

What Determines The Entrepreneurial Propensity? A Study on the Adivasi Entrepreneurs in Assam

Binita Topno, Dr. Ricky A. J. Syngkon

Research Scholar, Department of Commerce North Eastern Hill University (N.E.H.U.), Shillong, Meghalaya - 793022.

Assistant Professor Department of Commerce North Eastern Hill University (N.E.H.U.), Shillong, Meghalaya - 793022.

ABSTRACT: Numerous literature have recognized entrepreneurial development as not only an approach to solve the problem of unemployment but also a means to climb the economic ladder and walk out of poverty within many communities. But there is little research explaining the factors determining the entrepreneurial propensity of an individual in context of a specific community. The study focuses on Adivasi community who is economically backward and was originally brought to Assam by British as indentured worker for the tea industry, from other parts of India towards the middle of nineteenth century. With a gradual display of entrepreneurial activities within the community, the study aims to examine the factors that determine the entrepreneurial propensity among the entrepreneurs. A sample size of 120 entrepreneurs were selected through snow ball sampling method and interviewed with the help of a structured schedule. The findings show that marital status, entrepreneurs' age and religion among the demographic factors have significant effect on the entrepreneurial propensity. On the other hand problems of the entrepreneurs among the socio-economic factors determine the entrepreneurial propensity of Adivasi entrepreneurs. It extends that the demographic factors have better potential to explain the entrepreneurial drive among the Adivasi comparative to socio-economic factors.

KEY WORDS: Entrepreneurship, Adivasi, propensity, enterprise, determinants, community.

Date of Submission: 18-01-2020

Date of Acceptance: 06-02-2020

I. INTRODUCTION:

A wide variety of literatures have recognized entrepreneurial development as not only a means to solve the problem of economic development but also a way to solve the unemployment problem and unbalanced area development. The entrepreneurial development depends on an individual's intention and initiative to create a viable business and there are number of factors that intrude into the decision making process. Very often entrepreneurship is defined by the attributes related to the personality of an entrepreneur shaped socially and psychologically (McClelland, 1961; Shapero, 1975; Bird, 1988; Ajzen, 1991; Finlay, 1994).

With respect to community development, the literature depicts certain group of people in India as entrepreneurial communities such as Marwaris, Gujratis and Bengalis who with their entrepreneurial activities climbed the economic ladder (Kalmins & Chung, 2006; Iyer & Schoar, 2008; Gupta, n.d.). In the light of developing an unbalanced area, an attempt has been made to study a group of people called Adivasis (Munda, Oraon, Kharia and Santhal Tribes) who are economically backward and comprises a significant part of the population of Assam as tea plantation labours. They were originally brought to Assam by British as indentured worker from other parts of India towards the middle of nineteenth century (Chatterjee & Gupta, 1981; Bhowmik, 1985; Palatty, 2006). They worked as bonded labours in the tea gardens of Assam. It has been more than a century and it is observed that they are conscious, educated and showing some entrepreneurial activities by taking up businesses in different areas. But the drivers that propel them to take up entrepreneurship are yet to be discovered. So an attempt has been made to contribute to the literature of entrepreneurship, considering a backward community within India, through this study.

The study aims to examine the determinants that contribute to entrepreneurial propensity among the Adivasi entrepreneurs and at the same time, attempts to verify the validity of the various demographic and socio-economic factors in determining the entrepreneurial propensity in Assam.

The article is organized as follows. Firstly, it provides a review of literature; secondly, the research methodology; thirdly, the empirical model; fourthly, the results and finally the conclusion and implications.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW:

Extensive literature on entrepreneurship reveals that there are various factors that contribute to the growth of entrepreneurship across the world. These factors are demographic, economic, socio-cultural, psychological, political and legal. But this study basically focuses on the demographic and socio-economic factors in order to better portray role of these factors in explaining the entrepreneurial inclinations.

Demographic factors:

Demographic factors play an important role in entrepreneurship. Various researchers have been using different variables like gender, age, education, marital status, nationality, years of residence etc. for explaining entrepreneurship, and their findings present a mixed picture.

The importance of *education* in entrepreneurship cannot be ignored. Individual across the world converts their educational attainments into occupational prestige which often leads to entrepreneurship. It is often perceived that entrepreneurship is associated with high status in society and individual with good amount of formal education enters into entrepreneurship because of higher earnings (Koo, 1976). In fact, education enhances employee earnings and raises the probability of self employment (Rees & Shah, 1986) emphasizing a positive relationship between education and entrepreneurship (Borjas, 1986; Li, 2001; Fairlie & Robb, 2006). Contradicting the findings, education also displays a negative relationship indicating an advantage in occupational opportunities outside self employment among the highly educated ones (Fernandez & Kim, 1998; Hammarstedt, 2004).

