

Original Research Article

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS AND THE PERFORMANCE OF MICRO AND SMALL SCALE ENTERPRISES (MSEs) IN NIGERIA: LESSONS FROM SOME SELECTED MSEs IN ONDO STATE NIGERIA.

ABSTRACT

Micro and small scale enterprises (MSEs) are very vital for economic growth and development. Despite their importance, they still contend with myriad of environmental factors (internal and external) which negatively affect their performance. This paper examines the relationship between environmental factors and the performance of MSEs focusing on two commercial towns (Ikare and Ugbe Akoko) in Akoko North East local government of Ondo State, Nigeria. Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire and analysed using descriptive statistics and Spearman Product-Moment Correlations. A purposive sampling technique was employed and a sample of 204 owners/managers of MSEs were surveyed. The findings revealed that environmental factors (inadequate finance, inadequate infrastructure and poor managerial skills) have a significant ($p < 0.05$) and negative relationship with MSEs performance (profit, revenue and employees). The findings imply that majority of MSEs are chronically under financed as a result of funding inaccessibility. Owners/managers of MSEs do not possess the requisite managerial skills because of the ignorance of training benefits. Lastly, inadequate infrastructure affects MSEs performance minimally because of substitute like generators, sachet water, etc.

Key words- Environmental factors, Micro and small scale enterprises (MSEs), performance, Ondo State, Nigeria.

1 INTRODUCTION

Micro and small scale enterprises are no doubt the engine room for economic growth, poverty alleviation, job creation and by extension crime rate reduction in third world countries. Most of the existing MSEs employ less than 20 workers which comprise mainly of family members; they rarely expand by not employing more workers and opening other branches (Nuwagaba & Nzewi, 2013). Micro business has ≤ 10 employees, ≤ 5 million naira total asset, ≤ 20 million naira annual turnover and ≤ 10 million naira loan amounts while

35 small business has $>11 \leq 50$ employees, $> 5 \leq 100$ million naira total asset, ≤ 100 million
36 naira annual turnover and $>10 \leq 100$ million naira loan amounts. (BOI, 2016)

37 They have been the means through which accelerated economic growth and rapid
38 industrialization have been achieved (Harris & Gibson, 2006). Moreover, small businesses
39 have been identified as renders of feeder service to large businesses (Fabayo, 2009). While
40 the contributions of small businesses to development are generally recognized,
41 entrepreneurs in this sector go through series of obstacles that inhibit their long term
42 survival and growth. Researchers have indicated that starting a business is a risky venture
43 and predict that the probability of small-business owners surviving the first five years of
44 running the business is almost nil (Obasan, 2014). Some researches into small-business
45 development have also shown that the rate of failure of small scale businesses in developing
46 countries is higher than in the developed world (Marlow, 2009).

47 The problems of poverty, unemployment and malnutrition have undermined the capacity of
48 the economy and small scale enterprises are seen as the only viable options of salvaging the
49 situation. Regrettably, MSEs have been unable to propel economic growth and development
50 which are capable of alleviating the impact of Poverty, crime, hunger, unemployment, and
51 low standard of living on the economy. The challenge of addressing the problem of hunger,
52 poverty and unemployment is even more worrisome when considering the actualization of the
53 millennium development goals which Nigeria is still struggling to fulfill till this year 2018,
54 surpassing the deadline of 2015. Significant issues identified by the millennium development
55 goal such as hunger, poverty, literacy, maternal and mortality rate were not achieved because
56 the problems of SMEs were ineffectively handled.

57 It is argued that small scale businesses in many countries where they operate are germane to
58 the economic growth and development of that country or nation and they significantly better
59 the lives of people.(Ohanemu, 2006).

60 Small businesses open up new jobs, create opportunities for upward social mobility, enable
61 economic flexibility, and contribute to competition and economic efficiency and
62 effectiveness (Liao, Welsch, and Moutray, 2009).

63 Adidu & Olanye (2006) submit that businesses around the world operate within environments
64 which is an aggregate of all conditions, events, circumstances and influences that surround
65 and affect the operations of the business.

66 Environment does not necessarily mean visible and physical surroundings but, it connotes
67 total forces, factors and influences that surround and impact business organizations as a
68 separate entity. This means that business organizations must envision, analyze, understand
69 and interact with those forces that influence its objectives, goals and operations in order to
70 succeed.

71 Neoclassical environment is fast getting prone to change and competition and since business
72 organizations are open systems, they affect and are affected by environmental issues
73 Ukaegbu, (2006). Therefore, business organizations regardless of their goals must take into
74 consideration, these environmental opportunities and threats. One important thing to note at
75 this juncture is that, the ability of managers to identify, analyze and respond appropriately to
76 emerging environmental issues will considerably impact organizational performances.

77 Kuye, (2004), emphasized that the need to study business environments is very crucial
78 considering the fact that business organizations are not islands and an effective management
79 in complex and dynamic society requires the assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the
80 organization and the opportunities and threats provided by the challenges of the external
81 environment, hence for survival and growth, organizations must cope and adapt to these
82 challenges posed by the ever changing environment (internal & external) in which managers
83 operate means that managers must not only be aware of what constitutes the elements of their

84 business environment but also should be able to respond to the forces of the environment
85 which inevitably impinges on the operations of the business organization.

86 Ukaegbu (2006) also explains that the relationship between a business organization
87 and its host environment can be viewed from three strategic angles; Firstly, the organization
88 can be viewed as importing various kinds of inputs (resources), such as human resources,
89 capital, managerial and technical inputs. These inputs are then transformed to provoke output
90 which takes the form of goods and services. The second view is the study of the relationship
91 between the organization and the society. It focuses on the demands and legitimate rights of
92 various stakeholders such as consumers, suppliers, stakeholders, employees, government and
93 the host community itself. The third view is to see the organization as operating in an external
94 environment of opportunities and constraints. All these approaches are equally important and
95 complement each other.

