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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the research problem, background of the problem, research setting, thesis statement, purpose, scope, assumption, and significance of the study. The second chapter is devoted to the literature review, followed by chapters on research methodology, results, discussion, and conclusion.

The concept of an entrepreneur includes entrepreneurial skills, personal attributes of the individual that identifies the opportunity, gathers the necessary resources, and takes risk to create a successful endeavor (Lilia, Amar-Sepúlveda, & Enohemit, 2022). Kallas (2019) explained that entrepreneurial readiness has individual, social/environmental, and institutional components, and the individual aspect is determined by one's attitude, motivation, and competencies.

This study aims to assess youth entrepreneurial readiness in relation to entrepreneurial training conducted by Ethiopia's Entrepreneurship Development Institute (EDI). EDI was established following the latest government reorganization bringing together two entities: the UNDP-supported Entrepreneurship Development Center (EDC), established in February 2013, and the World Bank-financed Women Entrepreneurship Development Project (WEDP), inaugurated in December 2012.

EDI aims to aid in producing the emergence of a competitive and innovative private-sector driven by a dynamic, vibrant, and growth-oriented small and medium enterprise (SME) sector. The new mandate includes playing a pivotal role in the entrepreneurial ecosystem, especially in self-employment, with a strategic shift from direct service providers to building the capacities of other public and private institutions. In addition, two EDI programs target women and youth who wish to start their businesses or develop their start-up businesses. The EDI programs include training, business development services, a forum for networking innovative services, and establishing the center of excellence in selected universities.

Zhartay, Khussainova, and Yessengeldin (2020) defined youth entrepreneurship as "A tool to ensure the growth of employment, the involvement of young people in economic activities, their socialization, and self-realization" (p. 1190). The Macrotrends estimated that the unemployment rate for Ethiopia in 2021 was 3.69%, and the youth unemployment rate was 5.72%. At the same time, the Central Statistics Authority (2021) labor force and migration survey provide information on the country's labor force, which indicates the economic performance through the employment and unemployment rate. The survey result reveals that the jobless rate in Ethiopia is 8.0 percent. Despite efforts to improve the economic conditions of Ethiopia, youth unemployment remains one of the significant challenges.  The survey result also shows that the youth unemployment rate in the urban setting is estimated to be 23.1 percent.

In youth entrepreneurial training and education, creating an enabling environment is one of the ways to curb the challenges of youth unemployment and take entrepreneurship as a career option (Akubo, 2021). In this research, regression studies will be conducted to investigate if there are significant relations between entrepreneurial readiness as mediated by level 2 entrepreneurial training effectiveness.

Problem Statement

Social scientists disagree on what makes an entrepreneur, but research falls into individual, environmental, and institutional factors (Kallas, 2019) that create readiness to start an enterprise. A great deal of attention is given to entrepreneurial intention (Saptono, Purwana, Wibowo, Wibowo, Mukhtar, Yanto, Hadi, & Kusumajanto, 2019; Aleksandrova, Gerry, & Verkhovskaya, 2019); impacts of entrepreneurship training (Efobi & Orkoh, 2018; Rahim, Mohamed, Tasir, & Shariff, 2022); impact of entrepreneurial education programs (Hernández-Sánchez, Sánchez-García, & Mayens, 2019; Paray & Kumar, 2020); the role of entrepreneurial self-efficacy (Darmanto & Yuliari, 2019; Newman, Obschonka, Schwarz, Cohen, & Nielsen, 2019), psychological dispositions that predict entrepreneurial success, and factors that determine entrepreneurial success (Salisu, Hashim, Mashi, & Mashi, 2020) and entrepreneurial behavior (Ho, Lu, & Bryant, 2021).

Reflecting on the past five years from 2014 to 2019, Chan and Mustafa (2021) did an overview of published articles on entrepreneurship and innovation in emerging economies. They pointed out that entrepreneurship requires different skills in emerging economies than in developed economies. Therefore, factors for entrepreneurial practices at the individual, societal, and organizational levels must be understood considering contexts. Lilia, Amar-Sepúlveda, and Enohemit (2022) described the need to focus on developing the entrepreneurial skills of the young generation for sustainable development.

Nathani, Kaurav, and Pathak (2020) studied factors that contribute to entrepreneurial readiness and concluded cognitve, regulative, conducive, and normative factors play role in social readiness of entrepreneurship. Schillo, Persaud, and Jin (2016) definition of entrepreneurial readiness is based on individuals’ social capital, opportunity perception, risk aversion, and self-efficacy; whereas Darmasetiawan (2019) stated that entrepreneurial readiness is determined by the person’s ability for entrepreneurial activity. On another note, Lau, Dimitrova, Shaffer, Davidkov, and Yordanova (2012) described that entrepreneurial readiness might help target suitable candidates for training; especially in lower-income countries; and measuring entrepreneurship readiness supports intakes for training. Similarity, Dardiri, Irsyada, and Sugandi (2019) studied that in the industrial era, self-efficacy is a strong motivator for entrepreneurial readiness. However, this research takes the individuals’ entrepreneurship readiness definition of Ruiz, Soriano, and Coudras (2016), that convergence of a set of personal, social, and business traits which differentiates individuals with readiness for entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurial initiatives, including training, are believed to curb unemployment problems by grooming the youth for entrepreneurial endeavors (Olayinka & Sulyman, 2022). Boris and Parakhina (2022) stated how youth entrepreneurship is a neglected and yet an important sector of economy, which is substantiated because of the unstable post-COVID pandemic economic conditions. Ahmed and Ahmed (2021) pointed out that the challenges of young generation to find decent job in African countries including Ethiopia due to lack of skill, experience, and attitude towards the youth in the workplace.

The alarming rate of unemployment in Ethiopia is worth noting to strategize entrepreneurial interventions. According to the Ethiopian Statistics Service and International Organization for Migration (2021), published statistical report of employment to population ratio was 59.5 percent, with 69.0 percent males and 50.2 percent females. Whereas the employment to population ratio of youth 15-29 was 57.4 percent at national level. The rate of youth employment to population ratio in rural areas was 64.9 percent and 50.6 percent in urban areas.

Entrepreneurial readiness has been studied in relations to entrepreneurial skills, business opportunities, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and opportunity identification (Adeniyi, Derera, & Gamede, 2022). Since studies show that youth entrepreneurship contributes to economic development, it is essential to know how one acquires the entrepreneurial mindset and use potentials to create jobs, expand the existing businesses, increase the possibility of business startups, and maximize opportunities to curb developing countries unemployment issues by using the youth potentials (GEM, 2022).

A study conducted on the relationship of micro-enterprises targeting youth and socio-economic development, showed that the youth play big role in reducing poverty in Ethiopia (Kidane, Mulugeta, Adera, Yimam, & Molla, 2015). In addition, entrepreneurship was acknowledged as one of the stimulating factors for economic growth in developing countries (Muhammad & Ahmad, 2020). According to Ahmed and Ahmed (2021) study on Ethiopia’s potential constraints of youth’s entrepreneurship, next to conducive policy environment, limited access to finance, markets, and business assistance and support, entrepreneurial education and training was stated as one of the constraining factors not to engage in entrepreneurial endeavor. Acknowledging the positive role of the youth in the economic development (Chernova, Matveeva, & Mikhalkina, 2020), it is essential to prepare the youth for such engagement. However, little has been researched on determining the entrepreneurial readiness of the youth and how that relates to social, psychological, and business predispositions mediated by entrepreneurship training effectiveness in Ethiopian context.

Purpose

This research aims to examine the social, psychological, and business experience background of the youth to start up or develop a business as moderated by EDI’s entrepreneurship training. The research outcome will suggest developing more awareness of the youth to engage in entrepreneurial training as a potential career choice to help the youth be active in income generation and economic development. The research objective includes determining the dominant factors that affect the dependent variable (youth entrepreneurial readiness) and assessing the significance of the relationship between the variables.

Background of the Problem

According to the United Nations, in 2015, countries adopted 17 goals to end poverty, protect the planet, and ensure prosperity for all as part of a new workable development agenda, with 169 sub-targets to be achieved by 2030 (Weiland, Hickmann, Lederer, Marquardt, & Schwindenhammer, 2021). This global agenda promotes an integrated approach to achieving sustainable development that tackles the interwoven issues of multidimensional poverty, inequality and exclusion, and sustainability while enhancing knowledge, skills, and production technologies to reduce risks and sustain development gains. The National Planning Commission (2016) described that Ethiopia developed the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP) that is aligned with the world agenda of sustainable development.

The Entrepreneurship Development Center (EDC) was established to realize the vision of Ethiopia’s GTP in response to the growing role the private sector can play in achieving the plan. The Ethiopian government established the program in partnership with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Ethiopia and launched it in February 2013. The program was designed to foster a robust and competitive private sector by developing the micro and small enterprise sectors. Based on that, entrepreneurship training is provided by the United Nations Development Program for one week for those who want to start a business and strengthen their existing one (Ministry of Trade and Industry & United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 2019).

Describing the impact, as of November 4, 2021, the EDC report shows 141,927 new jobs are created, 12,809 businesses are expanded, 12,790 new businesses are established, 7070 businesses are formalized, and 70,391 existing businesses are supported. In addition, EDC reports 107,529 training have been provided, which is instrumental in creating the needed impact.

The Setting of This Research

This will be quantitative research, in which individuals between ages 18 - 35 and taking entrepreneurship training at the EDC within one month will be taken. Entrepreneurship readiness measurement tool (EMRET) will be used to assess the entrepreneurial readiness test, and pre- and post-training level 2 – learning will be assessed to know the degree to which the participants acquire the intended knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence, and commitment based on their participation in the training. Socio-demographic, psychological, and business ability will be the three independent variables, and youth entrepreneurial readiness will be the dependent variable moderated by entrepreneurial training effectiveness.

Thesis Statement

Improving the entrepreneurial mindset of the youth improves their lives and their contribution to the entrepreneurial ecosystem in Ethiopia.

Research Hypothesis

There is no statistically significant difference in entrepreneurial readiness to develop business among participants engaging in entrepreneurial training at the EDI in Ethiopia.

**Hypothesis 1**

H01: There is no statistically significant relationship between socio-demographic background and the entrepreneurial readiness of youth toward new business start-ups or business development.

**Hypothesis 2**

H02: There is no statistically significant relationship between psychological factors and the entrepreneurial readiness of youth toward new business start-ups or business development.

**Hypothesis 3**

H03: There is no statistically significant relationship between business factors and entrepreneurial readiness of youth towards new business start-ups or business development.

**Hypothesis 4**

H04: There is no statistically significant effect in the moderation of entrepreneurship training and the study group's entrepreneurial readiness.

Anticipated Outcomes

First, the research will result in an increased critical discourse regarding youth and young adults’ engagement in entrepreneurial activities in Ethiopia. Second, the findings will have an enhanced understanding of the role of entrepreneurial training in developing one’s business, innovativeness, and personal development in young adults. Third, there will be an improved conviction in creating interventions to enhance the entrepreneurial ecosystem and systematize business development with an entrepreneurial mindset locally. Fourth, subsequent research can be done to assess Level 3 (behavioral change) and 4 (results) to assess if knowledge and skills are translated to actual business value on the job behaviors. This is believed to reinforce new behaviors and know how many jobs were created, how much quality is improved, productivity and sales increased, customer service and retention enhanced, critical thinking resulted in the business field, and in general how individuals and organizations benefited from the investment on training (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick 2007). Assessing all the four levels will enable organization to make informed decision on continuation and scaling up training investments as a moderating effect in the overall interventions of youth engagement in economic development.

Scope of the Research

All youth whom EDI will train within a month and willing to participate in the study will be assessed on entrepreneurial readiness concerning the effectiveness of entrepreneurial training. Then to measure the training effectiveness, pre-test will be given to assess their knowledge and skill before the training is conducted. After six days, the same test, post-test of level 2, will be conducted.

