

INFLUENCES, PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF MICRO, SMALL AND MEDIUM ENTERPRISES: EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS ACROSS DISTRICTS IN MANIPUR

Kh.Tomba Singh¹, Raibirola Koijam², A.Victoria chanu³ and A. S. Rapheileng⁴

¹Professor and Head, Department of Commerce, Manipur University, Canchipur

²Associate Professor, DM University, Imphal West, Manipur

³Assistant Professor, DM University, Imphal West, Manipur

⁴Post Doctoral Fellow, Department of Commerce, Manipur University

¹kctomba@gmail.com,²raibiolak@gmail.com,³victoriaayekbam@yahoo.co &

⁴rapheilengas@gmail.com

Abstract

The present paper presented a comparative analysis of the influences, problems and prospects of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) entrepreneurs across four valley districts of Manipur. A total of 280 entrepreneurs (male = 176, female = 104), 70 from each district, that is, Bishnupur, Imphal East, Imphal West and Thoubal participated in the study. It was found that there were differences in three items out of the five items influential scale, nineteen items out of the twenty items problematic scale, and all the eight items of the prospective scale across districts. The differences in the mean scores of overall influences, overall problems and overall prospects across districts were not equal across districts.

Keywords: Influences; problems; prospects; MSMEs

Introduction

The World Bank Review on Small Business Activities establishes the commitment of the World Bank Group to the development of the small and medium enterprise (SME) sector as a core element in its strategy to foster economic growth, employment and poverty alleviation (Ayyagari, Beck & Kunt, 2007). The World Bank Group approved approximately \$2.8 billion in the year 2004 alone in support of micro, small and medium enterprises. Acknowledging the importance of SMEs and to foster SMEs in India too, a landmark Act, the Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development (MSMED) Act, 2006 was passed. The MSMED Act seeks to

address policy issues affecting MSMEs as well as the coverage and investment ceiling of the sector. The salient features of the Act include:

- Setting up of a National Board for MSMEs
- Classification of enterprises
- Advisory committee to support MSMEs
- Measures for promotion, development and enhancement of MSMEs
- Schemes to control delayed payments to MSMEs
- Enactment of rules by State Governments to implement the MSME Act, 2006 in their respective States

India has a vibrant micro and small enterprise sector. The micro, small and medium enterprises sector contributes significantly to the manufacturing output, employment and exports of the country. It is estimated that in terms of value, the sector accounts for about 45 per cent of the manufacturing output and 40 per cent of the total exports of the country. The sector is the second largest employer of human resources after agriculture, providing employment to about 59 million persons in over 26 million units throughout the country. Further, this sector has consistently registered a higher growth rate than the rest of the industrial sector. There are over 6000 products ranging from traditional to high-tech items, which are being manufactured by the MSMEs in India. Despite the contributions of this sector the micro, small and medium enterprises are grappled with several continuous and numerous problems like non-availability of adequate raw materials, lack of technology and skilled labour, non-availability of power, problem of finance, transport, human resource management, marketing competition from large scale sector, threats inherent to globalization and the likes which are apparent from various studies (**Sangeetha, 2017; Kiritkumar, 2017; Lalhriatchhung, 2017; Rajkumar, 2013; Rao, 2012**). This paper presents comprehensive empirical analysis on the influences, problems and prospects of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) across four valley districts of Manipur.

Literature Review

Sangeetha (2017) pointed out that MSME entrepreneurs encounter various challenges particularly in the field of finance, human resource, raw material purchase and marketing while running their businesses. In the field of finance, manufacturing enterprises found it difficult to get subsidy from the government for the development of industry. In the area of human resource, entrepreneurs found it challenging to recruit the required number of manpower and to manage effectively the recruited workers. Marketing challenges included the fact that selling of MSME products were concentrated in local and domestic market mostly by credit and later face difficulties while collecting the credit from customers.

Subasri (2017) found that variables such as gender, age, education, marital status, nature of business, annual turnover and type of firm had significant association with problems of micro, small and medium enterprises. As with prospects age, nature of business and annual turnover had

significant association with prospects but variables such as gender, marital status, educational qualification, place of residence and type of firm did not have any significant association with prospects.

Lalhriatchhung (2017) conducted an empirical research on the role of micro, small and medium enterprises in economic development in Manipur. The study revealed that MSME enterprises in Manipur contributed highly to the economic growth of the state. The study further revealed that though enterprises in Manipur faced various problems, only labour problem and general problem had negative effect on the economic impact of the MSMEs. Thus, concluded that the economic impact of MSMEs on economic development of the state was generally high.

Kiritkumar (2017) found that MSME offered good employment opportunities, nurtured the locally available entrepreneurial skills, helped in balanced growth and improved overall economic conditions. However, despite the contributions of MSMEs they faced various problems like non-availability of power, lack of technology and skilled labour, high cost of labour, finance and transport. Another major threat faced by MSMEs was globalization.

