International Journal of Scientific Research and Management (IJSRM)
||Volume||12||Issue||8||Pages||7080-7100||2024||
Website: https://ijsrm.net ISSN: 2321-3418
DOI: 10.18535/ijsrm/v12i08.em10

Women Entrepreneurs' participation in Agribusiness Value Chain in Kano State

***Abubakar S. Garba, Mahmoud Ahmad Mahmoud, Fatima Usman Sabo**

Department of Business Administration Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Yusuf Maitama Sule University Kano
Department of Business Administration Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Yusuf Maitama Sule University Kano
Department of Business Administration Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Yusuf Maitama Sule University Kano

Abstract
The aim of the study is to examine women entrepreneurs' motivation to participate in agribusiness value chain. Specifically, the study assessed the role of demographic factors, institutional factors and socio-cultural factors on women motivation towards entrepreneurship participation based on either opportunity or necessity. The study used cross-sectional survey design in which data was collected from 219 women entrepreneurs in Kano State's agribusiness value chain. It employed binary logistic regression, a statistical method that involved observing and analyzing multiple statistical outcome variables simultaneously. This approach is particularly useful in situations where multiple measurements were made on each experimental unit. The study found that demographic, institutional and socio-cultural factors influenced women entrepreneurial motivation to agribusiness. The result indicates that educational level and age are significant demographic factors that influence women participation in agribusiness. It discovered that the probability of women to be motivated in participating in agribusiness to pursue an opportunity is decreasing with more education attainments, while, the probability for women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness is increasing with their ages. The study also reveals that the probability of women to participate in agribusiness based on opportunity is decreasing with access credit facility (IFACF), access to market (IFAM) and access to government grant and support (IFAGS). While, the probability for women to participate based on opportunity is increasing with accessing training and other extension services (IFATES). It further indicates that the possibility for women to participate based on necessity is increasing with socio-cultural influences, while decreasing for opportunity-pull entrepreneurs. The study highlights to policy makers that opportunity-pull entrepreneurs may not be affected by socio-cultural factors as it will do to necessity-push entrepreneurs. It has shown that the necessity entrepreneurs have limitation to exploit opportunities due to their poor background, low social networks and are only struggling to survive. This study is constrained to collect data from only women in urban areas as such the research findings is cannot be applied to those in the rural areas. The study contribute in enriching the literature by providing explanation on the role of demographic, socio-cultural and institutional factors on women who participate in agribusiness based on either necessity or opportunity.

Keywords: Agribusiness, Women entrepreneurship, Push-necessity and Pull-opportunity factors

1.0 Introduction

Entrepreneurial motivations have been studied for decades, but very few studies have focused on women in agribusiness. The agribusiness sector in Nigeria has a lot of potentials in bringing prosperity and curtailing many socio-economic challenges facing the country. Agriculture and agribusiness should be at the top of the agenda of government for economic transformation and development of any Africa country. The agribusiness sector is projected to be a US$ 1 trillion in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) by the year 2030 (World

Bank, 2018). It is playing a critical role in kick-starting economic transformation through the development of agro-based industries that bring much-needed jobs and incomes. Successful agribusiness investments will in turn stimulate agricultural growth through the provision of new markets and the development of a vibrant input supply sector.

After decades of neglect, the agriculture and agribusiness sub –sector is presently receiving attention from the Nigeria government. There were deliberate efforts and policies by the federal government to diversify, invigorate the national economy and create jobs for women and youth through this sector. In order to actualize this onerous desire, the government did not only focus on agricultural production, but promote and supports agribusiness opportunities for vast majority of rural and urban populace. The government challenge is to develop the downstream agribusiness activities (such as processing) as well as upstream activities (such as supplying inputs) to be able to succeed. The government plays an important role in developing commercial agriculture. It support and link smallholders and small enterprises to productive agribusiness value chains. In fact, in the recent time, agribusiness is strategically placed to drive the Nigeria's future economic development. It is expected to create important linkages and encourages investment in a way that can have strong multiplier effects on growth and development of the country. Although, developing a viable and vibrant agri-business sector is very tasking, it is indeed significant in creating market opportunities for growth and development of the country.

Therefore, investments in agribusiness by Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) and large agribusiness sectors are critical to the poverty reduction and economic development of Nigeria. However, no matter the amount of investments, it may not translate to jobs creation and poverty reduction without examining the drivers, and models that would work for optimum productivity. According to Solesvik et al. (2019), women entrepreneurs in developing economies experienced notable marginalization and disempowerment in the formal sectors. Therefore, they are more complaisant to operate within the informal setting to earn their livelihood. In fact, women are the worst hit in most of the countries where poverty and unemployment have become endemic. Notwithstanding their hindrances, women play a prominent role in bringing new initiatives and innovations to various sectors of the economy. It is believe that women participation in agribusiness and agricultural production will directly increases their income and wellbeing of their immediate family members. Agribusiness sector provides powerful growth linkages to the rest of the economy by providing affordable food, raw materials and a greater demand for processing and service industries. It is expected that an agribusiness value chain is to provide opportunity for women to fully participate in productive economic activities and maintain their domestic responsibilities.

The micro and small-scale subsector which women largely operate is being face with a number of obstacles that inhibit greater participation and productivity in particularly agribusiness sub sector. Some of these obstacles include lack of access to land, skills and knowledge to improve production efficiency, financing for expansion and adoption new technology. They limit the capacity of women to fully participate in agri-business activities, explore new markets or even add value to existing products. Throughout history, women have actively engaged in many roles associated with agriculture. However, recently, there is a surge in the number of women working in farm-related industries.

To date, researchers gave relatively little attention on exploring whether there is gender difference in the push and pull motivations for women to become an entrepreneur. Brush and Hisrich (1998) asserted that the extent to which women create different organizations, or manage differently from men is not well understood. This suggests further study and exposition of the issues. It may be interesting to see applicability of existing research on gender differences in push-pull theory based on the increasing numbers of women now choosing entrepreneurship as a career option. There were evidences across many countries that women are starting businesses at increasing rates (Devine, 1994; Minniti et al., 2004). Notwithstanding the increasing rate in the numbers of women entrepreneurs, there is still large gender gap in participation in some countries. In the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor survey, women entrepreneurs are found to make important contributions to the global economy (Allen et al., 2008). Of course, there is variation amongst different nations, but women's contribution to entrepreneurship is particularly evident in low and middle income countries (Allen et al., 2008).

The role of women generally in entrepreneurship development is well researched and documented. However, there has not been adequate effort to explore factors influencing women participation in agribusiness. This study contributes in assessing the motivation and reasons why women are participation in agribusiness in Kano State by taking into cognizance the implication of opportunity and necessity based entrepreneurship. This study particularly enriched the literature by providing explanation on the role of demographic, socio-cultural and institutional factors on women who participate in agribusiness based on either necessity or opportunity. The purpose of the study is to examine women entrepreneurs' motivation to participate in agribusiness value chain.

2.0 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 Women Entrepreneurship Landscape in Nigeria

The Nigeria business and entrepreneurial landscape cover huge informal sector activities and a small proportion of them operating in the formal sector. Women-led businesses, particularly micro-enterprises, become a critical component of Nigeria's micro, small and medium enterprises (MSME) ecosystem with a total size of 39.7 million. According to National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) and the Small and Medium Enterprises Development Agency of Nigeria (SMEDAN) Survey Report, of the 38.4 million nano and micro-businesses in Nigeria, women account for 32.9% of business ownership (SMEDAN &NBS, 2021).

According to Women Entrepreneurs Survey (WES) undertaken by ILO (2022) and supported by evidence from the National MSME survey 2021, women have a high level of interest in becoming entrepreneurs, but face many challenges related to the business and regulatory environment, which include access to financial and business development services that are critical to formalizing and growing their businesses. Similarly, the National Gender Policy of 2021, highlights that while women entrepreneurs play critical roles in enhancing a country's productivity and development, structural inequalities continue to systematically disadvantage women in the country. Nigeria still ranks low on the gender gap parity, ranking 123 (with a score of 0.639) out of a total of 146 countries (Global Gender Report, 2022). Women continue to experience deficits in decent work related to business and regulatory environment and access to financial and business development services critical in formalizing and growing their business (National Gender Policy, 2021).

Therefore, different strategies for encouraging and empowering women entrepreneurs are needed by the government and key stakeholders. The Federal, State and Local Governments have intensified efforts to improve and promote women's entrepreneurship over the years. For example, the federal government came up with National Gender Policy which was adopted in 2006 and updated in 2021. This policy shows the government commitment in addressing gender-related problems and attempt to mainstreaming women's issues in the formulation and implementation of all government policies and programmes. Similarly, there are key agencies of the government, financial institutions, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that have initiated and introduced programmes and schemes to enhance women's participation and entrepreneurship development in Nigeria.