Research Assumptions

There is a positive and statistically significant relationship between socio-demographic, psychological, and entrepreneurial ability factors, and entrepreneurial readiness to start or develop a business. Entrepreneurship training moderates the relationship between socio-demographic, psychological, and entrepreneurial ability factors, and the entrepreneurial readiness of the study group.

Significance of the Research

The concept of social background, psychological make-up, and previous business-related knowledge and experiences in relation to entrepreneurial training opportunities is believed to increase entrepreneurial readiness. The research outcome will suggest developing more awareness of the youth to engage in entrepreneurial training as a potential career choice to help them be active in income generation and economic development. The research has a potential contribution to the development of the entrepreneurial culture in the youth community of Addis Ababa through analysis of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants of the EDI’s entrepreneurship training program. The assessment of the effectiveness of the training may suggest possible changes in the training format that could be implemented to improve its effectiveness. If training moderates new venture creation, training activities will be scaled up to meet the needs of the millions of the Country.

In addition, current research contributes to the entrepreneurship literature on the role of individual-level entrepreneurial readiness to select potentials for training in engaging the youth, mediated by the training offered at EDI. At the national level, the research has some valuable practical implications for the national and local policymakers and the providers of Ethiopia on informal entrepreneurial education. Policymakers will be encouraged to introduce policies that provide a secure environment for individuals to start their ventures after investing in suitable candidates for training.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature review focuses on several types of publications on "Youth Entrepreneurial Readiness and Entrepreneurial Training." The review is divided into four sections: a conceptual review, a theoretical review of entrepreneurship, an empirical review of entrepreneurial contexts, and the study's conceptual framework.

Conceptual Review

The recognition of an entrepreneur dates to the eighteenth-century French economist Richard Cantillon who associated the 'risk bearing' activity in the economy with the entrepreneur (Murphey, 1986; Hebert, 1985). During the same period, the Industrial Revolution took place in England, with the entrepreneur playing a visible role in risk-taking and the transformation of resources (Kirzner, 1979). In the nineteenth century, an entrepreneur was a successful businessman. Early historians described the evolved definition of entrepreneurs from the vague meaning of a person who takes risk in the sixteenth century to a government contractor, or political entrepreneur in the seventeenth centuries, then to a person who is engaged in business activity after the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (Thornton, 2019).

Similarly, entrepreneurial readiness has been defined differently depending on the theoretical background. Ruiz, Soriano, and Coduras (2016) have taken social, psychological, and business background of a person that increases individuals’ predisposition to start and develop their business as entrepreneurial readiness. Wulandari, Hermawan, and Mukhlis (2021) defined entrepreneurial readiness as, “the willingness and desire of individuals to respond to business activities by utilizing their knowledge” (p. 307).

Coelho, Marques, Loureiro, and Ratten (2018) studied entrepreneurship in relation to training as creating value by people or organizations who invest in implementing a concept born of innovation, adaptability, and a willingness to take risks. As a result, entrepreneurship can be viewed as a motivator for people to apply their rational and intuitive abilities by pursuing knowledge in a continuous learning process. They also evaluated the importance of training to improve individuals’ ability to generate new business and found out that training is an important aspect to transform individuals in their career and life. Contrary to this finding, Ahmed, Chandran, Klobas, Liñán, and Kokkalis (2020) sited different conclusions on the values and effectiveness of entrepreneurial education. However, the current study of entrepreneurial readiness is associated to entrepreneurial training due to the fact that readiness can be enhanced by providing knowledge, insight, and skill through entrepreneurial training activities (Wulandari, Hermawan, & Mukhlis, 2021).

**Definition of Entrepreneur**

An entrepreneur precedes entrepreneurship. Joseph A. Schumpeter defines an entrepreneur based on one's innovation and creative capacity leading to disequilibrium (Schumpter, 1934). Gartner focuses on a new business venture (Gartner, 1985); Peterson sees an entrepreneur as a person who recognizes opportunity and taps into new endeavor (Peterson, 1985); and for Garfield, it is identifying a market and developing a strategy to encounter the needs (Garfield, 1986). In contrast, Cantillon redefines an entrepreneur as someone “who works for a contract price and has uncertain future costs into a pervasive one who purchases inputs at market prices only to make sales in the future at uncertain market prices” (Thornton, 2019; p.277).

**Definition of Entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship and entrepreneur are defined differently depending on the theoretical orientation, model of what an entrepreneur is, and school of thought. For example, Akulava, Marozau, Abrashkevich, and Guerrero (2020) defined *entrepreneurship* as “a process of starting and running a new business.” p.20, whereas Omoniyi and Bongani (2022) defined *entrepreneurship* as

a necessary production component and a driving force behind any successful business. As a result, entrepreneurship is defined as the science of completing tasks with associated risks and rewards, with the entrepreneur serving as the organizer, innovator, and risk bearer in any commercial venture. The primary goal of entrepreneurship is to make money rather than lose money (p. 4.)

Therefore, even though no consensus has been reached among academicians and researchers in defining entrepreneurship and entrepreneur, the broader concept entails taking the initiative, arranging, and restructuring social and economic mechanisms to put resources (labor, materials, and other assets) together in ways that increase their worth and situations to practical use, accepting risk or failure; and bringing change, innovation, and a new order into the world (Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991; Steenekamp, 2013; 2013; Akulava et al., 2020).

For Schumpeter (1934), "Entrepreneurship" is a human activity and a creative act that involves creating something of worth from almost nothing. It is the pursuit of opportunity regardless of available resources or the lack thereof. It necessitates both a vision and a burning desire. It also necessitates a readiness to take calculated risks. On the other note, Fuster (2022) acknowledged entrepreneurship as a dynamic process of accumulating wealth by producing value through capital, risk-taking, technology, and human talent.

Entrepreneurship is explained from different fields of study such as economics, sociology, and psychology for more than two centuries. In the early eighteenth century, the French term entrepreneur was first used to designate a "go-between" or "between-taker". Many consider Cantillon used the phrase to describe someone who adopted a proactive risk-taking approach to pursuing possibilities giving the present meaning of an entrepreneur (Parker, 2009). However, the twentieth and twenty-first-century popularity of entrepreneurial endeavors has incorporated broader description beyond innovation and startup businesses.

Entrepreneurship is a multi-component and multi-category dynamic system, and it should be considered holistically as a dynamic system of an individual’s causally interrelated personality traits, motivation, cognition, needs, emotions, abilities, learning, skills, and behavior based on which an individual or a group of individuals interact with the context for identifying, generating, and realizing opportunities into new values (Oganisjana, 2010, p. 54).

As the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) suggest, entrepreneurship is a vital driver of society's health and prosperity and a powerful engine of economic progress. It promotes innovation required to seize new opportunities, increase productivity, create jobs, and address some of society's most serious concerns (Bosma, Hill, Ionescu-Somers, Kelley, Levie, & Tarnawa 2020; GEM, 2022).

**Definition of Youth**

Youth means a lifetime when someone is young and usually refers to the period between adolescence and adulthood or maturity. It is a transition stage from babyhood reliance to adulthood independence (Mwampote, 2019). However, there is no agreement on the age span for the youth. The UN definition of *youth* is between 15 and 25, but the African Union defines *youth* as between 15 to 35 years old. Because some entrepreneurship research adheres to the fact that youth entrepreneurship emboldens up to age 35, in this study, the term “youth” will be used to refer to ages 18-35.

Youth entrepreneurship promotes youth to be innovative and resilient in their pursuit of new ideas and solutions. In addition, it instills in young people a sense of responsibility and belonging in order for them to help build the future by contributing to economic progress through creativity and innovation (Adeniyi, 2021). Moreover, entrepreneurship is critical to community peace and prosperity that it plays a role in poverty alleviation, wealth distribution, and self-sufficiency (Emmanuel, Mohammed, & Patrick, 2018; GEM, 2022).

Theoretical Review

Researchers have identified several theories to explain the topic of entrepreneurship. Ahmed and Ahmed (2021) explained that the multi-disciplinary nature of entrepreneurship theories, rooted in disciplines such as applied economics, psychology, sociology, anthropological, and management fields of study. McMullen, Brownell, and Adams (2020) studied what makes an entrepreneurial study have a unified theory and identified five elements of entrepreneurial agency: ability, motivation, opportunity, institution, and process skills to transform social structures into action. The multifaceted aspect of entrepreneurship is examined in this study, and a theory that resonates with the purpose of the study and firmly explains the phenomenon of youth entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial training will be selected.

**Economic Entrepreneurship Theories**

The economic approach that enhances entrepreneurial behavior originates in the classical, neoclassical theories of economics, and the Austrian market process (AMP). These theories look at and explore the economic factors that develop entrepreneurial intention. As a result, economic approaches have generally focused on the function of entrepreneurship in the economic system rather than on the personal characteristics of entrepreneurial individuals (Simpeh, 2011).

Classical Theory

Scholars such as Smith (1776) and Ricardo (1817) believe that free trade, specialization, and competition are the foundations of classical philosophy. The economic theories proponents say it arose from Britain's industrial revolution, which began in the mid-1700s and continued until the 1830s (Ezennia & Mutambara, 2022). Classical thinking extolled the virtues of specialization, free trade, and competition by identifying capital, land, and labor as the three modes of production (Smith, 1776). In the context of manufacturing and distributing goods in a competitive marketplace, the classical movement portrayed the directing function of an entrepreneur (Ricardo, 1817). However, critics of classical theorists state that they have not explained the role of entrepreneurs in the dynamic growth of the industrial era (Simpeh, 2011).

Neo-Classical Theory

The neo-classical theory was developed in response to many objections against the classical theory, assuming an increase in the quantity of a commodity purchased or sold is due to increased utility, revenue, or the cost of the previous unit (Ezennia & Mutambara, 2022). The neo-classical model argues that economic phenomena could be reduced to a combination of land, labor and capital to bring technological change (Holcombe, 1998). Murphy, Liao, and Welsch (2006) state that the exchange of economic participants stimulates entrepreneurship, occurrences, results on market actors, and diminished marginal utility. However, critics state that this theory focuses on aggregate demand and neglects the role of entrepreneurial activities of individuals (Simpeh, 2011) and therefore the theory would not address youth entrepreneurship.

Austrian School

The AMP is the third theory from economic entrepreneurship, which created a whole new movement due to unsolved problems of the classical and neo-classical. The AMP, which was influenced by (Schumpeter, 1934), was a model that focused on people's actions in setting a knowledge economy. Joseph Schumpeter (1883-1950), an Austrian-born professor, is famous for focusing on the entrepreneur as the central figure in advancing the wealth of nations and creating dynamic disequilibrium in the global economy. Schumpeter stated that in the process of "creative destruction" of the market system, entrepreneurs play a central role by constantly assimilating knowledge not yet in current use and setting up new production forms and functions to produce and market new products.

Badelt (1997) stated that the "new combinations of Schumpeter include: the introduction of a new good or a new quality of a good; a new method of production; the opening of a new market; the conquest of a new source of supply of raw material; or the carrying out of the new organization of any industry" (Schumpeter, 1934, p.66). He pointed out that knowledge underlying the innovation need not be newly discovered and may be existing knowledge that has never been utilized in production. Therefore, the entrepreneur need not be an inventor and vice versa. He is the one who turns an invention into commercial exploitation. For Schumpeter, successful innovation requires an act of will, not intellect. It, therefore, depends on economic leadership and not mere intelligence. He felt that ordinary economic agents would not undertake such a hazardous activity but only entrepreneurs with the vision, drive, and commitment to survive the uncertainty and turbulence.

According to Schumpeter (1934), when an entrepreneur succeeds, he will realize exceptional profits, and he may be able to change existing or introduce new market and industry structures fundamentally. Therefore, Schumpeter's theory of "creative destruction" has sometimes also been known as "heroic entrepreneurship" (Glancey & McQuaid, 2000) making entrepreneurship the "driver of market-based systems" to create new products and economic movements.

