

Multicultural Education

Research Article

Homepage: www.MC-caddogap.com

Women's Entrepreneurship in the Global South: Empowering and Emancipating?

Funmi (Olufunmilola) Ojdiran and Alistair Anderson

Lancaster University Management School, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YX, UK;

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the following questions: Are women entrepreneurs empowered by entrepreneurship, and critically, does entrepreneurship offer emancipation? Our theoretical position is that entrepreneurship is socially embedded and must be recognized as a social process with economic outcomes. Accordingly, questions of empowerment must take full account of the context in which entrepreneurship takes place. We argue that institutions—formal and informal, cultural, social, and political—create gendered contexts in the Global South, where women's entrepreneurship is subjugated and treated as inferior and second class. Our thematic review of a broad scope of the literature demonstrates that in different regions of the Global South, women entrepreneurs confront many impediments and that this shapes their practices. We show how the interplay of tradition, culture, and patriarchy seem to conspire to subordinate their efforts. Yet, we also recognize how entrepreneurial agency chips away and is beginning to erode these bastions, in particular, how role models establish examples that undermine patriarchy. We conclude that entrepreneurship can empower but modestly and slowly. Some independence is achieved, but emancipation is a long, slow game.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

women's entrepreneurship;
institutions; freedom;
independence; power

Article History:

Received: 25 August 2020;
Accepted: 29 October 2020;

© 2020 The authors. Published by CADDO GAP Press USA. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons AttributionNonCommercial 4.0

1. INTRODUCTION

There is an increased awareness that entrepreneurship is a socialized economic phenomenon that occurs differently within diverse contexts (Jack and Anderson2002; Steyaert and Katz2004 ; Zahra et al.2014 ;Welter et al.2019). These diverse contexts—social, cultural, and economic—strongly influence how entrepreneurship is perceived (Dodd et al.2013), how it is practiced (McKeever et al.2014) , and the consequences and outcomes of entrepreneurship. Contextualizing entrepreneurship draws attention to different normative perceptions of who should be an entrepreneur and how they should “do” or enact entrepreneurship in different regions and different places (Anderson and Gaddefors2017) —the social embeddedness of women's entrepreneurship (Bastian et al.2018). This highlights gendered perspective of entrepreneurship (Ahl and Marlow2012) , especially in the Global South (Ramirez-Pasillas et al.2017;Welter et al.2019), where women may have different entrepreneurial experiences (Akobo2018).

Nonetheless, entrepreneurship is held up almost as a universal “solution” for numerous problems in the Global South—the World Bank term that includes poor regions outside of Europe and North America, mostly low income, and with less developed economies (Adamson and Tsourapas2020) . Economically, entrepreneurship creates wealth and jobs (Wennekers and Thurik1999 ; Carree and Thurik2010) ; socially, it offers welfare (Anderson and Ronteau2017) and can build confidence (Mordi et al.2010) and status (Kalden et al.2017) . Indeed, governments of emerging economies, policymakers, and international donor organizations have embraced entrepreneurship as a strategic tool for economic growth and social advancement (Al-Dajani et al.2015). This paradigm projects entrepreneurship as a mechanism for independence, the ability to stand on one's own legs for satisfying one's needs without dependence on others (Goyal and Parkash2011). For women, this independence is often typified as financial independence (Jamali2009;Pettersson et al.2017) or

contextually presented as autonomy from male family members (Gray and Finley-Hervey2005). The entrepreneurial self-fosters the fulfilment of human potentials. Entrepreneurship liberates from organizational and institutional impediments (Ahl and Marlow2012; Ogbor2000;Rindova et al.2009). Accordingly, governments of the Global South advocate female entrepreneurship as an element of women’s empowerment (Loh and Dahesihsari2013) and a tool for their economic empowerment (Anggadwita et al.2015). Alkhaled and Berglund(2018) sum up this assertion neatly: women are good for entrepreneurship and that entrepreneurship is good for women. This optimistic view may, however, neglect gendered inequality (Bastian et al.2019), marginality, and the subordination of female work.

Although women’s entrepreneurship and empowerment are intertwined conceptually, in practice, empowerment is a multidimensional process wherein women emerge as capable of organizing themselves to be self-reliant and confident of exercising their independent rights to make choices, alongside controlling the resources that will foster challenging and even eliminating female subordination in a society. It includes access to economic power or income generation, education, health, rights, and political participation (Duflo2012;Kabeer2005). Women’s entrepreneurship appears to be largely concerned with women’s position and role within society.Rindova et al.(2009) helpfully describe autonomy as a goal of entrepreneurial emancipation; they explain how the term “emancipation” arose around the Roman practices of keeping, transferring, and selling slaves, wives, and children. Its focus is escape from, or removal of, perceived constraints in their environments.

This forms the basis for our research problem. We want to know what the literature tells us about entrepreneurship empowering women. We are interested in whether, even broadly, entrepreneurship emancipates women. To do this, we offer a reflective account, one that is informed by what the literature tells us. Our conceptual point of departure is that entrepreneurship is deeply, socially embedded and cannot be understood from a purely economic perspective (Anderson2015). We recognize the gendered “otherness” and marginalization of women’s entrepreneurship (Stead2017) but also note how independence figures in women’s motivations (Goffee and Scase2015). Nonetheless, we take a critical perspective (Verduijn et al.2014), very aware of assumptions and social constructions of the entrepreneur as a white male (Verduijn and Essers2013) that contrast gendered social expectations of women’s work.

Accordingly, we see how entrepreneuring could be a liberating mechanism but also how entrepreneurial agency may be constrained or institutionally contained. We challenge the entrepreneurial myth, “with one leap she was free”, yet acknowledge the power of agency to influence or modify structures. We envisage the interplays of dependence and independence, liberty and license, self-determination, autonomy, and independence. Moreover, the dynamics of cultures, institutions, regions, and individuals suggests that it will be impossible to arrive at one single answer for the Global South, but it may be possible to better understand how dynamics and processes liberate.

The prevailing ideology of entrepreneurship is of inclusivity and individualism as if there are no restraints whatsoever. Ironically,Drakopoulou Dodd and Anderson(2007) call this the “everyman hypothesis”. This implies that we all—women and men, rich or poor—have the capacity to achieve our inherent enterprising potentials if we make the effort and are determined (Ahl and Marlow2012 ; Marlow and Swail2014). Moreover, influential supranational entities, such as the World Bank, the International Labor Organization (ILO), and the United Nations, position entrepreneurship as a pivotal remedy for impoverishment, acknowledging that women are crucial to this remedial process (Naude2013; Al-Dajani et al.2015). For instance, the World Economic Forum proposed that empowering women to engage in the global economy would add 28 trillion USD in GDP growth by the year 2025 (WEF2018).

It seems that these high expectations for women’s entrepreneurship intertwine with the idea of entrepreneuring as liberating. Yet, women have much lower prospects of controlling their lives, careers, and making economic decisions (Bastian et al.2019;Revenga and Sudhir2012). Largely, academic interest in women’s entrepreneurship was spurred by an article in 1976 (Jennings and Brush2013) . However, it was only in the early 1990s that a growing stream of literature began to examine the influences of gendered ascriptions on women’s entrepreneurial activities, exposing how gender discrimination and masculine bias frame the underlying assumptions of entrepreneurship and position women as being on the “losing side” (Ahl and Marlow2019, p. 5;Mirchandani1999;Ahl2006;

Ahl and Marlow2012 ;Marlow and Swail2014;Foss et al.2019). This apposite but complex line of debate has been explicated by several critical reviews, theories, and conceptual papers and clarified by empirical cases (Ahl2006;Carter and Shaw2006;Cal ás et al.2009;Marlow and Swail2014). Granted that these prior studies embrace different viewpoints and methods, the compelling general opinion is that the ontological underpinnings of entrepreneurship are premised on a masculine normative (Bruni et al.2004; Ahl2006;Ahl and Marlow2012). This discourse has highlighted discordance between the fundamental assumptions of entrepreneurship as an open, meritocratic, and agentic field (Marlow and

Swail2014; Al-Dajani et al.2015) and the actualities of “everyday” entrepreneurship (Welter et al.2017) restricted by ascribed social values and norms (Mole and Ram2012 ; Welter and Smallbone2008).

Regardless, within the Global South, there is a growing interest in entrepreneurship as an emancipatory instrument for women’s liberation and empowerment from endemic poverty, overt discrimination, and patriarchal restrictions (Rindova et al.2009;Al-Dajani et al.2015; Jennings et al.2016 ;Alkhaled and Berglund2018;Al-Dajani and Marlow2013;Banihani2020).

Yet, we must also take account of the primary function of women’s entrepreneuring in family welfare (Sarfaraz et al.2014;Loh and Dahesihsari2013;Xiong et al.2018). Here, the dual demands of family and business are the opposite of liberating.

Within these contexts, the form and the structure of entrepreneurial pursuits that women can engage in are largely determined by both formal (policies, laws, and regulations) and informal (societal values, culture, and family norms) institutions, economic conditions, and the prospects for social participation (Welter2020;Al-Dajani et al.2015;Xiong et al.2018) and a far cry from emancipation. Emancipation, described as a process in which an entrepreneur discovers and pursues opportunity that changes, creates value and wealth, and concurrently changes her position on a social hierarchy by breaking free from existing restraints that would have confined her and her activities (Rindova et al.2009;Laine and Kibler2020) . This breaking free may possess transformative strength such that it draws women to improved lives and could achieve institutional changes (Alkhaled and Berglund2018 ;Shepherd et al.2020). However,Jennings et al.(2016) maintain that it is unlikely that women’s entrepreneurial engagements change the pre-existing, conventional circumstances in their environments. Others assert that women’s endeavors actually sustain their oppression within these conventional systems (Verduijn and Essers2013;Verduijn et al.2014).

Our objective is to critically review the literature to try and establish the nature and extent of liberation in women’s entrepreneurship. This is a thematic rather than a formal bibliographic type of review. We want to build a picture of what the extensive and growing literature has to tell us about women’s emancipation through entrepreneurship. From this overview, we draw conclusions and theorize the nature of women’s emancipation.

Following this introduction, we examine and provide a synopsis of key issues in women’s entrepreneurship and empowerment literature within the context of the Global South. We commence by presenting the conceptualizations, differences, and similarities between empowerment and emancipation. We consider the different geographical and social terrains in the literature and how they identify specific regional characteristics and the effects on women’s entrepreneurship. We discuss our findings about women’s entrepreneurship in the Global South as liberation (and from what), draw conclusions, and propose potential avenues for future research within this domain.

