

A STUDY ON STUDENT STANCE TOWARDS ENTREPRENEURSHIP DURING PANDEMIC

¹D. Sathyaseelan, ²E.Nixon Amirtharaj

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, College of Science and Humanities, SRM Institute of Science & Technology, Vadapalani Campus, Chennai 600026, Sathyaseelan98@gmail.com

²Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, College of Science and Humanities, SRM Institute of Science & Technology, Vadapalani Campus, Chennai 600026, e.nixonamirtharaj@gmail.com

Abstract

A huge number of little and medium organizations shut down the nation over last year because of the effect of the once-in-a-century pandemic. A huge number of occupations and jobs were lost accordingly. Start-up subsidizing was down, and credit offtake evaporated in the wake of supported lockdowns and request lull. Certainly, the enterprising soul was gouged big time during the Covid-19. However business for greater part of business people is yet to get back to pre-Covid levels, has the country's unyielding innovative soul gotten over the Covid. In the present circumstance the analyst has found a way to break down the understudy mentality towards business. The analyst has chosen 450 understudies from Chennai District. The analyst has utilized ANOVA and Factor Analysis for the current investigation.

Keywords: Attitude, Entrepreneurship

Introduction

A country's mentalities toward business venture influence the affinity of people to become business people, their capacity to bounce back from business misfortunes and the help that business visionaries get (for example from family and family members) when setting up another endeavor. Albeit the impacts of these perspectives are hard to gauge, uplifting outlooks toward business venture are found to correspond with undeniable degrees of business venture. The proof likewise focuses to significant contrasts in disposition across nations. Perspectives toward business might be influenced by the degree of business and business venture abilities and involvement with a country, an economy's managerial system for passage and development, and chapter 11 guidelines, as they shape apparent hindrances and dangers to business new companies. Public arrangement can energize uplifting outlooks toward business visionaries by guaranteeing that all secondary school understudies are presented to the idea of business venture, by getting sorted

out worldwide and neighborhood occasions on business venture, and by utilizing numerous channels to advance business (for example promoting, TV and radio projects, web-based media).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To know the level of attitude towards Entrepreneurship of the students from Chennai District during pandemic time
- To know the reason behind to startup the Business during pandemic time.

HYPOTHESIS FRAMED

Ho: There is no significant relationship between the age, gender, educational qualification of the respondent and their level of attitude towards Entrepreneurship

Ha: There is a significant relationship between the age, gender, educational qualification of the respondent and their level of attitude towards Entrepreneurship

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Researcher Design:

The researcher has used Descriptive Research Design

Sampling Method:

The researcher has adopted simple random Sampling method for the present study

Sample Size:

The sample size for the present study is 450.

Data Used:

The researcher has used Primary and secondary data were used for the present study. The primary data were collected through structured questionnaire. The secondary data were collected from the Journals, Books, Magazine and the like.

Tools Used:

The researcher has Used ANOVA and Factor Analysis.

ANALYSIS

Age and Level of attitude towards Entrepreneurship Thoughts

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| Nature of Services | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Self believe | Between Groups | 250.166 | 3 | 83.389 | 45.852 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 811.114 | 446 | 1.819 | | |
| | Total | 1061.280 | 449 | | | |
| Innovative | Between Groups | 3.566 | 3 | 1.189 | .983 | .401 |
| | Within Groups | 539.314 | 446 | 1.209 | | |
| | Total | 542.880 | 449 | | | |
| Creativity | Between Groups | 52.886 | 3 | 17.629 | 33.441 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 235.114 | 446 | .527 | | |
| | Total | 288.000 | 449 | | | |
| Competitiveness | Between Groups | 16.457 | 3 | 5.486 | 4.108 | .007 |
| | Within Groups | 595.543 | 446 | 1.335 | | |
| | Total | 612.000 | 449 | | | |
| Curiosity | Between Groups | 201.463 | 3 | 67.154 | 63.394 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 472.457 | 446 | 1.059 | | |
| | Total | 673.920 | 449 | | | |

The table above represents the ANOVA analysis of age and the level of Attitude towards

entrepreneurship. It is clear from the table that the factors Self believe, Creativity,

Competitiveness and Curiosity having their p value less than 5 per cent level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected for these factors and concluded that there is a significant

difference between age and level of Attitude towards entrepreneurship. The null hypothesis is accepted for Innovative, which has the p value higher than 5 per cent level of significance.

