Dataset on the acceptance of islamic microfinance in Kano State, Nigeria

Surajo Musa Yakubu a,*, Asmadi Mohamed Naim b,c, Noraini Yusuff b

a Department of Banking and Finance, School of Management Studies, Kano State Polytechnic, P.M.B. 3401, Kano, Kano State, Nigeria
b Islamic Business School, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 Sintok, Kedah, Darul Aman, Malaysia
c Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Sultan Abdul Halim Mu’adzam Shah (UniSHAMS), 09300 Kuala Ketil, Kedah, Malaysia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 23 December 2020
Revised 16 April 2021
Accepted 21 April 2021
Available online 30 April 2021

Keywords:
Acceptance
Islamic
Microfinance

ABSTRACT

The present data from 194 customers of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) is about their acceptance of Islamic microfinance in Kano State, Nigeria. The dataset includes variables such as gender, age, marital status, duration as customer, account operate, annual income, type of business, service quality, perceived value, corporate image and religiosity of customers in Kano State. A survey from March to June 2019, self-administered questionnaires were used for data collection. This data may help scholars to understand how people of Kano State accept Islamic microfinance interacted with service quality, customer perceived value, corporate image and religiosity.
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Specifications Table

| Subject | Specific subject area |
|---------|-----------------------|
| 1. Value | Banking and Finance. |
| 2. Specifications | Islamic Finance and Banking. |
| 3. Type of data | Table |
| 4. How data were acquired | Survey method was used and primary data were collected from the respondents through the use of questionnaire. Survey method is appropriate because respondents are spread all over Kano State, Nigeria. |
| 5. Data format | Raw, Analysed |
| 6. Parameters for data collection | the data were collected from organization registered small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the survey |
| 7. Description of data collection | A total of 360 survey questionnaire were self administered and collected back by help of research assistant |
| 8. Data source location | Kano State, Nigeria. |
| 9. Data accessibility | The data are available at Mendeley Data [https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/pyvnbdsvgc/1](https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/pyvnbdsvgc/1) |

Value of the Data

- The dataset is particularly useful for public sector such as central bank, commercial bank, institutions both universities and others, regulatory authorities and many other sectors.
- The dataset can be used to address some of the economic crises such as high interest rate charges, poverty, kidnapping, robbery, herdsmen and farmers clashes and many others.
- The dataset can be reused for an empirical study that intend to examine various characteristics of Islamic microfinance, service quality, corporate image and religiosity in Kano State, Nigeria.
- The dataset is expected to be used by international financial institutions such the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and International Islamic Bank among others who wants to know more about the acceptance of Islamic microfinance in Nigeria.

1. Data Description

The data was acquired via survey questionnaire method. The questionnaire has six parts where part A is on the demographic information of respondents, and questions were asked in relation to gender, age, marital status, educational qualification, and customers’ experience, type of account, income, and type of beneficiary. Part B contains 27 items measuring the dependent variable (acceptance of Islamic microfinance) adapted from [1]. Part C is on service quality (independent variable) in which 22 items were used to measure the variable adapted from [2]. Part D comprises of 22 items used to measure the customer perceived value (independent variable) adapted from [3]. Part e consists of 11 items measuring corporate image as an independent variable adapted from [4] and [5]. Finally, part F is on religiosity as a moderating variable with 22 questions adapted from [6]. All were coded and rated on the five-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree. The survey questionnaire is provided as a supplementary material in this article. The constructs/variables and items are shown in table 1 below.