2. EMPOWERMENT AND EMANCIPATION

As a concept, empowerment is connected to terms such as agency, autonomy, liberation, participation, self-confidence, mobilization, and self-determination (Ibrahim and Alkire2007). While it is a much-debated concept, generally, it is linked to social change work and feminism (Cornwall and Rivas2015) with three notable aspects—resources, agency, and achievements (Kabeer1999) —and is well established in an array of literature. Thus, various definitions and conceptualizations exist from various perspectives embedded in different value systems and beliefs (Mosedale2014;Al-Dajani and Marlow2013;Ibrahim and Alkire2007), posing a challenge to the development of a consistent and logical focus (Batliwala2007;Kantor2003).

Regardless, the consensus is that empowerment is a process (Rehman et al.2020; Kabeer2005 ; Chattopadhyay2005;Rowlands1995;Carr2003) and “a condition (of being empowered)” (Akhter and Ward2009, p. 142) as opposed to a product (Mosedale2005;Akhter and Ward2009), and it is focused on expanding agency (Malhotra and Schuler2005;Kabeer2001;Inglis1997). Its approaches are categorized into five main groups: social, economic, educational, political, and psychological. Additionally, empowerment applies to women (individually and collectively) and other disadvantaged, marginalized, and socially excluded groups of the society lacking in power, such as ethnic minorities and the poor. Notably, women as a category traverse other socially excluded groups, and the nucleus of their disempowerment is their household interactions (Malhotra and Schuler2005;Duflo2012; Narayan2002). Thus, empowerment is perceived as the mechanism to achieve emancipation where independence is the outcome.

Although women’s entrepreneurship has become important and motivation-oriented perspectives to women’s entrepreneurship spotlight autonomy (decision making power) as a key driver for women’s entrepreneurial participation,Gill and Ganesh(2007) contend that autonomy interplays with contextual

constraints to influence women's sense of empowerment. Despite that, the debate focused on the basic relationship between income-earning and its empowerment possibilities is largely framed within the Western context. This simple relationship between income-earning and empowerment mostly works in this context; however, within the Global South, it has been argued to be too basic given that it overlooks the influences of patriarchy, sociocultural norms, and institutions on women's agency to convert resources to empowerment outcomes (Al-Dajani and Marlow2013;Kantor2003;Bastian2017).

Further, much of the literature explains the significance of and access to resources such as education and microfinance as enabling factors, or means, of empowerment that stimulate the empowerment process (Kishor2000;Kabeer2005;Malhotra and Schuler2005;Tambunan2009; Datta and Gailey2012) while simultaneously underlining agency as the substance of women's empowerment (Duflo2012 ; Kabeer2008;Datta and Gailey2012;Hanmer and Klugman2016). Regardless of the focus of modern empowerment interventions on better access to resources (Kabeer1999; Malhotra and Schuler2005; Swain2007), earlier literature argued that empowerment is not a gift aid that can be dispensed by others but that it is about acknowledging power inequalities, maintaining the rights to have rights, capacity to act as an individual, and collectively achieve structural change that supports more equality (Kabeer2005;Batliwala2007;Sen1997). This highlights the limitations of modern-day women empowerment agencies and initiatives that merely offer women better access to resources, such as microfinance through microenterprises (Cornwall and Rivas2015;Sholkamy2010), and ignores nonincome aspects of inequality and poverty, such as education (Bradley et al.2012).

While evidence shows that microfinance is not the magical antidote (Banerjee et al.2015a) for empowerment, many extant studies indicate that microfinance fosters women's empowerment through entrepreneurship in the Global South (Nader2008;Noreen2011;Rehman et al.2020), while others perceive a mission drift toward commercial activities instead of empowerment (Aubert et al.2009; Copestake2007). Further, recent debates on institutional embeddedness of entrepreneurial activities suggest that the existent power structures and gender imbalances are reproduced and reified in many contexts, including microfinance (Zhao and Wry2016; Hasan and Shahzad2012; Weber and Ahmad2014).

Certainly, women's empowerment is about expanding women's capacity to make strategic life choices in situations where they were once denied (Kabeer2002); essentially, it is about women developing the agency to act effectively within the existing system and structures of power (Inglis1997). Thus, from an individual's participation standpoint, empowerment is a passive process in which the outcome relies on different notions of power, its distribution, and self (Rowlands1995).

Within the West, emancipation is an emphatic and reinforced notion, implying liberation, equality, self-determination, and individual responsibility (van den Brandt2019; Birkle et al.2012) . However, with diverse conceptions and assumptions about agency, power and the subject, different systems and experiences, various perspectives on society, and how it could or should be changed, emancipation is thus a flexible notion that challenges definition through time and space. Moreover, its specific understanding is contingent on individuals, social categories, and issues involved (Birkle et al.2012) . Accordingly, women's emancipation has become fluid and understood as significantly context-dependent (van den Brandt2019).

Reminiscent of empowerment, emancipation is equally a process.Ruane and Todd(2005, p. 238) note that emancipation is "a process by which participants in a system which determines, distorts, and limits their potentialities come together actively to transform it, and in the process, transform themselves". It is traditionally synonymous with liberation or freedom but not essentially with equality (Scott2012). It entails critical analyzing, challenging, resisting, and transgressing existent systems and structures of power, both sociopolitical and economic, alongside narratives and discourses (Inglis1997) . Contrary to empowerment, it is an active process wherein the "othering", domination, and social exclusion by a group or class is challenged, resisted, transgressed, and transformed individually or collectively (Ackelsberg2005). It requires the collaboration of various stakeholders in society, including women, men, political actors, and activists (Brieger et al.2019).

Although emancipation is not an "all or nothing" phenomenon (Fraser and Liakova2008, p. 4), comprehension of the "proper" women's emancipation is predicated on manifold assumptions of which agency is pivotal and understood as the property of abstract individual and who affirms autonomous will, independence, choice, and resistance (Bracke and Fadil2012;Scott2012;van den Brandt2019).

Despite the increased attention on entrepreneurship as a necessary tool for women's empowerment, especially in the Global South, the emphasis is largely on the economics, thus failing to address key issues "of identity, phenomenology, ideology, and relations of power" (Tedmanson et al.2012). Further, the taken-for-granted assumptions and the essentialist conception of the entrepreneur as a "white, middle-class male" (Ogbor2000;Ahl2006) in entrepreneurship research reinforces the "otherness" in women entrepreneurs and impinges upon their legitimacy and agency, particularly within

the Global South (Essers and Tedmanson2014), thus bringing to the fore the question of the relevance of entrepreneurship as emancipatory for women in the Global South, where patriarchy and power imbalance is commonplace (Al-Dajani and Marlow2013;Alkhaled and Berglund2018).

Even though women's empowerment, particularly economic empowerment, promotes their decision-making ability (Swain and Wallenti2009), the ability to make decisions does not necessarily indicate that they actually make them; thus, the effects of empowerment may continue to be constrained in practice. Conversely, because of active engagement, emancipation advances women's freedom and boosts their confidence. Granted that both empowerment and emancipation are process-based concepts, emancipation challenges, disrupts, and defies the "othering", thus selecting gender equality over patriarchy, autonomy over authority, tolerance over conformity, and participation over security (Welzel and Inglehart2010;Brieger et al.2019) and consequently allowing women to take more control of their lives.

3. THE MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA (MENA)

Although no formal laws prohibit women-owned enterprises, the number of women entrepreneurs trails well behind the males in this region (Hattab2012). Due to the social structure of this region, women's entrepreneurship possesses some unusual features compared to their global counterparts (De Vita et al.2014; Bastian et al.2019;Banihani2020). The conservative social structure is embedded in patriarchal norms with political, legal, and religious systems that accentuate male domination and impede women's entrepreneurial activities and empowerment (Al-Kwif et al.2020; Bastian et al.2018; Caputo et al.2016;Banihani2020). This is regardless of the fact that in most MENA countries, constitutionally, men and women are proclaimed equal in rights and obligations (Hattab2012). Moreover, as opposed to being inspired to explore business opportunities like their male counterparts, economic necessity seems to be a major inducement for women to engage in entrepreneurship (Bastian et al.2019; Sarfaraz et al.2014;Bastian et al.2018;Al-Kwif et al.2020). Thus, social and consequential economic subjugation is a cause for entrepreneurship and hardly a liberation.

For instance, in Jordan, a more liberal regime, regardless of the increase in educational achievements of women, only 15% of businesses are female-owned (Banihani2020). In the conservative Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the government recently promoted women's entrepreneurship as part of the country's developmental plans (GEM2017). Yet, only 4% of registered businesses are female-owned (Al-Kwif et al.2020). Restrictive cultural practices stipulate that even the "right" to own a business is problematic as permissions and approval must be sought from familial male authorities. Under this societal code, even the supposedly autonomous financial institutions are reluctant to offer credit to female entrepreneurs (Loh and Dahesihsari2013); banks may require a male co-signature on credit applications. Moreover, sociocultural norms set boundaries for women such that to be socially accepted, women are often compelled to choose and engage in a family business arrangement as opposed to sole proprietorship to legitimize their undertakings; even then, it can only be after they have secured the backing of the men (Caputo et al.2016;De Vita et al.2014).

Women's entrepreneurial choices must respect traditional gender norms and religious guidelines, such as gender segregation (Al-Dajani and Marlow2010; Al-Alak and Al-Haddad2010; Caputo et al.2016) . Consequently, many women-owned businesses are home-based; they reflect traditional feminized roles and are organized in such a way that the traditional family structures are maintained. With less economic power and the limitations of culture, they achieve little empowerment, accompanied by little or no social legitimacy (Banihani2020; Al-Dajani and Marlow2010; Caputo et al.2016).

Moreover, women's physical mobility in countries such as Jordan, Iraq, Egypt, Bahrain, and Kuwait are restricted by the laws concerning securing permissions from their legal guardians to travel (Banihani and Syed2017; Metcalfe2008;Banihani2020). In Saudi Arabia, only recently were women permitted to drive their vehicles (Welter2020), and it is socially unacceptable for a woman to travel unaccompanied by a man (Kattan et al.2016). These constraints relate to ascribed women's domestic responsibilities but are often presented as concerns about women's safety (Assaad and Arntz2005; Banihani et al.2013).

