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Executive Summary

Entrepreneurial development is gaining greater attention as its potential for generating new job growth is increasingly recognized. For rural areas who are experiencing a decrease of economic activity in traditional segments of their economy, such as agriculture, natural resources and manufacturing, entrepreneurship offers an economic development strategy that has great potential. For local leaders who are interested in supporting entrepreneurship, a better understanding of what entrepreneurs need to be successful is of value. Taken another step, local leaders need to know what they can do to foster entrepreneurial activity.

This report provides the results of a survey instrument developed to assess a community’s entrepreneurial environment. The instrument measures the perceptions of small business owners and entrepreneurs as to how they would rate ten factors that influence entrepreneurship. The survey instrument was tested in twelve communities throughout the state of Missouri, with Fayette being one of the communities selected. Local leaders graciously worked with CPAC researchers in identifying business owners who had been in business for less than five years in the community. Face-to-face interviews with local business owners were conducted by CPAC researchers. A summary table provides an overview of the characteristics of businesses surveyed, as well as the mean scores for all ten factors. The results are reported in such a way as to avoid identifying individuals who responded to the survey. These results are to serve as input when making decisions regarding where to focus a community’s time and resources in strengthening the community’s entrepreneurial environment.

Key Findings

Top five community strengths:

1. Availability of legal, accounting, printing and marketing services
2. Availability of business planning assistance
3. City government’s utilization of external funding to improve the community
4. Community access to health care
5. Quality of community natural and man-made assets

Top five community weaknesses:

1. Business owners’ ability to provide employees with access to affordable health care
2. Educational opportunities for adults to become self-employed
3. Availability of financial resources other than commercial lenders
4. Educational opportunities for adults to become innovative
5. Willingness of city government to use public funding to meet business needs
Key Concepts

Entrepreneur: For the purpose of this report, an entrepreneur as defined by the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor is the definition being used. This broad definition was chosen given that in the context of rural communities, what is considered innovative in less populated areas may differ from urban areas. The definition is, “Any attempt to create a new business enterprise or to expand an existing business by an individual, a team of individuals, or an established business.”

Tangible factors: Based on a study of factors that influence economic performance of rural areas in Europe, called the “Dynamics of Rural Areas”, five factors of influence were identified as tangible, or more easily identified. These tangible factors include the following:

Financial Infrastructure
- knowledge of and willingness to use financial tools available to new businesses
- access to financing
- access to materials, education and other types of support in preparing for a business loan request

Physical Infrastructure
- availability of building space for new businesses
- availability of high speed Internet access

Commercial and Professional Infrastructure
- availability of assistance in business planning
- availability of business services, including accounting, printing, marketing and legal services

Community Environment and Design
- natural and man-made assets
- management of natural and man-made assets
- availability of public gathering places
- level of pedestrian activity

Human Resources
- availability of educational opportunities for youth and adults that support business ownership
Less Tangible Factors: Based on the same study, five additional factors that influence economic performance but were less identifiable due to their less visible nature were also identified. These five less tangible factors include the following:

Government and Institutions
- city government is responsive to small business needs
- city government is willing to work with small businesses on ordinances and planning requirements
- city government uses public funding and outside funding resources to enhance the community as a place to live

Markets
- unmet needs for products and services for the community are developed as business opportunities
- new products and services are being developed and marketed outside of the community

Networking
- business people network to exchange ideas
- business people network with various parts of the business community
- networks expand beyond the community
- networks are utilized for problem-solving
- existing networks are welcoming to new members

Quality of Life
- recreational opportunities exist for all members of the community
- arts and cultural opportunities exist for all members of the community
- access to health care
- affordable housing options

Community Beliefs and Attitudes
- locally owned businesses are patronized by community members
- business failure is not seen as a reason not to attempt another business venture
- diversity is tolerated
- regardless of gender, ethnic origin, sexual orientation or religion, people are treated fairly
- there is a can-do attitude to meet challenges
About the Rural Entrepreneurship Initiative

In 1999, the Rural Entrepreneurship Initiative (REI) was created by a partnership to support locally driven research on the topic of rural entrepreneurship. The idea was to support a growing learning community that would increase knowledge related to entrepreneurship in rural America. Partners of this effort include the Kauffman Foundation, Rural Policy Research Institute, Partners for Rural America, Inc., National Rural Development Partnership and the Nebraska Community Foundation, Inc.

REI has three desired outcomes:

1. Strengthen rural America through entrepreneurship;
2. Support learning that enables rural America to build a stronger and more supportive environment for entrepreneurship; and
3. Create and support a national learning community around rural entrepreneurship.

The Rural Entrepreneurial Initiative selected four states in 2000 – Maine, Minnesota, Missouri and West Virginia – to participate in its Discovery State Academy Program. The intent was to help these states better understand rural entrepreneurship opportunities and develop programs and policies to enhance a supportive entrepreneurial environment. In 2001, Discovery State work began in Colorado and Texas as well.