2.2 Agri-business and Women Entrepreneurs' participation

Agri-business as a concept has been associated with the notion of value chain (Mac Clay & Feeney, 2018). The ideas of agribusiness value chain started to evolve in the 1980s from the field of strategic management. Many researchers tried to explore this idea from the perspective of firm boundaries. They have analyzed value chain in relation to how firms gain competitive advantages (Bertazzoli, et al., 2011; Faβe et al., 2009; Kaplinsky and Morris, 2002).

Mac Clay and Feeny (2018) in their studies identified 19 research papers that are considered relevant to agribusiness value chain methodologies. They revealed some elements and different points of view of methodologies in analyzing agribusiness values chains. Some studies are classified into different categories, in terms of their approaches in analyzing agribusiness value chains. Strategy, efficiency, sustainability, value assessment, development and governance are the six major approaches identified in agribusiness analysis. De Figueiredo Junior et al. (2017) evaluate strategies for honey value chains in three regions of Brazil using a structure-conduct-performance model. They adapt a conceptual framework designed for industrial

organization, to make a diagnosis of the strategy, and argue that the value chain allows searching for promising strategies towards performance in an integrated way.

KeivanZokaei and Simons (2006) analyzed the UK red meat industry, and use value chain analysis on customer focus, stating the need to realign the process along the supply chain with true consumer requirements. Grunertet et al. (2005) study four agri-food value chains in different geographic areas in Denmark, Norway, Brazil and New Zealand. The aims of the study were to extend market orientation from a firm level to the value chain level. Mvumi et al. (2016), study product losses along the value chain. A value chain that does not work efficiently generates losses of valuable products at every stage. Bhandari and Vipin (2016) in their study used a more generic point of view regarding the efficiency approach. They analyzed the food and agro processing industry in India, benchmarking different value chains regarding their technical efficiency.

Women participation in agribusiness value chain differs across and within countries and regions (Doss et al., 2011). The women participation and success is very critical to the sector's competitiveness. It is evident that many small-scale women farmers are continually facing some constraints that limit their contributions. The position and role of women in any society is conditioned by their culture, tradition and other environmental factors. Apart from being mothers they usually in engaged in some economic activities will contribute to their wellbeing and family members. Their actual involvement into any form of business activity contributes significantly in addressing of their economic challenges (Garba, 2023). There are evidences to show the increasing participation of women in business and they collectively made a serious contribution the world economy (Kirwood, 2009a).The participation of women in business activities is not particular to develop or high income countries. It is now appears that many women were hindered due to either religious or cultural values are now increasingly participating in developing countries (Kirwood, 2009b). There were quite number of women in Middle East and North Africa who operate business in almost every sector of the economy (Weeks, 2009). In fact, many believed that women owned enterprises are the fastest growing business activities around the world (Brush, Bruin and Welter, 2009). Research by Kamberidou (2014) has demonstrated that increased women participation will lead to improved performance outcomes, because women value teamwork and collaboration. However, the number of women starting their own businesses has not been especially promising in some places. For example, gender inequality exists in countries like Mongolia, where women have the highest rates of illiteracy in the world (Aramand, 2013). Gender inequality and underdevelopment are a significant contributing factor to numerous social and economic issues, especially in industrialized nations like Europe and North America (Aramand, 2013).

It is noted that there were increasing interest and concern for women development by the social feminism, postmodern and post colonialist theories which led to the Gender and Development Approach (GAD) in 1980's (Konungo, 1998). The used of this approach brings women to the center of development and became change agents in their societies. Women are not supposed to be welfare recipients and only look after their homes, but rather contribute in socio-economic development of their countries. Moreso, GAD represents a transition that transformed unequal social relation and also empowered women while in their patriarchal family. In other word, the approach is categorically aim at given full and equal treatment to women within the framework of economic development (Braidotti et al., 1994; Evans, 1994; Young et al., 1993).

2.3 Push and pull theories of entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivation is influenced by two factors: push and pull factors (Martínez-Cañas, Ruiz-Palomino, Jiménez-Moreno, and Linuesa-Langreo, 2023; Schjoedt and Shaver, 2007; Poojary, 1997; Hakim, 1989). Push factors often stem from negative issues like joblessness or income issues, while pull factors are driven by opportunities to generate income or wealth (Hakim, 1989). The extant research on entrepreneurial motives considered Push-Pull theory (Amit & Muller, 1995; Caliendo & Kritikos, 2010; Thurik et al., 2008), which highlights a distinct difference between factors that contribute and as a means of understanding entrepreneurial motivation (Tipu, 2016). Most studies indicates that "pull" factors, such as autonomy (independence, freedom), income, wealth, challenge, recognition, and status, are more likely to draw the entrepreneurial population to self-employment (Barba-Sánchez & Atienza-Sahuquillo, 2018), while push factors have less of an impact (van Gelderen & Jansen, 2006). According to van Gelderen and Jansen

(2006), entrepreneurs are often most influenced by pull variables, such autonomy or independence, when deciding whether to launch a new business. According to Dawson and Henley (2012), some major motivators for the establishment of entrepreneurial intention in people include the need for more schedule flexibility, a better work-family balance, or the ability to be their own boss. Entrepreneurs who pursue business based on push factors are often referred to as necessity entrepreneurs, while those do so based on pull factors are regarded opportunity entrepreneurs.

Reynolds et al. (2005) also categorized entrepreneurship motivations into necessity and opportunity. Necessity entrepreneurship is driven by the desire to achieve a desirable state of living, while opportunity entrepreneurship involves identifying and exploiting business opportunities (Giacomin et al., 2011). Opportunity entrepreneurship occurs when entrepreneurs identify and exploit business opportunities, while necessity entrepreneurship arises when employment opportunities are insufficient or unaffordable (Wennekers et al., 2005). Thus, the necessity entrepreneurship is associated with push motivations, whereas opportunity entrepreneurship relates to pull motivations. Entrepreneurs that are driven by necessity are usually less innovative, while opportunity-driven entrepreneurs more innovative because by their nature, they usually require a higher level of knowledge on what to do. The literature suggests that the relationship between entrepreneurship and economic development depends on the nature of the entrepreneurship (Audretsch and Keilbach 2008; Aparicio et al., 2016). Opportunity-driven entrepreneurship has positive relationship with economic development. But necessity entrepreneurship has no significant effect on economic development (Acs and Varga, 2005).

In general, pull factors have been found to be more prevalent than push factors (Segal et al., 2005; Shinnar and Young, 2008). This is significant because businesses started by entrepreneurs who affected by push motivations are less successful than those with pull motivation (Amit and Muller, 1995). While these studies sort entrepreneurs' motivations in terms of push and pull categories, little explanatory research has been undertaken to review push-pull theory since the terms' inception in the late 1980s. It is important that these categorizations are revisited as some important events had happened as many studies might have impacted on the theory. Indeed, some would argue that push and pull theories may have changed

2.4 Entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivation pertains to the factors that propel people intention and desire to initiate a business endeavor (García-Cabrera, Lucía-Casademunt, and Padilla-Angulo, 2020; Hessels et al., 2008). Accordingly, those who have entrepreneurial motivation to participate in entrepreneurial process aimed recognizing, generating, and ultimately capitalizing on business opportunities and prospects therein (Dunkelberg et al., 2013). According to Zahra et al. (2005), this makes the motivation of entrepreneurs a crucial factor in real act of entrepreneurship. Some research frequently make distinction between motivations driven by need for opportunity (Williams, 2009), and link it to opportunity to wealth and progress (Acs et al., 2008). However, it is highlighted that both necessity and opportunity drivers of entrepreneurial motivation could manifest at the same time in one individual (Williams, 2009).

Motivations may be the spark that transforms a latent intention into real action and therefore, the missing link between intentions and action (Carsrud and Brannback, 2011).Therefore, motivation is believed to be a consequence of entrepreneurial intention. In this article, we emphasize on the "entrepreneurial motivation" sequence and propose that demographic factors, Institutional factors and socio-cultural factors are important antecedents of agri-business women entrepreneurial motivation.

However, previous studies have concentrate on knowing whether gender differences is as result push and pull motivations for becoming an entrepreneur. Based on the literature review, there are inconclusive results of extant research around gender differences in motivations for entrepreneurship exists. Some studies suggested that women may be more motivated by push factors than by pull factors (Orhan and Scott, 2001), while others found the opposite (Amit and Muller, 1995; Shinnar and Young, 2008). Although, this studies in not intended to reaffirm the argument of others that women and men have relatively similar types of motivations for entrepreneurship (Rosa and Dawson, 2006), but is well understood that at a broad level the

incidence of pull and push factors are almost equally apparent for both women and men participants. Perhaps, more subtle gender differences emerged when analyzing the rich qualitative data in future studies.