In Indian context, Oommen (1981) supports the notion that qualified people is better able to comprehend conditions and make his own independent assessment. Likewise Srivastava (2008) finds highly educated respondents to be high on entrepreneurial propensity. Nonetheless, Panda (2000) finds higher education to be negatively associated with entrepreneurial success while Panda (2002) finds no significant association between education and entrepreneurial success.

There is a wide difference in entrepreneurial behaviour across gender. *Gender* is an important determinant which influences the propensity towards entrepreneurship. Waldinger & Gilbertson (1994) studied immigrants' progress in the U.S. which reveals that women have lower occupational ranking than men and that male are proportionally more likely to be engaged in self employed small business than females (Fernandez & Kim, 1998; Li, 2001; Hammarstedt, 2004).

Contrary to the above findings, Mitchell (2004), Harvey (2005) and Minniti & Nardone (2007) views that there is no gender differences in terms of probability to start a business except a divergence in their choice, perceptions and motivations.

In case of the determinant of the choice between entrepreneurship and non- entrepreneurship, *marital status* plays a vital role. Borjas (1986) in determining the self-employment rates finds that married men have higher self-employment rates due to the fact that the family owned business have an advantage over other firms in solving shirking problems. Additionally, where the wife is working, the family is more prosperous and financially secured and this in turn provides a spring board for the husband to enter into entrepreneurship (Borooah & Hart 1999). On the other hand Constant & Zimmermann (2006) with an attempt to find the channel to become self-employed uncover that marriage and children are significant determinants of self-employment. Married men are more likely to choose the self-employment but those having young children are less likely to choose self-employment.

Duration of residence is another important determinant of entrepreneurship particularly for immigrant entrepreneurship. Studies reveal that it has a strong positive relationship with the rate of entrepreneurship. Borjas (1986), Li (2001) and Hammarstedt (2004) conducted different researches in different countries - U.S, Canada and Sweden respectively and all the researchers strongly support that duration of residence in a particular country increases the rate of entrepreneurship. This is in fact true because entrepreneurship requires large finance and the number of years since migration enables immigrants to mobilize financial resources that are necessary to establish business and moreover it provides a platform to have a better knowledge of the market.

Socio-economic factors:

In an increasingly global economy, entrepreneurs play a vital role in accelerating growth because they create organizations that yields new job, increases trade and accelerate the generation, dissemination and application of innovative ideas. There are extensive researches based on socio-economic perspective. Many researchers have tried to find the relationship between entrepreneurship and employment, entrepreneurship and earnings, while some between entrepreneurship and tax rate and so forth. All these variable acts as a push and pull factors in different scenario.

Entrepreneurship as an *employment* opportunity has been reflected by many researchers. Meager (1992) finds that in dependent employment, high and increasing levels of unemployment (in UK during 1983-

86), reflects a lack of employment opportunity which became a push factor for entry into entrepreneurship for people who are losing their jobs and those who have already lost theirs. Praag & Ophem (1995) while studying the effect of opportunity and willingness on becoming entrepreneurs suggest that opportunity for entrepreneurship which is largely determined by capital requirements is affected by regional unemployment rate, which again acts as a push factor. Therefore, indicating a negative association between unemployment and entrepreneurship. Thus, unemployment in many countries has been a push factor for many to enter into entrepreneurship which in turn leads to an increase in employment rate. On the other hand, Folster (2000) asserts that entrepreneurship has a positive effect on the employment. The findings are consistent with the study of Georarakos & Tatsiramos (2009) with regard to US.

The probability of taking up entrepreneurship also depends positively on the *earning* differences between self-employed and paid employment. However, there is very little difference between the average earnings of the self-employed and the salary workers. Yet it is being strongly supported by Rees & Shah (1986); Wit & Widen (1989) and Hammarstedt (2004). Opposing the mentioned studies, Portes & Zhou (1996) portrays a positive effect for the groups with lower earning level in U.S. But it has a negative effect for high average earners. In fact, it seems that entrepreneurs on traditional line of business earn comparatively less than the high yielding skill intensive services Bates (1999).

Fluctuations in the *tax rates* have always influenced the rate of entrepreneurship across the world. Both Blau (1987) and Yuengert (1995) explained high entrepreneurship rate in the U.S. where higher marginal tax rates have a positive effect on entrepreneurship because of greater opportunities for deductions and avoidance. At the same time, higher marginal tax rates at lower income levels have an opposite effect on entrepreneurship. On the other hand, Folster (2002) proved with the Granger causality test that lower taxes actually lead to increased entrepreneurship. This is due to the fact that people who are constrained in the labour market have greater incentive to take up entrepreneurship in O.E.C.D. (Organizations for Economic Co-operation and Development) countries. A review of literature clearly shows a mixed effect of tax rate on entrepreneurial propensity.

