

THE SOCIO-CULTURAL FACTORS INFLUENCE ON WOMEN'S ABILITY TO BECOME SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS.

***Yousaf Khan**

National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Regional
Campus Peshawar Pak

Fakhr e Alam Afridi

National University of Modern Languages (NUML), Regional
Campus Peshawar Pak

Fazaila Shad

PhD Scholar, Islamia College University Peshawar

Saif Ur Rahman,

Superior University Lahore

*Email of the corresponding author: ykhan@numl.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Women entrepreneurship is viewed as important critical factor in women empowerment. Unfortunately, the importance of gender has been understudied in the field of social entrepreneurship. Therefore, the aim of this study is to find out what sociocultural elements influence women's abilities to become social entrepreneurs. We employ logistic regression models to evaluate our study assumptions using data for the period 2017-2021 from the World Value Survey. The finding shows women are more positively affected by altruism than men are. Male social entrepreneurial activity is aided by increased income levels and post-materialism, whereas female social entrepreneurial activity is unaffected. This study has both practical and theoretical contribution. First, in the advancement of studies on women's social entrepreneurial activity, particularly when employing the institutional approach, where gender characteristics might be highly important.

Keywords: Institutional economics, social entrepreneurship, women empowerment, socio-economic.

INTRODUCTION

Women entrepreneurship is viewed as important critical factor in women empowerment (Datta & Gailey, 2012; Kimbu & Ngoasong, 2016; Mathew, 2010; Parvin, Jinrong, & Rahman, 2012; Tambunan, 2009; Yousfani, Aslam, Mahar, & Kazi, 2019). Scholars in the domains of gender and entrepreneurship have claimed that, women are more qualified to use inclusive tactics and run social businesses (Loarne-Lemaire, Maalaoui, & Dana, 2017; Rosca, Agarwal, & Brem, 2020) because of their feminine skills of compassion in contrast to men, (Datta & Gailey, 2012), empathic (Huysentruyt, 2014), and emotionality (Urbano, Jiménez, & i Noguera, 2014). Research shows women who start businesses play an important role in socioeconomic growth and poverty reduction (Corner & Ho, 2010; Datta & Gailey, 2012; Hechavarría et al., 2017). However, these statements must be

verified from the perspective of emerging economies (Yousfani et al., 2019). Furthermore, the unstable and uncertain environment of emerging economies poses a wide range of problems for female entrepreneurs (Yousfani et al., 2019), including filling institutional holes (Hechavarría et al., 2017), acute poverty (Warnecke, 2018), and entrepreneurial education (Zeb, 2018), and women's low sociocultural standing (Loarne-Lemaire et al., 2017; Warnecke, 2018; Yunis, Hashim, & Anderson, 2018).

In the literature, social entrepreneurship has been identified as a critical component of societal social, environmental, and economic development (Abu-Saifan, 2012; Dacin, Dacin, & Tracey, 2011). However, this study took a comprehensive approach since prior research defined it as innovative opportunities that meet social needs to accelerate social change (Nicholls, 2008). Furthermore, studies suggest that social entrepreneurial activities result in improving large-scale economic development benefit both social and economic development by reducing poverty (Abu-Saifan, 2012; Santos, 2012; Warnecke, 2018). However, women's participation in social entrepreneurship and firm formation has expanded in recent decades (Loarne-Lemaire et al., 2017). As a result, several levels of government, both regional and municipal, have developed and implemented a variety of instruments to encourage female entrepreneurship (Noruzi, Westover, & Rahimi, 2010). Micro-credits for women entrepreneurs were made available in Pakistan (Yunis et al., 2018).

A vast number of researches in the extant literature on female entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship focus on industrialized economies in this regard. (Abu-Saifan, 2012). Previous research is demonstrating social entrepreneurial processes is greatly impacted by socio-cultural (Nicolás, Rubio, & Fernández-Laviada, 2018; Warnecke, 2018). Underline in entrepreneurial activity determining gender patterns is the importance of socio-cultural aspects (Loarne-Lemaire et al., 2017). These writers assert that cultural values may have an impact on the types of employment and career prospects that women are willing to pursue (Datta & Gailey, 2012; Orr, Kickul, Gundry, & Griffiths, 2018; Urbano et al., 2014). Furthermore, while the percentage of female entrepreneurship continues to rise (Chipeta, Kruse, & Surujlal, 2020), gender concerns and cultural stereotypes persist in some locations, posing a barrier to business expansion (Dacin et al., 2011).

