

The Impacts of Integrated Youth Training Farm as a Capacity Building Center for Youth Agricultural Empowerment in Kwara State, Nigeria

*Abdul-Lateef Ayinde Latopa^{1,2}

Sharifah Norazizan Syed Abd Rashid¹

¹Department of Social and Development Science, Faculty of Human Ecology, University Putra Malaysia

²Department of Local Government Studies, College of Administrative Studies & Social Science
Kaduna Polytechnic, Kaduna State Nigeria; 'latieto@yahoo.com

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n5p524

Abstract

Capacity building in agriculture has become imperative in Nigeria due to the high rate of youth unemployment, over-dependence on white collar job and the need to prepare a replacement for the aging local subsistence farmers. To achieve this trend, some states in Nigeria established youth training farms to empower the youth in agriculture sector. Integrated Youth Training Farm Program was established by the Kwara State government as a youth empowerment strategy to reduce unemployment and associated social problems. About 418 youths were trained through the capacity building program between 2006 and 2013 as new generation of modern commercial farmers. In this regard, this study assesses the impact of the Integrated Youth Farm Training Program on youth in Kwara State. Using qualitative case study technique, 30 informants who included the youth participants, implementers and government officials were interviewed. Also, documents, Focus Group Discussion and observation were used as the researchers remain the main instrument. The findings revealed that, the capacity building program has made tremendous impact directly and indirectly on the lives of the youth in Kwara State. Eventually, the success of the program has led to multiplier effects that will subsequently go a long way in empowering the teeming youth population socially, economically and psychologically if the challenges of sustainability are adequately addressed.

Keywords: capacity building, malete youth farm, agriculture training, youth empowerment, youth unemployment.

1. Introduction

Capacity building is a process of improving the ability of individual or group with a view to empower them with a new knowledge or to add to their existing knowledge. UNESCO (2006) described capacity building in the same context; as individual, organization or system ability to perform some functions more appropriately, effectively, efficiently and sustain such ability. The idea behind capacity building program is to give what is lacking or what is causing a set-back in achieving a task or goal so that the task or goal will be achieved. In other word, UNDP (2009) defined capacity development as the process through which individuals, organizations, and societies acquire, strengthen and maintain the capabilities to set and achieve their development objectives over time. Therefore, developing youth capacity in this study can be described as a community capacity building¹ targeted to improve the youth ability in agriculture as a community. From the above definitions of UNESCO and UNDP, it can be observed that, building capacity was wrapped with sustainability. In this case, the role of government and other stakeholders is imminent and becomes imperative for a successful empowerment outcome in a program that is youth oriented for it to be sustained. The marriage between capacity building and empowerment is not far fetch because when capacity is built or developed one becomes empowered. Therefore, capacity building program is a process while empowerment is the output. The outcome is the result of the output overtime and this depend on effective monitoring and evaluation system. However, knowing the impacts of empowerment is an important factor in determining the effectiveness and sustainability level of the program upon which capacity is built. Consequently, youth capacity building on agriculture have multi-facet dimension depending on the mind-set of the government as the mastermind of the program. From the face value, it can be asserted that, building youth capacity in agriculture is to empower them to become able economically, socially, psychologically and by extension, politically (Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988).

The process of capacity-building goes in line with the nature of the empowerment program or what it intends to

¹ Youth is used as a community (community of youth)

