

Assessment of youths' participation in agribusiness in Jigawa State, Nigeria

Gama, E. Nkwi*, Umar Mukhtar, Gabriel T. Ahungwa and Isa A. Ringim

Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, Federal University Dutse, Nigeria.

*Corresponding author. Email: gamaemmanuel@gmail.com/gamaemmanuel@fud.edu.ng. Tel: +2348145005143.

Copyright © 2025 Gama et al. This article remains permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Received 12th March 2025; Accepted 1st June 2025

ABSTRACT: The agricultural sector in Nigeria is a major driver of economic growth and poverty reduction, given that it contributes to GDP and provides a source of employment to the population. This study was carried out to explore youth participation in agribusiness by examining the factors influencing their engagement and challenges encountered. Using a multi-staged sampling procedure, 288 participants were randomly selected from 1135 entrepreneurs for the study. Respondents were selected from the four agricultural zones that make up Jigawa State based on the concentration of entrepreneurs in each zone. Data was analysed using descriptive statistics (mean, minimum, maximum, and percentage), Likert scale, and binary logistic regression models. Results showed that the participants were on average 31.2 years old; predominantly (81.6%) male; and the majority (74.3%) were married, with a mean household size of 4 members. About 66% of the participants were educated up to secondary level and had entrepreneurial experience of 16 years. The logistic regression results showed that agribusiness participation was negatively influenced by sex, marital status, household size, level of education, and high tax rate, and different types of taxes on the same commodity. The odds of an increase in one unit of these variables showed a decrease in participation in agribusiness. Constraints identified were high investment capital requirements, different operational taxes, fixed input costs, and inadequate marketing skills. The study concluded that the youth were mostly educated and, under the right conditions, could participate in extensive agribusinesses. It was recommended that capacity-building programmes be organised to improve the skills of the youth through workshops, conferences, and seminars. Robust agricultural policies should be implemented by ensuring adequate interaction with relevant stakeholders.

Keywords: Agribusiness, entrepreneurs, Jigawa State, youth participation.

INTRODUCTION

Agriculture and agribusiness account for nearly half of GDP in Africa. The agribusiness sector can portray the importance in terms of input supply, processing, marketing, and retailing that further add to GDP. The agribusiness sector is pivotal in that it contributes not only to employment generation but also to the development of the national income. It plays a part in the country's economic stability in the country. According to Chawki (2018), agriculture (and by extension, the agribusiness sector) will be a trillion-dollar industry in sub-Saharan Africa by 2030, highlighting its critical role in economic transformation. While agriculture alone accounts for 24% of GDP, agribusiness activities (input supply, processing,

marketing, and retailing) contribute about 20% to the Nigerian economy (FAO, 2022). As a result, the agribusiness sector presents opportunities that can alleviate not only the food needs of the country but, youth unemployment, as well as improve the livelihoods and food condition of the country. The annual rise in the rate of unemployment among the youths in Nigeria is increasing by the day, and therefore, is worrisome. Information from NGYouthSDGs (2024) puts the general unemployment rate at 33% of the total workforce in the country, with the youth (from 15-35 years) making up 70 million of the total population. The study further puts the national youth unemployment rate at over 40%, with variations across

states. Osabuohien *et al.* (2018) report that a population of 85 million people was employed in the agribusiness sector, 65% of this population was based in local communities, while 20% were involved in food processing, marketing, and other economic activities outside their local areas of residence. It has been shown that youth participation in agribusiness activities halts the youth unemployment rate in Nigeria (Fawole and Ozkan, 2019). This emphasises the importance of the agribusiness sector in providing livelihoods for millions and offers the potential to drive industrialisation and economic diversification.

With the increasing level of economic decline and attendant low economic performance, the Nigerian government has, over time, intended to boost the performance of food self-sufficiency. The government had introduced policies to stimulate the youth's interest in agribusiness. To achieve this objective, policies and projects were put in place to address some of the challenges encountered in the process of agribusiness practices. These programs and projects failed to encourage the youth to engage in agriculture and agribusiness activities. This shows that the probability of youth participation in agribusiness activities in the country is generally low (Uwa *et al.*, 2016). While many factors are responsible for the low participation of youths in agribusiness, access to finance stands out as an important factor.