2.5 Demographic factors and Entrepreneurial motivation

Demographic factors are likely to support the internal tensions of entrepreneurial motivation. According to Fayolle et al. (2014), people may become more entrepreneurially inclined as a result of the internal pressure that motivations cause in them, either to satiate their intrinsic needs or to pursue rewards from other sources. Women's decision to venture into entrepreneurship often depends on their family structure, with married women having double-side influences from their immediate family and husband. This influence varies across societies, but is an axiom in any society.

Women often face restrictions due to their demography such as family, parents, or husbands, making them hesitant to move around and interact with others. Despite starting small businesses, they need access to markets to sustain and grow their businesses. Women living in rural areas or landlocked areas with poor transportation systems face challenges in blending domestic chores with entrepreneurial engagement. Men may also face similar constraints, but have the freedom to move around and seek market opportunities. This makes it difficult for women to expand their businesses.

When it comes to entrepreneurs seeking a better life for themselves or as a last resort due to their precarious employment, necessity-driven entrepreneurial motivation is less likely to be influenced by demographic factors than opportunity-driven motivation (García-Cabrera, Lucía-Casademunt, and Padilla-Angulo, 2020).This study suggest that, in order to assess the significance with which necessity drivers, opportunity drivers, or both, to entrepreneurial motivation and behavior, demographic characteristics must be taken into account. Given the aforementioned arguments, we propose the following:

H1: Demographic factors significantly influence entrepreneurial motivations of women to participate in agribusiness

2.6 Institutional factors and Entrepreneurial motivation

Institutional factors are defined as institutional support enjoyed by women entrepreneurs from government and other organization to either start or boost their business. Women's involvement in entrepreneurial activities is influenced by institutions and macro environment, including national policies, economic influences and culture. Despite the support given to women, many struggle due to lack of resources and access to essential business information. Men have more access to information and longer employment, while women are often not well connected to business networks. The institutional structure of the organizational field may influence an entrepreneur's motivation (Stenholm et al., 2013). Each business area has unique institutional characteristics that lead to entrepreneurial tendencies that differ across nations (García-Cabrera, Lucía-Casademunt, and Padilla-Angulo, 2020). Some examples of these factors are the role of risk, the availability of venture capital, the conception of opportunity as either imitative or innovative, etc. (Reuber et al., 2018).

According to some researchers the institutional framework is crucial to the growth of entrepreneurship (Kloosterman, 2010). Thus, to forecast the significance of necessity drivers, opportunity drivers, or the combination of both to entrepreneurial behavior, macro-level issues must be taken into account. For instance, the regulatory factor which is the most important facet of the institutional environment, considers issues such as laws, constitution, and property rights (Scott, 1995),which can foster or impede entrepreneurial motivation of entrepreneurs in familiarizing with the political, administrative, and economic frameworks. Stable institutional rules may incentivize entrepreneurs to evaluate risk, whereas flexible regulations allow entrepreneurs to experiment with different approaches to deal with uncertainty (Young et al., 2018). Hence, the regulatory features of establishments have the power to shape the motivations of entrepreneurs (Szyliowicz and Galvin, 2010). This can be achieved, for instance, by boosting opportunity motivation or arousing people with dormant opportunity motives to consider launching and operating their own companies (Garcıa-Cabrera et al., 2016).

According to Dheer (2018), policies that are implemented to ease the start-up of small businesses may have a "spillover" effect on entrepreneurship. Similarly, Kloosterman (2003) discovered that policies aimed at deregulating the Dutch market—such as lowering the requirements for small businesses in terms of licensing, health, and safety—facilitated the establishment of new entrepreneurial ventures. Therefore, institutions can both help and hinder people from pursuing business opportunities (Reuber et al., 2018). Indeed, people who believe that there are institutions that support the exploitation of large business opportunities will be more motivated by opportunity (Garcia-Cabrera et al., 2016). Hence, it is proposed that:

H2: Institutional factors significantly influence entrepreneurial motivations of women to participate in agribusiness.

2.7 Socio-cultural factors and Entrepreneurial motivation

Socio-cultural factors are broadly defined which consist of both the social system and the culture of a given people. These are primarily faetures which affect behaviour, relationship, perception and way of life of the people. The socio-cultural factors provide conditions and influences which shape the personality of people and likely affect their attitude, disposition, behavior and decisions of what to do.

Entrepreneurship is incorporated within a range of intricate social structures, and these kinds of structures might collectively have a significant impact on the causal processes that lead to entrepreneurship decisions and outcomes (Kim et al., 2016). The social-systems perspective holds that people interact with one another in a relational system of interaction between individuals and communities (Kroeber and Parsons, 1958), and that system plays a significant role in regulating people's economic behavior (Greif, 2006). Instead of acting independently, people behave within this system. From a systemic perspective, McMullen and Shepherd (2006) contend that entrepreneurial motivation and behavior should be examined in a larger context and that concentrating just on people in conjunction with macro-level variables is not a good idea (McMullen and Shepherd, 2006).

Society and organization is made up of different people from different socio-cultural background. It is believed that cultures affect their attitude, values, abilities and performances in some ways (Nwibere, et al., 2011). The socio-cultural environment differs among societies and states, as proven by several empirical works of Hofstede and colleagues over the decades (Hofstede et al., 2010). The inclusion of social context elements to is recommended to forecast their importance as drivers of entrepreneurial motivation among women agribusiness entrepreneurs, in keeping with the widespread agreement about the necessity of including meso-level factors into entrepreneurship study. Like all social creatures, these entrepreneurs are a part of the formal and informal social systems that shape their thoughts, emotions, and behaviors. This aligns with scholarly endeavors to comprehend social groupings within the context of entrepreneurship (Ruef, 2010). Since entrepreneurs are not living in a vacuum, there is possibility that their attitudes are being influenced by norms and values of their societies. In other word entrepreneur can be influence by the environment in which they are surviving and the way they operate. Similarly, socio-cultural factors which constitute the structure of the society, plays vital role in the practice of entrepreneurs (Ule, 2012). However, culture and social systems both affect the development of entrepreneurial spirit and motivation by exhibiting values that either improve or reduce entrepreneurship drive and behavior among individuals (Rahma & Farhana, 2014).

Anikpo and Atemie (2006) argued that culture is indispensable in the study of human social co-existence because of its connection to economic behavior and entrepreneurship. It is believe that since every society is blessed with different physical environment, entrepreneurs must adopt environmentally related patterns of behavior to enable them to succeed (Shane, 1993). In course these patterns of behavior may lead to different cultural values, some of which influences the decision to participate in entrepreneurial activity. An important socio-cultural factor to entrepreneurial motivation is the family factor (Kirkwood, 2009). Family-related motivations for starting a business are mostly referred to as push factors, and they have been noted as significant to global entrepreneurs of both genders (Verheul et al., 2006). It is now widely acknowledged that problems with the home and family play a major role in the explanation of women's entrepreneurship

(de Bruin et al., 2007). In contrast to the other primary entrepreneurship motivators, the majority of the data on family motivators significantly indicated that women were more driven by these factors than males. Hence, this study proposed that:

H3: socio-cultural factors significantly influence entrepreneurial motivations of women to participate in agribusiness.

3.0 Research Methodology

The study used cross-sectional survey which was designed to gather data from women entrepreneurs who are operating in agribusiness value chain in Kano State, Nigeria. Various aspects of the value chain were considered which include production, processing, and marketing.

The cross-sectional survey method was chosen for its short-term data collection and descriptive analysis of the subjects involved. The date collected process took approximately four months due to the nature of women and their locations. The respondents were approached independently and face to face to administer a survey questionnaire. Research assistants were employed to reach out women operating in various locations and from different value chain for the purpose of data collection. The study focuses on women entrepreneurs who have registered with Kano State Ministry of Trade and Commerce soliciting for government support and empowerment for funds. As at the time of the date collection their total number was reported to be 510. The sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) formula, which suggests a simple size of 219 for a population of 510.

In this study, the dependent variable represents the motivation (i.e. opportunity or necessity) for women participation in agribusiness. This is measured using yes or no question which was raised to obtain answers on whether women are motivated to start their agribusiness because of either opportunity (reference factor) which was coded as 1 or necessity coded as 0.

