CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

Chapters V and VI reported the findings of the study and chapter VII discussed the most important aspects of the findings. This is the final chapter of the thesis. It has two sections. The first section presents a summary of the rationale of the study and the important findings with respect to the specific objectives of the study. The second section presents certain concluding observations. These are about the implications of the study and suggestions for further research in the light of the present study.

The Rationale of the Study

Economic development is the result of entrepreneurial activity. In a developing country like India, the role of entrepreneurs is highly critical. While industrial entrepreneurship in India has made significant contribution to economic growth, it
remains unexplored and unexploited in the agricultural sector. Agriculture which is the backbone of the economy and which contributes a greater share to the GDP, NNP and National Income as compared to the industrial sector, it has not been given the importance it deserves, due to ill-conceived economic policies and priorities.

The agricultural Extension Officer at the Panchayat Union level is the key change agent to develop the rural entrepreneurship. Its role in developing agricultural entrepreneurship is a matter of great significance, in the context of the low-key socio-economic profile of the agriculturists. In view of the lack of any private agency, it is the only counterpart of the various entrepreneurship development institutes and development banks, with the backing of the National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD) and Co-operative banks. Hence, a study to understand the influence of agricultural extension agency in improving the entrepreneurial behaviour of agriculturists was considered a worthy effort. Hence, this study.
Not all agriculturists would respond to and actively participate in various development programmes. Those who actively participated and got benefited were called ‘typical’ and those who were lethargic laggards were called ‘atypical’ agriculturists. The study was conducted on 160 ‘typical’ and 160 ‘atypical’ cases of agriculturists, chosen by a logical norm. It was a case study probing into the whole gamut of their life-style by participant observation, discussions and cross-checks and references that are common in qualitative research methodology.

Ten components of entrepreneurial behaviour were identified as relevant to the study. Scale values were computed to these components using Guilford’s Normalized Ranking Method.

A content analysis of the case-respondents’ entrepreneurial behaviour with respect to the 10 components of behaviour was made. Scores were assigned by the research team. Based on the scores obtained by the case-respondents and the relative scale value, the entrepreneurial behaviour index (EBI) was computed.
Analysis of the entrepreneurial behaviour with respect to each of the entrepreneurship development programme and with respect to ascertaining the relationship between the personal & family traits and entrepreneurial behaviour of the case-respondents were made by using the mean EBI. Necessary safeguards were taken to ensure reliability and validity of the research instruments.

The Important Findings of the Study

(1) Behaviour in Extension Participation

With respect to participation in various extension education, training and demonstration programmes, the null hypothesis that there would be no difference in the behaviour as between the 'typical' and 'atypical' case-respondents stood rejected. This gives room to believe that the typical case-respondents in the study were more serious in attending the development programmes than the atypical case-respondents were.
(2) Behaviour Related to Entrepreneurship Development Programmes

Consistent with the above finding, there was a significant difference between the ‘typical’ and ‘atypical’ cases with respect to their participation in and getting benefited from the schemes under land development, crop husbandry, diversification, animal husbandry and farm-mechanisation programmes.

(3) Age and Entrepreneurial Behaviour

There was no significant difference as between the different age group of the case-respondents and their entrepreneurial behaviour. This leads to the inference that age per se would not influence entrepreneurship; other factors would intervene in the process of entrepreneurship-building.

(4) Caste and Entrepreneurial Behaviour

There was a significant difference as between the different castes of the case-respondents and their entrepreneurial behaviour. Forward caste people seemed to be more entrepreneurial than the most backward/backward and scheduled caste/tribe people. As
between the most backward/backward and scheduled caste/tribe, the former were more entrepreneurial.

(5) **Education and Entrepreneurial Behaviour**

Higher the education, better the entrepreneurial behaviour was. This was as predicted.

(6) **Type of Family and Entrepreneurial Behaviour**

Conjugal families (II generation and I generation nucleus families, in that order) were more entrepreneurial than the extended families. The findings here is in line with the results of many western studies.

(7) **Family Size and Entrepreneurial Behaviour.**

As in the matter of age, family size had no significant influence in enthusing entrepreneurial behaviour. More number of members in a family does not seem to deter the spirit of entrepreneurship among the typical cases of our sample.

(8) **Value-orientation and Entrepreneurial Behaviour**

As between the cases with conservative-orientation and liberal-orientation, there was not a statistically significant (at 5 percent level) difference in their entrepreneurial behaviour. But,
between the progressive and rest there was a significant difference in their entrepreneurial behaviour.

Looking behind the findings in an overall context, as given above, the deep understanding that emerged out of the investigation by qualitative methodology resulted in the following revelations which would not have come to light, had a different methodology and procedure been adopted in the pursuit of this study.

The atypical cases took part in extension service, mostly as mere observers, induced by extraneous consideration (petty incentives, to yield to persuasions) without real inclination to participate in benefit from the development programmes.

Thirty per cent of the atypical case-respondents were subjects of liquor addiction; 32 per cent had extramarital family life; 36 per cent had been in extended families; 71 per cent were large families; 33 per cent had reported family disputes/criminal litigation in courts; 80 per cent had achieved less than 25 per cent incremental wealth during the 10 years preceding the study period; had pessimistic vision of their future in agriculture. These could
possibly cause among the atypical cases occupational stress and financial hardships, leading to poor entrepreneurial behaviour.

Among the ‘typical’ ones, the percentage of such cases were too meager (not more than 10 per cent) in any of the above abnormalities. Seventy per cent had an optimistic vision of their future in agriculture.

In the absence of an empirical study anchoring on the above behavioral constructs, these inferences cannot be given credence as such in the present study. But they cannot be whisked away; they should be put to rigorous study in further research.

Concluding Observations

Implications of the Study

Given the methodological foundation of this study, the findings that emerged may be taken as hypothesis for being tested in further studies on empirical lines.

The study has the following implications:

(1) The extension service agency is not systematically institutionalized as an entrepreneurship development organisation. As such, the extension officers are not acting
as catalysts of entrepreneurship. They just sell their programmes. They do not have the objective of human development, with a holistic look at the agriculturists to understand their strengths and weaknesses and to gear them towards effective entrepreneurship.

The extension service programmes themselves are piece-meal schemes and are not wholesome packages to take the entrepreneurs to success in their occupation.

The sociological disadvantage of the scheduled caste and scheduled caste and scheduled tribe seemed to be a barrier for them to wield influence and power over the upper castes and the officials.

Suggestions for Further Research

This preliminary study gives some general insights about the antecedents of entrepreneurial behaviour of agriculturists. Further studies on the following lines may be useful in getting further support to the present findings with regard to the personal and family characteristics of the agriculturists.

A study based on grounded theory approach would be a quite useful contribution to the theory of agricultural entrepreneurship.
Empirical studies at microlevel on agricultural entrepreneurship may throw more light on the entrepreneurial behaviour of agriculturists.

Historical studies on agriculturists may also throw new light on understanding agricultural entrepreneurship.

Epilogue

This preliminary study has made an attempt to understand agricultural entrepreneurship. The significance of the study is the adoption of qualitative methodology and a case-study approach. The entrepreneurial behaviour scale developed for this study is a significant contribution. The instrument may be used by further studies in this regard. The findings of the study are, of course, subjective, but cannot be overlooked due to methodology of the study.

The study would be useful to provoke thought on building sound organization support for development of agricultural entrepreneurship. The basic trust in this regard should be a philosophical look at the development strategy. What is needed is a special focus on improving the personal and social facets of the atypical cases of agriculturists. This needs a bold attempt in infusing a sense of humanism and commitment in the bureaucratic set-up.