

G, Santhosha Shetty; Baliga, Vikram; Gil, Mathew Thomas

Article

Impact of entrepreneurial mindset and motivation on business performance: deciphering the effects of entrepreneurship development program (EDPs) on trainees

Cogent Business & Management

Provided in Cooperation with:

Taylor & Francis Group

Suggested Citation: G, Santhosha Shetty; Baliga, Vikram; Gil, Mathew Thomas (2024) : Impact of entrepreneurial mindset and motivation on business performance: deciphering the effects of entrepreneurship development program (EDPs) on trainees, Cogent Business & Management, ISSN 2331-1975, Taylor & Francis, Abingdon, Vol. 11, Iss. 1, pp. 1-23, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2314733>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/326045>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Impact of entrepreneurial mindset and motivation on business performance: deciphering the effects of entrepreneurship development program (EDPs) on trainees

Santhosha Shetty G, Vikram Baliga & Mathew Thomas Gil

To cite this article: Santhosha Shetty G, Vikram Baliga & Mathew Thomas Gil (2024) Impact of entrepreneurial mindset and motivation on business performance: deciphering the effects of entrepreneurship development program (EDPs) on trainees, Cogent Business & Management, 11:1, 2314733, DOI: [10.1080/23311975.2024.2314733](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2314733)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2314733>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 21 Feb 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 10647



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 9 View citing articles [↗](#)

Impact of entrepreneurial mindset and motivation on business performance: deciphering the effects of entrepreneurship development program (EDPs) on trainees

Santhosha Shetty G , Vikram Baliga  and Mathew Thomas Gil 

Department of Commerce, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurial mindset and motivation are essential for launching a successful business venture. Recognising this, the study investigates how Entrepreneurial Development Programmes (EDPs) offered by RUDSETIs (Rural Development and Self-employment Training Institutes) influence trainees in developing this mindset and motivation. Structured questionnaires were used to collect feedback from 386 unemployed trainees from three different training centres as part of a comprehensive method involving 386 unemployed trainees from three different training centres. The study has used quantitative research techniques such as the Chi-square test, Wilcoxon signed rank test, and Kruskal Wallis test to analyse the data. The findings show that EDPs have a significant positive impact on most trainees' entrepreneurial mindset, motivation, and subsequent follow-up quality. This, in turn, contributes to business success. However, a subset of trainees are unaffected by these programmes. The study raises an alarm for RUDSETIs, recommending that they increase their efforts for this specific group. Finally, the paper suggests that RUDSETI policymakers rethink and possibly reframe their current strategies. The goal should be to instill an entrepreneurial spirit, boost motivation, and improve the quality of follow-up mechanisms in order to ensure that every trainee, current or potential, benefits optimally.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 14 November 2023
Revised 30 January 2024
Accepted 31 January 2024

KEYWORDS

Entrepreneurship; entrepreneurship mindset; motivation; follow-up; entrepreneurship development program; fostering

REVIEWING EDITOR

Eric Liguori, Florida State University, United States

SUBJECTS

Business, Management and Accounting; Theories of Learning; Educational Research; Education Studies; Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management; Management Education; Management of Technology & Innovation

Introduction

Attaining entrepreneurial success in the contemporary economy is not solely contingent upon proficiently managing relevant abilities, but also involves the development of efficient entrepreneurs whose mindsets are congruent with the demands of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurs must be motivated and empowered through effective follow-up programs. The significance of entrepreneurial mindset, motivation, and follow-up cannot be overstated in the pursuit of business success. Understanding the current influence of Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) on these crucial aspects is essential for the enhancement of entrepreneurial success. In a previous study conducted by Ireland et al. (2003), the authors highlighted the necessity for upcoming cohorts to possess a greater inclination towards entrepreneurship. This entails placing significant emphasis on qualities such as creativity, innovation, and the capacity to capitalize on opportunities. These findings align with the observations made by McGrath and MacMillan (2000), who emphasize the criticality of adopting an entrepreneurial mindset that enables individuals to promptly perceive, act, and mobilize resources, even in situations characterized by uncertainty. Entrepreneurship development programs play a vital role in developing knowledge and skills, shifting mindsets, motivating trainees to establish enterprises, and achieving business success. Recent technological advancements have significantly impacted entrepreneurial capacity through the digitization of entrepreneurship education, offering novel training opportunities and approaches (Tóth-Pajor et al.,

2023). Despite the increasing demand for Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) as a means of fostering self-employment opportunities (Shettigar, 2012) through the dissemination of managerial information, there has been a dearth of comprehensive investigations into their impact, particularly with regard to trainees' mindset, motivation, follow-up, and subsequent company performance (Pato & Teixeira, 2016). In recent decades, there has been a notable increase in scholarly interest surrounding the topic of entrepreneurship development programs (Wadhvani et al., 2020). The impact of entrepreneurship development programs on mindset, motivation, and follow-up has emerged as a prominent subject of academic discourse in both developed and underdeveloped countries. This is due to their significant contribution to the promotion of entrepreneurship development and economic well-being (Yi, 2020) primarily through their influence on program participants.

Studies have reported that focusing on an entrepreneurial mindset can significantly contribute to the study of entrepreneurship (Kirzner, 1997; McGrath & MacMillan, 2000). Earlier research has shown that EDPs have positively affected the entrepreneurial mindset, motivation, follow-up, and entrepreneurial planning among individuals (Westhead & Solesvik, 2016; Hu et al., 2018; Pan et al., 2018; Jena, 2020). Nonetheless, the efficacy of entrepreneurship is still hindered by the constrained impact of Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) in altering the entrepreneurial attitude, fostering trainee motivation, and guaranteeing efficient post-training support (Dhliwayo & Van Vuuren, 2007). Additionally, research from Nigeria suggests that entrepreneurship programs can significantly improve the livelihoods of young individuals (Adeyanju et al., 2023). Despite the necessity of altering trainees' mindsets to facilitate entrepreneurial ventures, psychological aspects related to mindset management are often inadequately addressed in new and micro enterprises (Bharti, 2014). Among the various factors contributing to the high rate of Small and Medium Enterprises (SME) failure in South Africa, the entrepreneurial mindset is a significant factor (Abedian & Jacobs, 2001; Willemse et al., 2016; Fatoki, 2010; Ehlers & Lazenby, 2004). Emphasizing the transformation of trainees' mindsets through the influence of EDPs is imperative (Hormiga et al., 2011).

In rural areas, many unemployed individuals aspire to work for established companies rather than starting their own enterprises. In response to this issue, the Indian government has established strategies aimed at mitigating the stress caused by unemployment and facilitating viable business opportunities for educated individuals to pursue entrepreneurship. The significance of an entrepreneurial attitude in differentiating between success and failure in entrepreneurship has been acknowledged by scholars (Moore et al., 2021). According to Jena, 2020), an entrepreneurial mindset is linked to profound cognitive phenomena that demonstrate an exceptional dedication to entrepreneurial endeavors (Saptono et al., 2020). According to previous research conducted by Hu and Ye (2017; Handayati et al., 2020), it has been found that persons who have undergone entrepreneurial training are more prone to undergo a transformation in their entrepreneurial attitude, motivation, and exhibit a greater inclination towards initiating their own firms. The challenges entrepreneurs commonly face include a lack of motivation, a fixed mindset, and inadequate follow-up, emphasizing the pivotal role of an entrepreneur's mindset, motivation, and follow-up in shaping a successful enterprise. Therefore, motivating entrepreneurs can inspire trainees to initiate and develop their own businesses.

Despite the acknowledged necessity for motivation, follow-up, and attitude adjustment, these facets are frequently insufficiently addressed by educational development program (EDP) centers. Multiple studies have indicated that doing follow-up assessments has a crucial role in promoting the transfer of knowledge (Salinger & Deming, 1982; Tyson & Ward, 2004; Yorks et al., 2007; Cromwell & Kolb, 2004; Wexley & Baldwin, 1986). The success of a training program is contingent upon several factors, including program design, trainee characteristics, and the work environment (Robinson & Robinson, 1989). However, it is imperative to emphasize the importance of implementing targeted measures for follow-up training in order to achieve desired outcomes. The efficiency of training transfer can be hindered and diminished by many constraints and impediments in the post-training environment (Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). Scholars have also highlighted the significance of follow-up programs in evaluating the implementation of knowledge by individuals undergoing training (Holton et al., 2000; Rouiller & Goldstein, 1993; Tracey et al., 1995). It has been observed that training institutes often overlook follow-up activities, and many organizations lack confidence in their ability to execute them (Saks & Belcourt, 2006). Entrepreneurs require more than just enterprise management-related knowledge; they also need motivation, effective follow-up, and mindset transformation. This study focuses on the performance of EDPs in influencing trainees' motivation, follow-up, and mindset transformation, addressing a significant research gap.

The aim of this research is to study the role of EDPs in influencing entrepreneurial mindset, motivating trainees, and maintaining quality in the follow-up of trainees of Rural Development and Self-employment Training Institutes of select districts of Karnataka in India. This study is useful in designing and developing a robust entrepreneurship training programme content and pedagogy to benefit prospective trainees who are likely to take part in such programmes. EDP trainers and policymakers seeking entrepreneurship development will be able use the findings and improve the quality of training programmes. The findings, results and discussions presented in the study will enable Entrepreneurship Development Institutes (EDIs) and policymakers engaged in entrepreneurship development to redesign their training content and pedagogy. The overall assessments and measurements of items considered under entrepreneurial mindset, motivation and follow-up assistance have emphasized the adoption of relevant and suitable training interventions for EDPs which are suitable for emerging economies like India. EDPs can use the results to assess, evaluate and consider skills and competencies and psychological aspects involving mindset and motivation. This study contributes to an evolving body of literature in entrepreneurship training and entrepreneurship development. The insights are meant to create an understanding to the policy makers, practitioners, and other stakeholders on the need to promote entrepreneurial mindset. A positive change in mindset, motivation and increase in the quality of follow up will result in the manifestation of other related skills like innovativeness, creativity, business alertness and risk taking required to enhance the level of business performance. The findings will challenge the training institutes and entrepreneurs to strategize and promote the entrepreneurial mindset, motivation and increase quality in follow up program for better entrepreneurial performance. Thus, the study examines the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the role of entrepreneurship development programs on changing the mindset of trainees?

RQ2: Do EDPs positively affect trainees' motivation level?

RQ3: To what extent EDPs follow-up assistance helped trainees?

RQ4: Is there any difference among four types of EDPs with respect to extent of quality of follow-up programmes?

RQ5: Does the impact of entrepreneurship development programs on trainees' mindset, motivation, and follow-ups lead to an increased business success rate?

RQ6: Is there any difference among different types of EDPs with respect to rate of business success?

In the subsequent sections, an exposition of the theory and hypothesis will be presented, followed by an elucidation of the research methodologies employed. Subsequently, the obtained results and ensuing discussion will be provided, followed by an examination of the implications and limitations. Finally, concluding remarks will be offered. The hypotheses have been rejected based on our study, as the data indicate a positive correlation between EDPs and their influence on the alteration of mentality, motivation, and subsequent actions of trainees.

Review of literature

In recent decades, the domain of entrepreneurial capacity has shown notable progress and development. A comprehensive bibliometric analysis of research conducted from 1979 to 2022 by Chhabra et al. (2023) has shed light on the development, current state, and potential future directions in the field of entrepreneurship training and development. Building upon this framework, this review further explores specific areas of interest, with a particular focus on the role of Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) in shaping the entrepreneurial landscape.