The above mentioned literature show diverse aspects of entrepreneurship and each aspect plays a significant role in enhancing and increasing our understanding regarding entrepreneurship across the world. This study attempts to verify the validity of the various demographic and socio-economic factors in determining the entrepreneurial propensity among the Adivasis in Assam.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

A survey was designed through which primary data was generated to build a database. Entrepreneurs (individuals who have already manifested their entrepreneurial propensity by establishing an enterprise) are regarded as the source of information to capture the entrepreneurial propensity which is conceptually an inclination or tendency or readiness to take up entrepreneurship. Individuals belonging to Munda, Oraon, Kharia and Santhal tribes only are defined as Adivasis for the operational purpose. The survey period covers from the year 2016 to 2018. It should be noted that in case of entrepreneurs, only the first generation entrepreneurs belonging to Adivasi community and having a live business establishment (manufacturing, trading or service) were taken into consideration.

Sampling unit:

An entrepreneur whose enterprise satisfies the following two characteristics is to be regarded as the sampling unit.

- i. The enterprise is promoted and managed by an Adivasi entrepreneur (Mundas, Santhals, Oraons and Kharia tribes only), who is involved in all stages of enterprise life cycle. Inherited enterprises are thus to be excluded.
- ii. The enterprise is existing for a minimum period of 2 years (demonstrating some sort of success).

Data Collection Design:

Data on the entrepreneurial propensity was captured by means of a schedule designed by the researcher following the integrated behavioural framework discussed by Gartner, (1988) and Balakrishnan, Gopakumar and Kanungo (1998). This framework is based on five key elements: personal resourcefulness (Mishra & Kumar, 2000), achievement orientation (McClelland, 1961; Shaver & Scott, 1991; Thomas & Muller, 2000), strategic visioning (Mitton, 1989; Kuratko & Hodgetts, 1989), opportunity seeking (Leibenstein, 1968) and innovativeness (Schumpeter, 1949). The schedule contained two parts, the first part covering the demographic and socio-economic aspect of the sample entrepreneurs and the second part captures the entrepreneurial propensity which is based on five- point Likert scale with suitable anchors. Each of the mentioned dimensions

contained six statements (positive and negative) to which the respondents had to specify their degree of agreement or disagreement on a symmetric strongly agree – strongly disagree scale.

The survey was accompanied by the interview method. The researcher interviewed all the sample entrepreneurs and obtained their response on the schedule. Each interview lasted for more than an hour and was supported by written notes on observation and other clues that were noticed during the interview. Further, it should be noted that the Adivasi entrepreneurs were selected through snow ball sampling which was purposive in nature. The research began with a known entrepreneur who was interviewed and at the end was asked if he/she could recommend any other entrepreneur. The total sample size is 120.

Dependent variable:

Entrepreneurial propensity, the dependent variable is a categorical variable measuring the degree of entrepreneurial inclinations of from very low to very high based on the mean scores of the respondents on the propensity scale as shown in table 1. The dependent variable is grouped into two categories. The respondents scoring up to 3.40, indicating very low to moderate entrepreneurial propensity is considered as group one and the score above 3.40 denotes high to very high entrepreneurial propensity, considered to be group two. The measure takes the value 1 if the respondents fall under group two and zero otherwise.

Table 1: Ranges for Entrepreneurial propensity

Mean Score	Propensity
1 – 1.80	Very Low
1.81 – 2.60	Low
2.61 – 3.40	Moderate
3.41 – 4.20	High
4.21 – 5.00	Very High

Independent variable:

Gender is a dummy variable that was assigned value 1 if the respondent was male and zero if the respondent was female.

Entrepreneurs' age is measured using age in years, which is grouped into five class intervals. Value 0 = 15-24 years age group; 1 = 25-34 years age group; 2 = 35-44 years age group; 3 = 45-54 years age group and 4 = 55 years and above age group. 2016 is considered to be the base year.

Marital status is a dummy variable that was given value 1 if the respondent was married and zero if the respondent was unmarried or single.

Number of family members is a grouped into three categories. The variable takes the value zero if the respondents have 2-5 family members; 1 if they have 6-10 members and 2 if they have 11 and above family members.

Religion is a dummy variable where the measure takes the value 1 if the respondent belongs to Christianity and zero if the respondent follows Hinduism.

Education is grouped into six categories. The value 0 is assigned to the respondents who are illiterate; 1 = respondents who could not clear the high school examination; 2 = respondents who have cleared the high school examination; 3 = respondents who completed the higher secondary education; 4 = respondents who are graduate; 5 = respondents who have post graduation and above.

