

Does the Family Background and Marital Status Influence Woman's Entrepreneurial Intention?

Arunmozhi. M*

Faculty, Bharathiar School of Management and Entrepreneur Development, Bharathiar University.

Abstract:

The current study is to analyse the factors of working women who contribute to develop some intention to become entrepreneur. The researcher adopts multistage stratified random sampling method where 241 women working were chosen from banking sector, Coimbatore district, Tamil Nadu state for the study. A questionnaire was distributed among the chosen working women to find out their opinion towards entrepreneur intention. Literature evidence on working women intention towards the entrepreneurial attributes is relatively more. Fewer studies focus on difference of opinion with respect demographic variables like family background and marital status. These factors are considered to be highly sensitive when it comes to working women intention in becoming an entrepreneur. This current study also discuss about the challenges faced by women entrepreneur in international and national context as research question states. The study reports significant positive results as entrepreneurial intention varies with difference of opinion with respect to family type and marital status. Thus the research questions are proved.

Keywords: Working women, Entrepreneurial Intention, Family back ground and marital status.

1. Introduction

Many of the research studies show the importance of economic prosperity which has been critically developed with the success of entrepreneurship (Bowen, HP & De Clercq, D 2008; Katz, J. and C. Steyaert 2004; Kogut, CA, Short, LE, Wall, JL. 2010). In the words of (Goetz et al., 2012), individual employment is not only a factor that has a very promising positive impact on economy with regards to the salary and wages but also has a impact on the growth of per capita income and the reduction of poverty. According to Zellweger, Sieger & Halter 2011, entrepreneurship is highly relevant in economic development particularly, it is important to understand the important attributes that can affect such plans to start a company in about the future. There are numerous individual factors that motivate the decision of a person to become an entrepreneur. According to the evidence, the variables influence more is demographic factors Ashley-Cotleur, King & Solomon G (2009) and behaviors, beliefs or psychological variables. Two important variables are gender and family / family background that affect entrepreneurship intentions. To learn more about how they are created among teachers, consultants, advisors and policymakers and also to study how the values, attitudes, perspectives, and motivations of new venture founders affect the motive of starting a company (Zellweger, Sieger, Halter, 2011; Wang, Lu, Millington, 2011). Besides the personality characteristics, it have been found to predict entrepreneurship intention motives through individual differential variables from the study of Ismail, M, Khalid, Othman, Jusoff, Rahman, Kassim, Zain (2009). They include age, gender, education, experience at work and role of position, history of the family and education (Hatak, Harms, Fink, 2015; Fatoki, 2014 ; Quan, 2012).

1.1 Research Background

Most working women always expect to be in favorable zone of building their own dream entity through entrepreneurship interest. An unusual trend that continues to grow which hinder the number of women entrepreneurs establishing worldwide is their support towards finance, family support, age factor, entry level finance etc., According to the evidence available from Global Entrepreneurship Monitoring (2004) more than one-third of all individuals engaged in entrepreneurial activities.

1.2 Problem Statement

Women become pioneers, and conquer many hurdles and obstacles. There's no fixed and proven profile in exploring various factors why women want to become entrepreneurs. As there is no particular category, benchmark to categorize or 'mark' causes, inspiration, motives to encourage women neither men to have entrepreneurial intention (Kamal, Wojoud & Rana, 2009 ; Hart, Anyadike-Danes & Blackburn, 2004). Every individual focus on their business motive that they have developed and women in particular have secure motives, which are within themselves and also Self Independency.

1.3 Research Aim

The research aims to examine women, in particular, the reasons to leave their company jobs and want to become entrepreneurs. In particular the research studies to know the factors or the study variables that motivate them into business ownership and the intention which change them as entrepreneurs and also the difficulties and the hurdles they undergo.

