

# **Entrepreneurial Characteristics, Attitude and Self-Employment Intention: A Study of Public and Private Technical Institutes' Undergraduates**

**Dr. Pushkar Dubey**

*Assistant Professor and Head*

*Department of Management*

*Pandit Sundarlal Sharma (Open) University Chhattisgarh*

---

## **Abstract**

*Unemployment has become a great challenge for all the developing countries like India where number of educated people are keep increasing exponentially, but in response, jobs are not available. Specially, engineering graduates are in worse situation despite of having technical know-how of different processes. The present study attempts to examine the entrepreneurial characteristics (i.e., ambiguity tolerance, self-sufficiency, locus of control, risk-taking propensity, planning and organising ability, and social networking), attitude (i.e., achievement, innovation, personal control, and self-esteem) and self-employment intention of public and private technical institutions' undergraduates enrolled in 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> year of their engineering course. The author used stratified random sampling and distributed 1245 questionnaires to the participants of Chhattisgarh state. Approximately 1000 responses were found usable for data analysis. The results explained that all the dimensions of entrepreneurial attitude and some of entrepreneurial characteristics (i.e., ambiguity tolerance, locus of control) of public and private institutions' undergraduates were found significant whereas self-sufficiency, risk-taking propensity, planning and organising ability, and social networking of entrepreneurial attitude dimension along with self-employment intention of public and private educational institutes' undergraduates were found insignificant.*

**Keywords:** *Entrepreneurial Characteristics, Entrepreneurial Attitude, Self-Employment Intention, Public and Private Technical Institutes.*

---

Date of Submission: 10-01-2022

Date of Acceptance: 24-01-2022

---

## **I. Introduction**

The promotion of entrepreneurship and the improvement of the employment rate in India has emerged as an issue of critical importance. Entrepreneurship should be pursued as a career option for engineering graduates. According to Chaudhary (2018), science and technology have the potential to make major contributions to India's economic development and growth. Dr. A. P. J. Abdul Kalam, India's former president, was a firm believer that scientific and technological breakthroughs might pave the way for the country's future. He also emphasised the need of motivating the young, inspired brains of India to attain their ambitions.

India's government has emphasised the entrepreneurship culture by establishing more than 2,400 Atal tinkering labs (ATLs) in different Indian high schools to nurture nascent entrepreneurs' science spirit and creative nature. This emphasis connects the latent students with global knowledge, i.e., academic, private, and public organisations, to disseminate their best technology innovation practices. The all India council of technical education (AICTE) has identified top higher educational institutes of India that will be involved in mentoring the Atal tinkering labs (ATLs) in schools in order to leverage the latest technologies of artificial intelligence, robotics to build innovative technology solutions, internet of things (IoT).

Keeping the mission in mind, NITI Aayog has introduced a nationwide strategic initiative under the Atal innovation mission (AIM) named "Mentor India" with the help of India's motivated professionals with ATL's young minds. The initiative aims to develop a regional innovation micro-network environment with higher education institutes, local and global industry professionals for mentoring and motivating school children to think creatively and innovative for solving various problems by leveraging science and technology (Chaudhary, 2018) aiming these students become future innovators and entrepreneurs. Adding to this, it makes this a worth exploring area to investigate the entrepreneurial characteristics, attitude and self-employment intention to find the most contributing and positive entrepreneurial culture among public and private technical institutions in Chhattisgarh state.

## **II. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Entrepreneurial Characteristics**

The value of distinct personality qualities in the context of entrepreneurial conduct has been acknowledged by researchers at various periods throughout history. Different personality qualities were explored in a number of studies to determine the distinctions between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. Among researchers, individual qualities or personality characteristics continue to be important subjects of investigation, having garnered a lot of interest in the past and present (Robinson, Stimpson, Huefner & Hunt, 1991; Ho & Koh, 1992; Koh, 1996; Bakotic & Kruzic, 2010). Entrepreneurs share a number of features or attributes with one another. A person is defined by a characteristic. Characteristics are different characteristics of an individual that contribute to the development of his or her personality. Depending on their degree of self-confidence, individuals may be classified into a variety of psychological traits, including a strong demand for accomplishment, a high proclivity to take risks and a readiness to innovate, and a strong locus of control based on their level of self-confidence (Davidsson, 1989; Ho & Koh, 1992).

