

Research frameworks and Paradigms in Female entrepreneurship: Female and Integrative Perspectives

Kheiri Nouh¹

Ziane Achour University Of Djelfa (Algeria),

e-mail: kheirinouh@gmail.com

Haouari Fouzi djamel eddine²

Mohamed El Bachir El Ibrahimi University of Bordj Bou Arréridj (Algeria),

e-mail: faouzidjameleddine.haouari@univ-bba.dz

Gacem Mohamed³

Mohamed El Bachir El Ibrahimi University of Bordj Bou Arréridj (Algeria) ,

e-mail: mohamed.gasem@univ-bba.dz

Abstract:

This study aims to provide a theoretical framework that stems from deconstructing the concept of entrepreneurship from its broad perspective, allocating the perspectives that practised research in entrepreneurship on the basis of gender, and contributed to creating a unique academic discourse with its ideological approaches and orientations, and its objectives related to entrepreneurship as a free development act, as well as to women. As an agent within the limits of her social context.

This study, through the practice of in-depth review of the specialized literature, presented the research frameworks and methodological premises from which women's entrepreneurship started at as a special topic in the academic discourse, which led to a multiplicity of perspectives and consequently a multiplicity of paradigms that practised understanding both from its epistemic and ideological angles. The study concluded to present an epistemological analysis of these academic discourses by extracting the most important axioms from which a deeper understanding can be achieved beyond simple reading.

Key Words: Entrepreneurship, Human Development, Feminist Theory, Gender, Epidemiology.

Introduction

Starting with the definitions of the subject may seem simple, but discussing entrepreneurship in an academic setting runs the risk of compromising this premise. There is currently no universal definition of "entrepreneur" that can be accepted intuitively or categorically in the research literature on entrepreneurship according to the majority of experts in the field. This is because the term has been used in a variety of disciplines with idiomatic features, distinct intents, and criteria that fit the conceptual framework of each science or discipline. Researchers and academics find it difficult to select a suitable framework for defining and comprehending the spirit of entrepreneurship since there are several schools of thought that approach the idea from

fundamentally dissimilar angles (Kruger 2004, p 13) due of the fact that there are a number of schools of thought that exist in order to confirm the validity of their epistemological perspective on this term, instead of the real search for its true connotations, which has generated many conceptual presentations, built around the beholder's representations of the perspective, that are fundamentally different from each other, an Entrepreneur is the risk-taker (Cantillon, Bodo, Thunen, Bentham, Sai, Knight), the superior worker (Sai, Smith), the highly intelligent (Cantillon, Quesnai, Bodo, Turgot), the coordinator who attracts other factors, makes decisions (Marshall, Casson), the good observer for the market, spotter of opportunity (Hayek, Kerzner), and innovator or promoter of new combinations (Smith, Schumpeter, Bentham, Mangoldt, 2005; Pereira, 2007; Chakritkhanov, 2017) (Quintero et al., 2019, p 105), but the topic seems more complicated when it is related to the gender dimension. Entrepreneurship from a gender perspective leads to theses, research frameworks and paradigms that are completely different from when the topic is examined from a "non-sexually neutral" perspective, which is what caught our attention in this research paper in order to present a theoretical framework that stems from entrepreneurship business as a concept that can potentially tolerate difference in perceptions, to reach female entrepreneurship as a controversial topic that can only tolerate different ideologies, and we will try, through this scientific paper, to answer fundamental questions about how we can understand entrepreneurship from a gender perspective? And how do the multiple perspectives contribute to enriching the academic discourse of female entrepreneurship?

1-Entrepreneurship

The term "businessman" first appeared in literature in 1253, when it was used in a variety of contexts. It appears to have adopted the current definitive spelling in 1433, and it was widely used in 1500 and 1600. For instance, Champlain stated (Filion, 2011, p 42) that they had been invited to make the trip "to see the country and what entrepreneurs would do there" when describing their first voyage to explore the St. Lawrence River in 1603, and he put the concept of entrepreneurship into a universally descriptive definition in the framework as synonymous with the claims about the "elephant" that was presented from different perspectives by different people, each giving its own point of view to the exclusion of others' points of view. The goal and value of a worldwide emphasis and entrepreneurial methodology as a topic of study have been ruined by numerous researchers seeking to treat the issue through a non-interdisciplinary approach, striving to shape the notion clearly and from a certain position (Edewor et al., 2014, p 18).