The independent variables consists of three major components i.e. Demographic, institutional and socio-cultural factors (Nguyen, 2018). The demographic factors represent the personal features of the respondents. Respondents were asked to state their present position regarding their Age (AgeR), Educational Level (EL), Marital Status (MS), Family Business Background (FBB) and being head of the household (HOH). Institutional factors are defined as support received/enjoyed from government and other organization to boost their businesses; these consists of four items namely; Access to credit facility (IFACF), Access to market IFAM), Access to training/extension services (IFATES), and Access to government grant/financial assistance (IFAGS). Hear a yes or no answer was solicited to indicate whether or not the respondents have benefited from each of these factors. In this case, yes is coded by 1 and no is coded by 0. Socio-cultural factors are defined as socio-cultural components that influence women motivation to participate in agribusiness. It is measured with 13 items using 5 points Likert's scale ranging from 1 to 5 indicating agreements with the statement. This instrument was adapted from Gindi et al. (2023) and Wube (2010) which was modified to suit the purpose of this research.

Binary logistic regression was be used based on the statistical principle of regression statistics, which involves observation and analysis of more than one statistical outcome variable at a time. This method was used to address the situation in which multiple measurements are made on each experimental unit and the relations among the measurements and their structures.

Model

The "logit" model solves these problems: – $\ln[p/(1-p)] = a + BX$

Or

– $p/(1-p) = ea + BX$

– $p/(1-p) = ea\ (eB)X$

Where: "ln" is the natural logarithm, $\log_{exp}$,

where e=2.71828

"p" is the probability that Y for cases equals 1, p (Y=1)
"1-p" is the probability that Y for cases equals 0, 1 – p(Y=1)
"p/(1-p)" is the odds
ln[p/1-p] is the log odds, or "logit"

4.0 Results

The women's participation in entrepreneurial activity can be influenced by many factors among others are social, cultural as well as institutional factors. The effect of these factors may have negative implications on the future development of their enterprise and impact on the country's economic growth. Women business performance could be hampered by lack of knowledge, information and skills to improve their production efficiency. Similarly, lack of support from government and other agencies may vitiate and retard the progress of many businesses.

Table 1: Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients

		Chi-square	Df	Sig.
Step 1	Step	19.020	8	.015
	Block	19.020	8	.015
	Model	19.020	8	.015

In this study, the omnibus tests conducted was used for goodness of fit to determine whether the model is significant or not. The result indicates a significant improvement in fit when compared with the null model. In table 1, the result is significant (0.015) which is showing a good fit. The Hosmer and Lemeshow is also a model goodness of fit test which helps to indicate poor fit if the significant value is less than 0.05 and good fit if the significant value is equal or greater than 0.05. The result in table 2 shows that the model adequately fits the data which shows significant value is greater than 0.05 (i.e 0.863). Hence, there is no difference between the observed and predicted model.

Table2:Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
1	3.930	8	.863

This result is corroborated by the result in the contingency table 3 below which also shows that the model is adequately fit the data. It can be seen from the table that there is no significant difference between the observed and predicted values. In other words both values in predicted and observed values are nearly the same. In raw 1 of the table 3 under necessity motivation, the observed and expected values are 13 and 11.016 respectively. While on the other side of the table (opportunity motivation), the observed figure is 9 and expected value is 10.984. Similar pattern of insignificant differences can be seen across raw 2 up to 10. These affirmed the goodness fit of the model.

Table 3: Contingency Table for Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

		Reason for women participation = Necessity		Reason for women participation = Opportunity		
		Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Total
Step 1	1	13	11.016	9	10.984	22
	2	8	9.532	14	12.468	22
	3	10	8.514	12	13.486	22
	4	5	7.570	17	14.430	22
	5	7	6.270	15	15.730	22
	6	5	5.262	17	16.738	22
	7	4	4.356	18	17.644	22

	8	3	3.670	19	18.330	22
	9	3	2.913	19	19.087	22
	10	3	1.897	18	19.103	21

The classification table 4 provides an indication of how well the model is able to predict the correct category once the predictor is added in the model. The result was actually compared with that of classification table in block 0 to obtain information on the rate of correct classification if we always predict respondents who were motivated to participate in agribusiness because of opportunity rather than necessity. In other words, it provides information on the degree to which observed outcomes are predicted by the model.

From the table below, the percentages in the first two rows provide information regarding the specificity and sensitivity of the model in terms predicting membership groupings. On the one hand, specificity (true negative rate) considers the percentage of cases observed to fall into non target category i.e women who were not motivate to participate because of opportunity. In this case, the specificity is just 9.8 %. While, on the other hand, sensitivity (true positive rate) takes the percentage of cases observed to fall on the target group (Y-1) i.e women who were motivate to participate based opportunity. The sensitivity of the model is 98.1% as shown in the classification table. On the overall, it can be stated that the accuracy rate was good enough at 73.5 %. It indicates that the model shown good sensitivity since those women who were motivated to participate in agribusiness based on opportunity was correctly predicted at 98.1%.

Table 4: Classification Table[a]

			Predicted		
			Motivation for women participation		Percentage Correct
	Observed		Necessity	Opportunity	
Step 1	Motivation for women participation	Necessity	6	55	9.8
		Opportunity	3	155	98.1
	Overall Percentage				73.5
a. The cut value is .500					

In table 5, the model summary shows the Psuedo R-Square which is used to approximate variation in the criterion variable. The Negelkerke's R^2 is an adjusted version of the Cox & Snell R^2. It adjusts the scale of the statistics to cover full range from 0 to 1. Therefore, the result shows that 60% change in the criterion variable can be accounted by the predictor variables in the model.

Table 5: Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	79.418[a]	.452	.601
a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 4 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.			

It is evident from the result that the predictors (i.e demographic, institutional and socio-cultural factors) could substantially explain the motivation for women participation in agribusiness. The reference group in this study is women who were motivated by an opportunity to participate in agribusiness. Therefore, it can be further analyzed that opportunity entrepreneurs are those who have desire to create their future and wealth by involving in agribusiness. They are known for having the ability to identify and explore market opportunities in order to maximize personal gains. There could be different factors motivating different group of women entrepreneurs, but it is instrumental for this study to explore only these factors that may be responsible for women participation in agribusiness based opportunity rather than necessity.

Table 6: Demographic Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	EL	-.938	.361	6.753	1	.009	.391	.193	.794
	MS	-.459	.364	1.591	1	.207	.632	.310	1.289
	FBB	-.280	.325	.739	1	.390	.756	.400	1.430
	HOH	-.148	.367	.162	1	.687	.863	.420	1.772
	AgeR	.033	.014	5.540	1	.019	1.034	1.006	1.063
	Constant	.692	.609	1.291	1	.256	1.998		
a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: EL, MS, FBB, HOH, AgeR.									

In table 6 above, the result shows how the demographic variables contribute in motivating women entrepreneurs. It indicates that educational level and age are significant factors that influence women participation in agribusiness. In the case of educational level (EL), since the Exp(B) is less than 1, it suggest that the probability of women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness to pursue an opportunity is decreasing with more education attainments. Therefore, the probability for women to participate in agribusiness is decreasing by 0.391 times with higher educational attainments. While the Exp(B) for Age (AgeR) is greater than 1, this suggest that the probability of women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness because of opportunity is increasing with age. Therefore, the probability for women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness because of opportunity is increasing by 1.006 times with her increase in age. Other variables Marital status (MS), Family Business Background (FBB) and Headship of household (HOH) were found to be insignificant in motivating women to participation in agribusiness.

Table 7: Institutional Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	IFACF	-.047	.403	.014	1	.906	.954	.433	2.100
	IFAM	-.148	.310	.228	1	.633	.862	.469	1.584
	IFATES	.370	.497	.556	1	.456	1.448	.547	3.831
	IFAGS	-.232	.599	.150	1	.699	.793	.245	2.567
	Constant	1.016	.251	16.356	1	.000	2.762		
a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: IFACF, IFAM, IFATES, IFAGS.									

In table 7, the results show that all the institutional factors were not significant motivators to women to participate based on opportunity. Therefore, since the Exp(B) for all variables except IFATES is less than 1, it suggest that the probability of women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness based on opportunity is decreasing with access credit facility (IFACF), access to market (IFAM) and access to government grant and support (IFAGS). While, the probability for women to be motivated to participate based on opportunity is increasing with accessing training and other extension services (IFATES).

However, since the results are insignificant, the opposite can be the case and it can be expressed that the probability of women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness based on necessity is increasing with access to credit facility (IFACF), access to market (IFAM) and access to government grant and support (IFAGS).

Table 8: Socio-cultural Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for EXP(B)	
								Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	SCFmean	-.203	.254	.639	1	.424	.816	.496	1.343

	Constant	1.456	.653	4.978	1	.026	4.288		
a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: SCFmean.									

