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ABSTRACT

Women entrepreneurs are increasingly becoming one of the development determinants particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, the contribution which entrepreneurship has on women’s well-being is not adequately explored. Therefore, the general objective of this study was to determine contribution of entrepreneurship on women’s personal well-being. The study adopted a cross-sectional research design. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected through individual survey and focus group discussions respectively. A random sample of 180 respondents including 90 women entrepreneurs and 90 women non entrepreneurs was involved. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS while qualitative data were analyzed using content analysis. A multiple linear regression was used to model contribution of entrepreneurship on well-being. The results show that majority of women entrepreneurs were not employed in the formal sector. Being not employed in the formal sector explains their involvement in entrepreneurship. Majority were involved in shops and petty businesses. Secondly, majority of women entrepreneurs had acquired at least a primary education. In addition, entrepreneurs were constrained by many challenges including limited access to credit. Overall personal well-being was high among women entrepreneurs relative to non women entrepreneurs and the difference was significant at 0.1%. The personal well-being was high among women who had formal education, single, employed in the formal sector, middle to old age, high wealth status and whose households were headed by women. The multiple linear regression analysis showed that entrepreneurship had significant contribution on personal well-being at 0.1% level of significance. Based on the results, the study concludes that entrepreneurship is a key to improving personal well-being among women. Therefore, governmental and non-governmental efforts and policies to improve women’s well-being should focus at promoting entrepreneurship in the study area and the country at large.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background Information

Worldwide, entrepreneurship is recognized as an important driver of economic growth (Mahadea, 2013). This has emerged as an employment opportunity and a means of integrating women in the economy at different levels. History shows that women entrepreneurs may experience different levels of well-being depending on the initiatives they perform and also depending on their characteristics (El-Namaki, 1991). Borrowing an idea of functioning developed by Sen (1999), referring to valuable activities that contribute to peoples’ well-being; entrepreneurship activities can be seen as one of the functionings encompassing various things a person may value doing.

The concept of entrepreneurship was first coined in the 1700s, and the meaning has evolved ever since. However, entrepreneurship research has gained momentum in the previous four decades (Carree et al., 2002). Although some scholars including Ponstadt (1998) define entrepreneurship as a dynamic process of creating incremental wealth, some including Carree et al. (2002) simply take the concept as starting one’s own business. Most economists like Baumol (1999); Smallbone and Welter (2006) believe it is more than that. The wealth that Carree et al. (2002) is talking about is created by individuals who assume the major risks in terms of equity, time and/or career commitments of providing values for some product or service. The product or service may or may not be new or unique but value must be infused by the entrepreneur by securing and allocating the necessary skills and resources.

Timmons (1989) further defines entrepreneurship as a process of creating and building something of value from practically nothing. That is, it is the process of creating or seizing
an opportunity and pursuing it regardless of the resources currently controlled. It involves the definition, creation and distribution of values and benefits to individuals, groups, organizations and society. Entrepreneurship is very rarely a get rich-quick proposition. In addition, Hisrich (2005) argues that entrepreneurship is a process of creating something new with value by devoting necessary time and effort, assuming financial and social risks, and receiving rewards of monetary, personal satisfaction and independence.

Based on these definitions, it is clear that the concept of entrepreneurship is broader and it is defined differently by different scholars. This poses difficulties in measuring the concept empirically and therefore operationalizing the concept in research becomes unquestionably unavoidable for one to quantify it. For that matter, this study takes entrepreneurship concept as a process in which women develop business ideas, which in turn help to establish and run various activities. These women may or may not employ others and the owners are able to receive the resulting rewards of well-being.

The concept of well-being is also very broad and is applied to many situations differently (Paim, 1995). The application of the concept ranges from specific domains of well-being, such as economic, material, social, and psychological, to all the domains impacting upon people (Kukutai, 2006). A study conducted by Veenhoven (2004) suggests that the concept of well-being denotes that something is in a good state. Beyond that, the term does not, in itself, specify what is in a good state, nor the criteria for being in a good state. As with other catchwords, such as progress and welfare, Veenhoven (2004) suggests that the concept of well-being needs to be clarified by specifying what the term applies to and what constitutes it.

According to Gough et al. (2007), well-being can be seen as an umbrella concept embracing at least objective well-being (OWB) and subjective well-being (SWB). OWB
can be taken to mean externally approved, and thereby normatively endorsed, non-feeling features of a person’s life such as mobility or morbidity; while SWB refers to feelings of a person whose well-being is being estimated (Gasper, 2007). Objective well-being includes measures such as freedom, justice, medical care, and standard of housing, whereas SWB comprises person’s evaluative responses to their lives, and perceived or subjective experience of well-being and therefore taken as personal well-being (Vitterso, 2004). Based on these definitions, it can be argued that the concept of well-being is broad and it is defined differently by different scholars. This study conceptualizes well-being as women’s or person’s evaluative responses to their lives based on seven personal well-being measurement constructs suggested by the International Well-being Group in 2013.

In most developing countries, women’s well-being is deprived (Vitterso, 2004). For example, in the aspect of health, over 60% of all women face big barriers to accessing health care when they are sick. The most common problems related to women’s health include getting money for treatment (40%); distance to the health facility (38%); transport (37 %); and not wanting to go alone (24%). Problems in accessing health care are felt most acutely by women with little or no education and women from poorer households (Vitterso, 2004).

Based on different indicators of personal well-being, an individual may be seen as having Subjective Well-Being, which means feelings of the person whose well-being is being estimated (Gasper, 2007). In countries like Sri Lanka, entrepreneurship offers remarkable opportunities for women’s well-being by opening doors to greater self-sufficiency, education and growth, for both women and their families. A study conducted by Gawel (2013) in Western Europe provides an insight that, albeit a number of parental duties that women have, they still effectively combine to maintain a balance between running a business and
running a home. There are evidences to believe that countries which have higher percentage of entrepreneurs have developed faster compared to their counterparts (Vinesh, 2014).

According to the World Bank (2002), women entrepreneurs can become an engine of growth, essential for wealth of the family, key for poverty reduction, employment and play role in household well-being. Nevertheless, women entrepreneurs face many challenges in their business. For example in Canada, women face challenges like lack of support, limited credit and poor motivation which affect their activities (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). In addition, in developing countries like Tanzania, women entrepreneurs are constrained by challenges including lack of credit, lack of entrepreneurship skill, social discrimination due to cultural norms and lack of networking (Jagero, 2011). Despite those challenges, information on how they affect women entrepreneurs is scanty. Arguably, it is difficult to generalize the challenges because they are likely to vary depending on the context.

Despite challenges women entrepreneurs face, there is an increasing recognition given on the importance of helping women entrepreneurs to improve their well-being (World Bank, 2002). A study conducted by Bosma et al. (2013) shows the existence of 126 million women who have started businesses in 67 countries around the world. Besides, there are 98 million women who run stable businesses whose main benefit is employment creation. Worldwide, only 20% of all women are in the formal employment and the rest are in the informal business including other livelihood strategies (World Bank, 2002). This situation drives women to engage in entrepreneurship as an alternative solution that can contribute to their well-being.

In Tanzania, women’s participation in entrepreneurship is essentially rooted in the informal sector (Maliyamkono and Bagachwa, 2001; Rutashoby, 1991). To that effect, it
is difficult, in developing countries, to discuss women’s participation in entrepreneurship without examining the development of the informal sector in general. This is partly because many small businesses, especially of the traditional type, form an important part of the entire informal sector activities (El Namaki, 1991). Additionally, informal sector activities have enabled women to accumulate capital to start relatively large and legally recognized business. According to Mahadea (2013), the concern for women’s entrepreneurship is important because women continue to be the most disadvantaged and marginalized group in different spheres of life. This is manifested in the nature of women’s work, time devoted to work, women's unequal access and control over cash and its implication in poverty alleviation (Makombe et al., 2005).

