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SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

INTRODUCTION

Since the eighties accelerated efforts have been made for entrepreneurship development to tackle the problems of unemployment, poverty and regional imbalances in the development progress. Moreover, these efforts are intended to generate a new class of vibrant entrepreneurs from all walks of life, thus breaking traditional caste and community barriers. Meanwhile, the number of organizations engaged in entrepreneurship development has increased considerably. Apart from government agencies, the NGOs are also playing an active role in inculcating entrepreneurial spirit in different target groups. The present study focused on a comparative study of effectiveness of training programmes. For this purpose, training programmes of both RUDSETI and MDIC were analyzed.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In carrying out the empirical research, the following objectives were identified for the study:

(i) To find out the factors responsible for the success of EDPs;
(ii) To understand the role of support organizations in the performance of EDPs;
(iii) To measure the perception of entrepreneurs towards the role of MDIC and RUDSETI in inculcating entrepreneurialism; and
(iv) To compare the performance of RUDSETI and MDIC in promoting entrepreneurship; and
(v) To evolve an effective strategy for EDPs by drawing implications for planning, policy formulation and implementation.
HYPOTHESES FOR THE STUDY

In the background of the objectives, the following hypotheses were identified:

(i) The trainees of RUDSETI have more pre-training entrepreneurial attitude than those of MDIC;
(ii) The need based training programme of RUDSETI is more effective than the conventional programme of MDIC in developing entrepreneurs;
(iii) The starters of MDIC trained entrepreneurs are more influenced by finance availability and subsidy when compared to the starters of RUDSETI influenced by quality training;
(iv) The training programme of RUDSETI lays more emphasis on managerial strategies as against environmental role emphasized in the training programmes of MDIC;
(v) The entrepreneurial success is more influenced by training under different phases provided by RUDSETI than formal training by MDIC; and
(vi) The success of starters is more influenced by effective training provided to the entrepreneurs.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This is an empirical study based on both the primary and secondary data sources. The secondary data was used to highlight the conceptual analysis and review of literature. The sources of secondary data for the study were the reports of the government departments, MDIC and NGOs. The necessary details were also collected from ledgers of RUDSETI and MDIC and by holding discussions with the officials of RUDSETI and MDIC. The primary data was collected to analyze the effectiveness of training programmes based on the responses of trainee entrepreneurs. The study focused on a comparative analysis of perceptions of trainees on EDPs conducted by Rural Urban Development Self-employment Training Institute (RUDSETI) and Mysore District Industries Centre (MDIC), both imparting training to entrepreneurs in Mysore city. Totally, 6591 prospective entrepreneurs underwent training in these institutions for the period between 1994-95 and 2003-04. Out of 6591 prospective entrepreneurs, 4021 prospective entrepreneurs were trained by RUDSETI and 2570 prospective
entrepreneurs were trained by MDIC constituting 61.01 per cent and 38.99 per cent respectively. The number of sample respondents was determined to be 7.5 per cent and the number of sample respondents to be chosen stood at 301 and 199 in RUDSETI and MDIC respectively. The selection of respondents was based on the criterion of trainee starters and non-starters. Hence the selection of respondents was based on stratified random sampling. While selecting the sample respondents, it was found that RUDSETI maintained the records of the details of the trainees and MDIC did not have any details about the trainees. Hence the sample respondents were chosen on the basis of stratified random sampling in case of RUDSETI and the contact basis was used in case of MDIC by approaching the financial institutions, which provided financial assistance to the trainees of MDIC and contacting the other trainees through door-to-door visits to the areas where the prospective respondents selected from MDIC resided.

The framework of the study centered on the comparison of trainees of RUDSETI and MDIC in two stages. One is at the initiation stage, where the trainees were classified into starters and non-starters and thereby eliciting the opinions on training effectiveness by both starters and non-starters. And at the performance stage, the starters were then classified into successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs based on their performance and thereby measuring the entrepreneurial performance among successful and unsuccessful trainee entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC. The data was collated on SPSS package. The main statistical tools used in the study included mean value, standard deviation, chi-square value and ‘t’ test. Based on this methodology, the data was collated and interpreted to arrive at meaningful conclusions and to make relevant suggestions.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The major findings of the study have been presented under the following: (i) Patterns of Entrepreneurship Development; (ii) Impact of Training; and (iii) Entrepreneurial Performance.
(i) **Patterns of Entrepreneurship Development:**

The following were the major findings on the pattern of entrepreneurship development:

(1) The percentage of starters stood at 62.7 per cent as against non-starters constituting 37.3 per cent.

