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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to investigate the determinants of the business success of poultry agripreneurs based in Nairobi. The research questions that guide this study are: What are the socio-economic determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? What are the entrepreneurial conditions determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? What are the capacity building determinants of agripreneurs’ business success?

A combination of descriptive and explanatory research design have been adopted for this research. The study was limited to poultry agripreneurs based in Nairobi County who participated in the Metro Agri-foods Living Lab Project Phase One. The target population was 300 agripreneurs. The sampling technique used in this research was a mixture of probability and non-probability techniques: namely the cluster and judgmental sampling techniques. The sample size was 111 poultry agripreneurs. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS and the results and findings were be presented in tables and figures.

The findings of the study showed that most of the respondents were male 59% while the female had a representation was 41%. The majority of the respondents were aged between 26 and 30 years representing for to 23% of the respondents. The analysis of the respondents’ highest education level attained showed that 40% were bachelor degree holders, 33% high school certificate holders, 23% were tertiary trained and only 4% were master’s degree holders. The results for the socioeconomic factors education level, gender and income had statistically insignificant relationship with an agripreneur’s business success. The capacity building factors training, mentorship and technological showed no statistically significant correlation with an agripreneur’s business success. The study indicated a significant correlation between business success and access to market at p<0.05, which had a positive but weak association of 0.235. The regression analysis revealed that 4.5% of the variation in business success could be explained by an agripreneur’s access to the market, ceteris paribus.

In conclusion, the socioeconomic factors namely general education level, gender of the agripreneur and the income level of the agripreneur bear no statistical significance in the achievement of business success for an agripreneur based in Nairobi County. In particular, the education curriculum appears not to stimulate entrepreneurial activity, which enables access to external funding. In reference to the capacity building determinants, the study deduced that there was also no statistical significance. There
appears to be a disconnect between knowledge transfer and implementation. The study concludes that four point five percent of the variation in access to external funding can be explained by the variation in access to ready market. Furthermore, for an agripreneur based in Nairobi County to increase his likelihood of accessing external funding by thirteen point seven percent he needs to improve his access to a ready market by one percent.

The study recommends that potential agripreneurs and practicing agripreneurs should ensure that they have access to a ready market for their products. This will safeguard their profit margins and thus augment their access to funding. The government should improve the education system to contribute positively to the agripreneurs business success. The curriculum for the general education level should empower aspiring agripreneurs from an early stage with information on the procedures and processes of getting funding from formal financial organisations. The study recommends that it is not just enough to attend trainings and mentorship programs but rather agripreneurs should also practice the concepts and knowledge acquired during the training and mentorship programs.

Further studies should be conducted on the determinants of the agripreneurs improved productivity. There is also need to investigate the determinants of an agripreneur’s performance measured on the basis of increased ability to employ others.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Richard Cantillon is one of the earliest developers of the theories of entrepreneurship. In his book, *Essai Sur La Nature Du Commerce on Général*, Cantillon describes the entrepreneur as a self-employed individual who engages in a lifestyle of uncertainty in order to make a living. The entrepreneur purchases goods at a certain price and later sells them at an uncertain price due to the unpredictable market conditions. This notion resonates with Frank Knight’s assessment of an entrepreneur who has the responsibility of bearing the uncertainty(Knight, 1921). According to Cantillon and Knight, the entrepreneur is a prime controller of resources meaning they control the use of a resource based on their best judgment of what will yield greater profits(Cantillon, 1755; Knight, 1921).

However, it is important to note that Cantillon was not the first to coin the term ‘entrepreneur’ but rather it was his French counterpart Jean-Baptiste Say in his book *Traité d’économie politique*. Say asserted that an entrepreneur (rendered from the French word undertaker or adventurer) was responsible for the combination of factors of production to obtain a product from which he is able to derive profit, rent for land, interest on capital and wages for the industry (Say, 1821). Additionally, Bengt Johannsson offers us a more modern definition of the term entrepreneurship (Johannisson, 2016). He presents entrepreneurship as an attitude to life whereby the norm is change. He further asserts that entrepreneurship is natural and universal to man, owing to the fact that all humans are born as enterprising subjects. Through play, curiosity, creativity, spontaneity, following one’s passion and experiential learning beyond external control, the resultant processual phenomenon of entrepreneuring is practiced.

However, Schumpeter is responsible for making the link between economic growth and entrepreneurship. In his book, *The Theory of Economic Growth*, he concurs with Say’s description of the entrepreneur’s role of creating new combinations of factors of production. He however, takes it further by stating that the entrepreneur is an economic leader who actually uses innovate activities to come up with the new combinations. Schumpeter affirms that the entrepreneur does not have to be an inventor to innovate. The entrepreneur needs not convince everyone of his new combination except the financier
and soon his competitors will follow suit in his novel ways of production (Schumpeter, 1911). This will eat up into his entrepreneurship profit in what today’s economics refers to as an abnormal profit and soon the economy will be at a new equilibrium. This shifting of the economy to new equilibriums is what represents economic growth (Dejardin, 2000; Galindo & Méndez-Picazo, 2013).

Having a new appreciation for the word entrepreneur, this research will now delve into the different types of entrepreneurs. According to (Say, 1821), there are different types of entrepreneurs. These entrepreneurs can be involved in manufacturing, commerce (trader) or agriculture. Under agricultural entrepreneurs, more commonly known today as agripreneurs, this research will be focusing on the case of poultry agripreneurs. (Virgilio V. Vitug, 1988) stated that an agripreneur is an entrepreneur involved in agriculture or agricultural activities. Virgilio also said that an agripreneur should have technical and monetary backing in order to be successful.

According to Dailey, Niemeier, Elkhoraibi, Pitesky, and Senties-Cue (2016), one of the fastest growing subsectors in agriculture is the poultry sector, attributable to the rising increase in the demand for eggs and poultry meat globally. The sector’s contribution to food security and nutrition have been outstanding due to the short nature of its production cycles and the numerous edible products from the poultry meat and eggs. Dailey et al. (2016) asserted that poultry agripreneurship has also played a major role in poverty alleviation and economic empowerment particularly in developing countries. In both rural and urban areas, small holders of poultry enterprises, through the sale of the birds or their eggs for their subsistence have been able to raise their standards of living (Dailey et al., 2016).

United States of America is the world largest producer of poultry meat and also the second world exporter of the same (Putman, Thoma, Burek, & Matlock, 2017). Over the past forty-five years until 2010, the production of poultry meat in the United States has increased by fivefold. However, this increase has resulted in lower impact on the environment due to enhanced genetics in the broiler chicken (Putman et al., 2017). According to Elkhoraibi, Pitesky, Dailey and Niemeier (2017), they undertook a study that exhibited that roughly 88% of American poultry agripreneurs prefer mobile chicken coops as the desired mode of housing poultry. Of the eighty-eight percent who practice pastured poultry, 64% identified provision of sufficient feeds as a major concern. The
gaining popularity of pasture-raised poultry has emanated from the growing health concerns and the well-being of the birds themselves. This has opened up a niche market for poultry agripreneurs to sell meat and eggs at a premium price based on their practice of free-range husbandry (Dailey et al., 2016).

In China, the three most commonly practiced rearing systems of poultry agripreneurship are: free range, semi-intensive and confinement (Rehman, Mahmud, Mehmood, Pasha, Hussain & Khan 2017). Poultry agripreneurs in China rear either native breed slow-growing chicken or the broiler breed, which are fast growing. The broiler breed are more popular commercially due to their short production cycle, however there has been a growing increase in the demand for native breed chicken due to emergent health concerns (Sokolowicz, Krawczyk, & Swiatkiewicz, 2016). An alternative way of chicken rearing that has gained popularity, is raising chicken in the Bamboo forests. The peasant farmers in Fujian Province, an area recognized for Bamboo planting, over the years have identified the need to substitute their earning from Bamboo, with an economic activity that took less time to yield profits. Bamboo shoots are ready for harvest after three to six years; making chicken rearing was the next big thing for some of these farmers. Allowing the poultry reared in the Bamboo forests to free roam during the day, has resulted in taster and higher nutritional valued birds than the broiler types. The growing popularity of this type of chicken has seen the establishment of clusters due to economies of scale and more recently the formation of company plus base plus peasant households enterprises for even larger operations (Xue & Liu, 2015; Puri & Panwar, 2007).

In the Netherlands, according to Asselt, Poortvliet, Ekkel, Kemp and Stassen (2018), poultry husbandry is quite intensive, involving large numbers of birds and practiced predominantly in indoor systems. There has, however been legislation to control the mode of indoor systems, to the effect of terminating conventional battery cages to reduce the risks to public health. The Dutch, nonetheless, have a growing debate encompassing the public perception that free-range system reared poultry are healthier due to the improved animal welfare practices than their indoor system counterparts. Contrary to growing demand and approval of free-range system husbandry, numerous studies and existing literature indicate that indoor system husbandry has less public health risks than the outdoor system. Therefore, the Dutch government is working towards to finding socially acceptable ways of poultry husbandry that can appeal to both the public and the
professionals involved in poultry husbandry (Koerkamp & Bos, 2008). This, however, has proved to be a grueling balancing act of governance on how to prioritize both animal welfare and consumer welfare. According to Bos, Belt and Feindt (2018), animal welfare should not be used as an excuse to overcharge consumers. The trio conclude that the best way forward was transparency and inclusion in decision making.

Brazil is the world leader when it comes to poultry exportation (Bos et al., 2018; A. P. de O. Souza, Taconeli, Molento, & Plugge, 2015). In 2015, Brazil slaughtered approximately 5.2 billion broiler chicken, with an 46.1% increase of this figure expected by 2030 (A. P. O. Souza, Taceneli, Plugge, & Molento, 2018). In order to maintain the animal welfare standards, free-range husbandry practices have been legislated. The Ministry of Agriculture has stipulated that free range poultry can be “reared in pens for a maximum of 25 days, that these bird must have access to pastures with a stocking density of 3m$^2$/bird, and be slaughtered at no less than 85 days of age” (Fernando, Yamamura, Freire, & Headley, 2015). However, these birds were found to have a higher risk of contracting parasites and infections as opposed to commercial broilers and layers, which are reared under indoor system husbandry. This, therefore, has fashioned a challenge for free-range poultry agripreneurs to control the environment in order to reduce the risk of infections.

In Bangladesh, poultry is one of the major hidden sub-sectors that contributes largely to the economic empowerment of many. There are approximately 130,000 poultry enterprises worth $2 billion in investments. In spite of this huge potential, poultry agripreneurs are grappling to make due, owing to drastic climate changes, huge population pressures, poverty and limited resources (Shamsuddoha, Quaddus, & Klass, 2015). The sector provides a cheap source of proteins through the production of eggs and meat. Just like other countries, Bangladesh has both the broiler type of chicken which are reared using the indoor system and the free range poultry husbandry which is typically reserved for rural subsistence enterprises (Das et al., 2008).

Poultry is the biggest subsector of agriculture in South Africa accounting for approximately 17% of the total agricultural gross domestic product. Consequently, poultry has been flagged as one of the critical agricultural sectors in the quest to food security and reduced unemployment rates (Mkhabela & Nyhodo, 2011). According to the duo, broiler meat and egg production rank high in their engagement of direct and indirect
labour, making poultry one of the obvious solutions to the unemployment conundrum. Poultry meat continues to be one of South Africa’s cheapest source of meat proteins as compared to other sources like beef or pork (Idowu, Mpayipheli, & Muchenje, 2018). Broiler meat particularly, is the flagship product of this budding sector and accounts up to 70% of the poultry industry production. Traditionally, in the African setting, poultry is a commodity purchased live. However, an emerging trend towards processed chicken especially in the urban setting, is playing a major role in creating more market opportunities for poultry entrepreneurs. This has seen the advent of large operators dominating the poultry industry while small-scale poultry enterprises rely on small unreliable markets or contract farming. In spite the great potential and capacity the poultry industry holds, South Africa still imports poultry meat, a situation which the South African government hopes to rectify in the near future (Mkhabela & Nyhodo, 2011).

In Nigeria, the poultry subsector is experiencing rapid growth and transformation due to urbanization and increase in disposable income. The Northern part of Nigeria is home to 60% of the small-scale poultry entrepreneurs while the South hold 40%. Recently in 2003, the Nigerian government banned the importation of poultry products; a bold move to exploit fully the growing demand for poultry products in the country. Although poultry product imports still find their way into the country, the ban has allowed the local poultry industry to thrive. The domestic production covers about 85% of Nigeria’s poultry consumption while illegal imports covers only approximately 15% (Liverpool-Tasie et al., 2016). The dynamic growth present in the industry has driven many to invest in large feed mills that produce feeds for poultry in the country (Sanou, Osuntande, Liverpool-Tasie, & Reardon, 2017; Liverpool-Tasie et al., 2017).

