ISSN 0974-763X UGC-CARE Listed Journal

## SOUTH ASIAN JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT RESEARCH (SAJMR)

**Special Issue** 

Volume 15, Issue No.2



April, 2025

# CHHATRAPATI SHAHU INSTITUTE OF BUSINESS EDUCATION AND RESEARCH (CSIBER), KOLHAPUR, MAHARASHTRA, INDIA

(An Autonomous Institute) University Road, Kolhapur - 416004, Maharashtra State, India.

> website: www.siberindia.edu.in E-mail: editorsajmr@siberindia.edu.in

#### **Published by**

#### **CSIBER Press, Central Library Building**

#### Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business Education & Research (CSIBER)



(An Autonomous Institute)

University Road, Kolhapur - 416004, Maharashtra State, India

Phone: 0231-2535706 / 2535707 website: www.siberindia.edu.in E-mail: editorsajmr@siberindia.edu.in



#### **Chief Patron**

Late Dr. A. D. Shinde

#### **Patrons**

Dr. R. A. Shinde

President & Managing Trustee, CSIBER, Kolhapur, India

C.A. H. R. Shinde

Secretary & Trustee, CSIBER, Kolhapur, India

#### Editor

Dr. Pooja M. Patil

CSIBER, Kolhapur, India

#### **Editorial Board Members**

Dr. B. N. Menon

I/c. Director, CSIBER, Kolhapur, India

Dr. Deribe Assefa Aga

Ethiopian Civil Service University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Dr. Biswajit Das

KSOM, KIIT, Bhubaneshwar, India

Dr. Yashwant Singh Rawal

Parul University, Vadodara, India

Dr. Yuvraj Sunecher

University of Technology, Mauritius

Dr. Nyo Nyo Lwin

Yangon University of Education, Myanmar

Dr. Needesh Ramphul

University of Technology, Mauritius

Dr. K. Arjunan

University of Vavuniya, Sri Lanka

Dr. Amitabye Luximon-Ramma

University of Technology, Mauritius

#### Superintendent

Mrs. Maithili Santosh

CSIBER, Kolhapur, India

#### **Type Setting**

Mr. Abhijeet R. Sardesai

Mr. Sandeep Gaikwad

Mrs. Vidya Ingawale

#### Desigining

Mr. Chetan Khatawane

# **Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business Education and Research (CSIBER)**

# South Asian Journal of Management Research (SAJMR)

### **Special Issue**

Volume 15, Issue No. 2, April 2025

Editor: Dr. Pooja M. Patil

#### Publisher CSIBER Press Central Library

Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of
Business Education & Research (CSIBER)
University Road, Kolhapur – 416004, Maharashtra, India.
Phone: 91-231-2535706/07, Fax: 91-231-2535708,

Website: www.siberindia.edu.in Email: <a href="mailto:csiberpress@siberindia.edu.in">csiberpress@siberindia.edu.in</a> Editor Email: editorsajmr@siberindia.edu.in **Editorial Note** 

South Asian Journal of Management Research (SAJMR), is a scholarly journal that publishes

scientific research on the theory and practice of management. All management, computer

science, environmental science related issues relating to strategy, entrepreneurship, innovation,

technology, and organizations are covered by the journal, along with all business-related

functional areas like accounting, finance, information systems, marketing, and operations. The

research presented in these articles contributes to our understanding of critical issues and offers

valuable insights for policymakers, practitioners, and researchers. Authors are invited to

publish novel, original, empirical, and high quality research work pertaining to the recent

developments & practices in all areas and disciplined.

Cross-functional, multidisciplinary research that reflects the diversity of the management

science professions is also encouraged, the articles are generally based on the core disciplines

of computer science, economics, environmental science, mathematics, psychology, sociology,

and statistics. The journal's focus includes managerial issues in a variety of organizational

contexts, including for profit and nonprofit businesses, organizations from the public and

private sectors, and formal and informal networks of people. Theoretical, experimental (in the

field or the lab), and empirical contributions are all welcome. The journal will continue to

disseminate knowledge and publish high-quality research so that we may all benefit from it.

Dr. Pooja M. Patil

Editor

### Copyright © 2024 Authors All rights reserved.

### Address: CSIBER Press

Central Library Building
Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of Business Education and Research (CSIBER),
University Road Kolhapur, Maharashtra - 416004, India.

All Commercial rights are reserved by CSIBER Press. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in form or by any means, Electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

The views expressed in this journal are entirely those of the authors. The printer/publisher and distributors of this book are not in any way responsible for the views expressed by the author in this journal. All disputes are subject to arbitration; legal actions if any are subject to the jurisdictions of the courts of Kolhapur, Maharashtra, India.

ISSN: 0974-763X

Price: INR ₹ 1,200/-

Editor: Dr. Pooja M. Patil

#### Distributed By CSIBER Press Central Library

Chhatrapati Shahu Institute of

Business Education & Research (CSIBER)

University Road, Kolhapur – 416004, Maharashtra, India.

Phone: 91-231-2535706/07, Fax: 91-231-2535708,

Website: www.siberindia.edu.in Email: csiberpress@siberindia.edu.in

# South Asian Journal of Management Research (SAJMR) Special Issue

Volume 15, Issue No. 2

**April**, 2025

#### CONTENTS

| Sr.<br>No | Title Author  | Page No |
|-----------|---|---------|
|           | Human Resource Implications of the Merged Public Sector Banks in Tamil<br>Nadu  |         |
| 1         | Nilavarasan S Ph.D. Research Scholar, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu, India                   | 01-14   |
|           | Dr. K. Ganesamurthy Assistant Professor, Department of Corporate Secretaryship, Alagappa University, Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu, India           |         |
|           | Brand Hate and Avoidance in Indian Consumers: Does Poor Relationship Quality and Ideological Incompatibility Matter?                        |         |
| 2         | Pooja Sharma Research scholar/ Department of Management/Indira Gandhi University Meerpur-Rewari, Haryana, India                             | 15-25   |
|           | Dr. Samridhi Tanwar  Associate professor / Department of Management/Indira Gandhi University Meerpur-Rewari, Haryana, India                 |         |
|           | Role of Burnout between Classroom Incivility and Learning Engagement: A<br>Study of Select Colleges of Chandigarh                           |         |
| 3         | Dr. Luxmi Malodia Professor, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, Punjab, India                                       | 26-39   |
| 3         | Priya Kumari Butail Research Scholar, University Business School, Panjab University, Chandigarh, Punjab, India                              | 20-37   |
|           | Dr. Sumit Goklaney Assistant Professor, DAV College, Chandigarh, Punjab, India  |         |
|           | Remote Work in the Post-Pandemic Era: A Systematic Review of Its Impact on Employee Productivity  |         |
| 4         | Md Alijan Arif Ph.D. Research Scholar, Department of Commerce and Business Studies, Jamia Millia Islami, New Delhi, India                   | 40-53   |
|           | <i>Prof. N. U. K Sherwani</i> Professor, Department of Commerce and Business Studies, Jamia Millia Islami, New Delhi, India                 |         |
|           | Quality of Work Life: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research<br>Agenda  |         |
|           | Ashish Kumar Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, C.M.P. Degree College, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India      |         |
| 5         | Dr. Manish Kumar Sinha Professor, Department of Commerce, C.M.P. Degree College, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India   | 54-78   |
|           | Prashasti Keshari Research Scholar, Department of Commerce, C.M.P. Degree College, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India |         |

