AN INSIGHT TO THE WORLD OF FEMALE ENTREPRENEURSHIP: SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW OF THE PHENOMENON USING THE MCKINSEY 7S MODEL

Jan ZAVODNY POSPISIL[a)], Lucie Sara ZAVODNA[b)]

Prague University of Economics and Business, Prague, CZECH REPUBLIC
[a)]e-mail: jan.zavodny@vse.cz; ORCID: 0000-0003-2054-311X
[b)]e-mail: lucie.zavodna@vse.cz; ORCID: 0000-0001-7309-6590

Abstract: The paper's main aim is to contribute to the empirical knowledge of women's entrepreneurship by utilizing the McKinsey 7S Model to explain the managerial phenomenon in women-led companies. The paper is based on secondary data sources. The data were collected from case studies presented in academic journals indexed in the Scopus and Web of Science databases. The data collection used the PRISMA 2009 method. The case studies of women-led companies were assessed in the McKinsey 7S model on a qualitative basis. The paper introduces women companies' managerial traits and procedures, which the McKinsey 7S model can recognize. In the chosen and analyzed sample of case studies dealing with female entrepreneurship, not even one directly used the McKinsey model for analysis. Results also showed that the 7S model should be used with primary data rather than to evaluate incomplete secondary data. Also, factors that lead women to start a business worldwide have been shown.

Keywords: female entrepreneurship, gender, female-owned companies, McKinsey model.

JEL Classification: M140, M130, M160, L260, J710.

1 Introduction

There are more female-founded, female-owned, and female-led companies today than ever before (VanderBrug, 2013). It can also be expected, at least in certain countries, that this number will increase in the future (Daymard, 2015).

Therefore, there is a need for a better understanding of the overall complexity of the management of companies owned by women. Following the results of various studies, research into the female business area should be focused, for instance, on leadership style (Kephart and Schumacher, 2005), entrepreneurship (Stanford, Oates and Flores, 1995), strategies (Yadav and Unni, 2016), systems (Paoloni and Modaffari, 2018), skills (James, 2012), and innovation (Kemppainen, 2019). For future research, there is a need to leave national boundaries (Yadav and Unni, 2016; Jennings and Brush, 2013) and avoid gender bias in the research approach (Ahl and Marlow, 2012; Ahl and Nelson, 2010).

To meet the calls for future research using a more practical approach, and when hearing the appeals for a standardized research framework (e.g., Jennings and Brush, 2013; Mullen, Budeva and Doney, 2009 or Dean, Shook and Payne, 2007), the McKinsey 7S model has been adopted for examining the field of female entrepreneurship.

2 Understanding the tool

The so-called McKinsey 7S model was first introduced in the paper "Structure is not organization" by Waterman, Peters and Phillips (1980). The model is a practical tool, mostly used as an organizational analysis tool to assess and monitor changes in the internal situation of an organization (Ravanfar, 2015). To date, the 7S model is considered as one of the best known frameworks in management literature and is still widely used by consultants, practitioners, and also academics (Channon and Caldart, 2015).

As its name suggests, the model uses seven factors that provide a holistic view of business unit performance (Waterman, 1982). Three of these are "hard" factors: Strategy, Structure, and Systems. The other three factors, Skills, Staff, and Style, including the fourth particular factor, Shared values, are "soft" factors (Ravanfar, 2015). Perfect knowledge of the state of these factors is crucial for realizing how well an organization is positioned. This eventually allows

the company to achieve its intended objectives (Jalagat, 2016).

The McKinsey model, therefore, could be used at least for (a) improving the company's performance; (b) examining the likely effects of future changes within a company; (c) aligning departments and processes during a merger or acquisition, and (d) determining how best to implement a proposed strategy (Waterman, Peters and Phillips, 1980). Since the content of the 7S factors is, in fact, broad and fuzzy, the advantage of the model lies mainly in the setting of the strict prism on how to look at the company for its further evaluation (Waterman, 1982).

What is more, McKinsey elements are gender independent and, through their interdependency (Channon and Caldart, 2015), serve as a universal framework to evaluate the company's overall execution - whether run by a woman or a man. Therefore, the McKinsey 7S model can answer the calls for (a) leaving the practice of gender perspective on women's business (Ahl and Marlow, 2012), (b) avoiding partially obsolete feminist theory framing (Calás, Smircich and Bourne, 2009), and (c) the need for an unbiased view of women entrepreneurship performance (Ahl and Nelson, 2010; Henry, Foss and Ahl, 2016).

3 Theoretical background

Even though the debate about the factors influencing economic growth is still ongoing (Helpmann, 2004), one of the most frequently mentioned factors is entrepreneurial activities (e.g., Baumol, 1993; North, 1990; or even Schumpeter, 1911). In this regard, it could be said that entrepreneurship plays a significant role in most of the world's open economies.

Despite the long history of entrepreneurship and its unceasing economic importance, this field has undergone fundamental changes over the last decade (Casson and Casson, 2014). It is highly likely that these changes were mostly related to the overall development of society and included a variety of factors such as the impact of globalization (Petrova, 2013), digitalization (Nambisan, 2017), robotization (Garsombke and Garsombke, 1989), and postmodernism (Aldawod and Day, 2017). For this paper, it is necessary to mention the factor of changing gender stratification (Ahl and Nelson, 2010) in entrepreneurship or entrepreneurs, respectively.

Although women have been part of the working world for hundreds of years (Higginbotham and Romero, 1997), for an extended period, entrepreneurship has been considered as a male field (Kephart and Schumacher, 2005). However, even in the case of women's work, there is no question of full equality between the sexes. In the 1950s and 1960s, women were often seen as "support staff" (Morrison, et al., 1992). Today's situation is different, but not completely. Different types of sex discrimination can still be observed in the working field in some less-developed countries (e.g., Hayashi, 2015 or Goyal and Yadav, 2014). Interestingly, similar cases can also be found in the western world (e.g., Robinson and Finley, 2007), although discrimination is often concealed (Kephart and Schumacher, 2005) or is due to work and family balance issues (Brown and Irby, 2001).

It might appear confusing that discrimination in employment relates to entrepreneurship. However, the connection is relatively apparent as several studies emphasize sex discrimination in jobs as the critical factor for switching from being an employee to an entrepreneur (e.g., Paoloni and Modaffari, 2018; Robinson and Finley, 2007). There are also more gender-related reasons why women start their own businesses.

The combination of workload and different levels of family care can also be a factor affecting women's preferences toward entrepreneurship (Paoloni and Modaffari, 2018). Running her own business can help a woman to make money while staying at home and taking care of her children (Robinson and Finley, 2007). In this regard, unsurprisingly, Kephart, et al. (2005) point out that in the western world, especially in the USA, more than two-thirds of all home-based businesses are owned by women (Kephart, et al., 2005). It should be noted at this point that it is usually circumstances that push women to run their home-based businesses, which often makes their entrepreneurship a substitute for part-time work (Georgellis and Wall, 2005).

It is certainly not true that external circumstances are the sole factor that forces women into self-employment. As stated by Ducheneaut (1997), apart from the so-called "push" factor (Shapero and Sokol, 1982),

there are also the "pull" factors, such as independence, self-fulfillment, and income pursuit, which motivate women to become entrepreneurs (Ducheneaut, 1997). Nevertheless, empirical evidence shows that the push factors are more predominant in female than in male entrepreneurs (Jennings and Brush, 2013). In this context, it should also be noted that the dominant influence of push factors is correlated with less-developed countries (e.g., Kelley, et al., 2011; Welter, et al., 2006).

