



The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2023

Editor-in-Chief – Prof. (Dr.) Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT: A CASE STUDY OF KENDRAPARA DISTRICT, ODISHA

Dr. Surendra Kumar Mallick, Asst. Professor in Commerce, Brahmani College, Kendrapara

ABSTRACT

The study is based on entrepreneurship development in agriculture among farmers in Kendrapara district, Odisha state. Sixty households' entrepreneurs were selected using multistage random sampling techniques. Well-structured Questionnaire is the main tool for data collection. The analysis of data was done by using percentage analysis. Rationale proportion of farmer's identified personal intention, wanting autonomy and displacement in life as the key drive entrepreneurship development in the area. Entrepreneurship enterprise have been invaluable to farmers in the area. However farmers complained of poor access to entrepreneurship information inadequate startup capital and lack of marketing facilities in the area. Despite this short coming farmers perceived their extent to entrepreneurship drive and participation has been high. It was therefore recommended that effective and adequate Entrepreneurship Policies and Programme should be develop for farmers while urgently addressing the negative factors that hinder its growth and development in the study area. Fostering entrepreneurship education at all levels to ensure capacity building for diverse enterprises in agriculture. Ultimately government at all levels and private sector support fund in necessary to enhance entrepreneurship spirit and development among farmers in the area beyond. This study is based on both primary and secondary source.

Keywords

Entrepreneurship, Development, Entrepreneurship Drive, Participation, Farming activities, Barriers.

Introduction

The term entrepreneurship, entrepreneur and entrepreneur have acquired special significance in the context of economic growth in a rapidly changing social – economic and socio – cultural climates, particularly in industry developed and developing country. Entrepreneurial development in a complex phenomenon. Productive actually undertaken by him/her and constant endeavor to sustain improve it are the outward expression of this process of development of his personality. **Drucker** suggest that, “An entrepreneur is one who always search for change, responds to it as an opportunizing. Entrepreneurs innovate, innovation is a specific instrument of entrepreneurship”.

“A systematic innovation which consists in the purposeful and organised search for changes and it is the systematic analysis of the opportunities such changes right offer economic and social innovations”. – **Peter Drucker**.

So entrepreneurship is associated with innovative and dynamic development within the small, micro and medium enterprise (SMME) sector.

Significance of the study:

Entrepreneurship is often treated as an engine of economic growth. The main significance in the study area lies in assessing the level of entrepreneurial initiation can thrive. In Odisha, Kendrapara district we do not know farmers socio - economic farmers extents of entrepreneurship drive in agribusiness, farmers extent of intent to be involved agricultural production and factors that influence entrepreneurship in agribusiness enterprise in the study area. Constraints to entrepreneurship development drive in agribusiness enterprise are not known in the study area. So the question on entrepreneurship development in agriculture among farmers in Kendrapara districts, Odisha is still worthy of research. There is no empirical research available on entrepreneurship development in agriculture among the farmer in Kendrapara district, Odisha.

REVIEW OF LITRATURE

Ejaz Ghani, William R. Kerr, Stephen D. O'Connell May (2014) we quantify the link between the timing of state-level implementations of political reservations for women in India with the role of women in India's manufacturing sector. He measure and discuss the extent to which this heightened entrepreneurship is due to channels like greater finance access or heightened inspiration for women entrepreneurs.

Gerard McElwee, (2013) the role of the farmer in Europe is changing, as farmers have to develop new skills to be competitive. In a word, they need to become more entrepreneurial. Many of the skills associated with running a successful business are not necessarily skills that the farmer has. The paper presents a number of models, delineating these skills and provides initial definitions of farm entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial skills. Suggests that farmers do not systematically access Business Advice networks and that they are less likely to access opportunities because of limited business networks and feel farming is 'different'.

Jagannadha Pawan Tamvada (2008) Entrepreneurship literature (Parker 2004) has rarely considered spatial location as a micro-determinant of occupational choice, although there are compelling reasons to posit that spatial location influences economic behavior. The empirical analysis suggests the presence of spatial occupational neighborhoods and a clear north-south divide in self-employment choice in India when individuals of agricultural and nonagricultural sectors are considered together; however, such spatial patterns are less pronounced when individuals in nonagricultural alone are considered in the analysis. The results further suggest nonlinear relationships between age, wealth and the probable.