Despite barriers to youth participation in agribusiness, youths can still be identified to engage at different levels within the agricultural enterprise, particularly the agribusiness sector. Examples abound of youths who developed innovative and alternative ideas, methods, approaches, and enterprises that will improve the agribusiness sector in aspects like production, cleaning, sorting, processing, various forms of value addition, storage, marketing, and distribution (Generation Africa, 2019). The agricultural sector provides much to the economy; however, youth participation in agribusiness is not adequate to harness the innovative potential and energy of young people. Increased adaptation to new technologies and entrepreneurial spirit can drive significant advancements in productivity and efficiency in the agribusiness sector. Low youth participation in the agribusiness sector may be occasioned by no access to land, inappropriate financing, and no possibility of training. There is an emerging trend, particularly among youth pioneers who show an emerging and distinct approach to youth participation in agribusiness, particularly in Jigawa state. Understanding the factors influencing participation provides a useful pointer on youth-transformative pathways for engagement and productive employment in the agribusiness sector.

The study aimed to provide actionable insights and recommendations for policy-makers, development organizations, the government, and participants to enhance youth participation in agribusiness, leading to sustainable agricultural development and economic growth. Specifically, the study: (i) describes the socioeconomic

factors influencing youths' participation in agribusiness activities, (ii) determines the factors influencing the participation of the respondents, and (iii) identifies the constraints affecting the participation of these youths.

METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted in Jigawa State. The state is located in northwestern Nigeria between latitudes 11°N and 13°N and longitudes 8°E and 10.15°E (Figure 1). The informal sector dominates economic activities and is made up primarily of agriculture, which characterises the economy as a significant economic activity. The population of Jigawa State is engaged in subsistence farming, while trade and commerce are undertaken on a small and medium scale, especially in agriculture, livestock, and consumer goods. Other economic activities are blacksmithing, leather, tailoring services, auto repairs, metal works, carpentry, tanning, dyeing, food processing, and masonry.

Sampling procedure and sample size

The multi-stage sampling procedure was used to select respondents for this study. The first stage involved a purposive selection of two Local Government Areas (LGAs) from each of the four agricultural zones that make up Jigawa State based on the concentration of youth entrepreneurs in the selected LGAs. The LGAs selected were Dutse and Kiyawa in Zone I, Gumel and Ringim in Zone II, Kazaure and Roni in Zone III, and Hadejia and Kirikasama in Zone IV, respectively. The second stage involved the purposive selection of 4 villages from each of the selected LGAs, giving a total of 32 villages. The third stage involved the random selection of 288 respondents from a population of 1135 youth entrepreneurs obtained from the FADAMA-III database of registered youths actively engaged in agricultural entrepreneurial activities (Table 1).

Primary data were used for the study. The data was collected by an interview schedule using a semi-structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to ensure the relevance of solicited information in achieving the study objectives. Specifically, data were collected on important variables that could be classified into demographic information, entrepreneurial activities, and agribusiness characteristics. The data used for the study were collected by trained enumerators.

Methods of data analysis

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyse the data. Specifically, the socioeconomic characteristics of youth entrepreneurs' options were analysed

Table 1. Sampling size selection of youth entrepreneurs.

