British Journal of Research
ISSN: 2394-3718

Open access Research Article

Comparison of Groups of Inclusive Entrepreneurs in Asian Countries

Seiichi Fujii*

College of International Management, Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, Japan

ABSTRACT

The concept of Inclusive Entrepreneurship was raised in the European region to involve underestimated people in the economy. The research on inclusive entrepreneurship has focused on the impetus for starting a business and the comparison of regions. Although these studies are active in Europe, they have not yet been widely reported in Asia. The importance of the Asian economy is increasing because of the large influence of the Chinese and Indian population. To compare entrepreneurial activities of the regional differences and trends in India, Indonesia, China, South Korea, and Japan, 3 types of data are used. Those are GEM (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor) data, Basic national data by the United Nation, and the Hofstede measure. The analysis focused on Women entrepreneurship and Youth entrepreneurship in inclusive entrepreneurship. The differences between Women and Youth are clarified. Different types of trends also appeared in 5 countries. The environment for inclusive entrepreneurship depends on the nationality and the group. In intentions of Asian people for inclusive entrepreneurs, Female TEA (Total early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity) in India is the highest, and entrepreneurial intention is relatively higher. However, Chinese and Japanese people's entrepreneurial intentions are very low. Asian governments' policy for inclusive entrepreneurship also varies. Entrepreneurial Finance and Social and Cultural Norms in India and Indonesia are effective for both of Females and Youth. Chinese and Japanese governmental support would not be enough to raise Female and Youth TEA.

Keywords: Inclusive entrepreneurship; Global entrepreneurship monitor; Woman entrepreneurship; Youth entrepreneurship

ABBREVIATIONS

(APS) Adult Population Survey; (EU) European Union; (GDP) Gross Domestic Product; (GEM) Global Entrepreneurship Monitor; (OECD) Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; (TEA) Total Early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity

INTRODUCTION

Background

In Europe, the European Union (EU) leads not only the political environment but also the economic strategy. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) is working to bring people enriched life by building great relationships between Europe and other regions. OECD regards those who cannot join the labour market as "the missing people" [1]. OECD often publishes reports about "the missing people" and has made its website accessible to people around the world. This type of report focuses on the importance of entrepreneurship among vulnerable and underserved people, emphasizes the self-employment aspects of entrepreneurship, and provides several policies to the institutions, mainly local and central governments in the European region. Vulnerable people have different expressions, such as disadvantaged [2-5], under-represented [6-8], unconventional [9], underserved [10,11], or underprivileged [3,12,13] people. OECD selects specific population groups as "the missing people," which are women, immigrants, youth, seniors, and people with disability. The reports of the OECD define entrepreneurial activities of the missing people as inclusive entrepreneurship.

Many researchers have addressed the concept of inclusive entrepreneurship. Such discussions are mainly divided into 2 issues. The first issue is related to the impetus for starting a

Received:	28-Febraury-2024	**Manuscript No:**	IPBJR-24-19091
Editor assigned:	01-March-2024	**PreQC No:**	IPBJR-24-19091 (PQ)
Reviewed:	15-March-2024	**QC No:**	IPBJR-24-19091
Revised:	20-March-2024	**Manuscript No:**	IPBJR-24-19091 (R)
Published:	27-March-2024	**DOI:**	10.35841/2394-3718-11.3.21

Corresponding author Seiichi Fujii, College of International Management, Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, Japan, E-mail: fujiis@apu.ac.jp

Citation Fujii S (2024) Comparison of Groups of Inclusive Entrepreneurs in Asian Countries. Br J Res. 11:21.

business, that is, motivations and barriers. In previous articles, researchers revealed internal and external factors about motivations. In internal factors, motivation is categorized as opportunity and necessity [14]. Sometimes, internal factors are called push and pull factors. When opportunity-type entrepreneurs recognize the opportunity of creating a business, they take action based on pull factors. From another aspect, necessity-type entrepreneurs start their businesses when they face negative situations, such as joblessness, job losses, unstable job conditions, and declining wages [15]. The external factor is the environment for start-up businesses. Financial accessibility, government policy, market dynamics, social culture, and other environmental issues are involved in the rate of entrepreneurial activities, which are beyond the control of entrepreneurs. Several articles have pointed out that internal and external factors influence each other in actual entrepreneurial activities [3,12,14]. Individuals start their businesses as entrepreneurs through internal factors. However, they cannot do so successfully without connections to society. Entrepreneurs usually need some support from others, such as knowledge, skills, finance, purchase, and outsourcing. In particular, inclusive entrepreneurship among underserved people does not have enough resources.

Another issue is a comparison of regions, such as nations, states, and cities. The reason is that the concept of inclusive entrepreneurship is closely influenced by central and/or local government support. Inclusive entrepreneurship brings positive aspects not only to underserved people who start businesses but also to central and local governments. Some research cases were conducted in South America [15] and Africa [16], but most of them were conducted in Europe. European researchers have published fruitful articles on comparisons among neighboring countries. Perez-Encinas et al. [17] compared senior and young entrepreneurs in Spain, France, and Sweden. Tubadji et al. [18] focused on fear of failure as an internal factor in youth entrepreneurship in Greece and Germany. Gómez-Araujo and Bayon [19] surveyed youth entrepreneurship by comparing urban areas and the countryside in Spain. Dodescu and Cohuţ [8] pursued inclusive entrepreneurship in Romania. Holienka et al. [14] and Pilkova et al. [2] focused on the neighboring region called Visegrade (i.e., Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungry, and Poland). Pilkova and Rehak [20] clarified the regional differences in senior entrepreneurship in Europe. Kacer et al. [3] compared the three groups of seniors, youth, and women in 30 European countries as regional differences. The EU weighs on entrepreneurship in their region and is collecting entrepreneurial data through the original formation of the Flash Eurobarometer Survey on Entrepreneurship. From another aspect, research on Asia has not yielded many results compared with the rich outcomes of the European region. Economic growth is pursued not only in Europe but also in Asia. China and India have large populations of over 1,000 million. In particular, China has achieved radical economic development with a high growth rate in the last two decades. In addition to China, Japan and the Republic of Korea also have advanced economies. India is expected to be the next powerful economic locomotive owing to its large population. Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam are also expected to be economically developing countries. At present, some countries are unstable economically and politically. Inclusive entrepreneurs should appear to achieve inclusive growth.

Although the survey of global entrepreneurship is expanding, inclusive entrepreneurship studies are still at an earlier stage. Therefore, ambiguous issues have not been discussed fully. In previous articles, 5 important issues are raised. First, some of the groups overlap. They are sometimes investigated together or discussed separately and clearly. Which senior women should be included in women or senior? Which young migrants should be treated as youths or migrants? Which policy for women or the policy for youth is adequate for young women? Second, the size of groups has not been addressed thoroughly. Every day, many immigrants are flooding into European countries from Africa and the Middle East and into the US from Latin American countries. This number is increasing day by day, and no one can predict the exact size in the future. The population of people with disabilities is smaller than other groups. The questions of how policymakers and researchers handle these situations and how they prioritize the treatment of individual groups remain. Third, whether common issues exist for all groups or whether policies applicable to all groups exist is still not much debated. Scholars have discussed all groups individually. Fourth, many discussions have emphasized self-employment as the value and importance of inclusive entrepreneurship. Commercial and social entrepreneurship always pursue innovation and social change. Few studies have insisted on innovativeness by inclusive entrepreneurs. Finally, an effective common global framework to measure the degree of entrepreneurship has not yet appeared. One hopeful survey is the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM), but this cannot explain all environmental aspects, particularly cultural matters. Each region in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, North America, South America, and Asia has a different culture with various backgrounds such as religion, political system, and race.

