

## Chapter 6:

### **Impact of ADP on Entrepreneurs of Aspirational Districts of North-East India**

#### **6.1 Introduction**

There are several challenges that MSME-based entrepreneurs face in India; some of them are limited credit access, poor infrastructure, and inadequate market linkages (Singh & Bhanot, 2020). The ADP's multi-dimensional approach is expected to mitigate these challenges by fostering an ecosystem conducive to entrepreneurial growth in rural and backward areas of India. As mentioned, the ADP is structured around five core thematic areas; out of these, three areas (a) Financial Inclusion & Skill Development, (b) Agriculture & Water Resources, and (c) Basic Infrastructure can directly influence MSME-based entrepreneurship development in aspirational districts (NITI Aayog, 2018). The objectives of the ADP align with the needs of local and micro-entrepreneurs, who rely on affordable financing, practical skills, and reliable infrastructure to establish and scale their ventures (Kumar & Sharma, 2021). Hence, several benefits may be brought by the ADP for local and MSME-based entrepreneurs. Some of them are accessibility to financial services and improvement in the health and infrastructure in rural areas. Such benefits will automatically enhance the capacity of the MSME-based entrepreneurs. The type of benefits that can be accrued by an entrepreneur from ADP is shown in table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Type of benefits that can be accrued by an entrepreneur from ADP

S. No	Thematic Area of ADP	Benefits
1	<b>Financial Inclusion &amp; Skill Development:</b>	Enhancing access to banking services, credit facilities (e.g., Mudra loans, Subsidies ), and skill training & Capacity Development programmes to empower entrepreneurs.
2	<b>Agriculture &amp; Water Resources:</b>	Supporting agro-based enterprises by improving irrigation, promoting organic farming, and creating market linkages for rural produce.
3	<b>Basic Infrastructure:</b>	Improving connectivity (roads, electricity, internet) to facilitate business operations and market access.

Source: prepared by the researcher based on the literature

Hence, it is assumed that the entrepreneurs of the study area get various benefits from the implementation of ADP. This chapter is developed to fulfil objectives number three and four of the present study. They are:

- (a) To identify the benefits accrued from the ADP by the entrepreneurs of the study area (objective 3) and
- (b) To measure the impact of ADP on Entrepreneurs ( objective 4) in enhancing entrepreneurial activities in aspirational districts.

In the previous chapter, the awareness level of ADP among the sample entrepreneurs of North East India was shown and from the findings, it is revealed that the awareness level of ADP among the sample entrepreneurs is very low. In this chapter, the findings related to the benefits accrued from the ADP by the entrepreneurs and the impact of ADP on Entrepreneurs of the study area are presented.

To find out the benefits accrued, a structured questionnaire having 34 statements related to various benefits aligned with the thematic areas of ADP was distributed to the sample entrepreneurs and asked them to answer either 'yes or no'; and, if they received any benefits, they were asked to mention the year of availing.

To measure the impact of ADP, a 5-point rating scale is considered; they are 1= not at all, 2- Slightly, 3= Moderately, 4= significantly, and 5 to a great extent. The respondents were asked to rate from 1 to 5 against 10 questions.

Descriptive statistics, simple and cross-tabulations, simple percentages, median, mode, and standard deviation have been used to analyse and interpret data. An index is developed to measure the impact of ADP and it is shown in the following section. The chapter is presented in four parts. The first part deals with the introductory background of the chapter, the second part is related to the findings related to the benefits accrued by the entrepreneurs, the third part deals with the impact of ADP on sample entrepreneurs and the chapter conclusion is presented in the last part of the chapter.

## **6.2 . Benefits received by the entrepreneurs after the implementation of ADP**

### **6.2.i. Benefits Related to Access to Financial Resources**

According to NITI Aayog (2021), the ADP's emphasis on financial inclusion has significantly improved credit accessibility for small business entrepreneurs. This is evidenced by the increase in Mudra loan disbursements and the expanded outreach of banking services. Reports indicate that the black rice program in the Chandauli district of Uttar Pradesh, bolstered by small investments, has resulted in exports to countries such as Oman and Qatar, hence enhancing local earnings (UNDP India, 2022). The ADP also partners with banks to enhance credit delivery and reduce dependence on informal lenders (Singh & Bhanot, 2020). For example, in Virudhunagar of Tamil Nadu, micro-ATMs were introduced to the Self-Help Groups (SHGs) with commission-based income (NITI Aayog, 2021) which help women financially empowered. It indicates that ADP can provide certain financial resource-related benefits to entrepreneurs.

The benefits received by the sample entrepreneurs in this regard in the study area are presented in Table 6.2.a. The table reveals that 15 percent of the total respondents availed of Mudra(Micro Units Development and Refinance Agency Loans)loan. In the case of PMJJBY (Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana), and APY(Atal Pension Yojna), 27.1 percent and 19 percent of the total respondents have availed of these benefits. In the case of PMSBY, 72.9 percent of the total respondents are found to be availing of this benefit, 70.5 percent of the total respondents are found to be availing of PMJDY(Pradhan Mantri Jan Dhan Yojana), and 82.6 percent of the total respondents are found to be having financial subsidies from the government to run their enterprises.

Based on these findings, it can be derived that while the majority of the entrepreneurs haven't availed some of the schemes of the government like Mudra loan (85percent), PMJJBY (72.9 percent),and APY (80.4 percent), the majority of the total entrepreneurs availed some of the benefits such as PMSBY, PMJDY, and financial subsidies. It was found that all the benefits were received by the entrepreneurs after the implementation of ADP.

