

RESEARCH ARTICLE:

e ISSN-0976-6847

Impact of entrepreneurship development programmes in North Karnataka

■ Geeta P. Channal and K.V. Natikar

ARTICLE CHRONICLE:

Received:

18.04.2017;

Revised:

01.12.2017; **Accepted:**

15.12.2017

KEY WORDS:

Entrepreneur,
Entrepreneurship,
Entrepreneurship
development
programme (EDP),
RUDSETI, Impact,
Leadership, Decision
Making, Confidence,
Management
orientation,
Establishment of
enterprise, Growth/
Expansion of
enterprise

Author for correspondence:

Geeta P. Channal
Department of
Agricultural Extension
Education, College of
Agriculture, University
of Agricultural Sciences,
Dharwad (Karnataka)
India
Email:geetrajpatil@
yahoo.co.in

See end of the article for authors' affiliations

SUMMARY: The present study was undertaken during the year 2014-15 in three districts of North Karnataka. Fifty trained and 50 untrained entrepreneurs from each district were selected making a total sample size of 300. Majority of the trained and untrained were from middle age group, had education upto middle level of schooling, coming from rural area and having nuclear families.

How to cite this article: Channal, Geeta P. and Natikar, K.V. (2018). Impact of entrepreneurship development programmes in North Karnataka. *Agric. Update*, **13**(1): 1-8; **DOI**: **10.15740/HAS/AU/13.1/1-8.**

BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

"Instead of writing someone else's account through wage employment, after three to five years of collegiate education, it is more meaningful to write one's own account by embarking upon some self-employment".

Dr. D. Veerendra Heggade President, RUDSET Institute

Unemployment is the biggest challenge the country is facing in the process of its development. Job generating capacity of the economy has not coped with enhanced number of aspirants entering job market every year after completing their school/college education. On the rural side, the employment potential in agrarian economy also appears to have reached a saturation level leading to large scale migration of manpower from rural areas to urban areas. It has been globally accepted that entrepreneurship development

results in overall economic and social development of the nation. Entrepreneurial activities are not only a means for social empowerment but also, empowering them economically and enable them to contribute more to overall development.

The word entrepreneurship appeared first in French. In the early 16th century men engaged in leading military expeditions were referred as entrepreneur. Around 17th century the term was used for architects and contractors of public works. Later it was quoted by Casson (1991) as 'an entrepreneur is a person, who specializes in taking judgmental decisions about the coordination of scarce resources'.

Entrepreneurship is neither a science nor an art. It is a practice. It has a knowledge base. Knowledge in entrepreneurship is a means to an end. Indeed, what constitutes knowledge in practice is largely defined by the ends, that is, by the practice (Drucker, 1986).

Lots of efforts have been made by Government and non-Government organization to promote entrepreneurial development in the country through Entrepreneurial Development Programmes (EDP). Entrepreneurial development programmes can play an important role in influencing potential candidates to take advantage of new business opportunities and establish new business ventures. Programmes are designed for both to help potential candidates to start new ventures or to help existing entrepreneurs to improve their skills or to solve particular business problems. There are three stages for the entrepreneurship development programmes i.e., pretraining, training and post-training. In this regard many agencies and institutions are working towards organizing Entrepreneurship Development Programmes. Some of the important institutions working in this regard are, State Agricultural Universities, Khadi and Village Industrial Commission (KVIC), Rural Development Training Centers (RDTC), District Industries Centre (DIC), Rural Development and Self Employment Training Institute (RUDSETI), Krishi Vigyan Kendra (KVK), Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART), Association of Women Entrepreneurs of Karnataka (AWAKE), Centre of Entrepreneurship Development of Karnataka (CEDOK), Commercial Banks, the Coir Board, National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development, Small Industries Development Organization (SIDO), Small Industries Services Institutes (SISIs) etc. (Goyal and Prakash, 2011) are involved in providing training on various aspects and make them successful entrepreneurs. Hence, it is important to investigate the impact of entrepreneurship development programmes with the following objectives:

- To analyze the socio-personal characteristics of the entrepreneurs
- To assess the impact of Entrepreneurship Development programmes

RESOURCES AND METHODS

The present investigation was undertaken in Bagalkot, Vijayapur and Uttar Kannada districts of Karnataka state as in those district RUDSETI is operational since for minimum five years. A list of all trainees who have undergone training at RUDSETI during 2009-10 to 2012-13 was obtained from all the three districts *i.e.*, Bagalkote, Vijayapur and Uttar Kannada.