Vocational training is a dummy variable which indicates whether the respondent has acquired any vocational training. The measure takes the value zero if the respondents are trained and 1 if the respondents are untrained.

Location is an independent variable where the measure takes the value zero if the respondents belong to tea garden; 1 if they belong to village and 2 if they belong to town.

Reasons for starting an enterprise is grouped into push and pull factors. The measure takes the value zero if the respondents emphasize the push factor and 1 if they emphasize the pull factors.

Financial support is an independent variable that was assigned value 1 if the respondents started their enterprise with the help of loan from banks, friends and relatives and 0 if they started enterprise with their own savings.

Enterprise age is grouped into four categories where value 0 = respondents whose enterprises were 2-9 years old; 1 = 10-17 years; 2 = 18-25 years and 3 = 25 years and above.

Investment is categorized in four groups where the value 0 is assigned to the respondent whose investment ranged from Rs. 50,000 to 2 lakhs; 1 = 2 – 3.5 lakhs; 2 = 3.5 – 5 lakhs and 3 = above 5 lakhs.

Time spent in the enterprise is a dummy variable where the measure takes the value 1 if the respondent is engaged in enterprise on full time basis and zero otherwise.

Problems is a dummy variable where the value 1 was assigned to respondent who were facing problems in the business and 0 to those who had no problems in managing the business.

Parents' occupation is a dummy variable that was assigned value 1 if the respondents' parents were non-salaried worker and zero if the respondents' parents were salaried worker.

Empirical model:

In order to estimate the effect of each of the demographic and socio-economic variable on the entrepreneurial propensity, a Logistic Regression model was adopted as the variables were qualitative in nature. Logistic regression model is used to model the dichotomous outcome variable (Entrepreneurial Propensity) by segregating it into two groups using a threshold value δ (3.40). Mathematically, let π be defined as, $\pi = P [EP \geq \delta]$, then a logit model can be written as,

$$\ln \left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \dots + \beta_k X_k$$

Where, $X_1 \dots X_k$ are various predictor and control variables of interest, $\beta_0 \dots \beta_k$ are the parameters to be estimated as the effects of the predictors, and β_0 is constant.

The study uses the following specific logit models:

$$\ln \left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Gen + \beta_2 Entp. Age + \beta_3 MS + \beta_4 FM + \beta_5 Reg + \beta_6 Ed + \beta_7 VT + \beta_8 Loc \quad \dots (Model 1)$$

$$\ln \left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi} \right) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 RSE + \beta_2 Fin + \beta_3 Ent. age + \beta_4 Inv + \beta_5 TS + \beta_6 Prob + \beta_7 PO \quad \dots (Model 2)$$

Where, Gen is the gender, Entp. Age is the entrepreneurs' age, MS is the marital status, FM stands for number of family members, Reg denotes religion, Ed is the education, VT is the vocational training, Loc is location, PO is parents' occupation, RSE is the reasons for starting an enterprise, Fin is the financial support, Ent. age is the enterprise age, Inv the investment, TS is the time spent in the enterprise and Prob denotes the problems of the entrepreneurs.

IV. RESULTS:

Association between demographic variables and entrepreneurial propensity:

The results of the model 1 are shown in the table 2. Pseudo R^2 , which indicates the approximate strength of the model, is considerable for the Adivasi entrepreneurs. Among the demographic variables the effect of the entrepreneurs' age [($p = 0.04$), ($p < 0.05$)] marital status [($p = 0.00$), ($p < 0.01$)] as well as the religion ($p = 0.10$) on the entrepreneurial propensity are statistically significant for the Adivasi entrepreneurs. It is worth noting that, with an increase in the age cohort of the entrepreneurs, we expect to see about 59 percent decrease in the odds of being in the class of high entrepreneurial propensity, indicating an inverse relationship. In other words we can interpret that the probability of having high entrepreneurial propensity decreases with the increase in age. Perhaps, it can be justified in two ways. Firstly, age is a crucial characteristic in the thinking process of the decision makers. The likelihood of being an entrepreneurs actually peaks at a comparatively early age and decrease thereafter. The young minds are more energetic, enthusiastic and have lower aversion to risk (Miller, 1984) compared to a matured mind. Secondly, it follows the theory of time allocation (Becker, 1965). Younger individuals have sufficient time to commit in activities which yields future returns. As they grow old, the opportunity cost of time increases as the span of life decreases. So the older individuals tries to achieve maximum in limited time and become less willing to invest time in activities that yields return in future or over time. As a result it is found that the entrepreneurial propensity is high among the young cohort. The result is consistent with the existing empirical literature showing a link between the demographic characteristics particularly age and an individual's decision to become an entrepreneur (Arenius & Minniti, 2005) or likely to start a new firm (Levesque & Minniti, 2006) or a probability of being a self-employed (Lin, Picot & Compton, 2000; Blanchflower, Oswald & Stutzer, 2001; Grilo & Irigoyen, 2006).

