



## Evaluating micro and small enterprises (MSES) operators' awareness of policies, strategies and plans related to entrepreneurship development in Ethiopia: Addis Ababa in focus

Abaineh Degaga Anato<sup>1</sup>, Filmon Hadaro Hando<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> PhD, Assistant Professor of Management, Department of Management, Wolaita Sodo University, College of Business and Economics, Wolaita Sodo, Ethiopia

<sup>2</sup> PhD, Assistant professor of Management, Department of Center for Regional and Local Development, Addis Ababa University, College of Development Studies, Wolaita Sodo, Ethiopia

### Abstract

The purpose of this study was twofold: first, it reviewed relevant policies and strategies. Second, it assessed awareness of MSEs operators about policies and strategies. The study was based on pragmatism and it applied mixed methods research approach. Primary data were collected from 402 MSEs operators. Key informant interviews were held with officials from policy issuing organizations and support providing offices. Document analysis was made to review relevant policies and strategies. Kruskal-Wallis test was applied to compare if there are statistically significant differences among the four sectors in terms of their awareness. Frequencies, percentages, crosstabs and thematic analysis were used as data analysis methods. The results revealed that the incumbent government showed its commitment to promote the private sector, MSEs and entrepreneurship in the policies and strategies though it is criticized for weak implementation. The government is blamed for using support packages to silence youth protests, to win elections and failure to live up to the promises. Majority of the respondents (71%) are not aware of relevant policies and strategies whilst 60% of them do not know the benefits they are entitled. Kruskal-Wallis test revealed absence of statistically significant difference among the four sectors in terms of their awareness. Above two-thirds (70%) of the respondents stated that little attention has been given which contradicts with the promises in policy documents. Enhancing awareness of MSEs operators about relevant policies and strategies is crucial. Intensifying the provision of supports to MSEs and hence fostering entrepreneurial flairs of MSEs operators is highly recommended.

**Keywords:** policy awareness of MSEs, micro and small enterprises, policies, strategies and plans

### Introduction

Micro and small enterprises (MSEs) are viewed, more than ever, as vehicles for entrepreneurship as they boost innovative and competitive power of operators apart from contributing just to employment, social and political stability (Audretsch, Thurik, Verheul, & Wennekers, 2002) <sup>[5]</sup>. Countries that give special attention to entrepreneurship and small business development experience better chances of improved economy and industrialization (Akinymi & Adejumo, 2018) <sup>[2]</sup>. Nowadays, entrepreneurial support programs aimed at reducing unemployment and stimulating economic growth are of great interest to both academics and policymakers (Burton, 2020) <sup>[10]</sup>. Entrepreneurship is strongly linked to MSEs which are the main drivers of development (Stefanovic, Prokic & Rankovic, 2013) <sup>[44]</sup>. Small scale enterprises are viewed as breeding ground for entrepreneurship (Desai, 2009; Mulu, 2013) <sup>[17, 36]</sup>. The importance of MSEs to economic growth and job creation inspired government to intervene and facilitate growth of entrepreneurial flairs of people engaged in them (Audretsch *et al.*, 2002) <sup>[5]</sup>. Nowadays, entrepreneurship is part of economic development strategy employed by several countries globally to achieve macro-economic benefits (Obajil & Olugu, 2014) <sup>[39]</sup>. Governments encourage entrepreneurship development mainly by creating conducive environment. To this end, Desai (2009) <sup>[17]</sup> underscored that a hospitable environment is created for MSEs when sound

policies are enacted and the government and other stakeholders eagerly pursue those options that lead to economic and industrial development. It is well recognized that government policy ecosystem is central to the entrepreneurship development in any economy and generally includes policies relating to government spending, taxation and regulation (Bhat & Khan, 2014) <sup>[6]</sup>. Majorities of countries throughout the globe have established entrepreneurship and MSEs support programs.

The need to encourage entrepreneurship development in MSEs is essential especially for developing countries given the vast majority of citizens involved in these businesses. Government policies often affect entrepreneurial activities directly and indirectly (Akinymi & Adejumo, 2018) <sup>[2]</sup>. It has been emphasized that improving the ease of doing business in many developing economies requires broad institutional and regulatory overhauls as well as extensive investment in infrastructure (Burton, 2020) <sup>[10]</sup>. Small businesses, particularly, in their first life phase are often weak and need some support and protection to be able to properly compete in the market place (Audretsch *et al.*, 2002) <sup>[5]</sup>. The provision of support packages to MSEs is justifiable since entrepreneurship and small business development are the heart of many countries' economy (Akinymi & Adejumo, 2018) <sup>[2]</sup>. The various supports provided by government and other stakeholders can bring positive results only when the target recipients become

aware and start utilizing them. However, lack of awareness about relevant policies, strategies and plans among people engaged in MSEs severely hinders them from enjoying the benefits they are entitled. In this line, Hudsona, Hunterb and Peckhamc (2019) <sup>[31]</sup> contend that policies do not succeed or fail on their own merits; rather their progress is dependent upon the process of implementation. Moreover, Arshed, Carter and Mason (2014) <sup>[4]</sup> add that the process of enterprise policy formulation is greatly dominated by powerful actors and as a result, target beneficiaries including people engaged in MSEs are deprived from having a say in the policy formulation process. These dominant groups formulate policies, for the most part, based on their own interest rather than taking in to account the concerns of the target beneficiaries. Poor participation of target beneficiaries during policy formulation obviously limits their understanding about the nature and purpose of policies.

There are several policies, strategies, and plans designed in view of promoting MSEs and entrepreneurship. It has also been pointed out that such movements in Ethiopia have long been in place circa 19th century. Specifically, the private sector that incorporates MSEs and entrepreneurship emerged in Ethiopia during Emperor Menelik II's regime that lasted from 1889–1913 (Solomon, 2001). Since then, though varying in degree, efforts aimed at fostering private sector development have been exerted. The rationale behind these efforts is that a thriving private sector is deemed essential for economic development and thereby to curb the ever-increasing rate of unemployment, poverty and to mitigate the problem of widening income gap between the poor and the rich. Despite the promulgation of several policies, strategies and plans to spur private sector development in general and MSEs and entrepreneurship in particular, both entrepreneurship development and MSEs in Ethiopia are at their infant stage compared to the situation in other factor-driven economies and sub-Saharan countries (GEM, 2012) <sup>[29]</sup>. This can be partly attributed to the low level of awareness of people engaged in MSEs about relevant policies, strategies and plans which hinders them from fully utilizing the benefits they are entitled to. In other words, when MSEs operators become aware of available benefits and utilize them, the likelihood of success increases.

