

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY FUTURISTIC DEVELOPMENT

A Strategic Blueprint Model for Poverty and Unemployment Reduction through Public Policy Interventions

Mohammed Lawal Giwah ^{1*}, Zamathula Sikhakhane Nwokediegwu ², Emmanuel Augustine Etukudoh ³, Ebimor Yinka Gbabo ⁴

¹ Kwara State Government - Ilorin, Nigeria

² Independent Researcher, Durban, South Africa

³ Independent Researcher, Nigeria

⁴ Nuclear Security Technologies (UK), UK

* Corresponding Author: **Mohammed Lawal Giwah**

Article Info

P-ISSN: 3051-3618

E-ISSN: 3051-3626

Volume: 02

Issue: 02

July – December 2021

Received: 02-05-2021

Accepted: 03-06-2021

Published: 04-07-2021

Page No: 01-06

Abstract

This paper presents a strategic blueprint model aimed at addressing poverty and unemployment through integrated public policy interventions. Recognizing the multidimensional and systemic nature of these challenges, the study draws from classical, structural, and human development theories to frame a conceptual foundation for transformative policy action. It identifies key structural barriers, including institutional fragmentation, labor market informality, and social inequality, and argues for a coordinated, evidence-based approach to policy design and execution. The model advances three central pillars: integrated policy coordination across sectors and governance levels; targeted interventions such as employment-intensive programs, SME support, and education-to-employment pipelines; and adaptive governance mechanisms that include real-time monitoring, citizen engagement, and iterative learning. Together, these components form a holistic framework capable of delivering inclusive, scalable, and sustainable outcomes. By linking policy innovation to national development trajectories, the blueprint contributes to long-term resilience and inclusive growth. It also highlights the critical role of institutional reforms, capacity building, and stakeholder engagement in overcoming implementation gaps. The paper concludes with actionable recommendations for governments and development partners, emphasizing the importance of cross-sectoral alignment, participatory governance, and systems thinking. This model offers a practical yet strategic pathway for translating development intent into measurable socio-economic progress.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMFD.2021.2.2.1-06>

Keywords: Poverty Reduction, Unemployment, Public Policy, Strategic Planning, Inclusive Development, Governance Reform

1. Introduction

1.1 Context of Poverty and Unemployment Challenges

Poverty and unemployment continue to pose formidable challenges to socioeconomic development, particularly in emerging economies grappling with structural inequalities. Despite periods of economic growth, many populations remain excluded from the benefits of development due to enduring disparities in income, education, infrastructure, and access to opportunities. Structural poverty, often characterized by long-term deprivation and limited upward mobility, persists across rural and urban areas, revealing deep-rooted systemic flaws in national development strategies ^[1, 2].

Unemployment, especially among youth and graduates, reflects a mismatch between labor market demands and the skills produced by educational systems ^[3].

Many economies face what is termed “jobless growth,” where gross domestic product expands without a corresponding increase in employment opportunities. The informal sector absorbs a significant portion of the labor force, yet it lacks the stability, social security, and productivity needed to foster long-term economic resilience. The consequences of this imbalance are not only economic but also social, as joblessness fuels inequality, disillusionment, and political instability^[4].

The interplay between poverty and unemployment creates a vicious cycle where lack of income prevents investment in education and health, thereby perpetuating generational disadvantage. It is therefore imperative to approach these challenges not in isolation but as interrelated dimensions of underdevelopment^[5, 6]. A strategic and systemic response is required, one that integrates policy design, institutional coordination, and inclusive interventions aimed at breaking the cycle of deprivation and building pathways to economic participation and human development^[7].

1.2 Public Policy as a Transformational Tool

Public policy serves as a critical instrument for shaping socioeconomic outcomes by translating political vision into actionable programs, regulations, and institutional mechanisms. It plays a foundational role in structuring national responses to poverty and unemployment, offering levers to redistribute resources, stimulate inclusive economic activity, and deliver essential services. Effective policies can target the roots of deprivation, address structural barriers, and mobilize national capacities toward shared development objectives^[8].