| Sr.<br>No | Title Author   | Page No |
|-----------|--|---------|
|           | Factors Influencing Digital Financial Inclusion in India: Evidence from the Global Findex Database   |         |
| 6         | Ms. Anita Research Scholar, Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be University), Pune Bharati Vidyapeeth Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi, India   | 79-92   |
|           | Dr. Parul Agarwal Associate Professor, Bharati Vidyapeeth (Deemed to be University), Pune Bharati Vidyapeeth Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi, India  |         |
|           | From Recycling to Renewable Energy: A SEM-Based Study of Social Norms, Personal Values, and Environmental Knowledge as Drivers of Pro-Environmental Behavior Influencing Positive Spillover Effects                |         |
| 7         | Aishwarya Singh Research Scholar, Amity Business School, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India   | 93-108  |
|           | Dr. Jaya Yadav Professor, Amity Business School, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India   |         |
|           | Dr. Shalini Sharma Professor, GNIOT Institute of Management Studies, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India   |         |
|           | The Influence of Safety Culture on Safety Performance through the mediating role of employee engagement within the context of a Small Island & Developing State: A case study of the Mauritian Construction Sector |         |
| 8         | KODYE-DOMAH Dayalutchmee Department of Environment, Social Sciences & Sustainability, University of Technology, Mauritius  | 109-128 |
|           | LADSAWUT Jeynakshi Department of Tourism, Leisure & Services, University of Technology, Mauritius  |         |
|           | SOBHA Leena Devi Department of Environment, Social Sciences & Sustainability, University of Technology, Mauritius  |         |
|           | Effect of OTT Video Service Integration on Customer Retention in Indian Telecommunication Industry   |         |
| 9         | S Manikantan PhD Research Scholar, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu, India  | 129-139 |
|           | Dr. S Rajamohan Senior Professor and Director, Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu, India  |         |
|           | Internship-Induced Occupational Stress among B.Ed. Student-Teachers: A critical Analysis   |         |
| 10        | Dr. M. Ramakrishna Reddy Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Central University of Jharkhand, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India   | 140-147 |
|           | Saraswati Paul Research Scholar, Department of Education, Central University of Jharkhand, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India  |         |

| Sr.<br>No | Title Author   | Page No |
|-----------|--|---------|
|           | Exploring the Role of Co-Creation in Indian Private Banks  |         |
| 11        | Annu Kumari Research Scholar, University Business School, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, Punjab. India   | 148-158 |
|           | Dr. Harpreet Singh Chahal Associate Professor, Department of Business Management and Commerce, Guru Nanak Dev University Regional Campus, Gurdaspur, Punjab.India                      |         |
|           | Barriers to Financial Inclusion for Women in the Unorganized Sector: A<br>Study from Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Telangana  |         |
| 12        | N. Uma Devi Research Scholar, PG and Research Department of Commerce, NMSS. Vellaichamy Nadar College, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India  | 159-168 |
|           | Dr. S. Benita Associate Professor, PG and Research Department of Commerce NMSS. Vellaichamy Nadar College, Madurai, Tamil Nadu, India  |         |
|           | Cyberloafing in the Digital Age: A Bibliometric Exploration of Research Trends and Patterns (In the field of Human resource management and organization behaviour)                     |         |
| 13        | Dr. Navjeet Kaur Assistant Professor, Sri Guru Teg Bahadur Khalsa College, Sri Anandpur Sahib, Punjab, India   | 169-183 |
|           | Sahil Gautam Research Scholar, Department Of Commerce, Punjabi University Patiala, Punjab, India   |         |
|           | Examining Goods and Services Tax Compliance Behaviour among<br>Businesses: A State-Level Analysis from Goa, India.   |         |
| 14        | Mr. Gajanan B. Haldankar Ph.D. Scholar, Goa Business School, Research centre in Commerce, S.S.A Govt. College of Arts & Commerce, Pernem Goa, India                                    | 184-193 |
|           | Prof. Santosh Patkar Associate Professor, Principal, Sridora Caculo College of Commerce and Management Studies, Telang Nagar, Khorlim, Mapusa, Goa, India                              |         |
|           | Exploring the Intricate Nexus: Unravelling the Mediating Influence of Attitudes on Purchase Intentions in the Beauty Industry  |         |
|           | Dr. Kavir Kashinath Shirodkar Assistant Professor, Saraswat Vidyalaya's Sridora Caculo College of Commerce & Management Studies, Telang Nagar, Khorlim, Mapusa, Goa, India             |         |
| 15        | Dr. K.G. Sankaranarayanan Professor & Programme Director, Integrated MBA(HTT), Goa Business School, Goa University, Goa, India   | 194-206 |
|           | Mr. Gajanan B. Haldankar Assistant professor, Department of Commerce, VVM's Shree Damodar college of Commerce & Economics, Govind Ramnath Kare Road, Tansor, Comba, Margao, Goa, India |         |
|           | What Drives Omni-Channel Customer Experience? An Empirical Study of the Key Antecedents in the Technical Goods Sector  |         |
| 16        | Maria Sancha Ema De Assuncao Pereira Research Scholar, Goa University, Taleigao Goa, India   | 207-221 |
|           | Juao C. Costa Principal, Sant Sohirobanath Ambiye, Government College of Arts & Commerce and Research Centre, Virnoda, Pernem, Goa, India  |         |

| Sr.<br>No | Title Author   | Page No |
|-----------|--|---------|
|           | India—ASEAN Trade Diversification since AIFTA: An Empirical Assessment  Saurav Kalita PhD. Scholar, Department of Economics, Rajiv Gandhi University, Rono Hills,                |         |
| 17        | Doimukh Arunachal Pradesh, India  Lijum Nochi Associate Professor,   | 222-233 |
|           | Department of Economics, Rajiv Gandhi University, Rono Hills, Doimukh,<br>Arunachal Pradesh, India   |         |
|           | Determinants of Investment Preference: An Empirical Study  |         |
| 18        | Dr. Shivkumar L. Biradar Associate Professor, Hirachand Nemchand College of Commerce, Solapur, Maharashtra, India.   | 234-247 |
|           | Unlocking Potential: Gujarat's Sectoral Landscape and the Entrepreneurial Edge   |         |
| 19        | Dr. Shubhra Gautam Assistant Professor, Narayana Business School, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India  | 248-260 |
|           | Professor, School of Management, R K University, Rajkot, Gujarat India   |         |
|           | Analysing How Sociocultural Factors Impact Students' Academic<br>Performance through Mediating Effects of Stress, Alcohol and Tobacco<br>Use: The Use of Social Cognitive Theory |         |
| 20        | Sobha L D School of Sustainable Development and Tourism, University of Technology, Mauritius   | 261-276 |
| 20        | Ladsawut J School of Sustainable Development and Tourism, University of Technology, Mauritius  | 201 270 |
|           | Kodye-Domah D School of Sustainable Development and Tourism, University of Technology, Mauritius   |         |
|           | To Study the Relation between the Big Five Model of Personality Traits and Behavioural Biases of Individual Mutual Fund Investors  |         |
|           | Mrs Rucha Kamat Research Scholar, Goa Business School, Goa University, Taleigao, Goa, India.   |         |
| 21        | Prof. Guntur Anjana Raju Professor, Goa Business School, Goa University, Goa, India  | 277-289 |
|           | Dr. Kaustubh Kamat Assistant Professor, Bachelors of Business Administration, Multi Faculty College, Dharbandora Goa, India  |         |
|           | The Socio-Economic Determinants of Service Sector Contribution in India -<br>An Empirical Study Based on Sstate Level Panel Data   |         |
|           | Ritwik Mazumder Professor, Department of Economics, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, India  |         |
| 22        | Rimpi Kurmi Doctoral research scholar, Department of Commerce, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, India   | 290-298 |
|           | Rajat Sharmacharjee Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Assam University Silchar, Assam, India  |         |

