CHAPTER V

THE ENTREPRENEURIAL RESPONSE TO
ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Introduction

The previous chapter described the process of quantification of qualitative information gathered from the case-respondents of this study with regard to (1) the development of the entrepreneurial behaviour constructs, (2) measurement instruments and their reliability and validity and (3) the normalcy of distribution of the entrepreneurial scores.

This chapter would present the results of the behavioral responses of the ‘typical’ and ‘atypical’ groups of case-respondents with regard to the participation in extension service programmes and five specific entrepreneurship development programmes targeted at the rural community to kindle their spirit of entrepreneurship.

Taking the actual number of respondents who availed the benefit of development programmes and a matching number of atypical respondents (avoiding other cases in both categories) was inevitable. It was believed that the results would be representative of the whole sample size.
In all the entrepreneurial activities to be examined, the following null hypothesis was posited: “The entrepreneurial response would not show any difference as between the typical and atypical groups of case-respondents”.

The quantified data regarding the entrepreneurial response of the two categories (typical and atypical) of case-respondents are analysed by a paired ‘t’ test. The results are presented hereunder. And, discussion/interpretation of the results is to be made later in Chapter VII linking the result with the socio-economic variables of the case-respondents.

**Extension Services**

1. Extension Services: Entrepreneurial Response

This is the core of the whole process of agricultural planning and development. The Extension Service is the modal point through which all kinds of information and physical inputs (at subsidized prices/on credit) pass through to the end-users, the farming community. The whole rural community depends on this extension service for getting vital information and inputs. The extension services include education, training, demonstrations and counselling relating to every aspect of rural development.
The extent to which people consummate the various extension services may influence their entrepreneurial behaviour. To infuse a sense of involvement and serious participation in various development programmes among the people, the extension services are offered almost free, or, at the least, at a heavily subsidized fee/price/on credit. By this, it is being hoped that the people could reap the benefits of improved farming practices and prosper.

The data relating to the entrepreneurial behaviour index of the 160 typical and atypical case-respondents who took part in extension service programmes are shown in Table 5.1 given below.

**TABLE 5.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension Services: Entrepreneurial Response (n=160)</th>
<th>Categories of Case-Respondents</th>
<th>Mean Entrepreneurial Behaviour Index</th>
<th>Paired ‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>35.7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 1 per cent level.
As seen in the above Table 5.1, there was a significant difference as between the typical and atypical category of case-respondents in the matter of participation in various extension education, training and demonstration programmes organized by the Agricultural Extension Officers.

The null hypothesis that there would be no difference in entrepreneurship behaviour as between the typical and atypical agriculturists was rejected, the observed ‘t’ being greater than the Table value.

With the basic premise of equal opportunity to all respondents to attend the extension services offered, the nature of behavioural response to each of the other five entrepreneurship development programmes are examined.

**Entrepreneurial Development Programmes**

2. Land Development Programmes: The Entrepreneurial Response

Considering the precarious geographical features of the study area (such as: hilly terrain, dependence on rainfed crops, dependence on ground water resources), the Government had given foremost importance to Land Development Programmes in its
budget allocation for agricultural development in the Annual Action Plans for the Vellore District.

Liberal long-term financial assistance through Land Development Bank, Technical assistance and know-how were offered by the Agricultural Extension Officers for the benefit of the agriculturists, especially for the small and medium farmers, so that they may become better-off. Digging wells, deepening wells, digging borewells, soil conservation, land levelling, bounding, land terracing and shock fencing were the important schemes to be availed by agriculturists.

The entrepeurial response of 60 cases in our sample of typical agriculturists who had the maximum potential in their land to benefit from the various land development programmes and a matching number of atypical case-respondents who had similar potential latent in their land but showed little response to the programmes were examined.