The table 8 Socio-cultural constructs (SCFmean) were found to be insignificant to motivate women to participate in agribusiness based on opportunity. Since the Exp(B) is less than 1, it further indicate that the possibility for women to be motivated to participate based on opportunity is decreasing with socio-cultural influence by 0.816 times. Again, since the result is insignificant, it can be further interpreted in an opposite way that the possibility for women to be motivated to participate based on necessity is increasing with socio-cultural influences.

Table 6: Correlation Matrix

		Constant	SCFmean	EL	MS	FBB	HOH	AgeR	IFACF	IFAM	IFATES	IFAGS
Step 1	Constant	1.000	-.771	-.366	-.071	-.004	-.128	-.537	.153	-.281	-.008	.025
	SCFmean		1.000	-.009	-.008	-.080	.112	.141	-.138	.147	-.039	-.093
	EL			1.000	.205	-.070	.190	.180	-.020	-.037	-.066	.019
	MS				1.000	.033	.015	-.380	.181	-.052	-.112	.098
	FBB					1.000	-.161	-.120	-.048	-.001	.056	.041
	HOH						1.000	-.166	-.135	.111	-.157	-.009
	AgeR							1.000	-.273	.000	.146	-.039
	IFACF								1.000	.048	-.163	-.093
	IFAM									1.000	-.163	.032
	IFATES										1.000	-.303
	IFAGS											1.000

Table 9 above, the results show the correlations among all the variables to indicate how each variable is significantly relate with one another. High correlation signifies that the variables are the same. It can be seen that in most of the results the correlation is week. This justified the combination of the variables in the equations.

5.0 Discussions of findings

Women entrepreneurs play critical roles in enhancing a country's productivity and its development. Generally, women entrepreneurs are known for the important contribution to the global economy (Allen et al., 2008). Although, there are noticeable differences in terms of their contributions amongst different nations, women's contribution to business development is particularly seen in low and middle income countries (Allen et al., 2008). In Nigeria, women-led micro-enterprises become a critical component of Nigeria's micro, small and medium enterprises (MSME) ecosystem with a total size of 39.7 million (ILO.2022). Therefore, in view their importance to country's economic growth, there is need for the government to support the increase in women participation in business. This can only be done when carefully examine motivational factors that guide their decision to be involved business.

There are several factors motivating women entrepreneurs. In this study efforts have been made to study demographic, institutional and socio-cultural factors on how they contribute in motivating women folk to participate in agribusiness in Kano State. The dominant theories developed around entrepreneurial motivations have been the push and pull factors theories (Hakim, 1989; McClelland et al., 2005; Schjoedt and Shaver, 2007; Segal et al., 2005). Push factors are characterized by personal or external factors (including a marriage break-up, lack of income, lack of employment opportunity etc), and often have negative connotations. Alternatively, pull factors are those that draw people to start businesses – such as seeing an opportunity, becoming wealthier, building business empire, creating job for others etc (Hakim, 1989), and often have positive connotations.

In explaining the impact of each variable, we consider the odd ratio for women being motivated to participate in agribusiness based on opportunity. The odd ratio is equals to 1 if the probability of women

falling into a group of those participating because of opportunity is equal to the probability of women participating because of necessity. But if the probability of women participating because of opportunity is greater than the probability of those participating because of necessity, we can say that the odd ratio is greater than 1. Moreover, the probability of women to participate in agribusiness because of opportunity is decreasing if the odd ratio is less than 1.

In this study, the demographic variables that were found to be significant are age and educational level and explained how they affect women participation. Other variables such as marital status, family business background and being the head of the household were found to be insignificant in influencing women to participate in business. From table 6, the result suggests that the probability of women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness because of opportunity is increasing with age. Therefore, the probability for women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness because of opportunity is increasing by 1.006 times with her increase in age. There are numerous studies that examined the relationship between age and participation of women in business activity (de Kok, Ichou and Verheul, 2010; Van Es and Van Vuuren, 2010; Verheul and Van Stel, 2010; Nestorowicz and Tyrowicz, 2010; Rogott, 2008; Bergmann and Sterberg, 2007; Greene, 2005; Levent et al., 2003; Curran and Blackburn, 2001; Lin et al., 2000; Borjas and Bronars, 1989 etc.). In most of these studies, it was revealed that the relationship between age and business activity is positive and statistically significant which supported the findings of this study. There is no consensus in most of these studies on which particular age group are more likely to participate in entrepreneurial activity. In the Netherlands, the number of business owners is more among the ages of 25 to 44 years. It was found that those at the ages of 25 to 34 years are more likely to participate in business activity than the older ones (Van Es and Van Vuuren, 2010 and Veheul and Van Stel, 2010).

According to de Kok et al. (2010), the relationship between age and entrepreneurial activity is more likely to be indirect because of many factors that mediate the relationship. The interest of the individual in entrepreneurial activity may be hampered by other factors such as health, skill, experience, access to both social and financial capital etc. The participation of women is contingent upon other factors at different ages and her environment. For instance, old women who have more networks and social capital will be more likely to pursue business opportunity than younger ones. Similarly, older women who are impoverished, lacks both financial and social capital may be necessitated to start petty business for survival only. Therefore, age of women can be a good determinant of her involvement, but that is actually depends on other factors.

Generally, education plays an important role in successful management of business. Some studies made reference to human capital theory in explaining the importance of education in enhancing productivity and efficiency of the entrepreneurs. This study focuses on motivation of women to participate rather than their performance. The result of this study suggests that the probability of women to be motivated to participate in agribusiness because of opportunity is decreasing with more education attainments. It was discovered that those who attained high level of educational tend to prefer working for paid job which directly affects their decision for participation in entrepreneurial activity (Sluis, Praag, &Vijverberg, 2005). In Germany and the Netherlands women with high education attainments have higher opportunity costs for starting a business as compared to those with low levels of education attainment (Brixy & Hessels, 2010). Highly educated women shun business and prefer working in established organizations. It is evident In Egypt, Morocco, and Yemen that women prefer formal job because of its stability and working for some hours. Women with less formal educational attainment are pushed into entrepreneurship because of necessity of not having formal paid job (Hattab, 2012). Women with low level of knowledge have difficulties in getting paid job and they are motivated to be involved as necessity entrepreneurs (Arenius and Minniti, 2005). On the contrary, some studies revealed that women with high level of education are driven by opportunity to become entrepreneurs. This is because they may have better social network that will help them in developing their business ideas so easily (Ucbasaran et al., 2008). Women with high social networks may have more information and access to capital to pursue certain opportunity in the market place. Therefore, having evidences to suggest the influence of some demographic variables, it reasonable to affirm our hypothesis that *''Demographic factors (age and education level) significantly influence entrepreneurial motivations of women to participate in agribusiness''*

The institutional factors considered in this study include access to finance, availability and access to information, access to market etc. Access to finance is one of the critical factors contributing to the success of entrepreneurs generally. On the one hand, it is expected that women from poor family background may have difficulty in accessing finance. They may experience some constraints during both start-up and growth stage of their enterprise formation. They are worse off if the head of their family is financially weak and cannot provide funding as a support to their business (Garba, 2011). Based on the poor family status, some women struggle to engage themselves in petty business enterprise with motives to improve the family economic status. In most cases, women from poor background participate because of necessity and they probably continue to face difficulty in the process of sustaining their business. However, some women decided to venture into business knowing fully that they will be supported financially by the government or their husbands or parents. If such funding is not available, it may be difficult for them to start the business and eventually prosper. Most entrepreneurs mostly enjoy support and receive assistance or any form of grant only if they have already founded the business. The implication here is that those women who are participating because of opportunity may not heavily rely on government assistance and will continue to grow from strength to strength. But, in most cases, necessity entrepreneurs have expectations and rely on government for other form of assistance for them to be motivated to start and remain in business. For this kind of entrepreneurs pre-start up stage is of paramount importance in determine how far they will participate. The result shows that institutional factors although positive but not significant in influencing women participation to pursue business opportunity. This suggests rejecting our earlier hypothesis that "*Institutional factors significantly influence entrepreneurial motivations of women to participate in agribusiness".*

