

## EXPLORING RURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: MOTIVATIONS AND PROFILES IN KERALA

**DEEPTHI NAIR H V**

Research Scholar, PhD Commerce (Part – Time External), Department of Commerce Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamilnadu, India. Email: [deepthinairhv@gmail.com](mailto:deepthinairhv@gmail.com)

**Dr. V. MAHESWARI**

Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, PS.PT.MGR. Government Arts College, Puthur, Deputed from Annamalai University, Chidambaram, Tamilnadu, India.

### Abstract

This study sought to uncover the motivations driving rural entrepreneurship, specifically within the context of Kerala rural entrepreneurial profiles. By analyzing and interpreting data gathered from 270 rural entrepreneurs, this research provided invaluable insights into the relationship between entrepreneurial motivations and profiles within rural environments. In order to better understand the relationship between entrepreneurial profiles and factors including social anchoring, intellectual drive, autonomy, and an enabling environment, the researcher formulated and evaluated hypotheses. Her results revealed nine cases that supported the null hypothesis while twelve favoring alternative hypotheses; suggesting an association between specified motivators and entrepreneurial profiles.

**Keywords:** Rural Entrepreneurs, Entrepreneurial Profile and Rural Entrepreneurial Motivation.

### INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, India's agriculture sector has witnessed a significant slowdown in growth and employment levels. To combat these difficulties, an emphasis has been placed on building entrepreneurial skills in rural communities to stimulate economic development.

Rural entrepreneurialism has shown impressive gains in manufacturing production, job creation and economic development within rural communities - particularly through labor intensive activities rooted in traditional knowledge that align well with India's economic environment.

Almost 90% of India's businesses are micro, small, or medium-sized companies (MSME), and these establishments play a crucial part in the country's economic progress. Almost 69 million individuals work for rural businesses, with 15.4 million of them workers being women. 2.2 million of those businesses are controlled by women. From 365.76 lakh units to 515.57 lakh units, their numbers have recently increased exponentially, contributing 37.5 percent to India's GDP.

Rural enterprises - such as handicrafts, food processing, garment making and textile production as well as industries using resources such as wood, bamboo, rubber, clay electronics and electric components - play a complementary role to large industries by helping ensure more equitable income distribution to the advancement of several socioeconomic groups, including women, educated but jobless young, and SC/STs and physically handicapped individuals.

Kerala's rural enterprises sector holds immense potential to become an economically robust, dynamic, and globally competitive contributor to its economy. Thanks to excellent transportation networks, Economic development, job creation, and regional balance should result from the establishment of rural firms in Kerala, thanks to its highly skilled people resources and increasing industrial infrastructure (Venkateswaralu & Ravindra 2015). As such, this research seeks to investigate rural entrepreneurship from both motivations and profiles perspectives and assess any significant differences.

### **Significance of The Study**

Rural enterprises hold great promise for combatting economic backwardness in rural Kerala by addressing regional imbalances, exploiting untapped natural resources efficiently, improving living standards and encouraging self-reliance. Rural entrepreneurship has emerged as an effective strategy for mitigating rural unrest and increasing farm earnings, providing jobs and contributing to national GDP growth - providing autonomy and independence close to home. As a result, development organisations and institutions see rural entrepreneurship as a path to self-sufficiency that aids in the progress of nations, providing autonomy and independence close to home. This study offers invaluable insights into rural entrepreneurial motivations and any significant differences depending on individual entrepreneurial profiles. Understanding how government plays an integral role in supporting rural enterprises is paramount to creating successful enterprises in these rural regions, so identifying issues influencing motivation for rural entrepreneurs becomes critical to crafting appropriate measures - either new policies and programs or improving existing ones - that benefit all concerned governmental agencies. The results of this research study could have great ramifications.

Furthermore, this study can assist educational institutions in creating new curricula with an emphasis on entrepreneurial motivation. Such an emphasis may serve to inspire and attract students towards self-employment thereby cultivating an entrepreneurial culture within education institutions.

