

Study of Entrepreneurial Orientation among Indian graduates: Changes in recent times

R.B. Pachpute¹ and V.R. Malkar²

¹Research Scholar, IBMRD, Ahmednagar Maharashtra, Affiliated to SP Pune University

²Professor and Head, Dept. of MBA, Sanjivani College of Engineering, Kopergaon, Dist-
Ahmednagar, Maharashtra, Affiliated to SP Pune University

Abstract:

An inevitable answer to employment shortage is entrepreneurship. For a nation like India that once talked of receiving the demographic dividend rewards, the danger poses a potential threat of a demographic debacle. A crucial attitude change is needed among the youth to choose Business as a career. Average Indian family culture does not energize Business. Consequently, the onus of achieving this change lies with the educational organizations. However, they say that entrepreneurship orientation is more of a demographic trait and cannot be instilled during teaching. The institutions defend by saying that the entrepreneurial bent of mind is something that is in the DNA. It cannot be taught and imposed. This paper reviews the concept of entrepreneurial orientation in the context of Indian settings. It also dwells upon the possibilities that exist for the educational institutions within the limitations, which to are real.

Keywords: Educational Institutions, Entrepreneurial Orientation, Employment

Introduction

The bottom part of India's populace pyramid is enormous. The age-bunch 0-29 records for over half of its 1.30 billion populace. A massive chunk in the age-bunch 0-29 suggests a gigantic populace that is to be profitably utilized. It can mean a demographic dividend whenever utilized genuinely, or it can mean a demographic debacle whenever left in the present status. According to NSSO (Business Today, 2019), recent information on joblessness states that the joblessness rate in India crested to another high of 6.1% in 2017-18 and that this rate is a record-breaking high over the most recent forty years. There is no answer for this issue other than to take-up entrepreneurship. However, entrepreneurship to happen requires an appetite for risk-taking, advancement, and administration. As per a Randstad Workmonitor study (2017), 83 percent of the total Indian labor force has aspirations of turning into a business entrepreneur. This is essentially higher than the worldwide normal of 53 percent. Randstad MD and CEO credited this stronger desire and goals of the working Indians to factors like stable business climate, execution of GST, significant activities by the Government like Make in India and Digital India, market arranged changes like changing the FDI covers.

Beer et al. (2008) have expanded the extent of entrepreneurial abilities to remember for its area interior and external loci of control and inventiveness and development, notwithstanding three competencies – supportive of liveliness, accomplishment orientation, and commitment to others, recognized by McClelland (1986). Entrepreneurial behavior has been seen as a staggering marvel and was considered as a result of the collaboration among several various attributes in a particular institutional setting (Brundin et al., 2004.) simultaneously; there are views that the meanings of

entrepreneurial behavior are not generally relevant and subsequently it is advantageous to consider a possibility model of entrepreneurial behavior (Moore, 1986.) To a great extent, the entrepreneurial intention is impacted by close-to-home variables (character attributes) that can be developed through entrepreneurial training (Remeikiene et al., 2013). According to Wiklund (1999), most experts concur that entrepreneurial orientation is a blend of three measurements: ingenuity, support of liveliness, and risk-taking.

Entrepreneurship and Business are instructed at Universities and schools. In any case, clear contrasts are seen among students in their way of dealing with this subject. While some are believed to take distinct fascination and anticipate making business vocation, others do it only for its sake. The Professors need a realistic understanding of their students' entrepreneurial orientation (EO) to develop business venture and entrepreneurial competencies. They need to think of whether the students have that X-factor to become entrepreneurs, just as the competencies that suit an entrepreneurial vocation (Remeikiene et al., 2013).

Literature Review

The idea of EO has been concentrated generally with the assistance of various research instruments—for a couple of examples, allude Autio et al. (2001), Engle et al. (2010), Louw et al. (1997), Pruett et al. (2009), Reynolds et al. (1994), Segal et al. (2005), Shane (1992) and van Eeden et al. (2005). All around, these review-based instruments will generally measure the people's mental entrepreneurial attributes in the social setting to discover their tendency, self-adequacy, and the probability of starting an entrepreneurial vocation. These examinations principally utilize the respondents' entrepreneurial purpose as the correlation metric towards different factors. The examinations set an entrepreneurial expectation as a dependent variable and quantify its connection with autonomous factors, including demographic components.