From the list, 50 each trained entrepreneurs from Bagalkote, Vijayapur and Uttar Kannada districts each were selected by random sampling method making a sample of 150. For the untrained entrepreneurs, a list of entrepreneurs who have not undergone training from RUDSETI from same area was prepared and from this list 50 entrepreneurs were randomly selected making a sample of 150. For both trained and untrained entrepreneurs random selection was made by using snowball and accidental methods. The total sample therefore consisted of 150 trained and 150 untrained entrepreneurs.

Brief description of RUDSETI:

Rural development and self employment training institute (RUDSETI), a unique initiative in mitigating the problems of unemployed, was taken-up in Ujire, a small village near Dharmastala. This venture was taken up by Sri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwar Eduacational (SDME) Trust and two nationalised banks namely Syndicate Bank and Canara Bank under the visionary leadership of Padmabhushan Dr. D. Veerendra Heggade, Dharmadhikari of Dharmastala. The collective thinking of the trust, the banks and the people had led to giving a shape and an institutional framework to the initiative taken-up in the form of RUDSETI in 1982, which was registered under Karanataka Socities Registartion Act 1960. Due to the success of Ujire experiment, RUDSETI has now encouraged to established 578 units in India out of which 31 units are in Karnataka.

Establishment of RUDSETIs:

RUDSETI Unit at Vijayapur was established in 1992 jointly by Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Education (SDME) Trust, Syndicate bank and Canara bank. In Bagalkot district the RUDSETI was established in 2003 by Basaveshawar Vidya Vardaka Sangh (BVVS) in collaboration with ING Vyasya and Deshpande RUDSETI in Uttar Kannada was established in 2004 by Deshpande foundation with Canara bank.

Types of training programmes provided:

RUDSETI offers more than 60 types of entrepreneurship development programmes (EDPs) in various avenues. All the programmes are from one to six weeks. They are classified into four categories.

 Agricultural EDPs include agriculture and allied activites, dairy farming, poultry, bee keeping, horticulture, Plant nursery etc.

- Product EDPs include dress designing, agarabatti making, soft toys making, food processing, bakery products, embroidery, fabric painting etc.
- Process EDPs include electric motor rewinding and pumpset maintenance, beauty parlour, photography, videography, phone servicing, domestic electrical appliances repair, two wheel servicing, computer DTP, refrigeration and air condition, computer tally, computer basics etc.
- General EDPs include Rural Entrepreneurship
 Development programme (REDP), EDP for women,
 Prime minister employment guarantee programme (PMEGP) etc.

OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

The results obtained from the present study as well as discussions have been summarized under following heads:

Socio-personal characteristics of trained and untrained entrepreneurs:

Majority of the trained (58.67%) and untrained (66.67%) entrepreneurs belong to middle age group, only

a small percentage of trained (10.00%) and untrained (16.00%) belong to old age group and the remaining 31.30 per cent of trained entrepreneurs and 17.33 per cent of untrained entrepreneurs belong to young age group (Table 1).

Middle aged entrepreneurs have a free hand in financial affairs and they can take up independent decisions to implement their ideas. They have more physical vigor, want to be more independent, have more family responsibilities and are at a stage in life where they have to fulfill their family responsibilities. Young people lack experience whereas old aged people lack risk bearing ability and interest. The responsibility of the management of family enterprise would be relatively less with young and old people in the family. The results are in line with the study conducted by Ram *et al.* (2013).

