

Rural Entrepreneurial Motivations On Account of Rural Entrepreneurial Profile: A study with special reference to Kerala.

Asha A G, Assistant Professor

*Department of Commerce, Sree Sankara Vidyapeetom College, Valayanchirangara, Kerala.
E-mail: mail2ashaag@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

The present study was undertaken to understand rural entrepreneurial motivations on account of rural entrepreneurial profile, with special reference to Kerala. The analysis and interpretation of data collected from 270 rural entrepreneurs brought out fruitful findings relating to rural entrepreneurial motivations on account of rural entrepreneurial profile. The researcher framed and tested the hypothesis regarding the motivators such as enabling environment, autonomy and intellectual drive and social anchoring with the entrepreneurial profile, in which nine cases accepted null hypothesis and twelve cases rejected the same in favour of alternative hypotheses.

Key words: rural entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial profile and rural entrepreneurial motivation.

1.1 Introduction

Growth in the agricultural sector has shown a declining trend during the last decade (Government of India, 2016), which made a huge impact on the domestic production and employment of rural India. The problems affecting economic growth of rural population can be tackled by developing entrepreneurial skills in rural. Rural entrepreneurial sector always recorded marvelous growth in terms of manufacturing, employment generation and economic growth over the years and have been established in all the sectors of the nation's economy, which is less capital intensive and highly labour intensive built upon the traditional skills and knowledge suits the economic environment of India.

In India, rural enterprises include micro, small and medium enterprises which constitute nearly 90 percent of the total enterprises and have been regarded as the engine of economic growth and development of the country which provides employment to 69 million people, including 2.2 million women enterprises and 15.4 million rural enterprises (Ministry of MSMEs, 2013). The numbers of rural enterprises have increased from 361.76 lakh units in 2006-07 to 510.57 lakh units in 2014-15 which contributes 37.5 percent of India's GDP. (Ministry of MSME's, 2016).

Rural enterprises are complementary to large industries contribute enormously to the socio economic development of the country. Handicraft sector, food processing industries, garment making and textile industries, wood, bamboo, rubber, clay, electronic, electric components are included under this sector which targets the development of various social groups such as SC,

ST, women, educated unemployed youth and physically handicapped for the purpose of assuring more equitable distribution of income and wealth.

In Kerala rural enterprises sector has the potential to emerge as a strong, vibrant and globally competitive sector in the state's economy with its excellent connectivity, communication network, and availability of highly skilled human resources and developing industrial infrastructure which is best suited for the growth of rural enterprises contributing to the process of economic growth, employment generation and balanced regional development (Venkateswaralu, & Ravindra 2015). At this juncture, the researcher tries to understand rural entrepreneurship in terms rural entrepreneurial motivations and significance difference on account of entrepreneurial profile.

1.2 Significance of the study

Rural enterprises have the capacity to remove economic backwardness of rural Kerala through reducing regional imbalances, optimum utilization of unexploited natural resources, improvement of standard of living, and attainment of self reliance. Institutions and development agencies noticed rural entrepreneurship as an enormous employment potential, key strategy to prevent rural unrest, instrument for improving farm earnings, employment possibility near homes which provides autonomy and independence, a way for self-employment which contributes to national development through GDP contribution.

The study provides insights to the rural entrepreneurs regarding rural entrepreneurial motivations and its significant difference on account of entrepreneurial profile. Government, being the major promoter of rural enterprises would like to know the issues confronting motivation of rural entrepreneurs so as to devise appropriate measures, either by way of creating and implementing new policies and programs or by enriching the existing one, will benefit from the findings of the study. The study may enlighten educational institutions to frame new curriculum with emphasis on entrepreneurial motivation that may inspire and attract students towards entrepreneurship.

1.3 Statement of the problem

Rural entrepreneurial activities of Ernakulam District are not going well and educated unemployed youth are reluctant in taking up entrepreneurial activities Even though there is a bright prospect for rural enterprises in the district in the context of globalization and increased government support. A good number of such rural entrepreneurs withdraw from entrepreneurship but there are many instances of successful rural entrepreneurs who perform well amidst the difficulties around them. In this context, the researcher want to understand rural entrepreneurship in terms rural entrepreneurial motivations and significance difference on account of entrepreneurial profile which may provide fresh insights into the functioning of rural enterprises in Kerala in general and Ernakulam district in particular.