### **2.2 Entrepreneurial Attitude**

According to Asenjo and Barberá (2013), attitude is regarded to be the first and most important phase in the entrepreneurial process. As described by Ajzen (1987), it is an acquired propensity of a person to behave positively or negatively towards a certain activity; its creation may occur either via previous, preceding, and/or current experiences or perceptions gathered over the course of an individual's life span (Kuehn, 2008). Entrepreneurship may be fully comprehended by examining the significance of attitude, which has been described by several philosophers and scholars (Drucker, 1970; Olson & Bosserman, 1984; Gasse, 1985; Greenberger & Sexton, 1987). There are two basic or fundamental ways that may be used to understand a person's attitude toward a situation. Whereas the former characterises attitude as a one-dimensional construct, the latter explains the same as a multidimensional framework. It is just emotive response that is used to express the unidimensional method in its portrayal (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Individual responses, according to the multidimensional component, are comprised of three categories of reactions: affective, cognitive, and conative reactions. The tripartite paradigm is also known as the three-factor model, and attitude is a mixture of all three of these elements (Allport, 1935; Katz & Stotland, 1959; Rosenberg & Hovland, 1960; Ostrom, 1969; Kothandapani, 1970; Breckler, 1983, 1984; Carlson, 1985; Chaiken & Stangor, 1987; Shaver, 1987).

### **2.3 Self-Employment Intention**

Individuals with a self-employment intention may be characterised as those who are prepared, involved, or want to start a company (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993; Luthje & Franke, 2003; Drennan, Kennedy & Renfrow, 2005; Souitaris, Zerbinati & Al-Laham, 2007). Startups, entrepreneurship, and other entrepreneurial actions are made possible by the conscious state of mind, which focuses attention toward these behaviours and helps them succeed (Moriano, Gorgievski, Laguna, Stephan, & Zarafshani, 2012). When it comes to graduate entrepreneurship at the university level, the subject has been well researched (Wang & Wong, 2004; Van Gelderen, Brand, Van Praag, Bodewes, Poutsma & Van Gils, 2008; Iakovleva, Kolvereid & Stephan, 2011). Recent studies have shown that university students have a strong interest in pursuing entrepreneurial endeavours, with researchers discovering a high level of interest among them (Tkachev & Kolvereid, 1999; Autio, Keeley, Klofsten, Parker & Hay, 2001; Veciana, Aponte & Urbano, 2005).

### **2.4 Incorporated variables in the study**

#### *(a) Entrepreneurial Characteristics*

Entrepreneurial characteristics are the set of features or skills that a person has or acquires through time and various experiences. Entrepreneurial characteristics consists of ambiguity tolerance, self-sufficiency, locus of control, risk-taking propensity, planning and organising ability, and social networking.

#### *(b) Ambiguity tolerance*

Stanley Budner (1962) defines tolerance for ambiguity as "a tendency to perceive ambiguous situations as sources of threat."

#### *(c) Self-sufficiency*

Chen, Greene, and Crick (1998) defined entrepreneurial self-efficacy/self-sufficiency as the strength of beliefs in one's capabilities to successfully perform the roles and tasks of an entrepreneur.

#### *(d) Locus of control*

Someone who tends to have an internal locus of control believes that his deed will influence the result of what he does (Lefton, 1985; Rasheed, H.S. & Rasheed, B.Y., 2003).

#### *(e) Risk-taking propensity*

Risk-taking propensity is identified as a trait that distinguishes entrepreneurs from non-entrepreneurs and managers (Ahmed, 1985; Shane, 1996; Miner, Smith & Bracker, 1989).

*(f) Planning and organising ability*

The ability to plan and organise activities which helps an entrepreneur to manage every work associated with the desired results including time, tools and resources etc. (Beetroot, 2020).

