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**ABSTRACT**

Student perception plays a vital role in understanding the effectiveness of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs). These perceptions are shaped by various factors such as the relevance of the programme content, the quality of training, and the practical exposure provided. Students often evaluate the usefulness of EDPs based on their ability to bridge the gap between academic knowledge and real-world business practices. Programmes that focus on essential entrepreneurial skills like innovation, financial management, and leadership tend to leave a positive impression on students. By analyzing these perceptions, this study aims to provide insights into how EDPs can be improved to meet the expectations of students and serve as an effective platform for fostering entrepreneurial talent.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs) are structured initiatives aimed at nurturing the entrepreneurial skills and mindset of individuals. These programmes are designed to equip participants with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to identify business opportunities, create business plans, and manage ventures successfully.

The primary objectives of EDPs include:

* Enhancing the entrepreneurial capabilities of individuals.
* Encouraging innovation and problem-solving skills.
* Offering practical training to manage businesses effectively.

These programmes often include modules on ideation, market analysis, financial management, leadership, communication skills and risk assessment. EDPs are conducted by government institutions, private organizations, and academic institutions to promote entrepreneurship as a viable career path and contribute to economic growth.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

**Santha, S. (2016). "Entrepreneurial Perception among College Students."** This study examines how college students perceive entrepreneurship as a career option and the factors that influence their attitudes towards starting a business. The research explores key elements such as personal motivation, risk-taking ability, financial considerations, and societal support. It highlights that students with exposure to entrepreneurship education, mentorship programmes, and hands-on business training are more likely to develop a positive perception of entrepreneurship. Additionally, the study finds that fear of failure, lack of financial support, and limited business knowledge are common barriers affecting students' willingness to pursue entrepreneurship. The research concludes that well-structured educational programmes and institutional support can significantly enhance students’ confidence and interest in entrepreneurship.

**Kumar, V. & Sharma, P. (2017). "Role of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes in Enhancing Start-up Culture".** This study explores how Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs) contribute to fostering a strong start-up culture among students. The research highlights the role of structured training programmes, mentorship, networking opportunities, and financial assistance in shaping entrepreneurial mindsets. It examines the effectiveness of EDPs in equipping students with critical skills such as business planning, risk management, innovation, and leadership. The study also emphasizes the importance of collaboration between academic institutions, industry leaders, and government initiatives in creating a supportive ecosystem for budding entrepreneurs. The findings suggest that well-designed EDPs significantly increase students’ confidence and preparedness to launch and sustain their own ventures.

**Shinde, A. (2018). "Entrepreneurial Mindset among Engineering Students in India".** This study examines the presence and development of an entrepreneurial mindset among engineering students in India. It explores how factors such as academic curriculum, industry exposure, innovation-driven thinking, and technical skills influence students' entrepreneurial intentions. The research highlights that while engineering students possess strong problem-solving abilities, many lack business acumen and risk-taking confidence, which are crucial for entrepreneurship. The study also emphasizes the role of entrepreneurship education, startup incubation centers, and mentorship in bridging this gap. Findings suggest that integrating business training into engineering programmes and encouraging real-world project-based learning can significantly enhance entrepreneurial attitudes among engineering students, motivating them to pursue startups instead of traditional corporate jobs.

**Krishna, B. & Reddy, S. (2019), "Perceived Barriers and Motivations for Entrepreneurship among Undergraduate Students".** This study investigates the key barriers and motivations influencing undergraduate students' entrepreneurial aspirations. The research identifies major obstacles such as financial constraints, fear of failure, lack of business knowledge, and limited access to mentorship. At the same time, it highlights motivational factors like independence, financial success, passion for innovation, and the influence of role models. The study finds that students with exposure to entrepreneurship education and startup ecosystems are more likely to overcome these barriers and develop strong entrepreneurial intentions. It concludes that universities play a crucial role in shaping students' perceptions by offering structured entrepreneurship programmes, networking opportunities, and financial support to encourage startup ventures.