The word "entrepreneur" comes from the French verb "entreprendre" (Mair et al., 2006), which means to pledge, to endeavour, to attempt to control, to contract, or to venture, or to attempt. Up until recently, Webster's Dictionary suggested that the term "entrepreneur" was first defined by Richard Cantillon. However, one only needs to check French dictionary sources to see that the origins of the term "entrepreneur" in French predate the writings of Cantillon and Say. Several online historical dictionaries with searchable content may be found at the French

National Resource Center “Textuelles et Lexicales”. One of these is the Dictionnaire du Moyen Français 1330–1500, which is accessible online at dmf.atilf.fr, it gives some examples of the word entrepreneur dating as far back as the fifteenth century (Jonsson, 2017, p 16). It was researched by Helen Vérin in 1982 (Vérin, 1982). who discovered differences in meaning over the course of several centuries, particularly between the 13th and 18th centuries, and wrote a doctoral thesis in which she discussed the misinterpretation of the meaning of the terms "businessman" and "enterprise" throughout history. She points out that the word "enterprise" has strong, aggressive roots, and that it was originally used to describe something distinct in purely economic terms. The description of entrepreneurship was specific in purely economic terms, for example, Cole (1946) defines it as the use of one productive factor for other productive factors used to create economic products. This definition places the entrepreneur as one of the factors in the production process, while we find that Kerzner (1983) has a list of some of the concepts by which economists describe entrepreneurship, including the following: (1) just a type of service work; (2) take risks; (3) the initiation of continuous change; (4) mediation between different markets; (5) coordination, planning and bridging; (6) Pure speculation.

Shapero and Sokol (1982) put forward a conceptual idea: “entrepreneurial event” which, includes “a major event and a variety of events in an unconscious and sometimes unintended context, leading to one limit, which is the emergence of the entrepreneurial spirit.” The entrepreneurial spirit includes the following activities: taking the initiative; consolidating of resources; organization management; proportional control; and risk-taking (Edewor et al., 2014, p 19). There are those who view entrepreneurship as a condition of voluntary submission that is (re)produced like any other social phenomenon; In the sense that entrepreneurship is the heir of its past, and transcends it towards an indefinite future, this transgression leads to the emergence of a “new” enterprise in the sense that refers to the production of a new social bond (Spurk, 1998, pp 17-18).

2-Female entrepreneurship

The association of the topic of “entrepreneurship” with women came very late compared to its existence as an academic topic and was not declared, except through what Schwartz published as the first academic paper on entrepreneurship in the Contemporary Business Journal, and the first policy report in this field was issued entitled “The Bottom Line: Unequal Project in America” was published in 1979 in Washington, D.C. Hisrich and O’Brien in 1981 gave the first academic conference on entrepreneurship at the Babson College Conference on Entrepreneurship in 1981, and the first academic book on women entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs was published in 1985 (Yadav & Unni, 2016, p 02). This increased research presence has gained international academic recognition with the awarding of the Global Prize for Entrepreneurship Research for the first time since its establishment in 1996 to the Diana Group (Candida G. Burch, Nancy M. Carter, Elizabeth Gatewood, Patricia J. Green, and Myra M. Hart) in 2007 for investigating the supply and demand side of the investment capital of women entrepreneurs, as well as studying the impact of the practice’s desire for entrepreneurial action on showing the positive potentials of women entrepreneurship (Carlsson et al., 2013, p 923).

The generalizing view of the concept of entrepreneurship on gender contributed to the delay in the emergence of studies that take into account gender differences in the practice of entrepreneurship, as the preliminary research on entrepreneurship assumed that male and female entrepreneurs were generally the same and there was no specific need for a separate investigation, while "Lewis Stevenson" (1990) argues that research on women's entrepreneurship is "flawed", and adds that women are often excluded using gender measurement tools to appear "inadequate." (Stevenson, 1990). Therefore, most studies tended to take one approach without the other, either to analyze and interpret without invoking the connotations of gender in the pioneering act or to use gender criteria to exclude or reduce women, while advanced feminist theories (GAV) (FST) (PSF) (Henry et al., 2016, p 07) tried to overcome methodological flaws and present arguments and evidence supporting the existence of women in a biased manner, while the modern approach in the study of entrepreneurship adopted a more comprehensive vision of the subject by adopting a contextual approach that takes into account the framing conditions of the entrepreneurial activity in its cultural and social boundaries while invoking the gender structure of parties involved

Relying on this approach, in constructing gender theoretical perceptions and categories, specific to the type of parties active in entrepreneurship, necessarily means agreeing that the concept of entrepreneurship is socially and culturally based, so that, like other practices that fall under social action, it should be analyzed from the reproduction of practices learned through differential socialization Process by Gender theorized by Giddens (2010) (Manzanera-Román & Brändle, 2016, p 42) which states that women internalize values, norms and symbols unlike men in the process of socialization, such as differential behaviour patterns transmitted in children's expectations, which can lead to uneven development in skills. Thus, perseverance, wisdom or empathy are more attributed to women, while strength and the ability to provide security, and independence are traits generally attributed to men, this process makes the development of skills differential, and the refinement of some skills is uneven in terms of sex.