Many years of research should be accumulated for this research, which is not yet mature enough, to develop in the future. Therefore, in this research, the following research questions are set to contribute to the development of some of these 5 issues.

- Do Asian countries have a rich environment for inclusive entrepreneurship?
- Do Asians want to become inclusive entrepreneurs?
- Are Asian governments adopting enough policies to encourage inclusive entrepreneurship?

Literature Review

GEM data have a long history of over 20 years and many participants in over 120 countries [21]. Previous articles used GEM data for the analysis of inclusive entrepreneurship groups. Therefore, this chapter reviews articles on each group using GEM data. In addition, other measurements that relate to entrepreneurship and have global data are reviewed to explore adequate global comparisons. The EU has defined 5 groups for inclusive entrepreneurship, that is, women, immigrants, youth, seniors, and people with disabilities [6-8]. Individually, entrepreneurship by each group has been studied using GEM data. Some regions are advanced in terms of entrepreneurship

rates, whereas others have low entrepreneurship rates. Each country has different circumstances related to external and internal factors. In addition, given that the actual situation will differ for each group, the causal relationship between the entrepreneurship rate and the factors behind it will be clarified by making a wide-area comparison. GSM data include external and internal factors.

From another aspect, GSM data do not adequately address specific cultural characteristics. Many researchers have attempted to set the measurements of entrepreneurial environments [22,23]. Demographic factors, such as age, gender, and work experience, are also reported to affect entrepreneurial orientation. Moreover, although GEM quotes data from the United Nations, such data are insufficient in some respects [24-26]. In this chapter, after a literature review of each group analysis with GSM, the comparison of groups is also reviewed. The number of immigrants is increasing rapidly owing to conflicts globally and the substantial decline in political functions. Start-up businesses by immigrants will become a major issue in maintaining and revitalizing the economy in the future [27,28]. In addition, labour shortages, respect for human rights, and support for labour capacity through the use of IT are promising [29,30]. Moreover, the participation of people with disabilities in entrepreneurship in the labour market is expected to increase in importance [31,32]. At present, studies on immigrants and disabled entrepreneurs exist, but very few studies have used GSM data and criteria for cross-regional comparisons. For this reason, in this research, we review entrepreneurship among women and youth and compare groups using GEM data.

Woman Entrepreneurship in the GEM

Previous articles have discussed several traditional long-term problems. Examples are the lower rates of women entrepreneurship than men [14,26,34-36], emphasis on masculine phenomena of entrepreneurship [14], gender inequality [27,34], and religious susceptibility [27,37]. From another aspect, women entrepreneurs have several advantages, such as identification of market gaps by using feminine characteristics [38]; bringing innovation, particularly in service, from sensitivity to market needs [39]; undeveloped economic resources [39]; important contributors to the economy [35]; and the possibility to change social perceptions of women [27]. A consistent concept in previous women entrepreneurship articles is the importance of women joining economic activities.

Three chief arguments in previous women entrepreneurship articles with GSM data exist obstructions and promotion, role models, and regional differences. The first argument is about the obstacles faced by weak and disadvantaged women and how to remove them. In the GSM survey, these are expressed as internal and external factors, as already described in the former section. Regarding internal factors, Brush et al. [35] regarded human capital as consisting of education, experience, attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions and thought women have the disadvantage of such human capital. Moreover, the entrepreneurship rate does not increase without self-confidence [35]. Self-confidence is considered to be based on human capital. Fear of failure, which would prevent one from starting a business, was found to be a remarkable inhibitor of the involvement of women [14]. Soomro et al. [40] also supported that fear of failure is an effective barrier in certain societies. External factors are often discussed. Hechavarria and Ingram [41] insisted on the importance of the environment for entrepreneurship, which is called "ecosystem" to reduce the societal, cultural, and ideological barriers. They found that ease of entry into a market and cultural and social supportive norms by government policy and support are more effective for women entrepreneurs than for men. This case has been traditionally known as a disincentive to women's entrepreneurial decision-making, where barriers to accessing financial resources are greater for women than men [42]. Some traditional barriers, such as the lack of financial institutions' and investors' credibility to women entrepreneurs and permission for women's activities by men, remain wide. These barriers prove that social consensus needs to change to improve women's entrepreneurship rate [27]. Regarding such societal problems, cultural aspects disturb women's entrepreneurial activities when societies take uncertainty-accepting, high-power distance, and high in-group collectivism [43]. Social prejudice against female leaders is based on the idea that leadership should be done by men, which leads to the suppression of entrepreneurship [38]. External factors sometimes influence internal factors. Elizundia [44] and Soomro et al. [40] also supported that fear of failure is an effective barrier in certain societies. High equality in social, economic, and political trends does not encourage women to be entrepreneurs because they avoid risks.

The second argument is the role model that affects internal factors. Compared with male entrepreneurs, female entrepreneurs are aware of their lower financial management capabilities. However, they are known to bring about innovation in industries, such as the service industry that require skills to interact with people. This case is believed to be caused by their superior bargaining power with customers, high tolerance, and strong respect for customers [26,39]. In the GEM survey, questionnaires show that "I know someone who has started a new business," but close contact with entrepreneurs leads to aspiration and motivation to start a business. This case is known as role model theory, and the story of a successful female entrepreneur promotes the understanding that entrepreneurship is a promising career path, and contributes to the improvement of women's entrepreneurship rate. Simultaneously, this role model theory has a synergistic effect on possessing knowledge about entrepreneurship nurtured through recognition of market opportunities and education [38]. Soomro et al. [40] also found the set of individual perceptions constructed by role models, self-efficacy, and fear of failure. The role model has synergy with other issues. Darnihamedani and Terjesen [45] noted that policymakers in each country should support the promotion of role models and women institutional entrepreneurs as a bottom-up approach.

The last argument is the regional difference that closely relates to cultural aspects. Female entrepreneurship rates are higher in developed countries than that of their male counterpart. Some areas will decrease over time, others will expand. Social and economic contexts in equality influence the variety of barriers. Only inequality itself affects women's entrepreneurship rates

[34]. In the Middle East and North Africa regions, business persons recognize special environments, such as unclear, complicated, and insufficient trade manners. Hence, this case is considered an obstacle for women to start a business. Furthermore, according to industrial characteristics, the public enterprise sector dominates the entire economy in Iran. Such industrial composition influences the rate of entrepreneurship [27]. Even in countries that are geographically close to each other, women's participation in the labor force is low when their circumstances are unique compared with neighboring countries, which is becoming a problem. In a multiethnic country such as Albania, where various religions coexist, the entrepreneurial environment is different, so different measures are required from those in surrounding countries [26]. Hechavarria and Brieger [43] used Hofstede's measure to evaluate the differences among cultural differences in 33 countries using a combination of GEM and GLOBE studies by the World Bank. Elizundia [44] compared three Latin American countries using GEM data. A common finding among these countries is that confidence in business skills and knowledge is effective in female entrepreneurship. From another aspect, the combination of the most influential factors is different. Such factors include the informal investors' rate in Mexico; the informal investors' rate, fear of failure, and entrepreneurs' connection in Chile; and the entrepreneurial intention rate in Brazil. Traditionally, gender equality is discussed as a societal problem, not a personal issue. Then, those three controversial issues have a close relationship and influence one another.