2. Entrepreneurial Intention

The Planned Behavior Theory model is the most widely used model for research on the intention of entrepreneurship according to Liñán & Chen (2009). There are three conceptually independent determinants of intention towards entrepreneurship, attitudes towards entrepreneurship, subjective standards and control of perceived conduct Ajzen (1991). Attitude towards conducting entrepreneurial activities refers to perceptions of personal willingness to perform. It relies on the expectations and convictions of the personal behavioral aspects. The attitude of a person towards behavior reflects the assessment of behavior and its outcome. Attitude towards entrepreneurship relates to the personal desire to become an entrepreneur. According to Kolvereid (1996), study reports a favorable attitude towards entrepreneurship which is reflected by more expectations and beliefs towards self-employment. Financial protection of the attitude towards entrepreneurial intent was the most outstanding variable (Van Gelderen, Brand, Van Praag, Bodewes, Poutsma, Van Gils, 2008). A positive relationship is supported by several studies between attitude and purpose to conduct (Kolvereid ,1996; Van Gelderen et al., 2008 ; Krueger & Carsrud, 1993; Autio et al., 2001; Bodewes et al., 2010; Tegtmeier, 2012; Yang, 2013). From the study of Yang (2013) and Nguyen (2015) confirms that the most effective indicator of entrepreneurial intent was attitude. In comparison, the most effective indicators are verified by Zhang et al., (2015).

3. Entrepreneurial challenges and problems

There are many problems that are faced by women entrepreneurs in developing countries compared to any other countries. Analysis reveals that women entrepreneurs in developed countries face various obstacles emerging from diverse global and domestic influences according to entrepreneurs' viewpoints. The entrepreneur's agency will struggle with internal limitations, while external problems go beyond the entrepreneur's reach. Women entrepreneurs in Africa , for example, do not face internal family constraints but are impacted by obstacles raised by external labour markets (e.g., poor private sector, physically-intensive employment like agriculture and restricted access to global markets) Kuada (2009). The conservative family views present Muslim women with tough tasks but business support for the external economy (Itani, Sidani and Baalbaki, 2011). However, there are similar trends in the face of such apparently diverse restrictions, impacting all women entrepreneurs. For instance, the fundamental challenges faced by entrepreneurs in Saudi Arabia ,UAE, Turkey, Lebanon and Nigeria are insufficient support for business, difficult business conditions ,political uncertainty, unpredictable economies, minimal access to finance, lack of business expertise, work-family imbalances and domestic worries and insecurities (Abeer & Helen, (2012); Halkias, Nwajiuba, Harkiolakis and Caracatsanis (2011).

The following paragraphs address the five key restrictions facing entrepreneurs in developed countries.

3.1 Gender discrimination: The common opinion of entrepreneurship is that it is a male domain Jennings and Brush (2013). There is a large pay gap between men and women, and society puts far less emphasis on self-employing men (Karatas-Ozkan, Inal and Ozbilgin 2010 & Maden, 2015). Women find it more difficult to build reputation and face visible and hidden discrimination.

3.2 Work Family Conflict: Women continually deal for their own goals and their own societal norms. Woman entrepreneurs are under pressure from their organisation and families (Itani, et al., 2011) and this is also overcharged. Women are also under pressure as the primary caregivers of their children to meet "women" duty while also following the patriarchal expectations of "healthy wife and housekeeper" by a complete abandonment of entrepreneurship (Andersson, et al., 2007)

3.3 Financial limits: The researches made at large suggest that women entrepreneurs in developing countries have the biggest constraints on access to finance according to (Maden ,2015). This is partially because businesses have slipped into the high-risk category (Thampy, 2010). Data on asymmetry, a lack of debt background and inadequate equity make it tough for everyone.

3.4 Entry to loans for entrepreneurs: The potential of an entrepreneur to collect capital is constrained by growing financial markets (Panda, S. and Dash, S. 2013). Failure to have those alternatives because of lesser options also makes women entrepreneurs more difficult to acquire money, loans emerging in the history of inadequate jobs, low incomes and inadequate salaries (Andersson et al., 2007). Financial wealth is applied to firms that favour male enterprises, leaving Women's nothing to it (Jennings and Brush , 2013)

3.5 Failure to finance infrastructure: A shortage of technology access and industry support facilities form part of the key challenges faced by women entrepreneurs. Women still have little access to funding to carry out business research and feasibility studies. The productivity of their firms is being too hampered by limited networking and consulting facilities (Robb and Coleman S 2010). It's difficult to find assistance and tools to impede gender stereotypes for woman entrepreneurs. They refuse to bargain on costs, customer specific and leasing problems with their owners, vendors and customers. Entrepreneurs have been facing bias more because of increased gender pressures, especially in gender-specific communities (e.g. Saudi Arabia and the UAE). One case is Ethiopia, in which female businessmen face severe problems such as rampant corruption and gender discrimination (Singh and Belwal ,2008).

