2.1 Introduction

As pointed out in the last chapter, it is increasingly being recognised that entrepreneurship is not something in born; it can be developed in the individual through various kinds of interventions. This chapter discusses the theoretical premises of training intervention and traces the history of entrepreneurship development movement in India. Besides attempting to outline the salient features of an entrepreneurship development programme, the chapter also provides a brief review of major evaluation studies on EDPs.

2.2 Theoretical Premises of Entrepreneurship Development

The theoretical debate whether entrepreneurs can be created through training intervention has not arrived at any definitive conclusion. While some scholars hold the view that training is an effective intervention in developing latent entrepreneurial traits, there are others who hold the view that these traits grow into enterprise creation only under a conducive environment (Brenner, 1987; Cochran, 1965; Cooper, 1973, 1986; Gnyawali and Fogel, 1994). Another set of scholars explain entrepreneurship as the result of the interaction among
the individual, organisational, procedural and environmental factors (Aldrich and Zimmer, 1986\textsuperscript{6}; Covin and Slevin, 1989\textsuperscript{7}; Tripathi, 1981\textsuperscript{8}; Shapero and Sokol, 1982\textsuperscript{9}). It therefore follows that by identifying individuals with latent entrepreneurial traits and making the environment more conducive, it is possible to ‘create’ entrepreneurs. This kind of intervention assumes added importance in the context of developing countries which are acutely deficient in entrepreneurial resources. Policy makers in both developed and developing nations now pay considerable attention in creating entrepreneurs through various forms of interventions. There are basically two stages in the interventions aimed at entrepreneurship development. They are (1) awareness creation; and (2) training intervention (Ray, 1993\textsuperscript{10}). We may briefly outline the major features of each of these stages.

2.3 Entrepreneurship Awareness Creation

The pursuit of entrepreneurship can be compared to choosing an avocation. To be successful in any avocation, it requires an initial awareness about it. The individual should have an interest in it and a desire to achieve it and the decision and action to do it. It is wrong to assume that everyone is aware of entrepreneurship as a career option. The fact is that many people are simply not aware of entrepreneurship as a career option. It therefore follows that the first intervention step will be
an act of social persuasion to raise awareness of entrepreneurship and its potential benefits.

It has been pointed out that the best time to create awareness is at the school level. There are programmes that try to introduce young people to the notion of small business and the possibility of setting up a new business. In the actual environment, the entrepreneurs learn by doing, taking risks, problem solving, interacting with others and tolerating ambiguity. In such awareness programmes the emphasis is always on simulating an environment of actually doing business. Such an approach provides the trainees a feel of the actual environment confronted by an entrepreneur.

The objective of such programmes, it should be noted, is not to give an unrealistic picture of entrepreneurship as a career option. A realistic awareness programme should include both the rewards and challenges offered by entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship Awareness Programmes (EAP) of one to three days duration has become a standard form of intervention especially in developing countries. Such programmes are imparted in educational institutions and in community organizations. The basic objective of these programmers is to create interest in the target group in entrepreneurship so that at some point of time, they may take up entrepreneurship as a
career option. Such programmes when conducted widely across a country create an environment of confidence in the potential entrepreneurs and have long term impact from the point of view of supply of entrepreneurs in a society. Such programmes may help to identify potential entrepreneurs for long duration programmes. In India also entrepreneurship Development Organisations conducts such programmes in large numbers in educational institutions and community organisations.

It may be noted in this context that during the year 1995-96 and 1996-97, Centre for Management Development, Thiruvananthapuram conducted 19 and 3 entrepreneurship awareness programmes in Kollam and Pathanamthitta district respectively. These programmes were sponsored by Directorate of Industries and Commerce, Government of Kerala. On the basis of these programmes, Entrepreneurship Development (ED) clubs were formed in Arts and Science colleges, Engineering colleges and Polytechnics. Graduates, post graduates and final year students of engineering and Polytechnics were encouraged to participate in the activities of these ED clubs (CMD, 1996-97).  

2.4 Entrepreneurship Development Programme (EDP)

Though EDPs of one form or other exist in almost all countries of the world, there are no standardised formats for it. There is wide variation
across countries in the manner in which EDPs are organised and the inputs imparted and the mode of imparting the inputs. At the same time, one can observe that all programmes ultimately try to strengthen the latent entrepreneurial traits in the individual. In India, in almost all states, the EDPs organised are on the pattern developed by EDII, Ahmedabad in content and duration.