Youth Entrepreneurship in GEM

The importance of youth entrepreneurship is discussed as a solution to the high unemployment rate. Relatively, the necessity-driven type motivates young people to start businesses. From another aspect, young people are relatively familiar with new technology and systems and are eager to change the world with opportunity-driven motivation. The results of the GEM survey show that the opportunity-driven type occupied approximately 60%, and the necessity-driven type occupied approximately 40% [46]. In the research on youth entrepreneurship that uses GEM data, the primary issues are definition, obstacle removal, and geographical differences. The first argument is the definition of youth. The United Nations defined youth as 18-24 years old, whereas GEM defined it as 18-34 years old [14,46-49]. Generally, this category is divided into two groups according to the economic position. Those aged 18-24 are regarded as youth, and those 25-34 are young adults. Analysis of the GEM data shows some differences between these two groups as many young people are still students, and others are financially independent [14,18,46,47]. Sometimes, the division is that 18-24 is youth and 25-34 is youth adults [14,47,49], or 18-24 is young youth and 25-34 is older youth [46]. From another aspect, several articles have adopted the age range 18 years-29 years old, which was introduced by the EU and some previous literature [19].

The second argument is how to remove obstacles and women's entrepreneurship. Two aspects, internal and external issues, are also very important. Internal issues are richer than women's entrepreneurship. Fear of failure negatively influences entrepreneurial intentions [14,18,19,46,47,50]. This degree of effect is different in traditional cultural aspects in different localities [18], including rural and urban sides [19]. This fear of failure is created not only by cultural background such as societal norms or regulations but also by individual personality [46]. As another substantial factor, female gender has a negative influence [14,16,46,51]. The gender gap in youth is larger than that in other age groups [18]. Thus, young females have doubled disadvantages in entrepreneurship. Another internal issue is that motivations of necessity- and opportunity-driven types bring different obstacles. Self-confidence and knowing an entrepreneur have positive effects. Furthermore, alertness to opportunities is positive in the opportunity-driven type and negative in the necessity-driven type [14]. Some arguments about the differences between the necessity- and opportunity-driven types are considered for assistance for young entrepreneurs [51]. The motivation of individual intentions is considered perceived capabilities. Examples include skills, knowledge, and experience that closely relate to self-confidence [47]. Students do not have enough confidence and financial independence [14,18,46,47]. With regard to external factors, the scarcity of human, social, and financial capacity becomes a constraint for youth entrepreneurship [52]. Human capital consists of knowledge, skill, and experiences; social capital relates to implemented entrepreneurs as role models; and financial capital means funds reachable by young people [46]. When these supports are provided by the government, young people express positive attitudes toward entrepreneurship [50,51]. In these capacities, financial issues are often pointed out as the most difficult for youth [51], including women.

The last argument concerns geographical differences and women entrepreneurship. Setti [16] investigated youth entrepreneurship in the Middle East and North Africa, which comprises 14 countries. He emphasized that no same impact factors in sociodemographic variables influence youth intentions except for females and unemployment. From a global perspective, Schøtt et al. [46] pointed out the differences by regions, which are divided into five categories by geographical reasons: Sub-Saharan Africa, Middle East and North Africa, South and East Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and European culture countries. Cultural differences and government initiatives about the type and degree of barriers appear in the characteristics of each region. Sub-Saharan Africa shows the highest level in four issues: self-efficacy, opportunity alertness, risk willingness, and access to a role model in personal issues, and European culture countries show the lowest. Latin America and the Caribbean are the highest regions for opportunity-motivated entrepreneurship. Although South and East Asia have the lowest entrepreneurial intentions, and Latin America and the Caribbean have the highest entrepreneurial intentions. The opportunity-driven type is doubled in the necessity-driven type. In Caribbean countries, young people have relatively high entrepreneurship intentions owing to sociocultural perceptions. Thus, different trends were observed in different "entrepreneurial pipeline" steps, which are considered to be chiefly caused by individual government policies and culture [49]. Although individual countries have different situations according to other research, such a perspective in each region is still effective in capturing

the characteristics of each geographical difference [46].

Comparisons among Inclusive Entrepreneurship in GEM

Two major comparisons exist among inclusive entrepreneurship in GSM. The first one is youth and seniors. Another is a three-group comparison: youth, seniors, and women. Youth and senior entrepreneurship are compared in terms of differences by age and generation. In the advantage of seniors, the perception of abilities based on knowledge, skill, and experience is often picked up [13,53,54]. These abilities are sometimes expressed as human capital [54] and connect to self-confidence [13]. Self-confidence has the background of entrepreneurial networks as social capital [3,13]. From another aspect, senior citizens are negatively sensitive to fear of failure and personal conditions [17,53]. Education is positive for youth but negative for seniors, which is considered to be caused by the generation gap [53]. Concrete government policies, priorities, and support for the environment also negatively affect senior citizens. Youth has the advantage of opportunity perception, education, and gender [13,53]. In particular, opportunity perception is high in opportunity-driven motivations. Educational attainment is generally higher for senior citizens than for youth [13]. Then, youth have the disadvantage of lack of human and social capital as the network to entrepreneurs [17,53]. Human capital relates to knowledge and skills with experience. Common positive influential factors in both groups are business idea [17] and household income [53]. External negative issues that influence government policies, bureaucracy, and taxes equally influence both groups [13]. Some of the different results appeared among the comparisons of both groups. Pilkova et al. [53] insisted that cultural differences such as social attitudes toward entrepreneurship have a different influence on entrepreneurial intentions in both groups. In good economic conditions, entrepreneurship is a viable and attractive career option for youth and encourages opportunity-driven motivation. However, in such a situation, the senior is seeking employment opportunities because employment is stable and favorable for the senior. In different circumstances, this trend goes in opposite directions. Thus, economic situations and culture influence entrepreneurial intentions.