96 Factors that affect businesses and their performances are many, ranging from internal to
97 external factors and those internal factors are predictable and controllable while external
98 factors are unpredictable and uncontrollable. (Abubakar, 2015; Adebayo, Ogunyomi and
99 Ojodu, 2005).

100 MSEs have not performed to standard and consequently contributed miniscule efforts
101 towards economic growth and development in Nigeria. (Basil, 2005). The low standard of
102 MSEs towards vibrant and robust economic health could be attributed to internal and external
103 environmental factors that need a holistic approach to manipulate.

104 Business performance is usually measured financially and non-financially. Focusing on one
105 of these aspects could bring about incomprehensive approach. This study like other empirical
106 studies made use of both measures of performance.

107

Although many studies have been done on environmental factors and performance of small and medium sized enterprises in Nigeria, only a few focused on MSEs and none has been carried out in Ikare Akoko and Ugbe Akoko. Ikare Akoko is the headquarters of Akoko north east local government of Ondo state while Ugbe is a neighbouring town. These towns serve as a commercial hub for the whole Akoko area; have hundreds of businesses predominantly owned by Igbo people of the South-eastern region of Nigeria, hence a need for studying, identifying and explaining the environmental factors that affect business performance. This study focuses on this research gap and contributes to body of existing knowledge.

The rest of this paper is literature review, research methods, data analysis, conclusion and recommendation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 DEFINITIONS OF MICRO AND SMALL BUSINESS (MSEs)

Generally accepted definition of Micro and Small Business (MSEs) does not exist because the categorization of businesses into either small or large is not objective and quantitative in terms of judgment (Nuwagaba & Nzewi, 2013; Eniola & Ektebang 2014). Although many people have an idea of what small scale business is, but defining it poses a challenge and its definition depends on who is defining it and the purpose (Abubakar, 2015). Definition of MSEs is peculiar to each country, development agency or institution and as such definitions of MSEs arise due to purpose for which it is being defined, giving rise to different definitions (Kazeem, Mohammed, Nzelibe, Mohammed, Munirat, Mohammed, and Ibrahim, 2015). The parameter employed in describing and defining SMEs which MSEs is borne out of include capital, financial power and number of workers (Oluremi & Agboola, 2011). Julius (2004) described small business as having total assets in capital, plant, equipment and working capital that is not more than ₦250,000 and employs at most 30 full-time workers.

The yardsticks that have been utilized in the definition of small scale business include, capital investment, sales turnover, accessibility, employment, output and in some cases, a synthesis of some or all of these parameters (Abubakar, 2015). Eniola, Entebang and Sakariyau (2015) explains that MSEs are classified in the USA, Canada and Britain on the basis of annual turnover and the number of paid workers while in Japan MSEs are classified on the basis of industry paid up capital and the number of workers.

Generally MSEs produce light consumer goods like food and beverages, electrical parts, automotive parts, clothing manufacture, soap and detergents, leather products, woodworks etc. (Olabisi et al., 2013). A small scale business has total assets of less than ₦50 million, with less than 100 employees (Eniola et al., 2015) usually, small scale enterprises operate in informal and semi-formal sectors (EUROPA, 2003). Small scale business in Nigeria comprises of three sectors: (1) Trading sector (2) Production sector (3) Service sector (Fabayo, 2009). Ajibefun & Daramola (2003) explained that small scale enterprises are commercial enterprises that have up to ten or lesser number of employees. (NBS/SMEDAN, 2012 cited in Abubakar, 2015 p. 9), gives the classification adopted in the recent survey of the enterprises in Nigeria as: Micro enterprises less than 10 employees and small scale enterprises (10-49) employees. Meanwhile BOI, (2016) defines Micro business as having ≤ 10 employees, ≤ 5 million naira total asset, ≤ 20 million naira annual turnover and ≤ 10 million naira loan amounts while small business has $> 11 \leq 50$ employees, $> 5 \leq 100$ million naira total asset, $8 \leq 100$ million naira annual turnover and $> 10 \leq 100$ million naira loan amounts. Given that different criteria and purposes are used in defining MSEs across countries and institutions, it is plausible to adopt one of the definitions reviewed above. This study therefore adopts BOI, (2016) classification of MSEs.

2.2 CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

2.2.1 BUSINESS ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS (INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL)

Business environment is described as the combination of both internal and external factors of the business outfit influencing the continued and successful organisational existence (Sitharam & Hoque, 2016). The environment and its components undoubtedly have effects on the performance of MSEs. Internal environmental factors consists of variables that are easily controllable by the business (Kolstad & Wiig, 2015). These variables include finance, managerial competencies and skills, technological capabilities, raw materials and marketing. Finance is a vital variable of the internal environment and access to finance is one of the main obstacles for growth and survival of start-up SMEs in Africa (Mazanai & Fatoki, 2012; Nuwagaba & Nzewi, 2013). Managerial competencies and skills in MSEs context is the ability of managers or owners to produce a good business plans, do thorough accounting job, introduce sophisticated and appropriate technologies and expertise and ensure a high level human resources management. (Kedebe & Simesh, 2015). Technological capabilities is germane to the survival of MSEs especially in this era of stiff competition. Technology changes rapidly hereby has the potential of affecting the competitiveness of firms. (Akinruwa et al., 2013). Raw materials are the basic inputs for businesses to generate goods and services. The non-availability or low supply of raw materials pushes cost of operations up. (Ibrahim, 2008). Marketing literally is the ability to attract potential and actual customers and eventually stimulate a demand. However, many MSEs accept that poor marketing is a major growth obstacle. (Nuwagaba & Nzewi, 2013).

