Volume 22 Issue 47
Originally issued as H7

Global Journal of human-social science: H Interdisciplinary
Volume 22 Issue 7 Version 1.0 Year 2022
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460x & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Agribusiness Entrepreneurs and their Market Share

By Dr. Bilal Ahmad Sheikh, Dr. Yamini Raut, Dr. F.A. Shaheen, Dr. Omer Fayaz Khan & Dr. Imran Mehraj Dar

Abstract- Agribusiness venture has huge function in the economy to foster rural development in the nation. The current agribusiness venture in UT of Jammu and Kashmir is mainly in the nature of food processing units. They have implications on food security and essential necessities of human beings. The present study aims at recognizing qualities, shortcomings, opportunities, and threats for agribusiness ventures with economic and financial perspectives in UT of Jammu and Kashmir to capture market share. The article also proposes sufficient agribusiness entrepreneurship Characteristics, for example, Company image and Product Quality for tending to factors that obstruct the development and improvement of agribusiness entrepreneurship in Jammu and Kashmir. Hence, based on the survey data generated through 130 Agribusiness entrepreneurs where analyzed and the corresponding implications and Suggestions are discussed in the work.

Keywords: *SWOT analysis, agri-business and agri-entrepreneurship, income and growth.*

GJHSS-H Classification: *DDC Code: 657.3 LCC Code: HF5681.B2*



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:

© 2022. Dr. Bilal Ahmad Sheikh, Dr. Yamini Raut, Dr. F. A. Shaheen, Dr. Omer Fayaz Khan & Dr. Imran Mehraj Dar. This research/ review article is distributed under the terms of the Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). You must give appropriate credit to authors and reference this article if parts of the article are reproduced in any manner. Applicable licensing terms are at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

Agribusiness Entrepreneurs and their Market Share

Dr. Bilal Ahmad Sheikh [α], Dr. Yamini Raut [σ], Dr. F.A. Shaheen [ρ], Dr. Omer Fayaz Khan [Ѡ] & Dr. Imran Mehraj Dar [¥]

Abstract- **Agribusiness venture has huge function in the economy to foster rural development in the nation. The current agribusiness venture in UT of Jammu and Kashmir is mainly in the nature of food processing units. They have implications on food security and essential necessities of human beings. The present study aims at recognizing qualities, shortcomings, opportunities, and threats for agribusiness ventures with economic and financial perspectives in UT of Jammu and Kashmir to capture market share. The article also proposes sufficient agribusiness entrepreneurship Characteristics, for example, Company image and Product Quality for tending to factors that obstruct the development and improvement of agribusiness entrepreneurship in Jammu and Kashmir. Hence, based on the survey data generated through 130 Agribusiness entrepreneurs where analyzed and the corresponding implications and Suggestions are discussed in the work.**

Keywords: SWOT analysis, agri-business and agri-entrepreneurship, income and growth.

I. Introduction to Agribusiness

Agribusiness is a wide idea used to portray corporate agricultural endeavors independently and aggregately. Agribusinesses are organizations engaged with at least one phases of the creation of harvests and livestock (Mugonola and Baliddawa, 2014). The expression "agribusiness" was coined during the 1950s by John Herbert Davis and Ray A. Goldberg to focus the two-way relationship among financial specialists and agribusiness ventures as the dual roles of suppliers and buyers (Wortman, 1990). Firms that serve agribusiness depend on farmers for their business sectors and for a portion of their provisions (Yessentemirova et al., 2019). Anyway, in the mid nineteenth century, agribusiness was an independent industry. The typical farm family delivered its own food, fuel, shelter, draft animals, feed, devices and clothing, only a couple of necessities had to be bought off the farm Klerkx and Leeuwis (2008).The farm family performed all purposes and all tasks relating to the creation, handling, stockpiling, and distribution of farm commodities. In the resulting years, however, agriculture advanced from self sufficiency to intricate relationship with different sections of the economy, especially those identifying with the assembling of creation supplies, handling and circulation of food and fiber items (Escalante and Turvey, 2006).while as agribusiness comprises of a several million farm units and a few thousand business units, each an autonomous entities, allowed to settle their own choices. Agribusiness is the sum total of thousands of trade Associations many exchange affiliations, farm associations, semi research bodies and councils, each focusing on their own advantages (Gielen et al., 2003). The U.S. government likewise is a part of agribusiness to the extent that it is engaged with research, the guideline of food and fiber activities, and the possession and exchanging of farm commodities and having colleges and universities with their teaching and experimental stations, and extension capacities from another areas of agribusiness (Gielen et al., 2003). Agribusiness exists in a huge mosaic of decentralized substances, capacities, and activities identifying with food and fiber (Gielen et al., 2003). Subsequently the advancement from farming to agribusiness has carried with it various advantages, these incorporate creation of new jobs due to agribusiness Saiymova (2018). The creation of farm jobs has been the reason for the nation's monetary development and advancement throughout the previous 150 years, and is indirectly responsible for increment of national income of any nation (Gielen et al., 2003).