Whether in developed or developing countries, the volume of female entrepreneurs is growing. This is evidenced not only by statistical data (Niethammer, 2013), but also by the increased interest of researchers in the subject.

Although some authors suggest that there are no considerable differences between the businesses run by men and women in terms of ability (Han, Cui, Chen and Fu, 2019) and some of them even contradict the established understanding of gender differences (Delphy, 1993), a significant majority of research stresses that there are indeed differences.

The reason why it is important to look at those companies from the point of view of a consulting perspective lies in the previously mentioned needs for leaving the practice of gender perspective when analyzing women's business (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). Before that, however, it is necessary to verify whether the McKinsey 7S model allows this view of the area of women's entrepreneurship when analyzing existing case studies. Therefore, using the model as an evaluation tool, this paper aims to verify that the 7S model can serve as a conceptual framework that allows investigation and analysis of all the crucial areas of women-led organizations.

The paper also aims to determine the factors that lead women to start a business and to find out whether there are differences in these factors within developing and developed countries.

4 Research methods

The paper is based on secondary data sources. The data collection used the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA 2009) method (Moher, et al., 2009), a method often used in medical science (Knobloch, Yoon and Vogt, 2011) to provide verified preferred reporting items for preparing systematic reviews and meta-analyses. As the secondary data in this paper were collected as a result of a literature review, the chosen method with its checklist provided enough certainty for the literature review process.

The data were collected from case studies presented in academic journals. There were two main limitations connected with gaining the data from case studies. A significant limitation was (a) the different quality and, above all, the diverse reliability of the case studies. However, this is a long-known problem related to case studies (Gibbert, Ruigrok and Wicki, 2008). A related limitation was (b) the insufficient number of employable studies. If the authors aimed to explore the most expansive possible area of women's entrepreneurship, then it was necessary to select the largest possible sample of usable case studies for further analysis. In this regard, the case studies presented in academic journals indexed in the Scopus and Web of Science databases were considered. However, for the reasons stated above, the journal's ranking was not taken into account.

The only criteria for selecting case studies for further elaboration were (a) keywords, (b) source type, (c) document type, (d) publication stage, and (e) language of the contribution. In this regard, at least one of the following keywords had to be included in the document: "women entrepreneurship" or "female entrepreneurship" or "women owned." Mandatory to the previous was the keyword "case study." The designated keywords were selected based on the preliminary literature research presented in this paper's theoretical part. Searching was limited to journal papers written in English. Selected keywords were searched within the title, abstract, and author keywords. Since the first papers related to female entrepreneurship issues were published during the 70s, the time span for searching was set from 1970 to 2019.

Based on the specified criteria, a total of 420 records were obtained, with 66 records found in the Scopus database and 354 in the Web of Science™ (WOS) database. However, some records were duplicates. Therefore, following the PRISMA 2009 flow diagram (Stovold, Beecher, Foxlee and Noel-Storr, 2014), the records and their related full papers were manually

scanned for duplicity and relevance. The full-text assessment for eligibility was then conducted, where only the real case studies were selected from the total number of papers. After identification, screening, and an eligibility check for further research processing, overall, 292 articles were ready for further examination.

Such a created library of full texts was then processed in Qiqqa, a research management tool that enables to deal with further aspects of the academic research process (Graham, 2013). Using this tool, the selected papers underwent the tagging process by searching for the keywords within the full text. For each of the McKinsey 7S model elements, a specific set of keywords was set. Their selection was based on the simplified theoretical description presented by Channon and Caldart (2015). For each element, the keywords were as follows: (a) Structure: "structure" OR "functional" OR "industry" OR "client" OR "company structure;" (b) Systems: "system" OR "procedures" OR "formal" OR "informal;" (c) Style: "style" OR "management style" OR "micromanage" OR "plan ahead" OR "reactive" OR "taking risk;" (d) Staff: "staff" OR "employee" OR "co-worker" OR "colleague" OR "talented;" (e) Skills: "skills" OR "managerial skills" OR "soft skills" OR "hard skills" OR "entrepreneurial skills;" (f) Strategy: "strategy" OR "vision" OR "mission" OR "business strategy" OR "chosen strategy;" and (g) Shared values: "key beliefs" OR "corporate culture" OR "shared values."

It would be correct to point out that the given keywords cannot sufficiently cover the researched topic. It is a common problem caused by the very essence of the chosen research method. Choosing the right keywords is one of the basic limitations of similar research (Ismail and Kareem, 2011). In this case, however, the situation is somewhat different, as the McKinsey 7S model's simplicity makes it easy to identify the primary areas with only a few keywords (Ravanfar, 2015).

5 Results

Using the abovementioned methodology, the articles that were relevant for further investigation were manually selected. From the original quantity of papers selected for further elaboration, only 116 (n = 116) items were chosen after the final review, which were case studies or working papers with case studies. Most of the studies were dedicated to cases from specific countries. Only eight papers were focused globally; however, those studies were reviews only. The geographical distribution was not taken into account in the process of selecting studies. However, the subsequent analysis of the nationality of the studies showed interesting results. Most studies came from Asia (34), followed by Europe (24), Africa (17), America (5), and Australia (3).

These results somewhat contradict Yadav and Unni (2016) who claim that women entrepreneurship research is mostly conducted in developed economies. On the contrary, this finding may support the thesis that the situation is beginning to change, even in those countries where, until recently, women were in an unequal position (Kemppainen, 2019). Our results can confirm this because 23% of all evaluated studies came from countries in the Arabian Peninsula (10 case studies) and the Indian Peninsula (eight studies).

Analyzing women entrepreneurship within the prism of the McKinsey model has some general outputs. Each part of the 7S model is described in the text below. While in some categories, there is a larger number of findings, in other parts, there are only a few. This is due to the focus of the original case studies. Because the source case studies did not use the 7S framework to evaluate the cases, the resulting findings cannot be ultimate. Nevertheless, the outcomes can be considered as a valuable insight into the world of women entrepreneurship.

5.1 Structure

Every company is a multi-element entity; therefore, it must have a specific structure to function successfully. In the McKinsey model, the structure is considered to be a critical challenge when focusing on those factors that are essential for the evolution of the corporation (Channon and Caldart, 2015). In this regard, the structure in the 7S model is defined purely as how the company elements are organized (Ravanfar, 2015). These are mostly represented by the organization charts and the accompanying baggage (Waterman, 1982).

Despite the relative simplicity of the structure definition, a closer examination is missing from the analyzed case studies. Simultaneously, the findings show the highest semantic variance among all the analyzed categories. The partially unifying element was the emphasis on the importance of a functioning structure as a key element for the development of a successful company (Kumar, 2013; Kemppainen, 2019). Despite this importance, studies from Italy (Paoloni and Modaffari, 2018) and India (Datta and Gailey, 2012) highlight that it is women-led businesses that may lack a clearly defined structure.

