

COMPETENCE OF EDUCATED YOUTH FOR AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISES OF GUJARAT STATE

J.B. Dobariya^{1*}, S.A.Aklade² and C.K. Timbadia³

¹Department of Ext. Edu., NMCA, NAU, Navsari- 396450

²Polytechnic in agriculture, NAU, Waghai (Dangs)- 394730

³Navsari Agricultural University, Navsari – 396450

Received-05.08.2021, Revised-15.08.2021, Accepted-26.08.2021

Abstract: The present research pursuit was undertaken to assess competence of educated youths towards agricultural enterprises of Gujarat state. The study was conducted in 33 districts of Gujarat state. For the study 6 agricultural enterprise educated youths were identified from the lists. Simple random sampling methods was use to obtain 6 respondents from each district. So the total 198 respondents from all over district of Gujarat state were selected. It can be concluded that one half 54.55 per cent of the respondent had a high level of competency, followed by 23.23 per cent, 21.21 per cent and 1.01 per cent of them had very high, medium and low level of competency, respectively. No any respondent of them had a very low level of competency. From the above data it can be concluded that vast majority 77.78 per cent of respondent had a high to very high level of competency. This might be due to that their higher level of education, Perseverance, Insights into the market, entrepreneurial opportunities, creativity, business planning, networking, learning and independence.

Keyword: Competence, Educated youths, Agricultural enterprises

INTRODUCTION

Competence is a combination of the body of knowledge, skills and cluster of appropriate motives/traits and motives that an individual possess to perform a given task effectively and efficiently. Man, Lau and Chan, (2002) suggested that the entrepreneur's demographic characteristics, attitudinal, behavioural, managerial and technical competencies are often cited as the most influential factors related to the performance of small and medium sized enterprises. Quinn (1999) and Bird (1995) reported that core competencies can also be seen as an expertise or mental capacity advantage a firm has over its competitors and they are not necessarily products or tangible resources. According to Bird 1995 entrepreneurial competencies can be defined as underlying characteristics such as generic and specific knowledge, motives. Traits, self-images, social roles and skills that result in venture birth, survival, and/or growth. To know the competence of educated youths towards agricultural enterprises is prime importance. Present study was undertaken to assess a competence of educated youths towards agricultural enterprises of Gujarat state.

METHODOLOGY

The 09 major competencies were identified by the study that lead to superior performance of the

educated youth (www.ediindia.org) covering 51 statements which are crucial in enterprises that is risk taking, perseverance, insights into the market, entrepreneurial opportunities, creativity, business planning, networking, learning, independence. Development of structural interview schedule according to aspect viz. The study was conducted in 33 districts of Gujarat state. For the study, 6 agricultural enterprise educated youths were identified from the lists. Simple random sampling methods was use to obtain 6 respondents from each district. So the total 198 respondents from all over district of Gujarat state were selected. The appropriate measuring techniques/scales of independent and dependent variables were also assorted from the available resources however, the structured schedules were developed with the assistance of experts for such variables for those the appropriate measuring techniques were not available. The response obtained for each item in the interview schedule were scored and tabulated into a master sheet. The statistical parameters like Frequency, Percentage, Rank, Mean, Standard deviation and arbitrary method were used for analysis and developing the inference.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Profile of the respondents

Risk taking

Table 1. Distribution of respondents according to Risk taking n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Very low (Up to 5.40)	4	2.02
2.	Low (5.41 to 7.80)	23	11.62
3.	Medium (7.81 to 10.20)	85	42.93

*Corresponding Author

4.	High (10.21 to 12.60)	60	30.30
5.	Very high (12.61 to 15.00)	26	13.13
Total		198	100.00

Table 1 show that majority (42.93 per cent) of the respondent had a medium level of risk taking, followed by 30.30 per cent, 13.13 per cent and 11.62

per cent of them had high, very high and low level of risk taking, respectively. Only 2.02 per cent of them had a very low level of risk taking.

Perseverance

Table 2. Distribution of respondents according to Perseverance n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Very low (Up to 12.60)	1	0.51
2.	Low (12.61 to 18.20)	12	6.06
3.	Medium (18.21 to 23.80)	39	19.69
4.	High (23.81 to 29.40)	88	44.45
5.	Very high (29.41 to 35.00)	58	29.29
Total		198	100.00

The data presented in table 2 indicates that majority (44.45 per cent) of the respondent had a higher level of perseverance, followed by 29.29 per cent, 19.69 per cent and 6.06 per cent of them had very high,

medium, and low level of perseverance, respectively. Only 0.51 per cent of them had a very low level of perseverance.