Table 1 shows that male constitutes 45.4%, while female 54.6%. The percentage by age is as follows: 25–32, 36.1%; 33–39, 24.2%; 40–46, 25.8%; 47–53, 8.8% and 54 and above 5.2%. The marital status percentage are: single 47.4%, divorce/separated 50.0% and married 2.6%. The duration as customer consists of less than the year 28.4%, 1–2 years 19.1%, 3–4 years 26.8%, 5–6 years
Table 1
Demographic factors.

| Demographic Variables | Categories       | Frequencies | Percentage |
|------------------------|------------------|-------------|------------|
| Gender                 | Male             | 88          | 45.4       |
|                        | Female           | 106         | 54.6       |
| Age                    | 25–32 years      | 70          | 36.1       |
|                        | 33–39 years      | 47          | 24.2       |
|                        | 40–46 years      | 50          | 25.8       |
|                        | 47–53 years      | 17          | 8.8        |
|                        | Above 54 years   | 10          | 5.2        |
| Marital status         | Single           | 92          | 47.4       |
|                        | Married          | 97          | 50         |
|                        | Divorced/Separated | 5       | 2.6        |
| Duration as a customer | less than 1 year | 55          | 28.4       |
|                        | 1–2 years        | 37          | 19.1       |
|                        | 3–4 years        | 52          | 26.8       |
|                        | 5–6 years        | 26          | 13.4       |
|                        | 7-above years    | 24          | 12.4       |
| Account Operate        | Current account  | 58          | 29.9       |
|                        | Savings account  | 125         | 64.4       |
|                        | Fixed deposit acct. | 2     | 1          |
|                        | Others           | 9           | 4.6        |
| Annual income          | 50,000–100,000   | 68          | 31.1       |
|                        | 101,000–151,000  | 42          | 21.6       |
|                        | 152,000–202,000  | 42          | 21.6       |
|                        | 203,000–253,000  | 21          | 10.8       |
|                        | 254,000 and above | 21     | 10.8       |
| Type of business       | Agriculture      | 43          | 22.2       |
|                        | Whole sale/Trade | 90          | 46.4       |
|                        | Other services   | 61          | 31.4       |

13.4%, 7 and above 12.4%. Account operated percentage constitutes the current account 29.9%, savings account 64.4%, fixed deposit 1.0% and others 4.6%. The percentage of annual income is; 50,000–100,000, 31.1%; 101,000–151,000, 21.6%; 152,000–202,000, 21.6%; 203,000–253,000, 10.8%; 254,000 and above 10.8%. Lastly, the types of business are: agriculture 22.2%, whole sale and trade 46.4% and others 31.4%.

From Table 2, this dataset composite reliability coefficient ranges from 0.881 to 0.942 and AVE is in a range from 0.502 to 0.514, which is above 0.70 and 0.4 minimum acceptable level as recommended by [9].

In Table 3, the correlations among the latent constructs were compared with the square root of the average variances extracted. Table 4 also shows that the square root of the average variances extracted was all greater than the correlations among constructs, suggesting adequate discriminant validity [9].

2. Experimental Design, Materials and Methods

The systematic sampling technique was used in the collection of the data. Systematic sampling means procedure that involves randomly choosing an initial starting point on a list, and thereafter every undefined number element in the sampling frame is selected [7]. The sampling
In each of these sampling elements above, a questionnaire was self administered to the respondent. Before a questionnaire was administered, the researchers verbally asked the religion a respondent adheres to. Only respondents who claimed to be Muslims were administered the questionnaire. A total of 360 questionnaires were distributed, out of which 254 were returned. After data clearing in SPSS, 60 questionnaires were rejected because they were not properly completed. This article uses the remaining 194 for data analysis.

The article used Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) because of its advantages such as a good path modeling statistical tool for solving a complex multivariate