Historically, public policy in many developing nations has evolved from welfare-based approaches toward more strategic and targeted interventions. In the post-independence era, many African and Latin American governments adopted state-led policies focused on redistribution and employment creation through public works and social programs^[9, 10]. However, structural adjustment programs in the 1980s and 1990s shifted the focus toward market liberalization, often at the expense of social protection. This policy pendulum created fragmented development outcomes, leaving critical gaps in human capital development and employment generation^[11].

In recent decades, a new policy paradigm has emerged, one that emphasizes evidence-based, participatory, and adaptive policy frameworks. This paradigm views public policy not only as a technical exercise but as a transformational mechanism that must be coherent, inclusive, and responsive to social realities. By leveraging policy tools such as social transfers, labor market reforms, fiscal incentives, and education linkages, governments can restructure the conditions that perpetuate poverty and unemployment. Policy thus becomes not merely reactive but proactive, serving as the engine of inclusive growth and social resilience.

1.3 Aim and Relevance of the Strategic Blueprint Model

The primary aim of this paper is to propose a strategic blueprint model that integrates public policy interventions for the reduction of poverty and unemployment. This model seeks to provide a comprehensive and coordinated approach that goes beyond fragmented initiatives by aligning institutional goals, resource allocation, and implementation mechanisms. The strategic blueprint functions as both a planning tool and an execution framework, designed to guide

governments and stakeholders toward coherent, inclusive, and scalable solutions.

The model addresses key questions: How can public policy be designed to address the dual burdens of poverty and unemployment in a sustainable way? What mechanisms ensure policy coherence across sectors such as education, labor, health, and finance? How can feedback loops and data systems improve policy responsiveness and accountability? In answering these, the blueprint prioritizes inclusivity, intersectoral coordination, and adaptive governance, offering a structured pathway to transform development challenges into opportunities.

Relevance lies in the model's alignment with the broader goals of national development and global commitments such as the Sustainable Development Goals. By positioning poverty and employment at the core of policy design, the blueprint contributes to social stability, economic growth, and human capital development. It envisions a future where policy does not merely respond to crises but actively shapes inclusive and resilient societies, offering a replicable framework adaptable to diverse national contexts.

2. Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations

2.1 Theories of Poverty and Unemployment

Understanding poverty and unemployment requires a multidimensional theoretical lens that captures the interplay of economic structures, institutional dynamics, and individual circumstances. Classical economic theories, particularly those rooted in neoclassical thought, view poverty and unemployment as results of individual choices or market imperfections. In this perspective, labor markets are assumed to be self-correcting, and poverty is attributed to a lack of skills, productivity, or work ethic. While this approach emphasizes labor supply and incentives, it tends to understate structural constraints^[12, 13].

In contrast, structural theories emphasize the embedded nature of poverty and unemployment within broader socioeconomic systems. These include dual labor market theory, which differentiates between formal and informal sectors; dependency theory, which critiques global economic imbalances; and institutionalist approaches that highlight the role of governance and power relations in perpetuating inequality. These frameworks underscore the significance of historical, political, and systemic factors in shaping access to opportunities and resources, especially in post-colonial economies^[14].

Multidimensional theories of poverty and unemployment go beyond income and labor participation to include access to health, education, social capital, and voice in decision-making. These frameworks, popularized through the human development approach, intersect with labor economics and social welfare theories that advocate for redistributive policies, social protection, and public investment in human capabilities. Together, these theoretical perspectives provide a comprehensive foundation for designing inclusive, transformative policy interventions^[15].

2.2 Strategic Public Policy Design

Public policy design has evolved into a discipline that blends analytical rigor with strategic foresight. The policy cycle model, comprising agenda-setting, formulation, adoption, implementation, and evaluation, serves as a foundational framework for structuring interventions. However, real-world policymaking rarely follows a linear path. Systems-

based planning approaches have therefore emerged to address the complexity, uncertainty, and interdependence inherent in policy environments, especially when dealing with poverty and unemployment^[16, 17].

A systems approach considers feedback loops, multiple stakeholders, and dynamic interactions between social, economic, and institutional components. This method allows for the identification of leverage points where small, strategic actions can yield disproportionate benefits. For example, targeted youth employment programs can simultaneously reduce crime, boost household income, and improve educational retention, creating systemic ripple effects across society^[18].