If a clear structure is present in companies, its appearance is influenced by various factors. These factors are twofold: (a) those given by local cultural dimension and (b) those based on the feminine nature of women's entrepreneurship. In the first category, a case study from the United Arab Emirates (UAE; Erogul, Rod and Barragan, 2019) emphasizes that men are favored in corporate structures. A similar situation is reported in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA; Kemppainen, 2019), but with the difference that there is a call for change as the encouragement of pro-women structures can enable the use of women's innovation potential. On the contrary, a case study from Japan claimed that the company structure is determined by the gender identity of the company's owner, as well as by the culturally subordinate role of women (Leung, 2011). Historical evidence from Italy (Picciaia, 2017), as well as current evidence from the USA (Cochran, 2019), shows that although the role of women in the formal structure is lagging, its informal influence on the functioning of society may be crucial.

When searching for the typical features of women's structures in companies, these are focused primarily on relationships, sustainability, or consensus, as referred to by Indian case studies (Kumar, 2013; Datta and Gailey, 2012). On the other hand, Brazilian research mentions that structures in women's companies are more focused on control than in male-run corporate structures (Gomes, et al., 2014). The connecting element of the structure of the mentioned companies by women is usually a flat structure with a lesser focus on company profit.

5.2 Strategy

The business strategy is a vital part of every business as it enables future survival. In the analyzed case studies, the strategy is often described as visionary (Agarwal and Lenka, 2016; Datta and Gailey, 2012) as well as the ability to seize opportunities and have a vision (Agarwal and Lenka, 2016; O'Brien, 2018; Paoloni and Dumay, 2015; Tahir and Baradie, 2019; Tynan, et al., 2009).

The importance of strategy as a tool for achieving a competitive advantage is frequently mentioned in the analyzed studies. As described in a British case study (Tynan, et al., 2009), some companies tend to prefer candidates with certain strategic skills and predispositions when hiring. However, at this point, discrimination may occur as these "strategic abilities" are attributed more to men than women (Cochran, 2019). Therefore, many strategies of women-run companies are shaped because of the aim to break free from gender discrimination, as shown in the case study from Oman (Ghouse, et al., 2017).

Discrimination is often caused by local culture and its practices, for example, in Ghana (Anambane and Adom, 2018). The women mentioned in the Ghanaian study suffered, in addition to social condemnations, less chance of attaining the capital that is so important for the business. However, culture can also be considered as a source of inspiration and creativity when creating a strategy, as mentioned in the case studies from Indonesia and Java (Anggadwita, et al., 2017).

Creativity is also another vital element that can help create a sustainable and competitive strategy, as the examples from Britain (O'Brien, 2018) and China (Tan, 2008) show. In addition to creativity, a case study from Portugal mentioned a passion, namely, a passion for wine, which led women to come together and start a successful wine business (Santos, et al., 2019).

The social area is mentioned much more often in the studies as the main factor influencing the strategy and is generally considered to be dominant in women-run companies. When setting strategies, women aim to achieve a certain trade-off between the economic and social levels of business (Brieger, et al., 2019). For example, in a case study from Turkey, women set out a strategy as a result of the effort to attain greater

flexibility, autonomy, and the effort to make money, but with regard to the social sphere (Kalafatoglu and Mendoza, 2017).

In addition to the social area, the possibility of sharing is also typical for women's entrepreneurship and related strategies – whether this is about sharing information and emotions from business with the family, as in the Italian study (Cesaroni and Paoloni, 2016), or in the form of shared leadership, as in the studies from Australia (Collins, 2014), Japan (Leung, 2011) or Portugal (Santos, et al., 2019).

5.3 Systems

Systems in the McKinsey 7S model are defined as the formal and informal procedures that make the organization work. Although in the original concept of the model, the internal systems are mostly intentional, in the examined case studies, references to external systems were more often found. Regardless of this, the research results correspond with the theory highlighting the dual view of systems as formal and informal procedures (Ravanfar, 2015). In the same way, our results point out the importance of informal systems, as mentioned by Channon and Caldart (2015).

A specific feature of female entrepreneurship is that systems are primarily related to relationships, which can be appreciated by employees as shown by an Indian case (Datta and Gailey, 2012). As a key to the success of female entrepreneurs in Ghana, a strong family tie is found (Anambane and Adom, 2018). In India, family connections create a specific type of networking, which plays an essential role in collaborating and binding companies together (Jha, et al., 2018).

Although world literature is strengthening the significance of both formal and informal systems (Brieger, et al., 2019), a Ukrainian case study highlights the primary importance of informal systems (Aidis, et al., 2007). The Ukrainian case may be partly related to the shift to informal systems due to efforts to avoid rigid regulatory processes and the related costs. However, as shown in the case of the UAE, although there is a desire for formal business networking in women entrepreneurship, the contemporary culture and political situation lead women to participate less in formal systems (Tahir and Baradie, 2019). On the contrary, an Israeli case where the state policy attenuates gender differences shows that the state empowers women in the formal systems and disadvantages those in the informal systems (Pfefferman and Frenkel, 2015).

Further reasons why women prefer to do business in informal systems are shown in cases from other countries. For example, in Swaziland, women who want to do business often do not have enough money to start their own official business. Therefore, they remain in the informal sphere, enabling them to do business and make money (Nziku and Struthers, 2018). It is a similar situation in Jordan where women prefer to stay in the informal sphere of business because of easier access to profit (Mehtap, et al., 2019). Regarding the informal area, in Ghana, the vast majority of young women and men set up their businesses in the informal sector (Langevang, et al., 2015). Being in the informal business sphere does not necessarily mean that it is a fixed state. As shown in the case from Bangladesh, informal income-generating activities can lead women to start formal businesses (Ferdousi and Mahmud, 2019).

It is not only the financial factors that lead female entrepreneurs to prefer informal systems and networks. The case from Lithuania shows that informal networks of women entrepreneurs can provide a non-threatening environment where they can exchange views, advice, and experiences (Grundey and Sarvutytė, 2007). Also relevant is the experience described in the UK case study, where female entrepreneurs developed and sustained the informal network developed in the regular management skills training course (Tynan, et al., 2009).

5.4 Style

Among the "soft S" of the McKinsey model, Style represents the management style of the company's leaders (Ravanfar, 2015). In this regard, even though the investigated case studies are from all over the world, some common traits can be found, which can be labeled as part of a specific female management style. This observation is also mentioned in the case study from Italy, where an emerging feminine management style based on flexibility, creativity, and resilience was referred to (Demartini, 2018). Although a Canadian case suggested that a specific managerial

style is strongly linked to the individual entrepreneurs' characteristics and their vision of the company (Cadieux, et al., 2002), cases from other countries show something else. For instance, a case study from Bosnia and Herzegovina reported different entrepreneurial performances between female and male business owners, whereas women showed better results in entrepreneurial performance based on innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk taking (Palalic, Ramadani and Dana, 2017).

In some cases, the female entrepreneurial style is a result of societal norms and gender expectations, as shown in the case studies from Ethiopia (Gudeta and van Enge, 2018), Nigeria (Uzuegbunam and Uzuegbunam, 2018), and Portugal (Carvalho and William, 2014). Although sharing the same reasons, women in those countries choose a different leadership and managerial style: a boundary style in Ethiopia, a transformational style in Nigeria, and a participative style in Portugal. A participative style is also shown in an Italian case study (Paoloni and Dumay, 2015), where it is presented as a result of the influence of personal attributes. The same applies to the transformational style mentioned in the studies from Kuwait, which is shown as a result of female entrepreneurs' personalities (Al-Salem and Speece, 2017).