**Reddy, P. P., & Reddy, K. B. (2019), "Entrepreneurship Development Programme and Its Impact on Student’s Entrepreneurial Intention."** This study examines the impact of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs) on students' entrepreneurial intentions. It explores how structured training, mentorship, and hands-on business experiences influence students' decision-making towards entrepreneurship. The research highlights that students who participate in EDPs develop higher confidence, risk-taking ability, and problem-solving skills compared to those who do not. It also emphasizes the role of real-world exposure, networking with entrepreneurs, and access to funding opportunities in fostering an entrepreneurial mindset. The findings suggest that well-designed EDPs significantly increase students' motivation to start their own ventures by reducing fear of failure and improving business competencies.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs) are widely recognized as a tool to promote entrepreneurial skills and self-reliance among students. However, despite their increasing implementation, the effectiveness of these programmes in addressing the needs of students and fostering entrepreneurial capabilities remains uncertain. Many students often lack clarity on how these programmes contribute to practical skill development and perceive a disconnect between the training provided and real-world business challenges.

This study seeks to explore students' perceptions of EDPs as a platform for skill development, identifying the key strengths, limitations, and areas for improvement. The insights gained will help institutions and policymakers enhance the relevance and impact of these programmes in fostering entrepreneurship among students.

**SCOPE OF THE STUDY**

The scope of this study is limited to students who have participated in or been exposed to EDPs within academic or institutional settings. It investigates factors such as programme content, delivery methods, mentorship opportunities, practical training, and overall programme outcomes. By doing so, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the strengths and limitations of these programmes from the perspective of the participants.

The findings of this study are expected to benefit academic institutions, policymakers, and programme developers by offering insights into students’ expectations and experiences. These insights will help in refining the design and implementation of EDPs to ensure they are more effective in fostering entrepreneurial skills and aspirations among students.

 **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The primary objective of this study is to analyze students' perceptions of Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs) as a platform for developing entrepreneurial skills. The study aims to:

* To assess the perception of students regarding Entrepreneurship Development Programmes (EDPs) in colleges.
* To evaluate the effectiveness of EDPs in enhancing entrepreneurial skills among students.
* To examine the barriers and challenges students face in starting their own ventures.
* To identify the key skills and knowledge students feel are essential for successful entrepreneurship and how these are addressed in academic programmes.

 **METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY**

 The current study mainly based on the primary data which is collected from 162 students in Palani taluk through issue of structured questionnaire which contains questions relating to the socio-economic profile of sample respondents, factors influencing Entrepreneurship Development Programme (EDP) and student perception towards EDP. Necessary guidance was given to the respondents for fill up the questionnaire. Convenience sampling method is adopted to who are participating in Entrepreneurship Development Programme in Palani taluk. Statistical tools like simple percentage test and weighted average rank analysis, Chi- Square test were applied for this study.

 **FIELD WORK AND COLLECTION OF DATA**

 The field work for the present study covers a period of six months. The researcher has constructed a questionnaire for collecting data from the respondents. Completed questionnaire has been continuously checked and edited, referring back to the sources.

 **DATA PROCESSING**

 After completing the questionnaire, a thorough checkup of the data was made. The missing details were collected by revisits and correspondence afterwards. Editing of the data was done for further processing and the data was coded. A master table has been prepared to sum up all the information contained in the questionnaire from the master table, and one way tables were prepared for further analysis.

 **FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS**

 On the basis of data collected through questionnaire the researcher has analyzed the student perception of sample respondents. Mean and standard deviation were calculated to find out the level of satisfaction towards Entrepreneurship Development Programme. More over percentage analysis has been used for some factors which are necessary for the student perception.

Weight has been assigned to the various factors that motivate to participate in EDP. Maximum weight is give to the first rank and least weight is given to the last rank. Finally, for each factor total score are arrived at by multiplying the weighted by the number of respondents.