Insights into the market

Table 3. Distribution of respondents according to Insights into the market n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Very low (Up to 12.60)	0	0.00
2.	Low (12.61 to 18.20)	26	13.13
3.	Medium (18.21 to 23.80)	62	31.31
4.	High (23.81 to 29.40)	75	37.88
5.	Very high (29.41 to 35.00)	35	17.68
Total		198	100.00

It is apparent from the data given in table 3 that the majority (37.88 per cent) of the respondent had a high level of insights into the market, followed by 31.31 per cent, 17.68 per cent and 13.13 per cent of

them had medium, very high and low level of insights into the market, respectively. No any respondent of them had a very low level of insights into the market.

Entrepreneurial opportunities

Table 4. Distribution of respondents according to entrepreneurial opportunities n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Very low (Up to 12.60)	1	0.5
2.	Low (12.61 to 18.20)	4	2.02
3.	Medium (18.21 to 23.80)	35	17.68
4.	High (23.81 to 29.40)	83	41.92
5.	Very high (29.41 to 35.00)	75	37.88
Total		198	100.00

The data presented in table 4 indicates that majority (41.92 per cent) of the respondent had a high level of entrepreneurial opportunities, followed by 37.88 per cent, 17.68 per cent and 2.02 per cent of them had

very high, medium and low level of entrepreneurial opportunities, respectively. Only 0.5 per cent of them had a very low level of entrepreneurial opportunities.

Creativity**Table 5.** Distribution of respondents according to Creativity n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Very low (Up to 7.20)	2	1.01
2.	Low (7.21 to 10.40)	17	8.59
3.	Medium (10.41 to 13.60)	46	23.23
4.	High (13.61 to 16.80)	79	39.9
5.	Very high (16.81 to 20.00)	54	27.27
Total		198	100.00

The data presented in table 5 shows that majority (39.90 per cent) of the respondent had a high level of creativity, followed by 27.27 per cent, 23.23 per cent

and 8.59 per cent of them had very high, medium and low level of creativity, respectively. Only 1.01 per cent of them had a very low level of creativity.

Business planning**Table 6.** Distribution of respondents according to Business planning n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Per cent
1.	Very low (Up to 7.20)	0	0.00
2.	Low (7.21 to 10.40)	10	5.05
3.	Medium (10.41 to 13.60)	39	19.70
4.	High (13.61 to 16.80)	75	37.88
5.	Very high (16.81 to 20.00)	74	37.37
Total		198	100.00

From the table 6 is revealed that majority (37.88 per cent) of the respondent had a high level of business planning, followed by 37.37 per cent, 19.70 per cent and 5.05 per cent of them had very high, medium and

low level of business planning, respectively. No any respondent of them had a very low level of business planning.

Networking**Table 7.** Distribution of respondents according to networking n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Percent
1.	Very low (Up to 14.40)	1	0.51
2.	Low (14.41 to 20.80)	6	3.03
3.	Medium (20.81 to 27.20)	42	21.21
4.	High (27.21 to 33.60)	79	39.90
5.	Very high (33.61 to 40.00)	70	35.35
Total		198	100.00

The data given in table 7 revealed that two fifth (39.90 per cent) of the respondent had a high level of networking, followed by 35.35 per cent, 21.21 per cent and 3.03 per cent of them had very high,

medium and low level of networking, respectively. Only 0.51 per cent of them had a very low level of networking.

Learning**Table 8.** Distribution of respondents according to learning n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Percent
1.	Very low (Up to 10.80)	0	0.00
2.	Low (10.81 to 15.60)	5	2.53
3.	Medium (15.61 to 20.40)	24	12.12
4.	High (20.41 to 25.20)	49	24.74
5.	Very high (25.21 to 30.00)	120	60.61
Total		198	100

A look in to table 8 point out that majority (60.61 per cent) of the respondent had a very high level of learning, followed by 24.74 per cent, 12.12 per cent

and 2.53 per cent of them had high, medium and low level of learning, respectively. No any respondent of them had a very low level of learning.