So far, in available literature the majority of the studies on social entrepreneurship has focused on human qualities, experiences, and success determinants (Dwivedi & Weerawardena, 2018). Several theoretical approaches to studying the processes of women's business development and social entrepreneurship have been offered (Urbano et al., 2014). Among them, a growing body of research implies that institutional economics which served as the theoretical foundation for this study, is appropriate for analyzing environmental issues (Abu-Saifan, 2012; Dwivedi & Weerawardena, 2018). Further, relationships in the workplace have received little attention so far (Rawhouser, Cummings, & Newbert, 2019).

Following this brief introduction, in the next section the conceptual framework is defined; then the research methodology is presented; then the main findings are discussed; and finally, the conclusions and consequences of the study are included.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Social entrepreneurs are referred to those entrepreneurs that build enterprises and organisations that are focused on social change are referred to as social entrepreneurs (Peredo & McLean, 2006). Social entrepreneurs' primary purpose is not to generate a profit, but to invest in, and create new solutions to effectively address social or environmental issues in a certain community (Gupta, Chauhan, Paul, & Jaiswal, 2020). Individuals with innovative solutions to society's (Méndez-Picazo, Galindo-Martín, & Castaño-Martínez, 2021) most pressing social, cultural, and environmental concerns (Dwivedi & Weerawardena, 2018).

The issues that female CEOs and founders of social companies encounter are quite similar to those that female entrepreneurs face in general (Urbano et al., 2014). Women's entrepreneurship is hampered by a lack of financial opportunities, and many female CEOs have stated that attracting investors can be difficult. Furthermore, rigorous norms and regulations might make it difficult to start and run social businesses. Supporting initiatives that allow female social entrepreneurs to learn from one another and improve their knowledge and skills in running their firms is also critical (Rosca et al., 2020). Female social entrepreneurs face a lack of visibility, thus it's critical to promote networking events and projects that showcase their contributions to communities around the world (Chipeta et al., 2020).

THEORETICAL SUPPORT AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Institutional theory was employed to build the research model in this study. This idea, which is based on resilient features of the social environment, is commonly employed in organizational research (Tina Dacin, Goodstein, & Richard Scott, 2002). The structure process includes rules, procedures, schemes, and norms that offer social conduct guidelines. According to (Santos, 2012) institutional theory is well-known for emphasizing legitimacy (Stacey & Rittberger, 2003). In other words, policymaking that focuses on the legal and formal features of government organisation is known as institutional theory. There are two types of institutional factors: formal and informal (Salimath & Cullen, 2010). In terms of sociocultural elements, the social environment plays a significant role in promoting entrepreneurial activity (Igwe & Icha-Ituma, 2020), primarily from two viewpoints.

According to research of (Audretsch & Keilbach, 2004), when starting and developing a business non-material social links are a significant resource for overcoming current challenges, as well as providing chances and resources for social endeavors (Anggadwita, Luturlean, Ramadani, & Ratten, 2017). However, numerous researchers focus on the family environment in their research studies. According to (Corner & Ho, 2010), women may be more affected by family or domestic situations than men (Loarne-Lemaire et al., 2017). Some studies suggests that more likely people manifesting itself in activities like social entrepreneurship in the high level of post-materialism (Peredo & McLean, 2006; Zahra, Rawhouser, Bhawe, Neubaum, & Hayton, 2008). While some studies suggest that post-materialism is necessary for commercial entrepreneurship (Abu-Saifan, 2012; Rawhouser et al., 2019). Post-materialism have a greater impact on social entrepreneurship activities as compared to typical entrepreneurship activities (Loarne-Lemaire et al., 2017).

