



Perception of Gender and Barriers : Through Social Entrepreneurs

Dr. Bhavna

Assistant Professor, School of Finance &
Commerce, Galgotias University, UP-
203201

Abstract

There is a gender disparity in economic entrepreneurship that favors males, according to research. Since this gender difference is less pronounced in the social entrepreneurship sector, the data is a little hazy. By examining the degree to which female and male social entrepreneurs, this paper seeks to understand the gender differences in the creation of social entrepreneurial ventures. The key theoretical advancements are covered in a review of the research on gender differences in social entrepreneurship, which also develops the hypothesis. A questionnaire was emailed to social entrepreneurs in Delhi NCR working on the formation of social companies. In the social entrepreneurship literature, the gender of entrepreneurs are two significant themes that are linked in this essay. As a result, the research provides fresh empirical data to know the perception of social entrepreneurs

towards the various barriers faced by entrepreneurs.

Keywords: Gender, Delhi, Social, Entrepreneurship, Disparity

Introduction

A more contemporary idea that has gradually been used to address social challenges is social entrepreneurship. In general, we may state that social entrepreneurship's main objective is to provide significant and visible social benefit (Dees, 1998). The core of the entrepreneurial process is social entrepreneurship. They aim to simultaneously and mutually reinforce the creation of social and commercial value. Fostering organizational sustainability allows the social venture to continue carrying out its objective, which results in the production of social value. The literature currently in use has emphasized that social entrepreneurs are the result of their personal and external context, which incorporates a number of factors (such as skills, background/experience, discourse, demographics, and motives) that can affect their propensity to become social entrepreneurs (Obschonka et al., 2012). The



impact of these individual characteristics and environmental conditions on the emergence of entrepreneurial behavior has been examined by a number of studies (Harding and Cowling, 2006; Terjesen et al., 2012; Villeneuve-Smith and Chung, 2013).

Literature Review

Adhikary, Jyoti Regmi. (2016) the variation had been observed among the women employees holding the positions at different levels while more women employees were lying mostly in the lower-level positions. The proportion of the women employees had been found differently at different levels. The researcher also highlighted the facts stated by Tharenou (2000) identified that knowledge, skill, education, and work experience had been the strongest elements in advancing the women employees at top top-level managerial positions. The result of the study concluded that women working at managerial level positions perceived more individual-related barriers while women employees at the executive level position perceived more organization related barriers. Singh and Terjesen (2008) personal barrier prevail when women employees lack the skills and abilities to hold the administrative positions in the organization. Due to lack of self-belief and required level of determination female employees had

unallocated managerial positions. Lack of prominent leadership qualities leads to create the gap. Female employees had less sentiment in holding the managerial position. The organizational barrier exists when the organization lacks the adequate organizational facilities like absence of sufficient working hours, and difficulty in maintaining the balance between the organization and job. Different unfavorable situation exists which restrict the female employees from holding the managerial position in the organization. The insufficient managerial abilities often lead to the inequalities at the different managerial position. Different factors had been highlighted that negatively affect the promotion of women employees like to combine professional and family responsibilities, displacement of the women employees at different location and gender stereotyping which adversely affect the women employees. Inadequate corporate practices like lack of sufficient working practices in the form of flexible working timing, lack of family friendly policies affect the growth opportunities of female employees. Deficient managerial abilities and unequal advancement opportunities act as the major organizational barrier. Kiaye, Risper & Singh, Anesh (2013) females involved in a large number of family



responsibilities were less frequent to hold the managerial position at the top level. During the initial stage of the career, whatever position had been offered to them, they grow with the same position and if in the case they had sufficient abilities along with the promotional opportunities, they would move upward but after the certain level the level of the growth stock. The research had found that more than 50% of female employees fall within the same level of growth. Women employees with married marital status with more family responsibilities were less frequent to hold the position at the managerial level position. He explored the different barriers (organizational, societal and Personal barriers) faced by the women employees in the organization. Personal barriers incorporated the unwillingness along with the ability to hold the position and lack of the require skills to hold position. Organizational barriers include the organizational policy and culture. In addition to this employment practice, different management styles adopted by the different people and unfair promotion policy were reported as the organizational barrier which generates more complexities in the organization. The researcher had also prospected the viewpoint of the women employees, which consists of unfair

treatment, unfavorable working environment and twisted practices of the organization.