The remaining studies address the causes of managerial style selection. Leung (2011) states that in Japan, the managerial style is given by motherhood identity, which provides a significant resource for competitive advantage in female entrepreneurship. On the contrary, a more prosaic explanation of the choice of management style for female entrepreneurs is presented in a study from South Africa, where the authors claim that the actual managerial style could be a result of programs supporting women entrepreneurs (van Vuuren, et al., 2007).

5.5 Skills

Skills is one of the most stereotyped categories of the 7S model, which our data also proves. For example, a British study (Patterson, et al., 2012) accurately describes the biggest stereotype – the assertion that women possess more soft skills and men possess more hard skills. This cannot be said absolutely because the evidence (at least in our studies) is mixed. For example, a case study from Oman (Ghouse, et al., 2019) supports the idea of equality in the skills that both sexes can offer. It also claims that men and women have the same innovation potential. On the contrary, a study from Mauritius (Tynan, et al., 2009) argues that there are statistically significant findings of differences in the skills of women and men. Most of the selected and analyzed studies mention that women certainly lack so-called pro-entrepreneurial skills (Akinbami and Aransiola, 2016), with managerial experience and technical competencies specifically named (De Vita, et al., 2014). A case from the UAE, which describes the situation of women entrepreneurs in the country, is similar (Tahir and Baradie, 2019). Although women may be highly educated and hold a university degree, Arab women lack the skills needed to run a business. This lack of entrepreneurial skills may be true since the education system is not ready to educate women entrepreneurship, as shown by studies from India (Jha, et al., 2018), Uganda (Karakire Guma, 2015), and the Persian Gulf (Mathew, 2010). The education system prepares women for the role of employees rather than the role of managers. For the exact definition of given abilities, only one study from India (Lenka and Agarwal, 2017) lists the given abilities. These are creativity, emotional intelligence, initiative taking, leadership, managerial skills, networking, opportunity recognition, risk taking, social skills, and teamwork.

Insufficient or inadequate education for women is a real issue in some countries, which, in turn, reduces the competitive advantage of women-run companies. An improperly set up education system may be the result of the oft-cited discrimination, as is the case with the Ghana study (Anambane and Adom, 2018), where it is primarily cultural barriers and related discrimination against women. A similar situation is described in a study from Australia (Collins, 2014), which mentions the role of expectations in family businesses where, in general, women are not expected to take on the role of the leader in family businesses.

It is questionable how mutually supportive the negative influences are. Likewise, it is not possible to currently determine whether any of the forces is primary or the result of another force. The self-confidence of women entrepreneurs belongs to this category. As an Indian study (Kumar, 2013) shows, women

tend to be underestimated when evaluating their entrepreneurial skills. Their already lower self-confidence can be further reduced by the state's negative approach to women's entrepreneurship, as described in a case study from Japan (Kazumi and Kawai, 2017). The role of the government is crucial in supporting business. Indeed, if the government systematically supports women's entrepreneurship, this will have a positive effect on several levels, including an improvement in the education of women, as the example from Tanzania shows (Mbaruku and Mutalemwa, 2015). Governments can also support special entrepreneurial programs that help women reduce the abovementioned influences and improve their entrepreneurial skills. Statistical confirmation of this claim is provided by studies from South Africa (van Vuuren, et al., 2007). However, government programs to support women's entrepreneurship must be professionally prepared and should strengthen both soft and hard skills for women (Tynan, et al., 2009).

5.6 Staff

As stated by various iconic authors, staff should be considered as the vital core of every business (Drucker, 2002). The McKinsey model also places a strong emphasis on the issue of staff. The framework views staff as a system that considers people as a pool of resources, which need to be fostered, developed, guarded, and allocated (Channon and Caldart, 2015). Five essential factors related to staff within women's entrepreneurship can be identified in the analyzed papers. These are the number of employees, gender issues and discrimination, relationships and performance of employees, emotions, and common staff-managing problems.

Although some themes intersect, the main groups remain. Unsurprisingly, the most mentioned topics are gender and discrimination. Gender and related discrimination are also mentioned in studies of economically strong, developed countries. For example, in Germany, a gender-related difference in employees' perception of errors in male managers and female managers has been reported (Aggestam and Wigren-Kristoferson, 2017). A study from Italy (Picciaia, 2017) shows the strong influence of the manager's gender on the company's structure, where so-called "female subcultures" are emerging. These, in turn, influence the relationship between management, and employees and clients. In this regard, there was a British case study in which women entrepreneurs considered themselves more authentic concerning employees and clients compared to their male competitors (Patterson, et al., 2012).

The issue is also mentioned in a paper from Scandinavia, whose countries are among the most gender egalitarian in the world (Sanandaji, 2016). However, this is why the authors of the study state that male employees are in a much more comfortable position than female entrepreneurs. At the same time, the more complex situation of female entrepreneurs is due to the need to listen to the different voices of the responsible people (Nikina, et al., 2015). It is also important to mention that gender discrimination does not just mean worse conditions for women. As Leung (2011) shows in a study, a women-run company in Japan preferred women in the selection of employees because, according to the female owner, the qualifications of female job applicants stood out in comparison to male applicants (Leung, 2011).

However, gender issues and related discrimination are mentioned to the greatest extent in economically developing countries or those with different value frameworks. An example is Turkey, where democracy has been declining in recent years (Çınar, 2019). This results in harming female entrepreneurship (especially for young women) and, ultimately, difficulties in obtaining respect from customers and employees (Kalafatoglu and Mendoza, 2017). Thus, the patriarchal society in KSA, India, and South Africa is mentioned as a significant obstacle to women's entrepreneurship and the employment process (Kemppainen, 2019; Kothari, 2017; Nambiar, et al., 2019). In these countries, women entrepreneurs have a problem employing male employees, as they are unable to accept a woman as their superior and in a position of authority (Kothari, 2017). As a result, anecdotic evidence from sub-Saharan Africa indicates that women business owners have to use their husbands to give orders to their employees (Nambiar, et al., 2019).

It can also be problematic for "western style" entrepreneurs to understand the difficulties of mixing women and men in the workplace. As a study from

Saudi Arabia has shown, women themselves have differing views on whether they prefer working in a male society or separately (Tahir and Baradie, 2019). In the Arabian Peninsula, a case study from Kuwait mentioned that women perceiving such inequality feel it favors their male colleagues. The same-skilled male colleagues are promoted more often, which led the women to be less motivated to accomplish much at work (Al-Salem and Speece, 2017).

The issue of gender is also linked to the "self-discrimination" that women experience. They realize that they have more roles than just being an entrepreneur or an employee. For example, in a case study from Ghana, women stated their beliefs that their roles and responsibilities to their families harm both the earnings from their business and their readiness to expand their business (Adom, et al., 2018). These concerns may have many causes as the family and the mother role is relatively significant. Some anecdotal evidence from Lithuania and Ukraine mentions the praxis, where private businesses require a signed letter of resignation to be submitted upon hiring new female employees, which can be used if the employee becomes pregnant (Aidis, et al., 2007).

The second most frequently mentioned area of women's entrepreneurship was, in the case of the 7S model Staff element, relationships, and the impact on employee performance. In general, the analyzed studies mention a better approach by women entrepreneurs to their employees. For the terms of the wage amount, see case studies from Australia (Conway and Sheridan, 2005) and the USA (Juma and Sequeira, 2017), and for a more human approach based on trust, personal relationships, and empathy, see studies from India (Datta and Gailey, 2012), Mongolia (Aramand, 2012), Australia (Conway and Sheridan, 2005), and Tanzania (Mbaruku and Mutalemwa, 2015). However, at the same time, women entrepreneurs prefer to employ family members because they have a closer relationship with the company (Khan, 2016) and are more economically advantageous (Nambiar, et al., 2019). When employees are not family members, relationships with them need to be maintained and strengthened, as described in the Turkish study (Ozeren, et al., 2018). However, regardless of gender, the quality of the owner/manager relationship with his/her employees is determined by the level of human rights guaranteed in the country (Brieger, et al., 2019).