In the context of the United States (Doherty, Thompson, & Spear, 2006), their findings show those women are more likely to become social entrepreneurs who live in big cities. These ladies are more likely to demonstrate sympathy with those who are less fortunate in society and to donate on a regular basis to charities.

Similarly, (Dzombak, Mouakkad, & Mehta, 2016) found in their study that women are more likely to involve in social entrepreneurship activities. However this is driven by their own desire to help others.

Women may find an entrepreneurial job appealing if they see management as a participative, communicative, and flexible activity that takes place in a collaborative environment where members work as a team (Chipeta et al., 2020). The study also demonstrates the value of prior experience and collaboration networks results in to receive more personal assistance rather than operational assistance. In a similar spirit, according to the mega study of (Hechavarría et al., 2017), 92 percent of female entrepreneurs support philanthropic organizations. Recent research shows the presence of successful role models can help to alleviate the uncertainty that comes with establishing a firm (Rosca et al., 2020; Yunis et al., 2018).

As a result of the above discussion, the following hypotheses are derived:

H1 (a): The probability of social entrepreneurship activities increases with post-materialism.

H1 (b): Post-materialism has more effect on the probability of female entrepreneurship activities than male.

H2 (a): Altruism increase the probability of becoming a social entrepreneur.

H2 (b): Altruism increase the probability of females to become a social entrepreneur than males.

H3 (a): Social organization membership increase to become a social entrepreneur probability.

H3 (b): Social organization membership increase the probability of females to become a social entrepreneur than male.

RESEARCH METHOD

There aren't many databases that track social entrepreneurship activities at the moment. Many researchers have raised concerns about the difficulty of performing quantitative investigations the need to develop new methods for creating global databases. Despite the fact that these drawbacks must be acknowledged, some foreign databases may be effective in overcoming this predicament. The WVS has been released in five waves (1981–1984; 1989–1993; 1994–1999; 1999–2004; 2005–2009; 2010–2014; 2017–2022) to investigate people's core values on a wide range of topics, including economics, family, and religion. Researchers have utilized this database to study, post-materialism, values and cultural change, among other topics (Loarne-Lemaire et al., 2017).

This study used wave 7 data from period 2017–2021, which included 80 countries people on five continents (Table 1). Given the binary character of the dependent variables, we used binary logistic regression models (Hosmer, Hosmer, Le Cessie, & Lemeshow, 1997), also known as probabilities models (Senaviratna & Cooray, 2019), to test the aforementioned hypotheses. We used binary logistic regression models due to the binary nature of this study variables (Lindell & Whitney, 2001).

TABLE 1: VARIABLES DEFINITION

	Var	Detail	Reference	
	Social entrepreneurship	1 = self-employed 0 = otherwise.	WVS	(2017-2021)
Dept variables	Male social entrepreneurship	1 = self-employed 0 = otherwise..	WVS	(2017-2021)
	Female social entrepreneurship	1 = self-employed 0 = otherwise.	WVS	(2017-2021)
Indep variables: Institutional factors	Post-materialism	Index from 0 to 5.	WVS	(2017-2021)
	Altruism	“How important it is in your life”.	WVS	(2017-2021)
	Member of a social organization	1 = voluntary organization 0 = otherwise.	WVS	(2017-2021)
Control variables	Age	Respondent’s age.	WVS	(2017-2021)
	Age-squared	Age * Age	WVS	(2017-2021)
	Income level	Classification of income level: 1) Low, 2) Medium and 3) High.	WVS	(2017-2021)
	GDP	GDP at purchasing power parity.	WVS	(2017-2021)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The average of social entrepreneurial activity across the countries is presented in Table 2. The male entrepreneurial activity is recorded to be 3%. Which is greater than women entrepreneurial activity which is recorded as 2% (see table 2).

