



Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth: An Analysis of Impact of Public Policy On Entrepreneurship Development in Nigeria

S.A. Abdullahi

*Department of Business Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria-Nigeria.*

Email: sabdullahi2001@yahoo.com

Abstract

It has been argued that entrepreneurial activity and new firm formation are engines of economic growth and innovation especially at times of serious economic challenges. It is also generally believed that private sector participation in economic development can be increased through the use of public policy. This study appraised the impact of public policies on the development of entrepreneurship in Nigeria. It also examined the relationship between entrepreneurship and economic growth & development; undertook a comparative study of the characteristics of sole and team enterprises in terms of performance in Nigeria. The study used both primary and secondary data. The primary data was collected through the use of questionnaire and personal interview, while the complemented secondary data was collected from CBN statistical Bulletins. Descriptive statistical tools such as percentage, frequency distribution tables, and trend analysis of variables were used to describe the data and facilitate analysis, while inferential statistical tools of analysis such as Pearson correlation and regression were used for analysis. The study establishes that public policy in Nigeria has had negative impact on entrepreneurship development. Our empirical study reveals that team enterprises had more resources, more competence, more experience and better planning than the sole enterprises. Also established is the fact that teams performed better than soles on performance and growth indicators such as employment, turnover, and profitability. These and other findings of the study agree with Stam (2005) in Netherlands and Aghion and Howitt (1998). Our obvious conclusion therefore, is that, team enterprises contribute more to employment generation, income earning and economic empowerment as well as overall economic growth than sole enterprises. It is therefore recommended that entrepreneurship development and entrepreneurial orientation should be more vigorously pursued by government in order to accelerate economic growth and development in Nigeria.

INTRODUCTION

The Nigerian economy has been characterized with a lot of inefficiencies; public sector dominance, over reliance on oil as the major revenue earner and this has typically affected the country's course of development. However, since the mid-1980s, Nigeria has introduced some structural economic reforms, abolished policies and structures which prevented entry into certain industries, and opened up its markets to



competition from domestic and foreign entrepreneurs. The government have also introduced and pursued a number of entrepreneurship encouragement policies aimed at reducing the high rates of unemployment and poverty. Though, Nigeria is still plagued by many development challenges, "preliminary evidence suggests a favourable response by the private sector to the new entrepreneurial opportunities thus created" (Elkan, 1988).

The importance of entrepreneurship development through new business formation for economic growth has been recognized since Schumpeter (1934). According to the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Report (2000), about 70 percent of an area's economic performance and well being is dependent upon how entrepreneurial the area's economy is.

Ogundele, Olajide and Ashamu (2008) argued that Entrepreneurship activities are very fundamental to any meaningful development of an economy. Many well meaning people and leaders in the societies always clamour for the development of entrepreneurs that would bring a turnaround in the economy. This explains the reason behind the government conscious policy statements that are often made in this direction. However, it has to be noted that the benefit and relevance of entrepreneur to accelerated economic growth cannot be achieved in isolation without the existence of the right opportunities that serve as the wheel of its development. Entrepreneurship, as used in this paper, refers to innovative individuals who observe business opportunities or create business opportunities which they exploit in order to provide product or service to the society at a benefit to the entrepreneur. It is the trust of this paper therefore that without the opportunity, there cannot be entrepreneurship. Where entrepreneurs observe there are no opportunities, they will create one to make themselves relevant. The contention of this paper therefore, is that private organizations, public institutions and the entire society should provide necessary foundation structures for the existence of opportunities which the entrepreneurs can utilize/exploit to serve the society.

Abdullahi (2008) reported that Petrin (1992) opined that for countries to accelerate their economic growth and development, it is necessary for them to build up the critical mass of first generation entrepreneurs because development is now being linked more and more to entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship as argued by Abdullahi (2008) stands as a vehicle to improve the quality of life for individuals, families and communities and to sustain a healthy economy and environment. However, the acceptance of entrepreneurship as a central development force by itself will not lead to economic development and the advancement of private enterprises until an enabling environment necessary for entrepreneurship to be rewarding is created within communities. The existence of such an environment largely depends



on public policies promoting entrepreneurship and according to Petrin, (1994) as cited in Abdullahi (2008), the effectiveness of such policies in turn depends on a conceptual framework about entrepreneurship

One of the goals of economic development strategies pursued by successive Nigerian Governments has been the reduction of poverty through job creation. *Ipsa facto*, many government policies over the years for the achievement of the objective have been based on the development of indigenous entrepreneurship. However, Ekpu (1992) humorously observed some of these policies have been like changing one structure for another much like ‘exchanging a monkey for a baboon, recycling of ideas; a duplication of efforts (which) turn out to be of doubtful relevance or simply a money-guzzling machine.”

Chukwuemeka, Nzewi and Okigbo (2008) opined that a cursory look at Nigeria indicates that she either lacks entrepreneurship ability or that government entrepreneurship oriented policies are not effective. Ugwu (2006) argues that most entrepreneurship related policies and programmes in Nigeria fall short of appropriate development frameworks, some of the policies are poor, frequent changing of policies and programmes and lack of clear entrepreneurial development vision and commitment pose serious threat to entrepreneurship in Nigeria. Some of the entrepreneurial related policies are good but the issue of poor environmental forces hinders them. For instance electricity supply, water and good road network are not available to encourage entrepreneurs. An easy access to finance, high import tariff and other tariffs of government pose serious threat for the survival of young entrepreneurs. In the light of the foregoing, the pertinent question is that what has been the impact of these policies on entrepreneurship development in Nigeria?

