

Socio-Economic Dimensions for Innovation and Entrepreneurship



ISBN: 978-1-943295-11-1

Neeta Baporikar
(nectajb@rediffmail.com)

Innovation and entrepreneurship has assumed tremendous importance for accelerating economic and inclusive growth globally. Innovation refers to new product, process or service while entrepreneurship is the process of exploring the opportunities in the market place and arranging resources to exploit these opportunities for long-term gain. Therefore, innovation and entrepreneurship development is becoming a key policy matter too. Yet many variables as well as social and economic conditions effect innovation and entrepreneurship development. Adopting a grounded theory approach and in depth literature review the aim herein is to understand social-economic dimensions for innovation and entrepreneurship development in Namibia.

Keywords: Business Development; Entrepreneurship Policies; Innovation, Socio-Economic; Strategies

1. Introduction

Innovation and entrepreneurship has assumed super importance for accelerating economic growth in both developed and developing countries (Baporikar, 2007, 2011). It is an ability to take risk independently to make utmost earnings in the market. It is a creative and innovative skill and adapting response to environment. Hence, innovation and entrepreneurship development is becoming a key policy matter for all economies. Moreover, debate on the value and importance of Innovation and Entrepreneurship at the national level has almost reached consensus in developed Western societies. Unfortunately, this is not the case in many developing countries. Compared to developing countries, developed economies create 10 times new ventures per adult per year (World Bank, 2010). In many countries, the problem is not lack of, but rather negative macro environment and poor infrastructure, which does not channel entrepreneurial activity into productive and positive economic directions for wealth creation (Baporikar, 2014). This is especially visible in three core issues: opportunity to enter, access to capital, and access to skill and knowledge (UNDP, 2004). Furthermore, most of the entrepreneurship activity in these countries is 'necessity entrepreneurship' and not opportunity driven (Reynolds et al., 2004). A prevailing high unemployment situation, when combined with low social welfare infrastructure, pushes people in these countries to start a business in order to survive. In addition, many of these businesses are in the informal sector because of the rigid and expensive new business start-up process, thus limiting their ability to expand through formal channels of resources (Reynolds et al., 2004).

On the positive side, there have been some innovation and entrepreneurship development initiatives, especially in Namibia. India is also a promising role model for other developing countries, and is one of the oldest countries that has developed successful entrepreneurship development initiatives (Gupta, 1989). However, with approximately 50% of the developing world living below the poverty line and some of the highest population growth rates in the world, these government efforts need to be accelerate. The only way forward in these countries is through emphasizing indigenous development rather than depending on external aid or foreign investments alone. Encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship will do developing countries more good, in terms of long-term growth and gains in productivity, than policies aimed at accelerating near-term growth. Adopting mixed methods in conjunction with grounded theory approach and in depth literature, review of published documents the aim of this case is to provide insights regarding the social-economic dimensions for innovation and entrepreneurship development in Namibia. Hence, the objectives of this paper are

1. To understand social and economic dimensions for innovation and entrepreneurship with reference to Namibia
2. To understand the current scenario of innovation and entrepreneurship development in Namibia
3. To identify the challenges of innovation and entrepreneurship development in Namibia
4. To suggest strategies for innovation and entrepreneurship development in Namibia

2. Literature Review

Entrepreneurship has been a buzzword, especially among young people between the ages of 18-34 (Chen & Lai, 2010). They have recognized the various benefits of starting-up new businesses. According to Badulescu and Dodescu (2010), the motivations for business start-ups among potential women, entrepreneurs drive is mostly the 'self-achievement desire', 'need for more money' and 'desire for a higher social and professional status'. Entrepreneurs demonstrate a need to achieve, a willingness to exploit a challenge, to persevere, to work hard. This needs to drive by self-belief, but tempered with the ability to be flexible and to delegate to others when necessary as well as willingness to listen to advice and to recognize that they are not experts in every aspect of their business (Goodbody Economic Consultants, 2002). Allen (2006) stressed that entrepreneurs do not wait for someone else to make the decision, or solve the problem, or even ask for the problem solution; they recognize problems as opportunities and takes it upon themselves to solve them. Management specialists, policy makers, researchers, and practitioners view innovation and entrepreneurship in various perspectives. Goel, Vohra, Zhang, and Arora

(2007) briefly define it as the activity of establishing and managing a business for profit and growth. This notion resembles that Innovation and Entrepreneurship is an instrumental factor driving the emergence and growth of new businesses. In a parallel note, Smallbone and Welter (2001) said that Innovation and entrepreneurship includes self-employment and part-time businesses, while Bhide (2000) relates it to venture creation and ownership of small and medium enterprises. Innovation and entrepreneurship has the potential to support economic growth and the goal of many governments is to develop entrepreneurial thinking. This is through number of ways: by integrating Innovation and Entrepreneurship into education systems, legislating to encourage risk-taking, and national campaigns (Baporikar, 2014).

