

Gender Disparities in Entrepreneurship in Algeria: The Role of Family Influence on Young Women's Entrepreneurial Engagement.

Zakia SETTI¹

¹Associate Professor, School of Advanced Studies in Commerce, Kolea University Hub (Algeria).

The E-mail Author: zsetti@gmail.com

Received: 05/2024

Published: 11/2024

Abstract:

In recent decades, Algeria has witnessed a significant drop in gender gaps; however, gender disparity in entrepreneurship remains pronounced. Women in Algeria display a lower propensity to initiate new businesses compared to men. Prevailing analyses attributes this gender disparity to inherent traits, considering female as less risk-taking and confident and lacking key attributes for entrepreneurship. In this paper, we argue that entrepreneurial action is socially embedded, individuals' future decisions regarding entrepreneurship are significantly affected by social context, particularly family. The research explores how family characteristics impact entrepreneurial pursuits and how family embeddedness affects female's venture creation. Utilizing data from the 2016 SAHWA Youth Survey in Algeria, results reveal that young Algerian female exhibit a lower inclination toward entrepreneurship. Parental educational levels, especially the father's, negatively influence young female's entrepreneurial aspirations, while parental occupational status shows no significant effect. Additionally, highly educated female engages less in entrepreneurial endeavours.

Keywords: Female entrepreneurship, Young women entrepreneur, Family embeddedness, Algeria.

Jel classification: L26, L29, M13, J16, D1

INTRODUCTION

One of the main achievements of post-independence Algeria has been the establishment of numerous liberties for women and equal rights with men and women in

the 1962 constitution. Thus, the Algerian leadership has recognized woman as an active companion of man in socio-economic growth of modern Algeria (Bennoune, 2016; Lazreg, 1990). Since then, women's participation in formal economy has seen a gradual increase (National Office of Statistics, 2011), between 1977 and 2014, women's participation in the labour market rose slightly from 6 per cent to 16 per cent (National Office of Statistics, 2012). Thus, compared to the global average of 49.5 per cent, labour force participation of women in Algeria are among the lowest in the world (The World Bank, 2016). Similarly, the rate of women's participation in entrepreneurial activity is far fewer than the global average. Women in Algeria constitute only 10.2 per cent of the total number of entrepreneurs (National Office of Statistics, 2012); however, the proportion of women involved in entrepreneurial endeavours is approximately 37 per cent globally (IFC, 2011).

Thus, women entrepreneurs have been progressively determined as the new engine for economic growth and social development (Ahl, 2006; Allen et al., 2007; De Vita et al., 2014; Minniti & Naudé, 2010). As stated by several international institutions (UNIDO¹, ILO²) gender gaps in formal economy impose real costs on society. Whilst women do not participate equally in entrepreneurship, economies lose the benefits that would be generated by new products and services. Moreover, they fail to maximize the returns on the investment in education for nearly half of the region's human capital. However, closing gender gaps and empowering women could contribute to an increase in GDP³ per capita of more than 20 per cent (ILO, 2012) and, thereby improving the quality of life and well-being (Minniti, 2010; UNIDO, 2016).

Thenceforth, gender disparity in entrepreneurship has received considerable attention. Early studies mainly focused on how women differ from men in entrepreneurial endeavour (Ahl, 2004; Marlow & Swail, 2014; Marlow, 2015). Such analysis hinges upon the agency of individuals, and view entrepreneurship as an isolated and autonomous individual act. Yet, recently entrepreneurship is apprehended as a complex, socially embedded activity, which is pursued by individuals shaped by their social context (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986; Aldrich et al., 1989; Granovetter, 1985; 1995; Marlow & Swail, 2014; Marlow, 2015). Accordingly, individuals do not decide to start a business in a vacuum; but they "consult and are subtly influenced by significant others in their environment" (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986). Notwithstanding the social embeddedness approach to new venture creation has received considerable attention of many scholars. This approach has virtually neglected the influence of one social institution in which all entrepreneurs are embedded—the family (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003; Cramton, 1993). Thus,

¹ United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

² International Labour Organization.

³ Gross Domestic Product

the entrepreneurship literature has been criticized for falling to consider the impact of family dynamics on the entrepreneurial process. Scholars have, thus, been appealed to include the family dimension in their conceptual model and empirical investigation of entrepreneurship for more robust and generalizable results (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003; Dyer, 1999; Jennings & McDougald, 2007).

Although, the gender gap in entrepreneurship has become an attractive subject of research, scholars have noticed that it remains “vastly understudied” (Brush et al., 2009; De Bruin et al., 2006; Marlow et al., 2009; Minniti & Naudé, 2010); while others characterized this field as being at the “childhood stage” (Ahl, 2002; Hughes et al., 2012; Rouse, et al., 2013). De Vita et al. (2014) stressed on the importance of focusing on female entrepreneurship in developing countries, which requires further investigation by the fact that studies on women entrepreneurs from these countries recently appeared in international journals. Thereby, we consider that this challenging topic ‘entrepreneur’s gender gap in developing countries’ is ‘doubly understudied’. Hence, within this paper, we aim to understand the gender disparity in entrepreneurship in Algeria. We explore the hesitation of Algerian women to establish new ventures through the family embeddedness perspective lens. How family dynamics affect the entrepreneurial process among young women in Algeria, and to what extent the family embeddedness advantages and disadvantages female entrepreneurship. To analyse this issue, we focus upon the relationship between the family characteristics of young female entrepreneurs (i.e., parents’ human capital, parents’ socio-professional category, household size, household commitments...) and the venture creation.

Using data from the SAHWA Youth Survey carried out in 2016 among 2002 young adults in Algeria, our research makes several important contributions to the growing body of research, which examines the gender gap in entrepreneurship. First, we extend the gender disparity entrepreneurship literature to include family embeddedness by providing empirical evidence that family characteristics influence the entrepreneurial process. Second, we contribute to gender literature by showing that women hesitation to start a new venture is not necessarily associated with “feminine” versus “masculine” traits, but rather to their gendered social ‘family’ context. Third, we contribute to extending our understanding of female entrepreneurship in developing countries and particularly in Algeria.

This paper is structured as follows: the next section presents an overview of the relevant literature focusing on female entrepreneurship, notably on the gender gap in entrepreneurship and the role of household context and family characteristics on female entrepreneurship. Informed by the findings of existing studies, we develop our hypotheses in section two. Section three is devoted to methodological issues. Our empirical results are presented in section four. The final section highlights the main findings.

1- LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

1.1- Gender and entrepreneurship

With the rapid development of entrepreneurship field, several studies have demonstrated a particular focus on women entrepreneurs. The phenomenal growth of women business owners, named by Baker et al. (1997) “gender revolution in business ownership” has aroused the interest of both the academic and the development sector. Most of scholars acknowledged the importance impact of female entrepreneurs on economy in terms of job opportunities, the creation of new markets, innovation, and economic development (Allen et al., 2007; De Vita, et al., 2014; Greene et al., 2003; Minniti & Nardone, 2007). They are now recognized as a ‘driven force in the world economy’. Yet, researchers in the field of entrepreneurship have noticed that significant differences still exist in rates of participation and performance across genders; fewer women than man create new businesses, and those they do create are less likely to grow (Brush, 1992; Kepler & Shane, 2007; UNIDO et al., 2005).