a) Agribusiness and Society

Agribusiness incorporates all the exercises inside the agricultural food and natural recourse industry engaged with the creation of food and fiber. Individual agribusinesses may offer things to farmers for production; offer types of assistance to other agribusiness organizations; that are to be engaged with the advertising, transportation, handling, and distribution of agricultural products. Agricultural services are of significant worth to the client or purchaser (Senker and Faulkner, 2001). Agribusiness sector likewise provide food clothing and shelter in addition agribusiness gives jobs to a large number of individuals in science, research, engineering, government agencies, commodity organizations and trade organizations. Agribusiness relates to general society and private areas (Nwibo & Okorie, 2013). The public area is the financial and managerial elements of managing the conveyance of products and ventures by and for the public authority (Wortman, 1990). The private area is the area of the economy related with private benefit and isn't constrained by government (Wortman, 1990).

Corresponding Author α ¥: Lecturer Government Degree College Anantnag Jammu and Kashmir. e-mail: bilalsheikhphd@gmail.com
Author ρ Ѡ: School of Argi Economics and Horti Business management SKUAST Kashmir.
Author σ: Assistant Manager, RKVY RAFTAAR Division of Argi Economics and Agri Business Management SKUAST Jammu.

© 2022 Global Journals

b) The Scope of Agribusiness

Agriculture is the establishment of civilization, cultivation of different agricultural commodities for agricultural purposes permitted farmers to settle in villages instead of comfortable cities and towns. Agribusiness has played a significant role in the development of national and international levels (Rivotti et al., 2019).

c) Local Economies

Agriculture is a generous contributor of local economies, monetary yield and worth added financial effects can be generous (Herliana et al., 2018). Important non-conventional financial impacts of local agriculture are made through the travel industry, wild life viewing, fisheries, and entertainment. Numerous individuals are occupied with regular work tied directly or by indirectly to agricultural activities (Smagulova et al., 2018). Rural Agricultural land and agribusinesses pay taxes to support government in day today activities Saiymova (2018). Hence, the huge amount of taxes paid by different agribusiness activities to local economies in India leads to the development of local economies

d) State Economies

Agriculture is probably the biggest business in numerous states. The farming business creates huge money receipts inside most states and provides numerous jobs Smagulova et al. (2018). In addition, agriculture has an enormous monetary multiplier impact, so it contributes positively to different areas of the economy (Yessentemirova et al., 2019). Hence, the huge amount of taxes paid by different agribusiness activities to state economies in India, creation of business activities and creation jobs by different agribusiness activities leads to the development of State economies in India

e) World Economy

For a significant part of the total world's population, agriculture is a subsistence activity. Around 90% of the food cultivated on the planet is consumed through in the nation producing it (Saiymova, 2017). However, trade of agricultural merchandise on a worldwide basis has expanded. Trade brings down expenses of rural products and extends choices. Trade, alongside with aid and innovation, can expand agricultural part in the worldwide economy, bringing about more prominent food security, financial turn of events, and ecological supportability (Smagulova et al., 2018). Hence, globalization of Agribusiness products leads to development of World Economy.