With respect to the marital status, the results indicate that the married respondents are about 19 percent more likely to have high entrepreneurial propensity. The findings of the study could be due to the following reasons. Most importantly, when a person is married, the responsibility of a family increases, as it has more mouth to feed. The sense of responsibility is so strong that it triggers the respondents to look for better means to make living. As a result majority of the respondent finds entrepreneurship a better end to financially secure their family. At the same time for some respondents marriage seems to be advantageous as it follows the theory of marriage (Becker, 1974) which is based on the division of labour. According to economic approach, an individual decides to marry when the utility expected from marriage exceeds the utility expected from remaining single. Marriage generally increases the tendency of a spouse to commit more in purposeful activities as the responsibilities are divided. Again, it is more advantageous when the human capital of a spouse could be productively utilized for the other spouse's benefit (Benham, 1974; Scully, 1979). For example, a male entrepreneur obtains more labour market benefits when his wife is well educated (Wong, 1986). Similarly, where a spouse is into paid employment, the family is steady, prosperous and financially more secured which provides the other partner a spring board either to embrace entrepreneurship or increases the affordability to continue the business venture due to less reliance on business income (Borooah & Hart, 1999; Lin, Picot & Compton, 2000). Further more, a family owned business has an advantage over other firms in solving problems

(Borjas, 1986). The finding also supports the results of Constant & Zimmermann (2006) which indicates a significant relationship between marriage and the probability to be self-employed. However, Blanchflower & Meyer (1994) finds an insignificant effect of marriage on probability of being self employed in case of Australia.

In terms of religion, the Hindu Adivasi entrepreneurs are 33 percent more likely to be in the class of high entrepreneurial propensity than the Christian Adivasi entrepreneurs. Perhaps, this could be due to the fact that different religion and religious institution have different impact on the tendency to become an entrepreneur (Dana, 2009; Zelekha, Avnimelech & Sharabi, 2013) which varies over time and social settings (Dodd & Gotsis, 2007). The observations suggest that the religious services and participation among the Christian Adivasi entrepreneurs were comparatively higher than the Hindu Adivasi entrepreneurs. According to the Secularization Model (theory of religion), adherence to religious activities involves opportunity cost (Barro & McCleary, 2003; Radmard, 2012), further it is a manifestation of fear and ignorance which hinders entrepreneurial tendencies. Thus Hindu Adivasi entrepreneurs being less inclined to religious participation, have more time to spend on productive activities which enhances their entrepreneurial tendencies. However, the result contradicts the findings of Audretsch & Meyer (2009).

Table 2: Logit Regression results of demographic variables and Entrepreneurial Propensity:

Demographic variables	Odds Ratio	Z Statistics	P value	Pseudo R ²
Gender	0.536	-1.17	0.244	
Entrepreneurs' age	0.599	-2.00	0.045	
Marital status	7.198	3.24	0.001	
No. of family members	0.980	-0.05	0.959	
Religion	0.335	-1.60	0.104	0.132
Education	1.271	1.26	0.206	
Vocational training	0.472	-1.31	0.190	
Location	1.011	0.04	0.970	

Note: Dependent variable (Entrepreneurial propensity) is converted into binary digits, N=120. Log likelihood = -64.351

Overall, the demographic variables are still convincing to explain the entrepreneurial inclinations among the respondents. Nevertheless, the variables like gender, number of family members, education, training, location and parents' occupation, seem to have no significant effect in determining the entrepreneurial propensity of the Adivasi entrepreneurs.

Association between socio-economic variables and entrepreneurial propensity:

With a glance in the results of model 2 depicted in table 3 with respect to the socio-economic variables, only problems ($p = 0.01$) seem to have a significant effect on the entrepreneurial propensity. It indicates that the entrepreneurs with problems are 3.2 times more likely to be in the class of high entrepreneurial propensity. Generally it is perceived that individuals learn more from failures than success and problems provide a base for learning. It is core to entrepreneurial process. In this complex and competitive environment entrepreneurs encounter and tackle number of problems to survive. They perceive problems as entrepreneurial challenge. Following Newell & Simon's (1972) theory of human problem solving, the main component of problem solving is the cognitive process of the solver who is immediately unaware of the series of actions to be performed and becomes more alert and look for opportunities (finding relevant information, choosing series of action to perform and application of knowledge through decision making) to overcome the obstacles and this is exactly what makes them an entrepreneur (Fischer et al., 2012). The result supports the findings of Stevenson & Jarillo (1990); Hsieh, Nickerson & Zenger (2007); Baggen et al. (2015) asserting that complex problem solving contributes to better opportunity identification (entrepreneurial tendency). However, the Pseudo R² is not that prominent for Adivasi entrepreneurs in case of socio-economic variables.