4. Methodology Adopted

4.1 Research Design

The researcher adopted multistage stratified random sampling method which was employed with adopted questionnaires distributed to respondents in the Coimbatore district, Tamilnadu state, India. The respondents were asked to provide responses to items on a five-point Likert scale to measure the level of their opinion. The researcher adopted convenience sampling methodology and used a quantitative method to analyse the data collected on entrepreneurship intention.

4.2 Population and Sample

The target population of this study includes all working women in Banking sector, Coimbatore district. The sample for the study comprised 241 women respondents who participated in the survey. The study is descriptive in nature, with the sampling method of multistage stratified random sampling. There are about 397 public sector and 199 private sector banks with head office and branches in India. There are 27 public sector and 24 private sector banks in Coimbatore district. The population size of the Bank officers, working in bank at Coimbatore district are about is 6970. The bank has been classified in to strata's in the first stage. In the second stage proportionate random sampling i.e. the branches of the banks are selected according to the proportion, and also equal chances has been given to each bank. In the third stage for the selection of samples, random sampling was applied to arrive at a sample size of 710. From the source of Krejcie & Morgan (1970), based on the total population, sample size were derived. From the derived sample, 320 chosen working women respondents was chosen and questionnaires were distributed among the respondents, only 275 respondents returned the filled questionnaire. Then the researcher chose the valid respondents number 241 ignoring unanswered and missing values to test basic assumption.

4.3 Instrumentation

A self-administered questionnaire was used, consisting of two sections. Section A proceeded with general attempts and most importantly, the reasons for leaving job and intention to take up own business and the personal details. In Section B, the researcher collected data on the motivating or driving factors faced by the working women to enter own business, their personal and entrepreneurial characteristics, challenges and

problems. Participants were asked to respond in confidentiality to get the most useful opinions and to encourage better responses.

4.4 The following are research objectives for the study,

Research Objective 1: To study the demographic variables of the select women respondents.

Research Objective 2: To study the entrepreneurship intentions variables like entrepreneurial behaviour, attitude, risk taking ability and resources, feasibility, motivation, awareness and knowledge and skills.

Research Objective 3: To analyse the opinion of employed women’s entrepreneurial intention with respect to family type and marital status.

Research Objective 4: To study the overall challenges faced by the women entrepreneurs.

5 Data Analysis and Results

5.1 Socio Demographic profile of the Respondents

Based on the research objectives, the demographic profile of the respondents is tabulated to find the frequency distribution. The profile of the respondents is summarized in the following tables as it is one of the important factors to test the research question. The researcher studied the socio demographic profile of the respondents using the Descriptive Statistics.

5.2 Frequency Distribution (Percentage Analysis)

The Table 1 measures the personal details like age, educational qualification, marital status, family type and total family income of the respondents.

Table 1 Personal Details

Profile	Labels	Frequency	Percent
Age	Below 20 Years	18	7.5
	20 Years to 30 Years	64	26.6
	30 Years to 40 Years	73	30.4
	40 Years to 50 Years	61	25.2
	Above 50 Years	25	10.2
	Total	241	100
Educational Qualification	Bachelor of Engineering	64	26.5
	Master of Business Administration	104	43.2
	Master of Computer Application	54	22.4
	Master of Engineering	19	7.8
	Total	241	100
Marital Status	Married	192	79.8
	Unmarried	49	20.2
	Total	241	100
Family Type	Joint Family	58	24.1
	Nuclear Family	183	75.9
	Total	241	100
Total Family Income	Below Rs. 20000	27	11.3
	Rs. 20000 to Rs. 40000	32	13.4
	Rs. 40000 to Rs. 60000	56	23.4
	Rs. 60000 to Rs. 80000	59	24.3
	Rs. 80000 to 1 lakh	48	19.9
	Above 1 lakh	19	7.7