Critics of AMP state that entrepreneurship can arise without innovation, and failure to explain entrepreneurship in economic theories gave room to other relevant disciplines' explanations. Moreover, economic theorists have recognized the importance of sociological factors such as social background and cultural attitudes, and psychological attributes such as creativity and imagination (Simpeh, 2011). "In economic approaches, the prime motivation to undertake entrepreneurial activities is utility maximization, generally based upon profit, and the intrinsic gains to the individual undertaking entrepreneurial activity are relegated to relatively minor importance; nevertheless, thinkers may also generate ideas which open up vistas for others to act on entrepreneurially" (Glancey & McQuaid, 2000, p. 157).

Economists believe that entrepreneurship and economic growth will occur in environments where specific economic conditions are most favorable (Holcombe, 1998). Papanek and Harris believed that economic incentives such as access to bank credit, high capital formation with a steady flow of savings and investments, supply of loanable funds at a lower rate of interest, increased demand for consumer goods and services, availability of productive resources, and efficient economic policies encourage or discourage entrepreneurship in a country; which becomes the primary driver of entrepreneurial activity, in which a well-developed market and sound economic policies considerably foster entrepreneurship (Karitu, Wangondu, & Muathe, 2022). According to Papnek and Harris, a person's inner desires have always been related to financial gain, and as a result, these benefits and incentives are sufficient for establishing industrial entrepreneurship. When a person notices that the market for a product or service is unbalanced, he can buy or develop at the current price and sell to those ready to pay the highest. Market imperfections and inadequate economic policy hamper entrepreneurship (Parker, 2009).

Coutinho (2020) stated that entrepreneurship has evolved into a revered way of life rather than just an economic activity that leads to economic success by which the entrepreneur has become a social identity symbol of economic innovation and personal fortitude. Entrepreneurship has evolved into a valuable asset in creating work prospects, and it aids in improving the labor market and the country's economy and Chethan (2020) further stated starting a firm requires financial resources and diverse skills such as creativity, ingenuity, and self-confidence. There was no study found on youth entrepreneurship readiness and economic theories of entrepreneurship; however, since the concept of an entrepreneur emerged from economic theories, it was necessary to explore the background and its evolving nature in the past three centuries and the multidisciplinary nature.

**Psychological Theories of Entrepreneurship**

The individual is the level of analysis in psychological theories of entrepreneurship. This psychological theory section will review the personality theory that includes locus of control, need for achievement theory, emotional intelligence, and social learning theory that addresses self-efficacy and learning.

Thomas and Mueller (2000) described innovativeness, risk-taking, and tolerance for ambiguity are the personality characteristics of entrepreneurs needed to succeed in their endeavors. In addition, the individual characteristics or innate personality traits that determine an entrepreneur's success may include locus of control, motivation, intention, and the need for achievement (Shimoli, Cai, Naqvi, & Lang, 2020). According to Qudus, Mazhar, and Tabassum (2022), the psychological factors for entrepreneurship include locus of control, feeling about independence, need for achievement, risk-taking, and emotional intelligence.

Personality Traits Theory

According to trait theorists, an individual's inborn abilities or attributes naturally make them an entrepreneur. For example, entrepreneurs have qualities or goals that include being more opportunity-driven, innovating, and having high-level business know-how and managerial abilities (Ricardo, 1817). Different studies show contradictory results in determining entrepreneurial success and personality traits. A study conducted by Şahin, Karadağ, and Tuncer (2019) showed the effect of personality traits of the big-five theory (conscientiousness, openness to experience, emotional stability, extraversion and agreeableness are positively correlated with self-efficacy and entrepreneurial intentions. Similarly, a study conducted by (Jawabri, 2020) highlighted significant associations between personality traits and team entrepreneurial success. On another note, Baron, Frese, and Baum (2007) stated that there was no conclusive result in personality predicting entrepreneurial success.

McMullen, Brownell, and Adamsb (2020) stated that entrepreneurs are optimistic, emotionally resilient, hard-working, have the mental energy, show intense perseverance and commitment, thrive on a competitive desire to crave improvement, transformational, are lifelong learners, and use failure as a tool and springboard for success. Individuality is defined by one's locus of control (personality). Julian Rotter was the one who first proposed the idea of locus of control in the 1950s (Rotter, 1996). According to Rotter, locus of control is an individual's sense of the underlying reason for life events. To put it another way, a locus of control orientation is a view about whether the outcomes of our actions are determined by what we do (internal control orientation) or by events beyond our control (external control orientation). In this case, the entrepreneur's success is based on both his/her inward abilities and outside help (Ezennia & Mutambara, 2022). The construct locus of control was found to be highly correlated with ambiguity.

The findings on risk-taking suggests that some entrepreneurs exhibit mildly risk-loving entrepreneurial intention (Brockhaus, 2017), preferring the risks and challenges of venturing into the security of stable income. The current study takes locus of control, self-efficacy, risk aversion, tolerance, and proactively as some of the psychological variables in showing relationship of youth entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial training.

Need for Achievement Theory

While the trait model focuses on long-term inborn qualities and locus of control on the person's perceptions about the incentives and penalties in his or her life (Pervin, 1980), the need for achievement theory by McClelland (1961) clarified that human beings need to accomplish, succeed, achieve, or excel. While there is inconclusive evidence supporting personality traits predicting entrepreneurial success, there is evidence for the relationship between entrepreneurship and achievement motivation (Johnson, 1990).

According to McClelland, people are motivated to entrepreneurship because they have a tremendous desire to achieve; and this achievement incentive is instilled in the young generation by emphasizing high standards of excellence, material wealth, self-reliance training, and low paternal dominance; therefore, entrepreneurs are driven by this need to excel.

EDI’s training program of Empretec was designed after McClelland’s achievement theory that embraces humanity’s need for achievement, affiliation, and power (UNCTAD, 2018). Empretec is recognized by [United Nations General Assembly resolutions](https://unctad.org/system/files/official-document/ares75d211_en.pdf) since 2012 as a tool for sustainable development of entrepreneurship (UNCTAD, 2022). In this study, the pre- and post-training questions were based on the ten personal entrepreneurial competencies that have 30 behavioral traits the six-day skill development workshop offers.

Emotional Intelligence Theory

Wen, Chen, Pang, and Gu (2020) studied the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI) and entrepreneurial efficacy of Chinese vocational students and found a significant positive correlation between the two constructs. Furthermore, Humphrey (2013) describes how highly emotional-intelligent entrepreneurs have a high advantage in developing new products and services, for they can understand consumers' desires and feelings, lead innovative teams, and work more effectively with others. From another perspective, Escorcia, Ramos-Ruiz, Zuluaga-Ortiz, and Delahoz-Domínguez (2022) studied characteristics of nascent entrepreneurs and concluded that person-entrepreneurship fit has positive relation than self-efficacy and indirect relations with social capital.

Finally, Fatoki (2019) studied the relationship of emotional intelligence and success of immigrant-owned small businesses in South Africa and found a significant positive relation between EI and enterprises' personal and organizational success. No study was found on youth entrepreneurial readiness in relation to emotional intelligence. However, the current study incorporates some items that reflect emotional intelligence in the psychological and business questions.

Social Learning Theory

Albert Bandura theorized that learning might occur by observing others’ behaviors and the consequences of the behaviors, and social learning reinforces behavior as people interact with their environment to determine their actions (Bandura, 1971). Entrepreneurs learn by observing their surroundings, including parents, friends, partners, and competitors, as they interact with their environment (Fernando & Nishantha, 2019).

Scherer, Adams, and Wiebe (1989) studied the background of entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs and found that many non-entrepreneurs did not have self-employed or entrepreneurial parents. This implies that social modeling highly influences entrepreneurs in their entrepreneurial actions. Similarly, Drucker (1985) alluded to the fact that entrepreneurship can be a learned behavior as entrepreneurs with different personalities are educated in a social context and succeed.

The concept of self-efficacy is also part of Albert Bandura’s social learning theory, which addresses the ability of individuals to make judgments on decisive matters, effectively perform and face challenges (Bandura, 1982). The concept further contributed to the development of entrepreneurial self-efficacy to measure the person’s entrepreneurial beliefs to startup a business (Drnovšek, Wincent, & Cardon, 2010). According to Wen, Chen, Pang, and Gu (2020), the entrepreneurial self-efficacy of Chinese vocational college students is positively correlated with emotional intelligence.

This study takes social learning theory as a theoretical foundation to explore the different variables in the personal, psychological, and social factors of youth entrepreneurial readiness and entrepreneurship training. The entrepreneurial training provides the context of social learning, and the individual psychological attributes and the business context will be assessed to determine the entrepreneurial readiness of the youth.

**Sociological Entrepreneurship Theory**

Status withdrawal is the belief among sociological aspects of entrepreneurial theories that focuses on social contexts of entrepreneurship. According to Reynolds (1991), four social circumstances influence entrepreneurial opportunity: social networks, life course stage, ethnic identification, and population ecology. The social network focuses on developing relationships and alliances that foster trust and assumes that building trust will pay off in building business. The second social context involves analyzing the life circumstances and characters of the individual who aspires to be an entrepreneur. The third context focuses on social background that becomes a push factor to be an entrepreneur. Finally, the fourth social context, called population ecology, analyzes the broader political, government, customer, market, and so on factors that determine the success of new ventures of an entrepreneur.

Similarly, Hurleym (1999) described the sociological factors that forces to shape organizations, such as political and religious institutions, government policies, social unrest, the cultural climate, quality of life, availability of venture capital, professionalization of entrepreneurship, and all environmental conditions that affect the population's entrepreneurial context. Social group members that groups do not accept their life aims and ideals in society that they respect.

Kunkel's behavioral model focuses on people's externally revealed behaviors and ties to previously and currently surrounding social structures and physical conditions. This technique determines behavioral patterns by reinforcing unpleasant social environment cues. As a result, false economic and social incentives influence entrepreneurial behavior, a product of the surrounding social structure, both past and present (Kunkel & Nagasawa, 1973). On another note, Aldrich and Zimmer (1986) stated that entrepreneurship as a relational aspect of a process of tapping to social resources that require linkages to opportunity structures.

Entrepreneurship is a result of economic action being channeled through social-cultural ideals. In this sense, Weber and Cochran's views are primarily sociological and are worth mentioning. The entrepreneur, according to Cochran (1955), embodies society's model personality. His performance is influenced by his personal views toward his profession, sanctioning groups' role expectations, and the job's occupational criteria. The most fundamental determinant of attitudes and role expectations is society's values (Pawar, 2013). Culturally marginal groups, according to (Hoselitz, 1960), promote entrepreneurship and economic development. Due to their ambiguous position, such organizations are uniquely prepared to make creative modifications and produce genuine innovations. In numerous countries, entrepreneurs have emerged from a specific social stratum.

Entrepreneurship is stifled by the social system, limiting opportunities for creative facilities: tradition, values, social rigidity, rejection of new ideas, and intellectual curiosity all work together to produce a hostile environment for exploration and creativity (Pawar, 2013). According to sociologists, entrepreneurship is most likely to originate in a specific social culture that plays a part in the emergence of business. Though the social entrepreneurship theory does not fully explain the current research, it incorporates the social aspect in the socio-background items to assess entrepreneurial readiness of the youth.

**Anthropological Entrepreneurship Theory**

Anthropological theory of entrepreneurship studies communities' origins, development, practices, and beliefs in relation to entrepreneurship. For anthropologists, entrepreneurship is a cultural and social process, and less of business-related activities (Stewart, 1992). One should investigate the social and cultural contexts before successfully launching a business venture; because those contexts heavily influence the type of business endeavor a person should start (Simpeh, 2011). Furthermore, according to the cultural entrepreneurship concept, culture impacts how a new enterprise is developed (Ezennia & Mutambara, 2022).

Cultural practices influence entrepreneurial mindsets like inventiveness and the inclination to start a business. Individual ethnicity influences attitude and conduct, and culture reflect individual ethnic, social, ecological, economic, and political intricacies; as a result, differences in attitude and entrepreneurial intention might be caused by cultural settings (Mitchell, Smith, Morse, Seawright, Peredo, & McKenzie, 2002).