Uganda’s total poultry population was estimated at 45.901 million, consisting of nearly 40 million indigenous and about 6 million exotic birds in 2014. These figures have been on the rise since and the poultry industry has played a leading role in poverty alleviation and food security (Akite et al., 2018). In Uganda, for the provision of meat, eggs and profit, both indigenous breed and the exotic (broiler/layer) breed of chicken are reared. However, about 80% of the poultry are the indigenous breed while only 20% constitute the exotic breed (Ekou, 2013). Conventionally, the exotic breeds are highly commercialized due to their shorter maturity span but they have failed to gain popularity over the indigenous breed in Uganda. Consequently, the indigenous breed has become the
obvious choice as the point of intervention of the poultry subsector in Uganda. In Northern Uganda, the level of commercialization for the indigenous breed of chicken is 42% as opposed to the expected 50% which the Ugandan government is working on improving through the sensitization of poultry entrepreneurs (Ayremo, Kule, Kugonza, Okot, & Mugonola, 2016). One of the strategies employed to expand the level of commercialization has been through crossbreeding. The Kuroiler, a crossbreed of the indigenous and broiler breed, is fast gaining popularity in Uganda. Studies have been carried out vis-a-vis the indigenous breed and the Kuroiler breed has demonstrated a greater capacity of weight gain even when reared using the free-range system (Sharma et al., 2015).

The poultry industry in Kenya can be characterized as a dualistic sector, which is constitutes the small-scale producers and large-scale enterprises. Within these two spaces of poultry practice, there is the commercial hybrid system of production and the indigenous system (Ekou, 2013). Approximately 70% of poultry in Kenya are the indigenous type. This type of poultry is reared typically in the rural areas for domestic and commercial purposes. However, there has been a growing trend of rearing these indigenous birds in urban areas in a commercialized approach for the purpose of income generation and food provision. These enterprises mostly rear the improved indigenous breeds like the Kari, Kuroiler and the Kuchi breeds. The rearing of indigenous breeds in the urban or peri-urban areas is due to the emergent popularity of indigenous poultry meat and thus these enterprises have chosen close proximity to the market. However, these indigenous enterprises are not as profitable as their hybrid counterparts are due to the informal and variability nature of the market. The indigenous breeds are mostly reared through the free range system but are provided with supplementary feeds (Omondi, 2012; Mailu et al., 2012).

The Broiler breed are raised mainly in the urban and peri-urban areas. This is because of their short maturity cycle and thus proximity to the market make more economic sense. The broiler poultry industry constitutes of small-scale enterprises and medium to large integrated broiler production companies. One of such large broiler companies in Kenya supplies approximately 60% of Nairobi’s day old chick mainly through the Agrovet distribution channel. The broiler meat from the medium to large integrated companies sell their produce through high end retailers, leaving the small scale enterprises to sell their broiler meat through informal channels of mostly of middlemen to small hotels and
restaurants. The larger corporations mostly engage small enterprises to increase their economies of scale through contract farming (Strohm, Hoeffler, Orina, & Will, 2006; Wainaina, Okello, & Nzuma, 2014). Most peri-urban farmers slaughter their own broilers and sell carcasses to retailers while the rest in the urban areas mostly sell them live to the retailers. None of the broiler meat goes to waste, as the head and legs of the broilers are sold in informal settlements as roadside delicacies (Carron et al., 2017).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to Amolo, Oldja, Hassan and Kapoor (2018), access to external funding enables agripreneurs to start enterprises, propagate business growth for those enterprises and furthermore accumulate assets which leads to wealth creation. However, in keeping with the report by the Central Bank of Kenya, the agricultural sector is the least financed sector receiving an approximately 3.3% of the overall credit extended to the Kenyan economy (Kiplimo, Ngenoh, Koech, & Bett, 2015). Access to external funding as per Kiplimo et al. (2015), is a major driving factor for increased productivity and an upsurge in technological absorptive capacity for agripreneurs. Kenya has a great capacity for the poultry industry especially the chicken subsector. There has been a steady increase in the income earned from chicken meat and eggs over the period of 2015 to 2017 of about 2 billion Kenya shillings annually (KNBS, 2018). This growth has however been decelerated by the lack of access to external funding or credit needed to purchase inputs like feeds and vaccines (Omondi, 2019).

Njue and Mbogo (2017) in their study determined that gender is one of the factors that influence ones access to external funding. The duo’s study was further revealed that the male gender had easier access to external funding than their female counterparts. In another noteworthy study, Kiplimo et al. (2015) affirm that individuals who are educated and earned an income were seen to have easier access to external funding unlike less educated and unsalaried agripreneurs. This research therefore sought to ascertain if these socio-economic determinants play such a significant role in accessing external funding.

When it comes to capacity building factors such as training, Mukiri (2005) said in her study that knowledge based training which resulted in an entrepreneurial orientation played a significant role in an entrepreneur’s access to eternal funding. She asserted in her study that the training must generate entrepreneurial orientation. Thus, this research
purposed to establish if capacity-building factors play a significant role in an agripreneur’s ability to access external funding.

Infrastructure such as access to roads, water and electricity, plays a significant role in advancing an agripreneur’s competitive edge (Ouma, Obare, & Staal, 2003). The trio went ahead to state these non-market benefits were crucial for sustainability, which in turn allows these agripreneurs to have access to external funding. The researcher delved into investigating what entrepreneurial framework conditions manipulate once access to external funding

Of significance to note is, the focus of this study was poultry agripreneurs based in Nairobi County as the case. Consequently, the aim is to uncover what makes one poultry agripreneur to succeed and others fail in accessing external funding. What key attributes must one possess in order to attain business success? An understanding of the same will assist in designing better strategies that will enable poultry agripreneurs in achieving business success.

1.3 Purpose of the Study
The purpose of the study was to investigate the determinants of the business success of poultry agripreneurs based in Nairobi.

1.4 Research Questions
1.4.1 What are the socio-economic determinants of agripreneurs’ business success?
1.4.2 What are the capacity building determinants of agripreneurs’ business success?
1.4.3 What are the entrepreneurial framework conditions determinants of agripreneurs’ business success?

1.5 Significance of the Study
1.5.1 Poultry Agripreneurs

The research aims to benefit poultry agripreneurs who are currently in search of external funding. The research will shed light on possible gaps to attaining external funding. This will assist them to equip themselves so that they can qualify for external funding and thus attain business success.

1.5.2 Unemployed Kenyans
The research should provide unemployed Kenyans with a business idea that they can engage in to make an income. Poultry agripreneurship is a profitable venture. Through this research, they can avoid the common pitfalls and attain business success.

1.5.3 Policy Makers

The research will also be beneficial to policy makers. Policy makers in both government and private sector can therefore direct more resources to the poultry industry. This will ensure the growth of the economy in the country.

1.5.4 Other researchers

The research will assist other researchers carry out studies. It will also assist them to fill the gaps in poultry agripreneurship and the agricultural sector in general. The research will serve as a fire to propel more research in the field of poultry agripreneurship.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The investigation is limited to poultry agripreneurs in Nairobi County who participated in the Metro-Agrifoods Living Lab Project phase. The target population for the study was 300 agripreneurs. The sample size for the study was 111 agripreneurs. The data collection process was conducted in Nairobi County involving poultry agripreneurs. The duration of the study was 24 months. The limitations for this study was the difficulty in participation of the female gender due to cultural and societal constraints.

1.7 Definition of Terminologies

1.7.1 Mobile Chicken Coop

This refers to a chicken house constructed using heavy gauge chicken wire or wood slats for flooring. The open access allows feces to fall through the floor onto the pasture, fertilizing the soil and reducing the need for constant cleaning or bedding replacement (Dailey et al., 2016).

1.7.2 Free-range System
Animal production systems that offer outdoor access to the animals; also referred to as open production system (Dailey et al., 2016; Kijlstra & Meerburg, 2009).

1.7.3 Pastured Poultry

Pasture-raised poultry is an extension of free-range systems, and refers to the husbandry practice in which flocks of birds are housed in a mobile structure or “egg mobile” at night, with continuous access to outdoor vegetation during the day (Dailey et al., 2016; Sossidou, Bosco, Castellini, & Grashorn, 2015).

1.7.4 Business Success

Success in business is only achieved by addressing the needs of the multiple stakeholders involved (Neely, Adams, & Kennerley, 2007). In this study however, business success is defined as the ability to access external funding. Access to external funding in this study was measured by computing an agripreneur’s access to capital from family contribution, well-wishers, bank loans, Youth Fund, Uwezo Fund, NGO grant and others.

1.8 Chapter Summary

Chapter one introduced the concept of an entrepreneur as an individual who comes up with a new combination for the factors of production. The focus was then drawn to poultry agripreneurs in different countries and the differences in the practice was discussed in the background. The practice gaps were identified in the statement of the problem. The purpose of this research is to investigate the determinants of business success for agripreneurs involved in the poultry value chain. The study was guided by three research questions: What are the socio-economic determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? What are the capacity building determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? What are the entrepreneurial framework conditions determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? The investigation was limited to poultry agripreneurs based in Nairobi County. Chapter two presents the literature review. Chapter three highlights the research methodology used in the study. Chapter four presents the results and findings from the data analysis. Finally, chapter five presents the discussion, conclusions and the study recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter will cover a review of the empirical literature on the subject of the determinants of agripreneur’s business success. This study was guided by the following research questions: What are the socio-economic determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? What are the capacity building determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? What are the entrepreneurial framework conditions determinants of agripreneurs’ business success?

2.2 Socio-Economic Determinants of Business Success for Agripreneurs.

According to Heimer (1997), she defined socio-economic status as some combination of occupation, income and education. In their work, Verbeek, Kanis, Bett and Kosgey (2008), defined socioeconomic factors among agripreneurs as their gender, age and ethnic affiliation that motivates different decisions and preferences. They concluded that an understanding of these socio-economic factors would assist in persuading and designing the right interventions for poultry agripreneurs especially by policy makers (Verbeek et al., 2008).

2.2.1 Educational level

One of the major conclusions of Kiplimo et al. (2015) is that general education is a strong positive stimulus to the success of entrepreneurs. The four were investigating if truly education enabled individuals to readily access external funding for their enterprises more than their less educated counterparts. They was able to establish that individual with higher education level were more likely to achieve external funding than others who were less educated. From their study, the four were able to deduce a positive relationship between education and access to external funding. Dickson, Solomon and Weaver (2008) were able to ascertain that the measure of general education is usually in total number of years in education. They were in agreement with Kiplimo et al. (2015) that the level of one’s education positively influenced their success in business.

These findings are theoretically supported by the human capital theory. The theory states that formal education plays a major role in improving the productivity of workers (Almendarez, 2013). This implies that the more educated a population is the more productive they will be. Almendarez viewed formal education as an investment into
human capital, which he argued, was more valuable than physical investments. He also made strong deductions about the high correlation of highly educated population and technological innovation. This seems to be in agreement with Schumpeter (1911) who asserted that the entrepreneur is responsible for discovering new innovative combinations for factors of productions. These new innovative combinations are in-fact the drivers of economic growth according to Schumpter. He further acknowledged the role of increased productivity as a stimulus for access to external funding.

Another major concept can be found in (Van der Sluis, Van Praag, & Vijverberg, 2005). These scholars were able to go beyond establishing a strong positive influence of one’s educational background and access to external funding. Stemming from their work, they were also able to conclude that education helps to improve the likelihood of accessing external financing. However, they were not able to resolve the pedantic role of education in accessing external funding.

Bewaji, Yang, and Han (2015) conducted their study in the USA to investigate the association of the ethnic minority background and their access to external funding with one of their major emphasis being demographic characteristics. They construed that the educational background of an ethnic minority entrepreneur played a key role in their access to external funding. Higher educational level had a strong and positive correlation to access to external funding. Ha, Mai, and Kim (2016) also came to the same deductions in their own research in Vietnam. They concluded that well educated entrepreneurs have fewer constraints to external funding than less educated ones.

2.2.2 Gender

Several factors contribute to the disparity between male and female agripreneurship behavior. (Ager, 2015) did a study in Malawi revealing that gender does affect the ability of an agripreneur to attain business success. Most women in Malawi talk about of lack of collateral that prevents them from accessing financing. Land in Malawi is categorized as public, private or customary. Land ownership is still distributed based on customs and traditions, which favours the male gender. Ager was able to determine that women in Malawi due to the inability to own land as prescribed by the prevailing cultural norms, can only access financing which represents business success through Farming
Organizations. The Farming Organization is a model developed to ensure that members have access to financing on egalitarian basis.

In Ghana, the story is the same. Women agripreneurs lack the necessary resources as compared to their male counterparts (Suhiyini, Kuwornu, & Osie-Asare, 2018). The female headed agricultural enterprises have a smaller land tenure and less access to other factor of production like credit (FAO, 2011). This is despite the fact that they all face the same challenges as their male counterparts who have an advantage over them.