Many of the earliest studies explained this difference as well as the gender gap in performance from “the very limited perspective of the differences between men and women” (Ahl, 2004). Such analyses start from the assumption that women are less entrepreneurial than men, because they are internally different from men and suffer a lack of entrepreneurial potential (Cromie & Birley,1992). Ahl (2006) articulated, in her seminal work that the gender disparity in entrepreneurship through the objectivist approach presumes the existence of inner characteristics of ‘male’ versus ‘female’ which produce these gender differences. Accordingly, women contra-ry to their male counterparts are associated with risk aversion, caution, low confidence, affection, caring, i.e., characteristics which are not congruent with entrepreneurial conventional image (Green et al., 2011; Kepler & Shane, 2007; Marlow & McAdam, 2013), whereas, entrepreneurship, according to this perspective, is supposed to be a “men’s” domain (Bird & Bush, 2002). McClelland (1961) for instance defines the entrepreneur as the “man who organizes the firm [the business unit] and/or increases its productive capacity”.

So, this “gender polarization” view has fostered investigations of women entrepreneurs by comparing them to the entrepreneurial norms of their male counterparts (Baker et al., 1997; Marlow & McAdam, 2013). Man has, thus, been represented as the norm. However, women have been cast in the categories of ‘otherness’ (Ahl, 2002; Ahl, 2006; Lämsä et al., 2000); masculinity has then been taken as a “normative entrepreneurial model” (Ahl, 2006; Ahl & Marlow, 2012; Marlow, 2015) and the gender disparity in new firms creation and any subsequent performance differences would be explained through their deficiency. Accordingly, women are more likely to address this issue if they could be a little more like their men counterparts (Mar-low, 2015). Such argument denotes gender discrimination and describes women as “something weaker”

(Ahl, 2002) and lower-ranking (Marlow & McAdam, 2013), and, thus, they need to transcend their womanhood to correct deficiency and fulfil the stereotypical entrepreneurial persona. This line of reasoning contributes to affirming and sustain the hierarchical socio-economic context which evaluates the masculine and subordinates the feminine (Marlow & McAdam, 2013).

The argument outlined above analysed women's entrepreneurial achievement or lack of it through the notions of meritocracy and individual agency (Ahl & Marlow, 2012). It supposes that individuals, both women and men, are offered equal opportunities to show their enterprising capacity and realize their potential for wealth creation, and if any gender gap arises in this field, it will be attributed to individual deficit associated with femininity. Accordingly, entrepreneurial activities are presumed to be a personal agency exercised individually, and women's propensity toward entrepreneurship is evaluated through the focus upon the individual women as the unit of analysis. So, the social and contextual effect are excluded from this explanatory analyse of the gender disparity, while the recent entrepreneurial discourse argued that entrepreneurship is a complex, embedded socio-economic activity (Brush et al., 2009; Marlow, 2015; Welter & Smallbone, 2011; Welter, 2011). Such an interpretation of entrepreneurship has begun much earlier with sociologists' analyses (Aldrich, 2005; Granovetter, 1985, 1995, 2005; Thornton, 1999; Weber, 1930) who claimed that human agency is embedded in the social context in which it occurs.

Accordingly, the social embeddedness perspective suggests a new approach to understanding entrepreneurial activity by expanding the research beyond the individual and the firm to include the social and the environmental factors. From this perspective, men and women entrepreneurs are not isolated or autonomous individuals but their decision about enterprising is influenced by the social context and reflect societal conditions (Aldrich, 2005; Martinelli, 2004; Welter, 2011). This context includes the social networks, family, and household (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003; Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986). Within this discourse, some scholars argued that the process of starting and running a business cannot be fully understood without referring to the household and the family; most new ventures spring up from family relationships and are owned within households (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003; Alsos et al., 2014; Brush et al., 2009; Marlow, 2015; Welter, 2011; Arquisola et al., 2019; Vadnjal et al., 2020). As such, family and business are no longer seen as separate entities; quite the re-verse, they are viewed as two entities closely intertwined and interrelated with each other (Carter, 2011; Klyver et al., 2011; Ram, 2001).

1.2- Family embeddedness of women entrepreneurs

Recent research has increasingly started to incorporate household and family as a context for explaining the entrepreneurial behaviours, process, and outcomes (Brush et

al., 2009; Welter, 2011). There has been a growing realization that a person's decision of starting and running a business is frequently influenced by the characteristics of the household and the family (Alsos et al., 2014; Dimova et al., 2006). As mentioned above, this entrepreneur—even though he is a sole proprietor—is a member of a household and a family which is, indeed, a source of opportunities and success factors for the business (Marlow, 2015; Ram, 2001). However, those advantages that accrue to the family members are not necessarily experienced by both genders equally (Brush et al., 2009; Bruni et al., 2004; Chell & Baines, 1998; Minniti, 2009; Treanor & Henry, 2010). Usually, women benefit least; they are disadvantaged by and through gendered ascriptions and responsibilities which take their root in the family division of labour in a patriarchal system, where women's substantial responsibility is the family (domestic duties). However, men are perceived as the primary breadwinner (Ahl, 2006, Chell & Baines, 1998; Kleinrichert, 2013).

Thus, patriarchal family, which still prevail to a remarkable degree in almost all non-western societies (Akanle, 2011; Bui et al., 2018; Kandiyoti, 1988; Onoshakpor, et al., 2024; Spierings, 2014), emphasizes the gendered division of labour (Goffman, 1977) and consolidates its constructive dichotomy between autonomy (male) and dependence (female) (Bruni et al., 2004). Accordingly, the female who benefits from the patriarchal system, and earns honour as the 'Good Woman', is demanded and expected to act as a 'wife of', a 'daughter of' and a 'sister of' (Bui et al., 2018; Bruni et al., 2005; Long, 2015; Onoshakpor et al., 2024). However, Kandiyoti (1988) argued that women in a patriarchal system develop strategies and coping mechanisms that she called 'the patriarchal bargain' (1988) to renegotiate the relations between genders to optimize their life options. So, women entrepreneurs belonging to such societies formally accept the rules of patriarchy and bargain to deploy the 'resource of female' to their advantage (Burni et al., 2005). As such, through patriarchal bargain, women start rationally and passively processes of transformation of their social positioning (Al-Dajani & Marlow, 2013; Kandiyoti, 1988) to gain ground in the male space and obtain social legitimacy and admissibility to their demand for a greater autonomy and their entrepreneurial identity. In this respect, Verdaguer (2009) found from her research that most women described their self-employment as a family strategy that allowed them to undergo an entrepreneurial experience. As such, women's entrepreneurialism would not represent a challenge to the patriarchal order and ordering inasmuch as they enter entrepreneurship from the subordinate position and stay mirroring the portrait of 'Good Women'.