Furthermore, it is necessary to consider the religious perspective given the predominance of Islam in this region and the adherence to Islamic Sharia laws with its outright gender discrimination rules (Alkhaled and Berglund2018). The conventional interpretations of Islam strongly promote conformity with the traditional stereotypical gendered roles for women (Karam and Jamali2013). Nevertheless, in the UAE, Kuwait, Lebanon, and Oman (Al-Balushi and Anderson2017), some women entrepreneurs are inspired by Islamic precepts. For example, the Prophet Mohammed's first wife, Khadija, was a successful business owner.Essers and Benschop(2009) note how some women follow her model. These

women embrace a feminist interpretation of Islam and regard restrictions as incorrect patriarchal interpretations of the Holy Qur'an (Naguib and Jamali2015). The agency of these women offers them the opportunity to circumnavigate cultural norms (Tlaiss2015). Interestingly, Anggadwita et al.(2015) note that due to their beliefs, these women refuse credit from financial institutions because the interest system contradicts Islamic practice (Banihani2020). Rather, they depend on their personal funds and investments (Roomi et al.2018).

Owing to patriarchal systematization, support from household males is almost essential, irrespective of how bounded such support might be (Gill and Ganesh2007) because, ironically, women consider men to be an "empowering resource" (Alkhaled and Berglund2018, p. 889). Apart from emotional support, male support is commonly used for facilitating access to capital and the males' network opportunities (Caputo et al.2016;Al-Alak and Al-Haddad2010; McElwee and Al-Riyami2003) . While these women do not perceive themselves as less able to succeed in business, society expects them to take up their businesses or careers without undermining their gender-ascribed roles and responsibilities as wives and mothers (Al-Dajani and Marlow2010; Banihani2020) . As such, they may not be able to exploit opportunities for increased control over their lives because they shoulder the burden of running a household (Kabeer2005,2012). Therefore, women's entrepreneurial undertakings are often created such that they sustain the conventional family structures. Some semblance of empowerment is achieved, but the endemic patriarchal system with its power imbalance wherein women-owned businesses are embedded is hardly challenged or defied.

4. ASIA

Women's empowerment and entrepreneurship are emphasized in South Asian literature (Parvin et al.2012; Yunis et al.2020). Nonetheless, the challenges women entrepreneurs face feature in many papers. Moreover, the literature on Bangladesh, India, and Sri Lanka emphasize widespread, explicitly feminized poverty (Lucy et al.2008;Mahmood et al.2014). A major feature is the problem of social acceptance of women entrepreneurs and how choice is constrained (Nawaz2010; Bhatti et al.2010; Ayadurai and Sohail2006;Sharma2013;Tripathi and Singh2018).

These are patriarchal societies. Traditions, especially in India, are embedded in a social structure that underlines women's subordination, and male chauvinism is pervasive (Shukla et al.2018; Goyal and Parkash2011; Rashid and Ratten2020). Early female marriage is a norm in these societies, thus curtailing women's access to formal education (Kishor and Gupta2004). Even women high in the Hindu caste system are constrained and inherently disenfranchised. However, and irrespective of their limited agency, some women have a sense of social responsibility (Anderson et al.2019). They may engage in not-for-profit ventures that train and empower other rural women in their local communities (Field et al.2010;De Vita et al.2014). This is seen as chipping away at the patriarchal social order.

Most women enterprises are small, arguably due to gendered arrangements. However, microcredit can bolster their bargaining power (Osmani2007;Parvin et al.2012). Nonetheless, sociocultural beliefs restrict their chances, particularly in rural women's limited access to credit. Indeed, Nawaz(2010) believes microfinance funds from nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and microfinance institutions (MFIs) are considered heathen and sinful. Moreover, in Nepal, women may end up with "empowerment debts" from microfinance loans from NGOs as these funds are used for household expenses rather than business development (Rankin2008;Rashid and Ratten2020). Although women entrepreneurs are interested in and are supposedly capable of decision-making, they strive to free themselves from male domination. Still, they are at the mercy of familial male authority (Nawaz2010; Goyal and Parkash2011).

Indeed, women are their husband's properties once married (De Groot2001; Goyal and Yadav2014) .Husbands have the "right" to control women's behaviors, even if force is required (Kishor and Gupta2004) . Women's entrepreneurial participation is, at best, regarded as complementary to household incomes and duties.Bhuiyan and Abdullah(2007) andNawaz(2010) report how husbands may instruct women to close their businesses if they challenge the existing order.

Further, within Islamic Pakistan, gender disparity, systemic subjugation of women, and the underpinning sociocultural structures strongly constrain women's entrepreneurial activities and empowerment (Azam Roomi and Harrison2010;Yunis et al.2019). Gendered societal norms marginalize women and generally expect them to refrain from business endeavors (Yunis et al.2020). It appears that "containment" by gender mostly affects the lower class and poorer women. Yet, even for higher social class and educated women, any "empowerment" is expressed within families and circumscribed by household responsibilities (Malhotra et al.2002;Kabeer2005). Despite women's cognizance of their capabilities and improving educational achievements, persistent sociocultural structures and the economic framework continually disenfranchise women (Kabir and Huo2011; Parvin et al.2012).

In East Asia and the Pacific, though the countries are very different, culture, traditions, and religion play a critical role in women's entrepreneurship and empowerment (Loh and Dahesihari2013; De Vita et al.2014) . These societies are patriarchally systematized (Cole2007) with a high power distance culture "with emphasis on obedience, conformity, authority, supervision, social hierarchy and inequality" (Reisinger and Turner1997, p. 141). Nonetheless, women's entrepreneurship and development are policy issues within this region, but women's entrepreneurial endeavors are not widely embraced (Tambunan2009). Again, the literature emphasizes how the socioeconomic and sociocultural characteristics of these countries and the influence of religion dominates empowerment. While it is claimed that many Islamic laws are devoted to women's welfare, interpretations of Islam constrain Malaysian and Indonesian women; women's traditional duties take priority over a business (Tambunan2017;Loh and Dahesihari2013). Women entrepreneurs may be compelled to choose between their businesses and their marriages (Hashim et al.2012;Teoh and Chong2014). Social, cultural, and religious taboos reinforce and reproduce these gendered norms. For example, they inhibit rural women from accessing (higher) education because it is a common belief that education is for males (Tambunan2009). Granted that skills acquisition through experiential learning has advanced women entrepreneurial pursuits (Arsana and Alibhai2016;Indarti et al.2019), low education levels, feminized poverty, gender discrimination, and inequality foster these women's lack of confidence in their personal capabilities in business activities (Kelley et al.2011). Simply put, women are restricted from empowerment and from transforming their lives through entrepreneurship (Anggadwita et al.2015 ; Teoh and Chong2014).

In China, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Lao People's Democratic Republic (PDR), female subordination and gender bias, arguably emanating from Confucianism, are entrenched (Nguyen et al.2014; Inmyxai and Takahashi2010;Leahy et al.2017) . In Vietnam, although the gender gap has narrowed, gender inequality persists in the economic and social lives of women (World Bank2016; Oxfam2017) . Women themselves are not opposed to economic independence. However, cultural values and "face-saving" behaviors can confine their agency. Most often, women-owned businesses are household-based microenterprises (Rankin2008). Indeed, women are rarely encouraged to start businesses (Pham and Talavera2018 ;Leahy et al.2017). Moreover, gender bias restricts women entrepreneurs' access to social networks and financial institutions (Zhu et al.2019;Zhu et al.2015). Nonetheless, access to small loans from NGOs and MFIs are meant to empower and improve the livelihoods of rural women through entrepreneurship (Nguyen et al.2014).

Soviet-era ideology promoted the emancipation of women and had a progressive effect on women's lives in the Central Asia Soviet countries (Smallbone and Welter2010;Khitarihvili2016), albeit with a built-in glass ceiling in politics and economy (Welter and Smallbone2008). With the demise of communism, there was a rebirth of patriarchal systematization that strengthened the notion of "male guardianship" (Akiner1997, p. 285); changes in gender balance had adverse effects on the economic, social, and political participation of women (Welter and Smallbone2008; Kandiyoti and Azimova2004; Smallbone and Welter2010;Sattar2012;Khitarihvili2016). Culturally, entrepreneurship is considered a male domain demanding male qualities, such as assertiveness (Ogbor2000). Thus, for women entrepreneurs, this signifies "breaking out of the norms" (Berg1997, p. 265) of socially accepted woman behaviors. Despite, or perhaps because of this, some employ their femininity as the chief tenet in their entrepreneurial endeavors (Smallbone and Welter2010; Bruno1997) . Although recent studies note that some women in this region use entrepreneurship to exploit opportunities (Korosteleva and Stepien'-Baig2020), restored traditional institutions now constrain women's choices and capacity to act (Harris2004;Smallbone and Welter2010).

The Uzbekistan society leverages Islamic philosophy as well as the traditional values that accentuate male domination and foster power imbalance to impose housebound roles on women. Further, local neighborhood committees often control women's activities. Women are compelled to engage in home-based businesses, which are largely subsistence (Korosteleva and Stepien'-Baig2020) . Essentially, for women entrepreneurs, their gendered role constricts access to resources, confines their chances of enterprise development, and jeopardizes their welfare and empowerment (Khitarihvili2016) . Nonetheless, several women entrepreneurs empower other women by training and developing their skills and establishing businesses that address local needs (Smallbone and Welter2010). Thus, they are determinedly socially responsible and promote institutional change, albeit within their locale (Brush et al.2009).

5. LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (LAC)

This is a region of contrasts that falls behind developed nations on several counts (Buendía-Martínez and Carrasco2013; Amoros and Pizarro2007). Nonetheless, the World Bank(2020) reports that 50% of businesses are women-owned. Female entrepreneurship is wide-ranging and observable in most

sectors (Terjesen and Amoros2010). However, social exclusion and prevailing gender discriminatory practices in the labor market provoke women to engage in entrepreneurship as an avenue to change their personal situations (Rubach et al.2015;World Bank(2010,2011); Khwaja2005; Herranz et al.2010) . Put differently, women in LAC consider entrepreneurship as an escape from unemployment and discrimination (Giménez et al.2017) because it can grant them economic independence.

Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, and Paraguay have antidiscriminatory legislation to foster gender equality and economic autonomy (Giménez et al.2017;IFC-World Bank2013).

Nonetheless, machismo conventional cultural norms and values promote gender inequality that values women as mothers (Tabbush2010). Thus, women entrepreneurial activities are bounded by their social positioning as subordinate breadwinners. Women’s endeavors are typically microenterprises (Buendía-Martínez and Carrasco2013) and informal (Marques et al.2018). Empowerment is minimal with limited decision-making power and can hardly effect social change in their overall material and symbolic situations (Escobar Latapí and González de la Rocha2009;Tabbush2010;Gur ãu et al.2015). In Mexico, men are often overtly against their spouses working outside the home, and women need to seek permission and accept their husband’s opinions to run businesses (Appendini2010; Kabeer2012). The power dynamics within the household dispossesses women entrepreneurs of control, particularly over finance. This often forces them into a circle of debt and credit, limits their coping strategies, and compromises their long-term economic independence (Tabbush2010).