1.2 Problem Statement

According to the World Bank (2002), about 80% of the world’s women population are out of formal employment. This implies that their standard of living depends on alternative options including entrepreneurship. Although entrepreneurship is gaining momentum, subjective well-being in developing countries including Tanzania is significantly low (White, 2007). Despite the fact that entrepreneurship is important in addressing issues related to well-being, its contribution to women’s well-being is not clearly explored in Tanzania. Some of the available studies regarding women entrepreneurs do not show the influence of entrepreneurship on women’s well-being (Soubbotina, 2004). For instance, a study conducted by Sendi (2014), elaborates about entrepreneurship and how it can alleviate poverty, but does not show the extent to which entrepreneurship contributes to personal well-being. In addition, Kimaro (2014) elaborates about the impact of entrepreneurship education on women’s income generating activities, but does not link to personal well-being. Therefore, the aim of this study was to determine contribution of entrepreneurship on women’s personal well-being.
1.3 Justification for the Study

Entrepreneurship activities are increasingly being considered as ways of economic growth in developing countries including Tanzania (Katundu and Gabagambi, 2014). A number of initiatives have been taken by many stakeholders to improve entrepreneurship to women. In 2008, the International Labour Organization (ILO) adopted a strategy on promoting women’s entrepreneurs development where women were given priority for their entrepreneurship development. Additionally, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and the Small Industries Development Organization (SIDO) have made a great effort of promoting women’s entrepreneurship development.

Despite the efforts which have been made by various stakeholders, there is insufficient information to conclude that women entrepreneurs contribute to their personal well-being (ILO, 2008). The results of this study add knowledge to the body of existing knowledge or fill up the knowledge gap on the existing knowledge. This study is in line with the Small and Medium Enterprise Development Policy of 2003 (SME), whereby the government of Tanzania aims at ensuring women participation in all initiatives pertaining to SMEs development through identifying factors affecting women entrepreneurs and design programmes that can address those factors (URT, 2003).

1.4 Research Objectives

1.4.1 General objective

The general objective of this study was to determine contribution of entrepreneurship on women’s personal well-being

1.4.2 Specific objectives

The specific objectives of the study were;

(i) To assess entrepreneurial initiatives performed by women in the study area.
(ii) To explore the challenges affecting women entrepreneurs.

(iii) To determine the level of women entrepreneurs’ well-being based on women’s characteristics.

(iv) To determine the influence of entrepreneurship on women’s well-being.

1.5 Research Questions

The study was guided by four research questions;

(i) What initiatives are performed by women entrepreneurs and how the initiatives differ based on their characteristics?

(ii) What challenges affect women entrepreneurs?

(iii) What is the level of women’s well-being and how does it differ depending on their characteristics?

(iv) To what extent does entrepreneurship influence women’s well-being?

1.6 Theoretical Framework

Capability Approach

This study adopted Sen’s Capability Approach developed in 1999. The capability approach contains three main concepts: functionings, capabilities and agency. Sen defines functionings as various things a person may value doing or being such as a healthy body, being safe, being educated, having a good job, being able to move and visit people (Sen, 1999). Sen (1999) defines the concept of capability as various combinations of functionings that a person can achieve. Capability is, thus, a set of vectors of functionings, reflecting the person’s freedom to lead one type of life or another to choose from possible livings. Agency is the ability to pursue goals that one has reason to value. To that effect, the capability approach entails a key normative argument that social arrangements should
aim to expand people’s capabilities, that is, their freedom to undertake or achieve valuable doings and beings, and in doing so those arrangements should respect people’s agency.

The Capability Approach identifies four ways in which it contributes to a new approach for the social sciences and policy thinking. First, it argues for human beings and their quality of life to be the central focus of policy. This stands against an accumulated tendency in applied social sciences to focus on the means to promote the quality of life as ends in themselves. Second, it conceives human freedom and the ability to make decisions that affect one’s life as central to human dignity. Until then, bureaucratized policy interventions and their associated analytical frameworks have been criticized for treating humans as the objects of policies. Third, the Capability Approach re-establishes ethics at the heart of policy making. Contemporary policy processes have often over-privileged technocratic approaches to problem-solving which have overshadowed or obscured ethical considerations. Fourth, it sets itself out as an approach and not a theory. Therefore, the approach allows flexibility in its interpretation and use, and in doing so it first and foremost provides a way of reframing many of the issues that contemporary applied social sciences address.

The Capability Approach emerged as a challenge to the narrow utilitarianism which dominated the discipline of economics and was concerned to rebut the tendency to conceive of poverty and inequality in terms of the income that households command or the commodities they possess. Sen explains that the standard of living lies in the living and not in the possession of commodities. Sen (1999) gives five reasons for which income and commodities are narrowly viewed for assessing quality of life. (i) Heterogeneity: physical and biological differences between human beings will mean that they will have different requirements if their needs are to be met; (ii) Environmental diversity: differences in
physical environments will mean that human beings in different places will require different combinations of commodities if their needs are to be met; (iii) Variations in social context: the different social arrangements that prevail in different societies will affect the translation of incomes or commodity into human development outcomes; (iv) Differences in relational perspectives: example differences in customs and habits mean different commodity requirements for achieving the ‘capability to appear in public without shame’; (v) Distribution within the family: example the family income might be used to buy food and school equipment for boys but not for girls.

Thus, the above argument does not suggest that income and commodities are unimportant to well-being but indicate that if we are concerned with well-being outcomes, then we need to expand the informational basis of well-being. Income is not an end in itself but a means to further human ends. Therefore, this study aimed at using Sen’s capability approach to explore other factors beyond income and commodities that contributes to people’s well-being.

1.7 Conceptual Framework
This study hypothesizes that entrepreneurship, in addition to socio-economic characteristics, influences women’s personal well-being. The socio-economic characteristics considered in this study include education, marital status, age, employment status and household size. A study by Gawel (2013) show that married women are likely to have low well-being because of being submissive to their husbands. Married women have much to do with their family like playing different roles to the family like paying for school fees and health services for the family unlike the unmarried women. The same study also explains that a woman with a large household size is likely to have low well-being. In addition, women who are educated are likely to have high well-being compared to uneducated women because, educated women are more capable to have a good plan
from their business and hence they can generate much from their business. Despite these variables that can affect well-being of women entrepreneurs, different challenges can affect women entrepreneurs that in turn influence women’s well-being as summarized in Fig. 1.

Figure 1: Relationship between entrepreneurship and women’s well-being

**Women’s characteristics**
- Age
- Marital status
- Household size
- Employment status
- Education
- Wealth status

**Entrepreneurship**
- Business capital
- Working experience in business
- Entrepreneurship skill

**Personal well-being**
- Satisfaction with standard of living
- Satisfaction with health
- Satisfaction with achievements in life
- Satisfaction with personal relationship
- Satisfaction with safety
- Satisfaction with community connectedness
- Satisfaction with future security

**Challenges**
- Lack of reliable electricity
- High taxation
- Shortage of startup capital
- Poor infrastructures
- High price of raw material
- Theft of properties

1.8 Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is presented following the publishable manuscript format, and it is organized in four chapters. Chapter One covers the introduction which includes the problem statement and justification, objectives and research questions, theoretical framework and conceptual framework. Chapter Two presents the first manuscript that presents women entrepreneurial initiatives, while Chapter Three presents the second
manuscript that present the contribution of entrepreneurship on women’s well-being. The conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter Four.
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CHAPTER TWO

2.0 Women Entrepreneurial Initiatives and their Associated Challenges in Arumeru District, Tanzania

Eliakunda A. Urio¹ and Samwel J. Kabote²
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2.1 Abstract

Women entrepreneurs are increasingly becoming one of the development determinants particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. However, the relationship between women entrepreneurial initiatives and their socio-economic characteristics is not adequately explored. Therefore, the aim of this chapter was to address that knowledge gap through cross-sectional research design. Both quantitative, from a random sample of 90 women entrepreneurs, and qualitative data were collected. The results showed that most of women entrepreneurs were married. In addition, women entrepreneurs were not employed in the formal sector, which largely explains their involvement in entrepreneurship. Majority of women entrepreneurs owned either shops or conducted petty businesses. Women shop owners and those who conducted petty business had at least primary education. In addition, women entrepreneurs were constrained by various challenges including lack of entrepreneurial skills. The study concludes that entrepreneurial initiatives differed by demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Based on that conclusion, the study
recommends that efforts to promote entrepreneurship among women should consider women’s differences in terms of demographic and socio-economic characteristics focusing on, among other things, addressing specific challenges.