Table 6.2 a. Benefits Related to Access to Financial Resources

S. No	Type of Benefits	Yes		No		Total	
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent
1	Availing Mudra Loan	56	15.0	317	85.0	373	100
2	Availing PMJJBY	101	27.1	272	72.9	373	100
3	Availing PMSBY	272	<b>72.9</b>	287	76.9	373	100
4	Availing APY	73	19.6	300	80.4	373	100
5	Availing PMJDY	263	<b>70.5</b>	109	29.5	373	100
6	Availing Subsidies	308	<b>82.6</b>	65	17.4	373	100

Source: Field survey

### 6.2.ii. Benefits related to Training and Development of enhancing capacity of entrepreneurs

The ADP also emphasises skill training through government initiatives like Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana (PMKVY ). According to the Skill India Report, (2023), training in digital literacy, business management, and technical skills has empowered a number of entrepreneurs in the country, enhancing their productivity and competitiveness in local and national markets. The table 6.2 b. presents findings on benefits related to access to training and development for enhancing the capacity of entrepreneurs. It is revealed that 15.8percent of respondents have benefited from short-term or long-term training programs, while 84.2percent have not. Additionally, 27.1percent of respondents have registered for an apprenticeship program, whereas 72.9percent have not. The findings also indicate that 24.9percent of respondents have participated in a certification program for the recognition of prior learning for non-formally skilled workers, while 75.1percent have not participated.

Table 6.2 b. Benefits related to Access to Training and Development of enhancing capacity of entrepreneurs

S. No	Type of Benefits	Yes		No		Total	
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent
1	Beneficiary of any short/long term training	59	15.8	314	84.2	373	100
2	Registration of Apprenticeship Programme	101	27.1	272	72.9	373	100
3	Certification Programme for Recognition of Prior learning to non-formally skilled workforce	93	24.9	280	75.1	373	100

Source: Field survey

### 6.2.iii. Benefits related to Infrastructural Development in the study area

According to World Bank, (2022), the ADP has contributed to infrastructure improvements, such as better road connectivity, digital access, and electricity supply, which are essential for MSME-based entrepreneurs. Enhanced transportation networks can improve market accessibility, reducing logistics costs for entrepreneurs. How many of the sample entrepreneurs have received the benefits related to infrastructural development created as a result of ADP is shown in Table 6.2.c.

Table 6.2 c. presents findings on benefits related to infrastructural development. It shows that 74.5 percent of respondents have electricity connections in their homes and workplaces, while 25.5 percent do not. Regarding internet connectivity in gram panchayats, 58.2 percent of respondents have access, whereas 41.8 percent do not. Access to all-weather roads under the Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana (PMGSY) is available to 55.2 percent of respondents, while 44.8 percent lack this benefit. Individual household latrines provided by the government are available to 29.0 percent of respondents, while 71.0 percent do not have access. Access to an adequate quantity of potable drinking water (40 liters per capita per day - lpcd) is available to 56.3 percent of

respondents, while 43.7 percent lack this access. An established Common Service Centre (CSC) in the gram panchayat is available to 63.3 percent of respondents, whereas 36.7 percent do not have this facility. Additionally, 14.7 percent of respondents are beneficiaries of a micro-irrigation scheme, while 85.3 percent are not

*Hence, it can be derived that except in the case of 'Individual household 's latrine provided by the government', the majority of the respondents enjoyed the benefits related to infrastructural development created as a result of ADP in the study area.*

Table 6.2 c. Benefits related to infrastructural development

S. No	Type of Benefits	Yes		No		Total	
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent
1	Electricity connection in home and workplace	278	74.5	95	25.5	373	100
2	Internet Connection in Gram Panchayat	217	58.2	156	41.8	373	100
3	Access to all-weather roads under PMGSY	206	55.2	167	44.8	373	100
4	Individual household's latrines provided by the government	108	<b>29.0</b>	265	71.0	373	100
5	Access to adequate quantity of potable water (40 lpcd) drinking water	210	56.3	163	43.7	373	100
6	Gram Panchayat has an established Common Service Centre established by gram panchayat	236	63.3	137	36.7	373	100
7	Beneficiary of micro-irrigation scheme	55	14.7	318	85.3	373	100

Source: Field survey

#### 6.2.iv. Benefits Related to Agriculture and Animal Husbandry Development

The findings on benefits related to agriculture and animal husbandry development reveal a low adoption of key government schemes among respondents. Only 15.8 percent availed of the Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY) for both Kharif and Rabi seasons, while 84.2 percent did not enroll. Similarly, 14.5 percent of respondents availed of PMFBY in the last Rabi season, indicating a general reluctance or lack of awareness regarding crop insurance. In terms of animal husbandry support, 27.6 percent of respondents benefited from animal vaccination programs, while artificial insemination coverage was particularly low, with only 9.7 percent availing it. Additionally, soil health management efforts appear underutilized, as just 15.5 percent of respondents possessed Soil Health Cards.

