International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research

Vol.6, No.2, pp.1-14, March 2018

Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (www.eajournals.org)

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF OPINIONS OF ENTERPRISE MANAGERS AND BUSINESS STUDENTS ON YOUTH ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN ENTERPRISES IN THE CONTEXT OF ERITREA

Ghiorgis Tekle and Hagos Fesshaye

Department of Economics, College of Business and Economics, Halhale, Eritrea.

ABSTRACT: *The development of youth entrepreneurship has been forwarded as a very attractive alternative both to help the growing number of unemployed youth and to harness the potentials of the youth in an effort to bolster the economy of a country. This study has attempted to explore the level of importance of various factors for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises in the context of Eritrea by seeking the opinions of private and public manufacturing enterprise managers and senior students in a business college. A total number of 150 managers and students were asked to rate 56 factors that are expected to influence or affect youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises. Respondents were asked to rate each factor, presented in the form of 5-points likert-scale. The ratings of the factors of importance for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises by the three groups of respondents have a moderate degree of correspondence (as measured by the Spearman's rho). Among the factors considered for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises, prioritized factors by private enterprise managers are related with provision of more supportive environment for youth. Public enterprise managers have prioritized factors that target for the development of enterprise such as technology transfer and education while students have prioritized factors related with ambition, individual initiative and hard work In general, private enterprise managers were found to rate the factors higher compared to either public enterprise managers or the student group. The study has shown that the three groups of respondents have somewhat different opinions on how youth entrepreneurship in enterprises can be developed. This suggests the need to take into account the viewpoints of various relevant stakeholders when such programs of youth entrepreneurship development are envisioned.*

KEYWORDS: Youth, Entrepreneurship, Managers, Business Students, Eritrea.

INTRODUCTION

After the financial crisis of 2008, youth employment became much more important issue on the international agenda than before. This was partly because the trend of declining youth unemployment was reversed in 2008. According to ILO, the global youth unemployment rate increased from 11.8 to 12.7 percent from 2008 to 2009 (ILO, 2012). Since the 2008 crisis, the number of unemployed youth (aged 15 to 24 years) has increased to an estimated 73.4 million – a 12.6 percent of the total youth population in 2013, and is projected to rise to 12.8 percent of the total youth population in 2018 (ILO, 2013). Youth employment is the period of entry into a productive life. Failures at that stage are likely to have long term consequences both to the welfare of youth and the overall health of the labour market. To ease the challenges of youth unemployment, one of the ideas that have been forwarded as a solution is that policy should attempt to create more entrepreneurship among the young (Green, 2013).

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

According to Tijani-Alawiye (2004) entrepreneurship is the process of increasing the supply of entrepreneurs or adding to the stock of existing small, medium and big enterprises available to a country by creating and promoting many capable entrepreneurs, who can successfully run innovative enterprises, nurture them to growth and sustain them, with a view to achieving broad socio-economic developmental goals. One of these socio-economic goals is creating and sustaining employment. Entrepreneurship has often been studied in connection with youth employment creation. This is because youth in all societies are believed to possess qualities such as resourcefulness, initiative, drive, imagination, enthusiasm, ambition, energy, boldness, audacity and courage, which are all valuable traits for entrepreneurship development (Schnurr and Newing, 1997).

Promotion of youth entrepreneurship has a number of potential benefits. At the individual level, greater self-employment among young people may go along with increased self-reliance and well-being; and at the macro level, it may promote innovation and thus create new jobs, it may have a direct effect on employment if new young entrepreneurs hire fellow youths, new small firms may raise the degree of competition in the product market - bringing gains to consumers, young entrepreneurs may be particularly responsive to new economic opportunities and trends (Green, 2013; YBI, 2013; Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998). Despite the importance of youth entrepreneurship, the approach to youth entrepreneurship development varies from country to country, and to a large extent is a function of the national socio-economic context and specific development challenges faced by a country. According to UNCTAD's policy guide on youth entrepreneurship (2015), there are some considerations that need to be taken into account when formulating youth entrepreneurship development policies. These include optimizing the regulatory environment; enhancing entrepreneurship education and skills development; facilitating technology exchange and innovation; improving access to finance; and promoting awareness and networking.