3. Conceptual Framework

An entrepreneur is one who creates a new business in the face of risk and uncertainty for the purpose of achieving profit and growth by identifying significant opportunities and assembling the necessary resources to capitalize on them. As early as 1730, probably the first, French economist Richard Cantillon gave the phrase entrepreneurship and defined entrepreneurs as risk takers. Entrepreneurs attempt to forecast and act upon change within markets. The entrepreneur is a bearer of uncertainty (Cantillon, 1755). The entrepreneur bears the uncertainty of market dynamics (Knight, 1921). Innovation and Entrepreneurship has received much attention from both scholars and policy makers during the past decades because there is a growing need in many countries for entrepreneurs to enhance economic growth and development. Entrepreneurial activities provide employment opportunities and increase competitiveness (Reynolds, 1987; Zahra, 1999). Policy makers and scholars around the world are trying to learn how they can stimulate entrepreneurial activities as well as understand why some people choose entrepreneurial careers and others do not. Entrepreneurial behavior can be internal view or external view. The internal viewpoint looks at the personality traits of an individual such as, locus of control, risk taking, need for achievement, problem solving, innovation, creativity perception and work values in relation to entrepreneurial activity. Many social scientists have different views about entrepreneurial intentions of people and diverse studies focus on the effect of personality characteristics on attitudes towards entrepreneurial activities (Bonnett & Furnham, 1991). Although the results vary across the studies, these studies do indicate a link between entrepreneurial intention and some personality factors. These include self- confidence; risk taking ability; the need to achieve and locus of control. Other researchers have sought the entrepreneurial personality in risk-taking propensity; internal locus of control; tolerance for ambiguity; over-optimism, and need for autonomy (Baporikar, 2013). McClelland (1961) says that entrepreneurs are persons who have a high need for achievement. McClelland goes on to explain that, individuals with a high need to achieve will exhibit entrepreneurial behavior. Chell (2008) suggests that personality traits of entrepreneurs may be important for entrepreneurship. Shepherd and Wiklund (2006) posit that the personality traits of the entrepreneur may explain entrepreneurial failure.

According to Splaver (1977), it is important for you to have a good understanding of yourself and your personality, if you are to make intelligent career plans. (Ciavarella *et al.*, 2004; Zhao *et al.*, 2010) points out that personality trait have a direct effect on entrepreneurial performance measures. Personality traits of entrepreneurs may have a different effect on firm performance in case the firms are innovative (Zhao *et al.*, 2010). Individuals are seen to be productive in an industry or a firm, which is different from their previous sector of employment, provided the nature of the job remains similar. Penrose (1959) emphasized that carrying out similar tasks has important implications for cognitive processes of human beings. Simon's (1947) gave the idea of bounded rationality, which refers to human limitation to process information. Under the assumption of bounded rationality, therefore, experience influences the processing of incoming information. Witt (1998, 2000) explained that events in the environment are only perception and interpretation along some specific associative lines. In this sense, a cognitive frame is a schematic representation of an individual's perception of the environment built through prior learning and adaptation. Gardner (1983) argues that intelligence refers to both the personal decisions and potentials of individuals. This potential comes out or develops according to cultural environment, values and opportunities. Baum *et al.* (2001) reported a positive relationship between practical intelligence and entrepreneurial processes and entrepreneurial characteristics, which proposes that practical intelligence is one of the strengths underlying high performance enterprises.