*These figures suggest a significant gap in the outreach and implementation of agricultural and animal husbandry initiatives, highlighting the need for improved awareness, accessibility, and farmer engagement to enhance participation in these beneficial schemes*

Table 6.2 d. Benefits related to agriculture and animal husbandry development

S. No	Type of Benefits	Yes		No		Total	
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent
1	Availing PMFBY for both Kharif and Rabi season	<b>59</b>	<b>15.8</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>84.2</b>	373	100
2	Availing PMFBY in the last Rabi season	<b>54</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>85.5</b>	373	100
3	Availing Animal vaccination*	<b>103</b>	<b>27.6</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>72.4</b>	373	100
4	Having Artificial Insemination coverage	<b>36</b>	<b>9.7</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>90.3</b>	373	100
5	Having Soil Health Cards**	<b>58</b>	<b>15.5</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>84.5</b>	373	100

\*those who are having animals, \*\* Having agricultural land

Source: Field survey

### 6.2.v. Benefits related to the Education of children of entrepreneurs

The findings shown in Table 6.2e relate to the benefits of educating children of entrepreneurs, indicating disparities in school infrastructure and compliance with educational standards in gram panchayat areas. Only **15.5 percent** of schools have functional girls' toilets, highlighting a critical gap in sanitation facilities, while **84.5 percent** lack this essential amenity. However, **72.4percent** of schools have a functional drinking water facility, ensuring access to safe drinking water for students. Similarly, **77 percent** of schools have a functional electricity supply, whereas **23 percent** still face power-related challenges. Compliance with the Right to Education (RTE) specified pupil-teacher ratio is observed in **73.7 percent** of schools, but **26.3 percent** do not meet this standard.

*These findings underscore the need for targeted interventions to improve sanitation, electricity, and teacher availability to enhance the overall educational environment in rural schools.*

Table 6.2 e. Benefits related to the education of children of entrepreneurs

S. No	Type of Benefits	Yes		No		Total	
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent
1	All schools in gram panchayat have functional girls' toilet	58	15.5	315	84.5	373	100
2	All schools in gram panchayat have functional drinking facility	270	72.4	103	27.6	373	100
3	All schools in gram panchayat have functional electricity facility	287	77	86	23	373	100
4	All schools in gram panchayat are complying with RTE specified Pupil Teacher Ratio	275	73.7	98	26.3	373	100

Source: Field survey

## 6.2.vi. Benefits related to availing of Health facilities

Table 6.2 f. presents findings on the utilization of healthcare facilities by families, particularly focusing on maternal and child healthcare services. It shows that **63 percent** of women in these families received at least four antenatal check-ups during pregnancy, while **37 percent** did not. Antenatal care (ANC) registration in the first trimester was reported by **52.5 percent** of pregnant women, leaving **47.5 percent** unregistered in the early stages of pregnancy. Additionally, **57.1 percent** of families availed of supplementary nutrition under the ICDS program, while **42.9 percent** did not benefit from this service. Regarding treatment for anemia, only **39.4 percent of women received care in government hospitals, while 60.6 percent** did not access such treatment. Institutional deliveries were conducted for **63.5 percent** of births, but **36.5 percent** of deliveries occurred outside health institutions. Furthermore, **39.9 percent** of home births were assisted by a skilled birth attendant (SBA), but **60.1 percent** lacked professional medical assistance.

*These findings indicate a significant gap in access to essential maternal healthcare services, highlighting the need for improved awareness, outreach, and availability of health interventions to ensure safer pregnancies and childbirth outcomes.*

Table 6.2 f. Benefits related to availing of health facilities

S. No	Type of Benefits	Yes		No		Total	
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent
1	Availing women in the family got 4 or more antenatal check up during pregnancy	235	63.0	138	37.0	373	100
2	Pregnant women in the family got ANC registered in the first trimester	196	52.5	177	47.5	373	100
3	Availing supplementary nutrition under ICDS programme	213	57.1	160	42.9	373	100

4	Treatment of anemic in government hospital	147	<b>39.4</b>	226	60.6	373	100
5	Institutional birth delivery	237	63.5	136	36.5	373	100
6	Delivery of child at home by an SBA	149	<b>39.9</b>	224	60.1	373	100

Source: Field survey

### 6.3. Extent of Changes brought among entrepreneurs after the Implementation of the ADP

The impact of ADP on entrepreneurs after its implementation, the 'Extent of Changes brought among entrepreneurs after the implementation of the ADP', is measured based on the 10 (ten) questions which were given to the respondents related to various areas including behavioural change and organizational expansion. The respondents were asked to rate from 1 to 5 where 1 implies 'not at all' and 5 implies 'to great extent'.

The results are shown below in the form of a table. Descriptive Statistics is also shown in table 6.3. Here, a 5-point rating scale is considered to measure the impact of ADP on entrepreneurs. They are 1= not at all, 2- Slightly, 3= Moderately, 4 = significantly, and 5 = to great extent.

Table 6.3. Descriptive Statistics of the Impact of ADP on Entrepreneurs

		C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10
N	Valid	373	373	373	373	373	373	373	373	373	373
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		2.55	2.56	2.57	2.54	2.43	2.39	2.62	2.56	2.63	2.71
Median		2.00	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
Mode		2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
Std. Deviation		1.18	1.08	1.13	1.03	1.11	1.10	1.05	1.10	1.14	1.19
Variance		1.40	1.17	1.27	1.07	1.23	1.21	1.10	1.21	1.31	1.43
		4	2	7	7	6	1	7	5	0	1

Skewness	.399	.132	.411	.512	.450	.522	.385	.374	.182	.057
Std. Error of Skewness	.126	.126	.126	.126	.126	.126	.126	.126	.126	.126
Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

Source: Computed by the researcher based on the field survey

Table 6.4 presents the extent of impact on entrepreneurs after ADP implementation using a 5-point scale. The majority of respondents rated the impact between "Slightly" (2) and "Moderately" (3), indicating a **moderate but not substantial effect**. A significant portion reported "**Not at all**" (1) and "**Slightly**" (2), especially in areas like C5 and C6, suggesting minimal changes. Only **10–15 percent found the impact significant**, while less than **8 percent rated it as a great extent**. Overall, the findings indicate **limited but noticeable improvements**, with scope for strengthening ADP interventions for greater impact.