In Sub-Saharan Africa the median age is 18.6 years, lower than any other geographic regions, including other developing regions, around the world (Kew, 2015). Furthermore, while 62% of Sub-Saharan Africa's population is under the age of 25 years, in terms of employment the youth are three times more likely than adults to be unemployed. According to Kew (2015) the proportion of youth relative to the whole population of sub-Saharan Africa will continue to be significant at least until 2030. This huge proportion of youth poses a big opportunity as well as a challenge to the region. Countries of the region need to focus on the youth to provide sustainable employment opportunities and an easier transition from school to work for the youth.

In Eritrea, according to the Eritrea Population and Health Survey of 2010 (National Statistics Office, 2013), 62.5% of men aged between 15 and 59 years were employed, and 18.4% of women aged between 15 and 49 years were employed. The percentage of men working at the time of the survey increases with age from 26.7% for those age 15-19 years to 86.4% for those age 45-49 years. Similarly, older women were generally more likely to be employed than younger women.

In a study conducted by Ghiorgis and Hagos (2017) to assess the motivating and constraining factors for youth entrepreneurship in the manufacturing sector of Eritrea, the major motivating factors were found to be self-reliance and wealth accumulation while the major constraining factors were access to finances (bank credit), administrative barriers and fears related to financial risks. Moreover, the study found that instruction in entrepreneurial skills offers a potentially transformative impact on the work and career focus of young people.

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

From policy perspective, youth entrepreneurship policy is horizontal in nature and cuts across most other policy areas. Because its objective is to foster job creation and to contribute to economic development and growth, it can particularly be seen from an employment and economic policy perspective. From an economic perspective, the approach should be to put in place an all-round and comprehensive youth policy in light of macroeconomic policy framework of a country. In terms of organizational structures, it could be set up across various line ministries and organizations in a coordinated manner. For this purpose the focus on stimulating youth entrepreneurship requires studies on factors that influence youth entrepreneurship development. In more specific terms, youth training on entrepreneurship would be relevant if it contributes to employment and job creation. At the same time it would be effective if it is based on the assessment of labour market needs and takes into account opinions of different stakeholders. This study tries to find out whether there are differences in the opinions of three groups of respondents on key factors that are expected to influence youth entrepreneurship development in the context of Eritrea. The three groups of respondents are private enterprise managers, public enterprise managers and senior students in a business college.

This paper attempts to explore youth entrepreneurship development avenues in the context of Eritrea by seeking opinions of managers of enterprises and business students. Its specific objectives are to:

- Evaluate the correspondence of the ratings of a number of youth entrepreneurship development factors by the three groups of respondents; namely, private enterprise managers, public enterprise managers, and senior students in a business college.
- Compare if there are differences in ratings of the factors by the three groups of respondents.

The paper is organized into six parts. The first part is an introduction that provides the issues and concepts of entrepreneurship and employment in relation to youth. It also provides the objectives of the study. In the second part a description of the research methodology is presented. Part three provides background characteristics of the sample respondents. In part four survey results and findings are summarized and presented. The fifth part is a discussion of the results presented in part four. Some concluding remarks are given in part six.

METHODOLOGY

An opinion survey questionnaire was undertaken during the months of September and October 2014 to gather opinions of private and public sector managers in manufacturing enterprises and senior students in the College of Business and Economics - Halhale (CBEH) about factors influencing youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises in Eritrea. A total number of 150 individuals were asked to rate a number of factors that are expected to influence or affect youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises. Respondents were asked to rate each factor, presented in the form of 5-points likert-scale, with 1=not at all important, 2=of little importance, 3=of some importance, 4=important, and 5=very important.

The factors selected are chosen after examination of various studies. Some of the factors refer to behaviours of young entrepreneurs, socio-cultural environment, working conditions, capital, skills and market opportunities, while others refer to policies, technology transfers,

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

investments, foreign linkages, loan and credit system, training, research etc. The attributes are taken from prior works on the entrepreneurial process where myths and realities about entrepreneurs are discussed and a number of factors related to attitudes, behaviours, skills and capacities of entrepreneurs are considered (Jeffrey A. Timmons, 1999).

The factors considered are listed in table 1 and are classified as internal and external factors, although it is sometimes difficult to make a dividing line between the two. External factors are defined mainly as those that are given as exogenous and beyond the control of the individual entrepreneur or sometimes the enterprise concerned. Accordingly, 29 of them are internal factors and 27 are external factors.