Venkatajalapath (2016) evaluated the influence of socio economic factors on the establishment or growth of MSMEs in the Union Territory of Puducherry. The result showed that gender, religion and social category did not have any influence in establishing MSMEs indicating that region, religion and caste were not important criteria for establishing MSMEs in Puducherry.

Rajkumar (2013) showed that MSME entrepreneurs had to struggle for survival and success of their enterprises constantly. They faced difficulties in raising bank loans especially with regard to surrender of securities. They did not have adequate fixed assets and many of them are running in rented buildings. They even faced marketing hindrances because they had to face competitions from other MSMEs and large industries. Their products are concentrated to local market only and the scales of operations were very limited in terms of production, geographical area covered, marketing net work and such.

Rao (2012) investigated on the problems and prospects of micro and small scale enterprises in Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh involving 300 entrepreneurs, 150 entrepreneurs engaged in small scale units and 150 engaged in Prime Minister Rozgar Yojana units. The study deduced that small scale industries and its units were facing numerous problems in the areas like production, marketing, finance and human resource management. Competition from large scale sector was also found to be a major problem.

Objectives of the Study

This study is undertaken primarily with the following objectives:

- i. To study the socio-economic profile of MSME entrepreneurs in Manipur.

- ii. To find out the major influential factors to become entrepreneurs in Manipur, problems faced and the prospects availed to MSME entrepreneurs in Manipur.

Hypothesis of the Study

Keeping in view the above given objectives the following hypotheses is proposed:

Ho1: The level of influences to become MSME entrepreneurs does not differ significantly across districts

Ho2: The level of problems faced by MSME entrepreneurs does not differ significantly across districts

Ho3: The level of prospects availed to MSME entrepreneurs does not differ significantly across districts

Ho4: There is no significant difference in the level of overall influences, problems and prospects across districts.

Methodology

Sampling and Participants

The study was carried out in four valley districts of Manipur, namely, Bishnupur, Imphal East, Imphal West, and Thoubal district. 70 entrepreneurs from each district who had an experience of more than one year participate in the study. Each and every questionnaire was individually administered by the researcher adopting face to face interview method. Thus 100% correct response rate was achieved. A total of 280 entrepreneurs participated in the study (male = 176; female = 104). The study was carried out from February 2019 to January 2020.

Materials

Related information for the study was collected through a questionnaire which was construed into four distinct parts: Part-A was in relation to the general profile of the entrepreneurs and their enterprises, PART-B was in relation to the factors influencing to start business, PART-C was related to the problems of MSME in Manipur and PART-D was about the prospects of MSME in Manipur. The approximate completion time for the survey was 15-20 minutes.

Analysis

The data was analysed through SPSS. Frequency and percentage analysis were done to provide information about the demographic and business related variable of the entrepreneurs. Chi-square (χ^2) analyses was conducted to investigate whether the influential level to become an

entrepreneur, problems faced and prospects available were independent of districts. ANOVA was performed to tests whether the overall influence, problems and prospects were independent of districts.

Demographic and Business Related Variables

Table 1: Demographic and Business Related Variables across Districts.

VARIABLES	GROUPS	DISTRICTS				TOTAL
		BSPR	TBL	IE	IW	
AGE	25 - 30	7 (10.0)	2 (2.9)	3 (4.3)	2 (2.9)	14 (5.0)
	31 - 35	10 (14.3)	5 (7.1)	12 (17.1)	8 (11.4)	35 (12.5)
	36 - 40	5 (7.1)	13 (18.6)	10 (14.3)	13 (18.6)	41 (14.6)
	41 - 45	39 (55.7)	42 (60.0)	24 (34.3)	16 (22.9)	121 (43.2)
	45 and Above	9 (12.9)	8 (11.4)	21 (30.0)	31 (44.3)	69 (24.6)
GENDER	Male	51 (72.9)	40 (57.1)	29 (41.4)	56 (80)	176 (62.9)
	Female	19 (27.1)	30 (42.9)	41 (58.6)	14 (20.0)	104 (37.1)
EDUCATION LEVEL	Upto Primary	5 (7.1)	9 (12.9)	3 (4.3)	4 (5.7)	21 (7.5)
	High School	27 (38.6)	23 (32.9)	21 (30.0)	11 (15.7)	82 (29.3)
	Higher Secondary	15 (21.4)	15 (21.4)	27 (38.6)	12 (17.1)	69 (24.6)
	Graduate	17 (24.3)	21 (30.0)	17 (24.3)	34 (48.6)	89 (31.8)
	Post Graduate	5 (7.1)	2 (2.9)	2 (2.9)	6 (8.6)	15 (5.4)
	Technical/Professional	1 (1.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (4.3)	4 (1.4)
NATURE OF OWNERSHIP	Proprietary/ Pvt. Ltd	59 (84.3)	59 (84.3)	53 (75.7)	62 (88.6)	233 (83.2)
	Partnership	4 (5.7)	3 (4.3)	9 (12.9)	7 (10.0)	23 (8.2)
	Co-operative	7	8	8	1	24