	Total	241	100
--	--------------	------------	------------

From the table, it is inferred that, with respect to age, the majority of the respondents are between the age group of 30 years - 40 years with 30.4 percent. Then 26.6 percent of the respondents are between the age group of 20 years - 30 years. Then 25.2 percent of the respondents are between the age group of 40 years - 50 years. Then 10.2 percent of the respondents are above 50 years. And finally 7.5 percent of the respondents are below 20 years. The majority of the respondents are between the age group of 30 years - 40 years with 30.4 percent. As far as educational qualification is concerned, the majority of the respondents have Master of Business Administration as their educational qualification with 43.2 percent. Then 26.5 percent of the respondents have Bachelor of Engineering as their educational qualification. Then 22.4 percent of the respondents have Master of Computer Application as their educational qualification. And finally 7.8 percent of the respondents have Master of Engineering as their educational qualification. The majority of the respondents have Master of Business Administration as their educational qualification with 43.2 percent. With respect to marital Status, the majority of the respondents are married with 79.8 percent and finally 20.2 percent of the respondents are unmarried. As family type is concerned, the majority of the respondents belong to nuclear family with 75.9 percent and finally 24.1 percent of the respondents belong to joint family. In Total Family Income as one of the important demographic factor for this study concerned, the majority of the respondents income ranges between Rs. 60000 – Rs. 80000 with 24.3 percent. Then 23.4 percent of the respondent’s income ranges between Rs. 40000 - Rs. 60000. Then 19.9 percent of the respondent’s income ranges between Rs. 80000 – 1 lakh. Then 13.4 percent of the respondent’s income ranges between Rs. 20000 - Rs. 40000. Then 11.3 percent of the respondent’s income ranges between below Rs. 20000. And finally 7.7 percent of the respondent’s income is above 1 lakh. The majority of the respondents income ranges between Rs. 60000 – Rs. 80000 with 24.3 percent.

Respondent Business Profile

The measures used to analyse the business profile includes the year of experience in this line of business, nature of business, nature of capital, number of employees, nature of business place and types of dealers are discussed in Table 2.

Table 2 Respondent Business Profile

Profile	Labels	Frequency	Percent
Year of Experience in this line of business	1 Year - 2 Years	26	10.6
	2 Year - 3 Years	92	38
	Above 3 Years	124	51.4
	Total	241	100
Nature of Business	Partnership Firm	74	30.7
	Single Firm	167	69.3
	Total	241	100
Nature of Capital	Own Capital	99	41.2
	Borrowed Capital	43	17.8
	Both	99	40.9
	Total	241	100

Number of Employees	Less than 5 Members	60	24.9
	5 Members to 10 Members	71	29.4
	10 Members to 15 Members	90	37.5
	More than 15 Members	20	8.2
	Total	241	100
Nature of Business Place	Own Place	161	66.9
	Rented Place	80	33.1
	Total	241	100
Types of Dealer	Producer Cum Distributor	80	33.1
	Distributor	161	66.9
	Total	241	100

From the analysis it is found that year of experience in this line of Business, The majority of the respondents have an experience in this line of business of above 3 years with 51.4 percent. Then 38 percent of the respondents have an experience in this line of business between two year to three years. And finally 10.6 percent of the respondents have an experience in this line of business between one year to two years. The majority of the respondents have an experience in this line of business of above 3 years with 51.4 percent. With respect nature of business factor is concerned, the majority of the respondents own the business as single firm with 69.3 percent and finally 30.7 percent of the respondents own the business as partnership firm. The majority of the respondents own the business as single firm with 69.3 percent. With respect to nature of capital the majority of the respondents has own capital with 41.2 percent. Then 40.9 percent of the respondents has both (own and borrowed capital). And finally 17.8 percent of the respondents have borrowed capital. The majority of the respondents has own capital with 41.2 percent. Then with respect to number of employees, the majority of the respondents have 10 to 15 employees working in their organisation with 37.5 percent. Then 29.4 percent of the respondents have 5 to 10 employees working in their organisation. Then 24.9 percent of the respondents have less than 5 employees working in their organisation. And finally 8.2 percent of the respondents have more than 15 employees working in their organisation. The majority of the respondents have 10 to 15 employees working in their organisation with 37.5 percent. Then as nature of business place is concerned, the majority of the respondents have own place for their business with 66.9 percent and finally 33.1 percent of the respondents have rented place for their business. The majority of the respondents have own place for their business with 66.9 percent. In types of dealer, the majority of the respondents are distributor with 66.9 percent and finally 33.1 percent of the respondents are producer cum distributor. The majority of the respondents are distributor with 66.9 percent.