Table 1: List of factors for youth entrepreneurship development

Internal factors		External factors	
Q1	Education level of workers	Q30	Government policy
Q2	Leadership quality in work place	Q31	Enabling or supportive environment (peace and stability)
Q3	On the job training	Q32	External linkages and institutional cooperation
Q4	Experience of workers	Q33	Technology transfer
Q5	Dedication to a clear objective, responsibility	Q34	Research budget and expenditure
Q6	Team work behaviour	Q35	Age and retirement policy
Q7	Flexible and adaptable operation or work style	Q36	Red tape and bureaucracy
Q8	Household and family business skills (parental trade and skills)	Q37	Employment of foreign experts
Q9	Moral support and encouragement from superiors	Q38	Foreign aid and technical assistance
Q10	Initiative-based and commitments	Q39	Profit motive
Q11	Accumulation of capital and wealth	Q40	Salary and wages
Q12	Risk taking behaviour and risk management	Q41	Incentive systems such as bonuses
Q13	Ambition, independence, self confidence	Q42	Promotion and appointment policy
Q14	Time utilization and budgeting	Q43	Mentoring and advisory system in workplace
Q15	Longer working hours	Q44	Access to computerization and internet facilities
Q16	Community respect and recognition	Q45	Investment by enterprises
Q17	Commercial orientation	Q46	Training abroad and scholarships
Q18	Adequate start-up capital or funding	Q47	Local training, workshops, conferences
Q19	Access to well-trained and proper support staff	Q48	Integrated package of support for youth
Q20	Need for achievement	Q49	Reliance on local business specialists
Q21	Human relations and communication ability	Q50	Proper targeted and selected training
Q22	Technical knowledge, craftsman oriented	Q51	Loan and credit system for youth
Q23	Power need	Q52	Customer-centred loans for businesses

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

Q24	Energetic, positive, challenge taker	Q53	Transfers and family inheritance
Q25	Preference for technical over managerial tasks	Q54	Appropriate 'micro' delivery mechanisms
Q26	Familiarity with market and market opportunities	Q55	Effective supply chain management
Q27	Interpersonal skills, ability to manage customer or employee relations	Q56	Effective sustainability strategies
Q28	Networking with people having relevant skills and abilities		
Q29	Motivate others behave in synergistic manner		

The analysis involves obtaining the mean scores of the ratings for each factor for the three groups of respondents and compare the correspondence in rating of the factors using Spearman's Rho correlation coefficient. Furthermore, using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), the mean scores of the three groups of respondents for each factor are compared, and tested if there is significant difference in mean rating between them. Statistical analysis are conducted using SPSS Version 23.

Background characteristics of respondents

The study focuses on three groups of respondents; namely, managers of private enterprises, managers of public enterprises and senior students in a business college. Out of a total of 137 respondents who filled the questionnaire properly, about 52.6% are managers of private enterprises, 13.9% are managers of public enterprises, and 33.6% are college students. About a fourth of the respondents (23.4%) are females.

Table 2 presents the distribution of the respondents with respect to age and educational level.

Table 2: Number and percentage distribution of respondents by age and educational level

Characteristics of Respondents		**Number**	**Percentage**
Age	Below 25yrs	47	34.3
	26-40yrs	32	23.4
	41-50yrs	10	7.3
	Above 50yrs	12	8.8
	Missing	36	26.3
	Total	**137**	**100.0**
Educational level	Below secondary school	4	2.9
	Secondary school	20	14.6
	Technical school	18	13.1
	College/University	73	53.3
	Missing	22	16.1
	Total	**137**	**100.0**

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

Survey Results

Average mean score for each factor on its importance on youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises by the three group of respondents have been obtained from the likert-scale ratings. Some relevant descriptive statistics of the mean score rating for each factor by the three groups of respondents and for all respondents are presented in Appendix 1. Overall, taking all respondents into consideration, the factors that are given higher mean rating of importance for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises include enabling or supportive environment (peace and stability) (mean rating=4.47), technology transfer (4.44), salary and wages (4.44), ambition, independence, self-confidence (4.40), leadership quality in work place (4.39), team work behaviour(4.38), interpersonal skills, ability to manage customer or employee relations (4.38), effective sustainability strategies (4.38), government policy (4.38), proper targeted and selected training (4.37), on the job training (4.36).