Accordingly, women's decision to act entrepreneurially is positively influenced by parents' occupations and parents' entrepreneurial status (Birley, 1988; Bowen & Hisrich, 1986; Ergeneli & Boz, 2013; Gray & Finley-Hervey, 2005; Greene et al., 2013; Mathews & Moser, 1995). Shapero and Sokol (1982) noted that "The family, particularly the father or mother, plays the most powerful role in establishing the desirability and credibility of

entrepreneurial action for the individual". Yet, within the patriarchal family, women's ability to make decision concerning their own lives, namely creating a new business, is significantly affected by the male figure, usually the father, who has the authority over the family's decisions (Barakat, 1993; Gray & Finley-Hervey, 2005). Given the recognition of the parents' impact, notably the father, on the entrepreneurial motivation of their daughters, we anticipate that the role of the father figure presented as an entrepreneur encourages the tendency of their daughters to act entrepreneurially. Furthermore, we would anticipate that if mothers are self-employed (entrepreneurs), daughters are more likely to become an entrepreneur because we expect that those mothers have legitimated the female entrepreneurial identity within the patriarchal family. Our first hypotheses are therefore as follows:

H1: The entrepreneurial activities of parents significantly influence the likelihood of young females choosing entrepreneurial careers.

This general hypothesis (H1) can then be broken down into the specific sub-hypotheses (H1a, H1b, and H1c) to explore the nuances of this influence:

H1a: Young females whose parents are self-employed (entrepreneurs) are more likely to choose entrepreneurial activity than those whose parents are not.

H1b: Young female entrepreneurs are more influenced by their father figure in choosing entrepreneurship as a career path than by their mother.

H1c: Young females whose mothers are entrepreneurs have a higher likelihood of becoming entrepreneurs than those whose mothers are not.

Besides the parents' entrepreneurial status and the likelihood that their daughters become self-employed (entrepreneurs), studies have shown that the level of education decreases the support of traditional and patriarchal values (Alexander & Welzel, 2011; Inglehart & Welzel, 2005) which, as aforementioned, structurally discourage women from acting entrepreneurially. Also, research findings of and Linzer (2008) highlighted that women in Muslim countries brace traditional values such as traditional gender roles when they tend to be less educated. As such, we presume that patriarchal mentality is more widespread among parents who have a modest level of education and therefore discourage their daughters for enterprising. Accordingly, our hypothesis is as follows:

H2. Parents' education level affects positively the entrance of their daughters to entrepreneurship, in the way, that the higher the level of education of parents, the more likely the young women become entrepreneurs.

From an embeddedness perspective, studies have demonstrated that family size also influence women's propensity to start businesses (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003; Brush et al., 2010; Cetin-damar et al., 2012; Noguera et al., 2013; Pistrui et al., 2001). Thus, some scholars have revealed that the large family size increases the likelihood of women to engage in entrepreneurship (Brush et al., 2010; Cetindamar et al., 2012; Pistrui et al., 2001). It has a positive implication for both the opportunity recognition and the resource

mobilization process, particularly in the start-up phase. However, other scholars have argued that in traditional families, characterized by a large size (Aponte et al., 1999; Heper et al., 1988), the pressure on women is stronger in terms of classical domestic roles, which render entrepreneurial activity as a less desirable career choice for them (Baughn et al., 2006; Jamali, 2009; Taylor & Newcomer, 2005). As such, we suppose that household size is an indicator of traditionalism and patriarchal families. We therefore suggest the following hypothesis:

H3. The greater the size of the household, the lesser the woman acts entrepreneurially.

Most of the literature regarding the family embeddedness has focused attention on household commitments, which includes marital and maternal status. Cowling (2010) has observed that the presence of children and marital status tend to be more impactful on the women's decision to start business; in the way that being married and having children increase the odds of women's entrepreneurship. However, the story is much more complex for a part of scholars, they suggest that if the marital and maternal status hamper the women's involvement in entrepreneurial activity, it is in part due to the prevalence of patriarchal norms and the gendered roles and responsibilities (Brush, 1992; Rønsen, 2014) and the prevalence of patriarchal norms. So, matrimony as well as the number of children will increase the domestic duties and therefore lessen the likelihood of females to be involved in entrepreneurial activity. Accordingly, we suggest the following hypotheses:

H4. Unmarried women are more likely to create a new business compared to those who are married.

H5. The higher the number of children, the fewer the women act entrepreneurially.

2- RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

As discussed in the previous section, family characteristics may influence the probability of women becoming an entrepreneur. As such, our analysis focuses on examining the effect of the family background on female entrepreneurial engagement. Rather than simply using gender as a variable and measuring differences between men and women, we aim to explore the structural constraints that contribute to the marginalization of women as entrepreneurs. Specifically, we seek to empirically investigate how family characteristics affect women's likelihood of entering entrepreneurship.

2.1- Data Source: SAHWA Youth Survey 2016

The data for this study is drawn from the SAHWA Youth Survey 2016, a cross-national survey conducted as part of the SAHWA Project. The SAHWA project (meaning "awakening" in Arabic) was a collaborative, interdisciplinary research initiative that began in 2014 and concluded in 2017. It combined socio-anthropological, economic,

political, sociological, and cultural approaches to study the trends and perspectives of youth in the context of social, economic, and political transitions in Southern and Eastern Mediterranean countries. The goal of SAHWA was to connect specialized expertise in youth studies with a comprehensive analysis of political and socio-economic transformations.

This survey provides a rich dataset on youth dynamics in the Arab Mediterranean region, including Algeria, and is an invaluable resource for understanding the socio-economic, political, and demographic factors that influence youth behaviour and decisions. In total, 9,860 young people, aged 15 to 29, were interviewed across five countries: Algeria, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco, and Tunisia, during the second and third years of the project (2015-2016). The survey was designed to capture data on three specific research themes: youth opportunities, youth empowerment, and youth cultures.

2.2- Relevance of the Data

Although the data is from 2016, it remains highly relevant to ongoing social, economic, and cultural issues faced by youth in Algeria and the broader Arab Mediterranean region. Despite the passage of time, many of the challenges and opportunities identified in the survey continue to be pertinent today, making the data valuable for contemporary analysis. Moreover, the older data serves as a baseline for current studies, enabling researchers to track changes and developments over time.

Additionally, the survey data on Algerian youth, particularly young women, remains underexploited, meaning much of the valuable information it contains has not been fully analysed or utilized. This presents an opportunity to extract fresh insights and findings from the existing dataset. By revisiting and reanalysing the data, we can uncover significant trends and patterns that have not been explored, thus enhancing our understanding of the youth experience in Algeria, particularly in relation to the gendered dynamics of entrepreneurship.

2.3- Sampling and Respondent Selection

In Algeria, the SAHWA Project used a stratified random sample to interview 2,002 young adults, aged 16 to 29, across 38 provinces (wilayas). For the purposes of this study, we focused specifically on young women (aged 16 to 29), resulting in an analysis based on 160 female respondents. This targeted approach allows us to isolate the influence of family background on female entrepreneurship, providing a focused lens on how structural and socio-cultural factors shape women's engagement in entrepreneurial activities.

2.4- Measurement of variables

In order to measure the entrepreneurial activity (dependent variable), we recoded answers of the multiple-choice question, 'What is your current employment status?' The options of the possible answers were: employers, self-employed, a full time employed, part-time employed, ap-prentice, family help and other. We coded as 1 if the respondent reported that (s)he is an 'employer' or a 'self-employed' and 0 if (s)he reported otherwise.