Prior research and hypotheses development

Leadbeater (1997) made the initial attempt to put out a complete description of the social entrepreneur. The phrase highlights innovation in the way welfare services are delivered, efficiency in the management of resources (people, facilities, equipment, etc.), and the goal (to address unmet social needs) (Schuyler, 1998; Drayton, 2002; Bornstein, 2007). Later, "a vision for social change", "financial resources", "skills", and "a powerful desire to social change" were added. Since then, both the subject's definitions (Thompson et al., 2000; Bornstein, 2007; Brouard and Larivet, 2010; Bikse et al., 2015; Grieco, 2015) and its popularity have increased. The majority of definitions emphasize the uniqueness of the social entrepreneur (Drayton, 2002; Grieco, 2015), who is referred to as a "person" (Thompson et al., 2000), an "individual" (Schuyler, 1998; Brouard and Larivet, 2010), or "someone" (Martin and Osberg, 2007). According to certain writers, an entrepreneur may alternatively be referred to as an "entity" (Tan et al., 2005), group, network, or collection of organizations



(Light, 2006), or even a "private organization" (Korosec and Berman, 2006). The variety of definitions that were discovered partially reflects the concept's hybrid nature and emphasizes the crucial role that social entrepreneurs play in the creation of social enterprises. When defining the notion of the social entrepreneur, many scholars emphasize the inherent qualities and personality features of the entrepreneurs, which emphasize their "talent," enthusiasm, pragmatism, innovation, or ethics (Drayton, 2002). A number of other authors have emphasized "ambition" (Leadbeater, 1997), "courage" (Martin and Osberg, 2007), as well as "vision, passion, determination, proactiveness, and resilience" (Roberts and Woods, 2005; Grieco, 2015). In addition, Bacq et al. (2011) noted that entrepreneurs typically exhibit a high level of confidence, particularly when assessing their own skills and abilities (i.e., their capacity to start a social project). Although they are focused on a strong dedication to building a social purpose and are motivated by social or not-for-profit aims, the characteristics and behaviors of social entrepreneurs are comparable to those of ordinary economic entrepreneurs (Austin et al., 2006). However, there should be some discussion around the attitudes and actions of social

entrepreneurs as an explanatory component in the accomplishment of social entrepreneurial activity (Light, 2006). Dees (1998), for instance, contends that a prosperous social entrepreneur will embrace the goal of generating and sustaining societal value rather than just private value; aggressively seek out new chances to achieve the goal; participate in a process of ongoing innovation, adaptation, and learning, act with vigor and without regard to the resources available at any given time, and show strong accountability to stakeholders regarding the activity's outcomes. This conversation has highlighted the need for organizations to embrace a purpose that includes the power to influence society and the development and maintenance of social value (rather than just private wealth) as well as ongoing innovation, adaptation, and learning. According to some authors, social entrepreneurs exhibit a sense of complacency towards social justice and share a strong belief in their ability to change society (Roberts and Woods, 2005), have a clear vision and networking experience, and still have a great capacity to inspire and motivate others to join the social project (Barendsen and Gardner, 2004). In addition, social entrepreneurs seem to be skilled strategists (Light, 2006), indicating a