Among the private enterprise managers, the factors that are given higher mean rating of importance for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises include enabling or supportive environment (mean rating = 4.70), loan and credit system for youth (4.63), proper targeted and selected training (4.62), government policy (4.60), effective sustainability strategies (4.60), salary and wages (4.59), promotion and appointment policy (4.58), local training, workshops, conferences (4.57), team work behaviour (4.56), incentive systems such as bonuses (4.56), dedication to a clear objective and responsibility (4.54), technology transfer (4.54), integrated package of support for youth (BDS) (4.51). Among the public enterprise managers, the factors that are given higher mean rating of importance towards the development of youth entrepreneurship in enterprises include technology transfer (mean rating =4.74), education level of workers (4.58), dedication to a clear objective and responsibility (4.53), government policy (4.53), leadership quality in work place (4.47), team work behaviour (4.47), flexible and adaptable operation or work style (4.47), time utilization and budgeting (4.47), enabling or supportive environment (4.42), familiarity with market and market opportunities (4.39), on the job training (4.37), research budget and expenditure (4.37), salary and wages (4.37), investment by enterprises (4.37). Among the students, the factors that scored higher mean rating of importance for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises include ambition, independence, self-confidence from the part of the youth (mean rating=4.41), training abroad and scholarships (4.33), need for achievement (4.32), moral support and encouragement from superiors (4.30), leadership quality in work place (4.27), human relations and communication ability (4.26), interpersonal skills, ability to manage customer or employee relations (4.26), salary and wages (4.23), experience of workers (4.23), access to well trained and proper support staff (4.22), technology transfer (4.16), access to computerization and internet facilities (4.16).

Table 3 shows the degree of correspondence in ranking through the mean ratings of the factors by the three groups of respondents using the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient. The results show that there is significant positive correspondence in the ranking that the three groups attach to the factors in terms of their importance for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises, although it is far from perfect.

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

Table 3: Spearman's rho for the rating of the factors between the three groups of respondents

		Private	Public	Student
Private	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.679**	.584**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	56	56	56
Public	Correlation Coefficient	.679**	1.000	.675**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	56	56	56
Student	Correlation Coefficient	.584**	.675**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	56	56	56

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In what follows we test whether there are significant differences between the mean ratings by the three groups of respondents using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for factors influencing youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises. The null hypothesis is that for a given factor the mean ratings by the three groups of respondents are equal, and the alternative hypothesis is that the mean ratings are not equal. Table 4 presents the ANOVA results for the first 12 factors that were rated higher in importance by private enterprise managers for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises. As can be observed from the ANOVA significance column in the table, not all the means for the three groups of respondents are equal for almost every factor considered. Further, the Tukey post hoc mean comparisons shows that for each of the factors the private managers mean rating was higher in comparison to the mean ratings given by either public enterprise managers or students.

Table 4: ANOVA table for mean rating of factors by the three groups of respondents

	ANOVA		Tukey Post Hoc Mean Comparisons			
Factors	F	Sig.	I	J	Mean Diff.(I-J)	Sig.
Enabling or supportive environment (peace and stability)	7.345	.001**	Private	Public	.275	.335
				Students	.543**	.001
Loan and credit system for youth	10.009	.000**	Private	Public	.632*	.016
				Students	.676**	.000
Proper targeted and selected training	7.058	.001**	Private	Public	.413	.129
				Students	.577**	.001
Government policy	5.678	.004**	Private	Public	.071	.954
				Students	.597**	.004

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

Effective sustainability strategies	5.817	.004**	Private	Public	.337	.317
				Students	.552**	.003
Salary and wages	2.387	.096	Private	Public	.226	.587
				Students	.367	.084
Promotion and appointment policy	12.127	.000**	Private	Public	.367	.088
				Students	.623**	.000
Local training, workshops, conferences	14.295	.000**	Private	Public	.828**	.000
				Students	.656**	.000
Team work behaviour	5.117	.007**	Private	Public	.083	.917
				Students	.490**	.006
Incentive systems such as bonuses	5.929	.003**	Private	Public	.300	.396
				Students	.586**	.002
Dedication to a clear objective, responsibility	7.431	.001**	Private	Public	.017	.997
				Students	.678**	.001
Technology transfer	5.276	.006**	Private	Public	-.201	.550
				Students	.377*	.025
Integrated package of support for youth (BDS)	7.286	.001**	Private	Public	.455	.109
				Students	.624**	.001