1.4 Objectives of the study

The objectives of the study are

1. To review the rural enterprises in India in terms of its growth.
2. To identify entrepreneurial motivations behind the setting up of rural enterprises.
3. To test the significant difference of rural entrepreneurial motivations on account of entrepreneurial profile.

1.5 Hypotheses of the Study

H₀. Rural entrepreneurial motivations do not differ significantly on account of entrepreneurial profile.

1.6 Methodology

The study uses both secondary as well as primary data sources. The secondary data have been collected from the official publications, journals, books and official websites. The primary data have been collected from 270 respondents. A structured interview schedule was used to collect required data from the rural entrepreneurs in Ernakulam district. The questions in the interview schedule were brought under different headings like profile of the respondents and rural entrepreneurial motivations.

1.6.1 Sampling design

The entire rural enterprises in the district constitute the population of the study. Out of 15 Block Panchayaths in the District, 5 Block Panchayaths were selected randomly and 270 rural entrepreneurs are selected as respondents through stratified random sampling method.

The Statistical and Mathematical Tools used for the study includes one way ANOVA, Independent samples t-test and Factor Analysis. Statistical Software's Adopted for performing the analysis of the collected data is SPSS.

1.7 Scope of the study

The theoretical scope of the study covers the growth of rural enterprises, the profile of rural entrepreneurs and rural entrepreneurial motivations. The geographical scope of the study is limited to Ernakulam district and the concept of rural enterprises in the study covers only rural micro enterprises.

1.8 Limitations of the study

1. The scope of the study is limited to the district of Ernakulam of Kerala state.
2. The study was conducted from the perspective of rural entrepreneurs only.
6. Rural enterprises may also include medium and large enterprises set up in rural setting. However, the present study covers only the micro enterprises established in rural areas.

2.1 Entrepreneurial motivation

Motivation is defined, "as an inner state that energizes, activates, or moves, and that directs or channels behaviors towards goals (Berleson, 1964). Entrepreneurial motivation is the process which activates and motivates an entrepreneur to exert higher level of efforts for the achievement of entrepreneurial goals.

Generally entrepreneurial motivations are discussed by various researchers in different ways such as personal factors, intrinsic or extrinsic factors, family security factors, critical factors, necessity factors, opportunity factors, dissatisfaction factors independence, push factors, pull factors, economic factors and non economic factors of motivation.

2.2 Rural entrepreneurial motivation

The Rural entrepreneurial motivation is the process that activates and motivates the rural entrepreneur to exert higher level of efforts for the achievement of his/her rural entrepreneurial goals. The review of literature brought out 25 variables that can be considered as potential motivators of rural entrepreneurship. The lists of twenty five variables were pruned to 21 variables based on the feedback received during the pilot study covering 25 respondents and suggestions given by experts in the field.

In order to reduce the number of dimensions so as to make better interpretation, the collected data relating to motivators were analyzed using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) procedure and the EFA procedure brought out three factors that explain 89 percent of variation using the method Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation. These factors are labeled as 'Enabling Environment', 'Autonomy and Intellectual Drive' and 'Social Anchoring'.

2.3 Testing hypothesis - Rural entrepreneurial motivation

Rural entrepreneurial motivation may vary according to gender, caste, education, nature of business, religion ownership type of business etc. In order to find whether the profile of the rural entrepreneur and the rural enterprise makes any difference in rural entrepreneurial motivation, the collected data were tested using Independent samples t-test and one way ANOVA.