Table 6.4. Extent of Impact on Entrepreneurs after the implementation of ADP

S. No	Q. Code	Not at all (1)		Slightly (2)		Moderately (3)		Significantly (4)		To great extent (5)		Total	
		Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent	Count	percent
1	C1	82	22.0	111	29.8	101	27.1	52	13.9	27	7.2	373	100.0
2	C2	77	20.6	93	24.9	134	35.9	56	15.0	13	3.5	373	100.0
3	C3	69	18.5	118	31.6	115	30.8	45	12.1	26	7.0	373	100.0
4	C4	54	14.5	146	39.1	111	29.8	43	11.5	19	5.1	373	100.0
5	C5	86	23.1	119	31.9	106	28.4	44	11.8	18	4.8	373	100.0

6	C6	89	23.9	124	33.2	104	27.9	38	10.2	18	4.8	373	100.0
7	C7	50	13.4	133	35.7	118	31.6	52	13.9	20	5.4	373	100.0
8	C8	69	18.5	116	31.1	121	32.4	45	12.1	22	5.9	373	100.0
9	C9	76	20.4	89	23.9	128	34.3	58	15.5	22	5.9	373	100.0
10	C10	76	20.4	85	22.8	104	27.9	86	23.1	22	5.9	373	100.0

Source: Field Survey

Cross tabulations are also prepared to have a comparison among the entrepreneurs belonging to different categories with regard to the changes brought by the ADP to them. Table 6.6.a. reveals that for 16 percent of total entrepreneurs who own service enterprises, their level of skill development is ‘not at all improved’ whereas, for 7.2 percent of total entrepreneurs, their level of skill is improved ‘to large extent’ after the implementation of ADP . Further, for 34.4 percent, 24 percent and 18.4 percent of total entrepreneurs who own service enterprises, their level of skill development, are found to be ‘Slightly’ ‘Moderately’ and ‘Significantly’ improved after the implementation of ADP. .In case of entrepreneurs, who own manufacturing enterprises, 25 percent of the total are found to be responded as ‘not at all improved’, 27.4 percent of the total are found to be responded as ‘slightly improved’, 28.6percent of the total are found to be responded as ‘moderately’ improved. The remaining 11.7 percent and 7.3 percent total who own manufacturing enterprises are found to be responded as ‘significantly ‘ and‘ to large extent’ with regard to their level of skill development. *In case of entrepreneurs who own service- based enterprises, highest share of respondents is from the group who responded as ‘slightly’ where as in case of entrepreneurs who own manufacturing- based enterprises, highest share of respondents is from the group who responded as ‘moderately’.*

Table 6. 5.a Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and Skill Development(C1)

Nature of Enterprise		Skill Development					Total
		Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Significantly	To great extent	
Service	Count	20	43	30	23	9	125
	percent within Type	16.0	<b>34.4</b>	24.0	18.4	7.2	100.0
	percent of Total	<b>5.4</b>	<b>11.5</b>	<b>8.0</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>2.4</b>	33.5
Manufacturing	Count	62	68	71	29	18	248
	percent within Type	25.0	27.4	<b>28.6</b>	11.7	7.3	100.0
	percent of Total	<b>16.6</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>19.0</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>4.8</b>	66.5
Total	Count	82	111	101	52	27	373
	percent within Type	22.0	29.8	27.1	13.9	7.2	100.0
	percent of Total	<b>22.0</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Field Survey

From Table 6.5.b below, it is observed that among entrepreneurs owning service enterprises, 12.8 percent reported ‘no expansion at all’ in their enterprise after the implementation of ADP, whereas 5.6 percent reported that their enterprise expanded ‘to a great extent.’ Additionally, 31.2 percent of service-based entrepreneurs experienced ‘slight’ expansion, while 29.6 percent and 20.8 percent found their enterprise expansion to be ‘moderate’ and ‘significant,’ respectively. In the case of manufacturing-based entrepreneurs, 24.6 percent reported ‘no expansion at all,’ 21.8 percent experienced ‘slight’ expansion, and 39.1 percent reported ‘moderate’ expansion. Furthermore, 12.1 percent and 2.4 percent of manufacturing-based entrepreneurs reported ‘significant’ and ‘great’ expansion, respectively. Overall, for service enterprises, the highest percent of respondents experienced ‘slight’ expansion, whereas for manufacturing enterprises, the highest share of respondents reported ‘moderate’ expansion.

From Table 6.5.c, it is evident that among entrepreneurs owning service enterprises, 9.6 percent reported ‘no increase at all’ in sales after the implementation of ADP, while 7.2 percent experienced an increase in sales ‘to a great extent.’ Additionally, 43.2 percent of service-based entrepreneurs observed a ‘slight’ increase, whereas 25.6 percent and 14.4 percent reported a ‘moderate’ and ‘significant’ increase in sales, respectively. In contrast, among manufacturing-based entrepreneurs, 23 percent reported ‘no increase at all’ in sales, 25.8 percent observed a ‘slight’ increase, and 33.5 percent experienced a ‘moderate’ increase. Furthermore, 10.9 percent and 6.9 percent of manufacturing-based entrepreneurs reported a ‘significant’ and ‘great’ increase in sales, respectively. Overall, the highest proportion of service enterprise owners reported a ‘slight’ increase in sales, whereas for manufacturing enterprises, the majority experienced a ‘moderate’ increase in sales.

