Critical Analysis on Student's Entrepreneurship Development Influencing Factors

Dilip Kumar[1*], R. S. Sengar[2], P. Shrivastava[3] , P. R. Singh[4]

[1]Dept. of Rural Technology and Social Development, G.G.V., Bilaspur (C.G.), India
[2]Dept. of Agricultural Extension, COA, IGKV, Raipur (C.G.), India
[3]JNKVV, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India
[4]Dept. of Rural Technology and Social Development, G.G.V., Bilaspur (C.G.), India

Corresponding Author: dilipkumar.ext15@yahoo.com, Tel.: +9406440285

Abstract— The present study was conducted under the jurisdiction of Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (C.G.). The total 362 Final year (4th year) Under Graduate students have been selected randomly as respondents from 15 agricultural colleges. The primary data collected through pre tested structured interview schedule. Out of the total 362 respondents, majority of them (64.64%) were male and 35.36 per cent were female, majority (60.77%) of them were from the rural area, most (27.62%) of them had small size of land holding (up to 1 ha) and most (49.72%) of them had annual family income upto ☐ 1,00,000/-. Variables namely gender, family annual income, caste and size of land holding had significant and positive relationship with entrepreneurial behavior of respondents.

Keywords— entrepreneurial behavior, Socio-economic, gender, agricultural students

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent developments in economy field have led to a renewed interest in entrepreneurship. Many governments and policy-makers around the world consider the entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial drives as primary for economic growth and development [6]. The entrepreneur is an individual who forms an organization for commercial purpose. He/She is proprietary capitalist, a supplier of capital and at the same time a manager who intervenes between the labor and the consumer. "Entrepreneur is an employer, master, merchant but explicitly considered as a capitalist" [4]. [1] have defined an entrepreneur as "a person who habitually creates and innovates to build something of recognized value around perceived opportunities". It can be said from the above opinions that the entrepreneur is a risk taker, a capitalist, a manager, an employer, a master, a merchant, an innovator, a leader, a searcher for change, a creative thinker etc. who can changes the society and fulfill the needs of customers through providing services at their door step.

One of the most important components in the development of a country is educated entrepreneur. Unemployment rising particularly among educated people is alarming for the governments. Hence, it is to have essential, careful, comprehensive and long term planning. Today's students are graduating from colleges and universities where the environment changing rapidly. Thanks to technology and related factors that provide job opportunities always in the changing globe and creating new jobs in our globe [2]. In its global prospect of higher education for 21st Century, has described the new universities as: "A place in which the entrepreneurial skills in order to facilitate the graduates' capabilities and promoting them to job producers are developed" [5]. Graduate students' relationship with faculty is regarded by students as both the most important and most disappointing aspect of their graduate education [3].

1. To assess the socio-economic characteristics of agricultural students.
2. To determine the relationship between socio-economic characteristics and entrepreneurial behaviour of agricultural students.

II. METHODOLOGY

The present study was conducted under the jurisdiction of Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (C.G.). Out of 31 colleges, 15 colleges had been randomly selected from each faculty *i.e.* agriculture, horticulture and agriculture engineering for the present study. The Final year (4th year) Under Graduate students have been selected as respondents for the research work. Out of the total strength from each selected college, 50 per cent of the students have been selected randomly. Thus, out of total 717 students, 362 students have been selected as respondents. The primary data collected through pre tested structured interview schedule

were coded, tabulated and processed by using appropriate statistical tools and SPSS 16.0 version software.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

GENDER: Out of the total 362 respondents, majority of them (64.64%) were male and 35.36 per cent were female. In case of respondents from constituent colleges, majority of them (69.23%) were male, whereas 30.77 per cent were females. While in case of affiliated private colleges, majority of them (58.44%) were male and 41.56 per cent were female.

