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Abstract
Nigeria’s economy has been marked by many prominent and potential drivers, but the agricultural industry remains outstanding as a major industry with immense potential yet to translate into results. The country is in the middle of implementing Vision 2020 which has huge demands on the sector. The vision requires the sector to grow at a sustainable rate that will ensure continued profitability. However, the management of the industry over the past regimes has continually departed from the set goals due to a number of reasons and forces. This paper focuses on the departure from targets as drift and opines that the agricultural sector has been continually drifting from the mission that would see it become modern, with more value added outputs and one that would offer support to other sectors of the economy. It develops the Macroeconomic model on an input-output framework combining the agricultural sector historical and polemical analysis promoting the labour market and product market interactions in a considerable and empirical manner. Moreover, the model’s illustration entails linking with agricultural simulation model which facilitates the evaluation of alternative policies in Nigeria’s agricultural sector presenting an agricultural policy picture from 1970 to 2014. In addition, the model can potentially be used with various informal and formal analysis techniques to better establish the drift in Nigeria’s Vision 2020 with regard to the agricultural policy makers and implementers.

Introduction
To expound on the drift in the management, this paper reviews vision 2020 and the implications, targets, demands and needs for the sector. The paper appreciates the role that the sector is capable of playing in employment and food security. It also emphasizes the importance of agriculture in the vision’s pillar of optimizing critical sources of economic growth. The analysis of drifts in management of the sector is particularly important given that the sector has huge potential; there have been intermittent efforts to modernize the sector but, the sector continues to offer mixed and below average results compared to global averages. This paper proceeds to analyze the past and current state of the sector in a bid to understand the manner in which the market and non-market forces within the macroeconomic model have contributed to the departure from the mission. In addition to the analysis of past and present states, the paper looks at the non-market factors of perception of agriculture in the country; it focuses on the perception of the youth who are critical in transforming the sector. The paper concludes that the management of the sector has been on a drift and recommendations various approaches to mitigate this (Adesina, 2011).

Nigeria’s Vision 2020
Nigeria’s 2020 vision foresees a country that will be among the 20 largest world economies by the aforementioned year. One of the vision’s pillars is optimization of the critical sources of economic growth in a bid to increase competitiveness and productivity (national output and factor productivity). The vision outlines agriculture as one of the key drivers of growth since it is a key source of economic growth. Chapter six of the vision deals with Food Security and Agriculture; it notes the key role that agriculture continues to play in the country’s development and GDP. The vision outlines agriculture as an enormous sector that merits a lot of attention and consideration in the event of any major large scale project pertaining to development. According to Vision 2020, arable crops, livestock, forestry and fishery constitute the four subsectors in agriculture. In 2010, 2011 and 2012, the agricultural sector contributed to a nominal GDP by 30.3%, 31.0% and 33.1% respectively. Quarterly real GDP sector analysis revealed that there was a decline in the agricultural output from 1.70% to 1.43% between the third and fourth quarter of 2012, corresponding with the decreased real GDP. The decline can be attributed to decreased crop production (1.47%), forestry (0.03%) and livestock production (0.13%) in
the third quarter of 2012 to 1.21, 0.02, and 0.12 percent respectively. Further forecast outlines that crop production improvement as a sub-sector was driven by major crops. In a bid to boost the agricultural output, monetary policies were constituted under the Agriculture Credit Guarantee Scheme (ACGS) in 2013, granting N1,708.7 million to the crop sub-sector. The agricultural sector received a total of N221.9 billion to boost 294 agricultural projects in 2013 simultaneously. However, the resultant nominal non-oil GDP recorded in 2013 indicated that the agricultural output still decreased in 2013 despite the massive sectorial contributions made to the agricultural sector from 5.49% to 3.10% by the end of 2013. These figures underscore the importance of agriculture that the drafters of the vision accord to it, emphasizing the crucial role that monetary policy, macroeconomic policies and fiscal irresponsibility have on Nigeria’s agricultural performance resulting in a drift from the 2020 vision (Nigeria, 2009).