With the above backdrop, this study attempted to explore the awareness of people engaged in MSEs about relevant policies, strategies and plans. To this effect, it first discussed the extant policies, strategies and plans formulated with the prime aim of spurring entrepreneurial ingenuity of people engaged in MSEs and then it evaluated the degree of awareness of MSEs operators.

### Statement of the Problem

It is argued that designing and implementing appropriate economic policies, strategies, and legal/regulatory frameworks are the sine qua non for creating an enabling environment to promote MSEs (Gebrehiwot & Wolday, 2006) <sup>[28]</sup>. Hence, the government can play a prominent role in enhancing entrepreneurial endeavors by crafting policies that minimize bureaucracies and regulatory hassles that make the endeavors to be costly and daunting (Braunerhjelm, Larsson, Thulin & Skoogberg, 2016; Gebrehiwot & Wolday, 2006) <sup>[9, 28]</sup>. Nevertheless, mere formulation of policies, strategies and plans cannot lead to

success unless the implementation is closely monitored and the available benefit packages are made accessible. One of the main ways to enable MSEs operators benefit from such supports is by creating awareness. Unless the MSEs operators become aware of the existing benefit packages meant to enhance their operation, they are unlikely to exploit them. Thus, ensuring that the target beneficiaries of the stated policies, strategies and plans are aware of the availability of support packages and encouraging them to utilize them by reducing bureaucracies is essential. Otherwise, all the exerted efforts (financial, material and time) in the course of designing the relevant policies, strategies and plans turn out to be futile.

Various studies attempted to assess policies and strategies designed to promote MSEs and entrepreneurship. Many of them focus on the role of policies and strategies in spurring the development of entrepreneurship and MSEs. Audretsch *et al.* (2002) <sup>[5]</sup>, for example, studied policy as a determinant of entrepreneurship in Europe vs US context. This study reveals that in the United States there was divergent policy views about small businesses. The then policy was divided between allowing for the demise of small business on economic grounds, on the one hand, and preserving at least some semblance of a small-enterprise sector. However, nowadays, small businesses are seen more than ever as a vehicle for entrepreneurship contributing more than just to employment and social and political stability. Another study conducted by Bhat and Khan (2014) <sup>[6]</sup> which focuses on government policy ecosystem for entrepreneurship development in MSEs sector showed that government policy ecosystem impacts the rate of entrepreneurship via two distinct channels. First, through its impact on the quantity and quality of inputs going into the entrepreneurial process and second, through the impact of policy on the institutional structure that determines the rules of the game under which the entrepreneurial process unfolds.

Yet, another study conducted by Gebrehiwot and Wolday (2006) <sup>[28]</sup> focuses on policy and regularity challenges impeding growth of MSEs in Ethiopia found that policy predictability has a positive and significant effect on the growth of MSEs. Obaji and Olugu (2014) <sup>[39]</sup> in their study entitled as “the role of government policy in entrepreneurship development” underscored that government should play a leading role in entrepreneurship development and it should provide all necessary resources within its capacity. Hudsona, Hunterb and Peckhamc (2019) <sup>[31]</sup> carried out a study that focuses on policy failure and policy implementation. They found the major causes of policy failure to be overly optimistic expectations, implementation in dispersed governance, inadequate collaborative policymaking and vagaries of the political cycle. Moreover, Arshed, Carter and Mason (2014) <sup>[4]</sup> explored the ineffectiveness of entrepreneurship policy and attempted to confirm if policy formulation is the cause of policy implementation. They found that the top-down approach of policy formation, which deprives the target beneficiaries the chance to participate in the process of policy formulation and have a say, leads to policy failure.

Rambo (2013) <sup>[42]</sup>, however, points out that the majority of small business owners are not aware of these support services. The lack of awareness occurs in both developing and developed countries. Philips *et al.* (2014) in a study of native small businesses in South Africa found that minority of the respondents in the study were aware and received

government support. Mahajar and Yunus (2012) [35] in a study that focused on small businesses in Malaysia found that the level of awareness of government support programs is low. In addition, the low level of awareness is one of the factors that contribute to the weak usage of the government advisory services. Osano and Languitone (2016) [40]. Similarly, it is emphasized that despite the presence of a number of financial schemes and funding programs that support the SMEs' access to finance in South Africa, there was a low awareness of funding programs especially government support schemes (DTI, 2010) [16]. As it can be understood from the above studies, there is obvious shortage of previous studies that focus on assessing the awareness of people engaged in MSEs about relevant policies, strategies and plans and this has limited our understanding of the matter. Therefore, this study was conducted with the prime objective of filling this gap and thereby contributing to the stock of extant knowledge. This study builds on existing literature on entrepreneurship, economic development and government policy as it relates to entrepreneurial practices.

In line with the above problem statement, the study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What policies and strategies have been formulated to spur entrepreneurship development in MSEs?
2. Are the policies, strategies and plans of government well suited to the needs of people engaged in MSEs?
3. Are the people engaged in MSEs well aware of relevant policies and strategies as well as the benefits they are entitled in the policies and strategies?

**Objectives of the Study**

The general objective of this study was exploring Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs) operators' awareness of policies, strategies and plans related to entrepreneurship development in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. To this end, the following specific objectives were set.

1. To review extant policies and strategies that have been formulated to spur entrepreneurship development in MSEs
2. To assess whether the policies, strategies and plans of government are well suited to the needs of people engaged in MSEs
3. To explore the awareness of people engaged in MSEs about relevant policies and strategies and to assess if MSEs operators are aware of the benefits they are

entitled in the policies and strategies?

**Materials and Methods**

There are different worldviews that guide the choice of methods in conducting research (Blessing & Chakrabarti, 2009) [7]. Out of the many variants of philosophical orientations, pragmatism is selected. As a philosophical underpinning for mixed methods studies, pragmatism allows focusing attention on the research problem and using pluralistic approaches to derive knowledge about the problem (Creswell, 2014; Creswell & Clark, 2018) [14, 15]. Three major approaches of research are identified as quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods (Creswell, 2003, 2007, 2014; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) [11, 12, 14, 34]. In this study, mixed methods i.e., the combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches (Creswell, 2009) [13] was utilized. Mixed methods approach enables to measure overlapping but also different facets of a phenomenon, yielding an enriched and elaborated understanding of that phenomenon (Greene *et al.*, 1989) [30]. The multifaceted nature of entrepreneurship and the corresponding policies, strategies and plans warrant the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Doing so allows deep understanding of the underlying meanings and patterns besides investigating the extent of awareness of MSEs operators about relevant policies, strategies and plans.

