CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Data Analysis

Part I- Descriptive analysis of Entrepreneurs Opinion

Part II- Descriptive analysis of Employee Opinion

Part III- Organisation Performance

Part IV- Comparative Analysis

Part V- Hypothesis Testing

CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

4.1 Introduction:

The present chapter contains presentation and analysis of data. This is an effort to suffice the objectives set for this research and to test the hypothesis.

4.2. Data Analysis:

Data has taken on electronic spreadsheet for data validation and classification. Measures of central tendency, measures of dispersion and variance have brought in use as descriptive analysis. The hypothesis has tested using chi square test.

The data have presented in five parts enumerated herewith.

Part I	**Descriptive Analysis of Entrepreneurs Opinion**
Part II	**Descriptive Analysis of Employee Opinion**
Part III	**Organisational Performance**
Part IV	**Comparative Analysis**
Part V	**Hypothesis Testing**

Part I
Descriptive Analysis of Entrepreneurs Opinion

Part I of analysis highlights the analysis of data related with opinions given by Entrepreneurs.

Age of Entrepreneur

India is known as country of young population .It's average age is in between 25 to 29years. Following table shows age of the sample entrepreneurs. The age in years have taken in the range using four options i.e. age less than 25 years, 25 to 35 years and the last option is age more than 45 years. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.2.1
Age of Entrepreneur

Sr.	Age Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
1	Less than 25 yrs.	9	6.25
2	25-35 yrs.	51	35.42
3	35-45 yrs.	42	29.17
4	More than 45 yrs.	42	29.17
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table reveals that age of 35.42 % samples is in between 25-35 years. 59.34 percent samples age is between 35 years and above. Meagre 6.25 % samples having age less than 25 years. It shows that maximum number of samples having age more than 35.

It may be concluded that around 60% entrepreneur's falls in the adult age category followed by 40% belongs to young age category.

Education of Entrepreneurs

Entrepreneurs are made not born; most of the time education motivates individual to opt the path of an entrepreneurship. Following table shows the educational achievements of the sample entrepreneurs. Since the entrepreneurs found to have technical education, applicable technical educational qualifications have been taken for analysis. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.2.2
Education of Entrepreneurs

Sr.	Education Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
1	Engineering Degree	75	52.08
2	Engineering Diploma	15	10.42
3	I.T.I.	21	14.58
4	S.S.C.- Graduation	33	22.92
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table reveals that 52.08 % sample are from engineering field followed by almost one forth i.e. 22.92 % samples education is S.S.C.to Graduation. 14.58 % have completed I.T.I. and 10.42 % belongs to Engineering Diploma. It concludes that more than one third sample entrepreneurs i.e. 77.08 % have technical background. of the entrepreneurs i.e. 77% are from technical background.

Entrepreneur's Work Experience

In the days of cutthroat competition; experience is essential for running enterprise successfully. Experience to entrepreneur may come from previous job in other firm. Following table shows the entrepreneur's experience in number of years. Four options were facilitated to mark the experience option in range of years with uneven intervals. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.2.3
Entrepreneur's Work Experience

Sr.	Experience Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
1	1-5 yrs	62	43.06
2	6-10 yrs.	45	31.25
3	10-20 yrs.	30	20.83
4	More than 20 yrs.	7	4.86
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

BARR. BALASAHEB KHARDEKAR LIBRARY
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR.

Above table shows that 43.06 % samples have 1 to 5 years of experience, followed by 31.25 % sample with 6 to 10 years experience. 20.83 % samples have 10 to 20 years experience and 4.86 % sample have more than 20 years experience. It concludes that most of the entrepreneurs are new in business.

Sample entrepreneurs found to be experienced which varies from one year to more than 20 years. are found to have experience less than five years and mare four percent found to have experience more than 20 years.

Entrepreneur's Generation in Entrepreneurship

There are major two classes of entrepreneurs on the basis of entrepreneurship generations. One is founder and the other is successor. It is extremely hard for any individual to start and run the enterprise successfully for long time. Following table shows the analysis of entrepreneur's I'st or II'nd generation. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.2.4
Sample Entrepreneurs Generation in Entrepreneurship

Sr.	Generation Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
1	I'st Generation Entrepreneur	27	18.75
2	II'nd Generation Entrepreneur	117	81.25
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table shows that of i.e. 81.25 % samples belong to 2nd generation Entrepreneurship and 18.75 % belongs to 1'st generation entrepreneurs.

It is concluded that second generation entrepreneurs are more as compare to first generation entrepreneurs.

Period from Year of Establishment

Long period of enterprise establishment is always advantageous for its better performance. Its settled machinery in every area is supportive for it. The following table furnish details of age of enterprise from its establishment. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.2.5
Age of Sample Enterprise

Sr.	Period from Establishment Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
1	Less than 5 yrs	30	20.83
2	6-10 yrs.	54	37.50
3	11-15 yrs.	30	20.83
4	More than 15 yrs.	30	20.83
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table shows that 37.50 % organisations age is between 6 to 10 years, followed by three other categories i.e. Less than 5 yrs, 11-15 yrs., More than 15 yrs shows 20.83 % each. It concludes that 41.66 % enterprises have completed a decade of their existence.

It is concluded that 37.50% of enterprises are established before 6-10 years with moderate period.

Inspiration for Entrepreneurship

Behind every successful individual there is some inspiration. Human being is inspired by different members of society with whom he interacts occasionally. Following table describes details of inspiration to the entrepreneur. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.2.6
Inspiration for Entrepreneurship

Sr.	Particulars	Frequency	Percentage
1	Parents	61	42.36
2	Employer	18	12.50
3	Friends	19	13.19
4	Self	46	31.94
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table depicts that 42.36 % samples entrepreneurs inspired by parents to start business, followed to this 31.19 % samples have found to be self motivated to enter into the entrepreneurship. 13.19 % and 12.50% samples inspiration were friends and employers respectively.

It is observed that because of social, culture and traditions, parents have deep influence upon the career of their next generation. Self motivated entrepreneurship is also remarkable in case of samples.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style

The ten statements prescribed by Bolton (2012) were executed on samples to assess the leadership style of sample entrepreneurs. The entrepreneur's opinions regarding their own leadership style have been assessed using five point scale and mean and standard deviation per parameter have calculated as below.

Table 4.2.7
Entrepreneurial Leadership Style

Sr.	Parameter	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1	I like to take bold action by venturing into the unknown.	4.06	1.14	9
2	I am willing to invest a lot of time and/or money on something that might yield a high return.	4.35	0.80	3
3	I tend to act "boldly" in situations where risk is involved.	4.20	0.95	6
4	I often like to try new and unusual activities that are not typical but not necessarily risky.	4.13	0.88	8
5	In general, I prefer a strong emphasis in projects on unique, one-of-a kind approaches, rather than revisiting tried and true approaches used before.	3.80	1.05	10
6	I prefer to try my own unique way when learning new things rather than doing it like everyone else does.	4.19	0.87	7
7	I favor experimentation and original approaches to problem solving rather than using methods others generally use for solving their problems.	4.28	0.75	4
8	I usually act in anticipation of future problems, needs or changes.	4.42	0.70	2
9	I tend to plan ahead on projects.	4.24	0.83	5
10	I prefer to 'step-up' and get things going on projects rather than sit and wait for someone else to do it.	4.51	0.75	1

Source: (Field Data)

Above table shows the mean score and S.D. for the statements which were executed to know the entrepreneurship styles of individual samples. The mean value for all ten parameters shows positive inclination since the mean score ranges from 3.80 to 4.51. The standard deviation is at little higher side and ranges from 0.70 to 1.14 which shows much deviation in the opinion. The mean and standard deviation does not make clear regarding any of the entrepreneurship leadership style possess by individual sample hence the distinct methodology is warranted to devise the exact leadership style of an individual entrepreneur.

Leadership Style as per Organisation

Table number 1 in the annexure II (Page no. 108) narrates individual leadership style possess by samples. The column number 1 denotes the sample number; column number two denotes an organisation of specific destination. Column number 3 to 5 denotes mean of parameters which determines the leadership style i.e. risk taking style, innovative style and proactive style. Column number six talks of code number given to respective leadership style of which one denotes for risk taking style, two denotes for innovative style and three denotes for proactive style. In the last seventh column the qualitative style of respective sample has mentioned.
In nutshell, following frequency table shows the leadership styles possess by sample entrepreneurs.

Table 4.2.8
Leadership Style

Sr.	Leadership Style	Frequency	Percentage
1	Risk Taking Style	43	29.86
2	Innovative Style	18	12.50
3	Proactive Style	71	49.31
4	Risk Taking Style and Innovative Style	01	0.69
5	Risk Taking Style and Proactive Style	11	7.64
	Total	144	100

Source: Field Data

Above table interpret that as per the entrepreneur's opinion 71 sample possess proactive leadership style, 43 samples opines to have risk taking leadership style and 18 samples think that they have innovative leadership style. Other than this, 12 samples having mixed opinion.