| Sr.<br>No | Title Author   | Page No |
|-----------|--|---------|
|           | Consumer Satisfaction Towards Organic Produce: A Study in Western<br>Tamil Nadu  |         |
| 23        | S. Devendraprabu Ph.D Research scholar, K.S.Rangasamy college of Arts and Science (Autonomous), Tiruchengode, India.   | 299-319 |
|           | Dr. K. Visvanathan Associate Professor and Head, Department of Commerce, K.S.Rangasamy college of Arts and Science (Autonomous) Tiruchengode, , India                              |         |
|           | Decoding Financial Access and Performance in Women-Led MSMEs:<br>A Structural Equation Modeling Approach   |         |
| 24        | Ms. Raheena Research Scholar, Urumu Dhanalakshmi College Autonomous (Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Thiruchirappalli) Tiruchirapalli, India.                              | 310-326 |
|           | Dr.N. Rajamannar Associate Professor and Research Advisor, Urumu Dhanalakshmi College Autonomous (Affiliated to Bharathidasan University, Thiruchirappalli) Tiruchirapalli, India. |         |
|           | Corporate Financial Performance and its impact on Environmental, Social, Governance and ESG Performance: A Study of Indian Firms   |         |
| 25        | Pawan Kumar Research Scholar (Ph.D.), University School of Management and Entrepreneurship (USME), Delhi Technological University (DTU), Delhi, , India.                           | 327-336 |
|           | Dr. Amit Mookerjee Affiliation: Professor and HOD, University School of Management and Entrepreneurship (USME), Delhi Technological University (DTU), Delhi, , India.              |         |
|           | Determinants of Customer Satisfaction in Indian Telecom: A Multivariate<br>Analysis of Uttar Pradesh   |         |
|           | Ritanshi Trivedi Research Scholar, Department of Statistics, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India  |         |
|           | Prof. Madhulika Dube Department of Statistics, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India  |         |
| 26        | Mukesh Kumar Verma Research Scholar, Department of Statistics, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India  | 337-348 |
|           | Dr. Rinki Verma Associate Professor, School of Management, BBD University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India   |         |
|           | Dr. Shreyanshu Singh Assistant Professor, School of Management, BBD University, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India  |         |

#### Unlocking Potential: Gujarat's Sectoral Landscape and the Entrepreneurial Edge

**Dr. Shubhra Gautam**Assistant Professor,
Narayana Business School, Ahmedabad,
Gujarat, India

Dr. Reena Patel
Professor,
School of Management, R K University, Rajkot,
Gujarat India

#### **Abstract**

Gujarat, one of India's most industrially progressive states, presents a compelling case of economic dynamism driven by robust infrastructure, proactive governance, and an entrepreneurial culture deeply rooted in its socio-economic fabric. However, beneath this growth narrative lies a complex web of sector-specific challenges and structural bottlenecks that continue to shape the entrepreneurial journey in the region. This research paper aims to critically examine Gujarat's sectoral landscape by identifying the key industries contributing to its GDP—such as manufacturing, textiles, chemicals, agriculture, renewable energy, and financial services—and unpacking the challenges they face, ranging from policy constraints and environmental concerns to technological disruptions and global market shifts.

By leveraging secondary data analysis, government reports, and case-based insights, the study maps out growth catalysts that are shaping Gujarat's entrepreneurial ecosystem. These include government-led initiatives like the Gujarat Industrial Policy 2020, the emergence of innovation zones such as GIFT City and Dholera Smart City, increasing digitization, startup-friendly policies, and expanding export markets. The research further explores how entrepreneurs in Gujarat are navigating this evolving economic terrain, often innovating within constraints, forming cross-sectoral collaborations, and capitalizing on both traditional business acumen and new-age technologies.

The paper argues that unlocking Gujarat's full entrepreneurial potential requires not only addressing sectoral inefficiencies but also fostering a more inclusive, adaptable, and innovation-driven ecosystem. It concludes by outlining strategic implications for current and aspiring entrepreneurs, policy-makers, and academic institutions in enabling a resilient and future-ready entrepreneurial landscape in Gujarat.

**Keywords:** Entrepreneur, Growth, Drivers, Challenges, Government, Startups.

#### Introduction

Gujarat is widely recognized for its strong entrepreneurial culture in India. Startups in the state flourish within a larger business ecosystem shaped by various growth drivers, including historical economic reforms, current market trends, technological innovations, government policies, the influence of large corporations, and societal attitudes. The success of entrepreneurial ventures is influenced by societal values, financial market dynamics, regulatory frameworks, and foreign investments. The broader business environment, encompassing external factors beyond a startup's control, plays a crucial role in how entrepreneurs navigate and manage their operations. Shifts in this environment directly affect entrepreneurial outcomes, and a supportive ecosystem can significantly enhance business performance and growth.

Gujarat holds a key position in India's economic landscape, leading in sectors such as manufacturing, infrastructure, environment, tourism, healthcare, pharmaceuticals, textiles, innovation and R&D, defense and aerospace, and agro & food processing. This sectoral diversity underscores the state's industrial vitality and adaptability. The Government of Gujarat has strategically identified priority sectors to drive consumption and economic growth, creating a strong and sustainable foundation for the state's thriving economy.

#### Literature Review

Entrepreneurship in Gujarat is a key driver of the state's economy, particularly as it expands across diverse sectors such as manufacturing, agriculture, pharmaceuticals, textiles, retail, and tourism. However, entrepreneurs operating within Gujarat face a range of sectoral challenges, including infrastructure bottlenecks, regulatory hurdles, and increasing competition. At the same time, several growth catalysts, such as government initiatives, access to global markets, and the development of new technologies, provide significant opportunities for entrepreneurs to thrive.

This literature review focuses on the dual challenges and opportunities entrepreneurs encounter within Gujarat's economic landscape, exploring how sector-specific dynamics influence entrepreneurial activity.

#### Sectoral Challenges in Gujarat

#### **Manufacturing Sector Challenges**

Infrastructure and Energy Constraints: While Gujarat is an industrial hub, issues related to infrastructure—particularly in terms of transportation, power supply, and logistics—pose significant challenges. The state's industrial sectors, such as textiles, petrochemicals, and automobile manufacturing, are energy intensive. Energy cost fluctuations and inconsistent power supplies create uncertainty, increasing operating costs for entrepreneurs (Ahluwalia, 2015).

Regulatory and Policy Barriers: Entrepreneurs in Gujarat often face complex regulatory landscapes, including compliance with various industrial policies, environmental regulations, and land acquisition challenges. Delays in clearances and navigating bureaucratic processes can hinder business scaling (Nambiar & Jain, 2017).

Skilled Labor Shortages: While Gujarat has a significant labor pool, there is a shortage of skilled labor in specialized sectors like pharmaceuticals and advanced manufacturing. This lack of skilled workers increases operational costs, as businesses must invest heavily in training and development (Chandra et al., 2019).