More number of the trained entrepreneurs (35.30%) had education upto middle school followed by secondary (21.30%), primary (18.00%), collegiate (13.30%) and illiterates (12.00%). Among untrained nearly fifty per cent of the entrepreneurs (50.60%) had studied upto middle school level, 22 per cent had primary education and 6.70 per cent each had secondary and collegiate education and14 per cent were illiterates.

| Variables and asteronics | Train | ed | Untrai | ned |
|---|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Variables and categories | Frequency | % | Frequency | % |
| Age | | | | |
| Young (Upto 30) | 47 | 31.33 | 26 | 17.33 |
| Middle (31-50) | 88 | 58.67 | 100 | 66.67 |
| Old (>50) | 15 | 10.00 | 24 | 16.00 |
| Education | | | | |
| Illiterate (Nil) | 18 | 12.00 | 21 | 14.00 |
| Primary (Upto 5 th std) | 27 | 18.00 | 33 | 22.00 |
| Middle (Upto 10 th std) | 53 | 35.30 | 76 | 50.60 |
| Secondary (Upto 12 th) | 32 | 21.30 | 10 | 06.70 |
| Collegiate (>12 th std) | 20 | 13.30 | 10 | 06.70 |
| Type of family | | | | |
| Nuclear | 106 | 70.70 | 110 | 73.30 |
| Joint | 44 | 29.30 | 40 | 26.70 |
| Annual income | | | | |
| Low (Rs.<1,16,968) | 78 | 52.00 | 40 | 26.67 |
| Medium(between.Rs. 1,16,968 to >2,09,915) | 40 | 26.67 | 60 | 40.00 |
| High (>2,09,915) | 32 | 21.33 | 50 | 33.33 |
| Background of the entrepreneurs | | | | |
| Rural | 121 | 80.70 | 82 | 54.70 |
| Urban | 29 | 19.30 | 68 | 45.30 |

The probable reason for majority of the entrepreneurs being educated upto primary to secondary level of education might be due to lack of facilities in the village and nearby villages, As the rural people have still traditional base they generally do not prefer to send their children to school rather they want them to assist in farm and household activities. The distance of study centers from the villages and more investment also might have prevented the parents from providing higher education to their children. The results are in conformity with the findings of Hanagi and Joshi (2015).

Almost 70 per cent each of trained and untrained entrepreneurs belonged to nuclear type of families *i.e.* (70.70 and 70.30, respectively). The rest of trained (29.30%) and untrained (26.70%) entrepreneurs belonged to joint families.

A desire to lead an independent life with proper accommodation, basic amenities and to give better future to their kids, must have motivated most of the respondents to live in the nuclear families. The other reason could be the influence of urbanization and increased needs and wants. The findings of the present study agree with the findings of Hanagi and Joshi (2015).

The data recorded in Table 1 revealed that, more than half of the trained entrepreneurs belonged to low income category (52.00%) followed bt medium (26.67%) and high (21.33%) income categories. In case of

untrained entrepreneurs majority of them were in medium (40.00%) followed by high (33.300%) and low (26.67%) income category.

The possible reason for many of the trained entrepreneurs in low income category may be that low socio-personal status background people to supplement their family usually for training, have taken small enterprises and earns little income. The results are in accordance with Ravi (2007) The reason for untrained entrepreneurs in medium income category may be their family background is sound and doing business from many years and expert in that field hence might be earning good income. The results are in line with the findings of Hanagi and Joshi (2015).

Majority of trained (80.70%) and untrained (54.70%) entrepreneurs belongs to rural background and remaining 19.30 per cent of trained and 45.30 per cent of untrained entrepreneurs were from urban background.

