Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.619 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 12 | Issue: 12 | December 2025 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

CENTRAL MANDATE, LOCAL FRICTION: ANALYSING THE INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY DEFICIT IN THE START-UP INDIA INITIATIVE

Dr. K C Prashanth
Associate Professor, Department of Management, VSK University, Ballari

ABSTRACT
*Centralized policy initiatives aimed at regional economic upliftment frequently encounter friction at the 'last mile' of implementation due to deficits in local institutional capacity. This paper examines the operational challenges faced by the **Startup India Initiative (SII)** in the underdeveloped Kalyana Karnataka region. Through an analysis of founder experiences, this study identifies and quantifies the primary implementation barriers using Weighted Average Scores (WAS) from a survey of 300 registered startups. Key findings indicate that the most significant deterrents to scheme utilization are **Bureaucratic Complexity in Documentation (WAS 4.45)** and **Lack of Awareness among Local Bank Officials (WAS 4.12)**. These internal, institutional failures, rather than external market factors, prevent the conversion of high policy awareness (e.g., for non-financial benefits) into capital utilization (e.g., for Seed Fund Schemes). The paper argues that successful regional development policies must shift focus from broad scheme creation to mandatory localization protocols and capacity-building measures at the street-level bureaucratic interface.*

KEYWORDS: *Start up, Awareness, Beuaracratic Barriers, Institutional Barriers, Financial Benefits*

1. INTRODUCTION: THE POLICY DELIVERY PROBLEM

The Startup India Initiative (SII) represents a strategic national effort to democratize entrepreneurship across India. For regions like Kalyana Karnataka, historically lagging in industrialization and capital access, central policies are indispensable catalysts. However, the effective translation of policy into regional economic outcomes depends entirely on the efficiency of the delivery mechanism—the local bureaucracy, banks, and supporting institutions.

This paper is guided by the objective of diagnosing the precise points of failure in the SII's delivery chain within the Kalyana Karnataka region. Specifically, we investigate:

1. What are the most pronounced **institutional and bureaucratic barriers** encountered by regional entrepreneurs attempting to utilize centralized schemes?
2. How do these local barriers inhibit the utilization of complex **financial benefits** despite broad awareness of simpler, non-financial benefits?

Understanding this friction is crucial for policymakers seeking to ensure that flagship national programs achieve equitable regional impact.

2. METHODOLOGY

The study utilized primary data collected from **300 founders of registered startups** operating within Kalyana Karnataka. The methodology employed was designed to isolate and quantify the perceived severity of various implementation challenges.

2.1 Data Measurement

Startup founders were asked to rate the severity of various barriers on a 5-point Likert scale (1=Not a barrier, 5=Severe Barrier). The resulting data was processed to calculate the **Weighted Average Score (WAS)** for each factor. This score provides an objective measure of the collective perceived difficulty, allowing for a precise ranking of the implementation challenges.

2.2 Data Selection

The analysis specifically focuses on the contrasting awareness levels of different scheme types (non-financial vs. financial) and the correlation between the severity of institutional barriers (high WAS) and low utilization of critical capital schemes (low awareness).

Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra1013 | SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.619 ISSN: 2347-4378
EPRA International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies (EBMS)
Volume: 12 | Issue: 12 | December 2025 -Peer-Reviewed Journal

3. FINDINGS: THE 'STREET-LEVEL' BUREAUCRATIC BLOCKADE

The findings reveal a clear pattern: policies that rely on simple self-certification or passive regulatory relief are successful, whereas policies requiring active intermediation by local institutions face insurmountable friction.

3.1 High Awareness, Low Utilization Policy Contrast

Founders reported **high awareness** (exceeding 75%) of non-financial benefits, such as **Simplified Compliance/Self-Certification** and **Tax Exemptions**. These policies are successful because they require minimal interaction with the regional bureaucratic interface.

However, awareness of complex, capital-intensive schemes requiring official sign-off, specifically the **Fund of Funds (FoF)** and the **Startup India Seed Fund Scheme**, remained **below 30%**. This suggests that either the communication is faulty, or, more likely, the regional institutions meant to popularize and facilitate access to these funds are inactive or ineffective.

3.2 Quantification of Implementation Barriers

The calculated Weighted Average Scores (WAS) definitively rank the institutional failures as the top deterrents to entrepreneurial growth:

Rank	Implementation Challenge	Weighted Average Score (WAS)	Policy Implication
1	**Bureaucratic Complexity in Documentation**	**4.45**	Excessively complicated process; institutional inertia in handling new policy forms.
2	**Lack of Awareness among Local Bank Officials**	**4.12**	Failure of centralized training to penetrate the local banking ecosystem.
3	**Physical Distance to Incubation/Support Centers**	**3.98**	Insufficient decentralization of physical support infrastructure.