**TABLE 1**

 **MOTIVATING FACTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN EDP**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S.****NO** | **FACTORS** | **WEIGHT** | **10** | **9** | **8** | **7** | **6** | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **TOTAL** |
| **RANK** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** |
| 1 | Enhancing entrepreneurial skills and knowledge | 65 | 25 | 16 | 14 | 20 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | **162** |
| 2 | Providing practical exposure through workshops | 19 | 13 | 31 | 14 | 19 | 26 | 10 | 14 | 6 | 10 | **162** |
| 3 | Improving leadership and decision-making abilities | 23 | 16 | 31 | 27 | 11 | 18 | 15 | 7 | 9 | 5 | **162** |
| 4 | Access to mentorship from successful entrepreneurs | 4 | 26 | 15 | 24 | 24 | 18 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 14 | **162** |
| 5 | Fostering innovative and creative thinking | 16 | 13 | 11 | 12 | 30 | 23 | 21 | 15 | 7 | 14 | **162** |
| 6 | Developing financial management skills | 8 | 13 | 8 | 18 | 11 | 17 | 28 | 31 | 15 | 13 | **162** |
| 7 | Learning marketing and sales strategies | 10 | 7 | 16 | 17 | 7 | 16 | 11 | 33 | 28 | 17 | **162** |
| 8 | Building confidence to take risks in business | 8 | 25 | 18 | 13 | 20 | 5 | 25 | 15 | 27 | 6 | **162** |
| 9 | Networking opportunities with peers and professionals | 5 | 16 | 6 | 12 | 11 | 17 | 19 | 15 | 40 | 21 | **162** |
| 10 | Access to funding or startup resources | 4 | 8 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 12 | 21 | 14 | 13 | 60 | **162** |
|  | **TOTAL** | **162** | **162** | **162** | **162** | **162** | **162** | **162** | **162** | **162** | **162** | **162** |

***Source: Primary data***

From the above Table 1, that total score and the weighted average for the factors “Enhancing entrepreneurial skills and knowledge” have been arrived at as follow.

Total Score = (10\*65) + (9\*25) + (8\*16) + (7\*14) + (6\*20) + (5\*10) + (4\*3) + (3\*3) + (2\*4) + (1\*2)

=1302

**Weighted Average = Total Score / Total Weight**

 = 1302/55

 =**23.67**

The same procedure has been followed for the remaining factors also.

**TABLE 2**

**WEIGHTED AVERAGE RANK**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** | **Factors** | **Weighted Average** | **Rank** |
| 1 | Enhancing entrepreneurial skills and knowledge | 23.7 | I |
| 2 | Providing practical exposure through workshops | 18.2 | III |
| 3 | Improving leadership and decision-making abilities | 19.5 | II |
| 4 | Access to mentorship from successful entrepreneurs | 16.7 | IV |
| 5 | Fostering innovative and creative thinking | 16.4 | V |
| 6 | Developing financial management skills | 14.3 | VII |
| 7 | Learning marketing and sales strategies | 13.6 | VIII |
| 8 | Building confidence to take risks in business | 16.2 | VI |
| 9 | Networking opportunities with peers and professionals | 12.7 | IX |
| 10 | Access to funding or startup resources | 10.8 | X |

***Source: Primary Data***

Table 2 shows that the respondents have given first rank to the enhancing entrepreneurial skills and knowledge followed to the next second rank have given to improving leadership and decision-making abilities, third rank to providing practical exposure through workshops, fourth rank given to access to mentorship from successful entrepreneurs, fifth rank to fostering innovative and creative thinking, sixth rank to building confidence to take risks in business, seventh rank to developing financial management skills, eighth rank to learn marketing and sales strategies, ninth rank to networking opportunities with peers and professionals and tenth rank given to access to funding or startup resources.

**TEST OF HYPOTHESIS USING CHI-SQUARE TEST**

 The chi-square test is the widely used non-parametric test that describes the magnitude of discrepancy between the observed data and expected data to be obtained with a specific hypothesis. The observed and expected frequencies are said to be completely considering when χ2=0 and as the value of χ2 increases the discrepancy between the observed and expected data becomes significant. The following formula is used to calculate chi-square,

**Where = ∑(O-E)2**

**E**

**O= Observed Frequency**

**E= Expected Frequency**

The computed value of χ2 is compared with the p-value. If the calculated value exceeds the p-value, then the difference between the observed frequency and expected frequency are considered as not be significant. On the other hand, if the computed value is less than the p-value, then the difference between the observed frequency and expected frequency is considered to be significant.

**TABLE 3**

**AGE AND SATISFACTION LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** | **Age Group** | **Level of Satisfaction** | **No. of Respondents** |
| **High** | **Medium** | **Low** |
| 1 | Less than 21 Years | 23(30%) | 42(55%) | 11(15%) | 76(100%) |
| 2 | 21 Years | 6(14%) | 28(67%) | 8(19%) | 42(100%) |
| 3 | 22 Years | 5(13%) | 24(65%) | 8(22%) | 37(100%) |
| 4 | Above 22 Years | 1(14%) | 4(57%) | 2(29%) | 7(100%) |
|  | **Total** | **35** | **98** | **29** | **162** |

***Source: Primary Data***

The Table 3 shows that 30 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of less than 21 years, 14 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of 21 years, 13 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of 22 years and 14 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of above 22 years having high level of satisfaction with content and resourcefulness of EDP.