		(10.0)	(11.4)	(11.4)	(1.4)	(8.6)
SOURCE OF CAPITAL	Used Own Capital	37 (52.9)	42 (60.0)	38 (54.)	47 (67.1)	164 (58.6)
	Loan From Commercial Banks	22 (31.4)	18 (25.7)	19 (27.1)	17 (24.3)	76 (27.1)
	Loan From Family Members	4 (5.7)	4 (5.7)	11 (15.7)	6 (8.6)	25 (8.9)
	Loan From Friends	6 (8.6)	5 (7.1)	2 (2.9)	0 (0)	13 (4.6)
	Others	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0.7)
TURNOVER	Upto 10000	2 (2.9)	10 (14.3)	10 (14.3)	5 (7.1)	27 (9.6)
	10000 - 20000	4 (5.7)	8 (11.4)	13 (18.6)	22 (31.4)	47 (16.8)
	20000 - 30000	4 (5.7)	3 (4.3)	25 (35.7)	14 (20.0)	46 (16.4)
	30000 - 40000	43 (61.4)	28 (40.0)	12 (17.1)	14 (20.0)	97 (34.6)
	More Than 40000	17 (24.3)	21 (30.0)	10 (14.3)	15 (21.4)	63 (22.5)

Source: Computed from Primary Data. **Note:** Figures in the brackets indicates percentages.

Table 1 exhibited the composite demographic profile and business related variables of the respondents across the four valley districts under study, that is, Bishnupur, Thoubal, Imphal East and Imphal West. The composition of age group as shown in the table given above revealed that majority of the entrepreneurs' age falls between 41 to 45 years (about 43 percent) followed by those above 45 years (about 25 percent). The composition of young entrepreneurs, that is, those below the age of 30 years were very low (just about 5 percent). Regarding gender compositions, about two-third of the entrepreneurs were male. The educational information presented above showed that most of the entrepreneurs had high school to graduate level education (about 85 percent). The proportions of entrepreneur who had post graduate degree or acquired technical/professional education were very less (just about 5 percent). With regard to the nature of ownership as shown in the table above depicted that 83.3% of the enterprises were privately owned, just few of the enterprises were own by either partners (8.2%) or cooperative societies (8.6 %). Regarding the sources of capital, 58.6% started their enterprises with their own capital, 27.1 with loan from commercial banks, 8.9% and 4.6% started with loans from families and friends respectively. The monthly average turnovers of more than half of the entrepreneurs were above ₹30000 (34.6% + 22.5%). However there were also entrepreneurs who earned less than ₹10000 (about one-tenth) in a month.

Ho1: The level of influences to become MSME entrepreneurs does not differ significantly across districts

Table 2: Frequency, Percentage and Chi-square of Influential Level across Districts

Reasons	Levels	DISTRICTS				Total (n=280)	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
		BSPR	TBL	IE	IW				
1 Own ambition to be independent	SD	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)	20.740	9	0.014*
	D	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)			
	N	3 (4.3)	6 (8.6)	12 (17.1)	10 (14.3)	31 (11.1)			
	A	25 (35.7)	37 (52.9)	38 (54.3)	34 (48.6)	134 (47.9)			
	SA	41 (58.6)	27 (38.6)	20 (28.6)	26 (37.1)	114 (40.7)			
2 Previous Work Experience	SD	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	15.822	9	0.071
	D	2 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	4 (1.4)			
	N	12 (17.1)	7 (10.0)	10 (14.3)	18 (25.7)	47 (16.8)			
	A	31 (44.3)	32 (45.7)	39 (55.7)	34 (48.6)	136 (48.6)			
	SA	25 (35.7)	31 (44.3)	21 (30.0)	16 (22.9)	93 (33.2)			
3 Education and Training in the field	SD	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)	60.057	12	0.000*
	D	2 (2.9)	10 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	3 (4.3)	15 (5.4)			
	N	17 (24.3)	6 (8.6)	15 (21.4)	35 (50.0)	73 (26.1)			
	A	20 (28.6)	32 (45.7)	38 (54.3)	16 (22.9)	106 (37.9)			