On the other hand, external environmental factors encompasses factors that the firms can neither control nor manipulate. (Obasan, 2014). External environment broadly consists of

economic, socio-cultural, political, technological and legal/public policy environment. Specifically they include competition, infrastructure, government policies and political factors. Competition is a major issue that affect the performance of MSEs. Competition significantly affects MSEs market share and subsequently their inability to grow. (Nuwagaba & Nzewi, 2013). Infrastructure plays a significant role in the performance of MSEs and this role cannot be over-emphasized, because infrastructural issues like: power, steady water supply, good road network, market and sound communication system are regarded as flavour on MSEs performance. (Kebede & Simesh, 2015). Government policies are tools used by government to create a conducive environment for SMEs to thrive. (Akinruwa et al., 2013). So, government policies are naturally expected to favour local businesses at the expense of foreign ones. Political factors are hinged on the politics being played by the government of the day in power to assist MSEs and all forms of business. Political issues include nationalization, expropriation, government policy etc. (Kebede & Simesh, 2015).

The internal and external environmental factors need to be holistically identified, analysed and tackled effectively and efficiently for good business performance.

From the foregoing review of the literature, this study adopted three internal and external factors namely: inadequate finance, inadequate infrastructure and poor managerial skills.

2.2.2 PERFORMANCE (FINANCIAL AND NON-FINANCIAL)

Performance simply means the willingness and ability to be committed to specified goals and objectives and vigorously and genuinely pursue these goals and objectives and bringing them to fulfillment. GEM (2004) defined performance as the act of performing; doing something in a successful manner and utilizing knowledge as distinguished from ordinarily possessing it. Performances are diversely measured and the perspective are unified and are constantly monitored from the contextual view of the organization (Jamil & Mohammed, 2011).

204 Meanwhile, performance is likely to be conceptualized, measured and operationalized
205 differently thus making comparison an enormous task (Abubakar, 2015; Olabisi et al., 2013).
206 Past researches as noted by Cragg & King (1988) and Rutherford and Oswald (2000)
207 indicated that the determinants of small business performance are subdivided into three
208 categories namely: individual, firm, and environmental characteristics. Under the individual
209 characteristics of the firm, the studies focused on individual characteristics like education,
210 experience, entrepreneurial competence, age leadership practices, race, MD personality,
211 gender, industry experience and how they affect performance. The second set of studies that
212 focused on the firm characteristics examined top management team, family control, and
213 operations management, stage of development, structure, strategy /planning, competitive
214 orientation and how all of these characteristics affect performance. The last category of
215 studies that focused on environmental characteristics examined stockholders, financial
216 institutions, suppliers, customers, regulatory agencies, consultants and competitors.

217 Performance means different things to different organisations and should both be measured
218 financially and non-financially. Before the 1980s, financial criteria (profit, ROI, sales and
219 productivity) were used to measure performance but after 1980s till the present moment, non-
220 financial criteria have received considerable attention from scholars, researchers and
221 industrialists. These non-financial criteria include: communication, stakeholder satisfaction,
222 competitive position, just-in-time delivery, total quality management and trust (Rosli, 2011;
223 Saad and Patel, 2006). Abubakar (2015) opines that small business performance can be
224 measured in term of size, profitability, capital base, turnover and employment. These criteria
225 are both financial and non-financial in nature.

226 In the literature, business performance has been widely measured basically in three
227 parameters namely growth (turnover, number of workers and market share); survival and
228 profitability (profit and return on investment) (Dess and Robinson, 1984; Storey, 1994;

Kauranen, 1996; Robinson et al., 1984). Some scholars have argued that growth is the best criterion for measuring performance and is an important precursor to achieving other financial goals (Storey, 1994; Reynolds, 1993). Be it growth, profitability or survival, the criteria for performance measurements are expected to be holistic in nature i.e. both financial and non-financial. Hence, this study adopts both financial and non-financial measurement of performance, namely; profit, revenue and employment (number of employed workers).

2.3 EMPIRICAL REVIEW

The ever changing and dynamic business environment in which many business outfits operate has contributed to the significant impact business environment has on organizational survival and performance (Alaxander, 2000). Adeoye (2012) further explains that changes in the environment continuously affect company's performance and to cope with these environmental changes, companies often strategize by reorganizing and reforming the methods products are produced and distributed to the final consumers. Thibault et al. (2002) also argue that factors influencing business performance are related to personal factors such as demographic variables and business factors like business age, business location, finance, technology etc.

Sitharam & Hoque (2015) conducted a survey in Kwazulu-Natal South Africa to evaluate the factors affecting the performance of SMEs. They reported that only competition revealed a significant relationship with performance amongst all the internal and external environmental factors they analysed.

Akinrunwa, Awolusi and Ibojo (2013) in their study on determinants of small and medium enterprises performance in Ekiti state give factors determining the performance of SMEs as finance, politics, education, infrastructure, government policies, raw materials, entrepreneur competencies, patronage, technology and channel of distribution. Furthermore, Olabisi et al

(2011) summarized a comprehensive number of factors influencing business performance as individual characteristics, business strategies, parental influence, networking and entrepreneurial orientation etc. and other factors. External environmental factors assist in forecasting business survival analysis and growth in order to boost the understanding of how environmental factors blend well with the variables of business sound performance to ascertain the future of business enterprise (Ogundele and Opeifa, 2004 cited in Obasan, 2014, p.167).

In addition, the findings of Kebede & Simesh (2015) in their study on the impact of environmental factors on small scale enterprises performance in East Gojjan zone, Ethiopia, indicate that infrastructure and finance have a significant positive relationship with MSEs performance. This implies that lack of these two factors will bring about negative and significant relationship.

