

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, ECONOMICS & MANAGEMENT

I  
J  
R  
C  
M



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed (Refereed/Juried) Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

*Indexed & Listed at:*

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A., Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A., Google Scholar,  
Indian Citation Index (ICI), Open J-Gate, India (link of the same is duly available at Infibnet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C.)),  
The American Economic Association's electronic bibliography, EconLit, U.S.A.

Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland with IC Value of 5.09 (2012) & number of libraries all around the world.

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 5656 Cities in 191 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

<http://ijrcm.org.in/>

# CONTENTS

| Sr. No. | TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S)   | Page No.  |
|---------|--|-----------|
| 1.      | FACTORS INFLUENCING INVESTMENT DECISIONS AND GENDER DIFFERENCE: A DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS<br><i>DR. MALABIKA DEO &amp; VIJAYALAKSHMI SUNDAR</i>  | 1         |
| 2.      | CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PRACTICES OF NEW PRIVATE COMMERCIAL BANKS IN KERALA<br><i>JOMON JOSE M &amp; DR. B. JOHNSON</i>  | 7         |
| 3.      | SUCCESS STORIES OF WOMEN SHG PROMOTED BY SKDRDP AND THEIR INCOME GENERATING ACTIVITIES<br><i>K POORNIMA &amp; DR. RAMANAIAH G</i>  | 11        |
| 4.      | 20 YEARS AFTER WTO: ANALYSIS OF INDIA'S FOREIGN TRADE DURING TRANSITORY-TRIPS AND POST-TRIPS PERIODS<br><i>DR. SARADA CHENGALVALA</i>  | 14        |
| 5.      | ROLE OF POLITICAL INITIATIVES CONCERNING INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE ADVENT OF ACT EAST POLICY<br><i>P. CHINGLEN SINGH &amp; DR. N. TEJMANI SINGH</i>  | 17        |
| 6.      | IMPACT OF EXCHANGE RATE VOLATILITY OF TOP TRADABLE CURRENCIES ON THE PERFORMANCE OF EXPORT ORIENTED UNITS, SEZs AND TOTAL EXPORT OF INDIA<br><i>PRASHANTHA K.J &amp; DR. MANJUNATH S.J.</i>    | 23        |
| 7.      | TRENDS OF DEBT WAIVER & DEBT RELIEF UNDER "THE AGRICULTURE DEBT WAIVER AND DEBT RELIEF SCHEME (ADWDRS), 2008" AMONG THE COMMERCIAL BANKS IN INDIA<br><i>DR. Y.NAGARAJU &amp; RAVISHANKAR L</i> | 29        |
| 8.      | EFFECTS OF DEMONETIZATION IN INDIAN BISCUIT COMPANIES<br><i>DR. P. B. BANUDEVI &amp; BAVITHRA.P</i>  | 35        |
| 9.      | INTERNATIONAL WATER CLASHES AND INDIA (A STUDY OF INDIAN RIVER-WATER TREATIES WITH BANGLADESH AND PAKISTAN)<br><i>HIMANSHU GUPTA &amp; DR. KRISHNA KISHOR TRIVEDI</i>                          | 38        |
| 10.     | A REVIEW ON INDIAN TAX STRUCTURE WITH SPECIAL FOCUS ON BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES OF GOODS AND SERVICES TAX IN INDIA<br><i>DR. JIMMY CORTON GADDAM &amp; NAGASUDHA K</i>                          | 42        |
| 11.     | DEMAND FOR ORGANIC PRODUCTS IN THE MARKET<br><i>S. BABY &amp; DR. N. RAJA</i>  | 46        |
| 12.     | ECONOMIC REFORM POST 1991 - AGRICULTURE<br><i>DR. GURAVIAH PELLURU</i>   | 52        |
| 13.     | DATA ANALYSIS OF HEALTH CONDITIONS OF LOWER STRATA OF DELHI'S POPULATION<br><i>POOJA SINGH, DR. SEEMA SHOKEEN &amp; MEGHA PANJWANI</i>   | 55        |
| 14.     | IMPACT OF JOB SATISFACTION AND WORK ENGAGEMENT ON ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT<br><i>TEJASWINI PATIL, SAHANA MELBUDDI &amp; DR. RAMANJENEYALU</i>   | 64        |
| 15.     | CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY DISCLOSURE AND CORPORATE FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE: A META-ANALYSIS<br><i>HERU DWI PRASETYA, ERWIN SARASWATI &amp; ABDUL GHOFAR</i>                                | 68        |
| 16.     | HISTORY OF HANDLOOM INDUSTRY IN INDIA<br><i>VINAY KUMAR BOLLOJU &amp; A. SREENIVAS</i>   | 73        |
| 17.     | HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT CLIMATE: A NEW ANTECEDENT OF OCB<br><i>DR. SAIMA MANZOOR</i>  | 75        |
| 18.     | VALUES, ADJUSTMENT AND FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS OF XI GRADERS AT DIFFERENT INTELLIGENCE LEVELS<br><i>SONIA</i>   | 80        |
| 19.     | BRIEF STUDY TO TREND ANALYSIS OF FDI INFLOWS INTO THE ISRAEL DURING 1971-2015<br><i>V.LEKHA</i>  | 83        |
| 20.     | CITIZENSHIP AND GLOBALIZATION IN CONTEXT OF NEW DIMENSIONS<br><i>KANWAL MARWAHA</i>  | 94        |
|         | <b>REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK &amp; DISCLAIMER</b>   | <b>98</b> |

**CHIEF PATRON****Prof. (Dr.) K. K. AGGARWAL**

Chairman, Malaviya National Institute of Technology, Jaipur  
 (An institute of National Importance & fully funded by Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India)  
 Chancellor, K. R. Mangalam University, Gurgaon  
 Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Faridabad  
 Founder Vice-Chancellor (1998-2008), Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi  
 Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

**FOUNDER PATRON****Late Sh. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL**

Former State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana  
 Former Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri  
 Former President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

**CO-ORDINATOR****Dr. BHAVET**

Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Engineering & Technology, Urjani

**ADVISOR****Prof. S. L. MAHANDRU**

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

**EDITOR****Dr. R. K. SHARMA**

Professor & Dean, Bharti Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi

**FORMER CO-EDITOR****Dr. S. GARG**

Faculty, Shree Ram Institute of Business & Management, Urjani

**EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD****Dr. TEGUH WIDODO**

Dean, Faculty of Applied Science, Telkom University, Bandung Technoplex, Jl. Telekomunikasi, Indonesia

**Dr. M. S. SENAM RAJU**

Professor, School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

**Dr. JOSÉ G. VARGAS-HERNÁNDEZ**

Research Professor, University Center for Economic & Managerial Sciences, University of Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Mexico

**Dr. M. N. SHARMA**

Chairman, M.B.A., Haryana College of Technology & Management, Kaithal

**Dr. CHRISTIAN EHIOBUCHÉ**

Professor of Global Business/Management, Larry L Luing School of Business, Berkeley College, USA

