Research Article

Problems Of Micro Small And Medium Enterprises In Kerala With Special Reference To Thiruvananthapuram District Research

Dr.S.Malathi[1*,] Ms. Saranya. K. A[2]

[1*]Assistant Professor of Commerce, Annamalai University (Deputed to Govt. Arts College, C. Mutlur, Chidambaram)
[2]Ph. D Research Scholar, Department of Commerce Annamalai University

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	MSMEs, or micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises, are the backbone of a nation's industrialization. Since independence, MSMEs have become a thriving and dynamic part of the Indian economy. Both rural and urban areas have seen its spread. MSMEs not only help big industries grow and create jobs, but they also encourage low-skilled workers to start their own businesses and make the best use of the nation's resources. All of these factors contribute significantly to the elimination of economic backwardness in rural and underdeveloped areas of the country. MSMEs are a significant employer in many parts of the nation and make significant contributions to local prosperity, which reduces income, wealth, and consumption disparities. Since MSMEs account for about 45% of the country's industrial output, 70% of industrial employment, and 40% of exports, they play a significant role in the Indian economy and have an impact on a number of issues. This paper aims to investigate the issues MSMEs face and their prospects for the future through a thorough analysis. Researchers have also made an effort to identify the main issues and difficulties that MSMEs in India are facing. The paper also discusses significant government policy initiatives and various programs launched to support the expansion of MSMEs in India. **Keywords:** MSMEs, Economic Development, Opportunities and Problems

Introduction

Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSMEs) have become a vibrant and active sector of the Indian economy in the last few decades. The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Development (MSMED) Act of 2006 introduced the term Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs). Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSMEs) are regarded as one of the world's most dynamic and vibrant economic sectors. Low capital investments, the use of inherited or traditional skills, the utilization of local resources, and the potential for high employment are the main characteristics of this vital sector. Formal and informal MSMEs combined account for more than 90% of all businesses worldwide, according to data from the International Council for Small Business (ICSB). Most vulnerable populations, including women, youth, and the impoverished in rural areas, are employed by MSMEs. MSMEs have played a significant role in rural development and poverty reduction worldwide by giving such a vulnerable population opportunities for employment and income generation. Numerous people find work in the MSMEs sector, which inspires young people to launch their own businesses with little initial capital. It makes up about 8% of the country's GDP, 40% to 45% of its manufacturing output, and 40% of its exports. After agriculture, it is the second biggest generator of environmental opportunities. With its vast network of over 32 million businesses, it employs over 70 million people. With a little startup capital needed, producing over 8000 different products without the need for an expensive infrastructure. High levels of technology are not necessary for MSMEs to generate wealth and income for improved living standards, control population migration, lessen regional disparities, and promote balanced growth. The United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) declared June 27th to be Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Day in recognition of the significance of MSMEs. MSMEs have been recognized by the UN as one of the key players in accomplishing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). All governments in the world place a high value on these MSMEs and include adequate funding for the industry in their plans and policies. They serve markets that are local, regional, state, federal,

and worldwide. One essential component needed to speed up industrial growth is entrepreneurship. MSMEs can take many different forms, including trading, service, and manufacturing businesses. A variety of ownership structures are also possible, including private corporations, limited liability partnerships, partnerships, sole proprietorships, and cooperative societies. The Ministry of MSMEs' definition serves as the basis for identifying MSMEs. The definition of MSMEs has evolved several times since Independence. 1950 saw the introduction of the first definition of MSMEs, which called them Small Scale Industries (SSIs). Subsequently, they were classified as Small Scale Service & Business Establishments (SSSBEs), Export-oriented Units, Ancillary and Cottage Industries, and Tiny Industries. Major issues like unemployment, poverty, and overpopulation may be resolved by MSMEs. This paper made an effort to draw attention to Kerala's MSME issues.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Paramasivan C & Mari Selvam P (2013) has outlined how the micro, small, and medium-sized enterprise (MSME) sector contributes significantly to the nation's manufacturing output, employment, and exports. Based on approximations, the industry contributes approximately 45% of India's manufacturing output and 40% of its total export earnings in terms of value. Approximately 42 million people are employed by the MSME sector across more than 13 million units nationwide. The more than 6000 products that Indian MSMEs manufacture span from conventional to advanced technology items.