Gender and rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Prior studies (Tomin 2004, Mathias 2013) carry sufficient evidence about the role of gender in rural entrepreneurial motivation. Rural entrepreneurial motivation is generally high for male category compared to female category. In order to see whether gender makes any difference in rural entrepreneurial motivation, such as 'enabling Environment', 'Autonomy and intellectual Drive' and Social Anchoring, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using the Independent samples t-test. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.1

H_{0.1}: There is no significant difference between male and female rural entrepreneurs regarding the rural entrepreneurial motivation

H_{1.1}: There is significant difference between male and female rural entrepreneurs regarding the rural entrepreneurial motivation

Table 1.1 Gender and Rural entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Gender	Mean	SD	t	Df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Male	3.81	.322	1.63	147.5	0.02
	Female	4.40	.394			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Male	4.82	0.32	1.63	147.5	0.02
	Female	4.74	0.39			
Social Anchoring	Male	4.96	0.14	1.29	115.3	0.00
	Female	4.92	.262			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.1 shows the result of hypothesis test. As the P value is less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation. The mean score of male entrepreneurs are significantly more than the female entrepreneurs in autonomy and intellectual drive (male = 4.82, female = 4.74) and in social anchoring (male = 4.96, female = 4.92). The findings are consistent with the earlier studies that showed the gender difference exists with regard to various rural entrepreneurial motivations and male group usually have more rural entrepreneurial motivation than female entrepreneurs. However, with regard to enabling environment, the mean score of female rural entrepreneurs are significantly more than the male category (male = 3.81, female = 4.40). This might be because of enhanced support given by government and family to female rural entrepreneurs.

Caste and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Discrimination in the name of caste is and it's after effects still remain in the Indian society. In India, social protection in the form of reservation is given to lower caste people. Hence such reservation category is treated as 'lower classes and where no such reservation is given they are treated as 'Upper class' (general). Generally upper class is expected to have more motivation than their inferior lower class. In order to find whether significant difference between upper class (general) and lower class (reservation) with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using the Independent samples t-test. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.2

H_{0.2}: There is no significant difference between upper class (general) and lower class (reservation) category of entrepreneurs regarding various rural entrepreneurial motivations

H_{1.2}: There is significant difference between upper class (general) and lower class (reservation) category of entrepreneurs regarding various rural entrepreneurial motivations.

Table 1.2 Caste and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Caste	Mean	SD	t	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Upper class	3.99	.824	.85	268	0.16
	Lower class	4.14	.755			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Upper class	4.79	.353	.48	268	0.41
	Lower class	4.82	.313			
Social Anchoring	Upper class	4.96	.165	1.54	25.08	0.00
	Lower class	4.85	.353			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.2 presents the result of hypothesis test. As the P value is greater than .05, regarding the rural entrepreneurial motivation such as enabling environment and autonomy and intellectual drive the null hypothesis was accepted. However as the P value regarding social anchoring, is lesser than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis. Hence it can be concluded that there is significant difference between upper class and lower class category with regard to social anchoring. The mean score is higher for upper class group than lower class group (upper class = 4.96, lower class = 4.85).

This finding is in tune with the general perception that the lower classes are less motivated to entrepreneurship. Lower classes generally are still deprived of opportunities on account of their lower status in the society. Though the Government provides different kinds of supports for the encouragement of lower classes to bring them to the mainstream, it remains as a distant dream at least regarding rural entrepreneurship.

Nature of education and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Earlier studies (Mario and Arminda, 2011; P. S. Ravindra, 2014) show the relevance of educational qualifications of a rural entrepreneur in starting the rural enterprise. Educated people are better off in identification of opportunities and realising the pros and cones of proposed business in a competitive world.

Similarly the nature of education, technical or non technical may have varied influence on entrepreneurial motivation. In order to see whether the technical and non technical nature of education makes any difference in rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using the Independent samples t-test. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.3.

H_{0.3}: There is no significant difference between entrepreneurs with technical and non technical background with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

H_{1.3}: There is significant difference between entrepreneurs with technical and non technical background with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

Table 1.3 Education and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Education	Mean	SD	t	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Non-technical	4.00	.88	.822	197.3	.000
	Technical	4.02	.59			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Non-technical	4.80	.331	.438	113.6	.337
	Technical	4.77	.396			
Social Anchoring	Non-technical	4.96	.171	1.457	268	.008
	Technical	4.92	.237			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.3 shows that technical and non technical nature of education significantly distinguishes motivation. As the P value is less than .05 between non technical and technical education regarding 'enabling environment' and 'social anchoring', the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis. Hence there is significant difference between technical and non - technical background with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation such as enabling environment, autonomy and intellectual drive.

