

ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS AN ECONOMIC FORCE ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN ANAMBRA STATE, NIGERIA

OKEKE, M. N., ONUORAH, A. N., NEBOLISA, O. T. AND OBOREH, J. C.

Department Of Business Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Igbariam Campus

ABSTRACT

This study examined entrepreneurship as an economic force in the development of rural areas of Anambra state. Specifically, the study investigated the influence of poor access to finance, unemployment, entrepreneurship orientation and infrastructural facilities on rural development. Relevant literature conceptual, theoretical and empirical literatures were reviewed. The theoretical framework was anchored on opportunity-based entrepreneurship theory, resource-based entrepreneurship theory and the human capital entrepreneurship theory. Survey research design was adopted in this study. The population of the study comprised 1350 selected registered entrepreneurs in Anambra state. Taro Yamane's formula was applied for determination of a sample size of 309. The tools used in analysing the data collected were simple percentages, descriptive statistics and correlation analysis and the study also employed Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) in testing the hypotheses. Findings revealed that access to finance, unemployment and entrepreneurship orientation had significant influence on rural development while infrastructural facilities had no significant effect on rural development. The study therefore, concluded that entrepreneurship as an economic force had a significant influence on rural development in Anambra. It was recommended that government should initiate policies to create access to finance to entrepreneurs. Unemployment problem should not be left in the hands of government alone rather government should employ the public private partnership approach so as to allow the involvement of private individuals in helping to establish entrepreneurial development centres as well. Entrepreneurship orientation should be made an element at all levels of learning primary, secondary and tertiary institutions. Good infrastructure generally promotes business activities regardless of the size or type of enterprise.

KEYWORD: Access to Finance, Unemployment, Entrepreneurship Orientation, Infrastructural Facilities and Rural Development

Introduction

Entrepreneurship has been identified as a critical element in the structural and functional transformation of any economy Clausen, (2006). Entrepreneurship has generated (and is still generating) increased interest in Nigeria. This increased interest is partly due to the belief that entrepreneurship will help in combating unemployment, poverty and under-development and partly due to the belief that entrepreneurship will engender economic development (Praag and Versloot, 2007). Nigeria as a country fully endowed with human and natural resources has numerous business and investment potentials due to the abundant, vibrant and dynamic human and natural resources it possesses.

Nwachukwu and Ogbo (2012) assert that entrepreneurship represents the veritable vehicle for achieving a nation's economic objective of employment generation, poverty reduction, indigenous technology, reduce urbanisation, increasing the gross domestic earnings at low

investment rate as well as the development of capabilities. In every economy, both developed and developing, one cannot rule out the importance of entrepreneurs. Nwachukwu & Ogbo (2012) Small business through which entrepreneurship is given fleets expression, is the backbone of the market economy of the United States of America and the rest of the world.

Concrete attempts at encouraging the growth and development of entrepreneurship have led to the establishment of some government agencies such as the Nigerian indigenization and enterprises Decree, the establishment of the industrial development centre (IDCS), small scale industries credit scheme (SCICS), small scale industries and graduate employment programme (SSIGEO), Nigerians Banks for commerce and industries (NBCI), world bank SMEII loan scheme, National Directorate of Employment (NDE), National Economic Reconstruction fund (NERFUND) Nigerian Agricultural cooperative and Rural Development Bank (NACRDB) National Poverty and eradication programme (NAPEP).

Adebobola (2014)assert that several policy interventions in Nigeria that were aimed at stimulating entrepreneurship development via small and medium scale enterprises have failed. Instead of building in the country entrepreneurial capacity, entrepreneurs have become distribution agents of imported products. Attahir and Minet(2000) state that “on the account of encouraging entrepreneurial initiatives, the country has experienced exponential growth in the number of private firms. Majority of these businesses are very small when their operations are measured in terms of capital, employment and revenues “.

Statement of the Problem

Entrepreneurship is one of the key factors that contribute to the balance and rapid growth of the county’s economies (Kelley, Bosma, and Amorose, 2010). Many rural communities in Anambra State are economically depressed. The poor state of most rural economy is very devastating and pathetic. Rural areas have peculiar problems of low income; high degree of unemployment; low infrastructure; high illiteracy rate; malnutrition; low productivity low level standard of living among others (Kelley, Bosma, and Amorose, 2010). However, entrepreneurial ability and leadership tend to be relatively lacking in rural areas as a result of many factors inhibiting its growth and development which include poor access to finance, lack of infrastructural facilities, lack of adequate entrepreneurship orientation, employment creation problem and poverty reduction. Economic incentives are the main motivators of entrepreneurial activities. The incentives include taxation policy, industrial policy, source of finance and raw material, infrastructure availability, investment and marketing opportunities, access to information about market conditions and technology (Anupam, 2011). This study seeks to investigate effect of entrepreneurship as a force of economic rural development.

Objectives of the study

The main objective of the study is to investigate entrepreneurship as an economic force to enhance rural development. The specific objectives are to:

1. Determine the influence of access to finance on rural development.
2. Examine the effect of high degree of unemployment on rural development.
3. Investigate the influence of entrepreneurship orientation on rural development
4. Assess the effect of infrastructural facilities on rural development

Research Question

In order to solve the research problem the following research question were generated.

1. To what extent does access to finance influence rural development in Anambra State?
2. To what extent does high degree of unemployment affect rural development in Anambra State?

3. What is the influence of entrepreneurship orientation on rural development in Anambra State?
4. What are the lack infrastructural facilities affect rural development in Anambra State?