(2) The distribution pattern of trainee respondents, based on age status, indicated that the youth, adults and seniors constituted 10.4 per cent, 27.8 per cent and 61.8 per cent. There was significant difference in the age pattern of starters of RUDSETI and MDIC because there was more number of starters in RUDSETI when compare to MDIC. The distribution pattern of age status in non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC was non-significant.

(3) Majority of the respondents had low level of education and their percentage stood at 57.2 per cent. The respondents having high level of education constituted 42.8 per cent. Majority of the trainees in RUDSETI representing 53.8 per cent and 61.5 per cent of trainees in MDIC had low level of education. There was significant difference from the viewpoint of educational background in starters of RUDSETI and MDIC and it was non-significant in non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(4) No significance was found in case of family background of trainees, but the majority of the trainees came from employed and business families in both RUDSETI and MDIC on one hand and in both starters and non-starters on the other.

(5) There was no significant difference in the caste status of the trainees and the majority of the trainees belonged to forward community and their percentage stood at 59.0 per cent.

(6) Majority of the non-starters of RUDSETI were females as against males in MDIC. However, there was no significant difference in the gender status of starters of RUDSETI and MDIC and non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC.
(7) From the viewpoint of type of training, 36.7 per cent of trainees underwent training in process EDPs and this was followed by 26.3 per cent of trainee respondents who underwent training in product EDPs. There was no significant difference in starters and non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(8) The percentage of successful entrepreneurs stood at 62.0 as against unsuccessful entrepreneurs constituting 38.0 per cent.

(9) There was no significant difference in the age of entry into entrepreneurship between successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC, but majority of the entrepreneurs constituting 61.5 per cent were early entrants into entrepreneurship.

(10) Majority of the successful entrepreneurs were large investors as against small investors in case of unsuccessful entrepreneurs and their numbers stood at 78 and 40 representing 61.4 and 51.3 per cent respectively. There was significant difference in the investment pattern in successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and it was non-significant in case of MDIC.

(11) From the viewpoint of nature of activity, almost 49.7 per cent of respondents were engaged in service sector and this was followed by 25.4 per cent of entrepreneurs engaged in trading. Nearly, 24.9 per cent of entrepreneurs were engaged in manufacturing activity. There was significant difference in the nature of activity between successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI because most of the successful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI were engaged in service sector as against manufacturing in case of unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI. It was non-significant in case of successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(12) Almost 67.3 per cent of respondents were first generation entrepreneurs and majority of the entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC were found in this group and hence there was no significant difference.
(ii) Impact of Training:

The impact of training focused on perceptions on the effectiveness of EDPs covering management inputs, entrepreneurial traits and follow-up programmes. The findings of the study for each of them have been presented below:

(1) The trainees of RUDSETI assigned higher weightage to motivating factors for entrepreneurship than the trainees of MDIC and the mean values stood at 3.50 and 3.47.

(2) From the viewpoint of reasons for joining EDPs, the starters rated the reasons highly with the mean value of 3.29 as against the rating of 3.02 by the non-starters. The most influential variable was found to be 'to get technical training' with the mean value of 3.94 and this was followed by the variables of 'independent' (3.93); 'achieving more in life' (3.70); and others for starters. It was observed that the variable 'diversification of business' had the least mean value of 2.08. This least variable was preceded by the variables such as 'certificate' (2.55); 'facilitating loan' (2.91); and 'unemployment' (3.28). However, the non-starters had lower mean values for all these variables except for unemployment and technical training. The non-starters weighted technical training with the mean value of 3.99 and 'getting certificate' was found to have the least importance with the mean value of 2.16. Further, there was a high significance level.