*(g) Social Networking*

Social networking is a tendency to have a relationship and to interact with other people. It is seen as social behaviour and is regarded as a variable psychological personality (Taormina & Lao, 2007).

*(h) Self-employment intention*

Self-employment intention has been defined in different ways, such as, the intention to start a new business (Zhao, Hills and Seibert, 2005), the intention to own a business (Crant, 1996), the intention to be self-employed (Douglas and Shepherd, 2002).

*(i) Entrepreneurial attitude*

Ajzen (1987) defined attitude as a learned predisposition of an individual to behave favorably or unfavorably towards an action; its formation can occur either through past or prior experiences or perceptions accumulated over an individual's life span (Kuehn, 2008). Mitchell et al. (2003) explained entrepreneurial attitude as their opinion about the abilities, adaptability and actions in the entrepreneurial process.

*(j) Achievement*

Achievement refers to the feeling to achieve the desired outcome in the entrepreneurial process. McClelland proposed that achievement motivation is the key to entrepreneurial behavior (Chell, 2008).

*(k) Innovation*

Innovation is defined as creating new products, methods, markets, or a new organisation. Innovation relates to perceiving and acting upon business activities in new and unique ways (Kirton, 1978; Drucker, 1985).

*(l) Personal control*

Perceived personal control of business outcomes is concerned with the individual's perception of control and influence over their business. Internal personal control leads to a positive entrepreneurial attitude (Robinson, Stimpson, Huefner & Hunt, 1991).

*(m) Self-esteem*

Persons who believe that their skill and ability set is adequate for achieving success with a new venture are motivated to exert the necessary effort (Douglas and Shepherd, 2000).

### **III. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research Objectives**

1. To identify the entrepreneurial attitude of technical undergraduates enrolled in public and private engineering institutions of Chhattisgarh state.
2. To identify the self-employment intention of technical undergraduates enrolled in public and private engineering institutions of Chhattisgarh state.
3. To identify the entrepreneurial characteristics of technical undergraduates in public and private engineering institutions of Chhattisgarh state.

#### **3.2 Hypothesis**

H1. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across achievement construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

H2. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across innovation construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

H3. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across personal control construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

H4. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across self-esteem construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

H5. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across overall entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

H6. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across self-employment intention dimension.

H7. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across ambiguity tolerance construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

H8. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across self-sufficiency construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

H9. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across locus of control construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

- H10. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across risk taking construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.
- H11. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across planning and organising ability construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.
- H12. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across social networking construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.
- H13. There exist no significant difference among mean score of government and private technical institutions across overall entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

**3.3 Sampling and data collection**

Correlational research design is applied in the present study. Technical students enrolled in the third and fourth year in different government and private institution were selected to participate in the present study. About 1245 questionnaire were sent to participants, out of which 1000 questionnaire were found usable (approximately 80.32% response rate). The data collection process was completed during November 2019 to March 2020.

Table 1. Description of primary data

Gender		Locality		Institution		Total
Male	Female	Rural	Urban	Government	Private	1000
429	571	434	566	236	764	

**3.4 Research Instrument**

Selection, development, and finalization of research instrument is the essential part of collecting right form of primary data from respondents. Similarly, authors followed the scientific process of developing and validating the research instrument for the present study. Firstly, authors thoroughly studied previous literatures and extracted total eleven constructs related to the present study objectives either completely adapted or adapted with certain modifications. Afterwards, the developed constructs were sent to four subject experts for examining the content creation and to gain some valuable insights. Finally, after receiving minor changes in some items suggested by experts, authors conducted pilot study by taking a simple of 50 participants to check the content validity. No modifications were asked by the participants, and hence, a 47 items-questionnaire were finalised for the collection of primary data. The final constructs and items are entrepreneurial attitude dimensions (i.e., achievement (6 items), innovation (6 items), personal control (5 items), self-esteem (6 items)) adapted from Ismail, Jaffar and Hooi (2013), entrepreneurial characteristics dimensions (i.e., ambiguity tolerance (3 items) adapted from Bezzina (2010), self-sufficiency (3 items) adapted from Bezzina (2010), locus of control (3 items) adapted from Bezzina (2010), risk-taking propensity (3 items) adapted from Bezzina (2010), planning and organizing ability (3 items) adapted from Schmidt and Bohnenberger (2009), Rocha and Freitas (2014), and Moraes, Lizuka & Pedro (2018), social networking (3 items) adapted from Schmidt and Bohnenberger (2009)), and self-employment intention (6 items) adapted from Ismail, Jaffar and Hooi (2013).