A handful of studies focused on different types of factors and how they may be connected to small business performance(Gadenne,1998; Abubakar,2015). As earlier explained, good performance of business could be attributed to the personality traits of the entrepreneur, however storey(1994)vehemently opposed this view using the logic of ‘boat rowing on a turbulent sea’. Even with storey’s criticism, virtually all studies have shown that entrepreneur’s personality has a significant effect on the operation and existence of business. Key factors that are critical in analyzing MSEs success factors include entrepreneur’s characteristics ; MSES development.(Nurul & Marja,2005).

Aminul et al,(2008) in a survey of SMEs in Bangladesh established that business modus operandi, product and services rendered, managerial know-how and the external environment are mostly significant to determining small business success.

Akinruwa et al, (2013) studied the determinants of SMEs performance in Ekiti State, measuring performance of SMEs through some environmental factors like funding, politics, education, infrastructure, government policy were significantly related to performance ,while, raw materials ,patronage, channels of distribution, political environment and technology were insignificantly related to performance.

Further contributing to the factors affecting business performance is in the work of Jasra et al (2011),they conducted a survey on the determinants of business success of SMEs in Pakistan and concluded that funds, marketing strategy, government support, technology and entrepreneurial skill positively and significantly impact business success.

From this study, finance being significant and positively related to business success is in harmony with the work of olabisi et al. (2011);these authors studied factors affecting small-scale enterprises performance in informal economy in Lagos State Nigeria.

Finally, Abubakar (2015) in his study on the effect of environmental factors on small scale businesses performance in Kano and Sokoto States identified and utilized five key environmental factors affecting small business performance, i.e management inefficiency ,marketing and sales problems, inadequate infrastructure, market competition and financial inadequacy. He concluded that environmental factors have significant impact on the performance of small scale businesses in Kano and Sokoto States in Nigeria.

From the review of the literature and analysis of previous related researches, we therefore postulate the following hypothesis:

H1 -There is no significant relationship between environmental factors and the performance of MSEs.

299 **2.4 Theoretical Review**

300 The environment in which businesses operate as earlier explained are both internal and
301 external. The internal environment can to some extent be controlled by management and
302 entrepreneurs while the external are uncontrollable by business operators. The environment
303 can be assessed from the acronym ‘SWOT’ which simply means strength and weaknesses,
304 opportunities and threats. Strengths and weaknesses are internally viewed and opportunities
305 and threats are externally viewed. The healthier the relationship between a firm and its
306 environment, the better the chances of success (Abubakar,2015).

307 The relationship between firm performance and its environments have been anchored on
308 some theories. Tsai et al. (1991) asserted that the most common theories in research are the
309 strategic management and population ecology. These two theories explain business
310 performance antithetically: strategic management explains the internal performance while the
311 population ecology explains the external performance. Various research streams dominate the
312 strategic management theory, but the most dominant one is resource-based view of the
313 firm(Barney, 1991).This theory is hinged upon firm’s internal resources, which literarily
314 means organization’s internal factors. Resources and capabilities are the units of analysis
315 within the resource-based view(Peteraf & Barney, 2003). Resources of the firm are often
316 referred to as finance ,physical, technological, human, organizational and intangible (Bogner,
317 Mahoney, and Thomas,1998). The resource-based view principally centres on leveraging
318 current capabilities for achieving and maintaining competitive advantage (Teece, Pisano and
319 Sheun, 1997).

320 On the other hand, the population ecology i.e. environmental selection explains
321 organizational adaptation through environmental determinants. Adaptation of firms to change
322 in the environment is limited to the inactive forces of the firm, consequently the differences

in inactive forces among firms favours and at the same time negatively affects some firms (Abubakar, 2015). The population ecology theory studies the firms' totality (population) rather than single firm (Young, 1988). Three stages of evolutionary change occur under the population ecology theory, they are; variation, selection and retention. The variability in firms population makes environmental factors affect firms performance differently, hence some survive and some go into extinction (Vesalainen, 1995; Aldrich, 1979).

Another theory that explains environmental factors and firm performance is the contingency theory. The contingency theory of Fred Fiedler (1958) states that effective leadership and success of organization is not only dependent on leadership style but on the control over the overall situation. This theory also opines that firm performance is contingent upon adequate alignment of organizational design and the contextual factors of operations (Burns & Stalker, 1961; Donaldson, 1995). The contingency theory simply asserts that no one best way exists to successfully manage business organisations, but success is dependent on the ability to manage and adapt to environmental situation. Rather than isolating the strategic management theory and the population ecology theory that both focus on the internal and external environmental factors separately, scholars have argued and suggested an integrated approach to encapsulate both internal and external factors affecting business performance. Such integrated approach is referred to as "dialectical approach" (Bourgeois, 1984 as cited in Abubakar, 2015, p, 41). The rationale for this approach is based on the combination powers of all environmental factors affecting business performance.

From the foregoing theoretical review, it is pertinent to affirm that this study theoretically fits the dialectical approach and the contingency theory. The justification for these two theoretical locations is based on the premise that this study made use of both internal and external factors affecting MSEs performance and that business performance is contingent upon existing environmental factors.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopted the survey research design to evaluate the impact of environmental factors on the performance of micro and small enterprises (MSEs). This research design was adopted because it suits the study, since the researchers collected data directly from the field through the use of questionnaire.

A questionnaire was designed for data collection purposes majorly from relevant SMEs, MSEs and environmental factors literature. The population of the study was operators of Micro and Small Enterprises operating in Ikare and Ugbe Akoko Ondo State, Nigeria. In selecting a sample for this study, MSEs owners or managers from the selected council area of Akoko northeast local government, specifically in Ikare Akoko and Ugbe Akoko were selected through purposive sampling technique. Purposive in the sense that, only owners or managers of MSEs were identified and sampled. We recruited 4 Master of Science students for data collection. They were trained on how to administer the questionnaire. Since no record exists for the total number of MSEs operating in Ikare and Ugbe Akoko, we opted for a large sample of 240 MSEs owners/managers. 60 questionnaires in hard copies were given to each MSc students to administer. They followed up on the respondents for over two months after which 228 questionnaires were returned. Eventually, 204 were found to be valid for analysis.