Role of EDPs in changing entrepreneurial mindset

Many studies have reported the role of entrepreneurial education in influencing the mindset of learners who are enrolled as students in educational institutions and academic universities (Papagiannis, 2018; Jabeen et al., 2017; Larsen, 2022; Mohapeloa, 2017). However, such studies have surveyed students of academic institutions, and not trainees who have attended entrepreneurship development programmes offered by Non-Governmental Organizations like RUDSETIs. The purpose with which EDPs are launched

are different from the outcomes embarked upon by Entrepreneurship Education Programmes offered by educational institutions. Therefore, a literature gap is observed in the investigation of the role played by EDPs in examining change in entrepreneurial mindset. This study is an attempt to bridge such a gap in literature.

Another study has reported findings purely on the development of entrepreneurial mindset. (Rizvi et al., 2023) revealed that entrepreneurship is purely driven by mindset. A strong entrepreneurial mindset is an engine that drives entrepreneurial activity. Hence, the researchers feel that 'mindset' is a core attribute that drives entrepreneurial intent. Given this background, it is felt that EDPs are able to change entrepreneurial mindset.

Entrepreneurial mindset refers to a particular state of mind that directs individuals toward entrepreneurial careers and outcomes. It entails a propensity for seeking technological opportunities (Shane, 2001), fostering innovation, and creating new value. Entrepreneurs with this mindset exhibit a willingness to take calculated risks and embrace change and uncertainty. Such a mindset signifies a commitment to entrepreneurial activities (Kuratko et al., 1997). The entrepreneurial mindset involves a confluence of risk propensity, accomplishment orientation, and the impetus to build and structure enterprises in order to accomplish entrepreneurial objectives (Bosman & Fernhaber, 2018). Moreover, an entrepreneurial mentality is distinguished by an inclination towards imaginative and inventive thinking (Günzel-Jensen et al., 2017), which augments problem-solving capabilities and bolsters self-assurance in addressing novel issues linked to business advancement (Chia & Liang, 2016). Existing body of literature has examined many dimensions of the entrepreneurial mindset, such as knowledge, skills, abilities, innovative ideas, experience sharing (Winkler et al., 2023), and attitudes towards entrepreneurship (Green et al., 2020; Rodriguez & Lieber, 2020; Saptono et al., 2020). McLarty et al. (2023) highlighted the significance of processes and outcomes that act as conditions to spur the development of entrepreneurial mindset. There is a need to study these underlying conditions. Haynie et al. (2010) states that the foundation of entrepreneurial mindset has a metacognitive nature and as a result of such a nature, entrepreneurs have to formulate higher-order strategy to meet entrepreneurial ends. More literary efforts should be directed towards understanding various factors that influence entrepreneurial mindset and its effect on various outcomes (Daspit et al., 2023). Core attributes of entrepreneurial mindset can be identified when behaviour is exhibited, whereas meta-cognitive attributes are hidden in an individual (Naumann, 2017). The concept of entrepreneurial mindset should be investigated further using the survey of entrepreneurs from various cultures. Morris and Tucker (2023) investigate the critical issue of poverty in society and observe that mindset should be adaptable to poverty contexts. Another study (Nadelson et al., 2018) found constrained knowledge of entrepreneurship, teaching elements of entrepreneurial mindset to be barriers in fostering entrepreneurial thinking. Lynch and Corbett (2023) describe entrepreneurial mindset as an elusive concept made of duality, one that is made of finding solutions and another implementing those solutions. Entrepreneurial mindset is a goal-oriented process that constitutes dispositional beliefs and opportunity beliefs resulting in entrepreneurial behaviour (Pidduck et al., 2023). Further, such beliefs need to be integrated as implicit beliefs combined with explicit beliefs to bridge the gap between how entrepreneurs think and act as individuals (Mai & Dickel, 2023).

These studies consistently find that the entrepreneurial mindset is closely linked to individual attitudes and entrepreneurial actions. The entrepreneurial mindset is characterized by a dynamic outlook that views uncertainty as an opportunity (Dhliwayo & Van Vuuren, 2007). It drives individuals to identify opportunities, devise innovative solutions to challenges, and act on these opportunities with a positive attitude (Senges, 2007). An entrepreneurial mindset fuels the pursuit of opportunities, promotes disciplined pursuit of the best opportunities, emphasizes execution, and harnesses the energy of all stakeholders within a given domain (McGrath & MacMillan, 2000).

Studies have shown that possessing an entrepreneurial mindset is crucial for success in the entrepreneurial process. Individuals with a fixed mindset and low self-confidence tend to set low-performance goals and respond helplessly when faced with challenges (Johnson, 2009). In contrast, successful business leaders with a growth mindset are more adaptable to constant change, a necessary trait for building and maintaining successful enterprises (Dweck, 2006). Motivation, as a crucial psychological force, directs an individual's behavior, effort, and persistence in the face of setbacks (Dunnette & Hough, 1990). Entrepreneurial motivation is essential for acquiring knowledge, skills, and abilities required for effective

business implementation (Shane et al., 2003). Appropriate training programs enhance cognitive understanding, boost self-confidence, and foster motivation, facilitating the transfer and retention of learned behaviors (Colquitt et al., 2000). Numerous researches have documented a beneficial correlation between entrepreneurial digital platforms (EDPs) and the development of an entrepreneurial attitude (Birdi et al., 1997; Pfeifer et al., 2016; Karyaningsih et al., 2020). Entrepreneurial training refers to an educational endeavor that enriches one's understanding, competencies, proficiencies, and individual attributes pertaining to the field of entrepreneurship (Cui et al., 2019; Yuan & Wu, 2020; Hayward et al., 2006). The aforementioned sources (Zupan et al., 2018; Morris & Tucker, 2023; Wardana et al., 2020) assert that it confers individuals with the necessary knowledge and skills to recognize potential prospects and foster a mindset conducive to entrepreneurship.

A summary of published articles reveals that large volume of literature in the area of entrepreneurship highlight the effects of entrepreneurship education programs on entrepreneurial mindset. Entrepreneurship literature has also covered several scholarly works in operationalizing the concept of entrepreneurial mindset in detail. However, a research gap is observed in measuring the impact of EDPs on the mindset of trainees. The framework of EDPs in India is built on economic aspects, social aspects, psychological aspects, (Tang et al., 2023) change in mindset, leadership skills, development of human capital (Martin et al., 2013) and motivational aspects of trainees. Training institutes like RUDSETIs have launched EDPs to act as a catalyst and bring about change and curb the menace of unemployment by promoting self-employment among local youth. Thus, this research gap is hypothesized as:

H01: There is no significant difference between the mindset of trainees towards EDPs offered and taking up self-employment in the pre and post-training periods.

Role of EDPs in motivating trainees

Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) provide an additional stimulus for trainees to acquire knowledge, skills, and the determination to put their ideas into action. Motivation is a fundamental psychological force that guides a person's behavior, effort, and persistence within an organization (Dunnette & Hough, 1990). It is a crucial element that enables entrepreneurs to develop the skills and abilities needed for entrepreneurial endeavors (Shane et al., 2003). Motivation, stimulated by EDPs, is essential in creating an entrepreneurial mindset that drives individuals to undertake entrepreneurial actions. The 'Kakinada experiment', for example, demonstrated the positive impact of appropriate training in motivating entrepreneurs (McClelland & Winter, 1969). The experiment highlighted the significance of entrepreneurial training, now known as EDP, in stimulating motivation and enhancing the skills of potential entrepreneurs (Khanna, 2001).

EDPs are instrumental in motivating individuals to become entrepreneurs, establish self-sustainable enterprises, and contribute to global economic development (Anitha & Laxmisha, 2003; Yimamu, 2018; Chakravarty, 1987; Masur et al., 2014; Meenakshi et al., 2013) According to Yimamu (2018), the presence of motivational drive has the potential to cultivate an entrepreneurial attitude and influence decision-making inside the routine operations of a business. Entrepreneurship development programs are considered innovative approaches to instilling motivation (Chaudhari, 1999) and facilitating the development of essential qualities such as self-esteem and self-confidence (Shah, 2013). While several studies have explored the role of EDPs in motivating individuals to embark on entrepreneurial journeys, no specific research has been conducted on the influence of RUDSETIs' EDPs on motivating trainees in select districts of Karnataka, India. Thus, this study hypothesizes that EDPs significantly motivate trainees.

H02: There is no significant association between EDPs ability to motivate and trainees commencing the business.

Role of EDPs in follow-up of trainees

Effective follow-up is a critical component of training programs, aiding trainees in consolidating their learning and providing continued support. Follow-up activities encompass behavioural components such as soliciting feedback from trainees, evaluating their progress, and providing guidance to

facilitate their subsequent actions (Broad & Newstrom, 1992; Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). Numerous studies have continuously underscored the significance of follow-up activities in augmenting the transfer of acquired knowledge (Salinger & Deming, 1982; Tyson & Ward, 2004; Yorks et al., 2007; Brinkerhoff & Montesino, 1995). Several earlier literary classics have reported that trainers assume a vital function during the post-training period through the provision of feedback, motivation, reinforcement, and opportunity for practice (Baldwin & Ford, 1988; Ford et al., 1992; Kraiger et al., 2004; Tannenbaum & Yukl, 1992). Subsequent activities, such as the implementation of action plans, contribute to the improvement of trainee self-efficacy by enabling them to predict the behaviors required for successful execution. Consequently, this process enhances their confidence levels (Facteau et al., 1995).

Despite the critical role that follow-up plays in training programs, many training centers struggle with implementing effective follow-up activities (Saks & Belcourt, 2006). Properly devised follow-up activities can enhance trainees' cognitive understanding, build their self-confidence, and promote knowledge retention (Colquitt et al., 2000). As a result, many studies have explored the link between EDPs and the quality of follow-up programs (Pfeifer et al., 2016; Karyaningsih et al., 2020). However, research specifically examining the influence of EDPs of RUDSETIs on the follow-up aspects of trainees in select districts of Karnataka, India, remains limited. Therefore, this study hypothesizes that there is a significant difference between the quality of follow-up provided by EDPs.

H03: There is a significant difference among four types of EDPs with respect to the extent of the quality of the follow-up program.

EDPs' role in contributing to business success

The influence of entrepreneurial development programs (EDPs) on the success rate of entrepreneurs has been extensively examined by a multitude of academics. These studies have focused on the ways in which EDPs can alter attitudes, motivate participants, and offer comprehensive follow-up support, all of which contribute to entrepreneurial success. The significance of possessing an entrepreneurial mindset has been recognized as a pivotal determinant of achieving success in business (Dhliwayo & Van Vuuren, 2007). Businesses require creative and innovative thinking to adapt to rapidly changing environments, and owners must unlearn traditional management principles (Morris & Kuratko, 2002; Faltin, 2007). Entrepreneurs with an entrepreneurial mindset possess the adaptability needed to navigate uncertain and dynamic business landscapes (Hitt, 2000). Such individuals possess broad knowledge and a diverse skill set that enables them to create business value (Higham & Gerrard, 2005). The entrepreneurship development programs focus on developing the entrepreneurial mindset and have been found to have a positive impact on business performance (Njeru, 2012; Lackéus, 2016). Despite the increasing volume of scholarly literature pertaining to entrepreneurial development programs (EDPs) and their impact on business performance, there is a literary gap in investigating the extent to which these programs contribute to business success by influencing mentality, motivation, and facilitating effective follow-up procedures. Hence, the present study posits a hypothesis suggesting a notable disparity among four distinct types of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes in terms of their impact on the rate of business success.