The study population consists of all MSEs operators in Addis Ababa. There are five sectors MSEs are engaged in—construction, manufacturing, trade, service and urban agriculture. Nevertheless, due to the infeasibility of collecting data from all ten sub cities owing to limited budget, time and other logistics, the target population of the study is reduced to those MSEs operating in the three sub cities—Yeka, Bole and Lideta. Besides those people who are working in offices that facilitate the development of entrepreneurship and MSEs in Addis Ababa city are also considered as pertinent source of data. According to the data obtained from Addis Ababa City Administration's Micro and Small Enterprises Development Bureau [AACAMSEDB], in the ten sub cities there are a total of 25,399 MSEs (AACAMSEsDB & Ethiopian Civil Service University, 2017, p. 39) [1]. Data regarding the prevalence of MSEs in the three selected sub cities is presented in table 4.1 below.

**Table 1:** Distribution of MSEs in the selected sub cities in each sector

Sub city	The sector MSEs are engaged in					Total
	Manufacturing	Construction	Urban agric.	Service	Trade	
Yeka	674	1750	81	527	839	3,871
Bole	514	980	55	370	420	2,339
Lideta	296	639	31	246	499	1711
	1,484	3,369	167	1,143	1,758	7,921

Source: Addis Ababa City Administration MSEs Development Bureau (AACAMSEsDB) & Ethiopian Civil Service University, 2017, p. 39 [1].

However, since agriculture accounts for an insignificant amount of the MSEs (167/7,921=2%), it is intentionally excluded and this makes the target population size of the study to be 7,754 (7,921–167).

In this study the degree of precision is determined to be 0.05; the confidence level is chosen to be 95% and the population proportion is assumed to be 50% as this results in the largest sample size (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970) [33].

Given the finite target population of the study, to determine the sample size, a sample size formula for the finite population developed by Krejcie & Morgan (1970, p. 607) [33] was used.

$$S = \frac{X^2 NP (1-P)}{d^2 (N-1) + X^2 P (1-P)}$$

Where:

S = Required Sample size

X = Z value (e.g. 1.96 for 95% confidence level)

N = Population Size

P = Population proportion (expressed as decimal) (assumed to be 0.5 (50%))

d = Degree of accuracy (5%), expressed as a proportion (.05); It is margin of error

Accordingly,

$$S = \frac{1.96^2 \times 7754 \times 0.5(1-0.5)}{0.05^2(7754-1) + (1.96^2 \times 0.5(1-0.5))} = \frac{3.8416 \times 7754 \times 0.25}{(0.0025 \times 7753) + (3.8416 \times 0.25)} = \frac{7446.9416}{20.3429} = 366.07 \approx 366$$

To compensate for possible non-returns, 10 percent of 366 (36) is added; which turned the final sample size to be 402.

**Table 2:** Computation of the number of MSEs surveyed in each sub city under each sector

Sub city	The sector MSEs are engaged in				No. of MSEs surveyed
	Manufacturing	Construction	Service	Trade	
Yeka	197 x 0.18= 35	197x0.46=91	197x0.14=28	197x0.22=43	197
Bole	117x0.23= 27	117x0.43=50	117x0.16=19	117x0.18=21	117
Lideta	88x0.17=16	88x0.38=33	88x0.15=13	88x0.30=26	88
Total	78	174	60	90	402

Source: Computed by the researcher

Having stratified the MSEs in terms of their respective sector, the specified number of sample MSEs from each sector in the three sub-cities were selected by using simple random sampling. To facilitate this, a sample frame that contains the list of every MSEs in each sector in the corresponding sub city was used and those MSEs to be surveyed were chosen randomly.

In the course of conducting the study, both primary and secondary data were acquired from multiple sources. Primary data were collected from those individuals who are engaged in MSEs activities in the selected sub-cities of Addis Ababa and also from those officials who are working in areas that are directly related to the subject of interest. Questionnaire, key informant interviews (KKIs), observation and document review constitute the data collection techniques employed in the study.

Quantitative data analysis was made by using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Accordingly, some of the descriptive statistics used in this study include mean and standard deviation. Besides, frequency distributions, percentages, tables, crosstabs. Kruskal Wallis H test, the non-parametric version of one way ANOVA, was applied to test if there is statistically significant difference among the four sectors of MSEs in terms of their awareness of relevant policies, strategies and plans. To facilitate this, SPSS version 20 was principally applied and the corresponding interpretation of the output was made. Qualitative data, on the other hand, is analyzed by applying thematic analysis. Document analysis, which is a form of qualitative research in which documents are interpreted by the researcher to give voice and meaning around an assessment topic (Bowen, 2009) [8], is also applied.

**Results and Discussion**

**1. Results of Key Informant Interviews and Document Analysis of Policies, Strategies, and Plans Related to Entrepreneurship and MSEs**

Here, a brief overview of relevant policies, strategies, and plans have been made based mainly on document analysis and results from KIIs. To put the matter in perspective, relevant policies, strategies and plans are analyzed chronologically.

The Current Regime–Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front (EPRDF) EPRDF regime came to power in May 1991 after toppling the socialist Dergue and launched public sector reforms aimed at market and public

sector development (Wolday & Tassew, 2016) [45]. The regime is said to be inspired to introduce policy reforms to follow the footsteps of the then South East Asian tigers (Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore, and Malaysia) which achieved remarkable economic transformation between the 1960s and 1980s (IMF, 2014) [32]. The major macroeconomic reforms pursued by the regime and that affect the development of MSEs and entrepreneurship either directly or indirectly include adoption of market-led economic policy, deregulation of domestic prices, privatization of public enterprises, devaluation of local currency, decentralization and devolution of power and financial sector reforms involving private banks, insurance companies and MFIs (Gebrehiwot & Wolday, 2006) [28].