Family was also mentioned in connection with relationships and has a significant influence on employees in women-run companies. This is especially on their number, as shown by a study from Africa (Adom, 2015). Most analyzed studies show that women-run companies generally have fewer employees than men-run companies (e.g., Kalemci Tuzun and Araz Takay, 2017). This is even so despite the knowledge that more employees can move the company further (Kevill, et al., 2019). Why is this so? In the Ethiopian study (Gudeta and van Engen, 2018), the general problem was to find employees, as people prefer to do business on their own. The same could be found in the Brazilian study, where women prefer to do business rather than be employed (Gomes, et al., 2014). This may also be due to the emotional limits of women who suffer for their employees due to greater empathy, as a study from the United Kingdom shows (McGowan, et al., 2012). For some women in India, employee management can also be particularly challenging, and not every woman is competent in a given environment (Venugopal, 2016). To some extent, this is confirmed by the case from South Africa, where women are specifically trained for employee management (van Vuuren, et al., 2007). This is also mentioned in a study from the USA (Cochran, 2019). On the contrary, stronger empathy is cited in another Indian study (Lenka and Agarwal, 2017) as the reason for the business of a woman and her former colleagues from work.

5.7 Shared values

If the analyzed studies mentioned the issue of shared values, then most of them emphasized their importance and necessity in business (Anlesinya, et al., 2019; García and Capitán, 2016; Lo, 2016). This is in line with the general knowledge of the issue of shared values in business (e.g., Posner, et al., 1985). This also corresponds with the 7S model considering shared values as superordinate goals determining corporate destiny (Waterman, 1985). The factors that define shared values in the analyzed studies are twofold: (a) those that are a response to gender restrictions or discrimination and b) those that result from the influence of the environment.

In the first case, it is an attempt to break out of men's subordinate roles, as shown by a study from Japan (Futagami and Helms, 2009) and other countries worldwide (Véras, 2015). In the case of the influence of the environment, the Ghanaian studies mention the church in the first place (Anlesinya, et al., 2019; Quagrainie, et al., 2018). The German research suggests businesswomen's friends as the most substantial influential group. They have an even more significant influence on the formation of shared business values than the family (Spiegler and Halberstadt, 2018). On the contrary, the Ghanaian study mentioned that the family has a more significant influence than friends (Anlesinya, et al., 2019).

6 Discussion

Using the McKinsey 7S model, 116 case studies (or their reviews) dealing with women's entrepreneurship worldwide have been analyzed. It has been found that case studies on women's entrepreneurship do not consider the universal factors defining the principles of corporate governance. In practice, this means that none of the studies studied used the McKinsey 7S model to evaluate female entrepreneurship. However, this can be expected as the 7S framework is a consulting tool built for organizational purposes and not for research analyses.

However, more important is the finding that almost all the case studies examined lack a comprehensive view of the issue of women's entrepreneurship. They present partial results and views of the organization, regardless of the other important elements. This contradicts the 7S theory since it says that the organization's individual elements are interdependent (Channon and Caldart, 2015). Within the above analysis of individual elements of organizations, it turned out that if the corresponding data are given in the case studies, it is possible to process them with the 7S model's help. On the other hand, case studies that do not contain a complete set of information cannot be used for complex analysis using the 7S model.

Despite these limitations, this article brings some new findings. Due to the research methodology and the fact that secondary data were used, it is impossible to generalize the results in the given form. However, a recurring issue can be observed, which is also supported in the corresponding literature. In some cases, new findings contradict the current level of knowledge. For example, Yadav and Unni (2016) claim that women's business research is mostly conducted in developed economies. However, this paper points to a growing volume of studies addressing women's entrepreneurship in countries where, until recently, the issue was almost unthinkable. Examples include businesspeople in the Arabian Peninsula countries.

Among the frequently recurring findings, it is possible to include references to various forms of discrimination against entrepreneurs on the grounds of their sex, the need to create an environment that enables women to do business in the countries concerned, and to emphasize the quality and accessibility of education. In addition to the generality, as mentioned above, similarities can be found in female entrepreneurship in culturally close countries. Otherwise, each of the studies conducted gives a different perspective on women's entrepreneurship and related issues.

The abovementioned discrimination is also one of the answers to the research question, searching for what factors motivate women to start a business. Discrimination and related consequences seem to be the primary motive for women to start their own businesses. Moreover, this factor has been noted not only in developing economies, but also in countries with fully developed economies (Sanandaji, 2016).

The paper also aimed to determine the factors that lead women to start a business. In any case, the predominant influence of the so-called push factors in women's motivation to start their own business is evident. Thus, our findings are entirely consistent with the results of Jennings and Brush (2013). Our results are also partially in line with the claim that the dominant influence of push factors is correlated with less-developed countries (e.g., Kelley, et al., 2011; Welter, et al., 2006). On the other hand, it could not be proven whether it is a typical element of emerging economies or a global issue because of a small sample of the case studies from developed economies.

7 Conclusion

It is necessary to draw attention to the limitations that have influenced the research, limiting the possibilities of drawing general conclusions. Above all, it is a limited sample of case studies and the fact that they are secondary sources. Although the 7S model can serve well for business analysis, it is more unsuitable for meta-analysis. If the input data do not have the necessary parameters and range, it is impossible to obtain a complex picture, as in the case of working with primary data. Nevertheless, the research revealed two areas that significantly impact the success of female-owned businesses worldwide. It is a matter of reducing any discrimination and promoting skills in those cases where women lack them.

Research has also shown that it is possible to use the 7S model to analyze women-owned businesses. Still, it is necessary to have data from all seven areas that the model assesses. Therefore, it is not ideal for a retrospective analysis of case studies. Although in the sample examined, some of them aimed to "comprehensively evaluate" the business run by women, none of the case studies analyzed provided a comprehensive picture of the company as required by the relatively simple McKinsey framework.

Given the current debate among scientists on the relevance of feminist approaches to the research of women's entrepreneurship, this article may be an optimal tool for evaluating a selected company's management status. McKinsey's model 7S only evaluates selected areas of corporate performance without taking into account gender differences. Concerning the definition of entrepreneurship, it does not matter whether a woman or a man leads the company, but whether it generates profit.

In the future, in addition to its primary function, that is, analysis of companies based on primary information, it would be possible to use a model to evaluate the complexity of already published information about the company and its management. At the same time, our research results indicate the possibility of further processing of the issue. The analysis of individual case studies revealed several factors that affect women's entrepreneurship. For example, Principal Component Analysis (PCA) should be used to identify those factors that significantly impact women's entrepreneurship.

8 References

[1] Adom, K., 2015. Recognizing the Contribution of Female Entrepreneurs in Economic Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: Some Evidence from Ghana. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 20(01), 1550003.

[2] Adom, K., Asare-Yeboa, I.T., Quaye, D.M., Ampomah, A.O., 2018. A Critical Assessment of Work and Family Life of Female Entrepreneurs in Sub-Saharan Africa: Some fresh evidence from Ghana. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *25*(3), pp.405-427.