**3.5 Scale Validation**

The present study applied partial least square confirmatory factor analysis to examine the primary data’s reliability and validity measures (see Table 2 and 3).

*(a) Reliability measures*

Internal consistency can be measured through Cronbach alpha whose value must be greater than 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978). The present study analysis also explained the value of Cronbach alpha above 0.7 (see Table 2). The value of Rho A also helps in measuring the reliability whose value also must be greater 0.7, and the authors found the value of Rho A for all the constructs above 0.7 (see Table 2).

*(b) Convergent validity*

Convergent validity helps in measuring whether the multiple items in the scale are in agreement (Fornell & Bookstein, 1982; Barclay et al., 1995). The value of composite reliability (CR) must be greater than 0.7 which depict a fair measure of internal consistency reliability (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988; Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson, 2010). Table 2 explains the value of composite reliability above 0.7 for all the constructs.

Average variance extracted (AVE) is considered a determinant of convergent validity of the scale. The value of AVE must be more than 0.7 (Hu et al., 2004; Henseler et al., 2009). Table 2 explains the value of AVE above 0.7 for all the constructs.

**Table 2.** Measurement results

Factors	Cronbach Alpha	Rho A	CR	AVE
Achievement	0.857	0.887	0.861	0.52
Innovation	0.882	0.884	0.881	0.554
Personal Control	0.844	0.846	0.844	0.52
Self Esteem	0.716	0.733	0.715	0.503
Self-Employment Intention	0.812	0.827	0.817	0.531
Ambiguity	0.782	0.786	0.777	0.516
Self Sufficiency	0.765	0.774	0.77	0.504
Locus of Control	0.702	0.705	0.786	0.526
Risk-Taking	0.738	0.74	0.739	0.586
Planning	0.781	0.786	0.783	0.519
Social Networking	0.725	0.726	0.724	0.557
Entrepreneurial Attitude	0.944	0.951	0.946	0.539
Entrepreneurial Characteristics	0.893	0.897	0.894	0.521

*(c) Discriminant validity*

Discriminant validity explains whether the constructs are independent from each other. The value of discriminant validity must be greater than 0.7 to achieve the construct validity. Table 3 indicates the value of discriminant validity above 0.7 for all the seven constructs. Hence, it concludes that the present study possesses a satisfactory measurement model.

**Table 3.** Discriminant validity

Discriminant Validity (Fornell-Larcker Criterion)											
	A	AT	I	LOC	PC	POA	RTP	SEI	SE	SS	SN
A	<b>0.988</b>										
AT	0.887	<b>0.824</b>									
I	0.846	0.821	<b>0.917</b>								
LOC	0.721	0.718	0.744	<b>0.973</b>							
PC	0.759	0.778	0.841	0.962	<b>0.925</b>						
POA	0.693	0.66	0.714	0.865	0.721	<b>0.97</b>					
RTP	0.659	0.65	0.709	0.785	0.702	0.804	<b>0.832</b>				
SEI	0.491	0.562	0.59	0.707	0.621	0.647	0.744	<b>0.877</b>			
SE	0.635	0.63	0.613	0.776	0.656	0.734	0.697	0.738	<b>0.742</b>		
SS	0.466	0.556	0.564	0.703	0.613	0.642	0.663	0.697	0.619	<b>0.833</b>	

SN	0.448	0.493	0.51	0.571	0.557	0.617	0.546	0.656	0.551	0.636	<b>0.597</b>
----	-------	-------	------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------------

[A = Achievement; AT = Ambiguity tolerance; I = Innovation; LOC = Locus of control; PC = Personal control; POA = Planning and organising ability; RTP = Risk taking propensity; SEI = Self-employment intention; SE = Self-esteem; SS = Self-sufficiency; SN = Social networking]

**3.6 Data Analysis**

The present study applied SPSS v25 (licensed version) and Smart PLS 3 (trial version) to analyse the primary data.