high aptitude for analysis, planning, and investigation of chances to realize their social objectives (Dees, 1998; Tracey and Phillips, 2007). These business people seize, distribute, use, and exploit the limited resources at their disposal in order to maximize the social purpose they support (Leadbeater, 1997; Thompson et al., 2000). They continue to have a particular ability to recognize latent resources and have a great aptitude for transformative leadership and engagement with stakeholders and workers (Okpara and Halkias, 2011). According to other research, social entrepreneurs are able to effectively communicate with others and effectively represent the interests of employees and stakeholders in the social project. This trustworthiness and ability to do so are key factors in the social enterprise (Grayson et al., 2011). Additionally, learning and ongoing adaptation (Dees, 1998), a strong ability to forge alliances and networks (Roberts and Woods, 2005), the ability to concentrate on results and make timely corrections of poor decisions (Dees, 1998; Light, 2006), and the ability to focus on results are all additional competencies that could be added to the list of social entrepreneurs' skills. According to Brooks (2009), if a person lacks the necessary inherent skills to be a social entrepreneur,

such skills might be encouraged or developed through education.

Gender differences in entrepreneurship

Even in nations with the highest levels of gender equality, research on economic entrepreneurship often shows a gender disparity that is in favor of males (Bacq et al., 2011; Pines et al., 2012; GEM, 2016). Portugal is one of the almost all nations where this gender difference has been noted (GEM, 2016). For a mix of cultural, sociological, and economic factors, early-stage entrepreneurial activity is gender-sensitive, according to the GEM (2014, 2016) studies. Previous GEM research that demonstrated the predominance of males in early-stage entrepreneurial endeavors supports this claim. Researchers in the field of social entrepreneurship disagree on the impact of gender on entrepreneurial behavior. In a special report on social entrepreneurship, the GEM executive report (Terjesen et al. 2012) notes that while social companies are more frequently founded by men than by women, the gender disparity in entrepreneurial life cycle activities is not as significant as it is in early-stage ventures. According to a recent GEM (2015) research, 55% of social entrepreneurs worldwide identify as men. In contrast to the male



social entrepreneurship activity rate, which rises with economic growth, the female social entrepreneurship activity rate remains nearly constant across the three economic development phases (factor-driven, efficiency-driven, and innovation-driven economies). According to research conducted at the national level (Harding and Cowling, 2006; Levie and Hart, 2011; Bacq et al., 2011; Villeneuve-Smith and Chung, 2013), males outnumber women in social initiatives. However, this gender disparity is not as pronounced as it is in general economic entrepreneurship. The few outliers are located in the Caribbean, Latin America, and Southern and Eastern Asia (GEM, 2015). This evidence may have a connection to women's feeling of mission and service as well as social value orientation (Pines et al., 2012). In contrast, Van Ryzin et al. (2009) discovered that women are more likely than males to start a social business in the USA. According to research conducted at the national level (Harding and Cowling, 2006; Levie and Hart, 2011; Bacq et al., 2011; Villeneuve-Smith and Chung, 2013), males outnumber women in social initiatives. However, this gender disparity is not as pronounced as it is in general economic entrepreneurship. The few outliers are located in the Caribbean, Latin America, and Southern and Eastern Asia (GEM,

2015). This evidence may have a connection to women's feeling of mission and service as well as social value orientation (Estrin et al., 2011; Pines et al., 2012). In contrast, Van Ryzin et al. (2009) discovered that women are more likely than males to start a social business in the USA. Gender and the development of new social projects are not associated. When examining the impact of gender on different activity sectors, found that women are more concentrated in the arts and raising children than males are in sports. Additionally, the primary drivers for starting social initiatives are personal happiness for women and, in the case of males, the opportunity to run their own business and improve the social status of their family. The high variation in data between nations and the enduring gender gaps have been discovered by a GEM report study, therefore these empirical findings, which at first glance seem to contradict one another, are not entirely unexpected. Sometimes women are more active than males (Terjesen et al., 2012),

Methodology

The hypotheses formulated above will be examined by using empirical data to test gender differences in a social entrepreneurship context. Bearing this in



mind, an e-mail survey was conducted in India to collect data from social individuals. Social entrepreneurs engaged in the start-up process of a new venture were the unit of

was used to establish the one - dimensionality of the measurements. Also, the confirmatory factor analysis technique is used to establish the reliability and validity of the constructs. The partial least square (PLS) technique was used for confirmatory factor analysis. The PLS- based CFA technique that societal barrier was not relevant in entrepreneurship as all of the measurement items of societal barriers obtained very low factor loading with the construct of societal barrier to and significant level of cross -loading with other two constructs.