Impact of entrepreneurship development programme:

Leadership ability of the trained and untrained entrepreneurs with respect to entrepreneurship:

Leadership in entrepreneurship is referred to as not only the act of entrepreneurship of managing or starting a business but how one manages to do so by social processes or skills of leadership. Leadership is an

Table 2: Impact entrepreneurship development programmes on entreprenuers

| Leadership levels | Trained | Mean score | leadership levels | Untrained | Mean score |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------|
| Low | 45 | 32.37 | Low | 59 | 28.32 |
| (mean-0.425SD) <38.89 | (30.00 %) | | (mean-0.425SD) <32.09 | (39.33 %) | |
| Medium | 48 | 43.48 | Medium | 62 | 34.84 |
| (Mean + 0.425 SD) | (32.00 %) | | (mean+_0.425SD) | (41.34 %) | |
| 38.89 to 47.35 | | | 32.09 to 38.34 | | |
| High | 57 | 54.59 | High (mean+0.425SD) | 29 | 41.37 |
| (mean+0.425SD) >47.35 | (38.00 %) | | >38.34 | (19.33 %) | |

| Mean = 43.12 | Mean = 35.21 |
|----------------|----------------|
| SD = 9.95 | SD = 7.36 |

| Table 2 b: Comparison between trained and untrained entrepreneurs on leadership ability | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| I 4 | Mean lead | ership score | Mean difference | 't' value | | |
| Leadership levels | Trained (n=150) | Untrained (n=150) | - | | | |
| Low | 32.37 | 28.32 | 4.05 | 5.824** | | |
| Medium | 43.48 | 34.84 | 8.64 | 12.365** | | |
| High | 54.59 | 41.37 | 13.22 | 13.183** | | |
| Overall | 43.12 | 35.21 | 7.91 | 7.824** | | |

^{**}indicates significance of value at P=0.05

important function of management which helps to maximize efficiency and to achieve the goal.

The data presented in Table 2a showed the leadership ability of trained and untrained entrepreneurs in managing their enterprise. Thirty eight per cent of trained entrepreneurs had high leadership ability followed by medium (32.00 %) and low (30.00). With regard to untrained entrepreneurs 41.34 per cent belonged to medium followed by low (39.33 %) and high (19.33 %) leadership ability categories.

The data in Table 2b was subjected to 't' test to know the significance of difference in mean impact score of trained and untrained entrepreneurs with respect to leadership ability. The significance of difference between mean leadership ability scores for trained and untrained entrepreneurs was studied. When the mean scores of the three categories of trained entrepreneurs were compared to the corresponding scores of the untrained entrepreneurs, a significant differences was found in all the three *i.e.*, low, medium, high and overall categories.

This could be because the trained entrepreneurs were exposed to different situations where in they learnt to manage resources, way of approaching banks and in turn train their subordinates to perform in a better way.

Poor mean scores of untrained entrepreneurs for leadership could be low extension contact and contact with outside agencies. The results are in line with the findings of and Pandeti (2005).

Decision making ability of trained and untrained entrepreneurs with respect to entrepreneurship:

Decision making is ones mental processes to come up with a final choice after careful consideration of several options or alternatives.

The data in Table 3a revealed that 36.00 per cent of trained entrepreneurs belonged to medium decision making category followed by high (34.00 %) and low (30.00%). In case of untrained entrepreneurs, 39.33 per cent belonged to low decision making category and almost an equal percentage *i.e.*, 30.67 and 30.00 per cent belonged high and medium decision category, respectively.

The significance of difference between mean decision making scores of trained and untrained entrepreneurs was studied and it was found that there was no significant difference between mean decision scores in the low decision making categories of trained and untrained (Table 3b), however medium, high and over all decision making categories of trained and untrained entrepreneurs differed significantly in their decision making ability. The possible reason for such a finding is that during the training they were taught various aspects of finance management and marketing. This acquired knowledge and skill might have made them to take better decisions. The results are in line with the findings of Ravi (2007).

Confidence level of trained and untrained

| Decision making levels | Trained | Mean score | Decision making levels | Untrained | Mean score |
|------------------------|-----------|------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Less Rational | 45 | 22.68 | Low | 59 | 22.41 |
| (Mean-0.425SD) <38.89 | (30.00 %) | | (mean-0.425SD) <25.02 | (39.33 %) | |
| Intermediate | 54 | 28.17 | Medium | 45 | 23.72 |
| (Mean + 0.425 SD) | (36.00) | | (mean+.0.425SD) | (30.00 %) | |
| 38.89 to 47.35 | | | 32.09 to 38.34 | | |
| Rational | 51 | 33.67 | High (mean+0.425SD) | 46 | 25.03 |
| (Mean+0.425SD) >47.35 | (34.00 %) | | >29.00 | (30.67 %) | |