From the opinion of sample entrepreneurs towards their leadership style it has concluded that sample entrepreneurs spread over all the three leadership styles i.e. risk taking style, innovative style and proactive style.

Part II
Descriptive Analysis of Employee Opinion

Previous part of analysis highlights the analysis of data related with opinions given by Entrepreneurs. This part talks about the analysis based on opinions of employees.

Age of Employees

Experienced workforce is strength of an enterprise. Appropriate combination of experience and fresh air take organisation to the path of progress. Following is the table exhibiting age distribution of the employees in organisations. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table: 4.3.1
Age of Employees

Sr.	Age Particulars	Total	%
1	Less than 25 yrs.	66	22.92
2	25-35 yrs.	158	54.86
3	35-45 yrs.	56	19.44
4	More than 45 yrs.	8	2.78
	Total	288	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

From table it is clear that, of the employees (54.86%) are from age group of 25-35 years. Nearly one fifth of employees 22.92% and 19.44%) are from the age group of less than 25 years and 35-45 years respectively. Meagre number of employees (2.78%) is from age group of more than 45 yrs.

It is concluded that, workforce from the Small Scale Enterprises falls in young age category.

Education of Employees

Being small scale industry, these enterprises require more semiskilled and unskilled workforce as compared to enterprises. Following is the table showing details of education particulars of employees. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

BARR. BALASAHEB KHARDEKAR LIBRARY
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR.

Table 4.3.2
Education of Employees

Sr.	Education Particulars	Total	Percentage
1	Engineering Degree/ Diploma	7	2.43
2	I.T.I.	27	9.38
3	Graduation	27	9.38
4	S.S.C.	227	78.82
	Total	288	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

It is evident from above table that, more than three forth (78.82%) workforce in the Small Scale Enterprises is just matriculate. Equal per cent (9.38%) workforce possess educational qualification I.T.T and graduation. Very meagre number of employees (2.43%) is engineering diploma or degree holders.

From above table it can be concluded that, of the workforce in small scale enterprise sector is matriculate.

Employees Experience in Present Organisation

Length of service in one organisation has direct impact upon affection for it. Financial benefits also have equal bearing with length of service in one organisation. Below is the table showing employees Experience in Present Organisation. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.3.3
Employees Experience in Present Organisation

Sr.	Particulars	Total	Percentage
1	1-5 yrs	181	62.85
2	6-10 yrs.	76	26.39
3	11-15 yrs.	13	4.51
4	More than 15 yrs.	18	6.25
	Total	288	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

From the above table it is clear that, of the employees (62.85%) have less than 6 years of experience in the present organisation. Merely one forth (26.39%) of the employees have experience between 6-10 years. Meagre percentage (10.76%) of employees has experience more than 10 years.

It can be concluded that, of the employees have less than 6 years of experience in the present organisation.

Employees Total Experience

Employer tries to recruit experienced staff in his organisation. But day by day it is challenging to make available experienced workforce because of competition. Following table depicts the details about employee's total experience. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.3.4
Employees Total Experience

Sr.	Particulars	Total	Percentage
1	1-5 yrs	141	48.96
2	6-10 yrs.	97	33.68
3	11-20 yrs.	32	11.11
4	More than 20 yrs.	18	6.25
	Total	288	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

From above details it can be inferred that, nearly half of the employees (48.96%) total experience is less than 6 years. One third employees (33.98%) possess experience between 6-10 years. Considerable total experience between 11-20 years is possessed by only 11.11 % employees. Superior experience more than 20 years is possessed by small number 6.25 % employees.

It is concluded that, of workforce (82.64%) in the small scale industry possess experience less than 10 years.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style

Table 4.3.5
Entrepreneurial Leadership Style

Sr.	Parameter	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1	Owner likes to take bold action by venturing into the unknown.	4.24	1.01	4
2	He is willing to invest a lot of time and/or money on something that might yield a high return.	4.22	0.84	5
3	He tends to act "boldly" in situations where risk is involved.	3.93	0.98	8
4	He often likes to try new and unusual activities that are not typical but not necessarily risky.	3.86	0.95	9
5	In general, he prefers a strong emphasis in projects on unique, one-of-a kind approaches, rather than revisiting tried and true approaches used before.	3.76	0.98	10
6	He prefers to try my own unique way when learning new things rather than doing it like everyone else does.	4.09	0.78	7
7	He favour experimentation and original approaches to problem solving rather than using methods others generally use for solving their problems.	4.17	0.84	6
8	He usually acts in anticipation of future problems, needs or changes.	4.29	0.80	3
9	He tends to plan ahead on projects.	4.33	0.80	1
10	He prefers to 'step-up' and get things going on projects rather than sits and waits for someone else to do it.	4.33	0.81	2

Source: (Field Data)

Above table shows the mean score and S.D. for the statements which were executed to know the entrepreneurship styles of individual samples. The mean value for all ten parameters shows positive inclination since the mean score ranges from 3.76 to 4.33. The standard deviation is at little higher side and ranges from 0.78 to 1.01 which shows much deviation in the opinion. The mean and standard deviation does not make clear regarding any of the entrepreneurship leadership style possess by individual sample hence the distinct methodology is warranted to devise the exact leadership style of an individual entrepreneur.

Leadership style as per organisation

Table number 1 in the annexure III (Page no. 112) narrates individual leadership style possess by samples. The column number 1 denotes the sample number; column number two denotes an organisation of specific destination. Column number 3 to 5 denotes mean of parameters which determines the leadership style i.e. risk taking style, innovative style and proactive style. Column number six talks of code number given to respective leadership style of which one denotes for risk taking style, two denotes for innovative style and three denotes for proactive style. In the last seventh column the qualitative style of respective sample has mentioned.

In nutshell, following frequency table shows the leadership styles possess by sample entrepreneurs.

Table 4.3.6
Leadership Style

Sr.	Leadership Style	Frequency	Percentage
1	Risk Taking Style	45	31.25
2	Innovative Style	15	10.42
3	Proactive Style	68	47.22
4	Risk Taking Style and Innovative Style	15	10.42
5	Innovative and Proactive Style	1	0.69
	Total	144	100

Source: (Field Data)

Above table interpret that as per the employee's opinion out of 144 samples 68 entrepreneurs have proactive leadership style, 45 posses risk taking style and 15 have innovative leadership style. Remaining 16 are the combination of leadership style.

UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR

Working Environment

For assessing working environment at macro level applicable to small scale industry, twenty five parameters depicting working environment have taken for study which presumed to be representation of working environment with respect to small scale engineering industry. The opinions of employees towards satisfaction of working environment parameters were taken on five point scale. Basic statistics used for the purpose of data processing and analysis i.e. mean, standard deviation and ranks were computed on the basis of mean score.

Table 4.3.7
Working Environment

Sr.	Parameter	Yes	No	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1.	Workers participation in decision making	249	39	4.31	0.66	7
2.	Employees feel job challenging	232	56	4.02	0.64	15
3.	Regular feedback about work to employees	237	51	3.74	0.80	22
4.	Work in non-stress and positive conditions	189	99	3.97	0.78	17
5.	Adequate light and Ventilation arrangements	264	24	4.70	0.53	1
6.	Safety goggles and shoes	275	13	4.33	0.65	6
7.	Floor cleanliness	279	9	4.56	0.64	3
8.	Drinking water	283	5	4.64	0.54	2
9.	First aid box	269	19	4.13	0.59	13
10.	Firefighting equipment's	209	79	3.70	0.74	23
11.	Payment is made according to Minimum wages act	276	12	4.22	0.68	10
12.	Payment of bonus as per Bonus Act	261	27	4.15	0.62	12
13.	Productivity based incentives	212	76	4.08	0.79	14
14.	Provision of Provident Fund	125	163	3.94	0.72	19
15.	Availability of internal training and development program	196	92	3.56	0.74	25
16.	Suggestion scheme	258	30	3.90	0.70	20
17.	Workers meetings	224	64	4.18	0.52	11
18.	Workers meeting with top officials and owners	249	39	3.69	0.75	24
19.	Disciplinary and grievances procedure	254	34	3.96	0.66	18
20.	Performance appraisal policy	224	64	3.75	0.68	21
21.	Equality in work	277	11	4.25	0.75	9
22.	Workers spare time for family and society balancing his work	277	11	4.51	0.62	4
23.	Employees enjoy weekly off	281	7	4.43	0.62	5
24.	Employees enjoy pay leaves	192	96	4.27	0.72	8
25.	Communication facility for employees	258	30	3.97	0.71	16

Source: (Field Data)

Regarding working environment eight parameters of Waltons work life have been taken in representative form. The mean score of satisfaction towards these 25 parameters ranges from 3.56 to 4.70 with a standard deviation ranges from 0.52 to 0.80. The mean score shows that employees are satisfied towards working environment. The standard deviation is reasonably less shows consistency into the opinion. The first three ranks calculated on the mean score depict high satisfaction towards the physical environment the basic aspects required for performing task. Employees are found to be highly satisfied with respect to balanced role of work since they could enjoy time with their family and also could avail the leaves and weekly off. Sample employees found to be highly satisfied with monetary aspects of work; equally they are satisfied with safety arrangements.