In terms of our independent variables used in the study, they were as follows. First, age: it is measured in years (transformed logarithmically to avoid outliers). Second, education: it is the levels of education of participants were numerically measured in years through asking the following question: 'what is your latest class of education which you have succeeded in?'

Concerning the impact of family characteristics, variables are measured through the following variables: First, marital status: unmarried participants were coded 1, 0 for other status. Second, parental status: we coded 1 for the presence of children, and 0 for no children. Third, number of children: those with children were asked to provide information about the number of children (we calculated the logarithm of the number of children to avoid skewness in the distribution). Fourth, living with parents: the measurement was provided from the answer to the following question: 'Do you live with your parents?' We coded 1 for participants who reside with both their parents or one of them, and 0 for otherwise. Fifth, household size: it was measured by asking participants to provide information about the number of family members living in a household) (we calculated the logarithm of the number of members to avoid skewness). Sixth, the occupational status of parents: fathers' occupation was coded, 1 for employers and self-employed, and 0 otherwise. As concerns mothers' occupation, we coded 1 for they are active and 0 for inactive.

The educational level of parents: we have distinguished four levels of education for parents. Level 0 for no education; 1 for primary education; 2 for intermediate education; 3 for secondary education, and 4 for higher education.

2.5- Data Analysis and Model Development

To address our questions research, we conducted a logistic regression analysis to test the main effect of individual attributes namely age and education, and the family characteristics on women's entrepreneurial activity. As such, we conducted a series of models separately.

Model I: In the first step of the binary logistic regression analysis, we included only the individual attributes of active women in the sample; we tried to measure whether any of the standard demo-graphic characteristics (age, education) affect women's involvement in entrepreneurship.

Model 2: In the second step, we expanded the analysis by incorporating the influence of familial commitments on women’s entrepreneurial engagement, testing how family-related variables affect entrepreneurial activity.

Model 3: In the final and third step, we measured the effect of family characteristics on the probability of females to be an entrepreneur. In order to facilitate comparison of the effects, we standardized both the dependent and independent variables in all models.

3- RESULTS

Before testing hypothesis, we start by providing an overview of our sample and presenting the correlation matrix for each measure in our study. The results indicate that the majority of active women in the sample fall within the 25 to 29 age range (59.8%). Nonetheless, only 32.4% of them are engaged in entrepreneurial activities. The educational background of these active women reveals an average of 12.5 years of education. Additionally, a significant proportion (85.95%) are unmarried, and a substantial majority (over 89%) still reside with their parents. Concerning the presence of children, almost 70% of married active women are mothers, with an average of 1.32 children per mother. Examining the occupational status of parents, we find that 18.4% of active women in the sample have fathers categorized as employers or self-employed. In contrast, the involvement of mothers in the workforce is comparatively lower, with only 16.2% of them are declared active.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Individual characteristics</i>					
Age	25	3.28	15	29	
Education	12.5	3.83	2	19	
<i>Family characteristics</i>					
Marital status					85.9%
Parental status					69.6%
Number of children	1.32	0.61	1	3	
Living with parents					89.6%
Household size	6.09	2.166	2	13	
Occupational status of the father					18.4%
Occupational status of the mother					16.2%

Educational level of the father	
Primary	21%
Intermediate	26.5%
Secondary	12.5%
High education	9%
Educational level of the mother	
Primary	23.1%
Intermediate	14.4%
Secondary	12.5%
High education	5.9%

Table 2 shows the correlation matrix of the non-standardized data. It provides a nuanced understanding of the relationship between different independent variables and entrepreneurial engagement among females. Age and education demonstrate significant correlations with entrepreneurship, revealing that younger women and those with lower educational levels exhibit a higher inclination towards entrepreneurial activities. Additionally, marital status displays a minor negative correlation, suggesting that being married might marginally discourage women's engagement in entrepreneurship. Conversely, parental status reveals a positive correlation, indicating that women with children are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities. Similarly, living with parents demonstrates a subtle positive correlation, suggesting that living with parents may encourage entrepreneurial endeavours among women. Household size also displays a positive correlation with female entrepreneurship, indicating that women from larger households are more likely to venture in entrepreneurial activity. On the other hand, parents' education demonstrates a negative correlation, illustrating that higher levels of parental education correspond to decreased entrepreneurial activity among women. These findings diverge from our initial hypotheses (H2 and H3). The bivariate correlations among independent variables used in this study are almost weak or moderate, except between "living with parents" and "marital status", which suggests little evidence of multicollinearity.

Table 2. Bivariate correlations of all variables.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Entrepreneurship	1	-.238**	-.437**	-.058	-.029	.050	.265**	-.039	.013	.162*	-.176*	-.089	-.116	.042	-.056	-.134*	-.120
2. Age	-.238**	1	.271**	-.241**	.401*	-.141*	-.109	-.071	-.010	.011	.073	-.036	-.040	.044	-.035	-.062	.068
3. Education	-.437**	.271**	1	.090	-.220	.026	-.206**	.067	.010	.007	.003	.158*	.128	.062	.064	.079	.121
4. Marital status	-.058	-.241**	.090	1	-.117	.709**	.024	-.033	-.043	-.056	.072	.153*	.128	.077	.065	-.019	.022
5. Parental status	-.029	.401*	-.220	-.117	1	-.411*	-.370*	-.131	.148	-.381*	-.267	°	°	-.270	-.035	-.217	.139
6. Living with parents	.050	-.141*	.026	.709**	-.411*	1	.338**	-.011	-.061	-.019	-.023	.129	.108	.095	.025	-.112	-.005
7. Household size	.265**	-.109	-.206**	.024	-.370*	.338**	1	.107	-.180*	.041	.052	-.183**	-.120	.101	.006	-.240**	-.130*
8. Occupational status of the father	-.039	-.071	.067	-.033	-.131	-.011	.107	1	-.148*	-.017	-.200**	-.056	.071	-.045	-.195**	-.045	-.074
9. Occupational status of the mother	.013	-.010	.010	-.043	.148	-.061	-.180*	-.148*	1	-.140*	-.063	.259**	.238**	-.083	.133*	.131*	.362**
10.Primary education of father	.162*	.011	.007	-.056	-.381*	-.019	.041	-.017	-.140*	1	-.309**	-.194**	-.162*	.211**	-.007	-.072	-.130*
11.Intermediate education of father	-.176*	.073	.003	.072	-.267	-.023	.052	-.200**	-.063	-.309**	1	-.228**	-.190**	.078	.277**	.083	-.150*
12.Secondary education of father	-.089	-.036	.158*	.153*	°	.129	-.183**	-.056	.259**	-.194**	-.228**	1	-.120	-.060	.057	.264**	.358**
13.Higher education of father	-.116	-.040	.128	.128	°	.108	-.120	.071	.238**	-.162*	-.190**	-.120	1	.045	-.072	.079	.176*
14.Primary education of mother	.042	.044	.062	.077	-.270	.095	.101	-.045	-.083	.211**	.078	-.060	.045	1	-.225**	-.208**	-.138*
15.Intermediate education of mother	-.056	-.035	.064	.065	-.035	.025	.006	-.195**	.133*	-.007	.277**	.057	-.072	-.225**	1	-.155*	-.103
16.Secondary education of mother	-.134*	-.062	.079	-.019	-.217	-.112	-.240**	-.045	.131*	-.072	.083	.264**	.079	-.208**	-.155*	1	-.095
17.High education of mother	-.120	.068	.121	.022	.139	-.005	-.130*	-.074	.362**	-.130*	-.150*	.358**	.176*	-.138*	-.103	-.095	1