Mean = 28.90 Mean = 27.01SD = 5.84 SD = 4.67

| Table 3 b: Comparison between trained and untrained entrepreneurs on decision making | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| Decision malring levels | Mean dec | eision score | Mean difference | 't' value | |
| Decision making levels | Trained (n=150) | Untrained (n=150) | _ | | |
| Less Rational | 22.68 | 22.41 | 0.27 | 0.555^{NS} | |
| Intermediate | 28.17 | 27.84 | 0.87 | 3.158* | |
| Rational | 35.97 | 32.10 | 3.87 | 7.409** | |
| Overall | 28.90 | 27.01 | 1.89 | 3.087* | |

NS - Non-significant * and ** indicate significance of values at P=0.01 and 0.05, respectively

entrepreneurs with respect to entrepreneurship:

The data in Table 4 a depicts that 40.00 per cent of trained and 37.33 per cent of untrained entrepreneurs belonged to medium and low confidence category, respectively. About 33 per cent of trained and 35 per cent of untrained entrepreneurs belonged to low and medium confidence level categories. While, 27.33 per cent trained and 28.00 per cent untrained belonged possessed high confidence levels.

The significance of difference between mean and over all mean scores of trained and untrained entrepreneurs with respect to confidence level presented in Table 4b indicates that low, medium, high and over all confidence level categories of trained and untrained differed significantly which means confidence level of the entrepreneurs definitely changed due to the training. Confidence is the ability of a person to perform better in a given situation which in other words also means the management of the enterprise. Probably having taken training, the entrepreneur knows what to do and what not to do. This increases the self esteem and the capacity to perform better. The results are in conformity with the findings of Shah *et al.* (2010).

Management orientation of trained and untrained entrepreneurs:

Management is the art of getting things done through people. An effective entrepreneur should perform all these managerial skills.

The data presented in Table 5a indicated the management orientation categories. An equal percentage of trained and untrained (35.33 % each) entrepreneurs belonged to low category of management orientation. Among trained 32.67 per cent belonged to high management orientations whereas in untrained 33.33 per cent were in medium management orientation categories. Remaining 32.00 per cent (trained) and 31.33 per cent untrained fell under medium and high management orientation categories, respectively.

The significance of difference in mean and overall management orientation scores of trained and untrained entrepreneurs with respect to entrepreneurship revealed that trained and untrained entrepreneurs differed significantly in low, medium, high and overall management orientation (Table 5b).

Establishment of enterprise of trained and untrained entrepreneurs with respect to entrepreneurship:

Establishment of enterprise is willingness to undertake new ventures/initiative/ systematic activity, directed towards profit which requires extensive planning and hard work.

The information in the Table 6 a reveals among trained entrepreneurs, 34.00 per cent each belonged to low and high category for establishment of enterprise

| Confidence levels | Trained | Mean score | Confidence levels | Untrained | Mean score |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Low | 49 | 40.04 | Low | 56 | 35.73 |
| (mean-0.425SD) <46.72 | (32.67 %) | | (mean-0.425SD) < 40.87 | (37.33 %) | |
| Medium | 60 | 47.12 | Medium | 52 | 40.32 |
| (Mean + 0.425 SD) | (40.00 %) | | (mean+.0.425SD) | (34.67 %) | |
| 46.72 to 55.38 | | | 40.87to 50.14 | | |
| High | 41 | 54.20 | High (mean+0.425SD) | 42 | 44.91 |
| (mean+0.425SD) >55.38 | (27.33 %) | | >50.14 | (28.00 %) | |

| Table 4b: Comparison between trained and untrained entrepreneurs confidence level | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------|--|
| Confidence levels | Mean conf | idence score | Mean difference | 't' value | |
| Confidence levels | Trained (n=150) | Untrained (n=150) | | | |
| Low | 40.04 | 35.73 | 4.31 | 5.695** | |
| Medium | 47.12 | 40.32 | 6.80 | 13.598** | |
| High | 64.78 | 59.88 | 4.90 | 3.516** | |
| Overall | 51.05 | 45.51 | 5.55 | 4.550** | |

^{**} indicates significance of value at P=0.05

SD = 10.19

SD = 10.91

and 32.00 per cent were in medium category. With respect to untrained entrepreneurs maximum of them were in low (40.00 %), followed by high (31.33 %) and medium (28.67 %) level for establishment of enterprise.

