

A STUDY ON FACTORS AFFECTING ENTREPRENEURIAL TRAITS AMONG URBAN SEMI-URBAN AND RURAL COLLEGE STUDENTS IN THOOTHUKUDI DISTRICT, SOUTH INDIA

N. Hariprakash*, Lourdes Poobala Rayen**

Abstract *The academic field of entrepreneurship has evolved dramatically over the last three decades. It has become clear that entrepreneurship can be taught. Business educators and professionals have evolved beyond the myth that entrepreneurs are born, not made. Additional support for this view comes from the literature review of enterprise, entrepreneurship, and small-business management education. Most of the empirical studies surveyed indicated that entrepreneurship can be taught, or at least encouraged. In this backdrop the researcher has chosen this topic to study the discriminant factors leading to entrepreneurial traits among the urban, semi-urban and rural college students in Thoothukudi District.*

Keywords *Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial Traits Discriminant Factors*

INTRODUCTION

The entrepreneur is one of the most important inputs in the economic development of a country or of regions within the country. Entrepreneurial competence makes all the difference in the rate of economic growth. Entrepreneurial talent exists in all sections of the society. A high level of entrepreneurship is found in developed economy. The growth of entrepreneur is high, but entrepreneurship is still comparatively a scarce factor in India.

The academic field of entrepreneurship has evolved dramatically over the last three decades. It has become clear that entrepreneurship can be taught. Business educators and professionals have evolved beyond the myth that entrepreneurs are born, not made. Additional support for this view comes from the literature review of enterprise, entrepreneurship, and small-business management education. Most of the empirical studies surveyed indicated that entrepreneurship can be taught, or at least encouraged. Entrepreneurial talents can be nurtured by motivating people and making them capable of perceiving and exploiting business opportunities. Realising the importance of entrepreneurship development the planners and policy makers have formulated Entrepreneur Development Programmes (EDP) for various target groups of population in the country.

All the individuals are having certain qualities which help them to accomplish their task in a desired manner. In this paper the researcher is interested to analyse the factors leading to entrepreneurial traits among the urban, semi-urban and rural college students.

OBJECTIVES

- To identify the factor leading to entrepreneurial traits among urban, semi-urban and rural students.
- To analyse the factors leading to entrepreneurial traits among urban and rural students
- To identify the discriminant factors leading to entrepreneurial traits among urban, semi-urban and rural Students

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The main aim of the study is to find out the entrepreneurial traits of college students in Thoothukudi district. It also analyses the factors leading to entrepreneurial traits among the urban, semi-urban and rural college students' especially final year arts and science students.

SAMPLING

The study attempts to measure the entrepreneurial traits of college students in Thoothukudi district. The sample respondents were selected from the final year students studying in the Arts and Science College in Thoothukudi district. Stratified proportionate random sampling method was used to select the sample respondents from the population. Arts and Science colleges were stratified in to three categories such as Urban, Semi-urban and Rural on the basis of place of college and the sample was drawn proportionately to the total population from each category.

* Research Scholar, St Xavier's College, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli, Tamil Nadu, India. E-mail: nhprakash08@gmail.com

** Associate Professor and Dean of Arts, St Xavier's College, Palayamkottai, Tamil Nadu, India. E-mail: lourdes.sxc@gmail.com

The size of the sample and the different categories from which the sample was chosen are listed in table 1.

Table 1. Sample Size

S.No	Place of College	Final year under graduate Arts and Science students	Sample
1	Urban	1,482	148
2	Semi-urban	2,942	294
3	Rural	1,340	134
	Total	5,764	576

METHODOLOGY

The present study was based on primary data. Interview schedule was used to collect the primary data from the sample respondents. A well-structured interview schedule has been prepared after consulting the experts in the field to collect the information required for the study. The collected data were analysed using appropriate statistical tools.

FACTORS LEADING TO ENTREPRENEURIAL TRAITS AMONG THE URBAN AND SEMI-URBAN STUDENTS

Factors leading to entrepreneurial traits among the urban students are differing from the semi-urban students. The present study has made an attempt to identify the important discriminant factors among these two groups of students. Initially, the mean difference among the two groups of

students has been examined. The discriminant power of factor have been estimated with the help of wilkslambda. The results are given in the Table 2.