The external viewpoint examines things like, culture, role models, work experiences, education and environment. David McClelland (1961) argued that some societies have cultural attitudes, which translate into primary socialization practices that foster entrepreneurial individuals. Some studies take into account the relation between entrepreneurial attitudes and cultural, social, economic, political, demographical, contextual and situational factors (Hisrich, 1998). Kets De Vries (1985) has a view that family background and work experiences are significant in forming an entrepreneurial personality. He says that individuals who have gone through hardship in childhood form an aggressive behavior that forces them to start their own enterprises, instead of seeking employment. Timmons (1990) refers entrepreneurial behavior as a way of thinking, reasoning, and acting that is opportunity-directed and leadership-balanced and acknowledged that the entrepreneurship personality can be either acquired or inborn. Further this factors can be classified as the factors which affect attitudes towards entrepreneurial activities into regulatory factors (e.g. institutions and policies); cognitive factors (e.g. knowledge of how to start ventures and obtain financial support); and normative factors (e.g. the perception of entrepreneurship as a career); which were used to explain both types and levels of Innovation and Entrepreneurship in different countries. Begley *et al.* (1997) compared the role of social- cultural factors on attitudes towards entrepreneurial activities in a four dimensional model. The study indicated that only social status of entrepreneurs is predictable as factor to start a business. Barnett (1993) after studying more than 70 viewpoints of scholars on entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship concluded that it is not easy to come up with a consensus definition from the literature. It is people's experience, knowledge and commitment that influence their decisions to become entrepreneurs and these factors have roots in their behaviors and attitudes. Luthje and Franke (2003) produced a model with

contextual factors affecting attitudes towards entrepreneurial activities. The study reveals that the attitude toward self-employment is to two contextual factors (perceived barriers and perceived support). In the study of Turker et al (2005), contextual factors (perceived level of education, opportunities and support) in relation to entrepreneurial attitudes of university students examined. The study found that perceived level of support was a statistically significant factor. Baporikar (2014) discusses the relevance and opines that education and entrepreneurial training are more important in order to enhance entrepreneurial activities. Moreover, many previous studies indicate a link between entrepreneurship and education (Galloway & Brown, 2002; Hederson and Robertson, 2000; Kolvereid, 1997). Furthermore, a study by Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM, 2001) indicated that people with limited education are less likely to participate in entrepreneurial initiatives. Hill (1988) argues that the scope and structure of entrepreneurial education is different in different context. Another study by Turker and Selcuk (2009) using the entrepreneurial support model, considers the impact of contextual factors on entrepreneurial intentions. The model says that an entrepreneurial intention is a function of educational, relational and structural supports.

According to Wang and Wong (2004) study on the entrepreneurial attitudes of Singapore students based on personal background, gender, family, business experience and education level are significant factors in explaining entrepreneurial attitudes. However, the study did not giving any idea about how business environment, social network and government support factors affects the entrepreneurial attitudes of students. Similarly, Tung Moi (2011) study on Malaysian university students to find out entrepreneurial intentions provided new insight to understand the factors, which affect the young adults' entrepreneurial intentions. Their results emphasize again the importance of attitudes, education, academic major and family role models on the entrepreneurial intention of young adults, which has provided valuable implications to the academicians, educators and policy makers.

Lee et al (2000), in their cross-cultural study, investigated the differences in the attitudes of university students toward entrepreneurial activities in four countries. The study revealed that each country could think about tailored entrepreneurial education to foster Innovation and Entrepreneurship considering their unique cultural contexts. Autio et al (2001) and Veciana et al (2005) analyzed entrepreneurship among university students in which they checked the robustness of entrepreneurial intention in various cultural contexts. Their study indicated that the image of entrepreneurs and encouragement from the university environment affects the entrepreneurial attitudes of university students. Veciana et al (2005) tested the desirability, feasibility and internality for entrepreneurship according to gender and entrepreneurial history of students. Another cross-cultural study by Parrenll et al (1995) compared the entrepreneurial propensity of American and Egyptian university students. Accordingly, entrepreneurial propensity is a function of perceived level of education and perceived opportunities and the study revealed that the entrepreneurial propensities of American students are greater in comparison to Egyptians students. Hederson and Robertson, (2000) in their study, "Who wants to be an entrepreneur? Young adult attitudes to entrepreneurship as a career" examined the attitudes towards entrepreneurship as a career in UK. Their findings suggest that generally positive images of entrepreneurship hamper due to lack of identifiable role models, poor media presentation of individuals or small firms and lack of encouragement from important influencers on career choice such as teachers and career guidance specialists. Kapitsa (2011), in their study on youth entrepreneurial development perceived that once youth are given enough resources, they could easily establish and successfully run a business enterprise. Therefore, they perceived that the major obstacle to their entrepreneurial activity is the lack of funding, further adding that the lack of collateral also prevents many young people from starting- up their own businesses.

