

Socio – Personal Challenges Faced by Indian Women Entrepreneur

Purvi Pareek,

Research scholar,
Jain university, Bengaluru, India.

Dr. Chaya Bagrecha,

HOD of MBA,
Department Adarsh Institute of Management
and Information Technology, Bengaluru, India.

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship is the process that involves lots of hard work and ability to overcome challenges and survive to earn profits. Women entrepreneurs who are involved in business can be successful only if they are very strongly prepared to take major risks in terms of money, career, relationships, failure, & the right attitude of facing every difficulty, ultimately leading them towards the path of success. The purpose of the study is to address the Socio – personal challenges faced by women entrepreneurs of Small – scale industries and ways to overcome them and to understand the intensity of these challenges in different forms of business and reason for non inclusion. Women entrepreneurs are untapped source of economic growth and they create employment opportunities not only for themselves, but also for others. They make a difference in the society by generating solutions to management problems and reducing exploitation of women by making them financially independent. Qualitative, Survey, and Quantitative methods are used for the study. Qualitative research is done using thematic research, Survey through questionnaires, & Quantitative by analyzing the data through statistical tool (SPSS). The locale for the study is the Delhi / NCR region with sample size 200, covering Women entrepreneurs of Small scale industries. The findings of the study reveal that Women entrepreneurs from different forms of business face different level of Socio - personal challenges. Data analysis depicts that different forms of business affect the intensity on the level of different kinds of Socio – personal challenges that Women entrepreneurs face in India.

Keywords: Women entrepreneurs; Socio – personal challenges; forms of business; low education level; conservative mindset; family issues.

INTRODUCTION:

Women entrepreneurs face endless challenges in their venture. In fact, from the moment they conceive the idea of starting their own unit; they have to work hard against heavy odds. According to (Bipin Kumar, 2009), The woman of today has opted for new horizons, and paths, to satisfy her quest for self-expression and creativity. She strives to be economically, psychologically independent and attain her own social status, leading to harmonious family existence. This ultimately takes her towards acquisition of everything that her male counterparts could think of achieving for themselves. (A.K. Mishra, 2015), Although, women have owned and operated business for decades, but they were rarely recognized or given credit for their efforts. Because of centuries of exploitation and subjugation, Indian women have remained at the receiving end. Women in India have been the neglected lot. They have not been actively involved in the mainstream of development even though they represent an equal proportion of the population and labor force.

Primarily, women are the means of survival of their families, but are generally unrecognized and undervalued, being placed at the bottom of the pile. Mostly, the patriarchal social system in the society has always marginalized women and kept her aside. The management of domestic commitment and childcare support are the two issues where women have to play a more active role. This, coupled with the narrow vision of the society in still accepting women in a separate entity as an entrepreneur makes the life of a women entrepreneur all the

more difficult. Therefore, the need to conduct this study specifically into women's business ownership is based on the proposition that women face many Socio – personal challenges and does the choice of right form of business like – Proprietorship, Company, Cooperative, Association of persons, Hindu undivided family, and Partnership, depending upon their situation can have any significant affect in facing these challenges and what the ways by which they can overcome societal issues and focus on business.

Despite numerous situational barriers and tangible obstacles, more and more women are today entering the field of business. Presently, the small scale sectors have many limitations as compared to large sector in facing different challenges. (Anshuja Tiwari, 2007), Majority of functions have to be performed by the owner themselves due to limitation of resources. In the case of women entrepreneurs, the challenges get more compounded because of gender dimensions attached to it & unfair Socio – personal challenges that they have to face like - Low education level, social acceptability & religious riots, limited contacts outside the prejudice and class bias, negative approach of people & dealing with fear of failure, dealing with male dominated society and conservative mindset, dealing with misbehavior & taunting, non acceptability in society of successful single parents and so on.

(Okpachu AS, 2018), no country can achieve its potential without adequately investing in and developing the capabilities of women. In the interest of long-term development it is necessary to facilitate their empowerment. In many developing countries, including India, women have much less access to education, employment, income and power than men. Even after five and a half decades of planned development, Indian women have not achieved expected success in the mainstream of life. India will be unable to have a competitive edge over others until and unless the status and role of women is improved.

SOCIO-PERSONAL CHALLENGES:

India is a powerful nation and famous worldwide for being the largest democracy in the world. However, women backwardness is also very clear in the Indian society because of the social issues, problems and lots of restrictions against women. Women who belong to the lower and middle class family suffers more than the women of the higher class family. Few Socio – personal challenges that have been identified in the course of the study are as follows:

Lack of Education and Awareness - Knowledge of the latest technological changes, know how, and education level of the person is significant factors that affect business. The literacy rate of women in India is found at low levels compared to the male population.

Patriarchal Problems:

The greatest deterrent to women entrepreneurs is that they are women. A kind of patriarchal male dominant social order is the building block for them on their way towards business success. Male members think it's a big risk financing the ventures run by women.