N. Aruna (2015) carried out a study to determine the issues that businesses face and how they impact business growth, which in turn impacts national growth. Additionally, the information gathered showed that India's generally internationalized business climate has been favorable for the development of micro and small-scale industries. It is necessary to create straightforward policies and procedures that these businesses can comprehend, apply, and use in their daily operations to ensure compliance and reap benefits. Numerous government programs exist, but the study found that most of these businesses are unaware of them and do not know how to take advantage of them.

Ujjal Bhuyan (2016) has determined that one of the most dynamic and vibrant segments of the Indian economy is the Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises (MSME) sector. MSMEs are essential for creating a large number of jobs at a relatively lower capital cost than large industries. They also aid in the industrialization of rural and underdeveloped areas, which lessens regional imbalances and ensures a more equitable distribution of wealth and income across the country. MSMEs are supplementary to major industries as auxiliary units, and this sector makes a significant contribution to the nation's socioeconomic advancement.

Kankipati et al (2017) has noted that, in general, entrepreneurship refers to the entire set of activities an owner takes to launch and run his business in order to make a profit. Over the past 50 years, the Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSME) sector in India's economy has become a very dynamic and lively one. The MSME sector has become one of the most vibrant and active sectors of the Indian economy in the last fifty years. Over the past seven years, MSME employment has continued to rise and have created more job opportunities.

Vasa (2016) investigated the effects of a few chosen chemical, pharmaceutical, and textile industries in China and India on the performance of SMEs in these industries. Nonetheless, MSMEs continue to face a number of issues, such as insufficient capital, difficulty entering international markets, high financing costs, issues with product placement and stuffing, poor infrastructure, etc.

NEED and IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

It is widely acknowledged that Micro, Small, and Medium-Sized Enterprises (MSMEs) are the catalyst for economic expansion and the advancement of fair development. Undoubtedly, for this reason, it is crucial to the nation's economic growth. MSMEs make a contribution to the GDP (gross domestic product). Although numerous studies have been done on the various developments of the MSME sector, MSMEs generate employment, balance regional development, produce social goods, promote exports, etc. However, it has been noted that numerous issues have impacted the MSME sector's growth and developments over time due to its progressive growth and changes in policies. Thus, it becomes crucial to carefully consider the main issues influencing the operations and output of MSMEs in the state of Kerala. An attempt is being made to examine the issues that Kerala state's micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises face in this context.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Indian economy is regarded as being based primarily on MSMEs. However, the largest barrier to the development of this industry is the lack of funding, human resources, and marketing. Throughout the entire business lifecycle, finance is the essential input. For MSMEs, having sufficient funding sources is essential. Many issues, particularly those pertaining to raw materials, production, financing, and marketing, are making progress intolerably slow. Running a business is becoming more difficult due to financing and marketing concerns. According to a recent economic survey, finding funding sources is the largest challenge for both registered and unregistered businesses. The districts in Kerala state are backward districts, with the exception of Hyderabad. To develop the new state, a needs analysis has been conducted. Due to the fact that

funding is essential to MSMEs' operations and their lifeblood, issues are heavily burdening their businesses. Because funding is essential to all aspects of business operations, MSMEs require greater funding to maintain improved financial sustainability. Because it is so difficult for MSMEs to obtain financing from different sources in a timely manner for better financing, the researcher concentrated on the financing issues that Kerala state's MSMEs face. It was indicated in all of the reports that MSMEs had financial difficulties, but it was unclear exactly what financial issues these small businesses faced. The researcher set out to identify each financial issue and how it affected the sustainability of MSMEs, highlighting the necessity of researching MSMEs' financial issues and the damage they cause to their operations.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The current study attempts to get a picture of the issues and future prospects facing MSMEs in light of the research gap and the problem statement mentioned above. As a result, the study tackles the following research goals concerning Kerala-based MSMEs.
1. To measure the contribution of MSMEs in economic development of India.
2. To evaluate the challenges faced by MSMEs in Kerala.
3. To compare the challenges among MSMEs in the study area.