LOCALITY: As regards locality of the respondents, it was found that majority (60.77%) of them were from the rural area, followed by 26.52 per cent from urban area and 12.71 per cent from the semi urban area. Somewhat similar trend was observed in case of respondents from the constituent and affiliated private colleges. 61.06 per cent of them who belonged to constituent colleges were from rural area, followed by 27.40 and 11.54 per cent of them from urban area and semi urban area, respectively. While 60.39 per cent of the respondents of affiliated private colleges belonged to rural area, followed by 25.32 and 14.29 per cent belonged to urban area and semi urban area, respectively.

CASTE: As regards to caste, it can be inferred that out of the total respondents, majority (43.09%) belonged to the OBC category, followed by 24.31, 16.86 and 15.75 per cent of them from scheduled tribe, general caste and scheduled caste, respectively.

Caste wise distribution of the respondents from constituent colleges show that 39.42 per cent of the respondents were from OBC category, 25.00 per cent from scheduled tribe, 19.23 per cent general caste and 16.35 per cent scheduled caste. Whereas in case of respondents from affiliated private colleges, it was found that majority (48.05%) of the respondents were from OBC category, followed by 23.38, 14.93 and 13.64 per cent from scheduled tribe, scheduled caste and general caste, respectively.

TYPE OF FAMILY: Out of the total respondents, 54.70 per cent belonged to nuclear family and 45.30 per cent joint family. As regards constituent college respondents, it was observed that majority (58.17%) were from nuclear family and 41.83 per cent from joint family. Whereas, in case of affiliated private college, an equal number of the respondents (50.00%) belonged to nuclear and joint family. It can be inferred that as about 60.00 per cent of the respondents were from rural area, joint family still exists.

SIZE OF FAMILY: Regarding size of family of the respondents, it was found that 50.55 per cent of the respondents were from big family (>5 members), whereas 49.45 per cent from small family (<five members). In case of constituent colleges, 50.96 per cent of the respondents were from small family while, 49.04 per cent from big family. But in case of affiliated private college, 52.60 per cent of the respondents were from big family and 47.40 per cent from small family.

Table 4.1: Distribution of the respondents according to their socio-personal characteristics

S. No.	Characteristics	Constituent college		Affiliated Private college		Total
		f	%	f	%	%
A		**Gender**				
1.	Male	144	69.23	90	58.44	64.64
2.	Female	64	30.77	64	41.56	35.36
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.00**	**100.00**
B		**Locality**				
1.	Rural area	127	61.06	93	60.39	60.77
2.	Semi urban area	24	11.54	22	14.29	12.71
3.	Urban area	57	27.40	39	25.32	26.52
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.00**	**100.00**
C		**Caste**				
1.	Scheduled tribe	52	25.00	36	23.38	24.31
2.	Scheduled caste	34	16.35	23	14.93	15.75
3.	Other backward caste	82	39.42	74	48.05	43.09
4.	General caste	40	19.23	21	13.64	16.85
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.00**	**100.00**
D		**Type of family**				
1.	Nuclear family	121	58.17	77	50.00	54.70
2.	Joint family	87	41.83	77	50.00	45.30
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.00**	**100.00**
E		**Size of family**				
1.	Small family (up to 5 members)	106	50.96	73	47.40	49.45
2.	Big family (more than 5 members)	102	49.04	81	52.60	50.55
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.00**	**100.00**

4.1.1.6 Parents education

Table 4.2: Distribution of respondents according to their parent's education

Sr.	Education level	Constituent college				Affiliated Private college				Total	
		Mother		Father		Mother		Father		Mother	Father
		F	%	f	%	f	%	F	%	%	%
1.	Illiterate	45	21.63	09	04.33	23	14.93	04	02.60	18.78	03.59
2.	Primary school	33	15.87	31	14.90	24	15.58	17	11.04	15.75	13.26
3.	Middle school	37	17.79	24	11.54	35	22.73	11	07.14	19.89	09.67
4.	High school	31	14.9	21	10.10	32	20.78	15	09.74	17.40	09.94

     7

		0								
5.	Higher secondary	28	13.46	43	20.67	26	16.88	38	24.68	14.92	22.38
6.	Graduation and above	34	16.35	80	38.46	14	09.10	69	44.80	13.26	41.16
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.0**	**154**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

The Table 4.2 indicates that by and large fathers of the respondents were more educated than their mothers. Most (41.16%) of the respondent's fathers were educated upto graduation and above, followed by 22.38, 13.26, 09.94, 09.67 and 03.59 per cent educated upto higher secondary, primary school, high school, middle school and illiterate, respectively. Maximum (19.89%) number of respondents narrated that their mothers were educated upto middle school, followed by 18.78 per cent were illiterate and 17.40, 14.92, 13.26 per cent had their education upto high school, primary school, higher secondary and graduation and above respectively.