Family Problems:

Women's family obligations also bar them from becoming successful entrepreneurs in both developed and developing nations. "Having primary responsibility for children, home and older dependent family members, few women can devote all their time and energies to their business" (Starcher, 1996).

The financial institutions discourage women entrepreneurs on the belief that they can at any time leave their business and become housewives again. The result is that they are forced to rely on their own savings, and loan from relatives and family friends. Indian women give more emphasis to family ties and relationships. Married women have to make a fine balance between business and home. Moreover the business success depends on the support of the family members extended to women in the business process and management. The interest of the family members is a determinant factor in the realization of women folk business aspirations.

Other problems:

Having poor networking skills due to shortage of time, lack of social acceptability as it is very difficult for middle class and lower class people to resist a woman being successful, dealing with the perception of people around that a woman is incapable of handling different kind of stress that arise in business, dealing constantly with negative attitude of people who keep scaring of failing in business and at the same time dealing with pressure of not to fail and show the same people of their ability to be successful, no compromise on family and work & meeting high expectations of family members at home and consumers in business, non acceptability in society of successful single parent as in India the higher side of the population still feels that women cannot be

successful without the support of men and if she does she is considered to be conducting a character that is not good and so on.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Different studies show that women entrepreneurs in developing countries have to face and overcome various Socio – personal challenges to be competitive and successful.

According to (Mungai, 2012), rising women entrepreneurs in the society depends largely on economic, social, religious, cultural and psychological factors prevailing in their surrounding communities. In particular, social and cultural challenges are two critical barriers experienced by women, causing a less women participation in business activities. Similarly, (Maria Bogren, Yvonne von Friedrichs, Oystein Rennemo, Oystein Widding, 2013) have rightly pointed

out that Without a relational attitude and a willingness to put oneself into a relational interplay, women entrepreneurs will have a hard time succeeding in growing their businesses.

Whereas, (Tanvi Kothari, 2017) identifies the various factors that influence women’s entrepreneurship and how they have been successful in transitioning the social fabric to enhance the success of their ventures and have specifically attempted to understand the behaviour of women entrepreneurs in terms of human capital, and social capital and their gender - related distinctiveness in the Indian context. (HongBo Li, Lan Ding, 2015) studied that in given recent economic and social developments, female entrepreneurship has become a new trend in women’s employment and they can apply their unique strengths and weaknesses in entrepreneurship by making the best use of their advantages and demonstrating them in business to achieve self-value. (Anna Nikina, Lois M. Shelton, Séverine LeLoarne, 2015) in their research revealed that the pattern of dominance between the husband and wife, the gender role ideologies of the two spouses, and the interaction between this pattern and the gender role ideologies, and overall level of marital harmony were key determinants of husbands’ spousal support in the journey of entrepreneurship.

(Anil Boz Semerci, Thierry Volery, 2018) identified that the social support is a strong predictor of parenting stress and that there is a direct effect between parenting stress and family to work interference (FWI). (Stephanie Chasserio, Philippe Pailot, Corinne Poroli, 2014) in their findings broaden the too simplistic vision of Women entrepreneur as a homogeneous whole. The analysis reveals that forms of identity work are along a continuum from accepting conventional norms and social expectations and integrating them in self-identity, or challenging them by accommodation or transformation, or, in turn, by redefining and proposing new norms and it also brings a nuanced understanding of complexity and multidimensionality of their daily life. (Ignatius Ekanem, 2015) in their research studied some differences in the learning experiences between male and female entrepreneurs and found that male entrepreneurs were more likely to challenge and depart from industry norms, thus utilising double-loop learning process, whereas, female entrepreneurs were more likely to engage in “routinised” learning which enhances confidence, thus adopting the single-loop learning process.

According to (Kuratko and Welsch, 1994), women entrepreneurs have long felt that they have been victims of discrimination. Various studies examined the types of discrimination and some have been attempting to document them. This argument is supported by (De Bruin, Brush and Welter, 2007) Researchers (Sexton and Bowman-Upton, 1991) suggest that female business owners are subject to gender-related discrimination. (Shelton, 2006) advised that in order to improve the survival and performance of women-owned ventures, programs should be implemented to assist women in selecting appropriate work-family management strategies. If work-family conflict is addressed, a potential stumbling block for women business owners will be removed and the effectiveness of other programs will be enhanced. (Ghosh & Cheruvalath, 2007) Challenges to women entrepreneurs cover a wide spectrum, including education, inter-role conflicts emanating from greater parenting responsibilities, a dearth of financial assistance and Socio-cultural constraints.