In Uganda, the narrative remains the same. Women agripreneurs still face the same challenges as their counterparts in other African countries. These include lack of access to financing and other factors of production. However, Lourenço, Sappleton, Dardaine, Akosua, Gerard, Cheng, Taylor W, Taylor and Anthony G (2014) introduced an interesting dynamic to the gender conversation. They introduced the all too familiar hostility toward female agripreneurs from the society. Women who are involved in agripreneurship are looked down upon as having abandoned their domestic responsibilities. The society does not embolden them rather it seeks to discourage them unlike their male counterparts who are encouraged to more enterprising. In spite of their hard work, most female agripreneurs are still on or just above the poverty line. This has forced the government to create initiatives that boost the access to factors of productions like funding for female run agricultural enterprises due to the negative perspective men have towards agripreneurship.

Konovalchuk, Hanson and Luloff (2008) in their study conducted in Pennsylvania, were able to conversely conclude that gender has no significant impact on one’s ability to run an agricultural enterprise. The fact that one is female has no significance because the environment they are operating in has no cultural barriers towards the female gender. This is a far cry from the practices and beliefs that are held in Africa where the study was conducted. This can be supported by Njue and Mbogo (2017) findings in their research where they deduced that gender of the entrepreneur affected their access to funding. However, the findings from Gicheva and Link (2015), reveal that female entrepreneurs are disadvantaged in their access to private investment in the USA. These results resonate with the findings of similar studies conducted in the content of Africa as described above.
2.2.3 Level of Income

The income level of the enterprise also influences the agripreneurs ability to achieve business success. In China, a study was done by Yanyan, Jianghuai and Maoliang (2014), it was discovered that the income gap between the urban and rural area negatively affected the growth of the agricultural sector. This signifies for the agripreneur that his enterprise, which due to space challenges, would be situated in the rural areas and thus would not yield enough profit for him to do any significant improvements. The inability by the agripreneur to finance his operation would result lack of business success. The study conducted in China indicated that enterprises, which are based in the rural areas, which are mostly agrarian, yield less than other enterprises based in the urban areas.

Another way of looking at the income gap in relation to the agripreneurs, was to consider their market buying power (Yanyan et al., 2014). If the market is not able to sufficiently cover the operational cost, which would mean not breaking even for the agripreneur. This will eventually negatively influence the level of agricultural output being produced and the agripreneur will be forced to scale down. Scaling down will result in implications of negative growth which would affect the agripreneur’s ability to access funding and thus lack of business success.

The level of income as discussed by Mcgehee and Kim (2004) can be a source of motivation and as a means for an agripreneur to increase capacity or even improve on productivity. If the numbers make sense, the agripreneur is will be able to scale up and in some instances diversify using the earnings he has. Mcgehee and Kim (2004) were examining if indeed the extra income for agripreneur was a motivation for them to be involved in agri-tourism. Agri-tourism involves combining an agricultural enterprise with a tourism venture mostly lodges or resorts spots. The duo found that most agripreneurs diversify because their income level supports their expansion. In other words, if the profit obtained from the enterprise is not sufficient for the running of the enterprise’s operations, then the agripreneur is not able to scale up and lacks the motivation. This brings about the question of efficiency. However, McElwee (2008) warns against diversification for agripreneurs citing that it could lead to the core business, which is agriculture to suffer.
Klju and Belás (2016) in their study based in the Czech Republic revealed that entrepreneur’s access to external funding is subject to their credit score. From their study, Klju and Belás, (2016) describe the credit score as a measure of risk a bank client poses in defaulting loans. One of the measures of the credit score is the sales or income of the entrepreneur. The duo deduced that the higher an entrepreneur’s income is the more likely they are to access funding and thus attain business success. They stated that an entrepreneur’s income plays a significant role to his ability to access funding from a bank.

2.3 Capacity Building Factors for Business Success for Agripreneurs

Eade (2005) defined capacity building simply as an approach to development. Development, according to Eade, encompasses the process of transforming lives and societies. Consequently, capacity building is not something separate from development but rather a response to the multidimensional process of change. Capacity building can be political, social, cultural, intellectual, organizational, material, practical or financial.

2.3.1 Formal Educational Training as a Form of Capacity Building

Smith (2004) was of a firm believe that agripreneurship was the future of agriculture. He believed that the farmer must see himself as an entrepreneur and consequently equip himself with the necessary entrepreneurship skills. The inquiry by Santiago and Roxas (2015) on reviving interest in the agricultural sector in the Philippines, submitted that one of the ways to change mindset about agripreneurship is through formal education and training in institution. This was in full harmony of a study done in South Africa by (Fatoki, 2014). The Philippines government has set up a new education system, in the academic year 2012-2013, tracks that a student can follow as an alternative to college education. Santiago and Roxas (2015) focused on two tracks: a technical-vocational livelihood track in agricrop, and animal production, and the second as the entrepreneurship track.

For the agripreneur, he needs to take both tracks in order to be equipped with both the technical and the business skills. The duo examined the alternative learning systems like the Family Farm School, which focused on school going students to have half of the lessons in a classroom and the other half in the farm. The Sanayan sa Kakayahan Agrikultura commonly known as (SAKA) is a better learning alternative for out of school
youths with 70% of the time spent in the field. Another alternative is the Farm Business Schools (FBS), which unlike the Family Farm School targets those whose family does not own a farm. The students of FBS are on study now pay later basis and are attached to farms chosen for them by the school to learn the required agricultural technical skills. The higher Education sector in the Philippines has also approved the Bachelor of Science in Entrepreneurship (2005) and Bachelor of Science in Agripreneurship (2007). The NGO’s have also played their part in introducing Social Enterprise Model, which is a form of community based formal training on agripreneurship. These alternative learning have been seen to improve both interest and productivity in the Philippines agricultural sector. According to Santiago and Roxas (2015), these trainings would produce individuals who are better equipped at obtaining financing from funding institutions and thus realizing business success. Their study demonstrated a positive relationship between training and access to funding.

Efobi and Orkoh (2018) did a slightly different investigation in Nigeria. They came up with similar conclusions as Santiago and Roxas, that formal educational training is a positive catalyst for agricultural growth and productivity. However, in their study they illustrated that if trained agripreneur does not follow up their own formal training with the informal training of their workers, the agripreneur will not experience as the full impact of the potential positive change. Those who underwent formal educational training and went back to their agricultural enterprises to train their employees outperformed their counterparts who did not execute the same. One of the measures of performance for these entrepreneurs was access to funding and the duo concluded that formal training amplified ones access to it.

The positive influence of education on agripreneurs was also concluded by (Spais, 2010) whose work was in complete agreement with (Jameson & Lau, 1982). In his work Spais, found out that formal training for agripreneurs resulted in a deepened understanding of entrepreneurship concepts. Secondly, agripreneur’s education opened up new directions in terms of corporate globalization and brought about improvement in the knowledge economy. An agripreneur’s knowledge economy functions a critical player in their access to external funding. Spais concluded a positive correlation between formal training and access to funding. Finally, formal training deepened the understanding of the individual
instructors’ effectiveness thereby increasing the organizational effectiveness of adults’ learning institutions (Camp, Clarke, & Fallon, 2000).

Heins, Beaulieu, and Altman (2010) also agree with Spais even though they conducted a similar study but solely on women. They were able to come to the same conclusion that truly formal educational training aids the agripreneur to come to a more entrenched understanding of the entrepreneurship concepts, unveils new ways of doing things and as the instructors teach they get better at teaching and at the discipline itself; agripreneurship. An addition to their work was discovery that formal educational training reduced risks in the five areas of agricultural enterprises: production, marketing, financial, legal, and human resources. The financial risks reduced resulted in access to financing.

2.3.2 Mentorship and Apprenticeship

According to Clutterbuck (1991), there is a distinction between mentorship and apprenticeship. Mentorship is concerned with acquiring wisdom and skills from the mentor that encompasses more than the work life. Apprenticeship on the other hand, involves learning competences that will help boost outcomes focused on the work life. Mentorship and apprenticeship should be introduced formally into the informal sector in Kenya (Chebii, Bwisa, & Sakwa, 2016).

Studies have been conducted in the workplace that prove that indeed motivation can boost career success (Clutterbuck, 1991). This will provide Kenyan entrepreneurs including agripreneurs the much-needed guidance from the starting, growth and stabilizing stages of the entrepreneurship journey. The mentors can equip the mentees with the much needed skills, wisdom and motivation to prevent stagnation and the premature ends of enterprises. In line with Chebii et al. (2016) study, they concluded that mentorship and apprenticeship furnished the entrepreneur with the necessary skills which augments their access to external funding.

Mentorship, according to St-Jean and Mitrano-méda (2016), was meant to function as support to novice entrepreneurs by more seasoned professionals. Notwithstanding the growing popularity of the notion of mentorship and apprenticeship, St-Jean and Mitrano-méda (2016) began to interrogate if experience was a sufficient pre-requisite for one to become a mentor. Their study came up with the conclusion that experience is in itself, is
inadequate as the only attribute possessed by the mentor. Training for the mentor will also equip him with more competencies and thus assist the mentee under him to soar even higher. St. Jean and Mitrano-medea (2016) therefore submitted that training institutions for experienced mentor should be established to ensure the apprentices are privy to information that will boost their productivity. Training will equip the mentors on the relational aspect and ethical aspect of mentorship.

2.3.3 Technological Absorptive Capacity
An innovative entrepreneurial approach refers to an entrepreneur’s ability to open up to new ideas and to new ways of doing things (Verhees & Meulenberg, 2004). The more innovative one is the better his market orientation and performance. Gellynck, Jorge, Pieniak and Verbeke, (2015) hypothesized on the relationship between innovative entrepreneurship and the agripreneur’s absorptive capacity. Absorptive capacity based on their work is the ability to improve one’s technological innovation capabilities by recognizing, assimilating and adapting valuable knowledge from a particular external source. The two were able to conclude that the higher the level of innovative entrepreneurship the higher the agripreneur’s absorptive capacity. In other words, the more willing an agripreneur is open to new ways of doing things the more likely he is to incorporate the new of way of doing things in his business processes.

The higher the absorptive capacity of an agripreneur, the higher the technological innovation. This will give rise to higher performance for the agripreneur. In Gellynck et al. (2015) study performance is measured by access to financing. This however could only be concluded on a longitudinal basis. In the short run, this relationship bears little significance. The lack of significance of the relationship between technological innovation and performance could also be explained by other factors like the technology in question could just be enough to keep the agricultural enterprise operational but not to improve its performance (Gellynck et al., 2015; Micheels & Nolan, 2016).

Growing the enterprise absorptive capacity through knowledge acquisition and networking was major recommendation by (Micheels & Nolan, 2016). Technological innovation would ensue and thus the agripreneur would be running his enterprise more efficiently and at a more cost effective manner. A study on Dutch agripreneurs conducted by Diederen, Meijl, Wolters, and Bijak (2003) about the attribute differences between
early adopters of technology and the laggards (late adopters) was found to be in perfect harmony with Micheels and Nolan (2016) and Gellynck *et al.* (2015) work. Early adopters were discovered to enjoy greater performance though conversely they had to suffer greater risks. Therefore, it was concluded that early adopters of technology generally have a high absorptive capacity and thus illustrated a positive correlation with access to funding.

2.4 Entrepreneurial Framework Conditions

The entrepreneurial framework can be defined as the environmental conditions or the surroundings of an entrepreneur that encourage or support entrepreneurial activity (Valliere, 2010). Entrepreneurial activity is defined by P. Reynolds *et al.* (2005) as anything that involves new combinations of the factors of production which lead to economic growth (Schumpeter, 1911). Additionally, it should be noted that there are two types of frameworks: the general ‘national framework conditions’ and the specific ‘entrepreneurial framework conditions’ (P. D. Reynolds, Camp, Bygrave, Autio, & Hay, 2001; Levie & Autio, 2007). The role and constitutes of the entrepreneurial framework conditions are shown in Figure 2.1 below:

![Figure 2.1: The Role of the EFC’s adapted from P. Reynolds et al., (2005).](image-url)
Entrepreneurial activity, which involves recognizing entrepreneurial opportunities and exploiting based on one's entrepreneurial capabilities, is influenced by the following factors as shown in Figure 2.1. Financial conditions, support through government policies and programs, the availability and effectiveness of educational services for prospective entrepreneurs, the efficiency and predictability of the commercial and legal infrastructure for new businesses. It is also influenced by the access to local markets for new entrants, the availability and reliability of the physical infrastructure supports for new businesses, and the positive cultural and social norms that encourage and incent individuals to accept the personal risks inherent in entrepreneurship.

2.4.1 Physical Infrastructure
Davari and Najmabadi (2018) conducted their study on the entrepreneurial ecosystem and its effects on performance. The research was based in Iran investigating how an entrepreneurial ecosystem or framework conditions like infrastructure affects their business performance. One of the measures of performance according to Davari and Najmabadi (2018), was access to external funding. They concluded that access to infrastructure has a positive impact on access to financing for entrepreneurs.

