

Towards Inclusive Entrepreneurship: Understanding Stakeholders, Gender, and Tech Dynamics

Introduction

Entrepreneurial ecosystems are critical in promoting technological growth, economic development, and social evolution in today's rapidly shifting global environment [1]. Entrepreneurship and startup undertakings are aided by the complex connectivity between numerous stakeholders, organizations, resources [2], and networks found in the ecosystems. Nevertheless, while EEs are well identified, additional research is required to fully understand the nature of diversity and inclusion within the ecosystems [3]. The biggest issue to be solved presented in this study is the rapidly growing gap in diversity and inclusivity discovered in entrepreneurial ecosystems throughout the world [4]. Entrepreneurial ecosystems are well proven to promote innovation and economic activity. Despite, there are significant differences in access [5], representation, and opportunity in EEs, especially to minority or less fortunate entrepreneurs [6]. The complexity is to understand how entrepreneurs' participation and prospects in EEs are connected to the interaction of various backgrounds, origins, and traits responsible for systemic barriers [7]. Despite attempts to classify and examine how inclusive EEs are, the current body of literature on the subject fails to adequately describe the intricate relationship of gender diversity and its impact on the prosperity of entrepreneurship [8]. It has hampered the development of targeted initiatives and legislation for achieving equality and inclusivity objectives within EEs [9].

To date, research has concentrated on EEs with respect to traditional EEs that exist in urban centers of developed economies [10]. Given the wide range of entrepreneurial experiences and challenges from non-traditional EEs [11], those which are internet platform affiliates, situated in underserved urban regions and rural areas generally observed in the studies [12,13], the current research allows for minimal leverage insights that highlight the potential non-traditional EEs can have towards inclusivity and entrepreneurship

Research Article

Hina Ahmed*

**Faculty of Business & management Sciences
Superior University Lahore, Pakistan*

***Correspondence:** Hina Ahmed, Faculty of Business & management Sciences Superior University Lahore, Pakistan. Email: hina.ahmed@superior.edu.pk

Received date: 10 March, 2025; **Accepted:** 20 March, 2025; **Published:** 31 March, 2025

Copyright: © 2025 Hina Ahmed. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

[14] specifically focusing on gender. Despite the acknowledgment that governmental bodies, businesses, academic institutions, and community organizations, in their capacities as stakeholders within entrepreneurship ecosystems [15], can be inclusive or restrict EEs diversity and inclusivity, the precise roles and interactions among them have received inadequate attention [16]. The relationship between technology and EE inclusiveness has also not been studied in sufficient depth considerably in regard to gender. More and more people are concerned that digital platforms and technologies' transform active effects, if not monitored more closely, might inadvertently exacerbate existing gaps in opportunity and access [17]. Systemic changes can destroy the networks that existed before pandemics and economic crises, change the ways resources are spent, and increase inequality, therefore, impacting marginalized entrepreneurs and challenge entrepreneurial ecosystems [18,19].

Methodology

The research methodology for the current study is a mixed-methods approach [20], to obtain a structured view of the factors influencing inclusivity and diversity

in entrepreneurial ecosystems. As a result, qualitative interviews and focus groups allowed in obtaining in-depth insights into the participants' experiences [21], quantitative surveys assisted in collecting the demographics and inclusiveness/oppression levels [22]. Thematic analysis identified the patterns and themes [23], network analysis helped to map the interactions within the stakeholder systems [24].

Results

Multiple perspectives on the factors influencing diversity and inclusion in entrepreneurial ecosystems (EEs) are provided by the study's findings. The intricate interactions between genders, diverse backgrounds, experiences, and structural impediments that define entrepreneurs' engagement and opportunities inside EEs. Themes including networks, institutional support, and resource accessibility are significant determinants of inclusion. The various responsibilities that enterprises, community organizations, government agencies, and educational institutions play are highlighted by stakeholder analysis. Some of these institutions unknowingly support discriminatory behaviour, while others deliberately encourage diversity and inclusion. Network analysis reveals how stakeholders are interdependent and how they affect EE dynamics. Furthermore, differences in the ratio of minority entrepreneurs are shown by demographic insights derived from quantitative survey data. Case studies indicate how digital platforms improve EE inclusiveness and resilience to systemic disruptions by facilitating access for excluded firms in times of crisis and economic slump.

Discussion

The diversity and inclusion in entrepreneurial

ecosystems highlight the systemic barriers impacting both the commitment and opportunity of entrepreneurs intersect with other factors such as networking, access to resources, and support from institutions. Moreover, this study indicates the necessity of a broad, comprehensive approach to combatting structural and individual issues in inclusivity as well as the critical role of stakeholders such as government, businesses, academia, and community groups in a coordinated effort. Some, however, are already actively contributing to the cultivation or exclusion of inclusive and effective EEs, and others are inadvertently falling into the latter category, but the cooperation and understanding hereby facilitated can help in creating a much fairer environment.