Hypothesis
Ho "There is no significant difference among the respondents with respect to different social economic factors in facing problems of MSMEs".
Ho: "There is no significant difference among micro, small and medium level enterprises towards facing different categories of problems**".**

Research methodology
Geographical area of study
As the title of the research mentions, the study has been conducted in the Kerala state of India.

Research Design
This research is descriptive. Both primary and secondary sources provided the data and other information needed for the study. Using a structured interview schedule, primary data were obtained directly from the respondents, and secondary data were gathered from a variety of online resources such as newspapers, journals, libraries, and websites.

Sample Design
Due to its superior number of MSME units compared to all other districts, Thiruvananthapuram district was specifically chosen to host the MSM entrepreneurs. The study focused specifically on the district of Thiruvananthapuram's revenue division in round two. Thiruvananthapuram and Nedumangadu are the two revenue divisions chosen for the study, which is focused on taluks in round three. Out of the four taluks Thiruvananthapuram, Chirayinkeezhu, Varkala, and Kattakada taluks; two taluks Thiruvananthapuram and Kattakada were chosen to make up the Thiruvananthapuram revenue division, or 50% of the total. Out of the two taluks Kattada and Neyattinkara, one taluk Neyattinkara taluk, was chosen as the 50% representative of the Nedumangadu revenue division. Ultimately, from each of the taluks that were chosen, 10 units from the micro, 10 from the small, and 10 from the medium levels, all of which only fall under the definition of MSMEs were chosen. As a result, a total of 90 units 53 from the manufacturing and 37 from the service sectors were chosen for this study. Additionally, five respondents representing various employee categories were included in each of the units that were chosen. The following is the study's sample design:

TABLE - 1SAMPLE DESIGN

District	Revenue Division	Taluk	Category			Sector		Total No. of Respondents
			Micro	Small	Medium	Manufacturing	Services	
Thiruvananthapuram	Thiruvananthapuram	Thiruvananthapuram	10	10	10	19	11	150
		Kattakada	10	10	10	18	12	150
	Nedumangadu	Neyattinkara	10	10	6	16	14	150
		Total	30	30	26	53	37	450

Hence, total sample size of the respondents for the study was 450.

PROBLEMS OF MSME

MSME development, employment, production, innovation, and development, as well as the enhancement of entrepreneurship skills, all significantly contribute to the Indian economy. Nonetheless, MSME's face numerous challenges, such as: excessively long payment delays from major industry participants; lack of timely credit; inadequate infrastructure; low managerial capability; low capital & knowledge; low ROI; low production & productivity; ineffective marketing strategies; failure to identify new markets; barrier to expansion & innovation; lack of warehousing; fierce competition; and declines in total exports. Present days MSME's face a number of issues. The researcher has attempted to comprehend the issues MSMEs face in this section. Thirty-five issues were selected for this purpose from earlier research and are shown in the following table. The following table 2 displays the specific results of the mean score and its percentage technique used to aggregate these problems.