II. Objectives of the Study

To Study the characteristics leading Agribusiness entrepreneurs to increase their market share.

a) Hypothesis

$H_o(1)$: There is no statistical association between Agribusiness entrepreneurs product quality offered and Market Growth expectations in near future.

$H_o(2)$: There is no statistical association between Agribusiness entrepreneurs Brand Name and Agribusiness dealers Market Growth expectations in near future.

III. Materials and Methods

In order to ensure that the researcher responds to the research problem, a detailed description of the procedures and methods used to carry out the research is explained systematically. This portion provides descriptions of study design, sampling technique, variables and their analytical estimation, data collection instruments, data collection methods employed and statistical tests used to analyze data.

a) Geographic location

The present study is carried in Anantnag, Shopian Baramulla and Ganderbal districts of Kashmir valley, the sampling design adopted in the study was Stratified random sampling technique.

b) Sampling Design

Stratified sampling is based on grouping units into subpopulations called strata and then using a hierarchical structure of units within each stratum.

c) Sample size

The present study is carried in Anantnag, Shopian Baramulla and Ganderbal districts of Kashmir valley 150 questionnaires were circulated. The filled up response were collected successfully from 140 respondents, however from collected 140 responses 130 responses were valid and 10 responses were incomplete and hence eliminated from the current study. Hence the sample size for the present work is treated as 130 Respondents.

d) Respondents

Population using Agribusiness Products (Corn, soybeans, dairy products/milk, broilers, hogs, miscellaneous crops, wheat, chicken eggs, and hay) in their day today life.

e) Agribusiness entrepreneurs

Agribusiness dealers dealing with Corn, soybeans, dairy products/milk, broilers, hogs, miscellaneous crops, wheat, chicken eggs, and hay

f) Survey Instrument and Data collection

The present study utilizes primary data for addressing the specific objectives of the study. The primary data for the present study were collected through questionnaire, containing general demographic data, education level and information concerning income and growth expectations.

© 2022 Global Journals

IV. SWOT Analysis of Agribusiness

SWOT is precise information that can be used to make a strong activity plan for tending to a shortcoming and dangers, and emphatically exploiting your qualities and openings (Schenck and Gangrened, 2013). It is difficult to precisely outline business' future without first assessing it from all points, which incorporates an exhaustive look at all inside and outer assets and threats (Taylor, 2013), so this examination prompts business mindfulness and the foundation of any effective key arrangement and also proposes sufficient agribusiness entrepreneurship strategies, for example, price adjustment strategy and programmers for tending to factors that obstruct the development and improvement of agribusiness entrepreneurship in India.

V. Results and Discussions

Table 1: Strength, weakness opportunities and threats of Agribusiness entrepreneurship in India

Strength	Weakness
• Huge natural recourses • Suitable geographical conditions • Availability of Raw material • Strong traditional knowledge • Large domestic as well as International demand	• Financial problems • Lack of professional management • Limited access to technologies • Dependence on climatic conditions • Lack of proper infrastructure facilities
Opportunity	**Threats**
• Value addition • Increasing market demand for Agricultural products • Employment generations • Proper utilization of natural recourses	• Unorganized market • High competition • Price Fluctuations • High cast of infrastructure

Computed from Secondary data by analysis of different reviews

a) Inference of SWOT Analysis

i. *Internal*

India is one of the flexible nations on the planet where numbers of huge natural recourses are available. Every natural asset giving a possibility to set up new agro based venture in the country. It prompts to undertake an attempt to establish agribusiness venture in rural region (Saparaliyev et al., 2019).Also India has a wealthy natural resources for fitting geological conditions for Agriculture creation where tremendous agriculture production is possible (Wortman, 1990). Agro based firms predominantly depend on farming yields so it is one of the significant qualities of the agribusiness venture to the extent its advancement are thought of (Saparaliyev et al., 2019). Anyway crude material is the fundamental contributions for getting an end result for agribusiness venture. India is delivering enormous agribusiness items, which become the crude material for agro exercises Saiymova (2018).India is additionally ready to trade its item in the worldwide market. Agribusiness venture can procure an important unfamiliar trade, which will reinforce public economy. Consequently Agribusiness venture in India has a solid conventional information, which is permeated from the generations to generations, which is giving contributions to the skill in assembling like craftsman's industry, material industry, cashew industry, handicraft industry and so forth Saiymova (2018).Also agribusiness venture in India produces additional employment in rural areas and this opportunity may help an individual from poor family and helps in reducing the poverty by providing income sources for day to day lives. Agriculture venture Creation has an enormous demand in the homegrown market (Wortman, 1990). Huge homegrown market demand is making an alternate point of view for agribusiness venture it is viewed as one of the significant positive parts of this industry Saiymova (2018).

