths have desirable qualities that can promote agriculture, most of them have strong apathy toward it. According to Ashford (2013) youths who are attached to agriculture are disadvantaged and this is because consideration of the youths as future farmers in Africa has not received adequate attention.

Poor societal value orientation is considered one of the constraints to youth involvement in agriculture. While premium is placed over such vocational callings as medicine, engineering and law, agriculture was relegated, a condition that worsened over the dominant influence of the emergent petro-economy. Youth thus look down upon agriculture (Amadi, 2012). They therefore shy away from agriculture because people who engage in agriculture do not get any recognition. Akpan (2010) asserted that there are a wide variety of factors that inhibits the youth from participating in agricultural activities; from economic, social and environmental factors reducing youth involvement in agricultural production. Akpan listed economic factors such as inadequate credit facilities, low farming profit margins, and a lack of agricultural insurance, initial capital and production inputs. Inadequate credit facilities and low profit margins drive most youth from agriculture.

According to White (2012), one reason why young people express reluctance to farm may reflect their aversion, not to farming as such, but to the long period of waiting that they face before they have a chance to engage in independent farming, even when land is available in the community. White stressed that in many or most agrarian societies the older generation – parents, or community elders in places where land is controlled not individually but by customary law – retain land as long as possible. White is of the view that the tension between the desires of the older generation to retain control of

family or community resources, and the desire of young people to receive their share of these resources, form their own independent farms and households, and attain the status of economic and social adulthood, is a common feature of agrarian societies. Umeh and Odom (2011) enumerated constraints faced by youth associations to include drudgery nature of agriculture due to the dependence on hand tools; investment in developing countries usually discriminate against agriculture, backwardness of the rural area where farming activities predominate-lack of social amenities such as electricity, good roads, pipe borne water, transportation, schools, markets, hospital and communication facilities. The youth today is trendy and prefers new and innovative ways of doing things. The drudgery involved in farm work in rural areas of Ghana scare them from farming and other agricultural activities. Amadi (2012) indicates the following factors as some of the major constraints to youth involvement in agriculture:

- i. Lack of scientific knowledge of agriculture among the surviving generation of illiterate farmers;
- ii. The sustained use of traditional farming tools and methods; and
- iii. The non-lucrative and energy consuming farm-occupations with the attendant low morale among farmers and youth.

Amadi (2012) also posited that production resources such as land, finance and market intelligence are a serious constraint considering the fact that agriculture is capital intensive. He further added that fund mobilization is still a major setback and of course, returns to investment (RTI) are still low due largely to low input value for those who eventually take up the adventure. People always invest in activities where they can generate more income and be able to recoup their investments. Due to the low profit margins associated with agriculture, it is often difficult to get good returns from investments made in agriculture.

### Youth and Agriculture

Youths are very important resources for every nation especially for sustaining agricultural productivity, an important sector for the development. The youth is a stakeholder in the development process especially in view of the great assets of youth, resilience, resourcefulness and perseverance. Unfortunately, this category of people is virtually left out in policies and programmes considerations (FAO *et al.*, 2009) even though this is a critical stage for this group of people since this is a period of transition into adulthood. For instance, the unemployment rate of this group globally ranked 12.6% compared with 4.8% as the rate of the adults in 2010 according to United Nation (UN, 2011) and this has the potential of tempting most youth to embark on migration especially to urban centres and beyond since this act creates room for accessing job opportunities. This group of people is over 1.8 billion in the world today, 90% of whom live in developing countries, where they tend to make up a large proportion of the population and needs to be empowered since this is an important means of improving food security, youth livelihoods and employment.

There is insufficient youth participation in the agricultural sector (Mangal, 2009) even though this class of people is the most productive of any society as it contains people in the prime of their lives physically and mentally. Agriculture being one of the foundation pillars of any society can only function as such if this insufficient youth participation is reversed. For instance improving youth productivity in the agricultural sector and exploring effective livelihood diversification is imperative. Also, investing in the youth by promoting good habit is crucial if they are to realize their full

potential. This is in view of the fact that the number and proportion of the older persons is growing faster than any other age group (UNFPA and HelpAge International, 2012). The youth with the dynamism and flexibility has the potential as an agent of positive change and this should be ensured by development programmes. In the most adverse and risky situations, young people have an extraordinary resilience and ability to cope, according to UNFPA (2006). As stakeholders, rural-based youth are actively engaged in family livelihood activities and play key support roles within their families and usually desire to be acknowledged, emotionally and financially, for such contributions and for the supporting role they played within their families, in addition to controlling the financial returns from their activities (PAFNET, 2010). Exposure of youths to modern cash economy and technologies that give them access to information from around the world are changing the perceived needs of young people, and this must be recognized especially by leaders, thus harnessing the opportunities and challenges thereof.