(3) For majority of the trainees, the source of awareness on EDP was found to be newspapers. The ED organization, ex-trainees, word of mouth and public meetings did not have much influence on the knowledge of EDP. Significant difference was found in both starters and non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(4) From the viewpoint of motivational sources for joining EDP, almost 48.3 per cent of trainee respondents were self-motivated. And this was followed by 29.4 per cent of respondents, who were motivated through
friends. There was no significant difference in starters of RUDSETI, but there was a significant difference in case of non-starters of MDIC.

(5) The stage of preparedness before joining EDP was found to have significant difference in both starters and non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC. Majority of the starters numbering 123 and forming 60.0 per cent had decided the line of business or service before participation in EDP as against 64 non-starters forming 52.4 per cent having not identified business opportunity.

(6) There was significant difference in perceptions on duration on EDP by starters and non-starters. Majority of the trainees who underwent training in RUDSETI felt that period of the training was normal. But in case of MDIC, equal percentage of trainees felt that training was too short and normal.

(7) The contents of EDP were assigned more weightage by the trainees of RUDSETI than the trainees of MDIC and their respective mean values stood at 2.88 and 2.85. From the viewpoint of starters and non-starters, the level of impact was higher in the starters of RUDSETI than in the starters of MDIC, but it was higher in the non-starters of MDIC than in the non-starters of RUDSETI. Further, the contents of EDP were more effective for the trainees of RUDSETI than those of MDIC resulting in significant difference.

(8) Market survey and field visits were an integral part of training programmes to get first hand information and real-life experience about negotiation in RUDSETI and this was totally absent in the training programmes given by MDIC.

(9) The total effectiveness of teaching methods was assigned more weightage by the trainees of RUDSETI than those of MDIC and their respective mean values stood at 3.35 and 3.17. By comparing starters with non-starters with regard to effectiveness, the starters of RUDSETI and MDIC
assigned more weightage than the non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC and their respective mean values stood at 3.61, 3.23, 3.10 and 3.12. There was a gap in the effectiveness between starters and non-starters of RUDSETI and starters and non-starters of MDIC indicating the mean value difference of 0.51 in RUDSETI and 0.11 in MDIC. The teaching methods were more effective for trainees of RUDSETI than for the trainees of MDIC and there was a significant difference.

(10) The total fulfillment of expectation was assigned more weightage by the trainees of RUDSETI than the trainees of MDIC and their respective mean values stood at 2.83 and 2.35. There was a gap in the fulfillment level of all the variables at 16.96 per cent. On the whole, all the expectations fulfilled had significant variations in both starters and non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC and there was a significant difference for all the variables excepting project report, project implementation, infrastructure support and subsidy.

(11) The trainees of RUDSETI assigned higher weightage with the mean value of 2.01 as against the mean value of 1.72 by the trainees of MDIC for management potential before training. The most influential variable of management potentials was 'day-to-day management' with the mean value of 2.73 and this was followed by variables of 'customer relations' (2.24); 'procurement of funds' (2.14); 'communication' (2.01); and others in both starters and non-starters of RUDSETI. It was observed that the cost control as a variable of management potential before training had the least mean value of 1.76. The trainees of MDIC including both starters and non-starters assigned more weightage for day-to-day management with the mean value of 1.87 and financial control was found to have the least management potential with the mean value of 1.63. Further, for all the variables there was no significant difference in starters of RUDSETI and MDIC except for financial control, customer relations and communication. For non-starters, the day-to-day management and customer relations showed significant differences.
(12) The overall effectiveness of training on management potential after training was higher in trainees of RUDSETI than those of MDIC and their respective mean values stood at 3.27 and 2.85.

(13) The gap between the management potential before and after training was higher in case of starters of RUDSETI and MDIC than non-starters of RUDSETI and MDIC at 1.75, 1.84, 0.78 and 0.74 in terms of mean values and the percentage of deficiencies were found to be 55.43 and 59.78 percent respectively.

(14) The overall mean value of entrepreneurial traits was higher in the trainees of RUDSETI than in the trainees of MDIC and the respective mean values stood at 2.04 and 1.11.