In Latin America, over 54% of women businesses are informal, while it is 48% in the Caribbean. In Brazil, women entrepreneurs seem to prefer the formal sector of the economy (Marques et al.2018). However, their choices are bounded by tax and regulatory burdens as well as high barriers to accessing credits intermixed with feminized pove[r]rty, low education levels, gender, and race discrimination, which play background roles in compelling them to consciously remain in the informal sector as a marginalized group (Van der Sluis et al.2005;Muravyev et al.2009;Klapper and Parker2011).

Access to finance remains a major concern for women entrepreneurs (Smith-Hunter and Leone2010) . MFI loans and programs can offer more opportunities (Bruton et al.2011), helping women to “challenge the existing social norms, culture, and effectively improve their wellbeing” (Swain and Wallenti2009, p. 544) by empowering them and improving their social welfare (Banerjee et al.2015b) . Unfortunately, the financial products of MFIs in LAC target richer clients (Churchill and Appau2020) and exclude poor rural women. Regardless of being opportunity cocreators (Alvarez and Barney2014) , women borrowers often end up paying higher interest rates, which deters their loan repayment capability (Sun and Im2015) and pushes them into an empowerment debt trap. Moreover,Silverberg(2014) explains how MFI loans can create conflict on the home front. Economic autonomy garnered from their enterprise may seem threatening to their spouses.

6. SUB-SAHARA AFRICA (SSA)

Women’s entrepreneurship rates in sub-Sahara Africa are the highest globally (Kelley et al.2017), with women twice as likely to start an enterprise than in other places (AfDB et al.2017). Women represent 50% of entrepreneurs in SSA, although their ventures are mostly micro and small businesses in the informal sector (GEM2019;De Vita et al.2014). This is explained by weak and counterproductive formal institutions (AfDB et al.2017;Mair and Marti2009;Webb et al.2015). Women are thus often driven into entrepreneurship by economic necessity. Moreover, within an informal institutional order, the inherent patriarchy in most African societies accentuates women’s subordination, stipulating men as household heads, providers, and protectors of the family (Woldie and Adersua2004; Bawa2012; Okafor and Mordi2010). Sociocultural values, norms, and traditions position women as inferior to men, stress the traditional role of homemaking for women and expectations to bear children, and yet be responsible for their livelihoods (Amine and Staub2009;Quagraine2016). The family, characterized by an imbalanced power structure, is critical as it plays a pivotal role in women’s entrepreneurship and empowerment activities (Amine and Staub2009;Mordi et al.2010). As an institution, it sets the rules of the game (North1990;Xiong et al.2018), and women are deeply embedded in their families (Aldrich and Cliff 2003;Webb et al.2015).

Although society expects women to be less involved in income-making activities (Singh et al.2010) , in poor rural Nigeria, women are literally the de facto heads of the households as they organize how production and consumption happen in their microenterprises in order to sustain their families and attempt to free them from abject poverty (Xiong et al.2018). The family’s minimal income is primarily derived from these women’s enterprises. Yet, they are mostly excluded from household decision-making, property rights, security, education, and resources. Culturally, husbands are supreme, and women are their property through marriage (De Groot2001;Goyal and Yadav2014; Woldie and Adersua2004;Okafor and Mordi2010).

It appears that spousal support is important to these women entrepreneurs (Powell and Eddleston2016) as the husbands sometimes provide the enterprise's inputs on credit (Xiong et al.2018). However, many African men do not want the income women make from their entrepreneurial activities to give them economic independence or bargaining power such that they become dominant (Wolf and Frese2018). Correspondingly, in Ethiopia, the husbands insist that women entrepreneurs must continually display an inferiority charade, especially at home (Wolf and Frese2018). Essentially, husbands can have lubricating or braking effects for women's businesses; they are decisive stakeholders in women entrepreneurs' endeavors given the economic restraints within marriage and the shared, delegated responsibility for the family (Jang and Danes2013;Wolf and Frese2018).

Women entrepreneurs are also constrained by their access to finance; over 70% of women entrepreneurs in developing countries lack access to financial products that suit their enterprise needs (World Bank2017). Due to patriarchal power structures in SSA, few women own properties, and this general lack of suitable property as bank collateral decisively restricts their access to finance for growth. Formal financial institutions are also elitist, and male bank officials may prefer to speak to the husbands (Mwobobia2012;Goyal and Yadav2014). Only South Africa legally proscribes gender-based discrimination in accessing credits (World Bank2015). However, women are further restricted by the gender bias entrenched in financial institutions' lending models (Derera et al.2014).

Nonetheless, microfinance can be useful for developing women's enterprises, arguably reinforcing their confidence and empowering them (Al-Dajani and Marlow2013;Ukanwa et al.2018). In practice, however, in rural Africa, male family heads may take control of this resource (Gobezie2009), denying the borrower access (Tamale2004). Not only does this disempower (Salia et al.2018) but also burdens women with repaying the loan (Ssendi and Anderson2009). If the loan is applied to the family wellbeing rather than the business, high interest rates may also disempower by locking women into a debt trap (Ukanwa et al.2018).

Male spouses may feel threatened by women entrepreneurs' "achievements". This can disrupt family power structures and creates tension about any perceived abandonment or even diminishing of domestic responsibilities. As such, there is an increase in polygyny as men strive to regain their traditional authorities through a divorce or a second marriage (Salia et al.2018). Thus, women may ultimately be forced to choose between their marriages or being empowered through their enterprises.

7. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Our overview shows the burgeoning academic interest in women's entrepreneurship as empowerment in the Global South. Exploring women's entrepreneurship within this context highlights the gendered nature of these societies and forms an important element in the Global South discourse. Although each country's context differs, the literature across the regions draws a picture of limited empowerment. Entrepreneurship does offer some agency and has some power to challenge male hegemony and oppression, power imbalance, and the deeply entrenched cultures that marginalize women's enterprises. We noted how these socially embedded features create conditions and how the formal and informal institutions that characterize these societies adversely influence and shape what women can legitimately do and how they restrict their businesses. Essentially, these make it much harder for women to seize the power to reshape their futures and improve their wellbeing. We noted how ownership can confer some autonomy and some financial independence but also how that was hedged and bounded by institutionalized constraints. In particular, the gendered cultural allocation of household responsibilities has an overwhelming influence on both the perceived legitimacy and practice of entrepreneurship. It is thus little surprise that most women's entrepreneurship is at a micro level, informal, and unlikely to grow.

Culture seems to be the most comprehensive and cumbersome form of subjugation, and it is manifested in numerous ways. The most obvious is the embeddedness of male power as patriarchy to construct the world through an everyday struggle of influencing, inducing, ordering, and enforcing their choices upon us (Inglis1997). Across the board, women proclaim a desire to be liberated from the "status quo" (Rindova et al.2009) and poverty (Bruton et al.2013) by being empowered within the systems in which they live through entrepreneurship (Al-Dajani and Marlow2013). They consider their lack of economic autonomy, the associated feminized poverty, and the double standards manifested within these existing social systems confinement but perceive entrepreneurship as a gateway out of this "imprisonment" to achieve more as individuals in their households. This is not only individual agency but also conferring agency by striving to involve other women who are interested in entrepreneuring, altering the established societal status quo and rectifying women's subjugation.

We see how even the partial and incomplete power that entrepreneuring brings carries with it some marginal agency to confer some relative independence. Particularly, we see financial

independence creating more autonomy. Broadly, we see how the restricted agency has begun to erode the cultural bastions of patriarchy and control. Moreover, we observe how these women are role models for change. It may be that women's entrepreneurial practices will not only challenge the dominant order but also demonstrate how things can and should be done. Women's entrepreneurship, or rather entrepreneuring, is likely a challenge to the pre-existent social order as it seems to promote independence and an escape from dependency on male hegemony. It liberalizes some constrictions, yet, it never completely succeeds. We propose that the auspicious powers accredited to entrepreneurship seem to be overstated. Regardless, entrepreneuring gradually loosens the strongholds of masculine power and offers some degree of autonomy because when constraints to action are loosened, the capabilities for action (agency) are increased (Mosedale2005, p. 248).

Indeed, it is emancipatory on some counts, albeit a restricted form of freedom. It is a loosening rather than unshackling individual's freedom in how it changes the rules of the game (North1990) . These women creatively entrepreneur within their own taken-for-granted norms whilst slowly transforming these cultures. Thus, the "power" within these rules (norms and values) are continually adopted and transformed by individual agents (women entrepreneurs) (Giddens1984, p. 14). Entrepreneuring is a breaking out of the norms for women (Berg1997), and in breaking out, a "successful" woman entrepreneur through her endeavors opens the doors for others to follow.

Giddens(1984) explains this as structuration, where, in the interplay of the agency (individuals) and the structure (institutions), the agent (the successful woman entrepreneur) alters the structure for the next interaction.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Our thematic review enabled us to contribute to the debate on women's empowerment and emancipation through entrepreneurship by bringing to the fore the paradox in the dominant view of women's entrepreneurship as liberating from both organizational and institutional inhibitions. Our findings reveal that the meaning, themes, and the struggle for empowerment and emancipation in women's entrepreneurship are not particularly new within the literature focused on the Global South. However, we enrich extant scholarship by revitalizing and reconceptualizing the interplays of dependence and independence, liberty, and license while highlighting the dynamics of culture and institutions.

The impediment to women's empowerment is the fact that they are women, which is reinforced by cultures and the dominant patriarchal social order. Empowerment and the attendant liberation that present the choice of living autonomously remains to be attained in the Global South given the entrenched power imbalance in most of the regions. Still, entrepreneurship poses as a formidable counteragent to these established social structures by offering women some limited form of liberation. Regardless, women need to continually chip at the glass ceilings to slowly modify the structures for emancipation.