Table 3: Logit Regression results of Socio-economic variables and Entrepreneurial Propensity:

Socio-economic variables	Odds Ratio	Z Statistics	P value	Pseudo R ²
Reasons for starting an enterprise	1.222	0.46	0.644	
Financial support	1.122	0.26	0.794	
Enterprise age	1.335	1.40	0.161	
Investment	1.144	0.56	0.574	0.069
Time spent in the enterprise	0.899	-0.16	0.873	
Problems	3.209	2.63	0.009	
Parents occupation	0.873	-0.22	0.827	

Note: Dependent variable (Entrepreneurial propensity) is converted into binary digits, N=120. Log likelihood = -68.980.

Although the socio-economic variables have been placed a great importance in the entrepreneurship literature, yet the determinants such as reasons to start an enterprise, financial support, investment, enterprise age and time spent in the enterprise seem to be insignificant in influencing the entrepreneurial propensity of the Adivasi entrepreneurs.

V. CONCLUSION:

The study sets out to examine the factors that contribute to the entrepreneurial propensity among the Adivasis in Assam and in the process tries to verify the strength of the diverse demographic and socio-economic variables in explaining the entrepreneurial propensity. Building on prior extensive research on the characteristics of entrepreneur, a propensity scale (based on Likert's scale) was developed emphasising the integrated behavioural framework (personal resourcefulness, achievement orientation, strategic vision, opportunity seeking and innovativeness). Based on the threshold value δ of the propensity scale the entrepreneurial propensity (dependent variable) was segregated into two, forming a dichotomous variable. Thus, a logistic regression model was used to fulfill the purpose of the study.

The key determinants among the demographic factors that found to be significantly influencing the entrepreneurial propensity were the marital status, entrepreneur's age and religion. Interestingly, in contrast to the picture depicted in the wide literature on entrepreneurial intentions, the demographic factors such as gender, education, number of family members, location, professional training and parents' occupation were not highlighted as very important determinants in the study. Likewise, among the socio-economic variables, only the problems of the entrepreneurs contributed to the propensity whereas, the reasons to start an enterprise, financial support, enterprise age, investment and time spent in the enterprise seems to be less informative in explaining the entrepreneurial propensity among the Adivasis. Comparatively, demographic variables demonstrate to have a better potential in explaining the entrepreneurial propensity than the socio-economic variables in case of the Adivasi entrepreneurs in Assam.

While, many findings reported in the study are encouraging and attention-grabbing, the limitations of our study should be kept in mind. The findings of the study are restricted to the Adivasi entrepreneurs only. It is not known if the results hold true to non entrepreneurs of the community. Moreover, it cannot be generalized to entrepreneurs belonging to other communities in the same setting.

VI. IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH:

To the knowledge of the researchers, this research is one of the first studies to extend the descriptive investigation on the determinants of entrepreneurial propensity among the Adivasis of Assam. The study ruptures the general perception of lacking entrepreneurial drive among the Adivasis. By statistically testing the drivers of the entrepreneurial propensity, the study validates the predictive potential of demographic and socio-economic variables. This study has taken the first step to uncover the mystery of entrepreneurship within Adivasi community.

Second, the study is also among the first to apply the integrated behavioural framework (Balakrishnan, Gopakumar and Kanungo, 1998) in explaining the entrepreneurial propensity among the Adivasis in Assam. On the basis of findings of the study, it can be asserted that the framework can efficiently elucidate the behaviour towards entrepreneurial inclinations.

Finally, the study bridges the literature on Adivasi entrepreneurship. It provides a base for further studies within the community in the field of entrepreneurship. The study leaves a scope for future research by inculcating the cultural aspects in determining the entrepreneurial inclinations among the Adivasis. Moreover, there is a good potential for comparative studies between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs within the community as well as among entrepreneurs between two communities.