The market reforms were launched with the view to developing a vibrant private sector that can foster the development of productive MSEs and entrepreneurship. The current government adopted a very comprehensive policy framework, ADLI, in 1995 which acknowledged the importance of the private sector in economic development. Unlike the socialist regime that intentionally crippled the private sector, the incumbent government recognized it as the engine of growth and MSEs were singled out as instruments to create and expand a vibrant private sector. More specifically, the issuance of national MSEs strategy in 1997 along with the establishment of MSEs development offices at federal and regional levels is considered to be a good indicator of the attention given. The strategy focused on creating a conducive policy, legal and institutional environment and providing support packages that could enhance MSEs and tackle structural problems impeding their progress. The MSEs strategy aimed at facilitating economic growth, realizing equitable development, creating sustainable jobs, strengthening cooperation among MSEs, providing the bases for medium and larger enterprises development, promoting export and extending preferential support to MSEs. The strategy divulges bold initiative on the part of the government at least in principle. Nevertheless, the actual result obtained from the MSEs operators through survey and from higher officials via KIIs, to be discussed in the subsequent section, disclosed that what had been promised in the policy document could not be changed into reality.

The incumbent government clearly showed its commitment to promote the private sector in general and MSEs and entrepreneurship in particular in the policies, strategies, and



plans issued subsequently. The industry policy of the country formulated in 2002 recognized the need to promote MSEs as instruments for nurturing entrepreneurship and private sector development. Improving the supply of working premises, seed capital, raw materials, access to market and training and consultancy services were among the key areas emphasized in the policy. The issue has also been emphasized in the SDPRP (2002/3 – 2004/5), PASDEP (2005/6–2009/10), GTP I (2010/11–2014/15), GTP II (2015/16–2019/20). The TVET strategy, education policy, and others gave due emphasis to the importance of promoting MSEs and entrepreneurship. It has been stated that the inclusion of the private sector and entrepreneurship development in the major development policies and strategies of the country is informed by OECD's (2004) direction that calls for integrating MSEs' development strategy in the broader national development strategy and/or poverty reduction and growth strategy of transition and developing countries.

With the aim of consolidating the supports to entrepreneurship and MSEs development, the government amended the 1997 MSEs strategy in 2011. Doing so is commendable since countries with high level entrepreneurial systems also display high levels of sustainability (Raposo, Fernandes & Veiga, 2020) <sup>[43]</sup>. However, the obvious motive of the government behind committing itself to support MSEs and entrepreneurship has been unequivocally stated in the amended document. It has been stated that the government gave due attention to promote MSEs and entrepreneurship because the urban youth who would be benefited from such schemes constitute the major political base like the farmers in the rural area. It can be argued that the government's motive is more political than economical. This is evident from the allocation of a huge budget in the name of youth's revolving fund to silence the public protests mainly orchestrated by unemployed youth. The weak performance of MSEs thus can be partly attributed to the lack of genuine and sustainable commitment of the government. An interviewee stated that he noticed a lack of strong commitment on the part of support giving institutions in that they tend to strengthen the support during elections.

The government is blamed for using MSEs and entrepreneurship development as a strategy to win elections in urban areas and failure to live up to the promises stated in the policy and strategy documents. Another study conducted by Altenburg (2010) <sup>[3]</sup> found that little attention has been paid to monitoring and evaluation of the success of policy and strategy implementation. Wolday and Tassew (2016) <sup>[45]</sup> also uncovered that there is big difference between what have been promised in the documents and the actual experience. To this effect, the survey result proved that the stated support schemes are not widely accessible to the MSEs community in that only 30% of the respondents reported that they have ever received supports from government offices while only 19 % have got financial supports from MFIs. Altenburg (2010) <sup>[3]</sup> further disclosed that MSEs rarely grow to the next level mainly due to lack of entrepreneurial and managerial capability. Gebrehiwot and Wolday (2006) <sup>[28]</sup> verified that the attempts of government to liberalize and improve the policy, regulatory and institutional environment have paid off in terms of increased competition and improved licensing and registration procedures. The same study, however, indicated

that there is marked difference between what have been promised in the policy and strategy documents and the actual result on the ground. The study finally suggested the need to exert concerted efforts so as to further streamline the situation like capital shortage, shortage of working premises, inadequate market and high tax rate continued to be major constraints. These findings align to the empirical findings of the current study to be discussed next.

The MSEs constitute emerging private sector in developing countries like Ethiopia and thus government and other stakeholders interested in fostering the private sector should focus on them. Gebrehiwot and Wolday (2006) <sup>[28]</sup> stressed that based on the promises stated in policy and strategy documents mentioned above, one can reasonably expect the transformation of MSEs and entrepreneurship shortly. Nevertheless, they found that the policy environment in which MSEs operate is a major hindrance. Altenburg (2010) <sup>[3]</sup> added that entrepreneurship development is very weak in that entrepreneurs bitterly complain of unfair competition and bias towards state owned, endowment owned and even foreign enterprises in terms of access to land, credit, foreign exchange and other support packages. Gebrehiwot and Wolday (2006) <sup>[28]</sup> suggest the need to undertake a comprehensive review of the policy, regulatory and institutional environment and they pointed out the importance of regularly reviewing the success of policy implementation. A key informant from FeUJCFSA also substantiated that there is weak practice of monitoring and evaluating the implementation of policies and strategies.

## **2. Awareness of MSEs Operators about Relevant Policies, Strategies, and Plans**

When the MSEs operators become conversant with the policies, strategies, and plans pertaining to the sector, they can properly make use of them and amass the benefits arising thereof. Lack of awareness, on the contrary, hinders them from requesting and enjoying their privileges, which in turn negatively affects their performance. With this backdrop, the data collected regarding the level of awareness of MSEs operators about relevant policies, strategies, and plans are presented in table 5.1 As it can be understood from the table, the level of awareness is measured in terms of six items. Hence, analysis is made for each of the six items turn by turn since the approach employed here is a Likert item type rather than a Likert scale which can be treated as continuous data.

The data in the table is produced by using crosstabs and running the Kruskal Wallis test. The six items included under the awareness theme are measured on 5 points Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The respondents showed their degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements presented. Furthermore, the Kruskal Wallis test was run to check if there is a significant difference across the four sectors of MSEs regarding the level of awareness on related policies, strategies, and plans.

Although the non-parametric techniques, including the Kruskal Wallis test, have less stringent assumptions (Pallant, 2011, p. 214) <sup>[41]</sup> unlike their parametric counterparts, there are some general assumptions that should be checked. The four commonly mentioned assumptions, in this regard include, 1) The dependent variable should be measured at the ordinal or continuous level; i.e., interval or ratio; 2) The independent variable

should consist of two or more categories, independent groups; 3) Independence of observations which means that there should be no relationship between the observations in each group or between the groups themselves and 4) random sample (Field, 2013; Pallant, 2011) [27, 41].