b) Agribusiness business in India has a few shortcomings, which are talked about beneath

Infrastructure is the significant component, which is important to be considered deliberately. If there should arise an occurrence of the agribusiness venture outcomes in India, foundation isn't satisfactory like street, transportation, banks, media communications etc the same is counted as shortcoming in agribusiness sector Saiymova (2017). Anyway the export procedures are exceptionally complicated as export procedures require additional time that may make issues for agribusiness venture, like wise it needs to complete various kinds of customs it requires additional time and efforts for them (Saparaliyev et al., 2019). Utilization of innovation and technology increases the production of the organization with the ease and time, however the expense of present day innovation and technology is exceptionally high which isn't affordable to small and

© 2022 Global Journals

medium agribusiness ventures, there the high price of modern technology and innovation is become the shortcoming (Herliana et al., 2018).

c) *External Factors*

Agribusiness business venture is the significant component in the provincial economy of the India. These agribusiness industries especially have the accompanying chances; initially just neighbourhood market was accessible for agribusiness ventures however at present market range has expanded. It isn't essential agribusiness venture is depend just to the neighbourhood market it tends to move outside market (Herliana et al., 2018). Anyway the rural industry can make esteem expansion item like reprocessing on milk, reprocessing on sugar and so on (Saparaliyev et al., 2019). This is zone where agribusiness venture has considered large open doors likewise agribusiness ventures can create more employment in the rural areas of a country, this may likewise considered as one of the opportunities for agribusiness entrepreneurship in India (Yessentemirova et al., 2019).India is rich with natural assets, to use the proper natural assets is huge opportunities for agribusiness ventures.

d) *The accompanying variables are making threats for agribusiness entrepreneurship*

Agribusiness entrepreneurships are facing the worldwide rivalry; it is hard to agribusiness entrepreneurships to maintain a business in the high competitive zone with the position of safety (Herliana et al., 2018). For the most part, agribusiness venture is having little capital in the remote zone of the nation so it is hard to face the huge organizations (Yessentemirova et al., 2019).while as it is exceptionally hard to establish the efficient market for agribusiness item; good market is the essential to have the fitting cost for the end result. Issue of the marketing is viewed as one of the significant threat for agribusiness business (Senker and Faulkner, 2001) anyway to maintain the economical development of any industry good trade practices are essential. If there should arise an occurrence of agribusiness with absence of good trade practices like quality of products, weight, packaging and so forth are making the issue of this industry (Herliana et al., 2018), also because of the price variances it is hard to maintain pricing technique some time organization may have losses, these losses agro based industry couldn't bear, thus this factor making the threat for agribusiness business venture (Herliana et al., 2018). Henceforth the expense of present day innovation is in every case high it is hard to buy new technology for little association in India (Saparaliyev et al., 2019). The significant expenses of machineries are making dangers for the agribusiness venture in India (Herliana et al., 2018).

VI.

Table 2: ANNOVA results with multiple comparisons for Product Quality-(factor of purchase) of Agribusiness Products and Age of Respondents.