However, it shows that this is only a part of the problem. The potential of the business idea, in terms of the existing and future demand for products or services, is of great importance as well. This review of literature shows us that many researchers have taken entrepreneurial activity/attitudes/intentions as the outcome of different factors. Broadly they can be divided into internal or personality factors or external factors. The most frequently used variable is personal traits. Depending on the scope of their study, researchers have used both external and internal viewpoints and contextual and situational factors to explore entrepreneurial culture in a country or group. On the same time, these reviews have not incorporated many sub variables, which are very crucial to know entrepreneurial attitudes. For example, many have given more importance to personal background rather than external factors like government support and countries' business environment, which also play a great role in development and creation of entrepreneurs. Thus, the conceptual framework for this case study is through literature review. Previous studies used many variables, internal or external; to define the entrepreneurial attitudes, while here both internal and external factors incorporation is there to know about entrepreneurial attitudes, apart from also considering sub - factors which are suitable to the country/place.

4. Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Namibia

Namibia has entered its third decade of independence from apartheid rule inclusive of economically segregate laws that has left the majority of the population economically disadvantaged. It is not only the third decade of independence but also the third decade in the fight for economic freedom and the economic emancipation for the majority of her people. Namibia poses the greatest potential for driving growth in the small to medium enterprises (SME) market, which in turn possesses the greatest potential in curbing the high unemployment rate, and driving national economic growth. The mandate for the Ministry of Trade and Industry of Namibia is to develop and manage Namibia's economic regulatory regime, based on which the country conducts its domestic and external economic relations. This Ministry is also responsible for promoting growth and development of the economy through the formulation and implementation of appropriate policies to attract investment, increase trade, develop and expand the country's industrial base. Its mission is to create an enabling environment for

increased domestic and foreign direct investment, trade and industrial development, and to position and safeguard the interest of Namibia in the regional and global economy. The mandate and programmes of the Ministry of Trade and Industry are in line with the NDP 3 Goals of Increased Smart Partnerships and Private Sector Development; Regional Integration and Innovative; and Productive Usage of Technology.

Accordingly, the five key programmes of the Ministry designed in such a way that they interlink and carry forward the objectives encapsulated in the NDP 3 and NDP 4 goals. Suffice to submit that the Ministry of Trade's Targets for the period between 2011 and 2014 are

- Increased exports of Namibian products by 15% by 2014.
- SME contribution to GDP increased by 20% by 2014.
- To achieve a 10% increase in manufacturing output and value added activities contribution to GDP by 2014.
- 100% of new company, close corporation and industrial property registrations (inclusive of name reservations) within 10 working days by 2014.
- Increase the value of FDI by 20% by 2014.
- Improve Namibia's competitiveness ranking in Africa to position three (3) by 2014, according to the Africa Competiveness Index.

As espoused earlier, economic empowerment should be a joint effort by all: ministries, all relevant stakeholders, both public and private. The participation of all especially the youth in economic activities in a bid to meet national development goals has many good reasons:

- Helps young men and women develop new skills and experiences that can be applied to many other challenges in life;
- Creates employment-not only for the young person who owns the enterprise but also for those the business may employ;
- Provides valuable products and services for the country-with most of Namibia's goods and services coming from South Africa, there is a great need for Namibian enterprises to replace these imports;
- Promotes innovating and development – it encourages young women and men to find now solutions, ideas and ways of doing things;
- Helps promote social change and cultural identity.
- Creates a sense of community-one where young women and men are valued and better connected to society; and
- Gives young people a sense of meaning and belonging-it can shape a person's identity and encourage others to treat them as adults.

Innovation and Entrepreneurship Development in Namibia

Entrepreneurial ecosystems, or start-up ecosystems, are important and much growth and development of Innovation and Entrepreneurship credit goes to a good ecosystem. However, what are they and what do they mean? In practitioner parlance, entrepreneurial ecosystems can mean anything. Consultants produce the bulk of the literature on entrepreneurial ecosystems. Consultants love fuzzy concepts because they are less likely to be accountable for results and deliverables. However, this ambiguity is bad for policy. It would be nice to actually know, when attempt of the policy-makers, to build entrepreneurial ecosystems (as many do), as to what it is that they are trying to build. Otherwise, they will just resort to policies they know – regardless of whether these make sense or not.