The significant mean differences are noticed in the case of good organising, innovativeness, optimism, informativeness, hard work, problem solving skills, enterprising and foretelling ability since their respective 't' statistics are statistically significant at five percent level. The higher mean differences are noticed in the case of hard work and enterprising since their respective mean difference are 0.5953 and 0.5847. The higher discriminant power is noticed in the case of enterprising and innovativeness since their wilks lambda are 0.1045 and 0.1173 respectively.

The significant factors have been included to estimate the two group discriminant function. The unstandardised procedure has been followed to estimate the two group Discriminant functions. The estimated functions is:

$$Y = 0.7384 - 0.0845 X_1 + 0.1244 X_3 + 0.1865 X_4 - 0.0733 X_6 + 0.1459 X_7 + 0.1738 X_9 + 0.1673 X_{12}$$

The relative contribution of factors in total discriminant source is computed by the products of discriminant coefficient and the mean difference of the respective factors. The results are given in table 3.

The higher discriminant coefficients are noticed in the case of informativeness and enterprising since their coefficient are 0.1865 and 0.1738 respectively. It shows the higher influence of the above said two factors in discriminant functions. The higher relative contributions in TDS is identified in the case of enterprising and informativeness since their relative contribution are 18.76 and 17.86 percent respectively. The estimated two groups discriminant analysis

Table 2. Discriminant factor leading to Entrepreneurial Traits among urban and Semi-urban Students

S.No	Factors	Mean score among students		Mean difference	t- statistics	Wilks lambda
		Urban	Semi-urban			
1	Good organising (X1)	3.0889	3.5869	-0.4980	2.4919*	0.1396
2	Innovativeness(X2)	3.9197	3.3441	0.5756	3.1173*	0.1173
3	Optimism (X3)	3.8082	3.4509	0.3573	2.1903*	0.2865
4	Informativeness (X4)	3.6889	3.1703	0.5186	2.7391*	0.2733
5	Decision making skill (X5)	3.7172	3.8684	-0.1512	1.3318	0.5549
6	Hard work (X6)	3.3038	3.8991	-0.5953	3.3965*	0.1946
7	Problem solving (X7)	3.8917	3.3842	0.5075	2.6891*	0.2132
8	Confident (X8)	3.8084	3.6674	0.1410	0.8417	0.4881
9	Enterprising (X9)	3.9692	3.3845	0.5847	3.9173*	0.1045
10	Punctuality (X10)	3.1171	3.2671	-0.1500	0.9696	0.4733
11	Sincerity (X11)	3.8844	3.6649	0.2195	1.3388	0.3892
12	Foretelling ability (X12)	3.8911	3.5344	0.3567	2.1211*	0.1817

* Significant at five percent level

Table 3. Relative contribution of Discriminant factors in Total Discriminant sores (TDS)

S.No	Factors	Discriminant ficient	coef-	Mean difference	Product	Relative contribution in TDS
1	Good organising (X1)	-0.0845		-0.4980	0.0421	7.77
2	Innovativeness (X2)	0.1379		0.5756	0.0794	14.66
3	Optimism (X3)	0.1244		0.3573	0.0444	8.21
4	Informativeness (X4)	0.1865		0.5186	0.0967	17.86
5	Hard work (X6)	-0.0733		-0.5953	0.0436	8.05
6	Problem solving (X7)	0.1459		0.5075	0.0740	13.67
7	Enterprising (X9)	0.1738		0.5847	0.1016	18.76
8	Foretelling ability (X12)	0.1673		0.3567	0.0597	11.02
	Total				0.5415	100.00
Percent of cases currently classified: 71.82						

correctly classifies the cases to the extent of 71.82 percent. The analysis reveals that the important discriminant factors among the urban and semi-urban students are enterprising and informativeness, which are higher among the urban students than that of among the semi-urban students.