Overall sample employees in small scale industry are satisfied with working environment prevail in.

Part III
Organisational Performance

Product Lines of Organizations

Organizations invariably produce multi products to maintain profitability. Since the scenario may differ with small scale units. The effort has been made to assess to know the number of products produce by sample small scale engineering units. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table: 4.4.1
Product Lines Handled by Sample Organizations

Sr.	Product Line i.e. No. of Products	Frequency	%
1	Four & More Products	2	1.39
2	Three Products	4	2.78
3	Two Products	17	11.81
4	One Product	121	84.03
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table reveals that 84.03% of sample units indulge in manufacturing only one product. Four and more products are found to manufacture by only 1.39% of sample units. Around 11.81% of units manufacture two products.

It may be concluded that small scale engineering units generally focused on manufacturing single product.

Nature of Component Produce

Sample companies deal in different modes as far as product manufacturing is concern. The companies may go for its own brand or an original equipment manufacturing status from a corporate or job work production. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.2
Status of Work

Sr.	Status of Work	Frequency	%
1	Own Brand Name of Company	4	2.78
2	Manufacturer Original parts for other Company	47	32.64
3	Production on the basis of Job Work	74	51.39
4	Others	19	13.19
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

i.e. 51.39% of sample units found indulge in job work and that is what the peculiarity of small scale engineering units in Maharashtra, followed by 32.64% are OEM manufacturer and very meagre i.e. 2.78% sample units are having product with their own brand.

It is concluded that 51.39% of sample units are engaged in job work production followed by 32.64% are original equipment manufacturer.

Scenario of White Collar Employees

White collar employees are office staff working with SSI which required generally for managing day to day affaires, accounts and the like. The number of white collar employees existed in the sample organization and percent number left in the year 2012-13 is as follows. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.3
Number of White Collar Employees

Sr.	Particulars	Frequency	%
1	Three & More than	38	26.39
2	Two	45	31.25
3	One	34	23.61
4	Zero	27	18.75
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table shows number of white collar employees working in sample organization. Surprisingly 18.75% of units found to be managed exclusively by entrepreneurs since they do not have a single white collar employee. Whereas 23.61% sample units have one followed by 31.25% sample units have two white collar employees to manage day to day business. Only 26.39% of sample units found to have more than three white collar employees.

It is concluded that 18.75% sample units do not have a white collar employee followed by 23.61% units have one and 31.25% units have two white collar employees on work.

Attrition of White Collar Employees

Table 4.4.4
White Collar Employees Left Their Job

Sr.	White Collar employees left %	Frequency	%
1	Zero	100	69.44
2	One to Twenty	10	6.94
3	Twenty One to Forty	3	2.08
4	More than Forty	31	21.53
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Size of white collar employee in the small scale enterprises is minute. This category is always involved in the more responsible and esteemed activities. It is observed from above table that, of the organizations is successful in retaining their white collar employee.

In 69.44% units not a single white collar employee left job. Extent of job leaving was little i.e. 6.94% for range of 1-20 percent. In only three units i.e. 2.08%, 21-40 % white collar employees preferred to shift to another place. In 21.53% unit's comparatively noticeable level of job leaving more than Forty percent is observed.

It is concluded that, in 69.44% units not a single employee left the job. One to twenty percent employee exit is observed in 6.94% units. Least percentage of employees i.e. 2.08% left in the range of twenty one to forty percent. In 21.53% unit percent of employee left are more than forty percentages.

Scenario of Blue Collar Employees

Blue collar employees are of key significance in the engineering SSI They play vital role in the time bound production targets in prescribed cost with appropriate quality and the like. The number of blue collar employees existed in the sample organization and percent number left in the year 2012-13 is as follows. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table: 4.4.5

Number of Blue collar employees

Sr.	No. of Employees Blue Collar	Frequency	%
1	More than Sixteen	30	20.83
2	Eleven to Fifteen	34	23.61
3	Five to Ten	72	50.00
4	Less than Five	8	5.56
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Small Scale Enterprises produces limited number of units. It results in restricted recruitment of its blue collar employee. It is revealed that 20.83% units have more than sixty blue collar employees. There are eleven to fifteen blue collar employees in 23.61% units. Widespread size of Small Scale Enterprises 50.00% has five to ten employees. It is remarkable fact that only 5.56% of units blue collar employee size is less than five. It illuminate that too small or too large blue collar employee size is infrequent in case of Small Scale Enterprises.

It is concluded that in the greater part 50.00% of the Small Scale Enterprises have Five to Ten blue collar employees. Moderate number of units, 23.61% has Eleven to Fifteen blue collar employees. Nearly equal number of units, 20.83% has more than sixteen blue collar employees.

Attrition of Blue Collar Employees

Table 4.4.6

Percent Blue Collar Employees Left Their Job

Sr.	Blue Collar left %	Frequency	%
1	Zero	68	47.22
2	One to Twenty	60	41.67
3	Twenty One to Forty	12	8.33
4	More than Forty	4	2.78
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

BABASAHEB KHARDEKAR LIBRARY
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR

Small Scale Enterprise is like family unit with more harmony among members of the unit. Less extent of parting is observed in such units. It also provides employment to the semiskilled local workers for whom it benefits with minimum livelihood expenses near their own residence. In 47.22% units there is no blue collar employee exit. Only One to Twenty percent blue collar employee's left job in 41.67% units'. It shows evidence of nearly all units have faced extremely minor percentage of blue collar employee exit. Twenty One to Forty percent blue collar employees left job in small number 8.33% of units. More than Forty percent of blue collar employee exit is observed in meagre number of units 2.78%.

It is concluded that of the Small Scale Enterprises face blue collar employee exit problem. In 47.22% units no single blue collar employee found to left job. 41.67% units experienced One to Twenty percentage percent blue collar employee exits. Small number of units 8.33% and 2.78% faced problem of Twenty One to Forty and More than Forty percent blue collar employee exit problem. The rate of attrition is significantly high.

Absentisum

Timely achievement of target is major task behind organizational success. It depends primarily on prompt attendance of employees involved in the job work. Frequent employee absentisum slow down the performance of organization. Following table depicts the percent employee absentisum in Small Scale enterprises in the year 2012-13.The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.7
Percent Employee Absentisum

Sr.	Absentisum	Frequency	%
1	0	9	6.25
2	1-5	76	52.78
3	6 -10	39	27.08
4	More than 10	20	13.89
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table reveals that zero percent absentisum is observed in only 6.25% units. 52.78% units have absentisum of one to five percent. Considerable 27.08% units have

six to ten percent absentisum. Notable size of units 13.89% has more than 10 absentisum.

It may be concluded that semiskilled and hard functioning nature of job along with geographical nearness of employees have resulted in one to five percent and six to ten percent absentisum of 52.78% and 27.08% units respectively.

Productivity

Productivity of organization is foremost criteria for measuring its performance. It is the ultimate outcome of organization's extensive efforts. Following table shows the information about productivity of units as compared to their target in the year 2012-13. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table: 4.4.8
Productivity Percent as Compared to Target

Sr. No.	Productivity Percent as compared to Target	Frequency	%
1	100 - 90	64	44.44
2	90 - 70	58	40.28
3	70 -50	19	13.19
4	Less than 50	3	2.08
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

From above table it can be analyzed that the most part of unit's productivity is up to satisfactory level. Maximum ninety to hundred percent of productivity as compared to target is achieved by 44.44% units. Nearly equal number of units 40.28% has achieved 90 – 70 % of productivity as compared to target. Substantial 13.19% units are successful in reaching fifty to seventy percent productivity as compared to target. Only 2.08% units have less than fifty percent productivity as compared to target is an encouraging indication for Small Scale Enterprises.

It is concluded that of the units 84.72% are successful in achieving more than seventy percent productivity as compared to target. Meagre percent of units 2.08% have less than fifty percent productivity as compared to target. Average fifty to seventy percent productivity as compared to target is accomplished by insignificant 2.08% of units.

Product Rejection

Rejection of final product has direct impact on profitability of the organization. Higher degree of wastage has direct relation with monitory loss to unit. Higher product rejection percent also question marks the efficiency and credibility of the organization. Following table presents details about product rejection percent of Small Scale Enterprises. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.9
Product Rejection Percent

Sr.	Product rejection %	Frequency	%
1	0-4	78	54.17
2	4-8	45	31.25
3	8-12	16	11.11
4	> 12	5	3.47
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

In Small Scale Enterprises there is culture of producing maximum with the use of minimum. Avoiding material wastage maximizes profit. Therefore owner's tendency is to reduce the rejection percentage. From above table it is evident that there is least zero to four percent product rejection in 54.17% units. In big size of 31.25% unit's product rejection percentage is four to eight. In 11.11% units' product rejection percentage is eight to twelve percent which is slightly high. Very small 3.47% units show exhibit twelve and higher product rejection percentage.