Research however, suggests that entrepreneurial ecosystems differ from traditional objects of policy in important ways (Autio, 2015). The salient differentiating characteristics are

- **Entrepreneurial Ecosystems are Complex.** They comprise a multitude of different stakeholders who are much more heterogeneous than of 'markets', 'industries', and even 'systems of innovation' stakeholders. Usually we do not even know them all. In addition, there are higher-order elements such as infrastructure, culture, norms, and regulations. The interactions of all of these drive the ecosystem benefits. We are talking about a complex, multi-level, and multilateral interaction systems here.
- **Entrepreneurial Ecosystems Create 'Ecosystem Services'.** Like natural ecosystems, also entrepreneurial ecosystems create 'ecosystem services'. These emergent, system-wide benefits in myriad localized interactions among individual ecosystem stakeholders. The entrepreneurial ecosystem service created is system-wide allocation of resources towards productive uses through innovative and high-growth new ventures. This dynamic drives Total Factor Productivity, the difference between inputs required and valuable outputs created. This translates into the ecosystem's ability to create new wealth.
- **In entrepreneurial Ecosystems, no one is really in Charge.** Ecosystem stakeholders are mutually co-dependent, yet hierarchically independent. Hence, if the working in the ecosystem is smooth all stakeholders will benefit. However, no one actually 'owns' the ecosystem. Because stakeholders are independent, you cannot do command and control in entrepreneurial ecosystems. It is more like herding cats. In addition, with all these different stakeholders, how do you coordinate, if top-down command and control is not possible?
- **Entrepreneurial Ecosystems are Dynamic.** Entrepreneurial ecosystem services co-create in dynamic interactions among its stakeholders. There may be cascading effects, as interactions influence one another. This means you may get unintended consequences, as cascading effect chains complicate the link between actions and consequences.
- **Entrepreneurial Ecosystems are Inertial.** Because of their complexity, localised interactions, cascading effects, and large numbers of independent stakeholders, the typical outcome one tends to see for policy action is nothing. In complex dynamic systems, external impulses tend to create no discernible effect, if not appropriately targeted.

5. Social and Economic Dimensions

Levels of motivation to start a business differ around the world Baporikar, (2015a), and in Namibia and African region, innovation and entrepreneurship is more often a necessity and business creation is as a need for employment. According to Christo Botes, Executive Director of Business Partners Limited, in order to shift necessity-driven entrepreneurship to opportunity-driven entrepreneurship, there is a need of an investment into entrepreneurial development in the country. Entrepreneurs are economic development assets and Innovation and Entrepreneurship development enables a country to grow its economy by supporting local entrepreneurs (Baporikar, 2015b). Hence, entrepreneurial development and equipping entrepreneurs with the necessary tools is a method of ensuring further entrepreneurial opportunities identification for capitalisation by not only the business owner, but also its employees, family, suppliers, customers and the economy at large. Moreover, the true test of entrepreneurship does not lie in starting a business, but in being able to maintain continued success and growth.

One way to ensure innovation and entrepreneurship growth in Namibia is to empower and equip motivated entrepreneurs, which will ensure that they are capable to capitalise on the opportunities available to them. This means providing business owners and equipping new business owners with knowledge on how to manage expand and develop their business to ensure continued business growth and profitability. To do that there is need to nurture entrepreneurial development, establish an entrepreneurial ecosystem, which is conducive. Creating such an ecosystem is a long-term project, which requires a mix of structured programs and support mechanisms that aim at stimulating and developing entrepreneurs, and one such element to this ecosystem is establishments that focus on Innovation and Entrepreneurship, as well as provide education in business skills and promote mentorship and training. Example is the Tertiary School in Business Administration (TSiBA), a non-profit business school that educates entrepreneurial leaders who ignite opportunity and social change. Founded in 2004 with the vision to 'Ignite Opportunity', TSiBA provides emerging leaders with the opportunity to study high quality, accredited academic courses focused on developing innovation and entrepreneurship and leadership. Apart from nurturing innovation and entrepreneurship and creating entrepreneurial ecosystem through training and education, the policies must promote and support Innovation and Entrepreneurship development in letter and spirit. Namibian Government is taking steps in the right direction by Ministry of Trade and Industry having efficiently allocated its resources to see growth in the SME sector. Table 1 shows the allocation of resources by the ministry for the period 2008-2014.

Table 1 Resource Allocation for MTI in millions of Namibian Dollars

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
Trade Promotion and Facilitation	54,981	100,155	171,471	154,675	217,120	177,032
SME and Entrepreneurship Development	44,398	41,692	69,263	123,896	109,084	100,403
Industrial Planning and Infrastructural Development	20,533	84,857	139,946	157,670	276,544	448,182
Domestic market Competitiveness	35,259	88,878	74,222	70,164	87,954	126,287
Domestic and Foreign Direct Investment Promotion	30,648	29,163	35,787	51,647	29,600	55,879
Total	185,819	199,865	490,689	558,052	720,302	907,783