H04: There is no significant difference among four types of EDPs with respect to rate of business success.

From the analysis of existing literature in the area of entrepreneurship training and development, it is observed that there is lack of research that provide deep insights on the impact created by EDPs on entrepreneurs' mindset and motivation. Earlier studies have reported relevant findings such as the EDPs ability to influence trainees' innovative ability and creativity (Al-Dairi et al., 2012) in entrepreneurs, bolster entrepreneurial intentions (Porfírio et al., 2022) contribute to capacity building (Tóth-Pajor et al., 2023) and trait based emotional intelligence (Zampetakis et al., 2009; Ghosh & Rajaram, 2015). However, these evidences are insufficient to draw conclusions on the ability of EDPs to influence the level of business performance. Similarly, more research is needed to investigate the ability of EDPs to motivate

entrepreneurs. Earlier studies have revealed that EDPs are able to generate pull motivation (Martínez-Cañas et al., 2023; Adeyanju et al., 2023), possess the ability to positively affect entrepreneurial intentions (Adjimah & Perry, 2014; Kuckertz & Wagner, 2010), provide technical skills (Bose, 2013), nurture creative transfer of entrepreneurship skills (Minja et al., 2023) play a role in enhancing entrepreneurship potential (Cárdenas-Gutiérrez et al., 2023) and enable knowledge sharing (Smirnov et al., 2023). Further, (Bose, 2013) has reported the inadequate nature of follow-up support process maintained by training institutions which is essential to track progress of business. The study states that the follow-up sessions should continue for 3-5 years with a feature of appointing counsellors to track progress. Based on the evidence available in literature, the present study examines the level of impact the EDPs are able to create in changing the trainees' mindset and the factors determining trainees' motivation. Furthermore, we also feel that the follow-up assistance process that should be followed by the organizers of the training programme plays a crucial role in achieving effectiveness of EDPs.

Considering the findings analysed in entrepreneurship literature and the current landscape of entrepreneurship development practices (Singh & Verma, 2015) in India, the aim of this study is to investigate the effects of Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) on the mindset, motivation, and follow-up of trainees. The subsequent sections will delve into the methods, results, discussion, implications, limitations, and conclusions of this research. The hypotheses mentioned earlier will be tested and analysed to provide a deeper understanding of the impact of EDPs on various aspects of entrepreneurship.

Research methods

The scope of our research is to assess the performance of EDPs of three RUDSETI (Rural Development and Self-employment Training Institutes) centres namely Ujire, Dharwad and Bramhavar. These centers are based in various districts of Karnataka State in India. The training was offered between 2017 to 2020. Those trainees who have started business operations within six months after attending the training were considered for the study. The survey was conducted in the year 2022 from July to December 2022 as the researchers felt that all the trainees who have established their ventures (Herron & Sapienza, 1992) needed at least two years to overcome initial teething problems. This was validated by a discussion with EDP training instructors whom we met to run a pilot survey in April 2022.

Multistage sampling was used to select samples. For calculating the sample size of 386 among 10,550 trainees, the researcher went by Yamane's criterion (Yamane, Taro 1967). Since the researcher is working with a finite population and the population size is already known, Yamane's criterion was appropriate as a corrected sample size factor. We also concur with earlier researchers' (Ogunlusi et al., 2018) study on the use of the Yamane Taro method on finite and known population parameters. According to this method, for a population size between 10,000 and 15,000, the required sample size (n) is 386 for Precision (e) of $\pm 5\%$ where the confidence level is 95 percent and $P=0.5$ (Israel, 1992).

Samples were selected out of trainees of four types of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes offered by RUDSETI centers, namely; Agriculture, Product, Process, and General EDPs including both men and women (Rahman et al., 2000; Sidhu & Kaur, 2006) 3006 trainees had enrolled for EDP in Agriculture, 2,214 in Product EDP, 3,307 in Process EDP and General EDP were 2,023 totalling 10,550 trainees. The same numbers have been proportionately allocated to the sample size of 386 as Agricultural EDP -110, Product EDP-81, Process EDP -121 and General EDP -74. The sample size of 386 trainees was allocated among three institutes for survey purposes in proportion to their total population. 61.9% of the respondents belong to OBC, 10.9% belong to ST, 10.6% belong to Minority, 10.6% belong to SC and 6% belong to General category. 60.4% are unmarried, 38.9% are married, 5% are divorced, and 3% are widowers.

Out of the existing 27 centers of RUDSETI, three centers were chosen because they were involved in entrepreneurial training for more than thirty years and are near the place of the researchers. The trainees of three institutes have been considered as the universe for this study because the institutes have a large number of trainees compared to other institutes and the researchers are familiar with the area. During the study period, 10,550 trainees enrolled in these training centers with 3196 in Ujire center, 3,983 in Dharwad, and 3,371 in Brahmar. Unemployment among the local youth is a perennial problem in the study area. To navigate this problem of unemployment, Rural Development and Self-Employment Training

Institute (RUDSETI) was formed. Concerned by this tremendous waste of human resources in this region, the researchers were keen to study the role of Entrepreneurship Development Centres (EDCs) in influencing the trainees to take up self-employment. This mismatch of potential (Thompson, 2004) with productive deployment has not only baffled the researchers but also planners and administrators. Thus, these regions were selected as the location for the study.

The study has used experimental research design to test the effect of EDPs on change in mindset of the trainees. The research has considered Wilcoxon signed-rank test as a good alternative to t-test to measure whether the change in mindset of trainees before and after the EDP training is statistically significant. Chi square (χ^2) was used as an appropriate test to ascertain whether EDP training is able to motivate trainees to commence business. Since RUDSETI offers four different type of EDPs, the research has used Kruskal Wallis test as a measure of comparing two or more independent samples drawn from the same trainee population. Trainees are drawn from different EDP centres of Ujire, Dharwad and Brahmavar locations.

Regarding data collection, a structured questionnaire was used as a suitable research instrument. The questionnaire was designed with three sections. The first section included questions related to trainees' background and demographic information, the academic status of trainees and trainees' family background. The second section included questions related to the role of EDPs in changing mindsets, motivating and quality of follow-up programs. The third part of the questionnaire is related to the opinion of trainees regarding the rate of business success.

The key variables of performance aspects of EDPs related to change in mindset, motivating and extent of quality in follow up and how they were measured in the study are detailed below.

For the purpose of the survey, the trainees were contacted two years after the completion of training program and opinion related to 'degree of change' in mindset was collected. The researchers felt that the trainees need such time to overcome teething problems and accelerate business operations. The aim of the survey was to measure whether the participation in EDPs have been able to change the mindset of trainees towards entrepreneurial success. Thus, change in mindset has been measure at three levels as 'to a great extent', 'some extent' and 'not at all'. The details of the measurement of 'change in mindset' is provided in Table 1 with impact results before and after training. Wilcoxon signed-rank test was found to be the appropriate test of statistical significance of data, as samples contained units of different locations and the mean value of such groups were not of research interest. The results are reported as $p > 0.05$, NS=no significant difference between the extent of change in mindset before training and change in mindset after the training is recorded; $p < 0.05$, SIG=significant difference. If the $p < 0.01$, HS=highly significant difference. Further, change in mindset is measured and recorded based on findings derived after taking trainees opinion before and after the survey. The levels of measurement denoting the change in mindset are 'to a great extent'; 'to some extent'; 'not at all'.

The next construct considered for analysis is performance of EDPs in motivating trainees. The motivation aspect was tested to find out whether the EDPs' role helped the trainees to set up the business and apply the learnings to ensure the smooth conduct of the business. A similar study made by Tracy et al.

Table 1. Testing of hypothesis related to the change in the mindset of trainees towards EDPs and self-employment in the pre and post-training period.

	Opinion about Extent of requirement of training and need for self employment	Agricultural				Product				Process				General				Total			
		Before		After		Before		After		Before		After		Before		After		Before		After	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
	Great extent	40	36.4	88	80	30	37.0	66	81.6	43	35.5	99	81.9	20	27.0	61	82.92	133	34.5	315	81.5
	some extent	24	21.8	14	12.7	25	30.9	10	12.2	50	41.3	10	8.2	10	13.5	6	7.59	109	28.2	39	10.2
	not at all	46	41.8	8	7.3	26	32.1	5	6.2	28	23.1	12	9.9	44	59.5	7	9.49	144	37.3	32	8.3
	Total	110	100	110	100	81	100	81	100	121	100	121	100	74	100	74	100	386	100	386	100
Wilcoxon signed rank test	Z value	6.861				5.805				6.720				6.947				13.179			
	p value	0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000				0.000			
		HS				HS				HS				HS				HS			

Source: Field Survey

Table 2. Factors motivated to start self-employment.

Factor	Items	EDPs									
		Agricultural		Product		Process		General		Total	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Factors motivated for starting the entrepreneurial activity	To support family	8	7.3%	6	7.4%	7	5.8%	5	6.8%	26	6.7%
	Encouragement by friends	8	7.3%	6	7.4%	7	5.8%	3	4.1%	24	6.2%
	Motivating role of RUDSETI's EDP programs	92	83.6%	69	85.2%	106	87.6%	64	86.5%	331	85.8%
	To gain social prestige	2	1.8%	0	.0%	1	.8%	2	2.7%	5	1.3%
	Success stories of other entrepreneurs	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Availability of factors of production	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%	0	.0%
	Total	110	100 %	81	100 %	121	100 %	74	100 %	386	100

Source: Field Survey

(1999) identified that, by comparing a sample of individual level of motivation, researchers were able to determine the contributions of motivations (Carsrud & Brännback, 2011) on the decision to become an entrepreneur. The key variables forming the constituents of the construct motivating trainees are shown in Table 2. To test the hypothesis, a Chi-square test was applied. To measure the contribution of RUDSETI motivational factors in starting the business, the Chi-square test was applied. For interpretation of results, if the p-value is greater than 0.05, the term 'NS' denotes 'no significant association between motivational factors and starting the businesses. Similarly, if the p-value is less than 0.05, the term 'SIG' denotes a significant association between motivational factors and starting a new business. Also, if the p-value is less than 0.01, the term 'HS' denotes highly significant association between motivational factors and starting the business.

To measure the extent to which follow-up assistance helped the entrepreneurs, seven questions were framed. The key variables of follow-up of trainees measured in the study are depicted in Table 5. The extent of help of follow up was measured on 5-point rating scale – low extent (1) - - - high extent (5). To measure the extent, mean and standard deviation were calculated and interpretation was done as – if mean value < 2 helped them very low extent, if mean value < 3 helped them low extent, if mean value > 3 helped them to a high extent and if mean value > 4 helped them very high extent. To test the differences if any among opinions of trainees of four types of EDPs related to the extent of help, Kruskal Wallis test was applied. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, 'NS' denotes no significant difference between different types of EDPs. If the p-value is less than 0.05, 'SIG' denotes a significant difference between EDPs. If the p-value is less than 0.01, 'HS' denotes highly significant difference between EDPs.