In April 2003 the Missouri Rural Development Partners, with funding from USDA-Rural Development partnered with the Community Policy Analysis Center to further the initial research by refining a survey instrument developed through the Discovery State grant and testing it in twelve rural communities in Missouri. A guidebook, entitled, “Growing Entrepreneurs from the Ground Up: A Community Based Approach to Growing Your Own Business” will be available in October 2004 for rural communities that wish to assess and enhance their entrepreneurial environment.

About the Missouri Rural Development Partners

The Missouri Rural Development Partners (MRDP) was formally organized in November 1992 and is one of nearly 40 state rural development councils comprising the National Rural Development Partnership (NRDP). MRDP recently received federal designation as Missouri’s official state rural development council.

The mission of MRDP is “to improve the quality of life, enhance opportunities, and help empower citizens and rural communities of Missouri by bringing together a coalition of public and private entities.” To fulfill its mission, MRDP brings together partners who represent the Federal, State, Local and Tribal governments, as well as private sector, for-profit and not-for-profit organizations, to identify and assess rural Missouri’s developmental needs, develop strategies, and facilitate actions for solutions. MRDP works on both programs and policies that remove barriers to rural development and bring about resources that assist citizens to help themselves in providing overall quality of life for all members of their communities.
Report Outline

Findings in this report are presented in five separate sections. The first section is the summary table and presents indicators of entrepreneurial activity, business characteristics of those business owners surveyed, and the mean scores of the community’s tangible and less tangible factors. The second, third and fourth sections report the survey results in a graphical format. The data are categorized as community strengths/weaknesses and as tangible/less tangible factors. The fifth section reports the survey responses to three open-ended questions.

Using this Report

The results of this report are intended to provide communities with information that will assist in identifying elements of their small business environment that are in need of strengthening. A guidebook entitled, “Growing Entrepreneurs from the Ground Up: A Community-based Approach to Growing Your Own Businesses” will be available in October 2004 to assist communities in developing an environment in which small businesses can thrive. For more information about the guidebook, contact the Missouri Rural Development Partners by calling 816-781-8631.
Survey Analysis

I. Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fayette, Missouri</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators,</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population, 2000</td>
<td>2,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income, 2000</td>
<td>$13,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Business Licenses Granted, 2003</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Business Closings, 2003</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Business Creations, 2003</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Characteristics,</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Businesses Surveyed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical/Veterinary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Number of Years Living in Community</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Number of Years in Business</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Number of Employees (FTE)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible Factors,</strong></td>
<td>Survey Mean $^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Professional Infrastructure</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Support</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Environment and Design</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less Tangible Factors,</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Institutions</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Beliefs and Attitudes</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$ One full-time equivalent (FTE) equals one full-time employee or two part-time employees.

$^2$ Survey response averages measured on a scale ranging from -3 to 3, with “-3” being strongly disagree, “0” being neutral and “3” being strongly agree.
II. Community Strengths and Weaknesses

The survey responses were measured on a scale ranging from 1 to 7, with “1” being strongly disagree, “4” being neutral and “7” being strongly agree. The mean survey responses were then converted to a scale ranging from -3 to 3, with -3.0 to -0.1 being a community weakness, “0” being neutral and 0.1 to 3.0 being a community strength.

Figure 1. Top Five Community Strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Availability of legal, accounting, printing and marketing services
2. Availability of business planning assistance
3. City government’s utilization of external funding to improve the community
4. Community access to health care
5. Quality of community natural and man-made assets

Figure 2. Top Five Community Weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Business owners’ ability to provide employees with access to affordable health care
2. Educational opportunities for adults to become self-employed
3. Availability of financial resources other than commercial lenders
4. Educational opportunities for adults to become innovative
5. Willingness of city government to use public funding to meet business needs
III. Tangible Factors

Figure 3. Physical Infrastructure

1. For a new business, a person can find available building space.
2. High speed Internet access in this community is adequate to meet business needs.

Figure 4. Commercial and Professional Infrastructure

1. Getting help in business planning is available within thirty miles to someone with an interest in starting a new business.
2. Accounting services, such as bookkeeping and payroll, are readily available within thirty miles for someone starting a new business.
3. Legal services are readily available within thirty miles for someone starting a new business.
4. Printing services are readily available within thirty miles for someone starting a new business.
5. Marketing services are readily available within thirty miles for someone starting a new business.
1. There are several state and federal programs, such as the Small Business Administration’s Guaranteed Loan program and USDA’s Business Opportunities program to reduce the risk to commercial lenders when making loans for new businesses. In your opinion, would you agree that local lenders use these programs when they have a credit-worthy business loan application?

2. There are financial resources available, other than commercial lenders, to invest in new and growing businesses.

3. Commercial lenders provide support, such as courses or materials, in preparing for a business loan request.

1. The community has natural and man-made assets that make this an enjoyable place to live.

2. The community manages its assets in such a way that those living here twenty years from now will find this community as enjoyable as current residents.