Table 3 includes the results for logistic regression. Model 1 reports the main effects of age and education on women's entrepreneurial activity and shows a negative relationship, significant for education and not significant for age. From these findings, it appears that educated active women are less likely to act entrepreneurially. They choose to be a salaried employee than self-employed and entrepreneur. Thus, in our study women entrepreneurs have lower levels of education than other active women. Model 2 includes the four measures of family commitments; metric coefficients show that the effects of marital status, motherhood and number of children and living with parents are negative and statistically insignificant. However, household size effect is positive and statistically significant. Based on the review of the literature on the family size and women's entrepreneurship, we expected a sizeable household, betoken as a patriarchal and traditional family, reduce the woman likelihood to choose entrepreneurship as a vocation. Yet, we were wrong; the large family size encouraged women to act entrepreneurially which corroborates with some scholars' findings (Cetindamar et al., 2012; Brush et al., 2010; Pistrui et al., 2001). As such, our hypothesis H3 was not supported; even more, H4 and H5 were also rejected. The next step of analysis tested the main effects of parents' occupation and education on the likelihood of their daughters to engage in entrepreneurial activity. Parents' occupation has a disparate impact on their daughters' vocations, but the effect was insignificant. Hence, these findings did not provide strong enough evidence to support our hypotheses H1a, H1b and H1c. As far as the parents' education is concerned in Model 3, the educational level of the father has statistically significant but negative relationship with the likelihood of their daughters to become entrepreneurs. The higher the level of education of the father, the less likely the daughter becomes an entrepreneur. For the educational level of the mother, the effect is also negative but insignificant. Thereby, H2 was rejected.

Table 3 also reports the standardized regression coefficients; this would help us to realize the magnitude of the effects and to compare the strength of the association between our outcome (women entrepreneurial activity) and various predictors (individual attributes and family characteristics) within the same model (Vittinghoff et al., 2005). Contrary to what we expected, in each model only one standardized coefficient was statistically significant; as such, the comparison of the magnitude of the effects was nonsensical.

Table 3 Logistic regression estimate effects of individual and family characteristics on women entrepreneurial activity.

Parameter	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
-----------	---------	---------	---------

	Metric coefficient	Standardized coefficient	Metric coefficient	Standardized coefficient	Metric coefficient	Standardized coefficient
Individual characteristics						
Age	-0.033	-.109				
Education	-0.128***	-1.813***				
Family characteristics						
Marital status			-20.811	-7.259		
Number of children			-.276	-.129		
Living with parents			-.293	-.090		
Household size			1.791**	.662**		
Occupational status of the father					-.520	-.202
Occupational status of the mother					.725	.268
Father with non-formal education: reference category						
Primary education of father					.086	.035
Intermediate education of father					-1.337**	-.592**
Secondary education of father					-1.158*	-.392*
Higher education of father					-1.484*	-.427*
Mother with non-formal education: reference category						
Primary education of mother					-.232	-.098

Intermediate education of mother					-0.853	-0.301
Secondary education of mother					-1.493*	-.496*
Higher education of mother					-2.280*	-.542*
Constant	3.295*	-1.308***	-3.655**	-.796**	-.438	-.820***

DISCUSSION

In this study we adopted the family embeddedness approach (Aldrich & Cliff, 2003) to explore how family characteristics and commitments influence women's entrepreneurship in Algeria. Drawing upon the SAHWA Youth Survey data, the research provided evidence that family characteristics affect the women's engagement in entrepreneurial activity. Even though findings were not robust enough to support our presumption, they revealed a more nuanced picture of the role of family characteristics and family commitments.

The binary logistic regression highlighted significant relationships between women's entrepreneurial activity and three main predictors: level of education, household size and level of education of the father. Interestingly, these relationships diverged from our initial hypotheses. The most notable finding was the positive correlation between low levels of education and the likelihood of engaging in entrepreneurial activity. This suggests that women with limited formal education may seek entrepreneurship as an accessible avenue for economic participation. This phenomenon could be attributed to a lack of alternative employment opportunities, leading women to create their own ventures as a means of subsistence.

Further, contrary to our expectations, we found that household size increases the likelihood of women becoming entrepreneurs. This finding aligns with studies that view household size as a proxy for family capital (Dyk & Wilson, 1999; Cetindamar et al., 2012). Specifically, a larger family is seen as a valuable resource, providing additional hands to assist with work, as well as offering economic, psychological, and social support to the entrepreneur (Cetindamar et al., 2012; Dyk & Wilson 1999; Messikh, 2021). Our results challenge the assumption that larger families are indicative of traditional, patriarchal structures that inhibit female entrepreneurship. Instead, they suggest that family size may actually encourage women's engagement in entrepreneurship. Although our data do not allow us to fully explore the mechanisms behind this relationship, it highlights the importance of this family characteristic in the entrepreneurial process. We

encourage future research to further investigate how and why household size may facilitate entrepreneurial entry, particularly in Algeria and developing countries.

Moreover, the influence of the father's educational level revealed a complex dynamic. Contrary to our expectation which considered the level of education as an undermining of traditional and patriarchal values (Alexander & Welzel, 2011; Welzel & Inglehart, 2005); the finding revealed that the daughters whose fathers are educated choose other vocations than entrepreneurship. Again, our study did not allow us to understand the mechanism that underlay this relationship, hence the need for more research on women entrepreneurship in developing countries in general, and Algeria in particular. Additionally, we encourage further research which examines the impact of gender socialization processes on the performance of women's engagement in entrepreneurial activity.

CONCLUSION

This study provides valuable insights into the intricate relationships between family characteristics and women's entrepreneurship in Algeria. While our findings did not fully support our initial hypotheses, they reveal a more complex picture of how familial factors can influence entrepreneurial engagement.

Education emerged as a critical factor, with women with lower levels of education are more inclined to pursue entrepreneurship. Moreover, larger household sizes were found to support women entrepreneurs, challenging the assumption that traditional family structures inherently limit female entrepreneurial activity.

The unexpected findings concerning the father's educational level highlight the need to explore the socio-cultural context influencing women's career decisions. This study suggests the necessity for further research to better understand these dynamics, particularly by examining how gender socialization processes shape women's entrepreneurial outcomes.

Finally, our findings contribute to growing insight on women's entrepreneurship in developing contexts, indicating that policies designed to encourage female entrepreneurial participation should take into account family dynamics and support systems as essential elements.