Further the significant difference for low, medium, high and overall mean scores categories for establishment of enterprise differed significantly. This means there is difference in trained and untrained entrepreneurs in establishment of enterprise (Table 6 b).

Growth/ expansion of enterprise of trained and untrained entrepreneurs :

The enterprise growth is used to describe a development process of enterprise from small to big and from weak to strong. Enterprise growth is the process where the enterprise tends to maintain balanced and stable growth. It is ability of enterprise to grow continually, quickly and healthily. Expansion is increasing the number of units and producing more goods for the market.

The data in Table 7 a depicted that 38.67 per cent

| Management orientation levels | Trained | Mean score | Management orientation levels | Untrained | Mean score |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Low | 53 | 44.53 | Low (mean-0.425SD) <32.09 | 53 | 38.58 |
| (mean-0.425SD) <51.13 | (35.33 %) | | | (35.33 %) | |
| Medium | 48 | 54.08 | Medium (mean+_0.425SD) | 50 | 48.84 |
| (Mean + 0.425 SD) 51.13 to 60.60 | (32.00 %) | | 32.09 to 38.34 | (33.33 %) | |
| High | 49 | 63.64 | High (mean+0.425SD) | 47 | 61.38 |
| (mean+0.425SD) >60.60 | (32.67 %) | | >38.34 | (31.33 %) | |

Mean = 55.87 Mean = 49.15 SD = 11.13 SD = 10.41

| T 11 51 0 1 1 | | | | • , ,• |
|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------|
| Table 5 h : Comparison l | hetween trained an | d untrained entr | enreneurs management | orientation |

| T | Mean manageme | Mean management orientation score | | | |
|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------|--|
| Impact | Trained (n=150) | Untrained (n=150) | - | | |
| Low | 44.53 | 38.58 | 5.94 | 5.855** | |
| Medium | 54.08 | 48.84 | 5.96 | 11.702** | |
| High | 68.84 | 61.38 | 7.46 | 6.393** | |
| Overall | 55.87 | 49.15 | 6.72 | 5.40** | |

^{**} indicates significance of value at P=0.05

| Table 6 a : Status of trained and untra | rained entrepreneurs on establishment of enterprise |
|---|---|
| | |

| Establishment of enterprise levels | Trained | Mean score | Establishment of enterprise levels | Untrained | Mean score |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| Low | 51 | 66.84 | Low | 60 | 55.63 |
| (mean-0.425SD) < 76.23 | (34.00 %) | | (mean-0.425SD) <62.63 | (40.00 %) | |
| Medium | 48 | 77.56 | Medium | 43 | 68.09 |
| (Mean + 0.425 SD) | (32.00 %) | | (mean+_0.425SD) | (28.67 %) | |
| 76.23 to 90.32 | | | 62.63 to 74.50 | | |
| High | 51 | 88.29 | High (mean+0.425SD) | 47 | 85.51 |
| (mean+0.425SD) >90.32 | (34.00 %) | | >74.50 | (31.33 %) | |
| Mean = 83.28 Mean = 68.57 | | | · · | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |

Mean = 83.28 Mean = 68.5° SD = 16.57 SD = 13.97

Table 6 b : Comparison between trained and untrained entrepreneurs on establishment of enterprise

| Establishment of enterprise | Mean establishmer | nt of enterprise score | Mean difference | 't' value |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| levels | Trained (n=150) | Untrained (n=150) | | |
| Low | 66.83 | 55.63 | 11.21 | 8.753** |
| Medium | 82.50 | 68.09 | 14.40 | 19.008** |
| High | 103.32 | 85.51 | 17.81 | 10.481** |
| Overall | 83.28 | 68.57 | 14.71 | 8.312** |