Table 4.3: Distribution of respondents according to their parent's occupation

Sr	Occupation	Constituent college				Affiliated Private college				Total	
		Mother		Father		Mother		Father		Mother	Father
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	%	%
1.	Civil servant	13	06.25	49	23.55	06	03.91	42	27.28	05.25	25.14
2.	Farmer	20	09.62	118	56.73	13	08.44	79	51.30	09.11	54.43
3.	Business	01	0.48	14	06.74	04	02.59	09	05.84	01.38	06.35
4.	Teacher	05	02.40	17	08.18	06	03.90	14	09.09	03.04	08.56
5.	House wife	163	78.37	0	0.00	120	77.92	0	0.00	78.18	0.00
6.	Others	06	02.88	10	04.80	05	03.24	10	06.49	03.04	05.52
	Total	208	100.0	208	100.0	154	100.0	154	100.0	100.0	100.0

The data related to parents occupation depicted in the table 4.3 reveals that out of the total 362 respondents, the maximum number of the respondent's mothers (78.18%) were house wife, followed by 09.11 per cent farmers, 05.25 per cent civil servant, 03.04 per cent each teacher and doing other work and 01.38 per cent business. Whereas majority of the respondent's fathers (54.43%) were farmers, followed by 25.14 per cent civil servant, 08.56 per cent teacher, 06.35 per cent business and 05.52 per cent doing other jobs, which were not included in the list of occupation.

Table 4.4: Distribution of the respondents according to their parents land holding

S. No.	Characteristics	Constituent college		Affiliated Private college		Total
		f	(%)	F	(%)	(%)
1.	Land less	34	16.35	23	14.93	15.74
2.	Marginal (up to 1 ha)	37	17.79	20	12.99	15.75
3.	Small (1.1 to 2 ha)	71	34.13	29	18.83	27.62
4.	Medium (2.1 to 4 ha)	37	17.79	42	27.27	21.83
5.	Big (above 4 ha)	29	13.94	40	25.98	19.06
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.00**	**100.00**

The data given in Table 4.4 demonstrates the distribution of respondents according to their parents land holding. Out of the total respondent's parents, most (27.62%) of them had small size of land holding (up to 1 ha), followed by 21.83 per cent medium size of land holding (2.1 to 4 ha), 19.06 per cent big size of land holding (above 4 ha) and 15.75 per cent had marginal size of land holding (up to 1 ha). However, 15.74 per cent of the respondent's parents had no land.

Table 4.5: Distribution of the respondents according to their relative owning business

S. No.	Relative owning business	Constituent college		Affiliated Private college		Total
		f	(%)	F	(%)	(%)
1.	Yes	112	53.85	87	56.49	54.97
2.	No	96	46.15	67	43.51	45.03
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.00**	**100.00**

The Table 4.5 depicts the responses according to their overall relative owning business. It was observed that majority (54.97%) of the respondents had their relatives who own business, while 45.03 per cent had no relative who owned business.

In case of constituent colleges, it was found that majority (53.85%) of the respondent's relatives had owned business and 46.15 per cent had no relatives owning business. On the other hand, majority (56.49%) of the respondents from affiliated private colleges, informed that their relatives own business and 27.27 per cent not owning business.