Although our review is a critical account of the literature on women's emancipation through entrepreneurship, it has its limitations. Due to space limitations, we adopted a broad geographic grouping for each region with countries that are heterogeneous on many counts. While we realize this is a convenience, given our objective of painting a big picture, it allows us sufficient depth to describe this literature. While highlighting predominant themes, the papers explored may not be exhaustive for all the management and sociological literature on women's entrepreneurship within the Global South. We noted how the literature indicates some improvements and developments; therefore, future studies might monitor these changes across regions. Fine-grained, possibly even ethnographic studies, could show us what women can achieve. Moreover and similarly, we noted that women employ various strategies and tactics for empowerment; future studies could explore these more closely to establish what works and why.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Ackelsberg, Martha A. 2005. *Free Women of Spain: Anarchism and the Struggle for the Emancipation of Women*. Oakland: AK Press.
2. Adamson, Fiona B., and Gerasimos Tsourapas. 2020. The Migration State in the Global South: Nationalizing, Developmental, and Neoliberal Models of Migration Management. *International Migration Review* 54: 853–82.
3. AfDB, OECD, and UNDP. 2017. *African Economic Outlook 2017: Entrepreneurship and Industrialization*.
4. Ahl, Helene. 2006. Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 30: 595–621.
5. Ahl, Helene, and Susan Marlow. 2012. Exploring the dynamics of gender, feminism and entrepreneurship: Advancing debate to escape a dead end? *Organization* 19: 543–62.
6. Ahl, Helene, and Susan Marlow. 2019. Exploring the false promise of entrepreneurship through a postfeminist critique of the enterprise policy discourse in Sweden and the UK. *Human Relations* 1–28.
7. Akhter, Rifat, and Kathryn B. Ward. 2009. Globalization and gender equality: A critical analysis of women's empowerment in the global economy. *Advances in Gender Research* 13: 141–73.
8. Akiner, Shirin. 1997. Between tradition and modernity: The dilemma facing contemporary Central Asian women. In *Post-Soviet Women: From the Baltic to Central Asia*. Edited by Mary Buckley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 261–304.
9. Akobo, Loliya A. 2018. Action learning through radio: Exploring conceptual views and lived experiences of women entrepreneurs. *Action Learning: Research and Practice* 15: 235–48.
10. Al-Alak, Basheer, and Fatima Al-Haddad. 2010. Effect of gender on the success of women entrepreneurs in Jordan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* 1: 42–62.
11. Al-Balushi, Rashid A., and Alistair R. Anderson. 2017. Entrepreneurship in Oman Policies and practices. *Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability* 13: 29–47.
12. Al-Dajani, Haya, and Susan Marlow. 2010. Impact of women's home-based enterprise on family dynamics: Evidence from Jordan. *International Small Business Journal* 28: 470–86.
13. Al-Dajani, Haya, and Susan Marlow. 2013. Empowerment and entrepreneurship: A theoretical framework. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research* 19: 503–24.
14. Al-Dajani, Haya, Sara Carter, Eleanor Shaw, and Susan Marlow. 2015. Entrepreneurship among the displaced and dispossessed: Exploring the limits of emancipatory entrepreneuring. *British Journal of Management* 26: 713–30.
15. Aldrich, Howard E., and Jennifer E. Cliff. 2003. The pervasive effects of family on entrepreneurship: Toward a family embeddedness perspective. *Journal of Business Venturing* 18: 573–96.
16. Alkhaled, Sophie, and Karin Berglund. 2018. 'And now I'm free': Women's empowerment and emancipation through entrepreneurship in Saudi Arabia and Sweden. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 30: 877–900.
17. Al-Kwafi, Osama S., Tran T. Khoa, Viput Ongsaku, and Zafar U. Ahmed. 2020. Determinants of female entrepreneurship success across Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Transnational Management* 25: 3–29.
18. Alvarez, Sharon A., and Jay B. Barney. 2014. Entrepreneurial opportunities and poverty alleviation. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 38: 159–84.
19. Amine, Lyn S., and Karin M. Staub. 2009. Women entrepreneurs in sub-Saharan Africa: An institutional theory analysis from a social marketing point of view. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 21: 183–211.
20. Amoros, José E., and Olga Pizarro. 2007. Women entrepreneurship context in Latin America: An exploratory study in Chile. In *The Perspective of Women's*

- Entrepreneurship in the Age of Globalization. Edited by Mirjana R. Markovic. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, pp. 107–26.
21. Anderson, Alistair R. 2015. Conceptualising entrepreneurship as economic ‘explanation’ and the consequent loss of ‘understanding’. *International Journal of Business and Globalization* 14: 145–57.
 22. Anderson, Alistair R., and Johan Gaddefors. 2017. Entrepreneurship and context: Is entrepreneurship research out of context? Dilemmas with (non) contextualized views of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability* 13: 3–9.
 23. Anderson, Alistair, and Sébastien Ronteau. 2017. Towards an entrepreneurial theory of practice; emerging ideas for emerging economies. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies* 9: 110–20.
 24. Anderson, Alistair R., Sohail Younis, Hinaa Hashim, and Carol Air. 2019. Social enterprising informing our concept; exploring informal micro social enterprise. *Social Enterprise Journal* 15: 94–110.
 25. Anggadwita, Grisna, Hendrati D. Mulyaningsih, Veland Ramadani, and M. Yahya Arwiyah. 2015. Women entrepreneurship in Islamic perspective: A driver for social change. *International Journal of Business and Globalization* 15: 389–404.
 26. Appendini, Kirsten. 2010. Economic liberalization, changing livelihoods and gender dimensions in rural Mexico. In *Report Gender Dimensions of Agricultural and Rural Employment: Differentiated Pathways out of Poverty Part III Rome*. Rome: FAO, IFAD and ILO.
 27. Arsana, I. Gede Putra, and Aly S. Alibhai. 2016. *Women Entrepreneurs in Indonesia: A Pathway to Increasing Shared Prosperity*. Washington: World Bank Group.
 28. Assaad, Ragui, and Melanie Arntz. 2005. Constrained geographical mobility and gendered labour market outcomes under structural adjustment: Evidence from Egypt. *World Development* 33: 431–54.
 29. Aubert, Cécile, Alain De Janvry, and Elisabeth Sadoulet. 2009. Designing credit agent incentives to prevent mission drift in pro-poor microfinance institutions. *Journal of Development Economics* 90: 153–62.
 30. Ayadurai, Selvalamar, and M. Sadiq Sohail. 2006. Profile of women entrepreneurs in a war-torn area: Case study of North East Sri Lanka. *Journal of Development Entrepreneurship* 11: 3–17.
 31. Azam Roomi, Muhammad A., and Pegram Harrison. 2010. Behind the veil: Women’s capacity building and enterprise development in Pakistan. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship* 2: 150–72.
 32. Banerjee, Abhijit, Esther Duflo, Nathanael Goldberg, Dean Karlan, Robert Osei, William Parienté, Jeremy Shapiro, Bram Thuysbaert, and Christopher Udry. 2015a. A multifaceted program causes lasting progress for the very poor: Evidence from six countries. *Science* 348: 1260799.
 33. Banerjee, Abhijit, Esther Duflo, Rachel Glennerster, and Cynthia Kinnan. 2015b. The miracle of microfinance? Evidence from a randomized evaluation. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 7: 22–53.
 34. Banihani, Muntaha. 2020. Empowering Jordanian women through entrepreneurship. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship* 22: 133–44.
 35. Banihani, Muntaha, and Jawad Syed. 2017. A macro-national level analysis of Arab women’s work engagement. *European Management Review* 14: 133–42.
 36. Banihani, Muntaha, Patricia Lewis, and Jawad Syed. 2013. Is work engagement gendered? *Gender in Management: An International Journal* 28: 400–23.
 37. Bastian, Bettina L. 2017. Empowerment Against All Odds: Women Entrepreneurs in the Middle East and North Africa. In *Entrepreneurship: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications*. Edited by Philippe W. Zgheib. Hershey: IGI Global, pp. 1975–87.
 38. Bastian, Bettina L., Yusuf M. Sidani, and Yasmina El Amine. 2018. Women entrepreneurship in the Middle East and North Africa: A review of knowledge areas and research gaps. *Gender in Management* 33: 14–29.

39. Bastian, Bettina L, Beverly D. Metcalfe, and Mohammad R. Zali. 2019. Gender Inequality: Entrepreneurship Development in the MENA Region. *Sustainability* 11: 6472.
40. Batliwala, Srilatha. 2007. Taking the power out of empowerment—An experiential account. *Development in Practice* 17: 557–65.
41. Bawa, Sylvia. 2012. Women’s rights and culture in Africa: A dialogue with global patriarchal traditions.
42. Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d’études du développement 33: 90–105. Berg, Nina G. 1997. Gender, place and entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 9: 259–68.
43. Bhatti, Nadeem, Amira H. Shar, and Faiz M. Shaikh. 2010. Entrepreneur business development in Sindh: The case of Jacobabad district. *International Business Research* 3: 132–38.
44. Bhuiyan, Mohammad B., and Rubab Abdullah. 2007. Women Empowerment through Entrepreneurship Development: Bangladesh perspective. *DIU Journal of Business and Economics* 2: 135–54.
45. Birkle, Carmena, Ramona Kahl, Gundula Ludwig, and Susanne Maurer, eds. 2012. *Emanzipation und Feministische Politiken. Verwicklungen, Verwerfungen, Verwandlungen*. Königstein: Helmer.
46. Bracke, Sarah, and Nadia Fadil. 2012. Is the headscarf oppressive or emancipatory? Field notes from the multicultural debate. *Religion and Gender* 2: 36–56.
47. Bradley, Steven W., Jeffery S. McMullen, Kendall Artz, and Edward M. Simiyu. 2012. Capital is not enough: Innovation in developing economies. *Journal of Management Studies* 49: 684–717.
48. Brieger, Steven A., Claude Francoeur, Christian Welzel, and Walid Ben-Amar. 2019. Empowering women: The role of emancipative forces in board gender diversity. *Journal of Business Ethics* 155: 495–511.
49. Bruni, Attila, Silvia Gherardi, and Barbara Poggio. 2004. Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: An ethnographic account of intertwined practices. *Gender, Work and Organization* 11: 406–29.
50. Bruno, Marta. 1997. Women and the culture of entrepreneurship. In *Post-Soviet Women: From Baltic to Central Asia*. Edited by Mary Buckley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 56–74.
51. Brush, Candida, Anne De Bruin, and Friederike Welter. 2009. A gender-aware framework for women’s entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship* 1: 8–24.
52. Bruton, Garry D., Susanna Khavul, and Helmutha Chavez. 2011. Microlending in emerging economies: Building a new line of inquiry from the ground up. *Journal of International Business Studies* 42: 718–39.
53. Bruton, Garry D., David J. Ketchen, Jr., and R. Duane Ireland. 2013. Entrepreneurship as a solution to poverty. *Journal of Business Venturing* 28: 683–89.
54. Buendía-Martínez, Inmaculada, and Inmaculada Carrasco. 2013. Women, entrepreneurial activity and rural development in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Rural Development Notebooks* 10: 21–45.
55. Calás, Marta B., Linda Smircich, and Kristina A. Bourne. 2009. Extending the Boundaries: Reframing Entrepreneurship as Social Change Through Feminist Perspectives. *The Academy of Management Review* 34: 552–69.
56. Caputo, Andrea, Salime Mehtap, Massimiliano Pellegrini, and Reem Al-Refai. 2016. Supporting Opportunities for Female Entrepreneurs in Jordan. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 27: 384–409.
57. Carr, E. Summerson. 2003. Rethinking empowerment theory using a feminist lens: The importance of process. *Affilia* 18: 8–20.
58. Carree, Martin A., and A. Roy Thurik. 2010. The impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth. In *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*. New York: Springer, pp. 557–94.