3. There are places in the community where people can meet together and socialize.

4. There is a great deal of pedestrian activity in the downtown during the day.
1. There are educational opportunities available for youth to develop their ability to be innovative.
2. There are educational opportunities available for youth to develop skills needed for self-employment.
3. There are educational opportunities available for adults to develop their ability to be innovative.
4. There are educational opportunities available for adults to develop skills needed for self-employment.

IV. Less Tangible Factors

1. City government is responsive to the needs of those starting a new business.
2. City government is flexible to update ordinances and planning requirements to meet the needs of new types of businesses.
3. City government is willing to use public funding to encourage new business start-ups.
4. City government utilizes outside funding, such as Community Development Block Grants and USDA Community Facility grants to improve the community as a place to live and work.
1. Unmet needs for products and services in the community are seized upon as opportunities for new business development.
2. Local businesses are developing new products and services that are marketed outside of the community.

Figure 9. Markets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Whether it is a chamber of commerce meeting or getting together over coffee, people in the business community get together frequently (six times a year or more) to exchange information and ideas.
2. People from different parts of the business community get together to exchange information and ideas.
3. Business networks expand beyond the community to other parts of the world.
4. When in doubt about a business decision, there is someone that can be called upon for guidance.
5. Existing business networks are welcoming to new members.

Figure 10. Networking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. There are recreational opportunities for all members of the community.
2. There are opportunities to enjoy music, dance, theatre, painting, sculpture and other various forms of arts in the community.
3. There is access to health care providers for all members of the community.
4. Business owners are able to provide employees with access to affordable health care.
5. There are affordable housing options available in the community.

1. People in this community support locally owned businesses by choosing to spend money with them whenever possible.
2. If someone fails at business the first time, people in this community will give a second business venture a chance for success.
3. Diversity comes in many forms. For example, a person can look different in some way than most others in the community. It may be that a person looks the same, but may have different religious beliefs, lifestyle choices, or interests than most others in the community. Would you agree that diversity among residents of this community is tolerated?
4. Anyone interested in starting a business is treated fairly.
5. People in this community have a can-do attitude to meet challenges.
V. Open-ended Survey Questions and Responses

_If you could identify one aspect of your community that is its greatest strength as a place to start a business in this community, what would it be?_

- Small town atmosphere.
- You don’t have the hassles of a larger city.
- A lot of unmet needs in terms of retail-you have a client base.
- Over the past 10 years I believe this community has worked very hard to do community assessment and development of downtown businesses - we are looking toward a comprehensive plan for sustaining into the future.
- You’ll get local support for business.
- Close knit community that is willing to accept you.
- The college is an asset – the townspeople have been very supportive- has southern feel to it.
- It’s a pretty town.
- Affordability - building space.
- Supportive people.
- The community has begun to become very supportive of our service.

_If you could identify one aspect of your community that is its greatest weakness as a place to start a business in this community, what would it be?_

- Lack of financial support
- You aren’t going to get rich - smaller population.
- Lack of any type of community guide for services with phone numbers, etc. No information on who you need to contact for starting a business. No incentives for new businesses.
- Youth recreation and development - creating business opportunities for younger citizens.
- Property - this is a hard town to grow business - we’re limited on where we can go.
- Available buildings need a major investment to occupy.
- City administration and planning. High turnover in city administration - hard time working together with city. Not open to new ideas. Nobody on council that runs a business.
- A great deal of residents do not realize that supporting their local business will improve their personal real estate values.
- Lack of population base - large percentage are elderly and don’t have expendable income.
- Proximity to four-lane highway.
- There are those who still refer to providers outside of our community - very frustrating to me.
What activity would you most like to see happen that would enhance this community as a place to start a business?

- Need programs to make financing available for new business start-ups.
- Make it easier for business to get started. Many projects don’t happen.
- Better accessibility from I-70.
- Personally I would like to see a youth center where young citizens are mentored by older citizens to create a healthier place for our youth to reside. This I believe will attract more young families to our community. It will also better prepare our youth for the leadership and business roles that will sustain our community in the future.
- Better youth facilities for all seasons. Many travel outside the community for these activities.
- Attract an industry into the community.
- Educate city council on what is needed for successful business development, and business operations. Business owners should be the major part of a city council.
- Improve sense of community among business owners.
- Lending foundations to provide low interest loans to start-up businesses.
- Continuing education for good business practices.
- I grew up in Fayette and it has changed tremendously over the years. It is now a much more “open minded” community although there is always room for improvement. Diversity of services, products, etc. is necessary to draw others - we have a pretty good start.

Extra Comments:

- Would like to figure out how to provide health care. Hard to attract good employees without providing health care insurance. Insurance rates/premiums-cost prohibitive.
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