Table 4.6: Distribution of the respondents according to their annual family income

S. No.	Income group	Constituent college		Affiliated Private college		Total
		F	%	F	%	(%)
1.	Upto □1,00,000.00/-	101	48.56	79	51.30	49.72
2.	□1,00,001.00/- to 2,00,000.00/-	35	16.73	21	13.64	15.47
3.	□ 2,00,001.00/-	21	10.19	15	09.74	09.95

	to 3,00,000.00/-				
4.	Above □3,00,000.00/-	51	24.52	39	25.32	24.86
	Total	**208**	**100.00**	**154**	**100.00**	**100.00**
		$\bar{x}$=193377.00/-		$\bar{x}$=198173.00/-		$\bar{x}$=196133.00/-

The data given in the Table 4.6 show that out of the total respondents, most (49.72%) of them had annual family income upto □ 1,00,000/-, followed by 24.86 per cent had family annual income above □ 3,00,000/-, 15.47 per cent had family annual income between □ 1,00,001 to □ 2,00,000/- and 09.95 per cent had family annual income between □ 2,00,001/- to □ 3,00,000/-.

In case of respondents of constituent colleges and affiliated private colleges, the results were more or less on similar lines. As regards to the former, 48.56 per cent had annual family income upto □ 1,00,000/-, followed by 24.52, 16.73 and 10.19 per cent who had family annual incomes above □ 3,00,000/-, between □ 1,00,001 to ` 2,00,000/- and between □ 2,00,001/- to □ 3,00,000/-, respectively.

Similarly in case of affiliated private colleges, majority of the respondents (51.30%) had annual income upto □ 1,00,000/-, followed by 25.32 per cent of the respondents had annual income above □ 3,00,000/-, 13.64 per cent had annual income between □ 1,00,001/- to 2,00,000/- and 09.74 per cent between □ 2,00,001/- to 3,00,000/- . It can be inferred from the above findings that parents who have even annual income upto □ 1,00,000/- can afford to send their children for higher education in agriculture.

Table 4.29: Correlation analysis of independent variables with the entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents

S.N.	Independent variables	Coefficient of correlation "r" value		
		Constituent college	Affiliated private college	Overall
		n=208	n=154	n=362
01.	Gender	0.157*	0.312**	0.139**
02.	Locality	0.121	0.092	0.027
03.	Caste	0.149*	0.106	0.107*
04.	Family type	0.045	0.147	0.064
05.	Size of family	0.210	0.121	0.045
06.	Parents education	0.021	0.113	0.048
07.	Parents occupation	0.057	0.072	0.090
08.	Size of land holding	0.026	0.214*	0.121*
09.	Relative owning business	0.078	0.095	0.061

The data presented in Table 4.29 regarding correlation analysis of independent variables with entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents reveal that out of the ten variables under the study, only two variables namely gender and family annual income had highly significant and positive relationship with entrepreneurial behavior of respondents at

0.01 per cent level of significance. Two variables namely caste and size of land holding had significant and positive relationship with entrepreneurial behavior of respondents at 0.05 per cent level of significance.

In case of constituent college respondents, the correlation analysis of independent variables with entrepreneurial behavior of respondents reveals that out of the ten variables under the study only one variables namely family annual income had highly significant and positive relationship with entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents at 0.01 per cent level of significance. Two variables namely gender and caste had significant and positive related with entrepreneurial behavior of students at 0.05 per cent level of significance.

Regarding affiliated private college respondents, it is also noted that out of the ten variables under study, only one variables namely gender had highly significant and positive relationship with entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents at 0.01 per cent level of significance. Two variables namely size of land holding and family annual income had significant and positive relationship with entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents at 0.05 per cent level of significance.

Multiple regression analysis reveals that out of the ten variables under the study, only three variables namely gender, size of land holding and family annual income had significant and positive contribution towards entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents at 0.05 per cent level of significance. As evident from the significant 't' value of the variables, we can infer that if there is one unit increase in gender, size of land holding and family annual income there would be 0.502, 0.211 and 0.005 unit increase, respectively in entrepreneurial behavior of agricultural students. The R^2 value of 0.591 indicates that all the ten independent variables jointly contributed towards entrepreneurial behavior of agricultural students to the extent of 59.10 per cent.