| Agric Zones | LGAs | Villages | Sampling frame | Sample size |
|--------------------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Zone I | Dutse | Dutse | 50 | 13 |
| | | Chamo | 41 | 10 |
| | | Baranda | 34 | 9 |
| | | Kudaii | 36 | 9 |
| | Kiyawa | Andaza | 42 | 11 |
| | | Katanga | 28 | 7 |
| | | Kwadabe | 35 | 9 |
| | | Dungu | 40 | 10 |
| Zone II | Gumel | Danfarantama | 36 | 9 |
| | | Maidabara | 43 | 11 |
| | | Dan Amma | 24 | 6 |
| | | Nasarawa | 38 | 10 |
| | Ringim | Ringim | 48 | 12 |
| | | Zangon Kanya | 34 | 9 |
| | | Dabi | 38 | 10 |
| | | Sintimawa | 36 | 9 |
| Zone III | Kazaure | Farundaba | 28 | 7 |
| | | Gada | 31 | 8 |
| | | Tudun Wayo | 25 | 6 |
| | | Abujar galadanci | 26 | 7 |
| | Roni | Kagadama | 26 | 7 |
| | | Dansure | 40 | 10 |
| | | Ungwar Mani | 30 | 8 |
| | | Gora | 38 | 10 |
| Zone IV | Hadejia | Guducin | 42 | 11 |
| | | Aguyaka | 30 | 8 |
| | | Bariki | 46 | 12 |
| | | Mai Alkama | 42 | 11 |
| | Kirikasam | Kirikasama | 32 | 8 |
| | | Tarabu | 38 | 10 |
| | | Madaci | 28 | 7 |
| | | Tuwankalta | 30 | 8 |
| Grand Total | 8 | 32 | 1135 | 288 |

Source: Survey, 2024.

The results further revealed that 81.6% of the respondents were males, while 18.4% were females. A study by Akronga and Bekele (2022) explained that males outnumber females in agribusiness because women are more attracted to domestic tasks than farm work. The level of education showed that 66% attained up to secondary education, while 22.9% did not attend any formal education. Saeed *et al.* (2015) showed that entrepreneurship education enhances agribusiness decisions. It was concluded that education offers a level of exposure to agribusiness management, with a positive influence on an individual's willingness to exploit available agribusiness

opportunities. In some instances, well-educated youths may prefer white collar jobs to participation in agribusiness activities.

The results also revealed that 85.8% of respondents had household sizes from 1-6 members, with an average of 4 persons. The table further revealed that 56.9% members belonged to agricultural cooperatives, while 61.5% had no contact with extension agents. This implies that more respondents will not access agribusiness services, given the limited access to extension services. On access to credit, 57.3% had no access. This could be explained by a lack of collateral and a tedious application process.

Table 2. Distribution of respondents based on socioeconomic characteristics.

| Variable | Frequency | Percentage | Min | Max | Mean |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|-----|-----|------|
| Age (years) | | | | | |
| 19-29 | 94 | 32.6 | | | |
| 30-39 | 166 | 57.6 | 19 | 41 | 31.2 |
| 40-49 | 28 | 9.8 | | | |
| Sex | | | | | |
| Male | 235 | 81.6 | | | |
| Female | 53 | 18.4 | | | |
| Marital Status | | | | | |
| Single | 74 | 25.7 | | | |
| Married | 214 | 74.3 | | | |
| Level of Education | | | | | |
| Non-Formal | 66 | 22.9 | | | |
| Primary | 32 | 11.1 | | | |
| Secondary | 57 | 19.8 | | | |
| Tertiary | 133 | 46.2 | | | |
| Household size | | | | | |
| 01-06 | 247 | 85.8 | | | |
| 07-12 | 38 | 13.2 | 1 | 16 | 4 |
| 13-18 | 3 | 1.0 | | | |
| Farming experience (years) | | | | | |
| 04-14 | 176 | 61.1 | | | |
| 15-24 | 87 | 30.2 | 5 | 25 | 16 |
| 25-34 | 25 | 8.7 | | | |
| Cooperative Membership | | | | | |
| Member | 164 | 56.9 | | | |
| Non-member | 124 | 43.1 | | | |
| Extension contacts | | | | | |
| Contact | 111 | 38.5 | | | |
| No Contact | 177 | 61.5 | | | |
| Access to credit | | | | | |
| Access | 123 | 42.7 | | | |
| No Access | 165 | 57.3 | | | |

Source: Field Survey (2024).