Despite underscoring the immense contribution, vision 2020 indicates that such high percentage of the GDP arising from agriculture is an indicator of rigidities within the system. These rigidities would definitely impede the vision’s goal of making the country one of the 20 large economies in the world by the year 2020. Thus, the vision emphasizes the need for reforms in the sector towards mechanized, technological and vibrant sector. The visions outlines that such a transformation and good management would support expansion in, and compliment the industrial sector; ensure food sufficiency for Africa’s most populous country with a growing population; boast the foreign exchange earnings; lead to creation of wealth and poverty reduction; increase chances of gainful employment and support other sectors of the economy. The vision proposes improvement in the technological base and knowledge application to enhance total productivity in the sector as the major policy focus (Nigeria, 2009). This will result from the transformation of agricultural produce, through processing, from primary to processed states (more value addition).

The Journey of the Agricultural Sector

While Nigeria has many unique issues relating to its economic, political, cultural or social standing, its agricultural policy is not excepted from the dilemma of many regional countries and African states; it swings between states of acknowledging its enormous potential, setting ambitious projections, and scarcity of concrete results. Successive governments have publicly acknowledged the pivotal role of the sector yet few have succeeded in changing the landscape of the sector, as traditionally known. Perhaps Vision 2020 will make a difference (being a national economic blueprint that hugely focuses on agriculture); the vision states that the agricultural sector has been weak despite its huge contribution. This arises mainly due to the increase in hectares being committed to cultivation (Nigeria, 2009). Despite the apparent importance of the sector to national development, it has continually experienced inefficient production through poor inputs. These inputs include vast weaknesses in linking the sectors, ageing workers, extensive use of informal production techniques and lack of a strong marketing structure.

Despite the huge gaps between what is and the desired, this paper note that Nigeria’s agricultural sector has been on a journey since the country’s attainment of independence. The National Development Plans of the 1960s indicate huge government interventionist mechanisms at the federal level. The Federal government at that time came up with plans and gave directives of boasting domestic production of cash crops in the country. These were implemented by the state governments. The consequence was a vibrant sector that propelled the country to the top in ground-nuts, rubber and palm oil production. It was also the second largest producer of cocoa, which indicated the success of these intervention mechanisms (Adesina, 2011).

Economic history reveal that Nigeria’s agricultural sector contributed to its GDP by 64% in the 1960’s, gradually declining to 48% in the 70’s and drastically decreasing to 20% and 19% in 1980 and 1985 respectively as a result of its shift from agricultural production to petroleum and oil glut in the 1980’s. There was a policy shift from agriculture to the petroleum industry; a lax approach to agricultural
policies robbed the sector off its previous support. The federal government turned its focus to oil, developing dependence on a mono-cultural economy which resulted in a sharp reduction of agricultural output compelling the nation to start depending on imports. For instance, the 1976-79 ‘Feed the Nation’ and 1979-83 ‘Green Revolution’ programs were the consequence of this laxity and an ailing sector.

These programs were geared towards measures that would strengthen the sector once again; they included provision of subsidized inputs, increased access to agricultural credit and focus on community development. However, the implementation of these programs lacked transparency in the application of the programs’ framework and the structured actions. In addition, the successive regimes did not ensure continuity of the programs. This indicated that such programs within the sector were not entrenched as national undertakings; rather, they were seen as political commitments that successive regimes did not have to adhere to. Once again, the agricultural sector was on its knees until 1978 enactment of the Land Use Act. Despite this breakthrough, the on-and-off commitment to agricultural improvement continued in 1987 when the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), aiming at reducing the national dependency on oil, reversed the gains (Ihimodu et al., 1993). The sector slumped back to a lower level since focus was on private sector development. This was only to change in 1998 when focus came back to the sector and the government objectively established policies that would ensure food security through improved local production.