As the P value of 'autonomy and intellectual drive' is greater than .05, the null hypothesis was accepted. Non technical education have significantly higher mean score regarding social anchoring (non- technical =4.96, technical=4.92) where as technical education have significantly higher mean than non technical group regarding enabling environment (non- technical =4.00, technical=4.02). Hence it appears that entrepreneurs with non-technical background are

motivated more by social anchoring. Whereas, people with technical education are more motivated by enabling environment. This may be because of the reason that technical nature of education provides confidence in respective field of business with practical knowledge, experience etc which in turn motivates them towards entrepreneurship. The findings are consistent with the results of earlier studies (Hessel Oosterbeek .Mirjamvan Praag, 2010) which showed that education whether it is non technical or technical has significant difference in motivating the entrepreneurs and in quite true in the case of rural entrepreneurs.

Marital status and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Growth intention and responsibility towards the family and children motivates a person to become self employed. In order to establish whether the marital status of entrepreneurs makes any difference in rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using the Independent samples t-test. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.4

H_{0.4}: There is no significant difference between married and unmarried entrepreneurs regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation

H_{1.4}: There is significant difference between married and unmarried entrepreneurs regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation

Table 1.4 Marital status and rural entrepreneurial Motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Marital Status	Mean	SD	t	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Unmarried	3.82	1.05	4.19	43.00	.000
	Married	4.25	.708			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Unmarried	4.85	.230	1.81	74.78	.006
	Married	4.77	.370			
Social Anchoring	Unmarried	4.90	.345	.997	39.07	.006
	Married	4.96	.138			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.4 shows the result of hypothesis test. As the P value is less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis with regard to entrepreneurial motivation. The mean score of married entrepreneurs are significantly higher for enabling environment (married = 4.25, unmarried = 3.82) and ‘social anchoring’ (married = 4.96, unmarried = 4.90). The mean score of unmarried entrepreneurs are higher for autonomy and intellectual drive’ (married = 4.77, unmarried = 4.90). Married entrepreneurs are more motivated by enabling environment and social anchoring than unmarried rural entrepreneurs.

Nature of business and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Every rural enterprise has peak seasons and off seasons .Concentration of the activity decides the seasonal and non seasonal nature of business. The motivation for entrepreneurship may be different for seasonal and non seasonal business. In order to find whether significant difference exists between seasonal and non seasonal nature of business regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using the Independent samples t-test. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.5

H_{0.5}: There is no significant difference between seasonal and non-seasonal business regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation

H_{1.5}: There is significant difference between seasonal and non-seasonal business regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation

Table 1.5 Nature of business and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Nature of business	Mean	SD	t	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Seasonal	4.36	.693	2.11	46	.557
	Non seasonal	3.91	.836			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Seasonal	4.82	.400	.625	46	.631
	Non seasonal	4.75	.323			
Social Anchoring	Seasonal	4.89	.327	.703	46	.142
	Non seasonal	4.95	.150			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.5 shows that the P values of rural entrepreneurial motivation are greater than .05, and therefore the null hypothesis was accepted. Hence there is no significant difference between seasonal and non seasonal nature of business about rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Age of rural entrepreneur and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Age makes a man perfect with practical experience in handling various situations and creates the ability to take much better decisions. Hence, it may acts as a driving force behind the motivation of a rural entrepreneur to start a venture and run it successfully. In order to see whether there is any difference among young, middle aged and senior entrepreneurs regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using One Way ANOVA. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.6

H_{0.6}: There is no significant difference among young, middle aged and senior entrepreneurs with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

H_{1.6}: There is significant difference among young, middle aged and senior entrepreneurs with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