Table 6. 5.b. Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and Expansion of Enterprise (C2)

			Expansion of enterprise					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Signifi-cantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	16	39	37	26	7	125
		percent within Type	12.8percent	31.2percent	29.6percent	20.8percent	5.6percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	4.3percent	10.5percent	9.9percent	7.0percent	1.9percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	61	54	97	30	6	248
		percent within Type	24.6percent	21.8percent	39.1percent	12.1percent	2.4percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	16.4percent	14.5percent	26.0percent	8.0percent	1.6percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	77	93	134	56	13	373
		percent within Type	20.6percent	24.9percent	35.9percent	15.0percent	3.5percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	20.6percent	24.9percent	35.9percent	15.0percent	3.5percent	100.0percent

Source: Field Survey

Table 6. 5.c. Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and increase of Sales (C3)

			Increase of Sales					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Signifi- cantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	12	54	32	18	9	125
		percent within Type	9.6percent	43.2percent	25.6percent	14.4percent	7.2percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	3.2percent	14.5percent	8.6percent	4.8percent	2.4percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	57	64	83	27	17	248
		percent within Type	23.0percent	25.8percent	33.5percent	10.9percent	6.9percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	15.3percent	17.2percent	22.3percent	7.2percent	4.6percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	69	118	115	45	26	373
		percent within Type	18.5percent	31.6percent	30.8percent	12.1percent	7.0percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	18.5percent	31.6percent	30.8percent	12.1percent	7.0percent	100.0percent

Source: Field Survey

From Table 6.5.d, it is observed that among service-based entrepreneurs, 13.6 percent reported ‘no increase at all’ in the number of employments after the implementation of ADP, while 4.8 percent saw an increase ‘to a great extent.’ Furthermore, 40 percent of service entrepreneurs experienced a ‘slight’ increase, whereas 28 percent and 13.6 percent reported a ‘moderate’ and ‘significant’ increase, respectively. In contrast, among manufacturing-based entrepreneurs, 14.9 percent reported ‘no increase at all,’ 38.7 percent observed a ‘slight’ increase, and 30.6 percent experienced a ‘moderate’ increase in employment. Additionally, 10.5 percent and 5.2 percent of manufacturing entrepreneurs reported a ‘significant’ and ‘great’ increase, respectively. Overall, the highest proportion of respondents in

both service and manufacturing sectors indicated a ‘slight’ increase in employment, followed by a ‘moderate’ increase, suggesting a positive impact of ADP on job creation.

Table 6. 5.d Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and Increase number of employment

			Increase number of employments					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Signifi- cantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	17	50	35	17	6	125
		percent within Type	13.6percent	40.0percent	28.0percent	13.6percent	4.8percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	4.6percent	13.4percent	9.4percent	4.6percent	1.6percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	37	96	76	26	13	248
		percent within Type	14.9percent	38.7percent	30.6percent	10.5percent	5.2percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	9.9percent	25.7percent	20.4percent	7.0percent	3.5percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	54	146	111	43	19	373
		percent within Type	14.5percent	39.1percent	29.8percent	11.5percent	5.1percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	14.5percent	39.1percent	29.8percent	11.5percent	5.1percent	100.0percent

Source: Field Survey

Table 6.5.e presents the cross-tabulation of the nature of enterprises and their expansion into new markets. Among service-based entrepreneurs, 19.2 percent reported ‘no expansion at all,’ while 5.6 percent experienced expansion ‘to a great extent.’ The highest percent (40 percent) indicated a ‘slight’ expansion, followed by 24.8 percent with a ‘moderate’ expansion and 10.4 percent reporting ‘significant’ expansion. For manufacturing-based entrepreneurs, 25 percent reported ‘no expansion at all,’ whereas 4.4 percent achieved expansion ‘to a

great extent.’ 27.8 percent experienced ‘slight’ expansion, while 30.2 percent saw ‘moderate’ expansion and 12.5 percent reported ‘significant’ expansion. Overall, 31.9 percent of respondents across both enterprise types experienced a ‘slight’ expansion, while 28.4 percent had a ‘moderate’ expansion. The findings suggest that while there is some level of market expansion for both sectors, manufacturing enterprises show a slightly stronger trend in ‘moderate’ and ‘significant’ expansion than service enterprises.

Table 6. 5.e Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and Expansion of product in new market

			Expansion of product in new market					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Significantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	24	50	31	13	7	125
		percent within Type	19.2percent	40.0percent	24.8percent	10.4percent	5.6percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	6.4percent	13.4percent	8.3percent	3.5percent	1.9percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	62	69	75	31	11	248
		percent within Type	25.0percent	27.8percent	30.2percent	12.5percent	4.4percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	16.6percent	18.5percent	20.1percent	8.3percent	2.9percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	86	119	106	44	18	373
		percent within Type	23.1percent	31.9percent	28.4percent	11.8percent	4.8percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	23.1percent	31.9percent	28.4percent	11.8percent	4.8percent	100.0percent

Source: Field Survey

Table 6.5.f states that in service-based enterprises, 18.4 percent reported ‘no new launches,’ while 3.2 percent managed to launch ‘to a great extent.’ The highest percent (41.6 percent) introduced new goods/services ‘slightly,’ followed by 30.4 percent with ‘moderate’ innovation and 6.4 percent reporting ‘significant’ new launches. For manufacturing-based enterprises, 26.6 percent did not launch new

goods/services, whereas 5.6 percent successfully launched ‘to a great extent.’ 29 percent introduced new offerings ‘slightly,’ while 26.6 percent did so ‘moderately’ and 12.1 percent made ‘significant’ new launches. Overall, 33.2 percent of respondents across both sectors introduced new goods/services ‘slightly,’ while 27.9 percent did so ‘moderately.’ The results suggest that manufacturing enterprises show a relatively higher tendency for ‘significant’ and ‘to a great extent’ launches than service enterprises.