TABLE 2 PROBLEMS FACED BY MSMEs

Sl.No	Problems	Mean Score	Mean Score %
1	Insufficient funding for working capital	3.264	65.28
2	Absence of fixed capital	3.165	63.30
3	Interest penalties	3.336	66.72
4	Fierce rivalry	3.228	64.56
5	Inadequate technology foundation	3.619	72.38
6	Absence of infrastructure	3.694	73.88
7	Lack of competent labor	3.769	75.38
8	Issues with distribution and marketing	3.659	73.18
9	Inadequate ability to collect	3.105	62.10
10	Issues with mindset	3.089	61.78
11	Neglected social welfare areas	3.097	61.94
12	Infrastructure limitations	3.821	76.42
13	Handiness of raw materials	3.957	79.14
14	Absence of further investment	4.012	80.24
15	Absence of marketing infrastructure	4.032	80.64
16	Unfavour effects of globalization and reforms	4.236	84.72
17	No sufficient and timely supply of bank financing	3.628	72.56
18	Limited expertise in contemporary business	3.754	75.08
19	Minimal return	3.599	71.98
20	Absence of appropriate technology	3.989	79.78
21	Limited ability to produce	3.549	70.98
22	Inadequate advertising tactics	4.032	80.64
23	Finding new markets can be difficult	4.339	86.78
24	Limitations on modernization and growth	3.642	72.84
25	Absence of uniform regulations	3.481	69.60
26	High absenteeism from work	3.721	74.42
27	Involvement of the government	4.032	80.64
28	Issues with the Labour Union	3.668	73.36
29	Insufficient creativity	3.619	72.38
30	Insufficient professionalism	3.762	75.24
31	Regular modifications to the technology	3.669	73.38
32	Insufficient instruction	3.889	77.78
33	Absence of knowledge	3.761	75.22
34	High training expenses	3.264	65.28
35	Severe issues with transportation	3.824	76.48

Source: Computed from primary data

It is explained from the above table 2 that the following problems faced by more than 80 percent of the MSMEs i.e., Absence of further investment (80.24%), Absence of marketing infrastructure (80.64%), Unfavour effects of globalization and reforms (84.72%), Inadequate advertising tactics (80.64%), Finding new markets can be difficult (86.78%), Involvement of the government(80.64%). 60 to 70 percent of the selected MSMEs faced the following problems i.e. ,Inadequate technology foundation (72.38%), Absence of infrastructure (73.88%), Lack of competent labor (75.38%), Issues with distribution and marketing (73.18%), Infrastructure limitations (76.42%), Handiness of raw materials (79.14%), No sufficient and timely supply of bank financing (72.56%), Limited expertise in contemporary business (75.08%),Minimal return (71.98%), Absence of appropriate technology (79.78%), Limited ability to produce (70.98%) Limitations on modernization and growth (72.84%), High absenteeism from work (74.42%), Issues with the Labour Union (73.36%), insufficient creativity (72.38%), insufficient professionalism (73.38%), Regular modifications to the technology (75.24%), insufficient instruction (77.78), Absence of knowledge (75.22%), severe issues with transportation (76.48%). From the analysis, it was inferred that minimum of the respondents faced the following problems at below 60%. Insufficient funding for working capital (65.28%), Absence of fixed capital (63.30%), Interest penalties (66.72%), Fierce rivalry (64.56%), Inadequate ability to collect (62.10%), Issues

with mindset (61.78%), Neglected social welfare areas (61.94%), Absence of uniform regulations (69.60%), High training expenses (65.28%).

Analysis of Significant Difference in Problems Faced by MSMEs
Respondents' Gender and Level of Problems
To determine whether respondents' gender groups differed significantly in how they dealt with issues they encountered when running MSM enterprises, a hypothesis was developed and tested using the "t" test.
Ho: "There is no significant difference among the respondents with respect to different gender in facing problems of MSMEs".
The results of 't' analysis is presented in the following table 3.

TABLE 3 RESPONDENTS' GENDER AND LEVEL OF PROBLEM

Sl.No	Gender	Mean score	SD	CV	't' value	'p' value
1.	Male	3.98	0.38	9.55		
2.	Female	3.93	0.42	10.69	6.945	.000
	Overall	3.91	0.38	9.72		***

Source: Computed from primary data

The result t-test (6.945) is significant at 1 per cent level; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Significant difference is found among the respondents belonging to different gender groups towards level of problems faced by MSME. It is also found that there is more consistency in the variation of male respondents (CV=9.55) than female respondents.

Respondents' Age and Level of Problems
An hypothesis was formulated and subjected to an ANOVA test in order to determine whether there were any significant differences in the respondents' attitudes toward dealing with various problems across the age groups.
Ho "There is no significant difference among the respondents with respect to different age groups in facing problems of MSMEs".
The results of ANOVA analysis is presented in the following table 4.