Table 4.31: Multiple regression analysis of independent variables with the entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents

S.N.	Independent variables	Regression Coefficient "b" value		
		Constituent college	Affiliated private college	Overall
01.	Gender	1.179*	0.163*	0.502*
02.	Locality	0.631	0.900	0.124
03.	Caste	0.260	0.936	0.205
04.	Family type	1.080	1.329	0.911
05.	Size of family	0.034	0.065	0.126
06.	Parents education	0.246	0.057	0.188
07.	Parents occupation	0.041	0.095	0.055
08.	Size of land holding	0.085	0.131*	0.211*
09.	Relative owning business	0.579	2.489	0.592
10.	Family annual income	0.102*	0.078	0.089*
		R^2=0.612	R^2=0.573	R^2=0.591

** Significant at 0.01 level of probability
* Significant at 0.05 level of probability

Regarding constituent college respondents, the data reveal that out of the ten variables under the study, only two variables namely gender and family annual income had

significant and positive contribution towards entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents at 0.05 per cent level of significance. As evident from the significant 't' value of the variables, we can infer that if there is one unit increase in gender and family annual income there would be 1.179 and 0.102 unit increase, respectively in entrepreneurial behavior of agricultural students. The R^2 value of 0.612 indicates that all the 10 independent variables jointly contributed towards entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents to the extent of 61.20 per cent.

In case of affiliated private college respondents, the data reveal that out of the ten variables under study, only two variables namely gender and size of land holding had significant and positive contribution towards entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents at 0.05 per cent level of significance. As evident from the significant 't' value of the variables, we can infer that if there is one unit increase in gender and size of land holding there would be 0.163 and 0.131 unit increased, respectively in entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents. The R^2 value of 0.573 indicates that all the 18 independent variables jointly contributed towards entrepreneurial behavior of the respondents to the extent of 57.30 per cent.

IV.   CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SCOPE

So far as gender is concerned, it is evident from the data that more and more girls are enrolling for agriculture education and are taking it as a career option. The notable feature of the study is that a higher percentage of the girls had enrolled even in affiliated private colleges for agricultural education as compared to those in constituent colleges. Majority (one fourth) of the respondents were from the urban area, may be due to the fact that they prefer engineering, medical, commerce, business *etc.* as career options rather than agriculture. In case of respondents from the rural area, more number (60.77%) them had opted for agriculture as a career option and pursuing graduation in agriculture. As there are very little choices in the rural areas to pursue higher education, business and commerce, agriculture is a natural choice for students residing in rural areas. It can be noticed from the above findings that even youth from the traditionally weaker section like SC, ST and OBC were enrolling for higher education in the field of agriculture. In case of general caste, the figure is almost less than 20 per cent. In other words, it can be concluded that less number of general caste category youths were opting for higher studies in agriculture. In case of affiliated private college, this figure was even lesser.

REFERENCES

[1] Bolton, W.K. and Thompson, J.L. (2000), *"Entrepreneurs: Talent, Temperament, Technique"*. Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford.
[2] Collins, L., Hannon, P. D. and Smith, A. (2004), *"Enacting entrepreneurial intent: the gaps between student needs and higher education capability"*. *Education training,* Vol. 46 Issue 8/9 pp. 454-463.
[3] Hartnett, R. T. and Katz, J. (1977), *"The education of graduate students. Journal of Higher Education"*, Vol. 48 Issue 6, pp. 646-664.
[4] Smith, A. (1776), *"Inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of Nations, originally printed in Glasgow"*, Scotland, reprinted as The Wealth of Nations, Random House, New York, 1937. pp. 48-49, 86, 114.
[5] UNESCO (2004), *"Higher education in Europe"*, http://www.unesdoc .unesco.org/images/001621/16 2192 e.pdf.
[6] Zeffane, R. (2012), *"Gender and youth entrepreneurial potential: evidence from the United Arab Emirates"*. International Journal of Business and Management, Vol. 8 Issue 1, pp. 60.