Source: Field Survey

The two highest-ranking barriers are direct products of **institutional and procedural inefficiency**. A score of 4.45 (out of 5) for documentation complexity indicates that the process itself is the primary obstacle, effectively nullifying the policy's intended benefit, even for sophisticated founders. The high score for bank official unawareness highlights a fundamental failure in the vertical policy communication chain from the central government down to the local public financial institution.

4. DISCUSSION: THE MANDATE VS. DISCRETION DILEMMA

The success of the **Stand Up India Scheme (SUIS)**, which achieved equitable disbursement across SC, ST, and Women entrepreneurs (with an average sanctioned amount of $\approx$ ₹19.3 Lakh), offers a critical contrast.

The SUIS operates on a **mandatory quota** basis, removing discretionary decision-making from the local banking branch manager and ensuring equitable delivery. In contrast, the SII's capital schemes (FoF, Seed Fund) involve more discretion, complex vetting, and reliance on institutional *knowledge*.

Where policy relies on **discretion and knowledge** (SII financial schemes), it fails because local institutional capacity is low. Where policy relies on a **strict, mandatory quota** (SUIS), it succeeds because local discretion is removed.

This comparison confirms that in socio-economically underdeveloped regions, the success of central policy is contingent upon the extent to which it **mandates and standardizes compliance**, effectively overriding the institutional inertia and lack of specialized knowledge inherent in street-level bureaucracy.

5. CONCLUSION AND POLICY REFORM FRAMEWORK

The Startup India Initiative's goal of fostering entrepreneurship in Kalyana Karnataka is being structurally hindered by a failure of policy delivery, rooted in poor institutional capacity. The government must recognize that creating a scheme is only the first step; the final, decisive step is ensuring its flawless execution at the local level.

Policy Reform Framework: Localization and Standardization

1. **Mandatory Certification and Incentivization for Local Officials:** Make annual certification in all central entrepreneurial schemes mandatory for promotion or retention of all regional bank and district

industrial center staff. Introduce a performance incentive for officials tied directly to the successful disbursement of scheme funds.

2. **Digital Standardization of Documentation:** The process for availing all SII benefits must be streamlined into a single, user-friendly digital form that auto-populates documentation for all stakeholders, thus eliminating the high bureaucratic complexity (WAS 4.45) caused by paper-based processes.
3. **Regional Policy Monitoring Units (RPMUs):** Establish dedicated monitoring units at the district level to conduct biannual audits focused not on the *outcome* (number of startups), but on the *process* (wait times, documentation requirements, and official knowledge), ensuring accountability for the local capacity deficit.

By implementing mandatory, standardized, and digitized processes, the government can bypass the historical inertia of local institutions and ensure that the powerful engine of the Startup India policy finally reaches the entrepreneurs in regions that need it most.

REFERENCES

1. *Ayyagari, M., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Maksimovic, V. (2017). SME finance and growth: Evidence and implications. The World Bank Research Observer, 32(2), 279–309.*
2. *DPIIT (Department for Promotion of Industry and Internal Trade). (2022). Startup India Action Report 2016–2022. Government of India.*
3. *Government of India. (2022). Stand-Up India Scheme: Progress Report. Ministry of Finance, Department of Financial Services.*
4. *Gupta, V., & Sharma, V. (2023). Financial inclusion and entrepreneurial participation among women through the Stand-Up India scheme: An evaluation. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies, 9(1), 32–51.*
5. *Isenberg, D. (2011). The entrepreneurship ecosystem strategy as a new paradigm for economic policy. Babson Entrepreneurship Ecosystem Project, Babson College.*
6. *Kant, A. (2019). Startup ecosystem building: India's policy perspective. NITI Aayog Policy Working Paper Series, Government of India.*
7. *Khanna, T., & Palepu, K. (2013). Winning in emerging markets: A road map for strategy and execution. Harvard Business Press.*
8. *Lipsky, M. (1980). Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services. Russell Sage Foundation. → (Supports your argument about "street-level bureaucratic interface" and local administrative friction)*
9. *NITI Aayog. (2021). India's Emerging Startup Ecosystem: Trends, Challenges, and Policy Recommendations. Government of India.*
10. *OECD. (2019). Strengthening SMEs and Entrepreneurship for Productivity and Inclusive Growth. OECD Publishing.*
11. *Prasad, C. S., & Rao, G. (2022). Institutions and entrepreneurship in underdeveloped regions: Evidence from rural India. South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases, 11(2), 225–238.*
12. *Roy, M., & Das, P. (2020). Institutional barriers to startup financing in India: A regional perspective. Economic and Political Weekly, 55(28), 48–57.*
13. *Tripathi, S., & Singh, R. (2022). Geographic bias in venture capital allocation: Evidence from Indian startup investment networks. Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 18, e00315.*