Effectiveness Model: Impact of Entrepreneurial Development Programme on First Generation Entrepreneurs

Ms. Sarita S.Rana, Dr. Bhupender Som
Designation: Research Scholar,DCRUST Assistant Professor,MSI
Designation: HOD,IB,PGDM Official Address: JIMS,Rohini

Abstract: *Every year, numerous educational institutes and technical institutes organize and conduct EDP regularly to harness talent of youth and guide them. The policy makers have also promoted the development of small scale industries and EDPs training programmes. Various types of promotional packages including financial assistance and incentives are also provided with theoretical and practical training under EDP. This paper aims to find out the effectiveness of EDP programmes by developing an Effective Model and its Bench Mark figure. In order to achieve this bench mark figure the objectives of the model were set.*
Key Words: *Entrepreneur, Entrepreneur orientation, Effectiveness, EDP Model, Leadership, Training*

I. Introduction

Objectives of the Model

The following are the objectives of the model

a. To determine the bench mark figure this will assist the researcher in determining whether inconsistencies exist among the samples for the variables under study. In case the inconsistencies exist then the sample data is required to be validated and verified for any lapse in the process of data collection and verification and which needs to be rectified. Only when the inconsistencies are removed then the researcher is required to proceed further in the research process

b. To determine the benchmark figure or value which will indicate that that the training program is a success or not. In other words, this benchmark figure will be used to determine the impact which the training program has on the participants. This benchmark will indicate the degree of success determining whether the participants have succeed when they set up their venture or not

During the research process, it becomes imperative that descriptive research methodology must take into consideration the existence of a model on which the sample data that has been collected can be applied and that the results can be simulated. For, if the simulated results are satisfactory then the model passes the test and that it can be assumed that the model will hold true for further analysis of data. It is pertinent to mention that the model so used in this research process determines the existence of a bench mark figure. This figure is the minimum figure which the participants are required to obtain in the training program so that the effectiveness of the training programs can be determined.

Reason for choosing the model

The prime reason for developing a model for the determination of the bench mark figure to evaluate the minimum score which the participant must attain is the fact that before the start of the program certain basics must be in place with respect to the participant's mind set. The basics related to the basic understanding and the knowledge related to the parameters which the participant must have. Hence this model can be utilized to determine the minimum figure which will help to achieve the desired figure.

Alternatively the bench mark figure is used to screen the candidates for the training program once the effectiveness and the efficiency of the training program begins to make a strong foothold. The reason as to why the ratio has been chosen is the fact that this ratio can be suitably created and applied in the given scenario. Based on this the researcher can pin point exactly the rating or the figure of the ratio which can be conveyed to the participant and what the participant hopes to achieve or is capable of achieving the same. Thus through this figure the participant at once can come to know the actual state of his mindset in terms of numeric quantity and how he can best utilize the same in improving the score as well as in improving the basic parameters related to his personality traits.

Advantages of the Model

Having understood the reasons as to why this model was developed let us now dwell on the advantages of the model. The following are the advantages of using this model.

a. The model can be easily created by taking into account the several parameters related to the training program
b. The model can be easily customized and can be applied in various scenarios
c. The model can be developed in simple tools such as MS Excel or in any other spreadsheet program
d. The model can be applied at different stages of the training program. This will help the researcher to determine the affects of the training program and to take suitable corrective and preventive actions accordingly
e. By applying the model at different stages of the training program appropriate graphs can be constructed which will indicate the patterns which the participant is showing. Thus these patterns can be applied to know the grey areas of the participant
f. By suitably modifying the model, the researcher can determine the overall and the cumulative flow of the training program and the impact it is showing in different stages of the program

Model Development

The model follows a two step process. The first step is used to determine whether there is a variance among the samples in the perceived benefits and actual benefits or not. In order to determine this variance ANOVA 1 way is applied on the data for perceived benefits as well as for actual benefits. The results have been obtained from MS Excel.

Figure 1 depicts the calculations performed for the sample data of size 310 on the perceived benefits of the training program

Figure 1: ANOVA I on the perceived benefits of Entrepreneur Training programs
Figure 1: Depiction of calculations for calculating ANOVA 1 for the purpose of determining the significant difference among the participants w.r.t. perceived benefits.