Table 5.2 given below shows the relevant data regarding the mean entrepreneurial behaviour index (EBI) of the two categories of case-respondents.
### TABLE 5.2

**Land Development Programmes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Case-Respondents</th>
<th>Mean Entrepreneurial Behavioural Index</th>
<th>Paired ‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>48.56</td>
<td>10.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical</td>
<td>37.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 1 per cent level.

The result of the ‘t’ test for the data, as shown in the Table 5.2 was highly significant, indicating that agriculturist with high level of entrepreneurial spirit would take up development work on their farms more vigorously than those who are atypical of such spirit. Hence, the null hypothesis that there would be no difference in the nature of entrepreneurial behaviour as between the two categories of case-respondents stood rejected.

3. **Crop Husbandry: The Entrepreneurial Response**

This is the most populist and perennial activity of the Agricultural Extension Office at the Block level. It executes the government’s plans which brings into reality the proposals of
cropping pattern, crop diversity, cropping methods and use of new and better inputs, all aimed at increasing farm productivity. The field workers in the Agricultural Extension Office make direct contact with the farmers to propagate the new crop-related programmes. Printed literature and education through radio supplement these efforts. Seeds/seedlings/saplings and other farm inputs such as fertilizers and pesticides are supplied at subsidised prices. Expert counselling service is rendered by the Agricultural Extension Officers. Annual contests for innovative farming and highest yield are held to encourage agricultural entrepreneurship and to appreciate and recognize 'model and enterprising farmers'.

Seventy prominent typical case-respondents with high entrepreneurial behaviour score who had been very progressive and successful in farming activities and a matching number of atypical agriculturists who were not inclined to diffuse innovative cropping practices were considered to test the differential behaviour as between the typical and atypical case-respondents. Table 5.3 shown below gives the relevant data:
**TABLE 5.3**

**Crop Husbandry : Entrepreneurial Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Case-Respondents</th>
<th>Mean Entrepreneurial Behaviour Index</th>
<th>Paired ‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>52.90</td>
<td>10.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical</td>
<td>41.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 1 per cent level

The result of the ‘t’ test for the data, as shown in Table 5.3 was highly significant. This vindicated that entrepreneurs who scored higher on the entrepreneurial behaviour scale (typical cases) had been more enterprising than those who had scored lower. Thus, the null hypothesis that there would be no difference between the two categories of agriculturists stood rejected.

4. Diversification Activities : Entrepreneurial Response

Agricultural diversification is emerging as an important alternative (to expansionist strategy) to attain the objectives of output growth, employment generation and sustainability of natural resources. And so, the strategy of agricultural diversification is

---

gaining greater importance. The challenges and threats that necessitate agricultural diversification result from: (1) adverse changes like degradation of natural resources and environment; (ii) risks associated with existing production activities; (iii) market and price risk and (iv) socio-economic needs like employment generation and attaining self-sufficiency. The process of diversification leads to broadening and strengthening the income sources of the rural households, as Bargouti et al point out.

Thus, decision on ‘expansions’ Vs ‘diversification’ is a strategic issue in agriculture, if it is to be business-oriented. Realisation of the importance of this would mean a marked departure from traditionalism and the ‘way of life’ attitude among agriculturists. While ‘putting all eggs in one basket’ is expansionism, showing keen interest on different lines of allied activities would mean progressive-orientation. Also, it would satisfy the spirit of thrill of entrepreneurism. Time and human resources at

the family level could be best made use of. The Agricultural Extension Service include propagation and all-out assistance to enterprising people to enter into activities like horticulture, sericulture, floriculture, seed-farms, nursery farms, mushroom cultivation and social forestry. These activities would very well suit the physical and the ecological environment of the area of the study.