Similarly, Mihai and Avasilc (2014) undertook a similar study on the effects of the entrepreneurial framework conditions on the success of technological entrepreneurs. They found that entrepreneurial framework conditions like infrastructure had a positive influence on the success of the technological entrepreneur. Mihai and Avasilc (2014) demonstrated that physical infrastructure are one of the influencers of business success.

A study conducted in India by Venkataramany (2016), showed that financing for entrepreneurs is not significantly dependent on the physical infrastructure available to the enterprise. The study indicated that physical infrastructure has a no influence on financing for entrepreneurs. However, other forms of entrepreneurial framework conditions were found to have statistically significant influence on financing including market openness, commercial infrastructure and norms for the entrepreneurs (Venkataramany, 2016).

2.4.2 Social Capital- Associations and Cooperatives
“Social capital, although it benefits individuals, is expected to produce goods that are more collective than just individual” (Uphoff & Wijayaratna, 2000). Social capital can be
categorized into two: structural or cognitive forms. According to Uphoff and Wijayaratna, (2000), cognitive forms of social capital we have the mental processes of Norms, values, attitudes and beliefs that govern how we live. The structural form of social capital involves the roles, rules, procedures, and precedents as well as social networks that govern social interactions. Structural forms of social capital facilitate mutually beneficial collective actions.

The Gal Oya irrigation scheme irrigation scheme in Sri Lanka in the 1980’s used their social capital to establish farming associations to overcome the challenge of water shortage in a rice growing scheme (Uphoff & Wijayaratna, 2000). The rice agripreneurs based on their shared social capital were able to overcome water shortage brought about by drought and thus maintained their productivity. The associations were able to guarantee the agripreneurs access to the much needed financing to get water. The government due to the severity of the drought had gone as far as to insinuate that cultivation would not be possible that year. Sri Lanka at this point in time also faced major challenges with production of its subsistence food; rice. Through the existence of the favorable entrepreneurial framework condition of social capital.

Cooperatives are meant to increase agripreneurs’ bargaining power. This is meant to improve the market conditions for them (Pascucci, Gardebroek, & Dries, 2012). In their study is a distinction was made among different members of Italian agripreneurs. Strong membership, soft membership, shadow membership and no membership were critically analyzed and it was discovered that strong members enjoy an array of benefits like access to financing, marketing of their products, trainings, social capital and bargaining power as opposed to those who were non-members.

Another aspect of social capital is public-private partnerships (PPP). The applicability of PPPs for developing country agriculture is only appropriate in specific circumstances (where markets fail, high risks and low returns involved) because they involve high transaction costs, are complex and diverse, and can be difficult to replicate. Even in cases of market failures, it should be reserved as a last resort and instead allow the government to finance and deliver a specific public good on its own or to outsource delivery to the private sector. Ideally, when deciding whether or not to engage in agricultural PPPs, policy-makers should make sure that the partnerships will add value by generating greater
public benefits than could otherwise have been achieved through any of the alternative modes of public procurement (Rankin, Nogales, Santacoloma, Mhlanga, Rizzo, 2017).

2.4.3 Ready Market
According to Venkataramany (2016), entrepreneurs in India are facing a myriads of challenges. Government support has been lacking in many areas including the market dynamics. Venkataramany (2016) asserts that many unregistered entrepreneurs need to brought under a supporting microfinance environment in order for India to have a comprehensive financial inclusion. One of the challenges that many Indian entrepreneurs face is ready markets for their products and service. Venkataramany (2016) advocates for government support in helping entrepreneurs identify markets for their goods in order to access financing through microfinancing organization. In his findings, Venkataramany (2016) affirms that entrepreneurial financing is significantly dependent on market openness and market dynamics which ensures that an entrepreneur has a ready market for his products.

Audretsch, Cunningham, Kuratko, Lehmann and Menter (2019) in their attempt to define the term ecosystem touched on the effects of a ready market to entrepreneurial funding. According to Audretsch et al. (2019), an entrepreneur’s ecosystem is the market he operates in. If the entrepreneurial ecosystem is favourable then it attracts some economic, technological and social benefits (Audretsch et al., 2019). In their discussion about the economic impacts of an ecosystem to the entrepreneur, they conferred on the financial impacts that may arise due to an entrepreneur’s advantageous ecosystem or market. These financial translate into access to entrepreneurial funding based on ready markets.

In their study about the effects of the recession in the United Kingdom on small and medium enterprises, Cowling, Liu, Ledger, and Zhang (2015) investigated how the adverse market ecosystem affects the ability of entrepreneur access funding. They point out that even in a normal market ecosystem, it is not walk in the park for entrepreneur to garner funding for their ventures and thus enterprises, which can access financing during recession, are exceptional. They further describe a situation where the recession affects the market ecosystems for the SME’s due to the dwindling level of sales. These reduces the credit worthiness of most of these SME’s and thus denying them access to financing.
Cowling *et al.* (2015) conclude that indeed the market ecosystem, which represents the presence or absence of a ready market, has a positive influence on access to financing for SME’s.

Anderson, Chandy and Zia (2018) investigated the effects of improving financial viz a vis a marketing skills in among small-scale entrepreneurs. The study conducted in South Africa sought to find out what skill between marketing and finance, should be given priority. Their results showed that financial skills are lead to better business performance and thus significantly contribute to more established enterprises. Marketing skills were significantly more beneficial to start up enterprises due to their need to establish robust links with the market in order to secure a ready market for their products. Consequently, startup enterprises with strong marketing skills and robust market links outperformed their counterparts when it came to accessing financing.

Benjamin, Blum and Punt (2016) undertook a study in Kenya in the Eastern and Rift Valley provinces. They were examining the factors that determine the access to financing by formal institutions to rural agripreneurs. According to Benjamin *et al.* (2016), these particular group of agripreneur face the highest barriers when it comes to financing. Their findings revealed that distance to market inversely influenced an agripreneurs access to funding in rural Kenya. They observed the closer one was to the market, thus facilitating a ready market, the more likely the agripreneur was to access financing from a formal financial institution.

### 2.5 Chapter Summary

Literature review has been presented in this chapter. Literature on the various determinant of business success for agripreneurs. Socio-economic determinants was first presented, followed by capacity building determinants, and finally, literature on entrepreneurial framework condition determinants for the success of agripreneurs. Chapter three presents the research methodology that was adopted for this study.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction
This research aims to determine the factors that influence the business success of an agripreneur. This chapter highlights the research methodology adopted for this study in a bid to answer the research questions raised in the first chapter. The chapter is organized as follows: the research design, population and sample, sampling design and sample size, data collection methods, research procedures, data analysis methods and lastly the chapter summary.

3.2 Research Design
Research design is the general plan on how one intends to answer the given research questions (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2016; Kerlinger, 1986). The analogy of research designing as being similar to an architect designing a building was rightly given by (Hakim, 2000). Hakim further emphasized that the research design is based on the researcher’s preference, philosophies and the suitable ways and strategies of conducting the research. The research design should be able to satisfy the purpose of the study within the constraints of time and money (Saunders et al., 2016; Phillips, 1971). Conversely, according to Cooper and Schindler (2014), a “research design constitutes the blueprint for the collection, measurement and analysis of data.” Cooper and Schindler (2014) pointed out that in spite of the different definitions of the term research design the main components are: the activity (time-based plan), the plan that is always based on the research questions, a guide for selecting relevant information sources and types, the framework for specifying the relationships among the variables of the study and the procedural outline for each research time-based plan.

For this study, the research undertook an exploratory study or a causal research design. Explanatory research design entails conducting studies that establish causal relationships between variables (Saunders et al., 2016). The essence of this type of design is establishing that ‘A’ causes ‘B’ or that ‘A’ forces ‘B’ to occur (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Therefore, the research aims to establish; what are the socioeconomic determinants of business success for agripreneurs? What are the capacity building determinants of business success for agripreneurs? How does the entrepreneurial framework conditions influence business success for agripreneurs? The collection and analysis of data enabled
the researcher to determine the nature of the relationships. The relationships can be a method of agreement which describes a situation where ‘A’ can only be found in a case where ‘B’ is and only ‘B’ and can never occur where (C, D, E) are. Thus ‘A’ and ‘B’ have a causal or explanatory relationship (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). Contrariwise, the relationship can be a negative canon of agreement meaning the occurrence of ‘A’ is associated with the absence of ‘B’. In this instance ‘A’ and ‘B’ have a causal relationship (Cooper & Schindler, 2014).

The research also undertook a descriptive design. The descriptive design “portrays an accurate profile of persons, events or situations” (Robson, 2002; Cooper & Schindler, 2014; Saunders et al., 2016). Usually, descriptive research design act as a prelude to explanatory design (Saunders et al., 2016). Descriptive research can either be univariate in which we question the size, from, distribution or the existence of a variable. It can also be correlational which go beyond the description of variables but also establishes either the non-relatedness or the interdependence. This means establishing that indeed there is a relationship but not a causality (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The research subsequently investigated the percentages of the agripreneurs who participated in Metro Agrifood Living Lab, who have certain key socio-economic, capacity building and entrepreneurial framework conditions, attributes.

The purpose of the research is to undertake a causal-predictive study which aims to predict the behaviour of one variable by manipulating the other (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). This will enable this research inform policy makers on how best to support agripreneurs. The time frame for this research was six month thus; cross sectional studies were undertaken due to the time constraints. Cross sectional studies are conducted at once unlike longitudinal which are carried out over a period of year (Cooper & Schindler, 2014).

3.3 Population and Sampling Design

3.3.1 Population

This refers to the “total collection of elements about we wish to make some inference” (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). According to Saunders et al. (2016), the population is the source of the sample. Through the study of the sample, one is able to make inferences about the population i.e. to make generalization based on findings from the sample. The population elements being the person or object being measured helps us draw findings
(Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The target population for this research were 300 agripreneurs in Nairobi County who participated in the Metro Agrifood Living Lab project who had agri-enterprises or were about to start one.

3.3.2 Sampling Design

The sampling design is the definite statistical plan concerned with key steps taken in the selection of the sample and estimation procedure (Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). Cox and Hassard (2010) also defined sampling design as the plan on how units or elements within a population will be picked as to form part of the study. A sampling design therefore describes the sampling frame, the sampling technique used and the sample size adopted for the study.

3.3.2.1 Sampling Frame

Cox and Hassard (2010) defined the sampling frame as the “list of units that a researcher relies on to draw out a sample for a study”. It can also be described as complete list of all the cases in the population from which your sample will be drawn (Saunders et al., 2016). The sample is drawn from the sampling frame (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). According to Cooper and Schindler (2014), the sampling frame differs from the population in that the sampling frame could be less than the population if entire population is not registered or listed. The sampling frame is therefore the listed share of the population. In this study, the sampling frame was therefore the 300 agripreneur participants of the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project.

3.3.2.2 Sampling Technique

There are two types of sampling techniques: probability sampling and non-probability sampling. Probability sampling is based on random selection and entails a controlled procedure that ensures that each population element has a non-zero chance of selection. The procedure of probability sampling is never haphazard and gives the best estimate or inference of precision (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). With probability sampling the chance or probability of each case being selected from the population is known and is usually equal for all cases (Saunders et al., 2016). For non-probability samples, the probability of each case being selected from the total population is not known and it is impossible to answer research questions or to address objectives that require you to make statistical inferences about the characteristics of the population. One may still be able to generalize from non-probability samples about the population, but not on statistical grounds.
The research was also based on cluster sampling method, a type of probability sampling technique as demanded explanatory research designs (Cooper & Schindler, 2014), used by the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project. Cluster sampling is, on the surface, similar to stratified sampling as you need to divide the population into discrete groups prior to sampling (Henry, 1990; Saunders et al., 2016). For this study however, the cluster was based on the location of farming enterprise in Nairobi County and whether they practiced poultry agripreneurship.

Additionally the research was based on the non-probability technique used conduct an arduous vetting process by the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project researcher. Judgmental or purposive sampling method was used to select agripreneurs. Judgmental sampling occurs when a researcher selects sample member who conform to some criterion (Cooper & Schindler, 2014; Saunders et al., 2016). This research however, focused on agripreneur who run poultry enterprises or had the intention to start one.

### 3.3.2.3 Sampling Size

The sample size is a smaller set of the larger population (Cooper & Schindler, 2014). The larger your sample’s size the lower the likely error in generalizing to the population (Saunders et al., 2016). Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) assert that the sample must be carefully selected to be representative of the population and that there is a need for the researcher to ensure that the subdivisions entailed in the analysis are accurately catered for. A mathematical approach can be used to determine of the sample size for the research. The mathematical sampling approach based on Miller and Brewer (2003) formula that is given as follows:

\[ n = \frac{N}{1 + N(\alpha)^2} \]

Where:

- \( n \) = Sample size
- \( N \) = Sample frame
- \( \alpha \) = Significance level
However due to budgetary constraints and the gender balance representation requirement, the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project ended up having a sample size of 111 qualified respondents.