#### **Agriculture and Agribusiness Challenges**

Climate Vulnerabilities: Gujarat's agriculture is highly dependent on monsoons and changing weather patterns due to climate change have affected agricultural productivity. Entrepreneurs in the agribusiness sector are challenged by unpredictable rainfall and the lack of sufficient irrigation infrastructure (Singh & Shah, 2016).

Market Access and Pricing Volatility: Entrepreneurs involved in cash crops like cotton and groundnuts often face volatile pricing and market access issues, largely due to fluctuating demand and international competition. These factors can create instability for agribusiness startups (Desai, 2020).

Supply Chain Inefficiencies: Inefficiencies in agricultural supply chains—ranging from storage facilities to transportation logistics—pose significant barriers to scaling agribusinesses in Gujarat. Poor storage and distribution networks often lead to post-harvest losses (Mehta, 2017).

#### **Pharmaceutical Sector Challenges**

Regulatory Scrutiny and Compliance Costs: Gujarat is a leader in drug manufacturing, yet pharmaceutical entrepreneurs must navigate strict regulations around drug safety, clinical trials, and export standards. This often requires heavy investment in compliance, quality assurance, and certification processes (Patel et al., 2018).

International Competition: Gujarat's pharmaceutical sector faces intense global competition, particularly from countries with lower production costs. Entrepreneurs are challenged to innovate continuously to remain competitive on the international stage (Mehta & Patel, 2019).

Growth Catalysts in Gujarat's Economy

#### **Government Policies and Initiatives**

Make in India: The Indian government's "Make in India" initiative has played a critical role in boosting entrepreneurship in Gujarat's manufacturing sector. The policy offers incentives for startups in sectors such as textiles, automobiles, and electronics, providing capital subsidies and tax incentives (Govil, 2020). These measures create opportunities for entrepreneurs to scale rapidly and attract investment.

Ease of Doing Business Reforms: Gujarat has been consistently ranked as one of the best states for ease of doing business, with streamlined regulatory frameworks and support for startups through initiatives like Startup Gujarat and Vibrant Gujarat summits. These policies lower entry barriers and promote innovation (Joshi, 2020).

Sector-Specific Support: The government provides sector-specific incentives, such as reduced import duties on capital goods for the pharmaceuticals and chemicals sectors. These incentives help entrepreneurs in capital-intensive industries lower operational costs and increase profitability (Chaudhari, 2018).

#### **Access to Global Markets**

Export Potential: Gujarat's strategic location with well-developed ports like Mundra and Kandla allows businesses easy access to international markets. Entrepreneurs in the pharmaceutical and textile sectors, in particular, benefit from robust export infrastructure, increasing their global competitiveness (Kumar & Sharma, 2019).

Opportunities in the Automobile Sector: The automobile manufacturing sector in Gujarat has attracted significant foreign direct investment (FDI), with companies such as Ford and Suzuki establishing manufacturing facilities. This has created new opportunities for local entrepreneurs in the supply chain, from component manufacturing to logistics and after-sales services (Dhawan, 2019).

#### **Technological Advancements and Innovation**

Digital Transformation: The rise of digital technologies, including automation, artificial intelligence, and blockchain, offers new avenues for entrepreneurial growth. Startups in Gujarat are leveraging digital platforms to optimize production processes and enhance supply chain efficiency, particularly in sectors like textiles and agribusiness (Sharma & Bansal, 2020).

Sustainability and Green Technologies: There is a growing emphasis on environmentally sustainable technologies, with entrepreneurs innovating in clean energy, waste management, and sustainable farming practices. Gujarat's green energy initiatives, including solar power projects and waste-to-energy plants, provide fertile ground for startups in the sustainability space (Thakkar, 2020).

#### **Implications for Entrepreneurs**

Entrepreneurs in Gujarat must navigate a landscape of both significant challenges and opportunities. To thrive, they must:

Adapt to Sector-Specific Regulations: Entrepreneurs need to be adept at navigating regulatory frameworks, particularly in highly regulated sectors like pharmaceuticals and manufacturing. This requires knowledge of compliance and the ability to integrate best practices for quality control.

Leverage Government Support: Taking advantage of government incentives, such as tax benefits, startup capital, and sector-specific subsidies, is essential for growth. Entrepreneurs should also actively engage in policy dialogues and industry forums like Vibrant Gujarat to stay informed about new opportunities.

Invest in Innovation and Technology: Given the rapid pace of technological advancements, entrepreneurs must invest in research and innovation, especially in fields like clean energy, automation, and digital platforms. Doing so will help them remain competitive in global markets.

Focus on Sustainable Business Models: With growing global demand for sustainable products, entrepreneurs in Gujarat should explore green technologies and eco-friendly practices. Incorporating sustainability not only aligns with government policies but also enhances global marketability.

#### Comparison with another region:

Comparative Analysis: Navigating Sectoral Challenges and Growth Catalysts in Gujarat vs. Other Regions – Implications for Entrepreneurs

Entrepreneurship in Gujarat is characterized by a strong industrial base, agricultural productivity, and a conducive policy environment. However, when compared to other regions in India, such as Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, and Karnataka, Gujarat presents both distinct advantages and certain sector-specific challenges. This comparative analysis examines how Gujarat's economic landscape contrasts with other leading regions, focusing on sectoral challenges, growth catalysts, and the broader implications for entrepreneurs.

#### Manufacturing Sector Gujarat

Challenges: Gujarat is well-known for its manufacturing prowess, particularly in textiles, petrochemicals, and automobile production. However, the state faces infrastructure bottlenecks such as inconsistent power supply and high energy costs, especially in rural areas. Regulatory hurdles, particularly in environmental clearances and land acquisition, also impact the ease of doing business in heavy industries (Ahluwalia, 2015).

Growth Catalysts: The state's ports and strategic location provide strong advantages for export-driven manufacturing, making Gujarat an attractive hub for international trade. Initiatives like "Make in India" and ease of doing business reforms have significantly reduced the entry barriers for entrepreneurs in this sector (Joshi, 2020).

#### Maharashtra

Challenges: While Maharashtra has a more diversified industrial base (automobiles, chemicals, pharmaceuticals), the state faces significant issues related to urban congestion and high real estate costs, especially in cities like Mumbai and Pune. Additionally, the high cost of living and rising wages make scaling startups in manufacturing more expensive (Patil et al., 2018).

Growth Catalysts: Maharashtra benefits from being India's most urbanized and industrialized state, with better access to financial services and venture capital. Additionally, Maharashtra has more developed infrastructure in metro cities, especially in terms of connectivity and logistics, offering an edge in industries like automobiles and heavy engineering (KPMG, 2021).

#### Tamil Nadu

Challenges: Tamil Nadu is a significant player in manufacturing, particularly in textiles, automotive, and electronics. However, labor disputes and trade union activism are more common, creating challenges for entrepreneurs in managing labor costs and maintaining operational efficiency (Sharma & Singh, 2019).

Growth Catalysts: Tamil Nadu has a more skilled labor force, especially in the automotive and electronics sectors, and benefits from its well-developed industrial parks. Public-private partnerships (PPP) in industrial development have boosted ease of entry for startups (NCAER, 2020).

#### Karnataka

Challenges: Karnataka, especially Bengaluru, is better known for tech entrepreneurship than traditional manufacturing. Entrepreneurs in manufacturing sectors face challenges related to infrastructure gaps and high costs of setting up operations outside Bengaluru, where manufacturing hubs are less developed (Rao & Mahadevan, 2020).

