



## Study on Micro Enterprise Growth in Manado, Indonesia

Adolfina<sup>1</sup>, Genita G. Lumintang<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Lecturers, Department of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Sam Ratulangi University, Manado, Indonesia.

### Abstract

Micro enterprises conditions both nationally and regionally very large amount of the total MSMEs, but its contribution to GDP is very low compared to the population is very large. The low contribution of micro-enterprises to GDP describes the condition of the existing micro enterprises are not growing, so the need to do a study to determine the aspects related to growth. Under these conditions, this study aims to know the presence of micro-enterprises in Manado. A sample of 158 respondents consisting of 96 cafe, and 62 grocery, data was analyzed with a descriptive analysis of the frequency tables and cross tables. The findings show that characteristics of respondents who pursue the cafe mostly aged 30 to 39 years old and respondents who pursue the grocery mostly aged 40 to 59 years. Both types are mostly occupied by female, mostly senior high school educated. Characteristic microenterprises studied are mostly already in operation 1 to 5 years, using employees from 1 to 3 people. Enterprises growth from the aspect of sales, and from the aspect of assets also largely increased, but the number of employees did not increase. Another findings are the cafe run mostly female respondents increased sales compared to the run of male respondents. Unlike the grocery, enterprises were managed by male respondents largely increased sales. Based on the age of the enterprises, the cafe which has been operating from 1 to 3 years in general have the highest sales increase and thereafter declined; while the grocery which has been operating 3 to 5 years are generally highest sales increased and afterwards decreased. In terms of asset growth, the respondent cafe increased their assets until the age of 10 years after the age was declining. While respondents grocery increased their assets until the age of 5 years after the age was declining.

**Keywords:** Micro Enterprise; Growth, Manado; Indonesia.

### 1. Introduction

In Indonesia, the number of SMEs is very large unit that is 99.99 percent, most of SMEs are micro enterprises, which reached 98.79 percent and can create jobs as much as 90.12 percent, but its contribution to GDP is still low at 35.81 percent (Ministry of Cooperatives and SMEs, 2012). Factors inhibiting enterprises growth can be derived from the inherent characteristics of individual entrepreneurs themselves, because each individual has different characteristics (Gibson, et.al 2012; Robbins and Judge, 2013). These differences in characteristics will have an impact on individual behavior. *Furthermore*, individual behavior impacts on the outcome of both short term and long term, especially in growing the business. In addition to individual factors associated with the growing of enterprises are external and internal factors of business. According to Ebert and Griffin (2011), the external environment can influence the success or failure of an organization or company. The Internal factors of SMEs often hampered the growing of business because of the limitations that are owned as working capital, business location and management capabilities.

MSMEs in the city of Manado is the capital of North Sulawesi province as has been mapped by Development Planning Agency at Sub-National Level (BAPPEDA) Manado and Research Institutions and Management Review (LMPP) Faculty of Economics and Business Sam Ratulangi University (2013) includes enterprises motorcycles, grocery shops, cafes, minibuses, copy service, selling pulses, garage, laundry, apparel store, salon, shop building, internet cafes, play stations, drinking water refill. The various types of business such that a dominant pulse-sales, cafes/restaurants, and grocery shops. Each type of business has its own characteristics such as the risk of the business, place of business, and

the problems faced were different so as to growth MSMEs need to be replicated by the scale of business or type of business. The study results Sriyana (2010) revealed that small and medium enterprises face different problems depending on the type and characteristics of small industry, also revealed that there are businesses that claimed the main problem encountered is the ability to compete in the market, product marketing, and availability of skilled labor.

This study aims to map the characteristics of individuals who pursue micro-enterprises, map the characteristics of micro-enterprises, and to analyze the relationship between the growth of enterprises with individual characteristics, and characteristics of micro-enterprises in Manado.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Micro Enterprise

Micro-businesses, according to Indonesia Law No. 8, 2008 was a productive enterprise belonging to individuals and / or entities which meet the criteria of individual micro-enterprises, which have a net worth of at most Rp.50.000.000,00 (fifty million rupiahs), excluding land and buildings; or having annual sales of Rp.300,000,000.00 (three hundred million rupiahs). According to the Statistics Central Agency (BPS) criteria of MSMEs was which based on the number of workers. Micro-businesses are businesses that have a workforce of less than 5 people including unpaid family workers. Small businesses are businesses that have a workforce of 5 to 19 people. LPPI and Bank Indonesia (2015) gives the characteristics of the micro-enterprises, (1) Type of goods / commodities are not always fixed; may at any time change, (2) The business activities are not always settled; any time can be moved, (3) Not to perform financial administration that simple though, (4) Do not separate the family finances to business finances, (5) human resources (entrepreneurs) do not have the entrepreneurial spirit that is adequate, (6) Level of education average price is relatively low, (7) Generally, yet access to banks, but some have access to non-bank financial institutions, (8) generally do not have a business license or other legal requirements including the Taxpayer Identification Number.