3.4 Data Collection Methods
This research relied on data collected from the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab Project participants. In order to answer the ‘what’ questions, case studies generally involve quantitative (usage of multiple-sources secondary data). The researcher analyzed quantitative data to determine the causal relationships identified between the socioeconomic, capacity building and the entrepreneurial framework conditions attributes and business success for agripreneurs. The data was obtained poultry agripreneurs who participated in the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project, Nairobi County who formed the source of the quantitative data. A checklist was used in this study to sieve out the relevant data.

3.5 Research Procedure
The research began by obtaining an introductory letter from the university’s research office. The introductory letter was then used to make an online application for a NACOSTI research permit from the government of Kenya. After obtaining the NACOSTI permit, the introductory letter was then presented to the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project administrators to obtain consent to use data. Following this, based on anticipated observations, the researcher designed a checklist to assist in sieving through the secondary data. A reliability test was run to check the validity of the data collection instrument. Thereafter, the researcher used the checklist to collect data from the Metro-Agrifoods Living Lab project database.

3.6 Data Analysis Methods
The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to conduct statistical analysis on the collected data for descriptive statistics, this included frequency tables, percentages, mean and standard deviation. The percentages and frequency distribution were used to analyze the demographic profile of the participants to clearly capture the nature of the target population while the mean provided an accurate measure of the spread
of data from average as well as compare the weight of the variables under the same context.

The correlation analysis was used to establish strength and direction of relationship between variables. This inferential statistics used specifically was Pearson’s Correlation to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between business success and the socio-economic determinants, capacity building determinants and the entrepreneurial framework conditions determinants.

Ordinal lease square (OLS) method was used to estimate the relationship between socio-economic, capacity building and entrepreneurial framework conditions factors and the occurrence of business success.

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1(X_1) + \beta_2(X_2) + \beta_3(X_3) + \varepsilon \]

Where:

\[ Y = \text{Business success} \]

\[ \beta_0 = \text{constant, which is the variation in business success (Y) that cannot be explained with the estimation equation} \]

\[ \beta_1 = \text{the coefficient of socioeconomic determinants which represents the variation in business success (Y) that can be explained with the socioeconomic variables} \]

\[ X_1 = \text{socioeconomic determinants} \]

\[ \beta_2 = \text{the coefficient of capacity building determinants which represents the variation in business success (Y) that can be explained with the capacity building variables} \]

\[ X_2 = \text{capacity building determinants} \]

\[ \beta_3 = \text{the coefficient of entrepreneurial framework determinants which represents the variation in business success (Y) that can be explained with the entrepreneurial framework variables} \]

\[ X_3 = \text{entrepreneurial framework conditions} \]

\[ \varepsilon = \text{the error term for the estimation equation} \]

The data was then presented in tables and figures based on the research questions.
3.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the various methods and procedures that the researcher adopted in conducting the study in order to answer the research objectives raised in the first chapter. Discussed explicitly in the chapter are the research design, population and sample, data collection methods, sampling design and sample size, research procedures and data analysis methods. Both descriptive and explorative research design was adopted for this study. The data collection method used was secondary data using a checklist. Finally, the tool for statistical analysis used was SPSS. Chapter four presents the results and findings from secondary data collected from the field.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Introduction
The purpose of this study is to investigate the determinants for agripreneurs business success. This chapter depicts the major results and findings of analyzed data for this study in tables and figures. The respondents filled in questionnaires both at the baseline and at follow up stages. This study however will focus on the responses from the follow up stage who were specifically poultry agripreneurs. The data analysis carried out, was guided by the following research questions: What are the socio-economic determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? What are the capacity building determinants of agripreneurs’ business success? What are the entrepreneurial framework conditions determinants of agripreneurs’ business success?

The study focused on agripreneurs in Nairobi County involved in poultry enterprises. One hundred and eleven participants were used as the sample size.

4.2 General Information
The researcher aimed to uncover the general characteristics of the poultry agripreneurs characteristics including gender, age, educational level and their marital status based on gender.

4.2.1. Gender of the Respondents

The researcher aimed to discover the gender of the respondents who are poultry agripreneurs. Out of the total poultry participants, 59% of them were male and 41% were female represented with Figure 4.1. This gap shows there was some level of gender disparity between the male and female respondents.

Figure 4.1: Gender of Poultry Participants
4.2.2. Age of Respondents

Figure 4.2 illustrates the ages of the respondents in the study who were poultry agripreneurs. The respondents involved in the study were majorly between the ages of 26 and 34 years indicating a larger participation by the youth. Youths aged between 26 and 30 years were the highest in number accounting for 23% of the respondents. The oldest respondent was 52 years in this study. The youngest respondents were aged below 20 years of age forming 5% of the total respondents.

![Bar Graph Showing Age of Respondents](image)

Figure 4.2: Age of the Respondents

4.2.3 Level of Education

The researcher sought to identify the level of education of the poultry agripreneur respondents. Only 4% of the poultry respondents are master’s degree holders, who were the least in number as indicated by Figure 4.3. The greatest proportion of the poultry respondents were bachelor’s degree holders at 40%, thereafter were form four levels at 33% and finally the technically trained poultry respondents at 23%. This indicates that 67% of the respondents had been through tertiary education while the rest, 33% were high school trained individuals.
4.2.4 Marital Status Differences in Gender

The researcher aimed to ascertain the marital status differences between the genders. Table 4.1 shows that more married individuals took part as respondents, followed by the single individuals and only one individual was divorced. The male respondents in total were 65, and out of this, 32 of them were single while 33 identified themselves as married men. For the female respondents the narrative was the same with 21 of the total 45 female respondents classifying themselves as single and 23 as married women. However, the difference in number between the married and single individuals was negligible, indicating that one’s marital status was not a major consideration for participation.

Table 4.1: Cross Tabulation between Marital Status and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Socio-Economic Determinants of Business Success for Agripreneurs.

4.3.1 Education Level

Aforementioned above, 67% of the respondents had some form of tertiary education and 33% had only secondary education as their highest attained. The level of education varied between male and female respondents as depicted in Table 4.2. For the form four trained or the secondary educated poultry agripreneurs, the study had more females, 17 in number and for the male 15. This pattern of distribution however differed in the tertiary education categories. The technically trained female poultry agripreneurs were only nine, while the male were 13. The bachelor’s degree holders had an even bigger distribution disparity, the males being 27 in number, whereas the female were less than half coming to only 12. At the master’s degree level, all respondents were with zero observations for their female counterpart. From the Table 4.2, the researcher was also able to observer that the most female poultry agripreneurs in the study were high school trained, 17, almost half of the total 38 female poultry agripreneurs. Contrarily, their male colleagues had their biggest representation being bachelor’s degree holders, coming to 27 out of the total 59 male poultry agripreneurs.

Table 4.2: Cross Tabulation between Highest Level of Education and Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form Four Training</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Training</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.1 Correlational Analysis between Access to External Funding and Highest Level of Education

Correlation analysis was conducted to ascertain the association between highest education level and the access to external funding. From the Table 4.3, the Pearson correlation coefficient denotes the relationship between access to external funding and ones highest level of education attained for the respondents was indirect and almost nonexistent. At the
95 percent confidence level, the test of significance of the association between gender and access to external funding was statistically insignificant. This signifies that the general level of education of the poultry agripreneurs who participated in the study has no association with their access to external funding.

**Table 4. 3: Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Highest Education Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Access to External Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation -0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.2 Gender**

The Table 4.4. below, depicts the frequency distribution table of the gender of the participants. Out of the total one hundred and eleven respondents, sixty-six were of the male gender and remaining 45 respondents identified themselves as belonging to the female gender.

**Table 4. 4: Descriptive Analysis of Gender of the Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.3.2.1 Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Gender**

The relationship between gender and access to external funding was also tested. From the Table 4.5 below, the relationship between access to external funding and the gender of the respondents was negative and quite weak as indicated by the Pearson correlation coefficient -0.06. The test of significance, at the 95 percent confidence level (p<0.05), of the association between gender and access to external funding was statistically insignificant. This suggests that the gender of the poultry agripreneurs who participated in the study has no association with their access to external funding.
Table 4.5: Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Access to External Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sig. (2-tailed) | 0.557 |

4.3.3 Income Level

The other socio-economic indicator used in this study was income, depicted using the poultry agripreneurs monthly sales in this study. Figure 4.4 shows a pie chart illustrating the distribution of monthly income poultry agripreneurs. The Figure shows that 22% of the poultry agripreneurs earned between Kshs 10,000 and Kshs 20,000 as monthly sales. This was matched by another category of monthly earners of Kshs 5,000 and Kshs 10,000 who also formed 22% of the respondents. The highest earners formed only 2% of the entire respondents and earned monthly sales between Kshs 500,000 and Kshs 1,600,000. The least earners who earned monthly sales of below Kshs 1000 formed 15% of the entire respondents.

![Pie chart showing monthly sales](image-url)

**Figure 4.4: Pie Chart Showing Monthly Sales**
4.3.3.1 Cross tabulation Analysis between Monthly Sales and Highest Level of Education

Table 4.6 illustrates the distribution of income among the different education levels for the poultry agripreneurs. One would expect the master’s degree holder to be the highest earner but from the Figure, a bachelor’s degree holder was the research’s highest earner followed by a secondary school trained poultry agripreneur. Most of the form four or high school trained agripreneurs earned less than Kshs 10,000 monthly. The highest earners of Kshs 20,000 and above were mostly comprised of bachelor’s degree holders. For the agripreneurs who had technical training as their highest education attained, they had a relatively even distribution across the different income levels.

Table 4.6: Cross tabulation between Monthly Sales and Highest Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly sales KSHS</th>
<th>Less than 1,000</th>
<th>1001-5000</th>
<th>5001-10,000</th>
<th>10,001-20,000</th>
<th>20,001-30,000</th>
<th>30,001-50,000</th>
<th>50,001-50,000</th>
<th>500,001-1600,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Education</td>
<td>Form Four</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3.2 Correlational Analysis between Access to External Funding and Monthly Income

The Pearson correlation analysis was undertaken to determine the relationship between ones monthly income and their access to external funding. It was established that the association was weak and inverse as indicated in Table 4.7. The association was also insignificant (p<0.05).
Table 4. 7: Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Monthly Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to External Funding</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your current; monthly sales in Kshs</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Capacity Building Factors for Business Success for Agripreneurs

4.4.1 Training

The Table 4.8 shows the descriptive statistics for the number of trainings attended by the poultry agripreneurs who participated in the study. The maximum number of agribusiness trainings attended by a single poultry agripreneur is ten while the least having attended zero trainings. The majority of the poultry agripreneurs had attended one training before their participation in the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab Project, constituting approximately 40% of the total respondents. Only 2.7% of the entire sample of respondents had attended 10 trainings prior to the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project. The distribution of the respondents’ number of trainings attended centered around one to three number of prior trainings attended.

Table 4. 8: Descriptive Analysis on Number of Agribusiness Trainings Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Trainings Attended</th>
<th>Percent %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing (did not respond to question)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1.1 Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Number of Trainings Attended

Correlation analysis was also conducted by the researcher to determine the relationship between the number of agribusiness training attended by an agripreneur and their access to external funding. The Pearson correlational coefficient connotes that association between the number of agribusiness attended and access to external funding was negative and virtually nonexistent. The association was also found to be statistically insignificant (p<0.05).

Table 4. 9: Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Number of Trainings Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many training workshops in agribusiness have you attended</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Access to External Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Mentorship and Apprenticeship

Table 4.10 indicates the descriptive statistics on the number of mentorships the participating agripreneurs follow. The minimum mentorship programs followed by the agripreneurs is one while the maximum is 2.78, which is two mentorship programs. On average, the agripreneurs follow 1.65 mentorship programs, which is essentially one mentorship program per agripreneur. The low standard deviation of 0.24 signifies that the sample agripreneurs used in study follow 2.78 mentorship programs and do not really deviate from given average of 2.78

Table 4. 10: Descriptive Analysis on the Number of Mentorship Programs Followed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Mentorship Programs Followed</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.6531</td>
<td>0.23946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2.1 Descriptive Analysis on the Various Mediums to Follow Mentorship Program

The agripreneurs used several mediums of communication to follow the various mentorship programs available to them. The study reported that the agripreneurs used websites, Facebook, Twitter, You Tube, e-newsletters, vlogs/blogs, TV programs, radio and newspapers to receive agribusiness mentorship. The traditional media of communication like radio, TV programs and newspapers had the highest number as compared to the newer methods of communication. Twitter had the least users followed by vlogs or blogs, as shown in Table 4.11.