The questionnaire has three sections; section A consists of questions on the demographic and business information of sampled MSEs, section B consists of questions on performance and section C consists of questions on environmental factors affecting businesses.. Section B, C consist of questions in a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1-5 where 1(strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (undecided), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree).

Data collected were analysed using Pearson Product-Moment Correlations of the SPSS version 20 to assess if environmental factors are significantly related with the performance of MSEs.. Descriptive statistics was also used in analysing the bio-data characteristics of the respondents. The independent variables as identified in the literature are environmental factors given as- inadequate finance, inadequate infrastructure and poor managerial skills. Inadequate finance, poor managerial skills are internal factors while inadequate infrastructure is an external factor. The dependent variables measuring performance and extracted from the literature are profit, revenue and employment (number of employees). The research instrument was extracted and compiled from past related researches, hence, validated. Meanwhile, we conducted the reliability test using Cronbach Alpha test of SPSS. The average reliability score for environmental and performance scales was 0.9. This score surpasses the benchmark of 0.7 as opined by (De Vellis, 2003 and cited in Pallant, 2007, p, 95).

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The descriptive analysis reveals that 167(81.9%) of the respondents were owners and managers were 37(18.1%). It shows that a large number of MSEs principals preferred to own and manage their businesses themselves. Male respondents were 176(86.3%) and female were 28(13.7%). This again shows that men participate more in MSEs than women in the area of study. 108(52.9%) of the MSEs are aged 11-20 years, many of them have been in business for a considerable number of years. 56(27.5%) are aged 1-10 years while 40(19.6%) are aged 20 years and above. Manufacturing business was 16 (7.8%), Wholesale and Retail was 86(42.2%), Agricultural sector was 14(6.9%), Building and Construction business was 14(6.9%), Education business was 24(11.8%), Health related business was 8(3.9%) and Service business was 42(20.6%). This reflection is also not strange given that majority of the MSEs are apparently into wholesale and retail business. Micro business was 160(78.4%)

396 while small business was 44(21.6%); indicating a high level of individual and family
397 businesses in the area of study.

398 The results of the correlation between performance and environmental factors are presented
399 in the tables below-

400 TABLE 1

401 Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between profit and environmental factors.

Scale	1	2	3	4
1.Total Profit	-	-.239***	-.125*	-.152*
2.Total Inadequate Finance		-	.710***	.784***
3.Total Inadequate Infrastructure			-	.781***
4.Total Poor Managerial Skills				-

402 Note: [*P<0.05, **P<0.01 and ***P<0.001, (2-tailed)]

403 Source: Field Survey, 2018

404

405 TABLE 2

406 Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between revenue and environmental factors.

Scale	1	2	3	4
1.Total Revenue	-	-.287***	-.134*	-.170**
2.Total Inadequate Finance		-	.710***	.784***
3.Total Inadequate Infrastructure			-	.781***
4.Total Poor Managerial Skills				-

407 Note: [*P<0.05, **P<0.01 and ***P<0.001, (2-tailed)]
 408 Source: Field Survey, 2018
 409

410 TABLE 3

411 Pearson Product-Moment Correlations between employee and environmental factors.

Scale	1	2	3	4
1.Total employee	-	-.236***	-.157*	-.172**
2.Total Inadequate Finance		-	.710***	.784***
3.Total Inadequate Infrastructure			-	.781***
4.Total Poor Managerial Skills				-

412 Note: [*P<0.05, **P<0.01 and ***P<0.001, (2-tailed)]
 413 Source: Field Survey, 2018

414 The relationship between performance (as measured by profit, revenue and employee) and
 415 environmental performance (as measured by inadequate finance, inadequate infrastructure
 416 and poor managerial skills was investigated using Pearson Product-Moment correlation
 417 coefficient. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure that all the assumptions of
 418 correlation were not infringed. In table 1, a small negative correlation is revealed between
 419 profit and inadequate finance, $r = -.239$, $P < 0.001$ (significant), with inadequate finance
 420 resulting into about 24 % reduction in the profit of MSEs. The correlation between profit and
 421 inadequate infrastructure also shows a small negative correlation, $r = -.125$,
 422 $p < 0.005$ (significant), which implies that inadequate infrastructure accounts for reduction of
 423 about 13% in MSEs profit. Lastly profit and poor managerial skills reveals a little negative
 424 correlation, $r = -.152$, $p < 0.005$ (significant), which indicates that poor managerial skills brings
 425 about 15% cut in the profit of MSEs.

In table 2, a small negative correlation is revealed between revenue and inadequate finance, $r = -.287$, $p < 0.001$ (significant), with the implication that inadequate finance reduces revenue by 29%. The correlation between revenue and inadequate infrastructure also shows a small negative correlation, $r = -.134$, $p < 0.05$ (significant), with inadequate infrastructure bringing about a reduced revenue to the tune of 13%. Lastly, revenue and poor managerial skills reveals a little negative correlation, $r = -.170$, $p < 0.001$ (significant), which suggests that poor managerial skills are prevalent and this lowers the revenue generated but only to about 17%.

In table 3, a small negative correlation is revealed between employee and inadequate finance, $r = -.236$, $p < 0.001$ (significant), with inadequate finance resulting to about 24% reduction in staff strength. The correlation between employee and inadequate infrastructure also shows a small negative correlation, $r = -.157$, $p < 0.05$ (significant), with inadequate infrastructure bringing about a reduced staff number to about 16%. Lastly, employee and poor managerial skills reveals a little negative correlation, $r = -.172$, $p < 0.01$ (significant), which suggests that poor managerial skills adversely affect staff strength, only by 17%.