	SA	30 (42.9)	22 (31.4)	17 (24.3)	16 (22.9)	85 (30.4)			
4 Demand for product in the market	SD	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	1 (0.4)	37.013	12	0.000*
	D	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	1 (0.4)			
	N	20 (28.6)	11 (15.7)	20 (28.6)	6 (8.6)	57 (20.4)			
	A	26 (37.1)	28 (40.0)	26 (37.1)	50 (71.4)	130 (46.4)			
	SA	24 (34.3)	31 (44.3)	24 (34.3)	12 (17.1)	91 (32.5)			
5 To achieve high social status	SD	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	23.307	9	0.006*
	D	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	2 (2.9)	4 (5.7)	7 (2.5)			
	N	13 (18.6)	4 (5.7)	16 (22.9)	18 (25.7)	51 (18.2)			
	A	21 (30.0)	27 (38.6)	26 (37.1)	29 (41.4)	103 (36.8)			
	SA	36 (51.4)	38 (54.3)	26 (37.1)	19 (27.1)	119 (42.5)			

Source: Computed from Primary Data. Note: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree. BSPR = Bishnupur, TBL = Thoubal, IE = Imphal East, IW = Imphal West.

Chi-square (χ^2) analyses were conducted to examine whether the levels of the five influential reasons to become an entrepreneur were independent across the four districts under study (that is, Bishnupur, Thoubal, Imphal East and Imphal West). The χ^2 result of the five influential reasons to become an entrepreneur across districts (presented in Table 2) showed that only 1 item out of the five items influential scale, that is, item #2 'Previous work experience', failed to differ significantly at 5 % level of significance. Thus, the supposition of no difference in the level of influences across districts stated as part of Ho1 was mostly rejected at 5 % level of significance.

Ho2: The level of problems faced by MSME entrepreneurs does not differ significantly across districts

Table 3: Frequency, Percentage and Chi-square of Problems across District

Problems	Levels	DISTRICTS				Total (n=280)	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
		BSPR	TBL	IE	IW				
1. It is difficult to get loans from authorized financial institutions	SD	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	4 (1.4)	21.235	12	0.047*
	D	5 (7.1)	4 (5.7)	0 (0.0)	6 (8.6)	15 (5.4)			
	N	7 (10.0)	13 (18.6)	5 (7.1)	2 (2.9)	27 (9.6)			
	A	33 (47.1)	25 (35.7)	40 (57.1)	37 (52.9)	135 (48.2)			
	SA	23 (32.9)	27 (38.6)	25 (35.7)	24 (34.3)	99 (35.4)			
2. Tiresome procedures to get loan in all nationalized/public sector banks	SD	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)	21.144	12	0.048*
	D	4 (5.7)	6 (8.6)	1 (1.4)	5 (7.1)	16 (5.7)			
	N	12 (17.1)	13 (18.6)	4 (5.7)	4 (5.7)	33 (11.8)			
	A	22 (31.4)	29 (41.4)	30 (42.9)	34 (48.6)	115 (41.1)			
	SA	31 (44.3)	22 (31.4)	35 (50.0)	27 (38.6)	115 (41.1)			
3. The credit worthiness of MSMEs are weak	SD	3 (4.3)	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	2 (2.9)	7 (2.5)	27.352	12	0.007*
	D	2 (2.9)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)	8 (11.4)	13 (4.6)			
	N	13	16 (22.9)	12 (17.1)	14 (20.0)	55 (19.6)			

		(18.6)							
	A	26 (37.1)	26 (37.1)	32 (45.7)	39 (55.7)	123 (43.9)			
	SA	26 (37.1)	25 (35.7)	24 (34.3)	7 (10.0)	82 (29.3)			
4. Private money lenders demand high rate of interest	SD	4 (5.7)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	5 (1.8)	38.276	12	0.000*
	D	3 (4.3)	2 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	5 (7.1)	10 (3.6)			
	N	16 (22.9)	24 (34.3)	8 (11.4)	9 (12.9)	57 (20.4)			
	A	21 (30.0)	20 (28.6)	15 (21.4)	16 (22.9)	72 (25.7)			
	SA	26 (37.1)	23 (32.9)	47 (67.1)	40 (57.1)	136 (48.6)			
5. Poor financial management and maintenance of accounts	SD	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)	3 (4.3)	6 (2.1)	33.438	12	0.001*
	D	3 (4.3)	2 (2.9)	4 (5.7)	14 (20.0)	23 (8.2)			
	N	11 (15.7)	10 (14.3)	18 (25.7)	11 (15.7)	50 (17.9)			
	A	28 (40.0)	28 (40.0)	25 (35.7)	32 (45.7)	113 (40.4)			
	SA	28 (40.0)	28 (40.0)	22 (31.4)	10 (14.3)	88 (31.4)			
6. The absolute scarcity of raw materials leads to closure of industry	SD	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	3 (1.1)	47.470	12	0.000*
	D	7 (10.0)	5 (7.1)	5 (7.1)	13 (18.6)	30 (10.7)			
	N	15	8 (11.4)	14 (20.0)	6 (8.6)	43 (15.4)			