Independence

Table 9. Distribution of respondents according to Independence

n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Percent
1.	Very low (Up to 09.00)	0	0.00
2.	Low (9.01 to 13.00)	5	2.52
3.	Medium (13.01 to 17.00)	29	14.65
4.	High (17.01 to 21.00)	76	38.38
5.	Very high (21.01 to 25.00)	88	44.45
Total		198	100.00

The data reported in table 9 indicate that majority (44.45 per cent) of the respondent had a very high level of independence, followed by 38.38 per cent, 14.65 per cent and 2.52 per cent of them had high,

medium and low level of independence, respectively. No any respondent of them had a very low level of independence.

Overall competency of educated youth

Table 10. Distribution of respondents according to overall competency of educated youth

n=198

Sr.	Categories	Frequency	Percent
1.	Less competency (Up to 91.80)	0	0.00
2.	Low competency (91.81 to 132.60)	2	1.01
3.	Medium competency (132.61 to 173.40)	42	21.21
4.	High competency (173.41 to 214.20)	108	54.55
5.	Very high competency (214.21 to 255.00)	46	23.23
Total		198	100.00

From the table 10 it is observed that more than one half (54.55 per cent) of the respondent had a high level of competency, followed by 23.23 per cent, 21.21 per cent and 1.01 per cent of them had very high, medium and low level of competency, respectively. No any respondent of them had a very low level of competency.

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that one half 54.55 per cent of the respondent had a high level of competency, followed by 23.23 per cent, 21.21 per cent and 1.01 per cent of them had very high, medium and low level of competency, respectively. No any respondent of them had a very low level of competency. From the above data it can be concluded that vast majority 77.78 per cent of respondent had a high to very high level of competency. This might be due to that their higher level of education, Perseverance, Insights into the market, entrepreneurial opportunities, creativity, business planning, networking, learning and independence.

REFERENCES

Amini, Z., Arasti, Z. and Bagheri, A. (2018). Identifying social entrepreneurship competencies of

managers in social entrepreneurship organizations in healthcare sector. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, **8** (19): 1-14.

Bernardino, S. and Santos, J. (2019). Network Structure of the Social Entrepreneur: An Analysis Based on Social Organization Features and Entrepreneurs' Demographic Characteristics and Organizational Status. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, **13**(2).

Bikse, V., Rivza, B. and Riemere, I. (2015). The Social Entrepreneur as a Promoter of Social Advancement. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, **185**: 469-478.

Bird, B. (1995). Towards a theory of entrepreneurial competency. *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth Journal*, **2**: 51-72.

Fadhil, R., Qanytah, Q., Hastati, D.Y. and Maarif, M.S. (2018). Development strategy for a quality management system of gayo coffee agro-industry using soft systems methodology. *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, **26**(2): 168-178.

Ghalwash, S., Tolba, A. and Ismail, A. (2017). What motivates social entrepreneurs to start social ventures? An exploratory study in the context of a developing economy. *Social Enterprise Journal*, **13** (3): 268-298.

Godawat, A. (2010). Adoption of entrepreneurial activities envisaged under Rajasthan mission on

livelihood by women, *Rajasthan journal of Extension Education*, **17&18**: 191-193.

Jha, K. K. (2012). Entrepreneurial behaviour of pineapple Growers. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*, Special Issue, (1)

Man, T., Lau, T. and Chan, K. (2002). The competitiveness of small and medium enterprises. A conceptualization with focus on entrepreneurial competencies. *Journal of Business Venturing* **17**: 123-142.

Nieto, M. and González-Álvarez, N. (2016). Social capital effects on the discovery and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities. *International Entrepreneurial Management*, **12**: 507-530.

Patel, P. H., Patel J. K. and Mashaliya K.V. (2020). Association between profile of the post-graduate students and their entrepreneurial competency level. *Guj. J. Ext. Edu.*, **31**(2).

Quinn, J. B. (1999). Strategic outsourcing: Leveraging knowledge capabilities. *Sloan Management Review*, **40**(4): 9-22.

Royo, M., Sarip, A. and Shaari, R. (2015). Entrepreneurship traits and social learning process: an overview and research agenda. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, **171**: 745-753.

Satapura, M. (2014). Entrepreneurial competency of the postgraduate students of Anand agricultural university of Gujarat. *Ph.D. Thesis*, B.A.College of agriculture, Anand agricultural university, Anand.

Seelos, C. and Mair, J. (2015). Social Entrepreneurship - The Contribution of Individual Entrepreneurs to Sustainable Development. *IESE Business School Working Paper No. 553*.

Udoh, E. J., Inyang, E. B. and Oguzie, B. A. (2017). Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Competencies of Agribusiness Managers in Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. *Athens Journal of Business & Economics*, **3**(4): 367-382.