It is concluded that Small Scale Enterprises commonly takes effort to minimize their product rejection percentage. There is only zero to four percent product rejection in 54.17% units. Greater size of 31.25% units has product rejection percentage four to eight. Slightly high eight to twelve percent product rejection percentages is observed in 11.11% units. It is not manageable to 3.47% units to limit product rejection percentage below twelve.

Honours Conferred on Organizations

Small scale units are in the fray of immense competition. Few corporate have prescribed the quality norms for their own vendors and the vendors are small scale units. Following is the discussion on the honours and rewards conferred on

organizations. The honours viz. ISO 9000 award or award by their own corporate to whom they are supplying material or the award from local bodies. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.10
Honours or Awards Received by Sample Units

Sr.	Honours/ awards if any	Frequency	%
1	International	25	17.36
2	Corporate Level	9	6.25
3	Other	7	4.86
4	No Award	103	71.53
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table reveals those majorities i.e. 71.53% of units have not bagged in any honour or award nor have they attempted for ISO 9000 certification. Only 17.36% organizations have ISO 9000 award and meagre i.e. 6.25% units received recognition from their corporate followed by 4.86% receive the local honours. The scenario is seems to be pathetic on the horizon of globalization where the quality is the key.

It is concluded that 71.53% of sample units have not honoured with any award like ISO 9000 etc. but 17.36% found to bagged in ISO 9000. 6.25% and 4.86% units have received corporate level award and local level award respectively.

Annual Turnover

Rising annual turnover indicates progress of the organization. It is associated with owner's skill to deal with both internal and external environment. Following table depicts annual turnover of the Small Scale Enterprises. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.11
Annual Turnover

Sr.	Annual Turnover Rs. Cr.	Frequency	%
1	More than 1.50	41	28.47
2	1-1.50	15	10.42
3	0.5-1.00	19	13.19
4	Less than 0.50	69	47.92
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

From above table it clear that that 47.92 % Small Scale Enterprises fall in category having annual turnover less than 0.50 cores. This is relevant with name small it's self. Surprisingly nearly one third 28.47% Small Scale Enterprises has their annual turnover more than 1.50 cores. This is sign of taking maximum benefit of favourable industrial condition using effective management and scientific techniques. Almost same number of 10.42% and 13.19% Small Scale Enterprises fall in category having annual turnover less than 1.00-1.50 cores and 0.50-1.00 cores respectively.

It is concluded that as name small indicates in 47.92 % Small Scale Enterprises annual turnover is less than 0.50 cores. Considerable 28.47% Small Scale Enterprises are on the way of development with encouraging annual turnover more than 1.50 cores. 10.42% Small Scale Enterprises have their annual turnover between 1-1.50 cores followed by 13.49% units having 0.5-1.00 cores annual turnover

Plant run capacity / efficiency used

Maximum utilization of operational capacity of plant is related to production efficiency of the unit. Technical proficiency is required for attaining this efficiency. Increasing this capacity will result in enhancing productivity and profitability of organization automatically. Following table states plant run capacity used by the Small Scale Enterprises .The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.12
Plant Run Capacity / Efficiency Used

Sr.	Plant run capacity / efficiency used %	Frequency	%
1	100-75	82	56.94
2	75-50	41	28.47
3	50-25	17	11.81
4	Less than 25	4	2.78
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

From above table it is clear that highest 56.94% Small Scale Enterprises use 75-100 percent plant run capacity. Average to higher 50-75 percent plant run capacity is used by 28.47 % Small Scale Enterprises. Substantial 11.81 % Small Scale Enterprises

have lower plant run capacity between 25-50 percent. Only little number of 2.78 % Small Scale Enterprises have meagre plant run capacity less than 25 percent.

It is concluded that for survival in competitive age 56.94% Small Scale Enterprises have maintained their plant run capacity above 75 percent. 28.47% Small Scale Enterprises are successful in retaining 50-75 percent plant run capacity. More than ten percent 11.81% Small Scale Enterprises are not economically viable because of only 25-50 percent plant run capacity. 2.78% Small Scale Enterprises are on the way of collapse due to plant run capacity less than 25 percent.

Accidents

Accidents in the organization are linked to employee's technical expertise, timely maintenance of machinery, use of advance technology and frequent trainings. Dealing with accident incidences has direct association with employee welfare and likely expenses necessary for treatment. It may also result into loss of man days of workforce impacting output. Following table presents details about percentage of average number of accidents in the Small Scale Enterprises .The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.13
Accidents

Sr. No.	Average No. of Accidents %	Frequency	%
1	0	47	32.64
2	1 - 5	82	56.94
3	5 - 10	10	6.94
4	More than 10	5	3.47
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

From above table it is evident that, Small Scale Enterprises are keen about physical care of their employees. More than half of the sample Small Scale Enterprises 32.64% is successful in restricting accident percentage between 1-5 percent. The fact that in one third of Small Scale Enterprises there is occurrence of none of accidents 0 %, shows technical and welfare related preparedness of the enterprises.

In all around 90 % of Small Scale Enterprises there is meagre percentage of accidents incidences.

Average Annual Profit

Final objective of any enterprise is to earn maximum profit at the end of year. Small Scale Enterprises have many limits in maximising their profit because of inadequate resources and facilities. Following table depicts details of average annual profit of the Small Scale Enterprises. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.13
Average Annual Profit

Sr.	Average Annual Profit %	Frequency	%
1	More than 20	15	10.42
2	20 -15	16	11.11
3	15 - 10	48	33.33
4	Less than 5	65	45.14
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

It is not unexpected from above table that nearly half of the enterprises 45.14 % have reported their average annual profit as less than 5 percent. Only 10.42 % enterprises have reported that their average annual profit is more than 20 percent. Nearly same percent of entrepreneurs 11.11% earns reasonable and practical average annual profit between 15-20 percent. It is realistic observation that one third enterprises 33.33% earn average annual profit between 10-15 percent. There is no legal obligation on entrepreneur to disclose their financial details. Also tendency to hide such facts and figures in industry is experienced many times.

It is concluded that nearly half of the enterprises accomplish less than 5 percent average annual profit. One third enterprises earn average annual profit between 10-15 percent. Very few enterprises reported that they earn sizeable average annual profit more than 15 percent. This may be because of enterprises common tendency to hide financial details.

Managerial Reform Program

These days' enterprises experience need of implementing different managerial reform program like trainings in various areas, outbound programs and other activities. It

proves beneficial for both employee and organisation. Following table provides information regarding implementation of different managerial reform programs in the enterprise. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.15
Managerial Reform Program

Sr.	Managerial Reform Programs	Frequency	%
1	Yes	91	63.19
2	No	53	36.81
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

From above table it is clear that nearly two third 63.19% enterprises implement managerial reform program while more than one third 36.81% enterprises didn't consider it as necessary. Capacity to bear expenses, availability of appropriate resources and opportunities are some of the major reason behind it.

It is concluded that significance of implementing different managerial reform program is recognised by two third enterprises while it is ignored by one third enterprises.

Implementation of Quality Model

Implementing quality models through ISO, facilitate in enhancing overall quality improvement. Following table shows details about implementation of Quality Model in the enterprise. The data is taken on frequency and percentages are calculated.

Table 4.4.16
Implementation of Quality Model

Sr.	Implementation of Quality Model	Frequency	%
1	Yes	90	62.50
2	No	54	37.50
	Total	144	100.00

Source: (Field Data)

Above table provides evidence that comparatively higher number of enterprises 62.50% is conscious enough in implementing Quality Model. Whereas in implementing Quality Model more than one third enterprise 32.50% didn't show any interest.

It is concluded that of enterprises are aware of importance of implementation Quality Model.

Part IV
Inferential Analysis

The comparative analysis of opinions of entrepreneurs about their own leadership style and opinions of employees on the leadership style of entrepreneur which were taken on ten variables with the help of five point scale has compared.