(Prema Basargekar, 2007) analyzed the evolution of various concepts and definitions of entrepreneurship with special reference to women. It provided the present scenario of women entrepreneurs in India and the various challenges, which they are facing in the changing global scenario. (Daphne, Halkias, Chinedum, Nwajuba, Nicholas, Harkiolakis, Sylva M. Caracatsanis, 2011), examined the business and social profiles of women entrepreneurs in three regions of Nigeria in order to identify patterns of entrepreneurship and social and economic challenges faced by them. (Vijay Kumbhar, 2013) revealed that absence of definite agenda of life, absence of balance between family and career obligations of women, poor degree of financial freedom for women, absence of direct ownership of the property, the paradox of entrepreneurial skill & finance in economically rich and poor women, no awareness about capacities, low ability to bear risk, problems of work with male workers, negligence by financial institutions, lack of self-confidence, lack of professional education,

mobility constraints and lack of interaction with successful entrepreneurs are major problems of women entrepreneurship development in India. (Goel, 2002), has analyzed the problems of SSIs and created excellence models for management of SSIs. The products of the SSIs would be popular only if they satisfy the essential need of the customer.

(Gunjan Sharma & Kushagra Kulshreshtha, 2014), studied that the BRIC countries (Brazil, India, China and Russia) are the fastest growing economy and among these some also have a significant percentage of youth but surprisingly have almost lowest entrepreneurial activities. This paper strives to dig out the facts that what are the opportunities and barriers which hinder the emergence of entrepreneurs and how the knowledge of these economies can help them to open consumer oriented ventures. (Monika Sharma, Vandana Chaudhary, Rajni Bala and Ranchan Chauhan, 2013) suggested that the distressed regions tend to be characterized by strong structures that may be mobilized as social capital for entrepreneurial activities and examined the challenges observed for entrepreneurial activities in rural regions in developing countries such as that of India. (Dr. Ravinder Jit, Anju Bharti, 2016) suggested that women entrepreneurs are facing a plethora of constraints at various stages of their growth and development. Constraints related to psycho- social factors, legal and policy framework, support services like financing, training, technology, information, and production and marketing of product and services have been discussed. This paper makes various suggestions to remove these impediments or constraints. The paper also suggests the need for systematic research on various aspects of women entrepreneurship. This will pave the way for gender – sensitive industrial policy formulation and implementation.

(Sweta Saurabh, 2012) examined the quality of management by women in Socio-cultural milieu and to project the management training needs of women entrepreneurs. (Pauric Mc Gowana, Caroline Lewis Redekera, Sarah Y. Cooperb Kate Greenana, 2012) focused upon the entrepreneurial journeys of 14 women as they established and managed their ventures, whilst balancing domestic/familial demands. Drawing upon information-rich evidence from in-depth interviews, and presented insights of their motivations and expectations of what entrepreneurship would offer, and the realities of their experience. It also focused on why women switch from employment to setting-up in business for themselves and revealed a range of push and pull factors. (Elizabeth Walker, Calvin Wang Janice Redmond, 2008) sought to explore self-employment through home-based business ownership as a potential solution to the inter-role conflict experienced by women attempting to balance dual work and family roles.

The literature review talks about different aspects of Socio-personal challenges like relationships, dominant behavioural aspects, parenting stress, discrimination, education, cultural constraints etc., There exists a gap as suggestions and best practices women entrepreneurs should adopt for facing challenges effectively are not explored much and the area has lot of potential for researchers in this field.

The need for the study arose to address the Socio- personal challenges faced by Indian women entrepreneurs and to identify the intensity of these challenges with different forms of business as they generate employment not only for themselves but, also for other women and make themselves financially independent contributing to the economic development of the nation. Socio- personal

challenges act as big obstacle for women entrepreneurs especially in Small-scale industry as their interface with society is much more than women entrepreneurs belonging to macro industry.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

1. To understand the Socio – personal challenges faced by women entrepreneurs.
2. To recommend/suggest different ways by which women entrepreneurs can overcome Socio – personal challenges and
3. To understand the relationship of these challenges with forms of business.
4. To understand the challenge for non inclusion of women entrepreneurs in other forms of business.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Primarily, a pilot study of successful women entrepreneurs was conducted for identifying various challenges they were facing or had already faced. (Findings from the pilot study included that socio-personal challenges was the most critical and sensitive challenge amongst all, as it was directly linked to attitudes, mindsets, religion, family, society, expectations, psychological tests, marital status, insecurity, distrust, misbehaviour, relations, kids, responsibilities, demands, support and health).

Population size was identified with the help of available secondary sources of targeted geographical location Delhi/NCR region that is 14,383 (Source: MSME, 2015). Inclusion criteria for the study conducted is age factor,

i.e. Women entrepreneurs under age of 40 were considered and Women entrepreneurs were restricted to Small - scale industry sector.

Women entrepreneurs falling under Proprietorship, Company, Cooperative, Association of persons, Hindu undivided family, and Partnership form of business were considered for the study. The sample size for the study calculated was N = 200 in the following way and the selection of the sample was based on a random pick by lottery system

Reliability test Calculation for sample size

Margin of error	6.89
Confidence level	95%
Population size	14400
Response distribution	50%
Recommended sample size	200

Thematic study was used to identify meaningful patterns across the dataset for getting the answers. Patterns were identified through a rigorous process of data familiarization, data coding, sub - coding, theme development and revision. It was suited well for questions related to people's experiences or people's views and perceptions. It helped in getting the real results with the help of data that was created with the help of thematic analysis.