Table 1: Structural composition of GDP in percent from Agriculture and Petroleum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>34.06</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>48.57</td>
<td>34.21</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude Petroleum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>37.22</td>
<td>38.87</td>
<td>37.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: FRN/FOS 1996: Socio-economic Profile of Nigeria; and NBS 2007: National Account of Nigeria

The Macroeconomic Model

The Macro-Economic Model is an input-output framework that is built on the basis of a simple simulation model, disaggregating the general economy into various interacting sectors of interest. The model’s emphasis is on conventional classification of industrial defining, small-scale sectors namely major agricultural crops, small industry, residual agricultural produce as well as small trade-services. The model is categorized into five major components namely national accounts, consumption, output, employment-incomes, and investment. The incorporation of income and employment distribution promotes the distinction of policy goals. The separate components of the macro-economic model generate the investment and consumption computations endogenously while the exports are exogenously computed and subsequently aggregated with the computation of investment and consumption to provide final demands for domestic production in the agricultural sector. Results from employment-incomes component simulate their demand in every sector providing a Gini-ratio of migration of labour requirements and resources out of agriculture as well as the income distribution ratio.
Macro-Economic Model

Model Application in Nigeria’s Agricultural Policy
The model’s data for agricultural analysis is estimated by different means from various sources through methods like regression analysis. The validation of a simulation model is its evidence-based ability to give an in-depth description of the real world. The macro-economic model is crucial in the creation of general projections like income distribution, GDP and employment which are consistent internally. In addition, the model provides input-output techniques which provide general agricultural policy inferences relating to challenges in the Nigerian economy. With respect to Nigeria’s vision 2020, the model indicates that when there is a balance distribution of the two forces, such that the agricultural players can access the resources necessary, they are available and affordable, the country will achieve the vision’s target. The mission of the agricultural sector, that these forces are responsible
in driving towards achieving, are clearly aiming at elevating the industry form a national to an international profile.

The consumption and investment component disaggregate into sectors of non-agriculture and agriculture computing per capita consumption of other non-agricultural sectors. There are market forces impacting agricultural change at a macro level. These forces are particularly influential since they affect the direction of agriculture at national levels. The market forces operate within other four larger areas that deal with utilities, transportation, and services, areas that also have sub factors coming into play such as demand, supply, access to information, public policy, production, ethics, leadership, governance, labor laws, taxation, security, infrastructure, climate, national resources among others. Investment in agricultural sector is given an exogenous treatment as the investments can be estimated in a realistic manner.

Current State of Agriculture
Agriculture has become the centre of Nigeria’s current reforms and strategic plans; since it employs three quarters of the population, any strategic plan must resort to it, given that other macro-economic variables such as population that need a guarantee of sustainable food security. Agriculture is also a sector that the Nigerian government knows will and must compliment all the development in other sectors to achieve its Vision 2020 targets. This makes it part of the central industries in focus as the country aligns it economy to the requirements of the vision (Mogues, 2008). For the recent past, starting from the early 2000s, agriculture has been assigned an ambitious role in the country’s economic targets. For instance, the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy of May 2007 and the “7-points agenda” that are guiding economic reforms (as the country’s medium term plans) have far reaching implications for agriculture. Part of these implications (which has led to a lot of focus and management approaches to agriculture lately) includes the estimation that the sector has to grow by over five times its current rate, if Nigeria is to achieve vision 2020 of its MDGs by 2015. As highlighted by Chief Philip Asiodu (Hamisu, 2008), the achievement of Vision 2020 requires a GDO growth rate of 13%, calling for an investment of $60 billion for the modernization of the transport system to promote easy transportation of Agricultural produce and raw materials. In addition, various implications like changing the mind set of Nigerians with respect to the importance of investing in the Agricultural sector will be as crucial step towards the achievement of the vision as well as reforms in the economic policy to help alleviate institutional and governance problems that affect the agricultural sector as argued by the 14th Nigeria Economic Summary Group (NESG 14) (Abdullahi, 2008).