		(21.4)							
	A	11 (15.7)	24 (34.3)	34 (48.6)	37 (52.9)	106 (37.9)			
	SA	36 (51.4)	33 (47.1)	17 (24.3)	12 (17.1)	98 (35.0)			
7. Poor quality raw materials affects the quality/image of the products produced	SD	2 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	4 (1.4)	13.028	12	0.367
	D	3 (4.3)	1 (1.4)	1 (1.4)	4 (5.7)	9 (3.2)			
	N	10 (14.3)	14 (20.0)	10 (14.3)	13 (18.6)	47 (16.8)			
	A	36 (51.4)	28 (40.0)	42 (60.0)	36 (51.4)	142 (50.7)			
	SA	19 (27.1)	27 (38.6)	16 (22.9)	16 (22.9)	78 (27.9)			
8. Inadequate availability of land, plots and premises	SD	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (4.3)	4 (1.4)	42.778	12	0.000*
	D	6 (8.6)	10 (14.3)	1 (1.4)	8 (11.4)	25 (8.9)			
	N	10 (14.3)	10 (14.3)	24 (34.3)	16 (22.9)	60 (21.4)			
	A	38 (54.3)	22 (31.4)	23 (32.9)	36 (51.4)	119 (42.5)			
	SA	15 (21.4)	28 (40.0)	22 (31.4)	7 (10.0)	72 (25.7)			
9. Inadequate technical support for product identification and machinery utilization	SD	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.4)	34.618	12	0.001*
	D	4 (5.7)	5 (7.1)	5 (7.1)	8 (11.4)	22 (7.9)			
	N	13	12 (17.1)	27 (38.6)	20 (28.6)	72 (25.7)			

		(18.6)							
	A	19 (27.1)	27 (38.6)	21 (30.0)	33 (47.1)	100 (35.7)			
	SA	34 (48.6)	26 (37.1)	16 (22.9)	9 (12.9)	85 (30.4)			
10. Lack of up gradation of technology for Research & Development	SD	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (4.3)	3 (1.1)	41.408	12	0.000*
	D	6 (8.6)	3 (4.3)	4 (5.7)	10 (14.3)	23 (8.2)			
	N	24 (34.3)	17 (24.3)	11 (15.7)	14 (20.0)	66 (23.6)			
	A	19 (27.1)	26 (37.1)	41 (58.6)	37 (52.9)	123 (43.9)			
	SA	21 (30.0)	24 (34.3)	14 (20.0)	6 (8.6)	65 (23.2)			
11. Ancillary MSME units are forced to sell their products in local market	SD	4 (5.7)	1 (1.4)	3 (4.3)	4 (5.7)	12 (4.3)	32.366	12	0.001*
	D	8 (11.4)	5 (7.1)	21 (30.0)	16 (22.9)	50 (17.9)			
	N	10 (14.3)	19 (27.1)	17 (24.3)	20 (28.6)	66 (23.6)			
	A	23 (32.9)	20 (28.6)	15 (21.4)	22 (31.4)	80 (28.6)			
	SA	25 (35.7)	25 (35.7)	14 (20.0)	8 (11.4)	72 (25.7)			
12. The products of MSME have to travel long distance for marketing	SD	5 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	3 (4.3)	10 (3.6)	40.040	12	0.000*
	D	5 (7.1)	15 (21.4)	6 (8.6)	25 (35.7)	51 (18.2)			
	N	19	15 (21.4)	20 (28.6)	15 (21.4)	69 (24.6)			

		(27.1)							
	A	23 (32.9)	18 (25.7)	25 (35.7)	23 (32.9)	89 (31.8)			
	SA	18 (25.7)	22 (31.4)	17 (24.3)	4 (5.7)	61 (21.8)			
13. MSME units are not able to advertise in mega manner	SD	3 (4.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (5.7)	7 (2.5)	31.911	12	0.001*
	D	9 (12.9)	3 (4.3)	11 (15.7)	15 (21.4)	38 (13.6)			
	N	24 (34.3)	20 (28.6)	18 (25.7)	13 (18.6)	75 (26.8)			
	A	18 (25.7)	25 (35.7)	28 (40.0)	32 (45.7)	103 (36.8)			
	SA	16 (22.9)	22 (31.4)	13 (18.6)	6 (8.6)	57 (20.4)			
14. Lack of knowledge of how to market and whom to contact	SD	3 (4.3)	1 (1.4)	6 (8.6)	4 (5.7)	14 (5.0)	31.635	12	0.002*
	D	4 (5.7)	14 (20.0)	10 (14.3)	22 (31.4)	50 (17.9)			
	N	17 (24.3)	10 (14.3)	17 (24.3)	14 (20.0)	58 (20.7)			
	A	19 (27.1)	25 (35.7)	24 (34.3)	21 (30.0)	89 (31.8)			
	SA	27 (38.6)	20 (28.6)	13 (18.6)	9 (12.9)	69 (24.6)			
15. Exploitation by middlemen and difficulties in collection of dues	SD	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)	3 (4.3)	5 (7.1)	11 (3.9)	56.285	12	0.000*
	D	6 (8.6)	7 (10.0)	25 (35.7)	31 (44.3)	69 (24.6)			
	N	16	19 (27.2)	15 (21.4)	11 (15.7)	61 (21.8)			