The Objective of the Study

The main objective of this study therefore is to determine the impact of public policy on entrepreneurship development in Nigeria as well as undertake a comparative study of the characteristics of sole and team enterprises in terms of performance. The study is also concerned about identifying the specific generic constraints affecting entrepreneurship development in Nigeria.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Operational Definitions of Concepts

Gana (2001:5) define entrepreneurship as the willingness and ability of an individual to seek out investment opportunities in an environment, and be able to establish and run an enterprise successfully based on the identified opportunities. Though Gana’s definition was based on the managerial perspective, it is important to mention that the entrepreneur has certain personality traits which influence his



behaviour (psychologists view). He also lives in a society (sociologist view) and he is obviously affected by the economic opportunities and government incentives (economist view). Gana (2001) therefore cautioned that any attempt to describe the entrepreneur against only one dimension will be inadequate and would not give a holistic view of who the entrepreneur is.

Mbaebgu (2008) opined that entrepreneurship refers to the activities of the entrepreneur as the initiator, organizer, innovator and risk bearer in production or business. The entrepreneur is the person whose activities create wealth and employment which can be measured either directly or through economic growth rates. This definition is without prejudice to the classification of entrepreneurs on a continuum from small craftman entrepreneurs to big time opportunistic entrepreneurs adopted by Inegbenebor and Osaze (1999: 193). Whether big or small entrepreneurs are all in business to make profit and grow their enterprises (Carland et al 1984).

According to the UNDP (1999) entrepreneurship can be defined as the process of using private initiative to transform a business concept into a new venture or to grow and diversify an existing venture or enterprise with high growth potential. Entrepreneurs identify an innovation to seize an opportunity, mobilize money and management skills, and take calculated risks to open markets for new products, processes and services. While Entrepreneurship development (ED) refers to the process of enhancing entrepreneurial skills and knowledge through structured training and institution-building programmes. ED aims to enlarge the base of entrepreneurs in order to hasten the pace at which new ventures are created. This accelerates employment generation and economic development. Entrepreneurship development focuses on the *individual* who wishes to start or expand a business. Small and medium enterprise (SME) development, on the other hand, focuses on developing the *enterprise*, whether or not it employs or is led by individuals who can be considered entrepreneurial. Furthermore, entrepreneurship development concentrates more on growth potential and innovation than SME development does. However, many of the lessons learned from experiences in both types of development are similar (UNDP, 1999).

Abdullahi (2008:360) explained that Burnett (2000:1) posited that throughout the theoretical history of entrepreneurship, scholars from multiple disciplines in the social sciences have grappled with a diverse set of interpretations and definitions to conceptualize this abstract idea. Over time, "some writers have identified entrepreneurship with the function of uncertainty-bearing, others with the coordination of productive resources, others with the introduction of innovation, and still others with the provision of capital" (Hoselitz, 200:12). Burnett (2000:1) then



concluded that even though certain themes continually resurface throughout the history of entrepreneurship theory, presently there is no single definition of entrepreneurship that is accepted by all or that is applicable in every economy.

Thus, our most appropriate and adopted definition is a combination of three different definitions, wherein, entrepreneurship can be defined as-a force that mobilizes other resources to meet unmet market demand (Jones & Sakong, 1980); the ability to create and build something from practically nothing (Timmons, 1994); and the process of creating value by pulling together a unique package of resources to exploit an opportunity (Stevenson, et al, 1985).

Public Policy

According to Mbaegbu (2008), many definitions of public policy abound. Dye (1965) and Jones (1977) agree that public policy is a public decision to achieve a purpose. However, policy only lays down the general directive rather than detailed instructions or strategies to follow to achieve the objective. Basically, public policies are formulated by the three arms of government working in concert. But, policies can be initiated from para institutional sources and from private persons. Ultimately all public policies in Nigeria derive their legitimacy from the constitution (Uchendu 1989).

Nwizu (1997) simply defines it as a guiding principle which governs action especially repetitive actions, it is a decision as to what should be done and how, when and where. Easton in Chukwuemeka (2001) defines public policy as the authoritative allocation of value of the whole society. Some of these definitions are in one way or the other not adequate.

However, we make bold to say that public policy is a pronouncement of government intentions by people in positions of public trust, demanding governmental actions or inactions and having impact either negative or positive, on the majority of the members of a given society. Public policy is a statement about future events.

Entrepreneurship Education

According to Mainoma and Aruwa (2008), entrepreneurship education generally refers to programmes that promote entrepreneurship awareness for career purposes and provide skill training for business creation and development (Vesper, 1990; Bechard & Toulouse, 1998). It is distinguishable from other forms of business education when its purpose is creating a new product or service that results in higher economic value (Hanesmark, 1998).

Entrepreneurship literature has considered the effectiveness of education at various stages of adulthood. For example, entrepreneurial education has been linked to the propensity toward entrepreneurship for adults (Gorman et al., 1997). Vesper



(1990) suggested that university entrepreneurship educators facilitate the entrepreneurial process by creating awareness among collegiate students. Studies by Hanesmark (1998) support the value of formal entrepreneurial education at the university level, but only in terms of affecting the attitude toward entrepreneurship as a career alternative. Gasse (1985) recommended that entrepreneurial potential should be identified and developed at the secondary school level, when the possibility of self-employment as a career option is still open. There are indications that the formal education system is not particularly supportive of entrepreneurship and possibly suppresses entrepreneurial characteristics (Chamard, 1989).