achieve (Hur, 2006). Accordingly, building people's capacity in empowerment programs is determined by the objective of the empowerment program. Capacity building process for different empowerment programs can be found in Banducci, Donovan and Karp (2004), de-Shalit (2004), Weissberg (1999), Blanchard, Carlos and Randolph (2001), Terblanche (2003), Freire (1973), Parpart, Rai and Staudt (2003), Cheater (1999), Friedmann (1992), and Hur (2006); Goodkind, J. R., and P. G. Foster-Fisher (2002), and Banyard, V.L., and L.E. LaPlant. (2002). Building youth capacity is therefore, empowering the youth strategically to awake the embedded ability and capability for the benefit of themselves and their community (Matthew Morton & Paul Montgomery, 2010). As a diverse activities that can be planned to achieve different purpose, youth empowerment can be an intervention program to arrest social challenges as this study appears. It is also a right base on Article 12 of the United Nations Convention Right of a Child (UNCRC). As as well, it can be an instrument designed to strengthen community or institution of the government (Altman & Feighery, 2004; Freeman, 2005; Jennings & et al, 2006; Matthew Morton & Paul Montgomery, 2010; Suleiman & et al, 2006). Therefore, it can be suggested that empowering the youth in any community has multi-facet bases, purposes and benefits to all stakeholders with the aim to create a better future for the youth, their community and the nation as a whole. In line with this argument, the governments of developing countries including Nigeria strengthen their efforts by establishing various programs that will increase youth capacity to make them self-reliant and become useful to the society in general.

1.1 Youth Capacity Building on Agriculture in Nigeria

The concern of the federal government of Nigeria on capacity building for the youth on agriculture as an empowerment strategy cannot be over-emphasized. Agriculture had been the mainstay of the Nigerian economy before and during the colonial period and recorded tremendous success of about 66% of foreign exchange and rose to 74.3% in 1968 (Richard, 1978). The agriculture produce in Nigeria include cocoa, groundnut, palm oil, kola, fishery, potatoes, grains, livestock, cotton and many more (Chinweizu, 2006).

However, the agricultural sector was gradually abandoned after the discovery of crude oil in commercial quantity in the southern part of Nigeria in 1958. The crude oil raised the profile of the country in the world oil business to the 6th largest producer and indeed eighth largest deposit of natural gas in the world (Babatunde, 2010; Soludo 2006). Despite this abundant natural resources, the economy has not been impressive due to some salient factors that include leadership, corruption, and over-dependent on oil at the detriment of agriculture. Consequently, the abundant natural resources could not translate into wealth and socio-economic development due to annual Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of 4% recorded between 1960 and 2000 (Isiaka Badmus & Ogunmola, 2010). The effects of this development rest mostly on the youth population because they represent the larger population of country with 66%, therefore, they have potentials to contribute tremendously to the socio-economic development of the country (FGN, 2005). As a result, the youth become attracted to quick and high return investment business (effect of the oil industry) and other white cola jobs that equally attract 'quick money'. They left agriculture business that is considered to be a long-term investment by nature to the aged local farmers who were less active and close to extinction because of age and life expectancy of between 47 and 50 years (NBS, 2008 and 2010; Oboh & Sani, 2009).

It is important to mention that, the federal government had introduced various agriculture reforms and campaigns in order to attract attention to the potentials of agriculture and ensure food security for the nation (Adeyemo, 1984 ; Isiaka Badmus & Ogunmola, 2010; Nzechi, 2006; Obasi, 2013). These programs are;

1. National Accelerated Food Production Program (NAFPP) in 1970;
2. Operation Feed the Nation (OFN) in 1976;
3. Green Revolution (GR) in 1981; and
4. Back to Land (BL) in 1983.

These programs failed because of some factors that were mentioned earlier, but most importantly, change of government from one military to the other, and civilian government in-between (1981 -1983). Other causes of failure of these programs include corruption, sabotage, management failure and lack of political will to implement the program (Adeyemo, 1984; Isiaka Badmus & Ogunmola, 2010; Nzechi, 2006; Obasi, 2013). Unfortunately, none of these programs have specific roles for youth involvement in agriculture or another program that are youth oriented until 1986. It was at this period that the military government introduced National Directorate of Employment (NDE) with a views to provide vocational training for the youth and to stimulate them on agriculture. The program also created job opportunities for both male and female youth at the grassroots level through the establishment of 'better life program'. Supporting financial institutions like 'the people's bank' were established to create easy access to credit facilities (Akpan, 2010).