Evidence-based policy formulation further enhances strategic design by grounding decisions in reliable data, empirical analysis, and participatory insights. Inclusive policymaking ensures that diverse voices, particularly those of marginalized populations, inform policy priorities and implementation strategies. Strategic public policy design, therefore, is not merely about crafting laws or programs; it is about orchestrating institutional alignment, managing trade-offs, and enabling continuous learning to address complex societal challenges such as poverty and joblessness^[19].

2.3 Blueprint Thinking in Development Planning

Blueprint thinking refers to a structured and forward-looking approach to development planning that integrates long-term visioning with practical implementation strategies. It combines strategic frameworks, such as national development plans, poverty reduction strategies, and employment creation roadmaps, with robust planning instruments like logical frameworks, results-based management systems, and performance indicators. A blueprint approach is particularly useful in aligning fragmented interventions into a coherent, goal-oriented model^[20].

In the context of poverty and unemployment reduction, blueprint thinking provides clarity on priorities, sequencing, and resource mobilization. It fosters cross-sectoral coordination by linking macroeconomic, social, and labor market policies into a unified plan. Moreover, it strengthens accountability by embedding monitoring and evaluation mechanisms that track progress, detect implementation bottlenecks, and inform adaptive adjustments. This level of planning rigor ensures that policy interventions are not only aspirational but also executable and results-driven^[21].

Alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals reinforces the relevance of blueprint thinking. Goals such as decent work and economic growth (SDG 8), no poverty (SDG 1), and reduced inequalities (SDG 10) require multi-level governance, integrated planning, and inclusive policy frameworks. Blueprint models facilitate institutional reform by embedding strategic intent into governance structures and capacity-building programs. As such, blueprint thinking transcends rhetoric, serving as a vital tool for orchestrating sustainable, inclusive national development pathways^[22].

3. Structural Drivers and Policy Gaps

3.1 Institutional and Governance Barriers

Institutional inefficiencies and governance deficits constitute major impediments to the effective reduction of poverty and unemployment. Weak coordination among public institutions often leads to overlapping mandates, duplicated efforts, and policy fragmentation. Ministries responsible for labor, social

welfare, youth development, and economic planning frequently operate in silos, resulting in disjointed interventions that fail to address the complex, interconnected nature of poverty and joblessness^[23].

Moreover, corruption and lack of transparency erode public trust and divert resources away from intended beneficiaries. Misallocation of funds, favoritism in program delivery, and weak enforcement mechanisms undermine the integrity of public policy and discourage private sector and donor engagement. This environment hampers the sustainability and scalability of poverty and employment initiatives, as short-term political interests often override evidence-based planning and long-term developmental goals^[24].

Capacity gaps in public administration further constrain implementation. Many institutions lack the technical expertise, data systems, and human resources needed to plan, monitor, and evaluate complex social interventions. Additionally, frequent policy shifts driven by political transitions create inconsistency and disrupt program continuity. Addressing these governance challenges requires deep institutional reform, including clear policy mandates, anti-corruption safeguards, and investment in administrative capacity. Without resolving these structural flaws, even the most well-designed strategic blueprints will struggle to deliver meaningful and lasting outcomes^[25].

3.2 Labor Market and Economic Structure Issues

The structure and performance of the labor market are central to understanding persistent unemployment and underemployment in developing economies. A significant proportion of the labor force operates in the informal sector, characterized by low wages, precarious working conditions, and limited access to social protection. Informality not only reflects weak labor regulation enforcement but also signals structural mismatches between job seekers' skills and market demands^[26, 27].

Skill mismatches are particularly pronounced among youth and graduates, many of whom find themselves unemployable despite formal education. Education systems in many contexts remain poorly aligned with labor market needs, focusing on theoretical content rather than practical competencies. This disconnection contributes to jobless growth, where economic expansion fails to generate sufficient employment opportunities, especially in high-productivity sectors^[28].