Both entrepreneurship awareness and entrepreneurship development may be combined in a comprehensive programme for entrepreneurship development. Mention may be made about such a programme organised in Lakshadweep islands by Thiruvananthapuram based Centre for Management Development. This programme involved awareness and motivation camps in the islands of Kavarathy, Minicoy and Kadamat followed by full fledged entrepreneurship development programme for 25 prospective entrepreneurs. It has been pointed out that through this intervention, 12 new small scale industries were started in Lakshadweep islands (CMD, 1998\textsuperscript{12}).

2.5 Historical Evolution of EDP Movement in India

EDP movement in India is the continuation of the country’s efforts towards mitigating poverty and unemployment. Earlier, the policy makers have been emphasising promotion of small-scale industries. Till the early
sixties, the small scale industry (SSI) sector was considered an employment generating sector. From the late sixties, this sector began to be viewed as an instrument for tapping the latent entrepreneurial potential of the country.

It is a widely recognised fact that small scale entrepreneurs face a number of initial constraints while launching their ventures. It was thought that promotional packages would facilitate setting up of new ventures. Promotional packages consist of financial assistance, incentives, infrastructural facilities and technical and managerial guidance through a network of support organisations at the central, state and local levels. The policy makers and planners soon realised that facilities and incentives though important, may not ensure adequate entrepreneurial response. It became increasingly evident that entrepreneurial growth required focus on human resources as well.

They began to think in terms of fostering entrepreneurship through training interventions. Being the nerve centre of Indian entrepreneurship, it was quite natural that the initial steps in this direction were taken by industrial promotion agencies in Gujarat. Gujarat Industrial Investment Corporation (GIIC) and other state agencies jointly conceived and organised a three month training programme known as Entrepreneurship Development Programme (EDP). The target group of the programme
was people who had latent entrepreneurial traits in them. The initial programme was oriented towards business knowledge and skills i.e. setting up the venture, managing it and making profit out of it. Later, behavioural inputs like Achievement Motivation Training became a regular feature of the programme.

By the early seventies, EDPs which began as an experiment in Gujarat gained momentum at the national level. All India financial institutions like Industrial Development Bank of India (IDBI) took keen interest in the new initiative and invited the attention of state governments to the significance of the Gujarat experience. By then, all India financial institutions had established Technical Consultancy Organisations (TCOs) in almost all the states. IDBI encouraged TCOs to conduct EDPs and extended liberal financial assistance. The success of EDPs in Gujarat encouraged the state government to establish the first Centre for Entrepreneurship Development (CED) in Ahmedabad in 1979.

CED produced impressive results in terms of enterprise creation and this encouraged the All India financial institutions—Industrial Development Bank of India (IDBI), Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India (ICICI), Industrial Finance Corporation of India (IFCI) and State Bank of India (SBI) to form a national resource organisation for training, research and extension in entrepreneurship. With the active
support of Gujarat government, Entrepreneurship Development Institute of India (EDI-I) was established in 1983. Government of India later set up two national level resource organisations—National Institute of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development (NIESBUD) at New Delhi and Indian Institute of Entrepreneurship at Guwahati. The promotional organisations of Government of India like National Institute of Small Industry Extension and Training (NISIET) and Small Industry Service Institutes (SISI—now known as Micro, Small and Medium scale Enterprises Development Institute (MSME-DIs) also started conducting EDPs at the same time.

These national level resource organisations have been quite active in research and development and have come out with new approaches in curriculum and training. They have been disseminating these among state-wise ED organisations. There are specialised trainers’ training programmes and those who successfully complete these training programmes are given accreditation. There are refresher programmes and occasional national get together programmes of trainer motivators.

The spread of EDP movement can be gauged by the state-wise number of EDPs conducted, trainees trained and financial assistance extended for conducting EDPS. Between 1978 and 1989 EDP movement achieved tremendous growth across the country. The number
of EDPs conducted during the period and the number of trainees trained are 1170 and 30679 respectively (Awasthi and Sebastian, 1996).  