Stewart (1991) expressed one of the themes of anthropological theory of entrepreneurship is opportunity structure. This is described as a structure that gives rise to access to certain groups such as classes, regions, and ethnic members. In addition, anthropological entrepreneurship is interested in collective formation of businesses such as family business and community centeredness. No study was found in this theory that relates to youth entrepreneurial readiness and entrepreneurship training. However, the anthropological aspect of entrepreneurship is captured in limited ways as some social items of the questions address not just a snapshot but a process of business.

**Opportunity–Based Entrepreneurship Theory**

The opportunity-based paradigm is anchored by management experts Peter Drucker and Howard Stevenson. According to them, entrepreneurs do not genuinely produce change (as the Schumpeterian or Austrian school claims) but rather take advantage of the opportunities that change in technology, customer tastes, and others (Drucker, 1985). According to Drucker, entrepreneurs perceive opportunities caused by chance rather than difficulties. Similarly, Stevenson (1990) incorporates opportunity uniqueness of entrepreneurial and administrative management into Drucker's opportunity-based design.

Brown, Davidsson, and Wiklund (2001) highlight the opportunity-oriented concept of entrepreneurship resonated earlier with Kirzner (1973) as "alertness to opportunity." Stevenson (1983) places entrepreneurship into the broader organizational framework and puts opportunity-based behavior at the center. He, Nazari, Zhang, and Cai (2020) alluded to using the opportunity-based entrepreneurial theory that focuses on individuals’ attraction to business is the attractiveness to personal gains of independence. They examined the relationship between the opportunity-based business with environmentally sustainable development and found positive co-relations. In the current study, independence is one of the group elements in the psychological items that will help assess youth entrepreneurship readiness.
***Resource-Based Entrepreneurship Theories***

Barney (1991) proposed the resource-based entrepreneurship theory, which explains a firm's competitive advantage and organizational success. This theory was founded on the assumption that an organization's competitive advantages and subsequent success are derived from the resources and capabilities within its control (Barney, 1991). According to Aldrich (1999), there are three theories under the heading of resource-based entrepreneurship theories: financial, social, and human capital as direct predictors of company performance.

Financial/Liquidity Theory

According to empirical studies, people with access to capital are more likely to establish a business. This concept says that those with money are more likely to gather resources to take advantage of entrepreneurial opportunities and form a company effectively (Blanchflower, Oswald, & Stutzer, 2001; Evans & Jovanovic, 1989; and Holtz-Eakin, Joulfaian, & Rosen, 1994). On the other hand, other studies reject this notion, revealing that most new firm owners start with no or negligible financial capital and that financial wealth has little influence on the likelihood of becoming a rising entrepreneur (Aldrich,1999; Kim, Aldrich, & Keister, 2006; Hurst & Lusardi, 2004; Davidson & Honing, 2003). Liquidity theory alludes to the idea that entrepreneurs recognize opportunities and assemble enough resources to start new ventures (Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001).

Social Capital or Social Network Theory

In the mid-1980s, the social network theory became the interest of entrepreneurship scholars and expanded into the small and medium enterprises, organizational, and market research disciplines (Johannisson & Nilsson, 1989). Moreover, Johannisson (1986) claims that entrepreneurs who devote their time and energy to developing social networks are more likely to achieve better success than those who do not. According to Johannisson (1986), personal social networks are essential assets for a future entrepreneur in developing the individual character that the entrepreneur is attempting to impose on his business.

In his study, Filion (1990) postulated that networking should be considered part of a more comprehensive process, including technical knowledge of entrepreneurs and their vision. Filion suggested that entrepreneurs differ according to the size of their business, the types of social networks they can call on to complement their expertise and knowledge, and how they use and develop these networks. He claims that social networks tend to improve the entrepreneur's success in several ways at different stages of the development of the business.

Other researchers, such as Aldrich (1991) and Birley (1985), have discovered that social networks provide entrepreneurs with opportunities to gather helpful information from a variety of sources, test out their existing ideas, get referred to appropriate specialists by their contacts, obtain moral support, and gain the use of others who are interested in the entrepreneur's well-being. Ezennia and Mutambara (2022) complement this that from the moment entrepreneurs conceive a business idea and form a new venture to when they develop it from the point of establishment, dynamic social networks evolve.

Human Capital Entrepreneurship Theory

Human capital refers to the hierarchy of skills and knowledge that humans require to begin or sustain tasks. It is the most used theory concerning entrepreneur preparation, stating that entrepreneurs or people with higher inputs should create higher outputs (Mwampote, 2019). According to Ezennia and Mutambara (2022), the human capital theory has recently acquired prominence in entrepreneurship and has drawn a significant empirical effort from many entrepreneurship researchers. It claims that the human capital theory helps organizations enhance their performance and maintain their competitive edge.

It is highlighted that the above three resources are critical to any entrepreneur's success in the twenty-first century. When these elements are skillfully blended, entrepreneurs can find business opportunities, launch businesses, improve their performance, and gain long-term competitive advantages.

Resource-based entrepreneurship theory is based on organizational capabilities to use financial, social, and human resources. The current study focuses on youth entrepreneurial readiness and no literature was found in relation that directly applies to resource-based entrepreneurship. However, the social aspect of entrepreneurship is addressed in the business group items.

Empirical Review

**Entrepreneurial Ecosystem**

Over the last decade, the concept of entrepreneurial ecosystems has exploded in popularity among researchers, policymakers, and practitioners even though no agreed definition and theoretical ground (Fubah & Moos, 2021). For example, Spigel (2017) described entrepreneurial ecosystems as “a tool in the study of the geography of high-growth entrepreneurship, the union of localized cultural outlooks, social networks, investment capital, universities, and active economic policies that create environments supportive of innovation-based ventures” p.1. According to Spigel, as these attributes produce resources for entrepreneurs, the interactions and relations produce the entrepreneurial ecosystem.

Gueguen, Delanoë-Gueguen, and Lechner (2021) described entrepreneurial ecosystems as providing a context to start-ups to access resources, networks of actors, and process that link the entrepreneur with local resources. Entrepreneurial ecosystems reflect a growing interest in localized entrepreneurship settings and a focus on entrepreneurial actors' agency to build and modify their surroundings, which has contributed to developing a vibrant research landscape shaped by a legacy of various research traditions and new policies being implemented in several contexts around the world (Wurth, Stam, & Spigel, 2021).

Academic entrepreneurship and the entrepreneurial ecosystem in the project were investigated by (Hallam, Novick, Gilbert, Frankwick, Wenker, & Zanella, 2017). They concluded that fostering, supporting, developing, and commercializing new technologies necessitates creating and maintaining a transformational and progressive entrepreneurial ecosystem within the university environment. The findings highlight the significance of company culture in the commercialization of technology. Similarly, Yusof, Siddiq, and Nor (2009) investigated academic entrepreneurship as part of the larger ecosystem using a framework of a “Triple-helix of government-university-industry relations” to create a conducive entrepreneurial context. A transformational and progressive ecosystem within the academic environment is needed to foster support for the broader commercial context.

Bărbulescu, Tecău, Munteanu, and Constantin (2021) discussed the importance of focusing on information technology, having strong relationships with wider entrepreneurial ecosystems, particularly academia, public and private sector, and citizens in the post COVID era. Because of the importance of collaboration in today's business world, collaborative networks play an essential role. In addition, Lose (2022) alludes to the fact that institutionalized incubation programs supports the entrepreneurial ecosystem across economies accelerating entrepreneurship in sub-Saharan Africa encouraging governments to promote incubation and entrepreneurship at a local, national, and regional levels.

The GEM 2021 assesses entrepreneurial environments for enterprises using nine entrepreneurship points. This includes: ease of access to finance, relevant government policies, affordable taxes, and bureaucracy; government programs support new entrepreneurs at local, regional, and national levels; adequacy of entrepreneurial education introduced at school and post-school; transferring research and development to commercial ventures; affordable professional services to support new ventures; ease of entry into the market dynamics, availability and accessibility of physical infrastructures; and normalizing entrepreneurship among communities. Bloh (2021) also affirmed how GEM closed the gap of entrepreneurial ecosystem definitions and what it entails after entrepreneurial ecosystem index is introduced to enable entrepreneurial activities.

Therefore, a broader friendly ecosystem needs to be assessed for successful entrepreneurship implementation in countries, and actions are taken to boost socioeconomic development. The current study describes youth engagement in entrepreneurship and training within the Ethiopian ecosystem.

**Entrepreneurial Policy**

Bloh (2021) studied regional surveying entrepreneurs, economic development agencies or administrators, financial institutions, higher education institutions, and political leaders, business incubators, and the media who would be stakeholders in entrepreneurial activities and suggested that policy approach using entrepreneurial ecosystem stakeholders brings beneficial results. He concluded that policy approaches using entrepreneurial ecosystem stakeholders should yield more precise and effective results for policies. Entrepreneurial policies are designed to increase the quality of new firms or, more commonly, the number of new enterprises as small company development and entrepreneurship are at the heart of many countries' economies, and any country that pays special attention to its entrepreneurs has a higher chance of improving its economy Bramwell, Hepburn, & Wolfe, (2019). As a result, many governments have established policies to support entrepreneurial activities in response to the demand for such policies.

In addition, several policies have been explicitly designed to encourage entrepreneurship. In developing countries, entrepreneurship policies have also been introduced to encourage entrepreneurial activity (Akinyemi, Folashade, Adejumo & Oluwabunm, 2018), and they discovered that policy parameters that promote entrepreneurial activity vary depending on the stage of entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship and innovation have been linked in the economic theory of market capitalist economies since Schumpeter (1912, 1942). Modern policy frameworks hardly distinguish between the two, consistently incorporating entrepreneurship and innovation into broader public policy frameworks. Potts (2015) studied how national innovation policies interact strategically to create emerging de facto global entrepreneurship and innovation policies. Entrepreneurship policy is intrinsically linked to innovation policy, although innovation policy takes precedence in most countries. Improved innovation policies should enable more effective entrepreneurial settings. Entrepreneurship and innovation policy must begin with a better understanding of national innovation policy's strategic global interactions (Potts, 2015).

**Ethiopia’s Entrepreneurial Setting**

Ethiopia's estimated population is 120.8 million (22.7% urban and 77.3% rural) (USAID, 2021), making it the second most populous Country in sub-Saharan Africa after Nigeria. There are more than 80 ethnic groups with their own cultures and languages. Orthodox Christianity (43.8 percent) and Islam (33.3 percent) are the main religions. Although Ethiopia is the fastest-growing economy, with 6.1 percent in 2019/20, it is also one of the poorest, with a per capita income of $890 per year (World Bank, 2021). As a result, the government launched ten years development plan that runs from 2020/2021 to 2030 based on a 'Home Grown Economic Agenda,' gravitating towards a private sector-driven economy. According to USAID (2017), Ethiopia's youthful population is estimated at 104 million, 41 percent is under the age of 15, and more than 28 percent is between the ages of 15 and 29. In addition, youth unemployment is estimated at nearly 27 percent.

Urban unemployment is 29% (Sintayehu, 2017), and the government has made several changes to address the youth generation issues. This includes formulating a national policy in 2005 to promote youth participation in all spheres of life, developing a multi-sectoral strategy plan from 2006-2015; adolescent development and participation strategy in 2013; incorporating youth participation in the socio-economic and political activities in the ten years GTP of the Country; promoting the SME to large scale by mainstreaming youth issues within other development programs, increasing the number of youth centers, strengthening youth associations, encouraging youth entrepreneurship since 2014, and preparing youth development packages (Sintayehu, 2017). However, despite the efforts, youth unemployment remains high in the Country. According to the Central Statistics Agency (2022), Ethiopia's labor force and migration key findings, the total unemployment rate is 8 percent at a national level and 7.7 percent for the youth aged 15-29.