Factors affecting youth participation in agribusiness activities

Table 3 shows binary logistics results of factors affecting youths' participation in agribusiness activities. The coefficient for age of respondents was negative and had a significant ($p < 0.01$) effect on youths' participation in agribusiness activities. The negative coefficient shows that

as age increased by one year (estimate = -1.264, $p < 0.01$), the odds (probability) of increased participation by the youths in agribusiness activities decreased by 0.282. This shows that an increase in age is associated with a lower chance that entrepreneurs engage in agribusiness enterprises. The results are expected, given that young entrepreneurs are ready to take more risks by trying out various agribusiness activities, unlike the elderly, who

Table 3. Binary Logistic Regression.

| Variables | B | S. E | P-Value | Odd Ratio |
|--|-----------|-------|---------|-----------|
| Age (years) | -1.264*** | 0.019 | 0.00 | 0.282 |
| Sex (dummy) | -0.015 | 0.391 | 0.42 | 0.985 |
| Marital status | -0.559* | 0.334 | 0.09 | 0.572 |
| Household size (number) | -0.069* | 0.040 | 0.08 | 0.933 |
| Years of experience (years) | 0.025 | 0.020 | 0.20 | 1.026 |
| Membership in cooperative associations | -0.200 | 0.290 | 0.49 | 0.819 |
| Years of education (years) | -0.066*** | 0.022 | 0.00 | 0.936 |
| Access to credit (dummy) | 0.342 | 0.284 | 0.22 | 1.408 |
| The volume of credit or grant received | 0.002 | 0.082 | 0.74 | 0.018 |
| Extension visits per year | -0.006 | 0.076 | 0.93 | 0.994 |
| Model statistics | | | | |
| Cox & Snell estimate | 0.548 | | | |
| Nagelkerke estimate | 0.301 | | | |
| Model chi-square (df 8) | 274.11** | | | |

Source: Field Survey, 2024; n = 288***p<0.01 **p<0.05 *p<0.

prefer activities whose results are known. However, Mullu obtained positive results and opined that the more years of age of the respondents would significantly contribute to youth participation in agribusiness.

The coefficient for marital status was -0.559, showing that a change in marital status from single to married was associated with the odds (probability) that youth entrepreneurs engaged less in agribusiness activities. The p-value was 0.09, showing a weakly significant result at the 10% ($P<0.01$) level. The odds ratio of 0.572 showed that a change in marital status was associated with the probability of a reduction in agribusiness activities by the entrepreneurs. This may be explained by the need to spend more on family upkeep by supporting their families financially and building their careers, leaving less resources for investment in agribusiness. Adeyanju *et al.* (2021) had positive results and explained in terms of participation to improve the welfare of the family.

The coefficient for household size was -0.069 and was significant at the 10% level. The odds ratio of 0.282 indicates that a unit increase in household size will reduce the odds (probability) of youth entrepreneurs engaged in agribusiness activities by 0.282. As household size increases, more resources are required for family upkeep, taking up resources that could have been used for agribusiness activities. Boye *et al.* (2024) in their study on youth engagement in agribusiness observed that household size had positive effects. They opined that a larger household size will participate in agribusiness activities to improve the family welfare.

The coefficient for years of education was negative (-0.066) and significant at the 1% level. This shows that if the years in education increase by a unit, the probability that youth entrepreneurs undertake agribusiness activities decreases. The odds ratio of 0.936 indicates that a unit

increase in years of education reduces the odds of participation in agribusiness activities. While education increases, many youths develop an interest in white-collar jobs rather than agribusiness activities. Mullu (2023) had positive results and explained that education in agribusiness enables the perception of society towards agribusiness and transforms the sector to a lucrative entity.

Constraints militating against agribusiness development in Jigawa State

The result of constraints encountered by youths in an attempt to participate in agribusiness activities is presented in Table 4. The various attributes were rated in a 4-point Likert-scale-type question as Very Severe (VS), Moderately Severe (MS), Less Severe (LS), and Not Severe (NS). The high percentage for each series revealed its importance concerning participation to agribusiness activities (Nwaiwu and Udenwa, 2022). The results showed that high capital required for investment, high cost of fixed assets, no grants to boost access to agribusiness, and low access to institutional credits were very severe in limiting access to agribusiness activities. A study by Adigun *et al.* (2017) on youths' participation in agricultural production as a panacea to agribusiness development had similar results and encouraged financial institutions to make credits available to youths interested in agricultural activities at low interest rates. A further analysis shows that poor extension services, inadequate skills, poor market control, and poor access to agribusiness processing equipment and improved transportation equipment were moderately severe in influencing access to agribusiness activities. Abdullahi *et*