Leadership Style of Entrepreneur

Table 4.4.17
Leadership Style of Entrepreneur

Sr.	Parameter	Entrepreneur			Employee		
		Mean	S.D.	Rank	Mean	S.D.	Rank
1	I like to take bold action by venturing into the unknown.	4.06	1.14	9	4.24	1.01	4
2	I am willing to invest a lot of time and/or money on something that might yield a high return.	4.35	0.80	3	4.22	0.84	5
3	I tend to act "boldly" in situations where risk is involved.	4.20	0.95	6	3.93	0.98	8
4	I often like to try new and unusual activities that are not typical but not necessarily risky.	4.13	0.88	8	3.86	0.95	9
5	In general, I prefer a strong emphasis in projects on unique, one-of-a kind approaches, rather than revisiting tried and true approaches used before.	3.80	1.05	10	3.76	0.98	10
6	I prefer to try my own unique way when learning new things rather than doing it like everyone else does.	4.19	0.87	7	4.09	0.78	7
7	I favour experimentation and original approaches to problem solving rather than using methods others generally use for solving their problems.	4.28	0.75	4	4.17	0.84	6
8	I usually act in anticipation of future problems, needs or changes.	4.42	0.70	2	4.29	0.80	3
9	I tend to plan ahead on projects.	4.24	0.83	5	4.33	0.80	1
10	I prefer to 'step-up' and get things going on projects rather than sit and wait for someone else to do it.	4.51	0.75	1	4.33	0.81	2
Spearman's Correlation Coefficient		.661					
Sig. (2-tailed)		.038					
N		10					

Source: (Field Data)

Above table shows the mean score and S.D. for the statements which were executed to know the entrepreneurship styles of individual samples. The mean value for all ten parameters shows positive inclination since the mean score ranges from 3.76 to 4.51. The standard deviation is at little higher side and ranges from 0.70 to 1.14 which shows much deviation in the opinion. The mean and standard deviation does not make clear regarding any of the entrepreneurship leadership style possess by individual sample hence the distinct methodology is warranted to devise the exact leadership style of an individual entrepreneur.

Spearman's rank Correlations between opinion of entrepreneur and employee is 0.661which shows significantly high correlations.

Leadership Style and Status of Work Environment

Table: 4.4.18
Leadership Style and Status of Work Environment
Following table depicts the status of work environment parameters with leadership styles

Sr.	Parameters	Dissimilarities				Risk taking				Innovative				Proactive				Total			
		Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
1.	Workers participation in decision making	22	91.67	2	8.33	75	87.21	11	12.79	35	97.22	1	2.78	117	82.39	25	17.61	249	86.46	39	13.54
2.	Feel job challenging	21	87.50	3	12.50	70	81.40	16	18.60	32	88.89	4	11.11	109	76.76	33	23.24	232	80.56	56	19.44
3.	Feedback about work	22	91.67	2	8.33	69	80.23	17	19.77	31	86.11	5	13.89	115	80.99	27	19.01	237	82.29	51	17.71
4.	Work in non-stress & positive conditions	18	75.00	6	25.00	53	61.63	33	38.37	25	69.44	11	30.56	93	65.49	49	34.51	189	65.63	99	34.38
5.	Adequate light and Ventilation	24	100	0	0.00	78	90.70	8	9.30	31	86.11	5	13.89	131	92.25	11	7.75	264	91.67	24	8.33
6.	Safety goggles &shoes	23	95.83	1	4.17	80	93.02	6	6.98	33	91.67	3	8.33	139	97.89	3	2.11	275	95.49	13	4.51
7.	Floor cleanliness	23	95.83	1	4.17	84	97.67	2	2.33	33	91.67	3	8.33	139	97.89	3	2.11	279	96.88	9	3.13
8.	Drinking water	24	100	0	0.00	86	100	0	0.00	34	94.44	2	5.56	139	97.89	3	2.11	283	98.26	5	1.74
9.	First aid box	22	91.67	2	8.33	85	98.84	1	1.16	34	94.44	2	5.56	128	90.14	14	9.86	269	93.40	19	6.60
10.	Firefighting equipment	16	66.67	8	33.33	73	84.88	13	15.12	24	66.67	12	33.33	96	67.61	46	32.39	209	72.57	79	27.43
11.	Payment according to Minimum wages act	23	95.83	1	4.17	84	97.67	2	2.33	33	91.67	3	8.33	136	95.77	6	4.23	276	95.83	12	4.17
12.	Bonus as per Bonus Act	23	95.83	1	4.17	83	96.51	3	3.49	35	97.22	1	2.78	120	84.51	22	15.49	261	90.63	27	9.38
13.	Productivity based incentives	16	66.67	8	33.33	70	81.40	16	18.60	28	77.78	8	22.22	98	69.01	44	30.99	212	73.61	76	26.39
14.	Provision of Provident Fund	7	29.17	17	70.83	46	53.49	40	46.51	14	38.89	22	61.11	58	40.85	84	59.15	125	43.40	163	56.60

Sr.	Parameters	Dissimilarities				Risk taking				Innovative				Proactive				Total			
		Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%	Yes	%	No	%
15.	Internal training and development program	16	66.67	8	33.33	61	70.93	25	29.07	24	66.67	12	33.33	95	66.90	47	33.10	196	68.06	92	31.94
16.	Suggestion scheme	21	87.50	3	12.50	77	89.53	9	10.47	32	88.89	4	11.11	128	90.14	14	9.86	258	89.58	30	10.42
17.	Workers meetings	18	75.00	6	25.00	70	81.40	16	18.60	30	83.33	6	16.67	106	74.65	36	25.35	224	77.78	64	22.22
18.	Workers meeting with top officials and owners	18	75.00	6	25.00	76	88.37	10	11.63	32	88.89	4	11.11	123	86.62	19	13.38	249	86.46	39	13.54
19.	Disciplinary and grievances procedure	20	83.33	4	16.67	83	96.51	3	3.49	34	94.44	2	5.56	117	82.39	25	17.61	254	88.19	34	11.81
20.	Performance appraisal policy	16	66.67	8	33.33	77	89.53	9	10.47	29	80.56	7	19.44	102	71.83	40	28.17	224	77.78	64	22.22
21.	Equality in work	23	95.83	1	4.17	83	96.51	3	3.49	34	94.44	2	5.56	137	96.48	5	3.52	277	96.18	11	3.82
22.	Spare time for family and society	23	95.83	1	4.17	85	98.84	1	1.16	36	100	0	0.00	133	93.66	9	6.34	277	96.18	11	3.82
23.	Employees enjoy weekly off	23	95.83	1	4.17	85	98.84	1	1.16	36	100	0	0.00	137	96.48	5	3.52	281	97.57	7	2.43
24.	Employees enjoy pay leaves	12	50.00	12	50.00	64	74.42	22	25.58	29	80.56	7	19.44	87	61.27	55	38.73	192	66.67	96	33.33
25.	Communication facility for employees	23	95.83	1	4.17	80	93.02	6	6.98	34	94.44	2	5.56	121	85.21	21	14.79	258	89.58	30	10.42

Source: Field Data

BARR. BALASAHEB KHARDEKAR LIBRARY
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR.

Above table reveals status of 25 work environment parameter in sample units with respect to leadership styles. The efforts were top check the association of leadership styles and status of work environment parameters.

It is seen that entire parameters of work environment are in exist with little difference. The parameters viz. Workers participation in decision making, Feel job challenging, Feedback about work, Adequate light and Ventilation, Safety goggles &shoes, Floor cleanliness, Drinking water, First aid box, Payment according to Minimum wages act, Bonus as per Bonus Act, Disciplinary and grievances procedure, Equality in work Spare time for family and society, Employees enjoy weekly off, Communication facility for employees are available in sample units irrespective of the leadership style.

With respect to workers participation in decision making less participation found with prop active and risk taking leadership style since 17.61% and 12.79% of samples disagree with the variable workers participation in decision making.

The work environment variable viz. Work in non-stress & positive conditions, Firefighting equipment, Productivity based incentives, Provision of Provident Fund, Internal training and development program, Workers meetings, Workers meeting with top officials and owners, Performance appraisal policy, Employees enjoy pay leaves are absentisum in of the sample units irrespective of leadership style.

BARR. B. LASAHEB KHARDEKAR LIBRARY
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR

Productivity and Organisational Performance

Following table depicts the association between productivity and organisation performance. Productivity is measured in percentages i.e. 100-90, 90-70, 70-50 and less than 50. Organisational performance parameters includes Attrition of White Collar Employees, Attrition of Blue Collar Employees, Absentisum Product Rejection, Honour Conferred on Organizations, Annual Turnover, Plant run capacity / efficiency used, Accident, Average Annual Profit, Managerial Reform Program and Implementation of Quality Model. The chi square test has used to check the association between productivity and organisational performance parameters. Cramers coefficient has also been used to see the strength of these association.

Table:4.4.19

Productivity and Organisational Performance

Sr.	Description	Chi square	df	Exact Sig	Cramer
1	Attrition of White Collar Employees	6.972	9	.580	.127
2	Attrition of Blue Collar Employees	12.890	9	.182	.173
3	Absentisum	28.188	9	.003	.255
4	Product Rejection	19.487	9	.027	.212
5	Honour Conferred on Organizations	8.836	9	.445	.143
6	Annual Turnover	14.761	9	.097	.185
7	Plant run capacity / efficiency used	1.496	9	.000	.589
8	Accident	13.690	9	.147	.178
9	Average Annual Profit	19.885	9	.020	.215
10	Managerial Reform Program	.275	3	.974	.044
11	Implementation of Quality Model	3.680	3	.297	.160

Source: Compiled by Researcher

Above table reveals that, there is significant association between productivity and Absentisum, Product rejection, Plant run capacity and average annual profit. The Cramers coefficient found to be high with respect to productivity and plan run capacity. With rest of the parameters significant association found to be absentisum. Hence it is concluded that absentisum, product rejection, plant run capacity has an association with productivity of sample units.