Georgellis, Yannis.; Wall, Howard J. (2006) this paper uses a panel approach to examine the effect that the government-policy environment has on the level of entrepreneurship. Specifically, the authors investigate whether marginal income tax rates and bankruptcy exemptions influence rates of entrepreneurship. Whereas previous work in the literature finds that both policies are positively related to entrepreneurship, these results show non-monotonic relationships: a U-shaped relationship between marginal tax rates and entrepreneurship and Sshaped relationship between bankruptcy exemptions and entrepreneurship.

Lakshmi Sha (2003) conducted a study to know the motivational factors of entrepreneurship. The author found that ambition may not alone make an entrepreneur. At times, the encouragement of family members, friends, EDPs etc., also facilitates the exercise of entrepreneurship.

Fendley, K.; Christenson, J. A. Superior, (1989) rural reflation is a term for a small-scalesocioeconomic approach to building liveable economies in both depressed rural communities and rapid growth areas. The research with public participation, informed leadership, and organizational entrepreneurship, leaders can help citizens develop their community's niche in the world economy.

H. Sadhak (1989) evaluated the socio-economic origins of first generation entrepreneurs who were defined as those who have first time taken entrepreneurship after independence. He found that nearly 70% of entrepreneurs were graduates and post graduates.

Research Gap:

It became necessary that the study is necessary to drive enterprise development in agriculture. Specially, the study identified the socio – economic feature of famous extent of entrepreneurship drive in agribusiness ascertained to extent of intent to be involved in agricultural production and identified constraints to entrepreneurship development drive in agribusiness in the area.

Objectives:

- (i) To study socio – economic characteristics of farmers.
- (ii) To study farmers entrepreneurship intent/drive in agribusiness.
- (iii) To study farmer's level of entrepreneurial drive in agribusiness.
- (iv) To study the barrier to entrepreneurship development drive in agribusiness.

Methodology:

The study was conducted in Kendrapara districts, State of Odisha. Kendrapara district was carved out establish Cuttack district on 1st April 1993. The district extends from 20^o, 21/ N 20^o, 47/ N latitude and from 86^o, 15/E Longitude on the Eastern Coast of Odisha. It is bounded by Bhadrak district on the north, Jajpur on the Northwest, Jagatsinghpur district on the south and Bay of Bengal on the east. It has an area 2644 Sq. Km.

The district comes under the East and South Eastern Coastal Plain agro climate Zone of Odisha and it is divided into four Agro – ecological regions viz: Coastal Irrigated Alluvial, Rain fed Alluvial, Coastal Alluvial Saline and Coastal Waterlogged tract.

Most point of the district is planning transferred by many rivers like Mahanadi, Birupa, Brahamni, Baitarani, Luna Paika, Chotroptala and the Gobari.

The district has three Principal types of social viz: deltaic alluvium, saline and sandy loam. Agriculture is the main occupation of the people: Paddy, Mung, Black grams, Sugarcanes, Jute and vegetables are the main crops. Besides, there is complete potential for diary, poultry fishery activities. There is no medium and large scale industry in the district. Handloom activation are take up in a limited seals. But different handicraft activation like: Golden Grass craft, Nalia Grass Craft, Terracotta worksand Bamboo Craft are take-up by the artisans. Due to time and cost constraints’ ten entrepreneur take-up were randomly selected to the sample size of sixty entrepreneur farmer for study. Primary and secondary data were used for study. Primary data collected for the study includes the socio – economic characteristic of farmers. Extent of entrepreneurship intent/drive in agribusiness into area, extent or intent to be involved in agricultural productions in the area and constraints to entrepreneurship development drive in the study area. Secondary data was obtained from social, reports, articles and website etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Socio-economic Characteristics of Farmers

Table 1: Socio-economic Characteristics of Farmers

| Age (years) | No. of farmers | Percentage (%) |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Less than 40 | 19 | 31.67 |
| 41-50 | 38 | 63.33 |
| 51-60 | 3 | 5.00 |
| Total | 60 | 100.00 |
| Gender | | |
| Male | 43 | 73.33 |

| | | |
|---|-----------|--------------|
| Female | 17 | 26.66 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |
| Educational Level (Years) | | |
| Non formal education | 6 | 10.00 |
| Primary | 16 | 26.67 |
| Secondary | 34 | 56.67 |
| Tertiary | 4 | 6.67 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |
| Marital Status | | |
| Married | 43 | 71.67 |
| Single | 14 | 23.33 |
| Widowed | 3 | 5.00 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |
| Farming Experience (Years) | | |
| Less than 10 | 15 | 25.00 |
| 11-19 | 31 | 51.67 |
| 20 and above | 14 | 23.33 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |
| Household Size (Number of Persons) | | |
| 1-5 | 32 | 53.33 |
| 6-10 | 28 | 46.67 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |
| Membership of Cooperative | | |
| Member | 51 | 85.00 |
| Non-member | 09 | 15.00 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |
| Average Income | | |

