Participatory Rural Entrepreneurship Development for Grassroots Transformation: A Factor Analysis
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ABSTRACT The article identified crucial factors influencing participatory rural entrepreneurship development and employment promotion (PREDEP) amongst grassroots people in Lagos State, Nigeria. It specifically identified and analysed some selected socio-economic variables influencing people’s participation in PREDEP; identified and analysed infrastructural and institutional factors associated with PREDEP; identified the constraints to PREDEP; and determined the appropriate ways of enhancing grassroots peoples’ interest in PREDEP. The study was conducted in eight rural communities (selected from Badagry, Ibeju-Lekki, Epe and Ikorodu Local Government Areas) of Lagos State, using a multi-stage sampling procedure. A total of 320 respondents were sampled and interviewed, accordingly. Descriptive statistics (such as frequency counts, percentages, means and standard deviation) were used to summarise and describe the data. Factor analysis was employed to identify crucial factors influencing PREDEP. The result showed that most respondents (81.3%) were farmers and 50.0% were civil servants, indicating that majority of the respondents had between 1 and 2 jobs/businesses. About 60.0% were cooperators with just 16.3% being active members. Also, 46.0% rural entrepreneurs never employed more than 2 workers. Over 50.0% of the respondents preferred buying and selling to active production ventures. Non-availability of credit facilities and high cost of labour were major constraints to investment drive in rural communities. Seven crucial factors associated with PREDEP were social status (λ=2.41); personal experience (λ=2.24); infrastructure functionality (λ= 2.15); and educational advantage (λ= 1.98). Others are economic prowess (λ = 1.63), institutional influence (λ = 1.35), and information and project type (λ= 1.55).