REFERENCES:

- [1]. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- [2]. Arenius, P. & Minniti, M. (2005). Perceptual variables and nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 24(3), 233-247.
- [3]. Audretsch, D.B. & Meyer, N.S. (2009). Religion, culture and entrepreneurship in India. *Paper presented at IPPAA 2009 International Public Affairs Conference*. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- [4]. Baggen, Y. Mainert, J. Lans, T. Biemans, H. J. A. Greiff, S. & Mulder, M. (2015). Linking complex problem solving to opportunity identification competence within the context of entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 34(4), 412-429.
- [5]. Balakrishnan, S., Gopakumar, K., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*. University Press.
- [6]. Barro, R. J. & McCleary, R.M. (2003). *Religion and economic growth*. NBER Working Paper 9682.
- [7]. Bates, T. (1999). Exiting self-employment: An analysis of Asian immigrant owned small businesses. *Small Business Economics*, 13(3), 171-183.
- [8]. Becker, G. (1965). A theory of the allocation of time. *Economic Journal*, 75, 493-517
- [9]. Becker, G. S. (1974). A theory of marriage. In T. W. Schultz (Ed.), *Economics of the Family*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [10]. Benham, L. (1974). Benefits of women's education within Marriage. In T. W. Schultz (Ed.), *Economics of the Family*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- [11]. Bhowmik, S. (1985). Plantation labour in North-East India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 20(13), 538-541.
- [12]. Bird, B. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. *The Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442-453.
- [13]. Blanchflower, D. G. & Meyer, B. D. (1994). A longitudinal analysis of the young self-employed in Australia and the United States. *Small Business Economics*, 16(1), 1-19.
- [14]. Blanchflower, D. G. Oswald, A. & Stutzer, A. (2001). Latent entrepreneurship across nations. *European Economic Review*, 45(4-6), 680-691.
- [15]. Blau, D. M. (1987). A time-series analysis of self-employment in the United States. *Journal of Political Economy*, 95(3), 445-467.
- [16]. Borjas, G. J. (1986). The self-employment experience of immigrants. *Journal of Human Resources*, 21(4), 485-506.
- [17]. Borooh, V. K. & Hart, M. (1999). Factors affecting self-employment among Indian and black Caribbean men in Britain. *Small Business Economics*, 13(2), 111-129.
- [18]. Chatterjee, S. & Gupta, R. D. (1981). Tea-labour in Assam: Recruitment and government policy, 1840-80. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 16(44), 1861-1868.
- [19]. Constant, A. & Zimmermann, K. F. (2006). The making of entrepreneurs in Germany: Are native men and immigrants alike?. *Small Business Economics*, 26, 279-300.
- [20]. Dana, L. P. (2009). Religion as an explanatory variable for entrepreneurship. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 10, 87-99.
- [21]. Dodd, S. D. & Gotsis, G. (2007). The interrelationship between entrepreneurship and religion. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 8(2), 93-104.
- [22]. Fairlie, R. W. & Robb, A. (2006). Families, human capital and small business: Evidence from the characteristics of business owners survey. *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, 60(2).
- [23]. Fernandez, M. & Kim, K. C. (1998). Self-Employment rates of Asian immigrants' groups: An analysis of intra group and inter group differences. *International Migration Review*, 32(3), 654-681.
- [24]. Finlay, J. S. (1994). The strategic visioning process. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 18(1), 64-74.
- [25]. Fischer, A. Greiff, S. & Funke, J. (2012). The process of solving complex problems. *The Journal of Problem Solving*, 4, 19-42.
- [26]. Folster, S. (2000). Do entrepreneurs create jobs?. *Small Business Economics*, 14(2), 137-148.
- [27]. Folster, S. (2002). Do lower taxes stimulate self-employment?. *Small Business Economics*, 19(2), 135-145.
- [28]. Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who is an entrepreneur" is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 13, 11-32.
- [29]. Georarakos, D. & Tatsiramos, K. (2009). Entrepreneurship and survival dynamics of immigrants of the U.S. and their descendants. *Labour Economics*, 16, 161-170.
- [30]. Grilo, I. & Irigoyen, J. M. (2006). Entrepreneurship in the EU: To wish and not to be. *Small Business Economics*, 26(4), 305-318.
- [31]. Gupta, A. (n.d). The culture of entrepreneurship. In B. Berger (Ed.), *Indian entrepreneurial culture: Bengal and eastern India* (pp. 104-141). California: ICS Press.
- [32]. Hammarstedt, M. (2004). Self-employment among immigrants in Sweden: An analysis of intra group differences. *Small Business Economics*, 23(2), 115-126.
- [33]. Hsieh, C. Nickerson, J. A. & Zenger, T. R. (2007). Opportunity discovery, problem solving and a theory of the entrepreneurial firm. *Journal of Management Studies*, 7, 1255-1277.
- [34]. Iyer, R. & Schoar, A. (2008). *Are there cultural determinants of entrepreneurship?* Retrieved March 10, 2014, from http://www.mit.edu/~aschoar/IyerSchoarNBER_v1.pdf.
- [35]. Kalmins, A. & Chung, W. (2006). Social capital, geography and survival: Gujrati immigrant entrepreneurs in the U. S. lodging industry. *Management Science*, 52(2), 233-247.
- [36]. Koo, H. (1976). Small entrepreneurship in a developing society: Patterns of labour absorption and social mobility. *Social Forces*, 54(4), 775-787.
- [37]. Kuratko, D. F., & Hodgetts, R. M. (1989). *Entrepreneurship: A contemporary approach*. New York: Dryden.
- [38]. Levesque, M. & Minniti, M. (2006). The effect of aging on entrepreneurial behaviour. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21, 177-194.
- [39]. Li, P. S (2001). Immigrants' propensity to self-employment: Evidence from Canada. *International Migration Review*, 35(4), 1106-1128.
- [40]. Liebenstien, H. (1968). Entrepreneurship and development. *American Economic Review*, 58(2), 75.
- [41]. Lin, Z. Picot, G. & Compton, J. (2000). The entry and exit dynamics of self-employment in Canada. *Small Business Economics*, 15(2), 105-125.
- [42]. McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, N. J: Van Nostrand.
- [43]. Meager, N. (1992). Does unemployment lead to self-employment?. *Small Business Economics*, 4(2), 87-103.
- [44]. Miller, R. (1984). Job Matching and Occupational Choice. *Journal of Political Economy*, 92, 1086-120.
- [45]. Minniti, M. & Nardone, C. (2007). Being in someone else's shoes: The role of gender in nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 28, 223-238.
- [46]. Mishra, S. & Kumar, S. (2000). Resourcefulness: A proximal conceptualization of entrepreneurial behavior. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 9(2), 135-154.
- [47]. Mitchell, B. C. (2004). Motives of entrepreneurs: A case study of South Africa. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 13(2), 167-183.
- [48]. Mitton, D. G. (1989). The complete entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 13(3), 9-20.
- [49]. Newell, A. & Simon, H. A. (1972). *Human Problem Solving*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [50]. Oommen, M. A. (1981). Mobility of small scale entrepreneurs: A Kerala experience. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 17(1), 65-87.
- [51]. Palatty, V. (2006). The Adivasis in Assam: Problems policies and prospects. *Mission Today*, 8, 5-12.
- [52]. Panda, N. M. (2000). What brings entrepreneurial success in a developing region?. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 9(2), 199-212.
- [53]. Panda, T. K. (2002). Entrepreneurial success and risk perception among small-scale entrepreneurs in eastern India. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 11(2), 173-190.
- [54]. Praag, C. M. V. & Ophem, H. V. (1995). Determinants of willingness and opportunity to start as an entrepreneur. *Kyklos*, 48(4), 513-540.
- [55]. Radmard, H. (2012). *Religion and Entrepreneurship: A County-level Analysis*. Retrieved November 10, 2017, from <https://lawsdoxbox.com/Politics/66253158-Religion-and-entrepreneurship-a-county-level-analysis.html>.
- [56]. Rees, H. & Shah, A. (1986). An empirical analysis of self-employment in the U.K. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 1(1), 95-108.
- [57]. Schumpeter, J. A. (1949). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA: Howard
- [58]. Scully, G. W. (1979). Mullahs, muslims and marital sorting. *Journal of Political Economy*, 87, 1139-1143.
- [59]. Shapero, A. (1975). The displaced, uncomfortable entrepreneur. *Psychology Today*, 9, 83-133.