In Africa, 20% of the population aged between 15 and 24 years, comprising more than 20% of the population and a large majority lives in rural areas. Being 37% of the working-age population, rural youths who are attached to agriculture are disadvantaged and this is because consideration of the youths as future farmers in Africa has not received adequate attention. This category of people is the driving force behind economic prosperity in future decades, only if policies and programmes are in place to enhance their opportunities (Ashford, 2007).

According to Dr Namanga Ngogi, President of Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA), 60% of Africa’s population resides in rural areas and the large majority of this population is made up of youths, and the poor participation of this group of young people in farming is a threat to the future of agriculture and rural economic transformation on the continent (Ghana News Agency, 2012). Available evidence in Africa suggests an ageing farming population and high unemployment rate of youths, with for instance an average age of 47 years and 75% respectively in Nigeria (Akpan, 2010). Involvement of youth in agricultural activities has the potential of reducing the problems of the ageing farm population and increasing youth unemployment and this calls for securing the interest and participation of young people in agriculture in the form of deliberate shift in policy, training and promotion that specially targets the youth. This category of people are not only the productive backbone of every society, the major source of ideas and innovation, but also the main market for food consumption and very often the leaders and drivers of public opinion, public policy and action.

**III. METHODOLOGY**

This study adopted a survey approach and a five point likert scale questionnaire was used to elicit response from 80 youth respondents that were selected using purposive sampling method. The respondents were selected based on the level of their understanding of the concept under study. Data gathered was analyzed using simple percentage while hypotheses were tested with the non-parametric chi-square using the 20.0 version of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS)

**DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

In this section, we used the chi-square test to test the three hypotheses stated in this study with the aid of statistical software known as the SPSS Software version 20.00

**Table 1: Responses on Research Question 1**

Questions	Responses				Total
	SA	A	UD	SD	
1	46	32	2	0	80
2	34	27	11	8	80
3	51	16	3	10	80
4	20	40	12	8	80
5	34	24	16	6	80
6	51	21	3	5	80
<b>Total</b>	236	160	47	34	480

From the output of the SPSS software analysis, we have the following output;

**Table 2**

Case Processing Summary						
	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Questions * Responses	480	100.0%	0	0.0%	480	100.0%

**Table 3**  
Questions \* Responses Crosstabulation

			Responses				Total
			SA	A	UD	SD	
Questions	1.00	Count	46	32	2	0	80
		Expected Count	39.3	26.7	7.8	6.2	80.0
		% within Questions	57.5%	40.0%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses	19.5%	20.0%	4.3%	0.0%	16.7%
		% of Total	9.6%	6.7%	0.4%	0.0%	16.7%
	2.00	Count	34	27	11	8	80
		Expected Count	39.3	26.7	7.8	6.2	80.0
		% within Questions	42.5%	33.8%	13.8%	10.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses	14.4%	16.9%	23.4%	21.6%	16.7%
		% of Total	7.1%	5.6%	2.3%	1.7%	16.7%
	3.00	Count	51	16	3	10	80
		Expected Count	39.3	26.7	7.8	6.2	80.0
		% within Questions	63.8%	20.0%	3.8%	12.5%	100.0%
		% within Responses	21.6%	10.0%	6.4%	27.0%	16.7%
		% of Total	10.6%	3.3%	0.6%	2.1%	16.7%
	4.00	Count	20	40	12	8	80
		Expected Count	39.3	26.7	7.8	6.2	80.0
		% within Questions	25.0%	50.0%	15.0%	10.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses	8.5%	25.0%	25.5%	21.6%	16.7%
		% of Total	4.2%	8.3%	2.5%	1.7%	16.7%
	5.00	Count	34	24	16	6	80
		Expected Count	39.3	26.7	7.8	6.2	80.0
		% within Questions	42.5%	30.0%	20.0%	7.5%	100.0%
		% within Responses	14.4%	15.0%	34.0%	16.2%	16.7%
		% of Total	7.1%	5.0%	3.3%	1.2%	16.7%
6.00	Count	51	21	3	5	80	
	Expected Count	39.3	26.7	7.8	6.2	80.0	
	% within Questions	63.8%	26.2%	3.8%	6.2%	100.0%	
	% within Responses	21.6%	13.1%	6.4%	13.5%	16.7%	
	% of Total	10.6%	4.4%	0.6%	1.0%	16.7%	
Total	Count	236	160	47	37	480	
	Expected Count	236.0	160.0	47.0	37.0	480.0	
	% within Questions	49.2%	33.3%	9.8%	7.7%	100.0%	
	% within Responses	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	49.2%	33.3%	9.8%	7.7%	100.0%	