According to a study conducted by Sintayehu (2017) on the challenges and opportunities faced by Ethiopian youth entrepreneurs, as well as roadblocks to the development of entrepreneurship in the Country, he concluded that the significant challenges are: the absence of a culture of entrepreneurship, lack of technical and financial support to become an entrepreneur, burdensome administrative and regulatory framework, and poor access to infrastructures. In addition, society's incorrect perception of job creation, the society's lack of readiness to live a life apart from the traditional way of living, and the society's lack of willingness to live a life apart from the traditional way of life are additional challenges.

Moreover, Mehari and Belay (2017) studied the challenges and prospects of entrepreneurship development and job creation for unemployed youth in the Addis Ababa and Dire Dawa city administrations. They found that the social capital, using *iqub* – a social network that individuals or families contribute to meet the financial need of a person or a family. This is used as a substitute for microfinance credit to start-up businesses and has created a platform for start-ups without formal banks that avail credits only if there is matching collateral.

Sintayehu (2017) also stated the government of Ethiopia has created youth holistic development opportunities in collaboration with UNDP by launching a system where the youth would be engaged in entrepreneurship and enterprise formation programs to address youth unemployment of age 15-24 which was 24%. Investment in the youth development program was designed with development actors such as UN agencies like UNICEF, UNDP, and Italian Cooperation. Using government-led youth centers and developing the capacity of the youth by giving life skills training was one strategy. Another strategy to address employment needs was establishing EDI to increase employment by creating micro and small enterprises for youth and women.

According to the assessment report of the Entrepreneurship Ecosystem in Ethiopia (2018), the EDI has been providing different types of training to entrepreneurship trainers selected from various public universities. For instance, by May 2015, the Center had provided entrepreneurship training workshops to 306 university lecturers selected from 29 public universities. Addis Ababa, Bahir Dar, Mekelle, Wollo, and Hawassa universities constitute the top five from which many lecturers have attended training organized by EDI, representing 10.13%, 10.13%, 7.52%, 7.19%, and 6.21%, of the total participants drawn from public universities.

According to the study by Ahmed and Ahmed (2021), out of eight potential constraints for youth entrepreneurial engagement in small and medium enterprises, the lack of unfavorable government policy was the first possible constraint that was identified and drew the focus of the government to improve youth entrepreneurship.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework explains the link between the independent and dependent variables. The framework below shows how independent variables (socio-demographic, psychological, and business ability) influence the dependent variable, youth entrepreneurial readiness, as moderated by training effectiveness. This study's conceptual framework was created using the research problem and relevant literature.

**Socio-demographic Factor**

**Entrepreneurship Training**

**Youth Entrepreneurial Readiness**

**Psychological Factor**

**Business Factor**

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework: Own Source

Entrepreneurship has evolved significantly in the last two and half centuries. Due to the complexity of the notion of entrepreneurship, it is influenced by economic, social, psychological, ethical, religious, and cultural factors. The present study focuses on youth entrepreneurial readiness from a socio-demographic, psychological, and business standpoint, using entrepreneurship training as a moderator.

Because a wide range of factors influences entrepreneurship, no single factor can generate it independently. Using the social learning theory that encompasses the individual and social factors, entrepreneurship readiness is assumed to be measured by incorporating the individual’s socio-demographic background, psychological readiness, and business experience moderated by entrepreneurial training.

**Socio-Demographic Factors**

Socio-demographic factors in the current study incorporates gender, age, origin, habitat, education level, income level, work experience, marital status, and entrepreneurial background. Borhani, Amiran, Shahriari, and Ghadim (2020) stated that socio-demography was the first factor that affects the attitude of the youth to accept agricultural entrepreneurship with age 25-40 were likely to start a new business. Kolvereid (2017) studied demographic status such as the role of family background, sex, prior self-employment on employment status choice, and found that they have an indirect influence on entrepreneurial business activities. Likewise, Fairlie and Holleran, 2012; Sakkthivel and Sriram, 2012 deduced that individuals' socio-demographic and psychological stances are significant determinants of entrepreneurship. Similarly, Gibb and Ritchie (1982) identified an entrepreneurial social process of start-up is influenced in so many ways by family, employment, training, and career patterns. Bouichou, Abdoulaye, Allali, Bouayad, and Fadlaoui, (2021) identified young people age (20-25) positively correlated with entrepreneurial intentions to start a new business venture and as age increases 41-45, it was less likely to start a business.

**Psychological Factors**

Borhani, Amiran, Shahriari, and Ghadim (2020) showed how the psychological frame, which incorporates motivation, personality traits, mental disposition, and experiences shape entrepreneurial activities. The current research assumes psychological variables summarized in locus of control, self-efficacy, risk aversion, tolerance, and proactively. Multi-dimensional constructs of psychology of entrepreneurship include both affective and cognitive elements that are summarized in self-efficacy, achievement, and watchfulness orientation (Sowole, Hogue, & Adeyeye, 2018).

**Business Factors**

The entrepreneurship and business management group variables of the current study measure having knowledge, skills, experience in managing a business; ability to develop business ideas, observation of surroundings, societal needs, markets, and transforming into business ideas; ability to take calculated risk and having the opportunity to act as an entrepreneur within a large company. Borhani, Amiran, Shahriari, and Ghadim (2020) emphasized education, opportunities, and financial support have major impact in young adult career choices to startup businesses.

**Entrepreneurship Training**

Entrepreneurial training is intended to reinforce information, skills, and attitudes and have been utilized in different countries to influence entrepreneurial culture within a population (Wulandari, Hermawan, & Mukhlis, 2021). They defined entrepreneurship training as “carried out to train someone to have entrepreneurial skills so that they can create a business appropriately by using existing opportunities and providing job opportunities both for themselves and for others” p. 307. The current research uses training as a moderating factor to assess youth entrepreneurial readiness.

Most economies support entrepreneurship education and training to achieve goals such as encouraging citizens to have a positive attitude toward self-employment, identifying viable business opportunities, demonstrating managerial skills for running successful businesses, and encouraging new start-ups and other entrepreneurial ventures (Alam, Kousar, & Rehman, 2019; Cieslik, Barford, & Vira, 2022).

Coelho et al. (2018) studied and evaluated the impact of the entrepreneurship training program in Recife, Brazil. Such research aids to understand entrepreneurship education's ability to boost individuals' ability to generate new company prospects. The findings support the claim that entrepreneurship education is becoming more significant in emerging nations in reshaping society by allowing individuals to advance in their careers and lives.

The UN program that developed entrepreneurship coined Empretec from the Spanish for emprendedores (entrepreneurs) and tecnología (technology). Empretec is a mechanism that instills behavioral change into a select group of promising entrepreneurs. It is dedicated to helping promising entrepreneurs put their ideas into action and helping fledgling businesses to grow. The course was developed by Harvard University to encourage entrepreneurial behavior and motivate learners to contribute to countries economic prosperity by focusing on developing entrepreneurial competencies of entrepreneurs in emerging economies (UNCTAD, 2018). It has been more than 31 years experiences since the UN implemented this program in 41 countries UNCTAD (2022). The program evaluation showed that trainees' success was linked to their involvement in entrepreneurship education and therefore entrepreneurship training program are to be designed to create access for training and letting trainees develop their competencies.

The EDI uses EMPRETEC program identifies ten key areas of competencies related to entrepreneurial development. These include opportunity-seeking and initiative; persistence; fulfilment of commitments; demand for quality and efficiency; calculated risks; goal setting; information-seeking; systematic planning and monitoring; persuasion and networking; and independence and self-confidence. EDI trainees are provided with practical six days training with a practical tool that will help them to assess their strengths and weaknesses. Trainees are required to do 30 behavioral traits of each they have practiced since they completed the training.

Furthermore, Abdullah and Latif (2014) evaluated Bangladesh's entrepreneurship development training program and concluded that the country could take the initiatives required to develop an entrepreneurial environment to evolve the prevailing salient talent. Developing such training and development programs for the newcomer and existing entrepreneur in that field nourishes the existing entrepreneur. The study also showed the evaluation's validity by addressing the training program's effectiveness.

Vega, González-morales, and García (2016) studied the entrepreneurial aspirations of adolescents toward self-employment and found that interest increased in the case of foreigners, those who studied at state schools, and those who demonstrated lower academic achievements. Education has a long-term effect on students' attitudes, and training has a short-term practical effect in preparing a business plan and design projects. Therefore, the lines of public action that promote entrepreneurship should combine the abovementioned factors.

According to Chethan (2020), entrepreneurship training positively affects the trainees by involving them in their business enterprise due to enhancing confidence levels. Before training, participants were afraid due to lack of practical knowledge; however, their satisfaction level was drastically enhanced to start their business enterprise after training. Similarly, Klinger and Schündeln (2007) investigated the effect of entrepreneurial training on enterprise outcomes, particularly whether training and business development programs in developing countries can help improve entrepreneurial skills and foster entrepreneurial activities such as creating and expanding businesses. The findings show that business training significantly increases the probability that the trainee starts or expands an existing business. In addition, they suggest that entrepreneurial activities such as starting and expanding businesses can be fostered by training.

Efobi and Orkoh (2018) mentioned that entrepreneurs who received formal evaluation training would re-train their colleagues, resulting in expanded human resources, increased innovation, and revenue for the company. Moreover, the author describes how training within an entrepreneurial venture should be viewed as a 'two-sided coin' that empowers the trained employee and the transfer of knowledge by training other workers. They have also studied the impacts of entrepreneurship training on the growth performance of firms and elaborated on training programs directed at entrepreneurs as an essential catalyst for business growth and development. The difference in revenue, innovation, and employee growth of firms where the entrepreneurs were trained, and they went ahead to set up in-house training for their workers, compared to those who were trained but did not have in-house training for their workers. The results imply that policies that encourage just the training of entrepreneurs may be limited in the scope of impact if steps are not taken to ensure that the trained entrepreneurs go further to retrain their workers in their businesses. Entrepreneurial education and training equip students with abilities, skills, and knowledge, allowing them to spot opportunities, analyze the environment, and draft strategies to help the company succeed (Mack, White, & Senghor, 2021).

Moreover, entrepreneurial education and training increase confidence in individuals' ability to start and run a company. In class, students are given exercises to develop business plans, perform feasibility studies for business opportunities, or participate in running simulated or real businesses (Thamahane, 2017). Similar studies by Emmanuel, Mohammed, and Patrick (2018) mentioned that entrepreneurial orientation caused by inadequate entrepreneurial education and training has a statistically significant influence on entrepreneurial behavior among youths in the province.

Cieslik, Barford, and Vira (2022) conducted studies on why sustainable development 8.6 was not fulfilled as targeted and stated that was not due to the defectiveness of the entrepreneurship-based programs. Instead, broader job-market policies are to be assessed to make training, education, and skill deficits complemented.

Bouichou, et al. (2021) studied entrepreneurial intention among rural youth in Moroccan agricultural cooperatives and found that training is one of the factors that has a positive impact on entrepreneurial intensions of the young men and women. Entrepreneurship training has been used as one of the driving forces to improve entrepreneurial capabilities (Zahra, 2011) that enhanced knowledge, skills and attitude (Seun & Kalsom, 2015); and they showed entrepreneurship training moderated the relationship between entrepreneurial ability and readiness towards new venture creation.

**Youth Entrepreneurship**

Youth refers to the individual's development stage between adolescence and adulthood; as a result, juvenile learning is seen as a subset of adult learning and is described as a formative stage of adult learning (Pigozne, Luka, & Surikova 2019). According to Adeniyi (2021), entrepreneurship education is becoming more popular, as evidenced by business schools, conference proceedings, and a growing body of literature. In many industrialized countries, entrepreneurship education is constantly promoted to raise awareness and encourage business start-ups (Janissenova, Kaliyeva, & Kosmaganbetova 2021). Starting a business is a driver for economic development since it reduces unemployment; however, many countries adoption of entrepreneurial education is not generating dividends in terms of job generation, especially among youth (Cieslik, Barford, & Vira, 2022). According to their research findings, the stalled progress to meet the 2020 UN youth employment agenda was not due to the fact that entrepreneurial training and education does not work; rather they are not enough to address the structural nature of unemployment crisis. Factors such as socio-economic dynamics and bad governance should be studied in depth.