(15) The forty entrepreneurial characteristics were broadly grouped into six categories namely: innovation, managerial strategies, risk bearing, achievement orientation, leadership and networking. The overall mean value of all the six categories of entrepreneurial traits was evidenced higher in the trainees of RUDSETI than those of MDIC and the respective mean values stood at 2.04 and 1.11. Risk-bearing characteristic was assigned the highest mean value of 2.31 by the starters of RUDSETI. This rating of starters of RUDSETI was followed by innovation, achievement orientation, networking, managerial strategies and leadership and their respective mean values stood at 2.18, 2.17, 2.06 and 1.99 as against the assignment of mean values by starters of MDIC standing at 0.94, 0.96, 0.93, 0.98 1.00 and 1.02 respectively. The most influential characteristic in non-starters of RUDSETI was found to be innovation with the mean value of 2.12, which was followed by risk bearing, achievement orientation, leadership, managerial strategies and networking with their mean values standing at 2.09, 2.03, 2.01, 1.89 and 1.56 respectively as against the mean values of non-starters of MDIC standing at 1.36, 1.35, 1.26, 1.21, 1.17 and 1.16 respectively. For all the variables after training, there were significant differences.
(16) With both trainees of RUDSETI and MDIC assigning the highest weightage to risk bearing as a variable of entrepreneurial traits, the trainees of RUDSETI assigned the higher weightage with the mean value of 2.20 as against trainees of MDIC having assigned the mean value of 1.15.

(17) The least weightage was evidenced on networking by the trainees of both RUDSETI and MDIC as a variable of entrepreneurial traits and the respective mean values stood at 1.81 and 1.07.

(18) The functional effectiveness of follow-up assistance was assigned more weightage by the trainees of RUDSETI than those of MDIC and their respective mean values stood at 2.28 and 1.48. There was a gap in the follow-up assistance in MDIC in the sense than mean value difference was 0.80, which represented a deficiency of 35.08 per cent over RUDSETI. There was a significant difference between starters and non-starters for all the variables of follow-up assistance excepting sanctioning of loan, registration and licencing.

(19) From the viewpoint of quality of follow-up assistance the trainees of RUDSETI perceived higher quality than the trainees of MDIC with the overall mean value of 3.05 and 1.35 respectively. There was a gap in the quality of follow-up in MDIC indicating a mean difference of 1.70 and representing a deficiency of 55.74 per cent over trainees of RUDSETI. There were highly significant differences for all the variables of quality of follow-up assistance.

(iii) Entrepreneurial Performance:

(1) No significant difference was found in the sources of idea generation between successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(2) It was evidenced that easiness in setting up a venture was assigned the higher weightage by the successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC. And this was followed by work
experience for entrepreneurs of RUDSETI as against easy availability of finance for entrepreneurs of MDIC. The lowest influential variable in idea generation was found to be easy availability of finance for entrepreneurs of RUDSETI as against advice from friends/relatives for entrepreneurs of MDIC. It was observed that availability of finance for majority of the entrepreneurs of MDIC forced to become entrepreneurs. From the viewpoint of factors influencing idea generation, there was a significant difference between the entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(3) The entrepreneurs of MDIC identified easy availability of finance as the second variable influencing idea generation by assigning the mean value of 3.68, but the entrepreneurs of RUDSETI weighted it as the least influential variable with the mean value of 1.82. This perceptual difference indicated that the entrepreneurs of MDIC were more influenced by finance availability as a source of venture initiation as against the perception of quality of training as a source of venture initiation by the entrepreneurs of RUDSETI.

(4) There was no significant difference between RUDSETI and MDIC as a source of help in finance mobilization by the successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC, but the role of training institute was higher in MDIC than in RUDSETI.

(5) The training institute played a major role in product/business selection for successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI as against family members and the entrepreneurs themselves for the successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of MDIC. The role of training institute was found to be significant for both successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs.