**Dr. SIKANDER KUMAR**

Chairman, Department of Economics, Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

**Dr. BOYINA RUPINI**

Director, School of ITS, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi

**Dr. MIKE AMUHAYA IRAVO**

Principal, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture & Tech., Westlands Campus, Nairobi-Kenya

**Dr. SANJIV MITTAL**

Professor &amp; Dean, University School of Management Studies, GGS Indraprastha University, Delhi

**Dr. D. S. CHAUBEY**

Professor &amp; Dean, Research &amp; Studies, Uttaranchal University, Dehradun

**Dr. NEPOMUCENO TIU**

Chief Librarian &amp; Professor, Lyceum of the Philippines University, Laguna, Philippines

**Dr. RAJENDER GUPTA**

Convener, Board of Studies in Economics, University of Jammu, Jammu

**Dr. KAUP MOHAMED**

Dean &amp; Managing Director, London American City College/ICBEST, United Arab Emirates

**Dr. DHANANJOY RAKSHIT**

Dean, Faculty Council of PG Studies in Commerce and Professor &amp; Head, Department of Commerce, Sidho-Kanho-Birsha University, Purulia

**Dr. NAWAB ALI KHAN**

Professor &amp; Dean, Faculty of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

**Dr. ANA ŠTAMBUK**

Head of Department of Statistics, Faculty of Economics, University of Rijeka, Rijeka, Croatia

**SUNIL KUMAR KARWASRA**

Principal, Aakash College of Education, ChanderKalan, Tohana, Fatehabad

**Dr. SHIB SHANKAR ROY**

Professor, Department of Marketing, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi, Bangladesh

**Dr. S. P. TIWARI**

Head, Department of Economics &amp; Rural Development, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia Avadh University, Faizabad

**Dr. SRINIVAS MADISHETTI**

Professor, School of Business, Mzumbe University, Tanzania

**Dr. ABHAY BANSAL**

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engg. &amp; Tech., Amity University, Noida

**Dr. ARAMIDE OLUFEMI KUNLE**

Dean, Department of General Studies, The Polytechnic, Ibadan, Nigeria

**Dr. ANIL CHANDHOK**

Professor, University School of Business, Chandigarh University, Gharuan

**RODRECK CHIRAU**

Associate Professor, Botho University, Francistown, Botswana

**Dr. OKAN VELI ŞAFAKLI**

Associate Professor, European University of Lefke, Lefke, Cyprus

**PARVEEN KHURANA**

Associate Professor, Mukand Lal National College, Yamuna Nagar

**Dr. KEVIN LOW LOCK TENG**

Associate Professor, Deputy Dean, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Kampar, Perak, Malaysia

**Dr. BORIS MILOVIC**

Associate Professor, Faculty of Sport, Union Nikola Tesla University, Belgrade, Serbia

**SHASHI KHURANA**

Associate Professor, S. M. S. Khalsa Lubana Girls College, Barara, Ambala

**Dr. IQBAL THONSE HAWALDAR**

Associate Professor, College of Business Administration, Kingdom University, Bahrain

**Dr. DEEPANJANA VARSHNEY**

Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, King Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

**Dr. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA**

Associate Professor, Government College, Hodal

**Dr. BIEMBA MALITI**

Associate Professor, School of Business, The Copperbelt University, Main Campus, Zambia

**Dr. ALEXANDER MOSESOV**

Associate Professor, Kazakh-British Technical University (KBTU), Almaty, Kazakhstan

**Dr. VIVEK CHAWLA**

Associate Professor, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**Dr. FERIT ÖLÇER**

Professor &amp; Head of Division of Management &amp; Organization, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Economics &amp; Business Administration Sciences, Mustafa Kemal University, Turkey

**Dr. ASHOK KUMAR CHAUHAN**

Reader, Department of Economics, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra

**Dr. RAJESH MODI**

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

**YU-BING WANG**

Faculty, department of Marketing, Feng Chia University, Taichung, Taiwan

**Dr. SAMBHAVNA**

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

**Dr. KIARASH JAHANPOUR**

Research Adviser, Farabi Institute of Higher Education, Mehrshahr, Karaj, Alborz Province, Iran

**Dr. MELAKE TEWOLDE TECLEGHIORGIS**

Faculty, College of Business &amp; Economics, Department of Economics, Asmara, Eritrea

**Dr. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE**

Faculty, Dept. of Commerce, School of Business Studies, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga

**Dr. THAMPOE MANAGALESWARAN**

Faculty, Vavuniya Campus, University of Jaffna, Sri Lanka

**Dr. VIKAS CHOUDHARY**

Faculty, N.I.T. (University), Kurukshetra

**SURAJ GAUDEL**

BBA Program Coordinator, LA GRANDEE International College, Simalchaur - 8, Pokhara, Nepal

**Dr. DILIP KUMAR JHA**

Faculty, Department of Economics, Guru Ghasidas Vishwavidyalaya, Bilaspur

**FORMER TECHNICAL ADVISOR****AMITA****FINANCIAL ADVISORS****DICKEN GOYAL**

Advocate &amp; Tax Adviser, Panchkula

**NEENA**

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

**LEGAL ADVISORS****JITENDER S. CHAHAL**

Advocate, Punjab &amp; Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

**CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA**

Advocate &amp; Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

**SUPERINTENDENT****SURENDER KUMAR POONIA**

## CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to the recent developments & practices in the areas of Computer Science & Applications; Commerce; Business; Finance; Marketing; Human Resource Management; General Management; Banking; Economics; Tourism Administration & Management; Education; Law; Library & Information Science; Defence & Strategic Studies; Electronic Science; Corporate Governance; Industrial Relations; and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Rural Economics; Co-operation; Demography; Development Planning; Development Studies; Applied Economics; Development Economics; Business Economics; Monetary Policy; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Political Science; Continuing Education; Labour Welfare; Philosophy; Psychology; Sociology; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law; Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labour Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; International Relations; Human Rights & Duties; Public Administration; Population Studies; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism & Hospitality; Transportation Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic; Web Design and emerging paradigms in allied subjects.

Anybody can submit the **soft copy** of unpublished novel; original; empirical and high quality **research work/manuscript** **anytime** in **M.S. Word format** after preparing the same as per our **GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION**; at our email address i.e. [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com) or online by clicking the link **online submission** as given on our website ([FOR ONLINE SUBMISSION, CLICK HERE](#)).

## GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

### 1. **COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **THE EDITOR**

IJRCM

**Subject:** SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF \_\_\_\_\_.

(e.g. Finance/Mkt./HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)

#### **DEAR SIR/MADAM**

Please find my submission of manuscript titled ' \_\_\_\_\_ ' for likely publication in one of your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published anywhere in any language fully or partly, nor it is under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the co-authors of this manuscript have seen the submitted version of the manuscript and have agreed to inclusion of their names as co-authors.

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal. The Journal has discretion to publish our contribution in any of its journals.