Since 1999 when Nigeria returned to civil rule, the government was faced with the problem of how to tackle the

rate of youth unemployment (which has risen from 11.9% in 2005 to 28.5% in 2013)² to arrest associated social vices. Interestingly, despite all the factors militating against interest in agriculture practice and the failures of agriculture programs from 1970 to 1983, Agriculture still provide employment for about 60 – 70% of the Nigeria populace (United Nations, 2002). Therefore, various states in Nigeria developed youth capacity building program in agriculture as a perceived remedy to high rate of youth unemployment, with a view to empower them and by extension reduce some associated social problems (Umeh & Odo, 2002). One of such youth capacity building program on agriculture is the Integrated Youth Training Farm Centre, Malete, Kwara State.

1.2 Integrated Youth Farm Training Centre, Malete

The training farm was established by the Kwara State government in 2006 as an agriculture capacity building center for the youth. The center was rated high by the public and generally believes to be a success in youth agriculture training and a model for other centers across the country. For the center to serve the purpose of its establishment, professional Zimbabwean farmers were employed to produce the pioneer youth farmers in 2008. Facilities were provided, including residential accommodation for at least one hundred youth for the one-year duration of the training program. The implementers were also resident in the same vicinity Recreation facilities were provide to make the environment attractive and homely for the youth participants and other residents. Another important aspect of the center is that modern agriculture equipment and large farm settlement in three different locations were available for participants for farming after completion of the one year training. Therefore, this study is focused on exploring the capacity building process and to examine the impacts the center had made on the youth over the time.

2. Methodology

This study employs qualitative–case study research method which will provide an in-depth analytical description of the factual situation of the program as obtained from the primary sources (Merriam, 2009). This method will not only enable first-hand information but also give room for understanding of the reflection of the program as knowledge-based transformational activity employed to improve the skills of youth and add value to their lives. Data were obtained purposively, from thirty (30) informants. These included; twenty-one (21) youth participants from 2006 to 2013; three (3) implementers; and six (6) government officials (labeled as categories A, B, & C respectively). Individual interviews were conducted with seven (7) people in category 'A' with at least one participant from one batch (there were five batches from 2006 – 2013). Two sessions of Focus Group Discussion (FGD) were also conducted with seven members in each session, totaling to 14 participants. Documents were also obtained and analyzed for additional data, and observation of the daily routine at the farms for two weeks was also used to ensure the dependability of the instrument. The trustworthiness of the data was placed on the use of triangulation, FGD, member check and peer reviews. These were carefully carried out to ascertain consistencies and credibility of the data.

3. Aim of the study

The study is intended to examine the impacts of Youth Integrated Training Farm program as agricultural capacity building Centre and empowerment strategy purposely designed to reduce youth unemployment menace in Kwara state, Nigeria.

3.1 Objectives of the study

- i. To describe the capacity building process
- ii. To examine the impacts of Integrated Youth Training Farm Center as the capacity building center.

4. Findings and Discussion

Findings of this study that sought to examine the impacts of Integrated Youth Training Farm Center (IYTFC) Malete on youth participants were carefully themed and presented as follow;

² General Household Survey Report/NBS/CBN 2014.

4.1 Capacity building process.

There are six stages for the capacity building process. The process is; recruitment, residency, grouping, election of leaders, formation of the co-operative society and mobilization for empowerment packages. The process mainly involved two different offices; Office of the Senior Special Assistant (SSA) to the Governor on Youth Empowerment, and Office of the Senior Special Assistant (SSA) to the Governor on Agriculture. These offices report directly to the state Governor.

4.1.1 Recruitment

This is the first stage of the capacity building process. Youth were recruited through the 16 local governments in the state after following the application procedure through the youth empowerment office. Candidates were between the ages of 16 – 39 years with at least secondary school certificate qualification. Oral and written interviews were also used as part of the process. This process was not meant to disqualify any candidate but to ascertain the readiness and enduring spirit of the candidate.