Structured Personal interviews were conducted. Questions regarding Socio - personal challenges were asked and on the basis of the structured personal interviews final questionnaire was generated. Primary Data was collected with the help of a structured personal interview. Secondary Data was collected through available literature, Government site of MSME i.e. Ministry of Micro, Small & Medium Enterprises, newspapers, books, magazine articles etc. Tools of Data Analysis qualitative, survey and quantitative method were used for the study. Qualitative method with personal/individual interview of successful women entrepreneurs in Delhi/NCR region was conducted using thematic analysis followed with a six phase process: familiarization with the data, coding, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and finally, weaving together the analytic narrative, data extracts, and contextualizing the analysis followed with the survey method using structured questionnaire & quantitative method for various statistical analysis were used.

Data Analysis for Quantitative Study - Hypothesis testing through various tests such as One - way MANOVA for determining whether there was any difference between independent groups on more than one continuous dependent variable as one-way ANOVA, is used to only measures one dependent variable, and in this case, there were 17 dependent variables. The data set type was suitable for testing of hypothesis under One-way Manova., Multivariate analysis, i.e. factor analysis was used for statistical data reduction and to understand the correlations among multiple outcomes. The technique involved data reduction, as it attempted to represent a set of variables by a smaller number.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

The sample size was limited to 200.

Locale for the study was restricted to the Delhi/NCR region.

The study was restricted to women entrepreneurs from Small - scale industries.

HYPOTHESIS AND VARIABLES FOR THE STUDY:

Hypothesis: Understanding the relationship between Forms of business and Socio - personal challenges

Null hypothesis (Ho): Women entrepreneurs from different forms of business face equal levels of Socio - personal challenges.

Alternative hypothesis (H1): Women entrepreneurs from different forms of business face different levels of Socio - personal challenges.

THE VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY ARE MENTIONED BELOW:

Dependent Variable:

Forms of business

Independent Variables:

Education level - leading to low confidence, achievement, advancement & motivation

Handling conflicts
Lack of social acceptability & religious riots
The myth that woman cannot handle pressure
Having limited contacts outside prejudice and class bias leading to facing difficulty in accessing information
The negative approach of people & dealing with fear of failure
Dealing with male dominated society and Conservative mindset
Dealing with misbehavior, teasing & taunting
Difficulty in expansion due to dual responsibility
No compromise on family and work & meeting high expectations
Mislead appearance, not taken seriously
Conservative mindset, dealing with disrespect & distrust shown by others
Single parent difficult journey
Non acceptability in society of successful single parent
Mental torture, emotional blackmailing of family members
Insecurity of competitors
Continuous innovation, training and learning are needed, & training becomes difficult.

FINDINGS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS:

Women entrepreneurs from different forms of business face different level of Socio - personal challenges. Data analysis depicts that different forms of business affect the intensity on the level of different kinds of Socio – personal challenges that Women entrepreneurs face in India & there was strength in the relationship among all the variables.

REPORTING THE RESULTS:

In One – way Manova - Multivariate tests (Table 2), an analysis of variance showed that the forms of business are significantly dependent on Socio – personal challenges ($p < .05$) as value is .001. Tests of Between - Subjects Effects $p = 4.7$ is the average significant value of all the 17 dependent variables. As $p > 0.05$, we do not reject the null hypothesis i.e., Women entrepreneurs from different forms of business face equal levels of Socio - personal challenges.

Factor analysis (Table 4), measures varies between 0 and 1, and values are closer to 1 in which all of the diagonal elements are 1. the off-diagonal elements of the values on the left and right side of the diagonal were small and positively correlated to each other. There exists a significant relationship between the highlighted variables. In KMO and Bartlett's Test (Table 5), the KMO measure of sampling adequacy was .890, and it was acceptable. As per Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, there was strength in the relationship among variables and it was an identity matrix. The level of significance was .0001. That is, significance was less than 0.05 and we can reject the null hypothesis & therefore, we can say that Women entrepreneurs from different forms of business face different level of Socio - personal challenges. The first three factors account for 38.9%, 11.2%, & 6.64% of the variance and were significant wherein, the total variance was explained (Table 6).

Results for different forms of business (Table 8) indicate that 32.5% of women entrepreneurs were in the Proprietorship form of business, 11.0% - Partnership, 13% - Hindu undivided family, 6.5% - Association of persons, 13.0% - Cooperative & 29.5% - Company form of business.