Hypotheses

Ho₁: Access to finance has no significant influence on rural development

Ho₂: High degree of unemployment has no significant effect on rural development

Ho₃: Entrepreneurship orientation has no significant influence rural development

Ho₄: Infrastructural facilities has no significant effect on rural development

Significance of the Study

The study will highlight the importance of entrepreneurship and its role in the development of the nation's economy. It will help in identifying possible factors/variables that will improve the rural economy. It will also generate awareness to the government and policymakers on the need to encourage entrepreneurship and create enabling environment that could drive entrepreneurship activity in the country, especially at the rural level. Finally the study will be of benefit to academics because it will serve as secondary source of data as well as a reference to policymakers in rural development.

Scope of the Study

The study is only on entrepreneurship as an economic force on rural development in Anambra State, with focus on employment creation, poverty reduction entrepreneurship orientation and infrastructural facilities as variable components of entrepreneurship. Geographically, this study was carried out in three senatorial zones in Anambra State, which include Anambra Central, Anambra South and Anambra North senatorial zone.

Review of Related Literature

Conceptual Framework

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship phenomenon evolved in economics in the 1930s but it got recognition as an important factor of social and economic change only in the 1960s Timmons & Spinelli (2008). For more than a decade, the study of entrepreneurship was confined to large scale businesses, industries, and then to the small scale industrial sector. It was lately that this phenomenon percolated to artisans and farmers, the two major forces of rural transformation. The emergence and development of rural entrepreneurship is not a spontaneous one but a dependent phenomenon of economic, social, political, psychological variables often attributed as supporting conditions to rural-based development of commerce and industry (Hill & Mac Gowon 2009).

Nwafor (2007) perceives entrepreneurship as the most effective method for creating new enterprises and bringing new products and services to the market. Ajagbe (2014) opines that an act of being an entrepreneur is seen as one who undertakes innovations with finance and business acumen in an effort to transform innovations into economic goods. Entrepreneurial success is simply a function of the ability of an entrepreneur to see opportunities in the marketplace, initiate change (or take advantage of change) and create value through solutions. Ajagbe and Ismail (2014) posit that entrepreneurship is viewed as the capability and attitude of an individual or team of people to implement new ventures and ideas, with the possibility of success or failure. However, in business management, entrepreneurship is regarded as the prime mover of a successful enterprise, just as a leader in any organization must be the environmental change agent (Ajetunmobi 2000; Ajagbe and Ismail 2014).

Akanwa and Akpanabia (2012) argue that entrepreneurship is the willingness and ability of an individual to seek out investment opportunities and establish and run an enterprise successfully.

Paul (2013) argues that entrepreneurship is more than starting a business, and it is a process through which individuals identify opportunities, allocate resources, and create value". This creation of value is often through the identification of unmet needs or through the identification of opportunities for change. Igwe (2013) describes entrepreneurship as a powerful engine of economic growth and wealth creation for many developing countries, which is crucial for improving the quality, number and variety of employment opportunities for the poor". Soyibo (2006) perceives entrepreneurship as the process of identifying an opportunity related to needs satisfaction and converting it to a product or service of value. Nwankwo and Okeke (2016) defining it as stabilizing force, limits entrepreneurship to reading market disequilibria, while entrepreneurship defined as owning and operating a business denies the concept the possibility of entrepreneurial behaviour by non-owner managers who have no equity stake in the business. However, Kanothi (2009) describes entrepreneur as the instigator of entrepreneurial events.

Duru (2011), outlines some basic characteristics of entrepreneurs to include: Ambition; Optimism; Achievement orientation; Independent mindedness; goal orientation; individualism; self-confidence; open-mindedness and tolerance for ambiguity. Schumpeter introduced the concept of innovation and power. He argues that an entrepreneur brings about change through the introduction of new technological processes or products. Schumpeter maintains that only certain extraordinary people have the ability to be entrepreneurs and they bring about extraordinary events. However, the level of success of an entrepreneur depends on several factors which include his/her educational background, vision, organization, available funds, environmental condition, government regulation, availability of infrastructure, legal framework, information accessibility, cost control and management, quality of services/products, discipline and determination (Nwankwo and Okeke 2016).

Njoroge & Gathunu (2013) define rural entrepreneurship as creating new employment opportunities in rural areas via the generation of new business ventures. From this perspective, rural entrepreneurs may be seen as individuals living in rural locations. The difference between them and urban entrepreneurs may be found on the impact of the entrepreneurial process. Osuagwu (2006) states that "rural entrepreneurship is the creation of a new business organization that introduces new goods/services, serves or creates a new market, or utilizes a new technology in a rural environment".

Sherief (2005), Sukhjeet Kaur, Saini and Gill (2006), Timothy, Habbershon (2007), Ganapathi and Sannasi (2008) attempted to understand the determinants of rural entrepreneurship and the environment conducive for its development. Their study concluded that to accelerate economic development in rural areas, it is necessary to promote entrepreneurship. According to Satya pal (2013) and Sudipta Ghosh (2013), rural entrepreneurship should not only set up enterprises in rural areas but should be also using rural produce as raw material and employing rural people in their production processes. Rural entrepreneurship is, in essence, that entrepreneurship which ensures value addition to rural resources in rural areas engaging largely rural human resources. In other words, this means that finished products are produced in rural areas out of resources obtained in rural areas by largely rural people.