### **Statement of The Problem**

Entrepreneurial endeavors in Trivandrum District's rural areas face unique obstacles, particularly with respect to engaging educated unemployed youth in entrepreneurial activities. There is a lot of room for growth in rural businesses in this area, backed up by globalization trends and government support, an alarmingly large proportion of potential rural entrepreneurs opt out from such pursuits. However, even among these obstacles exist successful rural entrepreneurs who continue to make an impactful mark despite hardship. Under this context, the researcher hopes to delve into rural entrepreneurship, with particular attention paid to understanding rural entrepreneurial motivations and any significant variations between entrepreneurial profiles. Shed light on specific challenges and opportunities facing entrepreneurs in Kerala with particular reference to Trivandrum District is anticipated from this exploration.

## Objectives of The Study

This study's objectives are:

- Evaluate the growth of rural enterprises in India.
- Examining entrepreneurial motivations that motivate individuals to create rural businesses
- Explore whether there are any notable distinctions among rural entrepreneurs regarding entrepreneurial motivations.

## Hypotheses of the Study

H<sub>0</sub>. There is no significant distinction in rural entrepreneurial motivations depending on an entrepreneur's profile.

## METHODOLOGY

This study's conclusions are based on an analysis of secondary and primary data. Secondary sources included official publications, journals, books and websites while primary information was gathered through structured interviews of 270 participants using an interview schedule which asked specific questions to gather respondent profiles and motivations for rural entrepreneurship in Trivandrum district.

### Sampling design

This study covered all rural enterprises within a district. Five Block Panchayaths from across the district were selected at random, using stratified random sampling as the methodology. A total of 270 rural entrepreneurs were sampled using stratified random sampling; They used the independent sample t-test, ANOVA, as well as factor analysis tools as well as statistical software SPSS for this task.

### Scope of The Study

This study covered all rural enterprises within a district. Five Block Panchayaths from across the district were selected at random, using stratified random sampling as the methodology. A total of 270 rural entrepreneurs were sampled using stratified random sampling; for their analysis we utilized one-way ANOVA, independent samples t-test, factor analysis tools as well as statistical software SPSS for this task.

### Limitations of The Study

- The study is confined to the geographical area of Trivandrum district in the state of Kerala.
- The investigation was carried out exclusively from the standpoint of rural entrepreneurs.
- While rural enterprises can encompass medium and large-scale establishments in rural settings.

Research in this field is limited to small businesses set up in rural regions.

## **Entrepreneurial Motivation**

An individual's intrinsic drive to achieve their objectives is known as motivation (Berleson 1964). Entrepreneurial motivation refers to the process that stimulates an entrepreneur to put forth greater effort toward meeting entrepreneurial objectives.

Researchers frequently discuss entrepreneurial motivations using various terms, personal, critical, necessary, opportunity, unhappiness, independence, push, pull, economic, and non-economic considerations; personal, intrinsic, and extrinsic impulses; worries about family security; and so on.

## **Rural Entrepreneurial Motivation**

Rural entrepreneurial motivation refers to the mechanisms which motivate rural entrepreneurs to exert heightened efforts in pursuit of their entrepreneurial objectives. Based on a literature review that identified 25 potential motivators, feedback from a pilot study involving 25 respondents and input from field experts narrowed this list down to 21 variables.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was employed to simplify interpretation and reduce dimensions in our collected motivator data, the three components that explain 98% of the variance in EFA were found using Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation. Autonomy and intellectual drive, social anchoring, and an enabling environment are the three components in question.

## **Testing hypothesis - Rural entrepreneurial motivation**

Motivation in rural entrepreneurship may differ based on factors like gender, caste, education level, business type, religion and ownership structure. To assess whether the profile and characteristics of rural enterprises impact motivation among entrepreneurs in these areas, we used powerful statistical tools like the One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the Independent Samples t-test to examine the gathered data.

## **Gender and rural entrepreneurial motivation.**

There is evidence that gender influences rural entrepreneurs' desire to start a business, according to earlier studies (Tomin 2004 and Mathias 2013). Males generally tend to show greater rural entrepreneurial motivation compared to females. The goal of this research was to generate hypotheses concerning the link between gender and the desire of rural entrepreneurs to establish a firm, and to test those hypotheses using an Independent Samples T-test. The results are presented in Table 1.1.

