

# An Evaluation of the Post Training Phase of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes: Trainees' Perspective

Dr. Daisy Samuel

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Commerce, Mar Ivanios College (Autonomous), Trivandrum, Kerala (India)

## ARTICLE DETAILS

### Article History

Published Online: 13 March 2019

### Keywords

Entrepreneurship Development Programmes, Post-training phase / follow-up stage, Trainees perspective.

### \*Corresponding Author

Email: daisy.samuel[at]mic.ac.in

## ABSTRACT

The post training support provided as part of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes plays a vital role in creating and nurturing new entrepreneurs especially those with no family business background. The initial phase of entrepreneurial journey needs considerable support and motivation to persist in the face of many stumbling blocks. It is in this context the post training phase or the follow-up measures of the entrepreneurial training institution gains relevance. The present study is an attempt to sum up the responses of the trainees with regard to the follow-up support they had received from their training institutions.

## 1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship development is an educational process and an endeavour in human resource development. The relevance of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs) is that entrepreneurs are not just born but can be developed and trained to undertake ventures and be creative. The significance of EDPs has been recognised world over, both in developed and developing countries in the context of unemployment and in a drive to utilize the untapped human and material resources. Hence the governments are investing considerably in the process of training and developing entrepreneurs. The aim of EDPs is to create an entrepreneurial culture and develop a healthy small business sector to facilitate economic development.

However, majority of the institutions do not seem to be keen in follow-up activities, which are of course as equally important as training and pre-training preparations. This deprives the trainees of the hand-holding support necessary to progress in the entrepreneurial path. At the same time the institutions are ignoring the opportunity of a self-assessment of the efforts they have put in.

The post training phase is the stage of evaluation and follow-up. Though equally important as the preceding phases, the training institutions are not keen on implementing this

phase as they are of the opinion that it is difficult to bring together the trainees during the post training phase. This phase ensures a continued contact between the trainees and the trainers. This phase also provides an opportunity to the trainers to assess the effectiveness / results of their training programme. The support and encouragement provided during this phase goes a long way in determining ones progression towards entrepreneurship.

## 2. Objective

➤ To examine the **Post Entrepreneurial Support** for potential entrepreneurs.

### Sample Design

This study is conducted with reference to the state of Kerala which is acclaimed for its high standards of living. There are a number of agencies who conduct EDPs in the state. Among these the prominent institutions MSME and DIC, representing the Central Government and the State Government institutions respectively, have been selected on the basis of the number of EDPs conducted. Thus all the participants of the EDPs conducted by the MSME and DIC during the period from 2014-15 to 2017-18 are considered as the population for the purpose of this study. As per data available MSME has conducted 50 EDPs during this period and 1245 participants attended the programme, whereas DIC has conducted 58 EDPs providing training to 1458 participants.

Table 1.1  
Population and Sample Selected for the Study

Institution	Population		Sample		Percentage of sample on population	
	Number of programmes	Number of participants	Number of programmes	Number of participants	Programme	Participants
MSME	50	1245	10	150	20.0	12.1
DIC	58	1458	10	150	17.2	10.3
Total	108	2703	20	300	18.5	11.01

### 1.1. Motivation

One of the main aims of EDP is to motivate the prospective entrepreneurs to set up their own business units. Achievement Motivation Training is a main part of the EDP

which is directed towards motivating the participants to venture into entrepreneurial path. However, to what extent the trainees are motivated depends upon the efficiency of the trainer motivators.

As per the figures shown in the Table 1.2, 75.3 per cent of the respondents were motivated by the EDP whereas 24.67

per cent comments negatively.