Rural entrepreneurship has been considered to be representative of the informal sector of the Nigerian economy. Fapohunda (2012) asserts that the informal sector contributes to the national economy in terms of increased output and employment generation by providing productive outlets for a large number of people who may not be able to secure paid employment in the formal sector.

Factors Affecting entrepreneurship growth and Development

Rural entrepreneurship does not operate in a vacuum. It exists within an environment which is the totality of the factors that affect its operations. Entrepreneurship researches have established relationships between the business environment and entrepreneurial activities (Borkowski and Kulzick, 2006; Carter and Wilton, 2006). The effective manifestation of the functions and roles of entrepreneurship in socio-economic development have often been attributed to the presence of certain factors in the external environment of the entrepreneur over which he has little or no control. Borkowski and Kulzick (2006) list the interplay between entrepreneurship and environment as follows:

New venture strategies are formed in response to environmental forces, Entrepreneurs are negative towards and will resist political interference, Unstable economic, social and even political environments are negatively related to growth opportunities. Equally, other studies in this area have identified various environmental factors, which some have tagged external factors. Principal among the factors identified are influences of firms, influences of markets; public policies; regulations and policies; (Onwuka 2015) and physical infrastructure (Agboli and Ukaegbu 2006). Some scholars have gone ahead to particularize or associate environmental needs to the level of economic development. Agboli and Ukaegbe (2006) emphasized the imperatives of physical infrastructure of other external factors in their study of Nigerian entrepreneurs.

Osuagwu (2006) states that the three major features of the physical environment that affect entrepreneurship in rural areas include location, natural resources and landscape. He points out that the limited scale and scope of local markets, compel rural entrepreneurs to develop innovative products and effective marketing to compete with their urban-based counterparts, and that information and communication technology hold a central role in this process. On the other hand, areas which fail to participate in developments of information and communication technology risk increasing marginalization. The adoption of information and communication technology by rural small business enterprises is also highly dependent upon external pressure and organizational size. Proper use of information and communication technology in rural small business enterprises is important for the growth of entrepreneurship in rural areas.

Okoye (2014) identifies factors that could shape the success or failure of a potential entrepreneur as political, legal, ethnical, economic, social and physical. They play a role in stifling the dreams and aspirations of entrepreneurs towards assuming entrepreneurship positions. Economic factors such as policy reversals, high and double taxations, difficulty in procuring business approvals, high inflation and unstable exchange rates are some of the areas of concern for the potential entrepreneur who is in most cases a greenhorn. Basically there are three major factors that hinder entrepreneurship: structural, and the lack of political will by policy makers. Structurally, structural inhibitors in the growth of entrepreneurship have their origin in the Nigerian education policies since independence in 1960. Another related structural problem is the low budgetary allocation to the education sector, particularly the vocational and technical education sub-Sector. Poor leadership, corruption and mismanagement of resources have also contributed to the gross under-funding of education. Politically, lack of political will on the side of our political leaders has been a more serious hindrance to entrepreneurship development and reduction of unemployment in Nigeria (Onwubiko, 2011). The neglect of vocational/technical education has been robbing the nation of the potential contributions of its graduates to national growth and economic development.

Rural Development

The main concern in rural development is supposed to be the modernization of rural society through a transition from rural isolation to integration with the national economy for equitable and balanced development of the nation (Olisa & Obiukwu, 1992). According to the World Bank (2005), rural development is a strategy designed to improve the economic and social conditions of a specific group of the people, the rural poor. It involves extending the benefits of development to the poorest among those who seek a livelihood in the rural area. Apeh (2006) perceives rural development as a strategy designed to improve the social, economic, cultural and political conditions of rural dwellers and to make the process of their development self-sustaining through individual and collective participation. Anríquez & Stamoulis (2007) revealed that the definition of rural development has evolved through time as a result of changes in the perceived mechanisms and / or goals of development. Since 1970s, rural development as a concept has been highly associated with the promotion of standards of living and as a precondition for reducing rural poverty. Anríquez and Stamoulis (2007) define rural development as development that benefits rural populations; whereas development is understood as the sustained improvement of the population's standards of living or welfare. Anríquez and Stamoulis (2007) also quoted the following definitions of some scholars: Rural development encompasses agriculture, education, infrastructure, health, and capacity building for other than on-farm employment, rural institutions and the needs of vulnerable groups. They also expressed that rural development is essentially a part of structural transformation characterized by diversification of the economy away from agriculture. Adinyira et al (2007) narrated that the expression rural development is currently used in various senses in a number of public policy programs, and can be said to be a somewhat overworked expression. Simply put, rural development is about implementing a political, economic and social project attuned to a collective vision of the future of rural regions.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on opportunity-based entrepreneurship theory, resource-based entrepreneurship theory and Human capital theory.

Opportunity-Based Entrepreneurship Theory: The opportunity-based theory was propounded by names such as Peter Drucker and Howard Stevenson. An opportunity-based approach provides a wide-ranging conceptual framework for entrepreneurship research (Fiet 2002, Shane 2000). Entrepreneurs do not cause change (as claimed by the Schumpeterian or Austrian school) but exploit the opportunities that change (in technology, consumer preferences) (Drucker, 1985 cited in Simpeh 2011). He further says, "This defines entrepreneur and entrepreneurship, the entrepreneur always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity". What is apparent in Drucker's opportunity construct is that entrepreneurs have an eye more for possibilities created by change than the problems. Stevenson (1990) cited in Nkansah Simpeh (2011) extends Drucker's opportunity-based construct to include resourcefulness. This is based on research to determine the differences between entrepreneurial management and administrative management. He concludes that the hub of entrepreneurial management is the pursuit of opportunity without regard to resources currently controlled.