There were 75 case-respondents of the ‘typical’ category who had shown considerable interest in diverse activities besides the routine cultivation in their farm. They were mostly educated and were leading a prosperous life. Their entrepreneurial behaviour index and that of a matching number of atypical agriculturists who did not show any interest beyond routine farming operations were considered to test the null hypothesis of no difference as between these two groups in the behaviour of diversified activities. The relevant data are shown in Table 5.4 given below.
TABLE 5.4

Diversification Activities : Entrepreneurial Response
(n=75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Case-Respondents</th>
<th>Mean Entrepreneurial Behaviour Index</th>
<th>Paired 't'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>41.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical</td>
<td>34.55</td>
<td>6.87*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 1 per cent level

The result of the paired 't' test showed that the entrepreneurial behaviour of the typical agriculturists with regard to the extent of diversification was greater than that of the atypical group. And, it was a statistically significant difference.

5. Animal Husbandry : Entrepreneurial Response

Though this sector of rural entrepreneurship was not the portfolio of the Agriculture Department, the various animal husbandry programmes were implemented through the Agricultural Extension agency at the Block level and through the Co-operative
and Commercial Banks as well. Besides providing financial assistance for milch animals and for poultry, piggery, fish farming and goat & sheep rearing, expert counselling on health-care, breeding of animals and birds and on marketing the produce were also offered by the Agricultural Extension Officers

The participation in these programmes could augment the income of the rural entrepreneurs. The bi-products from these ventures could supplement the fertility of the soil in a natural way.

There were 80 case-respondents who had, besides hectic farming, engaged their family in ancillary activities in the field of animal husbandry and fish farming. These cases and a matching number of agriculturists who had participated in conducted tours, workshops, seminars organised to propagate and familiarize the programmes but failed to show sustained interest were considered for understanding their entrepreneurial behaviour. Table 5.5 given below shows the relevant data and the result of a paired 't' test.
### TABLE 5.5

**Animal Husbandry/Allied Activities:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Case-Respondents</th>
<th>Mean Entrepreneurial Behavioural Index (n=75)</th>
<th>Paired ‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>53-95</td>
<td>24.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical</td>
<td>30.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 1 per cent level.

As seen in Table 5.5 above, the obtained ‘t’ value being higher than the Table value, the typical category of case-respondents exhibited a significantly greater level of enterprising behaviour when compared to the atypical cases in the matter of engaging in activities allied to their major occupation.

6. **Mechanisation of Farming Operations : Entrepreneurial Response**

This was considered as the most critical factor in entrepreneurship. The degree of interest in mechanisation is an indicator of the innovativeness and achievement-orientation of
agriculturists more than any other behavioural components. 
Mechanization of the wide-ranging farming operations such as tilling, bunding, irrigation, application of inputs, harvesting and transportation are becoming not only popular but also inevitable in the context of labour shortage and high cost of labour, thanks to the support of government of Tamil Nadu, the co-operative banks and the commercial banks.

There were 85 cases of agriculturists who had mechanized their farming by investing more than Rs. 1.5 lakhs in the purchase of farm machineries and equipments during the five year preceding the conduct of this study. The mean entrepreneurial behaviour index of these cases and that of a matching number of atypical cases who did little mechanization but were adopting mostly traditional tools were taken for a paired ‘t’ test, to understand the difference in their entrepreneurial behaviour. The data are shown in Table 5.6 given below.
TABLE 5.6

Mechanisation of Farming Operations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Case-Respondents</th>
<th>Mean Entrepreneurial Behavioural Index</th>
<th>Paired ‘t’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>54-20</td>
<td>9.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atypical</td>
<td>41.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 1 per cent level

As seen in the above Table 5.6, the analysis of the data for a paired ‘t’ test shows that the entrepreneurial behaviour of the typical case-respondents were significantly greater than that of the atypical cases, in no matter of mechanization of farming operations. The null hypothesis of the difference in the behaviour stood rejected.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the findings of the study with respect to the entrepreneurial response to extension services and to five specific entrepreneurship development programmes. Though almost
all are attracted to the extension services, the entrepreneurial behaviour was found significantly greater among some cases, who are labelled 'typical' that among others who are labelled 'atypical'. As the proverbial saying goes 'we can only take the house to the pond, we cannot make it drink, the atypical cases remained uninspired, unmotivated.