Source: Ministry of Trade and Industry

Of particular significance and interest in terms of the above allocation for youth, economic empowerment would be but not limited to the SME, innovation and entrepreneurship development MTEF allocation. The importance of private sector development and its crucial role in financing and accelerating Namibia's economic transformation cannot be overstated. However, when the underlying environment is weak due to poor or inadequate infrastructure, limited access to finance, government bureaucracy, shortage of skilled labour force and market inefficiencies, there is very little a vibrant private sector can do to contribute to economic growth and development. The private sector in most African countries is in fragments with a low density of economic activity. The limited availability of skilled labour and human capital further obstruct the growth of firms. In fact, the lack of high and technological-related skills reduces prospects for moving up the value chain in industries, which end up reducing labour productivity and existing industries' competitiveness. However, the potential and opportunities are abundant. Such potential include the growing middle class, the geographic size, the wealth in natural resources and the improving political stability. As the continent presents opportunities for higher returns, the private sector should drive the transformation agenda.

Challenges for Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Namibia

Number of factors affect the business and investment climate negatively as per the 2012 Business and Investment Climate Survey. These factors pose challenges for Innovation and Entrepreneurship development and the most important challenges in Namibia are:

- Access and cost of finance.
- Scarcity of skilled labour: The lack of skills in the country as their major concern in the formal sector and specifically small, medium and large enterprises (Links, 2010:6 and 7). These findings are completely in line with the Global

Competitiveness Report. The inadequately trained workforce tops the list of the most problematic factors of doing business in the country (World Economic Forum, 2010:250).

- Low demand for goods and services tops. It is the most relevant factor for micro enterprises, informal businesses and SMEs.
- Crime and theft pose another challenge mainly for micro businesses and the informal sector. Based on the Global Competitiveness Report, Namibia ranks 107 and 75 out of 139 countries in terms of business costs of crime and violence and organised crime respectively and hence well below her overall ranking of 54 (World Economic Forum, 2010:251).
- Taxation policies. Namibia can hardly do better regarding the total tax rate (rank 2 out of 139) and features favourably regarding the extent and effect of the tax rate (rank 33 out of 139) (World Economic Forum, 2010:251).
- Public tender and procurement process
- Distance to markets that viewed by small and micro enterprises as a constraint, but has emerged as a more relevant barrier to medium and large companies as well. Low population densities in most parts of the country, except for Windhoek and the highly populated north central regions could explain this, as well as access to export markets on which medium and large companies rely to a greater extent than other firms
- Ease of doing business. Perception of establishing a business in Namibia as being challenging. It ranks Namibia on place 124 out of 183 countries in its most recent report (World Bank, 2010:182)
- Obtaining industry-specific permits is another hurdle.
- High cost of utilities- Concerns about the costs across all categories. Although no distinction between different utilities and in particular, the continuous and substantial increases in electricity tariffs are of concern to business people. However, Namibia like South Africa benefits from some of the lowest electricity tariffs in the world.

6. Strategies for Innovation and Entrepreneurship Development

- Investing in education and vocational education and training as means to strengthen the skills base of the African labour force.
- Attract investments in the most dynamic sectors. This will equip African countries with effective means to advance structurally with a strong technological base. This will enable to diversify towards a mix of manufacturing and services enterprises based on the comparative advantage of individual economies.
- To facilitate the establishment and ensure growth of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) more efficient use of the business incubator model to support nascent enterprises with start-up capital, innovative ideas etc. It is true that SMEs play a key role in creating employment, developing a skilled workforce and responding to various market demands.
- Revisit your regulatory environment to streamline approval process.
- Avoid creating a formal alliance between government and Innovation and Entrepreneurship organizations.
- Support or assist interested entrepreneurs and small business owners in their efforts to strengthen and build networks of entrepreneurs.
- Hold events that are of interest to, cover information for the participants, and inspire interaction among them.
- Celebrate success stories by inviting entrepreneurs or business owners to discuss the current state of their business and challenges they are facing to have hall of lessons and benchmarking best practices.
- Organize events with focus on stages of Innovation and Entrepreneurship development since entrepreneurial process is in three phases: Inspirational – potential entrepreneurs searching for opportunities; Start-up – starting a company; Scale-Growth – expanding annual revenue beyond \$1 million. This better serves the purpose of Innovation and Entrepreneurship development, as it is more fruitful to interact with others in the same developmental phase. It is helpful to think of the
- Celebrate and recognize successful local entrepreneurs.
- Comfortable migrants – Migrants and outsiders are twice as likely as native-born to start businesses. Create a welcome environment for all migrants and embrace ethnic diversity in order to attract job creating migrant entrepreneurs.
- Aim for Innovation and Entrepreneurship development, set targets for establishing enterprises and monitor and track the progress on both in relation to policy and initiatives.