#### **NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

Designation/Post\* :

Institution/College/University with full address & Pin Code :

Residential address with Pin Code :

Mobile Number (s) with country ISD code :

Is WhatsApp or Viber active on your above noted Mobile Number (Yes/No) :

Landline Number (s) with country ISD code :

E-mail Address :

Alternate E-mail Address :

Nationality :

\* i.e. Alumnus (Male Alumni), Alumna (Female Alumni), Student, Research Scholar (M. Phil), Research Scholar (Ph. D.), JRF, Research Assistant, Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Junior Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor, Senior Assistant Professor, Co-ordinator, Reader, Associate Professor, Professor, Head, Vice-Principal, Dy. Director, Principal, Director, Dean, President, Vice Chancellor, Industry Designation etc. **The qualification of author is not acceptable for the purpose.**

**NOTES:**

- a) The whole manuscript has to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only, which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript. **pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration.**
  - b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN of the mail:**  
**New Manuscript for Review in the area of** (e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Mgt./Engineering/Economics/Computer/IT/ Education/Psychology/Law/Math/other, please specify)
  - c) There is no need to give any text in the body of the mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any **specific message** w.r.t. to the manuscript.
  - d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is expected to be below **1000 KB.**
  - e) Only the **Abstract will not be considered for review** and the author is required to submit the **complete manuscript** in the first instance.
  - f) **The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email within twenty-four hours** and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of the manuscript, within two days of its submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending a separate mail to the journal.
  - g) The author (s) name or details should not appear anywhere on the body of the manuscript, except on the covering letter and the cover page of the manuscript, in the manner as mentioned in the guidelines.
2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be typed in **bold letters, centered and fully capitalised.**
  3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** Author (s) **name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline number (s), and email/alternate email address** should be given underneath the title.
  4. **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:** Acknowledgements can be given to reviewers, guides, funding institutions, etc., if any.
  5. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in **fully Italic printing**, ranging between **150 to 300 words**. The abstract must be informative and elucidating the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a **SINGLE PARA. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.**
  6. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of **five**. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stop at the end. All words of the keywords, including the first one should be in small letters, except special words e.g. name of the Countries, abbreviations etc.
  7. **JEL CODE:** Provide the appropriate Journal of Economic Literature Classification System code (s). JEL codes are available at [www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php](http://www.aea-web.org/econlit/jelCodes.php). However, mentioning of JEL Code is not mandatory.
  8. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER. It should be free from any errors i.e. grammatical, spelling or punctuation. It must be thoroughly edited at your end.**
  9. **HEADINGS:** All the headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
  10. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
  11. **MAIN TEXT:**

**THE MAIN TEXT SHOULD FOLLOW THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE:****INTRODUCTION****REVIEW OF LITERATURE****NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY****STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM****OBJECTIVES****HYPOTHESIS (ES)****RESEARCH METHODOLOGY****RESULTS & DISCUSSION****FINDINGS****RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS****CONCLUSIONS****LIMITATIONS****SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH****REFERENCES****APPENDIX/ANNEXURE****The manuscript should preferably be in 2000 to 5000 WORDS, But the limits can vary depending on the nature of the manuscript.**

12. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal **CLEAR, centered, separately numbered** & self-explained, and the **titles must be above the table/figure. Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure. It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.**
13. **EQUATIONS/FORMULAE:** These should be consecutively numbered in parenthesis, left aligned with equation/formulae number placed at the right. The equation editor provided with standard versions of Microsoft Word may be utilised. If any other equation editor is utilised, author must confirm that these equations may be viewed and edited in versions of Microsoft Office that does not have the editor.
14. **ACRONYMS:** These should not be used in the abstract. The use of acronyms is elsewhere is acceptable. Acronyms should be defined on its first use in each section e.g. Reserve Bank of India (RBI). Acronyms should be redefined on first use in subsequent sections.
15. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. **The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript** and they may follow Harvard Style of Referencing. **Also check to ensure that everything that you are including in the reference section is duly cited in the paper.** The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
- All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
  - Use (ed.) for one editor, and (ed.s) for multiple editors.
  - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc., in chronologically ascending order.
  - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
  - The title of books and journals should be in italic printing. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
  - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parenthesis.
  - **Headers, footers, endnotes and footnotes should not be used in the document.** However, **you can mention short notes to elucidate some specific point**, which may be placed in number orders before the references.

**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:**

**BOOKS**

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

**CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS**

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

**JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES**

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

**CONFERENCE PAPERS**

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–23

**UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS**

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

**ONLINE RESOURCES**

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

**WEBSITES**

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>

## ROLE OF POLITICAL INITIATIVES CONCERNING INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE ADVENT OF ACT EAST POLICY

**P. CHINGLEN SINGH**

**LECTURER**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NAMBOL HIGHER SECONDARY SCHOOL  
NAMBOL BISHNUPUR**

**DR. N. TEJMANI SINGH**

**ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR**

**COMMERCE DEPARTMENT  
MANIPUR UNIVERSITY  
IMPHAL**

### ABSTRACT

*The new phase marks a shift in focus from trade to wider economic and security cooperation, political partnerships, physical connectivity through road and rail links. India-ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nation) cooperation now covers a wide field, including trade and investment, science & technology, tourism, human resource development, transportation and infrastructure, and health and pharmaceuticals. India signed 'Long Term Cooperative Partnership for Peace and Prosperity' with ASEAN, which is the corner-stone of India's LEP. India prefers to use the Comprehensive Economic Cooperation Agreement as a template for Free Trade Agreements (FTAs), because of its comprehensive coverage of goods and services trade as well as investment. According to Rajiv Sikri, Secretary East of the Ministry External Affairs, 'the Look East Policy envisages the Northeast region not as the periphery of India, but as the centre of a thriving and integrated economic space linking two dynamic regions with a network of highways, railways, pipelines, transmission lines crisscrossing the region.' It is an effort to open the region that involved opening doors in intellectual, cultural, political matters as well as in the economic arena. However, the process of enhancing connectivity is not a cakewalk because there are also geographical, technical, political and security challenges that limit the process of infrastructure development. To take maximum benefit from the policy, the North-eastern region should develop industrially. The new NE Industrial Policy 2007 has practically made the whole region a special economic zone. Otherwise, no policy initiative, no opportunity is going to benefit the NE region.*

### KEYWORDS

ASEAN, look east policy, political partnerships, infrastructure, geographical.