Additionally, economic structural weaknesses, such as overreliance on extractive industries, underdeveloped manufacturing, and low agricultural productivity, limit job creation potential. Stagnant sectors fail to absorb the growing labor force, exacerbating unemployment and economic exclusion^[29]. The absence of value-added production and innovation hampers economic diversification and industrial growth, further restricting pathways to sustainable employment. To overcome these barriers, structural transformation of the economy is needed, anchored in industrial policy, skills development, and incentives for labor-intensive sectors, to build a more inclusive and dynamic labor market^[30].

3.3 Social Inequality and Access Disparities

Social inequality remains a persistent obstacle to inclusive development, undermining efforts to reduce poverty and create equitable employment opportunities. In many developing nations, regional disparities in infrastructure,

service delivery, and economic opportunities are stark. Urban areas often receive disproportionate attention and investment, while rural and peri-urban communities face chronic neglect, deepening spatial inequality, and limited access to employment and public services ^[31].

Gender gaps in labor market participation, education, and political representation further compound these inequalities. Women are frequently underrepresented in formal employment and overrepresented in unpaid or low-paid care work. Cultural norms, discriminatory practices, and structural barriers limit women's access to productive assets, credit, and professional advancement. Addressing these disparities is essential not only for equity but also for unlocking the full potential of the workforce and driving inclusive growth ^[32].

Marginalized groups, such as persons with disabilities, indigenous populations, and displaced persons, face heightened barriers to inclusion. These include limited access to quality education, healthcare, vocational training, and legal identity ^[33]. Without deliberate policy efforts to include vulnerable populations in the labor market and social protection systems, existing interventions risk reinforcing exclusion. Strategic planning must therefore embed equity as a guiding principle, ensuring that development outcomes are accessible and beneficial to all segments of society ^[34, 35].

4. Strategic Blueprint Model Components

4.1 Integrated Policy Design and Coordination

Central to the strategic blueprint model is the principle of integrated policy design, which promotes synergy across sectors and institutions. Poverty and unemployment are not standalone issues; they intersect with education, health, agriculture, finance, and infrastructure. Thus, effective intervention requires unified policy targets and smart regulation that cut across ministerial silos. Policy coherence ensures that macroeconomic planning, labor strategies, and social development programs work toward common outcomes, rather than operating in fragmented or contradictory ways ^[36].

Cross-sectoral integration also strengthens resource allocation and implementation efficiency. For instance, aligning youth employment initiatives with education reforms and enterprise development strategies enhances both impact and sustainability. Smart regulation, defined by flexibility, clarity, and enforceability, creates an enabling environment for innovation, accountability, and inclusive growth. Regulatory frameworks must be responsive to local conditions while ensuring national alignment with development priorities ^[37, 38].

Institutional collaboration must extend vertically across governance levels, from national ministries to local governments, ensuring that policies are not only well-conceived but also contextually implemented. Vertical policy coherence guarantees that national objectives are translated into community-level action through localized planning, capacity building, and responsive service delivery. This layered coordination empowers subnational actors and enables the adaptation of interventions to meet diverse community needs. Integrated design and coordination thus form the backbone of an effective and agile blueprint for reducing poverty and unemployment ^[39, 40].

4.2 Targeted Intervention Pillars

At the heart of the blueprint model are targeted interventions

aimed at expanding employment opportunities, enhancing social protection, and fostering inclusive entrepreneurship. Employment-intensive public works programs, particularly in sectors such as agriculture, housing, and environmental conservation, can provide immediate income for low-skilled workers while building essential infrastructure. These programs serve as short- to medium-term relief mechanisms that stabilize vulnerable populations and stimulate local economies.

Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) represent a significant engine for job creation, yet they often face constraints related to financing, market access, and regulatory compliance. The blueprint promotes SME support through policy incentives, microfinance programs, business development services, and simplified tax regimes. Strengthening the entrepreneurial ecosystem enables job multipliers and fosters local value chains, especially when linked with digital platforms and green economy initiatives ^[41, 42].