Table: 1.6 Age of rural entrepreneur and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Age of rural entrepreneur	Mean	SD	F	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Young rural entrepreneurs	4.05	.826	.121	267	.886
	Middle aged rural entrepreneurs	3.99	.782			
	Senior rural entrepreneurs	4.00	.977			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Young rural entrepreneurs	4.77	.323	.358	267	.699
	Middle aged rural entrepreneurs	4.49	.371			
	Senior rural entrepreneurs	4.83	.273			
Social Anchoring	Young rural	4.91	.260	2.43	267	.090

	entrepreneurs					
	Middle aged rural entrepreneurs	4.96	.157			
	Senior rural entrepreneurs	4.91	214			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.6, the results of hypothesis test reveals that P value is greater than .05 among the different age groups of rural entrepreneurs regarding enabling environment, social anchoring and autonomy and intellectual drive, the null hypothesis was accepted. Hence there is no significant difference among young, middle aged and senior entrepreneurs with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation. Therefore, rural entrepreneurial motivation is independent of age.

Religion and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Religion shapes the attitudes, culture, ethics, and values of a person. Therefore, different religions are likely to have varied influence on entrepreneurial motivation. In order to examine whether there is any difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim rural entrepreneurs regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using One way ANOVA .The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.7

H_{0.7}: There is no significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim entrepreneurs with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation.

H_{1.7}: There is significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim entrepreneurs with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Table 1.7 Religions and rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Entrepreneurial motivations	Religion	Mean	SD	F	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Hindu	3.20	.857	10.42	267	.000
	Christian	4.23	.720			
	Muslim	4.25	.692			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Hindu	4.82	.342	1.69	267	.186
	Christian	4.73	.368			
	Muslim	4.80	.336			
Social Anchoring	Hindu	4.94	.204	.462	267	.631
	Christian	4.96	.182			
	Muslim	4.94	.173			

Source: Field survey N = 270

As the P value is greater than .05 regarding social anchoring and autonomy and intellectual drive, the null hypothesis was accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Muslim entrepreneurs regarding social anchoring and autonomy and intellectual drive. As the P value regarding enabling environment is less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis. Muslim entrepreneurs have the highest mean score regarding enabling environment (Hindu =3.20, Christian = 4.23, Muslim = 4.25).

Post hoc analysis using Turkey multiple range test for significance revealed that enabling environment is significantly more for Muslims (m = 4.25) than Hindus (m = 3.20). Similarly a

comparison between Christians and Hindus also shows that the mean score of enabling environment is significantly higher for Christians ($m = 4.23$) than Hindus ($m = 3.20$).

However there is no significant difference between the mean score of Muslims and Christians with regard to enabling environment. Muslim and Christians have more supportive environment than other entrepreneurs. Hindu entrepreneurs may be hesitant to take risk and they may prefer stable income such as salary.

Nature of previous experience and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Previous experience in skills increases the confidence of a rural entrepreneur. Motivation level may be high for entrepreneurs with prior experience especially in similar business. In order to see whether there is any significant difference among similar, dissimilar and contributions of similar and dissimilar regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using the one way ANOVA. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.8

$H_{0.8}$: There is no significant difference among rural entrepreneurs of varied experience (similar/dissimilar/both similar and dissimilar) regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation.

$H_{1.8}$: There is significant difference among rural entrepreneurs of varied experience (similar/dissimilar/both similar and dissimilar) regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Table 1.8 Nature of experiences and rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Entrepreneurial motivations	Previous Experience	Mean	SD	F	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Similar Business	3.84	.894	6.85	267	.001
	Dissimilar Business	4.05	.898			
	Both	4.22	.637			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Similar Business	4.79	.344	.418	267	.659
	Dissimilar Business	4.72	.383			
	Both	4.80	.351			
Social Anchoring	Similar Business	4.94	.227	.403	267	.669
	Dissimilar Business	4.97	.117			
	Both	4.95	.146			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.8 shows that, P values of social anchoring, and, autonomy and intellectual drive, is greater than .05, hence the null hypothesis was accepted. As the p value is lesser than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis with regard to enabling environment. Post hoc analysis using Tukey multiple range test for significance indicated that previous experiences in both similar and dissimilar business has ($m = 4.22$) the highest mean score than similar business ($m = 3.84$) for enabling environment. This finding indicates that varied experiences in multiple fields may enhance the motivation level of rural entrepreneurs in starting their business.