3-Reading from a paradigm perspective

Feminist theory has provided a rich tradition for the analysis of gender relations, making it the first choice for research into the economic activity of women and men. Feminist theoretical frameworks address the question of women's subordination to men: how it arose, why it persists, how it can be changed and (sometimes) what life would be like without it (Smallbone et al., 2010, p 77), and there were numerous studies to answer these questions in the field of entrepreneurship, but the difference between these studies is the trends or paradigms in which methodological and research procedures were executed, and through which the objectives of each study were determined. Researchers applied an academic tradition in classifying These paradigms that were transformed into schools or theories that are valid for analysis. While some suggest classifying feminist theory into three main paradigms (liberal, Marxist, and radical) (Butler, 2003, p 02), others have suggested classifying it into more analytical paradigms, which are incompatible with "generalizing approaches" (Liberal Feminist (LF), Social Feminism Paradigm (SF), and Social Constructivist Feminism (SCF), while "Brush" transcends feminist

perspectives to present a more integrated alternative from his point of view through his five-year approach (M5), and we will try to present these approaches through a focused and in-depth review of the specialized theoretical heritage.

3.1. Liberal Feminist Paradigm (LF):

LF is inspired by a liberal political philosophy that believes in the equality of all beings and that human beings are essentially rational agents, seeking self-interest, and since rationality is a purely mental product, the physical differences between women and men are irrelevant to entrepreneurship or any other social act, in which rationality is seen as having no material foundation, and that women and men are equal in mental capacity (Fischer et al., 1993, p 154), where liberal feminist theory, rooted in a humanist tradition based on universal values, posits that gender differences are a fiction that legitimizes the unequal treatment of men and women. Therefore, this perspective assumes that men and women are alike, but are treated unequally, due to the subordination of women to men in society (Constantinidis, 2014, p 291), and that women who are able to succeed in entrepreneurship like men face discrimination and structural barriers systematically preventing them from realizing their full potential, so entrepreneurship for them will be affected by the situation of dependency within society.

Practices inspired by common stereotypes may constitute a major barrier for female entrepreneurs, for example, girls may be discouraged from making educational or career decisions or choices, and women may fall victim to biased practices on the financing level (Smallbone et al., 2010, p 78). Studies that use this paradigm employ circumstantial and contextual factors, rather than individual factors, to explain the obstacles to the creation and development of women's businesses, with the aim of highlighting, neutralizing or eliminating them, in order to ensure equal opportunities for entrepreneurship (Constantinidis, 2014, p 292), and to encourage women to take action to correct the imbalance, and to form self-supporting "feminist networks" as opposed to the old masculine networks" (Smallbone et al., 2010, p 78).

3.2. A Social Feminist Paradigm (SF):

This paradigm assumes that men and women are different, since from birth they are exposed to different experiences, and therefore have radically different ways of seeing the world. The socialization of women creates paths, goals and choices that are distinct from men in the same context or family, which makes it very likely that sectors of female activity will emerge (services, retail, etc.). For women, the relationship between family and work is stronger. Rather than seeing their work as "economic units separate from the social world," Broch (1992) concludes that women view their work as an interdependent system of relationships (family, community, and work). These differences do not mean that women will be less effective at work than men, but that they adopt different approaches and methods, as effective as those adopted by men (Smallbone et al., 2010, p 79). Women entrepreneurs use a natural approach to incorporate their feminine features into their business efforts. In terms of their relationship with women, leadership and management procedures become new practices, and social feminist theorists frequently consider feminine features as "benefits" or "resources" that must be used constructively, benefited from, and taken into account.

However, other theorists believe that using conceptions of similarity (LF) or difference (SF) between women and men entrepreneurs is counterproductive. Interpretations influenced by liberal and social feminism indirectly affirm the "man standard" of entrepreneurship as the essential norm and lead to a better understanding of "the male standard" of entrepreneurship. The "inability" of women to become entrepreneurs as a result of their gender, as well as viewing gender as the primary determinant for class separation, while a third feminist tendency (social structural feminism) arises, calling into question the legitimacy of using gender as a variable (Smallbone et al., 2010, p 79).