Anova: Single Factor					
SUMMARY					
Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*	
Column 1	310	1124	3.625806452	0.63622508	
Column 2	310	971	3.132258065	0.80769391	
Column 3	310	1170	3.774193548	1.58638689	
Column 4	310	1065	3.435483871	1.04922226	
Column 5	310	1175	3.790322581	1.20184779	
Column 6	310	1095	3.532258065	0.98762919	
Column 7	310	919	2.964516129	0.81750705	
Column 8	310	986	3.180645161	0.84104813	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*
Between Groups	206.0350806	7	29.43358295	29.7025384	1.24354E-39
Within Groups	2449.616129	2472	0.990945036		
				F-Critical	
Total	2655.65121	2479		2.01327994030482	

Form the figure, it is observed that the value F critical value of 2.01 is more than the p-value of 1.24.E-39 This indicates that there is no significant difference among the samples. In other words, the difference amongst the participants is purely due to chance and that there is no element of biasness in the samples.

On the other hand Figure 2: ANOVA I on the actual benefits derived by the entrepreneur figure 2: Depiction of calculations for calculating ANOVA 1 for the purpose of determining the significant difference among the participants w.r.t. actual benefits of the training program.

Figure 2: Depicting the ANOVA 1, statistical test which will assist the researcher in the process of determining whether there is significant difference between the participants of not. In case if there is no significant difference.

Figure 2: Depiction of the calculation steps in MS Excel for the purpose of determining the possibility of significant difference amongst the participants w.r.t to the actual benefits derived during the training program.

Anova: Single Factor						
SUMMARY						
Groups	*Count*	*Sum*	*Average*	*Variance*		

Column 1	312	1192	3.820513	0.913018		
Column 2	312	1159	3.714744	0.757595		
Column 3	312	1292	4.141026	0.893231		
Column 4	312	1261	4.041667	0.702438		
Column 5	312	1264	4.051282	0.904114		
Column 6	312	1291	4.137821	0.794449		
Column 7	312	1177	3.772436	1.10882		
Column 8	312	1157	3.708333	0.734593		
ANOVA						
Source of Variation	*SS*	*df*	*MS*	*F*	*P-value*	*F crit*
Between Groups	77.01563	7	11.00223	12.9281	2E-16	2.013256
Within Groups	2117.369	2488	0.851032			
Total	2194.384	2495				

.

From the figure, it is observed that the F-critical value of 2.01 3256 is more than the calculated value of 2E-16. In other words, there is no significant variance amongst the participants. The variance is any is purely due to chance. Further, it can be said that this p-value figure indicates that the sample respondents are positive about the training program and that there is no element of bias in it. In case the if the p-value had been more then this indicates that the participants are mixed and that some of the respondents do not perceive any benefit of this training program.

This was the first stage of the model wherein the initial bench mark figure of perceived benefits indicate the type of the respondents and what they expect to derive out of the training program. In other words, it indicates the mindset of the respondents. Further, the bench mark figure of actual benefits indicates the success or failure of the training program.

The next stage of the model proceeds on the basis assigning weights to the various parameters under study. Before the start of the program the weights assigned are equal in proportion to the ten parameters under study. Each of these weights have been assigned equal probability or weights of 0.1. This is due to the fact that at the start of the program the respondent is unsure as to what parameters he would be actually be focusing or targeting. This is depicted in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Assignment of weights and calculations pertaining to perceived benefits of the training program

	Perceived benefits before attending the EDP							
	Business opportunity identification	Market research outline	Foster leadership skills	Knowledge of fund raising	Confidence Building	Management skills	Knowledge to start venture	Risk taking
	3	3	5	4	5	4	3	4
	4	3	5	4	5	4	3	4
Response Summatio	1131	977	1180	1073	1185	1103	925	994
Weights	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125
Weighted calculation	141.375	122.125	147.5	134.125	148.125	137.875	115.625	124.25
Sumation of Weightage	1071							

In a similar manner we assign the weights to actual benefits. These are depicted in Figure 4 below