References

Books:

Allen, Elaine; Langowitz, Nan; Minniti, Maria, (2007) *The 2006 Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Special Topic Report: Women in Entrepreneurship*, Center for Women Leadership, Babson College, Babson Park, MA.

Ahl, Helene, (2002) *The construction of the female entrepreneur as the other. Casting the Other. The production and maintenance of inequalities in work organizations*, Routledge, London, UK.

Ahl, Helene, (2004) *The scientific reproduction of gender inequality. A discourse analysis of research texts on women's entrepreneurship*, Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen.

Barakat, Halim, (1993), *The Arab world: Society, culture, and state*, University of California Press, USA.

Bruni, Attila, Silvia Gherardi; Poggio, Barbara, (2004) *Gender and entrepreneurship: An ethnographic approach*, Routledge London, UK.

Chamlou, Nadereh, (2008) *The Environment for Women's Entrepreneurship in the Middle East and North Africa*, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank Washington, D.C.

Heper, Metin; Evin, Ahmet (Eds.), (1988) *State, Democracy, and the Military: Turkey in the 1980s*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York.

Inglehart, Ronald; Welzel, Christian, (2005) *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Kelley, Donna J.; Singer, Slavica; Herrington, Mike, (2016) *2015-2016 Global Entrepreneurship Monitor*, Global Entrepreneurship Research Consortium, Babson College, MA.

McClelland, David C. (1961), *The achieving society*, Van No Strand, New York.

Minniti, Maria A.; Arenius, Pia; Langowitz, Nan Safran, (2005) *The 2005 Global Entrepreneurship Monitor special topic report: Women in entrepreneurship*: Center for Women's Leadership at Babson College, MA.

Moore, Dorothy Perrin; Buttner, E. Holly, (1997) *Women entrepreneurs: Moving beyond the glass ceiling*, Sage Publications, London.

Smith-Hunter, Andrea, (2006) *Women entrepreneurs across racial lines: Issues of human capital, financial capital and network structures*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK, Massachusetts, USA.

Verdaguer, María Eugenia, (2009) *Class, ethnicity, gender and Latino entrepreneurship*, Routledge, London, UK.

Vittinghoff, Eric; Glidden, David V.; Shiboski, Stephen C.; McCulloch, Charles E., (2011) *Regression methods in biostatistics: linear, logistic, survival, and repeated measures models*, Springer Science & Business Media, London, UK.

Weber, Max, & Kalberg, Stephen, (2013), *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*, Routledge, London, UK.

Book chapters

Aldrich, Howard; Zimmer, Catherine, (1986) “Entrepreneurship through social networks”, in Sexton, Donald L.; Smilor, Raymond W. (Eds.): *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*, Ballinger Publishing Company, New York.

Aldrich, Howard, (2005) “Entrepreneurship”, in Smelser, Neil J.; Swedberg, Richard (Eds.), *The handbook of economic sociology*, Princeton university press, USA.

Alsos, Gry Agnete; Carter, Sara; Ljunggren, Elisabet, (2014) “Entrepreneurial families and households”, in Baker, Ted; Welter, Friederike. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship*, Routledge Companions in Business, Management and Accounting, Oxford.

Aponte, Robert; Beal, Bruce A.; Jiles, Michelle E, (1999) “Ethnic Variation in the Family”, in Steinmetz, Su-zanne K.; Sussman, Marvin B. (Eds.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, Springer US.

Bennoune, Mahfoud, (2016) “The industrialization of Algeria: An overview”, in Barakat, Halim. (Ed.), *Contemporary North Africa: Issues of Development and Integration*, Routledge, London.

Cowling, Marc, (2010) “Entrepreneurship, gender and job creation: European dynamics”, in Brush, Candida G.; de Bruin, Anne; Gatewood, Elizabeth J.; Henry, Colette. (Eds.). *Women Entrepreneurs and the Global Environment for Growth: A Research Perspective*, Edward Elgar Publishing, UK.

Granovetter, Mark, (1995) “The Economic Sociology of Firms and Entrepreneurs”, in Portes, Alejandro (Ed.), *Economic Sociology of Immigration, The: Essays on Networks, Ethnicity, and entrepreneurship*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Kleinrichert, Denise, (2013) “Gender Issues in Entrepreneurship, in Luetge,” Christoph (Ed.) *Handbook of the Philosophical Foundations of Business Ethics*, Springer Netherlands.

Klyver, Kim; Evald, Majbritt Rostgaard; Hindle Kevin, (2011) “Social networks and new venture creation: the dark side of networks”, in Hindle, Kevin; Klyver, Kim (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on New Venture Creation*, Edward Elgar, Northampton, UK and, MA, USA.

Lazreg, Marnia, (1990) “Women, Work and Social Change in Algeria”, in Stichter, Sharon; Jane L. Parpart (Eds.). *Women, employment and the family in the international division of labour*, Palgrave Macmillan, UK.

Long, Ziyu., (2015) “Privileging Women’s Voices and Experiences: A Career Perspective to Study Female Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies”, in Ramadani, Veland; Gërguri-Rashiti, Shqipe; Fayolle, Alain (Eds.) *Female Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies*, Palgrave Macmillan .UK.

Marlow, Susan, (2015) “Women, gender and entrepreneurship: why can’t a woman be more like a man?”, in Blackburn, Robert; Hytti, Ulla; Welter, Friederike (Eds.) *Context, Process and Gender in Entrepreneurship: Frontiers in European Entrepreneurship Research*, Edward Elgar Publishing Cheltenham, UK.

Martinelli, Alberto, (2004) “The social and institutional context of entrepreneurship”, in Corbetta, Guido; Huse, Morton; Ravasi, Davide (Eds.). *Crossroads of entrepreneurship*, Springer Science & Business Media, New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow.

Hausmann, Ricardo; Tyson, Laura D.; Zahidi, Saadia, (2012) “The global gender gap index 2012”, *The Global Gender Gap Report*, World Economic Forum, Geneva.

Shapero, Albert; Sokol, Lisa, (1982), “The Social Dimensions of Entrepreneurship.” in Kent, Calvin A.; Sexton, Donald L.; Vesper, Karl H. (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 72-90.

Taylor, Sherrill R.; Newcomer, Julia D. (2005) “Characteristics of women small business owners”, in Fielden, Sandra L.; Davidson, Marilyn (Eds.) *International handbook of women and small business entrepreneurship*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK, Massachusetts, USA.

Treanor, Lorna; Henry, Colette, (2010) “Influences on women’s entrepreneurship in Ireland and the Czech Republic”, in Brush, Candida G.; De Bruin, Anne; Gatewood, Elizabeth J.; Henry, Colette (Eds.) *Women entrepreneurs and the global environment for growth: a research perspective*, Edward Elgar Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA.

Welter, Friederike; Smallbone, David, (2010) “The embeddedness of women’s entrepreneurship in a transition context”, in Brush, Candida G.; de Bruin, Anne; Gatewood, Elizabeth J.; Henry, Colette (Eds.). *Women entrepreneurs and the global environment for growth: a research perspective*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA.

Articles

Acs, Zoltan J.; Bardasi, Elena; Estrin, Saul; Svejnar, Jan, (2011) “Introduction to special issue of Small Business Economics on female entrepreneurship in developed and developing economies”. *Small Business Economics*, vol. 37: 4, 393-396.