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Product Quality	Between Groups	17.873	3	5.958	3.636	0.015
	Within Groups	190.093	116	1.639		
	Total	207.967	119			
Multiple Comparisons						
LSD						
Dependent Variable	(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)		Std. Error	Sig.
Product Quality	25-34	35-44	0.053		0.321	0.869
		45-55	-0.661*		0.308	0.034
		55 & above	-0.861*		0.355	0.017
	35-44	25-34	-0.053		0.321	0.869
		45-55	-0.714*		0.319	0.027
		55 & above	-0.914*		0.364	0.013
	45-55	25-34	0.661*		0.308	0.034
		35-44	0.714*		0.319	0.027
		55 & above	-0.200		0.353	0.572
	55 & above	25-34	0.861*		0.355	0.017
		35-44	0.914*		0.364	0.013
		45-55	0.200		0.353	0.572

*Note: *Significance level 0.05*

Source: Authors' estimation

© 2022 Global Journals

The variation in the *Product Quality-(factor of purchase) of Agribusiness Products and Age of Respondents* is defined in hypothesis-1, taken up and its results are shown in table-2 as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized.

From the details provided in table-2, it can be inferred that the variations in the quality of a product between Age group of 25-34 and 45-55 are found to be significant at 5 percent level, similarly the variations in the quality of a product between Age group of 25-34 and 55 & above are found to be significant at 5 percent level. Also, the variations in the quality of a product between Age group of 35-44 and 45-55 are found to be significant at 5 percent level, while as the variations in the quality of a product between Age group of 35-44 and 55 & above are also found to be significant at 5 percent level. However, the variations in the quality of a product between Age group of 25-34 and 35-44 are not found to be significant at 5 percent level, similarly the variations in the quality of a product between Age group of 45-55 and 55 & above are found to be significant at 5 percent level.

a)

Table-3: Results of ANOVA for hypothesis-1

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Brand Name	Between Groups	8.240	3	2.747	1.630	0.186
	Within Groups	195.460	116	1.685		
	Total	203.700	119			
Multiple Comparisons						
LSD						
Dependent Variable	**(I) Age**	**(J) Age**	**Mean Difference (I-J)**		**Std. Error**	**Sig.**
Brand Name	25-34	35-44	-.143		.325	0.661
		45-55	-.191		.313	0.543
		55 & above	-.772*		.360	0.034
	35-44	25-34	.143		.325	0.661
		45-55	-.048		.323	0.883
		55 & above	-.629		.369	0.091
	45-55	25-34	.191		.313	0.543
		35-44	.048		.323	0.883
		55 & above	-.581		.358	0.108
	55 & above	25-34	.772*		.360	0.034
		35-44	.629		.369	0.091
		45-55	.581		.358	0.108

Computed from Primary Data
*Note: *Significance level 0.05 Source: Authors' estimation*

The variation in the *Brand Name -(factor of purchase) of Agribusiness Products and Age of Respondents* is defined in hypothesis-2, taken up and its results are shown in table-3 as an outcome of one way ANOVA model conceptualized.

Age group of respondents was categorized into four groups such as 25-34, 35-44, 45-55 and 55 & above for identifying variations in Company's name that influence respondents *Brand Name -(factor of purchase).* From the results of this one way ANOVA model as shown in table-1, it can be inferred that the F value of 1.630 corresponding to Brand Name that influence respondents *Brand Name -(factor of purchase)* decision between different Age groups of respondents such as 25-34, 35-44, 45-55 and 55 & above are not found to be significant at 5 percent level. Hence hypothesis-2 is accepted at 5 percent level of significance. This result clearly shows that there are no significant variations between different Age group of respondents and Company's name that influence respondents *Brand Name - (factor of purchase).*

© 2022 Global Journals

i. *Table 4:* Results of the regression for hypothesis 3rd

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	F	Adjusted R Square
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	17.605	0.760		23.180*	127.064*	0.50
	Product Quality	0.035	0.012	0.094	2.954*		
	Brand Name	0.042	0.012	0.114	3.424*		
	Product satisfaction	0.215	0.020	0.351	10.546*		

*Dependent Variable: Behaviour of respondents; *Significant at 5 percent level;*
Source: Computed from primary data

From the results it can be inferred that the F value of 127.064 is found to be significant at 5 percent level and hence hypothesis-3 is rejected. These results suggest that Behavioural Intention leading respondents to buy Agribusiness products depends on Product Quality, Brand Name and Product satisfaction (customer satisfaction after the usage of products).