 It is observed that 55 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of less than 21 years, 67 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of 21 years, 65 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of 22 years and 57 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of above 22 years having medium level of satisfaction with content and resourcefulness of EDP.

 It is observed that 15 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of less than 21 years, 19 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of 21 years, 22 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of 22 years and 29 per cent of the respondents are in the age group of above 22 years having low level of satisfaction with content and resourcefulness of EDP.

 Hence, it is concluded that the majority of the respondents in all the category of age show medium level of satisfaction with content and resourcefulness of EDP.

The following hypotheses are framed to study the relationship between age group of the respondents and their level of satisfaction with content and resourcefulness of EDP.

 Ho: Age group of the respondents does not have any significant relationship with their level of satisfaction with content and resourcefulness of EDP.

 Ha: Age group of the respondents has significant relationship with their level of satisfaction with content and resourcefulness of EDP.

In order to test the hypotheses, the chi-square test has been applied. The result of the chi-square test is shown below.

| **TABLE 4****AGE SATISFACTION CROSS TABULATION** |
| --- |
|  | Satisfaction Level | Total |
| High | Medium | Low |
| Age | Less than 21 Years | Count | 23 | 42 | 11 | 76 |
| Expected Count | 16.4 | 46.0 | 13.6 | 76.0 |
| % within Age | 30.3% | 55.3% | 14.5% | 100.0% |
| % within Satisfaction | 65.7% | 42.9% | 37.9% | 46.9% |
| % of Total | 14.2% | 25.9% | 6.8% | 46.9% |
| 21 Years | Count | 6 | 28 | 8 | 42 |
| Expected Count | 9.1 | 25.4 | 7.5 | 42.0 |
| % within Age | 14.3% | 66.7% | 19.0% | 100.0% |
| % within Satisfaction | 17.1% | 28.6% | 27.6% | 25.9% |
| % of Total | 3.7% | 17.3% | 4.9% | 25.9% |
| 22 Years | Count | 5 | 24 | 8 | 37 |
| Expected Count | 8.0 | 22.4 | 6.6 | 37.0 |
| % within Age | 13.5% | 64.9% | 21.6% | 100.0% |
| % within Satisfaction | 14.3% | 24.5% | 27.6% | 22.8% |
| % of Total | 3.1% | 14.8% | 4.9% | 22.8% |
| Above 22 Years | Count | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| Expected Count | 1.5 | 4.2 | 1.3 | 7.0 |
| % within Age | 14.3% | 57.1% | 28.6% | 100.0% |
| % within Satisfaction | 2.9% | 4.1% | 6.9% | 4.3% |
| % of Total | .6% | 2.5% | 1.2% | 4.3% |
| Total | Count | 35 | 98 | 29 | 162 |
| Expected Count | 35.0 | 98.0 | 29.0 | 162.0 |
| % within Age | 21.6% | 60.5% | 17.9% | 100.0% |
| % within Satisfaction | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| % of Total | 21.6% | 60.5% | 17.9% | 100.0% |

**TABLE 5**

| **RESULT OF CHI-SQUARE TEST** |
| --- |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Monte Carlo Sig. (2-sided) | Monte Carlo Sig. (1-sided) |
| Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |
| Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 6.972a | 6 | .323 | .333b | .261 | .406 |  |  |  |
| Likelihood Ratio | 6.965 | 6 | .324 | .414b | .338 | .489 |  |  |  |
| Fisher's Exact Test | 6.914 |  |  | .290b | .220 | .360 |  |  |  |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 4.756c | 1 | .029 | .012b | .000 | .029 | .000b | .000 | .018 |
| N of Valid Cases | 162 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. 3 cells (25.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.25. |
| b. Based on 162 sampled tables with starting seed 2000000. |
| c. The standardized statistic is 2.181. |

* Pearson Chi-Square Value = 6.972
* Degrees of Freedom (df ) = 6
* Asymptotic Sig. (p-value) = 0.323

Since the p-value (0.323) is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected, meaning there is no significant relationship between age and satisfaction level.