Literature reviews of EO propose that most past examinations have received Miller's way of thinking of EO as a combination of creativity, proactiveness, and risk-taking. (Andreas et al. 2009, Wales et al. 2013.) Lumpkin and Dess (1996) added two additional measurements, particularly serious forcefulness, and self-governance notwithstanding what was brought about by Miller/Covin and Slevin, in this way making an idea of five components. Further, they recommend an autonomous examination of the measurements give extra bits of knowledge. Jeffrey (2011, 2012) proposed that EO's assessment with regards to explicit examination addresses adds more worth. Ongoing examinations by Linton et al. (2017) recommend that the individual parts of danger taking, proactiveness, and inventiveness can be joined in various manners to frame arrangements. Studies by Wiklund et al. (2011) and Wales et al. (2013) show that EO can improve an organization's execution and the exhibition's change whenever taken with an essential orientation. Since numerous entrepreneurial activities in the end neglect to create a monetary return, expanded difference happens in this way, adding to expanded dissemination of firm execution results. The area of examination on EO has expanded quickly to understand its repercussions across various settings. (Ribs et al. 2013.)

Jenssen and Greve (2002), Rutten and Boekema (2007), and Wright et al. (1998) took the view that a firm is not a shut framework. Alternatively, maybe it is an open framework and has a network with its encompassing local area. Several creators supported this view. Networking is a channel that adds ability and different assets (Davis, 1969; Hautamaki, 2003; McAdam and McClelland, 2002; Myintet al., 2005; Shane and Stuart, 2002), bringing about upgraded intensity (Gertler and Wolfe, 2002;

Slotte-Kock and Coviello, 2010; Taatila, 2008a, 2009; Wright et al., 1998). To fathom the idea and viability of networking two critical elements of the network, specifically, the structure (size, thickness, and so forth) of the network and the degree of communication between network entertainers (Burt, 1992; Coleman, 1988; Granovetter, 1985), ought to be seen well. To use the network to its latent capacity, it ought to be enormous and dynamic (Nahapiet and Ghoshal, 1998; Shane and Stuart, 2002). A typical progression of intelligent and proactive long-range interpersonal communication cycles ought to be there (Swan et al., 1999; Oliver and Liebeskind, 1997).

Entrepreneurial Orientation and Indian Graduates

Three unique and recent studies were critically reviewed for the contextual settings of this paper.

Kumar et al. (2020) carried a study to quantify and understand the connection between individual entrepreneurial orientation (IEO) and entrepreneurial intention (EI) among students of higher learning establishments (HLI's) in India. This investigation is centered around understanding IEO measurement of proactiveness, creativity, and danger taking demeanor and EI across gender, academic foundation, and districts. Numerous new and past studies affirm that there is an evident gap in the literature to understand this marvel among students of higher learning organizations. The observational outcome shows a relationship and a positive effect of individual entrepreneurial orientation measurements upon entrepreneurial intentions. Controlling for gender, males portray higher determination toward individual entrepreneurial orientation and entrepreneurial intentions. A similar outcome was found for management and business venture students who likewise portray a higher (mean) self-esteem than science, designing students. This investigation's discoveries uncover a massive commitment to the academic literature by featuring the affecting job of gender, academic foundation, and area upon entrepreneurial intentions. The examination uncovers that institutional culture, absence of academic thoroughness, local distinction, monetary gaps, gender insight, and general culture might be considered disturbing powers for a business venture to develop using organizations. Whenever wiped out, these powers can help construct an institutional climate supportive for entrepreneurial movement in the nation.

Gautam et al. (2020) have posited that in innovative interruption and computerization, the hopeful youth's work is a test for all nations across the globe. However, innovation offers excellent chances for the new companies and adventure creation for the individuals who have intentions. This examination endeavors to receive the hypothetical builds to explore whether Indian optimistic youth of management training is being propelled to entrepreneurial intention. We have utilized six developments on students' insights on (business climate, business information, standard practices, self-viability, entrepreneurial intentions, and the future decision of vocation) for two times of investigation to assess one-year management's impact training. Information is gathered through study strategy for students for the long term PGDM course and following one year. We utilized a matched t-test to discover the mean contrast regarding entrepreneurial intentions because of one year of management schooling. Also, we utilized a higher request underlying condition demonstrating to test study theories. All in all, we bring up insufficiencies of present entrepreneurial intention models and propose a bearing of future examination for improving the adequacy of the entrepreneurial intention model and its impact on instructional method development of advanced education.