Table 4. 11: Descriptive Analysis on the Various Mediums to Follow Mentorship Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Websites</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>Twitter</th>
<th>YouTube</th>
<th>E-newsletters</th>
<th>vlogs/blogs</th>
<th>TV Program</th>
<th>Radio</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2.2 Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Mentorship

The researcher also conducted correlational analysis to investigate the relationship between access to external funding and mentorship. The association was negative and just about nonexistent. The test also revealed that the correlation between access to external funding and mentorship was statistically insignificant at 95 % confidence level (p<0.05).

Table 4. 12: Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Mentorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentorship</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Access to External Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 Technological Absorptive Capacity

The descriptive statistics on the agripreneurs’ technological absorptive capacity was found that the minimum was one. This signifies that every agripreneur ability to incorporate new technology in their everyday running of their enterprise. The maximum number of technologies that a single agripreneur demonstrated in absorbing into their enterprise was two. The average number of technologies absorbed was 1.55.

Table 4. 13: Descriptive Analysis on Technological Absorptive Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.5518</td>
<td>0.23204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3.1 Descriptive Analysis on Different Types of Technologies Absorbed in Enterprises

From the below Table 4.14, the agripreneurs have absorbed smartphone technology the most in their enterprises. The least absorbed technology is use of website. Half of the respondents had laptops for their enterprises whereas the other half had none. Forty-eight point six percentage of the enterprises use social media for their enterprises, 23.4% use Facebook and 14.4% WhatsApp.

Table 4. 14: Descriptive Analysis on Different Types of Technologies Absorbed in Enterprises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Smartphone</th>
<th>Laptop</th>
<th>Social Media for Business</th>
<th>Facebook</th>
<th>WhatsApp</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3.2 Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Technological Absorptive Capacity

Correlation was conducted and the results indicated that there is zero association between access to external funding and technological absorptive capacity. The zero correlation was also statistically insignificant (p<0.05).

Table 4. 15: Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Technological Absorptive Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technological Absorptive Capacity</th>
<th>Access to External Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 Entrepreneurial Framework Conditions
4.5.1 Infrastructure

The study depicted that agripreneurs have at minimum access to one infrastructural facilities. The maximum number of infrastructural facilities a single agripreneur has access is 3.60. The average number of infrastructural facilities that agripreneurs have access to is 1.9 from the Table 4.16.

Table 4. 16: Descriptive Analysis on Access to Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.9156</td>
<td>0.62675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1.1 Descriptive Analysis on Access to Various Infrastructural Facilities

The agripreneurs who participated in the study had the easiest access to mobile network as depicted in Table 4.17. Approximately 63% of the participants reported that they have access to mobile network. The least accessible infrastructural facility was a sanitation system with only 20.7% strongly agreeing to have easy access to a sewerage/sanitation system. Less than half (45.9%) of the agripreneur respondents strongly agreed to having easy access to water to run their agribusiness. Easy access to electricity garnered 46.4%
of agripreneur strongly asserting the same while internet as an infrastructural facility had 43.2% strongly affirming easy access to it.

Table 4. 17: Descriptive Analysis on Access to Various Infrastructural Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
<th>Electricity</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Mobile Network</th>
<th>Sanitation System</th>
<th>Internet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1.2 Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Infrastructure

Correlational analysis conducted by the researcher revealed that there was a positive but virtually nonexistent relationship between access to external funding and access to infrastructural facilities. Statistically the association between the two was also insignificant at a 95% confidence level (p<0.05).

Table 4. 18: Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Access to External Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 Social Capital

Descriptive analysis carried out, as depicted in Table 4.19, revealed that the minimum social capital association that a single agripreneur identifies with or follows is one. The maximum number of social capital associations was two for a single agripreneur who
participated in the study. The average number of social capital associations that a poultry agripreneur had was 1.5.

Table 4.19: Descriptive Analysis on Agripreneurs Social Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a member of an agri-business group online?</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2.1 Descriptive Analysis on Agripreneur Social Capital Association Membership

Table 4.20 below illustrates the percentages of the members and non-members of online agribusiness group which was the measure of social capital in this study. The results showed that only 48.6% were members of an online agribusiness group whereas the rest, 51.4% were non-members of online agribusiness groups.

Table 4.20: Descriptive Analysis on Agripreneur Social Capital Association Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a member of an agri-business group online?</th>
<th>Valid Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2.2 Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Social Capital

Correlational analysis performed on the data from the returned questionnaires, sought to unveil the association between access to external funding and one’s social capital. Social capital was defined as one’s membership of an online agribusiness group. The relationship was negative and almost nonexistent. The test of significance was also carried out and the association between social capital and access to external funding was found to be statistically insignificant at 95% confidence level (p<0.05).
Table 4.21: Correlation Analysis between Access to External Funding and Social Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you a member of an agri-business group online?</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Access to External Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3 Access to Market

The analysis for the agripreneurs access to ready market for their products was conducted. The results were coded from “1” as strongly disagree, “4” as the end of the spectrum to connote strongly agreeing and “5” to represent those who did not know whether or not they had a ready market for their products. From the Table 4.22, the best-case scenario reported by any of the poultry agripreneurs was that they had a ready market for their products. Conversely, the worst-case scenario for the agripreneurs was that some disagreed with the statement that they had access to a ready market for their products. The mean was 1.82, meaning that, on average the agripreneurs strongly agreed or agreed that they have access to a ready market for their product.

Table 4.22: Descriptive Analysis on Agripreneurs Access to Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have a ready market for my products</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3.1 Percentage Descriptive Analysis on Access to Market

Table 4.23 just further demonstrates the specific percentages represented in the different categories in relation to access to market. The highest number (53.2%) of agripreneurs asserted that they agreed that they had access to a ready market for their products. Approximately 33% of the poultry agripreneurs strongly agreed with the statement that they had access to a ready market for their products. The remaining 14.4% disagreed to having access a ready market.
Table 4. 23: Percentage Descriptive Analysis on Access to Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have a ready market for my products</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>32.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3.2 Correlation Table between Access to External Funding and Access to Market

The researcher aimed to discover the association between access to external funding and access to a market, Table 4.24. The association was positive but weak. The Pearson coefficient was found to be statistically significant at 95% confidence level (p<0.05).

Table 4. 24: Correlation Table between Access to External Funding and Access to Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have a ready market for my products</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>.235*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3.3 Model Summary for Access to Market for Poultry Agripreneurs

Having established the a correlation between access to external funding and access to market, the research regressed access to external funding on access to market using the simple linear regression method. The Table 4.25 gives us the R² which explains the proportion of variation of access to external funding that is predicted by access to market of the agripreneur. We however use adjusted R², which has taken care of the loss of degrees of freedom. This means that holding all other factors constant, 4.5% of the variation in access to external funding can be explained by the variable access to market, Table 4.24.

Table 4. 25: Model Summary for Access to Market for Poultry Agripreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3.4 ANOVA Table for the Regression of Access to External Funding Against Access to Market.

From the ANOVA Table 4.26, the researcher concluded that model, $F(1, 95) = 5.572, p=0.02$, is statistically significant at 95% confidence level ($p<0.05$).

**Table 4.26: ANOVA Table for the Regression of Access to External Funding Against Access to Market.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Regression</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>5.572</td>
<td>.020b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>14.364</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.207</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3.5 Coefficients of Regression Model of Access to External Funding Against Access to Market.

The researcher was also able to derive the model for using Table 4.27. The coefficient “$B$”= 2.969, is used to connote the constant in the linear equation or the y intercept if one is to represent the model in a graph. Beta, $.137$, is the coefficient for the independent variable access to market. According to the Table 4.26, the linear regression equation $Y= \beta_0 +\beta X$ is estimated to be:

$Y= 2.969 + 0.137 X$

Where $Y= \text{Access to external funding}$

$X= \text{Access to Market}$
Table 4. 27: Coefficients of Regression Model of Access to External Funding Against Access to Market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.969</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a ready market for my products</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Chapter Summary
This chapter highlights the results and findings of the researcher’s data analysis. Descriptive statistics were first presented to give the general characteristics of the poultry agripreneurs who were participated as respondents in the study. The rest of the analysis was then presented as guided by the research questions. The first section furnishes results for the socio-economic determinants of agripreneurs business success. The second section the results for the capacity building determinants of agripreneurs business success. The final section outlines the findings for the entrepreneurial frameworks conditions determinants of agripreneurs business success. The study yielded no significant correlation between access to external funding (business success) and any other variable except access to market at p<0.05, which had a positive but weak association of 0.235. Thereafter, the regression analysis carried out, determined the effect of access to markets on access to external funding. The results indicated that 4.5% of the variation in access to external funding could be explained by an agripreneur’s access to the market, ceteris paribus. The subsequent chapter will present the discussions, conclusions and the relevant recommendations.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter features the discussion, conclusions and recommendations based on the purpose of this study. Foremost, the discussion on the socio-economic determinants of business success were presented, after which, the discussion on the capacity building determinants of business success were presented and followed lastly by the discussion of the entrepreneurial framework determinants of business success. The conclusions and recommendations were also included as per the research questions.

5.2 Summary

The purpose of the study is to investigate the determinants of the business success of poultry agripreneurs based in Nairobi. The research questions that guide this study are: What are the socio-economic determinants of business success for agripreneurs? What are the entrepreneurial conditions determinants of business success for agripreneurs? What are the capacity building determinants of business success for agripreneurs?

The study was limited to poultry agripreneurs based in Nairobi County. The target population was 300 agripreneurs. A combination of descriptive and explanatory research design have been adopted for this research. The sampling technique used in this research was a mixture of probability and non-probability techniques: namely the cluster and judgmental sampling techniques. The sample size was 111 poultry agripreneurs. The data was obtained from the Metro Living Lab Project participants. The collected data was analyzed using SPSS and the results and findings were presented in tables and figures.

The findings of the study showed that most of the respondents were male 59% while the female had a representation was 41%. The majority of the respondents were aged between 26 and 30 years representing for to 23% of the respondents. The analysis of the respondents’ highest education level attained showed that 40% were bachelor degree holders, 33% high school certificate holders, 23% were tertiary trained and only 4% were master’s degree holders. The results for the socioeconomic factors education level, gender and income had statistically significant relationship with an agripreneur’s business success. The capacity building factors training, mentorship and technological showed no significant correlation with an agripreneur’s business success. The study indicated a significant correlation between business success and access to market at p<0.05, which
had a positive but weak association of 0.235. Thereafter, the regression analysis indicated that 4.5% of the variation in business success could be explained by an agripreneur’s access to the market, ceteris paribus.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Socio-Economic Determinants of Business Success for Agripreneurs.

The study tested and analysed there socio-economic characteristics: general education level, gender and the income level. When it comes to the general education level, the study exposed that most of the poultry agripreneur respondents who participated in the Metro-Living Lab project were majorly bachelor degree holders as their highest education level attained. These made up 40% of the entire respondents. Thirty-three percent had high school as the highest education level achieved. The technically trained poultry agripreneurs formed 23% while the study had only one master’s degree holder.

From the data analysis, testing the correlation between access to funding and an agripreneur’s education level, the study indicated that there is no significant relationship between access to external funding and an agripreneur’s education level. This signifies that a poultry agripreneur’s education level plays no role in determining whether one gets access to external funding or not.

This is contrary to what Kiplimo et al. (2015) who conducted a study of access to credit for small holder agripreneurs in Kenya. Their findings revealed that entrepreneurs that are more educated had a higher likelihood of getting external funding than the less educated. Their study showed a positive correlation between business success and level of education. Similarly, Dickson et al. (2008) was in concordance with Kiplimo and the his colleagues in affirming that indeed access to funding was positively related to an entrepreneur’s education level. Consequently implying, the educated entrepreneurs had easier access to external financing that their counterparts who are less educated.

It is important to note that several studies have yielded a positive correlation between access to external funding, however according to Van der Sluis et al. (2005), from their study they were not able identify the specific role education played in an entrepreneur’s ability to access funding. They were in accord with Bewaji et al. (2015) who concluded that educated entrepreneurs had fewer constraints in accessing funding owing to their better understanding of procedures and processes of funding entities. Nevertheless, Van der Sluis et al. (2005) pointed out that one may not be able to point out if one’s awareness
or society’s notions about the educated that garnered them the benefit of fewer constraints.

The other socio-economic variable the study analysed was gender. The poultry agripreneurs respondents from the Metro-Agrifoods Living lab project were 59% male and 41% female. Already one can quickly conclude there was some form of gender disparity in the respondents. The Pearson correlation test was conducted in SPSS and the gender was found to have no significance in matters pertaining to a poultry agripreneurs ability to access external funding. This indicates that for the agripreneurs based in Nairobi County, gender is not a consideration for one to access financing.

These discoveries are in concordance with Konovalchuk et al. (2008) research in Pennsylvania which yielded a zero significance to their ability run enterprises. One of the measures of the successful running of an enterprise was the ability to obtain funding for the enterprises. Konovalchuk et al. (2008) tried to explain these results as a consequence of the entrepreneurs operating in an environment with no cultural gender barriers, where one's gender does not provide one with any form of advantage.