**IV. Analysis And Interpretation**

**4.1 Entrepreneurial Attitude among Public and Private Institutions' Undergraduates**

**Table 4.** t-test of entrepreneurial attitude as per engineering institutions of undergraduates

Variable	Group	N	Mean	t	df	p-value	Significance
Achievement	Private	764	31.826	2.73	998	p < 0.01	Significant
	Government	236	33.314				
Innovation	Private	764	31.894	4.586	998	p < 0.01	Significant
	Government	236	34.403				
Personal Control	Private	764	25.957	3.784	998	p < 0.01	Significant
	Government	236	27.695				
Self-Esteem	Private	764	30.602	2.99	998	p < 0.01	Significant
	Government	236	31.945				
Entrepreneurial Attitude	Private	764	120.278	3.941	998	p < 0.01	Significant
	Government	236	127.355				

It is observed from the Table 4 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for achievement construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension. The mean score of government (M = 33.314) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 31.826) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically significant, t (998) = 2.730, p < 0.01. Hence, it is concluded that there exists a statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across achievement construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 4 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have differences in the mean score for innovation construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension. The mean score of government (M = 34.403) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 31.894) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically significant, t (998) = 4.586, p < 0.01. Hence, it is concluded that there exists a statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across innovation construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 4 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have differences in the mean score for personal control construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension. The mean score of government (M = 27.695) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 25.957) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically significant, t (998) = 3.784, p < 0.01. Hence, it is concluded that there exists a statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across personal control construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 4 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for the self-esteem construct of the entrepreneurial attitude dimension. The mean score of government (M = 31.945) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 30.602) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically significant, t (998) = 2.990, p < 0.01. Hence, it is concluded that there

exists a statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across self-esteem construct of entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 4 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for the overall entrepreneurial attitude dimension. The mean score of government (M =127.355) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 120.278) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically significant,  $t(998) = 3.941, p < 0.01$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists a statistically significant difference in means score for private and government engineering institutions across the overall entrepreneurial attitude dimension.

**4.2 Self-Employment Intention among Public and Private Institutions’ Undergraduates**

**Table 5.** t-test of self-employment intention as per engineering institutions of undergraduates

Variable	Group	N	Mean	t	df	p-value	Significance
Self-employment Intention	Private	764	30.733	0.913	998	p > 0.05	Not Significant
	Government	236	31.208				

It is observed from the Table 5 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for the self-employment intention dimension. The mean score of government (M = 31.208) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 30.733) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically insignificant,  $t(998) = 0.913, p > 0.05$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists no statistically significant difference in the mean score for private and government engineering institutions across the self-employment intention dimension.

**4.3 Entrepreneurial Characteristics of Public and Private Institutions’ Undergraduates**

**Table 6.** t-test of engineering characteristics as per engineering institutions of undergraduates

Variable	Group	N	Mean	t	df	p-value	Significance
Ambiguity Tolerance	Private	764	15.129	2.369	998	p < 0.01	Significant
	Government	236	15.716				
Self-Sufficiency	Private	764	16.223	1.504	998	p > 0.05	Not Significant
	Government	236	16.61				
Locus of Control	Private	764	15.593	2.534	998	p < 0.01	Significant
	Government	236	16.288				
Risk-Taking Propensity	Private	764	14.967	0.056	998	p > 0.05	Not Significant
	Government	236	14.983				
Planning & organising ability	Private	764	15.745	1.722	998	p > 0.05	Not Significant
	Government	236	16.208				
Social Networking	Private	764	15.059	1.73	998	p > 0.05	Not Significant
	Government	236	15.525				
Entrepreneurial Characteristics	Private	764	92.716	2.108	998	p < 0.05	Significant
	Government	236	95.33				