4.1.2 Residency

This is provision of accommodation for all recruited youth. It is mandatory for all trainees to reside in the farm center for the duration of the program, which is 12 months as pre-requisite for eligibility. Male and female trainees were accommodated in the available facilities with the capacity for 100 youth at a time. All female applicants were usually admitted since the inception of the program because they were few compared to their male counterpart. Recreation facilities and other infrastructures were provided to make the farm more homely and conducive.

4.1.3 Grouping

The recruited youth were grouped with five members in a group. Each group was to perform same assignments and task as an individual group member. The implementers serve as group coordinators with five groups under a coordinator. A group leader is also appointed from among the youth to serve as an intermediary and a foreman to ensure adequate monitoring of the youth as individuals and as a group member. The arrangement was to encourage leadership because it is rotational. It was also expected to enable proper monitoring of the activities of each cluster through competition within and among the groups.

4.1.4 Election of officials

Students were encouraged to conduct elections among themselves to appoint their leaders. The trainers/implementers supervised the elections. The elected officials were to represent others on issues of welfare, excursions, and coordination of other activities that may arise from time to time. They also serve as the cooperative society's leadership. The official posts of the elected leaders were; president, secretary general, welfare secretary, financial secretary, Treasurer and Public Relations Officer.

4.1.5 Practical and theory ratio:

The capacity building process also included a well-articulated Practical and theory sessions in ratio 8:2 respectively (80% practical to 20% theory). It revealed that the neighboring state-owned university assisted in designing and structure of the curriculum to address modern issues in farming and entrepreneurial skills. The structure was to enhance self-employment needs of the youth. However, the practical aspect carries more time and schedules because the program is more practical in nature and by the design. The theoretical aspect was to prepare the youth participants for well-understood rudiments of business success and financial management skills. The components of the theory included farm calculation, communication and use of English, administration and supervision, farm management and rural enterprise development.

4.1.6 Co-operative Society

Each batch of participants were mandated as part of the process to form a co-operative society and register the society

by the enabling laws of a Farmers Group Associations in the state. The co-operative society meant to introduce them to the mainstream of farmers' associations in the state as a body. It will also make them eligible to access credit facilities through the state government on any agriculture loan facilities or other aid that may be available to farmers in the state after their graduation from the training. Table 1 below shows the details of each batch of participants from 2006.

Table 1 - Detail of co-operative society for each batch of trainees from inception

Batch	Duration	Name of cooperative society	No. of participants	M	F
1	2006 – 2008	New Generation Commercial Farmers Cooperative Society.	93	87	6
2	2009 - 2010	New Face Cooperative Group Society.	64	58	6
3	2010 – 2011	Real Image Commercial Farmers Cooperative Society.	74	66	8
4	2011 – 2012	Harmony Commercial Farmers Group Cooperative Society.	90	72	18
5	2012 – 2013	Unique Commercial Farmers Co-Operative Group Society.	97	84	13

Note: the first batch spent two years as pioneer group from 2006 – 2008 as shown above

Source: author's construct

4.1.7 Mobilization for empowerment packages

The final stage of the process is after completion of the program. The government prepared empowerment package for each batch separately. At the end of the capacity building program, each participant are entitled to financial and land allocation across three designated farm settlements in the state. The first batch of the youth that graduated in 2008 were allocated five (5) hectares of land for crop farming, a motorbike each for mobility to and from the farm, agricultural inputs and herbicides. All these were components of a start-up loan facility of N850, 000 (\$5,600) accessible through their co-operative society. The farm land was for crop framings because the youth were strongly advised to start with cropping as beginners to reduce the risk involved in animal farming. However, this package was not maintained as it was reviewed almost yearly from the second batch. The last two batches of 2012 and 2013 were yet to receive similar package as at the period of this study.