There is no uniformity across the states in the number of EDPs conducted or candidates trained. State of Kerala conducted maximum number of EDPs and maximum number of trained entrepreneurs in comparison with other states. It is in 1982 in Kerala the Centre for Management Development (CMD), Thiruvananthapuram in collaboration with CED Ahmedabad initially and later on with EDI-I Ahmedabad organised a number of programmes on Gujarat pattern. Later CMD along with Kerala Industrial Technical Consultancy Organisation (KITCO) conducted EDPs in all the districts in Kerala with the support of Department of Industries and Commerce, Government of Kerala, National Financial Institutions and major banks. Total monitoring system was also in-built under the Chairmanship of Director of Industries and Commerce.  

EDP movement has been thus institutionalised during the last three decades. In most of the states specialised institutions known as Centre for Entrepreneurship Development or Institute of Entrepreneurship Development have been established. These institutions receive academic support from national resource organisations like EDI-I, NIESBUD and Indian Institute of Entrepreneurship. In Kerala CMD and KITCO were the institutions accredited for this purpose.
2.6 Target Group-wise Approach

An emerging pattern of EDPs is the target group-wise approach. EDPs are increasingly tailored to the requirements of the target groups. Major target groups are: 1. General, 2. Science and Technology, 3. Women, 4. Tribal, 5. Ex-service men and; 6. Rural. There are also product based EDPs to develop entrepreneurs in particular product lines. While some of the inputs are common for all EDPs, some inputs are tailor-made to the particular needs of the target groups.

One major pitfall in the EDP movement in the country is the lack of standardisation. There is no uniformity in the selection criteria of trainees, duration and course content of EDPs. Though Entrepreneurship Development Institute of India has prescribed the standard six week EDP with specified course content, they are not been followed uniformly across the country. The training programmes of 3 to 7 days duration are also called EDPs. As a consequence, there is wide variation across states in the quality of EDPs. This is one the major factors determining the success of EDPs.

2.7 EDP Process

EDP can be viewed as a process of grooming entrepreneurs. In order to have a clear understanding of this process, the various stages of
EDP process may be outlined in some detail. There are mainly three stages in the EDP process. They are pre-training phase, training phase and follow-up phase.

i. Pre-training Phase

One of the major activities in the pre-training phase is the selection of the location for conducting EDP. The trainer motivator has to assess the potential of the area considering a number of factors before finalising the location. The location selected should have sufficient number of potential trainees who are genuinely motivated to take up an entrepreneurial career. It should be admitted that the trainer motivator does not have much of a choice as the centre is often decided by the sponsor of the programme. Under such circumstances, the trainer motivator is left with little choice and this is one of the major factors determining the success of EDP in terms of the number of candidates actually launching the venture.

Once the centre is selected, the trainer motivator undertakes promotional campaign. Ideally, promotional campaign should start five to six weeks before the commencement of the training programme. The promotional campaign aims at taking the message of EDP to the potential trainees. News paper advertisement, printed notices, bill boards and hoardings are used to send the message of EDP to the target group.
The trainer motivator tries to involve community organisations and non-government organisations, support system agencies like District Industries Centre and managers of local banks in the promotional campaign. Besides reaching the potential candidates, this serves another purpose also. Once the training is over, the trainees will be approaching various agencies for getting permits and financial support. Involvement of local community and various support system agencies ensure that EDP trainees get the required support in the process of their setting up their units. Training programmes undertaken without adequate promotional campaign fails to evoke much response and this can be a major reason for the failure of EDPs.

Selection of potential trainees is the next important step of the pre-training phase. A proper and rigorous selection of genuinely motivated trainees is the single most important factor in this context. Towards this end, a comprehensive three-tier selection process consisting of scoring applications forms, followed by behavioural (written) tests and subsequent personal interviews has been developed.

**ii. Training Phase**

Entrepreneurship development programmes, as pointed out earlier, conducted by different organisations differ slightly in content as well as
duration. Even then, most of the inputs imparted are more or less the same. Some of the major inputs provided are:

1. Behavioural inputs: Achievement motivation training, communication skills, problem solving skills, interpersonal skills, creativity, decision making, etc. The objective of this input is to reinforce the motivation and entrepreneurial traits of the trainees.

2. Inputs to facilitate decision making process to set up a new venture: Business opportunity guidance, information, project planning and technical inputs.

3. Managerial inputs: office administration, finance, accounting, project management, project report preparation and similar management inputs etc.