TABLE 4 RESPONDENTS' AGE AND LEVEL OF PROBLEM

Sl.No	Age	Mean score	SD	CV	'F' value	'P' value
1.	Below 30	3.88	0.38	9.79		
2.	31-40	3.62	0.46	12.71		
3.	41-50	3.82	0.37	9.69	14.568	.000
4.	51-60	3.79	0.38	10.03		***
5.	Above 60	3.69	0.44	11.92		
	Overall	3.74	0.50	13.37		

Source: Computed from primary data

The result F-test (14.568) is significant at 1 per cent level, since the p-value is less than .001, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Significant difference is found among the respondents belonging to different age groups towards level of problem of MSMEs. It is also found that there is more consistency in the variation (CV = 9.69) of respondents belongs to 41-50 years age group than other age group of respondents.

6.10.3 Respondents' Marital Status and Level of Problem Facing
A hypothesis was formulated and the "t" test was used to analyze it in order to determine whether there was a significant difference in the respondents' approaches to dealing with problems based on their marital status.
Ho "There is no significant difference among the respondents with respect to different marital status groups in facing problems of MSMEs".
The results of 't' analysis is presented in the following table 5.

TABLE 5 RESPONDENTS' MARITAL STATUS AND LEVEL OF PROBLEM

Sl.No	Marital Status	Mean score	SD	CV	't' value	'P' value
1.	Married	4.02	0.31	7.71		
2.	Unmarried	3.73	0.34	9.12	8.118	.002
	Overall	3.70	0.30	8.11		**

Source: Computed from primary data

The result t-test (8.118) is significant at 5 per cent level, since the p-value is less than 0.05, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Significant difference is found among the respondents belonging to different marital

status groups towards level of problem of MSMEs. It is also found that there is more consistency in the variation (CV= 7.71) of married respondents than unmarried respondents.

Respondents' Educational Qualification and Level of Problem Facing
ANOVA testing was used to formulate and analyze a hypothesis in an effort to determine whether there were any significant differences in the respondents' approaches to problem-solving despite their varying educational backgrounds.
Ho "There is no significant difference among the respondents with respect to different educational qualification groups in facing problems of MSMEs".
The results of ANOVA analysis is presented in the following table 6.

TABLE 6RESPONDENTS' EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION AND LEVEL OF PROBLEM

Sl.No	Educational Qualification	Mean score	SD	CV	'F' value	'P' value
1.	School Level	3.56	0.39	10.96		
2.	Graduate	3.68	0.40	10.87		
3.	Post-Graduate	3.39	0.42	12.39		
4.	Professional Degree	3.58	0.36	10.06	7.034	.014**
5.	Diploma and others	3.61	0.39	10.80		
	Overall	3.44	0.43	12.50		

Source: Computed from primary data

The result F-test (7.034) is significant at 5 per cent level, since the p-value is less than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Significant difference is found among the respondents having different types of educational qualification towards level of problem. It is also found that there is more consistency in the variation (CV= 10.06) of respondents having professional degree than others.

Respondents' Business Area Income and Level of Problem
In order to find the significant difference in among the respondents residential area towards facing problems of MSMEs, a hypothesis was framed and analysed with by use of ANOVA test.
Ho "There is no significant difference among the respondents with respect to different business area groups in facing problems of MSMEs".
The results of ANOVA analysis is presented in the following table 7.

TABLE 7 RESPONDENTS' RESIDENTIAL AREA AND LEVEL OF PROBLEM

Sl.No	Residential Area	Mean score	SD	CV	'F' value	'P' value
1.	Urban	3.52	0.36	10.23		
2.	Semi-urban	3.49	0.39	11.17	3.857	.001 **
3.	Rural	3.61	0.31	8.59		
	Overall	3.53	0.302	8.56		

Source: Computed from primary data
The result F-test (3.857) is significant at 5 per cent level, since the p-value is less than 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Significant difference is found among the respondents having different business place towards MSMEs level of problem. It is noted from this analysis all the selected respondents for the present study are experienced not equal level of problems in MSMEs. It is also found that there is more consistency in the variation (CV= 8.59) of respondent from rural area than other respondents.