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------|
| Less than 30,000 | 2 | 3.33 |
| 30,000-60,000 | 9 | 15.00 |
| 61,001-90,000 | 16 | 26.67 |
| 91,001-120,000 | 32 | 53.33 |
| 120,001- 150,000 | 1 | 1.67 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |
| Farm size (Hectare) | | |
| Less than 1.0 | 14 | 23.33 |
| 1.0-2.0 | 41 | 68.33 |
| 2.1 and 2.5 | 5 | 8.33 |
| Total | 60 | 100.0 |

(Source: Primary Source)

Average age = 42.11years; Mean Educational level= 10.27 years; Average Farming Experience = 16.10 years; Mean Household size= 5.0 persons; Average Annual Income = ₹118, 392.00 (\$789.28); Average Farm Size= 1.61Ha

Table 1 displays the distribution of farmers by age. It revealed that majority (63.33%) of the farmers fell within the age range of 41-50 years, about 31.67% fell within the age range of less than 40 years while simple proportion (5.00%) fell within the age range of 51-60 years. The mean age was 42.11years. Since most of the farmers are in their productive and economic ages this could play a vital role in easy adoption of entrepreneurship skills in agribusiness in the area.

The distribution of farmers according to gender is also compiled in Table 1. It showed majority (73.33%) of the farmers are males while approximately 26.66% were females. This implies that both genders are involved in agribusiness production in the area but male have greater proportion. This could be attributed to the traditional right of dominance the males have over females on issues like land acquisition and other production factors. Also, having more males in the agribusiness offers a bright hope for entrepreneurship development since men tend to be more ready to undertake some energy and risk demanding ventures of agribusiness enterprises. The distribution of farmers by educational level is also reported in Table 1. It revealed that more

than half (56.67%) of the farmers had secondary education, about 26.67% had primary education, approximately 10.00% had no formal education while the remaining 6.67% had no formal education. The mean educational level was 10.27 years. The result implies that approximately 80.00% of the farmers had trainings in formal education institutions which no doubt increases their literacy levels. The findings signified that the farmers have adequate educational background that is relevant for adoption of innovations and skills in entrepreneurship development. It is expected that the higher level of education will contribute significantly to decision making of a farmer for entrepreneurship development. Entries in Table 1 also show the distribution of farmers by marital status. It indicates that majority (71.67%) of the farmers were married, (23.33%) were single while (5.00%) were widowed. This implies that the farmers who were engaged in farming enterprises in the area have a relatively large household size that formed bulk of the farm labour demand of the households. The distribution of farmers according to their farming experience is also addressed in Table 1. It revealed that majority (51.67%) of the farmers had 20 years and above of farming experience, 25.00% had less than 10 years of farming experience while 23.33% had 11-19 years of farming experience in agribusiness in the area. The mean farming experience was 16.11 years. The study implies farmers in the area have a relatively high farming experience which would enhance easy adoption of innovations and skills for entrepreneurship development. The distribution of farmers according to their household size is also seen in Table 1. It shows that majority (53.33%) of the farmers had household size of 6-10 persons while about 46.67% had household size of 1-5 persons. The mean household size was 5 persons. This implies that farmers in the study area have a large household size. The distribution of farmers according to their membership of cooperative society is reported in Table 1. It revealed that majority (85.00%) of the farmers in the area are member of cooperative while about 15.00% of the farmers do not belong to cooperative society. It is expected that membership of cooperative society will enhance farmers participation in entrepreneurial activities in agriculture in the area. The distribution of farmers according to their average annual farm income is shown in Table 1. It revealed that majority (53.33%) of the farmers in the study area have an average farm income between ₹1,00,000-1,20,000, about 26.67% had an average farm income between ₹61,000-90,000, approximately 15.00% had an average of ₹30,000-60,000, while about the remake% 3.33% and