**Keywords: Women, entrepreneurs, challenges, Arumeru District, Tanzania**

### 2.2 Introduction

Globally, women are increasingly becoming involved in entrepreneurship since the 1990s (Rasheed, 2002), although they also perform 66% of the world’s work, produce 50% of the food, but earn 10% of the income and own 1% of the property (World Bank, 2002). Women represent 51% of the total population in the world, but contribute only 40.8% of the total workforce in the formal sector (World Bank, 2002). The hidden entrepreneurial potentials of women have gradually been changing with the growing sensitivity to the role and economic status in the society. Skills, knowledge and adaptability in business are the main reasons for women to emerge into entrepreneurial initiatives. According to Rasheed (2002), entrepreneurial initiative refers to the enterprises that people carry out in order to improve their standard of living. This can be through improving ones well-being and improving ones daily income. A study conducted by Abor and Biekpe (2006) in Ghana reported that women own businesses in form of small firms that may technically be called sole proprietorship. Women are also likely to start-up and operate manufacturing or technological businesses (Mazzarol et al., 1999).

In Tanzania for instance, women are concentrated in specific types of business which are labour intensive as opposed to capital intensive. According to Rutashobya (1995), majority of women entrepreneurs are concentrated in retail, food processing textile and clothing as well as service businesses. Similarly, three studies conducted by the International Labor Organization in Tanzania (ILO, 2003), Ethiopia (ILO, 2003a) and Zambia (ILO, 2003b)
showed that women are mostly involved in service and retail businesses. Thus, understanding specific entrepreneurial initiatives performed by women is critical to inform policy that can create an enabling environment for women entrepreneurs.

Some literatures show that demographic factors like age of business and of the entrepreneur, education level, marital status, main occupation and household head influence involvement of women into a particular business (Rasheed, 2002). Zahra (2013) conducted a study in Pakistan to assess influence of demographic characteristics on the involvement of women into business. The results show that age of the business operator, education level, marital status, occupation and household head influenced not only the involvement of women into entrepreneurial initiatives but also the income resulting from the initiatives. Empirical evidence suggests that a business owned by a married woman, in Pakistan, performs better than that whose owners are single (Zahra, 2013 and Aderemi et al., 2008). This is because married couples extend to each other social, financial and psychological support and in that way support each other in handling business and family responsibilities as opposed to unmarried women, widows and the separated. However, it is difficult to generalize these results throughout different contexts and therefore geographically contextual studies are critical.

Furthermore, a study conducted by URT (2013) suggests that age of a business operator and age of the business had an implication towards the progress of a business. The age group of 25-40 is seen as a superior age to conduct a business and make big progress compared to the young age below 20 and the old age of 50’s and above. The same study suggests that a business that has existed for about ten years and above is expected to have progressed as compared to a business that has just started. In addition, education is found to be strongly associated with entrepreneurial success Kumar and Kalyani (2011).
According to Kumar and Kalyani (2011), high educational level provides individuals with the knowledge and tools necessary to create a business, while helping potential entrepreneurs identify market opportunities. According to a study conducted in Tanzania by Olomi (2009), education is a key factor to enlighten an entrepreneur towards the available opportunities.

Literature further shows that women entrepreneurs are not free of problems. For example, Samiti (2006) and Tan (2000) classified major problems and challenges that affect women entrepreneurs into two broad categories; economic and social. Economic factors include competition in the market; lack of access to the market, lack of access to raw material, lack of capital or finance, lack of marketing knowledge; lack of production/storage space; poor infrastructure; inadequate power supply and lack of business training. The social factors include lack of social acceptability; having limited contacts outside prejudice and class bias; society looks down upon; attitude of other employees; and relations with the work force. Based on the foregoing introduction, it is clear that information that characterizes women entrepreneurs and their corresponding initiatives is inadequate in the literature. Therefore, this study aimed at exploring the entrepreneurial initiatives conducted by women and their socio-demographic characteristics and also exploring the challenges that affect women in their initiatives.

2.1 Methodology

The study was conducted in Arumeru District (Fig. 2), which is located in South Eastern of Arusha Region and its human population is 268 144 (URT, 2012). Farming is the major economic activity in the district because of favourable weather condition. The common crops grown, among others, include maize, beans and banana. The district was selected because 57% of women in the district own and run businesses whether is formal or
informal (URT, 2013). The study adopted cross-sectional research design. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), such research design allows data to be collected at a single point in time without repetition.

Figure 2: Map of Arumeru district showing study villages
Based on availability of women entrepreneurs, purposive sampling was employed to select three wards. In each ward, two villages were randomly selected making a total of six villages, (Fig. 1). A systematic random sampling technique was used to select 15 women entrepreneurs in each village from a sampling frame which was prepared by listing all women entrepreneurs in the villages, making a total of 90 women entrepreneurs. The sample size was convenient to obtain the information relevant to the study because a minimum of 30 cases is appropriate in accommodating a range of varying sub-populations (Bailey, 1994).

Women entrepreneurs’ survey was used to collect quantitative data whereby a questionnaire with closed and open-ended questions was used for data collection. To ensure consistency of the instrument, the questionnaire was pre-tested before actual data collection. The pre-testing involved 15 respondents. After pre-testing, modifications were made to the questionnaires and an improved version was developed before administering the tool for actual data collection.

Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were used for women entrepreneurs to collect qualitative data using a checklist of items. The data collected using FGD were those related to challenges faced by women entrepreneurs. In each village, there was one FGD making a total of 6 FGDs. Each FGD comprised of 6-8 participants as suggested by Kumar and Kalyani (2011), making a total of 42 participants. Different characteristics of women entrepreneurs such as those who had been in entrepreneurship for a long time, those who had received entrepreneurship trainings and those who engaged in more than one initiative were used to select FGDs participants. Qualitative data analysis was done using content analysis while quantitative data were analysed by using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS). Patterns of the results and their implications were explained.
Specifically, cross tabulations were computed to establish relationships between variables particularly relationships between types of entrepreneurial initiatives performed by women entrepreneurs and their characteristics including education level, marital status, employment status and whether the household head was a woman or a man. In addition, descriptive analysis was done through computing frequencies and percentages of respondents’ socio-economic and demographic characteristics. Finally, challenges faced by women entrepreneurs were computed to show percentage distribution.

2.2 Results and Discussion

2.2.1 Women entrepreneurs’ characteristics

Table 2.1 shows that 51% of the women entrepreneurs had primary education level. Nearly 73% were not employed in a public or private sectors and therefore did not benefit from formal employment. In addition, the results from the same Table show that nearly 58% of the entrepreneurs were from the middle age group. The fact that women entrepreneurs had limited employment opportunities in the public and private formal sectors suggests that they mainly embarked on entrepreneurship to address limited formal employment. The results from Table 2.1 also show that 83.3% of women entrepreneurs were married and therefore were from male headed households. This was a challenge to some women, as reported during FGDs, because decision making at a household level, in most societies, in rural Tanzania is asymmetrically done by heads of households who are in most cases the men (Schorling, 2006). Although some decisions done by household heads can affect entrepreneurial initiatives positively, it is possible that some of them can affect them negatively.
Table 2.1: Respondents’ characteristics (n=90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary O-level</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary A-level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widows</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main occupation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household head</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2 Women entrepreneurial initiatives

Table 2.2 represents different types of entrepreneurial initiatives performed by women. The results show that women performed different types of entrepreneurial initiatives. About twenty seven percent (27%) of the women entrepreneurs owned and run shops and 23.2% owned and run petty business. Petty business in this study refers to initiatives like selling fruits and vegetables, while a shop refers to a building where different goods and services were sold. The results in this study showed that half of women entrepreneurs owned either a shop or conducted petty business like fruit selling, selling vegetables and selling milk. These results suggest that available support should focus on promoting a shop and a petty business. However, other women engaged in salon, bakeries, street
vending and tailoring work, suggesting diversified entrepreneurial initiatives among women in the study area.