Arafat et al. (2020) undertook an examination to affirm whether entrepreneurial intention models (EIM) clarify the entrepreneurial wonder when applied to India. We have tried Ajzen's hypothesis of

arranged behavior (TPB) structure for testing entrepreneurial intention (EI) in the Indian setting. The information has been gathered by regulating the entrepreneurial intention survey (EIQ) among Aligarh Muslim University students, Aligarh, India, who are trying to take up independent work as their professional choice. The paper utilizes a straight relapse model to inspect the determinants of entrepreneurial intention (EI) in light of the hypothesis of arranged behavior (TPB). Results acquired mostly uphold the hypothesis of arranged behavior. The construct social norms (SN) discovered to be irrelevant in anticipating entrepreneurial intention (EI). Besides, saw behavioral control (PBC) or self-viability clarifies the most elevated change than different factors, demonstrating that entrepreneurial behavior is not under volitional control; consequently, India has a less considerate climate for business visionaries in different countries. This is one of only a handful of few studies to prove to entrepreneurial intention models (EIM) in India dependent on the TPB system. What is more, it checks the TPB's heartiness in clarifying EI in India and affirms a portion of the past findings.

Initiatives by Government to promote entrepreneurship

Adhikari & Bhardwaj (2020) has enlisted various recent initiatives by the Government to promote entrepreneurship. They are briefly discussed below:

Startup India Initiative

The Prime Minister of India dispatched the Startup India Initiative in the year 2016. It changed the meaning of a startup as far as the scale and the skyline. The thought is to expand abundance and employability by offering wings to the entrepreneurial soul.

ASPIRE

The public authority has put forth ceaseless attempts to improve India's social and financial angles of life in rural zones. Since 56% of the Indian populace lives in the local zones, the public authority is advancing Business and advancement in this area. The ASPIRE scheme targets expanding Business, decreasing neediness and improving advancement in provincial India. Notwithstanding, the primary thought is to advance the agro-business Industry.

MUDRA BANK

Micro Units Development Refinance Agency (MUDRA) Bank has been made to improve credit office and lift independent venture development in provincial regions. The public authority has acquainted this scheme to help the private company in India. In 2015, the public authority assigned 10,000 crores to advance startup culture in the nation. The MUDRA banks give startup credits to Rs. 10 lakh to little ventures, Business non-corporate, and non-agricultural little/small undertakings. It goes under Pradhan Mantri Mudra Yojana (PMMY), which was dispatched on 8 April 2015. The credits have been arranged into Tarun, Kishore, and Shishu. The resources are made through the bank's money, and there is no guarantee of security.

Ministry Of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship

This assignment of advancing Business was before given to various divisions and government offices. In 2014, the Prime Minister chose to devote a whole service to fabricate this area. He felt that ability development required more push from the public authority's side to advance and support it among the individuals. The thought is to contact 500 million individuals continuously in 2022 by giving gap subsidizing and expertise development activities.

Atal Innovation Mission

In the financial plan of 2015, the public authority set up the Atal Innovation Mission (AIM) with the name coming from the Former Prime Minister of India, Atal Bihari Vajpayee. The Atal Innovation Mission was set up to give a limited-time stage, including academicians, and draw upon public and global encounters to cultivate a culture of advancement, examination, and development.

eBiz Portal

This is the principal electronic government-to-business(G2B) portal. The fundamental motivation behind the portal is to change and develop a favorable business climate in the nation. Infosys developed the eBiz portal in a public-private organization model. It is a correspondence place for speculators and business networks in India. The portal has dispatched 29 services in 5 conditions of India, viz., Andhra Pradesh, Delhi, Haryana, Maharashtra, and Tamil Nadu. The public authority will add more services to the scheme later on.

Conclusion

There are enormous possibilities for entrepreneurship to come-up and grow in India. Factors in favor are a large size of the youth population, particular push by the Government through macro and micro-level support, educational system changes focusing on aspects like skills and abilities, and knowledge to facilitate entrepreneurship. However, the single largest factor to push entrepreneurship in India is its need itself. The job position is so dismal; new opportunities are almost not there. This can be easily sensed through the fights on things like reservations. So when there is no new employment, the only option available is entrepreneurship. Need, they say, is the mother of all inventions. So entrepreneurship for India is not a fad, nor it is a fashion, nor is it a subject of debate and discussion. On the other hand, it is an issue of people's survival, and hence a solution is inevitable. Efforts on the part of educational institutions have not been so encouraging. They have quickly pointed fingers at the graduates and claimed that they lack the X-factor. However, the intervention by the Government has been significant. The various schemes launched by the Government in recent years have brought about a paradigm shift in the way graduates think of entrepreneurship. They are now more optimistic and willing to take the risk. As long as the *Sarkaar* is standing with them, there are willing and roaring to go. Educational Institutions should complement the efforts of the Government.