Further the adjusted R Square value of 0.5 from the table-4 indicates that 50 percent of such Behavioural Intention to buy Agribusiness products is contributed by Product Quality, Brand Name and Product satisfaction (customer satisfaction after the usage of products). The t values of 2.954, 3.424, and 10.546 corresponding to Product Quality, Brand Name and Product satisfaction (customer satisfaction after the usage of products), are found to be having significant effects on model conceived. More specifically Product satisfaction is found to be having significant superior effect on Behavioural Intention to buy Agribusiness products with a higher t value of 10.546 and Brand name is found to be having next significant effect on Behavioural Intention to buy Agribusiness products with a second higher t value of 3.424. Also, Product Quality is found to be having significant effect on behavioural Intention to buy Agribusiness products with a least significant t value of 2.954.

b) Findings

1. *Product Quality-(factor of purchase) of Agribusiness Products and Age of Respondents,* Specifically age group of 25 to 34 years and 45-55 years differs in their factor of *Product Quality-(factor of purchase) of Agribusiness Products and Age of Respondents.* Similarly, age group of 25 to 34 years and 55 and above years differs in their factor of *Product Quality-(factor of purchase) of Agribusiness Products and Age of Respondents* such as Product quality. Also, age group of 35 to 44 years and 45-55 years differs in their factor of purchase such as Product quality. In same manner age group of 35 to 44 years and 55 and above years differs in their factor of purchase such as Product quality.
2. Further from the mean it is found that 45 to 55 age group has better purchase experience regarding *Product Quality-(factor of purchase) of Agribusiness Products* than 25 to 34 years. Similarly 45 to 55 age group has better *Product Quality-(factor of purchase) experience of Agribusiness Products* than 34-44 years. Also, 55 and above age group has better purchase experience regarding quality of *Agribusiness Products* than 25-34years. In the same manner age group of 55 and above has better purchase experience regarding quality of pesticides than 45-55years.
3. *Brand Name - (factor of purchase)* decision between different Age groups of respondents such as 25-34, 35-44, 45-55 and 55 & above are not found to be significant. Hence, no variations were reported and we explored that brand name of Agribusiness products does not influence any age group of respondents to purchase certain Agri products.

VII. Implications

1. *The major implications of this study are to* create agribusiness entrepreneurship as a significant device to change rural economy of Jammu and Kashmir. Current circumstance of agribusiness entrepreneurship has incredible qualities and more opportunities in the competitive business climate. Hence, agribusiness entrepreneurs should serve their customers with quality of products rather than brand name
2. UT of Jammu and Kashmir has to be increased the agribusiness production according to demands of the agro based industry at the large extent with the quality. It requires making the exploration on various parts of agribusiness venture models.

VIII. Conclusion

It is important to create agribusiness entrepreneurship as a significant device to change rural economy of Jammu and Kashmir. Current circumstance of agribusiness entrepreneurship has incredible qualities and more opportunities in the competitive business climate. While as, the Jammu and Kashmir has some shortcoming and the threats, which are important to dispose of with cautious arrangements at macro level and micro level. Jammu and Kashmir has to be increased the agribusiness production according to

© 2022 Global Journals

demands of the agro based industry at the large extent with the quality. It requires making the exploration on various parts of agribusiness venture models. There is need of the revision of government schemes in the light of arising business climate at domestic and worldwide level, with advancements, the board aptitudes, management skills and innovations agribusiness venture can come up as significant tool in economy as well as a tool for rural development, it requires rural industry potential study to be directed based on rural assets management. Agribusiness venture has been given a privileged driving situation in rural change in both developing and developed nations; in such provincial advancement approach agricultural Cooperatives are incontestable entertainers.