Level of Problem Facing by Micro Small and Medium Level Enterprises
In order to analyse the significant difference among micro, small and medium level enterprises towards different categories of problems faced the following hypotheses have been tested.
Ho: "There is no significant difference among micro, small and medium level enterprises towards facing different types of problems**".
The ANOVA test has been administered to find out the significant difference and the result is presented the following Table 8.

TABLE 8 LEVEL OF PROBLEM FACING BY DIFFERENT MSM ENTERPRISES

Problems	Micro	Small	Medium	Total	'F' Value	'P' value
Insufficient funding for working capital	3.05 (1.13)	**3.47 (1.39)**	2.88 (1.21)	3.26 (1.35)	2.454	.010**
Absence of fixed capital	3.08 (1.18)	**3.71 (1.27)**	2.92 (1.12)	3.5 (1.16)	8.673	.004**
Interest penalties	**3.68 (1.18)**	3.57 (1.21)	3.21 (1.36)	3.46 (1.12)	4.334	.002**
Fierce rivalry	3.36	3.45	**3.52**	3.4	6.279	.925

	(0.85)	(0.82)	**(0.87)**	(0.82)		
Inadequate technology foundation	**3.34 (1.17)**	3.11 (1.09)	3.23 (1.11)	2.82 (1.28)	10.384	.860
Absence of infrastructure	**3.42 (1.09)**	3.32 (0.99)	3.35 (0.95)	2.76 (1.10)	11.072	.035**
Lack of competent labor	3.48 (1.38)	**3.55 (1.37)**	3.23 (1.38)	2.89 (1.15)	7.562	.729
Issues with distribution and marketing	2.87 (1.24)	**2.97 (1.29)**	2.93 (1.23)	3.21 (1.55)	.656	.657
Inadequate ability to collect	2.64 (1.08)	2.89 (1.07)	**2.73 (1.13)**	2.9 (1.02)	1.125	.006**
Issues with mindset	2.86 (1.09)	**3.14 (1.13)**	2.87 (1.14)	2.86 (1.13)	1.362	.237
Neglected social welfare areas	3.14 (1.55)	3.54 (1.58)	**3.93 (1.57)**	3.25 (1.49)	1.416	.217
Infrastructure limitations	3.02 (1.29)	**3.51 (1.31)**	3.47 (1.33)	3.22 (1.40)	2.063	.069
Handiness of raw materials	**3.42 (1.28)**	3.24 (1.20)	3.40 (1.35)	3.5 (1.27)	6.313	.005**
Absence of further investment	3.26 (1.17)	**3.61 (0.90)**	3.52 (1.20)	3.36 (1.13)	1.655	.144
Absence of marketing infrastructure	2.89 (1.29)	3.46 (1.45)	**3.65 (1.19)**	3.62 (1.19)	4.393	.025**
Unfavour effects of globalization and reforms	**2.97 (1.12)**	2.88 (1.24)	2.78 (1.36)	3.08 (1.31)	1.264	.001**
No sufficient and timely supply of bank financing	**3.29 (1.40)**	3.21 (1.32)	3.22 (1.37)	3.34 (1.36)	2.295	.265
Limited expertise in contemporary business	3.34 (1.45)	3.34 (1.28)	**3.37 (1.47)**	3.68 (1.27)	1.163	.523
Minimal return	**3.49 (1.41)**	3.14 (1.43)	3.03 (1.50)	3.16 (1.41)	9.705	.620
Absence of appropriate technology	**3.08 (1.24)**	2.92 (1.18)	2.91 (1.10)	3.55 (1.32)	10.541	.745
Limited ability to produce	2.94 (1.11)	**3.27 (1.12)**	3.07 (1.09)	3.25 (1.22)	1.883	.000***
Inadequate advertising tactics	3.19 (1.10)	3.36 (1.28)	**3.48 (1.17)**	3.47 (1.19)	9.378	.231
Finding new markets can be difficult	3.14 (1.12)	3.13 (1.30)	**3.44 (1.30)**	2.97 (1.24)	1.235	.291
Limitations on modernization and growth	3.14 (1.12)	**3.62 (1.18)**	3.27 (1.06)	3.42 (1.34)	1.791	.113
Absence of uniform regulations	3.12 (1.17)	3.01 (1.16)	**3.29 (1.18)**	3.13 (1.43)	9.263	.933
High absenteeism from work	3.12 (1.17)	3.01 (1.16)	**3.27 (1.18)**	3.57 (0.95)	9.263	.033**
Involvement of the government	**2.84 (1.23)**	3.5 (1.28)	3.72 (1.18)	3.76 (1.24)	7.316	.000***
Issues with the Labour Union	3.07 (1.09)	**3.47 (1.11)**	3.16 (1.27)	3.36 (1.33)	3.658	.000***
Insufficient creativity	3.07 (1.09)	**3.78 (1.09)**	3.58 (1.28)	3.31 (1.48)	4.032	.041**
Insufficient professionalism	3.08 (1.31)	**3.97 (1.33)**	3.48 (1.31)	3.47 (1.35)	9.034	.004**
Regular modifications to the technology	3.34 (0.98)	3.57 (1.28)	**3.74 (1.17)**	2.85 (1.42)	2.968	.000**
Insufficient instruction	**3.91 (1.45)**	3.09 (1.15)	3.62 (1.19)	3.45 (1.25)	5.032	.016**
Absence of knowledge	**3.77 (1.11)**	3.09 (1.15)	3.11 (1.32)	2.95 (1.32)	4.007	.008**
High training expenses	2.64 (1.05)	2.87 (1.17)	**3.14 (1.13)**	3.24 (1.39)	5.346	.004**
Severe issues with transportation	3.23 (1.46)	**3.25 (1.39)**	3.06 (1.36)	3.27 (1.32)	4.395	.005**