4. Technical inputs: On the job training in the particular product line so that the entrepreneur knows the intricacies of the production process.

iii. Post-programme Follow-up Phase

The follow-up phase starts immediately after the training phase. If training phase is the ‘learning phase’, the follow-up phase may be considered as the ‘action phase’. The objective of EDP is not only to strengthen entrepreneurial traits of the trainees, but also to help them to launch and manage their enterprises successfully. Evidences show that
the single most important factor behind the failure of EDPs from the point of view of enterprise creation is inadequate follow-up. In the absence of follow-up, training may turn out to be a futile exercise.

In follow-up, the most important aspects are quality and timeliness of follow-up. Though training teaches the trainees how to go about at various stages, when they actually start to set up their units, they face number of bottlenecks in many fronts. The government departments which are supposed to give various permits and sanctions may delay or create road blocks for various reasons. Unless the trainees are provided handholding services at this stage, many would give up. It is here that the role of the trainer motivator assumes significance. The trainer motivator has to personally counsel each trainee and help him/her to overcome the bottlenecks. He/she may have to take up the case of the trainee with the respective department or official.

2.8 Evaluating Entrepreneurship Development Programmes

It is well recognised that the strategy of training potential entrepreneurs through EDPs constitutes an important policy instrument. Substantial amount of public resources are annually committed to train potential entrepreneurs. This justifies the need for systematic and comprehensive evaluation of EDPs. On the basis of such evaluations
alone it is possible to identify the gaps and improve upon its performance. Such evaluation cannot be a onetime affair as EDP is a dynamic activity. EDPs should be subjected to continuous renewal and restructuring to meet the ever changing requirements of the potential entrepreneurs and the policy environment. In the context of a developing economy like that of India, the use of scarce resources for any developmental activity should be justified in terms of the costs involved and benefits accruing from it. The credibility and sustainability of a developmental activity greatly depends upon the extent to which it achieves its stated objectives. All these reinforce the need for in-depth evaluation and introspection of the ED movement which has gained momentum over the last three decades.

2.9 Approaches to EDP Evaluation

The success of any training intervention should be evaluated by looking at to what extent it has achieved its stated objectives and this applies to EDPs as well. The first national level evaluation of EDPs stated the objectives of EDPs as follows (Awasthi and Sebastian, 1996\textsuperscript{14}).

1. Increasing the supply of entrepreneurs who start new ventures;
2. Diversifying the base of enterprise ownership by promoting first generation entrepreneurs;
3. Reducing the incidence of unemployment by creating self-employment/employment opportunities; and

4. Improving the quality of entrepreneurship to avoid industrial sickness.

Viewed from the angle of these objectives, two major approaches to the evaluation of EDPs arise. It can be viewed as an enterprise creating activity or as a human resource development strategy. At the same time, both the approaches are geared towards creating an overall environment where entrepreneurship germinates and grows.

The supporters of the first approach hold the view that the major objective of EDP is to convert a potential entrepreneur into an actual entrepreneur. The underlying assumption is that training intervention can bridge the gap between those who are born in a business family and those who lack the advantages of such immediate environment.

Thus, if the objective of EDPs is accepted as an enterprise creation, its success can be evaluated in terms of the number of units started by the trainees within a reasonable period of about two years after completion of the programme. As the number of startup goes up, it can be assumed that the rate of success of EDP also goes up. Moreover, enterprise creation through training intervention provides an impetus to enterprise culture, especially in a region where
entrepreneurship is dormant. The programme also enhances its image before the society and support system organisations as they become convinced about the utility of EDPs. On the contrary, if EDPs do not succeed in creating entrepreneurs and ventures, sooner or later, people may lose faith in this process.

The major pitfall of this approach is that it ignores the fact that four major parties are involved in an EDP, viz., potential entrepreneurs (EDP trainees), organisers of the programmes, the support system and the sponsors. For enterprise creation to take place, all these parties have to work in a co-ordinated manner. The slackness of even a single party can jeopardise the whole programme. There are a number of other factors like, target group, location, project size, technology, existing infrastructure, etc. Many of these are beyond the control of the trainer motivator and trainees.