It is observed from the Table 6 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have differences in the mean score for the ambiguity tolerance construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension. The mean score of government (M = 15.716) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 15.129) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically significant,  $t(998) = 2.369, p < 0.01$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists a statistically significant difference in means score for private and government engineering institutions across ambiguity tolerance construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 6 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have differences in the mean score for the self-sufficiency construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension. The mean score of government (M = 16.610) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 16.223) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically insignificant,  $t(998) = 1.504, p > 0.05$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists no statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across self-sufficiency construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 6 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for the locus of control construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension. The mean score of government (M = 16.288) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 15.593) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically significant,  $t(998) = 2.534, p < 0.01$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists a statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across locus of control construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 6 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for the risk-taking construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension. The mean score of government (M = 14.983) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 14.967) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically insignificant,  $t(998) = 0.056, p > 0.05$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists no statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across the risk-taking construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 6 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for planning construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension. The mean score of government (M = 16.208) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 15.745) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically insignificant,  $t(998) = 1.722, p > 0.05$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists no statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across planning construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

Similarly, it is observed from the Table 3.41 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for social networking construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension. The mean score of government (M = 15.525) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 15.059) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically insignificant,  $t(998) = 1.730, p > 0.05$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists no statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across social networking construct of entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

Finally, it is observed from the Table 3.42 that respondents of private (N= 764) and government (N= 236) technical education institutions have a difference in the mean score for the overall entrepreneurial characteristics dimension. The mean score of government (M = 95.330) engineering institutions was higher than that of private (M = 92.716) institutions. The difference in the mean score of private and government institutions is found to be statistically significant,  $t(998) = 2.108, p < 0.05$ . Hence, it is concluded that there exists a statistically significant difference in mean score for private and government engineering institutions across entrepreneurial characteristics dimension.

## **V. Findings and Discussion**

Comparison of the mean score of government and private engineering institutions showed a significant difference in the mean score for all entrepreneurial attitude dimensions (H1-H5). The difference also existed for ambiguity tolerance (H7), locus of control (H9) and overall entrepreneur characteristics (H13). However, differences did not exist among government and a private institution for self-employment intention (H6), self-sufficiency (H8), risk-taking (H10), planning and organising ability (H11), and social networking (H12). From the obtained result, it is evident that there exist higher entrepreneurial attitude and characteristics among students of a government institution in comparison to that of private institutions. Also, students of government institutions have a higher level of tolerance of ambiguity, locus of control, higher support from society and family than the students of private institutions. Students of government institutions better integrate their available economic resources for favouring entrepreneurship. Both government and private institutions' students have a similar degree of opinions towards intention to become an entrepreneur. They are also similar in their planning and organising, and risk-taking ability. Both can create similar kinds of social networks for enterprises in rural development and are encouraged by their parents in favouring entrepreneurship as their career option.



## VI. Conclusion

Entrepreneurship can be the only solution to unemployment issue rising in the developing countries like India where number of educated people exponentially increasing, but jobs are not being created accordingly. Engineering graduates are in the worst situations despite of having adequate technical know-how of the different processes. The present study attempted to find out the most contributing educational institutions among public and private technical institutes where undergraduates' entrepreneurial characteristics, attitude and self-employment intention are being examined. The author incorporated stratified random sampling and collected 1000 usable responses for data analysis. The results explained that public/government educational institutes possess more encouraging and entrepreneurial culture in terms of undergraduates' entrepreneurial characteristics, attitude and self-employment intention as compare to private technical institutes.

## Acknowledgement

This study is a part of a research project funded by the Indian Council of Social Sciences Research (ICSSR), New Delhi, under the IMPRESS scheme (File no.: IMPRESS/ P42/ 85/ 18-19/ ICSSR dated 20.03.2019). The author sincerely acknowledges ICSSR, New Delhi, for providing resources for accomplishing the research work.