### INTRODUCTION

Political and Security Issues- ASEAN has expressed desirability to work together to fight terrorism and transnational crime, combating corruption and promoting good governance and the protection of human rights as well as cooperation in forums such as **ARF (hereinafter ASEAN Regional Forum)** and the **MGC (hereinafter Mekong Ganga Cooperation)**. The crowning glory of the **Look East Policy (hereinafter LEP)** is the signing of the India-ASEAN Free Trade Agreement on 13 August 2009 at Bangkok. The agreement was only for trade-in-goods and did not include software and IT. Negotiations for agreements on services and investment are in progress. Two-way trade between India and ASEAN was \$ 47 billion in 2008 and both parties expect a \$ 10 billion increase even in the first year. The **Free Trade Agreement (hereinafter FTA)** is part of the Framework Agreement on Comprehensive Cooperation signed with ASEAN in 2003. The FTA is significant for the reason that it is the first multilateral trade agreement entered into by India on ASEAN-India Summits. Hence, LEP is an attempt to forge closer and deeper economic integration with its eastern neighbors as a part of the new very politic evidence in India's foreign policy. In addition, the engagement with ASEAN is a part of the recognition on the part of India's strategic and economic importance of the region to the country's national interests. As the then PM Manmohan Singh said, the LEP is not merely an external economic policy; it is also a strategic shift in India's vision of the world and India's place in the evolving global economy.

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of Literature for the concerned study is essential to produce accurate and sufficient information related to the area of study. In other word, referring to the studies done previously is the foundation upon which development facts can be making possible. Therefore, an attempt has been made to review some of the available studies. The researcher had arranged the list according to the basis of concern year in chronological order. Many further studies may said to be need to identify problems of the concern topic. In this perspective, the present investigation proposed here is to be quite relevant.

**Chattatopadhyay (2008)** ensured to safety and security of tourists, the tourist industry should be destroyed by political unrest and terrorism.

**Kojima (2007)** highlighted the evolution of international trafficking in women appears to be closely linked to two areas: i) changing demands for women's labour in the global political economy, and ii) the changing patterns of international migration. The role of women in migration is because of being dependents on male who migrants to becomes the major economic phenomenon.

**Nandeibam (2013)** mention that we are in trouble again; perhaps, our own creation, a man-made trouble, a product of ignorance and arrogance, a hybrid of burden of history and hurdle of politics and a result of lop-sided political and economic design. If the right thinking is the ultimate asset of the nation, where do we stand now? When the literacy is 80 %, do we do exercise of 50 % of right thinking? Did not you like to have cheerful neighbours as sine- quo- non-for emotional stability? Once you destroy the foundation of peace and social order, the general atmosphere is imperiled and investment is bound to suffer. Subsequently the spiraling web of poverty and deprivation would endanger you and your society. How long NHs should be under the control of Highwaymen. Is it the fair sign of human civilization? How it could be possible that we feel strange in our own homeland? Are we getting close to the bigger world or are we getting close to the mini world while the new article of existence is "think globally and act locally"? Of course, conflict is unavoidable facet of modern life. We can at best contain the violence but we cannot address the root cause. Manipur remain terribly plagued with Insecurity of Life, Investment, Insecurity of Business and Insecurity of Income. Perhaps the funniest thing after 67 years of economic planning is Fuel Insecurity. It is also funny that when you talk of e-governance, e-banking and digital India, Manipur, a land of 27 lakhs, cannot even manage Petrol Market. How can you manage investment market? Go to basics before you go global.

### HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY

**Ho:** There is no difference among the three types of Industry viz. Service, Manufacturing and Trading sectors of Manipur with respect to presences of Quality Infrastructurespecially Tele-communication facilities.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

To explore the associated relevancy (viz. Infrastructure, Tourism, Foreign Direct Investments) of India’s Look East Policy and Manipur in particular of India.

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Study tools:** Pretested semi structural questionnaire (prepared for purposed)

**Sampling method:** Purposive Sampling

**Sample size:** It consists of 88 respondents.

**Statistical analysis:** After thorough checking and scrutinized the raw data, statistical data processing and analysis was performed through SPSS version 21. Results are report as number of cases/frequencies along with percentages. In order to establish the association, Pearson  $\chi^2$  - test/Likelihood Ratio  $\chi^2$  - test is use if data permit. All comparisons are two-sided and the P-values of < 0.05 and < 0.01 are treating as the cut off values for significance and highly significance respectively.

**FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**

With the addition of Myanmar and, in 2004, of Bhutan and Nepal, the grouping came to be known as **BIMSTEC or the Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation**. This forum has identified six sectors for focused cooperation: 1. Trade and Investment, 2. Technology, 3. Transport and Communications, 4. Energy, 5. Tourism and 6. Fisheries. When India initiated BIMSTEC in 1997, it received strong support from Thailand, which also saw it as a political and economic forum to bridge SEA and South Asia. India promotes BIMSTEC to establish economic links with peninsula member countries of ASEAN to boost the development of its seven NE states.

Since 2002, India has annual summits with ASEAN along with China, Japan and Republic of Korea. These political level interactions are further strengthen through the Senior Officials’ meetings, as also specialized working groups in functional areas. India-ASEAN functional cooperation includes cooperation in sectors such as Science & Technology, Health and Pharmaceuticals, Sciences, Agriculture, Infrastructure, Tourism and Culture and Small and Medium Enterprises etc. In his speech, former PM **Manmohan Singh** referred to India’s NE as a gateway to ‘Asian Century’. Through these efforts the government of India is showing its keenness in developing the NE. But still the government lacks commitment in its various efforts.

**TABLE 1: INDUSTRY ACCORDING TO TOURIST IN INCREASED EROSION& ENVIRONMENT ACCIDENT**

| Type of Industry | Tourist has increased the erosion & environmental accidents. |           |           | Total      |
|------------------|--|-----------|-----------|------------|
|                  | Yes  | No        | Can't say |            |
| Manufacturing    | 2(18.2%)   | 8(72.7%)  | 1(9.1%)   | 11(100.0%) |
| Service          | 0  | 4(100.0%) | 0         | 4(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 0  | 5(83.3%)  | 1(16.7%)  | 6(100.0%)  |
| Total            | 2(9.5%)  | 17(81.0%) | 2(9.5%)   | 21(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used

**TABLE 2: TYPE OF INDUSTRY ACCORDING TO TOURISM HAS INCREASED THE CONTAMINATION OF WATER**

| Type of Industry | Tourism has increased the contamination of water |           | Total      |
|------------------|--|-----------|------------|
|                  | No   | Can't say |            |
| Manufacturing    | 10(90.9%)  | 1(9.1%)   | 11(100.0%) |
| Service          | 4(100.0%)  | 0         | 4(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 5(83.3%)   | 1(16.7%)  | 6(100.0%)  |
| Total            | 19(90.5%)  | 2(9.5%)   | 21(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

The questions relating to the tourists – i) Tourist has increased the erosion problem and environmental accidents like landslides, and ii) Tourism has increased the contamination of water bodies such as Loktak lake are made in tables-1: and 2:. It may be observed for the former question that 9.5%, 81.0% and 9.5% of the respondents respond yes, no and can't say respectively. On the contrary in latter question, there is no ‘yes’ answer but ‘no’ and ‘can't say’ pertain to 90.5% and 9.5% respectively. Further, the tables exhaustive made illustration of % variations within each answer with respective of type of industry, considered in the study.