The results show that socio-cultural variables are insignificant on motivation of women to participate in agribusiness to pursue an opportunity. In most communities, social and cultural norms and family related issues are the very serious issues particularly to women (Poggesi, Mari, and De Vita, 2016). Women's entrepreneurial career choices are shaped by the complex interplay of these socio-cultural factors (Roomi, Rehman, and Henry, 2018). Moreover, these variables may determine the level of entrepreneurial participation and activity in a particular place and in a specific time. Similarly, social relationships and freedom of interaction with others have a crucial impact on business's performance and success of women entrepreneurs (Arasti et al., 2012). Balakrishnan and Low (2016) posit that social-cultural factors have significantly influenced women entrepreneurs' decision-making and success in developing economies. Socio-cultural factors are likely to play a greater role in an environment where education and social networking is less. Education and socialization help to free individuals from their ethnocentrism. In most cases, women with rich education background and social networks have wider view on how to capture opportunities in many ways. In other words, opportunity-pull entrepreneurs may not be affected by socio-cultural factors as it will do to necessity-push entrepreneurs. As argued earlier necessity entrepreneurs have limitation to exploit opportunities due to their poor background, low social networks and are only struggling to survive. The socio-cultural factors may as well constraint their involvement in business activities. Therefore, it can be summarized that socio-cultural variables have significant influence on necessity motivated women. While, for opportunity based women entrepreneurs, it has insignificant influence. Based on the findings of the study that socio-cultural factors are negative and have insignificant influence women opportunity based entrepreneurs, hence the earlier hypothesis is rejected that "*socio-cultural factors significantly influence entrepreneurial motivations of women to participate in agribusiness".*

6.0 Research Limitations

The study ought to have covered various groups of women participating in agribusiness in both urban and rural areas. This is important because of the differences in the environment that affects their motivation in entrepreneurial activity. However, this study was constrained to collect data from only those in urban areas as such the research findings is cannot be applied to those in the rural areas.

The priority of having opportunity over necessity based entrepreneurs is rationalized on the grounds that they contribute more in creative disruption, wealth creation, and boosting the country's economic growth. The study reveals that demographic and socio-economic factors will influence women participation in

agribusiness. Socio-cultural factors examined are significant and negative. This indicates that probability of women participating in agribusiness is decreasing as they are entangled more with socio-cultural factors in that society. However, there is no significant effect on the part of institutional factors. Further analysis shows that these factors as a whole may not to greater extent explain participation of women entrepreneurs in agribusiness based on opportunity-pull motivation. This is based on the fact that opportunity entrepreneurs are Innovators, solution providers and expose to taking high risk. There are numerous factors that could explain women participations in business, but this study is unable to determine and incorporate all these factors and segregate those that are applicable to women who were pulled into pursuing a business and those who were pushed as necessity to start a business.

6.1 Theoretical implications

Researchers on entrepreneurial motivation used the Push-Pull theory to provide a clear distinction between necessity and opportunity factors and their role in determining entrepreneurial intention (Amit & Muller, 1995; Caliendo & Kritikos, 2010; Gilad & Levine, 1986; Kirkwood, 2009; Thurik et al., 2008), (Tipu, 2016). Most of the previous studies discovered that the pull factors (such as autonomy, income generation, wealth creation, recognition, and status are more frequently attracted people to become entrepreneurs (BarbaSanchez & Atienza-Sahuquillo, 2018; Segal, Bogia & Schoenfeld, 2005). In fact, pull factors tend to have the greatest influence on entrepreneurs when making a decision to start a new venture (van Gelderen & Jansen, 2006). In particular, the quest for greater schedule flexibility, a better work-family balance or desire to become one's own boss, are important driving forces for entrepreneurial intention among individuals (Dawson & Henley, 2012).

There may be necessities that pushed individuals into entrepreneurship and opportunities that pulled some people into entrepreneurship (Dawson & Henley, 2012; Thurik et al., 2008). Although, these factors can be considered as motivators, however, how could it be explained taking into cognizance its affects on women gender? This study particularly enriched the literature by providing explanation on the role of demographic, socio-cultural and institutional factors on women who participate in agribusiness based on either necessity or opportunity.

6.2 Practical implications

Entrepreneurial motivation represents impetus for people starting a venture at a particular time and space. What has been their psychological motive for them to start a business? Understanding the reason and motivation is very important to researchers and policy makers. The better the understanding on what constitute entrepreneurial motivation, the more likely to grasp an idea on what to be done to influence someone to start a business (Fayolle et al., 2014). The implication of this finding is that governments and other agencies supporting women entrepreneurs should understand that difference between opportunity and necessity based entrepreneurs and limitations in using some of these factors in encouraging the participation of each group in agribusiness.

Additionally, educational attainments and age are demographic variables that are significantly influencing women participation in agribusiness. The study suggests that the probability of women participating in agribusiness is decreasing as they have more education experiences. Similarly, this finding clearly informs policy makers that higher educational experiences hinder people in participation in agribusiness. In encouraging women participation, they should be cautious that it is unlikely that women with high education qualification would venture into agribusiness. This also suggest women with low educational background, especially those facing adverse situation be encouraged to participate as necessity based entrepreneurs.

The study pointed out that necessity entrepreneurs have expectations and rely on government for other form of assistance for them to be motivated to start and remain in business. For this kind of entrepreneurs pre-start up stage is of paramount importance in determine how far they will participate. It also highlights to policy makers that opportunity-pull entrepreneurs may not be affected by socio-cultural factors as it will do to necessity-push entrepreneurs. It is noted that necessity entrepreneurs have limitation to exploit opportunities due to their poor background, low social networks and are only struggling to survive. The socio-cultural factors may as well constraint their involvement in business activities.

7.0 Conclusion

Agribusiness value chain is expected to provide opportunity for women to participate in business to promote their wellbeing. The agribusiness sector provides powerful growth linkages to the rest of the economy through various activities along the value chain. The women's participation in entrepreneurial activity may be influenced by many factors among others are social, cultural as well as institutional factors. Their performance is usually affected by lack of knowledge and skills to improve their production efficiency.

The study shows that the predictor variables i.e demographic, institutional and socio-cultural factors explained participation of women in agribusiness. Among the demographic factors used in this study, age and educational level were found to be significant and explained women participation in agribusiness based either opportunity-pull or necessity-push motivation.

It was understood from the literature that the priority of having opportunity over necessity based entrepreneurs is rationalized on the grounds that they contribute more in creative disruption, wealth creation, and boosting the country's economic growth. Therefore, the task of policy makers is to come up with different policies that will encourage entrepreneurs depending on their unique circumstance. The study contribute in enriching the literature by providing explanation on the role of demographic, socio-cultural and institutional factors on women who participate in agribusiness based on either necessity or opportunity.

References

1. Acs, Z., Varga, A. (2005). Entrepreneurship, agglomeration and technological change. *Small Business Economics, Research Policy, 31*, 630-640.
2. Acs, Z.J., Desai, S. and Hessels, J. (2008). Entrepreneurship, economic development and institution. *Small Business Economics, 31* (3), 219-234.
3. Allen, I.E., Elam, A., Langowitz, N. and Dean, M. (2008). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2007 Report on Women and Entrepreneurship, The Center for Women's Leadership at Babson College, Babson Park, MA.
4. Amit, R., and Muller, E. (1995). Push and Pull Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship,* 12(4), pp 64–80. doi:10.1080/08276331.1995.10600505.
5. Anikpo, M. O. C., and Atemie, J. D. (2006). *Nigerian socio-cultural heritage*. Peekay Production: Port-Harcourt, Nigeria
6. Aramand, M. (2013). Women Entrepreneurship in Mongolia: the role of culture on entrepreneurial motivation, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion. *International Journal (Toronto, Ont.), 32*(1), 68-82.
7. Arasti, Z., Zandi, F. and Talebi, K., (2012). Exploring the effect of individual factors on business failure in Iranian new established small businesses. *International Business Research, 5*(4), 2-6.
8. Arenius P.and Minniti M. (2005). Perceptual variables and nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics 24*(3), 233–247.
9. Audretsch, D. B., and Keilbach, M. (2008). Resolving the knowledge paradox: Knowledge spillover entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Research Policy*, 37 (10), 1697–1705.
10. Aparicio, S., Urbano, D. and Audretsch, D. (2016). Institutional factors, opportunity entrepreneurship and economic growth: Panel data evidence, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 102, 45-61.
11. Balakrishnan, B. and Low, F.S., (2016). Learning experience and socio-cultural infl uences on female engineering students' perspectives on engineering courses and careers. *Minerva, 54*(2), 219-239.
12. Barba-Sanchez, V., and Atienza-Sahuquillo, C. (2018). Entrepreneurial intention among engineering students: The role of entrepreneurship education. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, 24(1), 53–61. doi:10.1016/j.iedeen.2017.04.001.
13. Bergmann, H., and Sternberg, R. (2007). The changing face of entrepreneurship in Germany. *Small Business Economics, 28*(2/3), 205-221.
14. Bertazzoli, A., Ghelfi, R. and Rivaroli, S. (2011). Value sharing and food system dynamics for milk, tomato, and cereals food chains. *International Journal on Food System Dynamics* I(4), 330-341.