		Count	ColumnN%
Gender	Male	200	57.1%
	Female	150	42.9%
Age group	18-25years	156	44.6%
	26-35years	156	44.6%
	36-45years	26	7.4%
	46to60 years	12	3.4%
Marital Status	Married	157	44.9%
	Unmarried	193	55.1%
Educational Qualification	Technical certifications	105	30.0%
	Diploma	36	10.3%
	Graduate	89	25.4%
	Post-graduate	120	34.3%

Findings and Discussion

Table 1 illustrates the demographic characteristics of the respondents

analysis of the empirical investigation. A total 350 people filled out the questionnaire including 200 male and 150 female social entrepreneurs. Confirmatory factor analysis

The most popular measure of reliability of construct are Construct Reliability (also known as composite reliability CR) and Cronbach’s alpha. The desired level of Construct Reliability (CR) and Cronbach alpha is minimum of 0.7. As it can be seen from the table 5 that the composite reliability of both construct is above 0.7 supporting construct reliability (Hair, Jr, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010). Also, the cronbach’s alpha is above .70 suggesting acceptable level of internal



consistency(Meyers, Gamst,&Guarino, 2013).

The discriminant validity of the construct has been examined using Fornell Larker Criterion (Fornell& Larker, 1981). According to this criterion, the square root AVE of a construct should be higher than the bivariate correlation between the constructs

Table 3

Discriminant validity of constructs

	Entrepreneurship Barriers	Personalbarriers
Entrepreneurship Barriers	0.72	
Personalbarriers	0.342	0.804

Analysis of barriers with respect to demographic and socioeconomic profile of the respondents

The variables of demographic and socioeconomic profile are gender, marital

status, age, education. Other variables included in the study are relevant to their workplace like their work experience and

Barriers/constructs	AVE	CompositeReliability	CronbachsAlpha
Entrepreneurship Barriers	0.5181	0.7600	0.7286
Personalbarriers	0.6458	0.8447	0.7332

proportion of male and female entrepreneurs in their Entrepreneurship. T-test and one wayanova have been used to test the hypothesis. But before testing the hypothesis, the assumptions of t-test and anova were examined.

H0(a): gender did not affect the social entrepreneurs' perception towards Entrepreneurship and personal barriers.

H1(a): gender significantly affected the social entrepreneurs' perception towards Entrepreneurship and personal barriers.

Table 4

Differences in perception towards barriers with respect to gender



Gender	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	Sig.
Entrepreneurship Barrier	Male	200	2.95	.869	.0615	10.96	.000
	Female	150	2.03	.701	.0572	-18.51	.000
Personal Barrier	Male	200	2.05	.689	.0488	-	.000
	Female	150	3.69	.907	.07413	-	.000

Table 5

Differences in perception towards barriers with respect to marital status

As it can be seen male social entrepreneurs did not perceive the entrepreneurship barrier to be high or rather, they were neutral towards social entrepreneurship barriers (2.95, SD=.869) whereas the female social entrepreneurs perceived the Entrepreneurship barrier to be significantly low (2.03, SD=.701). The perception of males and females towards Entrepreneurship barriers was significantly different as $t = 10.96, p < .01$, was highly significant, suggesting that females social entrepreneur perceived Entrepreneurship barriers to be less important in withholding them from occupying managerial position. Women social entrepreneur considered personal barriers exist as they had been considered to lack leadership skills and lack of other skills similar results had been taken out from the previous research.