Al-Dajani, Haya; Marlow, Susan, (2013) “Empowerment and entrepreneurship: A theoretical framework”. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, vol. 19: 5, 503-524.

- Aldrich, Howard; Reese, Pat Ray; Dubini, Paola, (1989)**, “Women on the verge of a breakthrough: networking among entrepreneurs in the United States and Italy”. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 1: 4, 339-356.
- Aldrich, Howard E.; Cliff, Jennifer E., (2003)**, “The pervasive effects of family on entrepreneurship: toward a family embeddedness perspective”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 18, 573-596.
- Alexander, Amy C.; Welzel, Christian, (2011)**, “Islam and patriarchy: how robust is Muslim support for patriarchal values?”. *International Review of Sociology*, vol. 21: 2, 249-276.
- Akanle, Olayinka, (2011)**, “The sociology of gender equality and development in democratizing Nigeria.” *The Nigerian Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, vol.9:1, 2011, 22-36.
- Ahl, Helene, (2006)**, “Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions”. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, vol. 30: 5, 595-621.
- Ahl, Helene; Marlow, Susan, (2012)**, “Exploring the dynamics of gender, feminism and entrepreneurship: advancing debate to escape a dead end?”. *Organization*, vol. 19:5, 543-562.
- Arquisola, Maria J.; Muanar, Iseu A., (2019)**, “Role of family influence, gender, and entrepreneurial education on Indonesian vocational students becoming entrepreneurs”. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science*, vol. 8:5, 104-112.
- Baker, Ted; aldrich, howard E.; Nina, Liou, (1997)**, “Invisible entrepreneurs: the neglect of women business owners by mass media and scholarly journals in the USA”. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 9: 3, 221-238.
- Baughn, C. Christopher; Bee-Leng, Chua; Kent E. Neupert. (2006)**, “The normative context for women's participation in entrepreneurship: A multicountry study”. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 30: 5, 687-708.
- Bird, Barbara; Brush, Candida, (2002)**, “A gendered perspective on organizational creation”. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, vol. 26; 3, 41-66.
- Blydes, Lisa; Linzer; Drew A., (2008)**, “The political economy of women's support for fundamentalist Is-lam”. *World Politics*, vol. 60: 4, 576-609.
- Bowen, Donald D.; Hisrich, Robert D. (1986)**, “The female entrepreneur: A career development perspective”. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 11: 2, 393-407.
- Brush, Candida G. (1992)**, “Research on women business owners: Past trends, a new perspective and future directions”. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, vol. 16: 4, 5-31.
- Brush, Candida G.; De Bruin, Anne; Welter, Friederike, (2009)**, “A gender-aware framework for women's entrepreneurship”. *International Journal of Gender and entrepreneurship*, vol. 1:1 P. 8-24.

Brush, Candida G.; de Bruin, Anne; Welter, Friederike; Allen, Elaine, (2010), “Gender embeddedness of women entrepreneurs: an empirical test of the “5M” framework”. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, vol. 30: 8, 1-12.

Bui, Hong T.; Kuan, Alua; Chu, Tuan T., (2018), “Female entrepreneurship in patriarchal society: motivation and challenges”. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, vol. 30:4, 325-343.

Carter, Sara; Marlow, Susan; Henry, Colette, (2009), “Exploring the impact of gender upon women's business ownership”. *International Small Business Journal*, vol. 27:2, 139-148.

Carter, Sara, (2011), “The rewards of entrepreneurship: Exploring the incomes, wealth, and economic well-being of entrepreneurial households.” *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, vol. 35:1, 39-55.

Cetindamar, Dilek; Gupta, Vishal K.; Karadeniz, Esra E.; Egrican, Nilufer, (2012), “What the numbers tell: The impact of human, family and financial capital on women and men's entry into entrepreneurship in Turkey”. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 24:1-2, 29-51.

Chell, Elizabeth; Baines, Susan, (1998), “Does gender affect business ‘performance’? A study of microbusinesses in business services in the UK”. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 10:2, 117-135.

Cramton, Catherine Durnell, (1993), “Is rugged individualism the whole story? Public and private accounts of a firm's founding”. *Family Business Review*, vol. 6:3, 233-261.

Cromie, Stan; Birley, Sue, (1992), “Networking by female business owners in Northern Ireland”. *Journal of business venturing*, vol. 7:3, 237-251.

Davidsson, Per, (2003), “The domain of entrepreneurship research: Some suggestions”. *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth*, vol. 6:3, 315-372.

De Bruin, Anne; Brush, Candida G.; Welter, Friederike, (2006), “Introduction to the special Issue: Towards building cumulative knowledge on women’s entrepreneurship”. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 30: 5, 585–593.

De Vita, Luisa; Mari, Michela; Poggese, Sara, (2014), “Women entrepreneurs in and from developing countries: Evidences from the literature.” *European Management Journal*, vol. 32: 3, 451-460.

Dyer Jr, W. Gibb, (2003), “The family: The missing variable in organizational research.” *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, vol. 27:4, 401-416.

Dyk, Patricia Hyjer; Wilson, Stephan M., (1999), “Family-Based Social Capital Considerations as Predictors of Attainments Among Appalachian Youth.” *Sociological Inquiry*, vol. 69:3, 477-503.

Ergeneli, Azize; Boz, Anil, (2013), “A descriptive analysis of parents of women entrepreneurs in Turkey”. *Intelektinė ekonomika*, vol. 7 :1, 63-73.

Gartner, William B. (1989), “Who is an Entrepreneur? Is the Wrong Question”. *Entrepreneurial Theory and Practice*, vol. 13, 47-68.

Goffman, Erving (1977), “The arrangement between the sexes”. *Theory and society*, vol. 4:3, 301-331.

Granovetter, Mark (1985), “Economic action and social structure: The problem of embeddedness”. *American journal of sociology*, vol. 91:3, 481-510.

Granovetter, Mark (2005), “The impact of social structure on economic outcomes”. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 19:1, 33–50.

Gray, Kenneth R.; Finley-Hervey, Joycelyn (2005), “Women and entrepreneurship in Morocco: Debunking stereotypes and discerning strategies”. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, vol. 1:2, 203-217.

Greene, Patricia G.; Hart, Myra M.; Gatewood, Elizabeth J.; Brush, Candida G.; Carter, Nancy M. (2003), “Women entrepreneurs: Moving front and center: An overview of research and theory”. *Coleman White Paper Series*, vol. 3, 1-47.

Greene, Francis J.; Han, Liang; Marlow, Susan (2013), “Like mother, like daughter? Analyzing maternal influences upon women's entrepreneurial propensity”. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 37:4, 687-711.

Henry, Colette; Foss, Lene; Ahl, Helene (2015), “Gender and entrepreneurship research: A review of methodological approaches”. *International Small Business Journal*, vol. 34:3, 217-241.

Hughes, Karen D.; Jennings, Jennifer E.; Brush, Candida; Carter, Sara; Welter, Friederike (2012), “Extending women's entrepreneurship research in new directions”. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 36:3, 429-442.