Table 2.2: Respondents’ responses on entrepreneurial initiatives (n = 90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty business</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considering women entrepreneurs’ education level, the results on Table 2.3 show that women entrepreneurs had acquired at least primary education, secondary o-level and some had college education level. The results further show that those who owned a shop had either primary or secondary education level but none had college education level. In addition, those who run petty business had primary education, secondary o-level and college education. It is also not surprising that most women who had no formal education were mostly concentrated in shops or in petty business. This implies that education is one of the key factors for entrepreneurship among women and therefore promoting women entrepreneurial initiatives may need to consider women’s levels of education in relation to an entrepreneurial initiative they perform.
Table 2.3: Respondents’ responses on entrepreneurial initiatives and women’s education level (n = 90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entrepreneurial initiatives</th>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salon</td>
<td>1(6.7)</td>
<td>6(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>5(33.3)</td>
<td>15(32.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>1(6.7)</td>
<td>6(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty business</td>
<td>5(33.3)</td>
<td>10(21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td>3(20)</td>
<td>4(8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>5(10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15(100)</strong></td>
<td><strong>46(100)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: numbers in brackets are percentages

Furthermore, considering women entrepreneurial initiatives and marital status, Table 2.4 shows that all kind of entrepreneurial initiatives that women conducted had at least a married woman. Shop and petty business had 28% of married women. Widows were mostly involved in salon, shop and bakery while the separated were mainly involved in salon and shop business. Furthermore, the results show that women who were never married were involved in bakery; tailoring and some were street vendors. This means that when supporting women entrepreneurs in their initiatives, marital status should be considered. For instance, it is logical to focus on women entrepreneurs who are married because this kind of intervention is likely to involve a big proportion of women entrepreneurs.
Table 2.4: Respondents’ responses on entrepreneurial initiatives and marital status  
(n = 90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Never married</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Separated</th>
<th>Widow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salon</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>11(14.7)</td>
<td>1(50)</td>
<td>2(22.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>21(28)</td>
<td>1(50)</td>
<td>2(22.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>1(25)</td>
<td>9(12)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>5(55.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty business</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>21(28)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendor</td>
<td>1(25)</td>
<td>7(9.3)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring</td>
<td>2(50)</td>
<td>6(8)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
<td>0(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4(90)</td>
<td>75(90)</td>
<td>2(90)</td>
<td>9(90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: numbers in brackets are percentages

In addition, the results show that majority of women entrepreneurs were not employed in the formal sector. Results from Table 2.5 show that only those who engaged in tailoring, salons and those who owned bakeries were employed. Those who owned shops, or those who were street vendors and those who conducted petty business were not employed at all, and this largely explains their involvement in entrepreneurship. Furthermore, the same Table shows that women entrepreneurs from male headed households were spread throughout all initiatives more importantly in shops and petty business with 27.6%. This implies that interventions to promote women entrepreneurial initiatives should focus on those unemployed regardless whether a woman belongs to a male or a female headed household.
Table 2.5: Respondents’ responses on employment status and type of households 
(n = 90)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Household head</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salon</td>
<td>4(28.6)</td>
<td>10(71.4)</td>
<td>14(100)</td>
<td>11(14.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3(21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>00(00)</td>
<td>24(100)</td>
<td>24(100)</td>
<td>21(27.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3(21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakery</td>
<td>1(6.7)</td>
<td>14(93.3)</td>
<td>15(100)</td>
<td>9(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6(42.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petty business</td>
<td>00(00)</td>
<td>21(100)</td>
<td>21(100)</td>
<td>21(27.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0(00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street vendors</td>
<td>00(00)</td>
<td>8(100)</td>
<td>8(100)</td>
<td>7(9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1(7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailoring</td>
<td>3(37.5)</td>
<td>5(62.5)</td>
<td>8(100)</td>
<td>7(9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1(7.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: numbers in brackets are percentages

2.3 Challenges Faced by Women Entrepreneurs

Table 2.6 presents respondents responses on challenges faced by women entrepreneurs. Generally, the results show that women entrepreneurs faced various challenges in the initiatives that they were performing.

Table 2.6: Major challenges faced by women entrepreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of market for the products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expiring of products in shop due to slow circulation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High interest rate from financial institutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High price of raw materials</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High taxation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of reliable electricity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training on how to conduct business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of well trained workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low prices of goods due to high bargaining power of customers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor infrastructures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of startup capital</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of properties due to poor construction of houses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft of shop properties</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that 10% of women entrepreneurs reported unreliable electricity as the main challenge. This was in line with FGDs conducted at Madukani village whose
participants reported that: “unreliable electricity is a challenge to those who sell drinks in our village because during summer season, majority of customers need cold drinks but because of unreliable electricity the drinks are always warm. This makes us to incur additional cost of purchasing a generator”.

The above quotation affirms that electricity was a challenge particularly for those connected to the national grid and more importantly for those not connected to the national grids who were selling soft drinks in their shops. In rural Tanzania, about 2% of the population is connected to the national grid and power supply is characterized by frequent power-cuts, rationing, shortages, low and fluctuating voltage levels, which in essence entail high production costs to different businesses (Lyimo, 2006).

High taxation is another challenge reported by 5.6% of the respondents (Table 2.6). During FGDs at Madukani village participants reported that: “high taxation is a mess to our prosperity…whenever we want to make one step ahead, taxation takes us ten steps back. Why do these people impose too much tax to our small business?” The same FGD reported: “If high taxation continues it is likely to discourage most of people”. This implies that most of the FGD participants were not happy with the amount of tax imposed to them as small business owners. Some countries especially developed countries impose low tax rate while developing countries like Tanzania imposes very high tax to small-scale business owners (Veena et al., 2012).

Shortage of startup capital was reported by 4.4% of the respondents (Table 2.6). During FGD at Nkoansiyo village it was reported that: “every woman entrepreneur has a dream of owning a big business in which jobless people can be employed but the problem is shortage of startup capital”. The quotation above implies that lack of startup capital was a
challenge to women entrepreneurs. These results are in line with Leonard (2013) who argues that lack of access to start-up capital in many African countries is a common challenge and impact negatively on entrepreneurs. This translates that the unmet credit need among entrepreneurs including women entrepreneurs in Africa remains significant.

High price of raw materials was reported by 2.8% of the respondents (Table 2.6). During FGDs at Nguruma village participants reported that: “raw materials are very expensive compared to the profit that we get at the end of the day”. According to this quotation, the price of raw materials especially for bakery was perceived to be high and most of the women entrepreneurs could not afford the price given the fact that access to credit from financial institutions was limited.

The results also show that 2.2% of the respondents reported theft as one of the challenges (Table 2.6). This was also reported during FGDs especially at Tengeru village that: “theft is a common problem to most of us and thieves are our big enemies”. Based on this quotation, it is clear that robbery affected women entrepreneurs. Theft or robbery is also reported by Vishwanatha (2001) and by ILO (2008) in Kenya as a threat making entrepreneurs in town centers to close their businesses.

Expanding of product in shop due to low circulation and lack of market was reported by 0.6% of women entrepreneurs. During FGDs, participants also noted that: “for bakery owners in our village, high risk of expiry of loafs of bead is a major challenge”. This suggests limited market for the product. Nosa (2013) observed that women entrepreneurs who own micro and small businesses often complain about the lack of demand for their products, but also they hardly respond to increased markets. There are various factors that can explain this observation including women’s limited mobility due to various factors
linked to either their family responsibility or cultural practices. Those who can travel lack the market information on products and inputs; thus, becoming dependent on the middle traders who buy their products at relatively lower price compared to the market price.