The data at hand definitely satisfies all the four assumptions of non-parametric tests in general and that of the Kruskal Wallis test in particular. The dependent variable—the level of awareness about relevant policies, strategies, and plans—is measured on a 5 point Likert scale which is ordinal in nature; the independent variable—MSEs sector—consists of

four categorical independent groups; the observations are independent and the sample was random. Thus, the use of the Kruskal Wallis test at this juncture is appropriate to test the implied null hypothesis “the level of awareness about relevant policies, strategies, and plans do not significantly vary across the four sectors of MSEs”. The test is conducted at a significance level of .05 and a confidence interval of 95%. Accordingly, the null hypothesis is rejected at .05 level of significance which shows that the level of awareness significantly varies across the MSEs sectors; i.e., construction, manufacturing, trade, and service.

**Table 3:** Awareness of Operators About MSEs and Entrepreneurship Related Policies, Strategies and Plans

Item	Sector	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		Total		Kruskal Wallis Test	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean rank	KW values
1. I'm aware of policies, strategies and plans related to MSEs & entrepreneurship	Construction	35	24.5	68	47.6	4	2.8	30	21.0	6	4.2	143	100	171.66	H=3.090 df=3 p=.378
	Manufacturing	14	20.0	32	45.7	2	2.9	13	18.6	9	12.9	70	100	189.09	
	Trade	24	30.4	33	41.8	3	3.8	18	22.8	1	1.3	79	100	162.50	
	Service	12	22.2	27	50.0	0	0.0	14	25.9	1	1.9	54	100	174.27	
	Total	85	24.6	160	46.2	9	2.6	75	21.7	17	4.9	346	100		
2. I know the benefits MSEs are entitled to enjoy...	Construction	22	15.4	74	51.7	1	0.7	33	23.1	13	9.1	143	100	162.00	H=6.906 df=3 p=.075
	Manufacturing	5	7.1	30	42.9	3	4.3	23	32.9	9	12.9	70	100	194.94	
	Trade	7	8.9	36	45.6	3	3.8	30	38.0	3	3.8	79	100	181.32	
	Service	11	20.4	22	40.7	1	1.9	15	27.8	5	9.3	54	100	164.72	
	Total	45	13.0	162	46.8	8	2.3	101	29.2	30	8.7	346	100		
3. I have read the policies, strategies & plans	Construction	45	31.5	55	38.5	9	6.3	27	18.9	7	4.9	143	100	170.62	H=2.051 df=3 p=.562
	Manufacturing	18	25.7	26	37.1	2	2.9	20	28.6	4	5.7	70	100	187.94	
	Trade	25	31.6	30	38.0	4	5.1	19	24.1	1	1.3	79	100	169.70	
	Service	18	33.3	21	38.9	2	3.7	9	16.7	4	7.4	54	100	167.97	
	Total	106	30.6	132	38.2	17	4.9	75	21.7	16	4.6	346	100		
4. Currently enough attention has been given to MSEs...	Construction	46	32.2	53	37.1	4	2.8	30	21.0	10	7.0	143	100	169.22	H=5.246 df=3 p=.155
	Manufacturing	13	18.6	31	44.3	3	4.3	17	24.3	6	8.6	70	100	193.56	
	Trade	16	20.3	43	54.4	2	2.5	16	20.3	2	2.5	79	100	175.15	
	Service	19	35.2	22	40.7	2	3.7	8	14.8	3	5.6	54	100	156.42	
	Total	94	27.2	149	43.1	11	3.2	71	20.5	21	6.1	346	100		
5. The existing policies....are suitable	Construction	31	21.7	69	48.3	6	4.2	27	18.9	10	7.0	143	100	176.97	H=2.712 df=3 p=.438
	Manufacturing	12	17.1	35	50.0	3	4.3	18	25.7	2	2.9	70	100	184.68	
	Trade	17	21.5	45	57.0	2	2.5	12	15.2	3	3.8	79	100	165.01	
	Service	13	24.1	29	53.7	2	3.7	8	14.8	2	3.7	54	100	162.25	
	Total	73	21.1	178	51.4	13	3.8	65	18.8	17	4.9	346	100		
6. The current policies, strategies...fit to the situation	Construction	21	14.7	68	47.6	8	5.6	39	27.3	7	4.9	143	100	184.13	H=4.409 df=3 p=.221
	Manufacturing	18	25.7	25	35.7	1	1.4	21	30.0	5	7.1	70	100	175.79	
	Trade	14	17.7	44	55.7	5	6.3	15	19.0	1	1.3	79	100	162.80	
	Service	13	24.1	27	50.5	2	3.7	9	16.7	3	5.6	54	100	158.04	
	Total	66	19.1	164	47.4	16	4.6	84	24.3	16	4.6	346	100		

The respondents were requested to express their degree of agreement or disagreement to the statement “I am aware of the available policies, strategies, and plans in the area of MSEs and entrepreneurship”. Accordingly, 160 (46.2%) and 85 (24.6%) of the respondents stated that they disagree and strongly disagree respectively. These two response categories together make up 245 (70.8%) of the total and it implies that above two-thirds of the MSEs operators do not know what policies, strategies, and plans that have been issued so as to foster MSEs and entrepreneurship. Among the remaining respondents, 75 (21.7%) and 17 (4.9%) respectively indicated that they “agree” and “strongly agree” whereas only 9 (2.6%) remained “neutral”. As it has been thoroughly discussed, there are several policies, strategies, and plans dealing with promoting the private sector in general and MSEs and entrepreneurship in particular. Nevertheless, it can be argued that these policies, strategies, and plans have not been well communicated to

the targeted beneficiaries. This, in turn, impedes the development of MSEs and entrepreneurship in that the beneficiaries fail to work as per the directions indicated in these documents and this, in turn, renders them not to be in a position to enjoy the privileges available to those enterprises which satisfy what has been stipulated thereof. This result reinforces what has been emphasized in the KII held with higher officials at the city and sub-city level. The officials underscored that a low level of awareness about MSEs and entrepreneurship related policies, strategies and plans among those individuals seeking to embark on the sector has created several difficulties. Some of such difficulties were mentioned as failure to satisfy the formal requirements stipulated in the stated documents and other operational manuals derived from them. For instance, the majority of those who apply to get organized in a group and embark on MSEs want to work in areas of their inclination which in most cases do not fit the priority areas singled out

in the documents. It is common to encounter applicants who refuse to change their mind and consequently miss the opportunity to work in areas which are different from their choice but prioritized by the government. Thus, increasing the level of awareness among MSEs operators about relevant policies, strategies, and plans via such mechanism as organizing awareness creation sessions, dispatching the documents to offices at *Woredas*/districts, preparing leaflets and others are important.