### 2.2. Micro Enterprise Growth

The growth of enterprise is a process, not a chance event or due to chance, but through hard work an entrepreneur to manage the challenges associated with the enterprise growth. Growth is a vital indicator of a flourishing enterprise. There are many factors like characteristics of the entrepreneur, access to resources which affect the growth of the enterprise and differentiate it from a non-growing enterprise (Gupta et.al, 2013). According to Storey (1994) that there are three components influencing SMEs growth they are the entrepreneur, the firm, and strategy. Factors entrepreneur or individual factors is a crucial component because it involves a variety of inherent characteristics of the individual. Characteristics of individuals according to Gibson, et.al (2012); Nimran (1998); and Robbins (2013) are the ability and skills, background, personality, perceptions, attitudes, and biographical variables. These characteristics have a very real impact on individual behavior which then determines the outcome.

The growth process of a business, generally through four phases: introduction, growth, maturity, and decline. According to Churchill and Lewis (1983) that a business has five stages of growth, namely; Existence, Survival, Success, Take-off, and Resource Maturity. However, according to Bridge et al. (2003) that it is very difficult to say when the business moves from one stage to another. It is not possible for an enterprise to progress through each stage. They can grow, stagnate, and decline in any order, can even occur more than once. The same thing was stated by Blundel and Hingley (2001) that growth can be achieved quickly, slowly, or not at all, it depends on the strength of growth aspirations and the factors that allow the growth of a business. Each enterprise has to start, then grow while facing various challenges and crises, and finally mature and decline (Gupta et.al 2013).

Measurement of enterprise growth quantitatively can be used of the increased sales, increased profits, asset value increased, and the number of labor employed increased and so on. Sirec and Mocnik (2010) on their research on SMEs growth in Slovenia using employed growth, sales growth, and assets growth as a measurement of the SMEs growth. Jansen (2009) explicate that it is the increase in sales that makes it possible for business to invest in additional factors of production such as equipment and employees, which will in turn result in rising the profit of the business. Employed growth is also considered as an important aspect of firm growth. Fatoki (2013) says that the growth in employment is important in measuring the enterprise growth that is in terms of creating jobs. Levie and Autio (2013) also emphasize the importance of measuring the growth of enterprise in the context of increasing business assets. Asset growth can provide security guarantees for entrepreneurs to obtain financing from outside sources that can be used to help develop their business.

The problems in the growth of micro-enterprises can be sourced from individual entrepreneurs, of external and internal factors. According to empirical studies Bouazza et.al (2015) that there are many factors that influence the SMEs growth can be divided into two groups: internal factors of business and external factors that are outside the control of business actors. Research conducted by Bouazza et.al (2015) on external and internal factors that influence the growth of SMEs in Algeria found the influence of external factors ie, legal and regulation, access to finance; and internal factors are management skills, marketing skills, and technological capabilities. Mappigau and Maupa (2012) examine the internal

and external factors small businesses engaged in the food processing business in South Sulawesi. The results of study revealed that both external factors (the availability of government assistance, support services, processing technology, raw materials, and market opportunities) and internal (the availability of start-up capital, the desire to be free, the support of those closest, skills, and work experience) affect the growth of small enterprise directly and positive, and that external factors more dominant influence than internal factors. Edwin et al (2013) researched in a small industry South Kalimantan that related external factors, namely small industry suppliers, buyers, product substitution, competitors and new entrants, governments, and financial institutions. The internal factors are raw materials, capital, production equipment, and labor. The results of the study Anonymous (1996) rank the factors that influence on success of SMEs in North Sumatra namely internal ranking factors sequentially is capital, labor, technology, equipment, marketing, innovation, and business management. Ranking external factor is the availability of raw materials, economic conditions, security, infrastructure, socio-economic conditions, and economic facilities. Sudiarta, et al (2014) concerning the performance factors of SMEs in Bangli Regency include external and internal factors, namely: (1) marketing, (2) access to capital, (3) the ability of entrepreneurship, (4) human resources, (5) the financial knowledge, (6) a business plan, (7) social network, (8) legality, (9) government support, (10) construction, (11) technology, and (12) access to information.

Ebert and Griffin (2011), suggests reasons why did entrepreneur fail and successful. Failure entrepreneur due to poor management capabilities, negligence, weak controls, lack of capital. Successful entrepreneur because of hard work, with a market, managerial competence, as well as the luck factor. According Bouazza et.al (2015), the success and failure of SMEs are not only related to the environmental aspects of the business, but it also depends on internal factors of entrepreneur, managerial ability, marketing skills, and technological capabilities. Characteristics of entrepreneurs according to Robbins and Coulter (2012) include: levels of motivation, self-confidence, ability to engage in one job for a long time, your high levels energy, persistent in solving the problem, the level of initiative, ability to set goals, and the level of risk taking. It is also mentioned successful entrepreneur characteristics include: a high energy level, diligent, resourceful, capable and willing to self-drive, and the need for autonomy is relatively high. Director General of Higher Education (2013), that the characteristics of an entrepreneur is to have high creativity, are always committed in the work, has the work ethic and responsibility, independence, courage to face risks, achievement motivation high, always perspective, has the innovative behavior high, always looking for opportunities, has leadership, managerial ability, and has the personal skills. Sakur (2011), that some of the external issues in the SMEs growth in Surakarta include: (1) the business climate is not yet conducive, (2) the limited facilities and infrastructure, (3) the impact of free markets, (4) lack of market access, (5) limited human resources, (6) the financial restrictions.

### 3. RESEARCH METHODS

The research sample is the cafe and the grocery enterprise, amounting to 158 enterprises units, namely the cafe 96 samples and 62 samples of grocery. Data were collected using questionnaires and interviews that distribute questionnaires filled out by respondents and supplemented the data needed to do the interview. Sampling was done by the accidental on three districts in the city of Manado predetermined. The data is processed and analyzed using cross table with SPSS.

### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Samples are planned in this study were 160 respondents, but data obtained through questionnaires worth analyzing only 158 for 2 respondents did not fill most of the necessary data.

**Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents and Sales Growth**

| Characteristics of Respondents | Cafe             |                  |                  | Total            |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                | Sales Growth     |                  |                  |                  |
|                                | (a) Increased    | (b) Fixed        | (c) Decreased    |                  |
| Age of Respondents:            |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 20 – 29                        | 6 (12.5%)        | 1 (2.6%)         | 3 (30%)          | 10 (10.4%)       |
| 30 – 39                        | 20 (41.7%)       | 17 (44.7%)       | 5 (50%)          | 42 (43.8%)       |
| 40 – 49                        | 14 (29.2%)       | 6 (15.8%)        | 2 (20%)          | 22 (22.9%)       |
| 50 – 59                        | 7 (14.6%)        | 8 (21.1%)        | 0                | 15 (15.6%)       |
| ≥ 60                           | 1 (2.1%)         | 6 (15.8%)        | 0                | 7 (7.3%)         |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>48 (100%)</b> | <b>38 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| Gender:                        |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Male                           | 18 (38%)         | 19 (50%)         | 6 (60%)          | 43 (45%)         |

|                     |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Female              | 30 (62%)         | 19 (50%)         | 4 (40%)          | 53 (55%)         |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>48 (100%)</b> | <b>38 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| Level of Education: |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Elementary School   | 0                | 2 (5%)           | 0                | 2 (2%)           |
| Junior High School  | 9 (19%)          | 8 (21%)          | 0                | 17 (18%)         |
| Senior High School  | 36 (75%)         | 23 (61%)         | 7 (70%)          | 66 (69%)         |
| Undergraduate       | 1 (2%)           | 5 (13%)          | 3 (30%)          | 9 (9%)           |
| Graduate            | 2 (4%)           | 0                | 0                | 2 (2%)           |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>48 (100%)</b> | <b>38 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| <b>Grocery</b>      |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Age of Respondents: |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 20 – 29             | 3 (9,4%)         | 1 (5,6%)         | -                | 4 (6,5%)         |
| 30 – 39             | 6 (18,7%)        | 6 (33,3%)        | 3 (25,0%)        | 15 (24,2%)       |
| 40 – 49             | 7 (21,9%)        | 5 (27,8%)        | 5 (41,7%)        | 17 (27,4%)       |
| 50 – 59             | 10 (31,3%)       | 4 (22,2%)        | 4 (33,4%)        | 18 (29,0%)       |
| ≥ 60                | 6 (18,7%)        | 2 (11,1%)        | -                | 8 (12,9%)        |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>32 (100%)</b> | <b>18 (100%)</b> | <b>12 (100%)</b> | <b>62 (100%)</b> |
| Gender:             |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Male                | 18 (56%)         | 5 (28%)          | 4 (33%)          | 27 (44%)         |
| Female              | 14 (44%)         | 13 (72%)         | 8 (67%)          | 35 (56%)         |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>32 (100%)</b> | <b>18 (100%)</b> | <b>12 (100%)</b> | <b>62 (100%)</b> |
| Level of Education: |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Elementary School   | 0                | 0                | 0                | 0                |
| Junior High School  | 1 (3%)           | 0                | 3 (25%)          | 4 (6%)           |
| Senior High School  | 21 (66%)         | 18 (100%)        | 7 (58%)          | 46 (74%)         |
| Undergraduate       | 9 (28%)          | 0                | 2 (17%)          | 11 (18%)         |
| graduate            | 1 (3%)           | 0                | 0                | 1 (2%)           |
| <b>Total</b>        | <b>32 (100%)</b> | <b>18 (100%)</b> | <b>12 (100%)</b> | <b>62 (100%)</b> |

The micro-enterprise growth, from the sales aspect, the cafe and the grocery respondents largely increased its sales in the recent years and only a few are experiencing a decline in sales. But the enterprise respondents did not grow well enough. Based on the characteristics of the respondent, the respondent's age owned/managed mostly aged 30 to 39 years (43.8%). At the age of majority (41.7%) experienced an increase in sales and after passing the age of 39 years the sales began to decline. This finding agrees by Yeboah (2015) that SME owned/managed by people between the age 30 to 39 experienced the highest increase in sales. Also confirms to Sinha (1996) that entrepreneurs are younger tend to be more success than the older entrepreneurs. The respondents managed grocery enterprise mostly aged 50 to 59 years (29%), at the age of majority (31.3%) experienced an increase in sales and after passing the age of 59 years turnover began to decline. Age of the respondent that managed of the cafe is relatively younger than respondent that managed of grocery. This finding is consistent with the characteristics of the business where the cafe business is engaged in the processing of materials into goods ready for sale so that the workers engaged in this business work quite heavy compared to the workforce is engaged in the grocery because this business only manage goods that are ready for sale. The cafe and the

grocery enterprise have the same characteristics, they are rather more involved female than male, as well as the level of education that is mostly high school educated.