Growth Catalysts: The state's focus on technology and innovation provides a strong support system for advanced manufacturing, particularly in sectors like biotechnology, aerospace, and precision engineering, making Karnataka a hub for high-tech manufacturing (CII, 2019).

#### **Agriculture and Agribusiness**

#### Gujarat

Challenges: Agriculture in Gujarat faces significant climate risks due to its dependence on monsoons, making it vulnerable to erratic weather patterns. Water scarcity and limited irrigation infrastructure remain critical challenges for agripreneurs (Singh & Shah, 2016). Additionally, market access and pricing volatility for cash crops like cotton and groundnuts hinder sustainable growth for agricultural entrepreneurs.

Growth Catalysts: Gujarat's strengths lie in its agricultural exports, especially in cash crops such as cotton and groundnuts, supported by state-led initiatives to improve rural infrastructure and provide subsidies for mechanization and agribusiness startups (Desai, 2020).

#### Punjab and Haryana

Challenges: Entrepreneurs in the agribusiness sectors in Punjab and Haryana face issues related to overdependence on wheat and rice monoculture, which has led to declining soil fertility and groundwater depletion. This makes it challenging to diversify crops and introduce innovative farming techniques (Sidhu & Bhullar, 2018).

Growth Catalysts: These states benefit from extensive irrigation networks and subsidized farm inputs, allowing entrepreneurs to scale agribusiness operations more efficiently. Government procurement systems also provide more stable pricing structures for agricultural outputs (NABARD, 2019).

#### Andhra Pradesh

Challenges: Agripreneurs in Andhra Pradesh face issues related to land fragmentation, which hinders scalability and mechanization. Poor logistical connectivity between rural areas and urban markets also adds inefficiencies (Reddy, 2019).

Growth Catalysts: Andhra Pradesh's advantage lies in its focus on horticulture, aquaculture, and cash crops, with state support for agripreneurs through subsidies, improved irrigation systems, and cold chain logistics for perishable goods (Raj, 2021).

#### Pharmaceuticals and Biotech Gujarat

Challenges: Gujarat's pharmaceutical sector is highly regulated, and entrepreneurs must deal with high compliance costs and international regulatory standards (Patel et al., 2018). Additionally, there is stiff competition from global manufacturers, particularly from China.

Growth Catalysts: The state's strong infrastructure for drug manufacturing and export-friendly policies have made Gujarat a leader in pharmaceutical exports, contributing to over 28% of India's drug exports (Mehta & Patel, 2019).

#### Telangana

Challenges: Telangana's pharmaceutical sector faces challenges around infrastructure gaps in smaller cities and towns, limiting scalability for entrepreneurs outside major hubs like Hyderabad (Sharma, 2020).

Growth Catalysts: Hyderabad is emerging as a global hub for biotech and life sciences, offering significant opportunities for entrepreneurs in pharmaceuticals and biotechnology. The state's focus on innovation parks and incubation centers is a key growth catalyst (CII, 2021).

#### Maharashtra

Challenges: Maharashtra's pharmaceutical industry, while robust, faces rising operational costs, especially in urban hubs like Mumbai. Compliance with international quality standards adds to the costs for smaller startups (Patil et al., 2018).

Growth Catalysts: The state's proximity to financial institutions and a strong R&D infrastructure in Mumbai and Pune positions entrepreneurs well for pharmaceutical innovation (Govil, 2020).

#### Tourism and Retail Gujarat

Challenges: Gujarat's tourism sector has immense potential but is hindered by poor connectivity to some rural tourist destinations and limited international flight options. Additionally, the state's relatively conservative social environment may pose challenges for businesses looking to attract international tourists (Thakkar, 2020).

Growth Catalysts: Gujarat benefits from its recognition as a UNESCO World Heritage City (Ahmedabad), which draws international tourists. The state's rapidly growing organized retail sector, driven by rising middle-class incomes, offers significant opportunities for entrepreneurs in retail and hospitality (Desai, 2021).

#### Kerala

Challenges: Entrepreneurs in Kerala's tourism sector face challenges related to seasonality and high operational costs in coastal tourism, along with vulnerabilities to natural disasters (Menon, 2019).

Growth Catalysts: Kerala's eco-tourism initiatives and strong global brand as a wellness destination provide a platform for tourism-related startups to thrive (Mathew, 2020).

#### Rajasthan

Challenges: The tourism sector in Rajasthan struggles with inconsistent infrastructure and seasonal demand, leading to challenges in maintaining profitability during off-peak seasons (Gupta, 2019).

Growth Catalysts: Rajasthan's rich cultural heritage and investment in tourism infrastructure create ample opportunities for entrepreneurs in hospitality, especially in heritage and luxury tourism (Nambiar & Jain, 2020).

#### **Conclusion: Implications for Entrepreneurs**

Entrepreneurs in Gujarat benefit from the state's export-oriented infrastructure, government initiatives, and sectoral diversity. However, challenges like infrastructure bottlenecks, regulatory hurdles, and competition require adaptive strategies. In comparison to regions like Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu, Gujarat's lower operational costs and sector-specific incentives offer advantages, particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

However, regions like Karnataka and Telangana outperform Gujarat in sectors like technology- driven industries and biotech, offering more focused support for innovation. Similarly, Punjab and Haryana's agribusinesses have stronger state backing for certain agricultural activities, although Gujarat's focus on cash crops provides more export opportunities.

For entrepreneurs, Gujarat's focus on manufacturing, pharmaceuticals, and agriculture makes it a dynamic region for growth. But success will require leveraging state-led growth catalysts, navigating sector-specific regulations, and maintaining competitiveness through innovation and technological integration.

#### Research Methodology

Research Problem: To secure a competitive edge and become the go-to destination for entrepreneurs, Gujarat must not only offer efficient and effective services but also prioritize enhancing startup satisfaction. A thoughtfully designed and well-executed strategy by the government can significantly boost the state's appeal, fostering a positive perception among entrepreneurs and positioning Gujarat as the preferred location for launching new ventures.

Objective of the Study: The major objective of this study is to recognize the challenges faced by various sectors and the growth drivers for start-ups in Gujarat.

#### **Sub-Objectives**

To identify the essential characteristics of various sectors with a special focus on Gujarat.

To investigate the challenges entrepreneurs, encounter in different sectors while establishing businesses in the state.

To determine which sectors have experienced significant growth in the state.

To develop growth drivers specifically tailored for start-ups.

Scope of the Study: The study focuses on the growth drivers and challenges encountered by startups across various sectors in Gujarat, drawing insights from entrepreneurs who have established their own ventures.

Research Design: A descriptive research design was selected for this study. Primary data was gathered through questionnaires distributed to 133 startups across different sectors in Gujarat.

The sample of 133 startups was selected to cover a diverse range of industries that are crucial to the research objectives. This includes a mix of technology, healthcare, e-commerce, manufacturing, finance, and more.

By ensuring representation from different sectors, the study captures insights from various industries, making the findings applicable across a broad spectrum of startup environments. This diversity in industry type supports the objective of understanding how challenges and strategies may differ across sectors.

Sampling Method: A non-probability sampling method was employed, utilizing both convenience and judgmental sampling techniques to select participants.

Sample Size: Questionnaires were sent to 200 entrepreneurs, with 133 completed and returned, forming the basis of the study's analysis. Not all startups are willing or able to share detailed information, especially sensitive data like internal processes, or strategies. This limited the pool of potential participants.