Table 1.2  
Received motivation from training programme to start business

Motivation	Start-up Status						Institution conducted EDP				Total	
	Started		Not started		Prior		DIC		MSME			
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Yes	41	95.35	153	71.83	32	72.73	130	86.67	96	64.00	226	75.33
No	2	4.65	60	28.17	12	27.27	20	13.33	54	36.00	74	24.67
Total	43	100.00	213	100.00	44	100.00	150	100.00	150	100.00	300	100.00
							$\chi^2 = 20.74$ , df. = 1, Sig. = 0.000 All cells have expected count $\geq 5$					

Source: Primary data

Majority of the respondents in both the institutions (86.67 per cent of DIC and 64 per cent of MSME) comments in favour of the motivation provided by the EDPs to set up a business. However, the figures are more in favour of the DIC. The negative response shows a marked difference in the institutional split-up and MSME (36 per cent) has gathered high figures in this regard leading to conclude that the motivational training is more effective in DIC.

As significance level of chi square is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is significant difference between the trainees of DIC and MSME with regard to the motivation received from EDPs to set up own business unit.

Similarly, the analysis on the basis of start-up status basis shows that the trainees who had set up their own units subsequent to the EDPs are more motivated from the training programme. 95.35 per cent of the trainees belong to this category opined that they are motivated from the training

programme to start a business. But, the comparison of the non-starters (71.83 per cent) and the respondents already with business units (72.73 per cent) do not show marked difference with regard to the motivation received from the EDPs.

1.2. Product Identification

EDPs can yield more result in terms of start-up rates if it helps in identification of profitable business idea and its potential. Rather than mere theoretical orientation, if the EDP can focus on product identification and project plan preparation, the training programme can be more effective. Potential surveys are part of preliminary pre-training activities but the training institutions mostly do away with this due to the constraint of time, money and human resources.

However, as per the figures depicted in Table 1.3, only 31.3 per cent could identify a business plan through EDP. To the discredit of EDP, 68.7 per cent responds negatively.

Table 1.3  
Distribution of the sample respondents on the basis of product identification

	Start-up Status						Institution conducted EDP				Total	
	Started		Not started		Prior		DIC		MSME			
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Yes	5	27.78	61	31.44	6	33.33	37	37.00	35	26.92	72	31.30
No	13	72.22	133	68.56	12	66.67	63	63.00	95	73.08	158	68.70
Total	18	100.00	194	100.00	18	100.00	100	100.00	130	100.00	230	100.00
$\chi^2 = 0.140$ , df. = 2, Sig. = 0.932 All cells have expected count $\geq 5$							$\chi^2 = 2.669$ , df. = 1, Sig. = 0.102 All cells have expected count $\geq 5$					

Source: Primary data

The institutional wise analysis leads to the inference that the respondents of DIC (37 per cent) is in an advantageous position with regard to the product identification through EDP. However, as the significance level is greater than 0.05 there is no significant difference between the DIC and MSME with regard to the assistance provided for product identification.

The analysis on the basis of start up status shows that majority of the respondents have a negative comment with regard to the product identification. However, among the respondents who have failed to set up a unit, 31.44 per cent

comments in favour of product identification. But, they have not yet succeeded in setting up a unit of their own which indicates the lack of adequate hand-holding support provided to the trainees. The significance level of the chi-square value indicates that there exists no significant difference between the trainees on the basis of start-up status with regard to the product identification.

1.3 Follow-up

Follow-up meeting is an integral part of EDP though neglected by many of the training institutions due to many

difficulties. An EDP cannot create a class of first generation entrepreneurs until they are provided a hand holding support. The follow-up meetings are necessary for providing a continued motivation for the entrepreneurs and to provide assistance to the entrepreneurs to set up a unit.

As shown in Table 1.4, the institutional wise analysis also does not show a marked difference in this regard as majority of the respondents in both the institutions are in favour of the post-training meetings.

As the significance level is less than 0 .05 there is significant difference between the trainees of DIC and MSME with regard to the need for follow-up activities.

*i. Opinion about Follow-up*

Majority of the respondents (92 per cent) are in favour of such follow up meetings. Only 8 per cent comments otherwise.