There is a perspective that this kind of approach may not account for fringe benefits of such programmes which may be difficult to measure. A trainee might not start his/her own unit, but guide many people about EDP and some of them may launch their ventures. He/she may help someone else to launch and/or to manage a venture. Some others may expand/diversify family business; or may start working for someone else in a position where he/she may put into use the competencies acquired
during EDP. In certain cases the trainee may not immediately launch his/her venture but the idea of launching one’s own venture may be there in his/her mind. Once he/she mobilises the technology or finance, he/she may venture out. In other words, it would be rather too simplistic to evaluate the impact or contribution of EDPs in terms of the start-up rate only. While nobody can deny the importance of start up, that itself is not an indicator of the success of EDP.

The other view looks at EDPs as a human resource development activity. It holds that the contribution of EDPs goes much beyond enterprise creation. One of the critical objectives of EDPs is to inculcate entrepreneurial values in societies where environment for natural supply of entrepreneurs may not be very conducive. EDPs play this vital role. The other important objective is to widen the base of entrepreneurial supply by bringing such young potential entrepreneurs into the fold of entrepreneurship through training intervention, which otherwise would not have taken up the challenges of this career or would take much longer in becoming an entrepreneur. Therefore, according to this view, EDPs should be treated as a human resource development (HRD) activity, as it leads to an appreciation of human capital.

A closer look will reveal that both approaches have limitations. There is much weight in the argument that EDPs are primarily a human
resource development activity, and their contribution goes much beyond the creation of enterprises. It is also equally strong an argument that the training for training sake has very limited utility if results in terms of enterprises are not produced. In this case, the whole credibility of the EDP strategy becomes questionable. Further, a resource scarce economy like ours can ill afford such investment which does not yield tangible results.

It seems that the truth lies somewhere in between. We feel that both the approaches are compatible with each other. Both look at EDPs as an instrument for inculcating entrepreneurial values in the society as a long term objective. Therefore, a judicious blending of both approaches is necessary to make a comprehensive evaluation of EDPs which takes care of not only direct benefit or tangible contribution in terms of the number of enterprises created, but also the factors behind success (or failures). The evaluation should be able to take all these factors and the four interest groups, viz., the trainees, the trainers, the support system and sponsors into consideration while analysing success.

2.10 Evaluation of EDPs

Considering the importance of ED activities in the country, the question of its utility has always been raised at the academic and policy
circles. The funding agencies were also keen to know about it to decide whether continued financial assistance should be extended. This has prompted individual scholars and institutions to undertake evaluation of EDPs. We may briefly attempt an overview of some of the major evaluation studies on EDPs.

One of the earliest attempts at EDP evaluation was made by a team of researchers and experts appointed by the Gujarat corporations (Gaikwad et al., 1974\textsuperscript{15}). Their objective was to evaluate the EDPs which were pioneered and funded by them. They looked at the effectiveness of the selection tools, training inputs, impact of Achievement Motivation Training, training pedagogy and faculty, and organisational structure of EDPs conducted by the EDP cell of GIIC in Gujarat. The study broadly supported the selection techniques based on behavioural/psychological instruments, EDP inputs and trainers’ role. As far as the performance was considered, the findings were less reliable as the units started by EDP trained entrepreneurs were not in business from more than three years when the study was undertaken. The study undertaken by SIET Hyderabad to evaluate entrepreneurial/motivation training programme in Assam is another comparable to this one. The major limitation of this study was that it was restricted to a few organisational issues (SIET, 1974\textsuperscript{16}).
Another noteworthy study on EDP evaluation was undertaken by SBI. SBI’s Evaluation and Monitoring Cell undertook evaluation of EDPs conducted by SBI (SBI, 1987\textsuperscript{17}). The principal objectives were to assess overall success of these EDPs in terms of start-up rates, performance of the units started by EDP trained entrepreneurs and problems and prospects of SBI-EDPs. The study came to the conclusion that the funding of new ventures, poor follow-up, inadequate opportunity identification and guidance were major weaknesses of these EDPs. A noteworthy feature of this study was its good geographical coverage extending to nine states. The major limitation however was that it was restricted to SBI programmes conducted with SBI’s EDP training methodology.