TABLE 2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Var(s)	M	Std. Dev.	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
1. Social entrepreneur	.04	.00	1.00				
2. Female social entrepreneur	.02	.00	.55***	1.00			
3. Male social entrepreneur	.02	.00	.83***	-.01**	1.00		
4. Post-materialism	.02	.00	.01**	.01	0,01*	1,00	
5. Altruism	.75	.00	.02***	.02***	.01*	.02***	1.00
6. Social org. membership	.28	.00	.21***	.11***	.18***	.06***	.05***
7. Age	39.53	.10	.00	.00	0,00	-0,01***	.00
8. Age-squared	1.796, 20	8.95	-.01	.00	0,00	-0,01***	.00
9. Middle income	0.37	.00	-.02***	-.01*	-.01**	-.01**	-.01
10. Higher income	0.31	.00	.04***	.01**	0,04***	0,04**	0,00
11. Ln GDP	7.80	.01	-.07***	-.02***	-0,07***	0,10**	-.01*

Variables	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
6. Social org membership	1					
7. Age	-.03***	1				
8. Age-squared	-.02***	.98***	1			
9. Income (middle)	-.02***	-.04***	-.04***	1		
10. Income (higher)	.10***	-.04***	-.05***	-.48***	1	
11. Ln GDP	.02***	.16***	.13***	-.02***	.01***	1

Furthermore, the correlation analysis reveals a number of strong correlations that back with our claims. To rule out the possibility of multicollinearity the VIF value (Wong, 2013) were calculated and found that they were all low (less than 1.64) for all predictors variables. Robust standard errors were produced for each country to account for the possibility of autocorrelation and heteroscedasticity among observations from the same nation (White, 1980). Table 3 reported the logistic regression analysis results. All of the models have a great deal of significance (p 0.000).

In Model A (p 0.001), indicating that post-materialism increases one's chances to become social entrepreneur. This shows that hypothesis 1a was found to be positive and significant. Higher levels of post-materialism are linked to higher levels of social entrepreneurial engagement, according to research of (Urbano et al., 2014). Our findings, on the other hand, suggest that male social entrepreneurship benefits more post-materialism than female social entrepreneurship (Model C). However, the effect is not statistically significant (see Model B) as we expected and previous research suggests. Hypothesis 1b is directly contradicted by these findings. Models A and B have a statistically significant and consistent coefficient for this variable. Hypotheses 2a and 2b, on the other hand, are ruled out.

Our findings support Hypotheses 3a and 3b, which concern social organisation membership. All models show that they are significant and have the predicted sign at the 99 percent confidence level. Social entrepreneurs (Model A), female social entrepreneurs (Model B), and male social entrepreneurs (Model C) all have a significant impact on social entrepreneurship as a result of the findings (Model A).

(This is Model C). Our major findings (Model A). As previously stated (Dwivedi & Weerawardena, 2018), we discovered that post-materialism has a greater impact female social entrepreneurship, whereas the altruistic attitude had a greater impact on female social entrepreneurship. Belonging to a social organisation can also have an impact on social entrepreneurs both male and female.

TABLE 3. LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS RESULTS

	Model A.		Model B.		Model C.	
	Social entrepreneurship		Female Social Entrepreneurship		Male Social Entrepreneurship	
	dF/dx	Robust. Std. Err	dF/dx	Robust. Std. Err	dF/dx	Robust. Std. Err
Institutional Factors						
Altruism	.621***	-.231	.309	-.392	.761***	-.276
Post-materialism	.229*	-.122	.707***	-.264	.046	-.137
Member social organization	2.995***	-.119	2.736***	-.196	3.062***	-.149
Control Variables						
Age	.112***	-.018	.145***	-.03	.094***	-.021
Age ²	-.001***	.000	-.002***	.00	-.001***	.000
Income Level						
Middle income	-.121	-.108	-.335*	-.182	.005	-.132
Higher income	.201*	-.106	-.108	-.176	.349***	-.130
Ln (GDP)	-.252***	-.027	-.026	-.045	-.355***	-.033
Constant	-5.771***	-.455	-9.212***	-.756	-5.157***	-.556
Number of obs.	24.013		24.001		24.001	
Pseudo R-squared	.211		.145		.213	
Log pseudolikelihood	-2.457.12		-1.021,25		-1.838,91	
Percent correctly predicted	97.14%		99.13%		98.02%	
AIC	4940.24		2.068,49		3.703,82	
BIC	5.04536		2.173,61		3.808,94	