Average family income and rural entrepreneurial motivation

An individual enter in to the field of business with a profit motive. Rural entrepreneurs with sufficient support of family are more motivated than others in starting business because they have the confidence in accessing risk free initial capital. Higher the family income, higher will be the support for rural entrepreneurs. In order to find whether there is any difference among various levels of average family income regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using one way ANOVA. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.9

H_{0,9}: There is no significant difference among rural entrepreneurs of different family income level with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

H_{1,9}: There is significant difference among rural entrepreneurs of different family income level with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

Table 1.9 Average family income and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Average Family Income	Mean	SD	F	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Less than rupees 10,000	4.48	.635	7.36	265	.000
	rupees 10,000- 20,000	4.19	.756			
	rupees 20,000- 30,000	3.75	.877			
	rupees 30,000-40,000	3.46	.810			
	Above rupees 40,000	3.79	.423			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Less than rupees 10,000	4.82	.284	.720	265	.579
	rupees 10,000- 20,000	4.79	.353			
	rupees 20,000- 30,000	4.78	.334			
	rupees 30,000- 40,000	4.86	.245			
	Above rupees 40,000	4.58	.787			
Social Anchoring	Less than rupees 10000	4.91	.201	.818	265	.515
	rupees 10000- 20000	4.96	.191			
	rupees20000- 30000	4.93	.199			
	rupees30000- 40000	5.00	.000			
	Above rupees 40000	4.91	.204			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.9 shows the results of hypothesis test conducted in the collected data. As the P value is greater than .05 among rural entrepreneurs of different income levels regarding social anchoring and autonomy and intellectual drive, the null hypothesis was accepted. Hence, there is no significant difference among different family income groups with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation.

As the P value is lesser than .05 regarding enabling environment, null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis. Hence, there is significant difference among rural entrepreneurs of different family income groups.

Post Hoc analysis using Tukey Multiple range test shows that motivation through enabling environment is significantly high for less than rupees10,000 ($m = 4.48$) than rupees 10,000 to rupees 20,000 ($m = 4.19$), rupees20,000 to rupees30,000 ($m = 3.75$), rupees30,000 to rupees40,000 ($m = 3.46$).Therefore motivation through enabling environment is similarly more for low family income group than high family income group. The finding is against the popular belief that high family income provides more support and have environment for doing business.

Type of business and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Success behind the existing categories of business becomes the motivator in selecting the type of business. In order to find whether there is significant difference among the categories of activities regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using the one way ANOVA. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.10.

$H_{0,10}$: There is no significant difference among different types of enterprises regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation.

$H_{1,10}$: There is no significant difference among the different types of enterprises regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Table 1.10 Type of business and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Type of Business	Mean	SD	F	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Wood Based	2.63	.424	.657	264	.000
	Food Based	3.43	.238			
	Agro Based	3.98	.210			
	Service based	4.35	.059			
	Textile Based	4.72	.137			
	Marine Based	4.92	.019			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Wood Based	4.86	.231	7.81	264	.000
	Food Based	4.82	.287			
	Agro Based	4.61	.509			
	Service based	4.64	.463			
	Textile Based	4.97	.073			
	Marine Based	4.84	.184			
Social Anchoring	Wood Based	4.97	.149	3.75	264	.003
	Food Based	4.94	.167			
	Agro Based	4.85	.299			
	Service based	4.99	.037			
	Textile Based	4.92	.264			
	Marine Based	5.00	.000			

Source: Field survey N = 270

As per Table 1.10, the null hypothesis was rejected in respect of all motivators of rural entrepreneurship as the P value of all the motivators are less than .05. Hence, there is significant difference among different types of business with regard to various rural entrepreneurial motivations. The Post Hoc analysis using Tukey multiple comparison test for significance indicates that the mean value of marine based enterprises ($m = 4.92$) are significantly more than

all other types of business for enabling environment. For autonomy and intellectual drive, the mean value of Textile based enterprises are found significantly higher ($m = 4.97$) than other types of rural enterprises. In respect of social anchoring, wood based enterprises have significantly higher mean value ($m = 4.97$) than agro based ($m = 4.85$). Besides, mean value of marine based enterprises ($m = 5.00$) are significantly higher than service based enterprise ($m = 4.99$). Therefore, motivation on account of enabling environment is high for marine based enterprises than others. Motivations on account of autonomy and intellectual drive are significantly high for textile based enterprise.