[3] Agarwal, S., Lenka, U., 2016. An Exploratory Study on the Development of Women Entrepreneurs: Indian cases. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 18(2), pp.232-247.

[4] Aggestam, M., Wigren-Kristoferson, C., 2017. How Women Entrepreneurs Build Embeddedness: A Case Study Approach. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 9(3), pp.252-268.

[5] Ahl, H., Marlow, S., 22012. Exploring the Dynamics of Gender, Feminism and Entrepreneurship: Advancing Debate to Escape a Dead End? *Organization*, 19(5), pp.543-562.

[6] Ahl, H., Nelson, T., 2010. Moving Forward: Institutional Perspectives on Gender and Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), pp.5-9.

[7] Aidis, R., Welter, F., Smallbone, D., Isakova, N., 2007. Female Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies: The Case of Lithuania and Ukraine. *Feminist Economics*, 13(2), pp.157-183.

[8] Akinbami, C.A.O., Aransiola, J.O., 2016. Qualitative Exploration of Cultural Practices Inhibiting Rural Women Entrepreneurship Development in Selected Communities in Nigeria. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 28(2), pp.151-167.

[9] Aldawod, A., Day, J., 2017. A Critical Reflection upon the Postmodernist Philosophical Positions and Issues Relevant to Entrepreneurship Research. In: *BAM 2017*, 57 September 2017, University of Warwick, UK.

[10] Al-Salem, A., Speece, M., 2017. Women in Leadership in Kuwait: A Research Agenda. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 32(2), pp.141-162.

[11] Anambane, G., Adom, K., 2018. Assessing the Role of Culture in Female Entrepreneurship in Contemporary Sub-Saharan Society: Insights from The Nabadam District of Ghana. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 23(03), 1850017.

[12] Anggadwita, G., Luturlean, B.S., Ramadani, V., Ratten, V., 2017. Socio-Cultural Environments and Emerging Economy Entrepreneurship: Women Entrepreneurs in Indonesia. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 9(1), pp.85-96.

[13] Anlesinya, A., Adepoju, O.A., Richter, U.H., 2019. Cultural Orientation, Perceived Support and Participation of Female Students in Formal Entrepreneurship in the Sub-Saharan Economy of Ghana. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*. Vol. 11, No. 3, pp.299-322. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJGE-01-2019-0018.

[14] Aramand, M., 2012. Women Entrepreneurship in Mongolia: The Role of Culture on Entrepreneurial motivation. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 32(1), pp.68-82.

[15] Baumol, W. J., 1993. *Entrepreneurship, Management and the Structure of Payoffs*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[16] Brieger, S.A., Terjesen, S.A., Hechavarría, D.M., Welzel, C., 2019. Prosociality in Business: A Human Empowerment Framework. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159(2), pp.361-380.

[17] Brown, G., Irby, B.J., 2001. *Women and Leadership: Creating balance in life*. Nova Publishers.

[18] Cadieux, L., Lorrain, J., Hugron, P., 2002. Succession in Women-Owned Family Businesses: A Case Study. *Family Business Review*, 15(1), pp.17-30.

[19] Calás, M.B., Smircich, L., Bourne, K.A., 2009. Extending the Boundaries: Reframing "Entrepreneurship as Social Change" through Feminist Perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3), pp.552-569.

[20] Carvalho, L., Williams, B., 2014. Let the Cork Fly: Creativity and Innovation in a Family Business. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, *15*(2), pp.127-133.

[21] Casson, M., Casson, C., 2014. The History of Entrepreneurship: Medieval Origins of a Modern Phenomenon. *Business History*, 56(8), pp.1223–1242.

[22] Cesaroni, F.M., & Paoloni, P., 2016. Are Family ties an Opportunity or an Obstacle for Women Entrepreneurs? Empirical Evidence from Italy. *Palgrave Communications*, *2*(1), 16088. Altan-Olcay, Ö., 2015. The Entrepreneurial Woman in Development Programs: Thinking through Class Differences. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State, & Society*, *23*(3), pp.389-414.

[23] Channon, D.F., Caldart, A.A., 2015. McKinsey 7S Model. In: *Wiley Encyclopedia of Management* (eds C.L. Cooper, J. McGee and T. Sammut-Bonnici). Vol. 12. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom120005.

[24] Çınar, K., 2019. *The Decline of Democracy in Turkey: A Comparative Study of Hegemonic Party Rule*. Routledge.

[25] Cochran, S.L., 2019. What's Gender Got to Do with It? The Experiences of US Women Entrepreneurship Students. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57, pp.111-129.

[26] Collins, L., Al-Dajani, H., Bika, Z., Swail, J., Barrett, M., 2014. Revisiting Women's Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*.

[27] Conway, L., Sheridan, A., 2005. Women, Small Business and Regional Location. *Rural Society*, 15(1), pp.55-76.

[28] Datta, P.B., Gailey, R., 2012. Empowering Women Through Social Entrepreneurship: Case Study of a Women's Cooperative in India. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(3), pp.569-587.

[29] Daymard, A., 2015. Determinants of Female Entrepreneurship in India. *OECD Economic Department Working Papers*, No. 1191, 0_1–38. https://doi.org/10.1787/5js4rfh5qtbq-en.

[30] De Vita, L., Mari, M., Poggesi, S., 2014. Women Entrepreneurs in and from Developing Countries: Evidence from the Literature. *European Management Journal*, 32(3), pp.451-460.

[31] Dean, M.A., Shook, C.L., Payne, G.T., 2007. The Past, Present and Future of Entrepreneurship Research: Data Analytic Trends and Training. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31, pp.601-618.

[32] Delphy, C., 1993. Rethinking Sex and Gender. *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 16, No. 1, pp.1-9. Pergamon.

[33] Demartini, P., 2018. Innovative Female-Led Startups. Do Women in Business Underperform? *Administrative Sciences*, 8(4), p.70.

[34] Drucker, P.F., 2002. They're not Employees, They're People. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(2), pp.70-7.

[35] Duchéneaut, B., 1997. *Women Entrepreneurs in SMEs*. Rennes, France: Euro PME.

[36] Erogul, M.S., Rod, M., Barragan, S., 2019. Contextualizing Arab Female Entrepreneurship in the United Arab Emirates. *Culture and Organization*, *25*(5), pp.317-331.

[37] Ferdousi, F., Mahmud, P., 2019. Role of Social Business in Women Entrepreneurship Development in Bangladesh: Perspectives from Nobin Udyokta Projects of Grameen Telecom Trust. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(1), p.58.

[38] Ferraz Gomes, A., Pessoa Araújo, U., Fontes Martins, C.M., Piau Santana, W.G., 2014. Empreendedorismo Feminino como Sujeito de Pesquisa. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão de Negócios*, 16(51).

[39] Futagami, S., Helms, M.M., 2009. Emerging Female Entrepreneurship in Japan: A Case Study of Digimom Workers. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 51(1), pp.71-85.

[40] García, P.O., Capitán, Á.O., 2016. Elements that Contribute to Boost Female Entrepreneurship: A Prospective Analysis. *Suma de Negocios*, 7(15), pp.54-60.

[41] Garsombke, T.W., Garsombke, D.J., 1989. Strategic Implications Facing Small Manufacturers: The Linkage Between Robotization, Computerization, Automation and Performance. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 27(4), p.34.