Turnover and Organisational Performance

Following table depicts the association between turnover and organisation performance. Turnover is measured in Rs. Cr. i.e. More than 1.50Cr., 1Cr. to 1.50Cr., 0.5 Cr. To 1 Cr. and Less than 0.50Cr. Organisational performance parameters includes Attrition of White Collar Employees, Attrition of Blue Collar Employees, Absentisum Product Rejection, Honour Conferred on Organizations, Productivity,

Plant run capacity / efficiency used, Accident, Average Annual Profit, Managerial Reform Program and Implementation of Quality Model. The chi square test has used to check the association between productivity and organisational performance parameters. Cramers coefficient has also been used to see the strength of these association.

Table:4.4.20
Turnover and Organisational Performance

Sr.	Description	Chi square	df	Exact Sig	Cramer
1	Attrition of White Collar Employees	28.362	9	.002	.256
2	Attrition of Blue Collar Employees	8.047	9	.529	.136
3	Absentisum	4.337	9	.888	.100
4	Product Rejection	5.168	9	.819	.109
5	Honour Conferred on Organizations	30.965	9	.001	.268
6	Productivity Percent	14.761	9	.098	.185
7	Plant run capacity / efficiency used	14.644	9	.101	.184
8	Accident	15.538	9	.077	.190
9	Average Annual Profit	16.757	9	.053	.197
10	Managerial Reform Program	12.269	3	.006	.292
11	Implementation of Quality Model	10.291	3	.015	.267

Source: Compiled by Researcher

Above table reveals that there is significant association in between turnover and Attrition of White Collar Employees, Honour Conferred on Organizations, Managerial Reform Program, and Implementation of Quality Model. The cramers coefficient with respect to this parameters ranges from 0.25 to 0.29 which shows weak strength. With rest of the parameter i.e. Attrition of Blue Collar Employees, Absentisum, Product Rejection, Productivity Percent. Plant run capacity / efficiency used. Accident Average, Annual Profit the association found to be absentisum.

Regression Analysis

The effort has been made to find out the relationship between organisational performance variables and the related independent variables. Numerous calculations were made with respect to leadership styles as an dependent variable viz-a-viz the performance parameters viz. Productivity, Absentisum and the like. The entire regression models found to be insignificant since the significance of 'F' distribution has found to be more than 0.05.

Only one regression model with dependent variable as turnover and independent variables working environment indicators found to be significant hence included in this study.

Table:4.4.21

Model Summary of turnover as dependent variables

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.372	.139	.094	61.972

Source: Compiled by Researcher

Table:4.4.22

ANOVA of turnover as dependent variables

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	84080.574	7	12011.511	3.128	.004
Residual	522308.315	136	3840.502		
Total	606388.889	143			

Source: Compiled by Researcher

Table:4.4.23

Coefficients of regression model

Sr.	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-12.686	35.589		-.356	.722
2	Immediate opportunity to use and develop human capability	30.207	10.409	.345	2.902	.004
3	Safe and healthy working conditions	-10.151	7.131	-.156	-1.423	.157
4	Adequate and fair compensation	9.774	6.324	.166	1.546	.125
5	Future opportunity for continued growth and security	-.955	6.250	-.018	-.153	.879
6	Social integration in work organisation	-21.667	6.730	-.406	-3.219	.002
7	Constitution in the work organisation	9.760	8.889	.114	1.098	.274
8	Balanced role of work in the total life space	4.760	6.125	.073	.777	.438
Dependent Variable: Turn Over						

Source: Compiled by Researcher

From above regression model summary it has found that R^2 is 0.139 which is reasonably less. The ANOVA of regression at 7 df. Found to be significant since P value is 0.004.

The independent variables viz. Immediate opportunity to use and develop human capability and Social integration in work organisation are significant and rest of the variables are insignificant. The constant of model is – 12.686 which is insignificant in nature.

The model reveals that Immediate opportunity to use and develop human capability and Social integration in work organisation should be focused to get desired level of organisational turnover.

Part - V
Hypotheses Testing

This part deals with hypotheses testing. The restated hypothesis has tested using chi-square test. The research hypothesis has also been tested using chi-square test.

H_{01} – Entrepreneurial leadership style and working environment are independent.

H_{11} – Entrepreneurial leadership style and working environment are associated.

H_{02} –Entrepreneurial leadership style and organizational performance are independent.

H_{12} – Entrepreneurial leadership style and organizational performance are associated.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Organisation's Working Environment

The three leadership styles i.e. risk taking, innovative and proactive have identified. Besides opinion dissimilarities in identification of leadership styles have found mentioned in an independent category. Working environment which was assessed using five point scales is converted into dissatisfied and satisfied groups to facilitate execution of chi-square test.

Table: 4.5.1
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Organisation's Working Environment

Sr.	Leadership Style	Work Environment		Total
		Dissatisfied	Satisfied	
1	Dissimilarities	4	12	16
2	Risk taking	6	39	45
3	Innovative	3	12	15
4	Proactive	17	51	68
	Total	30	114	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and of sample workers opinions towards satisfaction of working environment provided to them. It shows that 30 samples are not satisfied with working environment and 114 samples seem to be satisfied with working environment. The relationship between leadership style and satisfaction towards working environment is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.2
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Organisation's Working Environment

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.425	3	.489
Likelihood Ratio	2.556	3	.465
Linear-by-Linear Association	.811	1	.368
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 2.425 with 3 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.489 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e. there is no association between leadership style and working environment is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and working environment is **rejected.**

As stated in the research hypothesis the relationship between entrepreneurial leadership style and organisational effectiveness has assessed. The parameters used for organisational effectiveness are organisation's turnover, labour turnover (blue colour and white colour), accidents, absenteeism, productivity, rejection, plant run capacity or efficiency, management reforms and profit.

The association between the relationships has assessed using chi-square test independently for every parameter.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Turnover

Table: 4.5.3
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Turnover

Sr.	Leadership Style	Turnover				Total
		Less than 0.50	0.5-1.00	1-1.50	More than 1.50	
1	Dissimilarities	11	3	0	2	16
2	Risk taking	27	4	5	9	45
3	Innovative	7	2	1	5	15
4	Proactive	24	10	9	25	68
	Total	69	19	15	41	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and turnover of the organization. In the above table 69 samples shows that turnover is less than 0.5 Cr, 19 samples shows that turnover is inn between 0.5-1.00 Cr, 15 samples shows that turnover is in between 1-1.50 Cr and 41 samples indicate turnover is more than 1.50 Cr. The relationship between leadership style and turnover is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.4
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Turnover

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.954	9	.165
Likelihood Ratio	14.969	9	.092
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.016	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 12.954 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.165 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and organizations turnover is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and organizations turnover is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Profit

Table: 4.5.5
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Profit

Sr.	Leadership Style	Profit				Total
		Less than 5	10 - 15	15 -20	More than 20	
1	Dissimilarities	7	6	3	0	16
2	Risk taking	24	8	8	5	45
3	Innovative	8	4	1	2	15
4	Proactive	26	30	4	8	68
	Total	65	48	16	15	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and profit gained. The above table shows that 65 samples shows that profit is less than 5% of the turnover, 48 samples shows that profit is in between 10-15% of the turnover, 16 samples shows that profit is in between 15-20% of turnover and 15 samples shows that profit is more than 20% of the turnover. The relationship between leadership style and profit gained is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.6
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Profit

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.049	9	.121
Likelihood Ratio	16.126	9	.064
Linear-by-Linear Association	.272	1	.602
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 14.049 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.121 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and profit is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and profit is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and White Collar left job

Table: 4.5.7
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and White Collar left job

Sr.	Leadership Style	White Collar left job				Total
		More than Forty	Twenty One to Forty	One to Twenty	Zero	
1	Dissimilarities	5	1	1	9	16
2	Risk taking	16	1	3	25	45
3	Innovative	1	1	1	12	15
4	Proactive	9	0	5	54	68
	Total	31	3	10	100	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and labour turnover of white collar employees. The above table shows that 31 samples indicate that more than 40 white collar employees has left the job, 3 samples indicate that twenty one to forty white collar employees has left the job, 10 samples shows that one to twenty white collar employees has left the job and 100 samples shows that white collar employees has not left the job . The relationship between leadership style and labour turnover of white collar employees is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.8
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and White Collar left job

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.692	9	.074
Likelihood Ratio	16.300	9	.061
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.343	1	.002
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 15.692 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.074 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and Labour turnover is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and labour turnover is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Blue Collar left job

Table: 4.5.9
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Blue Collar left job