Research Question 1: *Is there difference in mean scores with respect to entrepreneurial intention variables commitment to entrepreneurial behaviour, attitude, risk taking ability and resources, feasibility, motivation, awareness and knowledge and skills?*

To study the measuring variables of entrepreneurial intention based the researcher applies the measures of central tendency to find the mean scores to analyze the standard deviation measures the entrepreneurial intention dimension. The entrepreneurial intention dimension consists of the variables like commitment to entrepreneurial behavior, attitude, risk taking ability, resources, feasibility (social support, technical support, financial support and desirability), motivation, awareness and knowledge and skills.

Table 3 Mean and Standard Deviation of Overall Entrepreneurial Intention

Measuring Variables	Mean	SD
Commitment to Entrepreneurial Behavior	1.80	0.94
Attitude	2.02	0.95
Risk Taking ability & Resources	2.31	1.46
Feasibility	3.28	1.04
Motivation	3.45	1.26
Awareness	3.78	1.03
Knowledge and Skills	2.40	1.56
Mean Score	2.72	1.18

From the table, the researcher infers that, the respondents have moderate feel towards the entrepreneurial intention with a mean value of 2.72 and a standard deviation of 1.18.

The Research Question 2: *Is there difference of opinion on entrepreneurial intention based on the marital status, family type?*

To study this research question the researcher applied t test, to test the difference of opinion of the respondents on entrepreneurial intention based on marital status.

Based on the research questions, the researcher framed the hypothesis to find out significant results. The research hypothesis is as follows,

H₁: There is significant difference between the variables of entrepreneurial intention based on the marital status.

Table 4: Difference of Opinion on the Variables of Entrepreneurial Intention based on the Marital Status

Variables	Labels	Mean	SD	t test	df	Sig.
CEB	Married	1.70	.615	-11.931	1535	.000*
	Unmarried	2.14	.370	-15.900	793.323	.000*
ATT	Married	1.87	.645	-10.587	1535	.000*
	Unmarried	2.28	.456	-12.966	659.137	.000*
RTAR	Married	1.24	.426	-7.533	1535	.000*
	Unmarried	1.45	.498	-6.860	429.754	.000*
SS	Married	4.22	.645	8.497	1535	.000*
	Unmarried	3.90	.428	10.756	705.920	.000*
TS	Married	4.53	.514	11.829	1535	.000*
	Unmarried	4.16	.397	13.771	599.052	.000*

FS	Married	1.38	.486	-1.873	1535	.061
	Unmarried	1.44	.497	-1.848	469.224	.065
DES	Married	3.15	.603	.310	1535	.757
	Unmarried	3.14	.658	.294	449.011	.769
FEA	Married	3.30	.478	8.952	1535	.000*
	Unmarried	3.05	.256	12.615	912.680	.000*
MOT	Married	3.48	.514	1.238	1535	.216
	Unmarried	3.44	.516	1.235	475.850	.217
AWA	Married	3.76	.517	-.900	1535	.369
	Unmarried	3.79	.551	-.866	455.806	.387
KS	Married	2.29	1.416	-12.267	1535	.000*
	Unmarried	3.45	1.705	-10.989	422.865	.000*
EI	Married	2.49	.500	-11.382	1535	.000*
	Unmarried	2.84	.368	-13.613	629.426	.000*
* Significant at 0.05% level						

The variables showing significant difference are commitment to entrepreneurial behavior, attitude, risk taking ability, resources, social support, technical support, feasibility, knowledge and skills and entrepreneurial intention based on the marital status of the respondents. Since its p value is less than the significant value ($p < 0.05$). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. The variables showing no significant difference are financial support, desirability, motivation and awareness based on the marital status of the respondents. Since its p value is greater than the significant value ($p > 0.05$). Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Thus, the variables like commitment to entrepreneurial behavior, attitude, risk taking ability, resources, social support, technical support, feasibility, knowledge and skills and entrepreneurial intention variables reports significant difference and financial support, desirability, motivation and awareness reports non significant results. Therefore the study reveals that, there is a lack of financial support, desirability, motivation and awareness with respect to the marital status concerned when women want to start up her own business.