4.2 The impacts of IYTF as capacity building center

The findings on this objective were responses from the three categories of informants; the participants, the implementers, and the government representatives/officials or agency. Their response was resolute because all the three categories agreed on the positive impacts of the youth agriculture training center. It does not mean that the activities of the center were perfect. Various difficulties were noted by some informants across categories. Despite these difficulties, all informants, especially those in category 'A' (youth participants) unanimously agreed that the program was effective during the individual interviews and Focus Group Discussions (FGD). The impacts were themed and sub-themed from the direct responses obtained from informants. These answers constitute the findings and were themed as Direct Impacts and Indirect Impacts.

4.2.1 Direct Impacts

4.2.1.1 Rekindled interest of youth in agriculture

The program has been able to rekindled the interest of young people in agriculture and disabuse their minds that agriculture is a work for the downtrodden, hard labor and belittling. This was due to the exposure of the participants to modern agriculture equipment that made the farm work simple and convenient. Some of the participants revealed that they enrolled in the program because of the monthly stipend and the empowerment package. However, they got convinced within their first two months stay at the farm and resolved to participate consciously. Also, about four individuals among the informants were graduates of agriculture but they agreed to have learned new techniques that refocus their interest in agriculture business. The new knowledge became additional theoretical knowledge that will enable them to handle some challenges relating to the market determination, farm management and extension services. One of the participants responded when asked about the impacts of the program, *'in the first place I thought it was government handout just to take something monthly'* (informant A1). Another informant said; *'there is the difference in*

me. Before I went there, I did not have an interest in farming considering the stress of using cutlass and hoes' (Informant A2).

4.2.1.2 Broaden their minds to wealth creation

The finding also indicated that the program has exposed the participants to wealth creation that negate the pre-training mind of waiting for white cola jobs. The Integrated Training Farm Center has four departments; crop production, agriculture engineering, livestock production, and rural enterprise/extension. The researchers' visits to the farm settlements at Oke-oyi and Alateko revealed that graduates of the center were involved in the different farm business. In addition to being practicing farmers, some them also engaged in marketing of herbicides, consultants to local farmers and also operate small chicken farm behind their houses. A participant, who was a graduate of business administration, expressed that;

There is no knowledge that is a waste. When I got there, I felt like moving out. I felt I should have other better things doing that will get me more money than what i was paid tmonthly here. But acquiring the training has given me more power in some other areas, even to get job. I consult for people, there are friends of mine that are into the fishery, so when I get there, they will ask me one or two questions, and I will give them answers. Moreover, they know that I have knowledge of fishery so anytime they run into a problem, they call me for advice. (Informant A1).

4.2.1.3 From disoriented to orient

From the finding of background information of the participants, all of them were unemployed during the period of their training. Few of them mentioned that they were employed but left the job and enrolled in the program because of the low wages in their previous job and the potential of self-employed after training. Some confessed that they were just available for any odd job like site construction labors while few also agreed they were political thugs. The responses from them on the training at the center revealed that they had turned new leaf, who cannot return to such job again. They regretted waiting for government ignorantly that self-effort in farming would have made some impacts but due to their ignorance on the prospect in the farm business.

4.2.1.4 Increased capacity

As earlier mentioned that some of the youth participants were graduates of agriculture and other fields, the training has increased their ability with additional knowledge. This included in terms of additional practical benefits for agriculture biased youth and new knowledge for those who studied other courses like business administration. Therefore, their capacity was increased with more practical knowledge and new business as the case may be. One of the participants in the FGD said this;

..... like I said I'm an animal person, I studied Animal Science but when I got there I realized that all those things we were taught in the class (as undergraduate), were theories and meaningless until you practicalize all of them. Right now, I can boast that I am a crop person too because of the vast knowledge I gained at that Maleta youths integrated farm.

4.2.1.5 Networking and social capital

Networking and social capital were found to exist among the participants and across batches. The grouping system and co-operations enabled by the co-operative society had played a significant role in sustaining good working relationship among members. The kind of linkage, bridging, and bonding in their social relationship were proven in many ways during the field study. Such relationship influences the data gathering process because participants were quick in making references on any statement they made to confirm their claims. It was also noted that there was good working relationship between the alumni and the implementers to the extent of partnering and collaborating on cassava plantation private business to meet a particular commercial demand. Also, the alumni have network beyond the country's borders through their group effort and determination. They participated and won best performed young farmers' award by Agricultural Revolution for Africa (AGRA) and the Africa Climate Research in South African in 2012.