### Table 2
Convergent validity of the constructs.

| Constructs            | Items | Factor Loadings | Composite Reliability | AVE  |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------------|-----------------------|------|
| Acceptance            | ACC7  | 0.718           | 0.942                 | 0.505|
|                       | ACC9  | 0.693           |                       |      |
|                       | ACC10 | 0.727           |                       |      |
|                       | ACC11 | 0.720           |                       |      |
|                       | ACC12 | 0.731           |                       |      |
|                       | ACC13 | 0.721           |                       |      |
|                       | ACC14 | 0.646           |                       |      |
|                       | ACC15 | 0.754           |                       |      |
|                       | ACC17 | 0.695           |                       |      |
| Customer perceived   | CPV4  | 0.737           | 0.891                 | 0.505|
| value                 | CPV6  | 0.685           |                       |      |
|                       | CPV7  | 0.753           |                       |      |
|                       | CPV8  | 0.679           |                       |      |
|                       | CPV21 | 0.721           |                       |      |
|                       | CPV22 | 0.699           |                       |      |
|                       | CPV23 | 0.713           |                       |      |
|                       | CPV24 | 0.697           |                       |      |
| Corporate image       | CRI1  | 0.758           | 0.881                 | 0.514|
|                       | CRI2  | 0.764           |                       |      |
|                       | CRI3  | 0.729           |                       |      |
|                       | CRI4  | 0.683           |                       |      |
|                       | CRI5  | 0.744           |                       |      |
|                       | CRI6  | 0.754           |                       |      |
|                       | CRI7  | 0.683           |                       |      |
|                       | CRI9  | 0.674           |                       |      |
|                       | CRI10 | 0.653           |                       |      |
| Service quality       | SQ1   | 0.706           | 0.892                 | 0.509|
|                       | SQ2   | 0.702           |                       |      |
|                       | SQ4   | 0.718           |                       |      |
|                       | SQ11  | 0.716           |                       |      |
|                       | SQ13  | 0.768           |                       |      |
|                       | SQ15  | 0.707           |                       |      |
|                       | SQ16  | 0.692           |                       |      |
|                       | SQ17  | 0.698           |                       |      |

interval for this dataset is considered to be population divide by sample (population/sample) which is 1808/360 = 5. At the starting point the researcher selected a number between 1 and 5, and then the sample would be sampling element numbered thereafter, and then the consider sample for this dataset was sampling elements numbered 5, 10, 15 up to the 1808 sampled element numbers.
Table 3
Loadings and cross-loadings of the constructs.

| Constructs     | Items | ACC  | CPV  | CRI  | RGY  | SQ   |
|----------------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Acceptance     | ACC10 | 0.727| 0.516| 0.519| 0.344| 0.569|
|                | ACC11 | 0.720| 0.536| 0.470| 0.343| 0.580|
|                | ACC12 | 0.731| 0.468| 0.504| 0.382| 0.593|
|                | ACC13 | 0.721| 0.549| 0.497| 0.354| 0.601|
|                | ACC14 | 0.646| 0.511| 0.454| 0.258| 0.508|
|                | ACC15 | 0.754| 0.619| 0.581| 0.480| 0.627|
|                | ACC17 | 0.695| 0.532| 0.461| 0.375| 0.589|
|                | ACC18 | 0.751| 0.570| 0.534| 0.369| 0.552|
|                | ACC19 | 0.675| 0.517| 0.463| 0.363| 0.536|
|                | ACC21 | 0.706| 0.486| 0.497| 0.362| 0.579|
|                | ACC22 | 0.713| 0.508| 0.529| 0.437| 0.579|
|                | ACC23 | 0.689| 0.523| 0.493| 0.404| 0.570|
|                | ACC24 | 0.747| 0.580| 0.533| 0.366| 0.604|
|                | ACC25 | 0.670| 0.486| 0.456| 0.470| 0.556|
|                | ACC26 | 0.718| 0.523| 0.470| 0.379| 0.573|
|                | ACC27 | 0.693| 0.458| 0.456| 0.335| 0.549|
| Customer perceived value | CPV21 | 0.514| 0.721| 0.612| 0.444| 0.491|
|                | CPV22 | 0.460| 0.699| 0.500| 0.432| 0.522|
|                | CPV23 | 0.523| 0.713| 0.523| 0.433| 0.476|
|                | CPV24 | 0.469| 0.697| 0.493| 0.388| 0.427|
|                | CPV4  | 0.599| 0.737| 0.618| 0.561| 0.578|
|                | CPV6  | 0.519| 0.685| 0.542| 0.365| 0.504|
|                | CPV7  | 0.571| 0.753| 0.533| 0.445| 0.539|
|                | CPV8  | 0.525| 0.679| 0.538| 0.422| 0.532|
| Corporate image | CRI1  | 0.583| 0.593| 0.758| 0.609| 0.648|
|                | CRI10 | 0.411| 0.501| 0.653| 0.315| 0.463|
|                | CRI2  | 0.576| 0.556| 0.764| 0.551| 0.619|
|                | CRI3  | 0.511| 0.553| 0.729| 0.534| 0.566|
|                | CRI4  | 0.485| 0.581| 0.683| 0.439| 0.545|
|                | CRI5  | 0.508| 0.589| 0.744| 0.524| 0.605|
|                | CRI6  | 0.496| 0.569| 0.754| 0.531| 0.539|
|                | CRI7  | 0.461| 0.480| 0.683| 0.416| 0.495|
|                | CRI9  | 0.434| 0.534| 0.674| 0.436| 0.459|
| Service quality | SQ1   | 0.608| 0.376| 0.504| 0.378| 0.706|
|                | SQ11  | 0.597| 0.579| 0.554| 0.436| 0.716|
|                | SQ13  | 0.603| 0.525| 0.549| 0.429| 0.768|
|                | SQ15  | 0.590| 0.569| 0.579| 0.447| 0.707|
|                | SQ16  | 0.525| 0.538| 0.589| 0.413| 0.692|
|                | SQ17  | 0.515| 0.544| 0.579| 0.400| 0.698|
|                | SQ2   | 0.576| 0.442| 0.466| 0.416| 0.702|
|                | SQ4   | 0.581| 0.538| 0.595| 0.563| 0.718|