This however differed from Ager (2015) who conducted study to test gender disparity among agripreneurs in Malawi. He discovered that access to funding had a significant relationship with gender. According to Ager (2015), he described a cultural system of land ownership which gave preference to the male gender. Accessing to funding for these enterprises was determined by land ownership, which most women lack due to the prevalent cultural beliefs and practices, resulting in the lack of business success for a majority of the female agripreneurs in Malawi. These findings correspond to the study conducted in Ghana by Suhiyini et al. (2018) who asserted that male agripreneurs had an easier route to resources than their female counterparts.

The third socioeconomic determinant used in this study was income level measured as monthly sales. The study depicted that most agripreneurs earned between Kshs 5,000 and Ksh 20,000 per month. Only 2% of the entire poultry agripreneur respondents earned more than Kshs 500,000 in sales monthly. The Pearson correlation analysis revealed that the access to external funding had no significant relationship with monthly income in sales for the agripreneurs. Klju and Belás (2016) were of a different opinion based on their study, which showed a positive correlation between access to funding and an entrepreneur’s income level. This signifies that the higher the entrepreneur’s income is
the more likely they are to receive funding from formal financial organizations. They went a step further to state that the income level influenced an entrepreneur’s credit score, which was a determinant for funding in these financial institutions in the Czech Republic.

5.3.2 Capacity Building Factors for Business Success for Agripreneurs

Concerning capacity building factors the study investigated training, mentorship & apprenticeship, and the technological absorptive capacity. The study revealed that about 40% of the correspondents had attended a single prior training. Approximately 25% had attended two prior trainings before becoming participating in the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project. Only 18% of the poultry agripreneur respondents had attended three prior trainings. The Pearson Correlation analysis depicted that there is no significant relationship between access to funding and the number of trainings attended.

These findings are in contrast to the study by Santiago & Roxas (2015) who found a positive and significant relationship between access to financing and training. According to the duo, who conducted their study in the Philippines, their study investigate a new education system set up by the government to raise agripreneurs though technical and business skill trainings. Emanating from their study was the opinion based on findings that if an agripreneur completed the said curriculum, then they were more likely to be get funding. Therefore, this signifies the more trainings attended the higher the probability of an agripreneur accessing external funding.

Heins et al. (2010) conducted a study on women agripreneurs based in Illinois. They concluded that trainings generated a deeper understanding of the entrepreneurship concepts, which in turn lead to business success. They concluded that the entrenchment of entrepreneurial concepts reduced financial risks and thus enabled higher access to external funding. These results were harmony with Spais (2010) who attributed training as a major catalyst for the greater comprehension of entrepreneurship concepts which boosts business success.

However, the conclusion drawn by Efobi and Orkoh (2018) have produced the best explanation of the disparity of conclusions and findings in various studies. Efobi and Orkoh (2018) affirmed that practice of the concepts and knowledge inculcated during trainings is what yielded an increase in productivity and resulted in agricultural growth. The duo went ahead to assert that practice increased performance in agripreneurs, which included boosting an agripreneurs access to external funding.
The other capacity-building factor that the study interrogated was mentorship and apprenticeship. In the study, the form of mentorship and apprenticeship was through media channels. The mostly commonly used medium to follow an agribusiness mentorship or apprenticeship was via the radio 69%, newspaper 68% and television 63% respectively. The least used mediums by the poultry agripreneur respondents was Twitter with about 92% of non-users, vlogs and blogs had approximately 86% of non-users and YouTube with 83% non-users from among respondents. This indicates that most of the poultry agripreneurs prefer to use the traditional mediums of communication to follow mentorship and apprenticeship programs to the new forms of social media. Further analysis carried out using the Pearson’s correlation showed the relationship between business success and mentorship was insignificant.

Chebii et al. (2016) in their research based in Kenya on the Entrepreneurial Career Mentoring Functions and Entrepreneurs Objective Outcomes in Eldoret, they deduced that mentorship had a significant and positive relationship on an entrepreneur’s business success. Due to the augmentation of skills through mentorship that prevented stagnation and premature death of business, agripreneurs were able to achieve business success.

The final aspect of capacity building determinants that the study delved into was technological absorptive capacity. In the study, this was tested by virtue of the poultry agripreneur use or non-use of technology in their enterprises. The study tested on the use of smartphones, computers, social media and internet for their enterprises. The use of smartphone was the most highly absorbed form of technology by the poultry agripreneurs summing up to nearly 80% of the total. Fifty percent of the respondents identified themselves as users of laptops in their enterprises while about 49% claimed they used social media for their business. The correlational analysis demonstrated insignificant correlation between business success and use of technology in the enterprises.

Gellynck et al. (2015) undertook a study that showed positive and significant relationship between business success and the level of technological absorptive capacity. They affirmed that in the long run, based on longitudinal observations, the level of technological absorptive capacity had positive and significant relationship with business success. This implies the more technology an agripreneur absorbs into his enterprise; the more likely they are to succeed in business. However, Gellynck et al (2015) also made an interesting observation in their research that depicted, business success and technological
aborptive capacity bears little significant relationship in the short run. Another interesting perspective was brought by Diederen *et al.* (2003) who deduced that early adopters of technology had a higher chance of attaining business success unlike laggards.

5.3.3 Entrepreneurial Framework Conditions

The study also examine the entrepreneurial framework conditions of an agripreneur namely, infrastructure, social capital and access to market. In reference to the poultry agripreneur’s access to infrastructure, the study revealed that close to 63% of the respondents strongly agreed to having access to mobile network for their enterprises. Less than 50% of the respondents strongly agreed that they had access to electricity for their enterprises. Additionally, approximately only 46% of the respondents strongly agreed that they had access to water as an infrastructure for their enterprises. The Pearson Correlation analysis further unraveled that there is no correlation between access to external funding and an agripreneur’s access to infrastructure. This implies that whether or not an agripreneur’s enterprise has access to various infrastructure like water, electricity or even mobile network, this has no influence on his ability to attain business success.

In contrast, Davari and Najmabadi (2018) revealed that infrastructure has a positive influence on an entrepreneur’s business success. The duo deduced that infrastructure plays a key role in the entrepreneur’s ability to achieve business success. This implies the more accessible infrastructure is to the entrepreneur, the more his business success. Correspondingly, Mihai and Avasilc (2014) conducted a study on technological entrepreneurs. They deduced that physical infrastructure had a positive influence on success of a technological entrepreneur. However, Venkataramany (2016) unveiled through his study a different perspective to an agripreneurs access to infrastructure. According to his study, access to infrastructure had no significant influence on financing for entrepreneurs, which was similar to this study’s results.

As pertaining the social capital as an entrepreneurial framework condition, the study utilized membership of an online agri-business group as a measure of social capital. The study showed that approximately 49% of the poultry agripreneur respondents identified themselves as members of online agri-business groups while 51% identified themselves as non-members. Further correlational analysis revealed no statistical significance between online social capital and access to funding.
According to Uphoff and Wijayaratna (2000), his study documented a case of Sri Lanka rice agripreneurs who used their social capital to form an association in order to beat water shortage. The duo revealed the bargaining power created by the association, which enabled the rice agripreneurs access funding for irrigation. The two deduced from their study a positive correlation between business success and social capital in terms of association membership. This findings were in harmony with Pascucci, Gardebroek, Dries (2012) who conducted a study on how different types of membership yield different results for the agripreneur. They concluded that strong membership had a strong positive correlation with business success and weak membership did not enjoy same benefits. It is possible that the online membership of an agri-business group of respondents from this study did not mean that they were strong members.

The final entrepreneurial framework determinant examined was access to market. Only 32% of the poultry agripreneur respondents strongly identified themselves as possessing a ready market for their products. Fifty-three percent agreed to the statement that they had a ready market for their poultry products while the remaining 15% claimed they did not have a ready market. The Pearson correlation analysis demonstrated that there is a positive correlation between business success and access to ready market of 0.235 at 95% confidence level. The simple linear regression revealed that adjusted $R^2$ was equal to 0.045 signifying that 4.5% of the variation in access to external funding can be explained by the changes in access to ready market. The simple linear equation derived from the regression was $Y = 2.969 + 0.137 \times X$ where $y$= access to external funding and $x$= access to ready market. This therefore implies that if an agripreneur based in Nairobi County wants to improve his access to external funding by 13.7% then he should improve his access to a ready market.

Comparably, Venkataramany (2016) affirms that entrepreneurial financing is significantly dependent on market openness and market dynamics which ensures that an entrepreneur has a ready market for his products. His study based in India revealed a positive correlation between ready market and access to funding. This findings were in coherence with Audretsch et al. (2019) who asserted that if the market ecosystem is favorable then the entrepreneur will consequently have the benefit access to funding. However, it was Cowling et al. (2015) who brought the aspect of recession and dwindling demand to the discussion and deduced that enterprises which were able to access financing were rather exceptional for their ability to somewhat sustain a ready market for their products. They
pointed out that even in a normal market ecosystem, it is not walk in the park for entrepreneur to garner funding for their ventures and thus enterprises, which can access financing during recession, are outstanding. This lead to their conclusion that the presence or absence of a ready market has a positive influence on access to financing for SME’s.

5.3 Discussion

5.3.1 Socio-Economic Determinants of Business Success for Agripreneurs.

The study tested and analysed there socio-economic characteristics: general education level, gender and the income level. When it comes to the general education level, the study exposed that most of the poultry agripreneur respondents who participated in the Metro-Living Lab project were majorly bachelor degree holders as their highest education level attained. These made up 40% of the entire respondents. Thirty-three percent had high school as the highest education level achieved. The technically trained poultry agripreneurs formed 23% while the study had only one master’s degree holder.

From the data analysis, testing the correlation between access to funding and an agripreneur’s education level, the study indicated that there is no significant relationship between access to external funding and an agripreneur’s education level. This signifies that a poultry agripreneur’s education level plays no role in determining whether one gets access to external funding or not.

This is contrary to what Kiplimo et al. (2015) who conducted a study of access to credit for small holder agripreneurs in Kenya. Their findings revealed that entrepreneurs that are more educated had a higher likelihood of getting external funding than the less educated. Their study showed a positive correlation between business success and level of education. Similarly, Dickson et al. (2008) was in concordance with Kiplimo and the his colleagues in affirming that indeed access to funding was positively related to an entrepreneur’s education level. Consequently implying, the educated entrepreneurs had easier access to external financing that their counterparts who are less educated.

It is important to note that several studies have yielded a positive correlation between access to external funding, however according to Van der Sluis et al. (2005), from their study they were not able identify the specific role education played in an entrepreneur’s ability to access funding. They were in accord with Bewaji et al. (2015) who concluded
that educated entrepreneurs had fewer constraints in accessing funding owing to their better understanding of procedures and processes of funding entities. Nevertheless, Van der Sluis et al. (2005) pointed out that one may not be able to point out if one’s awareness or society’s notions about the educated that garnered them the benefit of fewer constraints.

The other socio-economic variable the study analysed was gender. The poultry agripreneurs respondents from the Metro-Agrifoods Living lab project were 59% male and 41% female. Already one can quickly conclude there was some form of gender disparity in the respondents. The Pearson correlation test was conducted in SPSS and the gender was found to have no significance in matters pertaining to a poultry agripreneurs ability to access external funding. This indicates that for the agripreneurs based in Nairobi County, gender is not a consideration for one to access financing.

These discoveries are in concordance with Konovalchuk et al. (2008) research in Pennsylvania which yielded a zero significance to their ability run enterprises. One of the measures of the successful running of an enterprise was the ability to obtain funding for the enterprises. Konovalchuk et al. (2008) tried to explain these results as a consequence of the entrepreneurs operating in an environment with no cultural gender barriers, where one’s gender does not provide one with any form of advantage.

This however differed from Ager (2015) who conducted study to test gender disparity among agripreneurs in Malawi. He discovered that access to funding had a significant relationship with gender. According to Ager (2015), he described a cultural system of land ownership which gave preference to the male gender. Accessing to funding for these enterprises was determined by land ownership, which most women lack due to the prevalent cultural beliefs and practices, resulting in the lack of business success for a majority of the female agripreneurs in Malawi. These findings correspond to the study conducted in Ghana by Suhiyini et al. (2018) who asserted that male agripreneurs had an easier route to resources than their female counterparts.

The third socioeconomic determinant used in this study was income level measured as monthly sales. The study depicted that most agripreneurs earned between Kshs 5,000 and Ksh 20,000 per month. Only 2% of the entire poultry agripreneur respondents earned more than Kshs 500,000 in sales monthly. The Pearson correlation analysis revealed that the access to external funding had no significant relationship with monthly income in
sales for the agripreneurs. Klju and Belás (2016) were of a different opinion based on their study, which showed a positive correlation between access to funding and an entrepreneur’s income level. This signifies that the higher the entrepreneur’s income is the more likely they are to receive funding from formal financial organizations. They went a step further to state that the income level influenced an entrepreneur’s credit score, which was a determinant for funding in these financial institutions in the Czech Republic.