Source: Computed from primary data

It is found from the Table 6.24 that with regards to following problem are highly affected micro level enterprises i.e., Interest penalties (3.68), Inadequate technology foundation (3.34), Absence of infrastructure (3.42), Handiness of raw materials (3.42), Unfavour effects of globalization and reforms (2.97), No sufficient and timely supply of bank financing (3.29), Minimal return (3.49), Absence of appropriate technology (3.08), Involvement of the government (2.84), Insufficient instruction (3.91), Absence of knowledge (3.77).

Small level enterprises highly affected by the following problems i.e, Insufficient funding for working capital (3.47), Absence of fixed capital (3.71), lack of competent labor (3.55), Issues with distribution and marketing

(2.97), issues with mindset (3.14), Infrastructure limitations (3.51), Absence of further investment (3.61), Limited ability to produce (3.27), Limitations on modernization and growth (3.62), Issues with the Labour Union (3.47), Insufficient creativity (3.78), Insufficient professionalism (3.97) and severe issues with transportation (3.25).

Medium level enterprises highly affected by the following problems i.e, Fierce rivalry (3.52), Inadequate ability to collect (2.73), Neglected social welfare areas (3.93), Absence of marketing infrastructure (3.65), Limited expertise in contemporary business (3.37), Inadequate advertising tactics (3.48), Finding new markets can be difficult (3.44) ,Absence of uniform regulations (3.29), High absenteeism from work (3.27), Regular modifications to the technology (3.74) and High training expenses (3.14). It is concluded that among the all the selected thirty-five problem considered under this study are classified into six categories namely starting enterprises, raw material and production, managerial, human resource , financial and marketing. It is noted from this analysis nineteen problems out of thirty five selected problems for the present study are significantly differed. Hence, Maximum problems significantly differed the null hypothesis is rejected and concluded that majority of the problems are significantly differed among micro, small and medium level enterprises. In order to analyse the significant difference among micro, small and medium level enterprises towards different categories of problems faced the following hypotheses have been tested.

Ho: "There is no significant difference among micro, small and medium level enterprises towards facing different categories of problems".

The ANOVA test has been administered to find out the significant difference and the result is presented the following Table 9.