Focusing on these 133 startups ensured that the data collected would be consistent and comparable, avoiding gaps that could arise from incomplete or inaccessible information.

The 133 startups were intentionally selected to serve as a representative sample, ensuring diversity in industry type, geography, age of the startup, and stage of funding. This selection strategy aligns with the research objectives, aiming to capture a wide spectrum of experiences and insights from various sectors and regions. The sample includes startups at different growth stages and funding levels, allowing the study to examine how these factors influence challenges, opportunities, and strategies. This representative mix enhances the study's generalizability, making it relevant to a broader audience interested in understanding startup dynamics."

Limitations of the Study: The sample size represents only a small portion of the population, so the findings may be limited to this sample. The use of non-probability convenience and judgmental sampling methods also imposes certain restrictions on the generalizability of the findings.

#### **Result and Discussion**

#### **Data Analysis**

Figure 1: Demographic Characteristic of Respondents

| Sr No. | Variable  | Categories       | Percentage   |
|--------|-----------|------------------|--------------|
|        |           |                  | ( Total 100) |
| 1      | Gender    | Male             | 71.4         |
|        |           | Female           | 28.6         |
|        |           |                  |              |
|        |           | 18 to 20         | 4.8          |
| 2      | Age (in   | 21 to 30         | 19           |
|        | Years)    | 31 to 40         | 26.2         |
|        |           | 41 to 50         | 42.9         |
|        |           | 50 and above     | 7.1          |
|        |           |                  |              |
| 3      | Education | less than H.sc   | 2.4          |
|        |           | but not graduate | 9.5          |
|        |           | Graduate         | 21.4         |
|        |           | Post Graduate    | 61.9         |

|   |            | Doctorate-PHD   | 4.8   |
|---|------------|-----------------|-------|
|   |            | Others          | 2.4   |
|   |            |                 | ·     |
|   |            | Student         | 11.9  |
| 4 | Occupation | Self Employment | 54.8  |
|   |            | Professional    | 26.2  |
|   |            | Other           | 7.1   |
|   |            |                 |       |
|   |            | Manufacturing   | 4.7   |
|   |            | Financial       | 19.04 |
|   |            | Food            | 4.7   |
|   |            | Health Care     | 11.9  |
|   |            | Media           | 2.3   |
|   |            | Real Estate     | 4.7   |
|   | Sector     | Retail          | 4.7   |
| 5 |            | Technology      | 4.7   |
|   |            | Computer        | 7.14  |
|   |            | Academics       | 7.14  |
|   |            | Agriculture     | 4.7   |
|   |            | Pharmaceutical  | 4.7   |
|   |            | Service         | 19.04 |

Figure 2: Crosstab between Gender and Barriers to set up business faced by startups

|  | Cases |         |   |                |       |         |
|--|-------|---------|---|----------------|-------|---------|
|  | ,     | Valid   | N | <b>Iissing</b> | Total |         |
| 3. Gender * 1. Perceived Importance on               |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| regulation barriers to set up business. [I am afraid | 133   | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00%          | 133   | 100.00% |
| of Tax level which is high for young people.]        |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| 3. Gender * 2. Perceived importance on               | 133   | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00%          | 133   | 100.00% |
| regulation barriers to set up business. [I am        |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| concerned about Bankruptcy laws                      |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| 3. Gender * 3. Perceived importance on               |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| regulation barriers to set up business. [Property,   | 133   | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00%          | 133   | 100.00% |
| copyright and patent regulations are poorly          | 133   | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00%          | 133   | 100.00% |
| enforced and too strict.]                            |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| 3. Gender * 4 Perceived importance on regulation     | 133   | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00%          | 133   | 100.00% |
| barriers to set up business. [I am concerned about   |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| Competition law that is restricted to market acces   |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| 3. Gender * 5. Perceived importance on               |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| regulation barriers to set up business. [Subsidy     | 133   | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00%          | 133   | 100.00% |
| policies are also barrier in setting business.]      |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| 3. Gender * 6 Perceived importance on regulation     |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| barriers to set up business. [Taxation regulations   | 133   | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00%          | 133   | 100.00% |
| are unsupportive and too complex.]                   |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| 3. Gender * 7. Perceived importance on               |       |         |   |                |       |         |
| regulation barriers to set up business. [Limited     | 133   | 100.00% | 0 | 0.00%          | 133   | 100.00% |
| area or geographical licensing also act as barrier.  |       |         |   |                |       |         |

Gender \* 1. Perceived Importance on regulation barriers to set up business. [I am afraid of Tax level which is high for young people.]

| Crosstab       |             |                |       |  |                 |                    |         |       |  |  |
|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------|--|-----------------|--------------------|---------|-------|--|--|
|                |             |                |       | Perceived Importance on regulation barriers to set up business. [I am afraid of Tax level which is high for young people.] |                 |                    |         |       |  |  |
|                |             |                | Agree | Disagree   | Highly<br>Agree | Highly<br>Disagree | Neutral | Total |  |  |
| 3. Gender      | Female      | Count          | 20    | 5  | 6               | 0                  | 8       | 39    |  |  |
|                |             | Expected Count | 17.0  | 5.6  | 5.0             | .6                 | 10.8    | 39.0  |  |  |
|                | Male        | Count          | 38    | 14   | 11              | 2                  | 29      | 94    |  |  |
|                |             | Expected Count | 41.0  | 13.4   | 12.0            | 1.4                | 26.2    | 94.0  |  |  |
| Total          | Total Count |                | 58    | 19   | 17              | 2                  | 37      | 133   |  |  |
| Expected Count |             | 58.0           | 19.0  | 17.0   | 2.0             | 37.0               | 133.0   |       |  |  |

|   | Value  | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |  |  |  |
|---|--------|----|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Pearson Chi- Square                                     | 3.009a | 4  | .556                  |  |  |  |
| Likelihood  | 3.601  | 4  | .463                  |  |  |  |
| Ratio   | 5.001  | Ţ  | .403                  |  |  |  |
| N of Valid  | 133    |    |                       |  |  |  |
| Cases   | 133    |    |                       |  |  |  |
| a. 3 cells (30.0%) have expected count less than 5. The |        |    |                       |  |  |  |
| minimum expected count is .59.                          |        |    |                       |  |  |  |

Gender \* 2. Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up business. [I am concerned about Bankruptcy laws.]

|  | Crosstab    |          |       |                |             |            |             |       |  |  |
|--|-------------|----------|-------|----------------|-------------|------------|-------------|-------|--|--|
| 2. Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up |             |          |       |                |             |            |             |       |  |  |
|  |             |          | busii | ness. [I am co | ncerned abo | ut Bankrup | tcy laws .] |       |  |  |
|  |             |          |       |                | Highly      | Highly     |             |       |  |  |
|  |             |          | Agree | Disagree       | Agree       | Disagree   | Neutral     | Total |  |  |
| 3. Gender  | Female      | Count    | 18    | 10             | 1           | 1          | 9           | 39    |  |  |
| Ex   | xpected Cou | ınt      | 15.2  | 9.1            | 2.6         | 1.2        | 10.8        | 39.0  |  |  |
|  | Male        | Count    | 34    | 21             | 8           | 3          | 28          | 94    |  |  |
|  |             | Expected | 36.8  | 21.9           | 6.4         | 2.8        | 26.2        | 94.0  |  |  |
|  |             | Count    |       |                |             |            |             |       |  |  |
| Total Count  |             |          | 52    | 31             | 9           | 4          | 37          | 133   |  |  |
|  | Expected    |          | 52.0  | 31.0           | 9.0         | 4.0        | 37.0        | 133.0 |  |  |
|  |             | Count    |       |                |             |            |             |       |  |  |