59. Carter, Sara, and Eleanor Shaw. 2006. *Women's Business Ownership: Recent Research and Policy Developments*. London: DTI Small Business Service Research Report.
60. Chattopadhyay, Arundhati. 2005. Women and Entrepreneurship. *Yojana*, a Monthly Journal of Ministry of Information and Broadcasting 5: 123–56.
61. Churchill, Sefaa A., and Samuelson Appau. 2020. Microfinance in Latin America and the Caribbean: The curse and blessing of ethnic diversity. *Applied Economics* 52: 1816–30.
62. Cole, Stroma. 2007. Entrepreneurship and empowerment: Considering the barriers—A case study from Indonesia. *Turizam: Medunarodni Znanstveno-Strucni Casopis* 55: 461–73.
63. Copestake, James. 2007. Mainstreaming microfinance: Social performance management or mission drift? *World Development* 35: 1721–38.
64. Cornwall, Andrea, and Althea M. Rivas. 2015. From 'gender equality and 'women's empowerment' to global justice: Reclaiming a transformative agenda for gender and development. *Third World Quarterly* 36: 396–415.
65. Datta, Punita B., and Robert Gailey. 2012. Empowering women through social entrepreneurship: Case study of a women's cooperative in India. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 36: 569–87.
66. De Groot, Tezer U. 2001. *Challenges Faced by Women in Industrial Development Section III in Women Entrepreneurs in Africa: Experience from Selected Countries*. Vienna: UNIDO.
67. De Vita, Luisa, Michela Mari, and Sara Poggesi. 2014. Women entrepreneurs in and from developing countries: Evidences from the literature. *European Management Journal* 32: 451–60.
68. Derera, Evelyn, Pepukayi Chitakunye, and Charles O'Neill. 2014. The Impact of Gender on Start-up Capital: A case of Women Entrepreneurs in South Africa. *Journal of Entrepreneurship* 23: 95–114.
69. Dodd, Sarah D., Sarah Jack, and Alistair R. Anderson. 2013. From admiration to abhorrence: The contentious appeal of entrepreneurship across Europe. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 25: 69–89.
70. Drakopoulou Dodd, Sarah, and Alistair R. Anderson. 2007. Mumpsimus and the mything of the individualistic entrepreneur. *International Small Business Journal* 25: 341–60.
71. Duflo, Esther. 2012. Women empowerment and economic development. *Journal of Economic Literature* 50: 1051–79.
72. Escobar Latapí, Agustin, and Mercedes González de la Rocha. 2009. Survival revisited: Women, households and poverty reduction in Mexico. In *The Gendered Impacts of Liberalization: Towards Embedded Liberalism?* Edited by Shahra Razavi. London: Routledge/UNRISD Series on Gender and Development.
73. Essers, Caroline, and Yvonne Benschop. 2009. Muslim businesswomen doing boundary work: The negotiation of Islam, gender and ethnicity within entrepreneurial contexts. *Human Relations* 62: 403–23.
74. Essers, Caroline, and Deirdre Tedmanson. 2014. Upsetting 'Others' in the Netherlands: Narratives of Muslim Turkish Migrant Businesswomen at the Crossroads of Ethnicity, Gender and Religion. *Gender, Work & Organization* 21: 353–67.
75. Field, Erica, Seema Jayachandran, and Rohini Pande. 2010. Do traditional institutions constrain female entrepreneurship? A field experiment on business training in India. *American Economic Review* 100: 125–29.
76. Foss, Lene, Colette Henry, Helene Ahl, and Geir H. Mikalsen. 2019. Women's entrepreneurship policy research: A 30-year review of the evidence. *Small Business Economics* 53: 409–29.
77. Fraser, Nancya, and Marina Liakova. 2008. "Emancipation is not an All or Nothing Affair": Interview with Nancy Fraser. *Eurozine*.
78. GEM. 2019. *Women's Entrepreneurship Report*, Global Entrepreneurship Research Association. London: London Business School. Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

79. Gill, R., and S. Ganesh. 2007. Empowerment, Constraint, and the Entrepreneurial Self: A Study of White Women Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Applied Communication Research* 35: 268–93.
80. Giménez, Daniela, Patricia Gabaldón, and Cathrine Seierstad. 2017. Women's entrepreneurship in Latin America and the Caribbean: A multidimensional approach. In *Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Growth of Women's*
81. *Entrepreneurship: A Comparative Analysis*. Edited by Tatiana S. Manolova, Candida G. Brush, Linda F. Edelman, Alicia Robb and Friederike Welter. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
82. Gobezie, Getaneh. 2009. Sustainable rural finance: Prospects, challenges and implications. *International NGO Journal* 4: 12–26.
83. Goffee, Robert, and Richard Scase. 2015. *Women in Charge (Routledge Revivals): The Experiences of Female Entrepreneurs*. London: Routledge.
84. Goyal, Meenu, and Jai Parkash. 2011. Women entrepreneurship in India-problems and prospects. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 1: 195–207.
85. Goyal, Preeti, and Vanita Yadav. 2014. To be or not to be a woman entrepreneur in a developing country? *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management* 2: 68–78.
86. Gray, Kenneth R., and Joycelyn Finley-Hervey. 2005. Women and entrepreneurship in Morocco: Debunking stereotypes and discerning strategies. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 1: 203–17.
87. Gurău, Calin, Frank Lasch, and Leo Paul Dana. 2015. Sources of entrepreneurial value creation: A business model approach. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 25: 192–207.
88. Hanmer, Lucia, and Jeni Klugman. 2016. Exploring Women's agency and empowerment in developing countries: Where do we stand? *Feminist Economics* 22: 237–63.
89. Harris, Colette. 2004. *Control and Subversion: Gender Relations in Tajikistan*. London: Pluto Press.
90. Hasan, Syed, and Bushra Shahzad. 2012. The real efficacy of microfinance sector in addressing women empowerment and poverty alleviation issues in Pakistan. *International Journal of Economic Research* 3: 174–82. Hashim, Ruzy S., Imran Ho-Abdullah, M. M. Raihanah, Noraini M. Yusof, Shahizah I. Hamdan, and Ezad Jamsari. 2012. Construction of a Muslim women entrepreneurs in Malay fiction. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Arts and Culture ICAC 2012, Montreux, Switzerland, December 29–31*; pp. 424–29.
91. Hattab, Hala. 2012. Towards understanding female entrepreneurship in Middle Eastern and North African countries. *Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues* 5: 171–86.
92. Herranz, Agustín Á., Pilar V. De Lara, Santiago Barraza, and Ana M. Legato. 2010. Factors determining the entrepreneurial consolidation in Latin America. *African Journal of Business Management* 4: 1717.
93. Ibrahim, Solava, and Sabina Alkire. 2007. Agency and empowerment: A proposal for internationally comparable indicators. *Oxford Development Studies* 35: 379–403.
94. IFC-World Bank. 2013. *Women, Business and the Law*. Washington: World Bank Group.
95. Indarti, Nurul, Rokhimaa Rostiani Tamara Megaw, and Juliet Willetts. 2019. Women's involvement in economic opportunities in water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) in Indonesia: Examining personal experiences and potential for empowerment. *Development Studies Research* 6: 76–91.
96. Inglis, Tom. 1997. Empowerment and emancipation. *Adult Education Quarterly* 48: 3–17.
97. Inmyxai, Sengaloun, and Yoshi Takahashi. 2010. Performance, contrasts and its determinants between male and female headed firms in Lao MSMEs. *International Journal of Business and Management* 5: 37–52.

98. Jack, Sarah L., and Alistair R. Anderson. 2002. The effects of embeddedness on the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Business Venturing* 17: 467–87.
99. Jamali, Dima. 2009. Constraints and opportunities facing women entrepreneurs in developing countries. *Gender in Management* 24: 232–51.
100. Jang, Juyoung, and Sharon M. Danes. 2013. Are we on the same page? Copreneurial couple goal congruence and new venture viability. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal* 3: 483–504.
101. Jennings, Jennifer E., and Candida G. Brush. 2013. Research on women entrepreneurs: Challenges to (and from) the broader entrepreneurship literature? *Academy of Management Annals* 7: 663–715.
102. Jennings, Jennifer E., P. Devereaux Jennings, and Manely Sharifian. 2016. Living the Dream? Assessing the “Entrepreneurship as Emancipation” Perspective in a Developed Region. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 40: 81–110.
103. Kabeer, Naila. 1999. Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women’s empowerment. *Development and Change* 30: 435–64.
104. Kabeer, Naila. 2001. Conflicts over credit: Re-evaluating the empowerment potential of loans to women in rural Bangladesh. *World Development* 29: 63–84.
105. Kabeer, Naila. 2002. Citizenship and the Boundaries of the Acknowledged Community: Identity, Affiliation and Exclusion. IDS Working Paper, 171. Brighton: IDS, pp. 1–48.
106. Kabeer, Naila. 2005. Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment: A Critical Analysis of the Third Millennium Development Goal. *Gender and Development* 13: 13–24.
107. Kabeer, Naila. 2008. Paid Work, Women’s Empowerment and Gender Justice: Critical Pathways of Social Change. London: LSE Library.
108. Kabeer, Naila. 2012. Women’s Economic Empowerment and Inclusive Growth: Labour Markets and Enterprise Development. London: International Development Research Centre, Discussion Paper 29/12. pp. 1–70.
109. Kabir, Mohammad S., and Xuexi Huo. 2011. Advancement of rural poor women through small entrepreneurship development: The case of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Business and Management* 6: 134–40.
110. Kalden, Jan N., James Cunningham, and Alistair R. Anderson. 2017. The social status of entrepreneurs: Contrasting German perspectives. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation* 18: 91–104.
111. Kandiyoti, Deniz, and Nadira Azimova. 2004. The Communal and the Sacred: Women’s Worlds of Ritual in Uzbekistan. *Journal of Royal Anthropological Institute (N.S.)* 10: 327–49.
112. Kantor, Paula. 2003. Women’s empowerment through home-based work: Evidence from India. *Development and Change* 34: 425–45.
113. Karam, Charlotte M., and Dima Jamali. 2013. Gendering CSR in the Arab Middle East: An institutional perspective. *Business Ethics Quarterly* 23: 31–68.
114. Kattan, Matouq M., Carmen de PablosHeredero, Jose-Luis M. Botella, and Vasilica M. Margalina. 2016. Factors of successful women leadership in Saudi Arabia. *Asian Social Science* 12: 94–107.
115. Kelley, Donna J., Candida G. Brush, Patricia G. Greene, and Yana Litovsky. 2011. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) 2010 Report: Women Entrepreneurs Worldwide*. Babson Park: Babson College.
116. Kelley, Donna J., Benjamin S. Baumer, Candida G. Brush, Patricia G. Greene, Mahnaz Mahdavi, Mahdi Cole, Monica Dean, and René Heavlow. 2017. *Global Entrepreneurship Research Association (GERA) 2017. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2016/2017 Report on Women’s Entrepreneurship*.
117. Khitarishvili, Tamar. 2016. Gender Dimensions of Inequality in the Countries of Central Asia, South Caucasus, and Western CIS. Working Paper, No. 858. Annandale-on-Hudson: Levy Economics Institute.