Resource- Based Entrepreneurship Theories: The Resource-based theory of entrepreneurship argues that access to resources by founders is an important predictor of opportunity based entrepreneurship and new venture growth (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001). This theory stresses the importance of financial, social and human resources. Thus, access to resources enhances the individual's ability to detect and act upon discovered opportunities (Davidson & Honing, 2003).

Financial, social and human capital represents three classes of theories under the resource-based entrepreneurship theories.

Financial Capital Theory: Empirical research has show that the funding of new firms is more common when people have access to financial capital (Blanch flower et al, 2001). By implication, this theory suggests that people with financial capital are more able to acquire resources to effectively exploit entrepreneurial opportunities, and set up firms to do so (Clausen, 2006). This theory argues that entrepreneurs have individual-specific resources that facilitate the recognition of new opportunities and the assembling of new resources for the emerging firm (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001). Some persons are more able to recognize and exploit opportunities than others because they have better access to information and knowledge (Anderson & Miller, 2003, Shane 2000, 2003, Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

Review of Empirical Studies

The review of related empirical studies showed that no research study is directly related to the present study. However, some were found to be very relevant. Mwaura, Gathenya and Kihoro (2015) examined the dynamics of entrepreneurial orientation on the performance of women-owned enterprises in Kenya. The study employed a cross-sectional descriptive research design. Relevant literature on the dependent and independent variables of the study were reviewed. Results indicated that entrepreneurial orientation had a positive relationship and played a major role on the performance of enterprises as evidenced by the increase in market share and cash flow stability in the business. Ebi (2007) studied the effect of small scale business in rural development in Bayelsa State. The purpose of the study amongst others was to evaluate the effectiveness of small scale business in developing the rural economy of Bayelsa State. Through the use of 80 copies of the questionnaire for data collection and analysis, the study found that various government officials have a perception that small scale businesses are beneficial to the development of the rural economy. Government does not encourage the spread and development of small scale businesses. Small scale business in local government areas of Bayelsa State are never funded by the government, despite the fact that they contribute to the development of local government areas by creating job opportunities and meeting the needs of the local population.

Ogbo (2012) examined the role of entrepreneurship in economic development: The Nigerian Perspective in Enugu State.” A total of 100 SMEs were randomly selected from a cross section of a population of all SMEs spread around some states of Nigeria and covering virtually all forms of enterprise. Participants were selected through a simple random sampling. Chi-square statistic, and analysis of variance were used in testing the hypothesis. Findings from the study include the following: Nigeria SMEs have performed below expectation due to a combination of problems which range from attitude and habits of SMEs themselves through environmental related factors, instability of governments and frequent government policy changes. They recommended that promoters of SMEs should thus ensure the availability or possession of managerial capacity and acumen before pursuing financial resources for the development of the respective enterprise.

Raymond (2014) investigated the appraisal of entrepreneurship and small and medium enterprises (SME) on sustainable economic growth in Nigeria. Survey research design was adopted. Data obtained were analysed with means and standard deviation. Z-test statistical technique was used to test whether entrepreneurship and SME as a profitable venture enhanced sustainable economic growth in Nigeria. The finding was that entrepreneurship has contributed significantly to sustainable economic growth of Nigeria through mobilization of individual savings and channelling of such in productive investment as a major source of domestic capital

formation in the economy. Consequently, they recommended that there should be policies that will emphasis more on technical education at all levels, for the training and development of human capital capacity building across the country.

Hassan and Olanrewaju Makinde (2013) carried out a research on curbing the unemployment problem in Nigeria through entrepreneurial development in Kogi State. The study made use of primary data sourced from 220 respondents in Kogi State through administering of questionnaire. Their responses were tested using appropriate statistical tools like the simple percentage and the Chi-square research techniques. The study revealed that unemployment problem in Nigeria can be solved through entrepreneurial development, and that government effort in this regard is not sufficient, given the magnitude of the unemployed in Nigeria. Therefore, the study recommended that solving the unemployment problem should not be left in the hands of the government alone, rather we should employ the public-private partnership approach so as to allow the involvement of private individuals in helping to establish entrepreneurial development centres as well.

Venkateswarlu and Ravindra (2014) carried out research on problems and prospects of rural entrepreneurs with special reference to Visakhapatnam District. Convenience sampling method was employed. Statistical analyses were performed by using Percentage method, Weighted Mean, Standard Deviation and Z score test. Findings from the study showed that many of rural entrepreneurs failed in getting the required assistance from different financial institutions because of their cumbersome procedures. Government agencies in rural areas are not providing sufficient support and incentives regarding finance, management, marketing and export related to entrepreneurs which badly affects the economic viability of their units. Technological gap among entrepreneurs was found to be highly serious technical problem encountered by rural entrepreneurs due to poor functioning of field functionaries, lack of means of communication, insufficient funds to use latest technology, and lack of specialized skills to use innovation in their units.