The results of this focus on agriculture as a key player in the macro level pursuits has seen its immense transformation. There have been a lot of efforts channelled towards improving its management towards sustainability and technologically driven sector. However, this paper notes that despite the obvious criticality of the industry to the economic agenda, a lot is yet to be done. Thus, the current state of the agricultural sector is still not in compete phase with the country’s overall pursuits.

Despite these shortcomings, Nigeria’s current state in Agriculture indicates positive results in some areas. Some of the areas have to do with vast commitments made in the past regimes especially by President Obasanjo 2002; he launched the presidential initiatives on seven major agricultural produces. This move aimed at taking advantage of the regional markets created by its neighbours and the World Trade Organization (WTO) preferential agreements. The benefits have been trickling since 2006 in the production of most of the seven agricultural produces encompassed in the initiative. This was evident through the increased production of cassava, maize, rice, sorghum, yam and vegetable oil by over 33 metric tons in cassava alone. These gains indicate that the current state of agriculture is more vibrant and doing better; this evidence is also emphasized by the increase in storage facilities that have reduced after harvest losses. It is not long since the sector completed the construction of four silo facilities that elevated the storage capacity to a million metric tons (Olamola, 2008).
In addition to the implementation of major initiatives, the agricultural industry is also witnessing major developments. Major programmes that underscore the recent developments in this sector include the Fertilizer Revolving Fund (FRF), the Fadama II Program, Nigerian Agricultural, Cooperative and Rural Development Bank (NACRBD) restructuring, the Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) among other measures. To complement these undertakings the industry has also witness a VAT waiver on certain local agricultural inputs, increase in market outlets, investment in more storage facilities and the establishment of companies for agricultural development and marketing. The industry is also experiencing federal support at the macro level through the Central Bank of Nigeria; the CBN has adopted strategies to mobilize credit to farmers through the Trust Fund Model (TFM) that enhances the ability of agricultural lenders to offer funds due to reduced risks. There is also an export subsidy of 10% that targets improvements in production and hence, exports promoting (Adesina, 2011).

However, the current state of affairs indicates mixed gains from both previous and current initiatives. The country’s production is still far below global averages since Nigeria spends an average of 3 billion USD on importation of food staffs such as rice, fish, milk and sugar (Mogues, 2008). This indicates that the industry is still not in a position that can guarantee food sufficiency. The situation also indicate the industry is still incapable of offering employment opportunities as projected since importation of agricultural produce undermines the need for expanding agricultural based industries. The agricultural industry today does in fact indicate, from the presidential initiatives, that investing in agriculture can raise domestic production and lead to sufficiency. However, the mixed results and reality of unsustainable production abound; this is because the implementation of the presidential initiatives retains their focus intensifying production without any meaningful focus on product processing or other downstream parts of the value chain (Olomola, 2008).

The industry is also facing a leadership and management challenge that makes it lag behind to date. The result of these challenges has been to reduce the effectiveness of the majority of meaningful initiatives that would have raised the sectors ability. For instance, all the regimes have consistently centered their policy on offering subsidized inputs to farmers but, the manner in which the implementation has been done has defeated the cause greatly. States have the mandate to select their subsidies; this has created a lot of variance which, translates to a lack of uniformity on a national agricultural pursuits. In addition, the existence of the subsidies have not been guaranteed over periods, management of delivery mechanism have created irrelevance since farmers do not always get the inputs when need (during the start of a season); most times the government has failed to stop subsidized inputs diversion to other countries and worse still, some states are still testing the distribution of vouchers on these subsidies since 2008 (Doublet, 2011).