118. Khwaja, Asim. 2005. Measuring Empowerment at the Community Level: An Economist's Perspective. In *Measuring Empowerment. Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by Deepa Narayan. Washington: The World Bank, pp. 267–84.
119. Kishor, Sunita. 2000. Empowerment of women in Egypt and links to the survival and health of their infants. In *Women's Empowerment and Demographic Processes: Moving Beyond Cairo*. Edited by Harriet B. Presser and Gita Sen. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
120. Kishor, Sunitaa, and Kamla Gupta. 2004. Women's empowerment in India and its states: Evidence from the NFHS. *Economic and Political Weekly* 39: 694–712.
121. Klapper, Leora, and Simon Parker. 2011. Gender and the business environment for new firm creation. *World Bank Research Observer* 26: 237–57.
122. Korosteleva, Julia, and Paulina Stepien-Baig. 2020. Climbing the poverty ladder: The role of entrepreneurship and gender in alleviating poverty in transition economies. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 32: 197–220.
123. Laine, Lauri, and Ewald Kibler. 2020. The Social Imaginary of Emancipation in Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 1–28.
124. Leahy, Caitlin, Juliette Lunel, Melita Grant, and Juliet R. Willet. 2017. Women in WASH Enterprises: Learning from Female Entrepreneurship in Cambodia, Indonesia and LaoPDR. Sydney: Enterprise in WASH Working Paper 6, pp. 1–29.
125. Loh, Jennifer M., and Rayini Dahesihsari. 2013. Resilience and economic empowerment: A qualitative investigation of entrepreneurial Indonesian women. *Journal of Enterprising Culture* 21: 107–21.
126. Lucy, Denise M., Jayati Ghosh, and Edward Kujawa. 2008. Empowering women's leadership: A case study of Bangladeshi Microcredit Business. *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal* 73: 31–50.
127. Mahmood, Samia, Javed Hussain, and Harry Z. Matlay. 2014. Optimal microfinance loan size and poverty reduction amongst female entrepreneurs in Pakistan. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 21: 231–49.
128. Mair, Johanna, and Ignasi Marti. 2009. Entrepreneurship in and around institutional voids: A case study from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing* 24: 419–35.
129. Malhotra, Anju, and Sidney R. Schuler. 2005. Women's empowerment as a variable in international development. In *Measuring Empowerment: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*. Edited by Deepa Narayan. Washington: The World Bank, vol. 1, pp. 71–88.
130. Malhotra, Anju, Sidney R. Schuler, and Carol Boender. 2002. Measuring women's empowerment as a variable in international development. In *Background Paper Prepared for the World Bank Workshop on Poverty and Gender: New Perspectives*. Washington DC: The World Bank, pp. 1–58.
131. Marlow, Susan, and Janine Swail. 2014. Gender, risk and finance: Why can't a woman be more like a man? *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 26: 80–96.
132. Marques, Carla, Carmem Leal, João Ferreira, and Vanessa Ratten. 2018. The formal-informal dilemma for women micro-entrepreneurs: Evidence from Brazil. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*.
133. McElwee, Gerard, and Rahma Al-Riyami. 2003. Women entrepreneurs in Oman: Some barriers to success. *Career Development International* 8: 339–46.
134. McKeever, Edward, Alistair Anderson, and Sarah Jack. 2014. Social embeddedness in entrepreneurship research: The importance of context and community. In *Handbook of Research on Small Business and Entrepreneurship*. Edited by Elizabeth Chell and Mine Karatas-Ozkan. London: Edward Elgar, vol. 1.
135. Metcalfe, Beverly D. 2008. Women, management and globalization in the Middle East. *Journal of Business Ethics* 83: 85–100.
136. Mirchandani, Kiran. 1999. Feminist insight on gendered work: New directions in research on women and entrepreneurship. *Gender, Work and Organization* 6: 224–35.
137. Mole, Kevin, and Monder Ram. 2012. *Perspectives in Entrepreneurship*. London: Palgrave.

138. Mordi, Chima, Ruth Simpson, Satwinder Singh, and Chinonye Okafor. 2010. The Role of Cultural Values in Understanding the Challenges faced by Female Entrepreneurs in Nigeria. *Gender in Management: An International Journal* 25: 5–21.
139. Mosedale, Sarah. 2005. Assessing women's empowerment: Towards a conceptual framework. *Journal of International Development* 17: 243–57.
140. Mosedale, Sarah. 2014. Women's empowerment as a development goal: Taking a feminist standpoint. *Journal of International Development* 26: 1115–25.
141. Muravyev, Alexander, Oleksandr Talavera, and Dorothea Schäfer. 2009. Entrepreneurs' gender and financial constraints: Evidence from international data. *Journal of Comparative Economics* 37: 270–86.
142. Mwobobia, Fridah M. 2012. The Challenges Facing Small-scale Women Entrepreneurs: A Case of Kenya. *International Journal of Business Administration* 3: 112–21.
143. Nader, Yasmine F. 2008. Microcredit and socio-economic the wellbeing of women and their families in Cairo. *Journal of Socioeconomics* 37: 644–56.
144. Naguib, Rabia, and Dima Jamali. 2015. Female entrepreneurship in the UAE: A multi-level integrative lens. *Gender in Management: An International Journal* 30: 135–61.
145. Narayan, Deepa, ed. 2002. *Empowerment and Poverty Reduction: A Sourcebook*. Washington: The World Bank. Naude, Wim A. 2013. *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development: Theory, Evidence and Policy*. IZA (Institute of Labor Economics) Discussion Paper No. 7507. Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor.
146. Nawaz, Faraha. 2010. Nexus between women entrepreneurship development and empowerment: Bangladesh context. *Nepalese Journal of Public Policy and Governance* 26: 62–74.
147. Nguyen, Cuc, Howard Frederick, and Huong Nguyen. 2014. Female entrepreneurship in rural Vietnam: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship* 6: 50–67.
148. Noreen, Sara. 2011. Role of Microfinance in Empowerment of Female Population of Bahawalpur District. Department of Economics Bahawalpur, Pakistan. *International Conference on Economics and Finance Research* 4: 65–71.
149. North, Douglass C. 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
150. Ogbor, John O. 2000. Mythicizing and Reification in Entrepreneurial Discourse: Ideology-Critique of Entrepreneurial Studies. *Journal of Management Studies* 37: 605–36.
151. Okafor, Chinonye, and Chima Mordi. 2010. Women Entrepreneurship Development in Nigeria: The Effects of Environmental Factors. *BULETINUL Universitatii Petrol-Gaze din Ploiești, Economic Science Series* 62: 43–52.
152. Osmani, Lutfun N. Khan. 2007. A Breakthrough in Women's Bargain Power: The Impact of Micro Credit. *Journal of International Development* 19: 695–716.
153. Oxfam. 2017. *Even It Up: How to Tackle Inequality in Vietnam*, Labour and Social Publishing House.
154. Parvin, Lovely, M. Wakilur Rahman, and Jinrong Jia. 2012. Determinates of women micro-entrepreneurship development: An empirical investigation in rural Bangladesh. *International Journal of Economics and Finance* 4: 254–60.
155. Pettersson, Katarina, Helene Ahl, Karin Berglund, and Malin. Tillmar. 2017. In the name of women? Feminist readings of policies for women's entrepreneurship in Scandinavia. *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 33: 50–63.
156. Pham, Tho, and Oleksandr Talavera. 2018. Discrimination, social capital, and financial constraints: The case of Viet Nam. *World Development* 102: 228–42.
157. Powell, Gary N., and Kimberly A. Eddleston. 2016. Family involvement in the firm, family-to-business support, and entrepreneurial outcomes: An exploration. *Journal of Small Business Management* 55: 614–31.