Another vital pillar involves creating strong education-to-employment pipelines. This includes investing in technical and vocational education and training (TVET), modernizing curricula, and fostering partnerships between education institutions and industries. Emphasis should be placed on entrepreneurship education, life skills, and digital literacy to prepare youth for a dynamic labor market. These pillars are mutually reinforcing, combining economic empowerment with social resilience to address both the symptoms and structural drivers of poverty and unemployment ^[43].

4.3 Monitoring, Feedback, and Adaptive Governance

Effective implementation of public policy requires robust monitoring systems and adaptive governance mechanisms capable of responding to emerging needs and contextual shifts. Real-time evaluation tools, such as performance dashboards, mobile data collection, and geo-spatial mapping, enable policymakers to track progress, detect inefficiencies, and identify underserved populations. These systems enhance transparency, improve accountability, and allow for timely corrective action ^[44].

Citizen engagement plays a critical role in monitoring and feedback. Public participation mechanisms, such as social audits, citizen scorecards, and community feedback platforms, bridge the gap between state and society. These tools empower citizens to co-create solutions, report grievances, and hold institutions accountable. When citizens are viewed as partners rather than beneficiaries, policy legitimacy and effectiveness increase significantly ^[45, 46].

Adaptive governance is the capacity of institutions to learn, evolve, and iterate policies in response to real-world outcomes. It moves away from rigid, top-down planning toward flexible frameworks that accommodate innovation and experimentation. Iterative learning processes, such as policy pilots, impact evaluations, and peer learning, help refine interventions and scale what works. Embedding these practices into the blueprint model ensures that poverty and unemployment reduction strategies remain dynamic, inclusive, and resilient in the face of complexity and change ^[47].

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Summary of Key Strategic Insights

This paper has developed a strategic blueprint model as a comprehensive framework for addressing poverty and

unemployment through public policy interventions. Drawing on theoretical insights from classical, structural, and multidimensional approaches, the model underscores the need for policies that address both immediate symptoms and systemic root causes. It combines labor economics, social welfare thinking, and strategic planning principles to guide policy formulation and execution.

Key structural drivers were identified, including institutional fragmentation, labor market informality, skill mismatches, and entrenched social inequalities. These challenges hinder the effectiveness of current interventions and demand a more coordinated, evidence-based, and inclusive response. The paper further outlined the essential components of the blueprint model: integrated policy design, targeted intervention pillars, and mechanisms for monitoring and adaptive governance.

By uniting policy coherence with practical action, the model offers a roadmap for governments and stakeholders to translate development intent into impactful outcomes. The emphasis on institutional alignment, multi-sectoral synergy, and iterative learning ensures that solutions are both sustainable and adaptable. These strategic insights lay the foundation for operationalizing transformative public policy that is capable of reducing poverty and unemployment in a meaningful and durable way.

5.2 Implications for National Development Trajectories

The adoption of a strategic blueprint model carries significant implications for the trajectory of national development. It aligns with the imperative of inclusive growth and economic advancement that benefits all segments of the population, and it repositions policy innovation as a central lever in achieving long-term socio-economic transformation. Rather than treating poverty and unemployment as isolated issues, the model embeds them within the broader context of structural reform and national development planning.

The model strengthens the capacity of governments to deliver on Sustainable Development Goals, particularly those related to no poverty, decent work, reduced inequalities, and institutional effectiveness. Through improved coordination, smarter regulation, and citizen-centered design, the blueprint redefines how policy is conceptualized, implemented, and evaluated. It supports a shift from reactive, fragmented interventions to proactive, data-driven strategies with measurable impact.

Moreover, the model positions inclusive policymaking as a core driver of national resilience. In a global context marked by economic shocks, demographic shifts, and climate vulnerabilities, countries must build institutions that are not only efficient but also equitable and responsive. This strategic approach ensures that the dividends of growth are widely shared, social stability is maintained, and the policy apparatus evolves with the needs of a dynamic society.

5.3 Recommendations for Policymakers and Institutions

To operationalize the strategic blueprint model, several actionable recommendations are proposed. First, policymakers should invest in institutional reform that enhances policy coordination and clarifies mandates across ministries and agencies. This involves establishing cross-sectoral task forces, harmonizing strategic plans, and improving regulatory clarity to reduce fragmentation and duplication of efforts.