References

1. A.A.de Beer, J Zeelie, D Groenewald, H Watson, D Russouw and H Jacobs (2008), *Entrepreneurship Skills*, Juta & Company Limited, 2nd edition, pp-3-4.
2. Adhikari, B., & Bhardwaj, A. (2020). List Of Government Schemes for Startups in India. StartupTalky. Retrieved from <https://startuptalky.com/list-of-government-initiatives-for-startups/#>.
3. Arafat, M. Y., Saleem, I., & Dwivedi, A. K. (2020). Understanding entrepreneurial intention among Indian youth aspiring for self-employment. *International Journal of Knowledge and Learning*, 13(3), 185-200.
4. Autio, E., Kelley, R.F., Klofsten, M., Parker, G.G. and Hay, M. (2001), "Entrepreneurial intent among students in Scandinavia and in the USA", *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 145-60.
5. Brundin, Ethel, Florén, Henrik and Tell, Joakim, (2004), *Entrepreneurial Behavior and Growth Performance – A Research Framework*, Conference Paper, Babson Conference.
6. Burt, R. (1992), *Structural Holes*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

7. Business Today (2019), “India's unemployment rate hit four-decade high of 6.1% in 2017-18, says NSSO survey”, 31st January, 2019.
8. Carol F. Moore (1986), *Understanding Entrepreneurial Behavior: A Definition and Model*, Academy of Management Proceedings Vol. 1986, No. 1
9. Coleman, J.S. (1988), “Social capital in the creation of human capital”, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94, Supplement, pp. 95-120.
10. Covin, Jeffrey; Lumpkin, G. T. (2011). "Entrepreneurial Orientation Theory and Research: Reflections on a Needed Construct". *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*. 35 (5): 855–872. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00482.x. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
11. Covin, Jeffrey; Slevin, Dennis (1989). "Strategic Management of Small Firms in Hostile and Benign Environments". *Strategic Management Journal*. 10 (1): 75–87. doi:10.1002/smj.4250100107. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
12. Covin, Jeffrey; Wales, William (2012). "The Measurement of Entrepreneurial Orientation". *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*. 36 (4): 677–702. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00432.x. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
13. Davis, J.H. (1969), *Group Performance*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
14. Engle, R.L., Dimitriadi, N., Gavidia, J.V., Schlaegel, C., Delanoe, S., Alvarado, I. and Wolff, B. (2010), “Entrepreneurial intent: a twelve-country evaluation of Ajzen’s model of planned behaviour”, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 35-57.
15. Gautam, V., Basu, A., Basu, A., & Singh, T. (2020). Entrepreneurial attributes and intention among management students: a longitudinal approach to evolution and applicability of conceptual and empirical constructs. *Journal for International Business and Entrepreneurship Development*, 12(2-3), 156-182.
16. Gertler, M.S. and Wolfe, D.A. (2002), *Innovation and Social Learning: Institutional Adaptation in an Era of Technological Change*, Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills.
17. Granovetter, M.S. (1985), “Economic action and social structure: the problem with embeddedness”, *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 91, pp. 481-510.
18. Hautamaˆki, A. (2003), *Kyllaˆ Amerikkaopettaa: Hyvinvointivaltiomuutostenedessaˆ*, Edita, Helsinki.
19. <https://www.populationpyramid.net/india/>
20. India Census, 2011
21. Janssen, J.I. and Greve, A. (2002), “Does the degree of redundancy in social networks influence the success of business start-ups?”, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior Research*, Vol. 8 No. 5, pp. 254-67.
22. Kumar, S., Paray, Z.A. and Dwivedi, A.K. (2020), "Student’s entrepreneurial orientation and intentions: A study across gender, academic background, and regions", *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-01-2019-0009>
23. Linton, Gabriel; Kask, Johan (2017). "Configurations of entrepreneurial orientation and competitive strategy for high performance". *Journal of Business Research*. 70: 168–176. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.022 – via ScienceDirect.
24. Louw, L., Du Plessis, A.P., Bosch, J.K. and Venter, D. (1997), “Empirical perspectives on the entrepreneurial traits of undergraduate students at the University of Port Elizabeth: an exploratory study”, *Management Dynamics*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 73-90.