Ho.1: There is no significant difference in rural entrepreneurial motivation between male and female rural entrepreneurs.

H1.1: There is a big difference between how motivated male and female rural entrepreneurs are when it comes to rural business drive.

**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: Primary data from the field survey.

The outcome of the hypothesis test is shown in Table 1.1. An alternate hypothesis on rural entrepreneurial motivation was accepted as the null hypothesis when the p-value was less than .05. Men entrepreneurs tended to score significantly higher on autonomous as well as intellectual drive (male = 4.82; female = 4.74) as well as social anchoring motivation than their female counterparts in these two measures of rural entrepreneurial motivations; these findings are consistent with earlier research showing a gender difference among different rural entrepreneurial motivations with men generally showing greater motivation than female entrepreneurs.

However, female rural entrepreneurs scored significantly higher on an enabling environment scale (male = 3.81; female = 4.40), most likely as a result of more backing from both family and the government for female entrepreneur.

### **Caste and rural entrepreneurial motivation**

In Indian society, caste discrimination is still very much alive and well, often having lasting repercussions. Social protection such as reservations is offered to individuals belonging to lower castes in India. Thus, those falling under a reservation category are perceived as "lower class," while those without such reservations are considered "upper class." Oftentimes, upper-class individuals exhibit greater motivation than their counterparts from lower classes. In order to determine if there was a notable difference in rural entrepreneurial motivation between entrepreneurs from lower socioeconomic classes (reservation) and those from higher socioeconomic classes (general), Three theories were proposed and examined with the use of the Independent Sample T-Test. You can see the results in Table 1.2.

Ho.2: Regarding numerous rural entrepreneurial incentives, there is little difference between upper class and lower-class entrepreneurs.

H1.2: Regarding to rural entrepreneurial incentives, there is a notable difference between upper class and lower-class entrepreneurs.

**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	26 8	0.16
	lower class	4.14	.755.			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	upper class	4.79	.353.	.48	26 8	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: Primary data from the field survey.

The results of the hypothesis test are showed in above table. There exists a discernible differential between social anchoring in upper-class and lower-class groups, as shown in Table 1.2, because the null hypothesis was accepted for rural entrepreneurial motivations like enabling environment, autonomy, as well as intellectual drive, while the alternative hypothesis was rejected for social anchoring; mean scores for upper-class group (4.96) are significantly higher than for lower class (4.85). This indicates significant difference between upper class as well as lower-class categories regarding social anchoring with higher means scores (5.86 for upper group).

This finding aligns with the long-held belief that individuals from lower social classes tend to exhibit less motivation for entrepreneurship. Because their opportunities remain limited due to lower social status, and despite various government initiatives aimed at supporting and encouraging these lower classes as part of mainstream activities - rural entrepreneurship remains an inaccessible goal.

### **Rural entrepreneurs' motivations and the nature of their education**

The importance of entrepreneurs' educational credentials while beginning businesses in rural areas has been highlighted in previous research (Mario and Arminda, 2011; P. S. Ravindra, 2014). More literate individuals tend to be adept at recognizing opportunities as well as comprehending both benefits and drawbacks associated with proposed business ventures in an increasingly competitive business environment.

Education of both technical and non-technical nature may exert different influences on entrepreneurial motivation. Using an Independent Samples T-Test, two hypotheses were tested to determine whether technical or non-technical education had a significant effect on rural entrepreneurs' desire to start their own businesses. The findings are shown in the table.

Ho.3: There is no significant distinction in rural entrepreneurial motivation between entrepreneurs with technical and non-technical backgrounds.

H1.3: There is a significant disparity in rural entrepreneurial motivation among entrepreneurs from technical and non-technical backgrounds.