Sr.	Leadership Style	Blue Collar left job				Total
		More than Forty	Twenty One to Forty	One to Twenty	Zero	
1	Dissimilarities	1	2	7	6	16
2	Risk taking	0	7	13	25	45
3	Innovative	1	0	6	8	15
4	Proactive	2	3	34	29	68
	Total	4	12	60	68	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and labour turnover of blue collar employees. The above table shows that 04 samples indicate that more than 40 blue collar employees has left the job, 12 samples indicate that twenty one to forty blue collar employees has left the job, 60 samples shows that one to twenty blue collar employees has left the job and 68 samples shows that blue collar employees has not left the job . The relationship between leadership style and labour turnover of blue collar employees is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.10
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Blue Collar left job

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.748	9	.174
Likelihood Ratio	14.610	9	.102
Linear-by-Linear Association	.091	1	.763
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 12.748 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.174 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and blue collar worker leaving the job is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and blue collar worker leaving the job is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Accident

Table: 4.5.11
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Accident

Sr.	Leadership Style	Accident				Total
		More than 10	5 - 10	1 - 5	0	
1	Dissimilarities	1	2	10	3	16
2	Risk taking	0	5	30	10	45
3	Innovative	2	1	3	9	15
4	Proactive	2	2	39	25	68
	Total	5	10	82	47	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and accident. The above table shows that 05 samples indicate that more than 10 accidents has happened in the organization, 10 samples indicate that 5-10 accidents has happened, 82 samples shows that 1-5 accidents has happened and 47 samples shows that no accident has happened in the organization . The relationship between leadership style and accident is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.12
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Accident

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	20.249	9	.016
Likelihood Ratio	20.922	9	.013
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.525	1	.060
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 20.249 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.016 reveals that the test is significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and accident is **rejected** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and accident is **accepted.**

BARR. BALASAHEB KHARDEKAR LIBRARY
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Absenteeism of Employees

Table: 4.5.13
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Absentisum

Sr.	Leadership Style	Absentisum				Total
		More than 10	6 -10	1-5	0	
1	Dissimilarities	2	5	8	1	16
2	Risk taking	5	12	27	1	45
3	Innovative	1	6	7	1	15
4	Proactive	12	16	34	6	68
	Total	20	39	76	9	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and absenteeism of the employee. The above table shows that 20 samples indicate that more than 10 employees were absentisum, 39 samples shows that 6-10 employees were absentisum, 76 samples shows that 1-5 employees were absentisum and 9 samples shows that no one was absentisum. The relationship between leadership style and absenteeism is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.14
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Absentisum

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.440	9	.794
Likelihood Ratio	5.724	9	.767
Linear-by-Linear Association	.016	1	.898
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 5.440 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.794 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and absenteeism is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and absenteeism is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Productivity

Table: 4.5.15
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Productivity

Sr.	Leadership Style	Productivity				Total
		3	19	58	64	
1	Dissimilarities	0	2	10	4	16
2	Risk taking	1	7	11	26	45
3	Innovative	1	1	8	5	15
4	Proactive	1	9	29	29	68
	Total	3	19	58	64	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and productivity. The above table shows that 03 samples indicate that productivity is less than 50, 19 samples indicate that productivity is in between 50-70, 58 samples shows that productivity is in between 70-90 and 64 samples shows that productivity is in between 90-100. The relationship between leadership style and productivity is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.16
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Productivity

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.772	9	.226
Likelihood Ratio	11.914	9	.218
Linear-by-Linear Association	.003	1	.956
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 11.772 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.226 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and productivity is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and productivity is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Rejection

Table: 4.5.17
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Rejection

Sr.	Leadership Style	Rejection				Total
		> 12	8-12	4-8	0-4	
1	Dissimilarities	1	2	4	9	16
2	Risk taking	1	2	17	25	45
3	Innovative	0	4	1	10	15
4	Proactive	3	8	23	34	68
	Total	5	16	45	78	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and rejection. The above table shows that 05 samples indicate that more than 12 jobs has been rejected, 16 samples shows that 8-12 jobs has rejected, 45 samples shows that 4-8 jobs has rejected, 78 samples shows that 0-4 jobs has rejected. The relationship between leadership style and rejection is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.18
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Rejection

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.910	9	.282
Likelihood Ratio	12.314	9	.196
Linear-by-Linear Association	.511	1	.475
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 10.910 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.282 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and rejection is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and rejection is **rejected.**

BARR. BALASAHEB KHARDEKAR L.B...
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency

Table: 4.5.19
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency

Sr.		Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency				Total
	Leadership Style	Less than 25	50-25	75-50	100-75	
1	Dissimilarities	0	2	5	9	16
2	Risk taking	1	6	8	30	45
3	Innovative	1	4	4	6	15
4	Proactive	2	5	24	37	68
	Total	4	17	41	82	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and plant run capacity. The above table shows that 04 samples indicate that plant run capacity is less than 25, 17 samples shows that plant run capacity is in between 50-25, 41 samples shows that plant run capacity is in between 75-50 and 82 samples shows that plant run capacity is in between 100-75. The relationship between leadership style and plant run capacity is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.20
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.922[a]	9	.357
Likelihood Ratio	9.819	9	.365
Linear-by-Linear Association	.173	1	.678
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 11.021 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.274 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and plant run efficiency is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and plant run efficiency is **rejected**.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Management Reforms

Table: 4.5.21
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Management Reforms

Sr.	Leadership Style	Management Reforms		Total
		Yes	No	
1	Dissimilarities	12	4	16
2	Risk taking	29	16	45
3	Innovative	7	8	15
4	Proactive	43	25	68
	Total	91	53	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and management reforms. The above table shows that 91 samples indicate that there are management reforms and 53 samples indicate that there are no management reforms in the organization. The relationship between leadership style and management reforms is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.22
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Management Reforms

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.751	3	.432
Likelihood Ratio	2.737	3	.434
Linear-by-Linear Association	.450	1	.502
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 4.570 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.206 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and management reforms is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and management reforms is **rejected.**

The previous part of hypothesis testing has done using leadership style perceived by employees. Following is the hypothesis tested using chi-square test. Leadership styles perceived by entrepreneur have been taken and established the association with the satisfaction of employees.

Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Organisation's Working Environment

Table: 4.5.23
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Organisation's Working Environment

Sr.	Entrepreneurial Leadership Style	Work Environment				
		Dissatisfactory	%	Satisfactory	%	Total
1	Undecided	3	25.00	9	75.00	12
2	Risk Taking	6	13.95	37	86.05	43
3	Innovative	3	16.67	15	83.33	18
4	Proactive	18	25.35	53	74.65	71
	Total	30	20.83	114	79.17	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and opinions of sample worker towards satisfaction of working environment provided to them. It shows that 30 samples are not satisfied with working environment and 114 samples seem to be satisfied with working environment. The relationship between leadership style and satisfaction towards working environment is assessed using chi-square test as follows

Table: 4.5.24
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Organisation's Working Environment

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.429	3	.488
Likelihood Ratio	2.515	3	.473
Linear-by-Linear Association	.993	1	.319
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 2.429 with 3 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.488 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e. there is no association between leadership style and Organisation's Working

Environment is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and Organisation's Working Environment is **rejected**.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Turnover

Table: 4.5. 25
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Turnover

Sr.	Leadership Style	Turnover				Total
		Less than 0.50	0.5-1.00	1-1.50	More than 1.50	
1	Dissimilarities	6	2	0	4	12
2	Risk taking	26	6	3	8	43
3	Innovative	7	5	0	6	18
4	Proactive	30	6	12	23	71
	Total	69	19	15	41	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and turnover of the organization. In the above table 69 samples shows that turnover is less than 0.5 Cr, 19 samples shows that turnover is inn between 0.5-1.00 Cr, 15 samples shows that turnover is in between 1-1.50 Cr and 41 samples indicate turnover is more than 1.50 Cr. The relationship between leadership style and turnover is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.26
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Turnover

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	15.029	9	.090
Likelihood Ratio	17.332	9	.044
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.326	1	.068
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 15.029 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.090 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e. there is no association between leadership style and organizations turnover **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and Organisation's turnover is **rejected**.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Profit

Table: 4.5.27
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Profit

Sr.	Leadership Style	Profit				Total
		Less than 5	15 - 10	20 -15	More than 20	
1	Dissimilarities	6	3	1	2	12
2	Risk taking	23	10	7	3	43
3	Innovative	9	6	0	3	18
4	Proactive	27	29	8	7	71
	Total	65	48	16	15	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and profit gained. The above table shows that 65 samples shows that profit is less than 5% of the turnover, 48 samples shows that profit is in between 10-15% of the turnover, 16 samples shows that profit is in between 15-20% of turnover and 15 samples shows that profit is more than 20% of the turnover. The relationship between leadership style and profit gained is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.28
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Profit

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.132	9	.425
Likelihood Ratio	11.001	9	.276
Linear-by-Linear Association	.361	1	.548
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 9.132 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.425 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and profit **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and profit is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and White collar left job

Table: 4.5.29
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and White collar left job