4.2.2 Indirect impacts

4.2.2.1 Arrest youth vulnerability

The program was able to arrest youth vulnerability through its 'garrison system' of accommodation. Keeping the youth away from the street where they were idle, and accommodate them in a particular standardized environment for 12 months had played a significant role in their formerly 'disorganized' lifestyle which exposed them to various anti-social behaviors. One of the senior officials and an implementer of the program boasted;

I will let you know some few things that you might find grateful. Go and check the statistics. In Nigeria today, Kwara State happens to be one of the most peaceful states in Nigeria because many youths have been engaged. It is not only in Malete; there are other places, other programs of the government that have absorbed a lot of our teeming youths. (Informant B1).

Another senior official of the government who was a coordinator of the program at the early stage said during the interview on the impacts of the program on the teeming youth in the state;

If you can take at any time, between 150 and 200 youth out of the street and keep them in a place for one year; one, they won't roam around again; capacity development involves arresting from the point of where vulnerability..... you are arresting vulnerability, it's a capacity building. Now taking them to that place, giving them that training, whether they use that training or not, it is still useful because they have acquired it. (Informant C6).

4.2.2.2 Reduced youth unemployment in the state

The finding also indicated that the program has contributed to the reduction in the rate of youth unemployment. This reduction has direct and indirect multiplier effects of the training program. While some of the youth that were trained were full-time farmers, other fractions were part-time farmers while some combined farming with marketing of agrochemical products. It is important to note that, there are other youth development/empowerment programs, but this study revealed that, youth have shown interest in farming and agriculture business. At the three farm settlements visited, the locals were found working in the youth' farms as support laborers who were on daily wages. The extension officer of the youth farm stated when asked about the effects of the training on rate of youth unemployment that;

So in terms of youth unemployment, in terms of other activities, I think Kwara State stands out in the country as a state that has done a lot for youth empowerment. Coming back to Malete, I recall last year there was a study done by the World Bank where they tried to assess the impacts of the training on our graduates and they went about the research by conducting a survey to determine what our ex-trainees have been doing since they left the center. I am pleased to tell you that over 70 percent of our ex-trainees are still involved in agriculture or agro-allied related activities.....so, there have been much multiplier effects. (informant B1).

4.2.2.3 Impact the community

This study also revealed that the host community and other communities where the farm settlement were located were impacted in many ways. One of the ways was infrastructure developments that attracted the area. Although the training farm was the farm site of the old Kwara Agricultural Development Program (KWADP), which means that, the farm building structures were inherited. However, the emergence of the agricultural training center attracted new and better infrastructure also to the state University that is situated in the same Malete community. Another impact of the youth training farm to the community is the social capitals that exist within the various segment of the community as a farming community. The community local farmers were assisted with farm equipment like tractor and planters which improved their productivity. Professional advice was rendered free of charge on how to increase farm produce and deal with cases of seasonal lost to farm insects. Aside these, the community also provide unskilled labor to the training school and settlement at Alateko, Olofere, and Okeoyi.

Another significant impact of the program is its networking with the neighboring State-owned University in the spirit of mutual service in one hand, and collaboration in the area of corporate responsibility on the other side. The youth farm center usually lends out some of its equipment to the State University for practical engagements. The university also reciprocates with upgrading the youth training farm curriculum and another professional assistant as the need may arise. The training center as part of the relationship with the University ceded about 50 hectares of land to the University for a

Demonstration Farm used for practical for the University students. The University also has a Community Development Center (CDS) that had also collaborated with the training farm on capacity development for some Malete local youths on "bee farming" and other community development projects.