Alembummah (2015) examined the influence of entrepreneurial orientation on the growth of SMEs in Ghana. The study employed a survey research design. Findings also indicated that SMEs in the food processing sector often exhibit high levels of proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness whereas innovativeness, risk-taking and autonomy seem to be non-existent when the environment is unstable

Akande (2014) examined the effect of Entrepreneurial business operation on the economic survival of the Nigeria people in Ilorin Metropolitan area. Random sampling technique was used, from which the sample of various SMEs Owners (Entrepreneurs) was drawn through the simple random sampling. A sample of (50) entrepreneurs were selected from a list of registered SMEs owners in Ilorin. The results of the research show that small scale business operation has a positive and significant effect on the economy survival. From the analysis carried out and the data obtained from this research, the result validates that small scale business operations contribute to economic growth of a nation. Also, there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial business operations and productivity. There is positive relationship between small scale business and employment.

Agu (2015) examined the prospects and problems of entrepreneurship development in Nigeria. The survey research design was adopted for the study. The study was carried out primarily through the survey method and interview of entrepreneurs in the agricultural sector at three locations namely: Igbariam, Awka and Abakiliki. Chi-Square statistical tool was used to test the three hypotheses. Findings indicate that multiple taxes and levies, lack of knowledge of

technology and unfair competition are the challenges of entrepreneurship development in Nigeria; Technology enhances entrepreneurship development in Nigeria through improved customer satisfaction and reduction in transaction time; Provision of technical support and research centre are the contributions of government towards entrepreneurial development in Nigeria.

Reddy and Kumar (2016) investigated socio economic origins of rural entrepreneurship in Ssis with special reference to Mahabubnagar district, Telangana State. The findings show that being role model and using the social class the rural areas are going for entrepreneurship. The competitors are also inspire the entrepreneurs because of their success being independent and providing employment self-motivated with various motivational factors and with sources of inspiration.

Abiola (2014) carried out a study on small and medium scale enterprises in Nigeria: The problems and Prospects. The study employed descriptive research such that copies of a structured questionnaire were administered to the sample drawn from the population of the study. The data collected were analysed with Chi-square. It was revealed that small and medium scale enterprises play a pivotal role in the socio-economic wellbeing of the citizenry if properly and carefully managed.

Henderson (2007) conducted a study on understanding rural entrepreneurs at the county level in Kansas. Straight forward growth model was used to analyse the relationship between entrepreneurial activity and economic growth. Regression analysis was also used. The 1991 to 2001 time frame was selected because it encompasses the complete business cycle that starts with the recession of 1991 and ends with the recession of 2001. The results indicate that counties with higher levels of economic growth had higher levels of entrepreneurial activity

Lekhanya and visser (2016) studied risks and factors contributing towards rural entrepreneurial orientation growth of business in an emerging economy. The study used quantitative technique for data collection. Mann-whitney u test was done to identify non-parametric variables. Results of the survey reveal that majority indicates competition as a big challenge for them. Findings further indicate that competitor is due to the small market and lack of products differentiation.

Amamieyenimighan (2006) carried out a study on entrepreneurship in rural development: A study of selected local government areas in Bayelsa state. The research design adopted in the study was descriptive research. Hypotheses were formulated and tested with the Chi-square. The study revealed the present of link between the deplorable state of social infrastructure and the inability of government to create an enabling environment for entrepreneurship in rural development. It also discovered that the personal idiosyncrasies of the entrepreneur help to increase the problem of entrepreneurship in rural development. The studies equally unearthed some macro-economic variables as well as corrupt/trade malpractices as responsible for the problem of rural entrepreneurship.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Survey research design was adopted in this study. The study was carried out in three senatorial zones in Anambra State: Anambra central, Anambra South and Anambra North senatorial zone. The population of the study comprised all registered entrepreneurs in Anambra state. The total population of registered entrepreneurs in Anambra state is 1,350. Taro Yamane's formula was used to obtain the sample size of 309. The primary and secondary sources of data were used in gathering information. The major instrument used for data collection was the questionnaire, containing questions that were relevant to the objectives as well as the research questions of the

study. The study used face and content validity. The tools used in analysing the data collected include simple percentages, descriptive statistics and correlation analysis. The study also employed Multiple Regression Analysis (MRA) method to determine entrepreneurship as an economic force and rural development.

Data Presentation and Analysis

In this section, the data generated from the entrepreneurship were presented, analysed and interpreted. A total of three hundred and nine copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the respondents, out of which three hundred was properly filled and found relevant to the study 5 copies were not properly filled and 4 copies got missing. Therefore, the analysis in this section will be based on the three hundred relevant copies. The first section covers the demographic features of the respondents. The second section will analyse the data relevant to research questions.

Descriptive Analysis

This section presents the descriptive statistics on entrepreneurship as an economic force and rural development. The aim of the analysis is to examine the variables of economic force on entrepreneurship in relation to rural development. The analysis of the individual characteristics of these variables is presented in the table below:

Table 1 Descriptive Characteristics of the Variables

| Variables | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Rural Development | 20.26 | 3.332 |
| Access to Finance | 17.89 | 3.751 |
| Unemployment | 18.74 | 4.070 |
| Entrepreneurship Orientation | 18.25 | 3.951 |
| Infrastructural Facilities | 17.72 | 4.264 |

Source: Authors' Compilation From SPSS Version 21.0

This table presents the summary of statistics used in the analysis. It provides information about the mean and standard deviation of the variables used in the study. The mean value for Rural Development is 20.26 while the standard deviation is 3.332. Access to finance and unemployment reduction recorded mean value of 17.89 and 18.74 with a standard deviation of 3.751 and 4.070 respectively. Entrepreneurship orientation and infrastructural facilities have mean values of 18.25 and 17.72 with standard deviation of 3.951 and 4.264 respectively.