**TABLE 3: INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO INCREASE NUMBER OF TOURISTS AT THE SITES HAS INCREASE DEMAND OF WATER RESOURCES WHICH HAS RESULTED IN SHORTAGE OF THESE RESOURCES**

| Type of Industry | Increase in tourists has resulted in shortage of resources | Total      |
|------------------|--|------------|
|                  | Yes  |            |
| Manufacturing    | 11(100.0%)   | 11(100.0%) |
| Service          | 4(100.0%)  | 4(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 6(100.0%)  | 6(100.0%)  |
| Total            | 21(100.0%)   | 21(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  can't be used.

Table-3: highpoints that all the industry felt yes on the question of increase number of tourists at the sites has increase demand of water resources which has resulted in shortage of resources.

**TABLE 4: INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO THE HILL AREAS AFFECTED BY DEVELOPMENTAL PROJECTS**

| Type of Industry | Hill areas affected adversely due to the development projects |           |           | Total      |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------|------------|
|                  | Yes   | No        | Can't say |            |
| Manufacturing    | 1(9.1%)   | 9(81.8%)  | 1(9.1%)   | 11(100.0%) |
| Service          | 0   | 4(100.0%) | 0         | 4(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 0   | 6(100.0%) | 0         | 6(100.0%)  |
| Total            | 1(4.8%)   | 19(90.5%) | 1(4.8%)   | 21(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

The question relating to vegetation on the hill areas has been affected adversely due to the developmental projects at the destination; most of them felt ‘no’ (90.5%) while 4.8% each of them respond ‘yes’ and ‘can't say’.

TABLE 5: INDUSTRY-WISE DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO TOURISTS CAUSE CONGESTION AND SUFFOCATION

| Type of Industry | Tourists cause congestion and suffocation. |            |
|------------------|--|------------|
|                  | No   | Total      |
| Manufacturing    | 11(100.0%)                                 | 11(100.0%) |
| Service          | 4(100.0%)                                  | 4(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 6(100.0%)                                  | 6(100.0%)  |
| Total            | 21(100.0%)                                 | 21(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Table-5 highlights that all the individuals of types of industry answer 'no' on the question – heavy rush of tourists at certain occasion cause congestion and suffocation.

TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION BASE ON 'FREQUENT SIGHTS OF GARBAGE AND UNHYGIENIC AT TOURIST SPOT

| Type of Industry | Garbage and unhygienic conditions at the tourist spot |          |           | Total      |
|------------------|---|----------|-----------|------------|
|                  | Yes   | No       | Can't say |            |
| Manufacturing    | 8(72.7%)  | 3(27.3%) | 0         | 11(100.0%) |
| Service          | 1(20.0%)  | 1(20.0%) | 3(60.0%)  | 5(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 5(83.3%)  | 1(16.7%) | 0         | 6(100.0%)  |
| Total            | 14(63.6%)   | 5(22.7%) | 3(13.6%)  | 22(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used

The question – there are frequent sights of garbage and unhygienic conditions en route the tourist spot – 63.6% of them felt yes while 22.7% and 13.6% felt 'no' and 'can't say' respectively. Again table shows the variation of percentages when classification is equipped in terms of type of industry, considered.

TABLE 7: TYPE OF INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO PRESENCE OF QUALITY INFRASTRUCTURE

| Type of Industry | Presence of Quality Infrastructure |           |              |          | Total      |
|------------------|------------------------------------|-----------|--------------|----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor                          | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good     |            |
| Manufacturing    | 3(50.0%)                           | 3(50.0%)  | 0            | 0        | 6(100.0%)  |
| Service          | 6(20.0%)                           | 12(63.2%) | 3(15.8%)     | 1(3.3%)  | 30(100.0%) |
| Trading          | 1(20.0%)                           | 19(63.3%) | 4(13.3%)     | 1(10.0%) | 10(100.0%) |
| Total            | 14(28.6%)                          | 26(53.1%) | 7(14.3%)     | 2(4.1%)  | 49(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

With reference to presence of quality infrastructure (roads, railways, airports and ports), the study subjects/individuals gave their views as very poor, poor, satisfactory and good by the respective percentages of 28.6, 53.1, 14.3 and 4.1. Further, the table exhaustive illustrates percentage variations within each answer with respective of type of industry, considered in the present study. However, test would not be applicable as some of the cell frequencies are less. Table-7: show the presence of quality infrastructure and  $\chi^2$  - test can't be used.

TABLE 8: TYPE OF INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS ACCORDING TO TELE-COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

| Type of Industry | Tele-communication Facilities (Internet, phone) |           |              |           | Total      |
|------------------|---|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor                                       | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good      |            |
| Manufacturing    | 0   | 8(61.5%)  | 2(15.4%)     | 3(23.1%)  | 13(100.0%) |
| Service          | 2(6.1%)   | 9(27.3%)  | 13(39.4%)    | 9(27.3%)  | 33(100.0%) |
| Trading          | 1(4.8%)   | 10(47.6%) | 7(33.3%)     | 3(14.3%)  | 21(100.0%) |
| Total            | 3(4.5%)   | 27(40.3%) | 22(32.8%)    | 15(22.4%) | 67(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2 = 6.504$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $P = .369$

The above table displays type of industry and Tele-communication facilities (internet, phone), and it may further be noticed from it that industrialists view on the matter are 4.5%, 40.3%, 32.8% and 22.4% with the respective opinion of very poor, poor, satisfactory and good. The table exhaustive shown percentage variations within each answer with respective of type of industry, considered in the present study.

TABLE 9: INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO TAXATION POLICY (CORPORATE, EXCISE, VAT, TAX)

| Type of Industry | Taxation Policy |           |              |           | Total      |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor       | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good      |            |
| Manufacturing    | 0               | 4(44.4%)  | 1(11.1%)     | 4(44.4%)  | 9(100.0%)  |
| Service          | 3(11.5%)        | 5(19.2%)  | 9(34.6%)     | 9(34.6%)  | 26(100.0%) |
| Trading          | 2(16.7%)        | 3(25.0%)  | 4(33.3%)     | 3(25.0%)  | 12(100.0%) |
| Total            | 5(10.6%)        | 12(25.5%) | 14(29.8%)    | 16(34.0%) | 47(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2 = 4.938$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $P = 0.552$

As the similar pattern of the previous tables, table-9: too displays percentage distribution of study subjects in terms of type of industry and taxation policy (corporate tax, excise, VAT & indirect taxes) and it may further be noticed from it that industrialists view on the matter are 10.6%, 25.5%, 29.8%, and 34.0%, with the respective opinions of very poor, poor, satisfactory and good. Further, the table exhaustive illustrates % variations within each answer with respective industry, considered in the study. The test value designates insignificant statistically ( $P=0.552$ ).