Table 6. 5.f Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and Launching of new goods and services

			Launching of new goods and services					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Signifi- cantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	23	52	38	8	4	125
		percent within Type	18.4percent	41.6percent	30.4percent	6.4percent	3.2percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	6.2percent	13.9percent	10.2percent	2.1percent	1.1percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	66	72	66	30	14	248
		percent within Type	26.6percent	29.0percent	26.6percent	12.1percent	5.6percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	17.7percent	19.3percent	17.7percent	8.0percent	3.8percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	89	124	104	38	18	373
		percent within Type	23.9percent	33.2percent	27.9percent	10.2percent	4.8percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	23.9percent	33.2percent	27.9percent	10.2percent	4.8percent	100.0percent

Source: Field Survey

The following Table 6.5.g presents the cross-tabulation of the nature of enterprises and their profitability. For service enterprises, 43.2 percent of respondents reported ‘slight’ profitability, while 36.0 percent saw ‘moderate’ profitability. A smaller proportion (9.6

percent) experienced ‘significant’ profitability, and only 4.0 percent reported profitability ‘to a great extent.’ Meanwhile, 7.2 percent indicated that their enterprise was ‘not at all’ profitable. For manufacturing enterprises, 31.9 percent saw ‘slight’ profitability, while 29.4 percent experienced ‘moderate’ gains. However, a relatively higher percent (16.1 percent) of manufacturing businesses reported ‘significant’ profitability, and 6.0 percent even achieved profitability ‘to a great extent.’ On the other hand, 16.5 percent of manufacturing businesses found their enterprises ‘not at all’ profitable, which is higher than in the service sector. Overall, 35.7 percent of all respondents saw ‘slight’ profitability, while 31.6 percent experienced ‘moderate’ gains. Notably, 13.9 percent of businesses achieved ‘significant’ profitability, and 5.4 percent reached profitability ‘to a great extent.’ The findings suggest that while service enterprises have a higher percent reporting ‘moderate’ profitability, manufacturing enterprises have a greater share of those achieving ‘significant’ or ‘great extent’ profitability. However, manufacturing also has a higher percent of businesses that are ‘not at all’ profitable.

Table 6. 5.g Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and Profitability of Enterprise

			Profitability of Enterprise					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Signifi- cantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	9	54	45	12	5	125
		percent within Type	7.2percent	43.2percent	36.0percent	9.6percent	4.0percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	2.4percent	14.5percent	12.1percent	3.2percent	1.3percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	41	79	73	40	15	248
		percent within Type	16.5percent	31.9percent	29.4percent	16.1percent	6.0percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	11.0percent	21.2percent	19.6percent	10.7percent	4.0percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	50	133	118	52	20	373
		percent within Type	13.4percent	35.7percent	31.6percent	13.9percent	5.4percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	13.4percent	35.7percent	31.6percent	13.9percent	5.4percent	100.0percent

Source: Field Survey

The table 6.5.h. examines how much ADP (Assistance Development Program) has helped enterprises grow, dividing responses into service and manufacturing businesses. Among service enterprises, 41.6percent reported that ADP has helped them slightly, while 30.4 percent said the support was moderate. Around 12.0 percent felt the help was significant, and 7.2 percent believed ADP had helped them to a great extent. Only 8.8 percent said ADP had not helped them at all.For manufacturing enterprises, 25.8 percent found ADP’s support to be slight, and 33.5 percent considered it moderate. About 12.1percent believed the support was significant, and 5.2 percent felt ADP had helped them to a great extent. However, 23.4 percent of manufacturing enterprises stated that ADP had not helped them at all, which is a higher percent compared to service enterprises.

Overall, 32.4percent of all respondents rated ADP’s support as moderate, making it the most common response. Around 31.1 percent felt the support was slight, while 12.1 percent found it significant, and 5.9 percent believed it had helped them to a great extent. Meanwhile, 18.5 percent of all respondents said ADP had not helped them at all, with manufacturing enterprises showing a higher level of dissatisfaction compared to service enterprises. This suggests that ADP’s strategies might need to be better tailored to meet the specific challenges faced by manufacturing businesses.

Table 6. 5.h

			ADP's help to grow enterprise					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Signifi- cantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	11	52	38	15	9	125
		percent within Type	8.8percent	41.6percent	30.4percent	12.0percent	7.2percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	2.9percent	13.9percent	10.2percent	4.0percent	2.4percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	58	64	83	30	13	248
		percent within Type	23.4percent	25.8percent	33.5percent	12.1percent	5.2percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	15.5percent	17.2percent	22.3percent	8.0percent	3.5percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	69	116	121	45	22	373
		percent within Type	18.5percent	31.1percent	32.4percent	12.1percent	5.9percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	18.5percent	31.1percent	32.4percent	12.1percent	5.9percent	100.0percent

Source: Field Survey

The table 6.5.i examine how much ADP has helped entrepreneurs continue their businesses, comparing service and manufacturing enterprises. Among service entrepreneurs, 28.0percent reported that ADP’s support was slight, while 38.4 percent found it to be moderate. Around 18.4 percent felt that ADP had significantly helped them continue, and 5.6 percent believed it had provided great support. Meanwhile, 9.6 percent of service entrepreneurs said that ADP had not helped them at all. For manufacturing entrepreneurs, 21.8 percent rated ADP’s support as slight, while 32.3 percent found it to be moderate. Around 14.1 percent felt that the support was significant, and 6.0 percent believed it had helped them to a great extent. However, 25.8 percent of manufacturing entrepreneurs stated that ADP had not helped them at all, a significantly higher percent than in the service sector.