If sales growth is associated with gender, then the cafe run by female more increased sales (62%) than those managed by male (18%). Another finding was that the micro enterprise managed by female is more stable in the growth of sales. This is consistent to Yeboah (2015) that small businesses were managed by female sales more stable than male-run. Unlike the grocery that occupied the lower sales of female respondents (44%) than those managed by male respondents (56%). Respondents with higher education levels are generally increasing sales. These findings support to Yeboah (2015) that the owner/manager SMEs with senior high school education experience high sales growth.

**Table 2: Characteristics of Respondents and Development Assets**

| Characteristics of Respondents | Restaurant        |                  |                 | Total            |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
|                                | Asset Development |                  |                 |                  |
|                                | (a) Increased     | (b) Fixed        | (c) Decreased   |                  |
| Age of Respondents:            |                   |                  |                 |                  |
| 20 – 29                        | 4 (7,7%)          | 6 (13,6%)        | -               | 10 (10,4%)       |
| 30 – 39                        | 24 (46,2%)        | 18 (40,9%)       | -               | 42 (43,8%)       |
| 40 – 49                        | 17 (32,7%)        | 5 (11,4%)        | -               | 22 (22,9%)       |
| 50 – 59                        | 6 (11,5%)         | 9 (20,5%)        | -               | 15 (15,6%)       |
| ≥ 60                           | 1 (1,9%)          | 6 (13,6%)        | -               | 7 (7,3%)         |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>52 (100%)</b>  | <b>44 (100%)</b> | <b>-</b>        | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| Gender :                       |                   |                  |                 |                  |
| Male                           | 23 (44,2%)        | 20 (45,5%)       | -               | 43 (44,8%)       |
| Female                         | 29 (55,8%)        | 24 (55,2%)       | -               | 53 (55,2%)       |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>52 (100%)</b>  | <b>44 (100%)</b> | <b>-</b>        | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| Education :                    |                   |                  |                 |                  |
| Elementary School              | 0                 | 2 (4,5%)         | -               | 2 (2,1%)         |
| Junior High School             | 7 (13,5%)         | 10 (22,7%)       | -               | 17 (17,7%)       |
| Senior High School             | 39 (75,0%)        | 27 (61,4%)       | -               | 66 (68,8%)       |
| Undergraduate                  | 4 (7,7%)          | 5 (11,4%)        | -               | 9 (9,4%)         |
| Graduate                       | 2 (3,8%)          | 0                | -               | 2 (2,1%)         |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>52 (100%)</b>  | <b>44 (100%)</b> | <b>-</b>        | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| <b>Grocery</b>                 |                   |                  |                 |                  |
| Age of Respondents:            |                   |                  |                 |                  |
| 20 – 29                        | 4 (11,8%)         | -                | -               | 4 (6,5%)         |
| 30 – 39                        | 8 (23,5%)         | 6 (28,6%)        | 1 (14,2%)       | 15 (24,2%)       |
| 40 – 49                        | 10 (29,4%)        | 4 (19,0%)        | 3 (42,9%)       | 17 (27,4%)       |
| 50 – 59                        | 6 (17,6%)         | 9 (42,9%)        | 3 (42,9%)       | 18 (29,0%)       |
| ≥ 60                           | 6 (17,6%)         | 2 (9,5%)         | -               | 8 (12,9%)        |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>34 (100%)</b>  | <b>21 (100%)</b> | <b>7 (100%)</b> | <b>62 (100%)</b> |

|                    |                  |                  |                 |                 |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Gender :           |                  |                  |                 |                 |
| Male               | 19 (55,9%)       | 6 (28,6%)        | 2 (28,6%)       | 27 (43,5%)      |
| Female             | 15 (44,1%)       | 15 (71,4%)       | 5 (71,4%)       | 35 (56,5%)      |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>34 (100%)</b> | <b>21 (100%)</b> | <b>7 (100%)</b> | <b>62 9100%</b> |
| Education :        |                  |                  |                 |                 |
| Elementary School  | -                | -                | -               | -               |
| Junior High School | 1 (2,9%)         | 2 (9,5%)         | 1 (14,3%)       | 4 (6,5%)        |
| Senior High School | 25 (73,5%)       | 17 (81,0%)       | 4 (57,1%)       | 46 (74,2%)      |
| Undergraduate      | 7 (20,6%)        | 2 (9,5%)         | 2 (28,6%)       | 11 (17,7%)      |
| Graduate           | 1 (2,9%)         | 0                | 0               | 1 (1,6%)        |
| <b>Total</b>       | <b>34 (100%)</b> | <b>21 (100%)</b> | <b>7 (100%)</b> | <b>62 9100%</b> |

The micro enterprise growth, from the assets aspect; the cafe and the grocery respondents in general experienced asset growth in recent years. In the cafe business there are no respondents who declined assets. But it did not growth its assets are also quite a lot. The growth of the asset based on the characteristics of respondents, ie the cafe aged 30 to 39 years the majority (46.2%) experienced an increase in assets and after this age of total assets decreased. In the grocery that aged 40 to 49 years the majority (29.4%) increased its assets and thereafter declined. The cafe respondents that run by female more (55.8%) increased their assets compared to (44.2%) were managed by male. Differ to the grocery that managed by male respondents more (55.9%) increased their assets compared to (44.1%) were managed by female. In terms of the respondents' education, assets growth of the cafe and the grocery generally increased in enterprises managed by the respondents with a high school education.