CONCLUSION

This study investigates the socio-cultural aspects that promote female entrepreneurship on a national scale. Using WVS data different countries we evaluated socio-cultural variables impact on male and female social entrepreneurship. The same determinants have an equivalent impact on both male and female social entrepreneurial activity rates, according to our findings. As a result, a country's conditions for female entrepreneurship are typically equivalent for social entrepreneurship. The impact of numerous factors on male and female social entrepreneurs, however, ranges dramatically. Participation in a social organisation and age are both beneficial in terms of broad elements that promote social entrepreneurship. When it comes to the impact on entrepreneurial activities, compassion has a considerable beneficial effect on women's chances of becoming social entrepreneurs. Male social entrepreneurial activity is aided by post-materialism, whereas female social entrepreneurial activity is unaffected.

This study has both practical and theoretical contribution. First, in the advancement of studies on women's social entrepreneurial activity, particularly when employing the institutional approach, where gender characteristics might be highly important. Second, this study adds to the theoretical literature on social entrepreneurship by providing information on gender based social entrepreneurship. Finally, the findings may help in making government level policy for female social entrepreneurship development.

We back up our findings with samples that allow us to extend the research period; we only used one wave (2017–2021) from the WVS 7 in our analysis. Furthermore, we believe that a study of the impact of socio-cultural components, not in isolation but as a whole, would be a worthwhile project. In the future, more nations should be included in the study, more explanatory factors should be studied, and other control variables should be addressed at the country level. To eliminate country disparities in these areas, institutional elements, both official and informal, should be adopted. Further, Future studies should consider the role of education and skill development in this context, as a higher educational level allows entrepreneurs to identify potential market opportunities.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Saifan, S. (2012). Social entrepreneurship: definition and boundaries. *Technology innovation management review*, 2(2).
- Anggadwita, G., Luturlean, B. S., Ramadani, V., & Ratten, V. (2017). Socio-cultural environments and emerging economy entrepreneurship: Women entrepreneurs in Indonesia. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*.
- Audretsch, D., & Keilbach, M. (2004). Entrepreneurship capital and economic performance. *Regional studies*, 38(8), 949-959.
- Chipeta, E. M., Kruse, P., & Surujlal, J. (2020). Effects of gender on antecedents to social entrepreneurship among university students in South Africa. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 12(1), 18-33.
- Corner, P. D., & Ho, M. (2010). How opportunities develop in social entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(4), 635-659.
- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization science*, 22(5), 1203-1213.

- Datta, P. B., & Gailey, R. (2012). Empowering women through social entrepreneurship: Case study of a women's cooperative in India. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 36(3), 569-587.
- Doherty, B., Thompson, J., & Spear, R. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: a different model? *International journal of social economics*.
- Dwivedi, A., & Weerawardena, J. (2018). Conceptualizing and operationalizing the social entrepreneurship construct. *Journal of business research*, 86, 32-40.
- Dzombak, R., Mouakkad, S., & Mehta, K. (2016). Motivations of Women Participating in a Technology-Based Social Entrepreneurship Program. *Advances in Engineering Education*, 5(1), n1.
- Gupta, P., Chauhan, S., Paul, J., & Jaiswal, M. P. (2020). Social entrepreneurship research: A review and future research agenda. *Journal of business research*, 113, 209-229.
- Hechavarría, D. M., Terjesen, S. A., Ingram, A. E., Renko, M., Justo, R., & Elam, A. (2017). Taking care of business: the impact of culture and gender on entrepreneurs' blended value creation goals. *Small Business Economics*, 48(1), 225-257.
- Hosmer, D. W., Hosmer, T., Le Cessie, S., & Lemeshow, S. (1997). A comparison of goodness-of-fit tests for the logistic regression model. *Statistics in medicine*, 16(9), 965-980.
- Huysentruyt, M. (2014). Women's social entrepreneurship and innovation.
- Igwe, P. A., & Icha-Ituma, A. (2020). A review of ten years of African entrepreneurship research. *Research handbook on entrepreneurship in emerging economies*.
- Kimbu, A. N., & Ngoasong, M. Z. (2016). Women as vectors of social entrepreneurship. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 60, 63-79.
- Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 114.
- Loarne-Lemaire, S. L., Maalaoui, A., & Dana, L.-P. (2017). Social entrepreneurship, age and gender: toward a model of social involvement in entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 31(3), 363-381.
- Mathew, V. (2010). Women entrepreneurship in Middle East: Understanding barriers and use of ICT for entrepreneurship development. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 6(2), 163-181.
- Méndez-Picazo, M.-T., Galindo-Martín, M.-A., & Castaño-Martínez, M.-S. (2021). Effects of sociocultural and economic factors on social entrepreneurship and sustainable development. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 6(2), 69-77.
- Nicholls, A. (2008). *Social entrepreneurship: New models of sustainable social change*: OUP Oxford.
- Nicolás, C., Rubio, A., & Fernández-Laviada, A. (2018). Cognitive determinants of social entrepreneurship: Variations according to the degree of economic development. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, 9(2), 154-168.
- Noruzi, M. R., Westover, J. H., & Rahimi, G. R. (2010). An exploration of social entrepreneurship in the entrepreneurship era. *Asian Social Science*, 6(6), 3.
- Orr, J., Kickul, J., Gundry, L., & Griffiths, M. (2018). The mediating role of female migration on social entrepreneurship activity. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 19(4), 273-281.