[42] Georgellis, Y., Wall, H.J., 2005. Gender Differences in Self-employment. *International review of applied economics*, 19(3), pp.321-342.

[43] Ghouse, S., McElwee, G., Meaton, J., Durrah, O., 2017. Barriers to Rural Women Entrepreneurs in Oman. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 23(6), pp.998-1016.

[44] Gibbert, M., Ruigrok, W., Wicki, B., 2008. What Passes as a Rigorous Case Study?. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(13), pp.1465-1474.

[45] Goyal, P., Yadav, V., 2014. To be or not to be a Woman Entrepreneur in a Developing Country. *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management*, 2(2), pp.68-78.

[46] Graham, K., 2013. TechMatters: "Qiqqa" than you Can Say Reference Management: A Tool to Organize the Research Process. *LOEX Quarterly*, 40(1), p.3.

[47] Grundey, D., Sarvutytė, M., 2007. Women Entrepreneurship in the European Labour Market: Time to Go Online. *Transformations in Business, & Economics*, *6*(2).

[48] Gudeta, K.H., & van Engen, M. L., 2018. Work-life Boundary Management Styles of Women Entrepreneurs in Ethiopia – "choice" or Imposition? *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 25(3), pp.368-386.

[49] Han, S., Cui, W., Chen, J., Fu, Y., 2019. Female CEOs and Corporate Innovation Behaviors—Research on the Regulating Effect of Gender Culture. *Sustainability*, 11(3), p.682.

[50] Hayashi, Y., 2015. Diversity and Innovation: Empowering Women Fosters Innovation. *Journal on Innovation and Sustainability*. RISUS ISSN 2179-3565, 6(1), pp.3-12.

[51] Helpman, E., 2004. *The Mystery of Economic Growth*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA. USA.

[52] Henry, C., Foss, L., Ahl, H., 2016. Gender and Entrepreneurship Research: A Review of Methodological Approaches. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(3), pp.217-241.

[53] Higginbotham, E., Romero, M. (eds.)., 1997. *Women and Work: Exploring Race, Ethnicity and Class*. SAGE Books. https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483327020.

[54] Ismail, M.A., Kareem, S.A., 2011. Identifying How Novice Researchers Search, Locate, Choose and Use Web Resources at the Early Stage of Research. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 16(3), pp.67-85.

[55] Jalagat, R., 2016. The Impact of Change and Change Management in Achieving Corporate Goals and Objectives: Organizational perspective. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 5(11), pp.1233-1239.

[56] James, A., 2012. Chapter 12: Conceptualizing 'Woman' as an Entrepreneurial Advantage: A Reflexive Approach. In: K.D. Hughes, & J.E. Jennings (Eds.), *Global Women's Entrepreneurship*

Research: Diverse Settings, Questions and Approaches, pp.226-240.

[57] Jennings, J.E., Brush, C.G., 2013. Research on Women Entrepreneurs: Challenges to (and from) the Broader Entrepreneurship Literature? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), pp.663-715.

[58] Jha, P., Makkad, M., Mittal, S., 2018. Performance-Oriented Factors for Women Entrepreneurs – a Scale Development Perspective. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 10(2), pp.329-360.

[59] Juma, N., Sequeira, J.M., 2017. Effects of Entrepreneurs' Individual Factors and Environmental Contingencies on Venture Performance: A Case Study of African-American Women-owned Ventures. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 29(2), pp.91-119.

[60] Kalafatoglu, T., Mendoza, X., 2017. The Impact of Gender and Culture on Networking and Venture Creation: An Exploratory Study in Turkey and MENA Region. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management*, 24(2), pp.332-349.

[61] Kalemci Tuzun, I., Araz Takay, B., 2017. Patterns of Female Entrepreneurial Activities in Turkey. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 32(3), pp.166-182.

[62] Karakire Guma, P., 2015. Business in the Urban Informal Economy: Barriers to Women's Entrepreneurship in Uganda. *Journal of African Business*, 16(3), pp.305-321.

[63] Kazumi, T., Kawai, N., 2017. Institutional Support and Women's Entrepreneurial Self-efficacy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 11(3), pp.345-365.

[64] Kelley, D., Brush, C., Greene, P., Litovsky, Y., 2011. *The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: 2010 Women's Report*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College & GERA.

[65] Kemppainen, R.P., 2019. Saudi Female Innovators as Entrepreneurs–Theoretical Underpinnings. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 11(2), pp.166-185.

[66] Kephart, P., Schumacher, L., 2005. Has the 'Glass Ceiling' Cracked? An Exploration of Women Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Leadership, & Organizational Studies*, 12(1), pp.2-15.

[67] Kevill, A., Brooks, R., Mallinson, K., 2019. From Pipe Dream, to Enterprise Incubator, to Award-winning Business: The Case of Scriba PR. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 1465750319884851.

[68] Knobloch, K., Yoon, U., Vogt, P.M., 2011. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) Statement and Publication bias. *Journal of Cranio-Maxillofacial Surgery*, 39(2), pp.91-92.

[69] Kothari, T., 2017. Women Entrepreneurs' Path to Building Venture Success: Lessons from India. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 6(2), pp.118-141.

[70] Kumar, A., 2013. Women Entrepreneurs in a Masculine Society: Inclusive Strategy for Sustainable Outcomes. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 21(3), pp.373-384.

[71] Langevang, T., Gough, K.V., Yankson, P.W., Owusu, G., Osei, R., 2015. Bounded Entrepreneurial Vitality: The Mixed Embeddedness of Female Entrepreneurship. *Economic Geography,* 91(4), pp.449-473.

[72] Lenka, U., Agarwal, S., 2017. Role of Women Entrepreneurs and NGOs in Promoting Entrepreneurship: Case Studies from Uttarakhand, India. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 11(4), pp.451-465.

[73] Leung, A., 2011. Motherhood and Entrepreneurship: Gender Role Identity as a Resource. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 3(3), pp.254-264.

[74] Lo, M.S., 2016. En route to New York: Diasporic Networks and the Reconfiguration of Female Entrepreneurship in Senegal. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 23(4), pp.503-520.

[75] Mathew, V., 2010. Women Entrepreneurship in the Middle East: Understanding Barriers and use of ICT for Entrepreneurship Development. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 6(2), pp.163-181.

[76] Mbaruku, M., Mutalemwa, D., 2015. Success Stories of Tanzanian Women Entrepreneurship Programs in Alleviating Poverty: Insights from WORTH Program. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 3(1), pp.87.

[77] McGowan, P., Redeker, C.L., Cooper, S.Y., Greenan, K., 2012. Female Entrepreneurship and the Management of Business and Domestic Roles: Motivations, Expectations and Realities. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(1-2), pp.53-72.

[78] Mehtap, S., Ozmenekse, L., Caputo, A., 2019. "I'm a Stay at Home Businesswoman": An Insight into Informal Entrepreneurship in Jordan. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 11(1), pp.44-65.

[79] Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D.G., and the PRISMA Group., 2009. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 151(4), pp.264-269. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-151-4-200908180-00135.

[80] Morrison, A.M., White, R.P., Van Velsor, E., 1992. *Breaking the Glass Ceiling: Can Women Reach the Top of America's Largest Corporations?* (Updated ed). Addison-Wesley.