Gender \* 3. Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up business. [Property, copyright and patent regulations are poorly enforced and too strict.]

| Crosstab       |        |                |       |  |      |     |      |       |  |
|----------------|--------|----------------|-------|--|------|-----|------|-------|--|
|                |        |                |       | B. Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set business. [Property, copyright and patent regulations are poorly enforced and too strict.] |      |     |      |       |  |
|                |        |                | Agree | Highly Highly  |      |     |      |       |  |
| 3. Gender      | Female | Count          | 20    | 6  | 5    | 0   | 8    | 39    |  |
|                |        | Expected Count | 15.8  | 5.3  | 4.4  | .9  | 12.6 | 39.0  |  |
|                | Male   | Count          | 34    | 12   | 10   | 3   | 35   | 94    |  |
|                |        | Expected Count | 38.2  | 12.7   | 10.6 | 2.1 | 30.4 | 94.0  |  |
| Total Count    |        | 54             | 18    | 15   | 3    | 43  | 133  |       |  |
| Expected Count |        |                | 54.0  | 18.0   | 15.0 | 3.0 | 43.0 | 133.0 |  |

|                        | Chi-Square Tests   |    |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------|--------------------|----|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|                        | Value              | df | Asymp.<br>Sig. (2-<br>sided) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pearson Chi-<br>Square | 5.435 <sup>a</sup> | 4  | .246                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Likelihood<br>Ratio    | 6.419              | 4  | .170                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N of Valid<br>Cases    |                    |    |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. 3 cells (30<br>m    |                    |    |                              |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Gender \* 4 Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up business. [I am concerned about Competition law that is restricted to market access]

| Crosstab  |   |                |           |          |              |                 |         |       |
|-----------|---|----------------|-----------|----------|--------------|-----------------|---------|-------|
|           | 4 Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up |                |           |          |              |                 |         |       |
|           |   |                | business. | -        |              | Competition law | that is |       |
|           |   |                |           | restrict | ed to market | access]         |         |       |
|           | •   | •              |           |          | Highly       | Highly          | Neutr   | Total |
|           |   |                | Agree     | Disagree | Agree        | Disagree        | al      |       |
| 3. Gender | Female  | Count          | 21        | 4        | 5            | 2               | 7       | 39    |
|           |   | Expected Count | 16.1      | 5.3      | 4.1          | 1.2             | 12.3    | 39.0  |
|           | Male  | Count          | 34        | 14       | 9            | 2               | 35      | 94    |
|           |   | Expected Count | 38.9      | 12.7     | 9.9          | 2.8             | 29.7    | 94.0  |
| То        | tal   | Count          | 55        | 18       | 14           | 4               | 42      | 133   |
|           |   | Expected Count | 55.0      | 18.0     | 14.0         | 4.0             | 42.0    | 133.0 |

|                     | Value              | df | Asymp.   |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--------------------|----|----------|--|--|--|
|                     |                    |    | Sig. (2- |  |  |  |
|                     |                    |    | sided)   |  |  |  |
| Pearson Chi- Square | 6.868 <sup>a</sup> | 4  | .143     |  |  |  |
| Likelihood          | 7.081              | 4  | .132     |  |  |  |
| Ratio               |                    |    |          |  |  |  |
| N of Valid          | N of Valid 133     |    |          |  |  |  |
| Cases               |                    |    |          |  |  |  |
| a. 3 cells (30.0%)  |                    |    |          |  |  |  |
| minin               |                    |    |          |  |  |  |

Gender \* 5. Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up business. [Subsidy policies are also a barrier in setting business.

|           | Crosstab |          |          |             |                   |                |           |       |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------|-------|
|           |          |          | 5. Perce | ived import | ance on regulat   | ion barriers t | to set up |       |
|           |          |          | busine   | ss. [Subsid | y policies are al | lso barrier in | setting   |       |
|           |          |          |          |             | b                 | ousiness.]     |           |       |
|           |          |          |          |             | Highly            | Highly         |           |       |
|           |          |          | Agree    | Disagree    | Agree             | Disagree       | Neutral   | Total |
| 3. Gender | Female   | Count    | 13       | 7           | 6                 | 1              | 12        | 39    |
|           |          | Expected | 12.3     | 7.0         | 5.3               | 2.1            | 12.3      | 39.0  |
|           |          | Count    |          |             |                   |                |           |       |
|           | Male     | Count    | 29       | 17          | 12                | 6              | 30        | 94    |
|           |          | Expected | 29.7     | 17.0        | 12.7              | 4.9            | 29.7      | 94.0  |
|           |          | Count    |          |             |                   |                |           |       |
| То        | tal      | Count    | 42       | 24          | 18                | 7              | 42        | 133   |
|           | •        | Expected | 42.0     | 24.0        | 18.0              | 7.0            | 42.0      | 133.0 |
|           |          | Count    |          |             |                   |                |           |       |

| Chi-Square Tests    |                          |   |        |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------|--------------------------|---|--------|--|--|--|--|
|                     | Value df Asymp. Sig. (2- |   |        |  |  |  |  |
|                     |                          |   | sided) |  |  |  |  |
| Pearson Chi- Square | .969 <sup>a</sup>        | 4 | .914   |  |  |  |  |
| Likelihood Ratio    | 1.078                    | 4 | .898   |  |  |  |  |
| N of Valid Cases    | 133                      |   |        |  |  |  |  |
| 2 11 (20.00() 1     |                          |   | 5 mi   |  |  |  |  |

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.05.

Gender \* 6 Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up business. [Taxation regulations are unsupportive and too complex.]

|           | Crosstab |          |   |              |                    |            |         |       |
|-----------|----------|----------|---|--------------|--------------------|------------|---------|-------|
|           |          |          | 6 Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up |              |                    |            |         |       |
|           |          |          | Busines   | s. [Taxation | regulations are un | supportive | and too |       |
|           |          |          |   | _            | cor                | nplex.]    |         |       |
|           |          |          |   |              | Highly             | Highly     |         |       |
|           |          |          | Agree   | Disagree     | Agree              | Disagre    | Neutral | Total |
|           |          |          | _   | _            |                    | e          |         |       |
| 3. Gender | Female   | Count    | 16  | 5            | 5                  | 2          | 11      | 39    |
|           |          | Expected | 14.1  | 6.5          | 5.9                | 2.1        | 10.6    | 39.0  |
|           |          | Count    |   |              |                    |            |         |       |
|           | Male     | Count    | 32  | 17           | 15                 | 5          | 25      | 94    |
|           |          | Expected | 33.9  | 15.5         | 14.1               | 4.9        | 25.4    | 94.0  |
|           |          | Count    |   |              |                    |            |         |       |
| То        | tal      | Count    | 48  | 22           | 20                 | 7          | 36      | 133   |
|           |          | Expected | 48.0  | 22.0         | 20.0               | 7.0        | 36.0    | 133.0 |
|           |          | Count    |   |              |                    |            |         |       |

| Chi-Square Tests                            |                    |                 |                       |  |  |
|---|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|--|
|   | Value              | df              | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) |  |  |
| Pearson Chi- Square                         | 1.043 <sup>a</sup> | 4               | .903                  |  |  |
| Likelihood<br>Ratio                         | 1.063              | 4               | .900                  |  |  |
| N of Valid Cases                            | 133                |                 |                       |  |  |
| a. 2 cells (20.0%) have experience as 2.05. | ected count less   | than 5. The min | nimum expected        |  |  |