Discriminant Factors Among The Urban And Rural Students

The factors leading to entrepreneurial traits among the urban students may be different from the rural students. It is imperative to exhibit the important discriminant factors among the two groups of students with the help of discriminant analysis. Initially, the mean difference and its statistical significance have been computed. The discriminant power of the factor have been estimated with the help of wilkslambda. The results are given in the Table 4.

The significant mean differences are noticed in the case of good organising, innovativeness, optimism, informativeness, hard work, problem solving skills, enterprising and foretelling ability since their respective mean difference are significant at five present level. The higher mean differences are found in the case of innovativeness and problem solving skills since their mean difference are 0.8736 and 0.8476 respectively. The higher discriminant power is noticed in the case of problem solving skill and fore telling ability since their wilks lambda are 0.1082 and 0.1173 respectively.

The significant factors are included to estimate the two group discriminant function. The unstandardised procedure is followed to estimate it. The estimated functions is:

$$Z = 0.9908 - 0.0456 X1 + 0.1887 X2 + 0.1336 X3 + 0.0917 X4 - 0.1776 X6 + 0.1887 X7 + 0.0997 X9 + 0.0456 X12$$

The relative contribution of factors in total discriminant source have been estimated with the help of the products

of discriminant coefficient and the mean difference of the respective factors. The results are given in Table 5.

The higher discriminant coefficients are noticed in the case of innovativeness and problem solving skills since their discriminant coefficient are 0.1887 and 0.1887 respectively. It shows the higher influence of the above said two factors in the discriminant functions. The higher relative contributions of factors in total discriminant are noticed in the case of aforesaid two factors since its relative contribution are 23.71 and 23.01 per cent respectively. The estimated two groups discriminant analysis correctly classifies the cases to an extent of 78.86 per cent. The analysis reveals that the important discriminant factors among the urban and rural students is innovativeness and problem solving skills which are higher among the urban students than among the rural students.

Discriminant factors among the Semi-urban and rural students:

The factors leading to entrepreneurial traits among the semi-urban students may be different from the rural students. It is estimated to identify the important discriminant factors among the two groups of students. Initially, the mean difference and its statistical significance have been estimated along with the wilkslambda. The results are given in the Table 6.

The higher mean differences are noticed in the case of foretelling ability and decision making skills since their mean difference are 0.3562 and 0.3343 respectively. The significant mean differences are noticed in the case of good organising, innovativeness, optimism, decision making skills, problem solving skills and foretelling ability since their mean difference are significant at five present level. The

Table 4. Discriminant factor leading to Entrepreneurial Traits among urban and rural students

S.No	Factors	Mean score among students in		Mean difference	t- statistics	Wilks Lambda
		Urban	Rural			
1	Good organising (X1)	3.0889	3.9197	-0.8308	3.4676*	0.1817
2	Innovativeness (X2)	3.9197	3.0461	0.8736	3.6874*	0.1458
3	Optimism (X3)	3.8082	3.2671	0.5411	2.4517*	0.1702
4	Informativeness (X4)	3.6889	3.3089	0.3800	2.0196*	0.1667
5	Decision making skill (X5)	3.7172	3.5341	0.1831	1.4331	0.2886
6	Hard work (X6)	3.3038	3.9677	-0.6639	2.6968*	0.1497
7	Problem solving (X7)	3.8917	3.0441	0.8476	3.5133*	0.1082
8	Confident (X8)	3.8084	3.5084	0.3000	1.8646	0.1997
9	Enterprising (X9)	3.9692	3.2171	0.7521	3.3969*	0.1452
10	Punctuality (X10)	3.1171	3.3089	-0.1918	1.5889	0.2667
11	Sincerity (X11)	3.8844	3.7334	0.1510	1.2673	0.3045
12	Foretelling ability (X12)	3.8911	3.1782	0.7129	3.1884*	0.1173

* Significant at five percent level

Table 5. Relative contribution of Discriminant factors in Total Discriminant sores (TDS)