Finally, several research groups pointed out the supplement of youth and seniors. Advantages and disadvantages in both groups can bury each other, such as opportunity alert and human capital [13,17,54]. They noted that the government needs to set the environment and provide chances to meet each other to achieve such collaboration. In the comparison of the 3 groups, youth, seniors, and women, the most positive common issues are self-confidence, education, and human skills, which include knowledge, skill, and experience. Then, the negative common issue is social attitudes that affect indirectly [2]. Comparisons among the 3 groups are less than 2 groups, senior and youth, but they are deeply analysed, and some differences are clarified. Pilkova, et al. conducted a comparison between groups of entrepreneurs in 30 European countries [2]. Each group had different characteristics. This research team developed their Total Early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA) inclusive index and analysed it to use that index. Sweden is the highest, whereas Lithuania is lowest in the index of senior. Then, Switzerland is the highest, whereas Macedonia is the lowest in the index of women. Moreover, Sweden is the highest, whereas Estonia is the lowest in the index of youths. Furthermore, they categorized and divided the 30 countries into 4 clusters. In the lower index cluster, youth TEA is higher, and senior and woman TEA is lower. Several entrepreneurial environments, including economic conditions, are lower and discourage the entrepreneurial intention of seniors and women and encourage youth. The opposite trend is observed in another cluster with a high index. Then, entrepreneurial environments are great and have high senior and woman TEA but low youth TEA. Thus, the characteristics of each group are considered to be caused by entrepreneurial environments. This research team also emphasized that the opportunity-driven type drives entrepreneurial activities more than the necessity-driven type, and good economic conditions make inclusive entrepreneurs aware of the opportunity-driven business. Kacer, et al. [3] also clarified the differences among the 3 groups. Age is negative for seniors and women; however, gender, age, and education are positive for youth. Gender is also negative for seniors. High opportunity perceptions are positive for seniors and women but negative for youth. Fear of failure is negative for seniors and youth but has no relevance for women. They also explained that culture-like social attitudes toward entrepreneurship and economic situations caused such different results. When we compare the group of inclusive entrepreneurship, researchers consider cultural and societal aspects that include economics.

METHODS

Data Sample

This research focuses on the comparison of youth and women in Asian countries using GEM data. GEM sets 2 core data: Adult Population Survey (APS) and National Expert Survey (NES). APS asks the individual intentions of adults (18 years-64 years old), which relate directly to internal factors. EFC collects insights from experts about the environment of entrepreneurship, which is information about external factors. These data are effectively used for the analysis of existing situations [2,3,12,13]. These GEM data include 2 controversial issues: Motivations and barriers and regional comparison. From another aspect, by reviewing previous literature, cultural and economic situations are important to realize trends and differences between the 2 groups in entrepreneurial activities. The United Nations provides basic national data publicly, and GEM uses part of those data, population, and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita [21]. Previous articles have pointed out demographics as an influential factor because of the relationship among social attitudes, the workforce, unemployment, and economic situation [19,52]. Therefore, population median age and urban population add to the basic national data. Hofstede measure is often used to measure differences in culture in entrepreneurship [55-58]. This measure has 6 dimensions: Power distance, individualism, masculinity, uncertainty avoidance, long-term orientation, and indulgence. These data have been openly provided by Hofstede Insights for over 35 years in more than 60 countries. This study uses 3 types of data. These are GSM data from the GEM Association, basic national data from the United Nations, and Hofstede measure data from Hofstede Insights.

Measures

This research pursues the influential factors of TEA. GEM regularly provides each country's TEA data with APS and EFC. When TEA is the objective variable, each issue in APS and EFC is included in the explanatory data. In addition, basic national data and Hofstede's 6 dimensions of culture are included in the explanatory data. **Table 1** shows the measurement of data. Multivariate analysis takes between the objective variable and explanatory data.

Table 1: Measurements of data

Objective variable					
Total Activity (Female and Youth)					
TEA (Total early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity)					
Explanatory data					
EFC		**APS: Attitudes and perceptions**		**Hofstede dimensions**	
E1	Entrepreneurial Finance	A1	Know someone who has started a new	H1	Power Distance
E2	Ease of Access to Entrepreneurial Finance	A2	Good opportunities to start a business in my area	H2	Individualism
E3	Government Policy: Support and Relevance	A3	It is easy to start a business	H3	Masculinity
E4	Government Policy: Taxes and Bureaucracy	A4	Personally have the skills and knowledge	H4	Uncertainty Avoidance
E5	Government Entrepreneurial Programs	A5	Fear of failure (opportunity)	H5	Long Term Orientation
E6	Entrepreneurial Education at School	A6	Entrepreneurial intentions*	H6	Indulgence
E7	Entrepreneurial Education Post-School				
E8	Research and Development Transfers		**APS: Motivational**		
E9	Commercial and Professional Infrastructure	M1	To make a difference in the world		Basic national data
E10	Ease of Entry: Market Dynamics	M2	To build great wealth or very high income	N1	Population
E11	Ease of Entry: Burdens and Regulation	M3	To continue a family tradition	N2	GDP per capita
E12	Physical Infrastructure	M4	To earn a living because jobs are scarce	N3	Population median age
E13	Social and Cultural Norms			N4	Urban population

Targets

Asia is a mixed area in terms of economic growth. Some countries are advanced, and some are developing. This research picks up these 5 countries that participated in GEM for a long time. India, South Korea, and Japan joined in 2001, China in 2002, and Indonesia in 2006 [59]. Then, the TEA ranking of each country in the 2022-2023 report of 49 countries is as follows: Republic of South Korea-22, India-24, Indonesia-36, Japan-43, and China-44 [21]. China has the second-largest GDP across the world and the largest GDP in Asia. In addition, China had the largest population until 2022 and was one of the global influential countries to other nations economically and politically. Japan has the 3rd largest GDP, is 11th in the population ranking, and is second in the aging rate ranking across the world. From another aspect, the global gender gap index 2022 ranking of Japan is 116, which is very low. India currently has the largest population and the 5th largest GDP in the world. India is considered one of the most hopeful developing countries in the 21st century. However, the global gender gap index ranking of India in 2022 is 135, which is lower than Japan. Indonesia ranks number 4 by population, and the average age population in 2022 is approximately 30, which is relatively young, similar to India. Indonesia has a population of over 270 million and is also one of the most hopeful developing countries in the 21st century. The GDP per capita of the Republic of South Korea is categorized into over $ 400 countries as one of the advanced countries alongside Japan in Asia. The Republic of South Korea has globally famous manufacturing companies in the automobile and household appliance industries. In recent days, the South Korean culture in the music and movie industries has become very popular globally. In the global gender gap index ranking in 2022, Asian countries are relatively lower than European countries: Indonesia-92, Republic of South Korea-99, China-102, Japan-116, and India-135 [59]. Meanwhile, according to WorldData.info, the average age of each country is as follows: Japan-48.6, Republic of South Korea-43.2, China-38.4, Indonesia-31.1, and India-28.7. India has a relatively larger young population, whereas Japan has a relatively smaller young population [60]. How the differences in those environments influence the larger gender and age gap to total ETA, female ETA, and youth ETA is the main research question of this research.

RESULTS

Results of Analysis

3 types of explanatory data are prepared: Total TEA, female TEA, and youth TEA. The objective variable data have 34 items, as listed in Table 1, 13 items in the EFC, 10 items in the APS, 6 items in the Hofstede cultural dimension, and 4 items in the basic national data. 5 countries have 34 items each. **Table 2** shows an example of the relationship to total TEA. Regarding the result of multivariate analysis, 0-1.00 has a positive correlation to TEA, whereas -1.00-0 has a negative

correlation. The range from 0.75 to 1.00 can be evaluated as strongly positive, and that from 1.00 to -0.75 can be evaluated as strongly negative. Additionally, the range from 0.5 to 0.75 can be evaluated as a positive correlation, and that from -0.75 to -0.5 can be evaluated as a negative correlation (Table 2).