To measure the rate of business success of entrepreneurs, three questions were framed. The rate of business success is measured by collecting opinions of trainees in terms of highly successful, successful or unsuccessful. The key variables of follow-up of trainees measured in the study are depicted in Table 6. Differences related to the opinion given by respondents among four types of EDPs regarding the rate of business success are tested by applying Chi-square test with the help of 'p-value.

Results

The data was subjected to statistical analysis using several methods, including percentage analysis, Chi-square tests, Kruskal-Wallis tests, and Wilcoxon signed-rank tests. Data analysis and interpretation involved the utilization of both descriptive and inferential statistical methodologies. The frequencies and percentages were used to summarize categorical variables, while the same approach was applied to variables evaluated on rating scales. In order to facilitate a more comprehensive understanding, calculations were performed to determine the mean and standard deviations.

The Chi-square test was utilized to compare responses from respondents in different EDPs for categorical data. This test also assessed whether the observed results aligned with the expected values. To

compare data on rating scales across various EDPs, the Kruskal-Wallis test was employed. A significance level of 5% was applied in the analysis, which was conducted using SPSS software.

EDPs role in changing trainees' mindset- pre and post training evaluation

Trainees may have high self-motivation to start a business and this may affect their decision in taking up self-employment without any external interventions. Alternatively, trainees may also have reposed a great deal of expectation on the ability of EDPs to change their mindsets towards taking up self-employment. Therefore, it is important to study the extent to which EDPs are capable of changing the mindset of trainees towards taking up self-employment. The below table depicts the perception of trainees about the extent of the requirement of training and the need for self-employment before and after attending it. The perception of the trainees on the extent to which EDPs are able to change their mindset is provided in Table 4. This perception is proposed as a hypothesis as follows:

H01: There is no significant difference between the mindset of trainees towards EDPs offered and taking up self-employment in the pre and post-training periods

Perceived change in the mindset of trainees towards the need for training before and after training is shown in Table 1. Change is measured in terms of change in opinion (as a percentage) of respondents before and after receiving training stated as 'to a great extent'; 'to some extent'; 'not at all'. The study has used Wilcoxon signed-rank test to measure such change. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, NS=no significant difference between the mindset of trainees towards EDPs and the need for self-employment in the pre and post-training periods. If the p-value is less than 0.05, SIG=significant difference between the mindset of trainees towards EDPs and self-employment in the pre and post-training periods. If the p-value is less than 0.01, HS=highly significant difference between the mindset of trainees towards EDPs and the need for self-employment in the pre and post-training periods.

This section reports the results of trainees perceived quality of training offered by EDPs before and after training. Before the training was offered, 35 percent of the trainees perceived that the training would help to a 'great extent', 28 percent perceived it would help to 'some extent' and 37 percent perceived that it would not help at all. 81.5% of trainees have responded that after getting the training they have perceived that training and self-employment were required to a great extent, 10.2% of trainees have responded that after getting the training they have perceived that training and self-employment were required to some extent and 8.3% trainees have responded that after getting the training they have perceived that training was not at all required. The change in perception was observed in all agricultural, product, process, and general EDPs.

Therefore, the change in the perception of respondents after attending training compared to before attending training was highly significant among all EDPs with $p=0.000 < 0.01$. So, the hypothesis H01: There is no significant difference between the mindset of trainees towards EDPs offered and taking up self-employment in the pre and post-training periods" is rejected.

Factors motivating the commencement of self-employment after attending EDPs

Table 2 below reveals the trainees' opinions regarding the factors that motivated them to embark on entrepreneurial activities. The primary objective behind this analysis, connected with Table 3, is to identify the motivating role of RUDSETIs' EDPs.

Table 3. Testing of hypothesis related to the association between the motivational factors and starting the business

	EDPs	Chi-Square	df	p
Factors motivated for starting the entrepreneurial activity	Agricultural	202.582	3	.000, highly significant
	Product	98.000	2	.000, highly significant
	Process	253.711	3	.000, highly significant
	General	149.459	3	.000, highly significant
	Total	762.580	3	.000, highly significant

Source: Field Survey

This study investigates and analyses the factors that encourage entrepreneurs to initiate their businesses. The findings indicate that 86 percent of the respondents commenced entrepreneurial activities due to the motivation provided by RUDSETI's entrepreneurship development programs. Furthermore, 7% initiated their businesses due to the support of family members, 6% began their entrepreneurial journey because of encouragement from friends, while the remaining 1% cited gaining social prestige as their motivation. Surprisingly, success stories of other entrepreneurs and the availability of production factors failed to significantly influence entrepreneurs in starting their businesses. The study has used the chi-square test to analyse the correlation between the effectiveness of EDPs in motivating trainees and their likelihood of starting firms. This analysis is presented in Table 3. The hypothesis offered to evaluate this association is presented as:

H02: There is no significant association between the ability of EDPs to motivate and the commencement of businesses.

The motivational component of 'Motivation of RUDSETI Entrepreneurship Development Program participants' shown a high level of significance in comparison to other motivational variables across various types of Entrepreneurship Development Programs, including Agricultural ($p=0.000$, very significant), Product ($p=0.000$, extremely significant), Process ($p=0.000$, highly significant), and General ($p=0.000$, highly significant). Therefore, the hypothesis that posits 'There is no statistically significant relationship between the capacity of Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) to motivate and the success of trainees in starting their own businesses' is refuted. The test findings indicate a statistically significant relationship between the motivational capacity of entrepreneurial development programs (EDPs) and the initiation of firms by program participants.

EDPs' ability to influence the level of trainees' motivation in starting a business

The Table 4 illustrates the opinions of the respondents regarding the extent of motivation provided by the training. An impressive 92% of respondents reported being highly motivated by the training, while the remaining 8% indicated being moderately motivated. Notably, none of the respondents reported being not motivated at all. The analysis of the test findings indicates that there is no statistically significant variation in the perspectives of participants from four distinct types of EDPs concerning the level of motivation imparted by the training program. The p-value obtained from the analysis is 0.824, which is greater than the predetermined significance level of 0.05. The present study employed the Chi-square test to examine and evaluate the responses of participants in relation to categorical data across different types of EDPs.

Extent to which follow-up assistance helped trainees

To evaluate the efficacy of post-assistance support for entrepreneurs, a set of seven factors was developed to correspond with the relevant inquiries. The variables were assessed using a 5-point rating scale, with 1 representing a low extent and 5 representing a large extent. Mean and standard deviation calculations were performed on these variables. The process of interpretation was conducted in the following manner: a) A mean value below 2 indicates a significantly low level of support. b) A mean value below 3 indicates a low level of assistance. c) A mean value above 3 indicates a high level of assistance. d) A mean value above 4 indicates a significantly high level of

Table 4. EDPs ability to change mindset, motivation and follow-up assistance.

	EDPs										Test results $\chi^2=40.92$ d.f=3 p=0.824, NS
	Agricultural		Product		Process		General		Total		
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	
To some extent	10	9.1	7	8.6	10	8.3	4	5.4	31	8.0	
To large extent	100	90.9	74	91.4	111	91.7	70	94.6	355	92.0	
Not at all	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Total	110	100.0	81	100.0	121	100.0	74	100.0	386	100.0	

Source: Field Survey

Table 5. Extent to which follow-up assistance helped entrepreneurs.

Follow-up factors	EDPs	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Median	KW test value	p-value	
Guidance and counseling for preparing applications for financial assistance	Agricultural	110	3.37	1.50	3.00	4.831	.185	NS
	Product	81	3.41	1.51	3.00			
	Process	121	3.03	1.43	3.00			
	General	74	3.14	1.46	3.00			
	Total	386	3.23	1.47	3.00			
Getting sanction of a loan	Agricultural	110	3.35	1.49	4.00	.399	.940	NS
	Product	81	3.38	1.57	4.00			
	Process	121	3.35	1.46	3.00			
	General	74	3.26	1.47	3.00			
	Total	386	3.34	1.49	3.50			
Helping the selection of business location and securing it	Agricultural	110	2.73	1.41	3.00	1.669	.644	NS
	Product	81	2.84	1.35	3.00			
	Process	121	2.96	1.52	3.00			
	General	74	2.93	1.56	3.00			
	Total	386	2.86	1.46	3.00			
Completing governmental formalities	Agricultural	110	3.09	1.42	3.00	4.227	.238	NS
	Product	81	3.49	1.35	4.00			
	Process	121	3.36	1.29	3.00			
	General	74	3.31	1.35	3.50			
	Total	386	3.30	1.36	3.00			
Registration under various statutes	Agricultural	110	3.09	1.42	3.00	4.227	.238	NS
	Product	81	3.49	1.35	4.00			
	Process	121	3.36	1.29	3.00			
	General	74	3.31	1.35	3.50			
	Total	386	3.30	1.36	3.00			
Obtaining a license	Agricultural	110	3.09	1.42	3.00	4.227	.238	NS
	Product	81	3.49	1.35	4.00			
	Process	121	3.36	1.29	3.00			
	General	74	3.31	1.35	3.50			
	Total	386	3.30	1.36	3.00			
Increase in the motivational level	Agricultural	110	3.09	1.42	3.00	4.227	.238	NS
	Product	81	3.49	1.35	4.00			
	Process	121	3.36	1.29	3.00			
	General	74	3.31	1.35	3.50			
	Total	386	3.30	1.36	3.00			
Total	Total	386	3.30	1.36	3.00			

Source: Field Survey

Table 6. Rate of business success.

		EDPs										Test results
		Agricultural		Product		Process		General		Total		
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	
Rate of business success	Highly successful	78	70.9%	59	72.8%	85	70.2%	55	74.3%	277	71.8%	$\chi^2 = 3.741$ d.f = 6 p = 0.712, NS
	Successful	24	21.8%	18	22.2%	22	18.2%	13	17.6%	77	19.9%	
	Unsuccessful	8	7.3%	4	4.9%	14	11.6%	6	8.1%	32	8.3%	
Total		110	100.0%	81	100.0%	121	100.0%	74	100.0%	386	100.0%	

Source: Field Survey

assistance. The statistical significance of the dataset was assessed using the Kruskal-Wallis test, and the findings are displayed in Table 5.

To explore differences among the EDPs concerning the extent of follow-up assistance, the Kruskal Wallis test was applied. The interpretation of the findings can be summarized as follows: when the p-value exceeds 0.05, it is denoted as 'NS', indicating that there is no statistically significant distinction observed among various categories of EDPs. A p-value that is lower than 0.05 is commonly denoted as 'SIG', which signifies a statistically significant difference between the experimental data points (EDPs). A p-value that is less than 0.01 is denoted as 'HS', indicating a statistically significant difference, which signifies a substantial change between EDPs.

Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) offer a variety of support services and subsequent assistance to aid trainees in the successful initiation of their firms. The findings of this study suggest that the provision of guidance and counselling services for the purpose of preparing financial assistance

applications had a considerable positive impact on the individuals surveyed. The data revealed a mean score of 3.23 with a standard deviation of 1.47. In a similar vein, the provision of aid in securing loan approvals was found to be exceedingly advantageous for the participants, as indicated by a mean value of 3.34 and a standard deviation of 1.49. In addition, the respondents reported that support for the process of finding and obtaining appropriate venues was moderately useful, as shown by a mean score of 2.86 and a standard deviation of 1.46. Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) played a significant role in facilitating trainees in completing administrative procedures associated with initiating a firm, as indicated by a mean of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 1.36. Furthermore, the respondents noted that receiving support in registering under different statutes and obtaining permits was found to be greatly advantageous. The data collected indicated a mean score of 3.30 with a standard deviation of 1.36. The implementation of Employee Development Programs (EDPs) significantly contributed to a substantial increase in trainee motivation. This effect was measured using a mean value of 3.30 and a standard deviation of 1.36.