(6) From the viewpoint in venue selection, the respondents themselves were the main source for venue selection in RUDSETI as against training institute for MDIC. The role played by friends in venue selection was found to be least for successful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI
and in case of unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC the major source for venue selection was found to be the respondents themselves. There was no significant difference in the sources of venue selection by unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC. However, the role played by training institute in venue selection was highly significant for successful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(7) The entrepreneurs of MDIC depended on training institute in preparing project reports, but the entrepreneurs of RUDSETI were capable of preparing the projects reports on their own. There was a significant difference in the preparation of project reports between the entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(8) The role of training institute was significant in successful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC in preparation of project reports.

(9) Majority of the respondents depended on the training institutes to acquire technical knowledge and there was no significant difference in the training imparted by RUDSETI and MDIC.

(10) The influence of family and relatives and training institute in work experience was found to be significant for successful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC. For unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC, the variables other than family and relatives were found to be non-significant.

(11) Majority of the successful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI perceived the importance of moral support by the training institute highly when compared to those of MDIC and there was a significant difference.

(12) There were no significant differences in reasons for delay in completing promotional formalities in successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC. However, formalities in getting finance and indecisiveness for unsuccessful entrepreneurs had significant
differences between successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC.

(13) There was a significant difference between successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI in the sense that the successful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI had less time gap between perception and initiation than the unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI.

(14) Regarding Management strategies, majority of the successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs constituting 83.4 per cent perceived the strategy of expanding their enterprises. There was no significant difference between successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC regarding future plans.

(15) The entrepreneurs of RUDSETI assigned higher mean value of 1.72 to managerial potential before training than those of MDIC with the mean value of 1.60.

(16) From the viewpoint of investment pattern and cost management at the initial as well as existing stage, a high level of significance was found with regard to furniture and fixed assets in RUDSETI.

(17) The average monthly turnover of successful entrepreneurs increased considerably from initial stage to the existing stage. The average monthly turnover of successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI was Rs. 6,910 and Rs. 2,800 in the initial stage, whereas it was Rs. 34,350 and Rs. 12,600 at present. The average monthly turnover of successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of MDIC was Rs. 2,100 and Rs. 1,870 in the initial year and it was Rs. 19,770 and Rs. 14,930 at present. There was an increase in monthly turnover of Rs. 27,440 and Rs. 9,800 for successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI. For successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of MDIC, it increased to Rs. 17,670 and Rs. 12,760 respectively. This indicated that successful entrepreneurs performed well when compared to unsuccessful entrepreneurs. Further, there was
significant difference between successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of MDIC and it was non-significant in successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI.

(18) The capacity utilization had no significance at the initial stage, but it was significant at the present stage for entrepreneurs of RUDSETI but not in the case of entrepreneurs of MDIC.

(19) The entrepreneurs of RUDSETI were characterized by more own contribution of capital and the entrepreneurs of MDIC had more debt leverage leading to severe financial constraints.

(20) There was high level of significant difference in management of loan in successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC. Majority of the entrepreneurs of MDIC were irregular in repayment of loan amount and there existed more overdue position in the entrepreneurs of MDIC than those of RUDSETI.

(21) For majority of the successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs, the repayment period was sufficient and their percentage stood at 71.2.

(22) The adequacy of profit for loan repayment was more in entrepreneurs of RUDSETI than in MDIC and their percentage stood at 84.1 and 55.6 per cent respectively.

(23) For majority of the entrepreneurs, the source of repayment of loan was borrowings and their percentage stood at 74.4.

(24) The problems faced by entrepreneurs of MDIC were more serious than by the entrepreneurs of RUDSETI. The delay in sanction of loan and lack of family support were the major problems faced by successful entrepreneurs of both RUDSETI and MDIC and there was a significant difference. The other problems was non- significant for successful and unsuccessful entrepreneurs of RUDSETI and MDIC.
On the whole, all the hypotheses proposed in the study were proved positively. The performance of the trainees of RUDSETI was influenced by the quality of training rather than other factors. The focus of EDPs should be on innovation and management of small enterprises.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the above empirical findings, the following major suggestions have been made:

(1) EDP technology can be used as an effective means for entrepreneurship promotion as well as self-employment generation only when there is synergy of both governmental and non-governmental organizations.