Second, capacity-building initiatives must be prioritized.

This includes training civil servants in systems thinking, policy analysis, and impact evaluation, as well as developing digital infrastructure to support data collection, analysis, and public accountability. Strengthening local government capacities is equally vital, as implementation often rests at the subnational level.

Third, integrated planning processes should be institutionalized through national development frameworks that explicitly link poverty reduction and employment creation to economic, educational, and social policy agendas. Governments should also adopt inclusive mechanisms that involve civil society, the private sector, and marginalized groups in the design and monitoring of interventions. Finally, continuous learning through pilot projects, real-time evaluation, and adaptive feedback loops should be embedded within the governance system to enable flexible and responsive policymaking.

6. References

1. Fukuyama F, Diamond L, Plattner MF. Poverty, inequality, and democracy. Baltimore: JHU Press; 2012.
2. Mehrotra SK, Delamonica E. Eliminating human poverty: macroeconomic and social policies for equitable growth (no. 84277-84774). London: Zed Books; 2007.
3. Lustig NC. Coping with austerity: Poverty and inequality in Latin America. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; 2010.
4. Bhorat H, Lilenstein K, Oosthuizen M, Thornton A. Structural transformation, inequality, and inclusive growth in South Africa (no. 2020/50). WIDER Working Paper. 2020.
5. MacDonald R, Shildrick T, Furlong A. 'Cycles of disadvantage' revisited: young people, families and poverty across generations. *Journal of Youth Studies*. 2020;23(1):12-27.
6. Moore K. Thinking about youth poverty through the lenses of chronic poverty, life-course poverty and intergenerational poverty. Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper. 2005;57.
7. Saunders P, Shang X. Social security reform in China's transition to a market economy. *Social Policy & Administration*. 2001;35(3):274-289.
8. Harper C, Marcus R, Moore K. Enduring poverty and the conditions of childhood: lifecourse and intergenerational poverty transmissions. *World Development*. 2003;31(3):535-554.
9. MacLean LM. Constructing a social safety net in Africa: An institutionalist analysis of colonial rule and state social policies in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire. *Studies in Comparative International Development*. 2002;37(3):64-90.
10. Kaltenborn M, Abdulai A-G, Roelen K, Hague S. The influence of policy and legal frameworks on the development of national social protection systems. 2017.
11. Moore K. Frameworks for understanding the inter-generational transmission of poverty and well-being in developing countries. Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper. 2001;8.
12. Thompson A, Gray BG. Employment structure and poverty: Theoretical perspectives and conceptual frameworks. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 1995;77(3):789-795.
13. Davis EP. A review of the economic theories of poverty.