Table 4. Constraints to entrepreneurship activities among youth in Jigawa State.

| Constraint | Severity | Frequency | Percent |
|---|----------|-----------|---------|
| High investment capital requirement | VS | 147 | 51.04 |
| | MS | 110 | 38.19 |
| | LS | 22 | 7.64 |
| | NS | 9 | 3.13 |
| Poor extension service | VS | 82 | 28.47 |
| | MS | 135 | 46.88 |
| | LS | 53 | 18.40 |
| | NS | 18 | 6.25 |
| High costs of fixed assets | VS | 144 | 50.00 |
| | MS | 106 | 36.81 |
| | LS | 32 | 11.11 |
| | NS | 6 | 2.08 |
| Inadequate skills | VS | 62 | 21.53 |
| | MS | 150 | 52.08 |
| | LS | 55 | 19.10 |
| | NS | 21 | 7.29 |
| Labour requirement for agribusiness tasks | VS | 104 | 36.11 |
| | MS | 142 | 49.31 |
| | LS | 35 | 12.51 |
| | NS | 7 | 2.43 |
| Poor market control | VS | 72 | 25.00 |
| | MS | 113 | 39.24 |
| | LS | 80 | 27.78 |
| | NS | 23 | 7.99 |
| No grants from the government or NGOs | VS | 130 | 45.14 |
| | MS | 71 | 24.65 |
| | LS | 54 | 18.75 |
| | NS | 33 | 11.44 |
| Poor entrepreneurial skills | VS | 80 | 27.78 |
| | MS | 122 | 42.36 |
| | LS | 58 | 20.14 |
| | NS | 28 | 9.72 |
| Lack of access to processing and transportation | VS | 73 | 25.35 |
| | MS | 100 | 34.72 |
| | LS | 92 | 31.94 |
| | NS | 23 | 7.99 |
| Poor access to institutional credit | VS | 137 | 47.57 |
| | MS | 70 | 24.31 |
| | LS | 50 | 17.36 |
| | NS | 31 | 10.76 |
| Multiple taxations | VS | 51 | 17.91 |
| | MS | 81 | 28.47 |
| | LS | 91 | 32.04 |
| | NS | 61 | 21.53 |

VS = very severe, MS = moderately severe, LS = less severe, NS = not severe (**Source:** Author analysis, 2024).

al. (2023) had similar results and recommended community-driven development through empowerment programmes. Multiple taxation was perceived as less severe in restricting participation in agribusiness activities.

This was premised on the fact that transportation of agricultural inputs was taxed by different LGAs on transit in addition to finished commodities and services that pay for value-added tax.

Conclusion

The study was conducted to assess youths' participation in agribusiness. The results showed that the average age of the farmers was 31.2 years. The respondents were mostly male, while 74.3% were married. Further analysis showed that 66% attained up to secondary education, and the mean household size of the respondents was 4 persons, and a farming experience of 16 years. While about half of the respondents belonged to a cooperative society, 61.5% did not have access to extension services, and 57.3% had no access to credit. Results of binary logistic regression to determine the factors influencing the level of participation in agribusiness activities showed that age, marital status, household size, and years of education were significant, but negatively influenced participation to agribusiness activities. The negative coefficient shows that as these variables increase by one unit, the odds (probability) of increased involvement of the youths in agribusiness activities decrease. On factors affecting participation in agribusiness by youths in the study area, high investment capital requirements, high cost of fixed assets, inadequate grants from NGOs, and poor access to credit were identified as severe factors. Further analysis showed that poor extension services, inadequate skills, poor labour requirement, poor market control, low entrepreneurial skills, poor processing and transportation were moderately severe in limiting youths' participation to agribusiness activities. Multiple taxation was less severe in influencing youths' participation.

