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Aligarh District is one of the most prosperous districts of U.P. It falls in the industrially developed western region of U.P. It consists of six tehsils such as Koll, Khair, Iglas, Hathras, Sikandra Rao, Atrouli and 1961 villages.

Aligarh is famous in the industrial field. It is famous for lock industry, electrical equipment, building fitting material, carpet, glass-beads, light engineering and other material products. If is also popular for handloom weaving and cotton carpets (because of suitable conditions). Dye industry also is very successful in the district and as a result many units have been established.

Thus, the entire district has become a home to labour intensive cottage and small scale industry keeping in view the presence of mentioned the above industrial units of other facilities, our sample for research is concentrated upon entrepreneurs of Aligarh district.

Sample

A sample is a small group or a fraction of a population representing the entire population. Mohsin (1984) emphasized that “sampling is a small part of the total existing events, objects or the information. Kerlinger (1983) believed that sample is a portion of population or universe as to be the representative of that population or universe. Thus sampling is a process for drawing a small portion of population representing the entire population, selected for the observation. The purposive random sampling technique is used to select sample for the study. By making observations of the appropriate sample, it is possible to draw reliable inferences or make generalization especially of the population as a whole from where the samples are drawn.

As pointed out by Selltiz et al (1962) that “a research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that
aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure.” In fact a research design can be considered as a blue print for collection, analysis and interpretation of the data.

The present investigation is aimed at identifying some important psychodemographic variables which are responsible for the success of a good entrepreneur. The methodology of the investigation is planned systematically keeping in view the lofty objectives of the study. The sample is primarily taken up from different enterprises of Aligarh and its various tehsils. After making identification of entrepreneurs, they were segregated with respect to their Annual turnover; and categorized as successful, moderately successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs.

Finally 180 entrepreneurs, 60 successful 60 moderately successful and 60 unsuccessful entrepreneurs were selected from Aligarh districts and its various tehsils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTIC OF THE SAMPLE (N=180)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRP I</th>
<th>GRP II</th>
<th>GRP III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successful Entrepreneurs (N=60)</td>
<td>Moderate Entrepreneurs (N=60)</td>
<td>Unsuccessful Entrepreneurs (N=60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Annual Turnover Between 50 Lacks to 1 Crores</td>
<td>Annual Turnover Between 25-50 Lakhs</td>
<td>Enterprises which have been closed down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Age : 30-60</td>
<td>30-60</td>
<td>30-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sex : Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tools used

However, these are some important Psychological devices which were being used in order to collect the responses from the respondent of the sample, such as.

1. Motivation Scale (Steers and Braunstein, 1976)
2. Self Confidence Scale
3. Risk Taking behavior.
4. Locus of control.
5. Biographical background of respondents.

Motivation Scale:

Motivation scale is an instrument designed by steers and Braunstein (1976) to measure achievement motivation, affiliation motivation and power motivation. The test has 15 items.

In this scale the respondents were being instructed to give their responses on a five point rating scale i.e. from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The test-retest reliability of the scale is .59 and split half reliability is 0.67.

Self confidence Scale:

This scale was developed by Anita Malik in 1996, Delhi University, Delhi. Several Scales were reviewed to be administered for the purpose of this Study. But unfortunately no Scale was found to be suitable. Therefore, a self-confidence scale was developed by the investigator herself in this regard. The following method was adopted to construct the scale. First of all, the self-confidence was given an operational definition for the purpose of the study. It was defined as having a strong belief in oneself and one's own abilities.
Later on, 50 statements were constructed to measure the self-confidence. These statements were given to different experts in the department to review and to analyze its appropriateness and aptness with the operational definition. After this, 30 items were retained; and this scale was administered on various entrepreneurs as part of a pilot study.

Subsequently, the items in this scale were again reviewed to see whether they had any discriminative values or not. The items which were found to be discriminating were, finally, retained in the form of 12 items. The test-retest reliability of this scale was found to be 0.56 and the split-half reliability was found be 0.48 etc.

**RISK TAKING**

The risk taking behavior scale consists of 8 items. Each items is a description of a situation involving risk in rural context. In each situation, a person is confronted with two alternative course of action—one safe but less rewarding and the other more risky but more rewarding. The subject is asked whether he would advise the person to opt for safe or more risky alternative. In order to know the minimum level of probability of success, for which he would recommend him to choose more risky alternative, different probabilities of success of the risky course of action are provided below. The probabilities listed are 1 in 10, 3 in 10, 5 in 10, 7 in 10 and 9 in 10. Besides, there is an additional response category, in which the subject has option to refuse to recommend the risky alternative even if its success is almost certain. It is assumed that in recommending the risky alternative, the subject is actually expressing his own attitude towards the problem; the way he would act in similar circumstance.
In developing risk measures, first, problems relating to different sphere of rural life were selected. Then, situations relating to the problems were constructed in a manner that it resembled problems faced by the rural people. Initially there were 12 items; out of which 4 were dropped after pre-testing. This was done in order to reduce the length of the measure and, also to avoid repetition of the similar contents. Some of the items were reframed in the light of information gathered during preliminary phase of the study. The items, thus, selected were related to problems such as, fighting general election, medical treatment such as heart operation, growing high-yielding seeds, investing saving in new enterprise, accepting prestigious and highly paid job outside the village, education, family planning and litigation.