In addition, lack of entrepreneurial skills was reported by 0.6% of women entrepreneurs (Table 2.6). This is in line with FGDs that reported: “entrepreneurship skill is what most of us lacks…most of us do not keep record of what we are selling”. Decal (2010) links the challenges faced by women who own micro and small businesses to low education and lack of training. He says that most of women often embark on business activities as a result of their family’s economic hardship. Hence, their economic participation is merely to support and ensure their families well-being. Essentially, their families’ status-quo compels them to own and operate micro and small businesses, but it does not encourage them to attend training programs or get educated.

Based on other studies by different authors, the challenges have being classified into groups like economic, social and cultural challenges. For instance, Samiti (2006) and Tan (2000) classified the basic challenges that affect entrepreneurs in to economic and social. The economic factors include competition in the market; lack of access to the market, lack of access to raw material, lack of capital or finance, lack of marketing knowledge; lack of production/ storage space; poor infrastructure; inadequate power supply and lack of business training The social factors include lack of social acceptability; having limited contacts outside prejudice and class bias; society looks down upon; attitude of other employees; and relations with the work force. Besides this, Gemechis (2007), Hisrich (2005) and ILO (2009) added social and cultural attitude towards youth entrepreneurship; entrepreneurship education; administrative and regulatory framework; business assistance
and support; barriers to access technology are crucial factors that affect entrepreneurial success.

2.4 Conclusions and Recommendations

The main objective of this manuscript was to discuss entrepreneurial initiatives performed by women based on their characteristics including challenges women entrepreneurs were facing. The study concludes that women perform variety of entrepreneurial initiatives but entrepreneurial types are associated to women’s demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Women entrepreneurs faced many challenges, depending on type of business performed, that definitely affected their businesses including inadequate access to credit, lack of entrepreneurship training and skills and limited market for their products. The study recommends that government’s or non-governmental organizations’ efforts to promote entrepreneurship among women should consider women characteristics because women, as a social group, are not homogeneous. Secondly, the central government should put effort on addressing the challenges that squarely affect entrepreneurship.
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3.1 Abstract

Women involvement in entrepreneurship is becoming one of the key interventions for development in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) including Tanzania. Although its contribution to economic development features very clearly in the literature, it is not clear the extent to which entrepreneurship contributes to personal well-being among women entrepreneurs, which is an overarching goal of all governments’ efforts in the world. This manuscript tested two hypotheses. First, the seven personal well-being measurement constructs used to construct a Personal Well-being Index (PWI) had similar variance contribution (P > 0.05) on the overall life satisfaction. Secondly, entrepreneurship had no significant contribution (P > 0.05) on a personal well-being. The study adopted a cross-sectional research design whereby the survey method was used to collect data from randomly selected sample of 180 women (90 women entrepreneurs and 90 women non-entrepreneurs). Multiple linear regression model was used to test the hypothesis. The results showed that both entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs had low personal well-being although entrepreneurs showed high personal well-being relative to non-entrepreneurs.
Unlike the hypothesis ($P > 0.05$), all personal well-being measurement constructs showed unique variance contribution on the overall life satisfaction, but four had significant contribution. Similarly, entrepreneurship showed significant contribution on personal well-being at 0.1% level of significance. The study concludes that the seven personal well-being measurement constructs can be quantified to form a personal well-being. Secondly, entrepreneurship is a key factor for improving personal well-being. Based on the conclusions, it is recommended that, the seven personal well-being measurement constructs should be quantified to form a personal well-being. Also in order to improve personal well-being, efforts done by the government and Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs) should focus on, among other things, promoting entrepreneurship among women.

**Keywords: Women entrepreneurs, personal well-being, Arumeru, Tanzania**

### 3.2 Introduction

Entrepreneurship is increasingly being recognized as an important driver of economic growth, innovation and employment, and it is widely accepted as a key aspect of economic dynamism (Mahadea, 2013). Transforming ideas into economic opportunities is the decisive issue of entrepreneurship. History shows that economic progress has been significantly advanced by pragmatic people who are entrepreneurs and innovative, able to exploit opportunities and willing to take risks (Hisrich, 2005). The role of entrepreneurship and an entrepreneurial culture in economic and social development has often been underestimated. Borrowing an idea of functionings developed by Sen (1999), entrepreneurship activities are taken in this study as functionings. Sen (1999) defines functionings as various things a person may value doing or being. In other words, functionings are valuable activities and states that make up people’s well-being such as being healthy and well nourished, being safe, being educated, having a good job and being able to visit the loved ones. Entrepreneurship development contributes to poverty
reduction when it creates employment through the start up of new entrepreneurship or the expansion of existing ones and they increase social wealth by creating new markets, new industries, new technology, new institutional forms, new jobs, and increasing income which improve standards of living for the population (Malaya. 2006).

Over the years, it has been increasingly apparent that entrepreneurship indeed contributes to economic development but the significant numbers of enterprises are owned by men (ILO, 2006). Until the 1980’s little was known about women entrepreneurship both in practice and research, which made its focus entirely on men (Bruni et al., 2004). Scientific discourse about women’s entrepreneurship and women owned and run organizations is the development since the 1980s (ILO, 2006). Even though, women involvement into business is increasing and recent studies show that most of the women are found in Micro and Small Enterprises (MSEs).

As globalization reshapes the international economic landscape and technological change creates greater uncertainty in the world economy, the dynamism of entrepreneurship is believed to be able to meet the new economic, social and environmental challenges (Smallbone et al., 2010). Governments increasingly consider entrepreneurship as the cornerstones of a competitive national economy and in most countries entrepreneurship policies are in fact closely connected to innovation policies, with which they share many characteristics and challenges (Johnstone and Lionais, 2004). The dynamic process of new firm creation introduces and disperses innovative products, processes and organizational structures throughout the economy. Entrepreneurship objectives and policies nevertheless differ considerably among countries, owing to different policy needs and diverse perspectives on what is meant by entrepreneurship.
Furthermore, according to a study conducted by Jagero (2011), in developing countries like Tanzania, entrepreneurship is seen as a key feature to the development of the economy especially for women and other marginalized groups. Despite the contribution that entrepreneurship has on economic development of an individual and the society in general, its contribution on personal well-being is not well known. Therefore, this study aimed at determining the contribution that entrepreneurship had on women’s well-being in the study area.

3.3 Methodology

This study was conducted in Arumeru District which is located in the South Eastern part of Arusha Region. The district’s human population is 268,144 (URT, 2012). Farming is one of the major economic activities in the district and crops grown include maize, beans and banana. The district was selected for the study because currently 57% of women in the district have developed interest in entrepreneurship (URT, 2013), and therefore raising interest to investigate entrepreneurship contribution on personal well-being. The study adopted cross-sectional research design. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), such research design allows data to be collected once at a single point in time without repetition, and also allows investigating relationships between variables involved in the study.

In order to demonstrate women entrepreneurs’ contribution on personal well-being, the study involved women entrepreneurs and women non-entrepreneurs for comparison purposes. Based on availability of women entrepreneurs, purposive sampling was employed to select three wards. In each ward, two villages were randomly selected making a total of six villages. Systematic random sampling technique was used to select 15 women entrepreneurs and 15 non-women entrepreneurs in each village, from a sampling
frame, which was prepared by listing all women entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs in
the village, making a total of 180 respondents. This sample size was convenient to obtain
the information relevant to the study because a minimum of 30 cases is appropriate in
accommodating a range of varying sub-populations (Bailey, 1994). Some village records
involved in the study are presented in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village names</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Women entrepreneurs</th>
<th>Non-entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nkoaranga</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tengeru</td>
<td>1705</td>
<td>2277</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguruma</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulala</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madukani</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nkoansiyo</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey method was employed whereby a semi-structured questionnaire, was used to
collect data. To ensure consistency and clarity of questions used for data collection, the
questionnaire was pre-tested to 15 respondents. After pre-testing, modifications were
made to the questionnaire and an improved version was developed before administering
the tool for actual data collection. Quantitative data were analysed by using Statistical
Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Patterns of the results and their implications were
explained.