H2: There is significant difference between the variables of entrepreneurial intention based on the family type.

Table 5: Difference of Opinion on the Variables of Entrepreneurial Intention based on the Family Type

Variables	Labels	Mean	SD	t test	df	Sig.
CEB	Joint Family	2.13	.341	13.170	1535	.000*
	Nuclear Family	1.68	.624	17.549	1159.952	.000*
ATT	Joint Family	2.28	.450	12.112	1535	.000*
	Nuclear Family	1.84	.647	14.538	895.097	.000*
RTAR	Joint Family	1.44	.497	7.879	1535	.000*

	Nuclear Family	1.23	.421	7.236	549.339	.000*
SS	Joint Family	3.89	.518	-9.983	1535	.000*
	Nuclear Family	4.25	.627	-11.011	744.038	.000*
TS	Joint Family	4.25	.463	-9.376	1535	.000*
	Nuclear Family	4.53	.511	-9.874	680.905	.000*
FS	Joint Family	1.39	.487	-.311	1535	.756
	Nuclear Family	1.39	.489	-.312	624.605	.755
DES	Joint Family	3.11	.669	-1.577	1535	.115
	Nuclear Family	3.17	.595	-1.484	568.448	.138
FEA	Joint Family	3.08	.311	-8.678	1535	.000*
	Nuclear Family	3.30	.477	-10.718	958.517	.000*
MOT	Joint Family	3.43	.522	-1.942	1535	.052
	Nuclear Family	3.49	.512	-1.923	613.097	.055
AWA	Joint Family	3.82	.510	2.491	1535	.013*
	Nuclear Family	3.74	.527	2.534	640.819	.012*
KS	Joint Family	3.12	1.737	8.684	1535	.000*
	Nuclear Family	2.34	1.435	7.872	539.908	.000*
EI	Joint Family	2.83	.376	12.475	1535	.000*
	Nuclear Family	2.48	.500	14.413	820.582	.000*
<i>* Significant at 0.05% level</i>						

The variables showing significant difference are commitment to entrepreneurial behaviour, attitude, risk taking ability, resources, social support, technical support, feasibility, awareness, knowledge and skills and entrepreneurial intention based on the family type of the respondents. Since its p value is less than the significant value ($p < 0.05$). Hence the null hypothesis is rejected. The variables showing no significant difference are financial support, desirability and motivation based on the family type of the respondents. Since its p value is greater than the significant value ($p > 0.05$). Hence the null hypothesis is accepted.

Thus, the study reports that the variables like commitment to entrepreneurial behavior, attitude, risk taking ability, resources, social support, technical support, feasibility, awareness, knowledge and skills and entrepreneurial intention show significant difference based on the family type of the respondents.

Research Question 3: To review the overall challenges faced by the Women Entrepreneurs

In India, women businesses are facing issues managing money, holding books, due to their lack of understanding of the market practices, participate in marketing and consumer related events. They lack formal training in business and entrepreneurship and face the issues at work. They come from a different range of backgrounds and have varying educational levels and skill sets. Business projects fail due to a lack of opportunity, job experience or an inability to adjust themselves to rapid technological changes. This is the real fact for all developing countries like India.

Findings and Conclusion

In current research focuses on working women intention to start their own businesses were discussed. This study focuses only analysing entrepreneurial intention among working women. The current study reports