15. Bhandari, A. K. and Vipin, V. (2016). Efficiency and related technological aspects of the Indian food processing industry: a non-parametric analysis. *Journal of Developing Areas, 50*(6), 227-243.
16. Borjas, G. J., and Bronars, S. G. (1989). Consumer discrimination and self-employment. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97 (2), 581-167.
17. Braidotti, R., Charkiewicz, E, Hausler, and Wieringa, S. (1994). Women, the Environment and Sustainable Development. Towards a Theoretical Synthesis. *Zeb Books Ltd, UK*
18. Brixy, U., and Hessels, J. (2010). Human capital and start up success of nascent entrepreneurs. EIM Research Reports No H201013.
19. Brush, C.G., de Bruin, A.M. and Welter, F. (2009). A Gender Aware Framework for Women's Entrepreneurship, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship, 1*(1), 8-24.
20. Brush, C.G and Hisrich, R.D. (1988). Women entrepreneurs: strategic origins impact on growth, Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, Babson College, Wellesley, MA.
21. Caliendo, M., and Kritikos, A. (2010). Start-Ups by the Unemployed: Characteristics, Survival and Direct Employment Effects. *Small Business Economics*, 35(1), 71–92. doi:10.1007/s11187-009-9208-4.
22. Carsrud, A. and Brannback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial motivations: what do we still need to know?, *Journal of Small Business Management, 49* (1), 9-26.
23. Curran, J., and Blackburn, R. A. (2001). Older people and the enterprise society: Age and self-employment propensities. *Work, Employment & Society Journal*, *15*(4), 889- 902.
24. Dawson, C., and Henley, A. (2012). 'Push' versus 'Pull' Entrepreneurship: An Ambiguous Distinction? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *18*(6), 697–719. doi:10.1108/13552551211268139.
25. de Bruin, A., Welter, F. and Brush, C. (2007b), What We Know About the "Mothers of Invention": An Overview and Research Agenda, International Council for Small Business, Turku.
26. De Figueiredo Junior, H.S., M.P. Meuwissen, I.A. Van der Lans and A. Lansink. (2017). Beyond upgrading typologies – in search of a better deal for honey value chains in Brazil. *PLoS ONE* 12(7): e0181391.
27. deKok, J. M. P., Ichou, A., and Verheul, I. (2010). New firm formation: Does the age of founders affect employment creation? SCALES and EIM Financed Research No H201015.
28. Devine, T.J. (1994). Changes in wage-and-salary returns to skill and the recent rise in female self-employment, *The American Economic Review, 84* (2), 108-13.
29. Dheer, R.J. (2018). Entrepreneurship by immigrants: a review of existing literature and directions for future research. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *14* (3), 555-614.
30. Doss, Cheryl and the SOFA Team (2011). The Role of Women in Agriculture. ESA Working Paper No. 11-02. Rome, Italy: Agricultural Development Economics Division, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Accessed at: http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/am307e/am307e00.pdf
31. Dunkelberg, W., Moore, C., Scott, J. and Stull, W. (2013). Do entrepreneurial goals matter? Resource allocation in new owner-managed firms, *Journal of Business Venturing, 28* (2), 225-240.
32. Evans, M. (1994). The Woman in question. Sage publication Ltd, London UK.
33. Faβe, A., U. Grote and E. Winter. 2009. Value chain analysis methodologies in the context of environment and trade research (No. 429). Discussion papers//School of Economics and Management of the Hanover Leibniz University, Germany.
34. Fayolle, A., Linan, F. and Moriano, J.A. (2014). Beyond entrepreneurial intentions: values and motivations in entrepreneurship, *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *10* (4), 679-689.
35. Garba, A. S. (2011). Stumbling block for women entrepreneurship in Nigeria: How risk attitude and lack of capital mitigates their need for business expansion. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 36, 38-49.
36. Garba , A. S. (2023). Women, Poverty and Sustainable Development in Nigeria . *Nigerian Academy of Management Journal*, 18 (1), 229–235.
37. Garcia-Cabrera, A.M., Garcia-Soto, M.G. and Duran-Herrera, J.J. (2016). Opportunity motivation and SME internationalization in emerging countries: evidence from entrepreneurs' perception of institutions. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *12* (3), 879-910.

38. García-Cabrera, A.M., Lucía-Casademunt, A.M., and Padilla-Angulo, L. (2020). Immigrants' entrepreneurial motivation in Europe: liabilities and assets. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 26(8), 1707-1737.
39. Giacomin, O., Janssen, F., Pruett, M., Shinnar, R. S., Llopis, F., Toney, B. (2011). Entrepreneurial intentions, motivations and barriers: differences among American, Asian and European students. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *7*, 219-238.
40. Gindi, A. A., Halilu, H., Kaka, Y. and Khalid, B. A. (2023). Pooled Measurement Model of Socio-cultural Factors Influencing Youths Engagement in Agribusiness Activities, Zamfara State, Nigeria. Direct Res. *J. Agric. Food Sci 11*(7), 180-185. https://doi.org/10.26765/DRJAFS26991369
41. Global Gender Report (2022). World Economic Forum Insight Report July 2022. Retrieved from www3.weforum.org
42. Greene, F. J. (2005). Young entrepreneurship: Latent entrepreneurship, market failure and enterprise support. Working paper No. 87. Coventry, UK: University of Warwick, Centre for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises.
43. Greif, A. (2006). Family structure, institutions, and growth: the origins and implications of western corporations, *The American Economic Review*, 96 (2), 308-312.
44. Grunert, K.G., L. Fruensgaard Jeppesen, K. Risom Jespersen, A.M. Sonne, K. Hansen, T.
45. Hakim, C. (1989). New recruits to self-employment in the 1980s, *Employment Gazette*, June, 286-97
46. Hattab, H., (2012). Towards understanding female entrepreneurship in Middle Eastern and North African countries: A cross-country comparison of female entrepreneurship, Education, Business and Society: *Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues*, *5*, (3), 171-186.
47. Henley, A. (2005). Job creation by the self employment: The roles of entrepreneurial and financial capital. *Small Business Economics*, 25(2), 175-196.
48. Hessels, J., van Gelderen, M.W. and Thurik, A.R. (2008). Drivers of entrepreneurial aspirations at the country level: the role of start-up motivations and social security, *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *4* (4), 401-417.
49. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J. and Minkov, M. (2010) Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind: Intercultural Cooperation and Its Importance for Survival. 2nd Edition, McGraw- Hill, London.
50. ILO (2022). National assessment of women's entrepreneurship development In Nigeria. Retrieved from https://www.ilo.org/.
51. Kamberidou, I. (2014). The East in the eyes of western women travellers of the 18th and 19th centuries: solidarity and understanding the East. Proceedings of the East in the Eyes of The West International Conference of the Faculty of Arts, Kuwait University. Retrieved at *http://www.tinyurl.com/jugon8b*
52. Kanungo, R.N. (1998). Entrepreneurship innovation, Model for development. Sage Publication India pvt Ltd, New Delhi(ed).
53. Kaplisky, R. and M. Morris. 2002. A handbook for value chain research. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, UK.
54. KeivanZokaei, A. and D.W. Simons. (2006). Value chain analysis in consumer focus improvement: a case study of the UK red meat industry. *International Journal of Logistics Management*, *17*(2): 141-162.
55. Kim, P.H., Wennberg, K. and Croidieu, G. (2016). Untapped riches of meso-level applications in multilevel entrepreneurship mechanisms, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 3(3), 273-291.
56. Kirkwood, J. (2009). Motivational factors in a push-pull theory of entrepreneurship. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 24(5), 346-364.
57. Kirkwood, J. (2009a). Is Lack of Self Confidence Hindering Women Entrepreneurs, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 1 (2), 118-133.
58. Kirkwood, J. (2009b). Motivational factors in a push-pull theory of entrepreneurship. *Gender in Management*, *24* (5), 346-364. https://doi.org/10.1108/17542410910968805
59. Kloosterman, R.C. (2003). Creating opportunities. Policies aimed at increasing openings for immigrant entrepreneurs in The Netherlands, Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, *15* (2), 167-181.