Barriers	Marital Status	N	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	t	Sig.
				Deviation	Mean		
Entrepreneurship Barrier	Married	157	2.48	0.87	0.07	-1.265	0.211
	Unmarried	193	2.61	0.96	0.07		
Personal Barrier	Married	157	2.74	1.09	0.09	-0.11	0.913
	Unmarried	193	2.76	1.17	0.08		

The perception of married and unmarried social entrepreneurs towards Entrepreneurship barriers was not significantly different as $t\text{-test} = (-) 1.265, p = .211$ was insignificant, suggesting that married and unmarried social entrepreneurs perceived Entrepreneurship barriers to be the same and not very prominent. Also, the perception of married and unmarried entrepreneurs towards personal barriers was 2.74 (SD = 1.09) and 2.76 (SD = 1.17) respectively. The perception of married and unmarried



entrepreneurs towards personal barriers was same as the t-test was highly insignificant ($t = - 0.11, p = .913$).

$H_{0(d)}$: the effect of entrepreneurs' age on the perception of social entrepreneurs towards Entrepreneurship and personal barriers was not significant.

$H_{1(d)}$: the effect of entrepreneurs' age on the perception of social entrepreneurs towards Entrepreneurship and personal barriers was significant

Table 6
Differences in perception towards barriers with respect to age group

Barriers	Age	N	Mean	Std.	F	Sig.
				Deviation		
Entrepreneurship Barriers	18-25 years	156	2.52	0.7	2.888	0.036
	26 - 35	156	2.63	0.66		
	36 - 45	26	2.51	0.75		
	46 to 60	12	2.06	0.62		
Personal Barriers	18-25 years	156	2.87	0.73	3.78	0.011
	26 - 35	156	2.64	0.79		
	36 - 45	26	2.91	0.74		
	46 to 60	12	2.36	0.66		

$H_{0(e)}$: the effect of education on the perception of social entrepreneurs towards Entrepreneurship and personal barriers was not significant

$H_{1(e)}$: the effect of entrepreneurs' education on the perception of social entrepreneurs towards Entrepreneurship and personal barriers was significant.

Differences in perception towards barriers with respect to educational qualification

The average perception of social entrepreneurs towards

Entrepreneurship barriers was not same as F test was found to be significant ($F = 2.897, p = 0.035$). It may thus be interpreted that as the education level of social entrepreneurs changed their perception towards Entrepreneurship barriers also changed. Regarding the personal barriers, the lowest level of personal barriers was perceived by the entrepreneurs with diploma(2.27,SD=0.94) followed by postgraduates (2.85, SD = 0.1.12). The average perception of social entrepreneurs with different education levels was not same as test was significant($F=3.346,p=.019$)s suggesting that as the education level changed, the employee's perception towards personal barriers also changed.

Conclusion: This research aims to expand understanding related to the barriers faced by social



entrepreneur employees. Past research has stated the the percentage of women in social entrepreneurs is fewer. This research explores the forms of barriers behind this inequity by adding more empirical evidence. Perceptions of both genders are significantly different, male social entrepreneurs considered organizational barriers as less significant. Personal barriers in the form of deficient decision skills and less leadership skills were considered more prominent for women employees. More research should investigate strategies women can use to overcome these barriers.

Limitations and directions for future research In this study, the data collected provided rich examples of experiences about the hindrances that women continue to face as social entrepreneurs. As a result of this, the author believes this topic could be investigated in

limited number of social entrepreneurs furthermore, greater depth. The study can be expanded in other sectors and advocate the procedures and policies in this sector. The findings of the study cannot be generalized because women are specifically selected from entrepreneurship. We propose that future research quantify the results of the current study by using a larger scale sample. Future research is also necessary to examine the other aspects of entrepreneurship.

&Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312>.

GEM (2014), “Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2014 Global Report”, available at: www.gemconsortium.org/report (accessed 25 November, 2017).