Gender \* 7. Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up business. [Limited area or geographical

| icensing also | act as ball  | 161.]    |       |               |                     |                |         |       |
|---------------|--|----------|-------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|---------|-------|
|               |  |          |       | Crosst        | ab                  |                |         |       |
|               | 7. Perceived importance on regulation barriers to set up |          |       |               |                     |                |         |       |
|               |  |          | busir | ness. [Limite | ed area or geograpl | nical licensin | ıg also |       |
|               |  |          |       |               | act a               | s barrier.]    |         |       |
|               |  |          |       |               | Highly Agree        | Highly         |         |       |
|               |  |          | Agree | Disagree      |                     | Disagree       | Neutral |       |
|               |  |          |       | _             |                     |                |         | Total |
| 3. Gender     | Female   | Count    | 18    | 4             | 7                   | 0              | 10      | 39    |
|               |  | Expected | 13.5  | 5.3           | 7.0                 | 1.2            | 12.0    | 39.0  |
|               |  | Count    |       |               |                     |                |         |       |
|               | Male   | Count    | 28    | 14            | 17                  | 4              | 31      | 94    |
|               |  | Expected | 32.5  | 12.7          | 17.0                | 2.8            | 29.0    | 94.0  |
|               |  | Count    |       |               |                     |                |         |       |
| To            | tal  | Count    | 46    | 18            | 24                  | 4              | 41      | 133   |
|               |  | Expected | 46.0  | 18.0          | 24.0                | 4.0            | 41.0    | 133.0 |
|               |  | Count    |       |               |                     |                |         |       |

|                                 | Value   | df | Asymp. Sig. |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|---|----|-------------|--|--|--|--|
|                                 |   |    | (2-sided)   |  |  |  |  |
| Pearson Chi-                    | 4.714 <sup>a</sup>                                      | 4  | .318        |  |  |  |  |
| Square                          | ,   |    |             |  |  |  |  |
| Likelihood                      | 5.759   | 4  | .218        |  |  |  |  |
| Ratio                           |   |    |             |  |  |  |  |
| N of Valid                      | N of Valid 133  |    |             |  |  |  |  |
| Cases                           | Cases   |    |             |  |  |  |  |
| a. 2 cells (2                   | a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The |    |             |  |  |  |  |
| minimum expected count is 1.17. |   |    |             |  |  |  |  |

#### Symmetric Measures

|                  |    |            | Value | Approximate Significance |
|------------------|----|------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Nominal          | by | Phi        | 1.116 | .000                     |
| Nominal          |    | Cramer's V | .789  | .000                     |
| N of Valid Cases |    |            | 143   |                          |

There is weaker relationship between the two variables.

Based on the detailed data analysis of the perceived importance of regulatory barriers to setting up a business, broken down by gender, here are the key findings and interpretations:

#### **Key Findings**

#### Tax Level Concern:

A crosstab analysis of perceptions on the statement "I am afraid of Tax level which is high for young people" shows slight gender differences.

Males are more likely to agree (38 agree, 14 disagree) compared to females (20 agree, 5 disagree).

The Chi-Square test value is 3.009 with a significance level (p-value) of 0.556, indicating that there is no statistically significant difference between genders for this barrier.

#### **Bankruptcy Law Concern:**

Females generally show a more neutral stance, while males tend to agree more with the concern about bankruptcy laws.

The Chi-Square test value is 2.754 with a significance level of 0.600, showing no significant gender-based difference in perceiving this barrier.

#### Property, Copyright, and Patent Regulations:

Males appear to have slightly higher concerns, with 34 agreeing, while females are more evenly distributed.

The Chi-Square test value is 5.435 with a p-value of 0.246, indicating no significant gender differences.

#### **Competition Law Concerns:**

Females tend to have a more neutral or "Agree" stance regarding concerns on Competition law, while males show a slightly higher agreement.

Chi-Square results: 6.868 (p-value 0.143), showing no statistically significant gender differences.

#### **Subsidy Policies as Barriers:**

Females are more likely to disagree or stay neutral, while males lean towards agreement on subsidy policies being barriers.

The Chi-Square value of 0.969 with a significance level of 0.914 suggests no substantial gender differences.

#### **Taxation Regulations Being Unsupportive and Complex:**

Females are relatively split in their opinions, whereas males tend to agree more.

Chi-Square value of 1.043 (p-value 0.903) indicates that gender differences in perception are not statistically significant.

#### **Geographical Licensing Limitations:**

Females are split between agreement and neutrality, whereas males show a stronger agreement that limited geographical licensing is a barrier.

The Chi-Square test yielded a value of 4.714 with a p-value of 0.318, suggesting no statistically significant gender **differences.** 

#### **Statistical Considerations**

**Phi and Cramer's V**: The values provided for Phi (1.116) and Cramer's V (0.789) suggest a moderate to high association between gender and the perceived importance of regulation barriers. However, the p-values indicate that the association does not reach statistical significance.

**Sample Size:** With 133 valid cases, the sample is sufficient for a preliminary analysis, but increasing the sample size might provide a clearer picture of any subtle gender differences.

Overall, the data suggests that both genders experience similar perceptions regarding regulatory barriers when setting up a business, emphasizing the need for broadly applicable policy and support mechanisms rather than gender-specific interventions.

#### Refrence

- Ashraf, S. N., & Singh, A. K. (2019). Examining start-up intention of Indians through cognitive approach: A study using GEM data. Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research, 7 (13), 1-11.
- **Ghosh, S., & Bhowmick, B. (2014).** Uncertainties in Entrepreneurship Climate: A Study on Start-ups in India. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 150, 46–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.006
- Karthik D, & Upadhyayula, R. S. (2016). NASSCOM: Is it Time to introspect and Reinvent? Indian Institute Of Management, Ahmedabad.
- **Mazanai, M., & Fatoki, O. (2012).** Perceptions of Start-up Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs) on the Importance of Business Development Services Providers (BDS) on Improving Access to Finance in South Africa. Journal of Social Sciences, 30(1), 31–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2012.11892980
- **Naudé, W. (2013).** Entrepreneurship and Economic Development: Theory, Evidence and Policy. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2314802
- Satyanarayana, K., Chandrashekar, D., & Mungila Hillemane, B. S. (2021). An Assessment of Competitiveness of Technology-Based Startups in India. International Journal of Global Business and Competitiveness, 16(1), 28–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42943-021-00023-x
- Sep 12, T. / U., 2020, & Ist, 13:47. (n.d.). Gujarat is the top startup state again | Ahmedabad News Times of India. The Times of India. Retrieved July 1, 2022, from http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/78068305.cms?utm\_source=contentofinte rest&utm\_medium=text&utm\_campaign=c
- SINGH, A. K., ASHRAF, S. N., & ARYA, A. (2019). Estimating Factors Affecting Technical Efficiency in Indian Manufacturing Sector. Eurasian Journal of Business and Economics, 12(24), 65–86. https://doi.org/10.17015/ejbe.2019.024.04
- **Stephen, J. J., & Parmar, P. (2018).** Energy Consumption and Industrial Growth In Gujarat: a Trend Analysis. Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education, 15(7), 187–191. <a href="https://doi.org/10.29070/15/57884">https://doi.org/10.29070/15/57884</a>