S.No	Factors	Discriminant coefficient	Mean difference	Product	Relative contribution in TDS
1	Good organising (X1)	-0.0456	-0.8308	0.0379	5.45
2	Innovativeness (X2)	0.1887	0.8736	0.1648	23.71
3	Optimism (X3)	0.1336	0.5411	0.0722	10.38
4	Informativeness (X4)	0.0917	0.3800	0.0348	5.02
5	Hard work (X6)	-0.1776	-0.6639	0.1179	16.97
6	Problem solving (X7)	0.1887	0.8476	0.1599	23.01
7	Enterprising (X9)	0.0997	0.7521	0.0749	10.78
8	Foretelling ability (X12)	0.0456	0.7129	0.0325	4.68
	Total			0.6949	100.00
Percent of cases currently classified: 78.86					

Table 6. Mean difference and decrement power of factors among semi-urban and rural students

S.No	Factors	Mean score among students in		Mean difference	t- statistics	Wilks Lambda
		Semi – urban	Rural			
1	Good organising (X1)	3.5869	3.9197	-0.3328	3.0141*	0.1279
2	Innovativeness (X2)	3.3441	3.0461	0.2980	2.7616*	0.1302
3	Optimism (X3)	3.4509	3.2671	0.1838	2.0145*	0.1455
4	Informativeness (X4)	3.1703	3.3089	-0.1386	-0.8667	0.4173
5	Decision making skill (X5)	3.8684	3.5341	0.3343	3.2661*	0.1177
6	Hard work (X6)	3.8991	3.9677	-0.0686	-0.4557	0.5886
7	Problem solving (X7)	3.3842	3.0441	0.3401	3.3969*	0.1072
8	Confident (X8)	3.6674	3.5084	0.1590	1.1771	0.4177
9	Enterprising (X9)	3.3845	3.2171	0.1674	1.2496	0.4542
10	Punctuality (X10)	3.2671	3.3089	-0.0418	-0.4991	0.6227
11	Sincerity (X11)	3.6649	3.7334	-0.0685	-0.6447	0.5889
12	Foretelling ability (X12)	3.5344	3.1782	0.3562	3.6562*	0.1526

* Significant at five percent level

Table 7. Relative contribution of Discriminant factors in Total Discriminant sores (TDS)

S.No	Factors	Discriminant coefficient	Mean difference	Product	Relative contribution in TDS
1	Good organising (X1)	-0.0361	-0.3328	0.0121	6.71
2	Innovativeness (X2)	0.0445	0.2980	0.0133	7.38
3	Optimism (X3)	0.1088	0.1838	0.0199	11.04
4	Decision making skill (X5)	0.1396	0.3343	0.0467	25.90
5	Problem solving (X7)	0.1788	0.3401	0.0608	33.72
6	Foretelling ability (X12)	0.0773	0.3562	0.0275	15.25
	Total			0.1803	100.00
Percent of cases currently classified: 68.84					

higher discriminant power is noticed in the case of problem solving skill and good organising since their wilks lambda are 0.1072 and 0.2179 respectively.

The significant factors are included to estimate the two group discriminant function. The estimated functions are:

$$Z = 0.6026 - 0.0361 X_1 + 0.0445 X_2 + 0.1088 X_3 + 0.1396 X_5 + 0.1788 X_7 + 0.0773 X_{12}$$

The relative contribution of each discriminant factor in TDS is estimated by the products of discriminant coefficient and the mean difference of the respective factors. The results are given in Table 7.

The highly discriminant coefficients are noticed in the case of problem solving skills and decision making skills since their respective coefficient are 0.1788 and 0.1396 respectively. It shows the higher influence of the above said two factors in discriminant functions. The higher relative contributions in total discriminant source is noticed in the case of problem solving skills and decision making skills since their relative contribution are 33.72 and 25.90 percent respectively. The estimated two groups' discriminant analysis incorrectly classifies the cases to an extent of 68.84 percent. The analysis reveals that the important discriminant factors among the semi-urban and rural students are problem solving skills and decision making skills which are higher among the semi-urban students than that of among the rural students.

FINDINGS

Discriminant factors of Entrepreneurial traits among the urban and semi-urban students

It is observed that discriminant factor among the urban and semi-urban group of respondents, significant mean difference are noticed in the case of good organizing, innovativeness, optimism, informativeness, hard work, problem solving skills, enterprising and foretelling ability since their respective 't' statistics are statically significant at five present level.