Consequently, the hypothesis 'H03: Follow-up programs of EDPs do not significantly assist trainees' is rejected. Based on these findings, it can be concluded that the follow-up programs of EDPs significantly contribute to the success of trainees.

Rate of business success

The study was conducted to gather the perspectives of trainees on the level of company success, specifically by examining the impact of Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) on trainees' mindsets, motivation, and subsequent actions. This evaluation aimed to measure EDPs' performance in changing mindsets, motivating trainees, and facilitating the management of their entrepreneurial endeavors. The rate of business success was categorized into three levels: 'highly successful', 'successful', and 'unsuccessful'.

A substantial majority of the respondents, specifically 72 percent, rated their businesses as highly successful. Another 20 percent considered their businesses to be 'successful', while 8 percent reported that their businesses were unsuccessful. The findings shown in [Table 6](#) suggest that there is no statistically significant variation in the perspectives of participants across the four categories of EDPs about the level of business success. This conclusion is supported by a p-value of 0.712, which surpasses the predetermined significance level of 0.05.

Discussion

This study has presented a comprehensive analysis of the crucial role played by Entrepreneurship Development Programs (EDPs) in inspiring and supporting trainees to initiate and maintain entrepreneurial ventures by instigating changes in their mindsets, providing motivation, and offering effective follow-up support. Beyond the delivery of enterprise management-related training, the transformation of mindsets, motivation, and follow-up activities are essential for the success of entrepreneurial endeavors. The study's results affirm the indispensable role of EDPs in fostering mindset changes, motivation, and effective follow-up, supported by the justification of hypotheses.

Earlier studies have highlighted the role played by entrepreneurship training programs in promoting start-ups and innovation (Al-Dairi et al., 2012; Wadhwa et al., 2009). This study observes that 'hands-on practice' and result orientation are the key focus areas set forth by entrepreneurship training programmes. It is felt that, understanding the entrepreneur's beliefs and mind-set would help in expanding the ranks of entrepreneurs. Another study (Looi & Maritz, 2021) has reported the challenges faced by EDPs in changing the mindset of entrepreneurs from necessity driven mind-set to opportunity driven mind-set. The present study corroborates the role played by EDPs in changing the mind-set of trainees intended towards achieving favourable business outcomes. The results of hypothesis (H01) in this study indicates a positive influence of entrepreneurial development programs on trainees' entrepreneurial mindsets. Across all EDPs, a significant change in respondents' mindsets is evident after participating in the training, compared to their pre-training mindset. A greater number of respondents expressed an increased need for training provided by EDPs after receiving it, highlighting the role of RUDSETIs in influencing

and amplifying trainees' commitment towards entrepreneurship. The influence of EDPs in altering mindsets implies a high level of trainee interest in entrepreneurship. This finding aligns with previous literature, (Looi & Maritz, 2021; Wadhwa et al., 2009; Tóth-Pajor et al., 2023) which underscores the significant impact of EDPs in fostering mindset changes. This study concurs with previous research, which defines entrepreneurship training as a structured program designed to equip trainees with the essential skills and mindset to identify and establish new enterprises (Cope, 2005; Katz, 2007). Moreover, our findings emphasize that EDPs' role in mindset change is linked to entrepreneurial success. EDPs facilitate a better understanding of factors affecting business outcomes, thereby leading to a mindset shift. Entrepreneurial development programs encourage trainees to adopt a lifelong learning attitude and guide them towards active engagement in their businesses. The study underscores that entrepreneurial development programs significantly influence trainees' entrepreneurial mindset by providing them with knowledge of entrepreneurship and guiding them toward a successful career choice. The findings presented in this study are consistent with the research conducted by other scholars in entrepreneurship (Nowiński et al., 2019; Saptono et al., 2020). These scholars have observed that programs aimed at fostering entrepreneurial development have the potential to significantly transform individuals' entrepreneurial attitude. As a result, individuals become better equipped to effectively handle and utilize precious assets and resources in the pursuit of new business endeavors. Previous studies, identified that financial training enhances entrepreneurs' confidence, better preparing them for loan application processes (Bauer, 2011). Entrepreneurship education and training have been shown to boost entrepreneurs' confidence (Barnard et al., 2018; Rauth Bhardwaj, 2014). According to Spinosa et al., (1997), modern business environments require an entrepreneurial mindset that embraces modern attributes such as creativity, motivation, and risk-taking, while unlearning traditional management principles to mitigate high failure rates (Morris & Kuratko, 2002). Other classical studies in entrepreneurship literature (Robinson et al., 1991; Zampetakis et al., 2009) reveal that creativity, empowerment (Veena & Mahadeva Murthy, 2015) alertness, proactivity, personal characteristics (Sarri & Trihopoulou, 2005) achievement and self-esteem are factors that influence a change in mindset among entrepreneurs when exposed to EDP interventions.

In connection with the role of EDPs in changing mindsets, the study suggests that despite a positive link between EDPs and trainee mindsets, additional efforts should be devoted to transform those trainees whose mindsets remain unchanged or only slightly altered. To achieve this end, an innovative training approach may involve the inclusion of a mentorship program where successful local businessmen can mentor the trainees for a determined period. Such interaction with achievers is likely to boost trainee morale and give positive results. The results indicate that a portion of trainees (10.2%) perceived training and self-employment as only somewhat necessary after receiving training, while 8.3% of trainees felt that training was not needed at all. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Neneh, 2012; Kuratko et al., 2021), which suggest that a low entrepreneurial mindset is a deciding factor to high SME failure rates in specific regions. The training program for entrepreneurship growth should aim to not only excite individuals, but also instill a sense of confidence by transforming their mindsets (Dunlap, 2010). It is necessary to ensure that trainees are cognizant of the fact that failure constitutes an inherent and inescapable component of the entrepreneurial trajectory. However, it is crucial to underscore that success can indeed be achieved with unwavering commitment. Training centers may consider organizing camps in rural areas to reach out to the local population.

Regarding H02, the study finds that EDPs play a crucial role in entrepreneurial motivation (Shane, 2000). All EDPs at RUDSETIs have significantly motivated trainees to initiate their businesses compared to other motivational factors. Studies have reported the positive effect of entrepreneurship development program on the motivation level of women entrepreneurs (Banajee & Talukdar, 1997; Das, 2012; Islam & Aktaruzzaman, 2001; Jyoti et al., 2011; Mehta & Mehta, 2011; Nagaraja et al., 2014) leading to business growth, size of the venture and business development (Abebe & Kegne, 2023; Du Rietz & Henrekson, 2000) Consistent with the findings of this study, our results reveal a strong association between motivational factors outlined by RUDSETI and the motivation generated in trainees to commence business. This outcome underlines the positive influence of entrepreneurial development programs on trainees' entrepreneurial motivation, consistent with previous meta-analytical findings (Naumann, 2017). Other studies (Adeyanju et al., 2023; Martínez-Cañas et al., 2023; Yaqoot et al., 2017) described this positivity as pull motivational factor which is the ability of EDPs to influence a change in the trainees' motivational levels

towards favourable business outcomes. These findings are further supported by earlier research (Bose, 2013) which indicates that EDPs act as a counsel and make trainees more assertive, build confidence, motivate upgrading and decision making and change value orientation by encouraging opportunity seeking entrepreneurial behaviour (Li et al., 2020). Another study (Cárdenas-Gutiérrez et al., 2023) indicates that EDPs bolster achievement motivation (Hansemark, 1998) among trainees by encouraging perseverance, proactivity and goal achievement. Studies (Minja et al., 2023) emphasize that entrepreneurship training instills confidence, increasing individuals' intentions to start businesses, engage in innovation (Nadelson et al., 2018) and business prosperity. Previous studies have reported that EDPs can address trainees need for professional achievements through the lens of social entrepreneurship using (Germak & Robinson, 2014) social security, social relations, social learning (Fernando & Nishantha, 2019) and cognitive interest and change entrepreneurial mindset (Jung & Lee, 2020).

This study reveals that EDPs play a pivotal role in motivating trainees' intent to commence business when compared with other factors of motivation like influence of family, friends, success stories of other entrepreneurs and gaining social prestige. Interestingly, EDPs can promote success stories of local entrepreneurs and suggest ways of gaining social prestige in the training program as an inclusion in the pedagogy (Smirnov et al., 2023) to encourage commencement of business. Furthermore, the trainee participation constitution should be made more inclusive by maintaining diversity and including trainees from the schedule castes (SC) and schedule tribes (ST). The SC/ST group of trainees present a unique case with different type of mindset and levels of motivation. Our study presents a new case for future researchers who can examine the relationship between trainee's affiliation to caste and entrepreneurial intent and EDPs role in measuring and addressing these mindset and motivational dimensions.

It is also felt that the practical aspect of training should be enhanced by extending the training duration and incorporating field visits, mentorship programs, exhibitions, coaching, grooming, seminars, conferences, and workshops. These strategies can help instill the spirit of entrepreneurship and foster achievement motivation, ultimately contributing to the success of entrepreneurial ventures.

Regarding H03, the study identifies that the quality of follow-up programs significantly contributed to trainees' success. These results are consistent with previous research findings, which emphasize that comprehensive follow-up assistance by EDPs results in higher trainee participation and a more positive perception of training program effectiveness (Nagesh & Murthy, 2008; Veena, 2008). Many respondents in this study reported attending follow-up meetings, with trainers visiting their enterprises after EDPs. The results indicate that follow-up assistance significantly aided entrepreneurs.

Nonetheless, it is suggested that RUDSETIs should consider enhancing the quality of follow-up programs in certain areas. For instance, assistance in selecting and securing suitable locations at the time of enterprise setup was rated below 3 on average. Additionally, the quality of follow-up programs was not very high, with mean values below 4 in all aspects. These findings are in line with a previous study, which cited inadequate follow-up support as a significant weakness of EDPs. Therefore, follow-up programs should be enriched and help in preparing detailed project reports for loan sanction, creating marketing facilities at the taluk level, and organizing regular exhibitions. New strategies should be introduced to raise awareness about government programs and schemes for rural entrepreneurs to promote discussions and interactions (Dasgupta et al., 2006; Yuan et al., 2021) through various media channels.

Regarding H04, the study reveals that trainees' success rates are positively influenced by RUDSETIs' training programs, which contribute to mindset changes, motivation, and follow-up quality. The findings of this study are consistent with prior research that suggests that the cultivation of an entrepreneurial mindset, along with motivation and ongoing support, has a substantial impact on the development of trainees. Specifically, it boosts their capacities, decision-making skills, quality of life, self-assurance, and leadership attributes. However, it is important for RUDSETIs to take additional measures to improve the success rates (Nieuwenhuizen & Kroon, 2002) of trainees who remain unsuccessful or are not highly successful.

EDPs have played a vital role in entrepreneurship development by transforming trainees' mindsets, providing motivation, and ensuring high-quality follow-up activities. This, in turn, leads to the enhancement of trainees' capabilities, decision-making, living standards, self-confidence, social interaction, and leadership abilities, empowering them.