From the above analysis, inadequate finance has the highest significantly negative impact on performance of MSEs. Most of the studied MSEs are supposedly not operating with adequate finance. This is an indication that external funds are difficult to access and this seems to be a major challenge. This finding is consistent with the findings of Abubakar, (2015); Osotimehin et al. (2012); Essien, (2014); Mashenene & Rumanyika. (2014); Bekele & Worku (2008); Obasan, (2014); Akinruwa et al. (2013); Nuwagaba & Nzewi (2013) and Kebede & Simesh (2015). All these studies established that finance is a major factor for business success and its insufficiency plagues SMEs and MSEs performance. A significant relationship was established between inadequate finance and business performance by all the studies. Poor managerial skills has the second highest significantly negative effect on MSEs performance. Majority of the MSEs studied are lacking the required management skills and

competencies to successfully manage their businesses. This finding is consistent with the research findings of Osotimehin et al. (2012); Bekele & Worku (2008); Akinruwa et al. (2013) and Kebede & Simesh (2015). All these studies found a significant relationship between poor managerial skills and MSEs performance. They noted that most MSEs owners and managers are ill-trained to successfully manage business and this could be attributed to lack of willingness to acquire management skills or total absence of organised training by government and small business owners. Lastly, the opinions of MSEs owners and managers is that inadequate infrastructure least affect the performance of MSEs. Infrastructure are inadequate but its impact on MSEs performance are not excruciating. Electricity, water, good roads etc affect MSEs performance but not as inadequate finance and poor managerial skills. This finding is in harmony with the findings of Abubakar, (2015); Essien, (2014); Obasan, (2014); Akinruwa et al. (2013); Nuwagaba & Nzewi (2013) and Kebede & Simesh (2015). A consensus exists among these studies that inadequate infrastructure is a bane of MSEs good performance especially in developing African countries. Poor electricity supply, lack of potable water, extremely bad roads etc all significantly affect MSEs performance.

It is apparent that environmental factors (inadequate finance, inadequate infrastructure and poor managerial skills) have a significantly negative relationship with performance (profit, revenue and employees) of MSEs in the area of study.

The correlation analysis results were able to successfully reject the null hypothesis. We therefore reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between environmental factors and the performance of MSEs and conclude that there is significant relationship between environmental factors and the performance of MSEs.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this paper was to assess the relationship between environmental factors and performance of MSEs in Nigeria, focusing on Ikare and Ugbe Akoko as the study areas. The environmental factors considered are -inadequate finance, inadequate infrastructure and poor managerial skills and the performance measures- are profit, revenue and employee of MSEs. From the findings of the study, significant and negative relationships were revealed between environmental factors and performance. This study concludes that inadequate finance posed the greatest threat to MSEs performance because of the "smallness" nature of MSEs, inability to provide collateral for loan and government negligence in providing flexible financial platforms for MSEs. In addition, managers and owners of MSEs do not possess adequate managerial skills for good performance, simply because of ignorance and lack of motivation from government. Lastly, inadequate infrastructure least affect MSEs performance because of alternative remedies like generators, sachet water, etc. This study recommends that government should do more by making MSEs friendly policies in terms of loan access and zero interest rate. They should also put in a place a strict disciplinary measures against government official who may want to corruptly allocate funds meant for MSEs growth. Although Nigerian government recently raised Sukuk bond of ₦100 billion solely for infrastructural development and also has almost concluded arrangements on raising \$3 billion Eurobond. Borrowing alone would not change the face of poor roads, bad railway system, non-existing water system etc., but concretely investing the money to give our moribund infrastructure a facelift. Government should regularly organise seminars, workshops and conferences for MSEs owners and managers to develop their management skills and competencies. MSEs owners/managers should also avail themselves of the training opportunities.

5. 2 IMPLICATIONS

The major implication of the findings of this study is that it provides a more comprehensive understanding of the environmental factors that affect MSEs performance. The findings also reflect that a large proportion of Micro and Small Scale Enterprises in the study area are still seriously unable to get adequate finance to start or run a successful business. The little one they use as capital are from personal savings, family members and friends or micro credit banks- Lift Above Poverty Organisation (LAPO). This is further supported by Kebede & Simesh, (2015) where they concluded that most MSEs relied on personal finance and lacked access to finance from other financial institution because of collateral security. This finding signals a need for more robust financial policies and aids for MSEs by the current government. Also poor managerial skills affect MSEs performance because many of MSEs owners/managers in Ikare and Ugbe Akoko do not know the importance of acquiring more management training through education, seminars, workshops and conferences. This finding is further confirmed by Alattar, Kouhy & Innes, (2009) as cited in Sharmilee and Muhammad, (2016), that micro and small enterprises owners/ managers have little or limited knowledge about sound and articulate business management especially in financial matters and do not know the value of extracted financial statement. Managers/owners of MSEs are expected to take a cue from this finding and avail themselves for periodic training to enhance better business performance. Dilapidated infrastructural amenities affect MSEs performance in the area of study, even though this is not pronounced as inadequate finance and poor managerial skills, this could be attributed to the ability to proffer substitutes for some needed infrastructure e.g power failure can be alleviated through the use of generating set and drinking water could be sourced through sachet water popularly called "pure water". This finding is corroborated by the work of Kebede & Simesh, (2016), that the absence of infrastructure like power, good road network, steady water supply, effective communication

and market could bring about less performance of enterprises which invariably could lead to winding up if urgent step is not taken on time. This finding will be another reminder to government to hasten up on revamping infrastructure that will always ensure MSEs continue to be life wire of the economy.