The important discriminant factor of entrepreneurial traits among the urban and semi-urban respondents is 'enterprising'.

DISCRIMINANT FACTORS OF ENTREPRENEURIAL TRAITS AMONG THE URBAN AND RURAL STUDENTS

It is identified that discriminant factor among the urban and rural group of respondents, significant mean difference are noticed in the case of good organizing, innovativeness, optimism, informativeness, hard work, problem solving skills, enterprising and foretelling ability since their respective 't' statistics are statically significant at five present level.

The important discriminant factor of entrepreneurial traits among the urban and rural respondents is 'innovativeness'.

DISCRIMINANT FACTORS OF ENTREPRENEURIAL TRAITS AMONG THE SEMI-URBAN AND RURAL STUDENTS

It is found that discriminant factor among the semi-urban and rural group of respondents, significant mean difference are noticed in the case of cordialness, innovativeness, optimism, decision making skill, problem solving and foretelling ability since their respective 't' statistics are statically significant at five present level.

The important discriminant factor of entrepreneurial traits among the semi-urban and rural is 'foretelling ability'.

SUGGESTIONS

While comparing urban and semi-urban college students the semi-urban college students are hesitating to share their views, so the students must take part in the group discussions to develop their enterprising traits.

Comparing urban and rural college students the rural college students are not ready to involve in innovative practice, so the rural students need to develop the innovativeness and exhibit their innovativeness through various activities.

While comparing semi-urban and rural college students the rural college students are unable to analyse the environment. So the rural students must expose themselves to the environment. The exposure to the environment will enrich their analytical skills.

CONCLUSION

The present study concluded that the factors leading to entrepreneurial traits are differing among the urban, semi-urban, and rural college students. As the factors leading to entrepreneurial traits differ the entrepreneurship development programmes should be designed in such a way to accommodate the different target groups to make the programme successful.

REFERENCES

- Shapero, A. (1975). *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. Wisconsin: Project ISEED, LTD., The Center of Venture Management, Summer.
- Singh, B. (1996). *Self-Employment Through Entrepreneurship Development*, MD Publication Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- Khanka, S. S. (1990). *Entrepreneurship in Small Scale Industries*, Educational Publishers, New Delhi.
- Mutsuddi, N. (1996). *You too Can Become an Entrepreneur*, Wheeler Publishing, New Delhi.
- Takey, N., Perryman, S., and Connor, H. (1999). *Graduated business start-ups, institute for employment studies*, UK,
- Tondon, B.C. (1975). *Environment and Entrepreneur*. Allahabad: Chugh Publications.
- Sayigh, Y. A. (1962). *Entrepreneurs of Lebanon: The role of the business leaser in a developing economy*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Brockhaus, R. H. (1980). Risk-taking propensity of entrepreneurs. *Academy of Management Journal*, 3.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). Who is an entrepreneur? is the wrong question? *American Journal of Small Business*, 12,11-22, 1988.
- Charney, A., & Libecap, G. (2000). Impact of entrepreneurship education. Insights: A Kauffman Research Series. *Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurship Leadership*, 2000.
- Cowling, M., & Taylor, M. (2001). Entrepreneurial women and men: Two different species?. *Small Business Economics*, 16(3), 2001.
- Littunen, H. (2000). Entrepreneurship and characteristics of the entrepreneurial personality. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 6(6), 2000.
- Hornaday, J. A., & Bunker, C. S. The nature of the Entrepreneur. *Personnel Psychology*, 23, 1970.
- Kolvereid, L., & Moen, O. (1997). Entrepreneurship among business graduates: Does a Major in a entrepreneurship make a difference?. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 21(4-5), 1997.
- Patel, V. G. (1990). Entrepreneurs are made not born. *Economic Times*.
- Muller, S. L. (2004). Gender gaps in potential for entrepreneurship across countries and cultures. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 9(3).
- Gurol, Y., & Astan, N. (2006). Entrepreneurial Characteristics amongst university students – Some insights for entrepreneurship education and training in Turkey. *Emerald*, 48(4).