Entrepreneurship among women, no doubt, improves the wealth of the nation in general and of the family in particular. Women today are more willing to take up activities that were once considered the preserve of men, and have proved that they are second to no one in regard to contributing to the luxuriant efflorescence of the economy. Women entrepreneurship must be molded properly with entrepreneurial traits and skills to meet the changes in trends, challenges of global markets and also be competent enough to sustain and strive for excellence in the entrepreneurial arena. We have to look at fostering a legion of women entrepreneurs, who can make significant qualitative changes in the economic landscapes of the countries”.

There is a great need to educate women entrepreneur for the nation’s development and overall growth of the economy. Presently not only are women generating employment for themselves in the organized and unorganized sector, they are also providing employment to others. Government should provide the essential planning for the development.

CONCLUSION:

The findings of the study reveal that Women entrepreneurs from different forms of business face different level of Socio - personal challenges. Though every form of business has its unique challenges. Proprietorship form of business is more complex as everything needs to be handled independently and without any support both in business and family front. Facing Socio - personal challenges is not easy as it is not only that practical implementations matter but, also have to strongly deal with emotions and sentiments of oneself and others. Based on structured personal interviews, it was observed that the non - inclusion of women entrepreneurs are more in Partnership and company form of business due to low confidence level on their stress handling ability, financial capability, practicality and their commitment for continuity in business in adverse situations. The following recommendations may help women entrepreneurs to face Socio - personal challenge to some extent.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

As per the study, women are more into the Proprietorship form of business. But, it can be better for women entrepreneurs initially, to enter into Partnership and then slowly move to a Proprietorship form of business as it helps in managing the responsibilities by dividing the time and gives a confidence for support and risk. To manage domestic issues one has to be strong and convincing enough by showing the positive side and the various benefits they would achieve once successful in monetary terms and how it would contribute to their standard of living, one has to clearly set priorities of their life and divide the time accordingly to overcome challenges hassle free, developing the qualities of perseverance, hard work and determination, one has to be very soft and polite to be successful, continuous motivation by the inner self, working with passion and utilizing talent. A woman should be considered a main target group for developmental activities. Free & better education facilities should be provided by Govt. of India. Training and counseling should take place on a larger scale of existing women entrepreneurs to remove psychological barriers like lack of self-confidence and fear of failure.

REFERENCES:

- Anil Boz Semerci, Thierry Volery, (2018). Entrepreneurs as parents: the antecedents and consequence of parenting stress, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 24 Issue: 1, pp.41-58, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-04-2017-0136>.
- Anna Nikina, Lois M. Shelton, Séverine LeLoarne, (2015). An examination of how husbands, as key stakeholders, impact the success of women entrepreneurs, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 22 Issue: 1, pp.38-62, <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-01-2012-0002>.
- Anshuja Tiwari (2007). Entrepreneurship Development in India. Okpachu AS, Women in Small and Medium Scale Agricultural Enterprises and Poverty Reduction in Yobe State: A Logistic Regression Approach, Volume 15 Issue 5 - May 2018 DOI: 10.19080/ARTOAJ.2018.15.555968.
- Arpita Kumari Mishra (2015). Problems of Women Entrepreneurs in Pondicherry, *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, Vol 3, No 7.
- Beggs, J., Doolittle, D., & Garsombke, D. (1994). Entrepreneurship Interface: Linkages to Race, Sex, and Class. *Race, Sex & Class*, 1(2), 35-51. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41680220>.
- Bipin Kumar (2009). *Women Empowerment: Challenges and Strategies*.
- Donald L. Sexton, Nancy B. Bowman-Upton (1991). *Entrepreneurship : creativity and growth*.
- Dr. Poonam Jain, Meenakshi Sharma (2013). Women Entrepreneurship Education Need for Today, *Kain et.al, Apeejay - Journal of Management Sciences And Technology* 1 (1), Oct – 2013.
- Lois M. Shelton (April 2006). Female Entrepreneurs, Work–Family Conflict, and Venture Performance: New Insights into the Work–Family Interface, *Journal of Small Business Management (JSBM)*, Volume 44, Issue 2, Pages 285-297.
- Ghosh, Piyali & Cheruvalath, Reena (2007). Indian female entrepreneurs as catalysts for economic growth and development. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 139-148.
- Goel, M.M. (2002). *Excellence Model for Management of Small Scale Industry in India*, published in Udyog Yug, Vol. 24, No 6.
- Halkias, Daphne, Nwajiuba, Chinedum, Harkiolakis, Nicholas, & Caracatsanis, Sylva M. (2011). Challenges facing women entrepreneurs in Nigeria. *Management Research Review*, 34(2), 221–235.
- HongBo Li, Lan Ding, (2015). Analysis of Gender Differences for Women Entrepreneurs by SWOT Model, *International Journal of Innovation Science*, Vol. 7 Issue: 3, pp.211-214, <https://doi.org/10.1260/1757-2223.7.3.211>.