Table 2: Part of the result by analysis

			E1			
Total Activity % Adults		**China**	**India**	**Indonesia**	**Japan**	**South Korea**
TEA (Total early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity)		6	11.5	8.1	6.4	11.9
			E1			
		Explanatory data				
	Hofstede dimensions	China	India	Indonesia	Japan	South Korea	Result
H1	Power Distance	80	77	78	54	60	-0.0551
H2	Individualism	20	48	14	46	18	0.0663
H3	Masculinity	66	56	46	95	39	-0.6853
H4	Uncertainty Avoidance	30	40	48	92	85	0.1261
H5	Long Term Orientation	87	51	62	88	100	-0.1891
H6	Indulgence	24	26	38	42	29	-0.3596
	EFC	**China**	**India**	**Indonesia**	**Japan**	**South Korea**	**Result**
E1	Entrepreneurial Finance	5.6	6	6	4.5	5.2	0.3112
E2	Ease of Access to Entrepreneurial Finance	5.2	5.7	5.1	4.8	5.2	0.6597
E3	Government Policy: Support and Relevance	6.3	6.6	6.2	5.6	6.2	0.5533
E4	Government Policy: Taxes and Bureaucracy	6.5	6.2	6.1	4.5	5.9	0.27
E5	Government Entrepreneurial Programs	5.6	6.3	5.2	4.6	6.2	0.8149
E6	Entrepreneurial Education at School	3.9	5.7	4.7	2.5	4.9	0.7486
E7	Entrepreneurial Education Post-School	4.8	5.6	6.2	5	5.1	0.2682
E8	Research and Development Transfers	4.9	5.7	4.5	4.9	4.9	0.5018
E9	Commercial and Professional Infrastructure	5.1	5.9	5.4	5.1	5.2	0.6103
E10	Ease of Entry: Market Dynamics	7	7	7	7.1	7.8	0.5807
E11	Ease of Entry: Burdens and Regulation	4.4	6	5.7	4.9	4.9	0.5276
E12	Physical Infrastructure	7.3	6.7	6.8	7.4	7.4	-0.3198
E13	Social and Cultural Norms	6.4	6.3	6.4	3.8	5.9	0.3509

Influential Factors for Total TEA

A strong positive factor is E5 in EFC. Mild positive factors are E2, E3, E6, and E9 in EFC and A6 in APS. From another aspect, mild negative factors are H3 in Hofstede and APS. No strongly negative factors were found. Relatively, many EFC items such as environmental issues influence the total TEA. In the comparison of countries, the order of TEA stands for South Korea, India, Indonesia, Japan, and China. Influential items totally and mildly appear because of 2 diversities. One of them is the situation in those individual countries. Another is the characteristics of each category, such as female, youth, or senior. In this situation, EFC items are very important for the overall and individual categories. One Hofstede issue is that H3 affects TEA in some amounts. Furthermore, some APS issues are common.

Influential Factors for Female TEA

Strongly positive factors are E1, E2, E3, E6, and E9 in EFC and A2, A3, A4, A6, and M2 in APS. Positive factors are E5 and E7 in EFC and M1 in APS. Strongly negative factors are H3 in Hofstede, N3 in basic national data, and E12 in EFC. Negative factors are H5 in Hofstede and N2 and N4 in basic national data. Female TEA is very sensitive to many items, and in particular, many EFC items have a direct influence. In the comparison of countries, trends of total TEA and female TEA are similar in 5 countries. India and South Korea are larger, whereas China and Japan are smaller. Many influential items appear. Six EFC items have a positive influence, and one EFC item has a negative influence on female TEA. Among the APS items, 4 attitudes and perceptions and one motivational item has a positive influence. From another aspect, the 3 major strongly negative items are Hofstede issue H3, basic national data N3, and FEC item E12. Environmental aspects such as culture or population that are beyond the control of women are crucial to female entrepreneurs.

Influential Factors for Youth TEA

Strongly positive factors are H1 in Hofstede, E13 in EFC, and A1, A2, and M4 in APS. Positive factors are E1 and E4 in EFC and A5 in APS. Strongly negative factors are E5 and E10 in EFC. Negative factors are H4 and H5 in Hofstede and N2 and N3 in basic national data. Relatively smaller factors influence youth TEA, and different items appear from influential factors to female TEA. In the comparison of countries, only 4 countries have this rate, but the range is so wide. Although the total TEAs of Indonesia and South Korea are 8.1 and 11.9, youth TEAs are reversed to 18.9 and 3.6, respectively, which are the maximum and minimum numbers. Five major strongly positive items are Hofstede issue H1, FEC item E13, and APS items A1, A2, and M4. Strongly negative items appear in EFC items E5 and E10.

Young people are reluctant to be interfered with by others and are willing to start by their own will.

DISCUSSION

Table 3 shows the relevance and differences to the total, female, and youth TEA and all items. The bold and underlined cells indicate a strong negative correlation. Female TEA is very sensitive to many items, and total TEA has very weak sensitivity. A2 is a strongly positive factor for females and youth, M4, E1, E4, and E13 are positive for females and youth, and H5, N2, and N3 are negative for both groups. However, some items gave different results to different groups. E5 is positive for females but strongly negative for youths. Some other issues, such as A3, A4, E2, and E3, are strongly positive for females but have no correlations for youth (Table 3).

Table 3: Relationship between TEA and explanatory data items

	Hofstede						Basic national data								APS					
	H1	**H2**	**H3**	**H4**	**H5**	**H6**	**N1**	**N2**	**N3**	**N4**	**A1**	**A2**	**A3**	**A4**	**A5**	**A6**	**M1**	**M2**	**M3**	**M4**
Total TEA			-N										P	P	-N	P		P		
Female TEA			**SN**		-N			-N	**SN**	-N		**SP**	**SP**	**SP**		**SP**	P	**SP**		P
Youth TEA	**SP**			-N	-N			-N	-N		**SP**	**SP**			P					**SP**

	EFC												
	E1	**E2**	**E3**	**E4**	**E5**	**E6**	**E7**	**E8**	**E9**	**E10**	**E11**	**E12**	**E13**
Total TEA		P	P		**SP**	P		P	P	P	P		
Female TEA	**SP**	**SP**	**SP**	P	P	**SP**	P		**SP**		**SP**	SN	P
Youth TEA	P			P	**SN**					**SN**			**SP**

Note: (SP) Strongly Positive correlation; (P) Positive; (-SN) Strongly Negative; (-N) Negative

When we take a global comparison of entrepreneurial activities using TEA, researchers used total TEA [62]. This approach is effective in terms of comparing regional differences and timelines. However, if we pursue the reasons and influential factors of low or high TEA rates to improve or promote them, we should analyse each group with comparisons of total and other groups [3,13,17,53,54].