5.3 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDY

This study has some limitations that could be an avenue for future study to explore. First, this study made use of three variables of internal and external environmental factors i.e inadequate finance and poor managerial skills (internal factors) and inadequate infrastructure (external factor). Meanwhile the environmental factors have additional variables like technology, firm strategy, political, raw materials, channel of distribution, firm structure, government policies. These could be included in the variables to get a more inclusive environmental factors influence. Second, three variables were used to measure performance-profit and revenue (financial) and employees' growth (non- financial). This aspect can also be augmented to allow more performance variables input. Third, the area of study is limited to two cities (Ikare and Ugbe Akoko) in Ondo state and the empirical findings may be difficult to generalise to Nigeria as a whole because of the different characteristics across the 36 states of the six geo-political zones in Nigeria. Future studies can enlarge the database to address this issue. Lastly, the statistical tool used in this study is Pearson Product Moment correlation Coefficient, which does not allow for control variables like size, age education etc which might affect MSEs performance as well. Future studies should adopt partial correlation that can control for these intervening variables.

REFERENCES

Abubakar, S. (2015). Effect of Environmental Factors on Small Scale Business Performance in Kano and Sokoto States (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved March 1, 2018 from <http://docplayer.net/60425119-Effect-of-environmental-factors-on-small-scale-businesses-performance-in-kano-and-sokoto-states.html>

Adebayo, I. O., Ogunyomi, P. O. and Ojodu, H.O. (2005). *Introduction to Business Management*, 2nd ed., Lagos: Abilejo Printing Press.

Adeoye, A. O. (2012). Impact of External Business Environment on Organizational Performance on Food and Beverage Industry in Nigeria. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 6 (2), pp. 56-65.

Adeoye, M. O. (2013). The impact of business environment on entrepreneurship performance in Nigeria. *Computing, Information System, Development Informatics & Allied Research*. 4(4).

Adidu, F. A. & Olannye, G. (2006). *Basic Small Business Entrepreneurship: A Modern Approach*. Agbor, Delta State: Royal Pace Publishers.

Ajibefun, I. a., and Daramola, A. G. (2003). "Determinants of Technical and Allocative Efficiency of Micro enterprises: Firm-Level Evidence from Nigeria". *African Development Review*, 15(2-3), 353-395.

Aldrich, H.E. (1979). *Organizations and Environments*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Akinruwa, T. E., Awolusi, O.D., & Ibojo, B.O. (2013). Determinants of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) performance in Ekiti state, Nigeria: *A business survey approach*. *European Journal of Humanities and social sciences*, 27(1), 1389-1406.

Alexander, D. & Britton, A. (2000). *Financial Reporting*, 5th ed., London: Thomas Learning Publishing.

Aminul I., Ejaz, M., & Muhammad, H. A. (2008). Determinants of business success of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Bangladesh. *Business Review*, 4(2), 45-57.

Bekele, E. & Worku, Z. (2008). Factors that affect the long-term survival of micro, small and medium enterprises in Ethiopia. *South African Journal of Economics*, 76(3), 548-568.

Bogner, W., Mahoney, J. T., & Thomas, H. (1998) 'Paradigm Shift: The Parallel Origin, Evolution and Function of Strategic Group Analysis with the Resource-based Theory of the Firm'. *Advances in Strategic Management* 15(63–102).

BOI. (2016). *MSEs definition*. Retrieved November 22, 2017 from <https://www.boi.ng/smedefinition/>

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17 (1), 99-120.

Basil, A. N. O. (2005). *Small and medium enterprise (SMEs): Problems and Prospect*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, St. Clements University.

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. (1961). The management of innovation. London: Tavistock.

Cooper, A. (1993). Challenges in predicting new firm performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8 (3), 241-253.

- Cragg, P. B. & King, M. (1988). Organizational characteristics and small firms' performance revisited. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13, 49-64.
- Dess, G., & Robinson, R. (1984). Measuring organizational performance in the absence of objective measures: The case of the privately-held firm and conglomerate business unit. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5, 265-273.
- Donaldson, L. (1995). *Contingency theory*. Aldershot: Dartmouth.
- Eniola, A.A., & Ektebang, H. (2014). SME firms performance in Nigeria: Competitive advantage and its impact. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management*, 3(2), 75-86.
- Eniola, A.A., Ektebang, H., & Sakariyau, O.B. (2015). Small and medium scale business performance in Nigeria: Challenges faced from an intellectual capital perspective. *International Journal of Research Studies in management*, 4(1), 59-71.
- EUROPA. (2003) *Definition of Micro, Small and Medium- sized Enterprises*. Official Journal. Retrieved November 25, 2017, from LIZU [http:// europa.eu.scadplus/leg /en/vh/n26026.htm](http://europa.eu.scadplus/leg/en/vh/n26026.htm).
- Essien, B.S. (2014). The Nigerian business environment and growth constraints of micro and small scale manufacturing industries. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 3(6), 67-76.
- Fabayo, J.A. (2009). *Small and medium enterprises development strategy: A critical option for sustainable long –term economic development in Nigeria*. A paper presented at the first Annual International Conference on: Effective Management of Small and Medium scale Enterprises for sustainable Economic Development held at Abraham Adesanya Polytechnic, Ijebu-Ode held from 25-27 August.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1958) *Leader Attitudes and Group Effectiveness*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Gadenne, D. (1998). Critical success factors for small business: An inter-industry comparison. *International Small Business Journal*, 17 (1), 36-56.
- GEM. (2004). *GEM 2004 Global Report- GEM Global Entrepreneurship Monitor*. Retrieved December 21, 2017, from www.gemconsortium.org/report/47103
- Harris, M. L., & Gibson, S. G. (2006). Determining the common problems of early growth of small businesses in Eastern North Carolina. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 71(2), 39-45.
- Ibrahim. (2008). An analysis of strategic factors affecting: The performance of small and medium industries in Borno State of Nigeria. *Published Doctoral Dissertation, St Clement University, Australia*.