		(22.9)							
	A	19 (27.1)	17 (24.3)	16 (22.9)	19 (27.1)	71 (25.4)			
	SA	27 (38.6)	26 (37.1)	11 (15.7)	4 (5.7)	68 (24.3)			
16. Within the limited hours of power supply, it is difficult to complete the production	SD	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	7 (10.0)	5 (7.1)	13 (4.6)	47.431	12	0.000*
	D	8 (11.4)	2 (2.9)	14 (20.0)	15 (21.4)	39 (13.9)			
	N	21 (30.0)	14 (20.0)	20 (28.6)	14 (20.0)	69 (24.6)			
	A	10 (14.3)	32 (45.7)	16 (22.9)	13 (18.6)	71 (25.4)			
	SA	31 (44.3)	21 (30.0)	13 (18.6)	23 (32.9)	88 (31.4)			
17. Lack of skilled labour	SD	0 (0.0)	2 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	4 (5.7)	6 (2.1)	41.506	12	0.000*
	D	11 (15.7)	8 (11.4)	6 (8.6)	10 (14.3)	35 (12.5)			
	N	11 (15.7)	11 (15.7)	18 (25.7)	12 (17.1)	52 (18.6)			
	A	32 (45.7)	20 (28.6)	41 (58.6)	35 (50.0)	128 (45.7)			
	SA	16 (22.9)	29 (41.4)	5 (7.1)	9 (12.6)	59 (21.1)			
18. Poor transportation	SD	2 (2.9)	2 (2.9)	7 (10.0)	5 (7.1)	16 (5.7)	33.453	12	0.001*
	D	4 (5.7)	14 (20.0)	16 (22.9)	19 (27.1)	53 (18.9)			

	N	32 (45.7)	11 (15.7)	20 (28.6)	17 (24.3)	80 (28.6)			
	A	12 (17.1)	18 (25.7)	15 (21.4)	16 (22.9)	61 (21.8)			
	SA	20 (28.6)	25 (35.7)	12 (17.1)	13 (18.6)	70 (25.0)			
19. Red tapism at various level	SD	0 (0.0)	3 (4.3)	2 (2.9)	1 (1.4)	6 (2.1)	67.528	12	0.000*
	D	9 (12.9)	7 (10.0)	25 (35.7)	19 (27.1)	60 (21.4)			
	N	19 (27.1)	19 (27.1)	22 (31.4)	22 (31.4)	82 (29.3)			
	A	29 (41.4)	9 (12.9)	16 (22.9)	24 (34.3)	78 (27.9)			
	SA	13 (18.6)	32 (45.7)	5 (7.1)	4 (5.7)	54 (19.3)			
20. Lack of family and spousal support	SD	1 (1.4)	4 (5.7)	10 (14.3)	10 (14.3)	25 (8.9)	57.556	12	0.000*
	D	6 (8.6)	12 (17.1)	23 (32.9)	14 (20.0)	55 (19.6)			
	N	14 (20.0)	14 (20.0)	21 (30.0)	12 (17.1)	61 (21.8)			
	A	23 (32.9)	11 (15.7)	12 (17.1)	24 (34.3)	70 (25.0)			
	SA	26 (37.1)	29 (41.4)	4 (5.7)	10 (14.3)	69 (24.6)			

Source: Computed from Primary Data. Note: SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree. BSPR = Bishnupur, TBL = Thoubal, IE = Imphal East, IW = Imphal West.

Chi-square (χ^2) analyses were conducted to examine whether the levels of the twenty problematic items faced by the entrepreneurs were independent across the four valley districts of Manipur. The χ^2 result of problems faced across districts (given in Table 3) showed that out of the 20 items of the problematic scale only 1 item, item #7 'Poor quality raw materials affects the quality/image of the products produced' failed to differ significantly. The remaining 19 items were found to be rejected significantly. Indicating that the supposition of no difference in the level of problems faced by entrepreneurs across the four districts stated as part of Ho2 was mostly rejected at 5% level of significance.