Adult learning is divided into two stages: youth learning and adult learning. Youth learning is regarded as an early stage of adult learning and is considered a part of adult learning. In Latvia, adult education is regulated by national law and is provided on three levels: national, local, and institutional. (Pigozne, Luka, & Surikova, 2019). Additionally, they mentioned that adult learning means 'the entire range of formal, non-formal and informal learning activities undertaken by adults after a break since leaving initial education and training resulting in new knowledge. This includes university-level or higher education under-taken after a break (other than deferred entry) since leaving initial education and training.' Pro-activity draws innovative change and moves society a step forward. Entrepreneurship, alongside other possible activities, such as volunteering, participating in social campaigns, and giving a hand to those in need, is a means to develop one's pro-activity (Pigozne, Luka, & Surikova, 2019).

Ahmed and Ahmed (2021) stated that Ethiopia aims at youth entrepreneurship as a possible tool for poverty alleviation and economic development through job creation. According to Adenle's (2017) research, entrepreneurship education is critical for African economic progress since it strives to empower young leaders for commercial and entrepreneurial activity. All study participants agreed that entrepreneurship education would be crucial in developing the next generation of young entrepreneurs who will help the continent establish solid and competitive economies. Furthermore, developing new company strategies and leadership leaders is critical, given the scarcity of entrepreneurial capabilities.

In the study conducted by Pigozne, Luka, and Surikova (2019) on promoting youth entrepreneurship and employability through non-formal and informal learning, they found out that young adults preferred experience sharing, collaboration with employers, doing internship projects, facilitating entrepreneurship experiences and training will help them learn practically and improve their life skills. Similarly, learning from good practices of training youth on entrepreneurship shows that training programs should never be a standalone agenda of youth employment but rather must be one aspect of a more extensive entrepreneurial ecosystem focusing on real examples from practicing entrepreneurs, entrepreneurial effectiveness, and personal transformation (Haule, 2012).

Pigozne, Luka, and Surikova (2019) emphasized working with employers to plan educational activities such as field trips, internships, projects, and meetings with entrepreneurs to learn about their experiences. Furthermore, the respondents recognized the value of collaboration in gaining first-hand work experience, facilitating their participation in entrepreneurship while also boosting their professional self-determination, competitiveness, career advancement, and overall quality of life. Internships in a company or institution, projects, other people's experience, success stories, and training enterprises are the most effective non-formal and informal learning methods, forms, and initiatives to promote youth entrepreneurship and employability in Latvia, according to the current research.

As far as the age of entrepreneurs is concerned, the study has similar findings that people establish their firm between the ages 25 and 45 and mainly between the ages 25 and 34 (Storey, 1994; Mehari & Belay, 2017; Delmar & Davidson, 2000) and therefore adopted the youth definition up to age 35.

**Entrepreneurial Readiness**

Entrepreneurial preparedness refers to a person's ability to start a business (Adeniyi, 2021). Individual readiness for entrepreneurship is the combination of personal characteristics that separate people ready to start a business. Entrepreneurs are particularly capable of observing and analyzing their surroundings to channel their highly creative and productive potential, so they may use their capacity to dare and desire self-achievement, according to (Coduras, Saiz-Alvarez, and Ruiz (2016). A young person's entrepreneurial preparedness is defined by their ability to study various environmental options, apply their potential entrepreneurial ability based on available resources, and motivation to achieve personal goals (Olugbola, 2017).

The readiness to start a business is influenced by sociological, psychological, and business management factors. Each of these disciplines contains measurable qualitative and quantitative indicators linked to entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial personality and behavior in scientific research and must be included in the theoretical foundation for designing an entrepreneurial readiness assessment (Ruiz, Soriano, & Coduras 2016). Their findings highlight the relevance of entrepreneurship training across the board, including entrepreneurial ability and the positive benefits of opportunity identification, motivation, and resources on entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship training is essential because it allows young people to develop their business talents (Coduras et al., 2016; Olugbola, 2017).

Raza, Muffatto, and Saeed (2018) investigated the relationship between entrepreneurial readiness and entrepreneurial behavior across nations to see if formal institutions have a role in this relationship. The findings suggest that entrepreneurial readiness is linked to entrepreneurial behavior (as measured by entrepreneurial entry and opportunity-based entrepreneurship) and that this link strengthens as political democracy, government regulations, financial capital availability, and market liquidity improve. For policymakers, the findings demonstrate that when individuals have a high level of entrepreneurial preparedness, political democracy, and government laws, financial capital availability and market liquidity connect favorably with entrepreneurial behavior. Therefore, policymakers should enact regulations that allow individuals to start their businesses in a safe atmosphere.

Mwampote (2019) studied factors in teenagers' entrepreneurial readiness and found that motivation, entrepreneurial skills, and perceived behavioral control were all statistically significant. On the other hand, family background was statistically unimportant concerning young entrepreneurial preparation. Furthermore, it was shown that young people confront various obstacles when they want to start a business. Lack of sufficient start-up funding, a lack of entrepreneurial education among the young, a lack of marketplaces to sell the products, and a lack of confidence among adolescents were identified as obstacles to youth readiness.

Wulandari, Hermawan, and Mukhlis (2021) state that entrepreneurial readiness can be cultivated in society informally and formally by training, coaching, seminars, and so on providing forum for entrepreneurs. The study suggested that young people shift their mindsets from waiting for government jobs to working for themselves. In addition, the government should provide children with specialized entrepreneurial training and programs that include methods for starting and maintaining firms under challenging times. Mack, White, Senghor, (2021) concluded there is positive correlation between exposing students to entrepreneurial training and later on engagement in entrepreneurial activities.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Chapter three describes the methods and procedures used to conduct the study and answer the research question. This includes the overview of information on the purpose of the study, the research question, the overview of the methodology, which includes general and specific research design, the targeted population and sampling, data collection procedures, instruments used to collect data, ethical considerations, limitations, and summary of the chapter.

Overview of Information Needed

The general objective of the research is to explore the social, psychological, and business factors that may contribute to youth entrepreneurial readiness in relation to entrepreneurship training effectiveness given by the Entrepreneurship Development Center.

Overview of Methodology

Quantitative research will be used to explore the entrepreneurial readiness of the youth in relation to the effectiveness of the training. The study will analyze the entrepreneurial readiness of youth in terms of socio-demographic, psychological, and entrepreneurial business factors to start up or develop a business as moderated by entrepreneurship training.

The present study will fill in the knowledge gap of how individual social, psychological, and business factors contribute to entrepreneurial readiness and are moderated by training effectiveness. This is assumed to suggest the need to engage the youth and build their entrepreneurial skills through training for business startups and business developments, thus contributing to employment creation and economic growth.

The quantitative research design is selected because it is appropriate for the research question, “To what extent do the different determinant factors (socio-demographic, psychological, and business management ability) influence the youth entrepreneurial readiness who are about to take entrepreneurship training? The study will address whether or not training moderates the socio-demographic, psychological, and business management ability components and entrepreneurial readiness. The finding is assumed to influence new business startups after participating in an entrepreneurship training program. The design will explore effectiveness by comparing the three components: socio-demographic, psychological, and business management ability.

Recruitment criteria are the youth and young adults’ category who will be taking the EDI training in one month and are willing to participate in the research. Therefore, the whole population of trainees will be used to select the participants to fill in the questionnaires. In addition, Entrepreneurship Readiness Measurement Tool 2019 will be used to assess the readiness of the trained youth, and EDI entrepreneurial pre- and post-test training will be administered to evaluate training effectiveness.

Research Approach

This research employs a quantitative study. Regression analysis will be used to study the relationship of the independent variables (socio-demographic background, psychological factors, and business factors; training as a moderating factor on entrepreneurial readiness to start or develop a business. More specifically, it focuses on how entrepreneurial readiness changes in relation to changes in the independent variables. The research also examines which factors have a significant effect and matter most on the entrepreneurial readiness of the youth and how different factors influence each other.

In this research, training is considered a moderating factor in analyzing the independent variables in relation to entrepreneurial readiness. According to Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2016), there are four levels of training evaluations. Level 1 is a reaction that assesses the degree to which the participants find the training favorable, engaging, and relevant to their jobs. Level 2 is learning – the degree to which the participants acquire the intended knowledge, skills, attitude, confidence, and commitment based on their participation in the training. Level 3 assesses behavior – the degree to which the participants apply what they learned during training when they are back on the job (post-training actions and competencies). Finally, level 4 assesses results – the degree to which targeted outcomes occur because of the training and the support and accountability package. This research will assess only Level 2 – entrepreneurial learning of the EDI trainees.

All youth who will be trained within a month and willing to participate in the study will be assessed on entrepreneurial readiness in relation to the effectiveness of entrepreneurial training. To measure the training effectiveness, pre- and post-test level 2 assessments will be conducted.

Ethical Compliance

Ethical standards in research create professional accountability, protecting researchers and research participants. "The goal of the ethical researcher is to develop a fair, clear, and explicit agreement with the subject so that the subject's decision to participate in an experiment is made voluntarily, knowingly, and intelligently. The most fundamental ethical principles implied in the treatment of subjects involve non-maleficence, autonomy, and fidelity" (Heppner, Kivlighan, & Wampold, 1992, p. 90).

In this research, participants will be asked for their willingness to participate in the study and sign an informed consent form. The sample I am considering taking will not be vulnerable groups, and there will not be any conflicts of interest. Moreover, approval will be received from the Omega Graduate School Internal Review Board before proceeding with data collection. During the data collection process, due attention will be given to keeping the participants' identities to protect the research participants' confidentiality.

The informed consent form includes the purpose of the study, study procedures, risks, benefits, confidentiality, contact information, and voluntary participation in the study. In addition, the researcher includes statements that assure them of participants' ability to withdraw from the study at any time and their rights to participate. Finally, the researcher documents the signed consent to participate in the research.

Demographic Data

According to the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2012 report, Ethiopia has few private enterprises compared to its population size. It has one of the lowest entrepreneurial activity rates in sub-Saharan African countries, with about 12% of the adult population (18-64) reporting establishing a new business or already running businesses in the last 3.5 years. The average for countries in the sub-Saharan region is about 28% percent. Similarly, 8% of adults in Ethiopia run established businesses, while the regional average stands at 15% (Herrington & Kelly, 2012).

In this quantitative research, the EDI trainees will be the population, and youth within the age range of 18-35, trained in one month, will be selected. The selection criterion will be set as a youth and young adult during training, those who have taken entrepreneurship training with EDI, and those willing to participate in the training. In addition, ten relevant socio-demographic data will be asked, with confidentiality ensured.

Analysis and Synthesis of Data

This section will incorporate the study and the researcher; a description of the study group; a brief description of how the methodological approach will be applied to the process of data analysis; the presentation of data and results; a summary of data analysis, a presentation of the data collected and analyzed, and the results of the study.

**Dependent Variable**

Youth entrepreneurial readiness towards new business start-up or development is the dependent variable. The entrepreneurial readiness survey questionnaire (EMRET) was developed in Spanish. This will be translated into English and then into one of the local languages, Amharic so that respondents feel comfortable answering their ideas freely. First, the translation will be conducted by offices with licenses to translate documents. Then this will be transcribed and translated into English to write the report.

**Independent Variables**

Three independent variables with 14 socio-demographic, 48 psychological, and 24 entrepreneurial and managerial-related questions will be asked in the entrepreneurial readiness survey. They will be analyzed regarding entrepreneurial readiness to start or develop a business before the study participants take the EDI training.

Sociological Variables

The selected sociological variables include gender, age, origin, habitat, education level, income level, work experience, marital status, and entrepreneurial background. The socio-demographic group's items were evaluated on a scale between 0 and 1 point. The maximum number of points provided in sociological is 8 for strictly socio-demographic variables and 0 for those referring to the background and external entrepreneurial influence. In total, the section is worth a maximum of 13 points.