References Références Referencias

1. Barzel, Y. (1997). *Economic analysis of property rights*. pp. 161. UK: Cambridge University Press.
2. Cook, M. L., & Chaddad, F. R. (2000). Agro industrialization of the global agrifood economy: Bridging development economics and agribusiness research. *Agricultural Economics*, *23*, 207-218.
3. Davis, J. H., & Goldberg, R. A. A. (1957). *Concept of agribusiness*. pp. 136. Boston: Division of Research, Graduate.
4. Escalante, C.L., & Turvey, C.G. (2006). Innovation and entrepreneurship in rural communities: Early business survival challenges for the agribusiness entrepreneur (No. 1366-2016-108207).
5. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO): AQUASTAT–FAO's Information System on Water and Agriculture. Country profile: Kazakhstan 2016, available at: http://www.fao.org/countryprofiles (last access: 2 May 2019), 2018.
6. Gielen, P.M., Hoeve, A., & Nieuwenhuis, L.F. (2003). Learning entrepreneurs: learning and innovation in small companies. *European Educational Research Journal, 2*(1), 90-106.
7. Goldberg, R. A. (1968). *Agribusiness coordination: A systems approach to the wheat, soybean, and Florida orange economies.* pp. 256. Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
8. Herliana, S., Lawiyah, N., & Aina, Q. (2018). SWOT Analysis Approach on SMEs Entrepreneurial Competence. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 24*(2), 1-8.
9. Interstate Commission on Sustainable Development (ICSD): National Report on the State of the Environment and Resource use of Kazakhstan 2016, available at: https://www.mkurca.org (last access: 4 August 2019), 2016.
10. Karatayev, M., & Hall, S. (2017). Integration of wind and solar power in Kazakhstan: Incentives and barriers. In Sustainable Energy in Kazakhstan (pp. 65-89). Routledge.
11. Karatayev, M., Hall, S., Kalyuzhnova, Y., & Clarke, M.L. (2016). Renewable energy technology uptake in Kazakhstan: Policy drivers and barriers in a transitional economy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 66*, 120-136.
12. Klerkx, L., & Leeuwis, C. (2008). Matching demand and supply in the agricultural knowledge infrastructure: Experiences with innovation intermediaries. *Food Policy, 33*(3), 260-276.
13. Koshim, A., Karatayev, M., Clarke, M.L., & Nock, W. (2018). Spatial assessment of the distribution and potential of bioenergy resources in Kazakhstan. *Advances in Geosciences, 45,* 217-225.
14. Kurttila, M., Pesonen, M., Kangas, J., & Kajanus, M. (2000). Utilizing the analytic hierarchy process (AHP) in SWOT analysis a hybrid method and its application to a forest-certification case. *Forest Policy And Economics, 1*(1), 41-52.
15. M. S. M., Silva, V. L. S., Souza, R. C., & Schnaider, P. S. B. (2011). *Analysing interfirm relationships: The knowledge perspective*. ISNIE. Working Paper.
16. Mayo, D.T., Helms, M.H., Becherer, R.C., & Finch, J.H. (2002). Influences on Entrepreneurial Awareness: Internal vs. External Motivations. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 8*(2), 79.
17. Menard, C., & Klein, P. G. (2004). Organizational issues in the agrifood sector: Toward a comparative approach. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, *86* (August (3)), 746-751.
18. Mugonola, B., & Baliddawa, C. (2014). Building capacity of smallholder farmers in agribusiness and entrepreneurship skills in Northern Uganda. *Agricultural Information Worldwide, 6*, 122-126.
19. Ncube, L.B., & Washburn, M.H. (2010). Strategic collaboration and mentoring women entrepreneurs: A case study. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 16*(1), 71.
20. North, D. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change, and economic performance.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
21. Nwibo, S.U., & Okorie, A. (2013). Constraints to entrepreneurship and investment decisions among agribusiness investors in Southeast, Nigeria. *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research, 1*(4), 30-42.
22. Rivotti, P., Karatayev, M., Mourão, Z.S., Shah, N., Clarke, M.L., & Konadu, D.D. (2019). Impact of future energy policy on water resources in Kazakhstan. *Energy Strategy Reviews, 24*, 261-267.
23. Saiymova, M., Esbergen, R., Baimukasheva, Z., Turganbaev, M., & Dzhusibalieva, A. (2017). Features of social and economic development of the small city of Kandyagash. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives, 11*(4), 125-130.