*Table 1.4  
Distribution of the sample by their start-up status and institution conducted EDP*

Follow-up needed	Start-up Status						Institution conducted EDP				Total	
	Started		Not started		Prior		DIC		MSME			
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Yes	42	97.67	194	91.08	40	90.91	144	96.00	132	88.00	276	92.00
No	1	2.33	19	8.92	4	9.09	6	4.00	18	12.00	24	8.00
Total	43	100.00	213	100.00	44	100.00	150	100.00	150	100.00	300	100.00
							$\chi^2 = 6.522, df. = 1, Sig. = 0.011$ All cells have expected count $\geq 5$					

Source: Primary data

The analysis on the basis of start-up status reveals that the respondents in all the three categories are in favour of the follow-up meetings. 97.67 percent of the respondents who have started the business unit after the training, 91.08 per cent of the respondents who have not yet started their business units and 90.91 per cent of the respondents who already had their business units while attending the training programme are of the opinion that there should be adequate number of follow up meetings after the training programme.

shown in Table 1.4a, has ever attended the meetings. The institutional wise analysis in this regard is in favour of MSME. As per the information provided by them such meetings were within a period of six months from the end of the training programme.

The significance level of the chi square is greater than 0.05, there exists no significant difference between the trainees of DIC and MSME with regard to the attendance in the follow-up meetings.

*ii. Attendance in Follow-up*

As presented in the above table though 92 per cent are in favour of the follow-up meetings but only 6.67 per cent, as

*Table 1.4a  
Distribution of the sample respondents who attended the follow up meeting*

Attended	Start-up Status						Institution conducted EDP				Total	
	Started		Not started		Prior		DIC		MSME			
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Yes	4	9.30	14	6.57	2	4.55	7	4.67	13	7.43	20	6.67
No	39	91.70	199	93.43	42	95.45	143	95.33	137	92.57	280	93.33
Total	43	100.00	213	100.00	44	100.00	150	100.00	150	100.00	300	100.00
							$\chi^2 = 2.464, df. = 1, Sig. = 0.117$ All cells have expected count $\geq 5$					

Source: Primary data

The analysis on the basis of start-up status shows that more proportion of respondents who have attended the follow-up meeting belongs to the category of those who have set up their units after the training programme (9.30 per cent). In the case of other two categories the proportion is 6.57 per cent and 4.55 per cent only. This indicates the importance of the follow up meeting in the entrepreneurship development and training programmes.

Among the total respondents who have not attended the follow up meeting (93.33 per cent of the total) , 90 per cent did not attend because they were not informed of the same and 3.33 per cent could not attend due to their personal inconvenience.

**1.4. Assistance during Post EDP Period**

During the post EDP period the entrepreneurs may face many difficulties and may need assistance to set up their

venture. The training institutions have to take up the responsibility for the same through follow-up and also by instilling confidence and creating a good rapport with the participants during the training period so that the participants may approach them at times of necessity for assistance and advise. But, in practice it is noticed that the link between the trainees and the training institution ends as soon as the

winding up of the EDP and though approached by the trainees, the institutions are not keen in providing them all possible assistance. The following table shows the distribution of the sample respondents on the basis of Post EDP assistance received by their start up status and institutions conducted the EDP.

Table 1.5  
Post EDP assistance received by their start-up status and institutions

Post EDP assistance	Start-up Status						Institution conducted EDP				Total	
	Started		Not started		Prior		DIC		MSME			
	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent	No.	Per cent
Yes	29	67.44	61	28.64	15	34.09	63	42.00	42	28.00	105	35.00
No	14	32.56	152	71.36	29	65.91	87	58.00	108	72.00	195	65.00
Total	43	100.00	213	100.00	44	100.00	150	100.00	150	100.00	300	100.00
$\chi^2 = 23.936$ , df. = 2, Sig. = 0.000 All cells have expected count $\geq 5$							$\chi^2 = 6.703$ , df. = 1, Sig. = 0.010 All cells have expected count $\geq 5$					

Source: Primary data

As presented in Table 1.5, only 35.0 per cent has approached the institution for assistance during the EDP period. The institutional wise analysis shows that more number of DIC participants (42 per cent) has approached for post EDP assistance and this is naturally because unlike MSME, DIC has an institutional network in all districts. The significance level of the chi-square value indicates that there is significant difference between the trainees of DIC and MSME with regard to approaching the training institution for post-EDP assistance.