5.3.2 Capacity Building Factors for Business Success for Agripreneurs

Concerning capacity building factors the study investigated training, mentorship & apprenticeship, and the technological absorptive capacity. The study revealed that about 40% of the correspondents had attended a single prior training. Approximately 25% had attended two prior trainings before becoming participating in the Metro-Agrifood Living Lab project. Only 18 % of the poultry agripreneur respondents had attended three prior trainings. The Pearson Correlation analysis depicted that there is no significant relationship between access to funding and the number of trainings attended.

These findings are in contrast to the study by Santiago & Roxas (2015) who found a positive and significant relationship between access to financing and training. According to the duo, who conducted their study in the Philippines based on a study on a new education system set up by the government to raise agripreneurs though technical and business skill trainings. Emanating from their study was the opinion based on findings that if an agripreneur completed the said curriculum, then they were more likely to be getting funding. Therefore, this signifies the more trainings attended the higher the probability of an agripreneur accessing external funding.

Heins et al. (2010) conducted a study on women agripreneurs based in Illinois. They concluded that trainings generated a deeper understanding of the entrepreneurship concepts, which in turn lead to business success. These results were harmony with Spais (2010) who attributed training as a major catalyst for the greater comprehension of entrepreneurship concepts which boosts business success.

However, the conclusion drawn by Efobi and Orkoh (2018) have produced the best explanation of the disparity of conclusions and findings in various studies. Efobi and Orkoh (2018) affirmed that practice of the concepts and knowledge inculcated during trainings is what yielded an increase in productivity and resulted in agricultural growth.
The duo went ahead to assert that practice increased performance in agripreneurs, which included boosting an agripreneurs access to external funding.

The other capacity-building factor that the study interrogated was mentorship and apprenticeship. In the study, the form of mentorship and apprenticeship was through media channels. The mostly commonly used medium to follow an agribusiness mentorship or apprenticeship was via the radio 69%, newspaper 68% and television 63% respectively. The least used mediums by the poultry agripreneur respondents was Twitter with about 92% of non-users, vlogs and blogs had approximately 86% of non-users and YouTube with 83% non-users from among respondents. This indicates that most of the poultry agripreneurs prefer to use the traditional mediums of communication to follow mentorship and apprenticeship programs to the new forms of social media. Further analysis carried out using the Pearson’s correlation showed the relationship between business success and mentorship was insignificant.

Chebii et al. (2016) in their research based in Kenya on the Entrepreneurial Career Mentoring Functions and Entrepreneurs Objective Outcomes in Eldoret, they deduced that mentorship had a significant and positive relationship on an entrepreneur’s business success. Due to the augmentation of skills through mentorship that prevented stagnation and premature death of business, agripreneurs were able to achieve business success.

The final aspect of capacity building determinants that the study delved into was technological absorptive capacity. In the study, this was tested by virtue of the poultry agripreneur use or non-use of technology in their enterprises. The use of smartphone was the most highly absorbed form of technology by the poultry agripreneurs summing up to nearly 80% of the total. Fifty percent of the respondents identified themselves as users of laptops in their enterprises while about 49% claimed they used social media for their business. The correlational analysis demonstrated insignificant correlation between business success and use of technology in the enterprises.

Gellynck et al. (2015) undertook a study that showed positive and significant relationship between business success and the level of technological absorptive capacity. They affirmed that in the long run, based on longitudinal observations, the level of technological absorptive capacity had positive and significant relationship with business success. This implies the more technology an agripreneur absorbs into his enterprise; the more likely they are to succeed in business. However, Gellynck et al (2015) also made an
interesting observation in their research that depicted, business success and technological absorptive capacity bears little significant relationship in the short run. Another interesting perspective was brought by Diederen et al. (2003) who deduced that early adopters of technology had a higher chance of attaining business success unlike laggards.

5.3.3 Entrepreneurial Framework Conditions

The study also examines the entrepreneurial framework conditions of an agripreneur namely, infrastructure, social capital and access to market. In reference to the poultry agripreneur’s access to infrastructure, the study revealed that close to 63% of the respondents strongly agreed to having access to mobile network for their enterprises. Less than 50% of the respondents strongly agreed that they had access to electricity for their enterprises. Additionally, approximately only 46% of the respondents strongly agreed that they had access to water as an infrastructure for their enterprises. The Pearson Correlation analysis further unraveled that there is no correlation between access to external funding and an agripreneur’s access to infrastructure. This implies that whether or not an agripreneur’s enterprise has access to various infrastructure like water, electricity or even mobile network, this has no influence on his ability to attain business success.

In contrast, Davari and Najmabadi (2018) revealed that infrastructure has a positive influence on an entrepreneur’s business success. The duo deduced that infrastructure plays a key role in the entrepreneur’s ability to achieve business success. This implies the more accessible infrastructure is to the entrepreneur, the more his business success. Correspondingly, Mihai and Avasilc (2014) conducted a study on technological entrepreneurs. They deduced that physical infrastructure had a positive influence on success of a technological entrepreneur. However, Venkataramany (2016) unveiled through his study that infrastructure had no significant influence on financing for entrepreneurs.

As pertaining the social capital as an entrepreneurial framework condition, the study utilized membership of an online agri-business group as a measure of social capital. The study showed that approximately 49% of the poultry agripreneur respondents identified themselves as members of online agri-business groups while 51% identified themselves as non-members. Further correlational analysis revealed no statistical significance between online social capital and access to funding.
According to Uphoff and Wijayaratna (2000), his study documented a case of Sri Lanka rice agripreneurs who used their social capital to form an association in order to beat water shortage. The duo revealed the bargaining power created by the association, which enabled the rice agripreneurs access funding for irrigation. The two deduced from their study a positive correlation between business success and social capital in terms of association membership. This findings were in harmony with Pascucci, Gardebroek, Dries (2012) who conducted a study on how different types of membership yield different results for the agripreneur. They concluded that strong membership had a strong positive correlation with business success and weak membership did not enjoy same benefits.

The final entrepreneurial framework determinant examined was access to market. Only 32% of the poultry agripreneur respondents strongly identified themselves as possessing a ready market for their products. Fifty-three percent agreed to the statement that they had a ready market for their poultry products while the remaining 15% claimed they did not have a ready market. The Pearson correlation analysis demonstrated that there is a positive correlation between business success and access to ready market of 0.235 at 95% confidence level. The simple linear regression revealed that adjusted $R^2$ was equal to 0.045 signifying that 4.5% of the variation in access to external funding can be explained by the changes in access to ready market. The simple linear equation derived from the regression was $Y = 2.969 + 0.137X$ where $y$= access to external funding and $x$= access to ready market. This therefore implies that if an agripreneur based in Nairobi County wants to improve his access to external funding by 13.7% then he should improve his access to a ready market.

Comparably, Venkataramany (2016) affirms that entrepreneurial financing is significantly dependent on market openness and market dynamics which ensures that an entrepreneur has a ready market for his products. His study based in India revealed a positive correlation between ready market and access to funding. This findings were in coherence with Audretsch et al. (2019) who asserted that if the market ecosystem is favorable then the entrepreneur will consequently have the benefit access to funding. However, it was Cowling et al. (2015) who brought the aspect of recession and dwindling demand to the discussion and deduced that enterprises which were able to access financing were rather exceptional for their ability to somewhat sustain a ready market for their products. This lead to their conclusion that the presence or absence of a ready market has a positive influence on access to financing for SME’s.
5.4 Conclusions

5.4.1 Socio-Economic Determinants of Business Success for Agripreneurs.

The study concludes that the socioeconomic factors namely general education level, gender of the agripreneur and the income level of the agripreneur bear no statistical significance in the achievement of business success. These socioeconomic determinants have no influence on whether or not an agripreneur based in Nairobi County will access external funding. In particular, the education curriculum appears not to stimulate entrepreneurial activity, which enables access to external funding.

5.4.2 Capacity Building Factors for Business Success for Agripreneurs

In conclusion, the study findings on the capacity building factors specifically, training, technological absorptive capacity mentorship and apprenticeship have no significant relationship with an agripreneur’s business success. These capacity-building determinants have no influence on whether an agripreneur based in Nairobi County has access to external funding or not. There appears to be a disconnect between knowledge transfer and implementation.

5.4.3 Entrepreneurial Framework Conditions

The study concludes that 4.5% of the variation in access to external funding can be explained by the by variation in access to ready market. Furthermore, for an agripreneur based in Nairobi County to increase his likelihood of accessing external funding by 13.7% he needs to improve his access to a ready market by one percent.

5.5 Recommendations

5.5.1 Recommendation for Improvement

5.5.1.1 Socio-Economic Determinants of Business Success for Agripreneurs.

The study recommends that the government improve the education system to contribute positively to the agripreneurs business success. The curriculum for the general education level should empower aspiring agripreneurs from an early stage with information on the procedures and processes of getting funding from formal financial organisations.

5.5.1.2 Capacity Building Factors for Business Success for Agripreneurs

The research recommends that it is not just enough to attend trainings but rather agripreneurs should also practice the concepts and knowledge acquired during the
training. This concept of practice should also be adopted when it comes to mentorship and apprenticeship programs. This will lead to a deeper understanding of entrepreneurship concepts which will enable agripreneurs attain business success.

5.5.1.3 Entrepreneurial Framework Conditions

Potential agripreneurs and practicing agripreneurs should ensure that they have access to a ready market for their products. This will safeguard their profit margins and thus augment their access to funding. There is also need for agripreneur to become strong members of agri-business associations in order to fully enjoy benefits.

5.5.2 Recommendation for Further Research

Further studies should be conducted on the determinants of the agripreneurs improved productivity. There is also need to investigate the determinants of an entrepreneur’s performance measured based on the increased ability to employ others. The influence of various combinations of socioeconomics on an agripreneur’s access to funding should be researched further. There is also need to study on a longitudinal basis, the long run effects of the technological absorptive capacity on an agripreneur’s ability to get funding.
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To whom it may concern
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RE: REQUEST OF PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC RESEARCH

I am a student at United States International University Africa (USIU-Africa) pursuing a Masters of Business Administration program. In partial fulfillment of my course work, I would like to conduct a research project to assess “DETERMINANTS OF AGRIPRENEUR’S BUSINESS SUCCESS: CASE OF POULTRY ENTERPRISES IN NAIROBI COUNTY.”

Therefore, kindly complete the attached questionnaire with as accurate information as possible. This research will be used entirely for academic purposes while observing utmost confidentiality.

Your assistance is highly appreciated. Thank you in advance.

Yours faithfully,

Janet Nakhayo Ojwang’.
APPENDIX IV: CHECKLIST

DETERMINANTS OF AGRIPRENEUR’S BUSINESS SUCCESS: A CASE OF POULTRY ENTERPRISES IN NAIROBI COUNTY

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Gender
   □ Male       □ Female

2. Age
   ___________________________________________

3. Highest Level of Education
   □ Primary    □ Secondary    □ Some College    □ University

4. What is your marital status?
   □ Single    □ Married    □ Widowed    □ Divorced    □ Separated

5. Where is your poultry located? __________________________
SECTION B: Socio-Economic Factors for Business Success for Agripreneurs

6. What is your current monthly sales in Kshs? _______________________

7. I get capital to run my business from:
   - Family Contribution □ Yes  □ No
   - Well Wishers □ Yes  □ No
   - Bank Loan □ Yes  □ No
   - Youth Fund □ Yes  □ No
   - Uwezo Fund □ Yes  □ No
   - NGO Grant □ Yes  □ No

8. What is your highest educational level?
   □ Primary  □ Secondary  □ Some College  □ University

9. State any other professional qualifications.

_____________________________________________________________

10. What is your gender?
   □ Male  □ Female
SECTION C: Capacity Building Factors for Business Success for Agripreneurs

11. How many training workshops in agribusiness have you attended?

12. Indicate (√ ) as appropriate to the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (Websites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (Facebook)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (Twitter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (Tv Programs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (E-Newsletters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (blogs/vlogs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (YouTube)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (Newspaper)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I follow an agribusiness program in (Radio)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Indicate (√ ) as appropriate to your enterprise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Do you own a smartphone?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do you own a computer/laptop?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do you have access to the internet?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do you use social media for your business?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Does your business have a Facebook account?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Does your business have a WhatsApp account?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Does your business have a website?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D: Entrepreneurial Framework Conditions

14. Indicate (✓) the extent to which you agree with the following statements (Strongly Agree-5, Agree-4, Neutral-3, Disagree-2, Strongly Disagree-1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I have access to electricity
2. I easily access water for farming
3. I have access to mobile network
4. The environment has a sewage/sanitation system
5. I easily access internet

15. Indicate (✓) as appropriate to your enterprise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you a member of an agri-business group online?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a ready market for my products.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>