entrepreneurial intention variables commitment to entrepreneurial behaviour, attitude, risk taking ability and resources, feasibility, motivation, awareness and knowledge and skills. According to Siri Roland Xavier et al (2012), the respondents however suggested the discrimination against women, job displacement, trauma, dissatisfaction as a result of career growth blocs, inability to fit in with the atmosphere of the business and lack of mentors. The entrepreneurial intention dimension consists of the variables like commitment to entrepreneurial behavior, attitude, risk taking ability, resources, feasibility (social support, technical support, financial support and desirability), motivation, awareness and knowledge and skills. Totally 12 variables were measured with various dimensions of the items / statements of proportions. The personal details like age, educational qualification, marital status, family type and total family income of the respondents were studied with the frequency analysis and also the business profile of the respondents, year of experience in this line of business, nature of business, nature of capital, number of employees, nature of business place and types of dealer of the respondents were all described with the frequency analysis. To study the opinion on entrepreneurial intention based on the gender, marital status, family type, nature of business, nature of business place and types of dealer, the researcher applies the measures of central tendency to find the mean scores to analyze the standard deviation measures the entrepreneurial intention dimension. The respondent's entrepreneurial intention opinion with respect to family background and marital status was studied and results were reported. The study reports that there is significant difference between the respondent's entrepreneurship intention with respect to family type and marital status. The question of challenges/problems faced by these women entrepreneurs found some evidences on work family conflict, financial boundaries, entry level financial support and poor infrastructure. Thus, the study reports that the variables like commitment to entrepreneurial behavior, attitude, risk taking ability, resources, social support, technical support, feasibility, awareness, knowledge and skills and entrepreneurial intention show significant difference based on the family type of the respondents. Then, the variables like commitment to entrepreneurial behavior, attitude, risk taking ability, resources, social support, technical support, feasibility, knowledge and skills and entrepreneurial intention variables reports significant difference and financial support, desirability, motivation and awareness reports non significant results. Therefore, the study reveals that, there is a lack of financial support, desirability, motivation and awareness with respect to the marital status concerned when women want to start up her own business. Hence, this study gives new findings with justification of framed objectives and hypotheses that working women entrepreneurial intention is significantly positive with relevant factors. The study concludes that the working women are intended to start the own business provided if family type and marital status supports.

References

1. Abeer Yousuf Danish, Helen Lawton Smith, (2012), Female entrepreneurship in Saudi Arabia: opportunities and challenges, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 4 Issue: 3 pp. 216 – 235
2. Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of planned behaviour, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
3. Andersson, I., Raihan, A., Rivera, M., Sulaiman, I. and Tandon, N. (2007), in Welter, F. (Ed.), Handbook on Women-Owned SMEs: Challenges and Opportunities in Policies and Programmes, *International Organisation for Knowledge Economy and Enterprise Development (IKED) and Global Knowledge Partners (GKP)*, available at: www.iked.org/pdf/Handbook%20on%20Women-owned%20SMEs.pdf
4. Ashley-Cotleur, C, King, S, Solomon, G (2009). Parental and gender influences on entrepreneurial intentions, motivations and attitudes. *George Washington University*.
5. Autio, E. H. Keeley, R., Klofsten, M., GC Parker, G., & Hay, M. (2001). Entrepreneurial intent among students in Scandinavia and in the USA. *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, 2(2), 145–160.
6. Bodewes, Wyn and Gelderen, Marco van and Brand, Maryse J. and van Praag, Mirjam and Poutsma, Erik and Van Gils, Anita. (2010). Explaining Entrepreneurial Intentions by Means of the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Career Development International*, 13(6), 538–559