Gender and the level of attitude towards Entrepreneurship Thoughts

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Self believe | Between Groups | 20.280 | 1 | 20.280 | 8.728 | .003 |
| | Within Groups | 1041.000 | 448 | 2.324 | | |
| | Total | 1061.280 | 449 | | | |
| Innovative | Between Groups | 58.080 | 1 | 58.080 | 53.671 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 484.800 | 448 | 1.082 | | |
| | Total | 542.880 | 449 | | | |
| Creativity | Between Groups | 12.000 | 1 | 12.000 | 19.478 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 276.000 | 448 | .616 | | |
| | Total | 288.000 | 449 | | | |
| Competitiveness | Between Groups | 12.000 | 1 | 12.000 | 8.960 | .003 |
| | Within Groups | 600.000 | 448 | 1.339 | | |
| | Total | 612.000 | 449 | | | |
| Curiosity | Between Groups | .120 | 1 | .120 | .080 | .778 |
| | Within Groups | 673.800 | 448 | 1.504 | | |
| | Total | 673.920 | 449 | | | |

The table above represents the ANOVA analysis of gender and the level of Attitude towards entrepreneurship. It is that the factors namely Self believe, Innovative, Creativity and Competitiveness have their p value lesser than the 5 per cent level of significance. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected for these factors and concluded that there is a difference between

gender and level of Attitude towards entrepreneurship. Rest of the factors namely Curiosity has its p value greater than 5 per cent level of significance and hence the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference between gender and level of expectation and Attitude towards entrepreneurship.

Educational Qualification and the level of Attitude towards Entrepreneurship Thoughts

| ANOVA | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|--------|------|
| | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Self believe | Between Groups | 111.511 | 3 | 37.170 | 17.455 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 949.769 | 446 | 2.130 | | |
| | Total | 1061.280 | 449 | | | |
| Innovative | Between Groups | 50.568 | 3 | 16.856 | 15.270 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 492.312 | 446 | 1.104 | | |
| | Total | 542.880 | 449 | | | |
| Creativity | Between Groups | 22.909 | 3 | 7.636 | 12.848 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 265.091 | 446 | .594 | | |
| | Total | 288.000 | 449 | | | |
| Competitiveness | Between Groups | 33.288 | 3 | 11.096 | 8.552 | .000 |
| | Within Groups | 578.712 | 446 | 1.298 | | |
| | Total | 612.000 | 449 | | | |
| Curiosity | Between Groups | 23.208 | 3 | 7.736 | 5.302 | .001 |
| | Within Groups | 650.712 | 446 | 1.459 | | |
| | Total | 673.920 | 449 | | | |

The table above represents the ANOVA analysis of educational qualification and the level of Attitude towards entrepreneurship. It is clear from the table that the factors Self believe, Innovative, Creativity, Competitiveness and Curiosity having their p value less than 5 per cent level of significance. Hence, null hypothesis is rejected for these factors and concluded that there is a significant difference between educational qualification and level of Attitude towards entrepreneurship.

FACTORS INFLUENCING THE ENTREPRENEURSHIP THOUGHTS

The major factors influencing the public sector bank employees are obtained through 31 variables in Likert's Five Point Scale. The application of Principal Component Factor Analysis is presented below:

KMO and Bartlett's Test

| | | |
|---|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | | 0.766 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 4927.409 |
| | Sig. | 0.000 |

From the table above KMO and Bartlett's Test it is found that the sampling adequacy value 0.766 and the Chi-Square value for Bartlett's Test of Sphericity 4927.409 are statistically significant at 5 percent level. This means that the 31 variables relating to the level of Attitude of the customers.

Total Variance Explained

| Component | Initial Eigen values | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|-----------|----------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 6.457 | 20.830 | 20.830 | 6.457 | 20.830 | 20.830 |
| 2 | 5.606 | 18.085 | 38.915 | 5.606 | 18.085 | 38.915 |
| 3 | 4.457 | 14.377 | 53.292 | 4.457 | 14.377 | 53.292 |
| 4 | 3.419 | 11.029 | 64.321 | 3.419 | 11.029 | 64.321 |
| 5 | 2.721 | 8.778 | 73.099 | 2.721 | 8.778 | 73.099 |
| 6 | 2.683 | 8.653 | 81.752 | 2.683 | 8.653 | 81.752 |
| 7 | 2.104 | 6.787 | 88.539 | 2.104 | 6.787 | 88.539 |
| 8 | 1.486 | 4.794 | 93.333 | 1.486 | 4.794 | 93.333 |
| 9 | .994 | 3.206 | 96.539 | | | |
| 10 | .820 | 2.646 | 99.186 | | | |
| 11 | .252 | .814 | 100.000 | | | |
| 12 | 1.218E-014 | 3.931E-014 | 100.000 | | | |
| 13 | 5.857E-015 | 1.889E-014 | 100.000 | | | |
| 14 | 3.384E-015 | 1.092E-014 | 100.000 | | | |
| 15 | 3.100E-015 | 9.999E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 16 | 2.671E-015 | 8.615E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 17 | 2.168E-015 | 6.993E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 18 | 1.106E-015 | 3.569E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 19 | 9.043E-016 | 2.917E-015 | 100.000 | | | |

| Component | Initial Eigen values | | | Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|-----------|----------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 20 | 1.899E-017 | 6.127E-017 | 100.000 | | | |
| 21 | -5.392E-016 | -1.739E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 22 | -1.698E-015 | -5.478E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 23 | -1.917E-015 | -6.183E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 24 | -2.415E-015 | -7.789E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 25 | -2.833E-015 | -9.140E-015 | 100.000 | | | |
| 26 | -3.238E-015 | -1.045E-014 | 100.000 | | | |
| 27 | -3.910E-015 | -1.261E-014 | 100.000 | | | |
| 28 | -4.369E-015 | -1.409E-014 | 100.000 | | | |
| 29 | -5.051E-015 | -1.629E-014 | 100.000 | | | |
| 30 | -6.065E-015 | -1.956E-014 | 100.000 | | | |
| 31 | -7.565E-015 | -2.440E-014 | 100.000 | | | |