60. Kloosterman, R.C. (2010). Matching opportunities with resources: a framework for analyzing (migrant) entrepreneurship from a mixed embeddedness perspective. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 22*(1), 25-45.
61. Krejcie, R.V., and Morgan, D.W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607 -46.
62. Kroeber, A.L. and Parsons, T. (1958). The concepts of culture and of social system, *American Sociological Review, 23*(5), 582-583.
63. Levent, T. B., Masurel, E., and Nijkamp, P. (2003). Diversity in entrepreneurship: Ethnic and female roles in urban economic life. *International Journal of Social Economics, 30*(11), 1131- 1161.
64. Lin, Z., Picot, G., and Compton, J. (2000). The entry and exit dynamics of self-employment in Canada, *Small Business Economics, 15*(2), 105-125.
65. Mac Clay, P and Feeney, R. (2018). Analyzing agribusiness value chains: a literature review. *International Food and Agribusiness Management Review, 22*(1), 31-46.
66. Martínez-Cañas, R., Ruiz-Palomino, P., Jiménez-Moreno, J. J., and Linuesa-Langreo, J. (2023). Push versus Pull motivations in entrepreneurial intention: The mediating effect of perceived risk and opportunity recognition. *European Research on Management and Business Economics, 29*(2), 100 - 214.
67. McClelland, E., Swail, J., Bell, J. and Ibbotson, P. (2005). Following the pathway of female entrepreneurs: a six-country investigation, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, 11*(2), 84-107.
68. McMullen, J.S. and Shepherd, D.A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur", *Academy of Management Review, 31* (1), 132-152.
69. Menzies, T.V., Diochon, M. and Gasse, Y. (2004). Examining venture-related myths concerning women entrepreneurs. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, 9*(2), 89- 108.
70. Minniti, M., Arenius, P. and Langowitz, N. (2004), Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Report on Women and Entrepreneurship, The Center for Women's Leadership at Babson College, Boston, MA.
71. Mvumi, B., L.T. Matsikira and J. Mutambara (2016). The banana postharvest value chain analysis in Zimbabwe. *British Food Journal, 118*(2), 272-285.
72. National Gender Policy (2021). Federal Ministry of Women and Gender Affairs, Federal republic of Nigeria. Retrieved from www.wrapanigeria.org
73. Nestorowicz, J., and Tyrowicz, J. (2010). Cynicism starts young: Age and entrepreneurship under transition. Working Paper No 2/2010(25). Warsaw, Poland: University of Warsaw, Faculty of Economic sciences.
74. Nguyen, C. (2018). Demographic factors, family background and prior self-employment on entrepreneurial intention - Vietnamese business students are different: why? *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 8(10) https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-018-0097-
75. Nwibere, B. M., Emecheta, B. C., and Worlu, G. O. (2011). *Comparative Management: A System Approach*. Samac Stationery Limited, Port-Harcourt.Nigeria.
76. Orhan, M. and Scott, D. (2001). Why women enter into entrepreneurship: an explanatory model, *Women in Management Review, 16*(5), 232-43.
77. Poggesi, S., Mari, M. and De Vita, L., (2016). What's new in female entrepreneurship research? Answers from the literature. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 12*(3), 735-764.
78. Poojary, M. C. (1997). Entrepreneurship: Push or Pull Effect?, *Small Enterprises Development, Management & Extension Journal, 24*(3), 11-18.
79. Rahma, A., and Farhana, R. S. (2014). Socio-cultural factors influencing entrepreneurial activities: A study on Bangladesh. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 16(9), 01-10.
80. Reuber, A.R., Knight, G.A., Liesch, P.W. and Zhou, L. (2018). International entrepreneurship: the pursuit of entrepreneurial opportunities across national borders. *Journal of International Business Studies, 49*, 395-406.
81. Reynolds, P. D., N. Bosma, E. Autio and others, (2005). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: Data Collection Design and Implementation 1998–2003', *Small Business Economics* (present issue)

82. Rogott, E. G. (2008). The issue and opportunities of entrepreneurship after age 50. AARP Occasional Papers No. 5. Washington, DC: AARP, Office of Academic Affairs.
83. Roomi, M. A., Rehman, S., and Henry, C. (2018). Exploring the normative context for women's entrepreneurship in Pakistan: a critical analysis. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, *10*(2), 158-180.
84. Rosa, P. and Dawson, A. (2006). Gender and the commercialization of university science: academic frontiers of spinout companies, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 18* (4), 341-66.
85. Ruef, M. (2010). The Entrepreneurial Group: Social Identities, Relations, and Collective Action, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
86. Schjoedt, L. and Shaver, K.G. (2007). Deciding on an entrepreneurial career: a test of the pull and push hypotheses using the panel study of entrepreneurial dynamics data", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, *31* (5), 733-52.
87. Scott, W.R. (1995). Institutions and Organizations, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
88. Shane, S. (1993). Cultural influences on national rates of innovation. *Journal of Business Venturing, 8*, 59-73.
89. Shinnar, R. and Young, C. (2008). Hispanic immigrant entrepreneurs in the Las Vegas metropolitan area: motivations for entry into and outcomes of self-employment, *Journal of Small Business Management*, *46* (2), 242-62.
90. Sluis, J. V., Praag, M. V. and Vijverberg, W. (2005). Entrepreneurship selection and performance: A meta-analysis of the impact of education in developing economies. *The World Bank Economic Review*, *19*(2), 225-261.
91. SMEDAN and NBS (2021). MSME Survey Report 2021.
92. Solesvik, M., Iakovleva, T., & Trifilova, A. (2019). Motivation of Female Entrepreneurs: A Cross-National Study. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 26*(5), 684-705.
93. Stenholm, P., Acs, Z.J. and Wuebker, R. (2013). Exploring country-level institutional arrangements on the rate and type of entrepreneurial activity, *Journal of Business Venturing, 28* (1), 176-193.
94. Szyliowicz, D. and Galvin, T. (2010). Applying broader strokes: extending institutional perspectives and agendas for international entrepreneurship research, *International Business Review, 19* (4), 317-332.
95. Thurik, A. R., Carree, M. A., van Stel, A., and Audretsch, D. B. (2008). Does Self-Employment Reduce Unemployment? *Journal of Business Venturing, 23*(6), 673–686. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.03.049.
96. Tipu, S. A. A. (2016). Comparing the Behaviour of Opportunity and Necessity Driven Entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business, 27*(1), 84–107. doi:10.1504/IJESB.2016.073359.
97. Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P., and Wright, M., (2008). Opportunity identification and pursuit: Does an entrepreneur's human capital matter?, *Small Business Economics, 30* (2), 153- 173.
98. Ule, P. A. (2012). *The influence of socio-cultural factors on the performance of female entrepreneurs: A study of selected small and medium scale enterprises in Bayelsa State.* Project submitted to the Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port-Harcourt.
99. Van Es, F. and van Vuuren, D. (2010). A decomposition of the growth in self-employment. CPB Discussion paper No.145. The Hague, the Netherlands: CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis.
100. vanGelderen, M. W., and Jansen, P. G. W. (2006). Autonomy as a Startup Motive. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *13*(1), 23–32. doi:10.1007/s40821-016-0065-1.
101. Verheul, I. and Van-Stel, A. (2010). Entrepreneurial Diversity and Economic Growth, in Bonnet et al (eds). Edward Elgar.
102. Verheul, I., van Stel, A. and Thurik, R. (2006). Explaining female and male entrepreneurship at the country level, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *18* (2), 151-83
103. Weeks, J. R. (2009).Women Business Owners in the Middle East and North Africa: A Five Country Research Study. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship, 1*(1), 77-85.

104. Wennekers, S., Van stel, A, Thurik, R. and Reynolds, P. (2005). Nascent entrepreneurship and the level of economic development. *Small Business Economics*, *24*(3), 293-309
105. Williams, C.C. (2009). The motives of off-the-books entrepreneurs: necessity- or opportunity-driven?", *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 5 (2), 203-217.
106. World Bank (2018). Growing Africa: Unlocking the Potential of Agribusiness. Financial and Private Sector Development Department, Agriculture, Irrigation and Rural Development Unit, Sustainable Development Department Africa Region.
107. Wube, M. C. (2010). Factors affecting the performance of women entrepreneurs in micro and small enterprises. Retrieved from thesis final.pdf (unesco.org)
108. Young, G., Samarasinghe,V. and Kusterer, K. (1993). Women at Center of Development Issues and Practices for the 1990s. Kumarian press, inc, USA. (ed)
109. Young, S.L., Welter, C. and Conger, M. (2018). Stability vs. flexibility: the effect of regulatory institutions on opportunity type", *Journal of International Business Studies*, *49* (4), 407-441.
110. Zahra, S.A., Korri, J.S. and Yu, J. (2005). Cognition and international entrepreneurship: implications for research on international opportunity recognition and exploitation", *International Business Review*, *14* (2), 129-146.