Lastly, a fundamental realization from the current state of Nigeria’s agricultural sector has been a lack of coherence in policy. The sector has indeed made significant strides in the right direction but, the positives, negatives and omissions of previous policy approaches to the sector remain an analyzed or unincorporated into the current decisions. The industry is yet to reconcile its current pursuits to its previous ones; this would allow for the creation of a transition mechanism that would replace the current state that resembles a phase within an intermittently occurring cycle of policy. There is still in existence, a widespread lack of performance indicators that would enable assessment and correction of policies adopted. Additionally, the industry is yet to experience harmony in cross-sector policies; for instance, MSMEs, rural development, water and natural resource management policies and agricultural policy. Lastly, the management of agricultural sector in the current state still portrayslack of optimality in the sharing of roles and interventions, between federal and state governments. This is because, the sharing seems not to consider effectiveness and efficiency on all occasions and it also contributes to exclusion of stakeholder participation (Olomola, 2008).
Agricultural Perceptions in Nigeria

A critical area of perception with regards to agriculture in Nigeria centers on the youth. It is clear from many studies that a major challenge to the agricultural sector in many nations is the lack of young and strong labor force. This situation has been occasioned by rural-urban migration that is leaving agriculture to an aging, lowly educated and not strong generation. The situation is not so different in Nigeria where the preference of agriculture amongst the youth is not so high. This is neither high among the urban elites who would be expected to join in the call for mechanization of agriculture to a technologically driven sector.

It is imperative to note that for agriculture to grow five fold in Nigeria so as to achieve vision 2020, it must depart from traditional means to modern technological means. This responsibility cannot be left in the hands of the parents and the old generation. Thus, agriculture must be remodeled to an attractive sector that will appeal to the youth and find preference among them as a desirable economic activity. The other side of this remodeling must be the returns attached to the agricultural activity. However, this is not the situation in Nigeria neither is it the perception.

Agriculture is not espoused among the young generation (Agricultural Extension Society of Nigeria, 2006).

Young people’s perception of agriculture can be captured by the information disseminated in the print media. Most of the Nigeria population comprises of young people who are literate, this makes them the largest consumers of media content and literature.

Despite this reality, there is scanty agricultural information disseminated through the media instruments and by inference, this study deduces that the foremost reason is lack of demand for it. It also captures the perception attached to agriculture (lack of interest in it) of the Nigerian population especially the young. This situation is elaborated by Ajayi and Nwoko (1995) who opine that the modern world operates in a phenomena known as an informational economy; the information disseminated through various channels become the starting point of innovation, creativity and production. A study by Atoma (2009) found out that little media information is disseminated to the rural youth involved in agriculture. Without dissemination of information, that can be intelligently organized to lead to production and profitability, there can be no modernization in agriculture. A study by Olowu (1990) notes these results from the perception of non-profitability of agriculture. He opines that news editors attach importance to other activities perceived to generate activities since agricultural content is not perceived as meaningful in the revenue sense (Atoma, 2009).

Thus, this study uses the media as an instrument to capture the perception of the Nigerian people towards agriculture. It focuses on the youth who are critical in achieving the countries targets, plans and visions. It concludes that the perception is not necessarily negative but, it is not ranked highly in the scale of economic activities, employment sector or as a preferred sector for investment (Olowu, 1990).

The Drift and Drive Model

As stated in the earlier sections of this paper, it is clear that the government and the ministry of agriculture have been on a continuous process of trying to manage the industry so as to align actions to results. However, it is also clear that despite these efforts outlined through well-conceived frameworks and plans, the results have not concretely indicated the realization of those targets. Thus, this paper introduces the concept of drifting and driving as the possible model explaining the reasons for lack of results that agree with the intermediate efforts.

The model of drifting and driving starts from the understanding that there are two major forces that drive change and development in the agricultural sector; these forces are either market or non-market.
As indicated in the figure, the non-market forces operate at the community, family and institutional levels. It plays its major influence on a micro level where it exerts pressure on the changes in the agricultural sector through actions undertaken by individuals, based on their attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, behaviors, motivations, religious affiliations, morals, community resources, virtues, individual endowment, and traditions among others. The non-market forces have an influence on the direction taken by the agricultural sector since they influence communities and individual’s perception of agricultural activities at a psychological or community level. Non-market forces work within larger frameworks of political, social, environmental and economical dimensions. Unlike the market forces, their sub dimensions are not macro factors rather, they are mostly social aspects of culture, belief, traditions, institutions, perceptions, values among others (Adesina, 2011).