From the table above it is found that the 31 variables are reduced into 8 major factors with total cumulative variance 93.333. This clearly indicates the very existence of 8 major factors with their respective variable loadings as expressed in the table given below:

The first factor consists of 8 variables: F1- Potential (0.468); F2. Freedom of superior (0.915); F5-Choose of time of work (0.420); F10- Variability (0.954); F11 – Choose my job and task (0.805); F14 – Identifying the customer (0.660); F21 – Choose the location (0.681) and F22 - Decision making (0.955). Hence, the first factor can be called as “Possibilities”

The first factor consists of 4 variables F6- Environment (0.906); F15- National Culture(0.899); F16- Social norms (0.315) and F26- Rule and Regulations (0.890). Therefore, the second factor is named as “External Issues”

The third factor consists of 2 variables: F28- Create New product (0.904) F7- New Business Strategies (0.588) Hence, the third factor can be called as “Innovative”

The fourth factor consists of 4 variables: F18- Finance barriers (0.241) F19- Administrative issues (0.653) F27- Infrastructure (0.638) F31- Lack of demand (0.697) and Thus, the fourth factor can be named as “Internal Issues”

The fifth factor consists of 5 variables: F3 - Possibility to fail entrepreneurship (0.969); F12 – Financial instability (0.788); F20 – Too expensive (0.253); F23 – Heavy taxation (0.788) and F30 - Current job security (0.344) Therefore, the fifth factor can be called as “Limitations”.

The sixth factor consists of 2 variables F4 – Family Issues (0.715) F29 - Social status (0.805) Hence, it would be apt to call the sixth factor as “Essential”

The seventh factor consists of 4 variables: F9 - Commitments (0.496); F13 – Family credit (0.364); F17 - Service motive (0.519) and F24 - Selecting suitable services (0.867) Thus, the seventh factor can be called as "Need for the Hour”

The eighth factor consists of variables F8 – Life style (0.952) F25 – Life Goal (0.635) Hence, it would be apt to call the sixth factor as “Aim”

CONCLUSION

The investigation of this examination most of the graduated and the post graduated young people are interests and energize the innovative profession in future. It was discovered that larger part of the graduated and post alumni understudies in Chennai District are intrigued to seek after enterprising tilt in future due to Coronavirus circumstances. It invigorates the positive considerations among the understudies. Every one of the respondents were endured monetarily and intellectually because of pandemic time. So the respondents need to recuperate from that by beginning business venture. The Govt. of India and the concerned state Govt. are figured and executed different ventures and plans for engage the informed adolescents, jobless individuals, and ladies strengthening and such.).

Reference

- [1] Azhar, A., Javaid, A., Rehman, M., & Hyder, A. (2010). Entrepreneurial intentions among business students in Pakistan. *Journal of Business Systems, Governance and Ethics*, 5(2), 13-21.
- [2] Baark, E. (2001). Technology and entrepreneurship in China: Commercialization reforms in the science and technology sector. *Review of Policy Research*, 18(1), 112-129.
- [3] Bird, B. (2002). Learning entrepreneurship competencies: The self-directed learning approach. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 1, 203-227.
- [4] De Noble, A. F., Jung, D., & Ehrlich, B. (1999). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: The development of a measure and its relationship to entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(4), 63-77.
- [5] Dickson, P. H., Solomon, G. T., & Weaver, K. M. (2008). Entrepreneurial selection and success: does education matter?. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, 15(2), 239-258.
- [6] Eke, H. N., Igwesi, U., & Orji, D. I. (2011). Information professionals as agents for promoting entrepreneurship and technology education in actualizing vision 2020 for Nigeria (Doctoral dissertation, Lincoln Libraries).
- [7] Lee, W. N., Lim, B. P., Lim, L. Y., Ng, H. S., & Wong, J. L. (2012). Entrepreneurial intention: A study among students of higher learning institution (Doctoral dissertation, UTAR).
- [8] Lunati, M., Schlochtern, J. M., & Sargsyan, G. (2010). Measuring entrepreneurship—the OECD-Eurostat Entrepreneurship Indicators Programme.
- [9] OECD Statistics Brief, (15), 1-12. Madhavrao, N. M. (2009). Students attitude towards entrepreneurship a study of MBA students of management institutes in Pune district.
- [10] Onstenk, J. (2003). Entrepreneurship and vocational education. *European educational research journal*, 2(1), 74-89.