**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: Primary data from the field survey.

Table 1.3 indicates a clear distinction in motivation based on technical versus non-technical education. With p-values under 0.05 for both "enabling environment" and "social anchoring" between non-technical and technical education, the alternative hypothesis was chosen above the null hypothesis; hence there exists a notable disparity in rural entrepreneurial motivation between individuals with technical and non-technical backgrounds in terms of rural entrepreneurial motivation (notably autonomy and intellectual drive).

However, the data was inadequate to invalidate the null hypothesis, therefore it was accepted, since the p-value for autonomy as well as intellectual drive was too high. In terms of social anchoring, technical education excels (non-technical = 4.92 vs. 4.00), but technical education really shines when it comes to building an enabling environment (4.02).

Social anchoring is a stronger motivator for those without technical training, while an enabling environment is more important for those with technical training, according to studies.

Technical education could be linked to this trend by instilling confidence in specific business fields through practical knowledge and experience, thus encouraging individuals towards entrepreneurialism.

These findings confirm earlier research (Hessel Oosterbeek and Mirjam van Praag, 2010), showing how both technical and non-technical education play an essential role in entrepreneurial motivation, particularly among rural entrepreneurs.

### **Marital Status and Rural Entrepreneurial Motivations.**

People often pursue self-employment for various reasons, including an aspiration for growth and the sense of responsibility towards family and children. The hypotheses listed below was formulated and test using an Independent Sample t-test to see whether marital status influenced rural entrepreneurs' desire to start a business.

Ho.4: There is no significant difference in rural entrepreneurial motivation between married and unmarried entrepreneurs, respectively.

H1.4: Married entrepreneurs have more rural entrepreneurial motivation.

**Table 1.4: Marital Status and Rural Entrepreneurial Motivations**

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: Primary data from the field survey.

You can see the outcomes of the hypothesis test in Table 1.4. With a p-value lower than 0.05, we may accept the alternative hypothesis about entrepreneurial motivation and reject the null hypothesis.

In terms of enabling environment (4.25) as well as social anchoring (4.96 vs. 4.90), married entrepreneurs fared far better than their single counterparts; however unmarried entrepreneurs scored higher on autonomy and intellectual drive (4.77; unmarried 4.89) suggesting they may be more driven by these factors than unmarried rural entrepreneurs.

These results support our conclusion that married entrepreneurs may be motivated more by factors related to social anchoring vs autonomy/intellectual drive than unmarried rural entrepreneurs who face various other sources of motivation such as autonomy/intellectual drive which may suggest they might be driven more by these than unmarried rural entrepreneurs due to these variables being present.

### Nature of Business and Rural Entrepreneurial Motivation

Depending on their industry, rural businesses go through busy and slow times, which then determines its seasonal or non-seasonal characteristics. To find out if there is a significant difference in entrepreneurial motivation between seasonal as well as non-seasonal businesses in rural areas, we used an Independent Samples T-test to test our hypotheses. The results are in Table 1.5.

Ho.5: In rural areas, the drive to start a business is the same whether the company is seasonal or not. H1.5: However, seasonal vs. non-seasonal businesses differ considerably when it comes to 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: Primary data from the field survey.



According to the above table, every p-value that dealt with rural entrepreneurs' incentive to start a business was more than 0.05, thus supporting the null hypothesis and ruling out any notable differences between seasonal and nonseason businesses in terms of rural entrepreneurial motivation.

### Age of rural entrepreneur and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Experience gained through exposure to various situations increases maturity and decision-making abilities, thus acting as an incentive for rural entrepreneurs. Age can serve as an added motivating factor, spurring them on to start and successfully manage ventures. To explore whether there were differences in rural entrepreneurial motivation among young, middle-aged and senior entrepreneurs using One-Way ANOVA tests; see Table 1.6 for results of hypothesis tests.

Ho.6: When it comes to the reasons why people start businesses in rural areas, there is no clear age gap.

H1.6: In rural areas, there seems to be a generational divide when it comes to what drives young, middle-aged, and elderly entrepreneurs.

**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 Entrepreneurs	4.91	.260	2.43	267	.090
	Middle Aged Rural Entrepreneurs	4.96	.157			
	Senior Rural Entrepreneurs	4.91	.214			

Source: Primary data from the field survey.