- Ignatius Ekanem, (2015). Entrepreneurial learning: gender differences, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 21 Issue: 4, pp.557-577, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBr-08-2014-0146>.
- Jit & Bharti, (June, 2016). Women Entrepreneurs of India: Issues and Challenges, *Apeejay-Journal of Management Sciences and Technology*, 3 (3), ISSN -2347-5005.
- Kuratko, D. & Welsch, H.P. (1994). *Entrepreneurial strategy, text and cases*. Fort Worth: Dryden Press.
- Maria Bogren, Yvonne von Friedrichs, Oystein Rennemo, Oystein Widding, (2013). Networking women entrepreneurs: fruitful for business growth?, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 5 Issue: 1, pp.60-77, <https://doi.org/10.1108/17566261311305210>.
- Monika Sharma, Vandana Chaudhary, Rajni Bala and Ranchan Chauhan, (2013). Rural Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries: Challenges, Problems and Performance Appraisal, *Global Journal of Management and Business Studies*, Volume 3, Issue 9, ISSN: 2248-9878.
- Mungai, E.N. (2012). Gender, Culture and Entrepreneurship in Kenya, *International Business Research*, Vol. 5, No. 51, pp. 175-183.
- Pauric Mc Gowana, Caroline Lewis Redekera, Sarah Y. Cooperb Kate Greenana, in Female entrepreneurship and the management of business and domestic roles: Motivations, expectations and realities in *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* Vol. 24, Nos. 1–2, January 2012, 53–72.
- Peggy Ntseane. Being a Female Entrepreneur in Botswana: Cultures, Values, Strategies for Success. *Gender and Development*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2004, pp. 37–43. JSTOR, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/4030612.
- Prema Basargekar, (2007). Women Entrepreneurs: Challenges Faced, *The ICAI Journal of Entrepreneurship Development*, Vol. IV, No. 4.
- Stephanie Chasserio, Philippe Pailot, Corinne Poroli, (2014). When entrepreneurial identity meets multiple social identities: Interplays and identity work of women entrepreneurs, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 20 Issue: 2, pp.128-154, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBr-11-2011-0157>.
- Sweta Saurabh, (2012). Issues and challenges faced by women entrepreneurs and their training needs, *International Journal of in Multidisciplinary and Academic Research (SSIJMAR)*, Vol. 1, No. 2, July-August (ISSN 2278 – 5973).
- Tanvi Kothari, (2017). Women entrepreneurs’ path to building venture success: lessons from India, *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, Vol. 6 Issue: 2, pp.118-141, <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-03-2016-0021>.
- Udyog Yug. Gunjan Sharma & Kushagra Kulshreshtha, Challenges and opportunities of entrepreneurs in emerging economies, *International Journal of Public Administration and Management Research (IJPAMR)*, Vol. 2, No 3, August, 2014.
- Vijay Kumbhar, (May 2013). Some Critical Issues of Women Entrepreneurship in Rural India, *European Academic Research*, VOL. I, Issue 2, ISSN 2286-4822.
- Walker, Elizabeth, Wang, Calvin, & Redmond, Janice. (2008). Women and work–life balance: Is a home-based business ownership the solution? *Equal Opportunities International*, 27(3), 258–275.
- Welter, F. (2004). The environment for female entrepreneurship in Germany. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 11(2): 212-221.

APPENDIX:

One – way Manova:

Table 1

Between-Subjects Factors			
		Value Label	N
Form of business	1.00	Proprietorship	65
	2.00	Company	59
	3.00	Cooperative	15
	4.00	Association of persons	13
	5.00	Hindu undivided family	26
	6.00	Partnership	22

Table 2

Multivariate Tests ^a									
Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power ^d
Intercept	Pillai's Trace	.905	99.649 ^b	17.000	178.000	.000	.905	1694.031	1.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.095	99.649 ^b	17.000	178.000	.000	.905	1694.031	1.000
	Hotelling's Trace	9.517	99.649 ^b	17.000	178.000	.000	.905	1694.031	1.000
	Roy's Largest Root	9.517	99.649 ^b	17.000	178.000	.000	.905	1694.031	1.000
q7	Pillai's Trace	.890	2.318	85.000	910.000	.000	.178	197.031	1.000
	Wilks' Lambda	.368	2.341	85.000	864.902	.000	.181	191.684	1.000
	Hotelling's Trace	1.135	2.355	85.000	882.000	.000	.185	200.193	1.000
	Roy's Largest Root	.434	4.649 ^c	17.000	182.000	.000	.303	79.034	1.000
a. Design: Intercept + q7									
b. Exact statistic									
c. The statistic is an upper bound on F that yields a lower bound on the significance level.									
d. Computed using alpha = .05									