**Table 3: Characteristics of Respondents and Employee Growth**

| Characteristics of Respondents | Restaurants     |                  |                  | Total            |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                | Employee Growth |                  |                  |                  |
|                                | (a) Increased   | (b) Fixed        | (c) Decreased    |                  |
| Age of Respondents:            |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| 20 – 29                        | 2 (33,3%)       | 8 (10%)          | 0                | 10 (10,4%)       |
| 30 – 39                        | 2 (33,3%)       | 34 (42,5%)       | 6 (60%)          | 42 (43,8%)       |
| 40 – 49                        | 2 (33,3%)       | 18 (22,5%)       | 2 (20%)          | 22 (22,9%)       |
| 50 – 59                        | 0               | 14 (17,5%)       | 1 (10%)          | 15 (15,6%)       |
| ≥ 60                           | 0               | 6 (7,5%)         | 1 (10%)          | 7 (7,3%)         |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>6 (100%)</b> | <b>80 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| Gender:                        |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Male                           | 4 (75%)         | 35 (43,8%)       | 4 (40%)          | 43 (44,8%)       |
| Female                         | 2 (25%)         | 45 (56,3%)       | 6 (60%)          | 53 (55,2%)       |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>6 (100%)</b> | <b>80 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| Education :                    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Elementary School              | 0               | 2 (2,1%)         | 0                | 2 (2,1%)         |
| Junior High School             | 1 (16,7%)       | 15 (18,8%)       | 1 (10%)          | 17 (17,7%)       |
| Senior High School             | 3 (50%)         | 55 (68,8%)       | 8 (80%)          | 66 (68,8%)       |
| Undergraduate                  | 1 (16,7%)       | 7 (8,8%)         | 1 (10%)          | 9 (9,4%)         |



|                      |                 |                  |                  |                  |
|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Graduate             | 1 (16,7%)       | 1 (1,3%)         | 0                | 2 (2,1)          |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>6 (100%)</b> | <b>80 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| <b>Grocery</b>       |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Age of respondents : |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| 20 – 29              | 3 (60%)         | 1 (1,9%)         | -                | 4 (6,5%)         |
| 30 – 39              | 1 (20%)         | 14 (26,9%)       | -                | 15 (24,2%)       |
| 40 – 49              | -               | 15 (28,8%)       | 2 (40%)          | 17 (27,4%)       |
| 50 – 59              | 1 (20%)         | 16 (30,8%)       | 1 (20%)          | 18 (29,0%)       |
| ≥ 60                 | -               | 6 (11,3%)        | 2 (40%)          | 8 (12,9%)        |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>5 (100%)</b> | <b>52 (100%)</b> | <b>5 (100%)</b>  | <b>62 (100%)</b> |
| Gender :             |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Male                 | 4 (80,0%)       | 21 (40,4%)       | 2 (40,0%)        | 27 (43,5%)       |
| Female               | 1 (20,0%)       | 31 (59,6%)       | 3 (60,0%)        | 35 (56,5%)       |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>5 (100%)</b> | <b>52 (100%)</b> | <b>5 (100%)</b>  | <b>62 (100%)</b> |
| Education :          |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Elementary School    | -               | -                | -                | -                |
| Junior High School   | 1 (20,0%)       | 2 (3,8%)         | 1 (20,0%)        | 4 (6,5%)         |
| Senior High School   | 0               | 42 (80,8%)       | 4 (80,0%)        | 46 (74,2%)       |
| Undergraduate        | 4 (80,0%)       | 7 (13,5%)        | 0                | 11 (17,7%)       |
| Graduate             | 0               | 1 (1,9%)         | 0                | 1 (1,6%)         |
| <b>Total</b>         | <b>5 (100%)</b> | <b>52 (100%)</b> | <b>5 (100%)</b>  | <b>62 (100%)</b> |

The micro enterprise growth, from the number of employees aspect, both the cafe and the grocery generally do not progress or the number of employees employed did not increase. In fact, more cafe enterprise that cut jobs than adding employees. When linked with gender, it appears that the number of employees increased in enterprises managed by male respondents. But in terms of education, the grocery that run by bachelor educated respondents, increasing the number of employees. Being the cafe increased the number of employees in enterprises that managed by the respondents who had senior high school.

**Table 4. Characteristics Of Enterprise And Sales Growth**

| Characteristics of Enterprises | Cafe             |                  |                  | Total            |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                | Sales Growth     |                  |                  |                  |
|                                | (a) Increased    | (b) Fixed        | (c) Decreased    |                  |
| Age of Enterprises (year):     |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| (a) < 1                        | 5 (10,4%)        | 6 (15,8%)        | 0                | 11 (11,5%)       |
| (b) 1 – 3                      | 15 (31,3%)       | 8 (21,1%)        | 2 (20,0%)        | 25 (26,0%)       |
| (c) > 3 – 5                    | 11 (22,9%)       | 12 (31,6%)       | 2 (20,0%)        | 25 (26,0%)       |
| (d) > 5 – 10                   | 11 (22,9%)       | 8 (21,1%)        | 4 (40,0%)        | 23 (24,0%)       |
| (e) > 10                       | 6 (12,5%)        | 4 (10,5%)        | 2 (20,0%)        | 12 (12,5%)       |
| <b>Total</b>                   | <b>48 (100%)</b> | <b>38 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |

|                             |                  |                  |                  |                  |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Number of employee (person) |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 1                           | 4 (8,3%)         | 9 (23,7%)        | 3 (30,0%)        | 16 (16,6%)       |
| 2                           | 26 (54,2%)       | 8 (21,1%)        | 3 (30,0%)        | 37 (38,5%)       |
| 3                           | 9 (18,8%)        | 15 (39,5%)       | 3 (30,0%)        | 27 (28,1%)       |
| 4                           | 5 (10,4%)        | 3 (7,9%)         | 1 (10,0%)        | 9 (9,4%)         |
| 5                           | 0                | 2 (5,2%)         | 0                | 2 (2,1%)         |
| >5                          | 4 (8,3%)         | 1 (2,6%)         | 0                | 5 (5,2%)         |
| <b>Total</b>                | <b>48 (100%)</b> | <b>38 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| <b>Grocery</b>              |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| Age of Enterprises (year):  |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| (a) < 1                     | 2 (6,3%)         | 2 (11,1%)        | 4 (33,3%)        | 8 (12,9%)        |
| (b) 1 – 3                   | 4 (12,5%)        | 6 (33,3%)        | 0                | 10 (16,1%)       |
| (c) > 3 – 5                 | 14 (43,8%)       | 2 (11,1%)        | 4 (33,3%)        | 20 (32,3%)       |
| (d) > 5 – 10                | 8 (25,0%)        | 2 (11,1%)        | 2 (16,7%)        | 12 (19,4%)       |
| (e) > 10                    | 4 (12,5%)        | 6 (33,3%)        | 2 (16,7%)        | 12 (19,4%)       |
| <b>Total</b>                | <b>32 (100%)</b> | <b>18 (100%)</b> | <b>12 (100%)</b> | <b>62 (100%)</b> |
| Number of employee (person) |                  |                  |                  |                  |
| 1                           | 11 (34,4%)       | 6 (33,3%)        | 6 (50,0%)        | 23 (37,1%)       |
| 2                           | 10 (31,3%)       | 10 (55,6%)       | 6 (50,0%)        | 26 (41,9%)       |
| 3                           | 3 (9,3%)         | 2 (11,1%)        | 0                | 5 (8,1%)         |
| 4                           | 7 (21,9%)        | 0                | 0                | 7 (11,3%)        |
| 5                           | -                | -                | -                | -                |
| >5                          | 1 (3,1%)         | -                | -                | 1 (1,6%)         |
| <b>Total</b>                | <b>32 (100%)</b> | <b>18 (100%)</b> | <b>12 (100%)</b> | <b>62 (100%)</b> |

If the sales growth associated with age of enterprises, it seems that the cafe business which has been operating from 1 to 3 years experience increased sales (31.3%) and after passing the age of 3 years sales continued to decline. This is shown also by the age of 5 to 10 years experienced decline in sales (40%). Somewhat different from the grocery, increased sales began at the age of 3 to 5 years, after passing this age sales continue to decline. This finding is consistent with the Coad and Halvarsson (2014) that sales growth for new ventures is characterized by positive autocorrelation, whereas it turns increasingly negative for older firms. It thus seems that the growth path of older firms are buffeted around by environmental turbulence, and that older firms have challenges in adapting their strategies to changing market conditions, whereas new firms need to grow in order to achieve a minimum efficient scale. Cafe enterprises that increased its sales largely employs 2 people (54%), and grocery mostly employ one person (34.4%) to 2 (31.3%).

**Table 5: Characteristics of Enterprise and Asset Growth**

| Characteristics of Enterprise | Cafe          |           |               | Total |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|-------|
|                               | Asset Growth  |           |               |       |
|                               | (a) Decreased | (b) Fixed | (c) Increased |       |
|                               |               |           |               |       |



|                              |                  |                  |                 |                  |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Age of Enterprises (year):   |                  |                  |                 |                  |
| (a) < 1                      | 7 (13,5%)        | 4 (9,1%)         | 0               | 11 (11,5%)       |
| (b) 1 – 3                    | 13 (25%)         | 12 (27,3%)       | 0               | 25 (26%)         |
| (c) > 3 – 5                  | 12 (23,1%)       | 13 (29,5%)       | 0               | 25 (26%)         |
| (d) > 5 – 10                 | 14 (26,9%)       | 9 (20,5%)        | 0               | 23 (24)          |
| (e) > 10                     | 6 (11,5%)        | 6 (13,6%)        | 0               | 12 (12,5%)       |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>52 (100%)</b> | <b>44 (100%)</b> | <b>0</b>        | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| Number of employee (person): |                  |                  |                 |                  |
| 1                            | 5 (9,6%)         | 11 (25%)         | 0               | 16 (16,6%)       |
| 2                            | 23 (44,2%)       | 14 (31,8%)       | 0               | 37 (38,5%)       |
| 3                            | 16(30,8%)        | 11 (25%)         | 0               | 27 (28,1%)       |
| 4                            | 4 (7,7%)         | 5 (11,4%)        | 0               | 9 (9,4%)         |
| 5                            | 0                | 2 (4,5%)         | 0               | 2 (2,1)          |
| >5                           | 4 (7,7%)         | 1 (2,3%)         | 0               | 5 (5,2)          |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>52 (100%)</b> | <b>44 (100%)</b> | <b>0</b>        | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| <b>Grocery</b>               |                  |                  |                 |                  |
| Age of Enterprises (year):   |                  |                  |                 |                  |
| (a) < 1                      | 4 (11,8%)        | 1 (4,8%)         | 3 (42,9%)       | 8 (12,9%)        |
| (b) 1 – 3                    | 6 (17,6%)        | 4 (19,0%)        | 0               | 10 (16,1%)       |
| (c) > 3 – 5                  | 14 (41,2%)       | 6 (28,6%)        | 0               | 20 (32,3%)       |
| (d) > 5 – 10                 | 6 (17,6%)        | 4 (19,0%)        | 2 (28,6%)       | 12 (19,4%)       |
| (e) > 10                     | 4 (11,8%)        | 6 (28,6%)        | 2 (28,6%)       | 12 (19,4%)       |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>34 (100%)</b> | <b>21 (100%)</b> | <b>7 (100%)</b> | <b>62 (100%)</b> |
| Number of employee (person): |                  |                  |                 |                  |
| 1                            | 9 (26,5%)        | 8 (38,1%)        | 6 (85,7%)       | 23 (37,1%)       |
| 2                            | 14 (41,2%)       | 11 (52,4%)       | 1 (14,3%)       | 26 (41,9%)       |
| 3                            | 3 (8,8%)         | 2 (9,5%)         | 0               | 5 (8,1%)         |
| 4                            | 7 (20,6%)        | 0                | 0               | 7 (11,3%)        |
| 5                            | -                | -                | -               | -                |
| >5                           | 1 (2,9%)         | -                | -               | 1 (1,6%)         |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>34 (100%)</b> | <b>21 (100%)</b> | <b>7 (100%)</b> | <b>62 (100%)</b> |