TABLE 10: TYPE OF INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

| Type of Industry | Environmental Regulations |            |              |          |            | Total     |
|------------------|---------------------------|------------|--------------|----------|------------|-----------|
|                  | Very poor                 | Poor       | Satisfactory | Good     | Excellence |           |
| Manufacturing    | 0                         | 5 (55.6 %) | 1(11.1%)     | 3(33.3%) | 0          | 9 (100%)  |
| Service          | 0                         | 4(44.4%)   | 3(33.3%)     | 0        | 2(22.2%)   | 9 (100%)  |
| Trading          | 1(10.0%)                  | 3(30.0%)   | 5(50.0%)     | 1(10.0%) | 0          | 10 (100%) |
| Total            | 1(3.6%)                   | 12(42.9%)  | 9(32.1%)     | 4(14.3%) | 2(7.1%)    | 28(100%)  |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Similarly, the information on environmental regulations with respect to type of individuals is also furnished in the table-11: and outcomes suggest that 33.6%, 42.9%, 32.1%, 14.3% and 7.1% of the individuals provided their grading as very poor, poor, satisfactory, and good and excellence. The table, further, comprehensively shows percentage variations within each answer.

**TABLE-11: TYPE OF INDUSTRY-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS ACCORDING TO REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

| Type of Industry | Regulatory Framework (Company Laws and Other laws) |           |              |          |            | Total      |
|------------------|--|-----------|--------------|----------|------------|------------|
|                  | Very poor  | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good     | Excellence |            |
| Manufacturing    | 0  | 6(85.7%)  | 0            | 1(14.3%) | 0          | 7 (100.0%) |
| Service          | 0  | 8(33.3%)  | 8(33.3%)     | 6(25.0%) | 2(8.3%)    | 24 (100%)  |
| Trading          | 1(14.3%)   | 2(28.6%)  | 3(42.9%)     | 1(14.3%) | 0          | 7(100.0%)  |
| Total            | 1(2.6%)  | 16(42.1%) | 11(28.9%)    | 8(21.1%) | 2(5.3%)    | 38 (100%)  |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Table-11: deals with type of industry distribution according to regulatory framework (laws for operating business) that expressed in terms of %. It is observed that 2.6%, 42.1%, 28.9%, 21.1% and 5.3% of industrialists, regardless of the type of industry, understandings as very poor, poor, satisfactory, good and excellence. Table, comprehensively shows % variations within each answer with respect to type of industry but test is not applicable.

**TABLE 12: TYPE OF INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO EASE OF LAND ACQUISITION**

| Type of Industry | Ease of Land Acquisition |          |              |          | Total      |
|------------------|--------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor                | Poor     | Satisfactory | Good     |            |
| Manufacturing    | 1(14.3%)                 | 4(57.1%) | 2(28.6%)     | 0        | 7(100.0%)  |
| Service          | 0                        | 2(22.2%) | 6(66.7%)     | 1(11.1%) | 9(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 4(40.0%)                 | 2(20.0%) | 3(30.0%)     | 1(10.0%) | 10 (100%)  |
| Total            | 5(19.2%)                 | 8(30.8%) | 11(42.3%)    | 2(7.7%)  | 26(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Once more, same table is made on the information of ease of land acquisition which is furthermore supplied on table-12: and it further indicates that out of the individuals, irrespective of the type of industry, 19.2%, 30.8%, 42.3% and 7.7% opted their assessments as very poor, poor, satisfactory and good.

**TABLE 13: TYPE OF INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS ACCORDING TO QUALITY OF BUREAUCRACY**

| Type of Industry | Quality of Bureaucracy |           |              |           |            | Total     |
|------------------|------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|                  | Very poor              | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good      | Excellence |           |
| Manufacturing    | 2(28.6%)               | 4(57.1%)  | 0            | 1(14.3%)  | 0          | 7 (100%)  |
| Service          | 3(11.1%)               | 9(33.3%)  | 4(14.8%)     | 9(33.3%)  | 2(7.4%)    | 27 (100%) |
| Trading          | 3(33.3%)               | 2(22.2%)  | 2(22.2%)     | 2(22.2%)  | 0          | 9 (100%)  |
| Total            | 8(18.6%)               | 15(34.9%) | 6(14.0%)     | 12(27.9%) | 2(4.7%)    | 43 (100%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Now, there are five answers – very poor, poor, satisfactory, good, and excellence – in the question of quality of bureaucracy. It is found from the table-13: that out of the individuals, irrespective of the type of industry, 18.6%, 34.9%, 14.0%, 27.9% and 4.7% assess their views. And again, the percentage is classified within each answer with respect to type of industry.

**TABLE 14: TYPE OF INDUSTRY ACCORDING TO AVAILABILITY OF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY**

| Type of Industry | Availability of advanced Technology |          |              |           | Total      |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|-----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor                           | Poor     | Satisfactory | Good      |            |
| Manufacturing    | 4(50.0%)                            | 1(12.5%) | 2(25.0%)     | 1 (12.5%) | 8(100.0%)  |
| Service          | 1(10.0%)                            | 2(20.0%) | 2(20.0%)     | 5(50.0%)  | 10(100.0%) |
| Trading          | 4(40.0%)                            | 3(30.0%) | 2(20.0%)     | 1(10.0%)  | 10(100.0%) |
| Total            | 9(32.1%)                            | 6(21.4%) | 6(21.4%)     | 7(25.0%)  | 28(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2 = 7.128$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $P = 0.309$

There are four answers – very poor, poor, satisfactory and good – in the question of availability of advanced technology which is further distributed over three types of industry in the present study. It is establish that out of the individuals, irrespective of the type of industry, 32.1%, 21.4%, 21.4% and 25.0% opted their understandings as very poor, poor, satisfactory and good respectively. And again, the % is classified within each answer according to industry.

**TABLE 15: INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO SUPPLIERS AND INDUSTRIAL CLUSTERS**

| Type of Industry | Presence of raw-material suppliers and other related industrial clusters |           |              |          | Total      |
|------------------|--|-----------|--------------|----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor  | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good     |            |
| Manufacturing    | 7(63.6%)   | 2(18.2%)  | 2(18.2%)     | 0        | 11(100.0%) |
| Service          | 0  | 3(33.3%)  | 0            | 6(66.7%) | 9(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 6(30.0%)   | 7(35.0%)  | 5(25.0%)     | 2(10.0%) | 20(100.0%) |
| Total            | 13(32.5%)  | 12(30.0%) | 7(17.5%)     | 8(20.0%) | 40(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used

Yet again, same table is made on the information of presence of raw-material suppliers and other related industrial clusters on the elsewhere the four answers which is set forth in the table-15: that further indicates that out of the individuals considered, 32.5%, 30.0%, 17.5% and 20.0% chosen their views as very poor, poor, satisfactory and good respectively. And for a second time, percentage is categorized within each response with respect to type of industry (table 15:).