**significant at the 0.01 level, * significant at the 0.05 level.

For the first 12 factors that were rated relatively higher in importance by public enterprise managers, ANOVA tests were conducted to see if there are significant mean differences between the ratings of the three groups of respondents. Table 5 presents the ANOVA results, and it shows that for some of the factors the mean ratings by the three groups of respondents were significantly different. The Tukey post hoc mean comparisons shows the mean rating differences for each factor considered between public enterprise managers and the other two groups. In general, the mean rating by public enterprise managers for the factors, fall between the mean ratings for the other two groups.

Table 5: ANOVA table for mean rating of some selected factors by the three groups of respondents

	ANOVA		Tukey Post Hoc Mean Comparisons			
Factors	F	Sig.	I	J	Mean Diff.(I-J)	Sig.
Technology transfer	5.276	.006**	Public	Private	.201	.550
				Students	.578*	.014
Education level of workers	1.975	.143	Public	Private	.193	.654

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

				Students	.427	.160
Dedication to a clear objective, responsibility	7.431	.001**	Public	Private	-.017	.997
				Students	.661*	.027
Government policy	5.678	.004**	Public	Private	-.071	.954
				Students	.526	.104
Leadership quality in work place	.688	.504	Public	Private	.037	.983
				Students	.201	.635
Team work behaviour	5.117	.007**	Public	Private	-.083	.917
				Students	.407	.165
Flexible and adaptable operation or work style	1.811	.168	Public	Private	.077	.931
				Students	.340	.284
Time utilization and budgeting	1.600	.206	Public	Private	.131	.820
				Students	.363	.261
Enabling or supportive environment (peace and stability)	7.345	.001**	Public	Private	-.275	.335
				Students	.269	.387
Familiarity with market and market opportunities	6.203	.003**	Public	Private	.032	.989
				Students	.571*	.043
On the job training	2.542	.083	Public	Private	-.117	.835
				Students	.229	.548
Research budget and expenditure	1.294	.278	Public	Private	.054	.973
				Students	.321	.430

**significant at the 0.01 level, * significant at the 0.05 level.

Mean rating comparisons were also conducted among the three groups of respondents for the first 12 factors that were rated relatively higher by the student group. The ANOVA result presented in table 6 shows that for most of the factors the mean difference among the three groups of respondents was not statistically significant.

Table 6: ANOVA table for mean rating of some selected factors by the three groups of respondents

	ANOVA		Tukey Post Hoc Mean Comparisons			
Factors	F	Sig.	I	J	Mean Diff.(I-J)	Sig.
Ambition, independence, self confidence	.401	.671	Students	Private	-.026	.982
				Public	.146	.755
Training abroad and scholarships	.365	.695	Students	Private	-.046	.967
				Public	.168	.804
Need for achievement	.325	.723	Students	Private	-.020	.992
				Public	.160	.781
Moral support and encouragement from superiors	.227	.797	Students	Private	.086	.855

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

				Public	.138	.821
Leadership quality in work place	.688	.504	Students	Private	-.164	.540
				Public	-.201	.635
Human relations and communication ability	4.072	.019*	Students	Private	-.225	.210
				Public	.261	.360
Interpersonal skills, ability to manage customer or employee relations	1.266	.285	Students	Private	-.225	.304
				Public	-.017	.997
Salary and wages	2.387	.096	Students	Private	-.367	.084
				Public	-.141	.830
Experience of workers	.833	.437	Students	Private	-.201	.409
				Public	-.089	.918
Access to well trained and proper support staff	.862	.425	Students	Private	-.144	.567
				Public	.064	.946
Technology transfer	5.276	.006**	Students	Private	-.377*	.025
				Public	-.578*	.014
Access to computerization and internet facilities	.160	.852	Students	Private	-.106	.840
				Public	-.051	.980

**significant at the 0.01 level, * significant at the 0.05 level.

DISCUSSION

This study seeks to explore the opinions of the three groups of respondents; namely, managers of private enterprises, managers of public enterprises and senior students of a business college, on the importance of a number of factors on youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises. The three groups of respondents have similarities in the sense that to a varying degree they have connections with business enterprises and are expected to have some knowledge of basic principles of entrepreneurship and management in theory and/or practice. At the same time they have differences in the sense that they have different roles, responsibilities, experiences, and expectations.