Overall, 34.3percent of all respondents rated ADP’s support as moderate, making it the most common response. Around 23.9 percent felt the support was slight, while 15.5 percent found it significant, and 5.9 percent believed it had helped them to a great extent. On the other hand, 20.4 percent of all respondents said ADP had not helped them at all, with manufacturing entrepreneurs reporting higher dissatisfaction than service entrepreneurs. This suggests that ADP’s initiatives may need to be more effectively tailored to address the challenges faced by manufacturing businesses in sustaining entrepreneurship.

Table 6.5.i Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and ADP's boost to continue as entrepreneur

			ADP's boost to continue as entrepreneur					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Signifi- cantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	12	35	48	23	7	125
		percent within Type	9.6percent	28.0percent	38.4percent	18.4percent	5.6percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	3.2percent	9.4percent	12.9percent	6.2percent	1.9percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	64	54	80	35	15	248
		percent within Type	25.8percent	21.8percent	32.3percent	14.1percent	6.0percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	17.2percent	14.5percent	21.4percent	9.4percent	4.0percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	76	89	128	58	22	373
		percent within Type	20.4percent	23.9percent	34.3percent	15.5percent	5.9percent	100.0percent
		percent of Total	20.4percent	23.9percent	34.3percent	15.5percent	5.9percent	100.0percent

Source: Field Survey

The table 6.5.j explores perceptions of a positive entrepreneurial environment in the entrepreneur's area, comparing service and manufacturing enterprises. Among service entrepreneurs, 28.8percent found the entrepreneurial environment to be moderate, while 28.0percent felt it was slightly positive. Around 24.8 percent believed the environment was significantly positive, and 6.4percent stated that it was positive to a great extent. However, 12.0percent of service entrepreneurs reported that there was no positive entrepreneurial environment at all.

For manufacturing entrepreneurs, 27.4 percent rated the environment as moderate, while 20.2percent considered it slightly positive. About 22.2 percent believed the environment was significantly positive, and 5.6 percent felt it was positive to a great extent. However, 24.6 percent of manufacturing entrepreneurs stated that there was no positive entrepreneurial environment at all, a much higher percent than in the service sector.

Overall, 27.9 percent of all respondents found the entrepreneurial environment to be moderate, making it the most common response. Around 22.8 percent rated it as slightly positive, while 23.1 percent considered it significantly positive. Meanwhile, 5.9 percent believed the environment was positive to a great extent. On the other hand, 20.4 percent of all respondents felt that there was no positive entrepreneurial environment in their area, with manufacturing entrepreneurs reporting higher dissatisfaction than service entrepreneurs. This suggests that creating a more supportive entrepreneurial ecosystem, especially for manufacturing businesses, could help foster enterprise growth.

Table 6. 5.j Cross Tabulation of Nature of Enterprise and Positive entrepreneurial environment in the entrepreneur’s area

			Positive entrepreneurial environment in the entrepreneur’s area					Total
			Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Signifi- cantly	To great extent	
Type	Service	Count	15	35	36	31	8	125
		percent within Type	12.0percent	28.0percent	28.8percent	24.8percent	6.4percent	100.0perce nt
		percent of Total	4.0percent	9.4percent	9.7percent	8.3percent	2.1percent	33.5percent
	Manufacturing	Count	61	50	68	55	14	248
		percent within Type	24.6percent	20.2percent	27.4percent	22.2percent	5.6percent	100.0perce nt
		percent of Total	16.4percent	13.4percent	18.2percent	14.7percent	3.8percent	66.5percent
Total		Count	76	85	104	86	22	373
		percent within Type	20.4percent	22.8percent	27.9percent	23.1percent	5.9percent	100.0perce nt
		percent of Total	20.4percent	22.8percent	27.9percent	23.1percent	5.9percent	100.0perce nt

Source: Field Survey

The table presents an Impact Score sheet designed to measure the extent of ADP's influence on entrepreneurs. The Impact Index Score (IIS) is categorized into three levels based on percent scores. This classification helps assess the effectiveness of ADP initiatives in raising awareness and supporting entrepreneurs.

Entrepreneurs who score 70 percent or more fall under the "Highly Aware" category, indicating a strong impact of ADP. Those scoring between 40 percent and 69 percent are classified as "Moderately Aware," reflecting a moderate impact of ADP. Finally, entrepreneurs with a score below 40 percent are placed in the "Low Awareness" category, signifying a low impact of ADP.

Table 6. 6. Impact Score sheet to show the extent of the impact of ADP on the entrepreneurs

<b>Impact Index Score (IIS)</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
≥ 70 percent of the total score	<b>Highly Aware</b>	Strong impact of ADP
40 percent – 69 percent of the total score	<b>Moderately Aware</b>	Moderate Impact of ADP
< 40 percent of the total score	<b>Low Awareness</b>	Low impact of ADP

Source: developed by the scholar based on literature

The following table 6.8 presents the Impact Index Score (IIS) based on various indicators assessing the effect of ADP on entrepreneurship. The total score is 9533, with each indicator contributing a weighted proportion to the overall impact.