## References

- [1]. Ahmed, S.U. (1985). nach, risk taking propensity, locus of control and entrepreneurship. *Personality & Individual Differences*, 6(6), 781-782.
- [2]. Ajzen, I. (1987). Attitudes, traits, and actions: Dispositional prediction of behavior in personality and social psychology. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* 20(1), 1-63.
- [3]. Ajzen, I. (1987). Attitudes, traits, and actions: Dispositional prediction of behavior in personality and social psychology. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* 20(1), 1-63.
- [4]. Asenjo, MPF, & Barbera, JP (2013). Assessing the impact of higher education on entrepreneurial intention. *History and Social Communication*, 18(11), 377-386.
- [5]. Autio, E., H. Keeley, R., Klofsten, M., GC Parker, G., & Hay, M. (2001). Entrepreneurial intent among students in Scandinavia and in the USA. *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, 2(2), 145-160.
- [6]. Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (1988). On the evaluation of structural equation models. *Journal of the academy of marketing science*, 16(1), 74-94.
- [7]. Bakotic, D., & Kruzic, D. (2010). Students' perceptions and intentions towards entrepreneurship: The empirical findings from Croatia. *The Business Review, Cambridge*, 14(2), 209.
- [8]. Beetroot (2020). Planning and organising. Retrieved Date 05 February 2021 from <https://www.beetroot.com/graduate-jobs/careers-advice/planning-and-organising/#:~:text=to%20find%20out!,What%20is%20planning%20and%20organising%3F,your%20own%20tasks%20and%20ti me.>
- [9]. Bezzina, F. (2010). Characteristics of the Maltese entrepreneur. *International journal of arts and sciences*, 3(7), 292-312.
- [10]. Chaiken, S., & Stangor, C. (1987). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual review of psychology*, 38(1), 575-630.
- [11]. Chaudhary, A. (2018). Why it is important to create and foster entrepreneurial mindset in India's high school students. Retrieved Date 05 September 2018 from [https://yourstory.com/2018/02/entrepreneurship-mindset-high-school-students?utm\\_pageLoadtype=scroll](https://yourstory.com/2018/02/entrepreneurship-mindset-high-school-students?utm_pageLoadtype=scroll)
- [12]. Chell, E., 2008. *The Entrepreneurial Personality: A Social Construction*, 2nd ed. East Sussex: Routledge.
- [13]. Chen, C. C., Greene, P. G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of business venturing*, 13(4), 295-316.
- [14]. Davidsson, P. (1989). Entrepreneurship and after? A study of growth willingness in small firms. *Journal of business venturing*, 4(3), 211-226.
- [15]. Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2000). Entrepreneurship as a utility maximizing response. *Journal of business venturing*, 15(3), 231-251.
- [16]. Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2000). Entrepreneurship as a utility maximizing response. *Journal of business venturing*, 15(3), 231-251.
- [17]. Drennan, J., Kennedy, J., & Renfrow, P. (2005). Impact of childhood experiences on the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 6(4), 231-238.
- [18]. Fornell, C., & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobserved variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18 (1), 39-50.
- [19]. Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: International version*. New Jersey, Pearson.
- [20]. Ho, T. S., & Koh, H. C. (1992). Differences in psychological characteristics between entrepreneurially inclined and non-entrepreneurially inclined accounting graduates in Singapore. *Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Change: an international journal*, 1(2), 243-254.
- [21]. Ismail, N., Jaffar, N., & Hooi, T. S. (2013). Using EAO model to predict the self-employment intentions among the Universities' Undergraduates in Malaysia. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 4(5), 282.
- [22]. Katz, D., & Stotland, E. (1959). A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude structure and change. *Psychology: A study of a science*, 3(423-475).
- [23]. Kirton, M. (1978). Field dependence and adaption-innovation theories. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 47(3), 1239-1245. Drucker, P. F. (1985). Principles of successful innovation. *Research management*, 28(5), 10-12.
- [24]. Koh, H. C. (1995). Factors associated with entrepreneurial inclination: An empirical study of business undergraduates in Hong Kong. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 12(2), 29-41.
- [25]. Krueger, N. F., & Carsrud, A. L. (1993). Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 5(4), 315-330.