The three groups of respondents rating of the factors for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises reflect their experiences. Overall, private enterprise managers have prioritized factors that are related with provision of more supportive environment for youth, public enterprise managers have prioritized factors that target for the development of enterprise, while students have prioritized factors related with individual initiative and hard work. Spearman's rho results show that there is stronger degree of correspondence in rating of the factors between private enterprise managers and public enterprise managers in comparison to between private enterprise managers and students. This could be attributed to the fact that the

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

private and public enterprise managers are in the world of work and their experiences differ from that of students who are yet to be employed.

By ordering the mean ratings of the factors for each group of respondents, the study selected the first 12 factors that were rated relatively higher for each group. For each group's first 12 factors ANOVA tests were conducted to see whether there is significant difference in mean ratings among the three groups. Private enterprise managers have prioritized factors that are related with provision of more supportive environment for youth such as creating enabling environment, loan and credit system for youth, and proper targeted and selected training for youth. The mean rating for most of these factors by the private enterprise managers were significantly higher in comparison with the mean rating of these factors by the other two groups. To a certain degree the results show that private enterprise managers value the importance of these factors for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises strongly than the other two groups. Public enterprise managers prioritized factors that target for the development of enterprises such as technology transfer, educational level of workers, government policy, and leadership quality in workplace. The mean rating of some of these factors were significantly different from those of the other two groups, and in most of these factors the mean rating by public enterprise managers is only significantly higher in comparison with the student group. The first 10 selections of the public enterprise managers, although rated higher by the group in comparison to the whole selection of factors, most of them are rated higher by the private enterprise managers and rated lower by the student group in comparison with the rating of public enterprise managers. The student group have prioritized factors related with individual initiative and hard work such as ambition and self-confidence from the part of the youth, educational opportunities abroad, desire for achievement, and moral support from superiors. For almost all of these factors, the mean rating is not statistically significant between the three groups of respondents. Moreover, although rated higher by students in comparison with all the other factors, the mean ratings for these factors are generally lower in comparison with the mean ratings of the private or public enterprise managers.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Youth entrepreneurship development have been forwarded as a very attractive alternative both to help the growing number of unemployed youth and to harness the potentials of the youth in an effort to bolster economies of countries. Youth entrepreneurship development is characterized by a number of motivating and constraining factors. This study have attempted to explore the level of importance of various factors for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises in the context of Eritrea by seeking the opinions of private enterprise managers, public enterprise managers and senior students in a business college. It is interesting to note that these three groups of respondents have similarities in the sense that to a varying degree they have connections with the world of business, and have differences in the sense that they have different responsibilities. Their opinions on the importance of the various factors considered for youth entrepreneurship development is important as they reflect their experiences and understandings.

The ratings of the importance of the factors for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises by the three groups of respondents have a moderate degree of correspondence (as measured by the Spearman's rho). In general, private enterprise managers were more likely to

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

rate the factors higher as important for development of youth entrepreneurship as compared to either public enterprise managers or the student group.

Stimulating youth entrepreneurship requires knowledge of the factors that influence youth entrepreneurship development, and it could be effective if it is based, among others, on viewpoints of different stakeholders. Among the factors considered, private enterprise managers have prioritized factors that are related with provision of more supportive environment for youth, public enterprise managers have prioritized factors that target for the development of enterprise such as technology transfer and education, while students have prioritized factors related with individual initiative and hard work for youth entrepreneurship development in enterprises.

In conclusion, the study has shown that the three groups of respondents have somewhat different views on how youth entrepreneurship in enterprises can be developed. The implication is that youth entrepreneurship development programs need to take into account the viewpoints of various relevant stakeholders when such programs are envisioned.

REFERENCES

A. Cyril Awogbenle and K. Chijioke Iwuamadi, (2010). *Youth unemployment: Entrepreneurship development programme as an intervention mechanism,* African Journal of Business anagement Vol. 4(6), pp. 831-835, June 2010

Blanchflower, D. and Oswald, A.J. (1998). *Entrepreneurship and the Youth Labour Market Problem: A Report for the OECD*, OECD: Paris.