- Parvin, L., Jinrong, J., & Rahman, M. W. (2012). Women entrepreneurship development in Bangladesh: What are the challenges ahead? *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(11), 3862-3871.
- Peredo, A. M., & McLean, M. (2006). Social entrepreneurship: A critical review of the concept. *Journal of world business*, 41(1), 56-65.
- Rawhouser, H., Cummings, M., & Newbert, S. L. (2019). Social impact measurement: Current approaches and future directions for social entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 43(1), 82-115.
- Rosca, E., Agarwal, N., & Brem, A. (2020). Women entrepreneurs as agents of change: A comparative analysis of social entrepreneurship processes in emerging markets. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 157, 120067.
- Salimath, M. S., & Cullen, J. B. (2010). Formal and informal institutional effects on entrepreneurship: a synthesis of nation-level research. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*.
- Santos, F. M. (2012). A positive theory of social entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 335-351.
- Senaviratna, N., & Cooray, T. (2019). Diagnosing multicollinearity of logistic regression model. *Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, 5(2), 1-9.
- Stacey, J., & Rittberger, B. (2003). Dynamics of formal and informal institutional change in the EU. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(6), 858-883.
- Tambunan, T. (2009). Women entrepreneurship in Asian developing countries: Their development and main constraints. *Journal of development and Agricultural Economics*, 1(2), 027-040.
- Tina Dacin, M., Goodstein, J., & Richard Scott, W. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1), 45-56.
- Urbano, D., Jiménez, E. F., & i Noguera, M. N. (2014). Female social entrepreneurship and socio-cultural context: An international analysis. *Revista de Estudios Empresariales. Segunda época*(2), 26-40.
- Warnecke, T. (2018). Social entrepreneurship in China: Driving institutional change. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 52(2), 368-377.
- Wong, K. K.-K. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) techniques using SmartPLS. *Marketing Bulletin*, 24(1), 1-32.
- Yousfani, K., Aslam, Y., Mahar, Q., & Kazi, H. (2019). The impact of microfinance on growth of women entrepreneurship in Pakistan. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Business and Economics*, 7(1), 133-152.
- Yunis, M. S., Hashim, H., & Anderson, A. R. (2018). Enablers and constraints of female entrepreneurship in Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan: Institutional and feminist perspectives. *Sustainability*, 11(1), 27.
- Zahra, S. A., Rawhouser, H. N., Bhawe, N., Neubaum, D. O., & Hayton, J. C. (2008). Globalization of social entrepreneurship opportunities. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 2(2), 117-131.
- Zeb, A. (2018). Determinants of successful women entrepreneurship in Pakistan. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(1).