There are several comparable studies on EDP evaluation. Some of the major among them are the ones conducted by EDI in 1989 and 1991, to evaluate EDI-EDPs (Awasthi, 1981\textsuperscript{18}) and EDPs conducted by North Eastern Consultancy Organisation (see Sebastian and Awasthi, 1991\textsuperscript{19}), by National Institute of Small Industries Extension and Training (NISIET) to evaluate their EDPs organised in North-eastern states between 1985-90 (NISIET, 1990\textsuperscript{20}) and by North Eastern Industrial and Technical Consultancy Organisation (NEITCO) to evaluate NEITCO-EDPs conducted between 1985 and 1990 (NEITCO, 1991\textsuperscript{21}).
Another category of studies is state specific studies. Some of the noteworthy among them are the studies conducted by Patel (1981\textsuperscript{22}) for CED, Ahmedabad, MITCON (1988\textsuperscript{23}) for Maharashtra, Directorate of Evaluation, Government of Gujarat (1988\textsuperscript{24}) for CED, Gujarat and by Singh (1990\textsuperscript{25}) for NITCON, Chandigarh. In all these studies, the basic objective has been assessing the success of EDPs conducted by the organisations in the respective states.

Patel (1981\textsuperscript{22}) attempted to assess the effectiveness of EDPs including financial performance of the units by keeping a control group of non-trained entrepreneurs. His findings showed that the EDP trained entrepreneurs had performed significantly better in terms of successful management of the ventures (as indicated by much less closures), profitability, return on investment etc., compared to non-trained entrepreneurs (control group). However, the major limitation of the study was that his selection of the control group and the sample size of the EDP trained entrepreneurs (25) for financial analysis confining only to Gujarat restricted generalisations.

While recognising the value of these studies in understanding the state-specific and organisation-specific performance of EDPs, the fact should be admitted that they do not provide any insight into the inter-state or inter-organisational variations in their performance. There are two studies which make organisation comparison of the performance of
EDPs. The first was conducted by EDI in 1987 (EDI, 1987\textsuperscript{26}). The study covered EDPs conducted in Madhya Pradesh by three organisations, viz., State Bank of India, Small Industries Service Institute and Madhya Pradesh Consultancy Organisation. Besides, inter-organisational comparison, the study carried out a comparative analysis of EDP trained and non-trained entrepreneurs. It observed that the performance of trained entrepreneurs was significantly better than the non-trained entrepreneurs. It also indicated that EDP inputs were reasonably effective. Irrespective of the organisation, shortage of capital was found to be the major reason for low rate of start-ups in EDPs. The second study was conducted by North-Eastern Council to evaluate EDPs organised by NISIET, NITCO and NECON in the North-eastern states (North-Eastern Council, 1990\textsuperscript{27}). However, the study did not focus its attention on inter-organisational differences in the performance.

The study by Mahajan (1992\textsuperscript{28}) stands apart from these studies. The focus of the study is on EDPs across two regions, viz., Rajasthan and the North-eastern region. The performance of the ventures launched by the EDP trained entrepreneurs is compared against non-trained entrepreneurs (control group). The findings showed that the trained entrepreneurs are significantly better than the non-trained ones with regard to profits, earnings, employment creation etc. However, the methodology of identification and selection of the control group is
methodologically weak as the sample is non-comparable to the trained ones. The study also attempted a cost-benefit analysis of EDPs. It was observed that both internal rate of return and the net present value of EDPs led units are high and positive even under very restrictive conditions like 200 percent cost overheads etc., vis-à-vis non-trained entrepreneurs. In this context also, the rationale of using cost-benefit analysis could be questioned on methodological grounds as investment (cost) is public and the benefits are private.

One of the recent attempts at evaluating the effectiveness of EDP has been made by Saini and Bhatia (1996). They argue that the approach of evaluating the success of EDPs purely in terms of the number of trainees starting enterprises is too restrictive. Though the findings of the study raise doubts about the effectiveness of EDPs, the fact should be admitted that without EDPs, many of those who became entrepreneurs would not have ventured out. This according to them is a major contribution of EDPs.

2.11 Concluding Observations

The overview of training intervention for entrepreneurship development shows that over the years the entrepreneurship development movement in the country established its root in terms of institutions and interventions. The attempts to evaluate the performance
of the training intervention show that there is considerable variation across states. While admitting the utility of such evaluations, it should be stated that they are not comprehensive especially in terms of their coverage. The studies suffer from several methodological limitations and therefore the findings cannot be generalised. The main limitation is that they assess the success of EDPs in terms of the number of enterprises started. This seems to be a too narrow way of looking at a development intervention. The contribution of EDPs should be assessed more comprehensively taking into account the direct and indirect impact of the programme. There is considerable scope for refining the methodology of EDP evaluation.
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