Similarly, the Kruskal-Wallis test revealed that there was a statistically insignificant difference in awareness of relevant policies, strategies and plans across the MSEs operators in the four sectors—construction, manufacturing, trade, and service. The test result is  $\chi^2(3) = 3.090$ ,  $p = .378$ , with a mean rank 162.50 for trade, 171.66 for construction, 174.27 for service and 189.09 for manufacturing. Though it is statistically insignificant, the level of awareness about the relevant policies, strategies, and plans varies across the MSEs operators in the four sectors as indicated by the mean rank. Hence, it can be understood that MSEs operators in manufacturing sector have relatively better awareness about the existing policies, strategies, and plans than those working in the rest three sectors.

The other item included in the table deals with whether the MSEs operators are aware of the specific benefits they are entitled to get in the mentioned documents. To this end, nearly half, 162 (46.8%), of the respondents showed their disagreement while the other 45 (13%) stated that they strongly disagree with the statement. Thus, almost 60 % of the respondents showed their disagreement which discloses that the majority of them are not aware of the benefits they are privileged to enjoy when working in MSEs. This obviously hinders their performance and hence calls for actions to make the operators aware of the benefits promised to be provided in the documents. There are several activities being undertaken by the Addis Ababa city MSEs development bureau and its branches at sub cities and *Woredas*/districts.

The major support schemes stated thereof include 1) human resource and technological development, 2) facilitating the provision of seed capital, 3) working and sales premises supply, 4) market development, 5) establishment of the one-stop center and 6) industry extension service. Indeed, the fact that the majority of MSEs operators are unaware of what specific benefits they can get while working in MSEs has been underlined during the KII held with officials working in various institutions. To this light, one of the participants of the KII stated that “people working in MSEs are negligent of the benefits they can formally get from support giving offices established at the city, sub city and *Woreda* level to facilitate MSEs and entrepreneurship”. Hence lack of awareness about these benefits by the majority of MSEs operators is something that calls for immediate actions from the pertinent bodies.

Out of the rest of the respondents, 101 (29.2%) showed their agreement while 30 (8.7%) stated that they strongly agree with the aforementioned statement. Those respondents who chose “agree” and “strongly agree” together makeup 131 (37.9%) of the total. This is something good that needs to be shared by the rest of the MSEs operators too. A Kruskal-Wallis test was run to check if there is a statistically significant difference in the degree of awareness about the benefits MSEs are entitled across the four sectors. However, the test result shows that there is no statistically significant

difference in the awareness of benefits the enterprises are privileged to enjoy in the documents across the sectors. This is given by  $\chi^2(3) = 6.906$ ,  $p = .075$ , with a mean rank 162.00 for construction, 164.72 for service, 181.32 for trade and 194.94 for manufacturing. Despite being statistically insignificant, it can be inferred from the values for the mean rank that operators working in manufacturing are again somewhat better in terms of their awareness of the benefits they are entitled to get while working in MSEs. This can be possibly attributed to the special attention accorded to the manufacturing sector by the government.

Another question was posed to assess if the MSEs operators have ever read the policies, strategies, and plans issued in light of MSEs and entrepreneurship. The result from the survey showed that above two-third, 232 (68.8%) of the respondents stated that they have not read the documents by choosing either “strongly disagree” or “disagree”. This finding reinforces what has been obtained regarding the first two items dealing with the degree of awareness of MSEs operators about the policies, strategies, and plans, as well as the benefits promised to be provided to them in the documents. The respondents who stated that they have read the document by selecting either “agree” or “strongly agree” constitutes a bit more than a quarter, 91 (26.3%) of the total. Therefore, there is a glaring need to increase the level of awareness among the MSEs operators about the policies, strategies, and plans designed to spur entrepreneurship and MSEs.

The result of the Kruskal-Wallis test again indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in reading the documents pertaining to MSEs and entrepreneurship across the respondents from the four sectors of MSEs. The result is  $\chi^2(3) = 2.051$ ,  $p = .562$ , with a mean rank of 167.97 for service, 169.70 for trade, 170.62 for construction and 187.94 for manufacturing. Since the mean ranks are somewhat closer to one another, it can be understood that there is insignificant difference among the four sectors in terms of reading the relevant policies, strategies, and plans. However, the manufacturing sector has, once again, got a higher mean rank which reveals that respondents from this sector have read the documents in a slightly better manner than those from the rest three sectors.

It has been boldly reaffirmed in the KIIs that the government gives utmost attention to MSEs and entrepreneurship development. This is because MSEs are singled out as vital outlets to moderate the unemployment problem of the city on top of their multifaceted benefits to the economy in terms of poverty alleviation, serving as a springboard for future industrialists, feeding large firms/ancillary function and, increasing the tax base. Of course, this issue has been thoroughly discussed in the literature review section and it is included in the policies, strategies, and plans pertaining to MSEs and entrepreneurship. To assess whether this promise has been materialized, a question was presented as “I believe that currently enough attention has been given to entrepreneurship and MSEs”.

To this end, 243 (70.2%) of the respondents showed their disagreement with the above statement by choosing either “strongly disagree” or “disagree”. On the other hand, a little bit higher than one-fourth, 92 (26.6%), of the respondents confirmed that enough attention has been given to the sector by showing the agreement to the statement. Nevertheless, since the majority of them showed their disagreement, it can



be argued that the extent of attention given to the sector is not enough. This again calls for intensifying efforts exerted to foster MSEs and entrepreneurship by all pertinent stakeholders. This holds true because when the sector thrives, the country in general and the city, in particular, would be in a position to enjoy the benefits mentioned above. A study conducted by Nziku and Henry (2021) <sup>[38]</sup> in Tanzania revealed that its policy is geared more towards small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) development than entrepreneurship. This coincides with what has been underscored in the KIIs as the participants vividly stated that the government gives more attention to the mere creation of MSEs and do not exert much effort to enhance their entrepreneurial flairs.