1.67% have an average farm income of less than ₹30,000 and ₹120,001 – ₹150,000 respectively. The mean monthly farm income was ₹118,392.00 (₹789.28). The result implied that the farmers are low income earners in spite of large family size they supported. Farmers with higher farm income would easily be involved in entrepreneur activities than those of their counterpart who have poor farm income. Farm size distribution of the farmers is also complied in Table 1. It indicates that larger proportion (68.33%) of the farmers in the study area had a farm size of between 1.0-2.0 hectares, about 23.33% had a farm size of less than 1.0 hectare, while approximately 8.33% had farm size of 2.1-2.5 hectares. The mean farm size was 1.61 hectares. The findings implies that farmers in the area are mainly smallholders operating on less than or equal to 2.0 hectares of farmland. This could be as a result of land tenure system or due to the increasing population predominate in the area. However, high level of farm size is a very important component of entrepreneurial success. Researcher asserted that large farm size increases agricultural productivity and improves farmers technical, allocative and resource use efficiency. Hence large farm size is a positive variable for entrepreneurship development in agribusiness in the study area.

Entrepreneurship Intent/Drive in Agribusiness

Table 2: Entrepreneurship Drive in Agribusiness

| Drive for Entrepreneurship | No. of Farmers | Percentage (%) |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| Personal intension | 57 | 95.00 |
| Wanting autonomy | 55 | 91.67 |
| Unstable income | 51 | 85.00 |
| Displacement/disruption in life | 46 | 76.67 |
| Self-realization | 43 | 71.67 |
| Access to good source of fund | 40 | 66.66 |
| Cooperative society support for entrepreneurs | 38 | 63.33 |
| Access to huge labour | 35 | 58.33 |

| | | |
|---|----|-------|
| Distance between home location and market area | 31 | 51.66 |
| Entrepreneurship experience/training agribusiness | 30 | 50.00 |
| Rural location | 24 | 40.00 |
| Propensity for risk-taking | 22 | 36.66 |
| Entrepreneurial opportunity | 19 | 31.66 |
| Debt | 18 | 30.00 |
| Access to farmland | 16 | 26.66 |
| Encouraging enabling environment | 14 | 23.33 |
| Government support for entrepreneurs | 11 | 18.33 |
| Access encouraging entrepreneurial information | 08 | 13.33 |

(Source: Primary data)

Entries in Table 2 revealed farmers entrepreneurship intent/drive in agribusiness in the study area. The entrepreneurship drive in agribusiness for this study were based on asking farmers about their perceptions on entrepreneurship and what drives them to pursue entrepreneurial activities. The various drive in agribusiness that farmers reported may be profit/economic driven, rather than entrepreneurial driven. Regardless of this dearth in knowledge, the study assumed that farmers actions were purely based on entrepreneurship driven rather than profit/economic driven in the study area. The findings revealed that personal intension, wanting autonomy, unstable income, displacement/disruption in life, self-realization, access to good source of fund, cooperative society support for entrepreneurs, access to huge labour, distance between home location and market area, and entrepreneurship experience/training in agribusiness were the most commonly entrepreneurial drive in agribusiness in the study as 95.00%, 91.67%,85.00%, 76.67%, 71.67%, 66.66%, 63.33%, 58.33%, 51.66% and 50.00% of the farmers in the area respectively identified it. The positive identification of all the above drives may be attributed to the need for self-realization, experience

in entrepreneurial activities, training in entrepreneurial activities, good home location, access to substantial source of fund and little or no distance between home location and market area which could enhance positive decision to pick up entrepreneurial enterprise in agribusiness in the study area.

The implication of the finding is that increase in the above drive would automatically increase farmers' entrepreneurial drive in agribusiness in the study area. However, propensity for risktaking, entrepreneurial opportunity, debt, access to farmland, encouraging enabling environment, government support for entrepreneurs and access, encouraging entrepreneurial information were poorly rated in the study area. The negative identification of all the above drives may be attributed to poor access to farmland, poor entrepreneurial opportunity, poor government support, poor information, long distance between home location and market area as well as dearth in research on entrepreneurship development. Ultimately, there is no doubt that all the drive farmers identified are key determinant of sustainable entrepreneurial development in agribusiness. Increase the most rated drives would promote self-realization; sustain agricultural production, enhance food security as well as alleviate rural poverty in the area and maybe beyond.