**Table 4**  
Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	64.659 <sup>a</sup>	15	.000
Likelihood Ratio	73.016	15	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.009	1	.315
N of Valid Cases	480		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.17.

Since the p-value or sig. (0.000) < the alpha level (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that agribusiness policies can be explored as a tool to enhance youths participation in agriculture.

Table 5 Responses on Research Question 2

Questions	Responses				Total
	SA	A	UD	SD	
7	55	17	8	0	80
8	32	28	8	12	80
9	34	46	0	0	80
10	17	36	11	16	80
11	40	34	0	6	80
<b>Total</b>	178	161	27	34	400

From the SPSS analysis of the data above, we have the following output;

Table 6  
Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Questions * Responses	400	100.0%	0	0.0%	400	100.0%

Table 7  
Questions \* Responses Crosstabulation

			Responses				Total
			SA	A	UD	SD	
Questions	7.00	Count	55	17	8	0	80
		Expected Count	35.6	32.2	5.4	6.8	80.0
		% within Questions	68.8%	21.2%	10.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses	30.9%	10.6%	29.6%	0.0%	20.0%
		% of Total	13.8%	4.2%	2.0%	0.0%	20.0%
	8.00	Count	32	28	8	12	80
		Expected Count	35.6	32.2	5.4	6.8	80.0
		% within Questions	40.0%	35.0%	10.0%	15.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses	18.0%	17.4%	29.6%	35.3%	20.0%
		% of Total	8.0%	7.0%	2.0%	3.0%	20.0%
	9.00	Count	34	46	0	0	80
		Expected Count	35.6	32.2	5.4	6.8	80.0
		% within Questions	42.5%	57.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses	19.1%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
		% of Total	8.5%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%
	10.00	Count	17	36	11	16	80
		Expected Count	35.6	32.2	5.4	6.8	80.0
		% within Questions	21.2%	45.0%	13.8%	20.0%	100.0%
		% within Responses	9.6%	22.4%	40.7%	47.1%	20.0%
		% of Total	4.2%	9.0%	2.8%	4.0%	20.0%
11.00	Count	40	34	0	6	80	
	Expected Count	35.6	32.2	5.4	6.8	80.0	
	% within Questions	50.0%	42.5%	0.0%	7.5%	100.0%	
	% within Responses	22.5%	21.1%	0.0%	17.6%	20.0%	
	% of Total	10.0%	8.5%	0.0%	1.5%	20.0%	
Total	Count	178	161	27	34	400	
	Expected Count	178.0	161.0	27.0	34.0	400.0	
	% within Questions	44.5%	40.2%	6.8%	8.5%	100.0%	
	% within Responses	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
	% of Total	44.5%	40.2%	6.8%	8.5%	100.0%	

Table 8  
Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	84.685 <sup>a</sup>	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	104.832	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.310	1	.012
N of Valid Cases	400		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.40.

Since the p-value or sig. (0.000) < the alpha level (0.05), we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there are prime factors militating against youths participation in agriculture

#### IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The contribution of agriculture to the aggregate gross domestic product (GDP) of Nigeria is still at its lowest, this may be associated partly to youth's refusal to actively participate in agriculture. Though there is a recent call to lure the youths back to farm, this study discovered that the failure to provide a friendly business atmosphere for agribusinesses to thrive through functional and supportive policies may have dissuaded the youths from getting involved into agriculture. The researcher therefore concludes that public policy makers in the agriculture sector should develop and implement policies that enhance agribusiness in order to promote youth's participation. The paper therefore recommends as follows;

- i. To attract youths back to farm, government should provide economic supports such as credit guarantee and modern farming equipment financing to youth farmers.
- ii. Provision of trade policies such as making available high breed seedlings, bumper harvest purchase plan to forestall spoilage.
- iii. Social policies that promotes the perception and image of agriculture such as agribusiness training to explain the opportunities in agriculture should be given to youths.