Conclusion

This research was undertaken to examine the effects of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs) on the mindset, motivation, and follow-up of trainees. The evidence from the analysis provides new perspectives on the influence of entrepreneurship development programs in India on trainees and their capacity to bring about changes in mindset, motivation, and follow-up outcomes. The results indicate that EDPs have a significant and positive impact on trainees' mindset, motivation, and follow-up abilities. Consequently, these factors contribute to an increased likelihood of achieving success in their business endeavors.

This study has provided valuable insights on the effectiveness of Rural Development and Self-Employment Training Institutes (RUDSETIs) in influencing attitude changes, encouraging individuals in rural areas who underwent training, and ensuring the quality of follow-up activities. The study has unveiled that entrepreneurship development programs are effective in reshaping mindsets, motivating trainees, and ensuring high-quality follow-up. It further demonstrates the success of EDPs in achieving the intended outcomes for trainees.

In addition to the acquisition of knowledge relevant to enterprise management, the transformation of mindset, strong motivation, and effective follow-up are essential components. Rural individuals often face obstacles such as limited education and poverty (Khan & Ali, 2014; Niranjana & Shivakumar, 2017) that can demotivate them from pursuing entrepreneurship. Within this particular setting, the significance of Rural Development and Self-Employment Training Institutes assumes utmost importance. The provision of post-training assistance, motivation, and family counselling has the potential to exert a considerable impact on fostering trainees' active engagement in the economic advancement of the nation.

The success of trainees (Prem, 1995) in initiating and sustaining their entrepreneurial ventures is heavily contingent on motivating factors, mindset alterations, the quality of follow-up programs, and the overall environment. Training alone may not yield the desired outcomes without adequate motivation and follow-up. By integrating motivation and follow-up components, RUDSETI training programs have achieved their intended objectives, providing a platform for trainees to realize their hidden desires and entrepreneurial passions. The RUDSETI awareness program, among other factors, has played a crucial role in inspiring trainees to embark on their entrepreneurial journeys. The training programs have gained considerable recognition among local entrepreneurs as a result of their substantial impact on trainees throughout the years. In conjunction with demographic characteristics such as age, educational attainment, marital status, and monthly household income, the inclusion of motivating elements, shifts in thinking, and the implementation of follow-up programs are crucial in both instigating and maintaining entrepreneurial pursuits. Undoubtedly, conducting an evaluation of the impact of entrepreneurship development institutions in certain regions of Karnataka on trainees' mindset, motivation, and follow-up holds significant potential for fostering the growth of entrepreneurship.

This study has implications and contributions on the role of EDPs in altering mindset, motivation, and ensuring the quality of follow-up. The findings pertaining to the impact (Martin, 2010) of entrepreneurship development programs (EDPs) on attitude transformation, motivation, and the sustenance of follow-up quality provide significant insights into the realm of Indian entrepreneurship development initiatives. These programs provide trainees with the necessary knowledge and practical expertise to effectively begin and oversee the operations of new firms. Entrepreneurial development programs aim to equip participants with the necessary tools and information to identify and exploit entrepreneurial prospects within the market. These programs build an enhanced comprehension, proficiency, and drive to fortify their entrepreneurial attitude, ultimately leading to successful entrepreneurial endeavors. The study provides policymakers at RUDSETI with insights for framing new policies and programs to alter trainees' mindsets in innovative ways.

Nevertheless, it is imperative to acknowledge the presence of significant limitations within this study, which in turn provides potential avenues for future research endeavors. Initially, the data were obtained by the administration of surveys to a subset of trainees enrolled in the Ujire, Bramhavar, and Dharwad RUDSETI training institutions located in Karnataka. It is important to note that the sample size used in this study was quite small. Future research endeavors should aim to increase the scope by include other training centers located throughout India. Furthermore, it is recommended to expand the sample size in

order to enhance the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, future research should investigate the impact of government policies in the realm of training on mindset and motivation. Although this study demonstrated a significant relationship between entrepreneurship development programs and changes in mindset and motivation among rural trainees, it is essential to explore the additional factors that significantly influence these changes.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

About the authors

Santhosha Shetty G Ph.D. is an Associate Professor in the Department of Commerce, Manipal Academy of Higher Education where he teaches financial accounting and advanced accounting. He is also the coordinator for quality and compliance at the Department level.

Vikram Baliga Ph.D. is an Associate Professor in Department of Commerce, Manipal Academy of Higher Education where he teaches marketing research, legal aspects of business and entrepreneurship. Additionally, he is the coordinator for the Centre for Consultancy Training and Corporate Interface.

Mathew Thomas Gil is an Assistant Professor in Department of Commerce, Manipal Academy of Higher Education where he teaches marketing analytics and total quality management. He is also Assistant Head in the Academic Strategy team.

ORCID

Santhosha Shetty G  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9875-2064>

Vikram Baliga  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1765-7485>

Mathew Thomas Gil  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5135-3397>

References

- Abebe, A., & Kegne, M. (2023). The role of microfinance on women's entrepreneurship development in Western Ethiopia evidence from a structural equation modeling: Non-financial service is the way forward. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(3), 2256079. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2256079>
- Abedian, I., & Jacobs, R. (2001). Tobacco taxes and government revenue in South Africa. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 28(6), 397–23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM000000006275>
- Adeyanju, D. F., Akomolafe, K. J., Mburu, J. I., Ohanwusi, E. O., Adebayo, S. A., & Joy, C. (2023). Does entrepreneurship improve the livelihood of young people? Evidence from the NDE program beneficiaries in Kano state, Nigeria. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(2), 2248735. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2248735>
- Adjimah, P. H., & Perry, A. L. (2014). Effectiveness of entrepreneurship development programs in Ghanaian polytechnics. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 4(1), 78–89. www.econjournals.com
- Al-Dairi, A., McQuaid, R., & Adams, J. Bahrain Polytechnic Bahrain. (2012). Entrepreneurship training to promote start-ups and innovation in Bahrain. *International Journal of Innovation and Knowledge Management in Middle East and North Africa*, 1(2), 179–210. <https://doi.org/10.47556/J.IJIKMMENA.1.2.2012.5>
- Anitha, H. S., & Laxmisha, A. S. (2003). Entrepreneurship development: A growing movement. *Kaigareka Varthe*, 21(6), 11–13.
- Baldwin, T. T., & Ford, J. K. (1988). Transfer of training: A review and directions for future research. *Personnel Psychology*, 41(1), 63–105. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1988.tb00632.x>
- Banajee, M., & Talukdar, R. K. (1997). Variables influencing entrepreneurship of women entrepreneurs. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*, XXXIII(1 & 2), 36. 25
- Barnard, A., Pittz, T., & Vanevenhoven, J. (2018). Entrepreneurship education in US community colleges: a review and analysis. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 26(2), 190–208. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-06-2018-0178>

- Bauer, K. (2011). Training women for success: an evaluation of entrepreneurship training programs in Vermont, USA. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 14, 1.
- Beena, C., & Sushma, B. (2003). Women entrepreneurs managing petty business: A study from motivational perspective. *Southern Economist*, 42(2), e01512.
- Bharti, N. (2014). The role of training in reducing poverty: the case of microenterprise development in India. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 18(4), 291–296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12042>
- Birdi, K., Allan, C., & Warr, P. (1997). Correlates and perceived outcomes of 4 types of employee development activity. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(6), 845–857. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.6.845>
- Bose, V. (2013). An analysis of women entrepreneurship development programmes in the state of Kerala. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Management*, 2(3), 41.
- Bosman, L., & Fernhaber, S. (2018). Applying authentic learning through the cultivation of the entrepreneurial mindset in the engineering classroom. *Education Sciences*, 9(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci9010007>
- Brinkerhoff, R. O., & Montesino, M. U. (1995). Partnerships for training transfer: Lessons from a corporate study. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 6(3), 263–274. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920060305>
- Broad, M. L., & Newstrom, J. W. (1992). *Transfer of Training: Action-Packed Strategies To Ensure High Payoff from Training Investments*. Corporate and Professional Publishing Group, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., One Jacob Way.
- Cárdenas-Gutiérrez, A. R., Domínguez-Quintero, A. M., & Bernal-Guerrero, A. (2023). Assessment of entrepreneurial potential in the training of a new generation of change agents in Spain. *Social Sciences*, 12(12), 680. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12120680>
- Carsrud, A., & Brännback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial motivations: what do we still need to know? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2010.00312.x>
- Chakravarty, T. K. (1987). Entrepreneurship development: Present status & emerging priorities. *SEDME (Small Enterprises Development, Management & Extension Journal): A Worldwide Window on MSME Studies*, 14(4), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0970846419870401>
- Chhabra, M., Hassan, R., Shah, M. A., & Sharma, R. (2023). A bibliometric review of research on entrepreneurial capacity for the period 1979 to 2022: Current status, development, and future research directions. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(1), 2178338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2178338>
- Chaudhari, P. T. (1999). *Entrepreneurship Development and Women* (pp. 29–30). Kisan World.
- Chia, C. C., & Liang, C. (2016). Influence of creativity and social capital on the entrepreneurial intention of tourism students. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 12(2), 151–167. <https://doi.org/10.7341/20161227>
- Choudhary, K. N., & Rayalwar, A. P. (2011). Opportunities and challenges for rural women entrepreneurship in India. *Variorum Multi-Disciplinary e-Research Journal*, 1(3), 1–4.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., & Noe, R. A. (2000). Toward an integrative theory of training motivation: a meta-analytic path analysis of 20 years of research. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 678–707. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.678>
- Cope, J. (2005). Toward a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4), 373–397. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2005.00090.x>
- Cromwell, S. E., & Kolb, J. A. (2004). An examination of work-environment support factors affecting transfer of supervisory skills training to the workplace. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 15(4), 449–471. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.1115>
- Cui, J., Sun, J., & Bell, R. (2019). The impact of entrepreneurship education on the entrepreneurial mindset of college students in China: The mediating role of inspiration and the role of educational attributes. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 19(1), 100296. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2019.04.001>
- Das, M. (2012). Women empowerment through entrepreneurship: A case study of Guwahati Municipal Corporation. *International Journal of Computer Applications in Engineering Science*, 11(1), 27–29.
- Dasgupta, T., Roy, A. K., & Chattopadhyay, R. N. (2006). Gender entrepreneurship in a rural scenario: a case study of South West Midnapore, West Bengal. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(2), 151–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2006.11978385>
- Daspit, J. J., Fox, C. J., & Findley, S. K. (2023). Entrepreneurial mindset: An integrated definition, a review of current insights, and directions for future research. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(1), 12–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1907583>
- Dhliwayo, S., & Van Vuuren, J. J. (2007). The strategic entrepreneurial thinking imperative. *Acta Commercii*, 7(1), 123–134. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC17005>. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ac.v7i1.20>
- Dunlap, A. (2010). *Understanding the Entrepreneurial Mindset; value added and alternative agriculture*. [WWW document]. <http://www.ncmarketready.org/pdfspt/toolkit/mindset.pdf>
- Dunnette, M. D., & Hough, L. M. (1990). *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 75–170). Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Du Rietz, A., & Henrekson, M. (2000). Testing the female underperformance hypothesis. *Small Business Economics*, 14(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008106215480>
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. Random House.
- Ehlers, T., & Lazenby, K. (2004). *Strategic management: Southern African concepts and cases*. van Schaik publishers.