GEM (2015), “Report on social entrepreneurship”, available at:



- www.gemconsortium.org/report (accessed 25 November, 2017).
- GEM (2016), 2015/2016 “Global Report”, available at: www.gemconsortium.org/report (accessed 25 November 2017).
- Grayson, D., McLaren, M. and Spitzbeck, H. (2011), “Social intrapreneurs - an extra force for sustainability”, Working paper Cranfield University School of Management, available at: www.som.cranfield.ac.uk/som/dinamiccontent/media/social%20intrapreneurs%20occasional%20paper.pdf (accessed 3 November 2016).
- Hair, J., Anderson, R., Tatham, R. and Black, W. (1998), *Multivariate Data Analysis*, 5th edition, Prentice-Hall International, New Jersey.
- Harding, R. and Cowling, M. (2006), *Social Entrepreneurship Monitor*, London Business School, London.
- Kiaye, R.E. and Singh, A.M. (2013) ‘The glass ceiling: a perspective of women working in Durban’, *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp.28–42. DOI:28.10.1108/17542411311301556.
- Korosec, R. and Berman, E. (2006), “Municipal support for social entrepreneurship”, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 66 No. 3, pp. 448-462.
- Leadbeater, C. (1997), *The Rise of the Social Entrepreneur*, Demos, London.
- Levie, J. and Hart, M. (2011), “Business and social entrepreneurs in the UK: gender, context and commitment”, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 200-217.
- Light, P. (2006), “Searching for social entrepreneurs: Who they might be, where they might be found, what they do”, in Mosher-Williams, R. (Ed.), *Research on Social Entrepreneurship: understanding and Contributing to an Emerging Field: Arnova’s Occasional Paper Series*, Association for Research on Nonprofit and Voluntary Organizations, Washington, DC, pp. 13-37.
- Martin, R. and Osberg, S. (2007), “Social entrepreneurship: the case for definition”, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Vol. 5 No. 2, pp. 28-39.
- Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J. (2013). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Obschonka, M., Silbereisen, R. and Schmitt-Rodermund, E. (2012), “Explaining entrepreneurial behavior: Dispositional



personality traits, growth of personal entrepreneurial resources, and business idea generation”, *The Career Development Quarterly*, Vol. 60 No. 2, pp. 178-190.

Okpara, J. and Halkias, D. (2011), “Social entrepreneurship: an overview of its theoretical evolution and proposed research model”, *International Journal of Social Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol. 1 No. 1, pp. 4-20.

Pines, A., Lerner, M. and Schwartz, D. (2012), “Gender differences among social vs. business entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurship”, in Burger-Helmchen, T. (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship - Gender, Geographies and Social Context*, InTech, Rijeka, pp. 171-190

Roberts, D. and Woods, C. (2005), “Changing the world on a shoestring: the concept of social entrepreneurship”, *University of Auckland Business Review*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 45-51.

Singh, V. and Terjesen, S. (2008) ‘Female presence on corporate boards: a multi-country study of environment context’, *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 83, No. 1, pp.55–63. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9656-1>

Tan, W., Williams, J. and Tan, T. (2005), “Defining the ‘social’ in ‘social entrepreneurship’: Altruism and entrepreneurship”, *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 353-365.

Terjesen, S., Lepoutre, J., Justo, R., and Bosma, N. (2012), “2009 Report on social entrepreneurship”, *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor*, available at: www.gemconsortium.org/docs/2519/ (accessed 27 November 2016).

Tharenou, P. (2000) *Gender differences in explanations for relocating or changing organizations for advancement* Management

Paper Series #97, Faculty of Business and Economics. Melbourne: Monash University

Thompson, J., Alvy, G. and Lees, A. (2000), “Social entrepreneurship - a new look at the people and the potential”, *Management Decision*, Vol. 38 No. 5, pp. 328-338.

Van Ryzin, G., Grossman, S., DiPadova-Stocks, L. and Bergrud, E. (2009), “Portrait of the social entrepreneur: Statistical evidence from a US panel”, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 20 No. 2, pp. 129-140.

Villeneuve-Smith, F. and Chung, C. (2013), *State of Social Enterprise Survey*, Social Enterprise Coalition, London