- [26]. Kuehn, K. W. (2008). Entrepreneurial intentions research: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 11, 87.
- [27]. Lefton, L. A. 1985. *Psychology*. Third Edition. Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Massachusetts.
- [28]. Luthje, C., & Franke, N. (2003). The 'making' of an entrepreneur: testing a model of entrepreneurial intent among engineering students at MIT. *R&D Management*, 33(2), 135-147.
- [29]. Miner, J. B., Smith, N. R., & Bracker, J. S. (1989). Role of entrepreneurial task motivation in the growth of technologically innovative firms. *Journal of applied psychology*, 74(4), 554.
- [30]. Moraes, G. H. S. M. D., Iizuka, E. S., & Pedro, M. (2018). Effects of entrepreneurial characteristics and university environment on entrepreneurial intention. *Contemporary Administration Magazine*, 22(2), 226-248.
- [31]. Moriano, J. A., Gorgievski, M., Laguna, M., Stephan, U., & Zarafshani, K. (2012). A cross-cultural approach to understanding entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of career development*, 39(2), 162-185.
- [32]. Nabi, G., Liñán, F., Iakovleva, T., Kolvereid, L., & Stephan, U. (2011). Entrepreneurial intentions in developing and developed countries. *Education+ Training*, 53 (5), 353-370.
- [33]. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). An overview of psychological measurement. *Clinical diagnosis of mental disorders*, 97-146.
- [34]. Olson, P. D., & Bosserman, D. A. (1984). Attributes of the entrepreneurial type. *Business Horizons*, 27(3), 53-56.
- [35]. Rasheed, H. S., & Rasheed, B. Y. (2003). Developing entrepreneurial characteristics in minority youth: The effects of education and enterprise experience. In *Ethnic entrepreneurship: Structure and process*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- [36]. Robinson, P. B., Stimpson, D. V., Huefner, J. C., & Hunt, H. K. (1991). An attitude approach to the prediction of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 15(4), 13-32.
- [37]. Rocha, E. L. C., & Freitas, A. A. F. (2014). Evaluation of entrepreneurship teaching among university students through the entrepreneurial profile. *Contemporary Administration Magazine*, 18 (4), 465-486.
- [38]. Rosenberg, M. J., Hovland, C. I., McGuire, W. J., Abelson, R. P., & Brehm, J. W. (1960). Attitude organization and change: An analysis of consistency among attitude components. (*Yales studies in attitude and communication.*), 3.
- [39]. Schmidt, S., & Bohnenberger, M. C. (2009). Entrepreneurial profile and organizational performance. *Contemporary Administration Magazine*, 13 (3), 450-467.
- [40]. Shane, S. (1996). Explaining variation in rates of entrepreneurship in the United States: 1899-1988. *Journal of Management*, 22(5), 747-781.
- [41]. Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business venturing*, 22(4), 566-591.
- [42]. Stanley Budner, N. Y. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable I. *Journal of personality*, 30(1), 29-50.
- [43]. Taormina, R. J., & Lao, S. K. M. (2007). Measuring Chinese entrepreneurial motivation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. 13 (4), 200-21.
- [44]. Tkachev, A., & Kolvereid, L. (1999). Self-employment intentions among Russian students. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 11(3), 269-280.
- [45]. Van Gelderen, M., Brand, M., Van Praag, M., Bodewes, W., Poutsma, E., & Van Gils, A. (2008). Explaining entrepreneurial intentions by means of the theory of planned behaviour. *Career development international*. 13(6), 538-559.
- [46]. Veciana, J. M., Aponte, M., & Urbano, D. (2005). University students' attitudes towards entrepreneurship: A two countries comparison. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1(2), 165-182.
- [47]. Wang, C. K., & Wong, P. K. (2004). Entrepreneurial interest of university students in Singapore. *Technovation*, 24(2), 163-172.
- [48]. Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1265-1272.

Dr. Pushkar Dubey. "Entrepreneurial Characteristics, Attitude and Self-Employment Intention: A Study of Public and Private Technical Institutes' Undergraduates." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 24(01), 2022, pp. 21-30.