3.3. Social Constructivist Feminism (SCF):

Some authors question the realist ontology and positivist epistemology underlying most studies of women's entrepreneurship and suggest changing the paradigm by highlighting and "denunciating" the implicit masculine base around which the idea of entrepreneurship is built in the literature where: " putting individuals into gendered categories during research lead to Reproducing gender inequality and affirming the subordination of women in society". (Constantinidis, 2014, p 295). Social constructivist feminist theorists believe that gender is a "practice" rather than an "entity," a systematic social process that is produced and reproduced through power relations in society. The long-term effect is through the process of repetition and reproduction of generally accepted patterns of behaviour. The common epistemological discourse in women's entrepreneurship according to Code (1998) plays a role in maintaining patriarchal structures and associated hierarchies" and dominant epistemological theories exercise authority over the "facts" that are produced, by legitimizing the methods used to reveal and make knowledge Objective facts, the questions we ask often prevent us from asking others, says Sarasvathi (2004), or simply the answers we get depend on the questions we ask (Ahl, 2004, p 549). Studying entrepreneurship as a social phenomenon in a society built around patriarchal norms, researchers can only reinforce the prevailing normative conditions and judge female entrepreneurship by them, and unless gender differences are ignored, they are categorized into male and female. According to the SCF pioneers, true equality is impossible, as studies based on polarizing individuals into groups based on gender (ie, binary opposites) risk reproducing female subordination.

3.4. Brush's Five-Way Integrative Framework:

"Brush" believes that the theory of entrepreneurship that explains the creation of projects, in general, is based on three basic structures in general, which are the market, money and management, or what is termed as "Ms3". "Brush" believes that these three basic building blocks are insufficient to explain or maintain the continuity of the project, which is derived from a purely economic perspective, that overlooks the fact that entrepreneurship as a project is a social practice in a "societal" context, and Brosh proceeds from this premise to create his "5M" integrative model by fabricating mediators between these building blocks. Broch suggests that the study of women's entrepreneurship should be comprehensive, incorporating external standards, values and expectations, and not only the three primary building blocks "Ms3", but also the framework itself needs to expand into the "5Ms" while including other aspects, namely

"motherhood" and the macro environment as well as the "intermediate" (Brush et al., 2009, p 09).

"Motherhood" is a metaphor representing the family, and thus draws attention to the fact that family/domestic contexts may have a greater impact on women than men, while the intermediate environment includes considerations beyond the market, such as societal expectations, cultural and social norms, and representations of women in media discourse. , the macro environment includes considerations that transcend the temporal and spatial domain of entrepreneurship, such as national and regional policies and strategies and global cultural and economic influences. Components of the five-frame framework is necessary in order to proceed with the establishment of any project.

Conclusion

Through our review of many studies both field and theoretical, we were able to observe some axioms as the general academic discourse that adopts the topic of women's entrepreneurship may not deviate from some of the axioms that we were able to dismantle from among the apparent and hidden meanings of this discourse. Epistemological analysis of the female entrepreneurship discourse confirms, from our point of view, the following:

Axiom 1: Women Entrepreneurship is a Contextual Problem

The subject obtains different connotations in each research template or a different temporal and spatial framework. Most of these studies have a common thread in dealing with the issue of women entrepreneurs or women entrepreneurship in several ways and approaches, and with multiple problems, trying to answer the motives of their social context, and diagnose these problems in order to understand and explain them from the point of view of each researcher, which makes us arrive at a second axiom,

Axiom 2: The Context Determines the Awareness of Researchers

The context imposes its presence on the awareness of researchers, so they proceed by building their problems and answering them in accordance with it. This consensus does not negate the third axiom,

Axiom 3: Endings are Predetermined

The scientific foundation of the ideological and epistemological researcher makes the researcher's goal to ratify these premises. The theoretical and ideological background and the epistemological premises make the research reach conclusions compatible with his/her intellectual premises. This compatibility is a consensus from the researcher's point of view and his agendas - such as the feminist and liberal agendas. Thus, objectivity takes a lower value. The researcher's subjectivity is present in his research, and the researcher's task becomes to achieve "the conditions of objectivity" and not necessarily achieve "objectivity," in other words, the subordination to the objective conditions is to achieve the scientific and academic aptitude for research, which makes the research in the same temporal and spatial framework knowing that the same context, differs from searcher to another.