Mainoma and Aruwa (2008), further opined that Entrepreneurship programme should also teach skills in detecting and exploiting business opportunities, as well as incorporate detailed and long-term business planning (Vesper & McMullan, 1988). Plaschka and Welsch (1990) introduced the concept of transition stages of entrepreneurship education suggesting programmes geared toward creativity, multi-disciplinary and process-oriented approaches, and theory-based practical applications. Consistent with these pedagogical criteria, Hammer (2000) suggested experiential learning entrepreneurship.

Theories of Entrepreneurship

In this paper we shall examine Schumpeter's and McClelland's theories of entrepreneurship on which many public policies are based. In Schumpeter's theory (1934) The supply of entrepreneurship is a function of the rate of profit accumulation and the "social climate." By this theory a vibrant profitable economy encourages people to venture into entrepreneurship while any action tending to squeeze profit such as increased bargaining power of trade unions, progressive income and corporate taxes, etc, will discourage enterprise. Schumpeter uses the concept of "social climate" to describe the whole lot of social, political and socio-psychological environment within which the entrepreneur operates namely: educational system, social values, class structure, reward system etc. (Higgins, 1968: 94)

While Schumpeter's theory is basically environmental – social, political and economic – McClelland's theory is purely psychological. He hinges entrepreneurship on the motive, the need for achievement. This motive is a personality trait which can be acquired through appropriate interventions or attitudinal changes such as by training and development. This underlines the success of the Indian Gujarat Model (Ekpenyong, 1989).

Mainoma and Aruwa (2008) The role of quality entrepreneurship education and training in identifying and nurturing entrepreneurial potential among youth is becoming apparent to students, policy makers, and educators. The recent introduction of entrepreneurial education for all undergraduates in Nigerian



universities by the Nigerian Universities Commission provides further evidence of the need for youth and family economic empowerment and self-employment as a viable career option. Hitherto, the polytechnics and colleges of education run small business management course as a variant of entrepreneurship education.

It has been argued that the supply of entrepreneurs can be increased by developing a positive perception about the feasibility and desirability of entrepreneurship through educational preparation at an early age (Kourilsky, 1980). When rooted in solid learning theory, entrepreneurial education develops entrepreneurs, by increasing business knowledge and promoting psychological attributes associated with entrepreneurs (Kruegar & Brazeal, 1994 and Walstad & Kourilsky, 1998).

Identifying and nurturing entrepreneurial potential among youth can have long-term implications for economic development. Prior research has addressed the potency of entrepreneurship education to affect the development of entrepreneurial talent prior to the collegiate level. Specifically, student with training in entrepreneurship have greater overall entrepreneurial characteristics, higher achievement motivation, more personal control, and greater self-esteem (Rasheed, 2002).

Contribution of Entrepreneurship to Economic Development

1. **Developing new markets:** Under the new concept of marketing, markets are people who are willing and able to satisfy their needs. Okafor (1995:5) saw marketing as looking at the business through the customer's eyes profitably. In Economics, this is called effective demand. Peterson (1983:14) observed that demand has relationship with prices and quality. Entrepreneurs are therefore resourceful and creative. They can create customers or buyers. This makes entrepreneurs different from ordinary businessmen who only perform traditional functions of management like planning, organising and co-ordinating.
2. **Discovering new sources of materials:** Owing to the entrepreneur's innovative nature, they persist in discovering new sources of materials to improve their enterprises.
3. **Mobile Capital Resources:** Entrepreneurs properly mix the factors of production to create goods and services. Capital resources, from a layman's view, refer to money. However, in Economics, capital resources represent machines, buildings, and other physical productive resources. Entrepreneurs have initiative and self-confidence in accumulating and mobilising capital resources for new business or business expansion.



4. Introducing new technologies, new industries and new products: Apart from being innovators and reasonable risk-takers, entrepreneurs take advantage of business opportunities and transform these into profits.
5. Creating employment: The biggest employer is the private business sector. The factories, services, industries, agricultural enterprises, and the numerous small-scale businesses provide millions of jobs.

Entrepreneurship, Small Business Enterprises and Economic Growth

Although there are many theoretical interpretations of entrepreneurship, there has been very little empirical research conducted on this phenomenon, especially when compared to the amount of research conducted on the other three factors of production. According to Burnett (2000) this neglect has occurred for two main reasons:

1. Entrepreneurship is difficult to measure empirically, largely because developing the tools to measure it has been especially problematic.
2. Entrepreneurship is characterized by uncertainty and typically occurs in the presence of imperfect information, unknown production functions, and market failure.

According to Saeed (1998), it is most preferred for governments to promote domestic and indigenous entrepreneurship because domestic entrepreneurs are more aware of the market gaps that need to be filled domestically. Burnett (2000) subscribed to this view when he opined that instead of producing goods that might not be consumed within the country; domestic market forces encourage domestic entrepreneurs to create innovations and creative imitations that fulfill a real market deficiency domestically. Hence, MNCs can be used for entrepreneurship-led development, but domestic entrepreneurship is thought to be more effective.