Ho3: The level of prospects availed to MSME entrepreneurs does not differ significantly across districts

Table 4: Frequency, Percentage and Chi-square of Prospects across Districts

Prospects	Levels	DISTRICTS				Total (n=280)	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
		BSPR (n =70)	TBL (n = 70)	IE (n = 70)	IW (n = 70)				
1 The installation of District Industries Centre programmes are helping MSMEs to revive	SD	12 (17.1)	1 (1.4)	5 (7.1)	7 (10.0)	25 (8.9)	56.935	12	0.000*
	D	28 (40.0)	35 (50.0)	15 (21.4)	8 (11.4)	86 (30.7)			
	N	15 (21.4)	20 (28.6)	14 (20.0)	15 (21.4)	64 (22.9)			
	A	14 (20.0)	9 (12.9)	24 (34.3)	30 (42.9)	77 (27.5)			
	SA	1 (1.4)	5 (7.1)	12 (17.1)	10 (14.3)	28 (10.0)			

2 The region and district officers of MSME often interact with the entrepreneurs	SD	15 (21.4)	13 (18.6)	7 (10.0)	7 (10.0)	42 (15.0)	63.920	12	0.000*
	D	34 (48.6)	34 (48.6)	14 (20.0)	9 (12.9)	91 (32.5)			
	N	9 (12.9)	14 (20.0)	24 (34.3)	18 (25.7)	65 (23.2)			
	A	7(10.0)	6 (8.6)	23 (32.9)	31 (44.3)	67 (23.9)			
	SA	5 (7.1)	3 (4.3)	2 (2.9)	5 (7.1)	15 (4.5)			
3 Policy formation, coordination and continuous monitoring are taken by the Government	SD	24 (34.3)	31 (44.3)	9 (12.9)	9 (12.9)	73 (26.1)	57.513	12	0.000*
	D	18 (25.7)	24 (34.3)	17 (24.3)	26 (37.1)	85 (30.4)			
	N	20 (28.6)	8 (11.4)	22 (31.4)	17 (24.3)	67 (23.9)			
	A	4 (5.7)	1 (1.4)	20 (28.6)	16 (22.9)	41 (14.6)			
	SA	4 (5.7)	6 (8.6)	2 (2.9)	2 (2.9)	14 (5.0)			
4 Reservation of certain products for MSMEs avoids competition from large scale industries	SD	28 (40.0)	32 (45.7)	10 (14.3)	1 (1.4)	71 (25.4)	89.969	12	0.000*
	D	14 (20.0)	29 (41.4)	34 (48.6)	20 (28.6)	97 (34.6)			
	N	13 (18.6)	7 (10.0)	20 (28.6)	34 (48.6)	74 (26.4)			
	A	11	1 (1.4)	2 (2.9)	14 (20.0)	28			

		(15.7)				(10.0)			
	SA	4 (5.7)	1 (1.4)	4 (5.7)	1 (1.4)	10 (3.6)			
5 MSMEs are treated as priority sector by the Government to help them financially	SD	25 (35.7)	22 (31.4)	12 (17.1)	4 (5.7)	63 (22.5)	61.136	12	0.000*
	D	21 (30.0)	31 (44.3)	15 (21.4)	10 (14.3)	77 (27.5)			
	N	14 (20.0)	13 (18.6)	28 (40.0)	34 (48.6)	89 (31.8)			
	A	6 (8.6)	3 (4.3)	13 (18.6)	18 (25.7)	40 (14.3)			
	SA	4 (5.7)	1 (1.4)	2 (2.9)	4 (5.7)	11 (3.9)			
6 Nationalized banks are given directions to disburse loans for MSME units for lesser interest	SD	24 (34.3)	24 (34.3)	9 (12.9)	2 (2.9)	59 (21.1)	79.316	12	0.000*
	D	21 (30.0)	27 (38.6)	15 (21.4)	11 (15.7)	74 (26.4)			
	N	16 (22.9)	12 (17.1)	20 (28.6)	13 (18.6)	61 (21.8)			
	A	6 (8.6)	4 (5.7)	22 (31.4)	37 (52.9)	69 (24.6)			
	SA	3 (4.3)	3 (4.3)	4 (5.7)	7 (10.0)	17 (6.1)			
7 Government makes direct purchases from MSMEs thus reduces the marketing burden	SD	16 (22.9)	26 (37.1)	9 (12.9)	11 (15.7)	62 (22.1)	45.635	12	0.000*
	D	27 (38.6)	31 (44.3)	21 (30.0)	24 (34.3)	103(36.8)			
	N	23	13 (18.6)	19 (27.1)	19 (27.1)	74			

		(32.9)				(26.4)			
	A	4 (5.7)	0 (0.0)	17 (24.3)	14 (20.0)	35 (12.5)			
	SA	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (5.7)	2 (2.9)	6 (2.1)			
8 Arrangement of market outlets like sales emporium, state cooperative societies and trade fairs	SD	21 (30.0)	25 (35.7)	11 (15.7)	5 (7.1)	62 (22.1)	62.435	12	0.000*
	D	23 (32.9)	26 (37.1)	16 (22.9)	15 (21.4)	80 (28.6)			
	N	22 (31.4)	16 (22.9)	24 (34.3)	18 (25.7)	80 (28.6)			
	A	2 (2.9)	3 (4.3)	15 (21.4)	25 (35.7)	45 (16.1)			
	SA	2 (2.9)	0 (0.0)	4 (5.7)	7 (10.0)	13 (4.6)			

Source: Computed from Primary Data. **Note:** SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree. BSPR = Bishnupur, TBL = Thoubal, IE = Imphal East, IW = Imphal West.