158. Quagraine, Fanny A. 2016. Institutional approach and competitive behaviours of informal Ghanaian women entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 28: 323–38.
159. Ramirez-Pasillas, Marcela R., Ethel Brundin, and Magdalena Markowska. 2017. Contextualizing entrepreneurship in-between. In *Contextualizing Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies and Developing Countries*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
160. Rankin, Katharine N. 2008. Manufacturing rural finance in Asia: Institutional assemblages, market societies, entrepreneurial subjects. *Geoforum* 39: 1965–77.
161. Rashid, Sumayya, and Vanessa Ratten. 2020. A Systematic Literature Review on Women Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies While Reflecting Specifically on SAARC Countries. In *Entrepreneurship and Organizational Change. Contributions to Management Science*. Edited by Vanessa Ratten. Cham: Springer, pp. 37–88.
162. Rehman, Huma, D. Amani Moazzam, and Nighat Ansari. 2020. Role of microfinance institutions in women empowerment: A case study of Akhuwat, Pakistan. *South Asian Studies* 30: 107–25.
163. Reisinger, Yvette, and Lindsay Turner. 1997. Cross-cultural differences in tourism: Indonesian tourists in Australia. *Tourism Management* 18: 139–47.
164. Revenga, Ana, and Shetty Sudhir. 2012. Empowering women is smart economics. *Finance & Development* 49: 40.
165. Rindova, Violina, Daved Barry, and David J. Ketchen Jr. 2009. Introduction to special topic forum: Entrepreneurship as emancipation. *Academy of Management Review* 34: 477–91.
166. Roomi, Muhammad A., Sumaira Rehman, and Colette Henry. 2018. Exploring the normative context for women’s entrepreneurship in Pakistan: A critical analysis. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship* 10: 158–80.
167. Rowlands, Jo. 1995. Empowerment examined. *Development in Practice* 5: 101–7.
168. Ruane, Joseph, and Jennifer Todd. 2005. Communal conflict and emancipation: The case of Northern Ireland. In *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., pp. 237–55.
169. Rubach, Michael J., Don Bradley III, and Nicole Kluck. 2015. Necessity entrepreneurship: A Latin American study. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship* 19: 126–39.
170. Salia, Samuel, Javed Hussain, Ishmael Tingbani, and Oluwaseun Kolade. 2018. Is women empowerment a zero-sum game? Unintended consequences of microfinance for women’s empowerment in Ghana. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research* 24: 273–89.
171. Sarfaraz, Leyla, Nezameddin Faghih, and Armaghan A. Majd. 2014. The relationship between women entrepreneurship and gender equality. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research* 2: 1–11.
172. Sattar, Sarosh. 2012. *Opportunities for Men and Women: Emerging Europe and Central Asia*. Washington: World Bank. Scott, Joan W. 2012. *Emancipation and Equality: A Critical Genealogy*. Inaugural lecture as Treaty of Utrecht Chair. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
173. Sen, Amartya. 1997. Human capital and human capability. *World Development* 25: 1959–61.
174. Sharma, Yogita. 2013. Women entrepreneurship in India. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management* 15: 9–14.
175. Shepherd, Dean A., Vinit Parida, and Joakim Wincent. 2020. Entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation: The importance of health and children’s education for slum entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 31: 104225871990077.
176. Sholkamy, Hania. 2010. Power, Politics and Development in the Arab Context: Or how can rearing chicks change patriarchy? *Development* 53: 254–58.
177. Shukla, Tanu, Gajendra S. Chauhan, and Saumya Null. 2018. Traversing the women entrepreneurship in South Asia: A journey of Indian start-ups through Lucite ceiling

- phenomenon. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 12: 50–66.
178. Silverberg, Sarah. 2014. One size does not fit all: A study of microfinance practices in Peru. *Undercurrent* 10: 45–53. Singh, Satwinder, Chima Mordi, Chinonye Okafor, and Ruth Simpson. 2010. Challenges in female entrepreneurial development- a case analysis of Nigerian entrepreneurs. *Journal of Enterprising Culture* 18: 435–60.
 179. Smallbone, David, and Friedericke Welter. 2010. Entrepreneurship and the role of government in post-socialist economies: Some institutional challenges. *Historical Social Research/Historische Sozialforschung* 35: 320–33.
 180. Smith-Hunter, Andrea E., and Joshua Leone. 2010. Evidence on the characteristics of women entrepreneurs in Brazil: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Management and Marketing Research* 3: 85–102.
 181. Ssendi, Lucy, and Alistair R. Anderson. 2009. Tanzanian micro enterprises and micro finance: The role and impact for poor rural women. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship* 18: 1–19.
 182. Stead, Valerie. 2017. Belonging and women entrepreneurs: Women’s navigation of gendered assumptions in entrepreneurial practice. *International Small Business Journal* 35: 61–77.
 183. Steyaert, Chrise, and Jerome A. Katz. 2004. Reclaiming space of entrepreneurship in society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 16: 179–96.
 184. Sun, Sunny L., and Junyon Im. 2015. Cutting microfinance interest rates: An opportunity co-creation perspective. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 39: 101–28.
 185. Swain, Ranjula B. 2007. Impacting women through microfinance. *Dialogue* 37: 61–82.
 186. Swain, Ranjula B., and Fan Y. Wallenti. 2009. Does microfinance empower women? Evidence from self-help groups in India. *International Review of Applied Economics* 23: 541–56.
 187. Tabbush, Constanza. 2010. Latin American women’s protection after adjustment: A feminist critique of conditional cash transfers in Chile and Argentina. *Oxford Development Studies* 38: 437–59.
 188. Tamale, Sylvia. 2004. Gender trauma in Africa: Enhancing women’s links to resources. *Journal of African Law* 48: 50–61.
 189. Tambunan, Tulus. 2009. Women Entrepreneurs in Indonesia: Their main constraints and reasons. *Journal of Asia Entrepreneurship and Sustainability* V: 37–51.
 190. Tambunan, Tulus. 2017. Women entrepreneurship in MSEs in Indonesia, their motivation and main constraints. *Journal of Women’s Entrepreneurship and Education* 1–22: 56–86.
 191. Tedmanson, Deirdre, Karen Verduyn, Caroline Essers, and William B. Gartner. 2012. Critical perspectives in entrepreneurship research. *Organization* 19: 531–41.
 192. Teoh, Wendy M. Y., and Siong C. Chong. 2014. Towards strengthening the development of women entrepreneurship in Malaysia. *Gender in Management* 29: 432–53.
 193. Terjesen, Siri, and José Ernesto Amoros. 2010. Female entrepreneurship in Latin America and the Caribbean: Characteristics, drivers and relationship to economic development. *European Journal of Development Research* 22: 313–30.
 194. Tlais, Hayfaa. 2015. How Islamic Business Ethics Impact Women Entrepreneurs: Insights from Four Arab Middle Eastern Countries. *Journal of Business Ethics* 129: 859–77.
 195. Tripathi, Kumari A., and Saumya Singh. 2018. Analysis of barriers to women entrepreneurship through ISM and MICMAC: A case of Indian MSMEs. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 12: 346–73.
 196. Ukanwa, Irene, Lin Xiong, and Alistair Anderson. 2018. Experiencing microfinance. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 25: 428–46.
 197. van den Brandt, Nella. 2019. Secularity, gender, and emancipation: Thinking through feminist activism and feminist approaches to the secular. *Religion* 49: 691–716.

198. Van der Sluis, Justin, Mirjam Van Praag, and Wim Vijverberg. 2005. Entrepreneurship selection and performance: A Meta-analysis of the impact of education in developing economies. *World Bank Economic Review* 19: 225–61.
199. Verduijn, Karen, and Caroline Essers. 2013. Questioning Dominant Entrepreneurship Assumptions: The Case of Female Ethnic Minority Entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 25: 612–30.
200. Verduijn, Karen, Pascal Dey, Deirdre Tedmanson, and Caroline Essers. 2014. Emancipation And/Or Oppression? Conceptualizing Dimensions of Criticality in Entrepreneurship Studies. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research* 20: 98–107.
201. Webb, Justin W., Christopher G. Pryor, and Franz W. Kellermanns. 2015. Household enterprise in Base-of-the Pyramid markets: The influence of institutions and family embeddedness. *Africa Journal of Management* 1: 115–36.
202. Weber, Olaf, and Adnan Ahmad. 2014. Empowerment through microfinance: The relation between loan cycle and level of empowerment. *World Development* 62: 75–87.
203. Welter, Friederike. 2020. Contexts and gender—looking back and thinking forward. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship* 12: 27–38.
204. Welter, Friederike, and D. Smallbone. 2008. Women’s entrepreneurship from an institutional perspective: The case of Uzbekistan. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 4: 505–20.
205. Welter, Friederike, Ted Baker, David B. Audretsch, and William B. Gartner. 2017. Everyday entrepreneurship—A call for entrepreneurship research to embrace entrepreneurial diversity. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 41: 311–21.
206. Welter, Friederike, Ted Baker, and Katharine Wirsching. 2019. Three waves and counting: The rising tide of contextualization in entrepreneurship research. *Small Business Economics* 52: 319–30.
207. Welzel, Christian, and Ronald Inglehart. 2010. Agency, values, and well-being: A human development model. *Social Indicators Research* 97: 43–63.
208. Wennekers, Sanders, and Roy Thurik. 1999. Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics* 13: 27–56.
209. Woldie, Atsed, and Adebimpe Adersua. 2004. Female entrepreneurs in a transitional economy: Businesswomen in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Economics* 31: 78–93.
210. Wolf, Kathrin, and Michael Frese. 2018. Why husbands matter: Review of spousal influence on women entrepreneurship in sub-Saharan Africa. *Africa Journal of Management* 4: 1–32.
211. World Bank. 2010. *Women Entrepreneurs: Barriers and Opportunities in the Formal Private Sector in Latin America and the Caribbean*. Washington: The World Bank.
212. World Bank. 2011. *An Ongoing (R) Gender Evolution. Expanding Economic Opportunities for Women in Central America. Review of the Last Decade*. Washington: The World Bank.
213. World Bank. 2015. *Women, Business and the Law 2016: Getting to Equal*. Washington: The World Bank.
214. World Bank. 2016. *Vietnam—Gender Gap Narrowed, yet Vietnam still Faces Challenges*. World Bank Report. Washington: The World Bank.
215. World Bank. 2017. *Women Entrepreneurs Finance Initiative (We-Fi)*.
216. World Bank. 2020. *Women Business and the Law 2020*.
217. World Economic Forum. 2018. *The Global Gender Gap Report*.
218. WEF_GGGR_2018.pdf(accessed on 20 July 2020).
219. Xiong, Lin, Irene Ukanwa, and Alistair R. Anderson. 2018. Institutional influence and the role of family in poor women’s micropreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research* 26: 122–40.

220. Yunis, Mohammad S., Hina Hashim, and Alistair R. Anderson. 2019. Enablers and constraints of female entrepreneurship in Khyber Pukhtunkhawa, Pakistan: Institutional and feminist perspectives. *Sustainability* 11: 27.
221. Yunis, Mohammad S., Hina Hashim, and Sajida Tayyeb. 2020. The Gendering of Context: A Fresh Perspective of Women Social Enterprise in Pakistan. *Business and Economic Review* 12: 25–48.
222. Zahra, Shakera A., Mike Wright, and Sondos G. Abdelgawad. 2014. Contextualization and the advancement of entrepreneurship research. *International Small Business Journal* 32: 479–500.
223. Zhao, Eric Y., and Tyler Wry. 2016. Not all inequality is equal: Deconstructing the societal logic of patriarchy to understand microfinance lending to women. *Academy of Management Journal* 59: 1994–2020.
224. Zhu, Lei, Orhan Kara, Hung M. Chu, and Anthony Chu. 2015. Female entrepreneurship: Evidence from Vietnam. *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship* 26: 103–28.
225. Zhu, Lei, Orhan Kara, and Xiaowei Zhu. 2019. A comparative study of women entrepreneurship in transitional economies: The case of China and Vietnam. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies* 11: 66–80.