Extent/Level of Entrepreneurship Intent/Drive in Agribusiness

Table 3 Distribution of Farmers Level of Entrepreneurship Drive in Agribusiness

| Perceptions levels | No. of farmers | Mean (X) | Remark |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Highly (3) | 51 | 2.55 | Accepted |
| Moderately (2) | 6 | 0.20 | Not accepted |
| Fairly (1) | 3 | 0.05 | Not accepted |
| Total/Grand Mean (X) | 60 | 2.80 | Accepted |

(Source: Primary)

As shown in Table 3, it indicates farmers level of entrepreneurial intent/drive in agribusiness in the study area. The levels of entrepreneurial drive in agribusiness for this study were based on asking farmers about their perceptions on their various rate of adoption of entrepreneurship behaviour in agribusiness. The assessments were rated in a three point likert scale of highly (3),

moderately (2) and low (1). Larger means of the farmers in the area perceived their extent of entrepreneurship drive as been high ($X=2.55$), about ($X=0.20$) reported of been moderate in adoption of entrepreneurship behaviour in agribusiness, while a simple mean ($X=0.20$) of the farmers identified been fair in adoption of entrepreneurship behaviour in agribusiness in the area. The result shows that in spite of the poor enabling environment for entrepreneurial activities in the area, farmers still adopt entrepreneurial activities. The finding shows a greater hope for entrepreneurship development in the area. The implication of the findings is that when there is adequate enabling environment, good government and private sector support to these farmers, entrepreneurship spirit will sprout out in the area while problem of food security and rural poverty would be addressed.

Barriers to Entrepreneurship Development Drive in Agribusiness

Table 4: Distribution of Barriers to Entrepreneurship Development Drive in Agribusiness

| Barriers | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--|------------------|-----------------------|
| Poor access to entrepreneurship information | 57 | 95.00 |
| Limited availability of farmland | 55 | 91.67 |
| Poor experience/training in entrepreneurship development | 51 | 85.00 |
| Long distance between home area and market area | 48 | 80.00 |
| Poor access to capital | 45 | 75.00 |
| Poor government support for entrepreneurs | 43 | 71.67 |
| Inability to cope with the task of entrepreneurship | 42 | 70.00 |
| Poor enabling environment | 39 | 65.00 |
| Poor road network | 35 | 58.33 |
| Poor managerial skills | 33 | 55.00 |
| Inability to withstand competition | 32 | 53.33 |
| Poor access to agricultural infrastructures | 25 | 41.66 |

| | | |
|---|----|-------|
| Poor government policies on entrepreneurial development | 20 | 33.33 |
| Poor access to market information | 13 | 21.66 |

(Source: Primary)

Table 4 showed the barriers to entrepreneurship development drive in agribusiness. About 95.00% of the farmers identified poor access to entrepreneurship information in agribusiness. Lack of information could be attributed to dearth in research on entrepreneurship development in agribusiness, poor information dissemination on the part of the government/private information agencies on entrepreneurship building in the study area and the country at large. Poor knowledge on appropriate entrepreneurship skills and development in agribusiness left most of the farmers unaware of better skills to choose in entrepreneurship for agribusiness. Approximately 91.67% of the farmers complained of limited availability of farmland. This could be attributed to land tenure system which is prevalent in the study area as well as the increasing population.

The implication of the findings is that farmers may have the entrepreneurship spirit but limited availability of farmland would continue to be a discouraging factor. About 85.00% of the farmers complained of poor experience/training in entrepreneurship development. Approximately 80.00% of the farmers identified long distance between home area and market area. 75.00% complained of poor access to capital. About 71.67% of the farmers identified poor government support for entrepreneurs. Approximately, 70.00% complained of Inability to cope with the task of entrepreneurship, while 65.00% identified poor enabling environment. Poor experience/training in entrepreneurship development, long distance between home area and market area, poor access to capital, poor government support for entrepreneurs, inability to cope with the task of entrepreneurship and poor enabling environment has been the bane of poor entrepreneurship spirit and development among prospective entrepreneurs. Others, 58.33%, 55.00%, 53.33%, 41.66%, 33.33% and 21.66% complained of poor road network, poor managerial skills, inability to withstand competition, poor access to agricultural infrastructures, poor government policies on entrepreneurial development and poor access to market information respectively. Barrier to entrepreneurs are poor management skills of farmers, lack

of entrepreneurial spirit, limited access to business support, farm tenancy agreements and regulation. They concluded that these barriers will differ for different farms depending on the personal and business characteristics of the individual farm and farmer. From the finding, there is no doubt that these barriers are responsible for poor entrepreneurial spirit of farmers in the area. Critically addressing these barriers will be important in achieving positive spirit for farmers entrepreneurship development in agribusiness, boost food security and reduce incidence of poverty in the area and maybe beyond.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The study was on entrepreneurship development in agriculture among farmers of Kendrapara district Odisha. Sixty households' entrepreneurs were selected using multi-stage random sampling techniques. Reasonable proportion of the farmers identified personal intension, wanting autonomy and displacement/disruption in life as the key drive to entrepreneurship development in the area. Entrepreneurship enterprises have been invaluable to farmers in the area. However, farmers complained of poor access to entrepreneurship information, inadequate start-up capital and long distance between farms and market in the area. Despite this shortcomings farmers perceived their extent of entrepreneurship drive and participation as been high ($X=2.55$). It was therefore recommended that:

- i. Effective and adequate entrepreneurship policies and programmes should be developed for farmers while urgently addressing the negative factors that hinder its growth and development in the area.
- ii. Fostering entrepreneurship education at all levels to ensure capacity building for diverse enterprises in agriculture was also advocated.
- iii. Effective and adequate entrepreneurship policies and programmes for farmers while addressing factors that hinder its growth and development as a way of actualising the current transformation agenda of the present government of India on poverty eradication through farming activities.
- iv. Government at all levels and private's support fund is necessary to enhance entrepreneurship spirit and development among farmers in the area and beyond.

- v. Extension agents in the state should be properly trained and provided with all necessary technological packages required to teach and guide farmers on entrepreneurship development.

REFERENCES

1. Agrawal, H.N, "Foreign Collaborations and Capital Inflows in India: Emerging trends and implications", *The Indian Journal of Commerce*, Vol. 191, Part II, June 1997.
2. Ali ki lian, Mohd. Akbar, (1993), "CRISIL Rating in India – A new financial service in capital market", *Finance India*, Vol. VII, No. 3.
3. Ejaz Ghani, William R. Kerr; Stephen, D. O'Connell. (May 2014). Political Reservations and Women's Entrepreneurship in India. *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 55-61.
4. Fendley, K. Christenson; J.A. Superior. (1989). Rural Reflation: An Idea for Community Development. *Journal of the Community Development Society*. vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 103-115.
5. Gatewood, E.; Hoy, F. Superior. (1989). Functionalist vs. Conflict Theories: Entrepreneurship Disrupts the Power Structure in a Small Southern Community. *Journal of the Community Development Society*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 70-83.
6. Gerard, McElwee. (2013). Working Paper- *The Enterprising Farmer: A Review of Entrepreneurship in Agriculture*. Lincoln Business School, University of Lincoln.
7. K.V.S.M., Krishna; K. Anand Singh. (March 1994). Agricultural Entrepreneurship: The Concept and Evidence. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 97-111.
8. Arora, Ashok Kumar, (2011), *Financing of small Scale Industries*, Deep & Deep Publishers, New Delhi.
9. Bhatnagar, Bhawana (2009), *Entrepreneurship Development and Small Business Management*, VAYU Education of India, New Delhi, India.
10. Badhai, B. (2011-12), *Entrepreneurship Development*, Dhanpat Rai & Company (P) Ltd. New Delhi, India.
11. Bala, Sashi, *Management of small Scale Industries*, Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi, India.

12. Balkrishnan, G, (2013), *Financing of small Scale Industry India*, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi.
13. Batra, G.S & Dangwal, R.C, *Entrepreneurship and small Scale Industries*, (New Publishers) By Deep & Deep Publishing Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
14. De. Wolf, P. & Schoorlemmer, H., (2007) *Exploring the Significance of Entrepreneurship in Agriculture*, Research Institute of Organic Agriculture FiBL, Frick, Switzerland.
15. Desai, Vasant (2011), *Entrepreneurship Development: A New Venture Creation*, Himalaya Publishing House Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai, India.
16. Dutt, Rudra & Sundaram, K.P.M, (2013), *Indian Economy published*, S. Chand & Company Ltd. Ram Nagar, New Delhi.
17. Gupta, C.B & Srinivasan, N.P, (2000), *Entrepreneurial Development*, Published by S. Chand & Sons, New Delhi.
18. Hisrich, Robert D., Peters Micael P. & Shepherd Dean A. (2007), *Entrepreneurship*, TATA McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi, India.
19. Holt, David H. (2009), *Entrepreneurship Development: A New Venture Creation*, PHI Learning Private Limited, New Delhi, India.
20. Breen, J.P. (2004) 'Enterprise, entrepreneurship and small business: where are the Boundaries?', *Int. J. Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 1, Nos. 1/2, pp.21–34.
21. <http://www.mofpi.nic.in/venturesetup/foreign>.
22. www.apeda.com/
23. www.ciionline.org