Addressing these constraints will leverage opportunities and strengthen the agribusiness sector. Collaborative efforts should be established between the public and private sectors to drive economic growth. This could be achieved by integrating youth-oriented activities like education, soft loans, appropriate skills, modern equipment, and a reduction of some taxes, especially on agricultural inputs. Government policy should be directed toward the establishment of infrastructure, like rural roads, as well as strengthening the extension services.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, M. Y., Balogun, B. I., & Jibrin, A. (2023). Assessment of youth empowerment programme as a viable policy for rural agrarian community development in Katsina State, Nigeria. *Gusau Journal of Economics and Development Studies*, 3(1), 1-17.
- Adeyanju, D., Mburu, J., & Mignouna, D. (2021). Youth agricultural entrepreneurship: Assessing the impact of agricultural training programmes on performance. *Sustainability*, 13(4), 1697.
- Adigun, G. T., Bamiro, O. M., & Oyetoki, A. (2017). Youths' participation in agricultural production in Oyo State: Panacea to agribusiness development in Nigeria. *Conference Proceedings of the 3rd Annual National Conference of The Nigerian Association of Agricultural Economists, held at Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria*, 16 ~ 19th October.
- Akronga, R., & Bekele, H. K. (2022). Economic analysis of youth participation in entrepreneurship in Benin, *Heliyon*, 8(2022), e08738.
- Boye, M., Ghafoor, A., Wudil, A. H., Usman, M., Prus, P., Feher, A., & Sass, R. (2024). Youth engagement in agribusiness: perception, constraints, and skill training interventions in Africa: A systematic review. *Sustainability*, 16(3), 1096.
- Chawki, C. (2018). *Africa agribusiness, a US\$1 trillion business by 2030*. African. Development Bank Group Newsletter.
- Fawole, W. O., & Ozkan, B. (2019). Examining the willingness of youths to participate in agriculture to halt the rising rate of unemployment in Southwestern Nigeria. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 46(3): 578-590.
- Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) (2022). Agricultural production statistics. 2000–2020. FAOSTAT analytical brief series 41. Rome: FAO; 2022.
- Generation Africa (2019). A landscape study: Youth Enterprise in AgriFood Systems. Nairobi.
- Mullu, L. M. (2023). *Factors influencing the participation of youth in agribusiness in Kiambu and Machakos Towns in Kenya*. Doctoral dissertation, Strathmore University. Retrieved from <https://su-plus.strathmore.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/f630f4e1-6264-4b05-986f-d03f56ea3c1b/content>.
- Network of Youth for Sustainable Initiative (NGYouthSDGs) (2024). Addressing youth unemployment in Nigeria: Policy brief. Retrieved from <https://nigerianyouthsdgs.org/yal/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Addressing-Youth-Unemployment-In-Nigeria>.
- Nwaiwu, J. C., & Udenwa, N. B. (2022). Analysis of the constraints faced by rural women farmers in vegetable production in south-east Nigeria. *International Journal of Agriculture and Earth Science*, 8(4), 53-67.
- Obisesan, A. A. (2019). What drives youth participation and labour demand in agriculture? Evidence from rural Nigeria. *Invited paper presented at the 6th African Conference of Agricultural Economists*, September 23-26, 2019, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Olugbola, S. A. (2017). Exploring entrepreneurial readiness of youth and startup success components: Entrepreneurship training as a moderator. *Journal of Innovative Knowledge*. 2017(2), 155-171.
- Osabuohien, E., Efobi, U., Olayiwola, W., & Beecroft, I. (2018). FDI, employment, and poverty reduction in developing countries: Does governance matter? In: *Institutional frameworks and realities* (pp. 63-89), Springer.
- Saeed, S., Yousafzai, S., Yani-De-Soriano, M., & Muffatto, M. (2018). The role of perceived university support in the formation of students' entrepreneurial intention. In *Sustainable entrepreneurship* (pp. 3-23). Routledge.
- Uwa, O. G., Chuke, P. I., & Elton, M. E. (2016). Youth unemployment and insecurity: Impediment of nation building in Nigeria. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(12), 16-20.