© 2022 Global Journals

24. Saiymova, M., Seisinbinova, A., Dauletova, R., Iskakov, S., Suleimenova, B., Bekbulatova, R., & Kabdullina, G. (2018). Complex Innovation Policy in Kazakhstan with the New Legal Regulations: Key Issues and Challenges. *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics, 9*(8 (38)), 2790-2797.
25. Saiymova, M., Yesbergen, R., Demeuova, G., Bolatova, B., Taskarina, B., Ibrasheva, A., Spankulova, L. & Saparaliyev, D. (2018). The knowledge-based economy and innovation policy in Kazakhstan: Looking at key practical problems. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 17*(6), 11-17.
26. Sanchez, T., & Omar, A.E. (2012). The impact of industry clusters on the economy in the United States. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 18*(1), 99.
27. Saparaliyev, D., Mokin, C., Movkebayeva, G., Saiymova, M., & Mustafina, A. (2019). Review and Analysis of Imposed European Union and United States International Sanctions on Ukrainian Crisis and Russia's Countermeasures. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues, 22*(2), 12-18.
28. Saparaliyev, D., Spankulova, L., Zhaxylykova, A., Aldashova, G., Saiymova, M., & Akhmetova, G. (2019). Impact of New Technologies, Innovations & Barriers on the Service Delivery and Financial Income of the Private Business in Transitional Economies: The Case of Health Centers. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal, 18*(3), 10-16.
29. School of Business Administration, Harvard University.
30. Senker, J., Faulkner, W., 2001. Origins of public–private knowledge flows and current state-of-the art: Can agriculture learn from industry? In: Wolf, S.A., Zilberman, D. Eds.), Knowledge Generation and Technology Change. Institutional Innovation in Agriculture. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston.
31. Smagulova, S., Nurseiytova, G., Madjarova, R., Spankulova, L., Koptayeva, G., Dzhunusov, A., Omarkulova, M., Bikenova, A., Turekulova, A., & Imashev, A. (2018). Entrepreneurship and investment environment in the Central Asian transition countries: Case Kazakhstan. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal, 24*(4), 18-26.
32. Taylor, S. and Todd, P. (1995). Understanding information technology usage: A test of competing models. Journal of *Information Systems Research,* 6 (2), *144-176.*
33. Taylor,M. and Murphy, A. (2004).SMEs and e-business. *Journal of small business and enterprise development, 11(3), 280-289.*
34. UNIDROIT, FAO and IFAD. (2015). *Legal guide on contract farming. Rome.*, 233 p.
35. Valeyev, A., Karatayev, M., Abitbayeva, A., Uxukbayeva, S., Bektursynova, A., & Sharapkhanova, Z. (2019). Monitoring Coastline Dynamics of Alakol Lake in Kazakhstan Using Remote Sensing Data. *Geosciences, 9*(9), 404.
36. Williamson, O. E. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism: firms, markets and relational contracts*. New York: The Free Press.
37. Wortman Jr, M.S. (1990). Rural entrepreneurship research: An integration into the entrepreneurship field. *Agribusiness,* 6(4), 329-344.
38. Yessentemirova, A., Balmagambetova, V., Kussainov, A., Busurmanov, Z., Gubasheva, D., & Nogaibayev, Y. (2019). Legislation and Higher Educational Policy in Kazakhstan since Independence: Problems, Perspectives and Prospects. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues, 22*(2), 11-17.
39. Zylbersztajn, D. (1996). Governance structures and agribusiness coordination: A transaction cost economics approach. In R. Goldberg (Ed.), *Research in Domestic and International Agribusiness Management* (Vol. 12) (pp. 245–310). Harvard University.
40. Zylbersztajn, D. (2005). Papel dos Contratos na Coordenação Agro industrial: um olhar além dos mercados. *Revista de Economia e Sociologia Rural*, *43*(3), 385-420.
41. Zylbersztajn, D., & Farina, E. M. M. Q. (1999). *Strictly coordinated food systems: Exploring the limits of the Coasian firm* v.2, n.2. pp. 249–265. Pergamon: International Food and Agribusiness Management Review, Santa Clara University.

© 2022 Global Journals