Ghiorgis, T. and Hagos, F. (2017). *An assessment of the Motivating and Constraining Factors for Youth Entrepreneurship in the Manufacturing Sector of Eritrea,* International Journal of Business and Management Review, Vol. 5 (1), pp.12-29, January 2017.

Greene, F.J. (2013). *Youth Entrepreneurship: A background paper for the OECD Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs and Local Development*, OECD: Paris.

International Labour Organization (2012). *The youth employment crisis: Time for action*. Geneva.

International Labour Organization (2013). *Global Employment Trends for Youth. A generation at risk*, Geneva.

Kew, J. (2015). *Africa's Young Entrepreneurs: Unlocking the Potential for a Brighter Future.* IDRC, Canada.

National Statistics Office (NSO) [Eritrea] and Fafo AIS. 2013. *Eritrea Population and Health Survey 2010*. Asmara, Eritrea: National Statistics Office and Fafo Institute for Applied International Studies.

UNCTAD (2015) Policy Guide on Youth Entrepreneurship, New York and Geneva.

Youth Business International (2013). *Generation Entrepreneur? The state of global youth entrepreneurship. Understanding the entrepreneurial attitudes, aspirations and activities of young people,* London.

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

APPENDIX 1: MEAN RATING OF IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT*

Factors for Entrepreneurship Development	Private	Public	Students	Total
Education level of workers	4.39* (0.873)	4.58 (0.607)	4.15 (0.894)	4.33 (0.855)
Leadership quality in work place	4.44 (0.788)	4.47 (0.772)	4.27 (0.845)	4.39 (0.803)
On the job training	4.49 (0.756)	4.37 (0.684)	4.14 (0.889)	4.36 (0.802)
Experience of workers	4.43 (0.693)	4.32 (0.582)	4.23 (1.054)	4.35 (0.817)
Dedication to a clear objective, responsibility	4.54 (0.793)	4.53 (0.697)	3.86 (1.134)	4.34 (0.939)
Team work behaviour	4.56 (0.629)	4.47 (0.612)	4.07 (1.095)	4.38 (0.839)
Flexible and adaptable operation or work style	4.40 (0.694)	4.47 (0.905)	4.13 (0.944)	4.32 (0.823)
Household and family business skills (parental trade and skills)	3.27 (1.406)	3.44 (0.856)	3.20 (1.069)	3.27 (1.223)
Moral support and encouragement from superiors	4.21 (0.897)	4.16 (0.602)	4.30 (0.823)	4.23 (0.831)
Initiative-based and commitments	4.39 (0.687)	4.26 (0.653)	4.12 (1.041)	4.28 (0.816)
Accumulation of capital and wealth	4.24 (0.892)	3.84 (0.834)	3.83 (1.034)	4.05 (0.947)
Risk taking behaviour and risk management	4.13 (1.120)	3.94 (0.802)	3.21 (1.279)	3.81 (1.203)
Ambition, independence, self confidence	4.43 (0.675)	4.26 (0.872)	4.41 (0.787)	4.40 (0.740)
Time utilization and budgeting	4.34 (0.759)	4.47 (0.697)	4.11 (1.005)	4.28 (0.846)
Longer working hours	3.65 (1.293)	2.72 (1.320)	2.39 (1.298)	3.10 (1.419)
Community respect and recognition	4.17 (0.907)	3.58 (1.121)	3.98 (1.089)	4.02 (1.015)
Commercial orientation	4.16 (1.072)	3.84 (0.765)	3.67 (1.034)	3.95 (1.039)
Adequate start-up capital or funding	4.21 (1.054)	3.84 (0.688)	3.82 (0.995)	4.03 (1.003)
Access to well trained and proper support staff	4.37 (0.681)	4.16 (0.765)	4.22 (0.823)	4.29 (0.742)
Need for achievement	4.34 (0.683)	4.16 (0.958)	4.32 (1.073)	4.31 (0.867)
Human relations and communication ability	4.49 (0.583)	4.00 (0.816)	4.26 (0.801)	4.34 (0.714)
Technical knowledge, craftsman oriented	4.30 (0.962)	3.94 (0.899)	3.70 (1.059)	4.05 (1.018)
Power need	3.96 (1.277)	3.39 (1.195)	3.05 (1.200)	3.57 (1.301)
Energetic, positive, challenge taker	4.25 (0.864)	4.11 (0.737)	3.95 (1.188)	4.13 (0.968)
Preference for technical over managerial tasks	4.24 (0.819)	3.58 (0.961)	3.55 (1.131)	3.92 (1.001)
Familiarity with market and market opportunities	4.36 (0.660)	4.39 (0.608)	3.82 (1.126)	4.18 (0.872)
Interpersonal skills, ability to manage customer or employee relations	4.49 (0.676)	4.28 (0.752)	4.26 (0.976)	4.38 (0.802)
Networking with people having relevant skills and abilities	4.46 (0.674)	4.11 (0.809)	4.04 (1.065)	4.27 (0.860)