Psychological variables

The psychological variables cover the sections of locus of control, self-efficacy, risk aversion, tolerance, and proactively. In addition, a set of personal values ​​and psychological traits was evaluated on a 7-point scale where one = strongly disagree, seven = strongly agree about the proposed statements describing the respondent's personality. The maximum score of the psychological factors is 48 points - ten questions on locus of control, ten on self-efficacy, six on risk aversion, 12 on tolerance, and ten on proactively.

Business Variables

The variables of entrepreneurship and business management include the parts of having knowledge, skills, experience in managing a business; ability to develop business ideas, observation of surroundings, societal needs, markets, and transforming into business ideas; ability to take calculated risk and having the opportunity to act as an entrepreneur within a large company. The entrepreneurship and business management group variables will be measured on scales from 0 to 1 point and do not need transformation or scaling. The maximum score that the entrepreneurship and business management block can give is 33 points.

**Moderating Variable**

After the EMRET is conducted, the study participants will take the Level 2 pre-test of the entrepreneurship training and the same test will be administered after six days to assess the training effectiveness. According to Cohen and Cohen (1983), moderation takes place when the independent variable and the moderating variable have mutual effects on variance of dependent variable than that explained by the direct effect. The moderator variable of this study is first measured by dividing the data into two parts, the “pre-test” and “post-test” of the study group. This moderator is tested by asking the students to determine to which extent they have entrepreneurial competencies and behavioral traits before and after they have taken the EDI training.

The training has ten entrepreneurial competencies, which has three behavior traits under each competency. A Likert-type five-point scale (ranging from 1 “much less” to 5 “much more”) will be used to assess the training output. The result will be used to assess how training influences behavior. The moderating effect of the EDI training is examined by dividing the data into two parts and paired t-test will be used to examine gain or loss after the training. In this approach, the direct effect of the constructs was first examined, and then the moderating effect of the training will be assessed in relation to the youth entrepreneurial readiness. Regression analysis will be used to analyze the data because it predicts future happenings between entrepreneurial readiness (dependent target) and the four independent variables (also known as a predictor), including the moderating variable.

The main uses of regression analysis are forecasting, time series modeling, and finding the cause-and-effect relationship between variables. A multiple linear regression model will be used because there is more than one independent variable. Regression analysis is the test that will be used, whereby Y=ax1+bx2+cx3+dx4+coefficient+error, where the coefficient is the y-intercept, i.e., the value of y when both x1, x2, x3, and x4 are 0.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Validated instruments of the entrepreneurial readiness tool will be used, and the study group will fit the research design. Furthermore, since the data are quantifiable, external generalizations can be made within the theoretical frame. The methodological procedures will clearly be stated, which are understandable and visible. In addition, the reason for a decision on design and sampling will be communicated.

Limitations

This section will be written after the research is conducted. It will contain any limiting factor hindering the research from being conducted as planned.

Summary

This section will be written after the research is conducted. It will summarize the primary research methodology's overview and how it is a good fit for the question being asked and the phenomena being studied.
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APPENDIX A:

**Entrepreneurship Readiness Measurement Tool**

**THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

**Section 1: Socio-Demographic Items**

|  |
| --- |
| **S1. Gender**S1.1. Man 🗖S1.2. Woman 🗖 |
| **S2. Country of birth**S2.1. This country 🗖S2.2. A different country 🗖 |
| **S3. Age group:** S3.1. 18-24 years 🗖 S3.2. 25-34 years 🗖S3.3. 35-44 years 🗖S3.4. 45-54 years 🗖 S3.5. 55-64 years 🗖 S3.6. 65 and + years 🗖  |
| **S4. Level of education:** S4.1. Does not have 🗖 S4.2. Primary 🗖 S4.3. Secondary 🗖 S4.4. Vocational/professional 🗖 S4.5. University 🗖 S4.6. Doctorate /postgraduate 🗖 |
| **S5. How long have you been active in any work experience?** S5.1. 0 years 🗖 S5.2. Up to 2 years 🗖 S5.3. 3-5 years 🗖 S5.4. 6-10 years 🗖 S5.5. 11-15 years 🗖 S5.6. 16-20 years 🗖S5.7. 21 and + years 🗖 |
| **S6. At what age did you start your work, if you have any?** S6.1. Before age 18 🗖 S6.2. At age 18 🗖S6.3. Between age 19 and 25 🗖S6.4. Between age 26 and 34 🗖 S6.5. After age 35 years 🗖  |
| **S7. How do you rate your annual gross income level based on the average standard of living in your country?** S7.1. Very low 🗖S7.2. Low or medium 🗖S7.3. High 🗖S7.4. Very high 🗖 |
| **S8. In what kind of environment have you been born and lived at least until the age of 18?** S8.1. Rural (up to 10,000 inhabitants) 🗖 S8.2. Urban (more than 10,000 inhabitants) 🗖 |
| **S9. Your civil status is…..** S9.1. Live with your parents or family 🗖 S9.2. Live alone 🗖S9.3. Live as a couple without children 🗖 S9.4. Live as a couple with children 🗖 |
| **S10. Have you ever received any entrepreneurial education or training?**S10.1. No never 🗖S10.2. Yes, only at school stage 🗖S10.3. Yes, only at post school stage 🗖S10.4. Yes, at both school and post school stage 🗖 |
| **S11. Is there any case of entrepreneurs within your close family (parents, grandparents, brothers, relatives?**S11.1. Yes 🗖S11.2. No 🗖 |
| **S12. Are some of your friends entrepreneurs?**S12.1. Yes 🗖S12.2. No 🗖 |
| **S13. Have you read books or watched videos or TV shows related to entrepreneurship recently? Do** S13.1. Yes 🗖S13.2. No 🗖 |
| **S14. Do you admire at least one famous entrepreneur?** S14.1. Yes 🗖S14.2. No 🗖 |

**Section 2: Psychological Items**

|  |
| --- |
| Please indicate your degree of agreement with these statements:**Locus of Control**P1. Generally, you are the one who controls your work and job requirements.Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P2. You always strive hard to achieve your work goals and objectives. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P3. You are motivated by a competitive work environment to work harder.Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P4. You speak with senior managers about your work that causes you some anxiety. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P5. If you are offered a new project or challenge that seems very difficult, you try not to get involved and pass it on to another person. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P6. You are considered a very responsible person at work. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P7. You frequently need to receive positive feedback on how you work or move towards your Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P8. You are willing to alter the comfort of your usual work schedule if a new project arises that you think is worth trying to develop. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P9. You like to have the ability to decide on the projects you work on.Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P10. You like to be under continuous supervision about the tasks you do.Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Self-efficacy: responsibility, organization, prevention, decisive capacity, positivism, self-realization**P11. You usually carry out your tasks with ease, even those that you may not like in the required time and form (responsibility). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P12. You distribute your time and effort well with respect to your workload organization.Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P13. You think that you excel at what you do (self-realization, positivism) Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P14. When making decisions always analyze their possible consequences and referrals (prevention). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P15. You have specific personal ways to measure your performance and apply them (self-realization, responsibility). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P16. You usually manage unforeseen events in your work effectively (resolving capacity). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P17. People trust your abilities to cope with stressful situations (resolving ability).Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P18. When there is a problem at work, ways of solving it comes to your mind quickly (resolving ability). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P19. If he ran out of work, he would quickly come up with ways to get ahead (positivism). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P20. You like that there are continuous opportunities for personal growth and development at work (self-realization). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree  |
| **Risk aversion**P21. You always identify the word risk with uncertainty or loss. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P22. You would feel very comfortable lending capital to an entrepreneur with a promising idea Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P23. You tend to gather exhaustive information before making any personal decision. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P24. You tend to gather comprehensive information before making any decision that involves money. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P25. You tend to gather exhaustive information before making any commercial or professional decision. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P26. You try to avoid situations you see as threatening. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree  |
| **Tolerance: adaptability, sociability, empathy, flexibility, dependence, self-esteem, perseverance**P27. You like to have close, friendly, and cooperative relationships with other people at work (spirit of collaboration, empathy).Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P28. You find it essential to have plenty of time to spend with your family and loved ones (dependence). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P29. You like or would like your environment and work routines to be completely predictable, without major changes (search for a security, dependency). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P30. You are always known for willingly accepting the criticisms that others may make about your work (Flexibility, adaptability). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P31. You always find it more effective to work with people who think like you (Flexibility, adaptability). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P32. You find it very difficult to have to separate yourself from truly appreciated people in your work (dependence). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P33. You like speaking more than listening (empathy, adaptability). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P34. You find it easy to recover your spirits after failing a specific task (adaptability). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P35. You find it easy to stay calm when you are being evaluated (tolerance, self-esteem).Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P36. You attribute a very high level of self-esteem (self-esteem). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P37. You are good at anticipating or preventing problems before they occur (prevention). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P38. It is easy for you to have patience and perseverance when you want to change something in your environment until you get it (perseverance).Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree  |
| **Proactively: self-confidence, creativity, sociability, leadership, initiative, independence, determination, commitment, non-conformity.**P39. You like to have freedom and opportunities to talk and socialize with others (sociability). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P40. You want or would like to have opportunities to set challenging goals (self-confidence) and more difficult responsibilities. Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P41. You want or would like to have a leadership position in which others work for you or in which they turn to you for direction (leadership, autonomy). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P42. You like or would like to have opportunities to create new things (creativity, proactively).Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P43. You want or would like to propose directly to whom it may correspond to new projects or process improvements that add value to your company or organization (creativity, initiative, proactively, independence, autonomy). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P44. You like or would like to have channels to convey ideas that occur to you (creativity, initiative, proactively). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P45. You want or would like to produce or perform high-quality work that makes a difference (determination, commitment, proactively). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P46. You want or would like to perform an action-oriented type of work (proactively, energy). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P47. When you have to make a decision that alters a bureaucratic norm of your work, if you think it will result in a benefit, you do it without problems (creativity, proactively, independence, non-conformity). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree P48. You think you have good skills to create and lead workgroups around a defined project (creativity, leadership). Strongly disagree O O O O O O O Strongly agree  |

**Section 3: Entrepreneurship and Business Items**

|  |
| --- |
| E1. Possession of training/education related to economics, business management, business creation, marketing or similar E1.1. Do not have or is low-level E1.2. Have high or very high-level E1.3. Have medium or professional level E2. Possession of training/education at the university level or postgraduate in another specialty. Write the specialty (engineering, architecture, humanities, sociology, history, philosophy.) Specialty \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ E3. Possession of experience in business management (Business management) E.3.1. None or scarce (up to 1 year) E.3.2. Some (2-5 years) E.3.3. Wide (more than 5 years) E4. Regardless of your current situation, if you could choose which of these types of jobs would you prefer? (Choose only one option) E4.1. Self-Employed /Autonomous E4.2. An employee in the private sector E4.3. An employee in the public sector E4.4. Be an owner or a partner and manager of a family or other business E4.5. A different option from the previous ones E5. Derived from your knowledge and skills, how often do you come up with ideas about activities or businesses that you could develop (alone or with others)?E5.1. Frequently E5.2. Continually E5.3. Rarely E5.4. Never E5.5. Sometimes E6. Derived from the observation of your immediate surroundings, how often do you come up with ideas about activities or businesses that you could develop (alone or with others)? E6.1. Never E6.2. Rarely E6.3. Continuously E6.4. Sometimes E6.5. Frequently E7. Derived from the observation of society, how often do you detect needs that can be transformed into activities or businesses that you could develop (alone or with others)? E7.1. Never E7.2. Rarely E7.3. Continually E7.4. Many times E7.5. Frequently E8. Derived from market observation, how often do you detect products or services that can be improved or susceptible to innovation? E8.1. Never E8.2. Few times E8.3. Sometimes E8.4. Frequently E8.5. Continuously E9. On a scale of 1 = nothing to 7 = completely, to what degree do you feel fulfilled about your aspirations in life? None O O O O O O O Completely E10. On a scale of 1- none to 7 = very high, if you had a chance, to what degree would you be attracted to be able to carry out an entrepreneurial activity either alone, as a team, or within a company or organization? None O O O O O O O Very high E11. On a scale of 1 = none to 7 = very high, to what extent would fear of failure be an obstacle to participating in entrepreneurial activity? None O O O O O O O Very high E12. Have you ever started a new independent business alone or with others, or as an intra-entrepreneur within an entity, or even through digital platforms? 12.1. No, never 12.2. Yes, alone 12.3. Yes, with others 12.4. Yes, as entrepreneur E13. If “yes” to the previous question, what method or methods did you use or use? 13.1. A digital platform 13.2. A traditional method (autonomous, S.L., S.A.) 13.3. Both methods E14. Imagine that you had the opportunity to act as an entrepreneur in a large company. Mark the two reasons that most motivate you to accept this opportunity: 14.1. Satisfy your need to self-realize 14.2. Increase your income or employment status 14.3. Implement your creativity and innovation capacity 14.4. Obtain recognition from others 14.5. Help the development and competitiveness of your company or organization 14.6. Offer better products and services to society E15, Imagine having the opportunity to act as an entrepreneur within a large company. Rate from 1 = nothing to 7 = very much the degree to which you feel qualified to: 15.1. I generate ideas innovations around existing products or services. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.2. I generate ideas or innovations around existing processes. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.3. I carry out research for the development of new products or services. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.4. I carry out market research for the introduction of new products or services. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.5. I carry out the planning/organization of launch of new products or services. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.6. I manage the uncertainty associated with the development of a new product or service until its launch. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.7. I am heard, convince others. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.8. I design a good approach to the customer/market approach. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.9. I am able to take calculated risks. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much 15.10. I can lead an entrepreneurship project generating trust and optimism among my team. Nothing O O O O O O O Very much  |