The asset growth associated with age of enterprises, shows that the cafe that has been operating up to 10 years increased asset but after passing the age of 10 years the number of assets continues to decline. In the grocery, total assets continued to increase until the age of 5 years of enterprise, after 5 year the amount of assets continues to decline. The cafe and the grocery that increased its assets mostly employ 2 employees.

The growth of employees associated with age of enterprise (Tabel 6), it appears that the cafe has been operating 5 to 10 years has increased the number of employees; and in the grocery decreased its number of employees by age 1 to 3 years of enterprise.

Table 6: Characteristic of Enterprise and Employee Growth

| Characteristic Of Enterprise | Cafe            |                  |                  | Total            |
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                              | Employee Growth |                  |                  |                  |
|                              | (a) Increased   | (b) Fixed        | (c) Decreased    |                  |
| Age of Enterprise (year):    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| (a) < 1                      | 0               | 9 (11,3%)        | 2 (20%)          | 11 (11,5%)       |
| (b) 1 – 3                    | 0               | 23 (28,8%)       | 2 (20%)          | 25 (26%)         |
| (c) > 3 – 5                  | 1 (25%)         | 22 (27,5%)       | 2 (20%)          | 25 (26%)         |
| (d) > 5 – 10                 | 5 (75%)         | 14 (17,5%)       | 4 (40%)          | 23 (24%)         |
| (e) > 10                     | 0               | 12 (15%)         | 0                | 12 (12,5%)       |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>6 (100%)</b> | <b>80 (100%)</b> | <b>10 (100%)</b> | <b>96 (100%)</b> |
| <b>Grocery</b>               |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| Age of Enterprise (year):    |                 |                  |                  |                  |
| (a) < 1                      | 3 (60,0%)       | 4 (7,7%)         | 1 (20,0%)        | 8 (12,9%)        |
| (b) 1 – 3                    | 2 (40,0%)       | 8 (15,4%)        | 0                | 10 (16,1%)       |
| (c) > 3 – 5                  | 0               | 18 (34,6%)       | 2 (40,0%)        | 20 (32,3%)       |
| (d) > 5 – 10                 | 0               | 12 (23,1%)       | 0                | 12 (19,4%)       |
| (e) > 10                     | 0               | 10 (19,2%)       | 2 (40,0%)        | 12 (19,4%)       |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>5 (100%)</b> | <b>52 (100%)</b> | <b>5 (100%)</b>  | <b>62 (100%)</b> |

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis and discussion already cited a number of conclusions, they are micro enterprise growth in few years, most of the increased sales and an increase in assets, but did not grow the number of employees. Characteristics of respondents who pursue cafe enterprises mostly aged 30 to 39 years, and at this age are subjected to the highest level of sales and assets. After respondents aged 39 years in sales and asset levels begin to drop. Grocery enterprises being largely respondents aged 50 to 59 years, and this age enjoy the highest sales level, after passing the age of 59 years of sales began to decline. Cafe and grocery enterprises occupied mostly female, and generally had senior high school. The cafe enterprises run mostly women experienced an increase in sales and an increase in assets, while the grocery enterprises that increased sales and assets are managed by male. Increased sales of the cafe at age 1 to 3 years and after the 3 years sales continue to decline. In the grocery sales increased at age 3 to 5 years and after the 5 years the downhill. This study only analyzed descriptively through cross table so it can't be generalized. In addition this study only focused on the cafe and grocery business so suggested further studies to analyze more deeply and thoroughly in order to be generalized.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Anonymous, 2006. Study of Factors Affecting the Growth of SME Business in North Sumatera Province. Journal Assessment Cooperation and SME 1<sup>st</sup> year, No. 1.
- [2] BAPPEDA Manado and LMPP Faculty of Economics and Business Unsrat, 2013. Study of Enterprises Growth Strategy Based Economy Village in the city of Manado. [http://www.google.co.id/bappeda.manadokota.go.id%2Fdownlot.php%3Ffile%3DUsahaEkonomi Manado](http://www.google.co.id/bappeda.manadokota.go.id%2Fdownlot.php%3Ffile%3DUsahaEkonomi%20Manado).
- [3] Blundel, R.K; and Hingley, M. 2001. Exploring Growth in Vertical Inter-Firm Relationships: Small-Medium Firms Supplying Multiple Food Retailers. Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 8 (3), 245-265.
- [4] Bridge, S.; O'Neill, K.; and Cromie, S. 2003. Understanding Enterprise, Entrepreneurship And Small Business. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [5] Bouazza, B. A.; Ardjouman, D.; Abada, O. 2015. Establishing the Affecting Factors the Growth of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in Algeria. American Journal of Social Science, vol 4, No. 2, April 2015.