Gillis (1996) and Burnett (2000) assert that entrepreneurship is a necessary ingredient for stimulating growth and in order to achieve successful economic development, a country must experience both economic growth and "fundamental changes in the structure of its economy. Despite their typically unappreciated role, entrepreneurs orchestrate these transformations and create new channels for economic activity and employment. Thus, all countries that wish to pursue continued development must encourage entrepreneurship. Given the importance of entrepreneurship to economic growth and development, it is incumbent upon governments to increase the supply of entrepreneurs. However this can only be done when policy makers understand the factors that affect the supply of entrepreneurs. Burnett, (2000) advanced two factors that affect the supply of entrepreneurship: opportunity and willingness to become an entrepreneur.



Evidences abound to suggest that many models of entrepreneurial firm performance exist within the field of entrepreneurship (Biggadike, 1976; Von Hippel, 1977; Sandberg, 1986). Most studies have attempted to link certain variables, such as business level strategy and industry structure, to new venture performance (Romanelli, 1987; McDougall, 1987; Stuart & Abetti, 1987). While there are many studies which have emulated the linear model of new venture performance espoused by Sandberg (1986), there have been differing results. In his study, Sandberg (1986) finds that industry structure and business strategy are important to new venture performance, but he is unable to empirically link the characteristics of the entrepreneur to the performance of an enterprise. He notes that this finding is troubling because most research has centered on new venture performance as a function of the entrepreneur (Brockhaus, 1980; Carland, Hoy, Boulton & Carland, 1984; Katz & Gartner, 1988). Therefore, despite his findings, Sandberg (1986) is unwilling to delete those characteristics of the entrepreneur from the model such as management competence and industry experience, because venture capitalists tend to value those characteristics as the most important criteria in funding.

Sherief (2004:4) reported that the studies conducted by Economic Commission for Latin America and Caribbean (ECLAC) and Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) in the Latin American and Caribbean region have indicated that rural based entrepreneurship is an important modernizing and development agent for small agriculture. The findings of the commission was also found to be true even in developed countries, explaining why it has been a clear policy of the European Union (EU) to channel a large part of the total common budget to develop the backward and poor regions of Europe.

Sherief (2004) also reported that Lyson (1995) study on entrepreneurship and economic development found that small-enterprises provide the framework of a development strategy for economically disadvantaged communities for the following reasons:

1. Small businesses would provide products for local consumption that are not readily available in the mass market.
2. Small-scale technically sophisticated enterprises would be able to fill the niche markets in the national economy that are too small for mass producers.
3. Small, craft-based, flexibly specialized enterprises can alter production quickly to exploit changing market conditions.

Stam (2005) observed that in contrast with the tradition of depicting the entrepreneur as a “lone hero” Schoonhoven and Romanelli (2001) research has shown



that entrepreneurship is a collective activity. Further more, relying on the works of Kamm et al. (1990); Weinzimmer (1997); Birley and Stockley (2000), Stam (2005) submitted that teams of entrepreneurs are critical for the growth of new ventures. In addition, Lechler (2001) empirical studies have demonstrated that starting with a team has a strong positive effect on growth with respect to both turnover and employment. Realising that previous researches have not focused on comparative analysis of regular solo and team enterprises, Stam (2005) undertook a comparative study of the characteristics of solo and team enterprises in terms of performance and bottleneck encountered. Using a sample size of 1286 new firms comprising of solo and teams, the study revealed that the share of successful team start ups is higher than that of solo start ups on several indicators. He however wondered whether the results of an empirical study in one particular context (the Netherlands in 1994-2000), could be relevant for explaining the same phenomenon (performance of team start-ups) in other context.

There have been a number of researches on entrepreneurship in Nigeria which we consider relevant to this paper. Some of these researches are Schatz (1962 and 1964); Harris and Rowe (1966); Harris (1968 and 1971); Kilby (1965 & 1971); Akeredolu – Ale (1975); Osoba et al (1987); and Inegbenebor (1995), and Ogundele (2000). They are quite representative of studies on entrepreneurship in Nigeria. Each of these works outlines methods of developing and aiding the emergence of effective indigenous entrepreneurs in Nigeria which should include women. Ogundele (2000) asserts the relevance of these studies to entrepreneurial development.

METHODOLOGY

This study made use of both primary and secondary sources of data. Specifically data for this study was obtained through the administration of survey questionnaire. There was also personal interview by asking direct, open-ended questions. In addition, data was obtained from secondary source materials. Such sources include published textbooks, magazines, periodicals, CBN statistical bulletin, UNDP Human Development Reports (HDR), Journal articles on Entrepreneurship and Economic Development, Publications of National Bureau of Statistics, Newspapers, Corporate Affairs Commission (CAC), NACCIMA, and SMEDAN.

The entrepreneur respondents were asked to respond to a set of questions which made it possible to gather information on their behaviour, experiences and the character and development of their enterprise. A sample of 168 sole and team enterprises was selected and used for the study from list of enterprises registered with the States Ministry of Commerce. Our definition of team enterprise used in the study was an enterprise that was formally registered and started by two or more owners while sole enterprise is one started by one owner. In quantitative sense, two



measures of growth dominate in academic research; sales growth and employment growth and these were applied.