Table 4 shows the strong positive and strong negative items for female TEA in bold and underlined cells. Bold entries show strong negative items. This table can be used for the differences in nationality. The most remarkable note is Japan. H3 Masculinity and N3 Population median age are highest in 5 countries. Thus, Japanese society is dominated by males and the elderly. A male-dominant society brings many disadvantages for females [26,27,29,38]. Most items in EFC as the environment for entrepreneurship and APS as the intention for entrepreneurship have relatively low scores. Such cultural and environmental factors are disturbing for females in start-up businesses. From another aspect, India is the most contrasting. H3 is smaller, and it has the youngest N3. EFS and APS items are relatively higher. China has the second-lowest female TEA. H3 and N3 are middle, but A3, E6, and E11 are lower. Previous articles have pointed out the importance of entrepreneurial education for female TEA [14,38,41] (Table 4).

Table 4: Comparison of five countries for female TEA

Female TEA		Hofstede						Basic national data							APS						
		H1	**H2**	**H3**	**H4**	**H5**	**H6**	**N1**	**N2**	**N3**	**N4**	**A1**	**A2**	**A3**	**A4**	**A5**	**A6**	**M1**	**M2**	**M3**	**M4**
5	China	80	20	**66**	30	87	24	1412	19	**38**	61	**56.5**	**25.9**	**54.4**	54	57	**6.4**	15	**60.9**	27	60
11	India	77	48	**56**	40	51	26	1393	7.3	**28**	35	**75.5**	**78**	**78.1**	78	54	**20.1**	81	**69**	69	78
9.2	Indonesia	78	14	**46**	48	62	38	276	13	**30**	56	**87.2**	**72.2**	**75.5**	76	37	**33.3**	49	**81.6**	31	81
3.6	Japan	54	46	**95**	92	88	42	125	43	**48**	92	**12.7**	**27.5**	**14.9**	15	51	**5.1**	32	**41.1**	27	37
8.5	South Korea	60	18	**39**	85	100	29	51	47	**44**	82	**41**	**37.4**	**54.8**	55	18	**23.9**	8.4	**79.2**	4.6	27

Female TEA		EFC												
		E1	**E2**	**E3**	**E4**	**E5**	**E6**	**E7**	**E8**	**E9**	**E10**	**E11**	**E12**	**E13**
5	China	**5.6**	**5.2**	**6.3**	6.5	5.6	**3.9**	4.8	4.9	**5.1**	7	**4.4**	**7.3**	6.4
11	India	**6**	**5.7**	**6.6**	6.2	6.3	**5.7**	5.6	5.7	**5.9**	7	**6**	**6.7**	6.3
9.2	Indonesia	**6**	**5.1**	**6.2**	6.1	5.2	**4.7**	6.2	4.5	**5.4**	7	**5.7**	**6.8**	6.4
3.6	Japan	**4.5**	**4.8**	**5.6**	4.5	4.6	**2.5**	5	4.9	**5.1**	7.1	**4.9**	**7.4**	3.8
8.5	South Korea	**5.2**	**5.2**	**6.2**	5.9	6.2	**4.6**	5.1	4.9	**5.2**	7.8	**4.9**	**7.4**	5.9

Several items as influential factors in previous articles should be considered. A5 Fear of failure [14,40] is not correlated. A4 Personally possessing the skills and knowledge as self-confidence [35] is also not correlated. In the EFC item, E3 Government Policy: Support and Relevance and E6 Entrepreneurial Education at School are positive influential factors [41]. E1 Entrepreneurial Finance as the financial barrier [27] is also a positive influential factor. A1 Knowing someone who has started a new business as a role model [45] is also not correlated.

Tables 4 and 5 show the influential items for youth TEA. This TEA score is based on the document "Youth Entrepreneurship in Asia and the Pacific" [62] published by the United Nations Development Programme in 2019. This score is used with GEM data and does not include the Japanese score. As the highest TEA scorer, Indonesia has H1, A1, and A2 higher. Then, South Korea, which has the lowest TEA among young people despite having the highest total TEA, has a lower score of A1, A2, and M4. E5 as the negative factor is strongly high, which seems to affect youth TEA. The set phenomena of strongly positive H1 and strongly positive E5, as observed in Indonesia, could mean that the authority-centralized government gives assurance of the entire life, does not interfere with the details, and gives confidence to challenge young people. Youth in South Korea may become conservative because of anxiety (**Table 5**).

Table 5: Comparison of five countries for youth TEA

Youth TEA		Hofstede						Basic national data				APS								
		H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H6	N1	N2	N3	N4	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	M1	M2	M3	M4
14.9	China	**80**	20	66	30	87	24	1412	19	38	61	**56**	**57**	26	54	57	6.4	15	61	27	**60**
10.2	India	**77**	48	56	40	51	26	1393	7.3	28	35	**47**	**76**	78	78	54	20	81	69	69	**78**
18.9	Indonesia	**78**	14	46	48	62	38	276	13	30	56	**71**	**87**	72	76	37	33	49	82	31	**81**
0	Japan	**54**	46	95	92	88	42	125	43	48	92	**20**	**13**	28	15	51	5.1	32	41	27	**37**
3.6	South Korea	**60**	18	39	85	100	29	51	47	44	82	**40**	**41**	37	55	18	24	8.4	79	4.6	**27**
Youth TEA		**EFC**																			
		E1	**E2**	**E3**	**E4**	**E5**	**E6**	**E7**	**E8**	**E9**	**E10**	**E11**	**E12**	**E13**							
14.9	China	5.6	5.2	6.3	6.5	**5.6**	3.9	4.8	4.9	5.1	**7**	4.4	7.3	**6.4**							
10.2	India	6	5.7	6.6	6.2	**6.3**	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.9	**7**	6	6.7	**6.3**							
18.9	Indonesia	6	5.1	6.2	6.1	**5.2**	4.7	6.2	4.5	5.4	**7**	5.7	6.8	**6.4**							
0	Japan	4.5	4.8	5.6	4.5	**4.6**	2.5	5	4.9	5.1	**7.1**	4.9	7.4	**3.8**							
3.6	South Korea	5.2	5.2	6.2	5.9	**6.2**	4.6	5.1	4.9	5.2	**7.8**	4.9	7.4	**5.9**							

A1 Good opportunities to start a business in my area is a positive factor for youth TEA, as pointed out by Holienka et al. [14]. A2 Good opportunities to start a business in my area [46] and A5 Fear of failure [14,18,19,46,47,50] are admitted as the positive factors, which is in accordance with previous articles. A4 Personally have the skills and knowledge [14,47] has no correlation. E1 Entrepreneurial Finance [14,18,46,47,51] and E3 Government Policy: Support and Relevance [49] also have no correlation.

The characteristics of each country are listed as follows:

China: Total TEA is the lowest. Female TEA is lower than the total, but youth TEA is much higher. Most of the EFC and personal items are in the middle. Hofstede issue "power distance" is very high, and only one personal issue "Entrepreneurial intentions" is very low.

India: Total TEA is second; female TEA is the top. The country has the youngest population median age, and that item would increase female TEA. Most of the EFC items are relatively higher, and most of the personal items are higher.

Indonesia: Total TEA is in the middle, and youth TEA is the highest. The country has a younger population median age, including in India. Although most of the EFC items are in the middle, personal items are relatively higher. In particular, aspirations for entrepreneurship that are "Know someone who has started a new business," "Good opportunities to start a business in my area," and "to earn a living because jobs are scarce" are the highest.