- [6] Churchill, C.N., and Lewis, L.V. 1983. The Five Stages of Small-business Growth. *Harvard Business Review*, May – June.
- [7] Coad, A. and Halvarsson, D. 2014. Firm Age and Growth Persistence, *Innovation Forum; Crisis, innovation and transition*.
- [8] Directorate General of Higher Education, 2013. *Entrepreneurship: Learning Module*. Ministry of Education and Culture.
- [9] Ebert, R.J., and Griffin, R. 2011. *Business Essentials*, 8<sup>th</sup> Edition. Pearson Education, Inc. Publishing as Prentice Hall
- [10] Edwin N. S.; Nugraha, S. D.; Ainuddin, I. 2013. Characteristics of Entrepreneurship and Business Environment as a determinants of Growth Enterprises. *Journal of Business Administration*, vol.2, no.1
- [11] Fatoki, O. 2013. The Determinants of Immigrant Entrepreneurs' Growth Expectations in South Africa. *Journal of Social Science*, 37 (3): 209-216
- [12] Gibson, I.J; Ivancevich, M.J; Donnelly, H.J; and Konopake, R. 2012. *Organizations: Behavior, Structure, Processes*, 14<sup>th</sup> Edition, McGraw-Hill, Irwin, New York.
- [13] Gupta, D.P., Guha, S., Krishnaswami, S.S. 2013. Growth Firm and Its Determinants, *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 2:15
- [14] Jansen, F. 2009. The conceptualization of Growth: Are Employment and Turn-Over Interchange-able Criteria?, *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 18 (1), 21-45
- [15] Ministry of Cooperatives and SMEs, 2012. *The Growth of SMEs Data 2011 -2012*. [http://www.depkop.go.id/index.php?option=com\\_phocadownload&view=file&id=394](http://www.depkop.go.id/index.php?option=com_phocadownload&view=file&id=394): Accessible Wednesday, March 25, 2015; 07:05 hours.
- [16] Levie, J. Dan Autio, E. 2013. *Growth and Growth Intentions: A Meta-Analysis of Existing Evidence*. Enterprise Research Centre, White Paper # 1.
- [17] LPPI and Bank Indonesia, 2015. *Business Profile Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs)*
- [18] Mappigau, P. and Maupa, H. 2012. Entrepreneurial Intention and Small-Business Growth; An Empirical Study of Small Food Processing in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *International Journal of Business and Social Research (IJBSR)* volume 2, no.4; August.
- [19] Munizu, M. 2010. Affecting of External and Internal Factors To Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) Performance in South Sulawesi. *Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship*, Vol.12, No. 1 March: 33-41.
- [20] Nimran, U. 1998. *Organizational Behavior*. Citra Media, Surabaya.
- [21] Republic of Indonesia. 2008. Act No. 20 Year 2008 on Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises. Jakarta: State Secretariat.
- [22] Robbins, P. S. Judge, A.T. 2013. *Organizational Behavior*, 15 Edition, Pearson Education. Inc. New Jersey.
- [23] Robbins, S.P. and Coulter, M. 2012. *Management*, 11<sup>th</sup> edition. Prentice Hall.
- [24] Sakur. 2011. Study of Factors That Support the Development of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise: A Case Study in Surakarta. *Public Spirit*; volume 7, number 2; 85-110
- [25] Sirec, K. and Mocnik, D. 2010. How Entrepreneurs Personal Characteristics affecting On SMEs' Growth. *Izvirni Znanstveni Clanki - Original Scientific Papers, NG*, sr. 1- 2 / 2010.
- [26] Sinha, T.N. 1996. Human Factors In Entrepreneurship Effectiveness. *Journal Of Entrepreneurship*; 5 (1), 23-39.
- [27] Sriyana, J. 2010. Development Strategy for Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs): A case study in Bantul. *National Symposium: Toward a Dynamic and Creative in Purworejo..*
- [28] Storey, D. 1994. *Understanding the Small Business Sector*. International Thompson Business Press, London.
- [29] Sudiarta, I.P; Kirya, I. K; Cipta, I. W. 2014. An Analysis of Affecting Factors Performance of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Bangli Regency. *E-journal Bisma Ganesha Education University Department of Management*, vol.2.
- [30] Yeboah, A. M. 2015. Determinants of SME Growth: An Empirical Perspective of SMEs In The Cape Coast Metropolis, Ghana. *The Journal of Business In Developing Nations*; volume 14.