The data collected was presented, and analysed using descriptive statistical tools such as percentage, frequency distribution tables, trend analysis of variables to describe the data and to facilitate analysis. The main goal of the analysis was to assess the impact of public policy on entrepreneurship development in Nigeria as well as determine whether there is difference in performance between team and solo enterprises.

This study also addresses the question of whether entrepreneurial education had impact on enterprise experience and influence on entrepreneurial characteristics in graduate entrepreneurs. Descriptive statistics and frequencies were performed on the data. The entrepreneurship education curricula of 10 tertiary institutions in the North-West geo political zone of Nigeria, including three (3) polytechnics, three (3) colleges of education and four (4) universities were compared. The respondents' entrepreneurial knowledge and characteristics were measured using the Entrepreneurial Attitude Survey adopted from research on adult entrepreneurs (Robinson et al., 1991) as well as Mainoma and Aruwa (2008). The entrepreneurial attitude survey was developed and validated with acceptable reliability measures for three primary scales. The only modification to the instrument was to change the four primary scales to three and change items to measure the perceptions of the students relative to knowledge of undergraduates about entrepreneurship education and the characteristics of the successful graduate entrepreneurs.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Out of the total 200 questionnaires distributed to the two selected classes of respondents across the twenty-three local government areas of the state, 168 (90 teams and 78 solos) were returned as fully and correctly filled, thus, representing a response rate of 84.0%.

Table 1

Age Distribution of Respondents

	Range	Num ber	Percen tage	Cumulative percentage
--	-------	------------	----------------	--------------------------



		(Frequency)		
A	20 – 30	25	14. 88%	14. 88
B	31 – 50	104	61. 91%	76. 79
C	51 and above	41	23. 21%	100
Total		168	100%	

Source: Field Survey October, 2011

Table 2

Distribution of Other Social Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	Elements	Number Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Sex	Male	130	77. 4%	77. 4
	Female	38	22. 6%	100.0
Highest Educational Qualification	First Degree/HND	50	29.76	29.76
	Masters Degree(2 nd Degree)	15	8.93	38.69
		2	1.19	39.88
		22	13.09	52.97
		30	17.86	70.83
		49	29.17	100.0
Job Experience (Work for Others)	Ever worked before	120	71.43%	71.43
	Never worked at all	48	28.57%	100.0
Management Knowledge & Skills	Yes	33	19.64%	19.64
	No	135	80.36%	100.0

Source: Field Survey October, 2011

The social characteristics of the respondents were considered necessary in order to understand and appreciate the nature and features of the study sample. These relates to frequency distribution of age, sex, educational qualification, job experience and possession of management knowledge and skills.

On the issue of the sex of the partners, it was discovered that male dominate in both cases, with an average of 77.4 % representing male partners. This



development in our opinion raises a very serious challenge for women economic empowerment for the state in particular and the North in general. With respect to age, it can be observed from table 1 that about 86% of the persons that owned enterprises are above the age of thirty (30) years. This means that most of our entrepreneurs who are engaged in mostly small scale business are above university leaving age using the National Youth Service Corp age limit. The implication of this is that the bulk of our unemployed who happened to be in the age range of 15 – 35 years could either not afford to be entrepreneurs owing to lack of capital and entrepreneurial skills or are not willing to take up the challenge. In the area of educational qualification of the respondents, only 39.88% have at least first degree or higher National Diploma. This portends a big danger for human resource management as our teeming unemployed university graduates are yet to imbibe the culture of being enterprising and self employed.

In terms of acquisition of management knowledge and skills, only 19.64% of the respondents indicated having acquired one form of formal management training or the other. This we consider not healthy for the survival and success of the enterprises and the long term growth of the economy. This might even be a major reason as to why many of them failed within the first five years of their establishment.

With respect to operational characteristics, the study discovered a number of differences between team and sole enterprises. The analysis of the responses revealed that 92% of the team enterprises had more resources in terms of start up capital as well as working capital than the solo enterprises, with only 4% of the solos having more capital than the teams. It was also discovered that 88% of the team partners had higher educational (academic) qualifications and wider experience than the Solo partners. In terms of how the enterprises were started and subsequently operationalised, it was observed that virtually all the team enterprises (86%) had a prepared business plan, while only 29% of the sole enterprises had a business plan at the start.

On performance, the study identified higher employment, turnover, growth and profitability in team enterprises than the sole enterprises. While on the average team enterprises showed growth rate of 4.2%, 20.6% and 5% for employment, turnover and profitability respectively, the sole enterprises had average growth rate of 0.3%, 1.6% and 1.8% for employment, turnover and profitability respectively. This result agrees with the findings of Stam (2006) in the Netherlands. This is not surprising especially, when one considers the fact that this study established that the teams had more resources, more competence, more experience and better planning than the soles. The implication of this is that team enterprises contribute to employment



generation, income earning and economic empowerment as well as overall economic growth than sole enterprises.

Table 3:

Whether the promotion of Entrepreneurship and the development of private business enterprises can accelerate economic growth and Development in Nigeria:

Response	Number (Frequency)	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	81	48.21%	48.21
Agree	70	41.67%	89.88
Disagree	13	7.74%	97.62
Strongly Disagree	0	0%	97.62
No Response	4	2.38%	100
Total	168	100%	

Source: Field Survey October, 2011

Table 4

To what extent do you agree that the trimming down of the public sector through retrenchments and privatization, the slow pace of expansion and development of the private sector in Nigeria are responsible for high unemployment and low economic growth & development in Nigeria?