- Facteau, J. D., Dobbins, G. H., Russell, J. E., Ladd, R. T., & Kudisch, J. D. (1995). The influence of general perceptions of the training environment on pretraining motivation and perceived training transfer. *Journal of Management*, 21(1), 1–25. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063\(95\)90031-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0149-2063(95)90031-4)
- Faltin, G. (2007). *The successful entrepreneurs start as an artist and composer*. German Industry and Commerce.
- Fatoki, O. O. (2010). Graduate entrepreneurial intention in South Africa: Motivations and obstacles. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(9), 87. Available at www.ccsenet.org/ijbm
- Fernando, M. S. J., & Nishantha, B. (2019). Impact of social learning on entrepreneurial behavior: Case of entrepreneurship education at state sector universities in Sri Lanka. *Entrepreneurship Education*, 2(3-4), 171–188. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41959-019-00016-1>
- Ford, J. K., Quiñones, M. A., Segó, D. J., & Sorra, J. S. (1992). Factors affecting the opportunity to perform trained tasks on the job. *Personnel Psychology*, 45(3), 511–527. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1992.tb00858.x>
- Papagiannis, G. D. (2018). Entrepreneurship education programs: The contribution of courses, seminars and competitions to entrepreneurial activity decision and to entrepreneurial spirit and mindset of young people in Greece. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 21(1), 1–21.
- Germak, A. J., & Robinson, J. A. (2014). Exploring the motivation of nascent social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 5(1), 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.01.065>
- Ghosh, N. B., & Rajaram, G. (2015). Developing emotional intelligence for entrepreneurs: The role of entrepreneurship development programs. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 22(4), 85–100.
- Green, D., Taylor, G., & Ford, V. (2020). Cultivating the entrepreneurial mindset in today's small liberal colleges and universities. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 4(1), 14–26.
- Günzel-Jensen, F., Moberg, K., Mauer, R., & Neergaard, H. (2017). Self-efficacy and the entrepreneurial mindset revisited. In *Revisiting the entrepreneurial mind* (pp. 319–335). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-45544-0>
- Handayati, P., Wulandari, D., Soetjipto, B. E., Wibowo, A., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2020). Does entrepreneurship education promote vocational students' entrepreneurial mindset? *Heliyon*, 6(11), e05426. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.101611>
- Hansemark, O. C. (1998). The effects of an entrepreneurship programme on need for achievement and locus of control of reinforcement. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 4(1), 28–50. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552559810203957>
- Haynie, J. M., Shepherd, D., Mosakowski, E., & Earley, P. C. (2010). A situated metacognitive model of the entrepreneurial mindset. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(2), 217–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.10.001>
- Hayward, M., Shepherd, D., & Griffin, D. (2006). A hubris theory of entrepreneurship. *Management Science*, 52(2), 160–172. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1050.0483>
- Herron, L., & Sapienza, H. J. (1992). The entrepreneur and the initiation of new venture launch activities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 17(1), 49–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879201700106>
- Higham, P. A., & Gerrard, C. (2005). Not all errors are created equal: Metacognition and changing answers on multiple-choice tests. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology = Revue Canadienne de Psychologie Experimentale*, 59(1), 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087457>
- Hitt, M. (2000). The new frontier: Transformation of management for a new millennium. *Organization Dynamics*, 28(3), 6–18. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616\(00\)88446-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)88446-6)
- Holton, E. F., III, Bates, R. A., & Ruona, W. E. (2000). Development of a generalized learning transfer system inventory. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 11(4), 333–360. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1532-1096\(200024\)11:4%3C333::AID-HRDQ2%3E3.0.CO;2-P](https://doi.org/10.1002/1532-1096(200024)11:4%3C333::AID-HRDQ2%3E3.0.CO;2-P)
- Hormiga, E., Batista-Canino, R. M., & Sánchez-Medina, A. (2011). The impact of relational capital on the success of new business start-ups. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(4), 617–638. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2011.00339.x>
- Hu, R., & Ye, Y. (2017). Do entrepreneurial alertness and self-efficacy predict Chinese sports major students' entrepreneurial intention? *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 45(7), 1187–1196. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6356>
- Hu, R., Wang, L., Zhang, W., & Bin, P. (2018). Creativity, proactive personality, and entrepreneurial intention: the role of entrepreneurial alertness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 951. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00951>
- Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., & Sirmon, D. G. (2003). A model of strategic entrepreneurship: The construct and its dimensions. *Journal of Management*, 29(6), 963–989. (03)00086-2. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(03\)00086-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00086-2)
- Islam, S. M., & Aktaruzzaman, M. (2001). The problems of rural women entrepreneurs in Bangladesh: A case study of Jhenaidah District. *Islamic University Studies*, 4, 19–32.
- Israel, G. D. (1992). *Determining sample size*. 2017.
- Jabeen, F., Faisal, M. N., & I. Katsioloudes, M. (2017). Entrepreneurial mindset and the role of universities as strategic drivers of entrepreneurship: Evidence from the United Arab Emirates. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 24(1), 136–157. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-07-2016-0117>
- Jena, R. K. (2020). Measuring the impact of business management Student's attitude towards entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial intention: A case study. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 107, 106275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106275>
- Johnson, V. D. (2009). *Growth mindset as a predictor of smoking cessation* [Doctoral dissertation]. Cleveland State University. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=csu1246034970

- Jung, E., & Lee, Y. (2020). College students' entrepreneurial mindset: educational experiences override gender and major. *Sustainability*, 12(19), 8272. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12198272>
- Jyoti, J., Sharma, J., & Kumari, A. (2011). Factors affecting orientation and satisfaction of women entrepreneurs in rural India. *Annals of Innovation & Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 5813. <https://doi.org/10.3402/aie.v2i1.7371>
- Kanitkar, A. (1994). Entrepreneurs and micro-enterprises in rural India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, M25. M30.
- Karyaningsih, R. P. D., Wibowo, A., Saptono, A., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2020). Does entrepreneurial knowledge influence vocational students' intention? Lessons from Indonesia. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 8(4), 138–155. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2020.080408>
- Katz, J. (2007). Education and Training in Entrepreneurship. In J. Baum, M. Frase and R. Baron (Eds.), *The psychology of Entrepreneurship, Slop, Organisational Frontier Series*. Psychology Press
- Khan, M. A., & Ali, A. J. (2014). The role of training in reducing poverty: the case of the ultra-poor in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 18(4), 271–281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12041>
- Khanna, S. S. (2001). *Entrepreneurship Development* (pp. 62–64). Chand Publications.
- Kirzner, I. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(1), 60–85. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2729693>.
- Kraiger, K., McLinden, D., & Casper, W. J. (2004). Collaborative planning for training impact. *Human Resource Management*, 43(4), 337–351. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20028>
- Kuckertz, A., & Wagner, M. (2010). The influence of sustainability orientation on entrepreneurial intentions – investigating the role of business experience. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 524–539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvent.2010.03.009>
- Kuratko, D. F., Fisher, G., & Audretsch, D. B. (2021). Unraveling the entrepreneurial mindset. *Small Business Economics*, 57(4), 1681–1691. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-020-00372-6>
- Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Naffziger, D. W. (1997). An examination of owner's goals in sustaining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 35(1), 24. Docview/221006386/se-2.
- Lackéus, M. (2016). A 'value' and 'economics' grounded analysis of six value creation based entrepreneurial education initiatives [Paper presentation]. *ECSB Entrepreneurship Education Conference* (Vol. 11, p. 13).
- Larsen, I. B. (2022). Fostering an entrepreneurial mindset: A typology for aligning instructional strategies with three dominant entrepreneurial mindset conceptualizations. *Industry and Higher Education*, 36(3), 236–251. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222211038212>
- Li, C., Murad, M., Ashraf, S. F., Syed, N., & Riaz, M. (2020). Entrepreneurial nascent behaviour: The role of causation process in opportunity discovery and creation. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 8(4), 183–200. 80410. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2020.0>
- Looi, K. H., & Maritz, A. (2021). Government institutions, entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurship education programmes in Malaysia. *Education + Training*, 63(2), 271–291. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-07-2020-0217>
- Lynch, M. P., & Corbett, A. C. (2023). Entrepreneurial mindset shift and the role of cycles of learning. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(1), 80–101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1924381>
- Mai, R., & Dickel, P. (2023). What we say = what we think? How implicit beliefs shape nascent entrepreneurial behavior. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(6), 2986–3026. 2021 International Council for Small Business <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1956505>©
- Martin, B. C., McNally, J. J., & Kay, M. J. (2013). Examining the formation of human capital in entrepreneurship: A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship education outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(2), 211–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2012.03.002>
- Martin, H. J. (2010). Improving training impact through effective follow-up: techniques and their application. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(6), 520–534. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621711011046495>
- Martínez-Cañas, R., Ruiz-Palomino, P., Jiménez-Moreno, J. J., & Linares-Langreo, J. (2023). Push versus Pull motivations in entrepreneurial intention: The mediating effect of perceived risk and opportunity recognition. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, 29(2), 100214. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iemeen.2023.100214>
- Masur, Y. V., Jadhav, V. S., & Sarojani, K. (2014). Entrepreneurship Development Programmes offered for Women by KVK and RUDSETI. *Advance Research Journal of Social Science*, 5(2), 188–192. <https://doi.org/10.15740/HAS/ARJSS/5.2/188-192>
- McClelland, D. C., & Winter, D. G. (1969). *Motivating economic achievement*.
- McLarty, B. D., Hornsby, J. S., & Liguori, E. W. (2023). Advancing entrepreneurial mindset: What do we know and where do we go? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2022.214809>
- McGrath, R. G., & MacMillan, I. C. (2000). *The entrepreneurial mindset: Strategies for continuously creating opportunity in an age of uncertainty*. (Vol. 284). Harvard Business Press.
- Meenakshi, S. P., Subrahmanyam, C. V., & Ravichandran, K. (2013). Entrepreneurship as a Tool for the Empowerment of Rural Women in India. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 13(5), 7–12.
- Mehta, A., & Mehta, M. C. (2011). *Rural women entrepreneurship in India: opportunities and challenges* [Paper presentation]. International Conference on Humanities, Geography and Economics (pp. 313–314).
- Minja, J. J., Charles, G., & Mbura, O. K. (2023). The influence of co-production of entrepreneurship training programmes on the creative transfer of entrepreneurship skills. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 13(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40497-023-00349-1>