(2) The NGOs have better training infrastructure and atmosphere when compared to governmental organizations. It would be better to training the beneficiaries of self-employment programmes of the government through NGOs.

(3) Training programmes are to be assessed frequently to improve the quality of training on the basis of feedback received during the training as well as at follow-up stage.

(4) Selection of candidates is to be made more rigorous so that the scare resources are not wasted.

(5) While selecting women candidates, the family members are also to be included to augment the familial support.

(6) Region specific training programmes are to be given priority and they are to be arranged after a thorough feasibility analysis.

(7) Region specific product profiles are to be developed that can be furnished to the trainees on demand so that the trainees could undertake new activities.
(8) As the entrepreneur trainer motivators are subjected to transfer frequently, permanent teaching faculty is to be developed to provide continuity.

(9) Officials of sponsoring banks are to be sensitized about the RUDSETI concept so that the honest trainees are not denied with bank finance.

(10) 'Alumni Association' is to be formed to keep contact with the trainee entrepreneurs.

(11) There are many programmes for promoting entrepreneurship initiated and operated by the government. The information on them is not widely being disseminated among potential entrepreneurs. It seems that the programmes are good in quality as well as quantity, but the major problem is with their implementation. A major thrust of any government should be on reforming the 'implementation machinery'.

(12) The trainees should be given adequate information on procedures, formalities and nature of assistance available for venture launching.

(13) The effectiveness of post-training phase can be further improved by means of providing consultancy support, single window scheme, project assessment wing, library facilities, making use of voluntary effort and promoting an association of trainees.

(14) The EDPs must provide sufficient inputs not only to start or setup a venture but also to sustain it during hard times. This may necessitate broadening of the EDP concept, as these programmes will have to incorporate subject like exports, packaging and even particular vocations to make them more purposeful through need-based EDPs.

(15) Modern electronic gadgets, equipments and educational aids should be made available to the institutes.
(16) In order to raise the performance level, there is a need to cultivate managerial skills besides entrepreneurial skills, keeping in line with the increased growth in the size of the organization.

(17) In the teaching methodology, concentrating on lecture method must be avoided. Role-playing, management games, case studies should be predominantly employed. These are necessary to elicit the trainee involvement, their learning and the transferability of learning to practice.

(18) The EDPs may fail to serve their purpose, if equal attention is not given to providing adequate follow-up support to the trained entrepreneurs by the governmental agencies.

(19) The training given by MDIC should focus on market information, technical problem solving, public relations, communication ability and financial analysis.

(20) Publicity of the scheme of MDIC needs to be intensified through different media and by distribution of publicity material in different areas especially rural and semi-urban areas.

(21) It seems necessary that the banks change their financing pattern and evolve a need-based rather than security-based financing policy to assist small entrepreneurs.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In carrying out the present study, the following were the limitations:

(i) It was a micro level study covering only two institutions of the Mysore city;
(ii) The study was confined to the Mysore city only; and
(iii) The effectiveness of EDPs was analyzed covering the entrepreneurs trained by these institutions for the period between 1994-95 and 2003-2004.
SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In the background of the relevance of entrepreneurial training, the following areas have been identified for further research:

(i) An extension of the present study covering all the branches of RUDSETI vis-à-vis MDIC;
(ii) A comparative study of effectiveness of training provided by NGOs vis-à-vis MDIC focusing on rural and urban entrepreneurship may be taken up;
(iii) A comparative study of effectiveness of training provided by NGOs vis-à-vis MDIC focusing on entrepreneurial level of caste hierarchy;
(iv) A comparative study of effectiveness of training provided by NGOs vis-à-vis MDIC focusing on male and female entrepreneurs; and
(v) An in-depth analysis of effectiveness of training with a focus on managerial inputs.

THE EPILOGUE

Learning is a continuous process. Training adds depth to this continuous process. Entrepreneurship should become a centripetal force as well as centrifugal force in the strategy of development of any economy. Its relevance is high in India, which is plagued by dismally low level of entrepreneurialism and hence a high level of mass unemployment coupled with the parasitic nature of her people to cling to a paid job. Training in entrepreneurship will go a long way in averting the socio-economic problems of India.