5. Discussion

Youth capacity building in agriculture at the Integrated Youth Training Farm has been effective and productive in regards to achieving the purpose it was created for. This has reflected in the lives of the participants directly and indirectly. As a program that was designed to arrest the high rate of unemployment among the youth, the program can be termed as an intervention program (Freeman 2005), it is also a right base on Article 12 of the United Nations Convention Right of a Child (UNCRC). Therefore, the impacts as revealed in this study was in line with the empowerment domain that include economic, social, psychological and by extension political ability as postulated by Zimmerman & Rappaport, (1988). This was evidenced with the direct impacts the capacity building had on the youth. The youth's interest was reawake, and their mind got broaden to an extent that some of them consult with local farmers, engaged in agro-allied businesses and earned income. The social impact in this regard enables them the senses of networking, social capital and influence among the community people due to the indirect effects of the program. This achievement might not be unconnected with the process adopted by the initiator of the program as enumerated above. The capacity building process indicated certain elements of community psychology and social welfare process of empowerment as noted in the findings. This was noticed in the interpersonal relationships and networking among participant as a result of co-operation and ability to source for funding partners. In addition, involving the community was in accordance with the studies of such process in Banyard and LaPlant (2002), and Goodkind and Foster-Fisherman (2002). By and large, the agriculture training program has contributed to the food production and security in the state. It is important to say that, the quality of the program, as enshrined in the curriculum, were effectively implemented and therefore, contributed immensely to the entrepreneurial prowess of the youth. For example, land measurement is a course that was designed to equip the youth with the knowledge on Land use and demarcation for farming. The study revealed an ex-trainee earns income through land demarcation as a business at a new developing site outside the state. In summary, it can be stated that, the capacity building for agriculture for the youth in Kwara state has been able to impact, transform and empowered the participants socially, economically and psychologically (Zimmerman & Rappaport, 1988).

6. Conclusion

Based on the above findings and discussion, it can be concluded that the youth capacity building in agriculture at malete farm is a success and has impacted the teeming youth accordingly. However, there is a need to ensure sustainability of the program through legislations. Capacity building should also be extended to the implementers in line with the vision and mission of the center while other stakeholders in youth development from Non-Government Organization should be considered for collaboration. Moreover, the internal structure of the center needs to be improved to reflect transformative development with ethical discipline for the center to be self-sustaining and apolitical.

However, the program is also faced with some challenges that could threaten its sustainability. These include poor maintenance of equipment, inadequate monitoring and evaluation system, inconsistent credit facility schedule, infrastructural decay, a weak collaboration with stakeholders, lack of institutionalization and politicization. It is the opinion of the authors that a general overall of the Training Center through the use of community development experts could re-energize the sustainability level and also improve the impacts beyond the current level.

References

- Adeyemo, R. (1984.). The food marketing system: Implications of the green revolution program in Nigeria. *Agricultural Systems*, Volume 14, (Issue 3).
- Akpan, Sunday Brownson (2010). "Encouraging Youth's Involvement in Agricultural Production and Processing; NIGERIA STRATEGY SUPPORT PROGRAM (Policy Note No. 29) ", edited by International Food Policy Research Institute. Abuja, Nigeria: CGIAR.
- Alabi, D. (2010). Malete Integrated Youth Farm Project: Training New Nigerian Farmers in Kwara. From Vanguard Media Ltd
- Altman, D. G., & Feighery, E. C. (2004). Future directions for youth empowerment: commentary on the application of youth empowerment theory to tobacco control. *Health Educ Behav*, 31(5), 641-647. Doi: 10.1177/1090198104268683
- Babatunde, O. (2010). The map of history: AGRICULTURE OUR FUTURE. Retrieved 4/5, 2013
- Banducci, S.A., T. Donovan, and J.A. Karp. (2004). "Minority representation, empowerment, and participation." *Journal of Politics* 66(2):534-56.