TABLE 9 RESULT OF ANOVA TO MEASURE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN PROBLEMS FACED BY MSMEs

Categories of Problems	Micro	Small	Medium	F	P Sig
Starting Enterprises	3.515 (0.864)	3.816 (0.917)	3.497 (0.714)	5.328	.001 **
Raw Material and Production	3.538 (0.628)	3.512 (0.687)	3.541 (0.668)	2.217	.328
Managerial	3.431 (0.567)	3.627 (0.774)	3.504 (0.628)	1.034	.203
Human Resource	3.912 (0.661)	3.484 (0.529)	3.228 (0.569)	5.509	.002 **
Financial	3.621 (0.448)	3.054 (0.514)	3.928 (0.552)	11.039	.000 ***
Marketing	3.405 (0.541)	3.854 (0.662)	3.201 (0.628)	7.013	.004 **

Source: Computed from primary data

The above analysis reveals that for problems pertaining to starting enterprises, human resources, financial, and marketing aspects that have significant differences, the calculated F value is less than the 'P' value is less than 0.05. As a result, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, there are notable differences between micro, small, and medium-sized enterprises when it comes to the challenges they face in the areas of marketing, finance, human resources, and starting new businesses. There were no appreciable differences observed in the problems encountered with raw materials, production, and managerial aspects.

CONCLUSION

MSMEs make up a significant portion of the Indian industrial sector and will remain so in the future, contributing significantly to the country's economy. MSMEs are crucial to the economy because they generate jobs, offer goods and services at reasonable prices, and help the nation earn foreign exchange through exports. The government has launched a number of initiatives to increase MSMEs' level of vigilance in their operations. MSMEs are propelled forward by entrepreneurs, and they are a vital structural and dynamic component of all economies. Even though the Indian government is doing a lot to encourage the growth of entrepreneurship, the MSMEs sector still faces significant obstacles like a lack of timely and sufficient credit availability. High credit costs, collateral requirements, restricted access to equity capital, competitive raw material procurement costs, storage, design, packaging, and product display issues, restricted access to international markets, Low technology levels, insufficient power, water, and road infrastructure, as well as a shortage of skilled labor for marketing, services, and manufacturing, among other things. The MSME sector has demonstrated impressive innovation, adaptability, and resilience to weather the recent economic downturn and recession despite the many obstacles it has faced. The remarkable rise of contemporary MSMEs is a gratifying aspect of India's economic development.

REFERENCES

1. Paramasivan C & Mari Selvam P (2013). Progress and Performance of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises in India. *International Journal of Management and Development Studies,* 2(4), 11-16.
2. Annual Report of MSME 2020-2021, *Ministry of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises,* Government of India.
3. Kumar, N.B.K., &Dr.Gugloth.S.(2012). Financial Management in MSMEs in India. *IJEMR*, (September), 2, Issue 9, ISSN 2249–2585.
4. Suresh, P., & Dr. Mohideen M. Akbar. (2012). Small Medium Enterprises in India- Issues and Prospects. (February), 2, Issue 2. Article No-4/247-255. ISSN: 2249-7196.
5. Kankipati, Ajay & Shaik, Meervali & Ramesh, & Shekar,. (2017). Performance of MSMEs Sector in India. *International journal of economics and management studies*. 4(3), 11-15.
6. Shastri, R.K., Tripathi.,& Ali, M. (2011). Liberalisation and its impact on small scale industries. *International Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 2(7), 81-83.
7. Sharma, R. (2012). Problem and prospects of small scale industrial units (A case study of exporting and non exporting units in Haryana). *Asia Pacifi c Journal of Marketing & Management Review*, 1(2), 191-210.
8. Ali, A., Firoz Husain, F. (2014). MSME‟s in India: Problems, Solutions and Prospectus in Present` Scenario.*Ijems.*,5(2)2014:109-115, ISSN2229-600X,
9. Vasu, M. S., & Jayachandra, K. (2014). Growth and development of MSMES in India: Prospects and problem. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, 4(5), 125-127.