The highest contributing factor is the "Positive entrepreneurial environment in the entrepreneur's area," with an overall weight score of 107.43 and a contribution of 10.62 percent. "Profitability of Enterprise" and "ADP's boost to continue as an entrepreneur" also show high influence, with scores above 100.7. Meanwhile, "Launching of new goods and services" has the lowest contribution, with a weight score of 83.28 and a percent of 9.35 percent. *The final weight distribution suggests that ADP plays a crucial role in business expansion, profitability, and fostering a supportive entrepreneurial environment.*

**Table 6.7.**Impact Index Score sheet

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Weight Calculation</b>	<b>Final Weight</b>	<b>Overall Weight Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
Skill Development	950	950/9533	0.099654	94.67114	9.965383
Expansion of enterprise	954	954/9533	0.100073	95.47005	10.00734
Increase in Sales	960	960/9533	0.100703	96.67471	10.07028
Increase number of employments	946	946/9533	0.099234	93.87559	9.923424
Expansion of product in new market	908	908/9533	0.095248	86.48526	9.524809
Launching of new goods and services	891	891/9533	0.093465	83.27714	9.346481
Profitability of Enterprise	978	978/9533	0.102591	100.334	10.2591
ADP's help to grow enterprise	954	954/9533	0.100073	95.47005	10.00734
ADP's boost to continue as entrepreneur	980	980/9533	0.102801	100.7448	10.28008
Positive entrepreneurial environment in the entrepreneur's area	1012	1012/9533	0.106158	107.4314	10.61576
<b>Total</b>	<b>9533</b>		<b>1.00</b>	<b>954.4342</b>	<b>10.0119</b>

Source: Computed by the scholar

#### **6.4. Conclusion**

The Aspirational Districts Programme (ADP) has been instrumental in providing targeted interventions aimed at fostering entrepreneurship in underdeveloped regions of North-East India. The findings in this chapter highlight the various benefits received by entrepreneurs, particularly in areas such as financial access, infrastructure development, skill enhancement, and agricultural support. However, while these interventions have contributed to the entrepreneurial ecosystem, their direct impact on enterprise growth, profitability, and sustainability remains limited.

Several key data insights support this conclusion:

1. **Financial Access:** While 82.6 percent of entrepreneurs availed financial subsidies, only 15percent accessed Mudra loans, highlighting gaps in credit utilization despite government efforts.
2. **Skill Development:** Only 15.8 percent of respondents benefited from short-term or long-term training programs, and 27.1 percent registered for apprenticeship programs, indicating limited impact on capacity building.
3. **Infrastructure Improvements:** 74.5 percent of respondents reported having electricity connections at both home and workplace, but only 55.2 percent had access to all-weather roads, showing partial infrastructure enhancement.
4. **Business Growth & Market Expansion:** The majority of entrepreneurs rated ADP's impact between "Slightly" and "Moderately" (31.1 percent and 32.4 percent, respectively), with less than 8percent stating it helped "to a great extent," suggesting room for stronger interventions.
5. **Profitability & Sustainability:** While 35.7 percent of entrepreneurs saw "slight" profitability growth, 13.9 percent experienced "significant" improvement, and 5.4percent reported substantial gains, reflecting a moderate but uneven economic impact.

The findings of the present chapter suggest that while many entrepreneurs have accessed financial schemes and infrastructural improvements, a significant portion still struggles with skill development, market linkages, and sustained business expansion. The moderate impact observed in key areas such as business growth, employment generation, and profitability indicates that additional policy measures may be necessary to enhance the effectiveness of ADP interventions. Though the findings also highlight high subsidy usage but low loan access, it indicates a reliance on grants over credit financing. Improved financial literacy and bank engagement are needed to increase loan uptake.

Hence, there is a need for more localized and sector-specific strategies that address the unique challenges of entrepreneurs in aspirational districts. Strengthening institutional support, improving outreach programs to enhance awareness of ADP

benefits, and fostering stronger public-private partnerships could amplify the programme's impact. Moreover, a continuous monitoring and feedback mechanism will be crucial in ensuring that the benefits of ADP translate into long-term, sustainable entrepreneurial growth in these regions.

## References

- Kumar, A., & Sharma, R. (2021). *Financial inclusion and entrepreneurship in India's backward regions*. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 56(14), 34–41.
- Ministry of Finance. (2022). *Annual report on financial inclusion schemes*. Government of India.
- Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship. (2022). *Pradhan Mantri Kaushal Vikas Yojana: Progress and impact*. Government of India.
- NITI Aayog. (2018). *Transformation of aspirational districts: Baseline ranking and real-time monitoring*. Government of India.
- NITI Aayog. (2021a). *Aspirational districts programme: Strategy for transformation*. Government of India.
- NITI Aayog. (2021b). *Champions of Change dashboard: Real-time data insights*. Retrieved from <https://www.niti.gov.in/champions-of-change>
- NITI Aayog. (2023). *Aspirational districts programme: Progress report 2022–23*. Government of India.
- Singh, P., & Bhanot, A. (2020). *Microfinance and rural entrepreneurship: A study of aspirational districts*. *Journal of Rural Development*, 39(3), 245–260.
- UNDP India. (2022). *Evaluation of the Aspirational District Programme: Socio-economic impacts*. United Nations Development Programme.