- Jamil, C.M. & Mohamed, R. (2011). Performance Measurement System (PMS) In Small Medium Enterprise (SMES). A Practical Modified Framework. *World Journal of Social Sciences*; 1(3), 200-212.
- Jasra, J.M., Asifkhan, M., Hunjra, A.I., Rehman, R.A & I-Azam, R. (2011). “Determinants of Business Success of Small and Medium Enterprises”. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(20), 274- 280.
- Julius, I. (2004). *Small Business*. Lagos: Longman.
- Kazeem, A.O., Mohammed, U.D., Nzelibe, C.G., Mohammed, N., Munirat, Y.O., Mohammed, I. S., & Ibrahim, Y. (2015). Evaluation of performance of small and medium enterprises (smes) development in Nigeria. *EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review*, 3(2), 25-31.
- Kauranen, I. (1996). The start-up characteristics of a new entrepreneurial firm as determinants of the future success of the firms in the short term and the long term. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 4 (4), 363-383.
- Kebede, M., & Simesh, G. (2015). The impact of environmental factors on the performance of micro & small-scale enterprises in East Gojjam zone, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Science and research*, 6(3), 1619-1629.
- Kuye, J.O. (2004). Continental Policy Targeting and the Nepadisation Process: Issues, Trends and Options. *Journal of Public Administration*, 39(4), 458 – 469.
- Liao, J., Welsch H., & Moutray, C.H. (2009). Start-up resources and entrepreneurial discontinuance: The case of nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 19(2), 1-15.
- Marlow, S. (2005). “Introduction”, In S. Marlow, D. Patton and M. Ram (Eds), *Labour Management in Small Firms*. London: Routledge.
- Mashenene, R.G., & Rumanyika, J. (2014). Business constraints and potential growth of small and medium enterprises in Tanzania: A review. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(32), 72-79.
- Mazanai, M., & Fatoki, O. (2012). Access to finance in the SME sector: *A South African Perspective*. *Asian Journal of Business Management*, 4(1), 58-67.
- Nurul, I., & Marja, L. (2005). *A study of factors affecting business success among SMEs: Empirical Evidences from Indonesia*. Retrieved from <http://www.smmeresearch.co.za/SMME>
- Nuwagaba, A. & Nzewi, H. (2013). Major environmental constraints on growth of micro and small enterprises in Uganda: A survey of selected micro and small enterprises in Mbarara municipality. *International Journal of Cooperative Studies*, 2(1), 26-33.

- Obasan, K.A. (2014). The impact of business environment on the survival of small scale businesses in Nigeria. *International Journal of Management Business Research*, 4(3), 165-170.
- Ohanemu, C.N. (2006). *The Complete Entrepreneur: Managing the Small Industry*. Rockfields Publishing. Lagos, Nigeria.
- Olabisi, S., Olagbemi, A.A., & Atere, A. A. (2013). Factors affecting small-scale business performance in informal economy in Lagos State-Nigeria: A gendered based analysis. *Journal of Business and General Education*, 5(1), 25-37.
- Olabisi, S. Y., Andrew, A. O., & Adewole, A. A. (2011). Factors affecting small-scale business performance in informal economy in Lagos state-Nigeria: A Gendered Based Analysis, *Lagos State university*.
- Oluremi, H. A. & Gbenga, M. A. (2011). Environmental Factors and Entrepreneurship, Development in Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 13 (4), 127- 139.
- Osotimehin, K.O., Jegede, C., Akinlabi, B.H., & Olajide, O.T. (2012). An evaluation of the challenges and prospects of micro and small scale enterprises development in Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(4), 174-185.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *SPSS survival manual. A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS*, 4th edition. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Peteraf, M. A., & Barney, J. B. (2003), Unraveling the resource-based tangle. *Managerial and Decision Economics*, 24(4), 309–323. doi:10.1002/mde.1126
- Reynolds, P. (1993). *High performance entrepreneurship: what makes it different?* Babson Entrepreneurship Research Conference, University of Houston, USA, March 24-27.
- Rosli, M.M. (2011). Determinants of Small and Medium Enterprises Performance In The Malaysian Auto Part Industry. *African Journal of Enterprises management*, 5(20), 8235-8241.
- Rutherford, M. W., & Oswald, S. L. (2000). Antecedents of small business performance. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 3, 21-33.
- Sharmilee, S., & Muhammad, H. (2016). Factors affecting the performance of small and medium enterprises in KwaZulu- Natal, South Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 14(2-2). doi: 10.21511/ppm.14(2-2).2016.03
- Saad, M. & Patel, B. (2006). An investigation of supply chain performance measurement in the Indian automotive sector. Benchmarking. *International Journal*. 13(1/2), 36-53.
- Storey, D. (1994). *Understanding the Small Business Sector*. London: Routledge.
- Teece, D.J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.

- 750 Thibault, M., Wilcock, A., & Kanetkar, V. (2002). *An exploratory study of factors influencing*
751 *sales performance of small and medium –sized enterprises*. Proceedings of the Administrative
752 Sciences association of Canada. Winnipeg, Manitoba.
753
- 754 Tsai, W., MacMillan, I., & Low, M. (1991). Effects of strategy and environment on corporate
755 venture success in industrial markets. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6, 9-28.
756
757
- 758 Ukaegbu, C. C. (2006). “Business Environment and Entrepreneurial Activity in Nigeria:
759 Implication for Industrial Development.” *Journal of Modern African Studies*. Cambridge
760 University Press.
761
- 762 Vesalainen, J. (1995). *The small firm as an adaptive organization: organizational adaptation*
763 *versus environmental selection within environmental change*. University of Vaasa.
764 Acta Wasaensia 42. Dissertation.
765
- 766 Young, R. (1988). Is population ecology a useful paradigm for the study of organizations?
767 *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 1-24.