7. Conclusion

Namibia has its own history of successful entrepreneurs, some of whom emerged even before Namibia achieved independence. Examples include Frans Aupa Indongo and Harold Pupkewitz. Similarly, a new wave of Namibian entrepreneurs is emerging and increasingly women are at the forefront. Example: Twapewa Kadhikwa launched her first hair salon in 2002 and has since opened several other beauty shops and a training academy. Undeterred by the likes of major international brands, Pewa created the first genuinely Namibian manufactured cosmetic line. Wise political leaders and economic managers understand the value of supporting Innovation and Entrepreneurship and Innovation and Entrepreneurship knows no gender (Baporikar, 2013). From this case study, one can realize entrepreneurial intention is a function of entrepreneurial attitudes. A recent report by the Kauffman Foundation advises local policy makers and entrepreneurship support organizations to adopt an entrepreneur-centred approach to their strategies for assisting and attracting entrepreneurs. Local government can work with local entrepreneurs to plan and organize events that bring together

entrepreneurs and small business owners to present business ideas, form teams, or pitch a new business to a group of experts and serial entrepreneurs.

Accordingly, Namibia needs to integrate its entrepreneurial attitudes and behavior into all its entrepreneurial planning activities and until date young people's entrepreneurial attitude generally ignored in SMEs' development and plans in Namibia. Hence, a joint effort from educational institutions, entrepreneurial development offices in governmental side and private sector will go a long way to promote more entrepreneurial attitudes via intentions and Namibia will have more enterprises. For that reason, the government duty is to identify the focus areas and priorities for Namibia's economic growth then make these opportunities visible and available to the private sector, including large companies, SMEs and entrepreneurs.

8. References

1. Allen, S. (2006). Entrepreneurship is an attitude. Retrieved on 25 October 2015, <http://entrepreneurs.about.com/b/2006/10/07/entrepreneurship-is-an-attitude.htm>
2. Autio, E, Keeley, RH, Klofsten, M, Parker, GGC, & Hay, M (2001). Entrepreneurial Intent among Students in Scandinavia and in the USA, *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, 2 (2), 145-160.
3. Autio, E (2015). Managing Entrepreneurial Ecosystems, Retrieved on April 10, 2018, from <http://thegedi.org/managing-entrepreneurial-ecosystems/>
4. Badulescu, A., & Dodescu, A. (2010). *Entrepreneurial training and attitude toward entrepreneurship: Assessing the impact of AntrES programme*. Proceedings of the 5th WSEAS International Conference on Economy and Management Transformation (Volume II), Romania.
5. Baporikar, N. (2007). Entrepreneurship Development and Project Management, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, India.
6. Baporikar, N. (2011). Entrepreneurship Development and Project Management, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, India.
7. Baporikar, N. (2013). Entrepreneurship and Small Industry (Theory and Practice), Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai, India, Pg. 7
8. Baporikar, N. (2015a). Distinctiveness of Techno-Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Strategic Information Technology and Applications (IJSITA)*, 6(1), 15-25. doi:10.4018/IJSITA.2015010102
9. Baporikar, N. (2015b). Entrepreneurship in Sultanate of Oman: A Case Approach. *International Journal of Asian Business and Information Management (IJABIM)*, 6(4), 14-26. doi:10.4018/IJABIM.2015100102
10. Barnett, C G. (1993). Defining Entrepreneurship. *Paper delivered at the 7th annual conference of small business, Southern Africa*.
11. Begley, TM, Wee-Liang, T, Larasati, AB., Rab, A, & Zamora, E (1997). The Relationship between Social-Cultural Dimensions and Interest in Starting a Business- A Multi-Country Study', *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Babson College, Wellesley, MA.
12. Baum, R. J., Locke, E. A., & Smith, K. G. (2001). A multidimensional model of venture growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 292-303.
13. Bhidé, A. (2000). *The origin and evolution of new businesses*. New York: Oxford University Press.
14. Bonnett, C., & Furnham, A. (1991). Who wants to be An Entrepreneur? A Study of Adolescents Interested in a Young Enterprise Scheme. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 12(3), 465-478.
15. Cantillon, R. (1931). *Essai sur la Nature du Commerce en Général*. London, UK: MacMillan. (Original work published 1755)
16. Chell, E. (2008). *The entrepreneurial personality*. Oxford, UK: The Psychology Press.
17. Chen, Y. F., & Lai, M. C. (2010). Factors influencing the entrepreneurial attitude of Taiwanese tertiary-level business students. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 38(1), 1-12.
18. Chigunta, F. (2002). *Youth entrepreneurship: Meeting the key policy challenges*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University.
19. Ciavarella, M. A., Buchholtz, A. K., Riordan, C. M., Gatewood, R. D., & Stokes, G. S. (2004). The Big Five and venture survival: Is there a linkage? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(4), 465-483.
20. Galloway, L, Brown, W (2002). Entrepreneurship Education at University, A Driver in the Creation of High Growth Firms?', *Education and Training*, 44 (8/9), 398-405
21. Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books.
22. Goodbody Economic Consultants (2002). *Entrepreneurship in Ireland*. Dublin, Ireland: Goodbody.
23. Goel, A., Vohra, N., Zhang, L., & Arola, B. (2007). Entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship: A cross cultural comparison of India and China. *Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad Journal*, 1-33.
24. Gupta, S. K. (1989). Entrepreneurship development: The Indian case. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 27(1), 67.
25. Hederson, R, Robertson M (2000). Who wants to be An Entrepreneur? Young Adult Attitudes to Entrepreneurship as a Career, *Career Development International*, 5(6), 279-287.
26. Hisrich, RD., Peters, MP. (1998). *Entrepreneurship*, 4th ed., Boston, Irwin / McGraw Hill.
27. Kets de vries, M. F. R. (1977). The entrepreneurial personality: A person at the crossroads. *Journal of Management Studies*, 14, 34-57.
28. Kapitsa, L (2002). *Youth Entrepreneurship Policies and Programmes in the UNECE Member States'*, Economic Commission for Europe for the Youth Employment.

29. Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.
30. Kolvereid, L. (1997). Prediction of Employment Status Choice Intentions, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 2(1), 47-57.
31. Lee, S.M. Peterson, S.J. (2000). Culture, entrepreneurship orientation and global competitiveness, *Journal of World Business*, 34(4), 401-416.
32. Lüthje, C., Franke, N. (2003). The 'Making' of an Entrepreneur: Testing a Model of Entrepreneurial Intent among Engineering Students at MIT, *R & D Management*, 33(2), 135-147.
33. McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. New York, NY: Free Press.
34. Parnell, J.A., Crandall, W., Menefee, M. (1995). Examining the impact of culture on entrepreneurial propensity, an empirical study of prospective American and Egyptian entrepreneurs, *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1), 39-52.
35. Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. John Wiley.
36. Reynolds, P. D., Bygrave, W. D., Autio, E., & Arenius, P. (2004). *GEM 2003 global report*: Babson College.
37. Shepherd, D. A., Wiklund, J., & Haynie, J. M. (2009). Moving forward: Balancing the financial and emotional costs of business failure. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(2), 134-148.
38. Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations*. Chicago, IL: Macmillan.
39. Smallbone, D., & Welter, F. (2001). The distinctiveness of entrepreneurship in transition economies. *Journal of Small Business Economics*, 16, 249-262.
40. Splaver, S. (1977). *Your personality and your career*. New York, NY: Julian Messner.
41. Timmons, J. A., & Spinelli, S. (2007). *New venture creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21st century* (7th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill Publications.
42. Turker, D., Selcuk, S.S. (2009). Which Factors Affect Entrepreneurial Intention of University Students? *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(2), 142-159.
43. Wang, C., Wong, P. (2004). Entrepreneurial interest of university students in Singapore, *Technovation*, 24(2), 161-172.
44. Tung Moi, Y. L. (2011). Young Adults responses to Entrepreneurial Intentions, *Journal of Arts, Science & Commerce*. E-ISSN 2229-4686, ISSN 2231-4172
45. UNDP (2004). *Unleashing entrepreneurship: Making business work for the poor*: Report to the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the Commission on the Private Sector & Development. New York: UNDP. 1 March.
46. Veciana, J.M., Aponte, M., & Urbano, D. (2005). University students' attitudes towards entrepreneurship: A two countries comparison, *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1, 165-182.
47. Witt, U. (2000). Changing cognitive frames - changing organizational forms: An entrepreneurial theory of organizational development. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 9(4), 733-755.
48. Witt, U. (1998). Imagination and leadership - The neglected dimension of an evolutionary theory of the firm. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 35(2), 161-177.
49. World Bank. (2010). *Doing Business 2010*. Washington, DC: The World Bank Group, IFC and Palgrave MacMillan.
50. Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2010). The relationship of personality to entrepreneurial intentions and performance: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Management*,