Response	Number (Frequency)	Percentage	Cumulative percentage
Strongly Agree	102	60.71%	60.71
Agree	51	30.36%	91.07
Disagree	11	6.55%	97.62
Strongly Disagree	0	0%	97.62
No Response	4	2.38%	100
Total	168	100%	

Source: Field Survey October, 2011



On the issue of whether the promotion of entrepreneurship and the development of private businesses can accelerate economic growth and development in Nigeria, table 2 indicated that 89.88% of the respondents were in agreement, while only 7.74% held a contrary view. However, It can be observed from table 4, that virtually all the respondents (91.07%) in this study believed that the trimming down of the public sector through retrenchments and privatization, the slow pace of expansion and development of the private sector in Nigeria are responsible for high unemployment and low economic growth & development in Nigeria. The combined effects of tables 3 & 4 is that generally, entrepreneurs and other business owners share in the belief that entrepreneurship development is a strong force of economic growth and development. This is a good development as researchers, policy makers and the public share a common thought. The implication is that any policy aimed at encouraging entrepreneurship and promotion of indigenous private businesses would obviously be welcomed and embraced by the people.

Though the respondents have listed several factors as militating against the success of entrepreneurship in Nigeria, the study identified factors such as high cost of operation and lack of adequate policy and institutional support; difficulty in accessing financing and lack of basic infrastructures like electricity, water, good roads and market; excessive bureaucracy, over regulation and too many taxes; and attitudinal problem in terms of willingness to undertake associate entrepreneurship as most prominent. The implication of this discovery is that unless urgent and decisive measures are taken to fix the energy and power sector, harmonise taxes and tariff charged by Federal, states and local governments' agencies, entrepreneurship development may elude us and continue to be a mirage

From the result of the survey (Table 5) on the impact of government policy on entrepreneurship education in tertiary institutions' (undergraduates), 92% reported they knew little about business; 52% reported that the entrepreneurship curricula is inadequate, 92% of respondents think that more entrepreneurship should be taught while 81% indicated a desire to learn more about entrepreneurship. 72% of the respondents reported that the entrepreneurship curricula are not sufficient to impart knowledge for enterprise management. Analysis of the responses on content delivery shows biases along the background of the trainer and that the background of the trainers influences their area of emphasises, that is, an economics trainer deliver economics focus, a finance trainer emphasizes on finance element. However, it must be emphasized that entrepreneurship education is multi-disciplinary and therefore require a multi-disciplinary approach to its curricula as well as delivery.

The inadequacy of tertiary entrepreneurship education as compared to post graduation entrepreneurship training is evident in this survey. However,



entrepreneurship education has more influence on development of entrepreneurial characteristics in graduate entrepreneurs than it influences enterprise experience. The practical orientation and enterprise experience seem to be lacking.

Table 5
Survey on Impact of Policy on Entrepreneurship Education

<i>Description of items</i>	<i>Sample</i>	<i>Satisfy (%)</i>	<i>Lit h (%)</i>	<i>Muc e (%)</i>	<i>Non</i>
Knowledge of Business	7	6	95	5	
Knowledge of Entrepreneurship prior graduation	7	6	82	14	4
Knowledge of Entrepreneurship post graduation	7	6	70	29	1
		<i>Adequacy (%)</i>	<i>Ad factory (%)</i>	<i>Satisfactory (%)</i>	<i>Inadequacy (%)</i>
Adequacy of Entrepreneurship Curricula	7	6	21	27	52
		<i>Agree (%)</i>	<i>Disagree (%)</i>	<i>Undecided (%)</i>	
Entrepreneurship Education had impact on enterprise experience	7	6	81	08	11
Entrepreneurship Education has influence on development of entrepreneurship characteristics in graduate entrepreneurs	7	6	87	06	07
There should be more entrepreneurship education	7	6	92	08	0
Desire to learn more about entrepreneurship	7	6	81	11	8
Entrepreneurship curricula are sufficient to impact knowledge	7	6	10	72	18



for enterprise management

Source: Field Survey October, 2011

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our obvious conclusion from the findings of this study therefore, is entrepreneurship has a strong link with economic growth and that, team enterprises contribute more to employment generation, income earning and economic empowerment as well as overall economic growth than sole enterprises. Since the results show that there are significant content differences among the curricula of tertiary institutions, the current neglect of core entrepreneurship topics may continue to make the impact of entrepreneurial studies suboptimal.

It is therefore recommended that government should formulate and implement policies that are germane in creating an environment conducive for team entrepreneurship to thrive. Entrepreneurial orientation should be based on stimulating local entrepreneurial talent and subsequent growth of indigenous companies. This in turn would create jobs and add economic value to a nation, and at the same time it will keep our scarce resources within the country.

Youths are a clear asset to our country and with appropriate support and conducive and enabling environment young people can bring dynamism to our country's economy and become great job creators of future rather than job seekers of the present. We must not forget that jobs in the formal sector of the economy have been stagnating. Therefore, it will increasingly be in the informal sector where youths find a viable option to engage in a remunerative economic activity particularly in the self-employment and setting up of micro and small enterprises. However, for this to be achieved, government must provide them with necessary prerequisites such as skills, technology, credit and market linkages.