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)

Motivate others behave in synergistic manner	4.45 (0.738)	4.00 (0.943)	3.77 (0.859)	4.16 (0.863)
Government policy	4.60 (0.854)	4.53 (0.697)	4.00 (1.121)	4.38 (0.968)
Enabling or supportive environment (peace and stability)	4.70 (0.602)	4.42 (0.769)	4.15 (0.918)	4.47 (0.782)
External linkages and institutional cooperation	4.35 (0.860)	4.21 (0.713)	4.09 (0.984)	4.24 (0.887)
Technology transfer	4.54 (0.608)	4.74 (0.452)	4.16 (0.987)	4.44 (0.764)
Research budget and expenditure	4.31 (0.894)	4.37 (0.831)	4.05 (1.035)	4.24 (0.935)
Age and retirement policy	4.00 (1.122)	3.95 (1.129)	3.49 (1.222)	3.82 (1.174)
Red tape and bureaucracy	4.00 (1.291)	3.56 (1.199)	3.71 (1.209)	3.83 (1.252)
Employment of foreign experts	3.76 (1.430)	3.26 (1.098)	3.48 (0.976)	3.58 (1.237)
Foreign aid and technical assistance	3.97 (1.237)	3.63 (1.012)	3.56 (1.179)	3.78 (1.194)
Profit motive	4.42 (0.822)	4.28 (0.669)	4.14 (1.112)	4.31 (0.914)
Salary and wages	4.59 (0.671)	4.37 (0.761)	4.23 (1.179)	4.44 (0.893)
Incentive systems such as bonuses	4.56 (0.626)	4.26 (0.806)	3.98 (1.229)	4.33 (0.924)
Promotion and appointment policy	4.58 (0.552)	4.21 (0.631)	3.95 (0.834)	4.32 (0.721)
Mentoring and advisory system in workplace	4.41 (0.712)	3.89 (0.809)	3.91 (0.984)	4.17 (0.857)
Access to computerization and internet facilities	4.26 (0.924)	4.21 (0.713)	4.16 (1.119)	4.22 (0.963)
Investment by enterprises	4.29 (0.941)	4.37 (0.684)	3.78 (1.073)	4.13 (0.984)
Training abroad and scholarships	4.37 (0.871)	4.16 (0.958)	4.33 (1.107)	4.33 (0.961)
Local training, workshops, conferences	4.57 (0.606)	3.74 (0.933)	3.91 (0.910)	4.23 (0.843)
Integrated package of support for youth (BDS)	4.51 (0.710)	4.05 (0.970)	3.88 (1.005)	4.23 (0.901)
Reliance on local business specialists	4.19 (1.067)	3.63 (0.895)	3.87 (0.944)	3.99 (1.016)
Proper targeted and selected training	4.62 (0.688)	4.21 (0.976)	4.05 (0.925)	4.37 (0.853)
Loan and credit system for youth	4.63 (0.710)	4.00 (0.970)	3.96 (0.988)	4.31 (0.909)
Customer-centred loans for businesses	4.18 (0.917)	3.56 (1.199)	3.57 (1.192)	3.89 (1.1094)
Transfers and family inheritance	3.55 (1.383)	3.39 (0.979)	3.22 (1.215)	3.42 (1.277)
Appropriate ‘micro’ delivery mechanisms	3.98 (1.053)	3.89 (0.963)	3.54 (1.072)	3.83 (1.058)
Effective supply chain management	4.27 (0.797)	4.06 (0.899)	4.05 (1.058)	4.17 (0.902)
Effective sustainability strategies	4.60 (0.610)	4.27 (0.961)	4.05 (0.999)	4.38 (0.838)

* figures in bracket are standard deviations.

ISSN 2053-5821(Print), ISSN 2053-583X(Online)