- Banyard, V.L., and L.E. LaPlant. (2002). "Exploring links between children maltreatment and empowerment." *Journal of community psychology* 30(6):687-707.
- Blanchard, K., J.P. Carlos, and A. Randolph. (2001). *The three Keys to Empowerment: Release the power within people for astonishing results*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.inweizu, N. (2006). Discuss in details, the history of agriculture in Nigeria from the colonial era to present day, pointing out clearly all agricultural programs. Retrieved 4/5/2013, from www.onlinenigeria.com/article/9d.asp
- Cheater, A. (1999). *Anthropology of power: Empowerment and disempowerment in changing structures*. New York: Routledge.
- de-Shalit, A. (2004). "Political philosophy and empowering citizens." *Political Studies* 53(4):802-18.
- FGN. (2005). *Vision 2010 Report: Youth Development And Empowerment*.
- Freeman, M. (2005). Beyond rhetoric: Extending rights to young people. In M. Barry & (Ed.) (Eds.), *Youth Policy, and Social Inclusion: Critical debates with young people* (pp. 65-68). London: Routledge.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum Publishing Company.
- Friedmann, J. (1992). *Empowerment: Politics of alternative development*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Goodkind, J. R., and P. G. Foster-Fisherman. 2002. "Integrating diversity and fostering interdependence: Ecological lessons learned about refugees participation in multiethnic communities." *Journal of community psychology* 30(4):389-409.
- Hur, Mann Hyung. (2006). "Empowerment in terms of Theoretical Perspectives: Exploring a Typology of the Process and Components across the discipline." *Journal of community psychology* 34(5):523-40.
- Isiaka Badmus, & Ogunmola, D. (2010). *Meeting the Challenges of the Millennium Development Goals in Nigeria: Problems, Possibilities, and Prospects*. Australia: Faculty of Arts and Sciences (E11), University of New England, Armidale, NSW 2351,
- Jennings, L., & et al. (2006). Toward a Critical Social Theory of Youth Empowerment. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(1/2).
- Matthew Morton, & Paul Montgomery. (2010). *Youth empowerment programs for improving self-efficacy and self-esteem of adolescents*. UK: University of Oxford.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research; A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- NBS. (2008 and 2010). Abuja, Nigeria: National Bureau of statistics.
- Nzechi, O. (2006). Nigeria: Why Operation Feed The Nation failed, *ThisDAY NEWSPAPER*.
- Obasi, T. (2013). The lesson from the 1972 National Accelerated Food Production Program *Business Day*.
- Oboh, V., & Sani, R. M. (2009). The role of radio in the campaign against the spread of HIV/AIDS among farmers in Markudi, Nigeria. *Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 19 (3), 179-184.
- Parpart, J. L., S. M. Rai, and K. Staudt. (2003). Rethinking Empowerment: Gender and development in a global/local world.
- Richard, J. A. (1978). Affluence and Underdevelopment: The Nigerian Experience. *Journal of Modern African Studies*, vol.16,(no.2), 221-239.
- Soludo, C. (2006). [Can Nigeria be the China of Africa].
- Suleiman, A., & et al. (2006). Youth action for health through youth-led research. *Journal of Community Practice*, 14(1/2).
- Terblanche, F. (2003). "Empowering people in the organization." *Mousaion* 21(2):128-37.
- Umeh, G. N., & Odo, B. I. (2002). Profitability of poultry production among school leavers in Anaocha Local Government Area of Anambra State Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Animal Production*, 29, 76 – 80.
- UNDP. (2009). *Capacity Building: UNDP Approach to Capacity Development*. Bureau for Development Policy.
- UNESCO. (2006). *Capacity Building: Handbook for Planning Education in Emergencies and Reconstruction*. Paris: International Institute for Education Planning.
- United Nations. (2002). Nigeria: Country Profile *Johannesburg Summit Report*: United Nations.
- Weissberg, R. (1999). *The politics of empowerment*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Zimmerman, M., & Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. *American Journal of community psychology*, 16(5), 725-750.