Table 3

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects									
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent Parameter	Observed Power ^r	
Corrected Model	2.	28.474 ^a	5	5.695	5.151	.000	.117	25.755	.985
	3.	7.769 ^b	5	1.554	1.986	.082	.049	9.930	.659
	4.	10.493 ^c	5	2.099	2.123	.064	.052	10.617	.694
	5.	21.897 ^d	5	4.379	4.281	.001	.099	21.405	.960
	6.	15.789 ^e	5	3.158	3.533	.004	.083	17.665	.913
	7.	23.241 ^f	5	4.648	4.616	.001	.106	23.080	.972
	8.	14.568 ^g	5	2.914	2.047	.074	.050	10.233	.675
	9.	19.626 ^h	5	3.925	3.873	.002	.091	19.367	.939
	10.	14.186 ⁱ	5	2.837	2.686	.023	.065	13.429	.808
	11.	14.425 ^j	5	2.885	2.503	.032	.061	12.517	.775
	12.	7.186 ^k	5	1.437	1.562	.173	.039	7.810	.539
	13.	13.687 ^l	5	2.737	2.059	.072	.050	10.295	.678
	14.	38.937 ^m	5	7.787	6.027	.000	.134	30.135	.995
	15.	18.334 ⁿ	5	3.667	2.489	.033	.060	12.444	.772
	16.	16.243 ^o	5	3.249	2.467	.034	.060	12.333	.768
	17.	9.558 ^p	5	1.912	1.800	.115	.044	9.002	.609
	18.	9.022 ^q	5	1.804	1.649	.149	.041	8.243	.565
	Intercept	2.	610.910	1	610.910	552.573	.000	.740	552.573
3.		678.423	1	678.423	867.103	.000	.817	867.103	1.000
4.		749.896	1	749.896	758.787	.000	.796	758.787	1.000
5.		681.731	1	681.731	666.417	.000	.775	666.417	1.000
6.		620.524	1	620.524	694.221	.000	.782	694.221	1.000
7.		579.964	1	579.964	575.944	.000	.748	575.944	1.000
8.		808.454	1	808.454	567.876	.000	.745	567.876	1.000
9.	849.431	1	849.431	838.223	.000	.812	838.223	1.000	

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects									
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent Parameter	Observed Power ^f	
	10.	652.452	1	652.452	617.641	.000	.761	617.641	1.000
	11.	616.190	1	616.190	534.680	.000	.734	534.680	1.000
	12.	832.140	1	832.140	904.427	.000	.823	904.427	1.000
	13.	874.830	1	874.830	658.052	.000	.772	658.052	1.000
	14.	948.144	1	948.144	733.827	.000	.791	733.827	1.000
	15.	1044.214	1	.000000	708.757	.000	.785	708.757	1.000
	16.	818.541	1	818.541	621.486	.000	.762	621.486	1.000
	17.	690.728	1	690.728	650.502	.000	.770	650.502	1.000
	18.	658.231	1	658.231	601.398	.000	.756	601.398	1.000
q7	2.	28.474	5	5.695	5.151	.000	.117	25.755	.985
	3.	7.769	5	1.554	1.986	.082	.049	9.930	.659
	4.	10.493	5	2.099	2.123	.064	.052	10.617	.694
	5.	21.897	5	4.379	4.281	.001	.099	21.405	.960
	6.	15.789	5	3.158	3.533	.004	.083	17.665	.913
	7.	23.241	5	4.648	4.616	.001	.106	23.080	.972
	8.	14.568	5	2.914	2.047	.074	.050	10.233	.675
	9.	19.626	5	3.925	3.873	.002	.091	19.367	.939
	10.	14.186	5	2.837	2.686	.023	.065	13.429	.808
	11.	14.425	5	2.885	2.503	.032	.061	12.517	.775
	12.	7.186	5	1.437	1.562	.173	.039	7.810	.539
	13.	13.687	5	2.737	2.059	.072	.050	10.295	.678
	14.	38.937	5	7.787	6.027	.000	.134	30.135	.995
	15.	18.334	5	3.667	2.489	.033	.060	12.444	.772
	16.	16.243	5	3.249	2.467	.034	.060	12.333	.768
	17.	9.558	5	1.912	1.800	.115	.044	9.002	.609
	18.	9.022	5	1.804	1.649	.149	.041	8.243	.565
	Error	2.	214.481	194	1.106				
3.		151.786	194	.782					
4.		191.727	194	.988					
5.		198.458	194	1.023					
6.		173.406	194	.894					
7.		195.354	194	1.007					
8.		276.187	194	1.424					
9.		196.594	194	1.013					
10.		204.934	194	1.056					
11.		223.575	194	1.152					
12.		178.494	194	.920					
13.		257.908	194	1.329					
14.		250.658	194	1.292					
15.		285.821	194	1.473					
16.		255.512	194	1.317					
17.		205.997	194	1.062					
18.		212.333	194	1.095					
Total		2.	1055.000	200					
	3.	1097.000	200						
	4.	1288.000	200						