Correlation Analysis

Here, Pearson correlation was employed to measure the strength and relationship between independent variables. The Pearson correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength of a linear association between two variables and is denoted by r. Table 4.3 below shows the summary of correlation coefficient.

Table 2 Correlation Matrix

| | | RD | AF | U NE | E O | IF |
|-------------------|---------------------|-----|------|---------|--------|-------|
| Rural Development | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .039 | -.394** | .498** | .536* |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .558 | .030 | .040 | .038 |
| | N | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------|---------|-------|-------|---------|
| Access to Finance | Pearson Correlation | .039 | 1 | .002 | -.072 | -.260** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .558 | | .981 | .276 | .000 |
| | N | 232 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Unemployment | Pearson Correlation | -.394** | -.002 | .1 | .081 | -.062 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .003 | .981 | | .220 | .345 |
| | N | 300 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Entrepreneurship Orientation | Pearson Correlation | -.498** | -.072 | .081 | .1 | .050 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .004 | .276 | .220 | | .450 |
| | N | 300 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Infrastructural Facilities | Pearson Correlation | -.536* | -.260** | -.062 | .050 | .1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .038 | .000 | .345 | .450 | |
| | N | 300 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 30 |

Source: Authors' Compilation From SPSS Version 21.0

The table above shows the extent of association between the dependent and independent variables used in the study. The correlation between poor access to finance and rural development shows the value of 0.039, which indicates that access to finance has a positive weak effect on rural development. Unemployment recorded a correlation coefficient of -0.394 with rural development which shows that unemployment has a negative moderate effect on rural development. Furthermore, the correlation between entrepreneurship orientation and rural developments recorded a correlation coefficient of -0.498. This indicates that entrepreneurship orientation has a negative moderate effect on rural development. Also, infrastructural facilities recorded a correlation coefficient of -0.536 with rural developments. This shows that infrastructural facilities have been a negative strong effect on rural developments.

Multiple Regression Analysis: Multiple regression result was employed to test the effect of independent or explanatory variables on the dependent variable. The result of the multiple regression analysis is presented in the tables below.

Table 3 Summary of the Regression Result

The result of the multiple regression formulated in chapter three is presented in the tables below.

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| 1 | .265 ^a | .690 | .504 | 3.241 | 1.879 |

Predictors: (Constant), a. Access to Finance, unemployment, Entrepreneurship Orientation, Infrastructural facilities
 b. Dependent Variable: Rural Development

Table 3 shows that R^2 which measures the strength of the effect of independent variable on the dependent variable has the value of 0.690. This implies that 69% of the variation in rural

development is explained by variations in access to finance, unemployment, entrepreneurship orientation and infrastructural facilities. This was supported by adjusted R² of 0.504.

In order to check for autocorrelation in the model, Durbin-Watson statistics was employed. Durbin-Watson statistics of 1.879 in table 4.4 shows that the variables in the model are not auto correlated and that the model is reliable for predications.

Table 4 ANOVA Result

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 179.546 | 4 | 44.886 | 4.272 | .002 ^b |
| | Residual | 2384.937 | 22 | 10.506 | | |
| | Total | 2564.483 | 23 | | | |

Predictors: (Constant), a. Access to Finance, unemployment, Entrepreneurship Orientation, Infrastructural facilities

b. Dependent Variable: Rural Development

The f-statistics value of 4.272 in table 4.5 with f-statistics probability of 0.002 shows that the independent variable has significant effect on the dependent. This shows that Access to Finance, unemployment, Entrepreneurship Orientation, Infrastructural facilities can collectively explain the variations on rural development.

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| (Constant) | 18.311 | 2.121 | | 8.632 | .000 |
| Access to Finance | .074 | .059 | .083 | 1.251 | .212 |
| Unemployment | -.159 | .053 | -.194 | -3.014 | .003 |
| Entrepreneurship Orientation | -.091 | .054 | -.128 | -2.112 | .026 |
| Infrastructural Facilities | -.110 | .052 | -.140 | -2.674 | .036 |

Predictors: (Constant), a. Access to Finance, unemployment, Entrepreneurship Orientation, Infrastructural facilities

b. Dependent Variable: Rural Development

Table 4.6 shows the coefficient of the individual variables and their probability values. Access to Finance has regression coefficient of 0.074 with a probability value of 0.212. This implies that rural development associated with Access to Finance has a positive but insignificant effect on rural development. Unemployment has a regression coefficient of -0.159 with a probability value of 0.003 implying that unemployment has a negative and significant effect on rural development. Furthermore, entrepreneurship orientation has a regression coefficient of -

0.091 with a probability value of 0.026. This implies that entrepreneurship orientation has a negative significant effect on rural development. On a similar note, infrastructural facilities have a coefficient value of -0.110 and a probability value of 0.036. This shows that infrastructural facilities has a negative significant effect on rural development

Test of Hypotheses

Four hypotheses formulated in chapter one were tested using t-statistic and significance values of the individual variables in the regression result. The essence of this is to ascertain how significant the effect of individual independent or explanatory variables are on the dependent variables. The summary of the result is presented in the table below.