[81] Mullen, M.R., Budeva, D.G., Doney, P.M., 2009. Research Methods in the Leading Small Business-Entrepreneurship Journals: A Critical Review with Recommendations for Future Research. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 47, pp.287-307.

[82] Nambiar, Y., Sutherland, M., Scheepers, C.B., 2019. The Stakeholder Ecosystem of Women Entrepreneurs in South African Townships. *Development Southern Africa*, pp.1-17.

[83] Nambisan, S., 2017. Digital Entrepreneurship: Toward a Digital Technology Perspective of Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(6), pp.1029-1055.

[84] Niethammer, C., 2013. Women, Entrepreneurship and the Opportunity to Promote Development and Business. *Brookings Blum Roundtable Policy Brief*, 37. Retrieved January 01, 2020, from https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/2013-BBR-Women-Entrepreneurship.pdf.

[85] Nikina, A., Shelton, L.M., LeLoarne, S., 2015. An Examination of How Husbands, as Key Stakeholders, Impact the Success of Women Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 22(1), pp.38-62.

[86] North, D.C., 1990. *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[87] Nziku, D.M., & Struthers, J.J., 2018. Female Entrepreneurship in Africa: Strength of Weak Ties in Mitigating Principal-Agent Problems. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 25(3), pp.349-367.

[88] O'Brien, J., 2018. Establishing a Retro-Marketing Rental Company: VW Kamper Case Study. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 19(2), pp.125-133.

[89] Ozeren, E., Saatcioglu, O.Y., Aydin, E., 2018. Creating Social Value Through Orchestration Processes in Innovation Networks: The Case of "Garbage Ladies" as a Social Entrepreneurial Venture. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 31(5), pp.1206-1224.

[90] Özsungur, F., 2019. A Research on Women's Entrepreneurship Motivation: Sample of Adana Province. *Women's Studies International Forum,* Vol. 74, pp.114-126. Pergamon.

[91] Palalic, R., Ramadani, V., Dana, L.P., 2017. Entrepreneurship in Bosnia and Herzegovina: Focus on Gender. *European Business Review*, 29(4), pp.476-496.

[92] Paoloni, P., Dumay, J., 2015. The Relational Capital of Micro-Enterprises Run by Women: The Startup Phase. *Vine*, 45(2), pp.172-197.

[93] Paoloni, P., Modaffari, G., 2018. Female-Owned Innovative Startups in Italy: Status Quo and Implications. *Administrative Sciences*, 8(4), p.66.

[94] Patterson, N., Mavin, S., Turner, J., 2012. Unsettling the Gender Binary: Experiences of Gender in Entrepreneurial Leadership and Implications for HRD. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(7), pp.687-711.

[95] Petrova, K., 2013. The Effects of Globalization on Entrepreneurship. *International Advances in Economic Research*, 19(2), pp.205-206.

[96] Pfefferman, T., Frenkel, M., 2015. The Gendered State of Business: Gender, Enterprises and State in Israeli Society. *Gender, Work, & Organization*, 22(6), pp.535-555.

[97] Picciaia, F., 2017. In Spite of Everything? Female Entrepreneurship from a Historical Perspective: The Italian Businesswoman Luisa Spagnoli (1877-1935). *Journal of Management History*, 23(4), pp.436-451.

[98] Posner, B.Z., Kouzes, J.M., Schmidt, W.H., 1985. Shared Values Make a Difference: An Empirical Test of Corporate Culture. *Human Resource Management*, 24(3), pp.293-309.

[99] Quagrainie, F.A., Opoku Mensah, A., Adom, A.Y., 2018. Christian Entrepreneurial Activities and Micro Women Entrepreneurship Development: Church Embeddedness in Action. *Journal*

of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy, 12(5), pp.657-676.

[100] Ravanfar, M.M., 2015. Analyzing Organizational Structure based on 7s Model of McKinsey. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*; Vol. 15, No. 10-A.

[101] Robinson, S., Finley, J., 2007. Rural Women's Self-Employment: A Look at Pennsylvania. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 13(2).

[102] Sanandaji, N., 2016. *The Nordic Gender Equality Paradox: How Nordic Welfare States are not Only Empowering Women, but also (un) Intentionally Holding Them Back.* Timbro.

[103] Santos, G., Marques, C.S., Ratten, V., 2019. Entrepreneurial Women's Networks: The Case of D'Uva–Portugal Wine Girls. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25(2), pp.298-322.

[104] Schumpeter, J.A., 1911. *The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. Transaction Books.

[105] Shapero, A., Sokol, L., 1982. The Social Dimensions of Entrepreneurship. In: C. Kent, D. Sexton, & K. Vesper (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, pp.72-90. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[106] Spiegler, A.B., Halberstadt, J., 2018. SHEstainability: How Relationship Networks Influence the Idea Generation in Opportunity Recognition Process by Female Social Entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 10(2), pp.202-235.

[107] Stanford, J.H., Oates, B.R., Flores, D., 1995. Women's Leadership Styles: A Heuristic Analysis. *Women in Management Review*, 10(2), pp.9-16.

[108] Stovold, E., Beecher, D., Foxlee, R., Noel-Storr, A., 2014. Study Flow Diagrams in Cochrane Systematic Review Updates: An Adapted PRISMA Flow Diagram. *Systematic reviews*, 3(1), p.54.

[109] Tahir, R., Baradie, M.E., 2019. Behind the Veil: The Challenges and Impediments Encountered by Women Entrepreneurs in the United Arab Emirates. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 11(3), pp.258-282.

[110] Tan, J., 2008. Breaking the "Bamboo Curtain" and the "Glass Ceiling": The Experience of Women Entrepreneurs in High-Tech Industries in an Emerging Market. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 80(3), pp.547-564.

[111] Tynan, M., Thomas, D., Durand, M., O'Gorman, B., Fuller-Love, N., 2009. Training Female Entrepreneurs: Lessons from the FEIW Project. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 1(3), pp.253-260.

[112] Uzuegbunam, A.O., Uzuegbunam, I., 2018. Arm's-length or Give-and-Take? Gender Differences in the Relational Orientation of New Ventures in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 12(4), pp.522-541.

[113] Van Vuuren, J., Nieman, G., Botha, M., 2007. Measuring the Effectiveness of the Women Entrepreneurship Programme on Potential, Start-up and Established Women Entrepreneurs in South Africa. South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences, 10(2), pp.163-183.

[114] VanderBrug, J., 2013. The Global Rise of Female Entrepreneurs. *Harvard Business Review*, accessed 20 December 2019 at https://hbr.org /2013/09/global-rise-of-female-entrepreneurs.

[115] Venugopal, V., 2016. Investigating Women's Intentions for Entrepreneurial Growth. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), pp.2-27.

[116] Véras, E.Z., 2015. Female Entrepreneurship: from Women's Empowerment to Shared Value Creation. *Journal on Innovation and Sustainability.* RISUS ISSN 2179-3565, 6(2), pp.109-123.

[117] Waterman Jr, R.H., 1982. The Seven Elements of Strategic Fit. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 2(3), p.69.

[118] Waterman Jr, R.H., Peters, T.J., & Phillips, J.R., 1980. Structure is not Organization. *Business Horizons*, 23(3), pp.14-26.

[119] Welter, F., Smallbone, D., Isakova, N.B., 2006. *Enterprising Women in Transition Economies*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing.

[120] Yadav, V., Unni, J., 2016. Women Entrepreneurship: Research Review and Future Directions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(1), p.12.