^{**} indicates significance of value at P=0.05

| Growth/expansion of entreprise levels | Trained | Mean score | Growth/expansion of entreprise categories | Untrained | Mean score |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|---------------|---|-----------|------------|
| Low | 58 | 65.41 | Low | 48 | 51.66 |
| (mean-0.425SD) < 75.97 | (38.67 %) | | (mean-0.425SD) < 57.65 | (32.00 %) | |
| Medium | 43 | 77.94 | Medium | 68 | 62.37 |
| (Mean + 0.425 SD) | (28.67 %) | | (mean+-0.425SD) | (45.33 %) | |
| 75.97 to 92.12 | | | 57.65 to 38.34 | | |
| High | 49 | 90.48 | High (mean+0.425SD) | 34 | 78.79 |
| (mean+0.425SD) >92.12 | (32.67 %) | | >67.69 | (22.67 %) | |

Mean = 84.05 Mean = 62.67 SD = 19.00 SD = 11.81

Table 7 b: Comparison between trained and untrained entrepreneurs on growth/expansion of enterprise

| Growth/expansion levels | Mean growth/expans | ion of enterprise score | Mean difference | 't' value |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| | Trained (n=150) | Untrained (n=150) | - | |
| Low | 65.41 | 51.66 | 13.75 | 10.374** |
| Medium | 82.91 | 62.37 | 20.54 | 27.728** |
| High | 107.10 | 78.79 | 28.31 | 13.372** |
| Overall | 84.05 | 62.67 | 21.38 | 11.706** |

^{**} indicates significance of value at P=0.05

of trained entrepreneurs were in low in expanding their enterprise followed by high (32.67 %) and medium expansion (28.67 %). Among untrained 45.33 per cent were in medium category of growth and expansion followed by low (32.00 %) and high (22.67 %).

It is evident from the results in Table 7 b that low, medium, high and overall growth/expansion categories of trained and untrained differed significantly. The significant difference in the mean score of the two groups could be attributed to the trainings given by RUDSETI. The RUDSETI is a well established institute training people in an effective manner not only to establish the enterprise but also its continual expansion.

Conclusion:

The trained and untrained entrepreneurs did not had same impact level with respect to leadership ability, decision making ability, confidence level, management orientation, establishment of enterprise and growth/expansion of enterprise.

Authors' affiliations:

K.V. Natikar, Department of Agricultural Extension Education, College of Agriculture, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad (Karnataka) India

REFERENCES

Casson, M. (1991). The entrepreneur: an economic theory. Hampshire: Gregg Revivals. p.193

Drucker, P.F. (1986). Innovation and entreprenurship: practice and principles, New Delhi, Affiliated East-West press.

Goyal, Meenu and Prakash, Jai (2011). Women entrepreneurship in India and prospects. *IJMR*, **1** (5):195-207.

Hanagi, C. and Joshi, N. (2015). A socio-economic analysis of women entrepenurenuers engaged in small food business. *Mysore J. Agric. Sci.*, **49** (2): 423-426.

Pandeti, C.M. (2005). A study on entrepreneurial behaviour of farmers in Raichur district of Karnataka. M.Sc.(Ag.) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad (Karnataka) India.

Ram, D., Singh, M.K., Chaudhary, K.P. and Jayarani, L. (2013). Entrepreneurship behaviour of women entrepreneurs in Impal of Manipur. *Indian Res. J. Extn. Edu.*, **13** (2): 31-35.

Ravi, G.K. (2007). A study on entrepreneurial behavioural characteristics of SC and ST farmers of Gulbarga district. M.Sc. (Ag.). Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad, Karnataka (India).

Shah, A.K., Nishi, Malik, B.S. and Yadav, V.K. (2010). Entrepreneurial behaviour and their corrrelates among dairy entrepreneurs in Northern India. *Indian J. Extn. Edu.*, **46** (3&4):53-61.