7. Bowen, HP, & De Clercq, D. (2008). Institutional context and the allocation of entrepreneurial effort. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(4), 747–767.
8. Fatoki, O. (2014). The entrepreneurial intention of undergraduate students in South Africa: The influences of entrepreneurship education and previous work experience. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(7), 294
9. Goetz, SJ, Fleming, DA, Rupasingha, A. (2012). The economic impacts of self-employment. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 44(03), 315–321.
10. Halkias, D., Nwajiuba, C., Harkiolakis, N. and Caracatsanis, S.M. (2011), “Challenges facing women entrepreneurs in Nigeria”, *Management Research Review*, Vol. 34 No. 2, pp. 221-235.
11. Hart, M., Anyadike-Danes, M., & Blackburn, R. (2004). Entrepreneurship and age in the UK: Comparing third age and prime age new venture creation across the regions. Paper presented at RENT XVIII, Copenhagen
12. Hatak, I, Harms, R, Fink, M. (2015). Age, job identification, and entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(1), 38–53
13. Ismail, M, Khalid, SA, Othman, M, Jusoff, HK, Rahman, NA, Kassim, KM, Zain, RS. (2009). Entrepreneurial intention among Malaysian undergraduates. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(10), 54.
14. Itani, H., Sidani, Y.M. and Baalbaki, I. (2011), “United Arab Emirates female entrepreneurs: motivations and frustrations”, *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 5, pp. 409-424.
15. Jamali, D. (2009), Constraints and opportunities facing women entrepreneurs in developing countries: a relational perspective , *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 232-251.
16. Jennings, J.E. and Brush, C.G. (2013), Research on women entrepreneurs: challenges to (and from) the broader entrepreneurship literature? , *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 663-715.
17. Kamal N, Wojoud R, Rana N, 2009, Factors that Affect Women Entrepreneurs: Evidence from an Emerging Economy, *International Journal of Organizational Analysis* Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 225-247, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, doi:10.1108/19348830910974932,
18. Karatas-Ozkan, M., Inal, G. and Ozbilgin, M. (2010), “Turkey”, In: Fielden, S. and Davidson, M. (Eds) *International Handbook of Successful Women Entrepreneurs*, Edward Elgar Press, Cheltenham and New York, NY, pp. 175-188.
19. Katz, J. and C. Steyaert 2004. Entrepreneurship in Society: Exploring and Theorizing New Forms and Practices of Entrepreneurship. Special Issue of *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 16(3): 179-250.
20. Kogut, CA, Short, LE, Wall, JL. (2010). Entrepreneurship: The basis for central European economic development. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 14, 13–23.
21. Kolvereid, L. (1996). Prediction of employment status choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 21, 47–57.
22. Kourilsky, ML, & Walstad, WB. (1998). Entrepreneurship and female youth: Knowledge, attitudes, gender differences, and educational practices. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(1), 77–88
23. Krueger, N.F.; Carsrud, A.L. Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour. *Entrep. Reg. Dev.* 1993, 5, 315–330.
24. Kuada, J. (2009), Gender, social networks, and entrepreneurship in Ghana, *Journal of African Business*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 85-103.
25. Liñán, F, & Chen, YW. (2009). Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593–617
26. Maden, C. (2015), A gendered lens on entrepreneurship: women entrepreneurship in Turkey, *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 312-331.
27. Naguib, R. and Jamali, D. (2015), “Female entrepreneurship in the UAE: a multi-level integrative lens”, *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 30 No. 2, pp. 135-161.

28. Nguyen, C. (2017). Entrepreneurial intention of international business students in Viet Nam: A survey of the country joining the trans-Pacific partnership. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 6(1), 7
29. Panda, S. and Dash, S. (2013), Trust and reputation in new ventures: insights from an Indian venture capital Firm , *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 9
30. Quan, X. (2012). Prior experience, social network, and levels of entrepreneurial intentions. *Management Research Review*, 35(10), 945–957
31. Robb, A.M. and Coleman, S. (2010), Financing strategies of new technology-based firms: a comparison of women-and men-owned firms, *Journal of Technology Management & Innovation*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 30-50.
32. Singh, G. and Belwal, R. (2008), Entrepreneurship and SMEs in Ethiopia: evaluating the role, prospects and problems faced by women, *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 120-136
33. Siri Roland Xavier, Opportunity Recognition Framework: Exploring the Technology Entrepreneurs, *American Journal of Economics*, Vol. 5 No. 2, 2015, pp. 105-111. doi: 10.5923/c.economics.201501.10.
34. Tegtmeier, S. (2012). Empirical implications for promoting Students' entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 20(02), 151–169.
35. Thampy, A. (2010), Financing of SME firms in India: interview with Ranjana Kumar, former CMD, Indian bank; vigilance commissioner, Central vigilance commission, *IIMB Management Review*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 93-101.
36. Van Gelderen, M.; Brand, M.; van Praag, M.; Bodewes, W.; Poutsma, E.; Van Gils, A. Explaining Entrepreneurial intentions by means of the theory of planned behaviour. *Career Dev. Int.* 2008, 13, 538– 559.
37. Wang, W, Lu, W, Millington, JK. (2011). Determinants of entrepreneurial intention among college students in China and USA. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(1), 35–44.
38. Yang, J. (2013). The theory of planned behavior and prediction of entrepreneurial intention among Chinese undergraduates. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 41(3), 367–376.
39. Zellweger, T, Sieger, P, Halter, F. (2011). Should I stay or should I go? Career choice intentions of students with family business background. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(5), 521–536.
40. Zhang, P, Wang, DD, Owen, CL. (2015). A study of entrepreneurial intention of university students. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 5(1), 61–82