**TABLE 16: DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO AVAILABILITY OF PARTNERS AND SERVICE PROVIDERS**

| Type of Industry | Availability of logistics partners and service providers |          |              |           | Total     |
|------------------|--|----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
|                  | Very poor  | Poor     | Satisfactory | Good      |           |
| Manufacture      | 3(37.5%)   | 1(12.5%) | 2(25.0%)     | 2(25.0%)  | 8(100.0%) |
| Service          | 2(7.7%)  | 4(15.4%) | 7(26.9%)     | 13(50.0%) | 26 (100%) |
| Trading          | 0  | 1(11.1%) | 3(33.3%)     | 5(55.6%)  | 9(100.0%) |
| Total            | 5(11.6%)   | 6(14.0%) | 12(27.9%)    | 20(46.5%) | 43 (100%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2 = 7.251; df = 6; P = .298$

The information of availability of logistics partners and other service providers required is distributed over the type and their possible answers are clubbed as same as elsewhere to 4 answers; and findings are exhibited in the table-16: It designates that out of the individuals, very poor, poor, satisfactory and good have corresponds 11.6%, 14.0%, 27.9% and 46.5% respectively. Again,  $\chi^2$ -test is found to be insignificant at 5% probability level (P=0.298).

**TABLE 17: TYPE OF INDUSTRY ACCORDING TO STABILITY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE POLITICAL SYSTEM**

| Type of Industry | Stability and effectiveness of the political system |           |              |          | Total      |
|------------------|---|-----------|--------------|----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor   | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good     |            |
| Manufacturing    | 5(71.4%)  | 0         | 0            | 2(28.6%) | 7(100.0%)  |
| Service          | 8(25.0%)  | 12(37.5%) | 12(37.5%)    | 0        | 32(100.0%) |
| Trading          | 6(40.0%)  | 4(26.7%)  | 3(20.0%)     | 2(13.3%) | 15(100.0%) |
| Total            | 19(35.2%)   | 16(29.6%) | 15(27.8%)    | 4(7.4%)  | 54(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Freshly, same table is made on the information of stability and effectiveness of the political system which is also abounding on table-17: that instantaneously indicates that out of the individuals, irrespective of the type of industry, 35.2%, 29.6%, 27.8% and 7.4% picked up their prophecies as very poor, poor, satisfactory and good. Due to fewer frequencies in some of the cells in the table,  $\chi^2$ -test would not be applicable.

**TABLE 18: TYPE OF INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO CRIME-FREE, SECURITY AND LEGAL SYSTEM**

| Type of Industry | Crime-free, Security and effectiveness of legal system |          |              |          |            | Total     |
|------------------|--|----------|--------------|----------|------------|-----------|
|                  | Very poor  | Poor     | Satisfactory | Good     | Excellence |           |
| Manufacturing    | 3(42.9%)   | 1(14.3%) | 0            | 3(42.9%) | 0          | 7(100.0%) |
| Service          | 11(42.3%)  | 3(11.5%) | 9(34.6%)     | 1(3.8%)  | 2(7.7%)    | 26 (100%) |
| Trading          | 2(40.0%)   | 0        | 2(40.0%)     | 1(20.0%) | 0          | 5(100.0%) |
| Total            | 16(42.1%)  | 4(10.5%) | 11(28.9%)    | 5(13.2%) | 2(5.3%)    | 38 (100%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Concerning about the crime-free environment, security and effectiveness of legal system, the respondent gave their views as very poor, poor, satisfactory, good and excellence by the respective percentages of 42.1, 10.5, 28.9, 13.2 and 5.3. The table exhaustive illustrations % variations within each answer with respective to type of industry, considered in study.

**TABLE 19: INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO CORRUPTION IN THE GOVERNMENT SYSTEM**

| Type of Industry | Corruption in the government system |          |              |          | Total      |
|------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|--------------|----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor                           | Poor     | Satisfactory | Good     |            |
| Manufacturing    | 5(62.5%)                            | 3(37.5%) | 0            | 0        | 8(100.0%)  |
| Service          | 1(11.1%)                            | 1(11.1%) | 5(55.6%)     | 2(22.2%) | 9(100.0%)  |
| Trading          | 2(22.2%)                            | 3(33.3%) | 4(44.4%)     | 0        | 9(100.0%)  |
| Total            | 8(30.8%)                            | 7(26.9%) | 9(34.6%)     | 2 (7.7%) | 26(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used

Information of corruption in the government system is furnished on table-19: which designate supplementary that 30.8%, 26.9%, 34.6% and 7.7% of the respondents furnished their views as very poor, poor, satisfactory and good. Further, the table exhaustive illustrations percentage variations within each answer with respective of type of industry.

**TABLE 20: TYPE OF INDUSTRY-WISE DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS ACCORDING TO POWER AVAILABILITY**

| Type of Industry | Power Availability |           |              |          | Total      |
|------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------|----------|------------|
|                  | Very poor          | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good     |            |
| Manufacturing    | 4(50.0%)           | 4(50.0%)  | 0            | 0        | 8(100.0%)  |
| Service          | 3(12.0%)           | 9(36.0%)  | 6(24.0%)     | 7(28.0%) | 25(100.0%) |
| Trading          | 11(68.8%)          | 4(25.0%)  | 1(6.2%)      | 0        | 16(100.0%) |
| Total            | 18(36.7%)          | 17(34.7%) | 7 (14.3%)    | 7(14.3%) | 49(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Regarding the power availability, table-20 indicates that 36.7%, 34.7%, 14.3% and 14.3% of the individuals irrespective of type of industry furnished their understandings as very poor, poor, satisfactory, and good. Further, the table thoroughly exhibits percentage variations within each answer according to type of industry, considered in the present study.

**TABLE 21: INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO GOVERNMENT SUPPORT IN EXPORTS AND MARKETING**

| Type of Industry | Government support in exports and marketing outside the country |          |              |          |            | Total     |
|------------------|---|----------|--------------|----------|------------|-----------|
|                  | Very poor   | Poor     | Satisfactory | Good     | Excellence |           |
| Manufacturing    | 6(75.0%)  | 0        | 0            | 0        | 2(25.0%)   | 8(100.0%) |
| Service          | 0   | 3(25.0%) | 6(50.0%)     | 3(25.0%) | 0          | 12 (100%) |
| Trading          | 2(25.0%)  | 4(50.0%) | 2(25.0%)     | 0        | 0          | 8(100.0%) |
| Total            | 8(28.6%)  | 7(25.0%) | 8(28.6%)     | 3(10.7%) | 2(7.1%)    | 28 (100%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SPSS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

It is observed from the table-21: that 28.6%, 25.0%, 28.6%, 610.7% and 7.1% of the individuals irrespective of type of industry furnished their views as very poor, poor, satisfactory, good and excellence on the question of government support in exports and marketing outside the country. Again, the table exhaustive illustrates percentage variations within each answer with respective of type of industry, considered in the present study.