- 2014.
14. Addison T, Hulme D, Kanbur R. Poverty dynamics: measurement and understanding from an interdisciplinary perspective. Brooks World Poverty Institute Working Paper. 2008;19.
15. Wagle U. Multidimensional poverty measurement: Concepts and applications. 2009.
16. Wauters B. Strategic management in the public sector and public policy-making: friend or foe. URL: https://ec.europa.eu/esf/transnationality/sites/esf/files/strategic_management_book_final2b.pdf; 2019.
17. Valle-Cruz D, Criado JI, Sandoval-Almazán R, Ruvalcaba-Gomez EA. Assessing the public policy-cycle framework in the age of artificial intelligence: From agenda-setting to policy evaluation. *Government Information Quarterly*. 2020;37(4):101509.
18. Rogge KS. Designing Complex Policy Mixes: Elements, Processes and Characteristics 1. In: *Routledge Handbook of Policy Design*. London: Routledge; 2018:34-58.
19. Radin BA. Beyond Machiavelli: Policy analysis reaches midlife. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press; 2013.
20. Haines SG, McKinlay J. Reinventing strategic planning: The systems thinking approach. Chelmsford: Systems Thinking Press; 2007.
21. Foxon TJ, Reed MS, Stringer LC. Governing long-term social–ecological change: what can the adaptive management and transition management approaches learn from each other? *Environmental Policy and Governance*. 2009;19(1):3-20.
22. Kemp R. Integrating environmental and innovation policies. In: *Industrial innovation and environmental regulation. Developing Workable Solutions*. Tokyo: UNU Press/IDRC; 2007. http://www.idrc.ca/es/ev-105261-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html
23. Bangura Y. Public sector restructuring: the institutional and social effects of fiscal, managerial and capacity-building reforms. Geneva 2000 Occasional Paper. 2000.
24. Khan M. State failure in developing countries and institutional reform strategies. In: *Toward pro-poor policies: aid, institutions, and globalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2004:165-96.
25. Yilema MG, Gianoli A. Infrastructure governance: Causes for the poor sectoral coordination among infrastructure sectors of Addis Ababa. *Cities*. 2018;83:165-172.
26. Campbell D, Ahmed I. The labour market in developing countries. 2012.
27. Maloney WF. The structure of labor markets in developing countries: Time series evidence on competing views (no. 1940). World Bank Publications. 1998.
28. Kannappan S. Urban employment and the labor market in developing nations. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. 1985;33(4):699-730.
29. Todaro MP. A model of labor migration and urban unemployment in less developed countries. *The American Economic Review*. 1969;59(1):138-148.
30. Layard PRG, Layard R, Nickell SJ, Jackman R. Unemployment: macroeconomic performance and the labour market. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA; 2005.
31. Rosenzweig MR. Labor markets in low-income countries. In: *Handbook of Development Economics*. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 1988:713-762.
32. Mazumdar D. Microeconomic issues of labor markets in developing countries: analysis and policy implications. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications; 1989.
33. Salmi J, D'Addio A. Policies for achieving inclusion in higher education. *Policy Reviews in Higher Education*. 2021;5(1):47-72.
34. Craig KD, Holmes C, Hudspith M, *et al*. Pain in persons who are marginalized by social conditions. *Pain*. 2020;161(2):261-265.
35. Gandelman N, Ñopo H, Ripani L. Traditional excluding forces: a review of the quantitative literature on the economic situation of indigenous peoples, afro-descendants, and people living with disability. *Latin American Politics and Society*. 2011;53(4):147-179.
36. Al-Sayed M. The Impact of Traditional Bank Credit, Alternative Forms of Lending, And Policy Reforms On Financing Mid-Caps And SMEs In Emerging Markets: A Multiple Case Study. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Paris: The International School of Management (ISM). <https://www.ism.edu/images/ismdocs/dissertations/alsayed-phd-dissertation-2020.pdf>; 2020.
37. Mittal S, Khan MA, Romero D, Wuest T. A critical review of smart manufacturing & Industry 4.0 maturity models: Implications for small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*. 2018;49:194-214.
38. Acs ZJ, Carlsson B, Karlsson C. Entrepreneurship, small and medium-sized enterprises and the macroeconomy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1999.
39. Mourougane A. Promoting SME development in Indonesia. 2012.
40. Taiwo O. Evaluation of the effects of micro, small and medium enterprises finance policy on job creation in Nigeria. 2019.
41. Muhammad MZ, Char AK, Yaso MR, Hassan Z. Small and medium enterprises (SMEs) competing in the global business environment: A case of Malaysia. *International Business Research*. 2010;3(1):66.
42. Harvie C, Charoenrat T. SMEs and the rise of global value chains: Challenges and policy actions in Asia. Manila: Asian Development Bank; 2015:1-26.
43. Kinyua AN. Factors affecting the performance of Small and Medium Enterprises in the Jua kali sector in Nakuru Town, Kenya. Nakuru: Egerton University; 2013.
44. Dunleavy P, Margetts H, Bastow S, Tinkler J. New public management is dead—long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2006;16(3):467-494.
45. Javed B, Khan Z, McClatchey R. An adaptable system to support provenance management for the public policy-making process in smart cities. In: *Informatics*. Basel: MDPI; 2018;5(1):3.
46. Janssen M, Van Der Voort H. Adaptive governance: Towards a stable, accountable and responsive government. *Government Information Quarterly*. 2016;33:1-5.
47. Harvie C. SMEs, trade and development in South-east Asia. 2015.