Many of our educated youths who have been in the educational system of our country including the graduates, have little in terms of marketable skills and those who have had opportunities to attend vocational training institutions often do not acquire skills for self-employment. It is therefore essential that government addresses these shortcomings in an effective manner by focusing on building skills for self-employment and entrepreneurship amongst young people through the transformation of curriculum and training methodologies in schools and training institutions. Basic entrepreneurship education should be taught right from secondary schools to university level. This will assist in inculcating in our youths the spirit of entrepreneurship and self employment, rather than acquiring education with the sole purpose of gaining employment in government.



REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, S.A. (2008), Entrepreneurship as a Force in Economic Growth and Development in Nigeria. A Paper presented at An International Conference on Entrepreneurship organized by Chike Okoli Centre for Entrepreneurial Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
- Aghion, P. And P. Howitt (1998), Endogenous growth theory, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Baumol, W.J. (1990), "*Entrepreneurship: productive, unproductive, and destructive*", *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, 5(1), 893-921.
- Baumol, W.J. (1993), Entrepreneurship, management, and the structure of payoffs, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Burke, A.E. (1995), The Re-Emergence of Entrepreneurial Analyses, In Burke, A.E., Ed., *Enterprise and the Irish Economy*, Dublin: Oak Tree Press, 4-20.
- Burnett, David (2000), Hunting for Heffalumps: The Supply of Entrepreneurship and Economic development, technopreneurial.com
- Carree, M.A., Van Stel, A.J., Thurik, A.R. And Wennekers, A.R.M. (2002), "*Economic development and Business Ownership: An analysis using data of 23 OECD countries in the period 1976-1996*", *Small Business Economics* 19 (3): 271-290.
- Case, K.E., and Fair, R.C. (2006), Principles of Macroeconomics. Prentice Hall. ISBN-10: 0132226456, ISBN-13: 978-0132226455.
- Casson, M. (1982), The Entrepreneur. An Economic Theory, Oxford: Martin Robertson. 13
- Chukwuemeka, C, Nzewi, A. Okigbo (2008), 'Public Policy and Entrepreneurship in Nigeria: Addressing Immediate Pathological Problems'. A Paper presented at An International Conference on Entrepreneurship organized by Chike Okoli Centre for Entrepreneurial Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
- Congleton, R.D. And R.D. Tollison, Ed. (1995), *The Economic Analysis Of Rent Seeking*, The International Library Of Critical Writings In Economics, 49, Aldershot: Edward Elgar, 1995.
- Dejardin, Marcus (2000), "*Entrepreneurs and Economic Growth: An Obvious Conjunction?*" Faculty of Economic and Social Science journal of entrepreneurship ISSN 00-8 Namur, Belgium.
- Domar, D.(1946), "*Capital Expansion, Rate of Growth and Employment*," *Econometrica*, Vol. 14.



- Dutz, M.A., J.A. Ordovery And R.D. Willig (2000), "Entrepreneurship, Access Policy And Economic Development: Lessons From Industrial Organization", *European Economic Review*, 44, 739-747.
- Drucker, Peter F., (1985) *Innovation and Entrepreneurship: Practices and Principles*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 220-225.
- Elkan, Walter, (1988) "*Entrepreneurs and Entrepreneurship in Africa*," *Finance & Development*, December, 20, 41-42.
- Elhanah Helpman, (2004) *The Mystery of Economic Growth*, Harvard University Press.
- EZ, (1999), *The entrepreneurial society. Entrepreneurship: more opportunities, less threats*, Den Haag: Ministry of Economic Affairs.
- Gana, Jonah Sheshi Suman (2001), *Entrepreneurship*, Jofegan Associates, Kaduna ISBN 978-33318-0-9
- Gavian, S., Meehy, T.E., Bulbul, L., and Ender, G. (1999). *The Importance of Agricultural Growth and SME Development to Increases in Rural Employment in Egypt*. MVE Unit – APRP, Special Study No. 5. Abt Associates Inc. Cairo, Egypt. July 2002.
- Gavron, R., M. Cowling, G. Holtham and A. Westall, (1998), *The Entrepreneurial Society*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Giannetti, M., Simonov, A., (2003). *Social Interactions and Entrepreneurial activity*. Department of Finance and SITE, Stockholm school of Economics, CEPR and ECGI, Stockholm, Sweden.
- Gillis, Malcolm, Dwight H. Perkins, Michael Roemer, and Donald R. Snodgrass, (1996) *Economics of Development*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 8.
- Harrod, R. F. (1939), "*An Essay in Dynamic Theory*," *Economic Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 1.
- Hoselitz, B. F., (2001) "*Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth*," *American Journal of Economic Sociology*, 12.
- [Ibn Khaldun](#), [Muqaddimah](#), 2:272-73, quoted in Dieter Weiss (1995), "Ibn Khaldun on Economic Transformation", *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 27 (1), p. 29-37 [30].
- Kayne, J., (2000). *Rural Entrepreneurship Initiative September*. Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership, (pp 8).
- Keeble D, Tyler P, Broom G, and Lewis J (1992). *Performance of Rural Enterprise*, HMSO, London.