**TABLE 6**

**GENDER AND SATISFACTION LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** | **Gender** | **Level of Satisfaction** | **No. of Respondents** |
| **High** | **Medium** | **Low** |
| 1 | Male | 17(25%) | 40(59%) | 11(16%) | 68(100%) |
| 2 | Female | 18(19%) | 58(62%) | 18(19%) | 94(100%) |
|  | **Total** | **35** | **98** | **29** | **162** |

***Source: Primary data***

The Table 6 shows that 25 per cent of the respondents are male and 19 per cent of the respondents are female having high level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

It is observed that 59 per cent of the respondents are male and 62 per cent of the respondents are female having medium level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

It is also observed that 16 per cent of the respondents are male and 19 per cent of the respondents are female having low level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

Hence, it is concluded that the majority of the respondents in both category of gender are having medium level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

The following hypotheses are framed to study the relationship between gender and the level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP:

Ho: Gender of the respondents does not have any significant relationship with their satisfaction level of the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

Ha: Gender of the respondents has a significant relationship with their satisfaction level of the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

In order to test the hypotheses, the Chi-Square test has been applied. The results of the Chi-Square test are shown below.

**TABLE 7**

| **GENDER SATISFACTION LEVEL CROSS TABULATION** |
| --- |
|  | Satisfaction Level | Total |
| High | Medium | Low |
| Gender | Male | Count | 17 | 40 | 11 | 68 |
| Expected Count | 14.7 | 41.1 | 12.2 | 68.0 |
| % within gender | 25.0% | 58.8% | 16.2% | 100.0% |
| % within satisfaction\_level | 48.6% | 40.8% | 37.9% | 42.0% |
| % of Total | 10.5% | 24.7% | 6.8% | 42.0% |
| female | Count | 18 | 58 | 18 | 94 |
| Expected Count | 20.3 | 56.9 | 16.8 | 94.0 |
| % within gender | 19.1% | 61.7% | 19.1% | 100.0% |
| % within satisfaction\_level | 51.4% | 59.2% | 62.1% | 58.0% |
| % of Total | 11.1% | 35.8% | 11.1% | 58.0% |
| Total | Count | 35 | 98 | 29 | 162 |
| Expected Count | 35.0 | 98.0 | 29.0 | 162.0 |
| % within gender | 21.6% | 60.5% | 17.9% | 100.0% |
| % within satisfaction\_level | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| % of Total | 21.6% | 60.5% | 17.9% | 100.0% |

| **TABLE 8****RESULT OF CHI-SQUARE TEST** |
| --- |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Monte Carlo Sig. (2-sided) | Monte Carlo Sig. (1-sided) |
| Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |
| Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Pearson Chi-Square | .874a | 2 | .646 | .667b | .594 | .739 |  |  |  |
| Likelihood Ratio | .869 | 2 | .648 | .667b | .594 | .739 |  |  |  |
| Fisher's Exact Test | .887 |  |  | .667b | .594 | .739 |  |  |  |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | .775c | 1 | .379 | .407b | .332 | .483 | .179b | .120 | .238 |
| N of Valid Cases | 162 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.17. |
| b. Based on 162 sampled tables with starting seed 92208573. |
| c. The standardized statistic is .881. |

* Pearson Chi-Square Value = 0.874
* Degrees of Freedom (df) = 2
* Asymptotic Sig. (p-value) = 0.646

Since the p-value (0.646) is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected, meaning there is no significant relationship between gender and satisfaction level of content and resourcefulness of EDP.

**TABLE 9**

**EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION AND SATISFACTION LEVEL OF THE RESPONDENTS**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S. No** |  **Current Level of Education** | **Level of Satisfaction** | **No. of Respondents** |
| **High** | **Medium** | **Low** |
| 1 | Undergraduate Degree | 26(31%) | 44(52%) | 14(17%) | 84(100%) |
| 2 | Postgraduate Degree | 9(12%) | 54(69%) | 15(19%) | 78(100%) |
|  | **Total** | **35** | **98** | **29** | **162** |

***Source: Primary Data***

The Table 9 shows that 31 per cent of the respondents are pursuing undergraduate degree and 12 per cent of the respondents are pursuing postgraduate degree having high level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP. It is observed that 52 per cent of the respondents are pursuing undergraduate degree and 69 per cent of the respondents are pursuing postgraduate degree having medium level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

It is also observed that 17 per cent of the respondents are pursuing undergraduate degree and 19 per cent of the respondents are pursuing postgraduate degree having low level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

Hence, it is concluded that the majority of the respondents in both category of educational qualification having medium level of satisfaction with the content and resourcefulness of EDP.

The following hypotheses are framed to study the relationship between the educational qualification and the level of satisfaction:

* Ho: The educational qualification of the respondents does not have any significant relationship with the level of satisfaction.
* Ha: The educational qualification of the respondents have a significant relationship with the level of satisfaction.

In order to test the hypotheses, the Chi-Square test has been applied. The results of the Chi-Square test are shown below.

**TABLE 10**

| **EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION SATISFACTION LEVEL CROSS TABULATION** |
| --- |
|  | Satisfaction Level | Total |
| High | Medium | Low |
| EducationalQualification | UG | Count | 26 | 44 | 14 | 84 |
| Expected Count | 18.1 | 50.8 | 15.0 | 84.0 |
| % within educationalQualification | 31.0% | 52.4% | 16.7% | 100.0% |
| % within satisfaction level | 74.3% | 44.9% | 48.3% | 51.9% |
| % of Total | 16.0% | 27.2% | 8.6% | 51.9% |
| PG | Count | 9 | 54 | 15 | 78 |
| Expected Count | 16.9 | 47.2 | 14.0 | 78.0 |
| % within educationalQualification | 11.5% | 69.2% | 19.2% | 100.0% |
| % within satisfaction level | 25.7% | 55.1% | 51.7% | 48.1% |
| % of Total | 5.6% | 33.3% | 9.3% | 48.1% |
| Total | Count | 35 | 98 | 29 | 162 |
| Expected Count | 35.0 | 98.0 | 29.0 | 162.0 |
| % within educationalQualification | 21.6% | 60.5% | 17.9% | 100.0% |
| % within satisfaction level | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| % of Total | 21.6% | 60.5% | 17.9% | 100.0% |

| **TABLE 11****RESULT OF CHI-SQUARE TEST** |
| --- |
|  | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Monte Carlo Sig. (2-sided) | Monte Carlo Sig. (1-sided) |
| Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval |
| Lower Bound | Upper Bound | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Pearson Chi-Square | 9.102a | 2 | .011 | .012b | .000 | .029 |  |  |  |
| Likelihood Ratio | 9.451 | 2 | .009 | .012b | .000 | .029 |  |  |  |
| Fisher's Exact Test | 9.214 |  |  | .012b | .000 | .029 |  |  |  |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 4.932c | 1 | .026 | .019b | .000 | .039 | .000b | .000 | .018 |
| N of Valid Cases | 162 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.96. |
| b. Based on 162 sampled tables with starting seed 475497203. |
| c. The standardized statistic is 2.221. |

* Pearson Chi-Square Value = 9.102
* Degrees of Freedom (df) = 2
* Asymptotic Sig. (p-value) = 0.011

Since the p-value (0.011) is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted, meaning there is significant relationship between educational level and satisfaction level of content and resourcefulness of EDP.

**CONCLUSION**

The study on "Student Perception of Entrepreneurship Development Programme in College as a Platform for Entrepreneurship Skill Development" highlights the significant role of EDPs in shaping students' entrepreneurial mindset and skills. The findings reveal that while students acknowledge the importance of EDPs in fostering business knowledge, skill development, and confidence in entrepreneurship, certain challenges such as language barriers, lack of practical exposure, and limited awareness hinder their effectiveness.

To enhance the impact of EDPs, colleges should focus on practical training, mentorship programmes, industry collaborations, and digital learning methods. Additionally, efforts must be made to ensure inclusivity, financial accessibility, and hands-on experience through startup incubation centers and industrial visits. Strengthening government and private sector partnerships can further enhance funding opportunities and exposure for aspiring student entrepreneurs.

Overall, EDPs serve as a crucial foundation for entrepreneurial skill development, encouraging students to explore self-employment opportunities and innovative business ventures. With continuous improvements in programme structure, accessibility, and practical implementation, EDPs can effectively contribute to a thriving entrepreneurial ecosystem among college students.

This study underscores the need for a structured and dynamic approach to EDPs, ensuring that students gain not only theoretical knowledge but also the confidence and resources to transform their entrepreneurial ideas into successful ventures.
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