**TABLE 22: INDUSTRY ACCORDING TO PRESENCE OF AUTHORITY (GOVERNMENT SUPPORTIVE POLICIES)**

| Type of Industry | Presence of government supportive policies |          |              |          |            | Total     |
|------------------|--|----------|--------------|----------|------------|-----------|
|                  | Very poor                                  | Poor     | Satisfactory | Good     | Excellence |           |
| Manufacturer     | 4(50.0%)                                   | 1(12.5%) | 3(37.5%)     | 0        | 0          | 8 (100%)  |
| Service          | 3(11.1%)                                   | 3(11.1%) | 11(40.7%)    | 8(29.6%) | 2(7.4%)    | 27 (100%) |
| Trading          | 4(26.7%)                                   | 4(26.7%) | 3(20.0%)     | 4(26.7%) | 0          | 15 (100%) |
| Total            | 11(22.0%)                                  | 8(16.0%) | 17(34.0%)    | 12 (24%) | 2(4.0%)    | 50 (100%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2$  - Test can't be used.

Due to some of the less cell frequencies found in the table-22:, the test can't be applied, but it may be observed from the table that there is variation of percentages regarding the answers of the question viz., presence of industry body in terms of supportive, effective in convincing government to make supportive policies.

**TABLE 23: INDUSTRY ACCORDING TO MEASURES (TECHNICAL, GOVERNMENT SUPPORT & CERTIFICATIONS)**

| Type of Industry | Quality control measures |           |              |           |            | Total     |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
|                  | Very poor                | Poor      | Satisfactory | Good      | Excellence |           |
| Manufacturing    | 2(18.2%)                 | 4(36.4%)  | 1(9.1%)      | 4(36.4%)  | 0          | 11 (100%) |
| Service          | 2(6.2%)                  | 7(21.9%)  | 3(9.4%)      | 19(59.4%) | 1(3.1%)    | 32 (100%) |
| Trading          | 2(14.3%)                 | 5(35.7%)  | 3(21.4%)     | 4(28.6%)  | 0          | 14 (100%) |
| Total            | 6(10.5%)                 | 16(28.1%) | 7(12.3%)     | 27(47.4%) | 1(1.8%)    | 57 (100%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2 = 6.701$ ;  $df = 8$ ;  $P = 0.569$

The table-23: indicates that there is no definite association of type of industry and quality control measures in terms of technical assistance, government support and ease of getting certifications as evident by insignificant values of  $P=0.569$  despite visible variations of percentage over five different types of opinion by the respondents. The types of opinion are very poor, poor, satisfactory, good and excellence.

**TABLE 24: INDUSTRY DISTRIBUTE ACCORDING TO UNIVERSITIES, TRAINING & VOCATIONAL TRAINING**

| Type of Industry | Availability of universities, training facilities and vocational training |           |           |             | Total      |
|------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------|
|                  | Yes   | No        | Can't say | Remain same |            |
| Manufacturing    | 3(23.1%)  | 4(30.8%)  | 5(38.5%)  | 1(7.7%)     | 13(100.0%) |
| Service          | 13(40.6%)   | 11(34.4%) | 6(18.8%)  | 2(6.2%)     | 32(100.0%) |
| Trading          | 2(9.5%)   | 12(57.1%) | 4(19.0%)  | 3(14.3%)    | 21(100.0%) |
| Total            | 18(27.3%)   | 27(40.9%) | 15(22.7%) | 6(9.1%)     | 66(100.0%) |

Source: Personal calculation using SSPS version 21

$\chi^2 = 9.314$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $P = 0.157$

It may be observed from the table-24: that there is no definite association between type of industry and availability of universities, training facilities and vocational training centre as evident by insignificant values of  $P=0.157$  despite visible variations of percentage over four different types of opinion by the industrialists.

**TESTING OF HYPOTHESIS**

**Ho: There is no difference among the three types of Industry viz. Service, Manufacturing and Trading sectors of Manipur with respect to presences of Quality Infrastructure especially Tele-communication facilities.**

Table-8: represent type of industry according to tele-communication facilities and highlight that  $\chi^2 = 6.504$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $P = .369$ . Hence, the test value indicates insignificant ( $P=0.369$ ). The null hypothesis is valid. Therefore, there is no significant difference between the three types of Industry viz. Service, Manufacturing & Trading sectors of Manipur and presences of Quality Infrastructure especially Tele-communication facilities.

**CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY**

The Indian government and the northeastern states must adopt proactive role and provide not only infrastructures but also political stability and good governance. Greater participation of the local people in production and distribution activities and raising agricultural productivity should be give prime importance. Trade alone will not be sufficient to transform the region into a sustained development path. In addition, growth in trading activities will only benefit those people who possibly are from outside the region and who are economically more powerful to exploit the resources of the region. India's Look East policy should include goals such as encouraging public debate and participation as well as opening doors and windows in the political and economic arena. The Indian government and the north-eastern states must adopt proactive role and provide not only infrastructures but also political stability and good governance. There are about 305 communities and over 200 tribes in the region. Each community has its distinct customs, cultural heritage and folklore and as such, the region has ample prospects to promote modern day tourism. The region also has several aromatic plants, which could be used to develop and promote health tourism in selective locations of the region.

**REFERENCES**

1. ChattatopadhyayKunal. (2008). "Understanding Tourism Economics". 1<sup>st</sup> Edition. New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers Distributors. 1<sup>st</sup> Edition. Pp. 87 – 90.
2. Chinglen Pukhrambam. (2016).Trends and Implication of Look East Policy in the norht east (a case study of Manipur). Unpublished PhD. Thesis, Manipur University.
3. Kojima. (2007). "International Female Migration and Trafficking in Asia" (last accessed on September 13, 2010).Retrieved from Manipur Daily Newspaper, www.thesangaexpress.com
4. NandeibamMohendro. (2014, September). Possibility of shifting the Commercial Hub. *The people's chronicle daily*. P. 6.

## REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce, Economics & Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as, on the journal as a whole, on our e-mail [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com) for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries, please feel free to contact us on our e-mail [infoijrcm@gmail.com](mailto:infoijrcm@gmail.com).

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward to an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

**Academically yours**

Sd/-

**Co-ordinator**

## DISCLAIMER

The information and opinions presented in the Journal reflect the views of the authors and not of the Journal or its Editorial Board or the Publishers/Editors. Publication does not constitute endorsement by the journal. Neither the Journal nor its publishers/Editors/Editorial Board nor anyone else involved in creating, producing or delivering the journal or the materials contained therein, assumes any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information provided in the journal, nor shall they be liable for any direct, indirect, incidental, special, consequential or punitive damages arising out of the use of information/material contained in the journal. The journal, neither its publishers/Editors/ Editorial Board, nor any other party involved in the preparation of material contained in the journal represents or warrants that the information contained herein is in every respect accurate or complete, and they are not responsible for any errors or omissions or for the results obtained from the use of such material. Readers are encouraged to confirm the information contained herein with other sources. The responsibility of the contents and the opinions expressed in this journal are exclusively of the author (s) concerned.

## ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

### *Our Other Journals*