Japan: Total TEA is lower, and female TEA is the lowest. The Hofstede item "Masculinity" that negatively affects TEA is critically the highest. This country has the oldest population median age, which negatively influences TEA. Most of the EFC items are relatively lower. Many personal items are the lowest. People seem not to be interested in start-up businesses in a male-dominated society.

South Korea: Total TEA is the highest, but youth TEA is the lowest. In Hofstede items, "Masculinity" is the lowest, which negatively influences total and female TEA. Several high EFC items could increase total TEA. Meanwhile, several personal items that positively influence youth TEA are relatively low. Particularly "To earn a living because jobs are scarce" is lowest. Established Business Ownership of South Korea ranks number one globally. Therefore, this situation could relate to low youth TEA.

CONCLUSION

Findings

Our findings can be summarized in 3 areas. First, the influential factors for each group and the differences in those factors for each group are clarified. We found that the influence of each factor on the total TEA of each nation was rounded and tended to weaken. Female TEA is very sensitive to many issues, particularly environmental issues that include cultural aspects. Youth TEA is

sensitive to specific issues, particularly interference with their intention. One issue is found to positively influence female TEA and negatively influence youth TEA, that is, Government Entrepreneurial Programs. Second, the characteristics and differences in each country were clarified. The 5 Asian countries have relatively low global gender gap index. These influences are evident in female TEA, although the degree of impact differs. From another aspect, the 3 types of TEA are different in the 5 countries. Consequently, each country has different influential factors. Thus, each government should set the target group and adopt the appropriate policy to improve TEA scores. In the case that cultural factors such as Muscularity or power distance have a strong effect, improvement will take a long time and will never be easy. Third, the importance of cultural aspects is emphasized in terms of the methodology of analysis for influential factors using GEM data. In this research, the Hofstede measure was included. This measure contributed to clarifying the differences and degree of influence on TEA.

Verification of Research Questions

We have set 3 research questions. These are the environment for inclusive entrepreneurship, the intentions of Asian people for inclusive entrepreneurs, and the Asian government's policies for inclusive entrepreneurship. The environment for inclusive entrepreneurship depends on the nationality and the group and has never been uniform. China and Japan have globally low total TEA, and the governmental support issues in EFC are not high. From another aspect, South Korea has a relatively high TEA, and the governmental support issues in the EFC are high. However, youth TEA is low, and negative factors to youth TEA exist. Regarding the intentions of Asian people for inclusive entrepreneurs, female TEA in India is the highest, and entrepreneurial intention is relatively higher. However, the Chinese and Japanese entrepreneurial intentions are very low. In addition to the shortage of governmental support, cultural aspects such as preferences for entrepreneurs also influence female and youth TEA. Asian government's policies for inclusive entrepreneurship also vary. Entrepreneurial Finance and Social and Cultural Norms in India and Indonesia are effective for women and youth. Chinese and Japanese governmental support would not be sufficient to raise the female and youth TEA.

Limitations and Future Research

This research uses GSM data as public and open data. These data have been collected regularly for around 3 decades. People consider these data versatile and reliable. Some studies have used individual personal data in multivariate analysis. The methodology of this research uses the total number in the nation, not individual personal data. This research is one of the perspectives for inclusive entrepreneurship. As the next step to further investigate the influential factors, analysing individual personal data in multivariate analysis is very meaningful. Next, the set of used basic data of TEA, EFC, and APS is 2022-2023 published in 2023. Youth TEA was published in 2018. Hence, researchers should consider the TEA trends of each country. Last, the score of the Hofstede measure is popular, open, and public data. Other measures of cultural aspects may be useful for inclusive entrepreneurship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

None.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author's declared that they have no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. OECD/European Commission (2021) The missing entrepreneurs 2021: Policies for inclusive entrepreneurship and self-employment. OECD Publishing, Paris.
2. Pilkova A, Jancovicova Z, Kovacicova Z (2016) Inclusive entrepreneurship in visegrad4 countries. Procedia Soc Behav Sci. 220:312-320.
3. Kacer J, Pilkova A, Mikus J (2019) Senior, youth and women entrepreneurship in the European regions. Innovation Management, Entrepreneurship and Sustainability. 733.
4. Pelucha M, Kourilova J, Kveton V (2017) Barriers of social entrepreneurship development-a case study of the Czech Republic. J Soc Entrep. 8(2):129-148.
5. Maalaoui A, Ratten V, Heilbrunn S, Brannback M, Kraus S (2020) Disadvantage entrepreneurship: Decoding a new area of research. EJM. 17(3):663-668.
6. Dodescu AO, Cohut ICP, Chirila L (2017) Boosting inclusive entrepreneurship as a strategic option of local development in Romania In 2014-2020 (I). AUOES. 121-900.
7. Gruzevskis B (2017) Inclusive entrepreneurship policies, country assessment notes, Lithuania. 1-24.
8. Dodescu A, Cohut IP (2015) Inclusive entrepreneurship in Romania in the context of European union: Policy analysis for 2007-2013. AUOES. 24(2):207-216.
9. Bakker RM, McMullen JS (2023) Inclusive entrepreneurship: A call for a shared theoretical conversation about unconventional entrepreneurs. J Bus Ventur. 38(1):106268.
10. Si S, Ahlstrom D, Wei J, Cullen J (2020) Business, entrepreneurship and innovation toward poverty reduction. Entrep Reg Dev. 30(3-4): 475–477.
11. Aparicio S, Audretsch D, Urbano D (2021) Does entrepreneurship matter for inclusive growth? The role of social progress orientation. ERJ. 11(4).
12. Pilkova A, Holienka M, Rehak J (2014) Senior entrepreneurship in the perspective of European entrepreneurial environment. Procedia Econ. 12:523-532.
13. Jancovicova JRAPZ, Holienka M (2017) Do Senior Entrepreneurs Differ from Youth Entrepreneurs? Evidences from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. Innovation Management, Entrepreneurship and Sustainability (IMES 2017). 836-848.
14. Holienka M, Jancovicova Z, Kovacicova Z (2016) Drivers of women entrepreneurship in visegrad countries: GEM evidence. Procedia Soc Behav. Sci. 220:124-133.
15. Leporati M, Torres Marin AJ, Roses S (2021) Senior entrepreneurship in Chile: Necessity or opportunity? A

GEM perspective. Eur Bus Rev. 33(6):892-917.