Chi-square (χ^2) analyses were conducted to examine whether the eight prospects availed to MSMEs entrepreneurs in Manipur were independent across districts. The χ^2 result of prospects availed across the four valley districts (Table 4) revealed that all the 8 items of the prospects scale were significantly found rejected. Demonstrating that the supposition of no difference in the level of prospects availed across the four districts stated as part of Ho3 was wholly rejected at 5% level of significance. In other word, prospects available across the four districts were not equal.

Overall Influence, Problems and Prospects and District

Ho4: There is no significant difference in the level of overall influences, problems and prospects across districts.

Table 5: ANOVA of Overall Influence, Problems and Prospects across Districts (n = 280)

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Overall Influence	Between Groups	112.571	3	37.524	8.505	0.000*
	Within Groups	1217.714	276	4.412		
	Total	1330.286	279			
Overall Problems	Between Groups	3661.629	3	1220.543	16.719	0.000*
	Within Groups	20149.457	276	73.005		
	Total	23811.086	279			
Overall Prospects	Between Groups	3208.839	3	1069.613	37.325	0.000*
	Within Groups	7909.271	276	28.657		
	Total	11118.111	279			

Source: Computed from Table 3.1, Table 3.2, and Table 3.3.

ANOVAs were conducted to investigate the differences in the mean scores of the three dependent variables, that is, overall influences, overall problems and overall prospects across the four districts under study (Table 5). None of the ANOVA result withholds the contention of no difference stated as H_04 . Thus explained that there were significant differences in overall influence $F(3; 179) = 8.505$, $p < 0.05$, overall problems $F(3; 179) = 16.719$, $p < 0.05$, and as well as overall prospects $F(3; 179) = 37.325$, $p < 0.05$. In simpler words, the levels of overall influence experienced, overall problems faced, and overall prospects available were not equal across the four valley districts under study, namely, Bishnupur, Thoubal, Imphal East and Imphal West.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study presented a comparative empirical analysis on the major influential factors to become an entrepreneur, problems faced and the prospects availed to MSME entrepreneurs across four valley districts in Manipur. The study also presented the demographic profile of the entrepreneurs as well as their entrepreneurial characteristics. Most entrepreneurs were aged above 41 years and most entrepreneurs had acquired high school to graduate level education. The composition of young entrepreneurs aged below 30 years was very low and also entrepreneur who had post graduate degree or acquired technical/professional education were very less. The gender distributions of the entrepreneurs revealed that about two-third of the entrepreneurs were male. More than eighty percent of the enterprises were privately owned and mostly started with either own capital or loan from commercial banks. The average monthly returns from businesses were rather promising with more than fifty percent of them earning more than ₹30000. Regarding differences in the levels of influences to

become an entrepreneur, problems faced and prospects availed across the four districts under study (that is, Bishnupur, Thoubal, Imphal East and Imphal West), it was found that there were differences in three items out of the five items influential scale, nineteen items out of the twenty items problematic scale, and all the eight items of the prospective scale across districts. As with the differences in the mean scores of overall influences, overall problems and overall prospects across districts, none of the three variables were found equal across districts.

References

Ayyagari, M., Beck, T., & Kunt, A. D.(2007). *Small and Medium Enterprises Across the Globe. Small Business Economics*, 29, 415-434. doi 10.1007/sl 1187-006-9002-5

Kiritkumar, V. D. (2017). *Problems and prospects of selected micro, small and medium scale enterprises (MSMEs) located in Anand district (Gujarat). (Doctoral dissertation, Sardar Patel University).*

Lalhriatchhung. (2017). *Role of micro, small and medium enterprises in economic development in manipur (Doctoral dissertation, Manipur University).*

Rajkumar, T. (2013). *A study on prospects and problems of micro, small and medium enterprises in Erode district (Doctoral dissertation, Bharathiar University).*

Rao, K. S. N. (2012). *A study on problems and prospects of micro and small scale enterprises (with special reference to Krishna District – A.P.). (Doctoral dissertation, Acharya Nagaijuna University).*

Sangeetha, S. (2017). *A study on challenges of entrepreneurs in micro, small and medium enterprises with special reference to manufacturing sector in Coimbatore district (Doctoral dissertation, Bharathiar University).*

Subasri, S. (2017). *A study on problems and prospects of micro, small and medium enterprises in Salem district. (Doctoral dissertation, Periyar University).*

Venkatajalapath, R. (2016). *Implications of msme policy on the industrial development of Pondicherry region (Doctoral dissertation, Pondicherry University).*