APPENDIX B

**Pre- and Post-Test**

**Objective:** The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine to which extent you have entrepreneurial competencies and behavioral traits before and after you take the EDI training. The result will be used to assess how training impacts behavior. You do not need to write your name. However, please give a code that has the first letter of your, your dad, and your mom’s name (three letters) so that we identify and compare the result with the post-test.

Code \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Instruction:** Please put a tick mark “√”in the box that demonstrates the appropriate present behavior.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ser. No.** | **Items** | **5****Much more** | **4****Some more** | **3****Average** | **2****Some less** | **1****Much less** |
| 1. **Opportunity-seeking and initiative**
 |
| 1.1 | I do things before being asked or forced to by events.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 | I take action to extend the business into new areas, products or services.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 | I seize unusual opportunities to start a new business, obtain financing, equipment, land, workspace, or assistance. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Persistence**
 |
| 2.1 | I act in the face of significant obstacles and challenges.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 | I take persistent actions, or switch to an alternative strategy to meet a challenge or obstacle.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 | I take personal responsibility for the performance necessary to achieve goals and objectives. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Fulfillment of commitments**
 |
| 3.1 | I make a personal sacrifice and extraordinary effort to complete a job.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 | I pitch in with employees, or take their place if needed, to get a job done.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 | I strive to keep customers satisfied and place long-term goodwill above short-term gain. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Demand for quality and efficiency**
 |
| 4.1 | I find ways to do things better, faster, and cheaper.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.2 | I act to do things that meet or exceed standards of excellence.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.3 | I develop and use procedures to ensure that work is completed on time and that work meets agreed-upon standards of quality. |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ser. No.** | **Items** | **5****Much more** | **4****Some more** | **3****Average** | **2****Some less** | **1****Much less** |
| 1. **Calculate risks**
 |
| 5.1 | I deliberately calculate risks and evaluate alternatives.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2 | I take action to reduce risks and/or control outcomes.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.3 | I place myself in situations involving a challenge or moderate risk. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Goal setting**
 |
| 6.1 | I set goals and objectives which are personally meaningful and challenging.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.2 | I articulate clear and specific long-term goals.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6.3 | I set measurable short-term objectives. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Information-seeking**
 |
| 7.1 | I personally seek information from customers, suppliers, and competitors.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.2 | I do personal research on how to provide a product or service.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.3 | I consult experts for business or technical advice. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Systematic planning and monitoring**
 |
| 8.1 | I plan by breaking large tasks down into sub-tasks with clear timeframes.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.2 | I revise plans considering feedback on performance or changing circumstances.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.3 | I keep financial records and use them to make decisions. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Persuasion and networking**
 |
| 9.1 | I use deliberate strategies to influence and persuade others.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.2 | I use key people as agents to achieve my objectives.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.3 | I take action to develop and maintain a network of business contacts. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. **Independence and self-confidence**
 |
| 10.1 | I seek autonomy from the rules and/or control of others.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10.2 | I attribute the causes of successes and failures to myself and to my own conduct. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10.3 | I express confidence in my ability to complete a difficult task or to face a challenge |  |  |  |  |  |

APPENDIX C:

**Consent Form for Social Science Study**

**TITLE OF STUDY**

Youth Entrepreneurial Readiness and Entrepreneurial Training

**RESEARCHERS**

Seble Hailu Diglu, Doctoral Candidate and Lead Researcher/Primary Investigator (PI), Omega Graduate School, +(251) 911 606055, seble.hailu@gmail.com; Dr. Cathie Hughes, Chief Academic Officer, Academic Dean, and faculty advisor, Omega Graduate School +(1) 307-871-4569; contact person for subjects, 804-823-9601; Dr. Curtis McClane, Committee Chair, Dr. David Ward, faculty advisor, Dr. Worku Tuffa Birru, Content Advisor.

**RESEARCHERS’ STATEMENT**

We are asking you to be in a research study. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether to be in the study. Please read the Consent Form carefully. You may ask questions about the purpose of the research, what we would ask you to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the study or about this form that is not clear. When we have answered all your questions, you can decide if you want to be in the research or not. This process is called “informed consent.” We will give you a copy of this form for your records.

To participate, you must be between ages 18 and 35 when you took the training given at Entrepreneurship Development Institute. Before you decide to participate in this study, it is essential that you understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please read the following information carefully.

**PURPOSE OF STUDY**

The purpose of this study is to assess how the entrepreneurship training given by the Entrepreneurship Development Institute relates to youth entrepreneurial readiness for business development. Participation in this study will help to demonstrate whether the training moderates new venture creation. Study results will be used to inform the Country better the need to develop more awareness of the youth to engage in entrepreneurship as a potential career choice and help them be active in the economic development of Ethiopia. This will also help to scale up the training activities to meet the entrepreneurial needs of the Country. Your participation in the research is voluntary, anonymous and confidential and there is no right or wrong answer. If there is anything that is not clear or if you need more information, please contact the Researcher at the address given above.

**STUDY PROCEDURES**

The study consists of two tests: entrepreneurial readiness and pre and post-test of the entrepreneurship training. Entrepreneurial readiness test begins with completing 14 socio-demographic questions, 48 psychological questions, 24 business experiences related questions.

The second test is given to investigate the pre- and post-training knowledge of entrepreneurship.

The entrepreneurial readiness questionnaire will take 35 minutes to fill in, while the pre- and post-test will take 10 minutes. The research data will be collected within one month.

All responses are identified only by a number and associated with you only by a unique code associated with your record. The use of the data is used for academic purposes, further research, and potential funding for future projects intended to improve entrepreneurial training and startup businesses.

**RISKS**

There will not be any harm in any way to those who will respond to the questionnaires. The person who fills out the questionnaire will not write his/her name. The information filled in the questionnaire will be used for research purposes.

**BENEFITS**

There will be no direct benefit to you for your participation in this study. However, we hope that the information obtained from this study may benefit from assessing Ethiopia’s efforts to meet the sustainable goal by 2030 by identifying how the youth and young adults are contributing to the economic development efforts of the Country.

**CONFIDENTIALITY**

Your responses to this survey will be anonymous. Please do not write any identifying information on your questionnaire. Every effort will be made by the researcher to preserve your confidentiality for participating in the research.

Data collected as part of this research will be provided to a personal repository for future use by other researchers. This data will not contain information that could directly identify you.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

If you have questions at any time about this study, or you experience adverse effects as the result of participating in this study, you may contact the researcher whose contact information is provided on the first page. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, or if problems arise which you do not feel you can discuss with the Primary Investigator, please contact one of the Institutional Review Board members at + 1 307 871-4569. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, you can call the Human Subjects Division at + 1 206 543-0098.

**VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION**

Your participation in this study is voluntary. It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part in this study. If you decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to sign a consent form. After you sign the consent form, you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason. Withdrawing from this study will not affect the relationship you have, if any, with the Researcher. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed, your data will ages.

**SUBJECT’S STATEMENT**

This study has been explained to me. I volunteer to take part in this research. I have had a chance to ask questions. If I have questions later about the research, or if I have been harmed by participating in this study, I can contact one of the researchers listed on the first page of this consent form. If I have questions about my rights as a research subject, I can call the Human Subjects Division at (+206) 543-0098. I have received an electronic copy of this consent form.

Printed name of the Subject Signature of the Subject Date

Printed name of the Researcher (PI) Signature of the Researcher (PI) Date

**Curriculum Vitae**

**Seble Hailu Diglu**

|  |
| --- |
| **Contact Information** * Cellular +(251) 911 60 60 55; Office +(251) 941 90 90 90
* E-mail: seble.hailu@gmail.com; sable.diglu@gmail.com
* Skype: seblehailu,
 |
| **Education Background**1. **Doctoral Studies in Sociology – Ph.D. (candidate),** Omega (Oxford) Graduate School, Dayton, Tennessee, USA, March 2017 – September 2023
2. **Master of Arts in Counseling and Human Relations,** Liberty University, Virginia, USA, 2001-2005
3. **Master of Arts in Educational Psychology,** Addis Ababa University – School of Graduate Studies, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 2001-2003
4. **Bachelor of Theology Degree,** Evangelical Theological College, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 1995-1999
5. **Bachelor of Arts in Management and Public Administration,** Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, 1983-1987
 |
| **Core Areas of Expertise*** **Psychological counseling**: providing individual, couple, family and group counseling and psychotherapy
* **Management consultancy:** providing consultancy services to several governmental and non-governmental organizations in various fields, including organizational and leadership development, strategic planning, project management, customer relations management, human resources management, and knowledge management.
* **Education:** providing classroom teaching, advising students, training to professionals, as well as preparing materials including manuals, training aids, and guidelines, writing, and documentation.
* **Research:** Conducting assessments, surveys, and evaluations including mapping, organizational analysis, situational analysis, knowledge, attitude and practice reviews and mid-term or final project evaluations.
* **Training:** Combining psychology and management to provide pieces of training in a range of specialized fields including management-related topics, project planning, and implementation, psychological counseling, gender policy formulation, community mobilization, and positive psychotherapy, EMDR therapy, peace psychology.
 |
| **Work Experience** 1. Endaee Communication, Consultancy, Counseling, and Training Services (ECCCTS) PLC – General Manager since June 2016 – present.
2. Director General, Ethiopian Reconciliation Commission, February 16, - March 11, 2022.
3. Wudassie Diagnostic Center (WDC) - Marketing Manager and Counselor, Sept. 2013 – May 2016.
4. United Nations Educational Scientific Cultural Organization (UNESCO) – National Program Officer for HIV and AIDS, February 2011 – August 2013.
5. Freelance Consultant - Management, Psychology, HIV/AIDS, Counseling, February 2010 – 2011.
6. Save the Children/USA, seconded to Management Sciences for Health - Training Manager, HIV/AIDS Care, and Support Program, November 2007 – February 2010.
7. United Nations International Labor Organization (ILO) - National Project Coordinator, HIV/AIDS Workplace Education Program, December 2004 – October 2007.
8. Bethzatha College of Health Sciences - Program Coordinator, August 2003 – December 2004.
9. Evangelical Theological College - Director of Administration, Finance and Information Services, September 2000 -August 2001Registrar and Instructor, August 1995 – 2000.
10. Ministry of Mines and Energy – Junior to Senior Management Expert, September 1988 - July 1995.
 |