Table 5T-Statistics and Probability Value from the Regression Result

| Model | T | Sig. |
|------------------------------|--------|------|
| (Constant) | 8.632 | .000 |
| Access to Finance | 1.251 | .212 |
| 1 Unemployment | -3.014 | .003 |
| Entrepreneurship Orientation | -2.112 | .026 |
| Infrastructural Facilities | -2.674 | .036 |

Source: Authors’ Compilation from the Regression Result

Test of Hypothesis One

Ho: Access to finance has no significant influence on rural development

Hi: Access to finance has a significant influence on rural development

In testing this hypothesis, the t-statistics and probability value in table 4.7 was used. Access to Finance has a t-statistics of -2.674 and a probability value of 0.036 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypotheses which states that access to finance has a significant influence on rural development.

Test of Hypothesis Two

Ho: Unemployment has no significant effect on rural development

Hi: Unemployment has a significant effect on rural development

Poverty reduction has a t-statistics of -2.112 and a probability value of 0.026 which is statistically significant. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypotheses which states that unemployment has a significant effect on rural development

Test of Hypothesis Three

Ho: Entrepreneurship orientation has no significant influence on rural development

Hi: Entrepreneurship orientation has a significant influence on rural development

Entrepreneurship orientation has a t-statistics of -3.014 and a probability value of 0.003 which is statistically significant. We therefore reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternative hypothesis which states that entrepreneurship orientation has a significant influence on rural development.

Test of Hypothesis Four

Ho: Infrastructural facilities has no significant effect on rural development

Hi: Infrastructural facilities have a significant effect on rural development

Infrastructural facilities have a t-statistics of 1.251 and a probability value of 0.212 which is statistically insignificant. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis and reject the alternative hypotheses and conclude that Infrastructural facilities have no significant effect on rural development.

Discussion of findings

This work examined entrepreneurship as an economic force on rural development. The data generated were subjected to statistical analysis. The result of the correlation showed that access to finance, unemployment and Entrepreneurship orientation had significant negative correlation on rural development.

The result of the first hypothesis showed that access to finance has a significant influence on rural development. The result agrees with the studies of Tende (2013), Ismaila, (2012) Farayibi (2015) which revealed that employment creation had a significant effect on rural development of entrepreneurial activities in the country and it also showed that beneficiaries do not derive maximum satisfaction from government programs and policies, and that employment creation in the country, has the capacity to absorb all categories of workers irrespective of their levels of education. The study concludes that the informal sector is a veritable tool towards reducing unemployment in Nigeria and recommends the development of an employment strategy that is informal sector based.

The study revealed that unemployment had a significant effect on rural development. The result of this study is in consonance with the prior researchers, Hassan and Olanrewaju Makinde (2013) Akande (2014). Thus it shows that entrepreneurship development is a key tool for unemployment; and unemployment problem in Nigeria can be solved through entrepreneurial development. Government effort in this regard is not sufficient given the magnitude of the unemployed in Nigeria.

The study also revealed that entrepreneurship orientation has a significant influence on rural development. This finding tallies with that of Mwaura, Gathenya and Kihoro (2015), Alebummah (2015), Kabiri and Salehi (2013) Results of this study indicated that, entrepreneurial orientation had a positive relationship and played a major role on the performance of enterprises as evidenced by the increase in market share and cash flow stability in the business. The study observed that even though SMEs in the food processing sector displayed some traits of entrepreneurial orientation, the business environment in which these firms find themselves often acts as an impediment to their growth propensity. The findings also indicated that SMEs in the food processing sector often exhibit high levels of proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness whereas innovativeness, risk-taking and autonomy seem to be non-existent when the environment is unstable

Finally, the study reveals that Infrastructural facilities have a significant effect on rural development. The result of this study is consistent with several studies ADB (2011); Ekong (2003) and OECD (2006). The study simultaneously revealed that infrastructural facilities affect the living standard of rural dwellers because with adequate infrastructure (power supply, water supply, good road, health care delivery, transportation and the rest), it will improve both the quality of life of rural dwellers, and the environment, and facilitate the generation of economic growth.

Summary of Major Findings

This work examined entrepreneurship as an economic force on rural development. The data generated were subjected to statistical analysis. The result of the correlation shows that:

1. Access to finance has a significant influence on rural development.
2. Unemployment has a significant effect on rural development
3. Entrepreneurship orientation has a significant influence rural development
4. Infrastructural facilities has no significant effect on rural development

Conclusion

It is evidently proved from the study that entrepreneurship plays a crucial role in accelerating economic development of rural areas. From the findings, access to finance, unemployment and entrepreneurship orientation have significant influence rural development. While infrastructural facilities have no significant effect on rural development. The study therefore concludes that entrepreneurship as an economic force has a significant effect on rural development.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusion above, the researchers recommend the following:

1. Government should initiate policies to enable rural entrepreneurs have access to finance from macro finance banks or other financial institutions.
2. Unemployment problem should not be left in the hands of the government alone, rather government should employ the public-private partnership approach so as to allow the involvement of private individuals in helping to establish entrepreneurial development centres as well.
3. Entrepreneurship orientation should be made an element at all levels of learning from primary through secondary to tertiary institutions.
4. Government should pay adequate attention to the provision and maintenance of basic infrastructure. Good infrastructure generally promotes business activities, regardless of the size or type of enterprise.