25. Lumpkin, G. T.; Dess, Gregory (1996). "Clarifying the Entrepreneurial Orientation Construct and Linking It to Performance". *Academy of Management Review*. 21 (1): 135–172. doi:10.5465/AMR.1996.9602161568. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
26. McAdam, R. and McClelland, J. (2002), "Individual and team-based idea generation within innovation management: organizational and research agendas", *European Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 86-97.
27. McClelland D C (1986), *Characteristics of Successful Entrepreneurs*, in GT Solomon and B G Whiting, (eds), *Keys to the future American Business*, The Ohio State University, The National Centre for Research in Vocational Education
28. Miller, Danny (1983). "The Correlates of Entrepreneurship in Three Types of Firms". *Management Science*. 29 (7): 770–791. doi:10.1287/mnsc.29.7.770. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
29. Myint, Y.M., Vyakarnam, S. and New, M.J. (2005), "The effect of social capital in new venture creation: the Cambridge high-technology cluster", *Strategic Change*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 165-77.
30. Nahapiet, J. and Ghoshal, S. (1998), "Social capital, intellectual capital, and organizational advantage", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 242-66.
31. Oliver, A.L. and Liebeskind, J.P. (1997), "Three levels of networking for sourcing intellectual capital in biotechnology: implications for studying inter-organizational networks", *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 76-103.
32. Pruett, M., Shinnar, R., Toney, B., Llopis, F. and Fox, J. (2009), "Explaining entrepreneurial intentions of university students: a cross-cultural study", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 15 No. 6, pp. 571-94.
33. Rauch, Andreas; Wiklund, Johan; Lumpkin, G. T.; Frese, Michael (2009). "Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance: An Assessment of Past Research and Suggestions for the Future". *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*. 33 (3): 761–787. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00308.x. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
34. Reynolds, P., Scorey, D.J. and Westhead, P. (1994), "Cross-national comparisons of the variation in new firm formation rates", *Regional Studies*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 443-56.
35. Rita Remeikiene, Grazina Startiene and Daiva Dumciuviene (2013), *EXPLAINING ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTION OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: THE ROLE OF ENTREPRENEURIAL EDUCATION*, International Conference, 2013, Zadar Croatia.
36. Rutten, R. and Boekema, F. (2007), "Regional social capital: embeddedness, innovation networks and regional economic development", *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, Vol. 74 No. 9, pp. 1834-46.
37. Segal, G., Borgia, D. and Schoenfeld, J. (2005), "The motivation to become an entrepreneur", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 42-57.
38. Shane, S. and Stuart, T. (2002), "Organizational endowments and the performance of university start-ups", *Management Science*, Vol. 48 No. 1, pp. 154-70.
39. Shane, S.A. (1992), "Why do some society invent more than others?", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 7, pp. 29-46.
40. Slotte-Kock, S. and Coviello, N. (2010), "Entrepreneurship research on network processes: a review and ways forward", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 31-57.
41. Swan, J., Newell, S., Scarbrough, H. and Hislop, D. (1999), "Knowledge management and innovation: networks and networking", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 262-75.
42. Taatila, V.P. (2008a), "Sosiaaliset verkostot innovaatioyrittysten kehtona", in Toivola, T., Tornikoski, E., Tuomi, L. and Varama`ki, E. (Eds), *Rohkeastikasvuun –*

- Na`ko`kulmiayrityksenkasvuunjakehittymiseen, Haaga-Heliapuheenvuoroja 1/2008, Haaga-Heliaammattikorkeakoulu, Helsinki, pp. 159-72.
43. Times of India, 2017, “83% of Indian workforce prefers to be entrepreneurs: Survey”, PTI, 9th August, 2017
 44. vanEeden, S., Louw, L. and Venter, D. (2005), “Entrepreneurial traits of undergraduate commerce students: a three-country comparison”, *Management Dynamics*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 26-43.
 45. Wales, William. "Entrepreneurial Orientation". Retrieved 2018-09-24.
 46. Wales, William; Gupta, Vishal; Mousa, Fariss (2013). "Empirical research on entrepreneurial orientation: An assessment and suggestions for future research". *International Small Business Journal*. 31 (4): 357–383. doi:10.1177/0266242611418261. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
 47. Wales, William; Patel, Pankaj; Lumpkin, G. T. (2013). "In Pursuit of Greatness: Ceo Narcissism, Entrepreneurial Orientation, and Firm Performance Variance". *Journal of Management Studies*. 50 (6): 1041–1069. doi:10.1111/joms.12034. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
 48. Wiklund J (1999) The sustainability of the entrepreneurial orientation-performance relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory Pract* 24(1):37–48
 49. Wiklund, Johan; Shepherd, Dean (2011). "Where to from Here? Eo-as-Experimentation, Failure, and Distribution of Outcomes". *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*. 35 (5): 925–946. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00454.x. Retrieved 2018-09-24.
 50. Wright, M., Westhead, P. and Sohl, J. (1998), “Editor’s introduction: habitual entrepreneurs and angel investors”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 22 No. 4, pp. 5-21.