On the other hand, there are the market forces impacting agricultural change at a macro level. These forces are particularly influential since they affect the direction of agriculture at national levels. The market forces operate within other four larger areas that deal with political, economic, social and environmental concerns; these four areas also have sub factors coming into play such as demand, supply, access to information, public policy, production, ethics, leadership, governance, labor laws, taxation, security, infrastructure, climate, national resources among others.

With the above knowledge of drivers of agricultural change, and the realization that Nigeria has been trying to manage its agricultural sector since independence and it is yet to sigh with relief; it is imperative to analyze the reasons for the lack of intended results (drift) despite the policy efforts (drive) throughout the years. This model comes in handy in understanding the reason for lack of concrete results in the Nigerian agricultural sector. This paper opines that the management of Nigerian agricultural industry has been experiencing continuous drifts from the plan; this has been the major impediment to realization of concrete and sustainable results (Ite, 2001).

It is worth noting that Nigeria is no exemption to the influence of the market and non-market forces and these two have been at play throughout the period. However, it is imperative to understand first, that the drift and drive model indicate a parallel working of the two forces. The nature of the forces are such that if they are in perfect balance, then the agricultural sector experiences a propelling force towards achievement of its targets. In regards to Nigeria’s vision 20-2020, the model indicates that when there is a balance distribution of the two forces, such that the agricultural players can access the resources necessary, they are available and affordable, the country with achieve the vision’s target. The mission of the agricultural sector, that these forces are responsible in driving towards achieving, are clearly aiming at elevating the industry form a national to an international profile. This will attract investors, enable use of technology, and usher in efficiency that will increase productivity and profitability (Adesina, 2011).

However, as indicated in earlier sections of this study, the Nigerian agricultural sector has been ailing from perceptual issues to management issues. The model indicates these issues as drifts from the mission’s drive. According to the model, drifts occur due to two major reasons namely change of course by revising the plan or a non-deliberate drift. This non-deliberate drift occurs in the instance that a collective or individual effort that deviates from the mission impacts hugely on the set plan. The drift apparent in the Nigerian case is not actually deliberate since little has been done in revising or consulting previous plans, when coming up with new ones. The model indicates that the major causes of drift arise within the market (macro level) and non-market (micro level) forces dimensions of political, social, economical and environmental. Under these dimensions over-arching forces drift the mission from the drive. The sub-dimensions of poverty, health levels, poor infrastructure, low literacy, undedicated leadership, pollution, and low foreign direct investments have been in constant action that creates obstacles to achieving the mission (Olomola, 2008).
As indicated in the model, agriculture must reach a level of increasing growth, sustainability and profitability in order to achieve vision 2020. However, the macro level drift sub-dimensions such as non-continuance of agricultural policies after old regimes exit power indicate huge causes of drift in managing the sector. Nigeria has also suffered from inadequate agricultural infrastructure such as storage facilities; this has led to after-harvest losses as indicated in the macro level drift contributors. In addition to leadership causes of drift, the management of the sector has also drifted from its mission due to governance issues. Cases of corruption in the sector are rife with allegations of channeling subsidized agricultural inputs to neighboring countries. This defeats the cause and efforts undertaken and explains the lag that is in existence. In addition to these macro-issues, the country is experiencing immense disturbances from national threats of terror attacks, grand corruption and food crisis (Nigeria, 2009).