In collecting data through this scale care is taken of the fact that the subject understood each situation and response categories clearly. In order to do this the investigator is required (a) to memorize whole set of items (b) familiarize with the local dialect (c) describe each situation in a most natural way. The investigator is free to explain the items and response categories to the subject in any manner. But the subject’s response is recorded only when the subject has understood it well.

Finally, this scale was administered on 118 rural subjects, out of which 63 belonged to two highly developed; the remaining 55 were of two very undeveloped villages of district. Out of 63 Ss of developed villages, 13 were boys of 10-15 years, 32 adults of 20-30 years and 18 old of above 45 years. Similarly, there were 7 boys, 26 adults and 22 old Ss from undeveloped villages. The average age of boys was 12 years, of adults 25 years and of old nearly 50 years. As the study was a part of a larger study on risk-taking
behaviour of rural people, the detail description of the sample is given elsewhere (Chaubey, 1970)

**Scoring**

The probability level is the unit of measurement. The subject’s score on an item is the level of probability chosen by him for the more risky alternative. For example, if a subject chooses the risky alternative on the probability level of 1 to 10 then he gets score 1 and if he chooses for the probability level 5 in 10, then his score would be 5. Thus, scores given for the probabilities 1 in 10, 3 in 10, 5 in 10, 7 in 10, and 9 in 10 are 1, 3, 5, 7 and 9 respectively. For the final category in which the subject has option to refuse to recommend the more risky alternative no matter what the chances of success are, a score of 10 is given. The total score of the subject on the east is equal to the sum of the scores on all items, which could range from minimum 8 to maximum 80. The low scores imply high risk and high scores represent low risk.

**Reliability**

In computing the reliability coefficient Spearman-Brown split-half method for odd-even items was followed. Table 1 give the reliability coefficients for samples of three age group, which ranges between 0.66 to 0.82. It is clear from the table that the measure is fairly consistent and stable.

**Inter-item correlations**

The inter-item correlations were computed on the pooled sample of three-age-groups of developed and undeveloped village separately.

In case of undeveloped villages there are seven negative but statistically not significant correlations. All other correlations are positive and 10 correlations are statistically significant. Thus, it is clear that the items of
the instrument are interrelated and are measuring the same thing. This conclusion is further supported by the item validity.

**Item Validity**

For item validity of the test, product-moment correlations between items-scores and criterion measure-total score were computed of both the villages both. It may be seen in this table that all the items are significantly correlated and all items were found to be significantly correlated on the sample of developed villages. But the same is not true in case of undeveloped villages.

Here, item one and eight are not significantly correlated with the total score; but the rest of the items are highly correlated with it. Further, the sizes of the correlations on the sample of developed villages are fairly high than that of undeveloped villages. This shows that the discrimination power of the test is high, as the two samples have been drawn from the two ‘extreme’ groups of villages, namely, highly developed and highly undeveloped.

**Locus of Control Scale**

Rotter’s locus of control scale was used to identify internally & externally controlled group of subjects. The scale consists of 10-pairs of statements categorized as groups A & B. The subject has to put-tick mark on the statements with which he/she agrees the most either from category A or B for all the 10 pairs of statements. The Scoring was done according to the key provided for internally & externally controlled groups.

**Information**

The information pertaining to biographical background of respondents was prepared by the investigator herself. This was designed to get a wide range of background information about the respondents – like age, sex,
religion, education, work experience, family environment, etc. Lastly, the information was converted into percentage.

**Procedure**

For collection of the data prime institutions who provide funds and training to the entrepreneurs were approached to identify the individuals who met the defined characteristics of the sample for the study. The institutions like National Institute for Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development (NIESBUD), Small Industries Bank of India (SIDBI) and Canara Bank CSSI Branch, Wazirpur provided the database of the entrepreneurs who had taken up loans and attended the training sessions with the institute. Apart from this number of entrepreneurs were contracted through network of friends and relatives.

Following steps were followed during collection of the data A proper rapport was established with the respondents by explaining the importance and relevance of the study the subjects were given the tests and schedules to fill up their responses. However, the procedure of every manual instruction was strictly followed. Instructions which forms a part of the research instrument were read out to the subjects before administrating the tool. Care was taken so that all the questions were answered with no skipping. Respondents were also asked to answer all the questions honestly. After all the doubts are cleared to the subjects, the instruments were given to the subjects for filling up their responses.

As the respondents were made obtained the information schedule was filled followed by motivation scale, self confidence scale, locus of control (one after and their) and a verbal measure of risk taking behavior. In the course of the data collection, entrepreneurs were encouraged to share the
reasons which they felt were responsible for the success, failure or average performance, whatever the case may be. The whole administration for each subject was dependent on how the subjects actively responded till certain questions. Some entrepreneurs due to the busy schedules requested it to continue in any following day, which were agreed up so as to avoid their unwillingness and also to get their responses at best accuracy.

**Statistical Analysis:**

For the scientific explanation of any finding we use statistical technique. Statistics provide very clear picture of the result. Statistical treatment is inevitable and necessary for measurement of the reliability pattern. In the present study the researcher used Chi Square test and t-test to fulfill research objectives.