Types of ownership and rural entrepreneurial motivation

There are different types of ownership structure such as sole proprietorship, partnership and co-operatives. The motivations for such entrepreneurship may vary according to ownership structure. In order to see whether there is significant difference among the different types of organisation structure with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using one way ANOVA. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.11

$H_{0.11}$: There is no significant difference among different types of organisation structure with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

$H_{1.11}$: There is significant difference among different types of organisation structure with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

Table 1.1 Types of ownership and rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Entrepreneurial motivations	Types of ownership	Mean	SD	F	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Sole – proprietorship	3.93	.765	8.00	267	.000
	Partnership	4.04	.922			
	Co-operative	4.81	.320			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Sole – proprietorship	4.77	.378	2.40	267	.093
	Partnership	4.86	.251			
	Co-operative	4.71	.366			
Social Anchoring	Sole – proprietorship	4.95	.184	.662	267	.516
	Partnership	4.95	.151			
	Co-operative	4.89	.400			

Source: Field survey N = 270

Table 1.11, shows that the P value is greater than .05 among the different types of organizational structure regarding social anchoring, autonomy and intellectual drive and therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted. As the P value of enabling environment is lesser than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis. Hence, there is significant difference among the different type of organizational structure with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Post hoc analysis using Tukey multiple range test for significance indicated that the mean score of co-operative business (m = 4.81) is significantly more than and sole proprietorship (m = 3.93) and partnership (m = 4.04). The findings indicates that collective form of entrepreneurs such as co-operative and partnership enjoy more supported enabling environment for starting new business.

Nature of Origin and rural entrepreneurial motivation

The formation of enterprise may be through the purchases, inheritance and a self developed. Self developed enterprises got in the result of hard work of the entrepreneur and was developed by the entrepreneur himself. Whereas, inherited or purchased enterprises are the fruit of somebody else’s effort.

The motivation may be different among self developed enterprises, inherited or purchased enterprises. In order to find whether the ownership of enterprise makes any difference regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation, the following hypotheses were formulated and tested using one way ANOVA. The result of hypothesis test is given in Table 1.12

H_{0.12}: There is no significant difference among inherited, purchased, and self developed enterprises with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

H_{1.12}: There is significant difference among inherited, purchased, and self developed enterprises with regard to rural entrepreneurial motivation

Table 1.12 Nature of Origin and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Entrepreneurial motivations	Types of ownership	Mean	SD	F	df	P Value
Enabling Environment	Inherited	3.69	1.02	6.56	267	.002
	Purchased	3.92	.691			
	Self Developed	4.11	.725			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Inherited	4.88	.245	2.57	267	.078
	Purchased	4.71	.336			
	Self Developed	4.76	.374			
Social Anchoring	Inherited	4.94	.219	.478	267	.621
	Purchased	4.90	.256			
	Self Developed	4.95	.177			

Source: Field Survey N = 270

Table 1.12 shows that the null hypothesis was accepted in respect of social anchoring and autonomy and intellectual drive as the P value is greater than .05. Where as the P value is less than .05 for enabling environment, and therefore, null hypothesis was rejected in favour of alternative hypothesis for enabling environment.

Self developed enterprises have the highest score for enabling the environment (inherited = 3.69 purchased = 3.92 self developed = 4.11). Self developed enterprises are more motivated by enabling environment than other purchased/inherited type of enterprises. Enabling environment motivates entrepreneurs who wish to self-develop a new business.