Kruskal Wallis test was conducted to test the implied null hypothesis “the level of attention given to MSEs and entrepreneurship is equally rated across the four sectors of MSEs”. The test result indicated that there is no statistically significant difference across the four sectors of MSEs in rating the level of attention given to MSEs and entrepreneurship. This is given by  $\chi^2(3) = 5.246$ ,  $p = .155$ , with a mean rank 156.42 for service, 169.22 for construction, 175.15 for trade and 193.56 for manufacturing. Just by comparing the mean rank, it can be understood that manufacturing sector respondents rated the statement higher than the respondents from the other three sectors.

The fact that respondents from the manufacturing sector tended to rate the aforementioned items higher than their counterparts from the rest three sectors can be ascribed to the special attention accorded to the sector. As it has been described, the incumbent government accorded utmost attention to the manufacturing sector and established a separate agency called “Federal Small and Medium Manufacturing Industry Development Agency” in regulation No. 373/2016. Before the issuance of this regulation, MSEs in all the five sectors were working under the FeMSEDA. However, FeMSEDA has been dissolved following the establishment of the Federal Small and Medium Manufacturing Agency and the other new agency referred to as the Federal Urban Job Creation and Food Security Agency. The special attention might have resulted in better awareness about the existing policies, strategies, plans, support packages and the level of attention given among the MSEs operators engaged in the manufacturing sector. The special priority given to the manufacturing sector has been stressed in the KIIs held with officials in different organizations included in the interview as well as other development policies and strategies of the country.

The other question posed to assess the level of awareness among the MSEs operators concerning the existing policies, strategies, and plans related to MSEs and entrepreneurship focuses on the suitability of the current legal and regulatory frameworks related to MSEs and entrepreneurship. Accordingly, 73 (21.1%) and 178 (51.4%) of the respondents picked “strongly disagree” and “disagree” respectively. When combined together, the two response categories make up 251 (72.5%) of the total. This implies that the existing policies, strategies, and plans are rated as unsuitable to spur the intended development of MSEs and entrepreneurship by nearly three-fourth of the respondents. The low level of MSEs and entrepreneurship development expressed in terms of a low level of graduation, employment creation potential and a higher level of members’ turnover mentioned during the KIIs, can be partly linked to the stated

unsuitability of relevant policies, strategies, and plans. This, in turn, brings the need to revise the policies, strategies, and plans in such a way that they can practically foster the development of MSEs and entrepreneurship. Thus, revising the stated documents and implementing the same can potentially enable them to achieve the envisioned progress of the sector. The proportion of respondents who rated the current policies, strategies, and plans as suitable is below a quarter, 82 (23.7%). This finding corroborates what has been found in a study conducted by Eton, Mwosi, Okello-Obura, Turyehebwa, and & Uwonda (2021) <sup>[18]</sup> which indicated the need to improve financial inclusion and networking capability of MSEs via suitable policies. A study conducted by Nguyen, Schinckus, Canh, & Thanh, (2021) <sup>[37]</sup> on “Economic Policy Uncertainty and Entrepreneurship” shown a finding that somewhat contradicts conventional wisdom in that it economic policy uncertainty is not always bad for entrepreneurs as the uncertainty may serve as exogenous shock, filtering ‘good’ business ventures from ‘not-so good’ ones. Nevertheless, it can be concluded that the policies and strategies formulated to enhance MSEs and entrepreneurship ought to be suitable; otherwise, given their small size, the MSEs can be highly affected by unfriendly policy environment.

The Kruskal Wallis H test run to test whether there is statistically significant difference among the respondents from the four sectors on the suitability of existing policies, strategies and plans to spur MSEs and entrepreneurship uncovered that the stated suitability has been somewhat invariably rated by respondents from the various sectors. The test result is  $\chi^2(3) = 2.712$ ,  $p = .438$ , with a mean rank 162.25 for service, 165.01 for trade, 176.97 for construction and 184.68 for manufacturing. The manufacturing sector has the highest mean rank here again. This result is consistent in all the individual questions/items discussed so far and it sheds some light on the higher degree of awareness about the stated policies, strategies and plans among respondents from the manufacturing sector.

## Conclusions

The exercise of formulating policies that particularly aim at enhancing entrepreneurship is at its infant stage in Ethiopia. The Ethiopian government launched market reforms with the view to developing a vibrant private sector that can foster the development of productive MSEs and entrepreneurship. The incumbent government clearly showed its commitment to promote the private sector in general and MSEs and entrepreneurship in particular in the policies, strategies, and plans issued. The issuance of national MSEs strategy in 1997 along with the establishment of MSEs development offices at federal and regional levels is considered to be a good indicator of the attention given. Besides, Industry Development Policy of 2002, Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Plan (2002/3 – 2004/5), Plan for Accelerated and Sustained Development to End Poverty (2005/6–2009/10), Growth and Transformation Plan I (2010/11–2014/15), Growth and Transformation Plan II (2015/16–2019/20), The TVET strategy, education policy, and others gave due emphasis to the importance of promoting MSEs and entrepreneurship. These policies and strategies clearly delineated various supports to be provided to MSEs. Despite acknowledging the importance of promoting entrepreneurship and MSEs, there are marked differences between the promises made on



the policy documents and the actual result. The government is blamed for using financial and other supports originally meant to foster MSEs and entrepreneurship development as a strategy to silence political protests, to win elections in urban areas and for its failure to live up to the promises stated in the policy and strategy documents. Majority of the respondents rated the policies and strategies to be not suitable. Despite the government's efforts in designing pro-MSEs and entrepreneurship policies, preeminent majority, 245 (70.8%) of the MSEs operators are unaware of those policies, strategies, and plans. Therefore, enhancing awareness of MSEs operators about relevant policies and strategies is crucial. Intensifying the provision of supports to MSEs and hence fostering entrepreneurial flairs of MSEs operators is highly recommended.