#### REFERENCES

- [1]. **Adewumi, M. O. & Omotesho, O. A. (2002).** An analysis of production objectives of small-scale rural farming households in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of Rural Development*, 25:201-211
- [2]. **Akpan SB (2010).** Encouraging youth's involvement in agricultural production and processing. International Food Policy Research Institute: Abuja.
- [3]. **Amadi, P.N.U. (2012).** Agricultural Entrepreneurship Development for Youth Empowerment in Nigeria: Constraints and Initiatives for Improvement. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*. Vol.2 (10).
- [4]. **Ashford L.S (2007).** Africa's Youthful Population: Risk or opportunity? Population Reference Bureau: Washington DC USA.
- [5]. **Barichello R, (2004).** Agricultural Development and Poverty Reduction in East Asia: The Impact of OECD Agricultural Policies. Paper presented to OECD Experts' Seminar on "The Impact and Coherence of OECD Country Policies on Asian Developing Economies," Paris
- [6]. **Bertow K, Schultheis A, (2007).** Impact of EU's agricultural trade policy on smallholders in Africa. <http://www.germanwatch.org/handel/euaf07.htm>.
- [7]. **Chikezie, N.P., Chikaire J., Osuagwu, C.O., Ihenacho, R.A., Ejiogu, N., Oguebuchulam, M. N. and Obi K.U. (2012).** Factors Constraining Rural Youths Involvement in Cassava Production in Onu – Imo Local Government Area of Imo State, Nigeria. *Global Advanced Research Journal of Agricultural Science* Vol. 1(8). 223-232pp, Available online <http://garj.org/garjas/index.htm>
- [8]. **Clancy K, Grow S, Oberholtzer L, (2003).** Agriculture as a Tool for Rural Development: Workshop Proceedings.
- [9]. **FAO, (2010).** Global strategy to improve agricultural and rural statistics. [www.worldbank.org/rural](http://www.worldbank.org/rural).
- [10]. **FAO, ILO, UNESCO, (2009).** Training and Employment Opportunities to Address Poverty Among Rural Youth: A Synthesis Report. UNESCO: Bangkok.
- [11]. **Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP II), 2007.**
- [12]. **Future Agricultures Consortium, (2009).** Agriculture and Social Protection in Ghana: A LEAP in the Dark? [www.future-agricultures.org](http://www.future-agricultures.org)
- [13]. **Ghana News Agency (2012).** Making agriculture attractive to the youth. Tuesday, march 20, 2012.
- [14]. **GIZ and ODI (2011).** Success stories 6: Aid coordination[online]. [www.nepad.org](http://www.nepad.org) or [www.nepad-caadp.net](http://www.nepad-caadp.net).
- [15]. **IFAD, (2004).** Report of support to NEPAD
- [16]. **Mangal H, (2009).** Best Practices for Youth in Agriculture: The Barbados, Grenada and Saint Lucia Experience. Final report.
- [17]. **Muhammad, A., Omotesho, O.A. and Falola, A. (2009).** Technical Efficiency of Youth Participation in Agriculture: A Case Study of the Youth - in - agriculture program in Ondo State, South western Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Agriculture, Food and Environment*, Vol. 5(1): 20-26 pp
- [18]. **National Agricultural Research Project (1994).** National agricultural research strategy plan: Draft report on North West Zone. Ibadan, Nigeria: NARP Press.
- [19]. **National Bureau of Statistics, 2014** review.
- [20]. **Umeh, G. N. and Odom, C. N., (2011).** Roles and Constraints of youths' associations in agricultural and rural development, IDOS Publications: Nigeria
- [21]. **UNFPA, (2006).** Moving Young People. [www.unfpa.org](http://www.unfpa.org)
- [22]. **UNFPA and HelpAge International, (2012).** Ageing in the Twenty-First Century: A Celebration and a Challenge. UNFPA and HelpAge International: New York.
- [23]. **United Nation, (2011).** World youth report. [UNWorldYouthReport.org](http://UNWorldYouthReport.org).
- [24]. **White, B. (2012).** Agriculture and the generation problem: rural youth, employment and the future of farming. FAC – ISSER Conference — Young People, Farming and Foodl, Accra, 19-21 March 2012

\*\*\*\*\*