- Kilby, Peter, (1983) "An Entrepreneurial Problem," *The American Economic Review*, 73, 107-11.
- Leibenstein, Harvey, (1995) "The Supply of Entrepreneurship," *Leading Issues in Economic Development*, New York: Oxford University Press, 273-275.
- [Lucas, Robert E., Jr.](#), "The Industrial Revolution: Past and Future," Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Annual Report (2003) [online edition](#)
- Lyson, T.A., (1995). "Down and Out in Rural America: The status of Blacks and Hispanics in the 1980s." In L.J. Beaulieu and D. Mulkey, eds., *Investing in people: the human capital needs of rural America*. (pp 167-82). Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.
- Lyons, T.S., (2002). Building social capital for rural enterprise development: Three case studies in the United States. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*,
- Mainoma, M.A. and Aruwa, S.A.S (2008), The Nature and Content of Entrepreneurship Education in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria. A Paper presented at An International Conference on Entrepreneurship organized by Chike Okoli Centre for Entrepreneurial Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
- Mbaegbu, D.G. (2008) The Effect of Public Policy on Entrepreneurship Development in Nigeria
A Paper presented at An International Conference on Entrepreneurship organized by Chike Okoli Centre for Entrepreneurial Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.
- Meadows, D.L., Meadows, D.L., and Randers, J. (1973) *The Limits to Growth* Washington, DC: Potomac Associates.
- Murphy, K. M., Andrei, S. and Vishny, R. W. (1991), The Allocation of Talent: Implications for Growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106: 503-530.
- Murphy, K.M., A. Shleifer and R.W. Vishnu (1993), "Why Is Rent-Seeking So Costly To Growth?" *American Economic Review*, Papers And Proceedings, May, 409-414.
- nDoen, Marthen L., Cees Gorter, Peter Nijkamp, and Piet Rietveld, (1998) "Ethnic Entrepreneurship and Migration : A Survey from Developing Countries," From <http://www.fee.uva.nl/bieb/edocs/TI/1998/TI98081.pdf>,
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, (OECD), (1999). "Best Practice Policies for Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises" In *ADB/TA 3150-PRC: A Study on Ways to Support Poverty Reduction Projects, Final Report, October 2000* (pp16).
- Petrin, T. (1992). "Partnership and Institution Building as Factors in Rural Development". Paper presented at the Sixth Session of the FAO/ECA Working Party on Women and



the Agricultural Family in Rural Development, Innsbruck, Austria, 13-16 October.

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.

Praag, C. Mirijam Van and Hans Van Ophem, (1995) "Determinants of Willingness and Opportunity to Start as an Entrepreneur," *Kyklos*, 48:4, 513-40.

Reynolds, P.D., Hay, M., Bygrave, W.D., Camp, S.M., and Autio, E. (2000), *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: 2000 Executive Report*, Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership.

Robert M. Solow (1956), "A Contribution to the Theory of Economic Growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 70(1), pp. 65-94.

Rosenstien-Rodan, Paul N., "Problems of Industrialization of Eastern and Southeastern Europe," *Economic Journal* (June - Sept. 1943), p. 202-211.

Saeed, Khalid, (1998) *Towards Sustainable Development*, Brookfield: Ashgate, 1998, 235-259.

Schultz, T.W. (1975), "The value of the ability to deal with disequilibria", *Journal of Economic Literature*, 13, 827-846.

Schumpeter, J. (1934), *The Theory of Economic Development*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Schumpeter, Joseph A., (1951) *Essays of J.A. Schumpeter*, Cambridge, MA: Addison Wesley Press, Inc., 1951, 248-250.

Smallbone, D. & North, D. (1997). *Innovation, SMEs and Rural economic development: some policy issues*. Centre for Enterprise and Economic Development Research (CEEDR).

Sherief, Sultan Rehman (2004), *Entrepreneurship as an Economic Force in rural Development*, Magnus school of Business, Chennai, India.

Stam, Erik. (2006), *The fragile Success of Team Start-up*, A Discussion paper on Entrepreneurship, Growth and Public Policy, Max Planck institute for research into economic system, the Netherlands.

Stevenson, H.H, et al. (1985). "*New Business Ventures and the Entrepreneur*", Homewood, Irwin.

Storey, D.J. (1994). *Understanding the Small Business Sector*, London/New York: Routledge.



- Storey, D.J. (1999). Six steps to heaven: evaluating the impact of public policies to support small business in developed economies, in: D.L. Sexton and H. Landström (eds.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship* (176-194). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Swoboda, Peter, (1983) "Schumpeter's Entrepreneur in Modern Economic Theory," *Lectures on Schumpeterian Economics*, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1983, 17-25.
- The National Report to the World Summit on Sustainable Development (2002). Swaziland Environment Authority, Mbabane, Swaziland.
- Timmons, J. (1994), *New Ventures Creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21st Century*, Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Trevor W. Swan (1956). "Economic Growth and Capital Accumulation", *Economic Record*, 32, pp. 334–61.
- Tyson, L., T. Petrin and H. Rogers (1994). "Promoting Entrepreneurship in Central and Eastern Europe", *Small Business Economics* 6: 1-20.
- Wennekers, S. And R. Thurik (1999), "Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth", *Small Business Economics*, 13, 1, 27-55.
- Wilken, Paul H., (1979) *Entrepreneurship: A Comparative and Historical Study*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, xi-8.
- Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the [Wikimedia Foundation, Inc.](http://www.wikimedia.org/), a U.S. registered [501\(c\)\(3\) tax-deductible nonprofit charity](http://www.wikimedia.org/).