Figure 4: Assignment of weights and calculations pertaining to perceived benefits of the training program

	Business opportunity identification	Market research outline	Foster leadership skills	Knowledge of fund raising	Confidence Building	Management skills	Knowledge to start venture	Risk taking
	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	4
	3	4	5	4	5	5	4	4
Response Summatio	1192	1159	1292	1261	1264	1291	1177	1157
Weights	0.08	0.08	0.2	0.08	0.2	0.08	0.08	0.2
Weighted calculation	95.36	92.72	258.4	100.88	252.8	103.28	94.16	231.4
Sumation of Weightage			1229					

From the figure 4 it is observed that there is difference in weights on the parameters from the perceived benefits. This is due to the fact that participant after the training program invariably assigns more weights as they have gained something from the program. For example, the maximum weights that the participants have understanding and willing the risk taking capability which is followed by confidence building. In a similar manner the weight ages are assigned to other parameters. The next step is the calculation steps which have been shown in the figure 3 and 4.The summation is the result of the weight age multiplied by the summed figure of the responses provided by the respondents. This is finally summed up to obtain the cumulative sum.

II. Results

The bench mark figure is obtained by dividing the cumulative summation of the actual benefits with the perceived benefits.

	Perceived benefits before attending the EDP									Actual benefits after attending the EDP:						
	Business opportunity identification	Market research outline	Foster leaders hip skills	Knowledge of fund raising	Confidence Building	Management skills	Knowledge to start venture	Risk taking		Business opportunity identif	Market research outline	Foster leadership skills	Knowledge of fund raising	Confidence Building	Management skills	Knowledge to start venture
Weights	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125	0.125		0.08	0.08	0.2	0.08	0.2	0.08	0.
Weighted calculation	141.375	122.13	147.5	134.1	148.125	137.875	115.65	124.25		95.36	92.72	258.4	100.88	252.8	103.28	94.
Sumation of Weightage	1071											1229				
Benchmark figure	=1229·1071															
	1.1475															

Thus the benchmark figure is 1.1475. This indicates that the participants have actually benefitted from the program.

Why these tests were applied on the model?
The prime reason as to why the ANOVA is applied in the model is the fact that it becomes essential to determine the variances among participants in the training program.

The variance is required to be determined due to the fact that if there is large variance among the participants then this will have consequences for the trainer as well as for the participants who are undergoing the training. This will affect the end result or the actual benefits which are to be derived by the participants in the training program.For example, let us consider the conduct of a training program. Due to large variance among the participants such as age difference, participants who have entrepreneurial background, low educational qualification as well as higher qualifications and the like. Due to these variances among the participants the end result or the benefits that are liable to be determined by the trainer would be result in large value of the standard value or the ratio. For, the trainer would be more focused on balancing the course contents as well as the audience and on the other hand he must be focused on finishing the training on time. In such a

scenario, he may rush through the course contents will severely impact the actual benefits of the training programs.

Thus the application of ANOVA test in the model assists the researcher to focus on the fact that the variance among the participants does not have very high value. In case if the value comes out to be very high then separate actions are required to be undertaken so as to ensure that the difference is not significant and as such does not amount to the failure of the objective of the training program.

The application of ANOVA test at the end of the training program wherein the actual benefits are determined as compared to the perceived benefits before the start of the training program. The ANOVA test has been applied to determine the significance of the actual benefits of the training program among the participants. The variances among the participants must not be significant. In case the variances are significant that this implies that the participants have been influenced by other factors which were not taken into consideration at the time of the conduct of the training program.

Alternatively, it implies that parameter under study such as confidence; leadership and the networking capabilities of the participants have profound impact on the participants. This thus forms a future scope of study.

Interpretation and Conclusion of the Model

The above model has been simulated for different responses from the sample and the following are the interpretation. The ratio figure must be greater than or equal to 1. As this figure of 1 indicates that the respondents have actually benefited in equal proportion for all the parameters under study that is what they perceived they actually got it in the training program.

On the other hand if the value is greater than 1 it indicates that they have benefitted more in some of the parameters and that this benefits has compensated the other parameters which they can develop on their own. If the value less than 1 indicates that they have not benefited at all from the training programs.