- [60]. Srivastava, K. B. L. (2008). Examining the relationship of sociocultural factors and entrepreneurial propensity among professional students. *Entrepreneurial Management*, 184-203.
- [61]. Stevenson, H. H. & Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 17-27.
- [62]. Thomas, A. S. & Mueller, S. L. (2000). A case for comparative entrepreneurship: Assessing the relevance of culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31(2), 287-301.
- [63]. Waldinger, R. & Gilbertson, G. (1994). Immigrants' progress: Ethnic and gender differences among U. S. immigrants in the 1980s. *Sociological Perspectives*, 37(3), 431-444.
- [64]. Wit, G. D. & Widen, F. A. A. M. V. (1989). An empirical analysis of self-employment in the Netherlands. *Small Business Economics*, 1(4), 263-272.
- [65]. Wong, Y. (1986). Entrepreneurship, marriage and earnings. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 68(4), 693-699.
- [66]. Yuengert, A. M. (1995). Testing hypothesis of immigrant self-employment. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 30(1), 194-204.
- [67]. Zelekha, Y., Avnimelech, G. & Sharabi, E. (2013). Religious institutions and entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 42(4), 747-767.

Binita Topno. " What Determines The Entrepreneurial Propensity? A Study on the Adivasi Entrepreneurs in Assam." *International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)*, vol. 09(01), 2020, pp 53-61