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects									
Source		Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared	Noncent Parameter	Observed Power ^r
	5.	1115.000	200						
	6.	1067.000	200						
	7.	1055.000	200						
	8.	1335.000	200						
	9.	1302.000	200						
	10.	1118.000	200						
	11.	1120.000	200						
	12.	1396.000	200						
	13.	1477.000	200						
	14.	1753.000	200						
	15.	1889.000	200						
	16.	1487.000	200						
	17.	1153.000	200						
	18.	1133.000	200						
Corrected Total	2.	242.955	199						
	3.	159.555	199						
	4.	202.220	199						
	5.	220.355	199						
	6.	189.195	199						
	7.	218.595	199						
	8.	290.755	199						
	9.	216.220	199						
	10.	219.120	199						
	11.	238.000	199						
	12.	185.680	199						
	13.	271.595	199						
	14.	289.595	199						
	15.	304.155	199						
16.	271.755	199							
17.	215.555	199							
18.	221.355	199							
a. R Squared = .117 (Adjusted R Squared = .094)									
b. R Squared = .049 (Adjusted R Squared = .024)									
a. R Squared = .117 (Adjusted R Squared = .094), b. R Squared = .049 (Adjusted R Squared = .024), c. R Squared = .052 (Adjusted R Squared = .027),									
d. R Squared = .099 (Adjusted R Squared = .076), e. R Squared = .083 (Adjusted R Squared = .060), f. R Squared = .106 (Adjusted R Squared = .083),									
g. R Squared = .050 (Adjusted R Squared = .026), h. R Squared = .091 (Adjusted R Squared = .067), i. R Squared = .065 (Adjusted R Squared = .041)									
j. R Squared = .061 (Adjusted R Squared = .036), k. R Squared = .039 (Adjusted R Squared = .014), l. R Squared = .050 (Adjusted R Squared = .026)									
m. R Squared = .134 (Adjusted R Squared = .112), n. R Squared = .060 (Adjusted R Squared = .036), o. R Squared = .060 (Adjusted R Squared = .036)									
p. R Squared = .044 (Adjusted R Squared = .020), q. R Squared = .041 (Adjusted R Squared = .016), r. Computed using alpha = .05									

Factor Analysis:

Table 4

CORRELATION MATRIX																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1	1.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2
2	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
3	0.2	0.5	1.0	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.5
4	0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
5	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.4	1.0	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.5
6	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.5	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4
7	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4
8	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4
9	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.3
10	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5
11	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.5	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3
12	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.2
13	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.2
14	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.3	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.2
15	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.6	0.3	0.2
16	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.0	0.4	0.3
17	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.5
18	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.5	1.0

Table 5

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.890
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	1655.407
	Df	153
	Sig.	.000

Table 6: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Comp onent	Total Variance Explained					
	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	7.015	38.971	38.971	7.015	38.971	38.971
2	2.023	11.237	50.208	2.023	11.237	50.208
3	1.195	6.641	56.849	1.195	6.641	56.849
4	.957	5.317	62.166			
5	.920	5.110	67.276			
6	.790	4.389	71.665			
7	.727	4.041	75.706			
8	.629	3.493	79.198			
9	.566	3.146	82.344			
10	.522	2.897	85.242			
11	.471	2.614	87.856			
12	.432	2.401	90.257			
13	.375	2.083	92.340			
14	.346	1.920	94.261			
15	.305	1.696	95.957			
16	.257	1.430	97.387			
17	.253	1.406	98.792			
18	.217	1.208	100.000			

Table 7

Component Matrix ^a			
	Component		
	1	2	3
Form of business			
Low education level - leading to low confidence, achievement, advancement & motivation	.593		-.483
Handling conflicts	.731		
Lack of social acceptability & religious riots	.620		-.423
The perception that a woman cannot handle pressure	.746	-.413	
Having limited contacts outside prejudice and class bias leading to facing difficulty in accessing information	.661		
The negative approach of people & dealing with fear of failure	.690		
Dealing with male dominated society and Conservative mindset	.628		
Dealing with misbehavior, teasing & taunting	.670		
Difficulty in expansion due to dual responsibility	.704		
No compromise on family and work & meeting high expectations	.624		
Mislead appearance, not taken seriously	.601	.444	
Conservative mindset, dealing with disrespect & distrust shown by others	.538		.448
Single parent difficult journey	.513	.674	
Non acceptability in society of successful single parent	.607	.615	
Mental torture, emotional blackmailing of family members	.631	.406	
Insecurity of competitors	.646		
Continuous innovation, training and learning are needed, & training becomes difficult	.622		

Table 8

1. Form of business				
Valid	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Proprietorship	65	32.5	32.5	32.5
Company	59	29.5	29.5	62.0
Cooperative	15	7.5	7.5	69.5
Association of persons	13	6.5	6.5	76.0
Hindu undivided family	26	13.0	13.0	89.0
Partnership	22	11.0	11.0	100.0
Total	200	100.0	100.0	

Interpretation: 32.5% of women entrepreneurs are in the Proprietorship form of business. Whereas, 11.0% are Partnership, 13% is Hindu undivided family, 6.5% is an Association of persons, and 13.0% is Cooperative & 29.5% is in Company form of business.

Table 9