References

- Abiola, R. (2014). Small and medium scale enterprises in Nigeria: The problems and Prospects. *Journal of Management Science*, 4,(3), 242-253.
- Ahmed, A and Mc Quid, R.W (2005) Entrepreneurship management and sustainable development. World review of entrepreneurship. *Management and Sustainable Development*.1,(2),6-30.
- Alembummah, A. B. (2015) This thesis is submitted to the university of Ghana, legon in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the award of Mphil marketing degree.
- Akande.O.O (2014). Entrepreneurial business orientation and economic survival of Nigerians. *International Review of Management and Business Research* 3(2) 1254-1263
- Agboli, M., & Ukaegbu, C. C. (2006). Business environment and entrepreneurial Activity in Nigeria: *Implications for Industrial Development” Journal of Modern African Studies* 44, 1: 1 -30.
- Ajagbe, A. M. & Ismail, K. (2014). Factors influencing venture capital assessment of high growth companies in Malaysia. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 21(4), 457-494.
- Ajagbe, A. M. (2014). Funding criteria in technology based firms in Malaysia. An Unpublished *PhD Thesis* Submitted to the Graduate School, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Ajagu, A. N. (2005). *The Entrepreneur*. Amuwo-Odofin, Lagos: Betsy Media.
- Ajetunmobi, M. O. (2000). Data analysis, recommendation and conclusion in research, a paper presented at chartered institute of bankers, by DTS consultancy services.
- Akanwa, P. U. & Agu, C. N. (2005). *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice in Nigeria*, Owerri: Resources Development Centre.
- Akanwa, P.U. & Akpanabia, N.H. (2012). Entrepreneurship development as panacea for unemployment Reduction in Nigeria. reikojournals.org

- Aldrich, H.E., & Cliff, J. (2003). The pervasive effects of family on entrepreneurship: Toward a family embeddedness perspective”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 3,(18),573-596.
- Alvarez, S., & Busenitz, L. (2001). The entrepreneurship of resource based theory. *Journal of Management*, 27,755-775.
- Badi, R. V. & Badi, N. V. (2006). *Entrepreneurship*. Mayur Vihar, Delhi:
- Baron, R.A. (1998). Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people. *Journal of business venturing*, 13,(4), 275-294.
- Clausen, T.H. (2006), “Who identifies and Exploits entrepreneurial opportunities”, Retrieved from www.ccsr.ac.uk
- Duru, M. 2011. Entrepreneurship opportunities and challenges in Nigeria. *J. Business*, 1(1).
- Eboh, M., (2007). World Bank, UNDP blame multiple taxation, corruption for investors apathy”, *Vanguard*, September 25. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 3, (6), 12-22
- Gwija, S. A., C. Eresia-Eke & Iwu,C. G. (2014). The link between entrepreneurship education and business success: Evidence from Youth Entrepreneurs in South Africa."
- Kelley, B.Bosma,,J and Amorose, H. (2010).The entrepreneurial personality in the context of resources, environment, and the start-up process A-configurational approach”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28,(1), 23-42.
- Nwachukwu, C. C. (2005). *The Practice of Entrepreneurship in Nigeria*. Onitsha: Africana-First Publishers Limited.
- Nwafor, P.Z.(2007), Practical Approach to entrepreneurship: small and medium scale enterprises (SMEs).*Journal of Business*
- Ogbari, M. I. E., Ajagbe, A. M. & Ade-Turton, D. (2015). Effects of Subcontracting on Modern Day Organizations. *Australia Journal of Commerce Study*, 2(2), 1-11.
- Onwuka E.M., Ugwu K. E., Itoya J., Okeke N.M. (2015), The relationship between entrepreneurship development and poverty reduction in rural communities in Edo State, Nigeria, *International Journal Of Technology Enhancements And Emerging Engineering Research*, 3, (09)234-428.Osuagwu, L. (2006) Small business and entrepreneurship management. Second Edition. Lagos, Gray Resource Ltd. Owerri: Klet-Ken Publishers.
- Petrin, T. (1994). *Entrepreneurship as an economic force in rural development*. Keynote paper presented at the Seventh FAO/REU international rural development summer school, Herrsching, Germany, 8 - 14 September 1994.
- Pillania, R. K., M. Lall and S. Sahai (2009). Motives for starting business: Indian women entrepreneurs’ perspectives." *International Journal of Indian Culture and Business Management*3,(1), 48-67.
- Rahmawati, F., A., Hasyiyati, T. & Yusran, H. L. (2012). The obstacles to be young entrepreneur. Proceedings of the international conference on business and management, Phuket, Thailand.
- Satya pal (2013). Rural entrepreneurship in India: Challenges and problems”, *TMIMT International Journal*, 4 , (4), 85-94
- Saxena, S. (2012). Problems faced by rural entrepreneurs and remedies to solve It”, *Journal of Business and Management* 3(1), 23-29.
- Soyibo, A. 2006. The concept of entrepreneurship. *J. Business Org. Dev.*, 1(5).
- Sudipta G. (2013). Entrepreneurship: An overview of the issues and challenges in the context of rural development in India”, *Business Spectrum*, I, (2),

- Stathopoulou, S; Psaltopoulos, D. and Skuras, D. (2004): Rural entrepreneurship, in Europe: A Research Framework and Agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial*.5, (8),22-38
- Sukhjeet Kaur, Saini and Gill, (2006). Entrepreneurship among rural women, *Kisan World*,
- Sykes, E., Gurbuzer, D. and Principia, J. (2016) Exploring the linkages between youth financial inclusion and job creation: Evidence from the ILO school-to-work transition surveys. Youth Employment Programme. Work4Youth Publication.
- Timmons, J. A. & Spinelli, T. (2008). *The entrepreneurial mind*” Andover: Brick House.