- Mohapeloa, M. T. (2017). Developing an entrepreneurial mindset within the social sector: A review of the South African context. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, 9(5), 645–652. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20421338.2017.1358917>
- Moore, C. B., McIntyre, N. H., & Lanivich, S. E. (2021). ADHD-related neurodiversity and the entrepreneurial mindset. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 45(1), 64–91. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719890986>
- Morris, M. H., & Kuratko, D. F. (2002). *Corporate entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial development within organizations*. South-Western Pub.
- Morris, M. H., & Tucker, R. (2023). The entrepreneurial mindset and poverty. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(1), 102–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1890096>
- Nadelson, L. S., Palmer, A. D., Benton, T., Basnet, R., Bissonnette, M., Cantwell, L., Joufflas, G., Elliott, E., Fromm, M., & Lanci, S. (2018). Developing next generation of innovators: Teaching entrepreneurial mindset elements across disciplines. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 7(5), 114–126. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v7n5p114>
- Nagaraja, V., Revathi, P., & Kumar, R. S. (2014). The Catalytic role of NGO's: Women Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 3, 162–165.
- Nagesh, P., & Murthy, M. N. (2008). The effectiveness of women entrepreneurship training program: A case study. *The ICFAI University Journals of Entrepreneurship Development*, 3, 24–40.
- Naumann, C. (2017). Entrepreneurial mindset: A synthetic literature review. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 5(3), 149–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1907583>
- Neneh, N. B. (2012). An exploratory study on entrepreneurial mindset in the small and medium enterprise (SME) sector: A South African perspective on fostering small and medium enterprise (SME) success. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(9), 3364. <https://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM10.1631>
- Nieuwenhuizen, C., & Kroon, J. (2002). Identification of entrepreneurial success factors to determine the content of entrepreneurship subjects: Research in higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 16(3), 157–166. <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC36933>. <https://doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v16i3.25228>
- Niranjan, R., & Shivakumar, S. (2017). Poverty and Employment Generation in India. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 3(8), 14–20.
- Njeru, P. W. (2012). *The effect of entrepreneurial mind set on the performance of manufacturing Businesses in Nairobi industrial area* [Unpublished PhD thesis]. Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.
- Nowiński, W., Haddoud, M. Y., Lančarič, D., Egerová, D., & Czeglédi, C. (2019). The impact of entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial self-efficacy and gender on entrepreneurial intentions of university students in the Visegrad countries. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(2), 361–379. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1365359>
- Ogunlusi, C. F., David, J. O., Atunbi, J. A., & Ajani, J. O. (2018). Employment generation and poverty alleviation: The effect of entrepreneurship development programmes in Southwest Nigeria. *World Journal of Entrepreneurial Development Studies*, 2(3), 44–46. www.iardpub.org
- Pan, J., Guan, Y., Wu, J., Han, L., Zhu, F., Fu, X., & Yu, J. (2018). The interplay of proactive personality and internship quality in Chinese university graduates' job search success: The role of career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 109, 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.09.003>
- Pato, M. L., & Teixeira, A. A. (2016). Twenty years of rural entrepreneurship: A bibliometric survey. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 56(1), 3–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soru.12058>
- Pfeifer, S., Šarlija, N., & Zekić Sušac, M. (2016). Shaping the entrepreneurial mindset: Entrepreneurial intentions of business students in Croatia. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54(1), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12133>
- Pidduck, R. J., Clark, D. R., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2023). Entrepreneurial mindset: Dispositional beliefs, opportunity beliefs, and entrepreneurial behavior. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(1), 45–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1907582>
- Porfirio, J. A., Carrilho, T., Jardim, J., & Wittberg, V. (2022). Fostering Entrepreneurship Intentions: The Role of Entrepreneurship Education. *Journal of Small Business Strategy*, 32(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.53703/001c.32489>
- Prem, S. (1995). Success of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes: An Evaluative Study. *SEDME (Small Enterprises Development, Management & Extension Journal): A Worldwide Window on MSME Studies*, 22(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0970846419950201>
- Radhika, M. K., & Siddappa, B. (2014). Motivational factors and status of women entrepreneurs in small-scale industries: A critical review. *Review of Res*, 3(12), 14–35.
- Rahman, M. M., Hossain, I. M., & Miah, A. S. (2000). Problems of women entrepreneurship development: A study of Grameen Bank finance on some selected areas. *Islamic University Studies*, 3, 124–128.
- Rauth Bhardwaj, B. (2014). Impact of education and training on performance of women entrepreneurs: A study in emerging market context. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 6(1), 38–52. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-05-2013-0014>
- Rizvi, S. A. A., Qureshi, M. A., Ahmed, Q. N., & Ali, M. (2023). Being and becoming an entrepreneur: A narrative study on the development of entrepreneurial mindset in Pakistan. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 11(2), 171–183.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879101500405> <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2023.110209>
- Robinson, D. G., & Robinson, J. C. (1989). *Training for impact: How to link training to business needs and measure the results*.

- Rodriguez, S., & Lieber, H. (2020). Relationship between entrepreneurship education, entrepreneurial mindset, and career readiness in secondary students. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 43(3), 277–298. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053825920919462>
- Rouiller, J. Z., & Goldstein, I. L. (1993). The relationship between organizational transfer climate and positive transfer of training. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 4(4), 377–390. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920040408>
- Saks, A. M., & Belcourt, M. (2006). An investigation of training activities and transfer of training in organizations. *Human Resource Management*, 45(4), 629–648. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20135>
- Salinger, R. D., & Deming, B. S. (1982). Practical strategies for evaluating training. *Training and Development Journal*, 36, 20–26, 28/29.
- Saptono, A., Wibowo, A., Narmaditya, B. S., Karyaningsih, R. P. D., & Yanto, H. (2020). Does entrepreneurial education matter for Indonesian students' entrepreneurial preparation: The mediating role of entrepreneurial mindset and knowledge. *Cogent Education*, 7(1), 1836728. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2020.1836728>
- Sarri, K., & Trihopoulou, A. (2005). Female entrepreneurs' personal characteristics and motivation: a review of the Greek situation. *Women in Management Review*, 20(1), 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649420510579559>
- Senges, M. (2007). *Knowledge entrepreneurship in universities. Practice and strategy in the case of Internet based innovation appropriation* [Doctoral dissertation]. Universitat Oberta de Catalunya). <http://hdl.handle.net/10803/9117>.
- Shah, H. (2013). Creating an enabling environment for women's entrepreneurship in India.
- Shane, S. (2000). Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science*, 11(4), 448–469. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.4.448.14602>
- Shane, S. (2001). Technological opportunities and new firm creation. *Management Science*, 47(2), 205–220. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.47.2.205.9837>
- Shane, S., Locke, E. A., & Collins, C. J. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2), 257–279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(03\)00017-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(03)00017-2)
- Shettigar, M. M. (2012). *Efficacy of skill development training in entrepreneurship development A case study of rural development and self-employment training institute RUDSETI*.
- Sidhu, K., & Kaur, S. (2006). Development of entrepreneurship among rural women. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(2), 147–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2006.11892543>
- Smirnov, S., Dmitrichenkova, S., Dolzhich, E., & Murzagalina, G. (2023). Entrepreneurial Competence Development Program: Implementing Efficiency through Knowledge Sharing. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(6), 147. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13060147>
- Singh, R., & Verma, O. P. (2015). Entrepreneurship development practices: A case study of Himachal Pradesh. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management*, 2(2), 139–142. <https://doi.org/10.3126/ijssm.v2i2.12285>
- Spinosa, C., Flores, F., & Dreyfus, H. L. (1997). *Entrepreneurship, democratic action, and the cultivation of solidarity: Disclosing new worlds*.
- Tannenbaum, S. I., & Yukl, G. (1992). Training and development in work organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 43(1), 399–441. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.43.020192.002151>
- Thompson, J. L. (2004). The facets of the entrepreneur: identifying entrepreneurial potential. *Management Decision*, 42(2), 243–258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740410515861>
- Tóth-Pajor, Á., Bedő, Z., & Csapi, V. (2023). Digitalization in entrepreneurship education and its effect on entrepreneurial capacity building. *Cogent Business & Management*, 10(2), 2210891. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.210891>
- Tang, J., Baron, R. A., & Yu, A. (2023). Entrepreneurial alertness: Exploring its psychological antecedents and effects on firm outcomes. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(6), 2879–2908. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1945071>
- Tracey, J. B., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Kavanagh, M. J. (1995). Applying trained skills on the job: The importance of the work environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(2), 239–252. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0021-9010.80.2.239>. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.2.239>
- Tracy, K., Locke, E., & Renard, M. (1999). *Conscious goal setting versus subconscious motives: Longitudinal and concurrent effects on the performance of entrepreneurial firms* [Paper presentation]. Annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Chicago, IL.
- Tyson, S., & Ward, P. (2004). The use of 360-degree feedback technique in the evaluation of management development. *Management Learning*, 35(2), 205–223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507604043025>
- Veena, K. P. (2008). *Effectiveness of entrepreneurship development programmes_ a comparative study of rudseti and MDIC in Mysore city*.
- Veena, K. P., & Mahadeva Murthy, C. (2015). Women Empowerment through EDPs: With Reference to Rural-Urban Development and Self-Employment Training Institute, Mysore City. *Acme Intellects International Journal of Research in Management, Social Sciences & Technology*, 9(9), 1–10.
- Wadhvani, R. D., Kirsch, D., Welter, F., Gartner, W. B., & Jones, G. G. (2020). Context, time, and change: Historical approaches to entrepreneurship research. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 14(1), 3–19. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1346>
- Wardana, L. W., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., Mahendra, A. M., Wibowo, N. A., Harwida, G., & Rohman, A. N. (2020). The impact of entrepreneurship education and students' entrepreneurial mindset: the mediating role of attitude and self-efficacy. *Heliyon*, 6(9), e04922. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04922>.

- Wadhwa, V., Saxenian, A., Freeman, R. B., & Gereffi, G. (2009). America's loss is the world's gain: America's new immigrant entrepreneurs, Part 4. <chrome-extension://efaidnbnmnibpcjpcglclefindmkaj/https://search.issuelab.org/resources/8243/8243.pdf>.
- Westhead, P., & Solesvik, M. Z. (2016). Entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial intention: Do female students benefit? *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 34(8), 979–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242615612534>
- Wexley, K. N., & Baldwin, T. T. (1986). Post training strategies for facilitating positive transfer: An empirical exploration. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(3), 503–520. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256221>
- Willemse, T. M., Boei, F., & Pillen, M. (2016). Fostering teacher educators' professional development on practice-based research through communities of inquiry. *Vocations and Learning*, 9(1), 85–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-015-9142-3>
- Winkler, C., Fust, A., & Jenert, T. (2023). From entrepreneurial experience to expertise: A self-regulated learning perspective. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 61(4), 2071–2096. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1883041>
- Yaqoot, E. S., Wan Mohd Noor, W. S., & Mohd Isa, M. F. (2017). Factors influencing training effectiveness: Evidence from public sector in Bahrain. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Œconomica*, 13(2) <http://journals.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/oeconomica/article/view/3991>
- Yi, G. (2020). From green entrepreneurial intentions to green entrepreneurial behaviors: the role of university entrepreneurial support and external institutional support. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 17(2), 963–979. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-020-00649-y>
- Yimamu, N. (2018). *Entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial motivation*.
- Yorks, L., Beechler, S., & Ciporen, R. (2007). Enhancing the impact of an open-enrollment executive program through assessment. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 310–320. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2007.26361622>
- Yuan, C. H., & Wu, Y. J. (2020). Mobile instant messaging or face-to-face? Group interactions in cooperative simulations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 113, 106508. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106508>
- Yuan, C.-H., Wu, C.-H., Wang, D., Yao, S., & Feng, Y. (2021). Review of Consumer-to-Consumer E-Commerce Research Collaboration. *Journal of Organizational and End User Computing*, 33(4), 167–184. <https://doi.org/10.4018/JOEUC.20210701.oa8>
- Zampetakis, L. A., Kafetsios, K., Bouranta, N., Dewett, T., & Moustakis, V. S. (2009). On the relationship between emotional intelligence and entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 15(6), 595–618. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550910995452>
- Zupan, B., Cankar, F., & Setnikar Cankar, S. (2018). The development of an entrepreneurial mindset in primary education. *European Journal of Education*, 53(3), 427–439. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12293>