Specifically, a multiple linear regression model was used to determine contribution of
explanatory variables on outcome variable. The model was run two times. To test the
hypothesis that each of the seven personal well-being measurement constructs used to
construct a Personal Well-being Index (PWI) had similar unique variance contribution to
the overall life satisfaction at 5% level of significance. The equation used was:

\[ Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \ldots + \beta_7X_7 + E \]  \hspace{1cm} \text{(1)}
Y is an outcome variable, and in this case, an overall life satisfaction. Respondents were required to respond how satisfied they were with their life as a whole. The response ranged from 0 (no satisfaction at all) to 10 (completely satisfied). A score of 5 was taken as neutral.

X\textsubscript{1} to X\textsubscript{7} are the explanatory variables that were the seven personal well-being measurement constructs suggested by the International Well-being Group (2013), including satisfaction with standard of living, satisfaction with one’s health, satisfaction with achievement in life, satisfaction with personal relationship, satisfaction with one’s safety, satisfaction with community connectedness and satisfaction with future security.

β\textsubscript{1} to β\textsubscript{7} are regression coefficients

E is an error term representing a proportion of variance in the outcome variable that is not explained by the regression model.

The multiple linear regression analysis was used because there were more than four categories of ordered responses (Sarracino, 2010; Hansen and Slagsvold, 2012). The descriptive statistics for the seven personal well-being measurement constructs used in the multiple regression analysis are presented in Table 3.2.
Table 3.2: Descriptive statistics for seven domains (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement constructs</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall life satisfaction</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with standard of living</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with your health</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with achievements in life</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with personal relationship</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with your safety</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with community connectedness</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with future security</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Personal Well-being Index (PWI) of an individual was quantified by computing the mean score of each of the seven personal well-being measurement constructs scored from a range of zero which means ‘no satisfaction at all’ to 10 which means ‘completely satisfied’. The mean score for each respondent was then converted into points by multiplying by 10 (International Well-being Group, 2013). Finally, respondents were grouped into two categories: those with low personal well-being in one category if their average scores were less than the mean score of 51.92, and those with high well-being category if their average scores were above the mean.

The second task related to the regression analysis was to test the hypothesis that entrepreneurship had no significant contribution to a personal well-being at 5% level of significance. In this case, the outcome variable was personal well-being measured as PWI, while entrepreneurship, measured as dummy variable, was an explanatory variable. The variables entered in the regression model are shown in Table 3.3.

Reliability analysis was used to test whether the personal well-being measurement constructs can be combined to form a Personal Well-being Index (PWI). The most commonly used statistic in this analysis is a Cronbach’s alpha value. The Cronbach’s alpha value was 0.850 higher than a minimum value of 0.7 indicating that the personal well-
being measurement construct can be quantified to form one variable, in this case, personal well-being.

Based on the tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values, there was no multicollinearity problem for the data involved in the multiple regression analysis. The mean difference in personal well-being between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs was tested using an independent t test because the two groups are independent and the personal well-being index is a continuous variable. Before running the independent t test, the data were transformed to log10 to make them normally distributed because the Shapiro Wilk W test showed that the personal well-being index was not normally distributed.

**Table 3.3: Variables used in the regression analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Level of measurement</th>
<th>Unit of measurement</th>
<th>Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Owning and running an enterprise</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 if owning and running an enterprise and 0 otherwise</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship has positive and significant contribution on personal well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal well-being</td>
<td>People’s satisfaction with life as a whole</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Education has positive contribution on personal well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td>Number of years spent in schools</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Education has positive contribution on personal well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Working in formal employment</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 if employed and 0 otherwise</td>
<td>Employment has positive contribution on personal well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>Number of members sharing resources at a household</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Big household size has negative contribution on personal well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>If married or single</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>1 if married and 0 otherwise</td>
<td>Women’s marital status has negative or positive contribution on personal well-being depending on the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Total number of years since the respondent was born</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Age has positive contribution on personal well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth status</td>
<td>Being poor or non-poor</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Wealth has positive contribution on personal well-being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before running the regression model, normality was tested using Shapiro-Wilk test. This test showed statistically significant difference between the normal curve and the curve of the population from which the sample was taken, at 0.1% level of significance. This implies that the overall life satisfaction and personal well-being were not normally distributed and therefore they were transformed using Log10 to make them normally distributed. In addition, the household wealth status from which respondents came from was quantified using a wealth index whereby the assets used in the formula were obtained from the FGDs conducted in the villages. Owning these types of assets in the selected villages was a sign of wealth to them. The following formula was used to quantify respondents’ wealth status:

\[ WET_i = \sum (y_{ij}/Y_{max}) \] (I=1, 2… x j=1, 2… n)………………………………………………………… (2)

Where:

- \( WET \) = Wealth Index
- \( y_{ij} \) = Number of household assets (Radio, Television, Furniture, Cattle, Cars, and houses roofed with iron sheets as identified during FGDs)
- \( Y_{max} \) = Maximum number of a particular asset in the sample
- \( X \) = Number of items considered as indicators for wealth
- \( N \) = Sample size

Based on the wealth index mean of 0.028, respondents were categorized into three. Those below the mean were taken as having low wealth status, while those above the mean were taken as having high wealth status. In addition, the mean was taken as medium wealth status.
3.4 Results and Discussion

3.4.1 Respondents’ characteristics

Table 3.4 presents respondents’ characteristics. The analysis showed that majority (51.1%) of the women entrepreneurs had primary education level compared to 48.9% of the non-entrepreneurs who had primary education level. Majority of non-entrepreneurs had no formal education while none of the entrepreneurs lacked formal education. This association was significant at 5% level of significance (Table 3.4) implying that education was considered an important factor for a woman to engage in entrepreneurship. In addition, majority of non-entrepreneurs were married compared to entrepreneurs. This relationship was significant at 5% level of significance implying that a few women entrepreneurs were married. Being married could be one of the constraints for women to own and run an enterprise while maintaining a family being one of woman’s triple roles (Bajpai, 2014).
The analysis also showed that there was significant association at 5% level of significance, between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs with regard to their main occupation, such that majority of the non-entrepreneurs were out of formal employment. This implies that being employed was one of the factors driving a woman to engage in entrepreneurship.
because an employed woman could use part of her salary to start up an enterprise given limited access to credit in the study area. In addition, the salary could also become collateral for a woman to access credit from formal financial institutions to start an enterprise. Based on household wealth status presented in Table 3.5, wealth status was high among women entrepreneurs relative to non-women entrepreneurs. This implies that entrepreneurship contributed to improving household wealth status. However, overall, wealth status was low across the sample. In addition, the results showed that majority (70.7%) women entrepreneurs were from the young age (18-35). This implies that this age group had active members and so many involved themselves into this business to improve their well-being.

Table 3.5: Household wealth status and respondent’s age (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth group</th>
<th>Responses status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>Non-entrepreneur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (0.00-0.027)</td>
<td>64(44.1)</td>
<td>81(55.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (0.028)</td>
<td>1(100)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (0.029-0.27)</td>
<td>26(76.5)</td>
<td>8(23.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young (18-35)</td>
<td>65(70.7)</td>
<td>27(29.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle (36-53)</td>
<td>28(34.1)</td>
<td>54(65.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old (54-62)</td>
<td>2(33.3)</td>
<td>4(66.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.2 Personal well-being

Table 3.6 presents respondents’ personal well-being. The results show that the mean for personal well-being scores was 51.92 while minimum and maximum were 34.29 and 84.29 respectively, with a standard deviation of 12.97. These results are in line with the previous personal well-being studies particularly in African countries (International Well-being Group, 2013). In addition, about 53% of women entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs were categorized under low personal well-being category. This is in line
with previous studies reporting low personal well-being in Africa particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa (White, 2007). However, generally, entrepreneurs showed high personal well-being relative to non-entrepreneurs. This relationship was strong and significant at 5% level of significance (Table, 3.6), implying that despite problems and challenges, which women entrepreneurs face in Africa including lack of capital, slow growth rate and limited external financing (Bajpai, 2014), entrepreneurship contributed towards improving personal well-being among women entrepreneurs in the study area.