Sr.		White collar left job				Total
	Leadership Style	More than Forty	Twenty One to Forty	One to Twenty	Zero	
1	Dissimilarities	4	0	0	8	12
2	Risk taking	13	2	4	24	43
3	Innovative	5	0	1	12	18
4	Proactive	9	1	5	56	71
	Total	31	3	10	100	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and labour turnover of white collar employees. The above table shows that 31 samples indicate that more than 40 white collar employees has left the job, 3 samples indicate that twenty one to forty white collar employees has left the job, 10 samples shows that one to twenty white collar employees has left the job and 100 samples shows that white collar employees has not left the job. The relationship between leadership style and labour turnover of white collar employees is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.30
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and White collar left job

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.664	9	.299
Likelihood Ratio	11.942	9	.217
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.477	1	.011
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 10.664 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.299 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and white collar employees leaving the job **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and white collar employees leaving the job is **rejected.**

Leadership Style and Blue Collar Left Job

Table: 4.5.31
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Blue collar left job

Sr.	Leadership Style	Blue collar left job				Total
		More than Forty	Twenty One to Forty	One to Twenty	Zero	
1	Dissimilarities	0	1	2	9	12
2	Risk taking	0	4	16	23	43
3	Innovative	1	1	11	5	18
4	Proactive	3	6	31	31	71
	Total	4	12	60	68	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and labour turnover of blue collar employees. The above table shows that 04 samples indicate that more than 40 blue collar employees has left the job, 12 samples indicate that twenty one to forty blue collar employees has left the job, 60 samples shows that one to twenty blue collar employees has left the job and 68 samples shows that blue collar employees has not left the job. The relationship between leadership style and labour turnover of blue collar employees is assessed using chi-square test as follows

Table: 4.5.32
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Blue collar left job

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.436	9	.316
Likelihood Ratio	12.073	9	.209
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.317	1	.069
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 10.436 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.316 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and blue collar employees leaving the job **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and blue collar employees leaving the job is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Accident

Table: 4.5.33
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Accident

Sr.	Leadership Style	Accident				Total
		More than 10	5 - 10	1 - 5	0	
1	Dissimilarities	0	2	4	6	12
2	Risk taking	0	4	31	8	43
3	Innovative	2	0	11	5	18
4	Proactive	3	4	36	28	71
	Total	5	10	82	47	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and accident. The above table shows that 05 samples indicate that more than 10 accidents has happened in the organization, 10 samples indicate that 5-10 accidents has happened, 82 samples shows that 1-5 accidents has happened and 47 samples shows that no accident has happened in the organization . The relationship between leadership style and accident is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.34
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Accident

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.740	9	.053
Likelihood Ratio	18.642	9	.028
Linear-by-Linear Association	.338	1	.561
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 16.740 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.053 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and accident **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and accident is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Absentisum

Table: 4.5.35
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Absentisum

Sr.	Leadership Style	Absentisum				Total
		More than 10	6 -10	1-5	0	
1	Dissimilarities	3	4	5	0	12
2	Risk taking	4	11	26	2	43
3	Innovative	3	5	8	2	18
4	Proactive	10	19	37	5	71
	Total	20	39	76	9	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and absenteeism of the employee. The above table shows that 20 samples indicate that more than 10 employees were absentisum, 39 samples shows that 6-10 employees were absentisum, 76 samples shows that 1-5 employees were absentisum and 9 samples shows that no one was absentisum. The relationship between leadership style and absenteeism is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.36
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Absentisum

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.717[a]	9	.858
Likelihood Ratio	5.229	9	.814
Linear-by-Linear Association	.230	1	.632
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 4.717 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.858 reveals that the test is not significant hence the null hypothesis i.e there is no association between leadership style and absenteeism accepted and alternative hypothesis i.e. there is an association between leadership style and absenteeism is rejected.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Productivity

Table: 4.5.37
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Productivity

Sr.	Leadership Style	Productivity				Total
		Less than 50	50-70	70-90	90-100	
1	Dissimilarities	0	2	4	6	12
2	Risk taking	2	6	12	23	43
3	Innovative	1	2	10	5	18
4	Proactive	0	9	32	30	71
	Total	3	19	58	64	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and productivity. The above table shows that 03 samples indicate that productivity is less than 50%, 19 samples indicate that productivity is in between 50-70%, 58 samples shows that productivity is in between 70-90% and 64 samples shows that productivity is in between 90-100%. The relationship between leadership style and productivity is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.38
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Productivity

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.636	9	.381
Likelihood Ratio	10.878	9	.284
Linear-by-Linear Association	.012	1	.912
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 9.636 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.381 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and productivity is **accepted** and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and productivity is **rejected**.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Rejection

Table: 4.5.39
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Rejection

Sr.	Leadership Style	Rejection				Total
		> 12	8-12	4-8	0-4	
1	Dissimilarities	0	2	3	7	12
2	Risk taking	0	3	19	21	43
3	Innovative	0	4	3	11	18
4	Proactive	5	7	20	39	71
	Total	5	16	45	78	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and rejection. The above table shows that 05 samples indicate that more than 12 jobs has been rejected, 16 samples shows that 8-12 jobs has rejected, 45 samples shows that 4-8 jobs has rejected, 78 samples shows that 0-4 jobs has rejected. The relationship between leadership style and rejection is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.40
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Product Rejection Percentage.

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	12.561	9	.183
Likelihood Ratio	14.105	9	.119
Linear-by-Linear Association	.514	1	.473
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 12.561 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.183 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and **rejection** is accepted and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and product rejection percentage is **rejected**.

BARR. BALASAHEB KHARDEKAR LIBRARY
SHIVAJI UNIVERSITY, KOLHAPUR.

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency

Table: 4.5.41
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency

Sr.	Leadership Style	Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency				Total
		Less than 25	50-25	75-50	100-75	
1	Dissimilarities	0	1	3	8	12
2	Risk taking	2	4	7	30	43
3	Innovative	1	4	4	9	18
4	Proactive	1	8	27	35	71
	Total	4	17	41	82	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and opinions of sample worker towards plant run capacity provided to them. It shows that 82 samples are opines that leadership affect on 75-100 % Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency, 41 samples seems opines leadership style affect on 50-75% Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency, 17 samples opines leadership style affect on 25-50% Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency. The relationship between leadership style and plant run capacity is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.42
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.021	9	.274
Likelihood Ratio	11.108	9	.268
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.513	1	.219
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 11.021 with 9 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.274 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and plant run efficiency is accepted and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and plant run efficiency is **rejected.**

Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Management Reforms

Table: 4.5.43
Relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Management Reforms

Sr.	Leadership Style	Management Reforms		Total
		Yes	No	
1	Dissimilarities	8	4	12
2	Risk taking	32	11	43
3	Innovative	12	6	18
4	Proactive	39	32	71
	Total	91	53	144

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the relationship between leadership style and opinions of sample worker towards Management Reforms provided to them. It shows that 91 samples are Agree that leadership leads towards management reforms and 53 samples seems disagree with change in management reforms due to leadership style. The relationship between leadership style and management reform is assessed using chi-square test as follows.

Table: 4.5.44
Chi-square Test of Entrepreneurial Leadership Style and Management Reforms

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.570	3	.206
Likelihood Ratio	4.650	3	.199
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.505	1	.061
N of Valid Cases	144		

Source: (Compiled by Researcher)

Above table shows the value of chi-square is 4.570 with 3 df. The asymptotic significance is 0.206 reveals that the test is not significant hence the **null hypothesis** i.e there is no association between leadership style and management reforms is accepted and **alternative hypothesis** i.e. there is an association between leadership style and management reforms is **rejected**.

Summary of Hypotheses Testing

Researcher tested the hypothesis using chi square test. Total 20 chi square test have been worked out for hypothesis testing. After the test researcher found that, in 19 tests the **null hypothesis is accepted** and in one test as per the opinions on entrepreneurs i.e. there is an association between leadership style and accident is accepted. The overall analysis of hypothesis is given in following table.

	Sr.	Parameters	Decision regarding Null Hypothesis	
			Entrepreneurs Perception	Employees Perception
H_1	01	Organisation's Working Environment	Accepted	Accepted
	02	Turnover	Accepted	Accepted
	03	Profit	Accepted	Accepted
	04	Labour Turnover	Accepted	Accepted
		White Collar		
		Blue Collar		
H_2	05	Accident	Rejected	Accepted
	06	Absenteeism	Accepted	Accepted
	07	Productivity	Accepted	Accepted
	08	Rejection	Accepted	Accepted
	09	Plant Run Capacity/Efficiency	Accepted	Accepted
	10	Management Reforms	Accepted	Accepted

Conclusion:

The chapter discuses data, which is analyzed from desired perspectives. The analysis involves macro analysis and wherever it is required. The data is analyzed by using relevant statistical tools. To keep data at minimal quantity inferential statistics has used. Hence, wherever it is a need to explain qualitative data with the help of researcher own observation and experience the effort has been made of such discussion to make analysis lucid and interesting to read. The findings and discussions of earlier researcher have taken out into next chapter; the chapter also discussed findings and suggestions.