Conclusion

The research highlights exactly how innovation impacts EE incorporation along with highlights the worth of digital remedies in eliminating barriers as well as advertising inclusivity inside EEs irrespective of gender. The research study likewise highlights the drawbacks of present metrics and methods for assessing EE influence directing to the need for even more complete analyses of EEs' results on variety as well as incorporation. The outcomes have crucial effects for technique as well as plan since experts plus, might create evidence-based methods to sustain even more comprehensive and fair business setups which will certainly advertise development as well as financial growth. The paper wraps up by acknowledging its restrictions, that include its focus on certain EEs and dependency on formerly released study as well as information.

References

1. Spigel, Ben, and Richard Harrison. "Toward a process theory of entrepreneurial ecosystems." *Strategic entrepreneurship journal* 12, no. 1 (2018): 151-168.
2. Audretsch, David B., and Maksim Belitski. "Entrepreneurial ecosystems in cities: establishing the framework conditions." *The Journal of Technology Transfer* 42 (2017): 1030-1051.
3. Calderón-Argelich, Amalia, Stefania Benetti, Isabelle Anguelovski, James JT Connolly, Johannes Lange-meyer, and Francesc Baró. "Tracing and building up environmental justice considerations in the urban ecosystem service literature: A systematic review." *Landscape and urban planning* 214 (2021): 104130.

4. Mason, Colin, and Ross Brown. "Entrepreneurial ecosystems and growth oriented entrepreneurship." Final report to OECD, Paris 30, no. 1 (2014): 77-102.
5. Fairlie, Robert W., and Alicia M. Robb. "Race and entrepreneurial success." Cambridge, MA: The (2008).
6. O'Brien, Emma, Thomas M. Cooney, and Per Blenker. "Expanding university entrepreneurial ecosystems to under-represented communities." *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy* 8, no. 3 (2019): 384-407.
7. Aldrich, Howard E., and Martha Argelia Martinez. "Many are called, but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship theory and practice* 25, no. 4 (2001): 41-56.
8. Brown, Ross, and Colin Mason. "Looking inside the spiky bits: a critical review and conceptualisation of entrepreneurial ecosystems." *Small business economics* 49 (2017): 11-30.
9. Brush, Candida, Linda F. Edelman, Tatiana Manolova, and Friederike Welter. "A gendered look at entrepreneurship ecosystems." *Small Business Economics* 53 (2019): 393-408.
10. Roundy, Philip T. "'Small town' entrepreneurial ecosystems: Implications for developed and emerging economies." *Journal of entrepreneurship in emerging economies* 9, no. 3 (2017): 238-262.
11. Cao, Zhe, and Xianwei Shi. "A systematic literature review of entrepreneurial ecosystems in advanced and emerging economies." *Small Business Economics* 57 (2021): 75-110.
12. Morris, Jonathan, Wyn Morris, and Robert Bowen. "Implications of the digital divide on rural SME resilience." *Journal of Rural Studies* 89 (2022): 369-377.
13. Philip, Lorna, and Fiona Williams. "Remote rural home based businesses and digital inequalities: Understanding needs and expectations in a digitally underserved community." *Journal of Rural Studies* 68 (2019): 306-318.
14. Aaker, David A., and Christine Moorman. *Strategic market management*. John Wiley & Sons, 2023.
15. Phillips, Wendy, Hazel Lee, Abby Ghobadian, Nicholas O'regan, and Peter James. "Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review." *Group & Organization Management* 40, no. 3 (2015): 428-461.
16. Malhotra, Ruchika T. *Inclusion on purpose: An intersectional approach to creating a culture of belonging at work*. MIT Press, 2024.
17. Gangadharan, Seeta Peña. "The downside of digital inclusion: Expectations and experiences of privacy and surveillance among marginal Internet users." *New media & society* 19, no. 4 (2017): 597-615.
18. Krishnan, Commander S. Navaneetha, L. S. Ganesh, and C. Rajendran. "Entrepreneurial Interventions for crisis management: Lessons from the Covid-19 Pandemic's impact on entrepreneurial ventures." *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction* 72 (2022): 102830.
19. Wang, Qingfang. "Planning for an inclusive entrepreneurial ecosystem: COVID-19 and business resilience in underserved communities." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 89, no. 3 (2023): 295-309.
20. Creswell, John W., Michael D. Fetters, and Nataliya V. Ivankova. "Designing a mixed methods study in primary care." *The Annals of Family Medicine* 2, no. 1 (2004): 7-12.
21. Gill, Paul, Kate Stewart, Elizabeth Treasure, and Barbara Chadwick. "Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups." *British dental journal* 204, no. 6 (2008): 291-295.
22. Nardi, Peter M. *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods*. Routledge, 2018.
23. Clarke, Victoria, and Virginia Braun. "Thematic analysis." *The journal of positive psychology* 12, no. 3 (2017): 297-298.
24. Wasserman, Stanley, and Katherine Faust. "Social network analysis: Methods and applications." (1994).

Citation: Hina, Ahmed. "Towards Inclusive Entrepreneurship: Understanding Stakeholders, Gender, and Tech Dynamics." *J Glob Entrep Manage* (2025): 123. DOI: [10.59462/JGEM.3.1.123](https://doi.org/10.59462/JGEM.3.1.123)