Jamali, Dima (2009), “Constraints and opportunities facing women entrepreneurs in developing countries: A relational perspective”. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, vol. 24:4, 232-251.

Jennings, Jennifer E.; McDougald, Megan S. (2007), “Work-family interface experiences and coping strategies: Implications for entrepreneurship research and practice”. *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 32:3, 747-760.

Kandiyoti, Deniz (1988), “Bargaining with patriarchy”. *Gender & society*, vol. 2:3, 274-290.

Lämsä, Anna-Maija; Säkkinen, Aila; Turjanmaa, Pirkko (2000), “Values and their change during the business education a gender perspective”. *International Journal of Value-Based Management*, vol.13:3, 203-213.

Marlow, Susan; Colette Henry; Sara Carter (2009), “Exploring the impact of gender upon women's business ownership: Introduction.” *International small business journal*, vol. 27:2, 139-148.

Marlow, Susan, and Maura McAdam (2013), “Gender and entrepreneurship: advancing debate and challenging myths; exploring the mystery of the under-performing

female entrepreneur". *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, vol. 19:1, 114-124.

Marlow, Susan, (2014), "Exploring future research agendas in the field of gender and entrepreneurship". *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, vol. 6:2, 102-120.

Marlow, Susan; Swail, Janine, (2014), "Gender, risk and finance: why can't a woman be more like a man?" *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 26:1-2, 80-96.

Mathews, Charles H.; Moser, Steven B., (1995), "Family background and gender: Implications for interest in small firm ownership", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 7:4, 365-378.

Messikh, Ayoub, (2021), "The Entrepreneurial Intention of Algerian Women: A Sample Study of Skikda University Female Students". *Journal of Women's Entrepreneurship and Education*, vol. 3:4, 134-150.

Minniti, Maria; Nardone, Carlo, (2007), "Being in someone else's shoes: The role of gender in nascent entrepreneurship", *Small Business Economics*, vol. 28:2-3, 223-238.

Minniti, Maria, (2009), "Gender issues in entrepreneurship". *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship*, vol. 5:7-8, 497-621.

Minniti, Maria; Naudé, Wim, (2010), "What do we know about the patterns and determinants of female entrepreneurship across countries?". *The European Journal of Development Research*, vol. 22:3, 277-293.

Minniti, Maria, (2010), "Female entrepreneurship and economic activity". *The European Journal of Development Research*, vol. 22:3, 294-312.

Noguera, Maria; Alvarez, Claudia; Urbano, David, (2013), "Socio-cultural factors and female entrepreneurship". *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, vol.9:2, 183-197.

Pistruì, David; Huang, Wilfred; Oksoy, Dolun; Jing, Zhao; Welsch, Harold, (2001), "Entrepreneurship in China: Characteristics, attributes, and family forces shaping the emerging private sector". *Family Business Review*, vol. 14:2, 141-152.

Ram, Monder, (2001), "Family dynamics in a small consultancy firm: A case study". *Human Relations*, vol. 54:4, 395-418.

Rønsen, Marit, (2014), "Children and family: A barrier or an incentive to female self-employment in Norway?" *International Labour Review*, vol. 153:2, 337-349.

Rouse, Julia; Treanor, Lorna; Fleck, Emma, (2013), "The gendering of entrepreneurship: theoretical and empirical insights". *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, vol. 19:5, 452-459.

Ruef, Martin; Aldrich, Howard E.; Carter, Nancy M., (2003), "The structure of founding teams: Homophily, strong ties, and isolation among US entrepreneurs". *American Sociological Review*, vol. 68:2, 195-222.

Setti, Zakia, (2017), “Entrepreneurial intentions among youth in MENA Countries: Effects of gender, education, occupation, income and competencies”. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, vol 30:3, 308-324.

Spierings, Niels, (2014), “The Influence of Patriarchal Norms, Institutions, and Household Composition on Women's Employment in Twenty-Eight Muslim-Majority Countries”. *Feminist Economics*, vol. 20:4, 87-112.

Thornton, Patricia H., (1999), “The sociology of entrepreneurship”. *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 25, 19-46.

Vadnjaj, Mateja; Vadnjaj, Jaka ; Dermol, Alenka B., (2020), “Proposal of a new research construct in female entrepreneurship”. *Management*, vol: 25, 63-80.

Welter, Friederike; Smallbone, David, (2011), “Institutional perspectives on entrepreneurial behavior in challenging environments”. *Journal of Small Business Management*, vol. 49:1, 107-125.

Welter, Friederike, (2011), “Contextualizing entrepreneurship—conceptual challenges and ways forward”. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 35:1, 165-184.

Welzel, Christian; Inglehart, Ronald, (2005), “Liberalism, post materialism, and the growth of freedom.” *International Review of Sociology*, vol. 15:1, 81-108.

Wong, George Y.; Mason William M., (1985), “The hierarchical logistic regression model for multilevel analysis.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 80:391, 513-524.

Various documents:

Birley, Sue, (1988), “SWP 5187 Female Entrepreneurs. Are they really any different?”.
Dimova, Ralitzia D.; Gang, Ira N.; Landon-Lane, John S., (2006), “Where to Work? The Role of the Household in Explaining Gender Differences in Labour Market Outcomes”, IZA Discussion Paper No. 2476, Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn.

IFC, (2011), “Strengthening Access to Finance for Women-Owned SMEs in Developing Countries.” International Finance Corporation, Washington, DC.

ILO, (2014), “Global Employment Trends 2014: Risk of a jobless recovery?”, International Labour Office, Geneva.

ONS, (Juillet, 2012), *Rapport no. 69*, Office National des Statistiques, Statistiques Économiques, Alger.

UNIDO, (2016), *Rapport Annual 2015*, United Nations Industrial Development Organization, Vienne.

World Bank, (2016), *Annual Report*.

Electronic publications

Kepler, Erin; Shane, Scott; Heights, Shaker, (2007), “Are male and female entrepreneurs really that different?”. *Small Business Research Summary*, Office of

Advocacy, US Small Business Administration, no. 309 (September 2007), (on-line) [Date accessed 15.09.2020] [http://cmapspublic3.ihmc.us/rid=1225646682718_310554911_6940/Erin kepler%26scotte Shane - are male and female entrepreneurs really that different.pdf](http://cmapspublic3.ihmc.us/rid=1225646682718_310554911_6940/Erin%20kepler%26scotte%20Shane%20-%20are%20male%20and%20female%20entrepreneurs%20really%20that%20different.pdf)

Office National des Statistiques. “*Rétrospective Statistique 1962-2011: Emploi*”. Chapitre II, (online) [Date accessed 25.02.2020] [http://www.ons.dz/IMG/pdf/CH2-EMPLOI .pdf](http://www.ons.dz/IMG/pdf/CH2-EMPLOI.pdf)

Onoshakpor, Chioma; Cunningham, James; Gammie, Elizabeth, (2024), “Entrepreneurship under patriarchy: the intersecting forces characterising everyday life for Nigeria’s women entrepreneurs”. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*. Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print, (14 May 2024), (on-line) [Date accessed 11. 09. 2024] <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-04-2023-0334>