16. Setti Z (2017) Entrepreneurial intentions among youth in MENA countries: Effects of gender, education, occupation and income. IJESB. 30(3):308-324.
17. Perez-Encinas A, Bueno Y, Santos B, Nieto-Mejia C (2021) Are there differences and complementarities between senior and young entrepreneurs? An intergenerational perspective. Sustainability. 13(9):5202.
18. Tubadji A, Dietrich H, Angelis V, Haas A, Schels B (2021) Fear-of-failure and cultural persistence in youth entrepreneurship: Comparative analysis: Greece versus Germany. J Small Bus Entrep. 33(5):513-538.
19. Gomez-Araujo E, Bayon MC (2017) Socio-cultural factors and youth entrepreneurship in rural regions. RBGN. 19:200-218.
20. Pilkova A, Rehak J (2017) Regional aspects of inclusive entrepreneurship of seniors in Europe. Econ Soc. 39(1):49-64.
21. Hill S, Ionescu-Somers A, Coduras Martinez A, Guerrero M, Menipaz E, et al. (2023) Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2022/2023 Global Report: Adapting to a" New Normal".
22. Gruzevskis B (2017) Inclusive entrepreneurship policies, country assessment notes, Lithuania. 1-21.
23. Acs ZJ, Autio E, Szerb L (2014) National systems of entrepreneurship: Measurement issues and policy implications. Res Policy. 43(3):476-494.
24. Stam E (2018) Measuring entrepreneurial ecosystems. EEs. 173-197.
25. Hechavarria 25 DM, Brieger SA (2022) Practice rather than preach: Cultural practices and female social entrepreneurship. Small Bus Econ. 1-21.
26. Ramadani V (2015) The woman entrepreneur in Albania: An exploratory study on motivation, problems and success factors. J Balk Near East Stud. 17(2):204-221.
27. Sarfaraz L, Faghih N (2011) Women's entrepreneurship in Iran: A GEM based-data evidence. GJE. 1(1):45-57.
28. Crush J, Skinner C (2015) Informal migrant entrepreneurship and inclusive growth in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Mozambique. African Books Collective.
29. Crush J, Ramachandran S (2014) Migrant entrepreneurship collective violence and xenophobia in South Africa. African Books Collective.
30. Colovic A, Lamotte O, Bayon MC (2019) Technology adoption and product Innovation by third-age entrepreneurs: Evidence from GEM data. Springer. 111-124.
31. Orser B, Riding A, Li Y (2019) Technology adoption and gender-inclusive entrepreneurship education and training. Int J Gend Entrep. 11(3):273-298.
32. Renko M, Parker Harris S, Caldwell K (2016) Entrepreneurial entry by people with disabilities. ISBJ. 34(5):555-578.
33. De Clercq D, Honig B (2011) Entrepreneurship as an integrating mechanism for disadvantaged persons. Entrep Reg Dev. 23(5-6):353-372.
34. Sarfaraz L, Faghih N, Majd AA (2014) The relationship between women entrepreneurship and gender equality. GJE. 4:1-11.
35. Brush C, Ali A, Kelley D, Greene P (2017) The influence of human capital factors and context on women's entrepreneurship: Which matters more? J Bus Ventur Insights. 8:105-113.
36. Manocha P, Hunt RA, Townsend DM, Stallkamp M (2021) When rising tides lift some boats more than others: Gender-based differences in the external enablement of entrepreneurship. J Dev Entrep. 26(3):2150017.
37. De Vita L, Mari M, Poggesi S (2014) Women entrepreneurs in and from developing countries: Evidences from the literature. Eur Manag J. 32(3):451-460.
38. Wannamakok W, Chang YY (2020) Understanding nascent women entrepreneurs: An exploratory investigation into their entrepreneurial intentions. Gend Manag. 35(6):553-566.
39. Ramadani V, Gerguri S, Dana LP, Tasaminova T (2013) Women entrepreneurs in the Republic of Macedonia: Waiting for directions. IJESB. 19(1):95-121.
40. Soomro RB, Memeon SG, Mirani IA (2018) Assessing the impact of social and demographic factors on female entrepreneurial intention in Pakistan: GEM data evidence. JISR-MSSE. 16(1):117-142.
41. Hechavarria DM, Ingram AE (2019) Entrepreneurial ecosystem conditions and gendered national-level entrepreneurial activity: A 14-year panel study of GEM. Small Bus Econ. 53:431-458.
42. Roper S, Scott JM (2009) Perceived financial barriers and the start-up decision: An econometric analysis of gender differences using GEM data. ISBJ. 27(2):149-171.
43. Hechavarria DM, Brieger SA (2022) Practice rather than preach: Cultural practices and female social entrepreneurship. Small Bus Econ. 58:1131-1151.
44. Elizundia ME (2014) Female entrepreneurship a comparison between Mexico, Brasil and Chile. Estudios de Administracion. 21(2):1-31.
45. Darnihamedani P, Terjesen S (2020) Male and female entrepreneurs' employment growth ambitions: The contingent role of regulatory efficiency. Small Bus Econ. 58:185-204.
46. Schott T, Kew P, Cheraghi M (2015) Future potential. A GEM perspective on youth entrepreneurship. 1-42.
47. Holienka M (2014) Youth entrepreneurship in Slovakia: A GEM based perspective. CMR. 8(2):41-50.
48. Guelich U, Bosma N (2019) Youth entrepreneurship in Asia and the pacific 2018/2019. RBAP. 1-72.
49. Villegas RV (2017) Youth entrepreneurship dynamics in the Caribbean region: 2011-2013. IJESB. 30(3):287-307.

50. Al Mamari F, Mondal S, Al Shukaili A, Kassim NM (2022) Effect of self-perceived cognitive factors on entrepreneurship development activities: An empirical study from Oman global entrepreneurship monitor survey. J Public Aff. 22(2):e2363.

51. Llisterri JJ, Kantis H, Angelelli P, Tejerina L (2006) Is youth entrepreneurship a necessity or an opportunity? A first exploration of household and new enterprise surveys in Latin America. Inter-American Development Bank. 1-22.

52. Buljan B, Miocic BK (2021) Youth entrepreneurship in rural areas-reflection on Croatia. In Proceedings of FEB Zagreb International Odyssey Conference on Economics and Business. 3(1):196-212.

53. Pilkova A, Mikus J, Rehak J, Psenak P (2022) Differences and similarities between key drivers of youth and senior starting entrepreneurs in central and eastern European countries. Post-Communist Econ 34(8):1054-1082.

54. Matricano D (2018) Grey vs. young entrepreneurs: Are they really that different in terms of entrepreneurial intentions? Empirical evidence from Italy. Int J Bus Manag. 13(2):76-86.

55. Hofstede G, Noorderhaven NG, Thurik AR, Uhlaner LM, Wennekers AR, et al. (2004) Culture's role in entrepreneurship: Self-employment out of dissatisfaction. Innovation, entrepreneurship and culture: The interaction between technology, progress and economic growth. 162203.

56. Tukur NM, Adam SI (2017) Culture and entrepreneurship: An overview of Hofstede's cultural dimensions. DRJ-JEF. 2(7):17-21.

57. Rarick C, Han T (2015) The role of culture in shaping an entrepreneurial mindset. IJE. 19:119-125.

58. Maleki A, Moghaddam K, Cloninger P, Cullen J (2023) A cross-national study of youth entrepreneurship: The effect of family support. IJEIM. 24(1):44-57.

59. Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry (2022) Report of Survey on Entrepreneurship 2022.

60. World Economic Forum (2023) Global Gender Gap Report 2022.

61. WorldData.info (2023) The average age in global comparison.

62. Sternberg R, Wennekers S (2005) Determinants and effects of new business creation using global entrepreneurship monitor data. Small Bus Econ. 24:193-203.

63. United Nations Development Programme (2019) Youth entrepreneurship in Asia and the pacific.