model [8], capable of estimating paths under situation of normality with large sample size due to its robustness and its possibility to detect variance between the groups when compared to the covarianc based approach [9].

Ethics Statement

The participants gave verbal consent to take part in this data collection exercise. The researchers gave assurances to the participants that responses will be kept anonymous.

CRediT Author Statement

Surajo Musa Yakubu: Conceptualization, Investigation, Data curation, Writing – original draft; Asmadi Mohamed Naim: Investigation, Data curation, Writing – review & editing; Noraini Yusuff: Supervision, Data curation, Writing – review & editing.
Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships which have or could be perceived to have influenced the work reported in this article.

Acknowledgments

The researchers acknowledge the respondents who took their time and participated in this data during this difficult and hardship of life time.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi: 10.1016/j.dib.2021.107108.

References

[1] M.J. Sim, Measuring User Acceptance of Internet Banking: A Survey in Northern Region of Peninsular Malaysia, Doctoral dissertation, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 2004.
[2] A. Parasuraman, V.A. Zeithaml, L.L. Berry, Servqual: a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perc, J. Retail. 64 (1988) 12.
[3] J.C.F. Roig, J.S. Garcia, M.A.M. Tena, J.L. Monzonis, Customer perceived value in banking services, Int. J. Bank Market. 24 (5) (2006) pp. 266-283 0265-2323, doi:10.1108/02652320610681729.
[4] N. Souiden, N.M. Kassim, H. Hong, The effect of corporate branding dimensions on consumers’ product evaluation: a cross-cultural analysis, Eur. J. Mark. 40 (7/8) (2006) 825–845, doi:10.1108/03090560610670016.
[5] R.G. Javalgi, M.B. Traylor, A.C. Gross, E. Lampman, Awareness of sponsorship and corporate image: an empirical investigation, J. Advert. 23 (1994) 47–58.
[6] R. Shabbir, A. Rehman, Marketing Strategies in Financial Crisis With Change in Mobile Technology, Master. Umeå University, Sweden, 2010.
[7] J.F. Hair, A.H. Money, P. Samouel, M. Page, Research Methods for Business, 2007 Education+ Training.
[8] J. Henseler, C.M. Ringle, R.R. Sinkovics, The use of partial least squares path modeling in international marketing, New Challenges to International Marketing, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2009.
[9] C. Fornell, D.F. Larcker, Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error, J. Market. Res. (1981) 39–50.