1.13 Testing of hypotheses summary: Rural entrepreneurial motivation

Variables	Factors	Results
Gender	Enabling Environment	H _{0.2} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	
	Social Anchoring	
Caste	Enabling Environment	H _{0.3} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	H _{0.3} accepted
	Social Anchoring	H _{0.3} rejected
Nature of Education	Enabling Environment	H _{0.4} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	H _{0.4} accepted
	Social Anchoring	H _{0.4} rejected
Marital Status	Enabling Environment	H _{0.5} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	
	Social Anchoring	
Nature of business	Enabling Environment	H _{0.6} accepted
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	
	Social Anchoring	
Age of Rural entrepreneur	Enabling Environment	H _{0.7} accepted
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	
	Social Anchoring	
Religion	Enabling Environment	H _{0.8} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	H _{0.8} accepted
	Social Anchoring	
Previous Experience	Enabling Environment	H _{0.9} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	H _{0.9} accepted
	Social Anchoring	
Average Family Income	Enabling Environment	H _{0.10} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	H _{0.10} accepted
	Social Anchoring	
Type of Business	Enabling Environment	H _{0.11} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	
	Social Anchoring	
Types of ownership	Enabling Environment	H _{0.12} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	H _{0.12} accepted
	Social Anchoring	
Nature of Origin	Enabling Environment	H _{0.13} rejected
	Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	H _{0.13} accepted
	Social Anchoring	

Table 1.13 shows the summary of the hypothesis tested under the head entrepreneurial motivation. The researcher framed and tested the hypothesis regarding enabling environment, autonomy and intellectual drive and social anchoring, in which nine cases accepted null hypothesis and twelve cases rejected the same in favour of alternative hypotheses.

3.1 Conclusion

In Kerala rural enterprises sector has the potential to emerge as a strong, vibrant and globally competitive sector in the state's economy with its excellent connectivity, communication network, and availability of highly skilled human resources and developing industrial infrastructure which is best suited for the growth of rural enterprises contributing to the process of economic growth, employment generation and balanced regional development. The study provides insights to the rural entrepreneurs regarding rural entrepreneurial motivations and its significant difference on account of entrepreneurial profile. Government, being the major promoter of rural enterprises would like to know the issues confronting motivation of rural entrepreneurs so as to devise appropriate measures, either by way of creating and implementing new policies and programs or by enriching the existing one, will benefit from the findings of the study. The study may enlighten educational institutions to frame new curriculum with emphasis on entrepreneurial motivation that may inspire and attract students towards entrepreneurship. The collected data relating to motivators were analyzed using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) procedure and brought out three factors which are labeled as 'Enabling Environment', 'Autonomy and Intellectual Drive' and 'Social Anchoring'. The researcher framed and tested the hypothesis regarding enabling environment, autonomy and intellectual drive and social anchoring with the entrepreneurial profile, in which nine cases accepted null hypothesis and twelve cases rejected the same in favor of alternative hypotheses

Reference:

Government of India. (2016). State of Indian Agriculture 2015-16. New Delhi: Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers, Directorate of Economics and Statistics.

Ministry of MSMEs. (2013). Annual Report 2012-13. Delhi: Ministry of MSMEs, Government of India.

Ministry of MSMEs. (2015). Annual Report 2014-15. Delhi: Ministry of MSMEs, Government of India.

Ministry of MSMEs. (2016). Annual Report 2015-16. Delhi: Ministry of MSMEs, Government of India.

Venkateswaralu, P., & Ravindra, P. S. (2015). An empirical study on problem and prospects of rural entrepreneurs with special reference to Visakhapatnam district. International Journal of Management and Commerce Innovations, 2(2), pp: 458-467, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Berelson, B. & Steiner G.A. (1964). Human Behaviour: An inventory of Scientific Findings, Harcourt Brace & World, Inc., New York, R 240.

Hessel Oosterbeek . Mirjamvan Praag, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. European Economic Review, Volume 54, Issue 3, pp. 442-454.

Raposo, Mario & Paço, Arminda. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: Relationship between education and entrepreneurial activity. Psicothema. 23. 453-7.