On the micro level, the causes of drifts in the model relate to sociological aspects of perceptions, beliefs, and values among others. This is in line with discoveries in the previous sections of this studies; the section on perception that the Nigerian community and youths have on agriculture is an outstanding evidence of the cause of drift. The government and the ministry has been trying to manage agriculture to reach international levels but, the social and community values espouse other sectors other than agricultural. This has defeated many efforts; if the young people are not positive about the sector, foreigners may not have equal confidence; if the local media does not disseminate agricultural content and update the country on the ministry’s efforts, then there is lack of unity of purpose (a central assumption in the national vision). This will lead to drifts from the cause as resources are channelled towards sensitization; some projects are halted due to low participation among other aspects. It is the opinion of this paper that such is enough evidence that the management of the sector has been constantly drifting from its mission (Olomola, 2008).

Discussion
This paper, with the use of the Drift and Drive model opines that the agricultural sector in Nigeria has been drifting from its mission of achieving Vision 2020 targets constantly. The apparent reasons for the drift arise from forces in the sub dimensions of the macro and micro level forces. This drift factors are what has made efforts of successive governments have little to show. The paper argues that the mixed results realized after undertaking huge focus has not been due to lack of efforts but, due to lack of accumulation of gains. Due to the forces that cause drift at the national levels and community levels through perceptions, there have been little gains.

Current plans have not built on previous plans, there has not been a good transition between policy approaches and continuity of some gainful approaches has not been guaranteed; this has negated previous gains when new regimes disregard the approaches of their predecessors. In addition, the drift in management of the sector has risen from a continuous lack of overseeing implementation of some policies. For instance, to achieve vision 2020 the agricultural sector must move towards producing more value as opposed to just more quantity. However, previous policies have focused on production in terms of quantity and have paid little attention to value adding approaches. The on and off kind of focus on the sector has also contributed to the drift; if the initial focus in late 1970’s was kept without shifting focus to oil, private sectors and others at the expense of agriculture, the country could be closer to achieving its targets (Nigeria, 2009).

Summary
Given the immense potential that the Nigerian agricultural sector has, but also considering the enormous goals set for the industry within the vision 2020 framework, this paper argues that apparent drifts in the management of the sector exists. It therefore recommends an approach that will guarantee continued focus and thus, ensure lack of drifting from the mission’s drive. This paper notes that there have been huge indicators of drifts arising from the political leadership of the country under the agricultural sector. As the above model indicates, the drive mission towards achieving vision 2020
within the agricultural sector will be determined by huge adherence to continuity, good governance, among other aspects that depend on a balance between market and non-market forces (Douillet, 2011).

The shortcomings enumerated in this paper especially regarding the current state of the industry have culminated from a continuous drift from the mission despite dedicated efforts to reform the sector. This study argues that for the sector to attain the goals of its mission, these sources of drift must be addressed; this will particularly fall in the area of harmonizing policies of the sector with those of other sectors, ensuring continuity of policy approaches over time, developing strong performance indicators that will enable detection of drifts and ensuring an optimal share of roles between federal and state governments (Atoma, 2009). In addition, this paper, basing its recommendations on the model conclude that to achieve sustainability, growth and profitability, the sector must invest in changing the perceptions of the citizens especially the youth. The youth will be critical in incorporating change, packaging agriculture as an attractive sector of employment and mobilizing media instruments to disseminate agricultural content (Adesina, 2011).

This paper concludes by appreciating the underlying issues that are catastrophic (this relate to the recent terrorist acts, food security crisis and mega corruption occurrences in the country that have been negating any meaningful gain made) would offer a good environment for growth in the industry. These large scale occurrences are at a level sufficient to destroy the nation, drift its drive to the vision’s mission completely and result in anarchy. Thus, continued efforts geared towards changing this situation, ensuring stability and creating an undistracted focus is essential towards achieving the vision. Nigeria is not at a state of doom, but, it must decisively depart from the current state of simply appreciating its enormous potential yet shows no results; it must put in place measure that withstand the test of governments, policies and marshal a pro agriculture perception in the nation (Douillet, 2011).
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