Thus the bench mark value in this study is the value of 1.0. In other words, this figure becomes the starting figure for the selection or rejection of the candidate for the purpose of ensuring that they are eligible for attending the training program.

The most important point of consideration

In the previous sections we have covered the issues related to answering the question of what does the bench mark figure represent and the significance impact it will have in the conduct of the training program. However, one question remains unanswered. The question is related to the consequences related to answering the following issues

a. What would be the future course of action in a scenario wherein the maximum number of participants prior to the conduct of the training programs i.e. the perceived benefits fails to achieve the benchmark score? In other words, the participants, based on the benchmark score consider the training program to be of no value. In such a scenario, what would the management action be? Should they go ahead and conduct the training program? Or should they try to convince the participants that the bench mark score is nominative only and hence it will affect the pre-conceived notion. In case the management convinces the idea that the training score is nominative then the whole purpose of the training program would be defeated. For, this will have cascading affect on the actual bench mark score as the participants would be inclined to provide arbitrary ratings to the data collection methodology. Alternatively, the management would try to improvise the teaching pedagogy by incorporating some major changes so that the participants gain some value from the program, worth mentioning is the case that the management when it adopts this course of action must take feedback and dip stick check at multiple points during the training program so that the actual flow of the participants mindset comes out clearly as to what exactly do they want and in what direction the training is progressing. This approach will provide the necessary thrust to alter or modify the teaching pedagogy or in extreme cases adopt the completely new style of teaching pedagogy.

b. The second scenario is also worth pondering and needs to be answered. The question is related to the issues wherein the maximum number of participants achieves the bench mark score of actual which is quite high in comparison to the bench score which they have achieved prior to the conduct of the training program i.e. the perceived benefits. Thus this scenario is reduced to the fact that although the perceived benefits bench mark score of the participants is below the benchmark figure yet the actual benefits bench mark score is significantly very high. This will definitely induce the thought in the mind of the management with regards to the capability and ability of the trainers as well as with respect to the contents of the training program. For example, the participants may find the training program quite easy and as such they have actually benefited significantly from the training program. Alternatively, the other point may be such that they have been significantly influenced by the trainer's methodology of teaching and the pedagogy deployed by him during the training program and the like and thus this may have spiked the benchmark score. Thus, this is another crucial question which needs to be answered.

c. The other question that is more of practical consideration is the determination of the actual benefits of the model as well as the management concerns is related to extending the model. In other words, this model can be extended. The extension can be in the form of taking feedback of the participants after a significant time gap at the end of the conduct of the training program. In other words, instead of taking the feedback at the end of the training program, extend the model to take the feed back after a sufficient period of say 6 months or so. For, this time gap will actually let the management know the co-relation between the perceived benefits of the training program as well as the actual benefits which the participants have garnered. For, this score would provide the more realistic figure and thus will form the basis of a sound foundation of the program. Further, the feedback provided by the participants would in fact benefit the management in altering or revising the teaching pedagogy and in some cases designing and redesigning the curriculum. The one crucial aspect that needs to be taken into consideration is the fact the practical implementation aspect of taking the feedback. In other words the modalities for taking the feedback after six months of the training program needs to be devised judiciously.

III. Limitations of The Model

Having covered the various aspects of the model, the following are the limitations of the same.

The model is based on the assumption that there is no significant difference among the participants prior to the training program. However, in practical scenario there is always a significant difference among the participants and that these differences do surface. For example, a participant having a high rating on the parameter leadership quality will try to influence the other participants during the team and group exercises which are a part of the teaching pedagogy. If this happens or in such a scenario, the other participants would fail to identify or develop or understand the core leadership qualities which they must have so as to become a successful entrepreneur

References

[1]   http://krishikosh.egranth.ac.in/bitstream/1/5810004210/1/th10928.pdf
[2]   http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/76876/9/09_chapter%204.pdf
[3]   http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/103242/8/08_chapter%201.pdf
[4]   http://kkhsou.in/main/EVidya2/commerce/entreprreneurship.html