The analysis on the basis of start-up status shows that more number of starters (67.44 per cent) has approached the training institution for post – EDP assistance followed by the group already with business units (34.09 per cent). The significance level of the chi-square value indicates that there exists significant difference between the three groups of

trainees on the basis of start-up status with regard to approaching the training institution for post-EDP assistance.

**1.5. Assistance Expected during the Post-EDP Phase**

The following Table 1.6 describes why the participants demand follow-up meetings. The analysis on the basis of start-up status shows that starters require follow-up meeting for arranging infrastructural facilities, product identification, and motivation respectively. The non-starters require it for arranging necessary licenses and permissions, infrastructural facilities and for getting approval for financial assistance whereas the trainees already with units favour follow-ups for arranging licenses and permissions and other infrastructural facilities. The institutional wise analysis also provides similar rankings requiring assistance for arranging infrastructural facilities and licenses and permissions grabbing the initial rank positions.

Table 1.6  
Ranks given by trainees to the aspects of the training they recommend for the follow-up

Aspects	Start-up Status			Institution conducted EDP		Total
	Started	Not started	Prior	DIC	MSME	
In arranging infrastructural facilities	1	2	2	2	1	1
In arranging licenses and permissions	4	1	1	1	2	2
Project report preparation	5	5	4	5	5	4
Getting approval for financial assistance	2	3	7	7	3	5
Motivation training	3	6	6	6	6	6
Product identification	7	7	5	4	7	7
Other	6	4	3	3	4	3
Spearman's Rank Correlation Coefficient	-0.143 Sig. = 0.76			0.50, Sig.=0.253		

Source: Primary data

The rank correlation coefficient of starters and non-starters is -0.143 (sig.=0.76). Since significant level of rank correlation

coefficient is greater than 0.05, the ranking of starters and non-starters are not similar. That means the reasons identified by

the respondents vary among the category based on the start up rate.

Similarly The rank correlation coefficient of DIC and MSME is 0.500 (sig.=253). Here also significance level is greater than 0.05, there is no similarity of ranking between trainees from DIC and MSME.

### 3. Conclusion

EDPs as an enterprise creation activity, though it has started yielding results, have not kept pace with the

entrepreneurial and industrial potential of the state. There is no dearth of programmes, policies, government schemes or initiatives but all such efforts lack an entrepreneurial spirit. Various agencies engaged in entrepreneurship development must understand the genuine need of such activities rather than engaging in them with a 'for the sake' attitude. The post training phase efforts of the training institutions does not seem to be commendable and fail to make up to the expectations of the trainees. Much initiative has to be taken to raise entrepreneurship to a salutary position and to develop an entrepreneurial culture in the state.

### Reference

1. Allan, Gibb, A. *Defining Success in Entrepreneurship Development Programmes: A Guide to a Model Approach*. United Kingdom: Durham University Business School, 2002.
2. Awasthi, Dinesh, N and Sebastian, Jose. *Evaluation of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, 1996.
3. Desai Vasant. *Entrepreneurial Development*, Vol.1. Bombay: Himalaya Publishing House, 2005.
4. Khanna, Tarun. *Billions of entrepreneurs: How China and India are Reshaping their Futures-and Yours*. New Delhi: Penguin/Viking, 2007.
5. Saravanavel. *Entrepreneurial Development – Principles, Policies and Programmes*. Madras: Eee Pee Kay Publishing House, 1987.