## References

1. Addis Ababa City Administration Micro and Small Enterprises Development Bureau (AACAMSEsDB) & Ethiopian Civil Service University. Addis ababa, Ethiopia: author, 2017.
2. Akinyemi FO, Adejumo OO. Government policies and entrepreneurship phases in emerging economies: Nigeria and South Africa. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 2018, 8(35). doi:10.1186/s40497-018-0131-5
3. Altenburg T. *Industrial policy in Ethiopia* (Discussion Paper 2/2010). Bonn, German: German Development Institute, 2010.
4. Arshed N, Carter S, Mason C. The ineffectiveness of entrepreneurship policy: is policy formulation to blame? *Journal of Small Business Economics*, 2014. doi: 10.1007/s11187-014-9554-8.
5. Audretsch D, Thurik R, Verheul I, Wennekers S. (Eds.). *Entrepreneurship: determinants and policy in a European – US comparison*. New York, USA: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002.
6. Bhat SA, Khan RA. *Government policy ecosystem for entrepreneurship development in MSEs sector*. India: University of Kashmir, 2014.
7. Blessing LTM, Chakrabarti A. *DRM, a design research methodology*. London Springer, 2009.
8. Bowen GA. Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 2009, 9(2).
9. Braunerhjelm P, Larsson JP, Thulin P, Skoogberg Y. *The entrepreneurial challenge: a comparative study of entrepreneurial dynamics in China, Europe and the US*. Sweden: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) and Swedish Entrepreneurship forum, 2016.
10. Burton J. Supporting entrepreneurs when it matters: Optimizing capital allocation for impact. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy*, 2020;9(3):277-302. Doi: 10.1108/JEPP-06-2019-0054
11. Creswell JW. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Florida: SAGE publications, Inc, 2003.
12. Creswell JW. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). USA: SAGE Publications, 2007.
13. Creswell JW. *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). USA: SAGE Publications. Inc, 2009.
14. Creswell JW. *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). California: Thousand Oaks, Sage publications Inc, 2014.
15. Creswell JW, Clark VLP. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage, 2018.
16. Department of Trade and Industry (DTI). *National Directory of Small Business Support Programs*. Pretoria, south Africa: author, 2010.
17. Desai V. *Entrepreneurship development: The entrepreneur, entrepreneurship and development principles, programmes and policies* (rev. ed.). Mumbai: Himalaya publishing house, 2009, 1.
18. Eton M, Mwosi F, Okello-Obura C, Turyehewa A, Uwonda G. Financial inclusion and the growth of small medium enterprises in Uganda: empirical evidence from selected districts in Lango sub-region. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 2021, 10. Doi: 10.1186/s13731-021-00168-2
19. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), Ministry of Education (MoE). *National technical and vocational education and training (TVET) strategy*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: author, 2008.
20. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoDED). *A plan for accelerated and sustained development to end poverty (PASDEP, 2005/06–2009/10: Policy Matrix)*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: auditor, 2006, 2.
21. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), Ministry of Finance and Economic Development (MoFED). *Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP, 2010/11-2014/15)*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Author, 2010.
22. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), Ministry of Trade and Industry. *Micro and small enterprises development strategy*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: author, 1997.
23. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), Ministry of Trade and Industry (MoTI). *Industry development strategy of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: author, 2002.
24. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), Ministry of Trade and Industry. *Micro and small enterprise development strategy: Provision framework and methods of implementation (Approved)*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Author, 2011.
25. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE), Ministry of Industry. *Ethiopian industrial development strategic plan (2013–2025)*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Author, 2013.
26. Federal Micro and Small Enterprises Development Agency (FeMSEDA). *Annual statistical bulletin of micro and small enterprises development sector*. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: Author, Information and Technology Directorate, 2016.
27. Field A. *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Los Angeles, LA: sage, 2013.
28. Gebrehiwot A, Wolday A. Micro and small enterprises (MSE) development in Ethiopia: strategy, regulatory changes and remaining constraints. *Ethiopian Journal of Economics*, 2006;10(2):1-32.
29. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). *African entrepreneurship: sub Saharan African report*. Massachusetts, USA: Babson College, 2012a.
30. Greene JC, Caracelli VJ, Graham WF. *Toward a*

- conceptual framework for mixed – method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*,1989;11(3):255-274.
31. Hudsona B, Hunterb D, Peckhamc S. Policy failure and the policy-implementation gap: can policy support programs help? *Journal of Policy Design and Practice*,2019;2(1):1-14.  
doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2018.1540378
  32. International Monetary Fund (IMF). Ethiopia's development experience: issues and comparative analysis with Asian peers (IMF Country Report No. 14/303). Washington, D.C.: author, 2014.
  33. Krejcie RV, Morgan DW. Determining sample size for research activities. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Measurement*,1970;30:607-610.
  34. Johnson RB, Onwuegbuzie AJ. Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Journal of Educational Researcher*,2004;33(7):14-26.  
doi: 10.11648/j.sjbm.20140204.12
  35. Mahajar AJB, Yunus JBM. Factors that encourage women involvement in SMEs in Pahang, Malaysia. *The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning*, 2012, 8(2).
  36. Mulu GE. Industrial policy and development in Ethiopia: Evolution and present experimentation (WIDER Working Paper No. 2013/125). Helsinki, Finland: UNU-WIDER, 2013.
  37. Nguyen B, Schinckus C, Canh NP, Thanh SD. Economic policy uncertainty and entrepreneurship: A bad for a good? *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 2021. DOI: 10.1177/0971355720974819
  38. Nziku DM, Henry C. Policies for supporting women entrepreneurs in developing countries: the case of Tanzania. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy*,2021;10(1):38-58. Doi: 10.1108/JEPP-09-2020-0073
  39. Obaji NO, Olugu MU. The role of government policy in entrepreneurship development. *Science Journal of Business and Management*,2014;2(4):109-115.
  40. Osano HM, Languitone H. Factors influencing access to finance by SMEs in Mozambique: case of SMEs in Maputo central business district. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 2016;5(13):1-16.  
Doi:10.1186/s13731-016-0041-0
  41. Pallant J. *SPSS survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS (4<sup>th</sup> ed.)*. Australia: Allen & Unwin, 2011.
  42. Rambo CM. The impact of microcredit on women owned small and medium enterprises: evidence from Kenya. *Global Journal of Business Research*, 2013;7(5):57-68.
  43. Raposo M, Fernandes CI, Veiga PM. National systems of entrepreneurship: goals of sustainability. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy*,2020;9(4):345-364.  
Doi: 10.1108/JEPP-04-2020-0018
  44. Stefanovic' I, Prokic' S, Rankovic L. Entrepreneurs' features in developing countries: A research synthesis from republic of Serbia. In Ramadani, V & Schneider RC. (Eds.). Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, Germany: Springe, 2013.
  45. Wolday A, Tassew W. Policy and regulatory challenges militating against the development of youth-owned micro and small enterprises (MSEs) in Ethiopia, 2016.