Table 3.6: Personal well-being (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal well-being categories</th>
<th>Non-entrepreneur</th>
<th>Entrepreneur</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Phi-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74(77.9)</td>
<td>21(22.1)</td>
<td>95(52.8)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>15(17.6)</td>
<td>70(82.4)</td>
<td>85(47.2)</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from Table 3.7 that demographic and socio-economic characteristics of women were related to their well-being. Those with formal education, employed in the formal sector and those categorized as having high wealth status registered high personal well-being than their counterparts. The married ones, the youth group and those whose families were headed by a woman showed low personal well-being and these relationships were significant except the relationship between employment status and being an entrepreneur or not.
Table 3.7: Association between personal well-being and respondents characteristics (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents characteristics</th>
<th>Low well-being</th>
<th>High well-being</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>63(48.1)</td>
<td>68(51.9)</td>
<td>131(100)</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non formal</td>
<td>32(65.3)</td>
<td>17(34.7)</td>
<td>49(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>91(57.2)</td>
<td>68(42.8)</td>
<td>159(100)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>4(19.0)</td>
<td>17(81.0)</td>
<td>21(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3(30.0)</td>
<td>7(70.0)</td>
<td>10(100)</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>92(54.1)</td>
<td>78(45.9)</td>
<td>170(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male headed households</td>
<td>90(56.2)</td>
<td>70(43.8)</td>
<td>160(100)</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female headed households</td>
<td>5(25.0)</td>
<td>15(75.0)</td>
<td>20(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>65(70.7)</td>
<td>27(29.2)</td>
<td>92(100)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>28(34.1)</td>
<td>54(65.9)</td>
<td>82(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>2(33.3)</td>
<td>4(66.7)</td>
<td>6(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wealth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>84(57.9)</td>
<td>61(42.1)</td>
<td>145(100)</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0(0.00)</td>
<td>1(100)</td>
<td>1(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11(32.4)</td>
<td>23(67.6)</td>
<td>34(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results further show that there was significant difference, at 0.1%, in personal well-being between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs (Table 3.8). This means that entrepreneurs had higher personal well-being relative to non-entrepreneurs implying that entrepreneurship showed positive and significant contribution to personal well-being among women.

Table 3.8: Personal well-being differences between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups Compared</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-entrepreneur</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-10.95</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.3 Determinants of overall life satisfaction

Table 3.9 presents unique variance contribution of personal well-being measurement constructs produced in multiple linear regression analysis, to the overall life satisfaction. The analysis showed that, overall, the model was significant at 0.1%. The adjusted $R^2$ was 0.74 implying that the model explained 74% of the variations in the overall life satisfaction. The column for $sr^2$ derived from squaring the PART coefficient, an output from SPSS, describes the percentage of unique variance contributed by each of the personal well-being measurement constructs. The results show that all personal well-being measurement constructs had unique variance contribution to the overall life satisfaction, unlike in developed countries like the Netherlands and Australia where satisfaction with safety does not show unique variance contribution (International Well-being Group, 2013). Satisfaction with safety showed greatest contribution followed by satisfaction with achievements in life, satisfaction with future security and satisfaction with community connectedness. This implies that the four indicators were major determinants of overall life satisfaction and quality of life in general.
Table 3.9: Unique variance of personal well-being indicators on overall life satisfaction (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Well-being Indicators</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>95% Confidence interval for B</th>
<th>Sr²</th>
<th>Multicollinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.012</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.337 to 0.404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with standard of living</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>-0.005 to 0.013</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.399 to 2.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with your health</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>-0.002 to 0.011</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.410 to 2.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with achievements in life</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>3.704</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.006 to 0.020</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.469 to 2.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with personal relationship</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.000 to 0.013</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.489 to 2.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with your safety</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>6.030</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.014 to 0.028</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.427 to 2.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with community connectedness</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.003 to 0.016</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.504 to 1.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with future security</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>3.218</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.004 to 0.017</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.585 to 1.710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted R² = 0.74; Total explained unique variance = 0.106; Total explained shared variance = 0.634

The results on Table 3.9 also show that out of the seven personal well-being measurement constructs considered as explanatory variables, four showed statistically significant differences. These include satisfaction with achievement in life and satisfaction with safety, which were significant at 0.1%. Satisfaction with future security and satisfaction with community connectedness were significant at 5%. This means that those measurement constructs had largest contribution to the overall life satisfaction relative to
other measurement constructs. It can further be translated that the personal well-being measurement constructs that were significant were important determinants of overall life satisfaction.

### 3.4.4 Major factors contributing to personal well-being

Table 3.10 presents determinants of personal well-being including entrepreneurship. In this study, personal well-being was measured using a Personal Well-being Index (PWI). Overall, the model was significant at 0.1%. The analysis shows that the adjusted $R^2$ was 0.521, which means, the model explained 52.1% of the variations on the Personal Well-being. In addition, three explanatory variables were significant at 0.1% including entrepreneurship, marital status and respondents’ age. As showing by the independent t test, multiple linear regression showed that entrepreneurship contribution to the women’s personal well-being was positive implying that it contributed to improving personal well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>95% confidence interval for B</th>
<th>Collinearity statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.432</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>[.566, 0.802]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>[.001, 0.004]</td>
<td>0.850 1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>-1.632</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>[.091, 0.009]</td>
<td>0.924 1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>-1.313</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>[.010, 0.002]</td>
<td>0.793 1.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>9.565</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>[0.092, 0.140]</td>
<td>0.837 1.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.201</td>
<td>-3.778</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>[-0.102, -0.032]</td>
<td>0.942 1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>4.026</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>[0.002, 0.005]</td>
<td>0.805 1.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth of an individual</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>[-0.217, 0.390]</td>
<td>0.977 1.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted $R^2 = 0.521(52.1\%)$
Looking at beta values on Table 3.10, it is clear that women’s personal well-being among entrepreneurs was between 9.2 and 14.0 points higher than that among women who were non-entrepreneurs. These results are in line with Berglund (2014) who reports strong and positive relationship between entrepreneurship and subjective well-being in Sweden, one of the developed countries in the world. Also according to a study conducted in Tanzania by ILO (2003), the study found that women entrepreneurs in Tanzania contributed to their well-being and even others well-being through creation of employment opportunities. To that effect, among other factors, entrepreneurship was critical for improving women’s personal well-being.

The results also show that, in addition to entrepreneurship, for every one year increase on respondents’ age, the personal well-being increased between 0.2 and 0.5 points. This implies that the personal well-being was high for an old age relative to the young age group. These results are in line with previous studies. For instance, Hansen and Slagsvold (2012) portray that the person well-being increases with age, stabilizes at an old age, but does not strongly declines as objective life condition deteriorate.

In addition, the significance contribution of marital status to women’s personal well-being reported in this study implies that marital status contributed strongly on personal well-being, but negatively (Table 3.10). The negative sign connotes that being married decreased the personal well-being among women entrepreneurs between -10.2 and -3.2. This can largely be explained by unequal gender relations that exist between husbands and wives in most societies in Africa. Marital status has positive contribution on personal well-being in developed countries, but not significant (Sarracino, 2010). The difference of the results from this study to Sarracino’s results can be explained by the context, cultural and
gender differences, differences between developed and developing countries. The fact that this study involved women only can also explain the differences.