Table 1.6 presents the results from a hypothesis test which indicates that, across age groups of rural entrepreneurs, there were no significant differences in rural entrepreneurial motivation among young, middle-aged, or senior entrepreneurs, suggesting that it does not depend on age. This occurred because variables such as intellectual desire, social anchoring, autonomy, and enabling environment all had p-values greater than 0.05. Therefore, we can accept the null hypothesis.

### Religion and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Religion and Rural Entrepreneurial Motivation Religion plays an influential role in shaping one's attitudes, culture, ethics and values; consequently, different religions could exert different influences on entrepreneurial motivation. Table 1.7 displays the results of the One-Way ANOVA tests that were used to see whether there were any variations in entrepreneurial motivation among rural entrepreneurs who identified as Hindu, Christian, or Muslim.

Ho.7: When it comes to the motivations of entrepreneurs in rural areas, there is no significant difference among entrepreneurs who are Hindu, Christian, or Muslim.

H1.7: In terms of what drives entrepreneurs in rural areas, there is a marked difference between Hindu, Christian, and Muslim business owners.

**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: Primary data from the field survey.

Since the p-value for social anchoring and autonomy as well as intellectual drive was more than 0.05, we may accept the null hypothesis and say that Hindu, Christian, and Muslim entrepreneurs are not significantly different in these areas. On the other hand, as soon as p-value for enabling environment fell below 0.05 (Muslim = 3.20, Christian = 4.23 and Muslim = 4.25), then null was rejected and alternative hypothesis accepted instead. In 2013, Muslims had a far better environment (mean=4.25) than Hindus (3.20), according to post hoc analysis employing the Tukey multiple range test for significance. Comparing Christians and Hindus reveals that Christians score significantly higher on an enabling environment scale (mean = 4.23 compared with 3.20 for Hindus). Muslims and Christians did not vary significantly on the mean score for an enabling environment. When compared to other types of entrepreneurs, Muslim and Christian business owners found themselves in more encouraging settings; it's plausible that Hindu entrepreneurs may exhibit less willingness toward risk-taking and may prefer secure income sources like salary over riskier ventures.

### Nature of previous experience and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Extensive prior experience can boost rural entrepreneurs' confidence. Their motivation levels tend to be greater when engaged in similar businesses. To explore whether there were any significant differences among rural entrepreneurs who shared similar, dissimilar, or both forms of experience regarding motivation levels for rural entrepreneurial ventures using one-way ANOVA tests; Table 1.8 contains the results.

Ho.8: Whether they have comparable, dissimilar, or mixed experiences, rural entrepreneurs' motivations are not significantly different.

H1.8: According to Table 1.8, the nature of experiences and rural entrepreneurial motivation show that there are considerable differences in rural entrepreneurial motivation among entrepreneurs with various types of experiences.

**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: Primary data from the field survey.

The results for social anchoring are shown in Table 1.8 as p-values, autonomy and intellectual drive exceed 0.05, supporting acceptance of the null hypothesis.

However, the p-value for an enabling environment falls below 0.05; hence it was determined that this evidence supports an alternative hypothesis instead.

Post hoc analysis employing the Tukey multiple range test for significance revealed that past experience in both organisations contributed to an enabling environment with an average score of 4.22 had the greatest mean score, when compared with experiences only related to similar businesses alone (mean = 3.84).

This suggests that varied experiences across different fields may increase motivation levels when initiating their businesses in rural communities.

### **Average family income and rural entrepreneurial motivation**

Its People typically enter business for financial gain. Rural entrepreneurs with enough family support tend to be more motivated than others when starting up businesses because they feel secure accessing risk-free initial capital sources. Assumptions were developed and tested using one-way ANOVA; results can be seen in Table 1.9.

Ho.9: Regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation, there is no substantial variation among entrepreneurs from various family income levels.

H1.9: When comparing the entrepreneurial motivation in rural firms across entrepreneurs from families with various income levels, a notable discrepancy emerges.

**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 10,000	4.48	.635	7.36	265	.000
	10,000- 20,000	4.19	.756			
	20,000- 30,000	3.75	.877			
	30,000-40,000	3.46	.810			
	Above 40,000	3.79	.423			
Autonomy and Intellectual Drive	Less than 10,000	4.82	.284	.720	265	.579
	10,000- 20,000	4.79	.353			
	20,000- 30,000	4.78	.334			
	30,000- 40,000	4.86	.245			
	Above 40,000	4.58	.787			
Social Anchoring	Less than 10000	4.91	.201	.818	265	.515
	10000- 20000	4.96	.191			
	20000- 30000	4.93	.199			
	30000- 40000	5.00	.000			
	Above 40000	4.91	.204			

Source: Primary data from the field survey.

The outcomes of the data-driven hypothesis test are shown in Table 1.9. There was no significant variation across family income groups when examining rural entrepreneurial motivation, since the P-value was larger than 0.05 for entrepreneurs from various income levels in relation to social anchoring, autonomy, and intellectual drive.

There is evidence of substantial difference among rural entrepreneurs belonging to different family income categories, the enabling environment hypothesis was accepted as the alternative explanation as the P-value for this hypothesis was lower than 0.05, thereby rejecting the null hypothesis.

Motive via an enabling environment was much higher for those earning less than 10,000 rupees (mean = 4.48), according to post hoc analysis utilizing the Tukey Multiple Range test, when compared to those earning from rupees 10,000 to rupees 20,000 (4.19), rupees 20,000 to rupees 30,000 (3.75), and rupees 30,000 to rupees 40,000 (3.46). Thus, motivation through an enabling environment was similar among low family income groups than among higher family income groups - contradicting widespread assumption that increased family wealth gives more support & favourable conditions for conducting business.

### Type of business and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Motivation to select a type of business often results from its existing success in certain categories. Using one-way ANOVA, we examined four hypotheses to see whether there was any difference in the kind of activities that motivate rural entrepreneurs. The findings are in Table 1.10.

Ho.10: In rural areas, entrepreneurial drive does not differ much across business kinds.

H1.10: When it comes to rural entrepreneurial drive, there is no discernible difference across various business kinds.

**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: Primary data from the field survey.

Table indicates that all motivators for rural entrepreneurship were excluded as having P values lower than 0.05, thereby illuminating separate categories of firms with respect to diverse rural entrepreneur drives. According to post hoc study that used the Tukey multiple comparison test for significance, businesses based on the water (m = 4.92), when measured against all other types of businesses for environmental enabling factors, rank significantly higher. Textile-based enterprises exhibit significantly greater autonomy and intellectual drive (m = 4.97), while their mean value in social anchoring terms was also significantly greater compared with agro-based. Additionally, marine based enterprises score significantly higher on motivation measures compared to service-based enterprises, reflecting increased motivation due to an enabling environment at marine-based companies in the textile industry are especially motivated by a strong sense of autonomy and intellectual drive.

### Types of ownership and rural entrepreneurial motivation

Distinct ownership structures like sole proprietorships, partnerships, as well as cooperatives may impact entrepreneurial motivations in rural areas. To explore whether there was any significant variation among organizational structures regarding rural entrepreneurial motivations, the results of the hypothesis testing one-way ANOVA are shown in Table 1.11.

Ho.11: When it comes to the factors that inspire rural entrepreneurs, there is no clear winner among the many organisational models.

H1.11: The results reveal significant variations among types of organizational structures in terms of rural entrepreneurial motivation.

**Table 1.11: 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: Primary data from the field survey.

Regardless of the kind of organization, the P-values for intellectual desire, social anchoring, and autonomy were all more than 0.05, as shown in Table 1.11; hence the null hypothesis was accepted for these factors. Conversely, the alternative hypothesis was accepted instead of the null hypothesis due to the fact that the P values for the enabling environment were less than 0.05; which suggests there may be significant variation across types of organizational structures regarding rural entrepreneurial motivation.

Cooperative enterprises had much higher mean scores ( $m = 4.81$ ), The results of the post hoc analysis that used the Tukey multiple range test for significance indicate, than sole proprietorship and partnership businesses ( $m = 3.93$ ) and indicated greater support and enabling environments when initiating new businesses such as cooperatives or partnerships. These results support collective forms of entrepreneurship such as cooperatives or partnerships being more conducive to starting businesses successfully.

### **Nature of Origin and rural entrepreneurial motivation**

It is possible to start a business by self-development, inheritance, or acquisition. Successful self-employment is the product of persistent effort by their owner-entrepreneurs while purchased or inherited enterprises are established through someone else's efforts. Given that rural entrepreneurs' motivation can vary depending on whether their businesses were self-developed, inherited, or bought, we used one-way ANOVA to evaluate the following hypotheses on the impact of ownership on rural entrepreneurs' motivation. This outcome of the hypothesis test is detailed in Table 1.12.

Ho.12: In rural areas, the desire to start a business is the same whether the business is inherited, bought, or created from scratch.

H1.12: When it comes to what drives entrepreneurs in rural areas, there is a wide range of opinions.

**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: Primary data from the field survey.

For social anchoring, autonomy, and intellectual drive, Table 1.12 shows that an alternative hypothesis was preferred above the null since their P values were larger than 0.05. On the other hand, for an enabling environment, their P values were below 0.05.

Self-developed enterprises scored highest for creating an enabling environment (inherited = 3.69, purchased = 3.92 and self-developed = 4.11). This shows that entrepreneurs seeking to self-develop new businesses are motivated by factors that create such environments.

## CONCLUSION

Kerala's rural enterprise sector holds great promise as an economically dynamic, globally competitive sector of its economy. This potential is a result of the favourable conditions for the expansion of rural businesses, which in turn boosts the economy, creates jobs, and promotes balanced regional progress.

These conditions are made possible by the accessibility of personnel with advanced degrees, robust communication networks, and continuous improvements to industrial infrastructure.

This study sheds light on rural entrepreneurial motivations and explores variations based on entrepreneurial profiles. Through this investigation, the government, a key supporter of rural enterprises, can gain an insight into challenges faced by rural entrepreneurs when it comes to motivation. Understanding can assist in the creation and improvement of policies and programs designed to better foster rural entrepreneurship.

Additionally, this study can assist educational institutions with revising their curricula to emphasize entrepreneurial motivation as a means of engaging students towards entrepreneurialism.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was applied to the data, revealing three key factors as being: "Enabling Environment," "Autonomy and Intellectual Drive," and "Social Anchoring." To test hypotheses related to these three key components and entrepreneurial profiles; The null hypothesis was accepted in nine situations, whereas alternative hypotheses were rejected in twelve.

## Reference

- 1) Padmakumar, V. G., & Rajagopal, P. (2023). Entrepreneurial motivations and challenges of rural women entrepreneurs in Kerala, India: An empirical study. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Research*, 21(3), 543-560.
- 2) Joshi, S., & Kumar, S. (2022). The Role of Social Capital in Rural Entrepreneurship Development: A Study of Kerala, India. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 32(2), 223-240.
- 3) Pillai, N. K., & Vijayan, G. K. (2021). Entrepreneurial Strategies and Performance of Rural Enterprises in Kerala, India: A Comparative Analysis. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 30(1), 143-162.
- 4) Kumar, S., & Harinarayanan, V. (2020). The Impact of Government Policies on Rural Entrepreneurship in Kerala, India. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Research*, 18(2), 205-222.
- 5) Pillai, P. K., & Mohanan, P. K. (2020). The Role of Entrepreneurial Education in Rural Entrepreneurship Development: A Study of Kerala, India. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Research*, 18(1), 67-84.
- 6) 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](http://www.researchpublish.com)
- 7) Berelson, B. & Steiner G.A. (1964). *Human Behaviour: An inventory of Scientific Findings*, Harcourt Brace & World, Inc., New York, R 240.
- 8) 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.
- 9) Raposo, Mario & Paço, Arminda. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: Relationship between education and entrepreneurial activity. *Psicothema*. 23. 453-7.