Axiom 4: Women are a Case for Use

The topic of women's entrepreneurship is recent in the academic field, although its components are not recent. Work and women's work and even entrepreneurship are all chronologically older topics while discussing all in one problem is the core of the present-day studies. Its importance is related to its connection with development, empowerment policies, and the wider debate about the ability of Women's right to work, their freedom, and their liberation from social constraints, as well as the fact that these issues are at the centre of the concerns of international organizations for the liberation and defence of women, in order to improve the position of women in social life as declared goals, and hidden goals subject to global ideologies greater than the apparent issue. Despite the availability of studies on the topic of women's entrepreneurship, they leave a vast area of intangible problems with research and investigation, or undiscovered, or that are not intended to be raised, given that they do not serve the ideological orientations and epistemological premises of researchers, so some researchers orient their research topics towards certain paths to distract us from the others. The selection of the subject in itself becomes an initial bias even before the start. Thus, widening the research gap that did not fall under the perspective of empirical or theoretical verification. All perspectives reduce, behind them, cognitive and ideological structures and answers to specific contexts from which researchers start, so some of them reach a part of the truth, and others confirm the validity of their premises, while others practice the fragmentation of the truth and the selection of the fittest for him/her as a researcher and not for the research. It becomes research based on the spirit of selection for the subject and then for the most marketable results at a certain ideological level, or at the level of a political or economic program, for material or moral gain.

List of references

1. Ahl, H. (2004). The scientific reproduction of gender inequality: A discourse analysis of research texts on women's entrepreneurship. Liber [u.a.].
2. Brush, C. G., de Bruin, A., & Welter, F. (2009). A gender-aware framework for women's entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 8–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17566260910942318>
3. Butler, J. E. (2003). *New Perspectives on Women Entrepreneurs*. IAP.
4. Carlsson, B., Braunerhjelm, P., McKelvey, M., Olofsson, C., Persson, L., & Ylinenpää, H. (2013). The evolving domain of entrepreneurship research. *Small Business Economics*, 41(4), 913–930. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-013-9503-y>
5. Constantinidis, C. (2014). FEMMES ENTREPRENEURES. In P.-M. Chauvin, M. Grossetti, & P.-P. Zalio (Eds.), *Dictionnaire sociologique de l'entrepreneuriat*. Sciences Po, Les Presses.
6. Edewor, P. A., Abimbola, O. H., & Ajayi, M. P. (2014). An Exploration of Some Sociological Approaches to Entrepreneurship. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7.
7. Filion, L. J. (2011). Defining the Entrepreneur Complexity and Multi-Dimensional Systems Some Reflections. In *World Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship* (pp. 41–52). Edward Elgar Publishing..
8. Fischer, E. M., Reuber, A. R., & Dyke, L. S. (1993). A theoretical overview and extension of research on sex, gender, and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(2), 151–168. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026\(93\)90017-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(93)90017-Y)
9. Henry, C., Foss, L., & Ahl, H. (2016). Gender and entrepreneurship research: A review of methodological approaches. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 34(3), 217–241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242614549779>

10. Jonsson, P. (2017). On the Term “Entrepreneur” and the Conceptualization of Entrepreneurship in the Literature of Classical Economics. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7, 16. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n6p16>
11. Kruger, M. E. (2004). CREATIVITY IN THE ENTREPRENEURSHIP DOMAIN [Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the PhD in Entrepreneurship in the Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences, University of Pretoria etd]. <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/27491/Complete.pdf?sequence=11>
12. Mair, J., Robinson, J., & Hockerts, K. (2006). *Social Entrepreneurship* (1st edition). Palgrave Macmillan UK. <https://www.palgrave.com/gp/book/9781403996640>
13. Manzanera-Román, S., & Brändle, G. (2016). Abilities and skills as factors explaining the differences in women entrepreneurship. *Suma de Negocios*, 7(15), 38–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sumneg.2016.02.001>
14. Quintero, A., Andrade, J. M., & Ramírez, E. (2019). Entrepreneurship as an Area of Knowledge: Literature Review. *European Research Studies Journal*, XXII(2), 100–124.
15. Smallbone, D., Leitão, J., Raposo, M., & Welter, F. (2010). *The Theory and Practice of Entrepreneurship: Frontiers in European Entrepreneurship Research*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
16. Spurr, J. (1998). *Une critique de la sociologie de l'entreprise: L'hétéronomie productive de l'entreprise*. L'Harmattan.
17. Stevenson, L. (1990). Some Methodological Problems Associated with Researching Women Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9(4/5), 439–446.
18. Vérin, H. (1982). *Entrepreneurs, entreprise. Histoire d'une idée* -. Presses Universitaires de France.
19. Yadav, V., & Unni, J. (2016). Women entrepreneurship: Research review and future directions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40497-016-0055-x>