3.5 Conclusions and Policy Recommendations

The aim of this study was to test the hypothesis that each of the seven personal well-being measurement constructs used to construct a Personal Well-being Index (PWI) had similar variance contribution to the overall life satisfaction at 5% level of significance. It also tested the hypothesis that entrepreneurship had no significant contribution on a personal well-being at 5% level of significance. Based on the results, the study concludes that all personal well-being measurement constructs showed unique variance contribution to the overall life satisfaction. However, satisfaction with safety, satisfaction with achievements in life, satisfaction with future security and satisfaction with community connectedness, in that order, had largest unique variance contributions. Secondly, women’s personal well-being was high among women entrepreneurs relative to non-entrepreneurs. Unlike the hypothesis, entrepreneurship contributed strongly and significantly to personal well-being. Based on these results, the study recommends that the seven personal well-being measurement constructs can be combined to form personal well-being. Secondly, policies to improve women’s well-being should focus at promoting entrepreneurship among women.
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CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Conclusions

The objectives of this study were to assess entrepreneurial initiatives performed by women in the study area; to explore the challenges affecting women entrepreneurs; to determine women entrepreneurs’ well-being based on women’s characteristics; and to determine the influence of entrepreneurship on women’s well-being.

The study concludes that:

(i) Women were involved in initiatives including salon, shop, bakery, street vending, tailoring, and petty business. The entrepreneurial initiatives differed by demographic and socio-economic characteristics.

(ii) Secondly, women entrepreneurs faced many challenges like lack of reliable electricity, high taxation rate, shortage of start-up capital, poor infrastructures, and high price of raw materials and theft of properties.

(iii) Thirdly, women’s personal well-being was high among women entrepreneurs relative to women who were non-entrepreneurs. All personal well-being measurement constructs showed unique variance contribution on overall life satisfaction. However, satisfaction with safety, satisfaction with achievements in life, satisfaction with future security and satisfaction with community connectedness, in that order, had largest unique variance contributions.

(iv) Fourth, entrepreneurship showed significant contribution on well-being relative to other factors in the multiple linear regression model.
4.2 Recommendations

(i) Based on the conclusions, the study recommends that when promoting women entrepreneurial initiatives, women should not be taken as homogeneous group. Promoting initiatives should consider socio-economic characteristics of women such as education, marital status and type of household whether is headed by a woman or by a man.

(ii) Secondly, the government should take part in eliminating the challenges that constrain women in their business.

(iii) Thirdly, it is recommended that, the seven personal well-being measurement constructs can be aggregated to form personal well-being.

(iv) Fourth, the government should promote women entrepreneurs through provision of credit, market for their products and provision of entrepreneurial skills because women are the agents of change, according to the Capability Approach, who can bring socio-economic changes.

4.3 Recommendation for Further Study

This study dealt with women entrepreneurs in the rural setting, thus comparable analysis between rural and urban areas at a national level is recommended to justify the need to promote entrepreneurship among women that in turn contribute significantly to personal well-being and therefore bringing socio-economic changes.
APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Questionnaire for a survey

My name is ………………………………………………….., a student of SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE taking my second degree (Masters of Arts in Rural Development). I am hereby collecting data in this area to make me accomplish my study. Please give me your cooperation as the findings of this research will be used for academic purposes only.

INDIVIDUAL IDENTIFICATION

Date of interview: ……………….………....Questionnaire No: …………………...
Name of interviewer: …………………........Name of respondent: …………………..

1. Ward Name
   1) Nkoaranga  
   2) King’ori  
   3) Akheri

2. Village Name
   1) Nkoaranga  
   2) Mulala  
   3) King’ori-Madukani  
   4) Nkoansiyio  
   5) Akheri  
   6) Nguruma

3. Years of schooling…………………

4. What is your main occupation?
   1) employed  
   2) Not employed

5. What is your household size? ……………………

6. Year of birth…………………

7. What is your marital status?
   1. Never married  
   2. Married  
   3. Separated  
   4. Widow
8. In a household where you come from, who is the household head?
   1. Husband
   2. Wife

9. What is the relationship with the household head?
   1. Household head
   2. Spouse

OBJECTIVE ONE: TO ASSESS ENTREPRENEURIAL INITIATIVES PERFORMED BY WOMEN IN THE STUDY AREA.

(Only women entrepreneurs should complete this section)

10. Do you own any business?
    1. Yes
    2. No

11. If yes, what type of business do you own?
    1. Shop
    2. Bakery
    3. Petty business
    4. Street vendor
    5. Salon
    6. Others (specify)

12. When did you start your business?
    ……………………………………………………………………………

13. What was the source of your startup capital?
    1. Credit from financial institution
    2. Own source
    3. Inherited
    4. Others (Specify)

14. If you got credit from an institution, specify whether the institution was:
    1. Formal or
    2. Informal

15. If you received credit to start your business, how much did you receive?
    ……………………………………………………………………………
    1. Yes
    2. No
16. Have you received any entrepreneurship training?
   1. Yes
   2. No

17. If yes in question 20, what is the type of the training and who was the organizer?
   Type ...................................................................................
   Organizer .............................................................................

18. Are you a member of any institution?
   1. Yes
   2. No

19. If yes, mention the institution and specify its roles
   Institution name; ............................................................
   Its roles; ...........................................................................

OBJECTIVE TWO: TO EXPLORE THE CHALLENGES AFFECTING WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS;

21. Do you face any challenge in your business?
   1. Yes
   2. No

20. If yes, what are the major challenges in your business?
   1. Taxation
   2. High prices of raw materials
   3. Shortage of startup capital
   4. Transport cost
   5. Theft
   6. Lack of reliable electricity

21. What do you think should be done to address the challenges?
   ......................................................................................
   ......................................................................................
   ......................................................................................
   ......................................................................................
   ......................................................................................
OBJECTIVE THREE: TO DETERMINE WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS’ WELL-BEING

BASED ON WOMEN’S CHARACTERISTICS

Satisfaction of life as a whole (Entrepreneurs & Non-Entrepreneurs)

22. Thinking about your life and personal circumstances, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole? Range from 0-10

0= Means not satisfied at all and 10 means completely satisfied

Questions | Domains
--- | ---
How satisfied are you with…? | 
1. Your standard of living? | [Standard of Living]
2. Your health? | [Personal Health]
3. What you are achieving in life? | [Achieving in Life]
4. Your personal relationships? | [Personal Relationships]
5. How safe you feel? | [Personal Safety]
6. Feeling part of your community? | [Community-Connectedness]

PERSONAL WELL-BEING INDEX (Both entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SATISFACTION</th>
<th>0 No satisfaction at all</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10 completely satisfied</th>
<th>Means Scores</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Your standard of living?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Your health?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Your achievements in life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Your personal relationship?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Your safety?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Your connectedness to the community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Your future security?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WEALTH INDEX

On the following box, I am going to ask you the number of assets that you own.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items you own</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Monetary value of the assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Number of radios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Number of television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Number of telephones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Number of cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Number of cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Number of house furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Number of houses roofed with iron sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

OBJECTIVE FOUR: TO DETERMINE THE INFLUENCE OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP ON WOMEN’S WELL-BEING.

36 Does entrepreneurship have any influence to your well-being?
   1 Yes
   2 No

37 If yes, what influence does it have? Please mention them.
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

38 What other factors other than entrepreneurship that influence your well-being?
   Please mention them
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
Appendix 2: A checklist of items for focus group discussions

1. Types of business done by most women entrepreneurs, reasons for doing them and why some women don't have any enterprise
2. Challenges which constrain the enterprises done by women
3. Well-being levels of women entrepreneurs and women who are not entrepreneurs, including indicators of well-being and those of being poor
4. What are the assets that women own and they are regarded as indicators of wealth?
5. Whether women entrepreneurs are satisfied with their levels of well-being?
6. What contribution does entrepreneurship have on women’s well-being?

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION